Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1987

Jesus and the recipients of the kingdom in the child saying.

Mary-Catherine J. B. McKenna
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI®

JESUS AND THE RECIPIENTS OF THE KINGDOM IN THE CHILD SAYING

by

Mary-Catherine J.B. McKenna

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of
Relgious Studies in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts at
the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1987

UMI Number: EC54813

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

87673

ABSTRACT

JESUS AND THE RECIPIENTS OF THE KINGDOM IN THE CHILD SAYING

by Mary-Catherine J.B. McKenna

Within early Christianity there are hints of views which stand in stark contrast to both Hebrew and Graeco-Roman views of children. Since such views permeate the gospel tradition and appear to derive from its earliest strata, it is reasonable to suppose that these anomalies can be traced back in some form to the historical Jesus. This thesis attempts to account for the earliest transmission of a radical child saying of Jesus, prior to its domestication and eventual transformation into less radical sayings. The search for the original form of the saying is prefaced by the recognition of biases inherent in interpretations of contemporary and traditional scholarship, and of those biases inherent in the communities maintaining and transmitting those sayings. The task of reconstructing the original child saying first necessitates defining the place of the child in the milieu of the first century C. E. The elevation of children in the child sayings of Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas do not cohere with the generally negative and demeaning perceptions of children in this time period. The thesis then involves a description and analysis of the ways in which each of these four writers utilizes the saying. The sayings are then situated within the broader redactional or editorial perspective of the author, differentiating between the original intent of Jesus and the subsequent intent of the author/ compiler. Finally, after sifting through various layers of tradition, the thesis moves on to the reconstruction of the child saying. Studies in orality suggest that a linear view of development is non-applicable to the dynamics of oral transmission as oral memory is primarily a memorization of structure. Subsequently, reconstruction involves not the an identification of the original words of Jesus, but the identification of the original structure of the saying. Proposing a recovered saying of Jesus naturally raises the question of authenticity. And so the reconstructed saying is tested against historical critical criteria. The aphorism stands against these tests, and is judged to be authentic. The thesis concludes with a brief analysis of the meaning of this radical child saying, now recovered, for Jesus' contemporaries and for twentieth century North America.

iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. John S. Kloppenborg, neologism detector *par excellance* and exacting scholar, has been kind and patient, and has taught me the art and the science of acedemia. Thank you, John. To Dr. J. Norman King for his sincere concern for children and his clarifying insights, I offer my gratitude. And thank you to Prof. Donna Foley for her boundless enthusiasm, her encouragement, and her ability to make an ancient world come alive.

And I offer my eternal thanks to Joan Donnelly-McKenna, who as a kindred spirit-friend-mother, has walked the long miles with me; and to Madeline McKenna, constant source of swift-kindnesses and gentle presence, who has encouraged me unfailingly over breakfast, lunch and dinner tables; and to Maggie Killoran, whose laughter and loveliness have kept me sane.

To Denise Zakoor, Claire Roy-Weber and Susan Beairsto who encouraged me to know how wide was the world and how deep were the colours of life, thank you.

And to my family, who, both near and far, have been supports, thank you. And especially, I am very grateful to Gavin, Patrick, Patricia, Kaidan (and sib.!) who were listening, gentle and loving during the last frantic moments. And lastly, I am grateful to Hilda, my grandmother, and to all of my foremothers, for being women of courage, perseverence, strength, and women of God.

v

For Joan, Madeline, Maggie and me

vi

LIST OF APPENDICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Within early Christianity there are hints of views which stand in stark contrast to both Hebrew and Graeco-Roman views of children. Since such views permeate the gospel tradition and appear to derive from its earliest strata, it is reasonable to suppose that these anomalies can be traced back in some form to the historical Jesus. However, in the last few decades biblical scholarship has made a concerted methodological attempt to delve behind the text to reconstruct the intentions of Jesus as they are reflected in his sayings and deeds. This thesis will approach the historical Jesus through the optic of the "child" sayings.

The pursuit of this topic is worthwhile for two reasons. First, as an exercise in history of tradition, it seeks to trace the development and changing use of the metaphor of "child" within primitive Christianity, and its distinctiveness when viewed in the context of the Hellenistic world. Second, it is important as a hermeneutical experiment, analogous to recent feminist reconstructions of primitive Christianity. These studies have indicated how androcentric christian tradition and androcentric scholarship have contributed to the obscuring of the role of women in early Christianity. In the face of pervasive androcentrism feminist scholarship attempts to identify hermeneutical and editorial agendas, showing how such agendas obscure the reports of history. Similarly, the extent to which modern values and agendas influenced the investigation and interpretation of historical data is also evident in the studies of ancient slavery. Moses I. Finley says,

> ... other contemporary ideological considerations are active in that seemingly remote
> field of historical study — active in the sense that they underlie, and even direct,
> what often appears to be a purely 'factual', 'objective' presentation. For that reason,
> the disagreements in this field are also profound, the controversies conducted
> polemically. I believe that a full, open account of how modern interest in ancient
> slavery has manifested itself is a necessary prerequisite to the substantive analysis
> of the institution itself ...[1]

-1-

It is conceivable and, I believe arguable, that an originally radical or revolutionary use of the metaphor of "child" existed at early levels of the tradition, but that the progressive institutionalisation, Romanisation, and hierarchalization of the church on the one hand, and modern cultural and social values, on the other, have tended to obscure or render invisible such views. Redress of this situation is possible, at least in part, by showing the extent to which Jesus' sayings about children cohere fully with and reflect other aspects of his preaching of the kingdom, and are not merely historical oddities or footnotes to the this preaching.

Any attempt to ascertain Jesus' original use of the "child" sayings necessitates defining more fully the place of the child in the milieu in which the sayings originated. This task includes both actual roles which children occupied in religion and society and the religious function of "child" as a metaphor within various salvific schemas.

The focus of this thesis will be, then, the diversity of uses of the metaphor "child" present within the earliest Christian tradition: the Synoptic Gospels and Thomas, and, to the extent that they can be recovered, the teachings of Jesus. The scope of the thesis is both literary or redaction critical and tradition-historical. This thesis involves (a) a description and analysis of the way(s) in which each of the four writers, Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas, utilizes "child" in the context of sayings of Jesus; (b) an accounting of the variety of usages of the metaphor by situating each usage within the broader redactional or editorial perspective of the author distinguishing between the original intent of Jesus, the subsequent intent of the author and the later intent of the early church; and (c) the reconstruction of the original child saying "matrix."

The variety and diversity of the "child" sayings in early Christian literature suggests that attempts to determine one original child "saying" of Jesus may be unrealistic. John Dominic Crossan attempts to construct not an original saying but an original structure

or matrix. In his critique of Norman Perrin's attempts to determine an original saying of Jesus Crossan distinguishes between <u>ipsissima verba</u> and <u>ipsissima structura</u>. He concludes that oral memory is "a memorization primarily of structure" and that the "basic unit of transmission is... at best and at most, the ipsissima structura"[2] Thus, one cannot find the "original wording" of a saying, since a cheirographic, linear view of the development of tradition is non-applicable to the dynamics of orality. It is in the determining of the original structure that one becomes capable of explaining the diversity of interpretations. I will make use of Crossan's insight that the structure originating these varied traditions will be that "which best explains the multiplicity engendered in the tradition."[3]

To propose a recovered aphorism of Jesus naturally raises the issue of authenticity, i.e., whether the child saying could go back to Jesus, and if so, in what sense did he intend the term "child" and how does this relate to "kingdom." I will employ the standard criteria for authenticity (the criterion of multiple attestation, of coherence, and that of linguistic and environmental tests, and will make use of five more criteria added by recent historical critics (i.e., multiple forms, tendencies of the developing tradition, modification, plausible traditiongeschichte, and hermeneutical potential).[4]

I am interested, then, in accounting for the earliest transmission of the radical child-saying, prior to its domestication and eventual transformation into less radical sayings. As such, this project will contribute to contemporary scholarship's "new quest for the historical Jesus," and will situate the child aphorism within Jesus' other dominical sayings. In the light of feminist scholarship the search for the earliest form of the saying will be prefaced by the recognition of biases inherent in the interpretations of contemporary and traditional scholarship, and of those biases inherent in the communities maintaining and engendering the Jesus tradition. Moreover, this study provide yet another means of determining the message of the child saying for our time. The question of whether or not the saying is indeed either relevant or applicable to twentieth century North America can then be addressed.

[1]Moses I. Finley, Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology (New York: Viking Books, 1980) 9-10.

[2]John Dominic Crossan, In Fragments (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983) 37, 40.

[3]This phrase is taken from John Dominic Crossan, "Divine Immediacy and Human Immediacy," an unpublished paper delivered at the Fall of 1985 meeting on the National Seminar on the Sayings of Jesus, St. Meinrad's, IN.

[4]See Norman Perrin's The New Testament: An Introduction (Chicago: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974) 281, 282. The criterion of dissimilarity is inapplicable to the recovered matrix. The environmental test is coupled with that of coherence. For the remaining criteria see M. Eugene Boring, "The Historical-Critical Method's "Criteria for Authenticity'," Foundations and Facets: Forum 1 (1985) 7-20.

Chapter One: Child in Antiquity

The synoptic gospels and the Gos. Thom. contain views of children which stand in stark contrast to those implicit in Graeco-Roman and Hebrew traditions of late antiquity. To understand more fully the radical nature of the child sayings in these gospels it is necessary to situate this early tradition in the milieux in which it originated. Such a task will include viewing both the actual roles which children occupied in religion and society as well as the religious function of "child" within various salvific schemas.

A. The Empire in its Diversity

The Mediterranean world of late antiquity was one of cultural and religious diversity, maintaining plurality under the guise of political unity. De jure Rome ruled the nest in the "superimposing ... [of] ... Roman government on top of native government in the provinces or by recognizing a client king."[1] In this manner Rome united the whole of the Mediterranean sea-board, the West (which was itself primarily Roman), and the East (which included the Graeco-Oriental civilisations).[2] Taxation and the situating of armed garrisons throughout the Empire effected Rome's constant presence in the lives and minds of its subjects. Political allegiance to Rome was reciprocated by the assurance of Rome's protection of the provinces from foreign invasion.[3]

De facto, however, the distinctive facets of Roman civilisation were dimmed in the light of the social and religious elements of those non-Roman cultures within the Empire. It is notable that the diversity of this early Mediterranean world is the logical consequence of the interaction of various cultures and ideologies upon each other. For

> [w]hen civilisations are thus thrown into a single cauldron, the result of
> the process of fusion is inevitably different from all or any one of the
> constituent elements, though it is probable that one, in virtue of its special

circumstance or quality will predominate in the composite product.[4]

Greek culture was preponderant in this pluralistic world. Koine Greek dominated, for example, the fields of commerce, literature and international affairs.[5] The politically conquered became the cultural victors as Greek culture permeated the Empire.

But even given the prominent Greek influence, diversity still characterized the nature of the Empire. Each province retained its native language, and the Roman state religion functioned alongside native cults.[6]

Recognition, at least in some form, of the Empire's state religion was fundamental to the existence and efficaciousness of Roman rule.[7] Roman state religion deified its "lawgiver." Acknowledging the validity of Rome's religious tradition inevitably granted the Roman emperor authority in both the social and the political spheres.

Flourishing alongside the Roman state religion was a multitude of religions and institutions having roots in cultures as diverse as those of Italy, Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor.[8] The beliefs and practices current in the Hellenistic period, and relevant to this study include private religions, the aforementioned state cult, the mystery religions and (enigmatic to the Roman eye) the tradition of the Jews.

Private religions were very much compatible with the imposed Roman religion. In the Graeco-Roman world such individualized beliefs generally centered in the home and "consisted in the worship of household deities, who were expected to protect the family from disaster and each member of the family from illness."[9] Astrology, similarly, was practiced as a privatized religion.[10] Hero worship, the deification of those humans born within the divine state (i.e., as a result of an indiscretion of the gods), also functioned in as a private religion, and would not interfere with allegiance to the Roman state god.[11]

Mystery religions were less readily accepted by Roman authorities, as their secretive practices, and their accompanying disharmony with Roman social rules, posed something of a threat.[12] On a general level mystery religions are important to this study as they functioned within the diverse reality of the Mediterranean world and, at least subtly, may have influenced the mind of Hellenistic individuals. More specifically, however, such religions inevitabley challenged Roman presuppositions regarding the place of "child."

Unique to the religions of this period was the Jewish insistence on monotheism. Because of its unique perception regarding the divine destiny of Israel, Judaism's retention of its national identity and religious practices prevented a full assimilation of Roman, Greek and other Near-Eastern customs.[13] Such an intractable stance did little to endear the Jewish peoples to their neighbours amidst the religious pluralism of the Hellenized world. More importantly for the Romans, the covenant of the Jewish peoples with their God (i.e., Ex 20:20) excluded full participation in the religious-political-economic system of the Empire. Although the Jews were at times the recipients of special favours, an uneasy peace existed between the Empire and the Jewish peoples. [14]

B. Child within Antiquity

It is very clear at the beginning that any analysis of "child" in antiquity must acknowledge the diversity of cultures and ideologies. There were, however, common perceptions which directly impinged upon the view of children. Especially significant to this study are the concepts of honor/ shame, progeniture, chastity, and the unique valuation of children found within Judaism. And the emphasis on honor/ shame and progeniture could very well be applicable to infants, adolescents, and adult "children" within late antiquity.[15]

An honor/ shame system and a concern with the begetting of children were common to the Graeco-Roman and Hebrew cultures. In the Greek perception of child chastity was a prominent consideration. The high valuation of children in the Jewish tradition stands in stark contrast to other traditions. Each of these four perceptions contributed strongly to a view of children that accompanied, sometimes complementing and sometimes in contrast to, the connotations of weakness, irrationality, defencelessness and simplicity associated with children in antiquity.[16]

1. Honor and Shame

Attempting to understand the role and function of children within late antiquity necessitates first gleaning a vision of family and social life. Bruce J. Malina in his study of the New Testament world observes that this period of late antiquity was shaped by the cultural pattern of honor/ shame.[17] This pattern normally exists in a system of dyadic ersonality formation wherein the individual is always seen as part of a group. Personality, then, is defined in terms of group estimation (honor) and influence in the group (status). The fundamental concern with honor links together what Malina calls the "boundary markers" of power, sexual status and religion. Power, existing in a symbolic form, is embodied in "the ability to exercise control over the behavior of others."[18] Likewise, Malina defines religion in terms of power, but includes in this category socially appropriate "respect and homage" due those who have virtual control over one's existence. Finally, sexual status involves the comportment and functions demanded of each gender. All three components of the honor/ shame system were operative in antiquity's view of children.

A. "Power" and "Religion"

The emphasis on "power-over" was significant for the child of late antiquity. Demarcations were important for the whole of society, and transgression of societal order was considered a serious crime. Plato's (428 B.C.E.-347 B.C.E) Athenian stranger speaks eloquently against the concept of complete liberty by citing the catastrophic events

generated in a disordered world.

> [B]ase effrontery ... is brought about by a liberty that is audacious to excess
> ... Next after this form of liberty would come that which refuses to be subject
> to the rulers; and following on that, the shirking of submission to one's
> parents and elders and their admonitions; then, as the penultimate stage,
> comes the effort to disregard the laws; while the last stage of all is to
> lose respect for oaths and privileges or divinities.[19]

Disruption of order on one level would inevitably threaten the existing order of other social stratas, in an ancient corollary of the "domino-effect." Submission of one level to the next was paramount for the maintenance of the economic, political and social structure of late antiquity.

Focussing more specifically on familial life, David L. Balch reflects that within this era there existed three fundamental relational household pairs, those of master-slave, husband-wife and parent-child.[20] In the parent-child dyad the place of the child ranked lowest. "Power-over" was thus granted to the parent, while the religious duty of the child included such attitudes and behaviours as submission, obeisence, honour and respect, etc. Each party of the respective household pairs was enjoined to remember his/ her appropriate place. The interdependent nature of these various dyads is exhibited in the following citation of Stobaeus, who opines,

> We have summarily shown how we ought to conduct ourselves toward our
> kindred, having before taught how we should act towards ourselves, our
> parents, and brothers, and besides those, towards our wife and children.[21]

In this light, the numerous exhortations of this period, addressed to both children and parents, emphasizing the importance each party's respective place, come not as a surprise.[22]

It is notable that in antiquity the degree to which parents had "power-over" their children was often a point of debate. On one extreme children were exhorted "to obey parents even if the parent ... [were] ... insane."[23] Hierocles links parents with the gods.

All children, even adult children, are to honor their parents as gods, providing food, a bed, sleeping quarters, unctions, a bath and a garment.[24] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in the Augustan period, observes that even the Roman judicial system could not interfere in the rights of power of a father over his son. Describing the death sentence of a father upon his "recalcitrant" progeny, Dionysius relates that "none present [in the Forum], neither consul, tribune, nor the very populace, which was flattered by them and thought all power inferior to its own, could rescue them."[25] A parent, in actual fact the father, had full rights over the destiny of the child. Such power existed not only during childhood but extended into adulthood.

> But the lawgiver of the Romans give virtually full power to the father over his son, even during his whole life, whether he thought proper to imprison him at work in the fields, or to put him to death, and this even though the son were already engaged in public affairs.[26]

Not unexpected, then, is the role of the father-vendor. Dionysius of Halicarnuss relates certain circumstances which obviate the right of the father to use his children as legal tender, noting that, "(i)f a father gives his son leave to marry a woman who by the law is to be sharer of his sacred rights and possessions, he shall no longer have the power of selling his son."[27] Thus the extent of the father's power over his children stretched beyond childhood, and included determining the right of his daughter or son to live.[28]

In the established social ladder of late antiquity children were relegated to the lowest rungs. It is in this respect that the synoptic pericopae with which we are dealing seem most at odds with their environment. Most strikingly different is Mark 9:33-37 in which children's status is apparently elevated significantly over adults. This elevation stands in immediate contrast to the "power-over" system described as pervasive of antiquity.[29]

B. "Sexual Status"

The final category proposed by Malina, that of sexual status is implicitly applicable to the place of the child in late-antiquity. It is apparent that through the optic of a patriarchal culture, the valuing of males over females has strong ramifications for importance of a child's gender, and his/ her subsequent rights to education, to inheritance, etc. Furthermore, the gender of the child was of consideration in regards to the absolute right of the parent to decide whether or not a child would live.

Lineage within patriarchal systems is carried through the male. The three major traditions relevant to this study of children, Roman, Greek and Jewish, function within this structure. The traditional view of Judaism, however, is not patriarchal, but matrilineal. In late antiquity the lines of family heritage, (i.e., land, name) were carried through male progeny. Indeed such inheritance proceedings would result in a stronger valuing of male children within an economic, social and political realm. The practice of infanticide makes most apparent the devaluation of female children.

The practice of "casting out" one's child involved leaving a newborn to its own devices, abandoning it in the wild where she/ he would die of starvation, exposure, or as the prey of some wild animal. This custom was so widespread that an Egyptian labourer Hilarian (circa 1 B. C. E.) writing to his pregnant wife exhorts, "I beg and entreat you, take care of the little one ... If by chance you bear a child, if it is a boy, let it be; if it is a girl, cast it out ... "[30]

Hans-Reudi Weber concludes that although cultic motives may have been influential upon child exposure, it was poverty that would have dictated such a practice.[31] Many lived on a subsistence level. It is even possible that the devaluing of progeny, resulting in low population growth, may also have contributed to the practice. Although some of the Caesars encouraged families to bear children, exposure of children, especially female

children, was nonetheless practiced.[32]

At a very early age gender could be the determinant in one's right to existence, and at the very least, to the quality of life lead within a familial setting. The phenomenon of valuing sons over daughters is common to all three major religious and cultural traditions aforementioned.[33] It is notable that in the child passages which we will be considering the issue of gender is not a concern. The children of the synoptics and the child of Thomas are not named as either male or female. In a milieu which attaches value to gender the pericopae in question again present an element of contrast.

2. Progeniture

The presence of the system of honor/ shame, marked by the various aspects of power, religion, and sexual status, is axiomatic to the understanding of child within antiquity. Linked with this mentality was the concern with reproduction, an issue which affects each and every culture. The harsh realities of a high rate of infant mortality, innumerable wars, an unpredictable environment and like factors threatened not only the quality of life, but the continuance of life itself. And linked to the production of children was the inter-generational maintenance of a socio-economic and political system. Progeniture was therefore culturally important in regards to ideological (i.e., economic, political, religious) perpetuity.

The issue of progeniture in antiquity is one of contrasts. Positive and negative attitudes toward the begetting of children stand side by side. Furthermore, an analysis of this issue necessitates viewing the topic on both familial, social, economic and political levels.

First, on a communal and familial level the children of an agrarian community would obviously contribute to the economic prosperity of their kindred through such daily tasks

as field labour. Second, within the familial sphere, reproduction was significant as an insurance policy for parents, who would eventually reach a point of economic incapacity. Children existed, then, as the Hellenistic equivalent to a contemporary pension plan installment. And finally as previously implied male progeny were important as descendence was traced through the sons.

Various works of this period allude to the political nature of progeny. With rather religious overtones, and implicitly political, is a petition in <u>Hymns</u> of Horace (65 B.C.E.-8 C.E.). The supplicants anticipate the gods' granting of fecundity, and "pray to be prolific in new offspring."[34] Exemplifying the political function of progeny was the phenomenon of Roman leaders granting provisions to those prolific in the bearing of children. At the beginnning of the Imperial period (approximately 31 B.C.E.) Suetonius (70-130 C.E.) observes that in the Imperial period " ... to those of the commons who could lay claim to legitimate sons or daughters when he [Augustus] made his rounds he distributed a thousand sesterces for each child."[35] Later, under Hadrian (76-138 C. E.), children were again the cause of additional appropriations made to families.[36] Similarly, various texts testify to the practice of granting sums of monies to newly founded institutions for orphaned boys and girls who lived on the streets.[37] The success of the Empire, in both a cultural and an economic sense, depended on its continuation from one generation to the next.

Of course, not all regarded children as a blessing. From a somewhat earlier period, the importance of progeny is contested by Propertius, who suggests that children are the least desirable consequence of love.

> How should I furnish children to swell our country's triumphs? ... Thou only
> pleasest me; let me in like manner, Cynthia, be thy only pleasure: love such
> as this will be worth more to me than the name of father."[38]

In a similar vein, Hesiod (c. 700 B. C. E.) opines that "(t)here should only be one son, to feed his father's house ... " for "more hands mean more work and more increase."[39]

Perhaps most telling of the attitudes concerning progeny, specifically within the elite of Roman society, are the statements of Suetonius concerning Augustus' prohibitions of celibacy. Because of the dangerous decline in birth-rates amongst the Senatorial class Augustus enforced laws expelling individuals from the Roman aristocracy on the grounds of not producing children.[40]

Concern with progeny appears to have been, at least on one level, of a political nature. It is as equally obvious that children were not consistently perceived as assets, either political, individual, social or economic, to the developing Empire. The general lack of interest in the begetting of children, certainly apparent within the Roman nobility, is indicated by the low birth rate in the Senatorial class. And irrespective of the motives, the phenomenon of infanticide (via child exposure) leads to the conclusion that children as progeny were not an absolute value.

In conclusion, concern with progeniture marked antiquity's view of children. Many perceptions regarding the necessity of child production reflect various political, social and economic stances. It is significant that in regards to the issue of progeny children are valued (or non-valued, as the case may be) not in and of themselves, but for their contribution to the maintenance of a predetermined system. And again the synoptics and Thomas are at variance with the emphases of late antiquity. Nowhere within the texts is there evidence that the children are valued merely as progeny. In fact, there are hints that even behind the texts lies a high regard for children that cannot be dismissed as of mere editorial nature.

Co-existing with the common cultural concern with progeny are varying perceptions

of children originating from the disparate religions of the Hellenized world. Two such points of divergence are preeminent in late antiquity. First, from Greek culture can be found an emphasis on chastity which pervades the understanding of child specifically within a salvific schema. And second, from within Hebrew tradition is a fundamental valuing of children which were signs of the Covenant, and were intrinsically of worth.

3. Chastity and the Greeks

References to chastity pervade reports of the religious schemas of the early Greeks. Cultic practices involved facilitation of rites performed only by those who were chaste. Arthur Darby Nock offers the explanation that "the ancients believed that numerous sacred functions could only be performed by one who was qualified for them by perfect continence."[41] Such stringent requirements for cultic ministry led to the appointment of vestal virgins, to the self-mutilation of eunuchs, to the temporary vows of abstinence made by husbands or wives, and finally, to the employment of pre-puberts in the ministerial realm.[42]

It is significant that this emphasis on chastity does not derive from ascription of godly powers to purity. Rather, the Greek view of chastity was founded in an anthropology that regarded sexual intercourse as impure.[43] One result of such a perception was the practice of temporary continence of married persons during specific sacred seasons, during war and during sacred acts. And perhaps most significant in this mentality for an appreciation of its ramifications upon children is the perception that "(a)bstinence helps people to approach the deity."[44]

What Nock observes as the "negative chastity of the eunuch," finds contrast in the more positive purity found in both the child and the virgin.[45] The virgin and the pure child are not considered as sexual abstainers, but exist in a primordially uncorrupted

sexual state. The eunuch, on the other hand, has had to transform himself to attain such purity.[46] It is notable, however, that neither the child nor the eunuch received respect comparable with that given to a virgin priestess. On one hand the legitimacy of the state of the virgin was consistent with more ancient Greek practices. The chastity of the pre-pubert and the self-made eunuch, on the other, was probably seen by a number of Greeks as an alien importation into proper religious customs, as it did not harken back to ancient Greek tradition.[47]

The ministerial functions of children within the cult varied from religious begging to performance of sacral rites including servile duties, intercessory processions, ritual cleansing and supplications to the gods.[48] An example of children's participation is found in Tacitus' Histories in which he limns one facet of the ceremony involved in the restoration of the Capitol. "(T)hen the Vestals, accompanied by boys and girls whose fathers and mothers were living, sprinkled the area with water drawn from fountains and streams."[49] Iamblichus notes that

> ... boys were most dear to the divinity, and hence in times of great draught
> they were sent to cities to implore rain from the Gods, in consequence of
> the persuasion that the divinity is especially attentive to children ... From
> this cause also, the most philanthropic of the Gods, Apollo and Love, are
> universally represented as having the age of boys."[50]

It is noteworthy and somewhat perplexing that in these ancient cults one prerequisite to a child's participation was the stipulation that his/her parents be living. This finds ample attestation throughout ancient literature.[51]

In yet other cultic ministries children functioned as priestesses and priests. Pausanias writes that "(t)he priestess is a maiden, who holds office until she reaches the age to marry."[52] The factor of marriage was an important religious and social boundary for the Greeks of the cultus, and thus received special emphasis. Catullus scribes,

> Under Diana's care are we,
> girls and boys unmarried.
> Of Diana let us sing
> unmarried girls and boys.[53]

Multiple attestations point to the demarcation between the prepubescent cultic minister and the former, marriageable minister. Pausanias (circa second century C.E.) observes that "(t)he priest of Athena is a boy: I do not know how long his priesthood lasts, but it must be before, not after, puberty."[54] The male child could be priest until his entrance into puberty, or colloquially, until "the beard began to grow."[55] His counterpart, the female child is as well not eligible for priestesshood upon reaching a marriageable age. Presumably this would be marked by her entrance into puberty, most probably signalled by menarche. In the eye of the ancient Greeks the importance of the distinction between prepubescence and adulthood must not be underestimated. This demarcation has ramifications within both a religious and a social realm.

Considering the emphasis on sexual purity, it is somewhat paradoxical that "the pure child or maiden appears in ceremonies intended to promote fertility."[56] Notwithstanding the importance of chastity to the Greeks, it is apparent that fecundity offered attractions that were, if not similar, at least as potent as a life of sexual "purity." Perhaps the contrast between a prepubescent state and a potentially fertile one, encountered in the concern with prepubescent priests/esses, points to the two institutions of religion and family life. The demands of both institutions are served by the pervasive emphasis on sexuality.

As has been demonstrated the metaphor of chastity for children functioned within the ancient Greek's salvific schema, as children metaphorically and literally embodied the sexually unsullied. Children as the embodiment of chastity were considered to be more cultically efficacious in their supplication of the gods than were those who were sexually

impure. On a very obvious level, because of their prepubescent state, children were most

differentiated from those able to fully partake in coitus. Sexual purity was cultically

important for girls and boys, rather than for babes or toddlers. No doubt this was at

least due partially, and pragmatically, to the demands of rituals.

It is notable that the mainstream Christian tradition did not absorb the Greek cultic

elevation of children <u>via</u> chastity. Yet in the <u>Gos. Thom.</u> is revealed a similar interest

in chastity and children. Like the religious traditions of the early Greeks we can see

in Thomas the tendency to associate children with purity. In fact, it is in this gospel

that children are linked with asexuality. Thomas uses this association within a salvific

schema and Thomas furthers the signification of child from those sexually pure to those

who are asexual.

4. <u>The Hebrew Valuing of Children</u>

The second relevant element encountered in the writings of antiquity which stands

alone can be traced to the Hebrew tradition of the valuing of children, which may be

linked to the problems of survival of a small nomadic tribe. Arising out of this valuation

of life was the perception of children as gift of God.[57] This moral stance most probably

has a strong basis in the covenant binding God to Israel, where children were to be

a sign of the faithfulness of God.[58] The various haggadic traditions regarding children

are indicative of the strong link between the presence of children and the commitment

of God. For example, R. Judah writes

> The Sanhedrin were exiled but the Shechinah [Spirit of God] did not go
> into exile with them. The priestly watches were exiled but the Shechinah
> did not go into exile with them. When, however, the little children were
> exiled, the Shechinah went into exile with them.[59]

It is not improbable that the apocalyptic metaphor of reversal is hinted at in this midrash,

nor that the midrash itself is devoid of rhetorical purpose. But germane to this study

is the very fact that "the little children" are closely linked with the Shechinah. The God of Israel and children are forever bound in the Covenant.

These valuations of children have social manifestations. It is not suprising that in the eyes of first century C.E. Jews, abortion, infanticide and birth control were seen as morally abhorrent.[60] The social implications of this standpoint, are, however, in strinking contrast to the practices of the majority of the Hellenized world. Although the "casting out" of children was by no means uncommon in antiquity, the Hebrew peoples' assertion of the valuing of children prohibited such measures. Tacitus writes that the Jews "regard it as a crime to kill any late-born child."[61]

It is significant that Jews did not practice infanticide even upon their daughters, as their contemporaries were wont. This fact does not imply that female chilren were of equal or greater value than their male counterparts. Philo of Alexandria (30 B.C.E.-40 C.E.), a Hellenized Jew whom Balch describes as "the Jewish status quo," was more than willing, for example, to assert the importance of the male child over his female counterpart.[62] Although denigration of female children did occur, that they were even granted the possibility of life is significant. This guarding and valuing of life was also found within the realm of pregnancy. The possiblity of miscarriage was recognized and women were admonished to take measures guarding against such an occurence.[63]

The Jewish tradition of the valuing children is significant for this study. The unusual stance of the Hellenized Jews speaks for the maintenance of their tradition when the practice of infanticide may have been expedient.[64] Of course, children were traditionally important within Jewish history. The roots of the Jews were strongly linked to that small band of Canaanites struggling to survive, and to the later Tribes of Israel which eked out their existence in a similarly harsh world. Children historically ensured survival of the race. Nonetheless, there is ample testimony to the temptations to infanticide offered

the Jews of antiquity.

5. Children as Deficient

It was, of course, common in all three traditions for children to be described in terms of intellectual deficiency. No doubt this was at least partially due to the high premium placed on rationality. Children were considered as mentally lacking. Satirizing the superstitious nature of some cultic rituals, Prudentius (c. 348- c. 405 C. E.) symbolizes the unthinking nature of superstition vis a vis a child. He begins his argument thus:

> The little one had looked at a figure in the shape of Fortune ... and watched
> his mother pale-faced in prayer before it. Then, raised on his nurses' shoulder,
> he too pressed his lips to the flint, and rubbed it, asking for riches from
> a sightless stone, and convinced that all wishes must be sought from thence.[65]

It is perhaps in the Pauline works that are most readily found derogatory allusions to the assumed simplicity of children. Ephesians 4:14 notes how easily swayed are children. Paul also exhorts the Corinthian church to "not be children (παιδία) in your thinking; be babes (νηπιάζειν) in evil but in thinking be mature"(1 Cor 14:20a, RSV).[66] Paul's denegration of children finds immediate contrast in the Q text 10:21-22 in which babes (here νηπίοις) are those to whom will be revealed the secrets of the kingdom. The place of honor given to children in the early sayings material has disappeared in the Pauline corpus. Rather, Paul's view is like that of his contemporaries.

A child's deficiencies extend beyond the realm of the rational. Children were thought to have no sense of joy or suffering, and even what at first blush appears to be positive perceptions of children in Jewish culture reflects, upon further exposure, views of children akin to the majority of those of late antiquity.[67] Such views effected children being viewed as immature adults, as exemplified in the art of this period.[68] Plato (c. 429-347 B.C.E.) writes "of all wild young things a boy is the most difficult to handle ... (H)e is

the craftiest, most mischievous, and unruliest of brutes. So the creature must be held in check, as we may say, by more than one bridle."[69] Plato further attributes to children "motley apetites and pleasures and pains."[70] Dio Chrysostom (c. 40- c. 112 C.E.) refers to the naturally lazy nature of children.[71] Contrasting with the Greek religious valuation of children (based in their sexual purity) was the mentality found within the Hebrew and Christian traditions that children were recipients of universal sin and guilt, and thus marked by that same sin and guilt. Compounding this perception was the view that children were considered to be lacking in a sense of [religious] discernment.[72]

The social irrelevancy attributed to children implicit within the aforementioned writings does not account for the importance of children within any cultural schema (i.e., progeniture, maintenance and transmission of culture, ready labour). The emphasis on children's non-value, does, however, speak to the multivalent metaphors of children as untaught, undisciplined, uninitiated, weak and undisciplined within various salvific schemas.[73] Undoubtedly there is an intrinsic connection between the social denigration of children and their either negative (e.g., weak) or etherial (i.e., asexual) metaphorical imagings within salvific schemas. In each case the child is not seen as important in and of her/ himself, but rather embodies characteristics denounced or esteemed by the culture and religious traditions.

C. Conclusions

It is of no great surprise to find such a variety of views regarding the nature and function of children within late antiquity. The points of commonality are equally not surprising. Situating the child within the milieu posed by late antiquity offers first a view of the diverse cultures encompassed by the Hellenized sea-board. It is from within this diversity that some commonalities become apparent. First, the honor/ shame system

pervading antiquity links the three major cultures of Greece, Rome and Judea. Basic to this system are the elements of power, religion and sexual status. Second, the inevitable concern with progeniture is significant to each of the three main religious traditions. Yet a third element is relevant. Differentiating Greek views of children from both Roman and Jewish usages is the function of children as chaste within salvific schemas. A fourth factor germane to this study is the Jewish divergence from the Hellenistic practice of infanticide, and an accompanying perception of children as having intrinsic value. Last, the views of children as imbecilic, and immature, are prevalent and as such find attestation in the literature, poetry and art of late antiquity.

It is appparent on the whole that the children of late antiquity were culturally viewed as non-beings. Their rights were non-existent.[74] They retained the lowest place in the social sphere. Characteristics of least social value were attributed to them. The value of children resided in what they could offer in terms of submission, progeniture and sexual purity. Excepting the Hebrew tradition, there was no implicit valuing of children.

It is at this point that Jesus' estimation of children does stand in stark contast to the views of his time. Even at first glance our pericopae elevate children in a manner unlike Jesus' contemporaries. The children are not only valued because they are alive (in keeping with the Jewish tradition), but they are presented to us in Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas as noteworthy models.

The task at hand is to now situate the various redactional intentions of Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas within the milieux observed. The points of divergence of each of the authors from their contemporaries' views of children will provide clues as to the original nature of the child sayings presented in these canonical and extra-canonical texts. Mark, as the earliest of the canonical gospels, will first be the focus of our attention.

[1]Joseph B. Tyson, A Study of Early Christianity (New York: Macmillan/London: Collier-Macmillan, 1973), 57.

[2]W. R. Halliday, The Pagan Background of Early Christianity (New York: Cooper Square, 1970), 147-148.

[3]Tyson, A Study, 57-58.

[4]Halliday, The Pagan Background, 146-147.

[5]Tyson, A Study, 58.

[6]Tyson, A Study, 58. As an interesting aside, it is not improbable that throughout the provinces, in various pockets of religious, political and cultural resistance, Rome's deities were worshipped in name only, or not at all.

[7]See H. R. Willoughby, Pagan Regeneration (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1929) 15, who states that "the primary function of [Roman] religion was to serve the interests of the state and that as a guarantee of political prosperity the rites of religion were potent in the extreme."

[8]See M. Rostovtzeff (Rome, trans. J. D. Duff, ed. Elias J. Bickerman [London, Oxford, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960] 291-317) on religious development within the Roman Empire within the first three centuries C. E. Rostovtzeff also studies the social and economic development within the first and second century Empire (p. 248-265). Note that childlessness was already a social reality within this era.

[9]Tyson, A Study, 76.

[10]It is notable that in under Roman law sorcery was prohibited. Astrology, however, was a strong practice in Roman society, even into the fourth century. See Ambrose, Exameron 4.4.13, and Exameron 4.5.34 on astrology.

[11]See Tyson, A Study, 76, who gives a cursory analysis of these various religious orientations.

[12]Joseph B. Tyson observes three qualities common to such religions, involving first the element of mystery, a second component apotheosis (by which the initiant is divinized), and a final common concern with redemption. Some significant mystery religions are the Dionysian and Orphic religions, the Eleusian mysteries, the cult of the Great Mother, that of Mithras, and finally, the worship of Isis and Osiris. See Tyson, A Study, 79-80.

[13]However much Judaism resisted acculturation, it is doubtful that the tradition itself escaped unscathed from the cultural bombardment of the Hellenized world. It is worth noting that not all Jews were opposed to embracing the diverse elements of their milieu. See for example, A History of the Jewish People, ed. H. H. Ben-Sasson, trans. George Weidenfeld (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1969, repr. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1976), 197.

[14]The isolation of Judaism in its refusal to assimilate the religions of a pluralistic world inspired inevitable ill-feeling. For example, according to the historican Tacitus (d. c. 117 C.E.), Jews reverse all Roman customs, regarding "as profane all that we hold sacred; and on the other hand, they permit all that we abhor." Tacitus, Histories 5.4; Loeb 5:179; and 5.5 Loeb 5:183. Note that consistent with Roman state concerns Tacitus views negatively the self-imposed cultural and religious isolation of the Jews. From a purely historical standpoint it is erroneous to presume that Jewish traditions arose from a reversal of Roman practices. Yet the refusal to become acculturated, at least by means of religion, marked Judaism in the eyes of its polytheistic contemporaries.

[15]For the purposes of this study late antiquity will denote that period of time between second century B. C. E. and third century C. E.

[16]Miscellaneous allusions to children within this time period include; 1. references to a Graecian child-God figure. See Oepke, "παῖς," 640 n. 12. Oepke refers to the work of O. Kern, Religion der Griechen, I (1926), 129-130, 134, 121.; 2. references to the use of children as entertainment for the Roman aristocracy. See, again, Oepke who notes the presence of "deliciae" or slave children who were eaten by beasts as a means of entertaining the audience. Oepke, "παῖς," 641.; 3. references to the mantic powers of children. See, for example, Plutarch (46-c. 120 C.E.), Iside et Osiride 14.356E who recounts the aetiological legend of Isis encountering children who provided her important information. Subsequently, "the Egyptians believe that children have the power of divination, and they take omens especially from children's shouts as they play near the temple and say whatever occurs to them." See Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride, ed. J. Gwyn Griffiths (Wales: U. of Wales Press, 1970), 139, 141. See also Pliny the Elder, Natural History 8.46.185; Loeb 3:129, 131.

[17]Bruce J. Malina, The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981) 25-48. In articulating cultural anthropology of the first century Malina applies the concept of honor/ shame to all social groups. I would suggest that the honor/ shame was indeed present within these social groups (e.g. Roman, Greek, Hebrew) in varying strengths.

[18]Malina, The New Testament, 26.

[19]Plato, Laws 3.701; Loeb 249.

[20]This is fairly treated in David L. Balch's recent study of the the presence and the effects of such dyads. For his excellent analysis see Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter SBLMS 26 (Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1981).

[21]Stobaeus, Anthologium 4, ed. O. Hense (1958) as cited in D. Balch, Let Wives, 4. Aristotle's (438 -322 B.C.E.) analysis on the internal dynamics present within various facets of these groups is interesting. He notes that the relation between parents and children is monarchic in nature, while between husband and wife an aristocratic system is in effect. Finally, children interact with each other democratically. See Nicomachean Ethics 1160B 23-25, 32-33; 1161A 3-4 as cited in Balch, Let Wives, 42.

[22]See for example, the exhortations in Col 3:18-4:1 and Eph 5:21-6:9; See also Philo, The Decalogue, 65 where children are definitively the lower element of the parent-child pair, and in Apology for the Jews 7.3; Loeb 9:425; and 7.5; Loeb 9:425 where "[p]arents must have power over their children." In a more religious context, the submission of one element to the other is exemplified in Clement of Alexandria, Exhortation to Endurance [or To the Newly Baptized] (tractate unnumbered); Loeb 373 where individuals are exhorted to "submit to [your] elders just as to fathers."

[23]Balch, Let Wives, 7 n. 66. Balch cites the Neopythagorean Perictone, On the Harmony of a Woman 145.13, found in The Pythagorean Text of the Hellenistic Period, ed. Holger Thesleff (Acta Academie Aboensis Ser. A., Humanoriora 30; Abo: Abo Akademie, 1965) 145, 13. It is significant that the extant sayings of Jesus do not deal with material regarding the appropriate comportment of children, a topic of concern in antiquity. This phenomenon is also witnessed in the absence of conventional wisom literature about women. For a treatment of these and other omissions see Charles E. Calrson, "Proverbs, Maxims, and the Historical Jesus," JBL 99/1 (1980) 87-105.

[24]Hierocles 4.642 ed. by O. Hense, and as cited by Balch in Let Wives 3 n. 23.

[25]Dionysius of Halicarnuss, The Roman Antiquities, 2.26.5; Loeb 1:389. See also the whole of 2.26.1-16; Loeb 1:387,389 which describes, in detail, the phenomenon of fathers having "power-over" their sons.

[26]Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Rom. Ant. 2.216.4; Loeb 1:387.

[27]Here Dionysius of Halicarnuss refers to the laws cited by Numa Pompilius, after which Dionysius notes that "he [Numa Pompilius] would never have written this unless the father had by all former laws the power of selling his son." Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Rom. Ant. 2.27.4; Loeb 1:393. See also 2.27.1; Loeb 1:389.

[28]Musonius, in Must One Obey One's Parents in All Circumstances 16, refutes the ultimate power of a father over his child and grants that children do other than their father's wishes in certain circumstances. See Musonius Rufus, the Roman Socrates, trans. C. Lutz (Yale Classical Studies 10; New Haven: Yale University, 1947), 100, 17-106-16. For a modern treatment of this phenomenon see Balch, Let Wives, 7.

[29]It is not surprising that Mark would have utilized the child saying in such a manner. The obvious contrast between Mark's use of the child saying and the milieu of late antiquity would serve well Markan redactional intent. For further analysis of Mark's editorial agendas see Chapter 2.

[30]Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 744 as cited by Hans-Reudi Weber, Jesus and the Children (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), 6. Stobaeus, Ecologae 75 recites an ancient Greek saying "The poor man raises his sons, but daughters, if one is poor, we expose" (as translated in Weber, Jesus, 6). See also Plutarch Lycurgus 16.1; Loeb 1:255.

[31]Weber, Jesus, 6. See also Oepke, "παῖς," 639 n. 9 who cites the work of F. J. Dodger, "Sacramentum infanticidii" Antike u. Christentum 14 (1934) 211-217. Oepke's article is an exacting work, and provides a fairly thorough outline of the varying aspects of children within Hellenism and into later New Testament usage.

[32]On Caesars encouraging children see Suetonius, Augustus 46; Loeb 1:201 and Aelius Spartinus, 1 Hadrian in Script. Hist. Aug. 7.8; Loeb 1:25. Weber notes that children who were exposed were sometimes picked up by professional beggers who then mutilated the infants for the purposes of begging (Jesus, 7). For elaboration on the topic of infanticide see the following section on "Progeniture."

[33]As will be studied in further detail, the Hebrew tradition was unique in its prohibition of the practice of exposure.

[34]Horace, Carmen Saeculare 17-24; Loeb 353. See also R. Herzog, Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und de Religion, Philol. Suppl. 22, (Leipzig, 1931) 2, 31, 34, 42, (as cited in Oepke, "παῖς," 639 n. 6), who notes that the god of Epidauros grants children as desired.

[35]Suetonius, Augustus 46; Loeb 1:201.

[36]See, for example, Aelius Spartinus, 1 Hadrian in Script. Hist. Aug. 7.8; Loeb 1:25 who notes that "alimenta," or grants "were...paid by the imperial government to the children of the poor of Italy."

[37]See Julius Capitolinus, Marcus Antoninus in Script. Hist. Aug. 4.7.8; Loeb 1:151; see also Aelius Lampridius, Severus Alexander, in Script. Hist. Aug. 3.57.7; Loeb 2.295; and finally, Julius Capitolinus, Antoninus Pius in Script. Hist. Aug. 3.8.1; Loeb 1:119.

[38]Propertius, The Elegies of Propertius 2.7.13; Loeb 53.

[39]Hesiod, Works and Days 376; Loeb 31.

[40]It is notable that such laws were protested publically by both the equestrian and the senetorial classes. See Suetonius, Augustus 34; Loeb 1:177. Within a hundred years the effects of a devaluation of progeniture can be seen. In striking contrast to Augustus' monetary affirmations of those begetting children, is the later Roman restriction upon family sizes. Albrecht Oepke notes that grain distribution sank from 14,600 hectolitres at the time of Augustus to 6,600 under Severus, marking a strong shift in population mass. See Albrecht Oepke, "παῖς," 640. who cites O. Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt, 1/3 (1910) 345.

[41]Arthur D. Nock, "Eunuchs in Ancient Religion," Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, ed. Zeph Stewart, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1972), 1:9.

[42]On the choosing of a vestal virgin Gellius writes that "...it is unlawful for a girl to be chosen who is less than six or more than ten years old." She must be perfect in body, not a coward, and under the legal control of her father. See Gellius, Noctes Atticae 1.12; Loeb 1:59.

[43]Nock, "Eunuchs," 11.

[44]Nock, "Eunuchs," 12. Athenagorus provides a useful example of such thinking with in a discourse concerning chastity in marriage. "But the remaining in virginity and in the state of an eunuch brings nearer to God, while the indulgence of carnal though and desire leads us away from Him, in those cases we shun the thoughts, much more do we reject the deeds." Legatio 33 in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1892), 417-418.

[45]Nock, "Eunuch," 7-15, esp. 14.

[46]Nock, "Eunuch," 7-15, esp. 10, 14.

[47]See Nock, "Eunuch," 14.

[48]See Nock, "Eunuchs," 13 who cites H. Hepding, Hess. Bl. f. Volksk. VII 40ff.

[49]Tacitus, Histories, 4.53; Loeb 3:101.

[50]Iamblichus (275- c. 330 C.E.), Vit. Pyth. 10.51, trans. Thomas Taylor (London: 1818/ repr. of orig. ed. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Univ. Microfilms, 1963), 33.

[51]See, for example, Livy (59 B.C.E.- 12 C.E.), 37.3.6; Loeb 10:299. See also Arnobius of Sicca (b. c. 235 C.E.) (The Case Against the Pagans 4.31, trans. George E. McCracken [Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1949], 2.402 where certain sacrifices required that the "patrimus" have a living father. This phenomenon is intriguing, as it obviously reflects some religious beliefs regarding death. Equally possible is a "check and balance" system ensuring that orphans were neither elevated nor the objects of exploitation.

[52]Pausanias (c. second century C. E.), Achaia 7.26.5; Loeb 3:331. See also Achaia 7.19.1; Loeb 3:280 and Boethia 11.10.4; Loeb 4:133 and finally, Corinth 2.33.2; Loeb 1:429 which attest to the maidenly nature of the priestess.

[53]Catullus 34.1-4, in Catullus, ed. and trans. G. P. Goold, (London: Duckworth, 1893), 75.

[54]Pausanias, 8.47.3; Loeb 4:133. See also Achaia 7.19.1; Loeb 3:279 and Phocis, Ozolian Locri 34.8; Loeb 4:579.

[55]Pausanias, Achaia 7.24.4; Loeb 3:313.

[56]Nock, "Eunuchs," 10. Here Nock cites the works of E. Fehrle, Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum (RGVV VI) 63 ff.

[57]See, for example, Ps. 127:3-5 which, in speaking of the rewards of following God cites sons as a blessing.

[58] See Gen 1:28; 12:3; 17:2, 6. Furthermore, women with many children are considered blessed (Gen 24:60). For a treatment of this see Weber, Jesus, 8-9.

[59]R. Judah, Lam. Rab. 1.6,33, as cited in C. Klein, Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology trans. Edward Quinn (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 9.

[60]On the issue of abortion, see, for example, Oracula Sibyllina, 3, 765 as cited by S. Safrai, The Jewish People of the First Century, ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern (Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, Assen., 1976), 2:50.

[61]Tacitus, Histories 5.5; Loeb 4-12:183.

[62]See Balch, Let Wives, 10. For an example of Philo's concepts regarding male children see Philo, On the Cherubim 54; Loeb 1:41.

[63]For a fairly thorough outline on the valuing of children within the Jewish tradition see Margaret Mary Sweeten, Child Talk M.A. Thesis (Windsor: U. of Windsor, 1981), 90-102; see also Weber, Jesus, 8-12, 69-71.

[64]The issues of birth control, abortion and infanticide were not inapplicable to the Jews of Hellenism. Such measures may, at least, have been an economic temptation as the Jews of late antiquity were not necessarily of wealthy stock. Tyson cites F.C. Grant's estimation that the Jewish family in the first century C.E. paid 30-40 percent of its income to both the Temple and Roman taxations. See Tyson, A Study, 62 and F.C. Grant, The Economic Background of the Gospels (London: Oxford University Press, 1926) 105.

[65]Prudentius, Contra Orationem Symmachi 1.208-211; Loeb 1:367.

[66]Weber notes that here "παιδία" has is pejorative, while "νηπιάζειν" receives "relatively positive significance" which recalls "a small child [that] does not yet have the corrupting experience of the world's wickedness." However it is notable that only in 1 Cor 14:20 does "νηπιάζειν" figure in a educative sense. Otherwise the word holds negative overtones. See Weber, Jesus, 58-9. Furthering the metaphor of immaturity Paul states, "when I was a child I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became a man I gave up childish ways" (1 Cor 13:11, RSV). For an overview of the various uses of "child" in the New Testament see Weber, Jesus, 56-58.

[67]E.g. Ps 51:5 "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Also Isa 3:4; Eccl. 10:16 in which cities ruled by boy(s) are in danger. For a thorough treatment on the view of children within the Jewish tradition see Weber, Jesus, 8-12.

[68]See Oepke, "παῖς," 642, 646.

[69]Plato, Laws 7.808D-808E. ET: A.E. Taylor, The Collected Dialogues of Plato, ed. E. Hamilton and H. Cairns, Bollingen Series 71 (New York: Pantheon Books, 1961), 1379. Similarly, children were thought to be lazy and overbearing, demanding that servants "dance attendance."

[70]It is not surprising that these same attributes are found as well in women, slaves

and "the base rabble of those who are freemen in name." Plato, The Republic 4.431C; Loeb 1:361. For further treatments of the sensual and sexual nature of children see Oepke, "παῖς," 647.

[71]Dio Chrysostom, On Servants 13; Loeb 427.

[72]Weber, Jesus, 7.

[73]See especially Philo of Alexandria's views of children. Philo places children in the lowest category in his salvific schema where they function as metaphors for non-enlightenment. The metaphor of child, for example, is associated with "immature," and describes "the soul of a common man" (Philo, On the Cherubim 63; Loeb 2:47). Philo intimates that children are the furthest from the goal of salvation in his denegrative metaphorical usage of children. For allusions to Philo's cosmology, anthropology, and eschatology, see On the Creation and On the Cherubim, of volume 1 in the Loeb edition.

[74]Aristotle posits that "a chattel or a child till it reaches a certain age and becomes independent, is, as it were, a part of oneself, and no one chooses to harm himself, hence there can be no injustice towards them." Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1134b, as cited by Balch, Let Wives, 36.

It is within the gospel of Mark that an attempt to recover the original matrix of the child saying actually begins. Even on a cursory analysis the intimacy between Jesus and the children of Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16 stands in sharp constrast to the contemporary valuation of children. Many commentators understand these sayings to use "child" as a metaphor for passivity, as a medium for instruction or guidance, or as a cipher for helplessness, humility, or the like.[1] Hence, Mark would be adopting some of the most obvious metaphoric significations available from contemporary Hellenistic culture. It is crucial, however, to view the child sayings *in the literary context* in which they appear in Mark, and to interpret them from that context. I will show that Mark's usage is consistent with an underlying polemic in the gospel which concerns the disciples and appropriate comportment for discipleship. Mark's editorial agenda becomes more explicit when viewed within the context of antithetical duality, a duality characterized by opposition.

A. Duality within Mark

Mark's use of the child sayings should be seen within the context of Mark's tendency to employ duality and contrast as a grammatical, structural and theological device. The presence of duality within Mark has been observed by many scholars. Most notable of these is Frans Neirynck, for whom Mark's numerous "[r]epetitions, pleonasms and duplications,"[2] are strongly indicative of the writer's tendency to utilize the grammatical device of "duality." In a rather exacting analysis of this literary tool Neirynck identifies the divergent forms of duality within Mark.[3] Duality is evident at all levels of the text. In a very basic manner duality functions within the grammatical structure of the text where, for example, verbs are followed by the same preposition or cognate verbs are duplicated.[4]

On a literary level Mark also incorporates a variety of duplicate expressions involving time (e.g., 14:30), geography (e.g. 11:15, 11:27), and activity (e.g., 7:14-15, 17-23; 9:14-27, 28-29; 10:1-9, 10-12). These duplications, however, are not mere repetition but signal refinement and precision.[5] The text also contains a number of double statements including instances where Mark repeats motifs (e.g., 1:2, 3 and 3:14, 16). Similarly, Mark incorporates duality within the context of a single unit or pericope by means of the correspondence of two elements [i.e., question and answer (e.g., 3:22, 23), request and realization (e.g., 5:28, 34 and 6:25, 27), command and fulfillment (e.g., 1:17, 18, 10; and 5:29, 34), quotation and comment (e.g., 1:2, 14 and 12:36, 37). More generally, duality is pervasive of the overall structure of the gospel through parallelism (e.g. 4:4, 5-6, 7), in the placement of pericopes (e.g., in a "sandwich arrangement" 3:20-21, 31-35 and 22-30; 5:21-24, 35-43 and 25-34), and through doublets (e.g., 1:2 and 9:7).[6] As E. A. Abbot once observed "(d)uality is part of Mark's style."[7]

1. Duality as a Grammatical Device

In this capacity duality is manifest in adverbial duality, repetition of antecedents, double negatives, double statements, synonymous expressions, double groups of persons, exposition and discourse.[8] Especially significant for our purposes is the function of duality within a system of contrasting elements. Contrast, however, is essential to antithetical parallelism and negative-positive constructions. Although Mark does utilize synonymous or synthetic parallelism (e.g., that evening... at sundown) which does not involve any polarities, the dynamic of contrast is significant at all levels of the narrative. This element of contrast, apparent in both of these literary elements, has strong implications for Mark's approach to the text on grammatical, structural and theological levels.

Antithetical parallelism is characterized by a general negative statement which in turn is followed by an excepting statement, often signalled by an affirmative.[9] The actual presence of this grammatical device in Mark can be seen as having roots in a pre-Marcan tradition. In the synoptics antithetical parallelism is often attested in the sayings of Jesus where it appears "well over a hundred times."[10] However, the fact that Mark retains

antithetical parallelism is significant. In the hands of the editor, this device serves to emphasize the antithetical nature of the Jesus sayings, and more subtly, the radical nature of the Jesus tradition.

The presence of negative-positive constructions within the gospel's schema is recognized by most scholars. These constructions are bipartite, comprised of a negative followed by an opposite.[11] Negative-positive constructions not only emphasize grammatical duality, but further create a narrative world characterized by duality and antithesis. As will be seen, this basic pattern of contrast is prevalent within Mark, and ultimately influences Mark's editorial agenda regarding the child saying.

2. Duality Within the Marcan Narrative World

Duality is not only present as a grammatical structure in Mark. A literary analysis of the gospel's narrative world uncovers these same foundational constructions. Identifying the presence of this narrative phenomenon David Rhoads and David Richie further observe a bipartite framework of the gospel itself. Jesus' acts of power present within the first half of the narration are furthered and complemented by his later acts of filial obedience.[12]

Of more significance, however, is the pervasive phenomenon of the juxtaposition of main and ancillary characters. These figures function in opposition to each other, and ultimately serve the writer's narrative interest. It is apparent that this literary device functions in a manner similar to antithetical parallelism. The ancillary characters, or "foils," embody the second, more "affirmative" component of antithetical parallelism, and find contrast with their more three dimensional counterparts. An explicit example can be seen in the differing portrayals of the "understanding" Syrophoenician woman of Mark 7:24-30 and the disciples. She is described within a two-dimensional manner as the pagan mother of an ailing child. Mark's depiction of the disciples, albeit in a negative light, evolves throughout the whole narrative, and consequently is more graphic.

The "foils" therefore emphasize the misunderstanding or non-comprehension of those about Jesus. And this is particularly relevant in relation to the role of the disciples of Jesus. Those who are given the greatest opportunities to comprehend the message of

Jesus do not understand. The Twelve (or a sub-set of the Twelve) are depicted as the privileged recipients of special instructions and disclosures (e.g. 4:10-12, 33-34; 6:7-12; 7:18-23; 8:31; 9:2-11; 13:3-37). Hence, their failure to understand is heightened when individuals outside of Jesus' daily entourage become the only recipients of the true message.

Those who do comprehend stand in isolation to each other. They are not expressly or implicitly designated as "those on the outside" who figure in the Parables chapter (Mark 4:1-34). Thus they do not belong to the Jewish crowds from whom instruction is withheld; but neither do they belong to the privileged circle. Instead, their almost total estrangement from the life of Jesus seems to be the common denominator. The characters are given a "cameo" appearance, for they disappear upon the completion of their role.13

The function of Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16 becomes clear when seen within this bipartite pattern of contrasting component elements. Particularly significant to the relevant pericopes is Mark's presentation of the disciples, who are, in fact, one component element of the formula. Mark employs children as the counterbalance for the grandiose and self-important views of the disciples.

B. Disciple, Discipleship and Children

Before drawing any conclusions regarding the disciples of Mark and their role within Marcan duality, it is first necessary to locate the meaning of "disciple." In Mark this task involves differentiating between "disciple" and "discipleship." Clarifying their respective meanings proves to be the first task of our analysis, and as such will prepare the way to defining Mark's use of the child saying in Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16.

1. Disciple

The prominent role of the disciples is recognized by most scholars. However, the term μαθητής (disciple) itself in Mark is potentially ambiguous. On one hand, μαθητής refers to those within the very broad group, the "many who followed," in Mark 2:15. Yet later in Mark 4:34 the disciples seem to be a limited number who receive privately Jesus'

explications. A further complication is the presence of "the Twelve," that group in Mark which is given centrality.[14] One school of thought suggests that Mark uses the terms interchangeably, in essence equating these "Twelve" and the "disciples."[15] There yet remain scholars who maintain a distinction.[16]

It is most probable that the use of "disciple" within Mark is not exclusively connected with those contemporaneous with Jesus. In fact, recent trends in biblical scholarship point to Mark's presentation of the disciples as being reflective of the the Marcan community. The appropriate comportment for a disciple was probably defined in retrospect by the Marcan community, after reflection on the events surrounding Jesus' life, death and resurrection. The post-resurrection believers would have recognized, however dimly, the breadth and depth of a commitment to the way of Jesus.[17] Mark's disciples, then, play a dual role; first as part of the historical drama; and secondly, as a means of speaking to the post-Easter community who desired to know more fully what it was to be a disciple of the man Jesus.

Some scholars hold that the faith of the Mark's own community is affirmed by the μαθηταί.[18] This perspective is problematic, specifically in view of the consistent misundertanding of Jesus' message by these very disciples. It is more likely that it is precisely the defects of the Marcan community that find reflection in the disciples. This constitutes the "paraenetic or pastoral view" of Mark's harsh portrayal of the disciples.[19] The disciples "represent prototypical Christians with whose weaknesses, lack of faith, miscomprehension and cowardice the readers are intended to identify... and thus be lead to self-criticism."[20] The disciples are exposed as prone to human error, and yet are still redeemable. This is apparent in the profession of faith on the part of Peter in Mark 8:29 with the following chastisement of Peter by Jesus. And after his emphatic denials of Jesus in Mark 14:66-72, Peter weeps for having betrayed his knowledge of Jesus (Mark 14:72).

The censure inherent in Mark's portrait of the disciples is not adequately explained in terms of a paraenetic intent. This lack has lead some scholars to identify an underlying

polemic against the disciples that includes but is not limited to a merely pastoral explanation. William Wrede places the stupidity of the disciples within a Marcan secrecy motif. The messianic secret of Jesus may not be originally an addition of Mark, but it is apparent that Mark uses this motif at the expense of the disciples themselves.[21]

Joseph B. Tyson detects within the gospel a controversy between the Marcan and the Jerusalem church. The latter is identified with those associated intimately with Jesus, that is, his family and the "Twelve," and more specifically, with Peter, James and John. Thus the disciples in the gospel find their counterparts in those comprising the Jerusalem assembly. The comportment of the μαθηταί would suggest, in turn, that the Jerusalem church, most probably the relatives and friends of Jesus, was adopting an exclusive and/or hierarchical stance (e.g. concern with "greatness" in Mark 9:33-37). Mark attacks on a literary level the vices of self-aggrandizement, intolerance of outsiders and reluctance to come to terms with a crucified messiah, those vices which Mark views as inherent in the church of Jerusalem.[22]

Theodore J. Weeden, asserting a similar position, offers the suggestion that the underlying construction of the gospel witnesses to an anti-disciple polemic. As the narrative unfolds the disciples become increasingly resistant to Jesus' message. The first such stage (Mark 1:16-8:26) is marked by the inability of the disciples to perceive the true identity of Jesus. With the onset of Peter's confession in Mark 8:31, and Jesus' following castigation, the disciples move from imperceptivity to misconception (Mark 8:31-10:43). The final stage begins at Mark 14:10 where Judas plots betrayal and ends with Peter's denial of Jesus (Mark 14:72). Thus the narration begins with imperception, moves to misunderstanding, and concludes with the disciples' respective and collective rejection of Jesus and his message.[23] Weeden opines that the polemic against the disciples points to the presence of heresy in Mark's community. By making a clear distinction between what Jesus was about, as opposed to the intentions of his disciples Mark implicitly establishes one Christology over another. The harsh portrayal of the disciples allowed Mark to combat the "divine man" Christology, in favour of Mark's "Christology of the cross."[24]

Just who ⸬ disciples respresent remains impossible to ascertain fully. Most probably, however, Mark uses the narrative as a means by which to identify the difficulties inherent in calling Jesus "Lord" and "Messiah." These problems were undoubtedly apparent amidst the developing community of believers and within the writer's community. Tyson's hypothesis, although difficult to verify, is not only plausible, but may indeed hint at the reality of the domestication of Jesus' message. Hierarchy and exclusivity remain antithetical to the messsage of a saviour who welcomes persons despite status or rank, and is seemingly indifferent to arbitrary structures (e.g. Mark 2:15-17, 7:15).

Despite the scholarly debate concerning the function of the disciples in Mark, few would dispute the narrative prominence of the disciples or that a major characteristic of those named disciples and/or the "Twelve" is their lack of comprehension regarding what Jesus says and does. Those who do not comprehend Jesus' message are differentiated from those who receive the message. This element of incomprehension brings us to the task of defining discipleship in Mark. We can then observe how the author uses the interplay between the disciples and the ideal of discipleship to further the literary movement of the gospel.

2. Discipleship and Disciple

It would be both hasty and erroneous to assume that the disciples in Mark express fully what Mark thinks of as the ideals of discipleship. Certainly "discipleship" is evidenced in the following of Jesus. And in respect to our "child" saying, discipleship is related to entrance into the "kingdom." In fact, the very qualities Mark views as necessary to discipleship are yet a point of scholarly debate.[25]

Robert P. Meye equates the comportment of the disciples in Mark with discipleship. The very human qualities of the disciples render them capable of being realistic models of the faith.[26] This stance however, is problematic. First, Matthew obviously finds it necessary to soften Mark's depiction of the disciples as completely misunderstanding (e.g., cf. Mark 9:32 and Matt 17:23) and fearful (e.g., cf. Mark 9:6 and Matt 17:4). Mark's harsh portrayal of the disciples does not place the them in either a positive or an enviable

light. Second, Meye's equation actually does not account for the positive role of ancillary figures who do stand in stark contrast to the disciples.

There is a growing number of scholars who challenge this proposed unity between the disciples of the gospel and the nature of discipleship. Rather than reflecting the characteristics of discipleship, those intimate followers of Jesus are actually those who are the targets of many of Jesus' challenges. The lack of understanding prevalent in the disciples' interpretation of Jesus' message acts as a mirror image to "true" discipleship. When Jesus predicts his death the disciples refuse, or are unable to comprehend the monitions (Mark 8:31-33, 9:31-33, 10:32-34). These same followers often define via negativa the meaning of discipleship.

Even this continual misunderstanding, some would suggest, serves well the intentions of the Marcan Jesus.[27] Through misinterpretation the disciples eventually come to understand Jesus' words. Their "blindness" may yet be a lesson of hope. Others present a less hopeful understanding of the role of the disciples. The conflict between the disciples and Jesus, a conflict that is both overt and covert, is constant. And undoubtedly the tension between Jesus and his disciples becomes stronger as the narrative progresses.

It is in this light that the role of the secondary characters becomes significant. Although they are presented as two-dimensional figures, the roles of these supplementary characters are often active ones, (e.g., the exorcist of Mark 9:38). The "blindness" of the disciples' is mirrored by these ancillary figures. Paradoxically, it is a blind man who names Jesus as the son of David (Mark 10:47-52), while later a Roman centurion declares that Jesus is the Son of God (Mark 15:39). And it is not the disciples, but a woman who annoints Jesus' head in Mark 14:3. These are the "little" people of Mark's gospel who hold no place within Jesus' travelling band. These supplementary characters function in a prominent role. And it is through these "little" people, these ancillary figures, that Jesus is able to reveal his message.[28] They recognize Jesus in a way that the "inner circle" cannot, or simply will not.

In Mark are the disciples merely incapable of receiving fully the message of Jesus? Perhaps they are deliberately obtuse. Weeden suggests that the growing "confusion" on the part of the disciples inevitably results in their ultimate rejection of Jesus and his message. The "inner circle" deliberately betray their relationship with Jesus in their rejection of him. In this sense, the disciples fully embody what they once chose to despise. Like the expectant Israel they define too clearly "Messiah", and thereby miss the Christ event.

In view of the various interpretations regarding "disciple" and "discipleship," it is apparent that Mark does not equate the two terms. The role of the disciples and the function of discipleship operate on several different levels. Not only does each exist within a narrative polemic, but disciple and discipleship seem to be wielded for the purposes of countering some of the inaccuracies within the author's own church.

3. Conclusion

Mark's use of duality becomes evident with a study of the meaning of discipleship and the function of the disciples. Antithetical parallelism does exist beyond a grammatical and a structural realm, and in fact is apparent in Mark's presentation of the disciples. The narrative world of the gospel is imbued with the negative and postive elements. The disciples are those non-comprehending main characters who function in opposition to the comprehending ancillary figures, namely, the "little" people. Although the disciples seem to have been gifted with knowledge of the "kingdom" (see esp. Mark 4:10), a knowledge that at first appears to be secret or exclusive, it gradually becomes apparent that even as privy to this information, the disciples cannot grasp its full dimensions. It falls upon the secondary characters, the "little people", the poor, the lepers, the synagogue leaders, etc., to comprehend the message Jesus reveals.

The irony inherent in the narrative is that those who should understand do not. Those who are not privy to the secret information unexpectedly do comprehend the breadth and depth of the message. The reversal of the ordinary, within the context of antithetical parallelism, functions as a tool by which Mark captures the attention of the audience,

as well as emphasizes the nature of discipleship.

It is precisely within this context that the child pericopae Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16 become explicable. In keeping with the juxtaposition of two contrasting elements, the disciples themselves are viewed in a negative light. The children of Mark 9:33-37 and 10:13-16 embody that which is lacking on the part of the disciples. The polemic against the disciples is heightened, as is the further distinction between discipleship and the role of the disciples.

In conclusion, Mark's proclivity to present the Jesus story _via_ duality is especially significant for this study. The narrative form of antithetical parallelism results in ancillary characters functioning in a positive light in contrast with Mark's depiction of the disciples. In the child pericopae Mark 9:33-37 and 10:13-15 we will witness the elevation of children at the expense of the disciples. Mark's agenda is revealed through the medium of the message.

C. Redactional Analysis: Mark 9:33-37

It is in the discourse on "true greatness," located approximately in the middle of the gospel, that our first saying Mark 9:33-37 appears. This pericope is preceeded by the second passion prediction of vv. 30-32 and is followed by the story of the strange exorcist of vv. 38-40.[29]

Within a larger perspective 9:33-37 can be seen as merely one of many Jesus sayings amalgamated in 9:33-50. Mark has been noted for the tendency to use a sequence of Jesus' sayings which relate by subject within the beginning of the passage, but which do not necessarily have relevant and/or consistent endings.[30] Various catchwords within 9:35-50 indicate that this section probably came to the writer as a unit through the oral tradition.[31] The logic of the sequence is itself unclear.[32] Mark most probably wanted to keep the first and last logia, and rather than divide the sequence, retained the overall formulation of 9:33-37.[33] Mark's editorializing, however, can still be seen within the entire unit.

The motif of the nature of discipleship is essential to Mark 9:33-50 and extends to Mark 10:31.[34] It is apparent that Mark's emphasis in Mark 9:33-50 lies upon the role and function of the disciples rather than the activities of Jesus. Taken in this way, vv. 33-50 can be placed within the context of Mark 8:27-10:52, in which the role of the disciples receives great prominence.[35] Evident within the key pasages of this broader unit, and in keeping with the basic dynamics of antithetical parallelism, Jesus's humility finds a contrast in the unfaithfulness of the disciples.[36]

1. Mark 9:33-34

(33) Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ. Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτοὺς τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε;
(34)οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τίς μείζων.

(33) And they came to Capernaum; and when he was in the house he asked them, "What were you discussing on the way?"
(34) But they were silent for on the way they had discussed with one another who was the greatest.

In the opening verse of this first "child" pericope Jesus is seen to be in retreat from the crowds which perpetually bombard him with demands. It is during this time, and other such instances, that he privies his disciples with special instructions, with secrets regarding the "kingdom."[37] It is somewhat ironical that v. 33 follows immediately upon the second passion prediction (Mark 9:30-32). The disciples who did not understand in v. 32 are to be the recipients, yet another time, of special teaching. The Marcan journey motif leads the disciples and Jesus to a house in Capernaum wherein is situated the teaching on "true greatness."[38]

Several of Mark's stylistic features appear in v. 33. Most typically the verse is introduced by καί, a preferred Marcan conjunction.[39] The geographical reference to Capernaum coheres with the writer's journey motif, a theme that underlies the whole narrative. Mark's Jesus and the followers find a brief respite from their ultimate destination of Jerusalem. It is probable then that journey reference "and they came to Caparnaum" is a Marcan addition to the narrative.[40] This is also the case with the setting

of the discussion. The setting of the "house," identified as part of Mark's style, invokes an atmosphere of intimacy for the ensuing dialogue.[41] It furthers, as well, the artificial geography and journey schema.

Verse 33 flows into 34, as the disciples' silence attests once again, to their failure(s). In this manner v. 33 functions as an introduction to the debate recalled in v. 34.[42] That the first two verses (vv. 33, 34) are grouped together is not insignificant. Numerous elements suggest that both of these earlier verses are Marcan additions.

First, vv. 33-34 are full of Marcan vocabulary. The geographical location of the town and the house further Mark's literary agenda by providing a comfortable setting for the narrative.[43] Second, the calling of the "Twelve" in v. 35 is at odds with the "disciples" of Mark 9:31. Third, the concluding verses 36 and 37 do not continue the theme of greatness established in vv. 33-34. Rather, the pericope ends with the motif of reception of little ones. The awkward and artificial thematic connection with vv. 35-37 suggests an editorial hand.[44] Fourth, the sequence of passion-prediction-misunderstanding found here in Mark 9:30-37 is repeated in Mark 8:31-33 and Mark 10:32-45. Mark evidently repeats the pattern for emphasis. It is also notable that within the third passion-prediction-misunderstanding sequence is a reference to greatness (Mark 10:43-45). And finally, it is apparent that vv. 33-34 serve, somewhat redundantly, as a Marcan introduction to a chriae which already had an introduction in v. 35a.

Based on these observations it is probable, then, that both vv. 33 and 34 represent Marcan creations. Their presence is congenial with both Mark's literary and theological agenda. On a narrative level, the addition of vv. 33-34 would have heightened for the reader the sense of dramatic irony pervading the following verse (v. 35).[45] On a theological level, the "blindness" of the disciples is emphasized in the face of the preceding passion prediction, the emphasis on service in the following verse, and the concluding reference to children in vv. 36-36.[46] It may well be that the concerns of vv. 33-34 hint at of the state of the Marcan community/church.[47]

2. Mark 9:35

(35) Καὶ καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος.

(35) And he sat down and called the twelve; and he said to them, "If any one would be first he must be last of all and servant of all."

Undoubtedly v. 35a functions as an introduction to the saying in v. 35b. In a similar way this opening narration links the initial introductory formula of vv. 33-34 to the "servant" saying. Further, the passion prediction preceding the pericope, in which the disciples misunderstand Jesus as he speaks of his own role as servant, is now irrevocably connected with the servant saying in v. 35. It would seem then that v. 35a is a Marcan addition. This conclusion might be supported by the presence of the "Twelve" which almost definitely indicates redactional work.

Although at first glance it seems likely that v. 35a is a Marcan creation, several elements give hint to an older dating. The uncommon usage of φωνεῖν usurps the more likely use of προσκαλεῖσθαι and signals not the Marcan but a pre-Marcan tradition.[48] Were the reference to the "Twelve" omitted v. 35a could easily have come to Mark already linked to the following logion. The "servant" saying of 35b appears within the Synoptics in a variety of forms and is undoubtedly pre-Marcan.[49] Mark's reference to the "Twelve" signals, then, the only redactional element in v. 35.

3. Mark 9:36

(36) Καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὸ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·

(36) And he took a child, and put him/her (literally "it") in the midst of them; and taking her/him in his arms, he said to them,

In the manner of vv. 33-34 and 35a, verse 36 functions in an introductory capacity. Its narrative formula precedes the saying found in v. 37. On the one hand, it is possible that almost the whole of v. 36 came to Mark while attached to the previous logion. Thus the "servant" saying would have concluded with Jesus taking a child into his arms, and perhaps even placing the child in the midst of the disciples. Mark would then have retained

most of the tradition, contributing what appears to be an introduction (i.e., v. 36c) to the concluding saying in v. 37.[50] This possibility, however, creates an obviously artificial link between the two verses. First, each verse offers a different theme. And second, the movement from narrative to discourse between v. 36 and v. 37 is rather stilted.

Best, on the other hand, places v. 36 within the pre-Marcan material. The formal tone of v. 35 signals an introduction. He further notes that if vv. 36-37 were to be omitted, there is no easy transition between v. 35b and the remaining verses between vv. 38-50.[51]

The majority of scholars, however, rightly deem v. 36 as a Marcan creation. The presence of the rare word ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι, which also appears in 10:16, has lead some to believe that all of 9:36 is derived from the pericope 10:13-16.[52] This is further suggested by the verbatim agreement in the use of the aorist participle καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος and the referrent αὐτο in both verses Mark 9:36 and 10:16. In fact, the presence of v. 36 does further the Marcan agenda insofar as it contrasts the disciples and the child. The child is first set in the midst of the followers, and then is embraced by Jesus. The child and Jesus are aligned in a way that the disciples and Jesus are not.

4. Mark 9:37

> (37) ὃς ἂν ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέξηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχεται οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

> (37) Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me; and whoever receives me, receives not me but him who sent me.

Following a pattern maintained throughout the whole of 9:33-37, this saying in turn functions to introduce the collection of sayings comprising the latter portion of chapter 9. Verse 37 concludes this pericope, and as is readily apparent, contains a reputed saying of Jesus regarding reception.[53]

Owing to the nature of the verse, it is commonly thought that v. 37 originally stood alone in isolation of the preceeding verses. Thematically this is easily verified. Greatness and the emphasis on service (vv. 33-35) have nothing to do with the reception of children (v. 37). Although not thematically incompatible v. 35 and v. 37 do not obviously belong

together.

The presence of παιδίον may be problematic. If Mark did not add v. 37 to the previous verses, but rather absorbed the order from an oral tradition, then presumably the "child" reference here actually belonged to an early stage in the tradition of 9:37. On the other hand, the reference to child in v. 37 may be a Marcan interpolation. The presence of "child" may signal the contamination of the "Receiving the Sender" saying by the child saying found later in Mark 10:15.[56] This final logion with its "child" reference is easily understood within Mark's editorial agenda. By combining the motifs of children and reception Mark characterizes discipleship not only by servanthood (v. 35) but by reception (v. 37). Unlike the child of v. 37 the disciples of Mark represent neither ideal.

The basic difficulty posed by this verse is hermeneutical. The verse remains problematic even though the tendency has been to interpret v. 37 in a very literal fashion. First, it is questionable whether Mark uses "child" in a metaphoric fashion. Certainly in a literary sense the "child" of v. 37 functions as a foil to the disciples, and hence the use of παιδίον may be metaphorical. The "child" embodies what the disciples do not.

Second, the ambiguous nature of the reception motif of v. 37a adds to the difficulties of interpretation. The text could mean that reception, even baptism, of children is to be accompanied by entreating Jesus by "name." The entreaty would have the ring of confession to it, the acknowledgement of the "Lordship" of Jesus. This confessional interpretation has its obvious limits, primarily the importation of a post-resurrection agenda.[57] Another interpretation renders the meaning of reception "for my name's sake." Taken in this way the believing Christian is to receive as Jesus receives. It is most probable that Mark uses the theme of reception to emphasize the difference between ideal discipleship and that modelled by the disciples. And Mark's inclusion of παιδίον furthers the distinction. The child of v. 37 again stands opposite to the disciples. The growing tension between the disciples and Jesus is becomes clearer through Mark's placement and use of v. 37.

5. Conclusions: Mark 9:33-37

Mark 9:33-37 is a mixture of pre-Marcan and Marcan features. Mark's hand is quite visible in all of vv. 33, 34 and 36. At the very onset of the pericope it is obvious that the disciples are in conflict with Jesus regarding "greatness" (vv. 33-34). Verses 33 and

34 ensure that v. 35, although alone not polemical, functions to chastize the dsciples. The tension between the varying themes expressed throughout the passage hint at a pre-Marcan strata in vv. 35 and 37. The chastisement in v. 35 emphasizes this division between what the disciples *ought* to be and what it is that they are. The presence of the "Twelve" in v. 35 and the "child" reference in v. 37 display Mark's attempts to merge the separate traditions. It is notable that Jesus puts the child in the midst of the disciples, furthering the chastisement. Finally, the concluding verse of the passage, v. 37, comments on the failure of the disciples by suggesting that they yet need to learn of the importance of reception.

The child of vv. 33-37 poses as a foil for the disciples and highlight their foibles. The fact that v. 37 is followed by a passage also dealing with reception provides some clue as to the overall intent of Mark. In vv. 33-37 Mark links real greatness with reception. In vv. 38-41 the disciples are chastized for hindering the workings a strange exorcist. It may very well be that Mark subtly suggests that God does work under uncommon guises, via children and those outside of the inner circle. The disciples are challenged to this recognition.

In 9:33-50 are found more hints as to Mark's use of the child saying. In effect, Mark creates redactionally a setting on greatness and then depicts a *series* of answers. The themes of greatness (v. 35), outsiders (vv. 38-40) and offending others (v. 42) are all followed by Jesus' answers on the topic. The sum of the series lies in being at peace with each other.

In conclusion, the disciples do exist in some antithetical state to the child elevated herein. And doubtless, Mark is successful in his rebuke of the disciples by means of this child pericope. We now turn to the second child passage, 10:13-16 wherein we will identify the redactional hand of Mark, and view further Mark's editorial agenda.

D. Redactional Analysis: Mark 10:13-16

Mark 10:13-16 is likewise located within the middle of the gospel, falling only forty verses after the earlier child passage. It follows the question on divorce found in Mark 10:1-12 and precedes the passage of the rich young man (Mark 10:17-22). And in a manner similar to Mark 9:33-37, Mark 10:13-16 can be seen as concerning the activities of the disciples and the increasing rift developing between Jesus and his followers.[56] It is significant that in vv. 13-16 the disciples actually prevent the reception of children, even after Jesus' teaching otherwise in Mark 9:33-37. In this light the passage is even more castigating that the previous pericope.

Mark 10:13-16 can be differentiated from the previous "child" passage by virtue of theme. Some scholars see this latter pericope as dealing with the model attitude toward children and even the nature of the "kingdom" itself.[57] Others, writing apologetically, suggest that in no way is this passage written to undermine the authority of the early church. The question of infant baptismal intent is also a point of dispute.[58]

The pericope itself consists of four verses, with the reputed Jesus saying in vv. 14b-15. It has been suggested that were these verses omitted from the text the pericope would read as a pronouncement story "whose climax was an action and not a logion of "Jesus".[59] Thus the textual division groups v. 13 with v. 16, presumably leaving 14a as a type of introduction to the narrative.

1. Mark 10:13

(13) Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς.

(13) And they were bringing children to him, that he might touch them; and the disciples rebuked them.

On one hand, this verse displays several stylistic contributions of Mark. The introductory καί is most probably a Marcan addition.[60] And Best notes that the Marcan favourite ἐπιτιμᾶν is present in v. 13b. On the other hand, however, although the composition of the verse may be ascribed to Mark, the ideas underlying the passage have their basis in pre-Marcan tradition.[61]

The impersonal reference to children (παιδία) intially suggests a distant relationship between Jesus and the children and/or between the disciples and the children. Viewed

in this light and from a literary standpoint, the youngsters are most likely not of the "house" mentioned in v. 10.[62] It would seem that Mark utilizes the implied relational distance between the children of v. 13 and the disciples to heighten the impact of the saying embedded further in the pericope. In this verse Mark immediately sets up the children and the disciples in positions of opposition.

The meaning of the "touch" of v. 13, rendered ἅψηται, has long been a focus of hermeneutical debate. Some scholars have suggested that the touch of Jesus might have been considered healing.[63] Or, the allusion to Jesus' gesture (fulfilled in v. 16) can be seen as a blessing. Such a gesture was not uncommon in the first century C.E. Hebrew culture.[64] The inclusion of this gesture, however, gives clue to the intimacy between Jesus and the children which is evidently not well received by the disciples. It is clear that at the very onset the children and the disciples are set in positions of polarity.

2. Mark 10:14

(14) ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ᾽Ιησοῦς ἠγανάκτησεν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

(14) But when Jesus saw it he was indignant, and said to them, "Let the children come to me, do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of God."

Verse 14 is of tripartite form, incorporating both a narrative introduction and Jesus' two-part verbal rebuke. Unlike the later Matthean and Lukan parallels Jesus' censure is prefaced by indignation.[65] His following reprimand involves both a positive and a negative command, concluding with a typical Marcan γάρ clause (i.e., τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων).[66] Both Jesus' indignation and his chastisement further the tension between the disciples and Jesus, and the disciples and the children.

The negative command μὴ κωλύετε does recall other canonical baptismal references (i.e., Acts 8:36, 10:47). And it is argued in this light that underlying Mk 10:13-16 is a a debate regarding acceptance of children into the community of believers. On this basis Kee concludes that 10:13-16 functions within an apologetic stance proposing that "children are fit subjects for baptism into the Marcan community."[67] The strength of Jesus' reprimand

emphasizes the disciples lack of understanding regarding the true nature of discipleship. In fact, the reference to "hindrance" recalls the reception theme seen earlier in 9:37 and anticipates the logion in v. 15.

Although all of v. 14 may be linked with v. 13 (and thereby with v. 16), the concluding portion of v. 14 is best read and understood in respect to the following logion.[68] Certainly v. 14c introduces well v. 15, cohering in both theme and content. And although the γάρ clause of 14c may reflect either an earlier tradition or Marcan redaction, the fact that the clause is typically Marcan suggests that 14c is redactional. As will be seen 14c is intrinsically connected to the saying in v. 15.[69] Its connection with vv. 13-14a, b will be seen as an example of Mark's attempts to link the saying of v. 15 to the earlier narrative material. And in this light v. 14c most likely functions as an introduction to v. 15 by means of a restatement of the motif of reception contained in the latter verse.[70]

The special relationship between children and the kingdom (v. 14c) adds some clarity to the intimacy established between Jesus and the kingdom (v. 13a, 14b). In this verse Mark has made explicit the distinction between the disciples, who supposedly are the privileged ones, and the children, who are in fact those recipients of the kingdom. Mark's disciples are chastized first by Jesus' words (i.e., "do not hinder them"), and second by the acknowledgement that the benefits of the kingdom are granted to the least expected. The positive light shone on the children casts a shadow on the portrait of the disciples.

3. Mark 10:15

(15) ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν του θεου ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.

(15) Truly, I say to you, whoever does not recieve the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it.

Were it not for the reference to the kingdom in v. 14c this child saying would appear quite at odds with vv. 13, 14a, b and 16. Verse 15 appears to "hang" with v. 14c, and together they function as the centre of the pericope.[71] Several literary clues hint that v. 15 came to Mark as an independent saying.

An analysis of motif and form support the originally isolated nature of v. 15. Given the divergence of theme between v. 15 (and v. 14c) and the remainder of the passage it is likely that within this pericope there exist two independent traditions.[72] First, the motifs of reception/blessing of children (vv. 13, 14a, b and 16) are distantly related to that of reception of the kingdom and the special relationship between children and the kingdom (vv. 14c-15).

Second, the difference in form between the pronouncement story of vv. 13, 14a,b, 16 and the logion of v. 15 would suggest that the latter began as independent of the pericope. Indeed, verses 13, 14a,b and 16 can function independently of the climactic saying in v. 15 in the form of a pronouncement story. The presence of ἀμήν attests to the independent nature of vv. 13, 14a,b and 16. Kee observes that in all thirteen of Mark's uses of ἀμήν fall within a pronouncement formula, and within community instruction. These features would suggest that vv. 13-14a,b and 16 together come to Mark from a different tradition that v. 14c and v. 15.[73]

Furthermore, it is apparent that v. 15 detracts from yet another (potential) literary climax. In vv. 13, 14a,b and v. 16 can be seen the rudiments of a pronouncement story which peaks in v. 14b, and concludes with the blessing of v. 16. Mark's presentation renders v. 16 as somewhat redundant. This further substantiates that v. 15 was probably inserted into the pericope on the basis of related theme and via the catchword παιδίον (vv. 13a, 14b) and βασιλεία (v. 14c).[74]

The independent and parenthetical nature of v. 15 has led many scholars to assume its historical link as a survivor of the few remaining "true words" of Jesus.[75] However, like many such sayings, the accompanying interpretations are as diverse as they are numerous. Frederick Schilling proposes that the best interpretation likens the "kingdom" itself to a child (implicit in Matt 19:13-15, Mark 9:37). Thus it is the nature of the "kingdom" that is of concern.[76] Best, offering a different analysis, understands the saying in terms of the necessary reception of the "kingdom". The inherent paradox of the saying lies in contrasting valuations of children and the kingdom respectively wherein the hightly

valued kingdom is compared with the low status of children.[77] Others suggest that this logion has an underlying baptismal agenda.[78]

John Dominic Crossan, in a thorough collection of sayings parallels, provides an important key to the problems present of interpretating Mark 10:15. After collecting the canonical and extra-canonical parallels to Mark 10:15, he identifies two sayings which are related to this verse. The first is that of the "Kingdom and Children," and the second, "Receiving the Sender."[79] In the "Kingdom and Children" saying (see esp. Mark 10:14b) the relevant motifs involve the special relationship between children and the kingdom (i.e., "for to such belongs the kingdom of God") and entrance to that same kingdom [e.g., "you shall (not) enter the kingdom"]. The second saying deals with reception and is notably present in Mark 9:33-37.

A close study of Mark 10:15 reveals that the emphasis on *reception* most likely reflects a late importation into the saying rather than pre-Marcan tradition. In fact the motif of reception "represent's Mark's rephrasing of his pre-Marcan 10:15 in order to underline the verbal and thematic parallel with [Mk] 9:37."[80] We witness here, then, the contamination of one saying by another. The radical nature of the motif of children and their relationship with the kingdom (and vice versa) is diminished by Mark's incorporation of reception into the saying.

It is obvious, however, that Mark utilizes v. 15 to further the polemic against the disciples. As was seen earlier in 9:37 Mark is not adverse to connecting the themes of reception and discipleship with that of children. Verse 15 emphasizes the distance between the children and the disciples, as well as the tension between ideal discipleship and the comportment of Mark's disciples. Reception is essential to discipleship (Mark 9:37, 10:14b, 15) for Mark. And the disciples do not understand the meaning of true discipleship.

4. Mark 10:16

(16) καὶ εναкαλισαμενσος αυτα κατευλογει τιθεις τας χειρας επ'αυτα.

(16) And he took them in his arms and blessed then, laying his hands upon them.

As noted previously v. 16 is rendered somewhat unnecessary following the inclusion of the independent logion of v. 15. This concluding narrative poses little interpretative difficulty as its form and content are straightforward. The central element, a gesture of blessing, is not exceptional in the Jewish world of late antiquity. The embracing, however, noted at the beginning of the verse is peculiar to the Mark, absent from Matthew's inclusion of the verse.

It is possible that v. 16 itself derives from a tradition independent of either v. 15 or vv. 13-14. It is apparent that in Mark v. 16 functions as conclusion to the story told in vv. 13-14 a, b.81 The influence of v. 16 on Mark 9:36 might suggest the traditional nature of Mark 10:16. Mark would have linked the two traditions of vv. 13-14a,b and v. 16 via the common motif of children. In its present form and placement in the narrative v. 16 functions to further the link between Jesus and the children, in contrast to the ever-developing tension between Jesus and the disciples. By taking the children into his arms Mark's Jesus makes evident how closely children are aligned with him and with the kingdom. And the disciples stand outside of this privileged, albeit unexpected, position.

5. Conclusions: Mark 10:13-16

This second child pericope is imbued with many Marcan stylistic features. The presence of καὶ, for example, in v. 13 and v. 16 is undoubtedly Marcan. Similarly, the indignation of Jesus in v. 14 is congenial with Mark's picturing of Jesus (e.g., Mark 14:33, 8:12) and may be ascribed to Mark. The presence of a Marcan γάρ clause in v. 14c would suggest that Mark created 14c in order to link v. 14b with v. 15.

The motif of reception in v. 15 signals the contamination of one saying by another. Because Mark already had access to the "Receiving the Sender" saying (e.g. Mark 9:37) it is possible that it was Mark who initiated the merging of the two logia. On the other hand, Mark may have merely received the already contaminated saying and merely incorporated it into the tradition. Although both explanations are possible, the fact that Mark once again combines the themes of reception, discipleship and children suggests

that Mark may have initiated the change.

Finally, the tension between vv. 13, 14a, b and 16, and the logion in v. 15, points to Mark's attempts to link two separate traditions. And if v. 16 is viewed as independent of vv. 13-14 a, b, Mark may have combined in this pericope not two, but three, traditions.

It is apparent upon redactional analysis of 10:13-16 that through this pericope Mark furthers the polemic against the disciples. The indignation of Jesus reveals Mark's interest emphasizing them misunderstanding nature of the disciples. Even further, the close association of the children and Jesus is contrasted with the distance implied between the disciples and Jesus. And perhaps most radically, the children's special relationship to the kingdom reflects poorly on those who outrightly claim to follow Jesus. Once again it is apparent that the children, as "little people" in the narrative, are privy to that which by rights ought to be the disciples'. The children are ancillary figures who receive and model the message of Jesus.

E. Conclusions: Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16

Evidently, both pericopae contain pre-Marcan material, although the identification of what is and is not Marcan is yet disputed. This earlier tradition is presented within the editorial agenda of the writer. It is evident that both Mark 9:33-37 and 10:13-16 reflect an underlying polemic against the disciples (i.e., the introduction of Mark 9:33-34, the indignant attitude of Jesus toward the disciples of Mark 10:14). The children of these passages do function as a means of chastisement for the wayward disciples.

Any attempts to interpret Mark's use of child in these two pericopae necessarily involve an overview of historical views on the subject. Mark's use of "child" within 9:33-37 and 10:13-15 has occasioned many interpretations. It is significant that most scholars view the children as functioning metaphorically.

One tendency is to ascribe to the children some characteristic which they in turn are to represent. For example, viewing the children of the passage as being primarily inactive leads to a passive interpretation of their function within the text. Some scholars

have identified within the children of these passages the passive characteristics of humbleness, dependence and helplessness. Such interpretations may be seen as having been influenced by other uses of the child saying (e.g. Matt 18:3) or by the interpreter's own views of children (e.g., passive).

Others characterize the children in relation to active behavior typically associated with children. In this perspective children embody those who fully love Jesus, those who welcome him, those open to instruction and those who are faithful.[82] Again, contamination from other sources render many interpretations not necessarily *Marcan*, but of Marcan derivation.

Still within a figurative view, is the perception of child as a representative of someone or something else. Metaphorically, then, children have been noted as representatives for those who have been denigrated and/or the least of all. Drawing on less human characteristics, the children of these passages have been seen to embody the traits of the "kingdom."[83] Such definitions, however, ensure that the children are defined by that which is external to them. It is more than possible that within these pericopae the agenda of the redactor or the interpreter supercedes the qualites essential to the children present therein.

What has been confirmed through previous analysis is the propensity of the Markan writer to utilize a system of duality to interpret the Jesus tradition. Within this system was the occurrence of antithetical parallelism in which the contrasting of elements capture the reader' attention and further Mark's editorial and literary agendas. The author utilizes a system of reversal, in which ancillary characters assume greater depth of insight than do their counterparts. Again, the little people are those who do understand, while it is the disciples who are "blind."

Mark uses the children not because they embody some "virture" or because they serve as metahpors for some virture, but because they serve as *anti-types* of the disciples. The children of Mark 9:33-37 and 10:13-16 are the ancillary characters, or the little people. They act as literary foils for the disciples who appear in the same context. This setting

only further emphasizes the role of "foil" which the children play.

In view of the antithetical roles of the disciples and the children respectively it can be concluded that what the disciples represent the children do not (and <u>vice versa</u>). The two are actually mutually exclusive in view of the redactional intent of the writer. It is significant that that the original matrix or saying most probably did not propose the same polarities.

What can be known of the behavior of the disciples is more readily accessible than that of the children. The disciples of Mark consistently portray a lack of insight, to such a degree that Weeden designates their non-comprehension as the ultimate rejection of Jesus and his message. As well, their "blindness" may be reflective of certain inappropriate perspectives that ensure an insular church.[84] It is evident that the disciples fall short of the goal of discipleship on several accounts. In Mark 9:33-37 they debate over who is the greatest. In 10:13-16 they hinder children from coming to Jesus. The disciples still follow a highly structured and stratified society in which "might makes right" and rules remain prominent.[85] They still hold to the pattern of great over small.

It is evident that the children of Mark 9:33-37 and 10:13-16 function within the agenda of the gospel writer. In the first pericope Mark uses the children as tools by which to chastize the disciples. In the latter passage the children are connected with the kingdom, embodying that which the disciples do not, or cannot. Mark utilizes children within an anti-disciple polemic and avoids figuring children metaphorically. And at the very most, Mark utilizes the children typologically insofar as they embody that which the disciples lack.

However, the children within these respective pericopae are not lacking a personal relationship with the man Jesus. They are not solely tools for teaching, nor merely accessible and expedient tools for chastizement. Even the numerous redactions of the author do not deprive the pericope of its underlying theme of relationship. Common to Jesus and the little people of the gospel is an inexplicable bond which is not comprehended by the disciples. Such a theme is congenial with other accounts of the historical Jesus. Further,

essential to the high estimation of children is the intimate relationship that exists between children and the kingdom, Jesus and the kingdom, and the children and Jesus. Even the polemical use of the child saying in Mark 10:15 does not diminish these underlying motifs.

From Mark we turn to the presence of the child saying in Matthew, Luke and Thomas. The former two most likely derive from Marcan source, but nonetheless contain significant interpretations and uses of the child saying. From these texts we will glean information regarding the nature of the child saying in various contexts and will be one step closer to establishing an original form of this saying.

[1]See Eduard Schweizer, The Good News According to Mark, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Virginia: John Knox, 1970) 206 who speaks of children's passivity. On humbleness see Scroggie, Mark, 168; R. Brown, "Jesus and Child," IBS 4 (1982) 179); on dependence see Joachim Jeremias (New Testament Theology [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971] 156) who speaks of the child's addressing of 'Abba. Extending from passivity into activity the dependent child may cling and/or cause others to be in her/his service. Thus dependency may be indeed be seen as active comportment. Further, children may be seen as the embodiment of helplessness, in need of both guidance and protection. See Charles R. Eerdman, The Gospel of Mark: An Exposition (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966) 153-154.

[2]Frans Neirynck, Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of Markan Redaction (Leuven: Leuven University, 1981) forward. Neirynck notes that these literary devices were once viewed as suggesting the dependence of Mark on the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

[3]The topic of duality in Markan exegesis has long been of interest. It played a significant role in nineteenth century synoptic criticism. For a historical overview see Neirynck, Duality, 14-32.

[4]Examples of verbs prefixed and followed by the same preposition are ἐξελθε ἐξ (9:25), εἰσέλθης εἰς (9:25), and εἰσελθόντος...εἰς (9:28). The duplication of verbs is apparent in 1:4, 9 (ἐγένετο...ἐγένετο). For more examples of grammatical duality see Neirynck's categories "Adverb in -θεν," "Verb with Cognate Accusative or Dative," "Double Participle," "Double Imperative," "Antecedent," and "Negative-Positive" (Neirynck, Duality, 75-96).

[5]Neirynck, Duality, 46. Neirynck identifies the repetitions of time as a "progressive two-step expression."

[6]For further examples of these and other literary forms of duality, see Neirynck, Duality, 94-136.

[7]E. A. Abbott "Gospels," Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th ed. (Edinburgh, 1879) 10:802 as cited by Neirynck, Duality, 16, n. 19.

[8]See Neirynck, Duality, esp. 88-88, 89-101, 101-106, 108-112, 114-115, respectively.

[9]See Neirynck, Duality, 59. See also David Rhoads and David Mickie, (Mark as Story [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982] 47) who identify the second element of antithetical parallelism as an "precise step in the affirmative." In the Christian canon antithetical parallelism places emphasis on the second element, or "stichos." Joachim Jeremias notes that this finds contrast within Hebrew Scriptures where the second element "normally illustrates the first by a contrasting statement." In the sayings of Jesus "the use of antithetic parallelism ... is uniformly characterized by the way in which the stress lies on the second line." Exceptions to this unusual early Christian emphasis are found within the presence of popular maxims (Matt 5:43), proverbial wisdom expressions (Luke 12:47-48a) and possible talmudic parallels (Mark 2:27, Matt 6:43), which trace their origins from the Hebrew tradition. See Jeremias, New Testament, 18.

[10]Jeremias, New Testament, 14. See also Neirynck, Duality, 58. Anthithetical parallelism can also be seen within Proverbs in the common juxtaposition of antithetical motifs (e.g., 10:4). Jeremias lists the presence of antithetical parallelisms in Matthew, Mark and Luke. He notes its presence in the following Marcan verses: 2:19b/20, 22a/c, 27a/b; 3:28/29, 33/34; 4:4-7/8, 11b/c, 21a/b, 31/32; 6:10/11; 7:6b/c, 8a/b, 10a/b, 10/11-12, 15a/b; 8:12b/c, 35a/b; 10:18a/ b, 27b/c, 31a/b, 42/43-44; 11:17b/c; 12:44a/b; 13:11a/b, 20a/b, 31a/b, 15:7a/b, 38b/c, 58b/c. Jeremias suggests that we can perhaps recover the ipsissima verba of Jesus within the instances of antithetical parallelism. Jeremias, New Testament, 14, 15 n. 1.

[11] Neirynck, Duality, 35. See, for example, οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός. See the studies of M. J. Lagrange, K. A. Credner, Einleitung in das Nue Testament, vol. 1, (Halle, 1836); H. J. Holtzmann, Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter (Leipzig, 1863); W. Larfeld, Die neutestamentlichen Evangelien (Gütersloh, 1925); N. Schneider, Die rhetorische Eigenart der paulinischen Antithese (Tübingen, 1970) et al (as cited by Neirynck, Duality, 35) for further studies on duplicate expressions and double statements in Mark.

[12] Rhoads and Mitchie, Mark as Story, 49. See, for example, the very brief appearances of the man with withered hand Mark 3:1-5, the Syrophoenician woman of Mark 7:24-30 and the blind man of Mark 8:22-26.

[13] For a further analysis of this phenomenon see N. Peterson's "The Composition of Mk 4:1 - 8:26," HTR 73 (1980) 185-217.

[14] Robert P. Meye suggests that "the Twelve," "the intimate companions of Jesus and his ministry" were viewed favourably by the Marcan church, or at the very least, were not hated by those generating the gospel. They were thus not the focus of any polemic. See Jesus and the Twelve (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968), 222-224.

[15] Ernest Best, "Mark's Use of the Twelve," ZNW 69 (1978) 35.

[16] R.C. Tannehill implicitly makes distinct the two groups, although still allowing for a strong connection between them. On the role of the discples in Mark see "The Disciples in Mark: the Function of a Narrative Role," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. R. Telford (Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985) 134-157.

[17] See Aloysius M. Ambrozic (The Hidden Kingdom [Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1972] 29) who suggests that what the disciples did not understand during the earthly life of Jesus the community does understand in light of the resurrection."

[18] See S. Schulz Die Stunde der Botschaft: Einfuhrung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten (Hamburg: Furche, 1967) 143-146, and J. Roloff "Das Markusevangelium als Geschichtsdarstellung," EvT 27 (1969) 91-92 as cited in Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom, 29.

[19] See Tannehill ("The Disciples in Mark," 141) who notes that "(t)he decision of the author to write a Gospel ... rests on the assumption that there are essential similarities between the situation of these disciples and the situation of the early Church, so that, in telling a story about the past, the author can also speak to ... [the] ... present." See also Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom, 29. Finally, see William R. Telford ("Introduction: The Gospel of Mark," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. R. Telford [Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985] 24-25) for an overview of the various studies in this area.

[20] Telford, "Introduction," 24.

[21] William Wrede, The Messianic Secret, trans J. C. G. Greig (Cambridge and London: James Clarke, 1971), esp. 81, 101. Wrede notes that this secret is more theologically than historically based (67).

[22] Joseph B. Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," JBL 80 (1961) 261-268. See also John Dominic Crossan ("The Relatives of Jesus," NovT, 15 [1973]) 111 who opines that it is not the disciples who are the villians of Mark's narrative, but the "inner three" (James, John and Peter).

[23] See Theodore J. Weeden, "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. Telford (Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985) 64-78.

Tannehill, although not in agreement with Weeden's thesis, does concur that there exists a movement from accord to intensifying conflict in the narration ("The Disciples," 158-166).

[24]Weeden notes that a conflict existed between the hellenistic Christology θεῖος ἀνήρ and Mark's own Christology and theologia crucis. See "The Heresy," 64-77, esp. 67. Weeden notes, for example, that in Mark 8:30-32 the disciples were unresponsive to the "Spirit-directed Jesus" (p. 75). Mark furthers the point by accentuating the necessary guidance of the Holy Spirit within the life of a disciple.

[25]See, for example, Ernest Best (Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark [JSNTSup 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981] 243) who notes that key to "discipleship" is its communal charactersitic (e.g. Mark 10:1-12). In many traditional interpretations the definitive quality of "discipleship" is thought to be servanthood. See James M. Robinson (The Problem of History in Mark [London: SCM, 1957] 84) who notes that the custom for Christians rejects "'lording it over' inferiors, and here too within the context of Christian table communion ... 'service' is the ideal (Mark 10:42-45; cf Mark 9:35)."

[26]Robert P. Meye (Jesus and the Twelve [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968] 223) who observes that "(i)t is true that the Twelve are not altogether spared. They are hard of hear, fearful, seeking worldly power ... and even betray or forsake Jesus in the end; but in all this they are not different from the servants of God pictured on the pages of the Old Testament, the Bible of the Marcan Church; and they are completely human and believable." Even further Meye suggests that the central place occupied by the disciples in Mark attests to the essential unity of the ideal of discipleship and the disciples of Mark.

[27]For rather pious renderings of the misinterpretations of the disciples, see Eerdman, The Gospel of Mark, 144-45; Graham Scroggie, The Gospel of Mark (Michigan: Zondervan, 1979), 165-173.

[28]See Weeden ("The Heresy," 64-77, esp. 75) who speaks of the polemic against the disciples. The "foils" or "little people" who heighten the polemic are evidenced throughout the gospel. Several examples are the Syrophoenician woman of Mark 7:24-31, the children of Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16, and the unnamed exorcist alluded to in Mark 9:38. See also Tannehill ("Disciples," 152-153) who notes that "contrasting figures ... appear in such brief flashes that they do not allow the reader to shift ... attention from Jesus and the disciples ... But they do point to the way which contrasts with the disciples' failure."

[29]Other predictions and their ensuing debates can be located in Mark 8:32-9:1 and Mark 10:35-45.

[30]Best, Following, 75.

[31]R. Schnackenburg, "Markus 9:33-50," Synoptische Studien: Festschrift A. Wikenhauser (Munich, 1953), 184-206 (as cited by Ernest Best ("Mark's Preservation of the Tradition," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. R. Telford [Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985] 131 n. 26) argues otherwise. He suggests that the interpolation of catch words is in fact a Marcan tendency. Best refutes this observation by reflecting that the wide use of catch word composition may still point to a pre-Marcan tradition. Although such literary style can be detected throughout Mark, it cannot be generalized that wherever there appear catch words Mark's editorial hand can be detected.

[32]Best, for example, would suggest that the pericope in question, namely Mark 9:33-37, contains elements which are thematically inconsistent. The debate over greatness finds

little correlation to the subsequent reference to children. See Following, 75.

[33]Best identifies the verbal connections of παιδίον and μικρόν: child, little children (vv. 37 42); ὄνομα: name (vv. 37, 38, 39, 41); σκανδαλίζειν: to cause to stumble (vv. 42-47); πῦρ: fire (vv. 43, 48, 49); ἅλας: salt (vv. 49, 50) within the unit 9:33-50. See Ernest Best, "Mark's Preservation of the Tradition," 124-125. Also, see M. Black (An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3d ed. [London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967] 169-171, 218-22) who observes Aramaic attestations to a pre-Markan tradition within 9:33-50 in vv. 38, 39, 42, 45 and 48; Best, Following, 75, 90 n.1.

[34]There exists, however, another school which argues primarily for the essential non-unity of Mark 9:33-50 as cited by Best in Following, p. 90 n. 1. See E. Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1968), 324; R. Schnackenburg "Mk 9, 33-50" ; R. Pesch, Das Markusevangelium (HTKNT 2/2; Freiburg, Basel, Wein: Herder, 1976-77), 101-102; Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom, 171-77.

[35]References to the cross and passion predictions are also prominent in Mark 8:27-10:52. The exception, Mark 10:1-12, deals with the institution of marriage.

[36]Ernest Best, The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Narrative Soteriology, ed. Matthew Black (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1965) 121.

[37]See, for example Mark 9:14-21, 14:32-34 and on this, Best, Temptation, 155.

[38]Robinson observes that here the disciples here are distinct from the crowds. A recurring motif in Mark is the withdrawal of Jesus from the crowds in order to give the disciples special instruction. This in turn accentuates the significance of the special teachings. See also Mark 4:10, 34; 7:17; 9:28, 10:10, 32; 13:3 (James R. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark [London: SCM, 1957] 80); see also Wrede, Messianic, 146 who notes with some skepticism the role of "house" in Mark.

[39]Out of the numerous uses of καί in Mark (numbering 1,078) it can be seen that slightly less than 10% of them function to connect major pericopes. It is also notable that Mark utilizes this conjunction as well within passages (e.g., connecting v. 34 with v. 35). What Mark's style lacks in variety it makes up in consistency.

[40]E. J. Pryke (Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978] 112) observes on the one hand the artificial Marcan geographical framework which includes "highly redactional Galilean references." On the other hand, it is possible that the locale of Capernaum is pre-Marcan as elsewhere Mark does not seem to be overly familiar or comfortable with Palestinean geography. See also Best, Following, 91 n. 2.

[41]Pryke, Redactional, 69 n. 3; Wrede, Messianic, 146.

[42]The reference to αὐτούς in v. 33 refers back to the disciples of v. 31, and serves as a further link between the two pericopae.

[43]Best, Temptation, 81.

[44]On the Marcan literary style see Bultmann who notes that Mark often uses dialogue or controversy as a setting for logia. See also Mark 8:16-21; 10:41. Furthermore, sayings of Jesus are commonly introduced by Jesus asking a question (e.g., Mark 8:27b-30; 9:33-37; 12:35-37). Bultmann identifies both of these Marcan traits in Mark 9:33-34. See Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh (New York/Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963), 330-31. On some specifically Marcan vocabulary see Pryke (Redactional, 126-27) who notes the γαρ explanatory clause beginning v. 34 and the clause's inherent

problems which speaks of a "non-literary writer who delays important details until the facts have tumbled out..." (p. 127), Marcan imprecisions regarding the impersonal reference of v. 33 (p. 109, n. 4), the use of "house" (p. 69 n. 3).

[45]Montefiore opines that Mark may have borrowed from the tradition mirrored in Luke 22:24 for the original introduction to this story. The Synoptic Gospels, ed. C. G. Montefiore (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968), 2.217.

[46]Best, Following, 76.

[47]Paul Achtemeier, "Mark as Interpreter of the Jesus Tradition," Interpretation 32 4 (1978) 34. See Achtemeier's emphasis on the "blindness" of the disciples. See also S. Légasse (Jésus et L'Enfant [Paris: Gabalda, 1966] 25) who notes that in vv. 33-34 are hints of the problems of the Marcan community.

[48]Best, Following, 76.

[49]John Dominic Crossan (Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986]) identifies the following parallels within the synoptics: Matt 20:26-27; 23:11; Mark 10:43-44, Luke 2:22-26. Other exegetes would grant a larger number of parallels, i.e., Mark 10:31; 20:16, Luke 13:30. See also Best, Following, 76; Montefiore, Synoptic, 217. Bultmann suggests that although Mark 9:35 manifests an original tradition, Mark 10:43-44 reflects yet an older tradition. πάντων ἔσχατος and πάντων διάκονος point to Mark 9:35 as deriving from a double saying. Bultmann concludes that it is unlikely that Mark 9:35 is "alien to Mark's text" (History, 144).

[50]See Montefiore (Synoptic, 219) for the suggestion that v. 36 serves as an editorial introduction to v. 37.

[51]Best (Following, 79) notes that the presence of catchwords between v. 35b and v. 36-50 would suggest that the latter were attached to v. 35b in a pre-Marcan tradition. Best, however, omits to identify just what these catchwords are, if indeed they do exist.

[52]K. G. Reploh, Markus: Lehrer der Gemeinde (Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien 9; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), as cited in Best, Following, 78. Best notes that for Reploh the appearance of this rare word, coupled with the sudden presence of the child "and the clumsiness of ἐν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων in v. 37," signals the Marcan creation of v. 36. Best, Following, 78. John Dominic Crossan, (In Fragments [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983] 109) notes that Mark 9:36 is most probably created from Mark 10:16.

[53]Montefiore, on the other hand, recalls a figurative interpretation which associates children with the disciples, and which thus speaks of deeds of kindness to these disciples. In fact, "children were subsequently turned into disciples or into lowly members of the Christian community." Montefiore, Synoptic, 219. Links drawn between the children of Mark 9:37 and the followers of Mark 9:41 further this metaphorical interpretation.

[54]Crossan identifies the following "Receiving the Sender" parallels: Matt 10:40; 18:5; Luke 9:48; 10:16; John 5:23b; 12:44b; 13:20; Ign Eph 6:1; Did 11:4. See Sayings Parallels, 60, 185. Jeremias (New Testament, 254) cites the contemporary saying of "The one who receives the scribes is like one who receives the ... [Shechinah]..." (see Mek. Ex. on 18:12 end; b. Ber. 64a).

[55]In support of this interpretation see Best (Following, 79-80) who notes the baptismal connotations but holds that reception has to do with welcoming, showing kindness to, etc. For attestation to the latter interpretation, see B. Harvie Branscombe, The Gospel of Mark (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937, repr. 1964) 169.

[56]Crossan, identifying the obvious parallels between this pericope and the earlier child passage suggests that Mark built 10:13-16 in parallel with Mark 9:36-37 and Mark 9:38-39 (In Fragments, 318).

[57]With the view of Mark 10:13-16 dealing with attitudes toward children see Etienne Trocmé, The Formation of the Gospel According to Mark (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963) 37 n. 2. Yet another school suggests that Mark 10:13-16 is concerned with the nature of the kingdom. See Frederick Schilling, "What Means the Saying about Receiving the Kingdom of God as a Little Child? Mark X:15; Lk XVIII:17," Expository Times 77 (1965) 56.

[58]Trocme (Formation, 175 n. 3) affirms that this passage does not reflect any anti-church polemics. Others propose that Mark 10:13-16 is unlikely as a defense of infant baptism. See Best, Following, 107; Schilling, "Kingdom of God," 58. In support of this pericope promoting infant baptism see Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries (London: SCM, 1960) 48-58.

[59]Best, Following, 109 n.9. Rhetoricians would call this a "practical chreia." On various types of chreia, especially action chreia, see Aelius Theon of Alexandria, "On the Chreia," The Chriea in Ancient Rhetoric ed. Ronald Hock and Edward O'Neil (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1976) 83-112.

[60]Best, Following, 106. See, as well, previous statistics on Mark's use of καί.

[61]Best, Following, 106.

[62]Best, Following, 106.

[63]This point of view is well represented by Eerdman, The Gospel of Mark, 153. A more theologically "packed" interpretation suggests that through this gesture Jesus reveals mediates grace. Kee notes that in Mark there are many allusions to Jesus mediating grace, and the adherents approaching him in faith (i.e., Mark 1:41, 3:10, 5:27, 28, 30, 31; 6:56; 7:33; 8:22). Mark 10:13 "should be understood against the background of the others: to touch Jesus or be touched by him is to receive divine grace." See Kee, Community, 91-2.

[64]Branscombe, Gospel of Mark, 177; Best, Following, 109 n. 9. Bultmann suggests that the whole of vv. 13, 14 and 16 may be based "in the Jewish practice of blessing." See History, 32. Even further he links the pericope with 2 Kings 4:27 in which Elisha is ordered not to push away Gehazi by a man of God. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck (Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch, 1:808 [as cited by Bultmann, History, 32]) suggest that an analogy to a Rabbinic story is being drawn within the original unit (vv. 13, 14a, b, 16). See also Jeremias (Infant Baptism, 49) who quotes from the Babylonian Talmud (Lemberg, 1861) on this subject. Soph. 18:5 reads that "(i)t was a beautiful custom in Jerusalem to make little children, boys and girls fast on the fast-day ... and then to carry or lead them to the elders ... for them to bless them, strengthen ... and pray for them, that they might one day attain knowledge of the Torah and to good works."

[65]In Mark Jesus' response is of a more cutting nature than the Matthean and Lukan parallels suggest. See Branscombe, Gospel of Mark, 180. Weeden notes that "(t)he serious disagreement between the disciples and Jesus in 10:13ff has been reduced in Matthew and Luke by their deletion of ... 'he was indignant'...(10:14)" (Weeden, "The Heresy," 76 n. 11). For a further example of Mark's use of strong emotional descriptions of Jesus see Mark 14:33 (cf. Matt 26:37) and Mark 8:12 (cf. Matt 16:2; 12:39 and Luke 12:54).

[66]Best, Following, 106-107. See also C. H. Bird "Some γάρ Clauses in St. Mark's Gospel,"

JTS 4 (1953) 171-187.

[67]Kee, Community, 93. Acts 8:36 and 10:47 utilize "κωλύει" and "κωλῦσαι" respectively in conjunction with baptismal concerns. The acceptance of children into the community Kee notes, is based upon the question of the meaning of life, as sacred and productive, or as fruitless. The baptismal connotation of 14b, linked to this fundamental valuing of life, has roots in Hebrew tradition (e.g., Job 6:20, Joel 1:10-12, Prov. 10:5, 14:35, 17:2, 19:26).

[68]On the one hand Crossan (In Fragments, 318) notes that it is possible to view v. 13a + v. 14b as an "aphoristic story," although Mark's interpolations in v. 13b and v. 14a turn the passage into a "dialectical story." Crossan prefers to view all of vv. 13, 14 and 16 as Marcan creations. Kee (Community, 152), on the other hand, asserts the essential unity of v. 14 and v. 15. Kee cites E. Percy (Die Botschaft Jesu: Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung [Lund: Gleerup, 1953] 35) who notes, that the explanation demanded by v. 14 is supplied by v. 15. Percy furthers this emphasis on unity by suggesting that all of Mark 10:13-16 may be seen as a whole, essentially preserved from pre-Markan tradition. He bases this on the argument that the thought of v. 15 necessitates the presence of children. Kee refutes both the essential unity of the passage and the last assumption, while affirming Percy's first observation.

[69]See Pryke, Redactional Style, 128. Also, Best (Temptation, 67) notes that the allusion in 14c to βασιλεία signals a present rather than a future kingdom. Best observes that "kingdom" within this pericope (see also Mark 12:34) indicates a present occurence, in contrast to other "kingdom" references in Mark which are future oriented. This becomes significant as it affirms the radical nature of original aphorism, and heightens the impact of the transformation(s) demanded.

[70]It is thus apparent that any interpretation of v. 14c will be connected with that of v. 15. Best notes that if, on one hand, v. 14c predates v. 15 then the whole of v. 14 may be understood in two ways. Within a classical interpretation the kingdom belongs "to those similar to children". In a Hellenistic sense the kingdom belongs "to those children." Best opts for the latter interpretation in which the "kingdom" literally belongs to children. On the other hand, if 14c can be seen as Marcan, introducing the independent logion of v. 15, then it cannot be connected to the pericope's original intent, and functions in an introductory and emphasizing capacity. Because v. 14c merely comments upon v. 15, this would suggest in turn that v. 15 is pre-Marcan. Best wisely chooses a later dating of v. 14c Following, 107).

[71]Best, Following, 107.

[72]See, for example, Bultmann (History, 32) who notes that the thematic difference between vv. 14 and 15 make it appropriate to treat v. 15 as an originally independent dominical saying.

[73]Kee, Community, 102. Kee bases his analysis on E. Käsemann "Pronouncements of Holy Law," New Testament Questions of Today (London: SCM/ Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 66-81. Kee observes, for example, the presence of "ἀμήν" (an Aramaic expression) in the following predicitons Mark 3:28-30; 9:41; 11:23.

[74]Best, Following, 107. Luke must have noticed the redundancy of v. 16 and subsequently omits the verse in Luke 18:15-17.

[75]Sean P. Kealy, Mark's Gospel: A History of Interpretation: From the Beginning until 1979 (New York: Paulist, 1982) 222.

[76]Schilling, "What Means the Saying about Receiving the Kingdom of God as a Little

Child?" ExpT 77 (1965) 57. Schilling suggests that the historical interpretation of Mark 10:15 has been confused with Matt 18:3 rather than its parallel in Matt 19:14. He suggests that the parabolic language involved in Mark 10:15 is obstructed in this confusion.

[77]Best, Following, 108. The concept of receiving the "kingdom" as a child is not paralleled in either Matt 18:3 or John 3:5. Nor do vv. 14c-15 suggest that children are models of how to be recipients. Best in effect proposes that the two elements, children and kingdom, need to be viewed as having equal status. He concludes rather generally that as children trust adults, so adults are to trust and receive from God. Children therefore are to be models of trust rather than reception.

[78]On the subject of possible baptismal intent Jeremias notes that although the narrative originally had "nothing to do with baptism" Mark 10:15 nonetheless "contains indirect references to baptism." See Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 49, 54.

[79]Crossan, Sayings Parallels, 77 and 194; 60 and 185 respectively. Crossan observes the "Kingdom and Children" saying in Matt 18:3; Matt 18:14; Mark 10 14b; Luke 18:16b; John 3:3,5; Gos. Thom. 22; 2 Clem. 12:1-6. "Receiving the Sender" has already been identified in the earlier child pericope in Mark 9:37. This presence of this verse has strong affects on Mark's presentation of 10:15.

[80]Crossan, In Fragments, 316.

[81]Crossan (In Fragments, 213) notes that an "aphoristic conclusion at the end of a story is quite common in Mark." Crossan, however, does not identify Mark 10:16 as such, but rather views vv. 13, 14 and 16 as wholly Marcan.

[82]On the loving nature and welcoming nature of the child see George R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament, (London: MacMillan, 1963); on the noetic characteristic of children see Ambrozic, The Hidden, 158; on faithfulness, see Légasse, Jésus, 139. For a thorough overview of interpretations of "child" in Mark see Ambrozic, The Hidden, 148-158.

[83]For child as the socially down-trodden see Best, Following, 79, 78 and Robinson, Problem, 84. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins [New York: Crossroad, 1984] 148) renders Mark 10:15 as "[w]hoever does not receive the basileia of God like a child (slave) shall not enter it." Here children are literally equated with the down-trodden. On embodying the traits of the kingdom see Schilling, "What Means," 57-58.

[84]See for example Crossan ("The Relatives," 82-113) for further clarification.

[85]See, for example, the incident involving the exorcist of Mark 9:38-40. The disciples question his "right" to cast out demons in Jesus' name. The disciples yet retain the "old" rules.

Chapter Three: Matthew 18:1-4, 5; 19:13-15

The next task in determining the original form of the "child" saying lies in the redactional analysis of the Matthew 18:1-4, 5 and Matt 19:13-15. It is foremost apparent that Matthew here relies heavily on Mark. As noted, Mark's chastizing presentation of the disciples greatly influences the meaning and use of the child saying. In a similar manner, Matthew's concept of ideal discipleship affects the child passages. And for Matthew relational and ecclesial humility are the key to both ideal discipleship and the child pericopae.

A. Disciples

There are a number of views of Matthew's disciples. These μαθηταί may represent the twelve leaders of the early Christian community. On the other hand, the disciples may refer to all of the members of the Matthean community, without distinguishing between μικρός and μαθητής.[1]

It is here that the first point of divergence from Mark's view of the disciples can be located. Thompson, in a thorough analysis of the question of the designation of disciple, concludes that the literary evidence favours Matthew's inclusive definition of discipleship. He suggests that four elements in Matthew supply near conclusive evidence that οἱ μαθηταί are representative of the whole Matthean community. First, Matthew makes more references to the disciples than do either of the other Synoptic writers. This fact may suggest the prominence of the disciples within the Matthean schema, but also points to the consistency of their presence throughout the whole narrative. Second, Matthew refers less to "the Twelve" than do either Mark or Luke, but instead prefers to use "the Twelve disciples" or the "Twelve apostles." Third, Matthew's inclusion of the choosing of "the Twelve" omits much of the detail found in Mark 3:12-19 and Luke 6:12-16. Matthew merely cites the names of "the Twelve" and appears uninterested in the specifics. And finally, references to the "Twelve" are found solely within missionary contexts, at points in which

-63-

these specific few are presented as distinct from the rest of the community for a specific proselytizing role. (i.e., Matt 10:1; 11:1; "apostles" of 10:2; "these Twelve" of 10:5). This evidence would suggest that the disciples of Matthew represent the Matthean church.[2]

The prominent role of Peter in this gospel provides yet a second point of divergence from Mark's depiction of the disciples. This "inflation" manifests itself in the presentation of Peter as the one first called (Matt 4:18), in his confessing of Jesus (Matt 16:16), and in other special roles within Matt 14:28-31; 16:17-19; 17:24-27 and 18:21-22. The depictions of Peter, however, are not all one sided. Matthew intensifies the rebuke in Matt 26:34 in response to Peter's profession of unfailing support (26:33). In Matt 16:23-24 and 26:69-75 Peter's remonstration and denials of Jesus are depicted in a harsher light.[3]

There are various interpretations of Matthew's intensification. Peter has been seen to be a "representative" disciple. In this same light, the authority given to Peter, the authority to bind and loose, can be seen as having been given to the whole of the Matthean community, and is exercised by all (e.g. Matt 18:18).[4] It is even possible that Matthew's depiction of Peter mirrors the problems inherent in Matthew's own community. The process of determining social roles and structures would have been of singular importance to the early church, requiring resolution that might be manifest in the depiction of Peter.[5]

Despite the prominent role of Peter, the disciples of Matthew's gospel are presented as a fairly homogenous group, distinct from both the enemies and the crowds. The disciples are those who are expected to hear and to follow Jesus (i.e., Matt 4:8-22; 8:18-22; 9:9). They are to manifest the radical ethical response inherent in believing in Jesus as Son of God.[6]

The final area of divergence from Mark is Matthew's presentation of disciples who do comprehend, albeit imperfectly. Here Matthew differs pointedly from Mark. The motif of the misunderstanding disciples in the earlier gospel is tailored to fit Matthew's own editorial agenda. Unlike the crowd the disciples already understand Jesus' meaning (e.g., Matt 18:36-52).

References to the disciples lack of understanding are actually omitted from Matthew's account (i.e., Matt 13:36, 51; 14:31-33; 15:16; 16:9-12; 17:3, 4, 9, 23; 20:17). Especially indicative of Matthew's motif of understanding is Matt 14:22-33. In Mark Jesus walks on the water (Mark 6:45-52) and the disciples exhibit collective terror, astonishment and hardness of heart. In Matt 14:33 the disciples (including Peter) profess to Jesus "ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ" ("Truly you are the Son of God").

Unlike the disciples in Mark, who are presumably graced with comprehension only after Jesus' death and resurrection, Matthew's disciples already do understand. They express disbelief and manifest sinfulness, but do move to understanding and faith. Although not always prototypes of discipleship, the disciples are able to penetrate the mystery of Jesus' identity.[7] Matthew softens the Marcan imaging of the disciples. Consequently, Matthew moves the child pericopae from polemical to didactic intent.

The role of the disciples within Matthew, including the representative and inflated role of Peter, has direct implications for the "child" pericopes in question. As noted, the disciples of Matthew differ greatly from those of Mark, existing not as opponents of Jesus, but as faithful, though fallible, followers. Basic to understanding Matthew's use of "children" is to recognize what virtues the disciples portray, and thereby to assess what Matthew defines as appropriate response to revelation. Also central to ideal discipleship in Matthew is the virtue of humility which functions both interpersonally and ecclesially.

B. Humility

In the earliest stages of modern biblical scholarship T. W. Manson ascertained that "humility is the virtue required of the disciples."[8] Subsequent scholarship is in accord Manson's hypothesis. The persistent thread in biblical scholarship which links the Matthean depictions of disciple, humility and salvation necessitates closer observation.

It is in the Beatitudes of chapter 5 that Matthew prounounces eschatological blessings and outlines the nature of discipleship. By aligning the Beatitudes with the promises of

Isaiah 61 Matthew presents Jesus as the fulfillment of ancient prophecy. And as a result the Beatitudes speak first of the coming of the eschaton, and periphrastically, of ideal Christian virtues.[9] They explicitly promise blessings to those who are meek, lowly, and persecuted, and the like. And these pronouncements of blessings function neither as guidelines for repentance, nor as guidelines for ecclesial comportment. "Rather, they are ways of describing the actual conditions of the Christian community which will be dealt with when the new Age arrives."[10] The lowly and the weak will comprise the eschatological Kingdom; it is to them that the promises are made.

The Matthean version differs from its Lukan counterpart at the very onset of the passage. In v. 3a it is the "poor in spirit" that are blessed, whereas Luke 6:20b speaks merely of "the poor." It is this point of divergence (or difference, as some debate still exists as to the priority of either version) that is axiomatic to an understanding of Matthew's intentions regarding virtue, discipleship and, subsequently, children.[11]

Luke's intentions regarding the meaning of Luke 6:20b are most often surmised as of economic import. The gospel writer speaks to the economically disenfranchized, and later explicitly chastizes those who are rich in Luke 6:24. The material state of poverty seems to be the focus of the Lukan form of the first beatitude.

The meaning of the Matthean version, however, is somewhat more problematic. Jan Lambrecht proposes three possible meanings for "poor in spirit."[12] The first is economic. The poor, like the Lukan referants, are those economically disadvantaged. To this socio-economic base Matthew adds a theological interest and construes these "poor" to be "interiorly detached." Thus the modifying phrase, "in spirit" functions as an addition to Luke's literal and economic intent of Luke 6:20b. A second plausible explanation is religious in nature. In early Jewish history the poor consisted of those ignorant of the law; those lacking in the necessary "spiritual goods."

Yet a third interpretation has gained much support in recent scholarship. It lies in the Hebrew vision of the poor in spirit being faithful to the law and to God in a state of humility. And axiomatic to the argument is the third Beatitude (Matt 5:5) in

which blessings are pronounced upon the meek. Jacques Dupont proposes that these two verses are more than thematically connected. The first (and perhaps third) beatitude he views as deriving from Is 61:1 and Ps 37:11a. Dupont further notes that the Hebrew/Aramaic term 'anawim refers to the bowed down, the lowly, and the oppressed. Greek, however, translates the one term into two, πτωχός ("poor," lit. "begging) and πραύς ("gentle," "humble"). In light of the common linguistic root of the terms it is possible that Matthew intends the same meaning for both 5:3 and 5:5. The audience, of course, would have had to understand the fundamental unity of the two terms.[13]

In a similar interpretive light is Ernest Best's position. Best proposes that the Matthean church may have been subject to both ostracism and persecution in its transition to an autonomous community. This would account for the rejection/persecution beatitude of Matt 5:10 where "(b)lessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."[14] In light of this social reality Best proposes that the meaning of "poor in spirit" may be best understood as referring to one who is "fainthearted." Matthew may have recognized the demands of discipleship in the midst of a persecuted church, and the very likelihood of accompanying fear.[15] Not dissimilarly, Ulrich Luz suggests that fear within the gospel of Matthew is to be "consistently understood as the expression of human unbelief and little faith."[16] Thus, unlike the misunderstanding disciples of Mark the fear-filled/ awe-filled followers in Matthew manifest qualities which render them capable of discipleship.

Of these possible explanations the third is most probable. Although at first glance it would appear that Matthew would have had to assume too much of the readers of the text, this is not the case. First, evidence suggests that v. 5 comes to Matthew as a clarification of the earlier v. 3. Its position in the text may be attributed to the lack of recognition of the Greek audience of its parallel to and clarifying of v. 3.[17] Its coherence with the later verse is explained by the common Hebrew/Aramaic source and language.

Lambrecht's preferred explanation, the double reference to "poor and interiorly detached" does cohere with the emphasis on humility. However, there is very little evidence to support that Matthew was overly concerned with poverty. Persecution is an obvious Matthean theme; economic abasement is not. Interpreting "poor in spirit" as a salvific reference alluding to the "people of the earth" does not follow well. This neither coheres strongly with Matthean redaction intent nor does it further the radical nature of the Beatitudes themselves. It is most probable, then, that in this eschatological blessing in 5:3 Matthew is referring to those who are interiorly detached from the world, rather than those fainthearted, meek, or possessing the land. This interior detachment has ramifications in both interpersonal and ecclesial settings. Here the virtue of humility ensures that there is no domination of one over another.

In conclusion, the emphasis on humility as a quality of true discipleship can be seen throughout the Matthew as an appropriate response to the revelation of the eschaton. The early recognition of humility as a Matthean virtue, in the works of T. W. Manson, and subsequent polemics in modern scholarship regarding the implications of "poor in spirit," suggest that Matthew's concern with humility is pervasive of the first gospel. The identification of Matthew's soteriological emphasis on the virtue of humility anticipates the subsequent relationship between "child" and discipleship. It is in the following redactional analysis that Manson's hypothesis that Matthew "accordingly finds [humility] in the child" will be tested and verified.[18]

C. Redactional Analysis: Matt 18:1-4, 5

The pericope 18:1-4, 5 falls in the middle of Matthew's gospel and occurs while Jesus and his followers are in Capernaum (17:24), having just come from Galilee (17:22). The general division of the gospel has been a source of interest, and has generated a variety of interpretations.[19] Noteworthy is Kee's hypothesis which partitions Matthew into three main categories. The central section, chapters from 3:1 to 25:46 contains five subsections. As one of these smaller units Matt 18:1-35 contains both 18:1-5 and 19:13-16.[20]

However, that Matthew has placed the Markan introduction of 9:33a in 17:24 suggests that 17:24-27 is connected with 18:1-4, 5 and subsequently is part of this subsection. Furthermore, 17:24-27 follows at the heals of the second passion prediction (as does Mark 9:33-37). Kee notes that greatness and responsibility are the themes that link 18:1-35 (now 17:24-18:35). Notably, these same motifs are contained within the first of the child sayings.

It is also apparent that Matthew associates 18:1-4, 5 with Matt 10:1-42, Matthew's discourse on mission. In fact, Matthew has omitted the dispute regarding the strange exorcist of Mark 9:38-40 and has transferred Mark 9:41 to this earlier discourse (Matt 10:42). This relocation and the association of Matthew's chapter 10 with Matt 18:1-4, 5 ensures that the first child pericope is related to issues of the Matthean church. However, it is probable that Matthew does not reinforce ecclesial hierarchy in Matt 18:1-4, 5. Matthew's emphasis in the pericope is also eschatological.[21]

At first glance it would appear that vv. 1-5 are almost directly parallel with Mark 9:33-37 as Matthew has preserved the relative Markan order of 18:1-4, 5 = Mark 9:33-37. However, the exact relationship between 18:5 and the preceeding verses is a matter of dispute. The catchword παιδίον no doubt functions as a link between 18:1-4 and 18:5. On one hand, then, v. 5 may be seen as concluding 18:1-4. In the vv. 6-9 the subjects are the little ones, τῶν μικρῶν τούτων, provide a possible link with the children of v. 5. As well, the monition regarding scandal (18:6b) is not unlike that of 18:3 in which woe befalls those unwilling to fulfill the stipulations. On the other hand v. 5 may be viewed as an introduction to the later pericope 18:6-9. And finally, it is possible to view v. 5 in connection to both the preceeding and the following pericopes.

The absence of Mark 9:37c provides a clue to Matthew's use of the final saying in a manner unlike both Mark and Luke. Verse 5 does in fact function as a link between vv. 1-4 and vv. 6-9. In v. 5 the child is no longer a model for imitation, as is suggested in vv. 3-4, but is symbolic of those being received. It is most probable, then, that in Matthew the basis of the child pericope with which we are dealing is found in vv. 1-4.[22]

Although Matt 18:1-4, 5 follows Marcan order Mark 9:34, 35 and 37c are omitted. Furthermore, the addition of Matthew 18:3 to the Markan skeleton subtly changes the focus of the pericope, as will be seen.

1. Matt 18:1

(18:1) Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες τίς ἄρα μείζων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν;

(18:1) At that time the disciples came to Jesus, saying, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?"

Attempting to ascertain the editorial hand of Matthew is not difficult in this verse. Manson notes that the whole of verse one can be understood as "an editorial rewriting of Mk 9:33f so as to save the face of the disciples."[23]

Distinctive elements within v. 1 mark it as a product of Matthean redaction. The first can be located in the geographical setting and locale. In Mark Jesus and his disciples arrive in Capernaum whereupon Jesus confronts the disciples (Mark 9:33).[24] In Matthew the disciples and Jesus are already in Capernaum (Matt 17:24). Matthew has moved the introduction to Mark 9:33 to the preceding passage.[25] Like Mark, Matthew keeps the incident in the comfortable setting of a house. This unity of location between Matt 17:24-27 and Matt 18:1-4, 5 points to Matthean editorializing.

Second, the introductory phrase ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ suggests that there is no time interval between Matt 18:1-4, 5 and the previous discussion in Matt 17:24-27. This formula is common to Matthew (i.e., Matt 5:1, 13:36, 19:15, 24:3, 26:17), and is a stereotypic narrative introduction.[26] This further strengthens the link between Matt 17:24-27 and 18:1-4, 5.

Third, Matthew's question in v. 1b contains the inferential particle ἄρα. Thompson notes that although τίς ἄρα is uncharacteristic of Matthew, the interrogative form utilized here is paralleled in Matt 19:25, 27 and 24:25 and likewise functions to link passages.[27] It is most probable, however, that Matthew's usage suggests that this question (explicitly dealt with in 18:4) is an inference of Jesus' immediately preceeding response, which has

to do with kings and their kingdoms (17:24-27).[28]

Fourth, Matthew changes the audience of the verse. The reference to οἱ μαθηταί differs from Mark's oblique term αὐτούς (Mark 9:33; cf Mark 9:31). In v. 1 Matthew makes no distinction between the disciples and the Matthean community.[29]

Fifth, Matthew's tendency to direct discourse is apparent in the direct questioning of Jesus by the disciples apparent in 1b (see also Matt 13:10, 15:12, 17:19, 21:20, 24:3). The disciples' direct questioning reflects positively back upon them. They do not expect Jesus to guess at their intentions, nor do they hide their queries from him. In fact, this more favourable picture of the disciples serves to refine the passage.[30] Jesus, too, is presented in a more human light, and need not read their minds or their hearts (cf. Mark 9:33-34). Consequently, the disciples of Matthew are presented as more open than their Markan counterparts.[31]

And finally, the second half of v. 1 contains the characteristic and idiosyncratic Matthean form of the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, the "kingdom of heaven." The allusion to "heaven" may indicate either Matthew's hand or a pre-Matthean tradition. In meaning βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is not to be distinguished from the more common expression "kingdom of God." Both expressions denote God's dominion. However, this terminology allows insight into Matthew's soteriological schema. This idiom places an accent on entrance into the future (i.e., eschatological) kingdom, but does not exclude either a past or a present kingdom.[32] In the Matthean beatitudes of Matt 5:3-12 those who are lowly inherit the kingdom. Similarly Matthew accents here the eschatological blessings pronounced on those who have priority in the kingdom. And these lowly ones are the children of vv. 2, 3, 4 and 5.

In conclusion Matt 18:1 shows many signs of the the gospel writer's hand. Matthew links v. 1 with the previous pericope Matt 17:24-27 with ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ and ἄρα Matthew's relocation of Mark 9:33a to the earlier pericope further binds the two passages. Matthew thereby contrasts the kings and kingdoms of Matt 17:25 and the kingdom of Matt 18:1 (and vv. 3, 4). The omission of the dispute (cf. Mark 9:33-34) and the movement to direct

discourse casts a positive light on the disciples and as well presents Jesus in an authoritative stance.

2. (Mark 9:35)

Matthew relocates Mark 9:35 to chapter 23. The absence of this verse coheres with Matthew's literary style of abbreviating narrative (e.g., Matt 8:2-4, 14-15; 9:18-26; 14:15-21).[33] At the same time Matthew omits a troublesome reference to "the Twelve," which is also absent in Matt 23:11. Matthew ensures that Matt 18:1-4, 5 is not interpreted on an ecclesial level. This pericope does not deal with servanthood in the church but rather emphasizes the eschatological kingdom.

The "Leader as Servant" saying, however, is transferred to Matt 23:11 within a discourse concerning the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt 23:1-36). This parallel is preceeded by a discussion on pride (Matt 23:2-7) and a discourse on the true practice of humility (Matt 23:8-10). In its usage, then, this aphorism functions within an exhortation on appropriate comportment in this present world. And perhaps Matthew speaks here of true humility.

3. Matt 18:2

(18:2) καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτό ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν

(18:2) And calling to him a child, he put him/her (lit. it) in the midst of them,

This verse, like 18:1, poses little difficulty in a redactional analysis. Manson suggests that Matthew derives 18:2 from Mark 9:36.[34] The vocabulary used is uncharacteristic of Matthew although v. 2 exhibits a style similar to Mark.

The form of v. 2 is bipartite. The conjunction καί follows v. 1 in a manner which suggests progression of the story line. The second half of the verse involves a a symbolic action which in turn introduces the saying found in vv. 3-4.[35]

The uncharacteristic verb προσκαλεῖν may suggest a more refined introduction than the Markan verb λαμβάνειν. In Matthew the child is not present in the house, the passage necessitating some form of calling the child.[36] Such clarification and polishing of the

verse is indeed indicative of an editorial hand.

Matthew edits Mark 9:36b, thereby omitting Jesus taking the child into his arms. This serves at least two literary purposes. First, Matthew shortens the narrative and subsequently emphasizes the dialogue (i.e., vv. 3, 4, 5). Second, although the child is still placed in the midst of the disciples, Jesus and the child are not as closely aligned in Matt 18:2 as Mark 9:36c would suggest. Does Matthew suggest, in effect, that the child need not be protected from the disciples? Perhaps. The omission certainly decreases the apparent tension between the disciples and the child of Mark 9:36.

In conclusion, the brevity of Matt 18:2 prepares the way for the discourse of vv. 3-5. Matthew's disciples do not function in opposition to the child of v. 2. By the onset of v. 3 Matthew has already thrown a positive light over the disciples.

4. Matt 18:3

> (18:3) καὶ εἶπεν
> ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία,
> οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

> (18:3) and said,
> "Truly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children,
> you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.

This verse does not appear in either of the immediate Markan or Lukan parallels. The structure of 18:3 is tripartite, consisting of an introduction, a condition of entrance and a following monition regarding salvation. A look to each of these components will be of assistance in determining both the hand and the intent of Matthew.

Matthew begins this verse with an introductory formula common to all the synoptics and John, namely, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν. Within Matthew's use, this formula preludes either an important statement, or is seen as an introduction to a concluding statement.[37] Because of the saying found in v. 3b it is probable that the earlier portion of the verse (i.e., "...and said, "Truly, I say to you...") functions primarily in an introductory capacity. It is notable that Matthew has dropped Mark's reference αὐτοῖς, thereby diminishing the presence of the disciples as a group distinct from the child.

The canon provides four parallels to the saying (i.e., Mark 10:15, Luke 18:17ab, John 3:3 and John 3:5) which are helpful in an attempt to determine the source of 18:3.[38] That Matthew has borrowed the narrative setting of Mark 9:33-37 to enclose 18:3 would suggest that v. 3 as well may derive from Mark. Bultmann, of this view, suggests that 18:3 "is clearly not an independent tradition, but is the Matthean form of Mark 10:15 in another context."[39] This would have first necessitated relocating Mark 10:15 to the setting of the first child pericope. Matthew would then have had to *alter* Mark's verb structure, from "receive" to "turn and become," involving both a substitution for Mark's "receive" and the introduction of a second verb.

Although Matthew is not unfamiliar with either στρέφειν and γένομαι, there seems little editorial logic in changing from "receive" to "turn and become."[40] The verbs of v. 3 do not serve Matthew's editorial agenda to any notable degree. Furthermore, the change between παιδίον of Mark 10:15 and παιδια of 18:3 suggests the independent nature of Matthew's logia. Were Mark 10:15 employed here Matthew would surely have utilized its singular referrant, as it would have been consistent with the παιδίον of vv. 2, 4 and 5. The plural of v. 3 stands out against the other referrants. The literary tension between the terms points further to 18:3 as paralleled in, but not deriving from, Mark 10:15. Contrary to Bultmann it is most probable that the saying itself existed in a migrant form, and came to Matthew independent of Mark.

How Matthew *utilizes* v. 3 is another matter altogether. Certainly the allusion to children, τὰ παιδία, is a general referrant.[41] The clue to Matthew's use of the saying may be found in the formulation of the verse in second person plural. Matthew directs the monition, and the whole of 3ab explicitly to the μαθηταί of Matt 18:1, unlike the third person referents in the Mark, Luke and John. Luz notes that in this form "the disciples themselves are challenged to conversion ... (This) ... corresponds to Matthew's conception of the community as 'corpus mixtum.'"[42] Matthew utilizes the child saying for the purposes of community exhortation.

On a more general level the entrance requirements recall Matt 5:20, "(f)or unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." In a thorough analysis of the points of contrast and complementarity, Thompson notes that both verses are characterized by an introduction, a negative formulation and a solemn tone. The conclusions of Matt 18:3 and 5:20 are identical in vocabulary, composition and word order. Determining the relative priority is rendered difficult as each verse could well have influenced the other. Because the earlier verse is considered "proper to the gospel" Thompson maintains that v. 3 was probably altered upon its reception and implementation by Matthew.[43] However, the strong similarities between Matt 18:3 and 5:20 do not explain the numerous parallels to the saying, specifically those with very similar structures (e.g., Joh 3:3; 3:5; Gos. Thom. log. 22a).

The *meaning* of Matt 18:3 is difficult to ascertain. Most problematic of all is the stipulation regarding "turning" and "becoming." In one sense, the στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε may be the demand of total conversion of both mind and heart, as argued by W. Trilling.[44] On another hand, στράφητε, based in the Hebrew sub and the Aramaic tub, could mean "again." Thus the phrase would be rendered "become again." Because both possibilities cannot be discarded Thompson wisely opts for the more neutral terminology, "turn and become."[45]

In conclusion, Matthew diminishes the presence of the disciples by omitting the reference to them in v. 3. Matthew thereby emphasizes the saying in v. 3 and the remaining discourse in v. 4 and v. 5. The presence of the logion in v. 3 may reflect the redeployment of Mark 10:15. Matthew's "turn and become," however, points to an independent tradition, as does the change from the singular to the plural in the reference to children. The emphasis on some type of conversion or transformation in Matthew's version of the saying becomes explicable in the juxtaposition ov v. 3 and v. 4. And it is in the light of v. 4 that Matthew's *understanding* of the child saying becomes clear.

5. Matt 18:4

(18:4) ὅστις οὖν ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὡς τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μείζων ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

(18:4) Whoever humbles himself like this child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.

Like the preceding verse, Matt 18:4 has no parallels in Mark's first child pericope. And it is this verse that makes clear Matthew's meaning and intention regarding the child saying in v. 3.   .

In form v. 4 is biparite. Several components of v. 4a suggest its independence from the previous verse. First, the audience of verse 4a has changed from those identified in the second person "you" of verse 3. Second, οὖν introduces v. 4a but does not ameliorate the fluidity of the passage, indicating the lack of logical sequence between the two verses.[46]

Third, the form and motif of v. 4a are akin to 23:12b which states that "whoever humbles himself will be exalted." The audience of each saying is signalled by a general pronominal referent. In both verses the motif of self abasement is associated with subsequent exultation.[47]

However, Matthew 23:12b has parallels in both Luke 14:11 and Luke 18:14, "(f)or every one who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted (Luke 14:11 ‖ Luke 18:14)." There is some possibility that Luke 14:11 ‖ 18:14b ‖ Matt 23:12 are from Q. If such is the case, Matthew has adapted a Q saying to the specific context of both chapters 23 and 18. In both cases Matthew has eliminated the antithetic form which predicts that those exalted will be humbled.[48]

In fact, the imitation of this saying does cohere with the theme of Matt 18:1-4, 5. The omission of the monition regarding exultation ensures that the disciples are not chastized here for self-aggrandizement, as they are in Mark. And the addition of the simile, "like this child," furthers Matthew's agenda. First, τὸ παιδίον functions as a catch-word, linking vv. 1, 3 and 4. And second, "children" are linked with humility (v. 4a).

There is also the distinct possibility that that Matthew 23:11 reflects Mark 9:35. We recall that Matthew relocates the servant saying to 23:12. The imitation of Mark 23:11 suggests an indirect connection with Mark 9:35. [49] This connection is not unlikely given that Matthew is aware of both the servant saying (Mark 9:35 ‖ Matt 23:12) and the saying on humility (Matt 18:4 ‖ 23:11). Their respective locations in the text (esp. 23:11-12) suggest an underlying connection. Albeit indirectly, Matthew links the humility of v. 4 with the theme of service (i.e., omitted servant saying in Mark 9:35).

The concluding statement in v. 4b restates the interrogative of v. 1b. In fact, an analysis of the form of 18:4b shows that it appears in almost exactly the same form as does 18:1b, with the exception of varying pronouns and a change of form from query to statement.[50]

Matthew uses v. 4, then, as a counterpart to the question of v. 1, which is answered in v. 3. Kee correctly observes that 18:4 indicates that "the previous verse needs an explanation... the logion no long carried a clear message by itself."[51] It is here in v. 4 that we find the clue to Matthew's interpretation of v. 3. The child of v. 4 is humble. In v. 3, one must be transformed as a child to gain entrance into the kingdom of heaven. Matthew binds, then, humility and salvation.

In conclusion, v. 3 and v. 4 were most probably originally unconnected. Verse 4a can be seen as helping to clarify the allusions to παιδίον of v. 2 and the παιδία the earlier verse.[52] This is accomplished by the alignment of children and humility. By linking the two Matthew understands and utilizes children as a cipher for humility.

The emphasis on the virture of humility serves Matthew's editorial agenda. Matthew juxtaposes two sayings regarding children and humility (and their indirect link to servanthood). Within a salvific model Matt 18:3-4 actually describe the nature and the rewards of true discipleship. Those who are humble will gain entrance to the kingdom. It is notable that in both v. 3 and v. 4 the disciples are not the focus of any polemic. Matthew has softened the logion of v. 3 by inserting the interpretive saying in v. 4, and successfully renders the passage paranetical rather than polemical.

6. Matt 18:5

(18:5) καὶ ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται ἓν παιδίον τοιοῦτο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται.

(18:5) Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me;"

Matthew deviates from Mark 9:37 in the addition of the conjunction καί. This serves to assist the connection between v. 4 and v. 5.[53] It is significant that v. 5 finds parallels in Mark 9:37a, Luke 9:46a, and John 13:20b. Matthew, however, omits the second half of the saying (cf. Mark 9:37b, Luke 9:48b).

Why Matthew edits Mark 9:37c from the pericope is a matter of debate. Matthew's use of the full saying in Matt 10:40 indicates that the editor, at the very least, is not opposed to the eschatology of the concluding promise. Thompson suggests that the same saying has been adapted to both Matt 18:5 and 10:40, and concludes that the latter part of the saying is best suited to its presence in 10:40. Furthering this McNeile notes that in 10:40 the disciples are in positions similar to the children of 18:5. It is possible, then, that the "children" of v. 5 represent for Matthew the "little ones" named in Matt 10:42a.[54]

On yet another level the omission of the latter part of the saying can be seen as Matthew's attempt to maintain a consistent soteriological aproach. It is possible that v. 5 is linked with the parable of the Judgement in Matt 25:31-46. As deeds are done to "the least of the brethren" so they are done to Jesus. It is also significant that in Matt 20:31-46 judgement and reward takes place at the eschaton. The parable of Judgement focusses upon deeds done prior to the eschaton. It is possible that v. 5 Matthew too emphasizes the necessity of reception in the here and now. The omission of Mark 9:35c reinforces the link between reception of the "least" and reception of Jesus in present times. Reception of "the one who sent me" signals immediate reward. Such is not Matthew's intent.

It is in the linking of v. 5 with the following pericope, vv. 6-9, that the meaning of "reception" becomes more clear. The παιδίον clearly are representative of those recipients of the "kingdom." Most probably the παιδίον of v. 5 are the "little ones" of v. 6a, and "the least" of Matt 20:31-46. As previously noted, Matthew utilizes the term "little ones"

in reference to the disciples. Thus, the promise of v. 5 logically is followed by the warning of v. 6, with the incumbent woes of v. 7, and the more general proverbs of vv. 8-9. [55]

In support of this connection is the fact that were 18:5 to be seen as inherently apportioned with 18:1-4 the meaning of παιδίον would be rendered unclear. The emphasis of the verse, and the passage, would suggest an equation of the child and Jesus.[56] However, such a connection is not fully consistent with Matthew's aims in chapter 18 wherein greatness and responsibility in the kingdom are of primary concern.

7. Conclusions: Matt 18:1-4, 5

In 18:1-4, 5 Matthew has typically expanded the discourse and shortened the narrative. Not only does this serve to tidy the form and content of the source material, but this editing also emphasizes the dialogue. The climax of the verse apears in vv. 3-4 in which the question of v. 1b finds an answer. The motif of reception in v. 5 is furthered in vv. 6-9.

Although 18:1-4,5 is connected via the catchword παιδίον, Matthew's references to children are not consistent. The reference to child in v. 2 seems to be one carrying a literal intent. The children of v. 3 and the child of v. 4 function merely as the embodiment of some trait (i.e., humility) glorified by Matthew. Verse 5, on the other hand, seems to refer back to the child of v. 2. This suggests that the reception of a child (v. 5) is not so much a spiritual matter but the reception of some tangible person (i.e., disciple).

Matthew's addition of v. 4 to the pericope functions to interpret v. 3. Becoming like children is tantamount to being humble. And it is humility that Matthew values (e.g., Matt 5:3-12). And the relocation of v. 3 from the second child passage in Mark ensures that becoming like children is not interpreted in the literal sense. Left in Matt 19:13-15 the child saying would have concerned the radical response to Jesus in discipleship (see Matt 19:13-12; 19:16-22). Placed in this pericope v. 3 is best understood as symbolic. Children are a cipher for humility.

In conclusion, the whole of verses Matt 18:1-4 can be viewed as a form of introduction to the monitions and promises of 18:5, 6-9. Thus "child" would be the "type of person whom the disciples are to receive in the name of Jesus."[57]

It is most probable that Matthew intends for the children of vv. 1-4, 5 to be associated with the "little ones" (alias disciples) of vv. 6-9. As the children are humble (v. 4), so are the disciples. And as the children are to be received (v.5), so too are the disciples.[58] Matthew's disciples are redeemable, and are urged to emulate the humility of children. And even further the positive estimation of children within Matt 18:1-5 directly reflects upon Matthew's depiction of the disciples (i.e., Matt 18:6-9).

D. Redactional Analysis: Matt 19:13-15

Like Matt 18:1-4, 5, this second pericope falls in the middle of the gospel. Within a broader setting Matt 19:13-15 is situated within Jesus' ministry in Judea and precedes the final Jerusalem ministry (Matt 21:1-9), culminating in the Passion and Resurrection drama of Matt 26:1-28:20.

Matthew has not relocated the pericopae relative to Mark, but has inserted a strictly Matthean passage in 19:10-12. This inclusion, dealing with eunuchs in the kingdom, follows a section on marriage (19:3-9). The eunuchs of vv. 10-12 are related to those who do not marry and cannot receive the preceding exhortations regarding marriage. Most probably the child passage has no relationship with Matt 19:10-12. Matt 19:13-15 introduces the story of the rich young man (Matt 19:16-22).

In vv. 13-15 Matthew has preserved Mark's sequence of verses almost without change. The most notable alteration lies in the deployment of Mark 10:15 from this pericope into 18:1-4, 5.

1. Matt 19:13

(13) Τότε προσηνέχθησαν αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύξηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς.

(13) Then children were brought to him that he might lay his hands on them and pray. The disciples rebuked the people (lit. them);

Matthew omits here Markan parataxis and substitutes the connective τότε.[59] This can be seen as Matthew's attempt to link this passage with the 19:3-12. Consequently Matt 19:13-15 is located in Judea (Matt 19:1) and it occurs during the same time frame as does Matt 19:1-10:17.

Matthew adds to this verse the desire that the children be prayed over by Jesus. Matthew utilizes προσεύχομαι and ἐπιτίθημι in anticipation of Mark's κατευλογεῖν and ἐπιτίθημι in Mark 10:16.[60] This renders Mark 10:16a somewhat redundant, which most probably account for its omission. Matthew's inclusion functions in the place of ἅψηται in Mark 10:13. This may be partially due to Matthew's interpretation of Jesus' touch as involving both gesture and prayer.

2. Matt 19:14

(14) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
ἄφετε τὰ παιδία καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν πρός με,
τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

(14) But Jesus said, "Let the children come to me, and do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven."

Most striking in this verse is Matthew's omission of the emotion of Jesus (cf. Mark 10:14). This is a Matthean tendency consistent with Matthew's imaging of a very controlled, authoritative Jesus.[61] When possible Matthew omits passages or descriptions that detract from this presentation of Jesus. A second point of divergence from the Mark lies in the variation found in the verb "come." The other synoptic writers utilize ἔρχομαι (Mark 10:14b, Luke 18:16a) signifying a general invitation. Mark's and Lukes' use of the present infinitive has the sense of "keep coming to me" which leads to a metaphorical interpretation of the verse. The reference is not only to those children of v. 14. Matthew's ἐλθεῖν is an aorist which is either ingressive or complexive (action completed). Matthew's usage suggests that Jesus is literally dealing with the disciples having hindered these specific children. The children in this passage are not figurative.[62]

In conclusion, then, Matthew's editorializing of v. 14 presents a more authoritative Jesus. The conflation of the narrative serves again to emphasize the following discourse. Furthermore, as Mark 10:15 is omitted, v. 14 stands alone as the dialogic element.

3. (Mark 10:15)

As noted in the analysis of 18:1-4, 5 Matthew omits Mark 10:15 from this passage and deploys it to Matt 18:1-4, 5.[63] It is possible that having already utilized this saying, Matthew considered it unnecessary to include the logion once again.[64] Furthermore, in this context the saying may be inapplicable. Matthew has already conflated the passage (cf. Mark 10:14a, 10:15, 10:16) by omitting non-essential details in an attempt to refine the pericope. The omission of this saying, however, subtly changes the pericope's content and focus. As a result, the passage revolves areoung the logion in Matt 19:14. There is no emphasis on the disciples emulating children here.[65] Matt 19:13-15 children are not explicitly identified with humilty. They are denoted as the recipients of the "kingdom of heaven" (19:14b).

4. Matt 19:15

(15) καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν.

(15) And he laid his hands on them and went away.

Typically conflating the narrative Matthew omits Mark's reference to Jesus "taking the children in his arms." The unusual "blessing" action found in Mark 10:16 is retained.[66] As noted, the laying of hands anticipated in v. 13 is fulfilled here. Thompson notes that the form of Matt 19:15 functions as a stereotypic formula utilized when introducing a text which speaks to the whole of the community rather to to the twelve disciples.[67] The inclusion of the departure of Jesus in Matt 19:15b functions to introduce the following dialogue with the rich young man (Matt 19:16-22). Again, the conflation of Mark 10:16 and Mark 10:17 can be seen within Matt 19:15a/b.[68] This formula points then, to the function of v. 15, as an introduction to the community exhortations found in the following pericope.

5. Conclusions: Matt 19:13-15

The shortened version of Mark 10:13-16 found in Matt 19:13-15 carries with it implications that are unique to this passage and to its editor. Matthew seems to have made an effort to refine Markss version, _via_ conflation of the narrative elements, anticipation of the action of Mark 10:16 (Matt 19:13, 15), and omission of the logion (cf. Mark 10:15). It is quite probable that v. 15, and perhaps all of vv. 13-15 function as an introduction to the community exhortations found in the following pericope.

There seems to be little indication that Matthew understands the παιδία of Matt 19:13 to be other than literal children. The omission of Mark 10:15 detracts from the esoteric nature of the pericope and ensures that at first glance the intent is indeed literal. Furthermore, in this shortened form, the meaning of the passage almost becomes lost in its introductory capacity.

However, viewing this passage from the optic of the surrounding pericopes is enlightening. In Matt 19:10-12 there is a hint of the radical nature of the call of Jesus. As the narrative progresses through Jesus' ministry in Judea this radical nature gains greater impetus and greater clarity. Subsequently a more definitive stance regarding the meaning of discipleship develops. In pericope 19:16-22 the rich young man is told to give up all he possesses. In Matt 19:23-30 the disciples are told of the rewards and the difficulties of discipleship. And in Matt 10:1-16 the unparalleled nature of the "kingdom" is described. The child passage Matt 19:13-15 can be seen as functioning within a whole group of passages emphasizing and elaborating upon the themes of disciple and discipleship. And it is in this perspective that the meaning of this second child pericope becomes clear.

On first analysis the children of Matt 19:13-15 seem to function within the familial setting of the previous passage. But, as noted, the whole framework of these later chapters is built upon the radical response to Jesus. Not only are children to be accepted into the presence of Jesus (as in 19:14), but to hinder the recipients and possessors of the "kingdom," (like the children/ disciples of Matt 18:2, 3, 4, 5 and 6) results in dire consequences. As discipleship is related to radical elements (i.e., the unparalleled "kingdom" of Matt 10:1-16), so too it is related to the children of Matt 19:13-15. Discipleship has to do with receiving, with non-hindering, with the rightful possessors of the βασιλεία.

As the first child pericope becomes clear through the optic of "humility" and discipleship, so the second passsage may be understood by means of studying its location in the text.

E. Conclusions: Matthew, Children and Humility.

It is apparent that Matthew links the themes of humility and discipleship to the child pericopae. Humility for Matthew is relational. It has to do with not exploiting the "little ones." And in this sense, humility falls within an ecclesial setting. Matthew's children, like those of the earliest gospel, can be understood in terms of discipleship and the appropriate response to salvation. Unlike Mark, Matthew portrays the disciples as faithful, albeit fallible, followers. Jesus' teachings function as clarifications rather than outright condemnations of the disciples' lack of understanding or misinterpretations.

The children of the pericopae do play several roles in Matthew. The child functions first as a representative (and/or embodiment) of humility, and thus poses a model for the disciples in both a relational and an ecclesial context. And the value which Matthew places on the virtue of humility has been approached through a study of the fist beatitudes. Discipleship and humility are linked through the children of the pericopae (esp. Matt 18:1-4, 5). Second, the emphasis on reception within the earlier pericope reflects the conception that children may be seen as representatives of what the disciples are to receive.[59] Even further, however, it can be seen that the subsequent presence of the theme of reception found within Matt 19:13-15 implicitly identifies the children and the disciples. Consequently, the children of Matt 18:1-4 who are humble (Matt 18:3) and those children of Matt 19:13-15, are equated with the little ones/disciples Matt 18:5-9.

Children are irrevocably linked with humility and discipleship in Matthew's gospel. Mark's pejorative view of Jesus' disciples stands in stark contrast with Matthew's depiction. The function of children within each writer's specific salvific schema corresponds to Mark's and Matthew's respective agendas. For Mark children are tools by which to highlight the grandiose and self-important views of the disciples. For Matthew children are a cipher for humility and are perhaps even symbolic of the disciples themselves. We turn now to the last of the synoptic child pericopae found in Luke.

[1]First, see Donald Senior (What are They Saying about Matthew? [New York: Paulist Press, 1983] 15) who suggests that Matthew, "wrote for a group of Christians who were undergoing a transformation from a predominately Jewish-Christian church to an increasingly Gentile church, from a church whose roots and cultural origin were Palestinian to a church plunged into the midst of the Roman Empire." See also J. D. Kingsbury, The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13 (London: SPCK, 1969; reprint St. Louis, Missouri: Clayton Publishing House, 1977) 134; Gunther Bornkamm, "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel; The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel," The Interpretation of Matthew, ed. Graham Stanton (Philadelphia: Fortress Press/ London: SPCK, 1983) 95. Second, the prevelant motif of persecution (e.g. Matt 5:11-12; 10:17-15; 10:28; 10:34-36; 18:6-9; 24:9-14) would suggest that Matthew's church was the focus of some polemic. Kingsbury (Parables, 134) notes that the church was the focus of "legal proceedings, verbal and physcial assault that may not even exclude martyrdom." On the motif of the "endangered boat" (alias church) see Heinz Joachim Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963) esp. 202-207. D. R. A. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew (SNTS 6: Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976) 127 who suggests that Matthew's church is outside of the Jewish community; for persecution in the early church see Dupont, Les Béatitudes, 2:317-318; for persecution in Matthew's church, ibid., 3:330; for persecution from both Jews and Gentiles, see Jack Dean Kingsbury, Matthew (Proclamation Commentaries: Philadelphia: Fortress 1977) 110. Consequently Matthew views persecution as essential to true discipleship. This further effects how Matthew uses the child sayings.

[2]William G. Thompson, Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Mt 17:22-18:35 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970) 71-72. Thompson notes that Matthew refers to ὁ μαθητής more than either Mark or Luke: Matt = 73x/ Mark = 46x/ Luke = 37x/ Acts = 28; also μαθητευειν Matt = 3x/ Mark = 0x/ Luke = 0x/ Acts = 1. For "Twelve disciples" see Matt 10:1 (vs. Mark 6:7 and "twelve"); Matt 11:1 (no par.); Matt 20:17 (vs. Mark 10:33 "twelve"); Matt 26:20 (vs. Mark 14:17 and "twelve"); Matt 28:16 (no par.). For references to "Twelve apostles" see 10:2 (vs. Mark 3:16); 10:5. For "Twelve" see Matt 8:5 (no par.) Although Mark does not seem as inclined to use "disciple" as does Matthew, Mark does exhibit the tendency to utilize "twelve" in sole reference to the disciples. See Matt 3:14; 6:7; 10:32; 14:10; 14:17 where Matthew adds "disciple" to Mark's sole use of "twelve." See Matt (3:16); 4:10; 9:35; 11:11; 14:20 where Matthew omits the reference to the "twelve." Note also Mark's preference for the number "twelve" in Mark 5:25; 5:42; 6:43; 8:19. See also Ulrich Luz, "The Disciples in the Gospel According to Matthew," The Interpretation of Matthew, ed., Graham Standon (Philadelphia: Fortress Press/ London: SPCK, 1983), 110. Luz also provides a thorough treatment of the nature of disciple and discipleship (98-128). See Rudolf Bultmann (The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh [New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963] 345) who suggests that the disciples are "the Twelve" in Matthew. With the contrary view see, for example, Gerhard Barth ("Matthew's Understanding of the Law," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew [Philadelphia: Westminster/ London: SCM, 1963] 95, 105-124) who holds a more communal definition.

[3]For example, in Matt 26:33 Peter will never fall away, Mark 14:29 does not retain the same emphasis. Gerhard Barth ("Matthew's Understanding of the Law," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, Gunther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth and Heinz Joachim Held [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963] 119 n. 4) notes that Peter's conduct ranks as disobedience to Matthew not only because of the addition of θέλεις but especially by the use of σκάνδαλον (cf. 13:41). Elsewhere in Matt 26:72 Peter denies Jesus with an oath in contrast to the mere denial in Mark 14:70. Matthew intensifies the role of Peter in both of its positive

and negative aspects. See R. Brown, K. P. Donfried and J. Reumann, <u>Peter in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars</u> (Minneapolis: Augsburg/ New York: Paulist Press, 1973). See also J. C. Kingsbury, "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem," <u>JBL</u> 98 (1979) 67-83.

[4]On representative disciples see Kingsbury, "The Figure of Peter," 72. On communal authority see Luz, "The Disciples," 108.

[5]Kingsbury notes that Matthew anchors Peter within the disciples (cf. 8:14-15 with 20:20-24; cf. 16:23 with 5:29-30, 18:6-9; cf. 26:69-75 with 26:35; also note Matthew's omissions of references to the inner group in 9:23 || Mark 5:37-38 and 24:3 || Mark 13:3. Matthew's inclusive depiction of the disciples gives rise to an interesting hypothesis. On the basis of textual evidence Kingsbury suggests that Matthew's church was of an egalitarian nature. Within the narrative different functions are present within the church with no existing rank. The entire community is given authority, and as noted, exercises this same empowerment (see Matt 23:8-13; 13:52; 18:18-20 respectively). In this ecclesial community Jesus is both ruler and leader (Matt 18:18-20; 23:8-10; 28:18-20). Kingsbury, "The Figure of Peter," 72-74.

[6]Senior, <u>Matthew</u>, 74-76.

[7]Jean Zumstein, <u>La Condition du Croyant dans L'Évangile selon Matthieu</u> (Orbis Biblicus Orientalis 16: Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977) as cited in Senior, <u>Matthew</u>, 71. Barth ("Matthew's Understanding," 108) suggests that in Matthew the disciples do understand. See especially pp. 105-125 for a thorough outline on "The Essence of Being a Disciple." Barth holds that essential to Matthean discipleship are not only the imitation of Christ, and doing the will of God, but also the following: (1) the call of Jesus [understanding is almost always accompanied with the concept of a "call" by Jesus (i.e., Matt 13:13, 14, 15, 19, 23, 51; 15:10, 16:12; 17:13)]; (2) faith; (3) conversion; (4) unbelief and sin; (5) being μικροί (little ones). On the understanding given to the disciples see the questions of Matt 13:36 and the disciples' comprehension in Matt 13:51-52. See also Matt 15:15 which suggests that the disciples do eventually grasp the principles at hand.

[8]T. W. Manson, <u>The Sayings of Jesus</u> (London: SCM Press, 1949) 207. For an overview of some biblical concepts of humility see Robert Brown, "Jesus and Child," 181. Note the emphasis on the personal and social aspects of humility, with the added element of repentance and conversion. Kingsbury, too, understands humility as essential to discipleship. He notes that the "posture of a Christian who lives under the imperative of the Kingdom and awaits the Parousia must be one of prayer (6:10), of humility (5:3, 18:1-4)..." etc (Kingsbury, <u>Parables</u>, 19). Note the link between Matthew's first beatitude and the earliest child pericope. Legasse, too, speaks of the importance of humility within Matthew's writing. See S. Légasse, <u>Jésus et L'Enfant</u> (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1969) 223-234, 245 but esp. 339 for variations on humility within the Hebrew Scriptures and later in the Christian Scriptures. See also Karl Paul Donfried, <u>The Dynamic Word</u> (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981), 98; Brown, "Jesus and the Child," 180-181.

[9]Robert A. Guelich, "The Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance-Requirements' or Eschatological Blessings?" <u>JBL</u> 95 (1976), 432. Jan Lambrecht (<u>The Sermon on the Mount</u> [Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1985] 64) similarly notes that the Beatitudes themselves outline Christian virtues in the form of "exhortations, encouragements ... (and) ... ethical demands." Lambrecht, however, does not emphasize well enough Matthew's emphasis on the eschaton.

[10]Guelich, "Beatitudes," 452. For further elaboration, see Leander E. Keck, "The Poor

Among the Saints in the New Testament," ZNW 56 (1965) 114. Keck also looks at the various definitions of "poor" in Qumran and Ebionite traditions in "The Poor Among the Saints in Jewish Christianity," ZNW 57 (1966), 54-78. See also Guelich ("Matthean Beatitudes," 415-434) for canonical concepts of "poor" in relationship to Matt 5:3.

[11]For an outline on the various positions regarding the priority of either Matthew or Luke see Jacques Dupont, Les Béatitudes (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969) 1:212-216. Most scholars do not hold for the priority of Matthew, although the existance of two (or more) variants of the blessing is granted.

[12]See Lambrecht Sermon, 68-73. For an outline of the ensuing debate regarding Matthew's meaning of "poor in spirit" see Sermon, 65. For an outline of Luke's ostensible references to the economically marginalized (ibid., 68-73).

[13]Dupont, Les Béatitudes, 1.293, 2.30, esp. 2.98. Dupont holds that the first and the third Beatitude in Matthew are actually doublets (1:252). In support of this note that the Septuagint version of Ps 37:11a reads "the meek... ... shall possess the land." See also Guelich ("The Matthean Beatitudes," 424) who holds for no material distinction between the two Beatitudes in their Greek form. He also notes that Luke's woe in Luke 6:24 to the rich, when compared with the "poor" of Luke 6:20b might point to the Hebrew/Aramaic word 'aniyyim behind πτωχός.

[14]Ernest Best, "Matthew V:3," NTS 7 (1960/1961) 257. Various forms of the rejection/persecution beatitude are present in antiquity. For a closer look at the divergent forms and their respective and collective sociological implications see John S. Kloppenborg, "Blessing and Marginality: The 'Persecution Beatitude' in Q, Thomas and Early Christian Tradition," Foundations and Facets Forum 2 (1986) 36-56.

[15]Best, "Matthew," 257. Discipleship, then, is manifest in those who are aware of their own inadequacy and who are likewise cognisant of the destructive consequences of not fully trusting in their God (i.e., Matt 6:24-34).

[16]Luz, "The Disciples," 121, n. 309.

[17]See Guelich's very thorough explanation of this, "The Matthean Beatitudes," 423-424. Lambrecht however stresses the unlikelihood that πτωχός and πραύς, two different Greek terms, would have been understood by Matthew's readers to by synonomous. And, "indeed, the beatitude of the meek does not follow the first in the best manuscripts. In Matt, it comes in the third place." See Lambrecht, Sermon, 61. Lambrecht, instead views v. 3 as having a parallel in v. 6a in which hunger is the operative element (Lambrecht, Sermon, 65).

[18]Manson, Sayings, 207.

[19]See, for example, J. D. Kingsbury, Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 8-17. Kingsbury suggests that the text is divided into segments separated by time, divisions cued by the temporal phrase "from that time", ἀπό τότε. This phrase appears only five times in Matthew. Kingsbury sees three main sections: the time of Jesus the Messiah as person (1:1-4:16), the era of the proclamation of the Messiah (4:17-16:20), and the suffering death and resurrection of the Messiah (16:21-28:20). It is into this latter category that the two child passages fall. Although ἀπο τοτε is also present in v. 26:16, Kingsbury notes that its use here is unlike its presence in the verses beginning the aforementioned categories. Senior (Matthew, 25) notes that the infrequent use of the phrase calls into question its "fixed" nature as an introductory formula.

[20]Howard Clark Kee (Jesus in History [New York/ Chicago/ Toronto: Harcourt Brace

Jovanovich, 1977] 152) for an elaboration on the gospel divisions. Kee follows B. W. Bacon ("The 'Five Books' of Matthew Against the Jews," The Expositor 15 [1918] 55-66) who suggests that Matthew imitates the sectioning of the Torah (i.e., Matt 7:28, 11:1; 13:53; 19:1 and 26:1). Kee, however, views Matt 3:1 to 25:46 as being divided into five sections.

[21]Note that Matt 18:23-35 precedes Jesus' last Journey to Jerusalem (19:1-2) as does Mark 9:42-50. It is apparent that Matthew does not significantly change the overall structure of Mark 9:33-50; Matt 18:1-4,5 || Mark 9:33-37; Matt 18:6-9 || Mark 9:42-50; (Matt 10:40 || Mark 9:38-41). See Bornkamm ("The Authority," 90) on the unity of Chapter 18. Bornkamm also notes that chapter 18 may be considered an address to the congregation. Matt 17:24-27 furthers this theme in suggesting that Matthew's church is still associated with Judaism via the concern with payment of the Temple tax. See "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (Philadelphia: Westminster Press/ London: SCM, 1963) 20, 48.

[22]Chapter 18 can be divided into four main sections. In the first, 18:1-4, 5 is the discourse on true greatness in the kingdom of heaven, including a call to repentence and humility. In the second section is contained the exhortation to care for the "little ones," in reference to the disciples. This second group contains two pericopes, vv. 6-9 and 10, 12-14. The third partition (Matt 18:15-20) contains the correction of offenders derived from Matthew's special source. The final section, Matt 18:21-25 deals with forgiveness. See Bornkamm, "The Authority," 90. In this Bornkamm agrees with and cites the division of W. Trilling. Note that Bornkamm includes v. 5 with Matt 18:1-4. The emphasis on community discipline in 17:24- 18:35 would suggest further that the audience is Matthew's church.

[23]Manson, Sayings, 207. For a more recent support of this position see Thompson, Advice, 81-82. Similary, Luz ("The Disciples," 102) concludes that the elimination of the Marcan motif of the disciples' failure to misunderstand drastically affects the story.

[24]In this redeployment Matthew omits Marcan parataxis and substitutes a temporal conjunction. This is not uncommon in Matthew. See, for example, the statistics regarding τότε in Matt 19:14 following.

[25]The geographical movement of Jesus and his followers corresponds to the Matthean editorial concern. Jesus moves from his birthplace in Bethlehem (Matt 2:1) to Galilee (Matt 3:13) and Jordan (Matt 3:13), coming eventually to Jerusalem where, in the Matthean schema, he "will be given up to the chief priests and doctors of the law; they will condemn him to death ... and on the third day he will be raised to life again" (Matt 20:18-19).

[26]Thompson, Advice, 81-82. Thompson suggests that the earlier emphasis on time, in "that same hour" may add to the solemnity of the question posed here in v. 1b, and subsequently mark a "new phase in the discussion between Jesus and his followers" (Thompson, Advice, 71).

[27]Thompson, Advice, 73. McNeile (Gospel, 259-260) suggests, on the other hand that τίς ἄρα is merely colloquial, and thereby does not point to any connection with the previous pericope.

[28]Bornkamm, "The Authority," 89. In its position v. 1 assumes an important role in defining the topic of the passage, the question of prominence in the "kingdom." Thus the link between the two passages would cohere with Matthew's intent.

[29]Luz, "The Disciples," 110. Also, the lack of reference to the "Twelve" points to the inclusive nature of the passage. See Matt 10:2-5, 11:1, 28:16 for distinct references to the twelve disciples. Thompson, Advice, 247. See Bornkamm, "The Authority," 89 who

suggests that Matthew is directing this passage to the congregation Matthew omits Mark's αὐτούς (cf Mark 9:33), and lacks to mention of a dispute over rank (cf Mark 9:34). This omission Bornkham views as due to Matthew's focus on the congregation rather than the disciples. See also Thompson, Advice, 134.

[30]Luz, "The Disciples," 101.

[31]Likewise, the Matthean tendency to omit passages or shorten introductions in order to boost the image of Jesus may be noted here. Matthew avoids having Jesus appear ignorant of the disciples' problems. Thompson, Advice, 133-134. See also Held, "Matthew as Interpreter," 236 who notes Matthew's tendency to enlarge discourse in Matt 18:1-4, 5. Jesus often engages in a regular didactic conversation involving a particular question and a relevant response.

[32]Kingsbury, Parables, 17. Dupont (Les Beatitudes, 1:210 n. 1) notes that Matthew alone utilizes this expression (31x). The expression βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is notably present in vv. 1, 3 and 4, and functions perhaps as a "catch word" uniting the verses. This expression may be an authentic circumlocution as Jesus himself who would have been reluctant to call upon God's name.

[33]This is not always the case in Matthew. In an attempt to refine Mark's literary style Matthew may *add* narrative material (e.g., introductory statements, clarifying sentences). See, for example Matt 16:44 (cf. Mark 14:40); Matt 26:56 (cf. Mark 14:49).

[34]Manson, Sayings, 207.

[35]Thompson, Advice, 69, 72.

[36]Thompson, Advice, 76 n. 24, 135-136. For example, προσκαλεισθαι appears only 6 times in Matthew, all but two (i.e., 18:2; 18:32) having direct parallel with Mark. Matthew has a tendency to change or omit Markan usage of προσκαλεισθαι (e.g., Matt 12:25 cf Mark 3:23; Matt 16:24 cf Mark 8:34; cf Mark 12:43 and Mark 15:44).

[37]Thompson, Advice, 76. Here Thompson cites the hypothesis of J. Gnilka, Die Verstockung Israels: Isais 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker (StANT 3) (Munchen: Kösel, 1981) 93 n. 18. Note the presence of ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν and ἀμὴν λέγω σοι Matt = 31x/ Mark = 13x/ Luke = 6x/ Acts = 0x and ἀμὴν ἀμὴν 25x in John. Also, ἀμὴν δέ and/ or γαρ λέγω ὑμῖν (σοι) 18:2:34/4 and πάλιν (δε) λέγω ὑμῖν Matt = 2x/ Mark = 0x/ Luke-Acts = 0.

[38] See Crossan (Parallels 77, 194) for "Kingdom and Children" saying and its parallels.

[39]Bultmann, History, 32. T. W. Manson (Sayings, 207) also suggests that Matt 18:3 is a free adaptation of Mark 10:15, resulting in the omission of this parallel in the later child pericope of Matt 19:13-15.

[40]Bornkamm, "The Authority," 86. Out of the 22 occurences of στρέφειν in the canon more than one quarter are Matthean. Of these 6 only 1 derives from Mark (Matt 16:23 ‖ Mark 8:33). Matthew's preference for this term is perhaps most apparent in 9:22 (cf. Mark 5:34; Luke 8:48). See also Matt 5:39; (18:3); 27:3 for uses of στρέφειν. Matthew uses γένομαι 75 times (cf. 50x in Mark). The fact that "turn and become are thematically similar with John 3:3 and John 3:5 further attest to the independent nature of 18:3. Richard H. Hiers (The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition [Gainsville: Univ. of Florida Press, 1970] 60-61) also notes the similarities on the use of "enter into," "of heaven," and "truly, I say."

[41]Thompson, Advice, 76-77.

[42]Luz, "The Disciples," 122 n. 31. It is significant that Matthew's concern may not be with the children per se, but with the community being addressed.

[43]For a more detailed analysis see Thompson, Advice, 78. Note that the admonition of both verses is "well suited to Jesus' solemn teachings" (Thompson, Advice, 77).

[44]Thompson, Advice 77 n. 30 cites W. Trilling Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthausevangeliums (Erfurter Theologischen Studien 7: Leipzig: St. Benno, 1959, ²1961; StANT 10: Munchen: Kösel, ³1964) 108. Similarly, Brown ("Jesus and Child," 180) suggests that Matthew here intends repentence and conversion to be the overriding emphases. Even further, beyond mere repentence, Hiers (Kingdom, 61) notes that Matt 18:3, like John 3:3, 5, may actually indicate a "quasi-physical new birth or recreation as prerequisite to entering or seeing the kingdom of God, as in 1 Cor 15:50ff."

[45]Thompson, Advice, 77.

[46]Thompson, Advice, 78.

[47]However, McNeile, Gospel, 260 notes that the positive formulation of 4a complements the negative component of 3b. The motif of humility is recalled also in 2Cor 11:7, Phil 2:8-9, Ja 4:10. See Thompson, Advice, 79. Note the infrequent use of ταπεινοειν in Matthew (18:4; 23:12). Also, it is present only 14 times in the Christian canon. Thompson also notes that the future indicative form of this verb further suggests that v. 3 refers to future entrance into the "kingdom." Thompson, Advice, 79. Hiers notes that the present tense is utilized when future times are implied by either the context or the general meaning of the passage (i.e., Mark 9:43-48 and Matt 18:8, 9; Matt 8:4; Luke 18:24-30, Mark 12:18-27 par.). Hiers, Kingdom, 24, 24 n. 8.

[48]McNeile, Gospel, 260 observes a similar formula in 16:25, "whoever saves his life will lose it." Thompson (Advice, 79) suggests that it is likely that v. 4 imitates "the more traditional response to the disciples question about greatness" of Matt 23:12b.

[49]Thompson, Advice, 137.

[50]For this reason Thompson suggests that v. 4b is Matthean (Advice, 137).

[51]Kee, Community, 150 n. 69. Thompson (Advice, 78) also notes that the function of v. 4a is to elaborate upon the statement of v. 3.

[52]For support of this point see Thompson, Advice, 78.

[53]Thompson notes that it is upon the basis of this conjunction, and the catchword "child" that many scholars link v. 5 with Matt 18:1-4. See, for example, Trilling, Das wahre Israel, 109. For an example of those who comine v. 5 with 18:6-9 see P. Gaechter, Die literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium (SBS 7: Stuttgart: KBW, 1966) 347-348 (as cited in Thompson, Advice, 101 n. 1, 2).

[54]McNeile, Gospel, 260-261 suggests as well that perhaps this shorter verse retains the force of an earlier version, with the "invocation" and "in my name" implicitlly suggesting the blessing of Mark 10:16. See Thompson, Advice, 139.

[55]Thompson, Advice, 105, 248.

[56]John P. Meier (Matthew [Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980] 201) notes that in this form vv. 1-4, 5 would be very much akin to Matt 10:40 and Matt 25:31-46. On reception see McNeile, Gospel, 261 who notes the presence of this same theme in Rom 14:1 and Rom 15:17. Some scholars hesitate to place v. 5 with either Matt 18:1-4 or 18:6-9. In some ways

Matt 18:5 may be seen as a verse linking the surrounding periocopes. Literarily, this is accomplished by the reference to child. The fact that v. 5 does exist in close proximity to the earlier child saying and the later monitions would suggest Matthew deliberately retained this portion of the saying (while omitting its concluding portion in Mark 9:37b) because it corresponded well with both the following pericope and the intent of the whole passage. Thompson (Advice, 118) notes that this is confirmed by traces of Matthean composition in parallel construction and word-order in ὃς ἐαν...ὃς δ'αν as signs of Matthew's redaction.

[57]Thompson, Advice, 138-139. In yet another perspective McNeile (Gospel, 260) notes that the child here may embody "the class which symbolizes the ideal." In this view Matt 18:5 would point to a reversal of the traditional valuation and prioritizing of the world.

[58] The dilemma of whom and of what are the "child" of v. 5 is representative has also been solved by granting a dual role to "child." Thompson (Advice, 136) notes that in this passage child functions both as a model for the disciples and as a representation of what the disciples themselves are to receive. See also Brown ("Jesus and Child," 181) who suggests that child is used both as model of humility and as the object of service of whom is a mark of humility.

[59]τότε occurs 160 times in the synoptics (+ Acts); Matt = 90x/ Mark =6x/ Luke = 15x/ Acts = 21x. Of these occurences Matthew changes Mark's καί to τότε 23x (i.e., Matt 4:1; 8:26; 9:14; 9:29; 12:13; 12:38; 15:1; 15:12; 15:28; 16:20; 16:21; 16:24; 17:19; (19:13); 20:20; 23:1; 26:31; 26:36; 26:38; 26:45; 26:56; 26:67; 27:38; 27:58). Matthew also adds τότε to καί (e.g., Matt 7:23; 9:15) and at times adds τότε to increase the flow of the narrative (e.g., Matt 9:6; 19:27; 21:1; 24:21; 24:40). For examples of the use of τότε instead of (1) δ/ οἱ see Matt 26:65; 27:27; and (2) ὁ δε see Matt 26:67.

[60]McNeile, Gospel, 276. Note that Matthew's verb is formed in an imperfect passive form, unlike Mark's present indicative tense. Here McNeile speaks of Matthew's anticipation of the action to come. Note προσεύχομαι Matt = 16x/ Mark = 10x/ Luke = 19x/ Acts = 16x. For this word Matthew relies heavily on Q and M. Note Matthew's own addition in 26:44. Nowhere else does Matthew use προσεύχομαι with ἐπιτίθημι. ἅπτειν: 8:9:13/1. Matthew is not unfamiliar with ἅπτειν. Matthew changes ἅπτειν 3x due to conflation (cf. Mark 5:30; 5:31; 7:33); keeps ἅπτειν 3x. Nowhere else does Matthew substitute another verb. Note that RSV translates αὐτοῖς as "people" rather than "them."

[61]See, for example Matt 26:37 (cf. Mark 14:33) and Matt 16:2 where Matthew's Jesus is sorrowful vs greatly distressed; and 12:39 (cf. Mark 8:12) in which Matthew omits Jesus being troubled deeply in his spirit. Note also Matthew's consistent phrasing of "kingdom of heaven." On the varying tenses used here see McNeile, Gospel, 260.

[62]This does not exclude Matthew's eventual use of children within a metaphorical context.

[63]See also McNeile (Gospel, 277) who notes that Mark's and Luke's allusions are "applicable to all." It is significant that Matthew's child saying differs in verbal content than does Mark 10:15. Thompson (Advice, 137) observes that the inclusion of the logion of Mark 10:15 in the first Matthean child passage ensures "greater emphasis on the discussionn about greatness in the kingdom of heaven (18:1-4)."

[64]Manson, Sayings, 207.

[65]Thompson (Advice, 136) suggests that this differs from Mark and Luke who use children as models for discipleship in this second pericope.

[66]It is notable that Matt 18:1-4, 5 also includes this tender action, as do both Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16.

[67]Thompson, Advice, 247. Other examples of this Matthean usage are found in Matt 5:1; 13:36; 19:15; 24:3; 26:17. Thompson notes that in Matt 10:1, 25; 11:11; 28:16 are found messages for the twelve rather the community as a whole.

[68]Thompson, Advice, 177 n. 122. See also McNeile (Gospel, 277) for the belief that ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν (Matt 19:15b) is derives from Mark 10:17 ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ.

[69]Thompson, Advice, 136.

Chapter Four: Luke 9:46-48; 18:15-17

The last synoptic of the child sayings to be studied are found in Luke 9:46-48 and 18:15-17. As virtually all New Testament scholars agree on Luke's use of a written Marcan text, it is apparent that in these passages Luke draws upon Mark for both content and form. There is very little divergence from Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16. Unlike Mark, who uses the child saying as a tool by which to chastize the disciples, Luke's presents the saying in in a context similar to Matthew. The ecclesial dimension of humility is more clear in Matthew than in Luke, although it is doubtful that Matthew's humility means submission within the ἐκκλησία. Luke's use of the child sayings must be seen as cohering with the writer's agendas regarding wealth, humility and discipleship.

A. Wealth, Humility and the Nature of Discipleship

The ostensible audience of Luke is Theophilus (Luke 1:1-4; see also Acts 1:1-2) although it is probable that the gospel was written to Christian communities situated throughout the Roman empire, and perhaps even educated (and literate) pagans.[1] The fluent Greek within the gospel would suggest that the author is proficient in the language, and most probably fairly well educated.

Several motifs permeate Luke's gospel and thus point to concerns of the writer and/or the community. The first of these is wealth. The varied references to riches in the gospel is only equalled by the opinions of modern scholarship on their meaning. It is probable that Luke is writing to a monied community (e.g., Luke 18:18-31; 19:1-10).[2]

That Luke does address many passages to the concerns of monied adherents is solidly based in the evidence and in the tradition of biblical scholarship. Although the Lukan community is most probably composed of rich and poor alike, "Luke is primarily taken up with the rich members, their concerns, and the problems which they pose for the community."[3]

-93-

David Mealand suggests that Luke is rather well grounded in the prosperous faction of the community. Luke speaks the language of the rich. For Luke money is silver rather than copper (e.g., Luke 9:3 diff. Mark 6:8; Luke 19:15). The financial vignettes utilized in the text incorporate the dynamics of a medium scale business (e.g., 15:11-32; 15:1-7; 16:1-9). And Mealand asserts that evidence points to Luke's sympathy to "people of power and influence."[4] Mealand concludes that Luke has had to adjust harsh sayings regarding money (contained within the Q source, Mark and Luke's special tradition) to accomodate for the financial prosperity of the audience. In fact, Luke is seen to have little or no agenda concerning wealth.

The possibility of the lack of a polemic against wealth necessitates some attention and criticism. Luke does indeed utilize harsh sayings from Q (i.e., Luke 6:20-22; 12:33; 9:57-62), from Mark (i.e., Luke 5:11, 28), and from Luke's own special source (i.e., Luke 12:16-21, 14:33, esp. 16:19-31, 19:1-10, 22:35-36) as bases for this diatribe. Mealand's conclusions that the harsh nature of these pericopae is solely attributable to the pre-Lukan texts, "to a period prior to the evangelist," places Luke in a very pale light. He gives no thought to the reality that Luke could as easily have omitted such passages, or have edited their radical demands.[5] Luke's inclusion of harsh sayings regarding riches, without softening their impact, indicates that, contrary to Mealand, Luke does maintain a similarly strong stance against riches. The impact of these sayings cannot be restricted to a pre-Lukan period. The first readers of Luke would not have been in a position to discriminate between Lukan and pre-Lukan emphases, unless Luke specifically qualified the pre-Lukan pericopae in some was as to attenuate or mitigate their force.

Nevertheless, it is probable that Luke has had to adapt the harsh pre-Lukan sayings to accomodate for the urban audience. This adaptation superficially quells the force of the diatribe, but its impact is not lost. The more radical sayings regarding poverty and wealth indicate that the softer demands regarding money are actually a precursor to a complete detachment from material wealth.[6]

Luke, then, does maintain a polemic against material possessions. This anti-wealth polemic is not discordant with other themes within the gospel. In fact, the anti-cultural nature of this diatribe merges well with the greater Lukan motif of societal reversal (e.g., Luke 1:39-56). Luke presents social polarities in an unexpected order, somewhat similar to Mark's use of antithetical parallelism. This social reversal is not unexpected in Luke, who portrays a Christ identifying not with those with rank and status, but with the marginalized. Jesus associates with the poor of Luke's gospel, and seems to have little or no preference for the company of the rich.[7]

This Lukan reversal of social conditions within the present era has direct implications for the eschaton. Ford notes that corresponding to antithetical parallelism is the favorite Lukan theme of "the eschatological reversal of existing conditions."[8] Situating Luke within a philosophical framework demanding earthly divestment may help to clarify the dynamics of this social and eschatological reversal.

The asceticism of the Cynics and related philosophies was prevalent in antiquity. Cynic preachers plied their audiences with counter cultural (and anti-social) exhortations that demanded detachment from the world. Only recently has modern scholarship recognized the influence of such schools of thought on early Christianity. Given the widespread activities of Cynic preachers it is unrealistic to presume that either Luke or the Lukan community were unexposed and/or uninfluenced by Cynic and other emphasis on material detachment.[9]

It is within the context of the Lukan diatribe against wealth and the framework of eschatological reversal that the influence of asceticism on Luke becomes clear. Jesus' identification with the poor, and other similar Lukan motifs (i.e., Luke 1:46-55, 18:14b), merely preview the impending inversion of social conditions at the eschaton.[10] The spiritual demands of the kingdom necessitate the renunciation of wealth. The disciples of Luke are exhorted to store up their treasures in heaven (Luke 12:32-34) while those who rely on their financial prosperity are doomed to perdition (Luke 12:13-21). The spiritual kingdom is characterized by a present renunciation of all ties to material goods. Just as the

good Cynic virtue of detachment from wealth is manifest in Luke, so too is the necessity of Cynic-like comportment, or self effacement.

The eschatological kingdom, marked by elements of inversion, requires earthly preparation. Ford observes that in Luke service and humility are prerequisite preparatory behavior (22:24-30). Thus, not only is humility the "condition of true greatness in the Kingdom of God" but humility is to be manifest in the pre-eschatological era. Cassidy notes that service and humility thereby "define the new pattern for social relationships" being both espoused and modelled by Jesus.[11]

The characteristic of humility holds several different nuances for Luke, and includes both social and economic factors. Humility characterizes both the comportment of those preparing for entrance into the kingdom, and the nature of those within the kingdom. It is in this light that humility can be seen as one essential virtue of Lukan discipleship. However, for Luke humble comportment and service do not fully comprise the appropriate response to revelation. There are conditions to discipleship that extend beyond these two requisites. One must eventually dispense of all material possessions in order to prepare oneself for the kingdom. "(I)t is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle" than for the rich "to enter the kingdom of God." (Matt 18:25).[12]

Thus discipleship necessitates a social humility which is based in service (i.e., Luke 17:10) as well as a type of economic humility grounded in a concern for spiritual rather than earthly riches (Luke 12:34). The radical demands of discipleship are thus concordant with the Lukan vision of a kingdom of social inversion. And there may even be a connection between the theme of social inversion and the fact that the audience of Luke is a wealthy, urban community.

The demands of discipleship are great indeed. Yet in Luke's text the expectations of those following Jesus are primarily based upon the life of Jesus. As prophet Jesus instructs both by words and by acts (i.e., Luke 4:1-12, 22:24-27).[13] Jesus models the eschatological reversal demanded of discipleship and present in the kingdom. "Whoever cannot bear his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:27).

In conclusion, these demands of discipleship and the themes of social and economic humility affect Luke's gospel. We now turn to the child passages of Luke 9:46-48 and Luke 18:15-16 wherein Luke adapts Mark 9:33-37 and Mark 10:13-16 to fit these editorial agendas.

B. Redactional Analysis: Luke 9:46-48

Luke 9:46-48 is situated after the second passion prediction of Luke 9:43b-45 and is one of several units continuing the instructions of Jesus to the disciples. Luke 9:46-48 takes place near the mountanous region of Bethsaida where both the feeding of the five thousand and the transfiguration occur. In the following the unit of instructions (Luke 9:46-50) Jesus begins his journey to Jerusalem.[14]

Luke's version of this pericope appears in shorter form than does either Matthew or Mark. Luke basically maintains the Marcan structure with the exception of the probable relocation of Mark 9:35 to the end of the passsage in Luke 9:48c.

1. Luke 9:46

(46) Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν.

(46) And an argument arose among them as to which of them was the greatest.

Various components of this verse indicates Luke's editorial hand. First, the geographic setting of the pericope is changed as Luke situates the pericope in a pre-journey setting around Bethsaida (9:10b cf. Mark 56:45, 8:22). Subsequently, the reference to Capernaum in Mark 9:33 is dropped. Second, Luke omits the motif of "house." This omission coheres with Luke's tendency to drop οἰκία from the established setting of Mark 9:33-37. Unlike Mark the disciples are not placed within a setting that readily distinguishes them from the crowds or outsiders. Luke attenuates the role of the disciples by not elaborating upon their presence in the pericope.[15]

Third, this verse is filled with Lukan vocabulary. Ἐν αὐτοῖς and διαλογισμός are both common to Luke. So, too, is the oblique optative phrase τίς ἂν εἴη.[16] And finally, τό frequently introduces indirect questions in Luke. Jesus' question to the disciples of

Mark 9:33 is thus rendered unnecessary. Accordingly, Luke replaces the question with an editorial comment placed in a narrative framework.[17]

In conclusion, the editing of Mark 9:46 allows Luke to diminish the antagonism between Jesus and the disciples. The latter are portrayed in a more positive light which anticipates a less chastizing response from Jesus in v. 47. The question of humility is implicit as Luke retains the theme of the greatest <u>versus</u> the least.

2. Luke 9:47

(47) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰδὼς τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῷ

(47) But when Jesus perceived the thought of their hearts, he took a child and put him by his side,

Verse 47 shows evidence of Luke's editorializing. First, Luke changes the connective from καί to δέ.[18] Second, Luke employs a favorite motif of "mind reading" rather than the direct questioning apparent in Mark 9:33-34. As in Luke 5:22 (cf. Matt 9:4 cf. Mark 2:8), 6:8, 11:17 (cf. Matt 12:25), and 24:38, Luke's Jesus perceives the thoughts of those before him. This imaging of Jesus can be seen as a function of Luke's prophetic Christology.[19] Jesus appears as more than human, and is a prophet to the peoples. This greater than human ability also effects a more embellished view of Jesus who does not need to ask the disciples the topic of their discussion (cf. Mark 9:33).

Ἐπιλαβόμενος is also Lukan and replaces λαβών of Mark 9:36. Henry J. Cadbury notes Luke's preference for compound verbs.[20] In Luke the child is placed at Jesus' side while in Mark the child is in the midst of them. Such positioning may speak of Jesus' symbolic honouring of the child as indicative of the attitude the disciples are to have regarding the child. The position of the child in such a place of honour "is well adapted to the following saying about 'this' child."[21]

Luke's editing of the Marcan passage is effected by a shortening of the dialogue of the source text (e.g., Mark 9:33), the omission of the Marcan reference to the twelve (Mark 9:35b) and the dropping of Mark 9:36c where Jesus takes the child in his arms.

Αὐτοῖς forms a referential link between v. 37 and v. 36. The decrease in dialogue is common as Luke edits a source text.[22] In 9:46-48 Luke addresses the disciples (9:43) rather than the twelve of Mark's gospel, and in effect, generalizes the audience of the pericope. Luke's omission of "twelve" may be attributed to the earlier mention of "disciple" in 9:43 as well as Luke's more general definition of disciple. Dropping of the allusion to Jesus taking a child in his arms also contributes to Luke's general interest in portraying a non-emotional Jesus.[23]

3. Luke 9:48

> (48) καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
> ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται ⁻οῦτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέξηται, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με· ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός ἐστιν μέγας.

> (48) and said to them,
> "Whoever receives this child in my name receives me, and whoever receives me receives him who sent me; for he who is least among you all is the one who is great."

The last verse of this child pericope has a tripartite division consisting of a two-part saying duplicating Mark almost verbatim, and a final saying adapted and relocated from Mark 9:35b.

Luke differs from Mark in referring specifically to the child as "this." Thus Luke's "(w)hoever receives *this* child," rather than Mark's "one such child" (Mark 9:37), echoes closely its Marcan source. Mark's reference to "one such child" may point to a more general concern with the attitudes toward children rather than the specific emphasis implicit in Luke's phrasing.[24] Luke does omit οὐκ ἐμὲ from the verse, effecting a closer alignment between Jesus and the one who sent him.

Luke 9:48b, c compose what Rengstorf refers to as the "Shaliach" principle. As in Mark 9:37a, b, reception of Jesus is tantamount to reception of the one who sent Jesus. According to this rabbinic institution, the one who was commissioned was representative of the one who gave the commission.[25] Thus reception of this child, as one whom Jesus specifically chooses, means reception of Jesus, and in turn, reception of the one who

sent Jesus.

The final portion of Luke 9:48 is introduced with the conjunction γάρ which, in Lukan terms "indicates that the final saying... both explains the previous proverb and answers the original dispute."[26] This concluding saying incorporates the major theme and content of Mark 9:35b, although notably omitting any reference to the "twelve." Thompson points out that an inclusio is created, μεῖζον... μέγας, ensuring that the argument concerning greatness and the following saying regarding reception reflect a unified composition.[27] Moreover, the placement of Luke 9:48c is emphatic. Luke has rearranged the Marcan sequence to effect the elevation of Mark 9:35b. This reordering results in Luke 9:48c having a position of importance in the pericope, containing the essential message underlying the whole passage.[28]

The meaning achieved by Luke's reversal of the sayings of Mark 9:33-37 has been a point of dispute in biblical scholarship. Marshall outlines various positions on this problematic verse. Some scholars suggest that here Jesus points to himself as the lowest of the disciples (i.e., Luke 7:28) and utilizes the child as a symbol for himself. This view, however, seems simplistic, and does not account for Jesus' implicit castigation of the disciples' concern with greatness within a larger social perspective.[29] Luke's use of the child sayings of Mark is more problematic than this explanation will allow.

Another school of thought suggests that Luke presents Jesus as teaching that (s)he who is willing to assume the lowest social or economic role is truly the greatest. This second school views children as the most "despised members of society."[30]

Yet another view, espoused by H. Schürmann, posits that the clause of 48c is not concerned with becoming great by one's own actions (as suggested by Luke 9:48a, b). Rather, greatness lies first in being the least. The "least" is the child. Within this paradox this same child is the greatest. Marshall concludes that it is this latter explanation that is most coherent in respect to the diversity of elements in the pericope. The disciples are adjured to forget their concern with preeminece before God.[31]

Schürmann's (and Marshall's) analysis, however, does not give justice to the function of the child saying within Luke's editorial agenda. That Luke's intentions regarding the verse cohere with more general Lukan themes is suggested by the relocation and adaption of Mark 9:35b to the end of the child pericope. The presence of Luke 9:48c following the saying regarding reception is both artificial and contrived. It is this fact that provides a clue to the interpretation of Luke's first child pericope. Luke suggests the restructuring of the social order.

In conclusion, v. 48 appears as an expanded version of Mark 9:37. The redeployment of Mark 9:35 to the last saying in this passage indicates Luke's understanding of the saying. Reception is linked with the appropriate comportment for discipleship, just as it is for Mark. It is within a broader scope that Luke 9:48 becomes more explicable.

4. Conclusions: Luke 9:46-48

It is in attempting to place this final saying (Matt 9:48c) and the saying of Matt 9:48 a, b within a wider perspective that Luke's editorial intent becomes somewhat more discernable. Luke has retained Mark's format of a passion prediction followed by a subsequent misunderstanding. In Matt 9:44 the second passion prediction is announced; yet the fear of the disciples prevents them from revealing that they "did not understand" (Luke 9:45a). The child passage follows directly on the heels of this second prediction/misunderstanding. It is apparent, then, that Luke 9:46-48 functions, obviously, as yet another means of depicting the motif permeating Luke 9:1-62. The disciples are ignorant of the meaning of discipleship. They misunderstand Jesus' premonition of 9:43b-45, and subsequently misconstrue the nature of discipleship in the child passage. The ensuing pericope of 9:49-50 deals with John forbidding a man to cast out demons in Jesus' name. Again, the nature of discipleship comes into question. Jesus castigates John for not comprehending that discipleship incorporates radical action. Furthermore, discipleship is not to be exclusive.

Within the context of the pericopes preceding and following the first child passage it can be construed that Luke's use of "child" in Luke 9:48 emphasizes the faulty perceptions of the disciples in Luke 9:46. Greatness is not the goal of discipleship. On the contrary,

implicit within Luke 9:46-48 is the Lukan interest in humility. The greatness of the disciples within the eschatological era will be determined by their present self-effacement (Luke 9:48c). And it is the Lukan relocation and adaptation of Mark 9:35b that provides the final proof of Luke's intent. Although here the "Shaliach" principle of Luke 9:48a, b has been borrowed from Mark it is not discordant with Luke's editorial intent. Service to the other accompanies humility. Because the child here is not only socially but economically "humble" it is not improbable that Luke also implies that the one who is "least" is not only socially but economically self-effacing. However, the context of chapter 9, which includes no denunciations of wealth would suggest that the primary concern of Luke at this point in the gospel is that of social comportment. Yet it has been seen that Luke's definition of discipleship is only not comprised solely of social comportment. Financial divestment ensuring detachment from worldly possessions is also a demand of discipleship. As we turn to the second child passage this theme of detachment may become more clear.

C. Redactional Analysis: Luke 18:15-17

This second child passage is situated in Luke's "journey narrative" in which Jesus gradually moves closer to his passion. This movement is strongly reflected Luke 9:51-19:27 and constitutes the central section of Luke's gospel.[32] In Luke 18:15-17 Luke resumes the use of Mark as a source, after the inclusion of non—Marcan material at 9:51-10:24. Much of this portion of the text is considered to be of Lukan arrangement.[33] In this passage Luke again assumes the Marcan framework for the narrative of the story. This second child pericope functions as a pronouncement story, and can be seen both within the context of, and in conjunction with, other passages detailing the necessary comportment of a disciple.[34]

1. Luke 18:15

(15) Προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅπτηται· ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτοῖς.

(15) Now they were even bringing infants to him that he might touch them; and when the disciples saw it, they rebuked them.

In this introductory verse Luke retains closely Mark's content in a bipartite narrative structure. A few points of divergence indicate that the verse has been subject to Luke's retouching.

As in 9:47 Luke diverts from Mark 10:13 by dropping καί and replacing it with δέ.[35] Most problematic and notable in 15a is the Lukanism βρέφη (infants) in the place of Mark's παιδία. Cadbury attributes this change to Luke's overall improvement of the source text in an effort to become more clear, eloquent, and/or exacting.[36] This alteration subtly changes the dynamics of the passage. Infants are more vulnerable than children. Luke may have changed the passage to evoke a protective response from the readers. Or perhaps the disciples' behavior is even less acceptable as they turn away even infants.

There is yet another reason for the alteration. Earlier in Luke babes (νήπιοι) are those to whom the hidden elements of the kingdom are revealed (10:21 ‖ Matt 11:25-27). Νήπιοι denote very young children. Certainly the allusions in both Luke 10:21 and 18:15 emphasize the unexpected nature of revelation and the kingdom. The change in Luke 18:15a may be influenced by either this earlier reference and/ or may yet be consistent with Luke's overall editorial style and concern.[37]

Luke begins the second half of v. 15 with the connective ἰδόντες which may have been displaced from Mark 10:14. Cadbury notes Luke's propensity for adding words of clarification assumed within the source text (i.e., came, saw, took, heard).[38] Mark's aorist form of rebuke is changed to the imperfect ἐπετίμων. This adds a subtle nuance to the text. The hindrance of the disciples is not bound in one moment of time. Rather, the imperfect would suggest the continuation of the action. Luke allows, perhaps, for the lesson of this pericope to be generalized outside of its context.[39]

In conclusion, the editing of Mark 10:13 leave this verse slightly expanded in content. Most of the additions can be seen as advancing the flow of the text. Luke's replacement of παιδία with βρέφη recalls the diminutive νήπιοις (Luke 10:21) and may function to enhance Jesus' slight chastisement of the disciples.

2. Luke 18:16

(16) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσεκαλέσατο αὐτὰ λέγων· ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

(16) But Jesus called them to him, saying, "Let the children come to me, and do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of God.

In 18:16 the points of difference between Luke and Mark are merely cosmetic. The verse itself can be divided into four segments containing a narrative introduction (v. 16a), and the concluding saying regarding children, hindrance and the kingdom (v. 16 b, c, d).

The Lukan use of ἰδόντες in 15b most probably accounts for the absence of ἰδών of Mark 10:14. Also lacking in the introduction of this verse is Jesus' indignation over the action of the disciples. Luke's avoidance of an emotional Jesus is well known.[40] The omission of ἰδὼν (saw) and the replacement of εἶπεν ...προσκαλέσατο (said (and) called) suggests first that Jesus is not merely an observer of the incident. Jesus participates by calling to the disciples, and then by teaching them. Jesus behaviour emphasizes a somewhat positive relationship between Jesus and the disciples, obviating at least part of Mark's agenda concerning the disciples.[41]

In 18:16b, c, d, Luke draws fully upon Mark and deviates from Mark's presentation solely be the addition of καί (e.g., Luke 5:36; 7:36). This parataxis facilitates the fluidity of the verse. Because of the change of reference in Luke 18:15, from children to infants, the παιδία of v. 16b and later, the παιδίον of v. 17, connotatively and contextually remain infants. The earlier use of infants, therefore, sets the tone for the remainder of the pericope, and as will be seen later, is congruent with Luke's editorial intentions. In summary, the editorializing of v. 16 is minimal, but nonetheless coheres with Luke's presentation of the disciples.

3. Luke 18:17

(17) ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.

(17) Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it."

The concluding verse of Luke 18:15-17 imitates perfectly its Marcan counterpart. The fact that ἀμήν introduces v. 17 is unusual as Luke retains this term only six times throughout the gospel, usually in regards to the kingdom. The presence of ἀμήν would suggest Luke is introducing a saying regarding the eschaton, and would suggest that Luke views the child pericope of Mark within an eschatological schema. Furthermore, ἀμήν speaks to the authoritative nature of Luke 18:17 within both the pericope and within Luke's soteriological concerns.[42]

4. (Mark 10:16)

Mark 10:16, the blessing of the children by Jesus is notably lacking here. Luke's avoidance of an emotional Jesus may account for the omission. It is also possible that Luke assimilates the Marcan pronouncement story of 10:13-16 to the form of a chria. It is typical for stories of this genre to end not with a gesture, but a saying. Certainly this is the case in Luke 18:17. Although the relationship between Jesus and the children, here βρέφη, is slightly diminished by the absence of Mark 10:16, the meaning of the pericope does not significantly change.

4. Conclusions: Luke 18:15-17

The fundamental similarity between Luke and Mark in this second child passage becomes problematic only in attempting to ascertain Luke's understanding of and intentions for this passage. It is here that a vertical rather than a horizontal analysis is an effective tool.

Unlike Mark, Luke does not situate this second saying following exhortations on appropriate marital comportment. Luke does not take over Mark 10:2-12, but rather substitues a Q saying at Luke 16:18. Luke 18:15-17, rather, follows a strictly Lukan passage concerning a Pharisee and a Publican (Luke 18:9-14), in what could be construed as an epilogue.[43] The climax of the parable, found in 18:14b precedes our pericope and subsequently sets both the theme and the tone of the child passage.

Luke 18:14b reads "... for everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, but he who humbles himself will be exalted." This paradoxical statement is echoed in Luke 14:11, Matt 23:12, and as previously studied, in Matt 18:4. Luke's concern for the humble and poor is present also in 18:1-8, and especially in 14:7-14, 15-24.[44] So the theme of self-effacement and the accompanying exaltation is not unfamiliar to Luke. The tone of Luke 18:14 is not unlike that of the later saying in Luke 18:17. Luke seems to utilize vv. 15-17, then, to further explain the necessity of being of humble comportment and/or stature.[45] Thus Luke's use of children is symbolic and has significance for the adults who are attempting to understand discipleship. Through situating Luke 18:15-17 in close proximity to Luke 18:9-14 Luke "is able to get a neat link between the preceeding story ... and this Marcan story by means of the common idea of humility."[46]

Luke again follows the Marcan format whereupon the story of the rich young man follows the second child passage. It is germane here to note that the climax of this story lies in 18:22 in which the young man is exhorted to "(s)ell all that you have and distribute it to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." The sadness of that same young man is tied to his difficulty in detaching himself from his material possessions.

The proximity of Luke 18:15-17 to this story regarding wealth is not coincidental. Luke follows Mark's skeletal structure only when it serves Luke's intent. The adjacent position of the child passage and that of the rich young man suggests that the two pericopes "are probably paired in contrast."[47] The humility demanded in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican is part and parcel of the humility demanded of the rich young man. Both aspects of this self-effacing can be symbolized in the child saying located between these pericopae.

In conclusion, Luke, like Matthew, utilizes the child within this passage as a model for self-humbling. The Lukan concern with a humble demeanour and economic status accords with with the use of "infants" in Luke 18:15a. It is that which is hidden from the wise and the understanding that is revealed to infants (Luke 4:21). Luke's choice of βρέφη

further emphasizes the depth and the breadth of the required social and economic humility.

D. Conclusions: Luke 9:46-48; 18:15-17

Luke's concern with both a social and an economic humility undergirds both of the child passages. The demands of discipleship include this two-fold approach to self-abasement. It is in the presence of ἀμήν (Luke 18:17) that Luke signals the important soteriological function of the child passage. For Luke children, discipleship and humility are bound together in the radical call of Jesus. And much like the παιδία of Matthew, the children of both pericopae function as ciphers for humility. Although Luke's editing of Mark is often nominal, Luke's agenda is still fairly clear. We turn, now, away from the synoptics to the Gospel of Thomas to identify the last child pericopae.

[1]For a description of Luke's general audience see Richard J. Cassidy, Jesus, Politics and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1980) 7. See M. Dibelius views the community in a similar fashion in Studies in Acts, trans. M. Ling and P. Schubert (New York: Scribner's, 1956) 103.

[2]For an outline on various interpretations of passages concerning wealth see Robert J. Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lukan 'Sitz im Leben'," Perspectives on Luke-Acts, ed. C. H. Talbert (Virginia: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978) 112-125. Most especially interesting is the suggestion that through these passages Luke is attempting to counteract a theology that speaks of riches as a sign of God's favour (Luke 16:1-31).

[3]Karris, "Poor", 124.

[4]David Mealand, Poverty and Expectation in the Gospel (London: SPCK, 1980) 20.

[5]Mealand, Poverty, 19.

[6]Bruce J. Malina (The New Testament World [Atlanta: John Knox, 1981] esp. 71-93) speaks of the system of patronage present in antiquity. It is likely that Luke's community also operated under this system. In the less emphatic anti-wealth statements Luke appeals to this well-known means of monetary dispersal as an initial step in financial divestment. Such a tactic would be logical as Luke would be utilizing that which the community knows well. The more demanding sayings regarding wealth might be Luke's second step in teaching material detachment.

[7]Joachim Jeremias, Parables of Jesus (London: SPCK, 1963) 140, 142. See also J. Massyngbaerde Ford, My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke (New York: Orbis, 1984) 75. Both identify antithetical parallelism within Luke's literary framework and note its implications for Luke's social concerns. Note Mark's characteristic use of antithetical parallelism and its significance for the child saying in Chapter 2. On social reversal, especially concerning the status of women see Eugene Maly, "Women and the Gospel of Luke," BTB 3 (1980) 101-102. Note that poverty and the "poor" become not only a social theme, in what has been called the "Christian social gospel," but are characteristics having eschtological implications. "For Luke, as for Jesus, it is not simply a question of making the poor rich, it is above all transcending worldly poverty and naming the poor as those who have access to the Kingdom of God" (Maly, "Women", 100). Utilizing Maly's theme, would the children then, who are named as recipients of the kingdom, be equated with the poor?

[8]The theme of reversal is most notable in the Magnificat (Luke 1:39-56). On reversal of traditional religious customs see Luke 14:7-14 and 18:14. On reversal of salvific expectations see Luke 6:20b-23; 13:30; 14:15-24; 16:19-31; 18:24-30; 22:28-30. On reversal of social customs see Luke 4:16-30; 6:27-28; 6:32-33; 9:57-62; 12:51-53; 14:25-33; and 22: 24-30. See especially Luke 3:4-6 (cf. Matt 3:3) which indicates well Luke's concern with reversal. See also Ford, My Enemy, 75.

[9]See F. Gerald Downing ("Cynics and Christians," NTS 30 [1984] 584-593) who notes that "for *some* early Christians ... the ethical approach of first century Cynicism afforded a very important model for the selection and preaching and teaching from the available 'stock'; and that the Cynics' normal audiences provided much of the 'market' which these early Christians will have tried to pursuade. The Christian groups whose spokesmen seem to me to have at least allowed their message to look Cynic are those from which we have received the 'Q' material, and 'special Matthew'; together with important aspects of Mark and James," (p. 585). See the Cynic-like demands from Q in Luke 10:3-12 cf. Matt

10:16, 9-10a, 11-13, 10b, 7-8, 14-15; Luke 6:29-30 cf. Matt 5:38-42; Luke 12:33-34 cf. Matt 6:19-21; Luke 12:22-32 cf. Matt 6:25-3. See also Luke 9:2-6 cf. Matt 10:7-11, 14 cf. Mark 6:8-12. Luke's special source supplies Luke 11—35-38 dealing with some consequences of the Cynic-like detachment from material possessions. For further illustration and points of comparison regarding the ascetic demands of Cynic life see Diogenes Laertius 6.21-23, 37 (LCL 2:25, 39).

[10]On entrance to the kingdom see I. Howard Marshall The Gospel of Luke (Exeter: Pater Noster, 1978) 683. Here Marshall outlines various views of the Luke's kingdom as a present or a future reality.

[11]Cassidy, Jesus, 37. See this same work (ibid., 37-40) for a closer analysis of the inter-personal and communal effects of such comportment. Also see Robert F. O'Toole ("Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts," Political Issues in Luke-Acts ed. Richard Cassidy and Philip Scharper [Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1983], 9-10) on the importance of service and humility in Luke. On humility in the Kingdom of God see Brown, "Jesus," 191 n. 3.

[12]Likewise see Luke 6:24, 16:13; 19-31, 18:4, 18-23, 24-25. Note that in Luke's gospel disciple and discipleship are not mutually exclusive as Luke "eliminates much but not all of the lack of understanding on the part of the disciples in Mark." Mark Sheridan, "Disciples and Discipleship in Matthew and Luke," BTB 3 (1973) 253. As well, Luke's disciples are not equated with the "Twelve" of Mark, but refer to a much larger group (p. 235-255). See, for example, the conditions of discipleship in Luke 14:25-33, perhaps better described as costs of discipleship. For an elaboration on the demands for humility, mission to the Gentiles, a concern with women and the sick, and renunciation of riches as inherent in the Lukan vision of discipleship see O'Toole, "Luke's Position," 9-13. See also C. H. Talbert ("Disicpleship in Luke-Acts," Discipleship in the New Testament ed. F. F. Segovia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985] 62-74) for a view to the corporate nature of discipleship and its orientation in tradition.

[13]See Luke T. Johnson (The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts, SBLDS 39 [Montana: Scholars, 1977] 98) for an outline of Luke's prophetic view of Jesus. For an outline of Jesus as model for the apostles in Acts see ibid., 60.

[14]Unlike Matthew and Mark there is no mention of Caesarea Philippi (diff. Matt 16:13, Mark 8:27) or Galilee (diff. Matt 17:22, Mark 9:30) or Capernaum (diff. Matt 17:24, Mark 9:33) in this part of Luke's gospel (Thompson, Advice, 42). Thompson also notes that this journey to Jerusalem (esp. Luke 9:51) is part of Luke's "journey narrative" of Luke 9:51-18:14 p. (130). See also Légasse, Jésus, 28.

[15]On Luke's omission of οἰκία see Luke 4:24; 9:12; (9:46); 11:22 (2x); 12:40; 16:18; 21:20-24. Note that the reference to οἰκία of Mark 9:33 can be placed within Mark's secret messianic mission and the Marcan teaching material which is reserved only for the disciples. See Legasse, Jesus, 28; Thompson, Advice, 42.

[16](1) ἐν αὐτοῖς is only found in Luke 9:46; 22:24 and 24:36 (cf. John 20:19). This phrasing is common to Luke in the setting of a dispute. Note also that αὐτοῖς appears in Luke 9:47, functioning perhaps as a catchword.

(2) διαλογισμός: Matt = 1x/ Mark = 1x/ Luke = 6x/ Acts = 0x. This term is obviously favoured more by Luke than any of the synoptic writers. See also Luke 2:35; 24:38 which are Lukan additions. Note its presence in Luke 6:8 in which Jesus also knows the thoughts of the disciples.

(3) τό see also Luke 19:48, 22:2; 22:4; 22:23; 22:24; Acts 4:21; 22:30 (Marshall, Luke,

89). Here Luke uses τό in the context of indirect questions.

(4) τίς ἄν εἴη: Maximilian Zerwick (Biblical Greek, trans. Joseph Smith [Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963] 70) notes that in biblical Greek there exists an affinity between relative clauses and indirect questions following verbs of saying, knowing, etc. Thus Luke could use τίς appropriately here to imply an indirect question. Note Mark's own use of τίς in Mark 9:34. Its presence here coheres with Luke's propensity to indirect questions. Zerwick also notes that the oblique optative is rare in Hellenism, but is not uncommon for Luke (e.g., Luke 1:29; 1:62; Acts 25:16)(p. 119). See also Luke 3:15.

[17] On the narrative framework, rather than that of a dialogue, see Marshall, Luke, 395.

[18]Henry J. Cadbury (The Style and Literary Method of Luke [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press: repr. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969] 143) notes that Luke prefers δέ to καί. See, for example, Luke 9:18 (cf. Mark 8:30); Luke 9:27 (cf. Mark 9:1).

[19]See Johnson, Possessions, 102. In Luke 7:36-50 Jesus "immediately shows that He is a prophet who can reveal men's thoughts by answering Simon's unspoken criticism (cf. again the prophecy of Simeon, 2:35)." For an analysis of the prophetic pictorializing of Jesus, see Johnson, Possessions.

[20]Cadbury, Style, 166. ἐπιλαμβάνομαι: 1:1:5/7. Marshall (Luke, 396) notes that ἐπιλαμβάνομαι is Lukan. See also Luke 14:14; 20:20; 20:26; 23:26; Acts 9:27; 16:19; 18:17; 21:30; 21:33; 23:19.

[21]Thompson, Advice, 132. See also Légasse, Jésus, 29. Note that elsewhere proximity to Jesus is indicative of the character's relationship to him. In Luke 7:38 standing behind Jesus is indicative of supplication. On the symbolic honouring of the child see Marshall, Luke, 396; on the attitude the disciples are to have see Legasse, Jesus, 29.

[22]Cadbury, Style, 79-80.

[23]Cadbury, Style, 91. This depiction affects, as well, the second child saying where both Jesus' indignation and his blessing of the children is omitted. Note that Mark (and subsequently Matthew) equate "twelve," "apostle," and "disciple" unlike Luke. Sheridan, "Disciple" 224 n. 23.

[24]Marshall, Luke, 396. Marshall suggests that the disciples are confronted on "their attitude to the present situation in which a child is before them."

[25]More specifically "(t)he one sent by a man is the man himself" (Ber., 5,5). Karl Heinrich Rengstdorf, "ἀποστέλλω..." TDNT 1 (1964) 398-446.

[26]Thompson, Advice, 131.

[27]Thompson, Advice, 131.

[28]Cadbury, Style, 135. Cadbury suggests that the change in form here is due to Luke's propensity to substitute for a relative clause a participle accompanied by an article. If one compares the themes of Mark 9:35b ("If anyone whould be first, he must be last of all and servant of all") with Luke 9:48c it is apparent that the two are thematically related.

[29]This view also assumes a rather unusual interpretation of 7:28. Note also that the disciples of Luke are not the "twelve" of Mark. Luke is using disciple in a broader sense, to depict a large crowd of followers.

[30]Marshall, Luke, 397. On a similar note, see Legasse, Jesus, 31 in which the child

is viewed as the lowest member of the church. "Située dans ce cadre, la figure de l'enfant en vient à symboliser 'le plus petit' dans l'Eglise..a cette categorie de fidèles, qui represèntent pour Luc l'idèal chrétien par définition, sont dûs tous les égards, parce que dans leur petitesse, ils sont 'grands.'"

[31]Marshall, Luke, 398. Marshall cites the work of H. Schürmann, Das Lukasevangelium (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Nt: Freeburg: Herder & Herder, 1969), 1:576-77.

[32]Jospeh Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke: I-IX,(New York: Doubleday & Co., 1981) 824-25. Fitzmyer notes that the travel account extends fully into Luke 13:21. This shift from Mark's geographical pattern connects Jesus to the assumption. This geographical perspective serves Luke's christological purpose of highlighting Jesus' journey toward the passion. And secondly, it coheres with Luke's theological purpose (p. 827). See also Johnson (Possessions, 105) for an analysis of the literary and theological import of the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, esp. pp. 103-105.

[33]Fitzmyer (Luke, 823) observes that Luke omits Mark 9:41-10:12 from the travel account, elsewhere deploying Mark 9:42-50 to Luke 17:1-3 and 14:34-35. Johnson (Possessions, 104 n. 1) observes that 57 of the verses of Luke 9:51-19:10 are found in Mark and these have been reordered by Luke. Even material common to both Matthew and Luke has drastic differences in order.

[34]Mark, on the other hand, places Mark 10:13-16 between Mark 10:1-12 which mitigates the increasing rift between Jesus and his disciples. For Luke the rift is neither as large nor as destructive as Mark presents.

[35]On καίand δέ, once again, see Cadbury, Style, 143. Luke prefers δέ to καί. Marshall suggests that the addition of καί may effect "the idea of class; that the children are representative of class" (Marshall, Luke, 682). καί, translated "even" is present later in the verse forming the Lukan combination δέ ... καί.

[36]Cadbury, Style, 187. See also, for example, Luke's improvements in Luke 4:37 (ἦχος) cf. Mark 1:28 (ἀκοή); Luke 7:1 (ῥήματα) cf. Mark 7:28 (λόγους); Luke 7:2-10 (δούλους) cf. Mark 8:5-13 (παῖς); Luke 8:51 (τῆς παιδός) cf. Mark 5:40 (τοῦ παιδίου) (p. 187).

[37]Charles H. Talbert, Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts, SBL Monograph Series 20 (Montana: Scholars, 1974) 53.

[38]On ἰδόντες see Marshall, Luke, 682. On Luke's addition of words see Cadbury, Luke, 90. Note 5:12, for example, where Luke adds ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν to Mark 1:40.

[39]Unlike this alteration Luke frequently changes the imperfect to the aorist. Cadbury, Style, 158. Legasse uniquely asserts, "(c)e ne sont proprement parles les enfants que Jesus apelle, mais les femmes qui les portent" (Légasse, Jésus, 41). This is not at all improbable as the disciples hinder the βρέφη via their caretakers. However, this is most probably an unexpected result of the change.

[40]See Cadbury, Style, 91. See also Légasse, Jésus, 41. For an example of Luke omitting the emotion of Jesus see Luke 10:41. Luke, however, does retain the term ἀγανακτεῖν: Matt = 3x/ Mark = 3x/ Luke = 1x/ Acts = 0x. See Luke 13:14 in which the synagogue ruler is indignant (cf. Luke 14:4).

[41]Cadbury (Style, 158) notes that in 31 cases Luke changes λέγει/ λέγουσι to εἶπεν/ εἶπον/ αν. The inverse substitution here furthers the relationship between Jesus and the disciples.

[42]ἀμήν: 31:14:6/0. Luke primarily deals with salvation when using this term. See

especially 4:24; 12:37; 21:32; 23:43. See also 18:29. Luke never uses ἀμὴν ἀμὴν.

[43]Legasse, Jesus, 41.

[44]Note the same theme of self humbling and divine exultation in 1 Pet 5:6, Jas 4:10.

[45]Dupont, Les Beatitudes, 2:185, notes that "(l)e sens et naturellement que, comme le publicain lest petit enfant doivent illustrere l'humilitè recommandèe aux disciples de Jesus: pour entrer dans le Royaume de Dieu il faul se faire pareil à un petit enfant en s'abaissant soi-mème." See also Legasse, Jesus, 41.

[46]Marshall, Luke, 691.

[47]John Drury, Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976) 104.

Chapter 5: The Child Sayings and Thomas

In the Gos. Thom. are found several variations on the child saying which function in a manner different than the child sayings of the synoptics. Mark employs the saying as a tool of chastisement. Matthew and Luke use the saying as ciphers for their respective concerns regarding humility. The extent to which Thomas was influenced by or had any contact with the synoptics is still under dispute, although it is probable that Thomas provides an independent witness to the Jesus tradition.[1] The gospel provides several variations on the child saying which are best seen within the context of the ascetic and asexual demands of discipleship. As has been suggested in Chapter One, linking children with asexuality is not unusual in antiquity.

A. The Literary Nature of Thomas

The Gos. Thom. is a collection of 114 sayings whose distinct form has provoked considerable scholarly discussion.[2] There is little narrative framework to the sayings. Some authors attempt to discern divisions within gospel. David H. Tripp, for example, suggests that the the term "disciple" constitutes "chapter headings" (i.e., sayings 1, 6, 12, 18, 20, 24, 37, 43, 51, 52, 53, 99, 113).[3] Bruce Lincoln argues that log. 2 establishes a pattern of division for the gospel and that the gospel divides easily into various levels of instruction for initiates.[4] Thomas, therefore, appeals to "those who seek," to "those who find and are troubled," to "those who are troubled and marvel," and finally, to "those who reign over the All" (log. 2). Although most scholars do not subscribe to such divisions of the text, the proposals of both Tripp and Lincoln challenge "interpreters to see the unity of the whole [gospel] as an instruction dialogue for community use rather than as a haphazard collection of sayings."[5]

There are several literary styles within the gospel which are ambiguous. Pheme Perkins in her recent studies notes that the pronouncement stories in Thomas pose interpretive problems. This genre of pronouncement stories often includes the simplification of the

introductory narrative. Consequently, an original element of controversy may be omitted. And unlike the synoptic tradition gnostic pronouncement stories do not establish distinctions such as friend, dull disciple, foe. The omission of lines of distinction in the Gos. Thom. effect ambiguity within the gospel.

Further, the dialogic pattern in gnostic texts renders interpretation difficult. The relationship between query and response is commonly unclear. This "lack of 'fit' between question and answer typifies the larger category of gnostic dialogue."[6] Interpretation of the text, for example, depends upon whether one understands the response to chastize the questioner, or whether it is merely informative.

Moreover, Tripp proposes a tripartite division of these questions: those posed by individuals who are not disciples (log. 21, 61, 114), those posed by "them," and finally, those posed by the disciples themselves (log. 6, 12, 18, 20, 24, 37, 43, 51, 52, 53, 99, 113).[7] Tripp would suggest, then, that each question must be understood in light of those who query.

Further, Howard Clark Kee notes that "the assumption underlying the gospel of Thomas is that the earthly Jesus' words simply could not be understood by his disciples without clues of comprehension granted them secretly in post-resurrection appearances."[8] This motif of secrecy may account for the ambiguity of the text, expressed in the literary genres used and the lack of distinction among characters. And this motif may also be linked with problems in interpreting the gospel. The text almost assumes that the readers are the recipients of some special information/revelation. In conclusion, the literary style of Thomas, with its underlying motif of secret revelation, makes interpretation difficult.[9]

B. Discipleship, Asceticism, Asexuality and the Kingdom

The disciples of Thomas are not well defined. Their number is not determined. Nor does the compiler make any effort to describe their nature. It is this group, however, that receives Jesus' "secret sayings" so named in the introduction to the gospel. The hidden knowledge is key to salvation.[10] And central to discipleship are asceticism and

asexuality.

For Thomas self-abnegation is a requisite of discipleship. Through rigorous self-discipline disciples are exhorted to "despise all things material" and further, to "abhor sex."[11] The allegorical form of log. 60, for example, can be seen as a means by which Jesus teaches that "salvation comes only to those who reject the world before it devours them."[12] This emphasis on asceticism, has strong ramifications for the gospel's view of and use of children. Furthermore, salvation is linked not only with the ascetic rigours of material renunciation, but is also linked with asexuality.

The negative attitudes toward sexuality or sexual differentiation reflected in Thomas can be partially traced to some Jewish interpretations of the creation story in Gen 2-3.[13] Although wholly different creation stories, Gen 1 and Gen 2 deal with the formation of humanity. The double mention of the creataion of humankind suggests to various Jewish exegetes that humankind was formed in two stages; the first, as androgynous being, and the second, as sexually differentiated beings. The androgynous Adam was created both sinless and immortal, a being clothed in "glory," exemplifying a unified sexual condition.[14] The division of the first androgyne into male and female is followed by the onset of sin. Eve and Adam rebelliously partook of the tree of knowledge. The Gen 2-3 story then tells of their subsequent expulsion from paradise and the toils that will accompany them.[15]

In light of this creation story salvation is symbolized and attained through the reunification of female and male into the primordial state. This motif is prevalent in antiquity. Philo of Alexandria, for example, utilizes a similar anthropology, but views the original immortal state as incorporeal. Sexual differentiation and embodiment appear within the material realm.[16] The majority of scholars concur on the influence of the Gen 2-3 creation story on the gospel's salvific schema.[17] The ramifications of such a mythology will become more clear in an analysis of the relevant logia, with specific emphasis on the theme of the "single one" in log. 22.

And finally, the presence of the kingdom is relevant to both Thomas' soteriological schema and the definition of disicipleship. Parables of the kingdom appear throughout

the text in log. 54, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 73, 76, 78, 86, 96, 97 and 98, and reflect the importance of the kingdom in Thomas.[18] The kingdom is attainable through gnosis, or knowledge of self and God (i.e., log. 3). Due to the nature of the salvific process, "(t)he kingdom is not in another place nor at a future time... [for Thomas]... it is here now."[19] And, as such, the kingdom is to be found within the disciples.

The influence of the themes of asceticism, asexuality, discipleship and kingdom on Thomas' use of the child saying will become more clear in a redactional analysis of the relevant logia. We turn now to the first of the variants found in log. 22.

C. Redactional Analysis: Logion 22

> Jesus saw infants being suckled. He said to His disciples, "These infants being suckled are like those who enter the Kingdom."
>
> They said to him, "Shall we then, as children, enter the Kingdom?"
>
> Jesus said to them, "When you make the two one, and when you make the inside like the outside, and the outside like the inside, and the above like the below, and when you make the male and the female one and the same, so that the male not be male nor the female female; and when you fashion eyes in place of an eye, and a hand in place of a hand, and a foot in place of a foot, and a likeness in place of a likeness, then you will enter [the Kingdom].[20]

1. Placement and Description

Logion 22 falls relatively early in the gospel, but exhibits themes which can be traced through the whole of the text. However, the motif of children (and/ or infants) is also seen in log. 21. In this saying children undress in a field in order to give the field back to its owners. The close juxtaposition of these two verses is undoubtedly deliberate. At the very least, the author connected these two verses on the basis of the catch-word "children."

Perkins notes that log. 22 seems to provide an "esoteric interpretation of the parables and sayings in the collection," presumably referring here to the whole of log. 20, 21 and log. 22. She observes that log. 22 thus contributes to the gnostic instructional dialogue

regarding entry into the kingdom.[21] If this is the case, the placement of 22 may be attributed to the compiler's redactional intent. This editorial concern may be difficult to ascertain precisely, as we shall see.

Thomas begins log. 22 with a short narrative statement situating the incident within a cause-result, question-answer dialectic. This introduction is followed quickly by a statement resembling some synoptic usage of the child saying.[22] The subsequent query of the disciples, based on Jesus' first observation, engenders a response from Jesus which is both lengthy and convoluted. Studying each of these aspects of log. 22 separately will facilitate identifying the Thomas' redactional concerns.[23]

2. Logion 22a

Log. 22a, has been described by John Dominic Crossan as a classic aphoristic story. This literary form is actually a narrative which develops from an aphoristic saying. The incident is initiated by Jesus instead of being a response elicited from him.[24] It is worthwhile noting that thematically log. 22a recalls both log. 11 and 18 in what Buckley suggests is a common concern regarding transformation within a soteriological construct.[25]

Not to be easily dismissed is the simplicity of the incident inspiring Jesus' comment and observation. A mother breast-feeding her child is itself a very natural biological event, as is the suckling act of an infant. In this sense, the suckling of the infant confronts the audience at a very basic biological level. Although there is little evidence to suggest that Thomas intends that this act be focal to log. 22, it is notable that the act of suckling recalls Thomas' theme of asceticism insofar as breast feeding involves no worldly implements other than mere biology.

3. Logion 22b

The query of the disciples (log. 22b), beginning what Crossan calls an aphoristic dialogue, carries well the theme of log. 22a, and retains "the language of Jesus' original saying in 22a."[26] It is significant to note that were 22a to be omitted, the query of 22b could constitute of itself an independent saying. However, in its present place log.

22b is employed as a connnecting unit between an "interpretative commentary" and a "preceding aphorism."[27] Because of the brevity of the whole passage it is at first unclear whether or not the Jesus' response is one of a chastizing nature, or merely an informative one. However, the tone and length of log. 22c, in contrast with the simple format and consise nature of log. 22b, seems to be more congenial with an instructional rather than polemical intent.

3. Logion 22c

The conclusion of log. 22 is tripartite, involving "making the two one" followed by the demand of interchangeable opposites, and the concluding emphasis on fashioning.[28] Buckley observes that the "making of the two one" signals a type of merging, or perhaps identification of the two elements. The second change required speaks not of identification but of being interchangeable. Through the language of transformation utilized in saying 22c a creation is required which "abolishes the pattern of opposites. The collapse of the two into one indicates a loss of dualistic relationships, a return to unity."[29] It is notable that in 22c, independent of Acts of Philip and 2 Clem., Thomas attempts to interpret the children receiving milk in 22a, b. This suggests that log. 22a, b, then, is a refraction of an original child saying. For Thomas, who tries to make sense of 22 a, b, the fashioning, or replacing, is to be on the part of the believer rather than imported from above.[30]

5. The Interpretation of Logion 22

It is apparent, then, that log. 22 involves three distinct, and somehow connected motifs of children, discipleship and transformation. The allusion to children, like that of the synoptics, appears to be metaphorical.[31] The audience of Jesus (i.e., the disciples) comprise the second interest of the logion, as they function to elucidate the meaning of "following" Jesus and the road to salvation.[32]

The third component of the logion, contained in log. 22c, is more problematic for interpreters in both form and content. It is the consensus of a number of scholars that

log. 22c displays an editorial interest in the renunciation of sexuality.[33] What exactly defines Thomas' interest? Central to the question is the phrasing of log. 22c which demands that the two be made one, and which later specifies that "the male not be male nor the female female." This theme of monachos, or "single one" has been the focus of much scholarly attention and debate.[34]

Some trace the state of the primal androgyne to the Adam and Eve creation story. By definition androgyny means the mergence of male (andro) and female (gyne) sexual characteristics.[35] And as such, this first creature would then exist in a state of involving both genders. In this light log. 22c, and more generally, log. 22, can be seen as demanding the assimilation of male by female, and female by male. This effects, perhaps, some sort of sexual juxtaposition of female and male in the "transcendence of sexual differences among the perfected."[36] And children, who implicitly embody this "single" state would be seen as somehow manifesting both male and female (sex) characteristics.

There is, however, yet another opinion on this issue. The contribution of Marvin Meyer is beneficial in elucidating an image of the asexuality that log. 22 demands.[37] It is not the androgynous (hermaphroditic) nor the supersexual being that results from the changes wrought in log. 22, but a creature which embodies the "mutual elimination of sexual characteristics."[38] This motif is paralleled in Gal. 3:27, 28, wherein Paul describes an ecclesial unity that supercedes the divisions of social structure, of ethnicity and of gender. And as is true of the Galatian church, this transformation is a radical consequence of baptism.[39]

Meyer's proposition is most likely the best of the two explanations. Asexuality coheres more with Thomas' asceticism than does androgyny. And the primal androgyne, signalled by the motif of monachos, is most likely not both female and male, but neither female nor male. Thomas writes not of androgyny, but of asexuality. It would seem, therefore, that log. 22 links children, discipleship and asexuality.[40] The path to salvation in the "here and now" is symbolized by the asexual nature of the child.[41] While the suckling child does function metaphorically in an asexual sense, s/he is not literarily utilized to

further define the means of transformation demanded in log. 22c. Entrance to the kingdom involves making oneself like a child, but the means of transformation are not clarified by the child metaphor. It is in log. 22c that the necessary elements of the transformation process are described.[42]

In a broader analysis log. 22 may have once been connected with log. 106 which speaks of reconciliation while using language similar to that of log. 22.

> Jesus said, "When you make the two one, you will become the sons of man,
> and when you say, 'Mountain move away,' it will move away."

This theme of settlement of relationships is echoed in log. 48 where, "two make peace with each other in this one house."[43] The possible connection between log. 22 and log. 106 supports the presence of the motif of asexuality in log. 22, as well as that of transformation. The theme of reunification present in log. 48 and log. 106 cannot be fully divorced from the reconciliation demanded in making the two (the male and the female as opposites or as complements) one.[44]

In conclusion, then, the child of log. 22 or more specifically, the infant of log. 22a, and the "children" of log. 22b, are used in a metaphorical sense. They not only are indicative of, but embody the transformation to asexuality that is required for discipleship and salvation. It will be in looking further into the meaning of child in log. 37 and log. 46 that the asexuality detected in the children of log. 22 becomes explicable within Thomas' editorial agenda, and the rituals which may have been in effect in Thomas' community or group.

D. Redactional Analysis: Logion 37

The second logion to be analyzed is log. 37.

> His disciples said, "When will You become revealed to us and when shall we
> see You?
>
> Jesus said, "When you disrobe without being ashamed and take up you
> garments and place them under your feet like little children and tread on
> them, then [you will see] the Son of the Living One, and you will not be

afraid."[45]

1. Placement and Description

This second variant follows soon after log. 22. The saying preceeding log. 37 deals with apparel, and exhorts the disciples to be unconcerned about clothing.[46] It is probable that both sayings 36 and 37 are bound by this thematic correspondence. In a very cursory analysis the latter logion can be seen as developing the theme of log. 36 within some sort of an eschatological discourse. Log. 38 speaks of the hidden nature of the message which Jesus offers, and contains an allusion to Jesus' impending departure. Other than retaining the motif of the secret nature of Jesus' wisdom, a theme which underlies the whole of the gospel, log. 38 seems unconnected with the log. 37.

The bipartite form of log. 37 is rather simple, consisting of question and answer. The straightforward nature of the question finds contrast in the (once again) rather convoluted form of the response. In typical gnostic style the question does not necessarily "fit" the answer, nor vice versa.

2. Logion 37a

The bipartite question of saying 37a is initiated by the disciples. The short introduction emphasizing that Jesus here is the respondant, rather than the initiator, is quickly followed by "(w)hen will you become revealed to us?" and "when shall we see You?" The question's bipartite form could signify either one concern or pose two separate interrogative phrases. "(W)hen shall we see You?" might merely qualify the initial question regarding revelation, providing clarification in the form of a paraphrase.

Alternatively, however, the two phrases may refer to separate revelations occurring within different moments of time. Although the disciples await Jesus' future inspiration (when Jesus is "revealed" to them), the form of that revelation may not be corporeal (i.e., when Jesus appears to them).[47] It is most probable, however, that Thomas uses the queries of log. 37a as one question. The revelation of Jesus is concomitant with seeing him. In the remainder of the saying Jesus speaks to the question of revelation.

3. Logion 37b

The response to the question of log. 37a appears to be divisible into three actions (i.e., disrobing, placing the garments beneath one's feet and treading upon the garments). It is through these actions that the children appear to be models for the disciples. Finally, log. 37b contains two qualifying phrases which speak of the positive salvific consequences of such comportment. Those who are willing to behave in the prescribed manner, as do children, will both see the "Son of the Living One" and will not fear.

4. An Interpretation of Logion 37

4.1 Disrobing

The references to disrobing and the subsequent action of trampling the clothing underfoot pose interpretive problems. Through these actions the disciples will see the Son of the Living One and not be fearful. The first exhortation, to disrobe without shame, has produced much scholarly response. There is little debate that a concern with salvation undergirds the logion. Nakedness, therefore is somehow linked with redemption. Klijn, referring back to the creation story of Eve and Adam notes that in Adam's sin, his "garment of light or glory was taken from him." The shame of Adam and Eve is linked to their sinfulness. They are no longer clothed in "glory," and realizing their nudity, cover themselves. Redemption entails a return to the original state "where the elect shall have been clothed with the garments of glory, and these shall be garments of life from the Lord of Spirits" (1 Enoch 62:15).[48] In the redeemed state there is no shame in being naked.

Many scholars note the connection between saying 37 and the first metaphor present in log. 21.[49] In the first half of saying 21 Jesus ascribes to the disciples characteristics of children in a field who, when confronted by the owners of the field, disrobe. The common theme of disrobing is seen as a clear reference to the Adam and Eve story, implying renunciation and reversal of the sinful state.[50] Both the children and the believers of log. 21 and log. 37 are naked without shame, a nakedness that is indicative of salvation.

Kee observes the sexual orientation of the allusion to nudity. However, the nakedness of log. 37b refers not to mere asceticism and/or sexual abstinence, but corresponds clearly to the "religious transformation of the individual."[51] Log. 37b implies the equation of asexual innocence with the primordial state of innocence.

A further interpretation of the nakedness asserted in log. 37b places the metaphor within the context of initiates and rites of entrance. In fact, there is general scholarly consensus that log. 37b reflects an interest in baptism. In an exacting analysis of this particular logion Smith traces the concept of nudity in the Jewish tradition and notes the attendant pejorative meaning.[52] It is only in baptism that the concept of nakedness assumes any positive nuance. The allusion to nakedness in log. 37b, obviously *not* derogatory, would involve an implicit reference to baptism. In this context saying 37b deals with two stages of nakedness. The first is present in the self-conscious guilt of Eve and Adam. The second stage of nakedness involves no shame, as nudity, within the salvific schema, reflects the "typological return to the state of Adam and Eve before the Fall."[53]

4.2 Placing the Garments Underneath and Trampling

The second and third metaphors, the placing of the garments under one's feet, and the subsequent trampling upon them can also be seen in the light of initiation/ baptism. Smith holds that the treading upon garments coheres with the pre-baptismal exercises of ancient Syria. In the four-stage ceremony cited by Theodore of Mopsueta in Liber ad baptizandos (Catechetical Homilies 12-14) Syrian baptismal practices included the laying aside of the outer garments of the postulants. After being annointed with oil the candidate removes any remaining garments, is baptised by immersion and is finally reclothed. Furthermore, such rituals were known to include standing on sackcloths as well as one's own clothing. Such actions imply renunciation, the seeking of distance from this world. In Jewish tradition the garments trampled underfoot may represent the clothing assumed by Eve and Adam in their tainted state. Taken to an extreme this action could symbolize the relinquishment of accepted social ties within the state of ownership.[54]

The metaphorical actions of log. 37b are most probably ritualistic in nature. Smith notes that the linking of the undressing of the disciples, their naked and unashamed state, the treading on garments, and their becoming as little children, are specific to baptismal rituals and homilies.[55] However, the degree to which the three actions and the child metaphor represent formalized initiation practices is a potential point of debate. It is very possible that the three actions recall a pre-Thomas tradition which incorporated such a ritual. Thomas' retention of log. 37b may not be indicative of practices within Thomas' community.[56]

4.3 Children

Perhaps the most problematic aspect of this logion is the the simile concerning children. Those who are naked and who tread upon their garments are like children. As has already been observed, gnostic literary formulae are not always clear, while metaphors often compounds interpretative problems. On the one hand, it is possible that in log. 37b children symbolize those who are "liberated from mortal existence to immortal life."[57] Viewing the children of log. 37b as adherents is consistent with gnostic soteriological intent wherein renunciation of this world is paramount.

On the other hand, the reference to children may be employed on a literal level. It is consistent with gnostic salvific intent that children are likely to be unbound by either earthly possessions or by sexual concerns. Logion 21 is especially indicative of the renunciation of worldy ties. Children are depicted as giving back what is not theirs by means of undressing. The gnostic motif of renunciation of rights to ownership may be reflected in log. 110 in which the disciples are told that "(w)hoever finds the world and becomes rich, let him renounce the world." Log. 37b can be seen in a similar light as furthering the theme of asceticism. It is also possible that the child metaphor signals the recurring gnostic motif of asexuality. Children do not exist in the world of sexuality. Saying 37b might suggest that the disciples comport themselves as do children, even distaining sexuality.

It is probable that the child reference functions on more than one level. Owing to the concerns of the Thomas community the metaphor almost certainly carries with it the implications of asexuality and unworldliness. The consequence of such comportment undoubtedly can be seen within a salvific schema where the elect are clearly distinguished from those condemned to perdition. The exhortation to behave "like" children therefore may constitute part of the soteriological construct of Thomas.

4.4 Rewards

The concluding elements of log. 37 deal with the rewards for those renouncing the world and sexuality. The adherents shall see the "Son of the Living One," presumably Jesus, and will know no fear. It is possible that here Thomas alludes to the secret revelation of Jesus to the faithful at the time of complete belief. In fact, several logia in Thomas suggest that the disciples themselves are not yet fully redeemed (i.e., log. 18, 19).[58]

Saying 37 also includes the admonition "do not be afraid." Fear is the normal response to theophany.[59] Throughout early Christian literature the admonition to not be afraid is frequent. In Matthew for example, the women see the resurrected Jesus who assuages their fright saying μὴ φοβεῖσθε, "do not be afraid," (Matt 28:10). In log. 37 the disciples' fear may signal an unredeemed state. In contrast, when the disciples fully participate in the benefits of the elect that they will no longer be fearful. It is rather ironic that courage is the consequence of salvation when it most likely would best accompany those who are on the way to choosing redemption.

4.5 Conclusions

In summary, the children of log. 37 appear to function both metaphorically and literally. They represent those who renounce sexuality and ties to the material world. Log. 37 also reflects a baptismal metaphor. The initiates are like the children of saying 37 who relinquish worldly (i.e., material and sexual) ties. The existence of allusions within antiquity to children symbolizing the cleansed entrant supports the probablity that such

a concern lies within the history of the logion.[60]

E. Redactional Analysis: Logion 46

The last of the three logia to be studied falls again within the first half of the gospel.

> Jesus said, "Among those born of women, from Adam until John the Baptist, there is no one so superior to John the Baptist that his eyes should not be lowered (before him). Yet I have said, whichever one of you comes to be a child will be acquainted with the Kingdom and will become superior to John.[61]

1. Placement in the Gospel

Saying 46 is preceded by the story of the evil man and the good man, and the fruits of their respective lifestyles.[62] There seems little thematic connection between log. 45 and log. 46, unless there exists an implicit paralleling of Adam and the man who brings forth evil things, and the good man and John the Baptist. Such a point of comparison is not impossible, but very likely improbable in this context. The two logia are thematically too different for such a comparison.

In the saying following log. 46 is Jesus states "it is impossible to serve two masters" and explains the folly of putting new wine into old wineskins.[63] Here again there is little thematic resemblance between the logia. There does exist, however, a consistent literary pattern within all log. 45, 46 and 47. All three sayings utilize dichotomies to clarify their points. Each compares opposite elements. Each elaborates on the irreconcilable nature of the points of comparison.[64] Thus the proximity of log. 45, 46 and 47 may be attributed to common literary composition, rather than catch-word composition or thematic correspondance.

2. Logion 46

The overall appearance of log. 46 renders it less literarily complex than either log. 22 or log. 37. There is no dialogue. Jesus speaks of eschatological and/or soteriological exaltation. The saying involves the contrast of several elements, namely those born between

the time of Adam and John the Baptist, and those becoming a child/little one. The exalted position of John is superceded by those of the child/lowly state in a concluding paradoxical statement.

Saying 46 is paralleled in Q 7:28. The temporal phrase ("from Adam to John the Baptist") and the final clause ("there is no one greater than John) in log. 46a, as well as "that his eyes should not be lowered" in log. 46b are unrepresented in Q. The temporal inclusion merely states what is implicit in the saying itself, although such allusions are not common in the collection.[65]

3. The Interpretation of Logion 46

3.1 Adam

Three elements of log. 46 demand initial attention. The first is Adam. Although the allusion in log. 46 is to those who lived between the time of Adam and John the Baptist, the reference has several layers of nuances. Given the prominent place of the creation story of Eve and Adam in Jewish tradition, it is not improbable that the compiler is aware of the tradition of the Adamic androgyne. This is supported by the references to monachos throughout the gospel (e.g., sayings 4, 11, 16, 22, 23, 49, 75, 106). At the very least, this imports onto the logion a nuance of asexuality. A salvific state involves the renunciation of sexuality.

The allusion to Adam also recalls the mortality and sinful nature of humankind. And similarly, the temporal reference to "those born of women, from Adam until John the Baptist" incorporates the history of the whole of creation. Thomas uses Adam to reference the beginning of the history of salvation.

Finally, it is notable that neither Adam was born of a woman. Consequently, the logion excludes Adam and Eve from those who would lower their eyes before John the Baptist. Lincoln suggests that the logion asserts Adam's superiority over John.[66]

3.2 John the Baptist

The positive reference to John the Baptist is the second component of the saying which demands attention. In saying 46 John is given an exalted position. It is significant that the logion divides the history of salvation into two eras; the times preceding and following John the Baptist. Thomas' community is not of the earlier group, but rather is comprised by those who have the potential of being greater than John.

3.3 Children

The third feature of the saying which is most problematic is the paradoxical allusion to children. The Coptic term ⲕⲟⲩⲓ can mean either "little one" or "child." Initially the reference to "child" seems unnatural in such close proximity to allusions to Adam and John the Baptist. However, a closer look at the link between children, sexuality and salvation renders the allusion less problematic.

Adam, John the Baptist and children can be linked through the motif of a/sexuality. Tradition imports a rather skewed vision of sexuality upon the figure of Adam. John's ascetic nature is attested to in early Christian works (i.e., Matt 3:4; Luke 7:35 || Matt 11:18). This may well have involved John's renunciation of sexual ties. And finally, the reference to children, in coherence with the some views of children in antiquity, is probably linked with asexuality.

Kee argues against such a conclusion, noting that in log. 46 "apart from its distainful attitude toward normal birth, there is no hint of connection between becoming a child and a negative attitude toward sexuality."[67] It is arguable that the allusion to sexuality in saying 46 is slight. However, the function of child within previous child sayings would suggest that implicit within the metaphor of child is the characteristic of asexuality. Even Kee, in an analysis of saying 37, notes the link between the function of child and a return to a state of innocence.

Linked to the asexual nature of child is the explicit reference to transformation in log. 46. Not only is the individual to emulate children's behavior or comportment, but

s/he who is superior to John "comes to be a child." The radical transformation demanded in log. 46 may be understood as a "new birth."[68] In the light of saying 37 such a birth may be an implicit reference to baptism and/or full gnostic revelation, neither of which the disciples participate in fully. It is doubtful that the allusion to transformation moves outside of a metaphorical realm into a literal one.

3.4 Little One

ⲕⲟⲩⲓ can also mean "little one." Although this does not alter the preceding interpretation significantly, this translation renders more direct parallels to log. 46. Crossan observes that in the Q/Matt 11:11 and Luke 7:28 the "least" in the Kingdom is greater than John. Similarly, Pseudo-Macarius (Hom. 28.6) judges that the "least one" is greater than John, and further equates the least one with the apostles.[69]

It is significant that the synoptic writers are not reluctant to make the same equation. Matthew, for example, uses the "little ones" in a metaphorical sense, pointing to the disciples (Matt 18:6-9, 10-14). Nor is it coincidental that such a reference follows a variant of the child saying (Matt 18:1-4, 5).

If "little ones" refers to the disciples the meaning of log. 46 assumes a slightly different emphasis. The motif of asexuality is lost insofar as the allusion to children is dropped, but is still carried by the reference to Adam. And second, the transformation motif may be aimed at more of a social than a physical alteration. Indeed, transformation into "little ones" is possible were such a change to require becoming lowly in both social and eschatological/soteriological states. However, this type of transformation is probably more congenial with a pre-Thomas, rather than Thomas' own, agenda.[70] As various logia would suggest (e.g., log. 21) Thomas is more concerned with relinquishing ties to the sexual and material world than with social alteration.

3.5 Conclusions

It is perhaps most likely that log. 46 is the product of the conflation of Q 7:28 and the child saying present in Matt 18:3 || Mark 10:15. [71] Thomas uses the child saying in log. 46 to elaborate upon asexuality and its link with discipleship.

F. Conclusions: Logia 22, 37 and 46

The allusions to children within Thomas, like those previously studied in the synoptics, are of a suprisingly positive nature. And, as in the respective synoptic versions, the appearance and usage of the child sayings are shaped by editorial intent. Here children function to further Thomas' salvific schema as the child metaphor functions alongside of kingdom references.

Within the gospel there is a pervasive emphasis on asexuality as one of the kingdom's basic elements. The reunification of the separated beings, embodied male and female, is essential to salvation. [72] The model of the primordial being corresponds to the vision of a redeemed humanity as asexual. The child, functioning within this early Hebrew salvific construct, appears as a symbol of asexuality. This aspect of the child metaphor is found more easily in log. 22 and log. 37, but can be seen as even pervading saying 46. [73] It is significant to note that in Thomas' use of children scholars have noted a formula for return to this asexual, pre-Adamic state. [74]

Children also appear to have an ascetic function. In saying 37 children are associated with renunciation of the material world by means of allusions to baptism. At some stage in the tradition, most likely before Thomas, the child sayings functioned in this very ritualized sense. It is not difficult to recognize how readily asexuality and renunciation of this world are linked in the symbol of the child. And equally not surprising, both elements are characteristic of the kingdom and are consistent with gnostic soteriologies.

Thus Thomas' use of the child sayings incorporates a metaphor which functions on several different levels. Of primary importance is the renunciation of sexuality, and secondarily, a more general renunciation of ties to this world. We turn to attempt to trace back through time the trajectories of each of the child saying variants.

[1]See, for example, Karen King ("Kingdom in the Gospel of Thomas," Foundations & Facets Forum 3 [1987] 49) who holds for the independent nature of Thomas. For an opposite view see W. Schrage, Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur gnostichen Synoptikerdeutung (BNZW 29; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964) (as cited by King, "Kingdom," 49).

[2]See Joseph B. Tyson's cursory analysis in, The New Testament and Early Christianity (New York: MacMillan/ London: Collier MacMillan, 1984) 205. Kendrick Grobel ("How Gnostic is the Gospel of Thomas" NTS 8 [1962] 369) concludes that the text is a "heap of heterogeneous sayings."

[3]See David H. Tripp ("The Aim of the Gospel of Thomas," ExpT 92 [1980] 41-44) who proposes the following divisions: log. 1-5; 6-11; 12-17; 18-19; 20-23; 24-36; 37-42; 43-50; 51,53,53-98; 99-112; 113-114.

[4]Bruce Lincoln ("Thomas Gospel and Thomas Community: A New Approach to a Familiar Text," NovT 19 [1977] 65-76) suggests log. 2 marks these divisions.

[5]Pheme Perkins, "The Pronouncement Stories in the Gospel of Thomas," Semeia 20 (1981) 131, n. 2.

[6]Perkins, "Pronouncement," 122. Perkins observes that both log. 22 and 37 are in the form of pronouncement stories. Here Perkins refers to the works of Kurt Rudolph, "Der gnostische Dialog als literarische Genus." Probleme der koptischen Literature (Wiss. Beitr. Martin-Luther University, 1968/1; Halle-Wittenberg. 1968) 80-90.

[7]Tripp implies here that Mary, for example, is not a disciple within the Gos. Thom. This may be debatable, dependent upon how one defines "disciple." Due to Thomas' lack of clarity on most issues, including the qualifications for discipleship, any definition of disciple may be a mixture of both eisegesis and exegesis. See, for example, John Dart ("The Two Shall Become One," TToday 35 [1978] 325) who explicitly suggests that Salome and Mary may have been disciples.

[8]Howard Clark Kee, "Becoming a Child in the Gospel of Thomas," JBL 82 (1963) 314.

[9]The motif of wisdom pervades the text, and to be sure, affects Thomas' soteriological schema. S. Davies ("Thomas: The Fourth Synoptic Gospel," BA 46 [1983] 13) notes that Thomas derives from the "type of Christianity that was oriented toward the Jewish wisdom tradition." On the sapiential nature of Thomas see, for example, log. 3 and 113 which echo Deut. 30:10-15. The believers are assured that the Law is "very near... it is in your mouth and in your heart for your observance" (v. 15). On the nature of the kingdom note that Jesus states that the kingdom is present "inside of you, and... outside of you" (log. 3) and is "spread out upon the earth" (log. 113). Davies assesses two important thematic shifts in Jewish wisdom tradition present within Thomas. First, Thomas equates Jesus with wisdom itself. A second feature, not parallelled in the synoptics, is the interchangeable nature of the kingdom of God and wisdom of the end time (Davies, "Thomas," 12). This description of the characteristics of the kingdom is relevant to Thomas' use of the "child" saying.

[10]Tyson, New Testament, 206 and Helmut Koester, "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," HTR 73 (1980) 115. See, for example, log. 17 in which the disciples are given "what no eye has seen, and what no ear has heard and what no hand has touched and what has never occurred to the human mind." Koester notes, as well, the phrase "(w)hoever has ears..." added to the parables of log. 7, 21, 63, 65, 96 (cf. Mark 4:9), which points to the hidden nature of this salvific wisdom. Although the whole of the gospel deals with various

features of discipleship, Perkins notes that it is in in log. 73, 86 and 89 that is found a "compendium on Gnostic discipleship" (Perkins, "Pronouncement," 128). Those who wish to follow Jesus renounce the comforts of house and home in their recognition of the ultimately saving nature of Jesus. See also log. 21, 27, 29, 42, 63, 64, 104 and 110 for ascetic allusions.

[11]Tyson, New Testament, 207. See also H. C. Frend ("The Gospel of Thomas: Is Rehabilitation Possible?" JTS 8 [1967] 17) who states that the text stresses "perfection through complete sexual abnegation" (log. 75, cf. Matt 25:1-13 and their respective emphases). A. F. J. Klijn ("The 'Single One' in the Gospel of Thomas," JBL 81 [1962] 273) views logia 105 and 114 as exhortations on the rejection of marriage. Lincoln ("Thomas Gospel," 75 n. 27) speculates that the highly rigourous ascetic demands not only affected harsh attitudes toward sexuality, but may have even resulted in self-castration. This ascetic mutilation, practiced in Syria, may have influenced a (hypothetically) Syrian Thomas community. Note that the self-abnegation has thematic parallel in Q.

[12]Perkins, "Pronouncement," 125. See also Gos. Phil. 93 which parallels this theme. Perkins observes that the "Thomas tradition consistently used sayings such as... [log. 24]... to support an ascetic Christianity" (Perkins, "Pronouncement," 125). In Dial. Sav. (CG III 125, 18-126; NHLE, 231) Perkins notes, supplies the conclusion to log. 24. In this particular saying the light can be understood as Jesus who brightens the darkness of the material world. For fuller elaboration on the symbolism of light/ darkness see Perkins ("Pronouncement," 125) who refers to further apocryphal works as Thom. Cont. (CG II 139, 12-31; NHLE, 189), and Dial. Sav. (CG III 126, 17-128, 6; NHLE, 231).

[13]See Klijn ("The 'Single One'," 273-275) who provides a clear summary of Jewish scholarship on this story. There is debate as to whether or not Thomas speaks of renunciation of sexuality. Some scholars suggest that Thomas demands from women some sort of repudiation of femaleness. Such a stance finds primary support in 114 where "every woman who will make herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Salvation for females appears to be much process to be much more complex than that of the males. See, especially Jorunn Jacobsen Buckley, "An Interpretation of Logion 114 in The Gospel of Thomas," NovT 27 (1985) 245-272.

[14]For early references to this see, for example, Ephrem In Gen. et in. Exod. 29 (as cited in Klijn, "The 'Single One'," 275-76).See also Hippolytus, Ref., 5.7.14 and 5.7.39 for references to the bisexual nature of the first being. For a closer look at the full definition of androgyne see the explanation which follows the overall meaning of log. 22.

[15]See Cyril C. Richardson ("The Gospel of Thomas: Gnostic or Encratite?" The Heritage of the Early Church, ed. D. Nieman and M. Schatkin, [Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1973] 75-76) who suggests, in a rather unique manner, that the Fall is "the division of the Light... [i.e., that which created Adam]... by sexual intercourse and propagation." This might mean that sexual intercourse was itself the cause of the expulsion. However, most commentaries on the story, in both Jewish and Christian traditions, concur that prior to the Fall Eve and Adam did not partake in coitus. See, for example, Gen. R. 8.11; 22.2; Cave of Treas. 5.15; Tertullian, de Monog. 5; Iranaeus 3.23.5. Certainly the varying emphases on the pejorative nature of sexual intercourse affects the degree to which sexuality is considered negative.

[16]See, for example, Philo Opif. mundi 134: "the one that was after the (Divine) image was an idea or type or seal, an object of thought, incorporeal, neither male nor female by nature incorruptible." Philo's incorporation of both the dualism of the Hellenistic

tradition, and this creation theme of the Jewish tradition, is classic. For other examples of Philo's anthropology see De spec. leg. 2.175; Leg. All. 1.31, Quaest. et. Sol. in Gen., 1.4. See, also, Richard A. Baer (Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970]) for further discussion on this topic.

[17]See traces of the mythology in logia 4, 11, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 46, 49, 51, 61, 72, 75, 84, 85, 98, 106, 113, and 114. See the composite lists of Klijn, "The 'Single One'," 271 and Lincoln, "Thomas Gospel," 73. Klijn ("The 'Single One,'" 276) notes the presence of this mythology in other gnostic texts (i.e., Hippolytus, Ref. 5-6, Gos. Phil. 71) Wayne A. Meeks ("Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," HR 13 [1974] 165-208) suggests that early Christianity adopted this myth, but later dropped the motif when it became too dangerous.

[18]Tripp, "The Aim," 43.

[19]Davis, "Thomas," 13. See also Tyson, The New Testament, 206.

[20]Note that the edition by A. Guillaumont, H. Peuch, G. Quispel, W. Till, and Y. 'Abd al Masih (The Gospel According to Thomas [Leiden: E.J. Brill/ New York: Harper & Row, 1959] 17) reads "to make the two into a single one" in log. 22c. Marvin W. Meyer (The Secret Teachings of Jesus: Four Gnostic Gospels [New York: Vintage, 1984] 23) translates "babies" in log. 22a and log. 22b. All citations from Thomas will be from the "The Gospel of Thomas," trans. Thomas O. Lambdin, The Nag Hammadi Library in English, ed. James M. Robinson (New York: Harper & Row, 1977) 118-130 unless otherwise noted.

[21]Perkins, "Pronouncement," 124.

[22]The variants of the saying Mark 10:15 and Matt 18:3, (also John 3:3; 3:5) will be further discussed in Chapter 5. It is significant that 2 Clem. 12:2 retains the first half of log. 22. On this latter note see Frend, "Gospel of Thomas," 18.

[23]I will divide the sections herein into "a," introduction and observation, "b," disciple's query and "c," concluding prerequisites for entrance.

[24]See Crossan (In Fragments, 324) for more on aphoristic sayings and aphoristic stories. Rudolph Bultmann (The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh [New York: Harper & Row, 1963] 66) notes that a primitive apophthegm... makes the occasion of a dominical saying something that happens to Jesus... It is a sign of a secondary formation if Jesus himself provides the initiative." Crossan first utilizes Bultmann's criterion to identify log. 22a as a secondary accretion. Crossan notes, too, that the form of log. 22a is oriented positively (Crossan, In Fragments, 325).

[25]Buckley, "An Interpretation," 253. Buckley observes that log. 11 refers to the miraculously transformative powers of Jesus' audience and to an otherworldly future and log. 18 is concerned with the secret knowledge that the beginning and the end may be equated in Jesus' salvific construct (p. 252).

[26]Crossan, In Fragments, 325.

[27]Crossan, In Fragments, 325.

[28]Buckley, "An Interpretation," 254. Crossan, on the other hand, divides log. 22c (referred to in his work as 22b, and incorporating the query of the disciples) into four parts. "When you make" phrasing which speaks of "the obliteration of bodily differences" (Crossan, In Fragments, 323). Note again that some prefer the translation "single one" rather than "one and the same." See Meyer, "Making Mary Male: The Categories 'Male'

and 'Female' in the Gospel of Thomas," NTS 31 (1985) 559. Buckley also observes the absence of the vice versa format characteristic in the phrase "[and when you make]... above like the below" (p. 254). Such an omission may be derive from gnostic soteriology which incorporates progression from the material (below) to the spiritual world (above). The demanded change, due to the nature of the kingdom, "must come about before the bodily death" (Buckley, "An Interpretation," 254).

[29]Buckley, "An Intepretation," 254.

[30]Buckley, "An Intepretation," 254.

[31]Recall Matthew's use of child as embodiment of humility, for example.

[32]As already noted, kingdom is a present reality for Thomas. Thus following Jesus, and being privy to, and comprehending Jesus' secret sayings, effects salvation, and subsequently entails immediate entrance to the kingdom.

[33]See, for example, Kee, "'Becoming a Child' in the Gospel of Thomas," JBL 82 (1963) 313; Lincoln, "Thomas Gospel," 75; Marvin Meyer, "Making Mary Male," 554-570; Frend, "The Gospel of Thomas," 17. For a summary analysis of the various views see Buckley, "An Interpretation," 255-256.

[34]See also log. 4, 11, 16, 23, 49, 75, and 106 for references to the "single one," and for an explanation and history of monachos see Klijn, "The 'Single One'," 271 and 272, respectively. To this list Ron Cameron adds log. 21a; 22; 30; 37; 61; 114. See Ron Cameron "Gos. Thom. 46, 78 and their Q Parallels (7:28, 24,25)" (Unpublished paper presented to SBL Q Consultation, Chicago 1984) 7 n. 12. Cameron also notes that Thomas' theology is clear in the epexegetical comments seen in log. 4, 16 and 23 (p. 7). For early extra-canonical literature on the theme of the "single one," see 2 Clem. 12:2-6, Clement of Alexandria's Strom., 3.13.92; Acts of Peter 38; Acts of Philip 140; Hippolytus' Elenchos, 5.7.13-15 (J. E. Ménard, "La Fonction Soteriologique de la Mémoire chez les Gnostiques," RevScRel 54 [1980] 307-308).

[35]See Plato, Symposium, 189E. Plato outlines a creation story involving a primal bisexual/ hermaphroditic/ androgynous creature, which was created beside the sun's descendents (male-male pairing) and the moon's descendents (female-female pairing). The split of the original beings resulted in the embodiment as male and female, and a genetic predisposition to heterosexuality or homosexuality, respectively. Each half of the three pairs forever seeks its estranged mate. Achieving the original androgynous state, therefore, for one third of the human race, entails hermaphroditic charactersitics.

[36]Frend, "Gospel of Thomas," 18. Frend suggests, however, that Thomas' asceticism here moves into the realm of rejection of sexual intercourse, as is seen in some gnostic circles, amongst the Nassenes, and possibly alluded to in Gal 3:28.

[37]Meyer, "Making Mary Male," 560. See also Klijn, "The 'Single One'," 271.

[38]Meyer, "Making Mary Male," 560.

[39]Kee contests the interpretation of Gal 3:28 as pointing to the eradication of sexual barriers. See Kee, "'Becoming a Child'," 313. For Paul in 1 Cor 7:21 does not abolish slavery, as might be intimated in Gal 3:27. The point of Gal 3:28, rather, "is that in Christ the distinctions which characterize human life... no longer have validity" (p. 313). Kee's point encounters the difficulty of attempting to define Paul's intentions along the basis of consistency which may present some difficulties in the diversity of stances present in strictly Pauline writings. As well, Paul may be correcting "abuses" within the Corinthian

church which are not apparent in Galatia.

[40]Kee concludes that in this logion becoming as a child, entering the Kingdom and achieving a state of asexuality are interchangeable terms ("Becoming," 313).

[41]Again Kee contributes to the debate regarding saying 22 by suggesting that a literalist view would have the child as an asexual being. In log. 4, for example, the child of seven days lives in a perfect week, in a pre-Fall (asexual) state ("Becoming," 311).

[42]Helmut Koester ("One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels," Trajectories through Early Christianity, ed. James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971] 174) suggests that the heirs of the proverbial kingdom are the Solitaries, "the children, the poor, the hungry, those who suffer persecution."

[43]Kee, "'Becoming a Child' 308-309. Kee, observing the connection between sayings 22 and 106, also notes that seen in the light of the gnosticizing elements of log. 106, saying 48 assumes the meaning of renouncing of sexuality.

[44]This motif could appear to support a vision of the monachos as bisexual rather than asexual, in the juxtaposition of the male and the female. However as reconciliation does not primarily mean assimilation of the other's qualities, the call to becoming a hermaphrodite is not fully supported through this motif.

[45]It is notable that the P. Oxy. 655.1b (cf. Coptic text lines 87:27-34; 88:1-2) retains the Coptic in almost an exact duplicate of the Greek text. The Coptic version reads, "His disciples say to him, 'When will you be revealed to us and when shall we see you?' He says, 'When you take off your clothes and are not ashamed, and take your tunics and put them under your feet like little children and tread upon them, then you will see the Son of the Living One and you will not fear.'" See "The Oxyrhynchus 'logoi' of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas," Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971) 409-410. "Without being ashamed," is translated by Guillamont, Peuch, Quispel et al as "when you put off your shame." Greek texts support the former translation in "ὅταν ἐκδύσηθε καὶ μὴ αἰσχύνθητε" (Fitzmyer, "Oxyrhynchus," 409-410). However, as the issue here is not the Greek translation but the Coptic, we will retain the translation of "without being ashamed." Note that Clement of Alexandria's Strom. 3.91 retains a parallel to log. 37. "When Salome asked when what she had inquired about would be known, the Lord said: When you have trampled on the garment of shame and when the two become one and the male with the female [is] neither male nor female" (O. Stählin, GCS 15 [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906] 263). For reference to and treatment of this parallel as within an anti-sexual polemic see Jonathan Z. Smith, "The Garments of Shame," HR 5 (1966) 235-36.

[46]Log. 36 reads, "Jesus said, 'Do not be concerned from morning until evening and from evening until morning about what you will wear.' Thematically log. 36 parallels Matthew's and Luke's passage on anxiety. See Matt 6:25-34, Luke 12:22-32.

[47]Buckley offers an even more literal interpretation of "see." The concern with log. 37 is "(t)o see Jesus as he really is," a vision equated with entering the Kingdom (Buckley, "An Interpretation," 256).

[48]Klijn, "The 'Single One'," 274. Compare Gen 2:25 in a pre-"Fall" state where "both of them were naked... but they felt no shame in front of each other" with the post-"Fall" world of Gen 3:7 in which Eve and Adam hurry to make themselves clothing to cover their nakedness.

[49]Klijn, "The 'Single One'," 275; Smith, "Garments," 235; Kee, "Becoming," 311-112.

[50]Smith, "Garments," 237. See also Hippolytus Ref. 5.8.44 in which asexuality and the action of disrobing appear to be equated. Smith suggests that saying 37 should be seen in comparision with log. 21. The reference to world in log. 21 may be based on a linguistic pun. In Coptic ⲕⲱⲕⲁϩ means "to leave the world." ⲕⲱⲕⲁϩⲏⲩ translates "to be nude." The Greek term κόσμος (i.e., "world" or "ornament"), similar to each of these Coptic terms, here means "to take off the world." However, ⲕⲁϩ literally means "dirt," "earth," or "soil." ⲕⲱϩ translates to mean "dust," "paste," "mud," "clay," "underneath heaven" and even "earth born," but never translates the Greek term κόσμος. The link between the Coptic and the Greek is weak, at best.

[51]Kee, "On Becoming," 310. Kee further suggests that on a sexual level the disrobing of log. 21 also connotes not mere abstinence, but inner transformation as well. For a more elaborate explanation of this interpretation see Kee, "Becoming," 312. Like Smith, Kee notes that Clement, in Strom. 3.12.92, is writing from within a controversy with a docetic opponent concerning matters of sexuality, gives the saying an anti-sexual polemic. Clement's use of the saying may be attributed to the Gospel of the Egyptians (Smith, "Garments," 237). Clement interprets the saying as referring to a child's unself-consciousness toward nakedness, due to freedom from sexual urges. Furthermore, Clement calls upon Eve's and Adam's robing themselves in response to their guilt (Kee, "On Becoming," 310). Note in this variant of the saying what could be the conflation of log. 22c and log. 37b.

[52]See, for example, Smith, "Garments," 217-238; Kee, "On Becoming," 310-311; John Dart, "The Two Shall Become One," TToday 35 (1978) 323. Smith traces the history of nudity in the Christian church through the first five centuries ("Garments," 222-224), furthering the motif present in log. 37.

[53]Smith, "Garments," 237. See the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia (bishop, d. ca 428) compiled by R. Tonneau and R. Devreesse (Homélies catéchétiques de Theodore de Mopsueste ["Studi e Testi" CXLV: Rome: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1949] esp. 417) as cited by Smith ("Garments," 224 n. 24).

[54]See, for example, Meyer, "Making Mary Male," 559 who suggests that the implication here is renunciation of property ties.

[55]Smith, "Garments," 237. Smith further observes that "(n)udity is clearly a symbol of new life ... and when apearing with baptism, must be interpreted as signifying sacramental rebirth" (p. 222).

[56]On the other hand, Karen King ("Kingdom," 68-69) notes that the baptismal references identified in log. 21 and 37 (cf. Smith, "Garments," 235-238) and the reunification baptismal formula in log. 22 (cf. Davies, The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom [New York: Seabury, 1983] 45) reflect a baptismal rite within Thomas' community which links entrance to the kingdom with entrance to the Thomas community (p. 20). Furthermore, the baptismal motif of 22, 37 and 46 presume the attachment of a ritual theology of re-creation to the ritual of baptism. This theology includes 1. a return to the original conditions of creation; 2. rejection of worldly associations and powers; 3. becoming children; and 4. entrance to the kingdom. See also sayings 49, 99 and 114 which address these motifs (p. 19).

[57]Meyer, "Making Mary Male," 559.

[58]See Buckley, "An Interpretation," 253, 257. Buckley notes that saying 18 implies that the disciples are not fully cognisant of Jesus' meanings, "and, in some sense, they

may not yet really be disciples, not yet initiated into the secrecies" (p. 253). Similarly log. 19 states "If you become My disciples..." Here in log. 37 it is possible that the disciples are not yet transformed, through baptism/initiation into the pre-Adam and pre-Eve unified sexual state (p. 257). Interpreting the text rather literally, perhaps Jesus will appear to the disciples in their ultimate moment of redemption. Not only the kingdom, but the moment of revelation, may be in the here and the now.

[59]There are several nuances to fear within Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. Fear may signal both religious awe and anxiety. On theophanies see Gen 15:1; 21:17; 26:24; 28:13; 46:3; Philo Migr. Abr. 21; Deus. Imm. 69. On fear as anxiety see Acts 23:10; Heb 11:7; 1 Clem. 44.5; Just. Dial. 7.1, 123.3. On fear as religious reverence see, for example, Pol. 6.3. On the exhortation "fear not" and theophanies see Exod 20:20; Jdt 6:23; Dan 10:12; 10:19. On fear and its history see Horst Balz, "φοβέω" TDNT 9 (1974) 189-219.

[60]Whether or not the Thomas community participated in this specific ritual involving the disrobing of the initiate and the trampling of the garments, or merely incorporated this allusion from some external tradition, would necessitate further study, and is not within the scope of this paper.

[61]On the ambiguity κογι see R. McL. Wilson, "The Gospel of Thomas"; Crossan, In Fragments, 325-326.

[62]See Q/Luke 6:45 = Matt 12:35.

[63]See Matt 6:24, Luke 16:3.

[64]Note that neither log. 44 nor log. 48 carry further this literary device. Saying 44 deals with sins against the spirit, while log. 48 and log. 49 elucidate upon the state of "oneness."

[65]Thomas does not repeat this temporal phrase elsewhere. However, for similar allusions to (a) figures within Jewish tradition (e.g., Adam) see log. 39; 52; 85; 102; (b) figures or elements within present times (e.g., the time of John the Baptist) see log. 10, 28; 52; 102.

[66]See Lincoln, "Thomas Gospel," 74. Only once elsewhere is there an explicit reference to Adam in Thomas. Saying 85 reads,

> Jesus said, "Adam came into being from a great power and a great wealth,
> but he did not become worthy of you. For had he been worthy [he would]
> not [have experienced] death.

[67]Kee, "Becoming," 309.

[68]Kee, "Becoming," 309, n. 8. Kee notes that in John 3:3; 3:5 is an explicit reference to this birth metaphor.

[69]See Crossan, In Fragments, 325. Ron Cameron ("Gos. Thom.," 17) notes that in log. 46b the protasis and apodeses are formulated both positively and negatively. Also, when κογι is translated as "child" the saying parallels Matt 18:3. When κογι s translated as "little one" log. 46b parallels Q 7:28b (p. 17).

[70]It is notable that translating κογι as "little ones" still retains the paradox seen in the synoptic variants of the saying. Social reversal is maintained. Althought the "little ones" (e.g., disciples) may be elevated within their own social group, they are still the least, albeit outside of the community's boundaries. Those who are the least are those who are acquainted with the kingdom.

[71] Cameron suggests that log. 46 is a conflation of Matt 18:3 par. and Q 7:28. He notes that the protasis of log. 46b is rendered by each of the two parallels. The apodoses are connected by ἄνω. Each apodosis "is a variant of its respective parallel" (Cameron, "Gos. Thom.," 17).

[72] See Koester ("One Jesus," 174) who suggests that children within Thomas, notably in log. 22, appear as metaphors for the true believer, "in whose religious experience the opposites are reconciled." Buckley suggests that Thomas is unconcerned with the male/female aspect, and focusses instead on the salvific process of unification (Buckley, "An Interpretation," 261). However, Thomas' concern with reunification implicitly involves the renunciation of sexuality.

[73] Hans-Reudi Weber ties log. 4 into the relevant logia in Thomas. He suggests that sayings 22, 37 and 46, in pointing to the pre-"Fall" state (or that of the androgyne) ultimately link with log. 4 in which those transformed into a state of innocence are truly wise. Asexuality, embodied by children, walks hand in hand with wisdom. See Jesus and the Children (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979) 74.

[74] See Lincoln, "Thomas Gospel," 75.

Chapter Six: Tracing the Trajectories of the Child Saying and the Question of Authenticity

It is apparent that three basic trajectories already witnessed in Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas cut their proverbial swaths through antiquity. The baptismal interpretation witnessed in Thomas surfaces in the fourth gospel as well as in the Shepherd of Hermas. Thomas' ascetic tendencies are furthered in 2 Clement.[1] Continuing the rather moralizing strain of the child saying in Matthew, Luke and Mark are other quotations in the Shepherd of Hermas. These post-biblical variants substantiate the trajectories witnessed earlier in the synoptics and the Gospel of Thomas. Furthermore, however, these variants will provide yet assistance in tracing the original form of the child aphorism, or saying. Common sentence formulation and themes in verb usages will help to indicate from whence the trajectories themselves originated.

Upon recovering the earliest form of the child saying it is possible to test for authenticity. This examination will be accomplished by applying various historical critical criteria to the recovered aphorism. Some criteria identified within biblical scholarship, however, will be inapplicable to the *form* of the reconstructed aphorism. It will then be possible to make some claims as to whether or not the child aphorism is an authentic saying of Jesus.

A. Post-Biblical Developments of the Saying

The fact that metaphors identified in the early streams of the material are yet present later in the tradition is significant. Perrin's studies on the nature of metaphors are illuminating here. Elaborating on the nature of metaphor and symbol, Perrin, following Philip Wheelright, delineates between steno-symbols and tensive symbols. The latter cannot be exhausted in meaning, while a steno-symbol "can have a one-to-one relationship with that which it represents."[2] Were "children" a steno-symbol, the allusion to "like children" would be bound to one interpretation, and perhaps bound to a single Sitz im Leben. However,

the survival of the aphorism attests to its adaptability, and suggests that "child" functioned as a tensive rather than as a steno-symbol.[3]

If the allusion to children was of a tensive nature, then the developing tradition would correspondingly interpret the symbol in a myriad of ways. As we will see, this diversity of interpretation is apparent in John whose "born again" cannot be divorced from the baptismal interpretations posed in Thomas, nor the "turn and become" of Matthew. In conclusion, then, the development of the aphorism depended not only on the dynamics of orality, but as well on the interpreter's view of child as steno- or as tensive symbol. And undoubtedly the ambiguity of the child metaphor is the very source from which arise the varied trajectories.

1. Baptismal Trajectory: John and the Shephard of Hermas

1.1 John 3:3; 3:5

John offers two variants of the saying. John 3:3 reads "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God"; and John 3:5 reads "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." They fall within the pericope 3:1-12 in which Nicodemus, surreptitiously approaching Jesus at night, initiates a conversation about "rebirth" or "birth from above." John gives v. 3 a double meaning. Although the adjective ἄνωθεν most commonly means "again," it can also be understood here, and later in John 3:7, to mean "from above." In v. 4 Nicodemus questions how it is possible to be "born anew" and Jesus responds with the second "child" saying variant (v. 5).

Both variants in John exhibit motifs signalling a necessary conversion or transformation through "birth from above" (John 3:3) and "birth of water and the Spirit" (John 3:5).[4] Although the debate about John's knowledge of and views of the sacraments continues, and the status of "water and" in John 3:5 is a matter of dispute, Helmut Koester persuasively argues that even without "water and" John 3:3, 3:5 are almost certainly to be understood within a baptismal context.[5]

Hence, regardless of whether John's use of 3:3, 3:5 is sympathetic to and approving of sacraments, or whether John employs sacramental language in an asacramental manner, or whether John is re-directing baptismal language to the theological/soteriological reality that stands behind baptism, John is nonetheless employing a baptismal saying. And this saying can be seen as continuing the baptismal trajectory witnessed earlier in Gos. Thom.[6]

1.2 Shephard of Hermas Sim. 9.29.1; 9.29.3

There are several variants in Hermas which further the child saying's baptismal association.[7] Especially exemplary of this is Sim. 9.29.3 which utilizes metaphors of initiation (i.e., "put away evil," "put on guiltlessness") especially in relationship to children (i.e., "babes").[8]

2. Ascetic Trajectory: 2 Clement, Acts of Philip

2.1 2 Clement 12:2, 6

In a fashion similar to that of Thomas the child saying functions within an ascetic construct in both 2 Clement and the Acts of Philip.[9] Like the saying rendered in the first child saying of Thomas (i.e., log. 22) 2 Clem. 12:2, 6 is embedded in an discourse expounding upon the arrival of the kingdom, and reads,

> For when the Lord himself was asked by someone when his kingdom would come, he said, "*When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female*" ... *When you do this, he says, the kingdom of my Father will come.*[10]

Like log. 22 in Gos. Thom. the whole passage (i.e., 2 Clem 12:1-6) is imbued with ascetic teachings, and similarly reflects the concept of monachos.[11] The child saying, at the root of this passage, signals a world in which asexuality is elevated.

2.2 Acts of Philip 34

The Acts of Philip most probably originate from Syria. The document dates, at the earliest to the end of the fourth century, but most probably was not written until the fifth century. The Acts of Philip are connected with the origin and the spread of the

cult of the saints, and feature Philip as a heroic figure. The relevant saying reads,

> "Unless you change your 'down' to 'up' (and 'up' to 'down' and 'right' to 'left') and 'left' to 'right', you shall not enter my kingdom (of heaven)."[12]

The accent on polarities found in Gos. Thom. is likewise manifest here. Equally obvious is the emphasis on alteration or conversion. Just as Thomas uses this format to signal asexuality, it is probable that Philip employs polarities to the same end. The asceticism of ancient Syria is well known, as is the connection of celibicay with sanctity in the developing Christian tradition. Implicit in the passage is the radical conversion formulated in Thomas' use of the child saying, significantly that of asexuality.

3. Moralizing Trajectory: Hermas, Clement of Alexandria

3.1 Shepherd of Hermas Man. 2.1

Undoubtedly the majority of the child variants in Hermas perpetuate the moralizing trajectory witnessed in Matthew's concern with humility, Luke's economic and social humility, and Mark's exhorations regarding reception and servanthood. Man. 2.1, begins a treatise on simplicity and innocence, and is shaped by an interpretation of children which hinges on the polarities of evil and innocence. Children, as innocents, are unexposed to the ways and the destructiveness of evil. As are children, so are the faithful. Sim. 9.29.1 reads,

> And from the twelfth mountain, the white one, are such believers as these: they are as innocent babes, for whom nothing wicked has arisen in the heart and they do not even know what evil is, but they have remained constantly childlike.[13]

3.2 Clement of Alexandria Paed. 1.5.12

Paed. 1.5.12 follows verbatim Matt 18:3, and of the parallels in Clement of Alexandria, offers the most complete version of the saying. Other variants appear to be mere conflations or portions of Matt 18:3. Although it seems probable that Clement copies from Matthew, the way in which the child saying is used can be signficant for this study. Clement, neither gnostic nor catholic, writes from within the context of passing on wisdom, and "sets the 'gnosis' taught by him under the protection of apostolic authority" (e.g., Strom.

1.2.3; 6.61.3; 6.131.3).[14] This is apparent, for example, in <u>Protrept.</u> 9.82 in which Clement uses both scripture and the child saying in the context of moralizing. In <u>Paed.</u> 1.5.12 and the numerous variations of the child saying it is apparent that Clement does in fact continue the moralizing trajectory witnessed in Matthew.

4. Conclusion

It is significant that the child saying surfaces in Christian (and other) literature beyond the first century C.E. The three trajectories, identified both within the synoptic and Thomas versions and in the above cited texts, demonstrate the tensive nature of the symbol of child and further attest to the wide variety of interpretations of the saying itself. We will now begin to trace back through these various trajectories in our endeavour to reach the original aphorism.

B. Status Quaestionis

Any attempt to reconstruct an authentic "child" saying is necessarily based in a history of biblical scholarship spanning a century.[15] In the earliest days of biblical scholarship, in a post-Enlightenment world, the foci of concern were the text and Jesus. How did the text present Jesus? Was it an accurate account? Following the First World War Dibelius, Bultmann and Schmidt pointed to the "gap" that existed between the life of Jesus and the phenomenon of the text. It was the tradition engendering the texts that caught the attention of the scholarly world. The New Quest for the historical Jesus in a post-World War II environment irrevocably shaped studies in the field with the combining of form criticism and redaction criticism. It is from this vantage point that modern biblical scholarship makes its present methodological attempts to reconstruct the intentions of Jesus.

In the 1960's Norman Perrin and R.H. Fuller independently produced four criteria by which to establish a saying as authentic.[16] The first of these criteria is distinctiveness, or dissimilarity. The saying could be determined as authentic if it appears distinct from emphases characteristic of both Judaism and Christianity. For example, the use of the

Aramaic _Abba_, or "Father," found in Mark 14:36, and probably lying behind Luke 11:2, is unparalleled as an address to God. Contemporary Jewish prayers used "Our Heavenly Father" or the like.[17] The second criterion is consistency, or coherence. This criterion tests the saying against those sayings already acknowledged as authentic, ensuring that the saying in question would cohere with Jesus' concerns. The third of the criteria is the "cross-section" test, or multiple attestation. A saying is assessed as authentic if it appears in a variety of unrelated sources, or if a consistent motif appears in a variety of forms or types of traditions (e.g., the positive view of "tax-collector").

Finally Fuller and Perrin utilized linguistic and environmental tests. If the language of the saying is compatible with that of Jesus (i.e., Galilean Aramaic), then the saying indeed may be authentic. This criterion in practice is a negative criterion, however. Since Jesus' Jewish contemporaries and his earliest followers also spoke Aramaic and lived in a Palestinian culture, their sayings also reflected Aramaic idiom. Thus any saying that does _not_ reflect Aramaic patterns, and Palestinian cultural features, it _cannot_ derive (in that form) from Jesus; but the mere fact that a saying can be said in Aramaic is no guarantee of authenticity. Since the development of these early criteria, the range of principles has expanded to include tendencies of the tradition,[18] attestation in multiple forms, modification, plausible development of the tradition (diachronic approach),[19] and hermeneutical potential (synchronic approach).[20]

Since Perrin's and Fuller's groundbreaking work and the subsequent methodological refinements, historical-critical methodology has been the focus of critique by many scholars. From the standpoint of his research into orality John G. Gager concludes that for oral transmission "all previous attempts at the quest [for the historical Jesus] have proceeded on ill-founded and misleading assumptions about the oral tradition."[21] Unlike the elongation and elaboration assumed in the historical-critical method, Ernest L. Abel notes that "_as information is transmitted, the general form or outline of a story remains intact, but fewer words and fewer original details are preserved._"[22] It is precisely on this basis that John Dominic Crossan attempts to construct not an original saying but an original

structure or matrix. In his critique of Perrin's attempts to determine an original saying of Jesus Crossan distinguishes between ipsissima verba and ipsissima structura. He concludes that oral memory is a "memorization primarily of structure" and that the "basic unit of transmission is... at best and at most, the ipsissima structura."[23] One cannot find the "original wording" of a saying, since a cheirographic, linear view of development of tradition is nonapplicable to the dynamics of orality. Crossan insightfully proposes that the original matrix or structure originating the plurality of variants will be that "which best explains the multiplicity engendered in the tradition."[24]

It is evident then, through recent studies on dynamics of orality, that the task is to identify a *matrix*, or structure, which generates the variants as we presently know them. This does not, however, discount the work of the early scholars, such as Perrin or Fuller, but rather augments their initial insights. The criteria for authenticity will be applied upon determining both the form of the saying and its internal dynamics.

C. Identification of the Aphorism

The ways in which the child sayings have been used in Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas are reflective of the editorial agendas of each respective author. Mark's polemic against the disciples is clear in the presentation of the child as an antithetical character highlighting the disciples' misunderstanding nature. In Matthew the child likewise poses as a model for the disciples and is used as a cipher for humility. Luke's child sayings independently further the theme of humility by linking economic abasement with behavioral humility. In Thomas several variants of the saying are responsible for its multivalent usages in pointing to asexuality (log. 22, 37, 46), renunciation of wordly goods (log. 37, 46), and finally, to a baptismal formula (log. 22, 37). In the following analysis I will identify those aspects of the saying which have escaped, or indeed, resisted editorializing by Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas.

1. Mark 9:33-37; 10:13-16

As has been evidenced, Mark's polemic against the disciples is reflected through the evangelist's use of the child saying.[25] Of particular interest is the effect of this editorial agenda on Mark 9:33-37 and the subsequent contribution of "aphoristic clusters."[26] In these clusters the aphorisms of "greatness/servanthood," "reception of the sender" became intertwined, resulting in a short discourse on appropriate comportment for discipleship. Mark 9:33-34   introduces the "leader as servant" aphorism found in v. 35. Verse 36 undoubtedly functions as an introduction to the concluding "reception of the sender" aphorism of v. 37.[27] Obviously the child saying is obscured through its contamination with various aphorisms.

In Mark 10:13-16 there exists some deliberate construction in regard to the child saying explicit in Mark 10:15. In this variant, reception rather than transformation is associated with children and entrance into the kingdom. This emphasis on reception furthers Mark's agendas concerning discipleship. Crossan detects the interplay of aphorisms in this verse. He identifies the presence of an aphoristic compound within Mark 10:15, wherein the saying regarding "reception" merges with that of "becoming a child."[28] Mark inserts v. 15 within the story of vv. 13-14 a, b and the concluding action of v. 16 which signals both Jesus' and the child's special relationship with the kingdom.[29] Mark's concern to chastize the self-aggrandizing disciples does not fully cohere with the saying in Mark 10:15. It is this verse that wholly reflects pre-Marcan material and which is variation of the child saying. . The variant may be isolated, then, as reading "(t)ruly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it" (Mark 10:15).

2. Matthew 18:1-4, 5; 19:13-15

Matthew 18:3 maintains the basic form of Mark 10:15. It is obvious that the editor has relocated the child saying from the Markan schema and has juxtaposed it with an aphorism whose principal motif is humility. Matthew further retains the Markan use of "reception" in 18:5 and thus binds children, humility and reception into a unified thematic schema. Matthew's presentation of the child saying in 18:1-4, 5 involves similar introductory

techniques as viewed in Mark (i.e., Matt 18:1-2).[30] Matthew, however, introduces an interest with humility in 18:4 which does not substantially change the structure or content of the child saying in 18:3, but which does act as an interpreter of it.[31] The whole of v. 3 is pre-Matthean. Even "turn," which seems to be a favourite of Matthew's, most probably derives from an earlier tradition, and is here taken over by Matthew.

Matthew's second child pericope incorporates much of the Markan framework, but because Matthew has transferred Mark 10:15 into the earlier child passage, Matt 19:13-15 is fairly brief. Here Matthew has virtually followed Mark in form and content, and thus most of Mark 10:13-14a, b. In summary, then, the relevant aphoristic variant found here in Matt (18:3) reads "Truly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven."

3. Luke 9:46-48; 18:15-17

The first child pericope in Luke omits information found in its Markan source, but supplements the text with a saying dealing with greatness (Luke 9:48). Consequently, Luke conflates the child passage by omitting details extraneous to Luke's agenda. Luke also interprets the aphorism by means of the appended saying. In Luke 18:15-17 the writer's hand edits the passage only slightly and thereby retains Mark's form of the child saying (Mark 10:15).[32] Subsequently, in future references to Luke 18:17 I will cite merely the source text of Mark 10:15.

4. Thomas Logia 22, 37, 46

Thomas contributes more variants of the child saying than do any of the synoptic writers.[33] Log. 22a functions as an introduction to the aphorism which is here in tripartite form. The narrative presentation of 22a involves the suckling of a child which can be related to Thomas' agenda of asceticism. Jesus' statement "These infants being suckled are like those who enter the kingdom" comprises the first element of the aphorism in a similar didactic format as Mark 10:13-14a, b. The disciple's response in 22b, preceded by a narrative introduction, reads "Shall we then, as children, enter the Kingdom?" and functions as the second aphoristic component. The convoluted statement of 22c reflects

Thomas' hand and concludes the tripartite form of this variant, "then you will enter [the Kingdom]."

The second relevant child logion in Thomas (saying 37) is imbued with editorial (or even pre-redactional) concerns. The motif of nakedness points both to baptismal intent and to asexuality. The variant present here is as follows: "When you disrobe without being ashamed... take up your garments... place them under your feet like little children and tread on them... then you will see the Son of the Living one, and you will not be afraid."

The last logion in question similarly hosts many of Thomas' editorial and theological agendas. The parallel of log. 46a with Q/Luke 7:28 ‖ Matt 11:11 suggests that this logion may represent what Crossan describes as an "aphoristic compound." Undoubtedly the implicit theme of the least as the greatest, and subsequent parallel to the "leader as servant" aphorism further complicates this variant. Nonetheless, extracting the child aphorism from log. 46 results in the remnant "whichever one of you comes to be a child will be acquainted with the Kingdom."

5. Synoptic and Thomas Variants: An Analysis

The redactional agendas of the respective editors do not completely obscure the form of the child saying. A number of preliminary observations can be made in regards to the form of these variants.[34] Two basic forms are attested: conditional formulations and definite relatives. With the exception of log. 22a all variants are of bipartite structure.

Robert H. Funk, in his text on Hellenistic Greek grammar notes that conditional sentences "consist of a subordinate clause stating the condition or supposition (the if-clause) and a main clause giving the inference or conclusion."[35] The first element in the conditional sentence is known as the protasis, and, in Hellenistic Greek, is connected by the subordinating conjunction εἰ or ἐάν to the main clause or apodosis. Additionally, ὅταν juxtaposed with a subjunctive functions as does ἐάν, or more simply, as an "if-clause."

Although the introductory elements of the protases in these canonical and non-canonical variants can in part be traced to the redactional agendas of the writers and/or oral transmittors, the conditional element which commences the saying is undoubtedly of fixed form. A cursory examination of the variants indicates that the relevant subordinate clauses consist of a conditional referrant which corresponds to the "if-clause" noted by Funk. In Matt 18:3 the "if-clause", translated by RSV as "unless", is introduced by ἐάν with an aorist subjunctive.[36] In Mark 10:15 the clause is implicit in the phrasing "whoever does not receive," the conditional use of a temporal clause.[37] Thomas, although preserved in Coptic still borrows the Greek ὅταν and utilizes this "if-clause" equivalent in log. 22c and 37b.[38]

Most of the variants also include explicit or implicit references to their audiences. Thus Mark 10:15 calls upon "whoever," while Matthew and Thomas use the more personal "you."[39]

The verbs employed in the protasis are those of action, namely to "receive" (Mark 10:15), to "turn and become" (Matt 18:3), to "make" (Gos. Thom. log. 22), to "disrobe," to "tread on" (Gos. Thom. log. 37), and to "come to be," (Gos. Thom. log. 46). Due to the nature of the conditional sentence, and the variations upon the "if-clause" the verbs themselves appear in varying tenses.[40] Matthew's "turn" and "become" are respectively formed by a second aorist subjunctive passive and a second aorist subjunctive. Since ἐάν and ὅταν take the subjunctive Mark's indefinite subject introduces therefore the aorist subjunctive δέξηται. The protasis also contains a fixed metaphor regarding children. Thus all of the synoptic and the Thomas variants retain the metaphor.[41]

The main clauses, or apodoses, introduce "enter the kingdom" (Mark 10:15, Matt 18:3, Gos. Thom. log. 22), and "be acquainted with the kingdom" in the Gos. Thom. log. 46.[42] The second child pericope in Thomas, reflects the motifs of "seeing" the Son of the Living One and "not being afraid." In all of these cases these clauses fulfill the conditions previously imposed. These verbs connote a change in state, perhaps the entering into a new realm or a change in intellectual status.

Mark, Matthew and Thomas are consistent in their use of either positive or negative formulations throughout the bipartite structure.[43] This repetition can be explained by the dynamics of oral transmission and narrative style. First, the retention of a postive-positive formulation and/or a negative-negative formulation within the various trajectories reflects both the oral and the written tradition. This formula, then, is obviously fairly easy to retain and repeat orally. Secondly, the effectiveness of this emphatic form is attested to in its expression in the written tradition, a tradition where editorializing is not uncommon. The repetition of positives or negatives does in fact provide literary emphasis.

In conclusion, then, the aphorism is in the form of a bipartite conditional sentence. It contains a verb of action in the protasis, which is balanced in the apodosis with a verb dealing with a change in state. They are linked by a fixed child metaphor. The aphorism does retain a final clause dealing with "the kingdom."

It is significant that the child aphorism is imbedded in the context of parenesis. The saying carries a didactic rather than a polemical intent and in the contexts viewed, is directed at the disciples of Jesus. In the synoptics Jesus speaks to his followers in response to some dispute *within* the group. Although the Gos. Thom. seldom includes narration (e.g., log. 37 and 46), log. 22 immediately situates the child saying within an address to the disciples.[44]

6. Ipsissima Structura and Linguistic Transformation

A description of the various child aphorisms through canonical, and extra-canonical texts prepares the way for the attempt to describe an early, and perhaps authentic form of the aphorism.[45] The initial task necessitated in such a procedure has involved identifying the basic pattern of the aphorism.[46] From there we can map the lingustic transformation of the saying.

It is among verbs of the protases and the apodoses that we find the greatest variation. As has been noted, the bipartite conditional framework, the child metaphor and the "kingdom" reference remain fixed.[47] We turn now to noting what links can be drawn between

the various verbs, and perhaps suggest how it is that they mutated through transmission.

6.1 Protasis

The protasis of the child sayings in Mark, Matthew and Thomas each contains a verb of action. Mark's rendering of "receive" stands isolated from the other verbs. It is apparent that the remainder of verbs deal with some variation upon radical transformation; that is, either inner transformation or an accompanying external action, or both. In Matthew 18:3 can be seen the fullest form of the protasis. (Clement Paed. 1.5.12; see also Herm. Man. 2.1). The other variants attend to at least one of the two features expressed in Matthew. Thomas log. 46 signals only internal change (see also John 3:3; 3:5; Acts of Philip 34; 2 Clem 12:2, 6; Herm. Sim. 9.29.1).[48] And finally, Thomas logia 22a and 37 incorporate only action into the protasis (see also Herm. Sim. 9.12.8; Sim. 9.16.2).

The thematic coherence between the majority of these verbs is significant in mapping their linguistic transformation. The dynamic of transformation is consistent throughout both the canonical and extra-canonical texts. "Turn and become" can be seen as moralizing insofar as it furthers Matthew's editorial agenda regarding humble comportment. Thomas utilizes the motifs of inner transformation and action to accentuate asceticism, and hints perhaps at a baptismal intent.[49] In other extracanonical trajectories these verbs promote as well the varying motifs of asceticism, baptism and moralizing, within the agendas of the respective writers.

Most striking, and most problematic, is the Markan rendering of "receive." Although it is probable that this verb represents a secondary influence from another aphorism "Receiving the Sender," it is nonetheless apparent that reception also constitutes an action of sorts. However, it is a reaction rather than an action, and directs alteration to that which is received rather than the act of inner transformation.[50]

The "suckling" of log. 22a also proves to be problematic in a thematic analysis. The reference to suckling is present in both the introductory narration and in Jesus' metaphorical speech to the disciples. On one hand, Thomas may be focussing on a childlike state rather than the action of "suckling." The center of gravity then lies in the latter

part of the aphorism. On the other hand, "suckling" may be seen as more than an incidental description of the children. This action coheres with the external movement seen in several variants. Perhaps Thomas anticipates the conversion identified in log. 22c (i.e., "make the two one..."). It is also possible that "suckling" may be a means by which Thomas interprets log. 22c. Could the inner transformation demanded by log. 22c result in such actions as "suckling" of log. 22a? At best Thomas might have used the suckling in a metaphorical sense, alluding to the abandonment of material concerns. In this light "suckling" functions interpretively and in accord with the external movement of the protasis verb.[51]

6.2 Apodosis

The verbs of the apodosis may be divided into two groups.[52] The first are those which contain metaphors of physical movement: i.e., Mark 10:15 (enter); Matt 18:3 (enter); Gos. Thom. log. 22a, b, c (enter); see also John 3:5 (enter); Acts of Philip 34 (enter); 2 Clem 12:6 (come). Thomas logia 37 (see) and 46 (acquainted), comprising the second group, also utilize metaphors of perceptual rather than physical movement (see also John 3:3 [see]; Herm. Sim. 9.29.1 [be]).[53]

The bridge between what seem to be two divergent types of movement can be found in ancient Greek theories of vision. Theophrastus (De sensu. §1-2) identifies two theories of cognition and sense perception in the pre-Socratics. Parmenides, Empedocles and Plato all held that the agent of cognition was directed from the body outward. The second school, ascribed to by Anaxagorus and Heraclitus, believed that "air imprints" (i.e., the image of the objects) were transported by the eye by means of the air. It is the former school of thought that is relevant here. Both vision and cognition for Plato were active phenomena, with direction of energy outward by the eye to the object of vision.[54] When viewed in this context the references to "acquaintance" (Gos. Thom. log. 46) and "see" (Gos. Thom. log. 37; see also John 3:3) become more explicable beside the frequent allusions to "enter" and "come."[55]

7. Conclusion: The Original Form of the Aphorism

As is apparent from the synoptics and Thomas, the original form of the aphorism lends itself to a metaphorical intent. It incorporates a term of explicit comparison (i.e., "like" or "as" in the protasis plus a verb of inner transformation. Later renditions of the aphorism may retain domesticate the form of the protasis by making the child metaphor implicit rather that explicit. The apodosis is constructed of a verb of external movement in relationship to the "kingdom." There is an obvious tendency within the tradition to separate the two fixed elements of the saying, that is, the child metaphor and the kingdom reference.

disrobe (Gos. Thom., log. 37)

come up... set aside (Herm. Sim. 9.16.2)

If... [you] . . . . turn and become (Matt 18:3). . . . . like children

make (Gos. Thom., log. 22c)

change (Acts of Philip 34)

shall be (Herm. Sim. 9.16.2)

have (Herm.Man. 2.1)

come to be (Gos. Thom., log. 46)

see (Gos. Thom., log. 37)

see (John 3:3)

[be] acquainted [with] (Gos. Thom., log. 46)

Then ... [you shall] . . . enter (Mark 10:15) . . . . the kingdom [of God].

enter (Matt 18:3)

enter (Gos. Thom. log. 22 a, b, c)

enter (John 3:5)

enter (Acts of Philip 34)

enter (Herm. Sim. 9.12.8)

It is significant that even though it is not possible to trace the _ipsissima verba_ of the sayings of Jesus, we encounter here two fixed elements. The first is the "child" metaphor. The second is the "kingdom" reference. We turn now to testing the authenticity of the proposed authentic saying by means of those criteria utilized by modern biblical scholarship.

D. The Reconstructed Aphorism and Historical-Critical Criteria

It is at this point in the reconstruction process that the historical-critical criteria can be applied effectively. M. E. Boring incorporates the works of Joachim Jeremias, Norman Perrin and Reginal Fuller into a refined methodical presentation of the criteria for authenticity. Where applicable his presention of the tests will be relied upon.[56] Further, the work's of Arnold van Gennep and Victor Turner and their work on liminal groups seem appropriate to this particular saying. Their sociological analyses will be helpful in determining whether this saying may be authentic. It is with the criterion of multiple attestation that the test for authenticity begins.

1. Multiple Attestation

One indication of the aphorism's authenticity is is attestation in several unrelated streams of material. As the preceding discussion makes obvious, this criterion is fact fulfilled. A significant number of variants surface in the synoptics, John and in extra-canonical literature. It is most probable that both Thomas and John offer variants independent of the synoptic tradition.[57] The dependence of the other variants upon either Thomas or the synoptics is more problematic. However, it is clear that the canonical and extra-canonical parallels provide a strong case for multiple attestation of the child aphorism.

2. Multiple Forms

This criterion assumes that authentic motifs are likely to have penetrated various forms in sayings-types. There are two related elements in question: children and their relationship to the kingdom.[58] The motifs of child and kingdom are present in Mark 10:15,

Matt 18:3 and Thomas log. 37 and 46 in various literary forms. Mark 10:15, Matt 18:3 and Gos. Thom. log. 37 and 46 retain the two themes within a dialogic framework. In Mark 10:13-14, where a dialectical story appears both motifs are present. Crossan detects here what may be either another aphorism, or yet another formulation of, or commentary upon, the aphorism. In the aphoristic compound of Matt 18:4 is perhaps located another commentary which contains both motifs. In Thomas, the themes of child and kingdom are present in log. 22a in the form of an aphoristic narrative.[59] The motifs are carried further into log. 22b in the form of an aphoristic dialogue (log. 22b). In the aphoristic commentary of log. 22c the motif of child is dropped and/or interpreted. Similarly, John 3:3 and 3:5 the theme of child is absent, but the element of kingdom is retained within the aphoristic dialogue of (Jn 3:3, 5, 7) and the intermittent aphoristic commentary. However, it is interesting that the Johannine variants do recall the theme of children/infants insofar as the baptismal nuances signal rebirth.[60] Hence it is apparent that the themes of child and kingdom penetrated multiple forms of aphorism-types.

3. Linguistic Criterion

The linguistic test suggests that if the saying is to judged authentic, it must cohere in language and style with Jesus' Aramaic.

Two variants, John 3:3 and Matt 18:3, are the immediate focus of this criterion. First, the double meaning of ἄνωθεν, which is intrinsic to the point of John 3:3, is impossible in Aramaic and is captured only in Greek. On the other hand, Matthew's στρέφω in 18:3 has a Semitic flavour. In fact, "(n)ous avons ici tout simplement la manière hébraique (šub) et araméenne (tubh, hefak) d'exprimer l'idée re." Matthew's "turn" may be a rendering of either the Aramaic or the Hebrew counterparts, most probably the former.[61]

Joachim Jeremias notes that Matt 18:3 is the earliest of the variants as it reflects more Semitisms than either the synoptic or Johannine counterparts.[62] Because of the dearth of abstract verbs in Aramaic it is likely that the two verbs of Matt 18:3 are close to the original intention. If Jesus were to have spoken of radical transformation, as the

reconstructed aphorism suggests, it would have been necessary to utilize a compound verb in order to depict both inner transformation and the accompanying action. Certainly the compound verb of Matt 18:3 carries out the task well. In conclusion, the use of compound verbs in the protasis, describing an abstract concept, is plausible.

4. Trajectories and Tendencies of the Developing Tradition

Boring concludes that in all probability the developing tradition augmented the material. As the saying was retold the tendency was to theological leveling and linguistic clarification. Theological domestication of the saying can be most clearly identified in the post-canonical variants which further these trajectories. But such domestication is visible in the canonical variants too: baptismal (i.e., Thomas), ascetical (i.e., Thomas, Luke) and moralizing interpretations (Matthew, Mark) are given to the saying. Eventually the saying was almost universally understood in a baptismal context.[63]

It is significant that various trajectories have arisen from the child saying. Undoubtedly this is due both to the tensive nature of the metaphor child and to the difficulty or obscurity of the saying itself. The abstract features of the verb of radical transformation and the final verb of external movement allow for the development of the various trajectories. In this light it is apparent that the verbs themselves are tensive. They certainly have been subject to modification and interpretation. The least clear or most tensive of the verbs is most probably the earliest.

As noted, however, the major critique of the historical-critical school of authenticity lies in a lack of understanding of orality. While Bultmann suggests that the trajectories of the tradition effected conflation of variants, reduction of Semitisms, elongation of narration, and the proclivity to move to direct discourse, data from the field of orality suggests otherwise. Gager cites psychological studies on rumour and notes three laws of distortion: "(a) leveling, or a tendency to grow ... more concise... (b) sharpening ... reporting of details ... as they seem relevant to the basic issue (c) assimilation of the material according to normal expectations."[64]

According to these dynamics, the oral transmission of the child saying rendered the saying more concise. This tendency is apparent in the several variants wherein the apodoses the form of the saying varies slightly. The explicit metaphor of child, apparent in the early matrix, is not present in some variants where the metaphor appears to have been absorbed by the verb of the protasis. This verb imputes a metaphorical reference.[65] And further, there is a definite tendency in the tradition to separate the motifs of child and kingdom, even resulting in complete omission one of the elements. The second law of distortion which Gager notes is the sharpening of details accompanying the reporting of rumours, a phenomenon inapplicable to the identification of the matrix of the aphorism. And finally, the tendency to domesticate can be seen in the omission of the child metaphor in the protasis and/or the importation of domesticating verbs.[66] Notably, the change in form (from an aphoristic saying to an aphoristic dialogue, story, etc.) also coheres with subverting and/or taming the radical and incomprehensive elements of the aphorism.

5. Dissimilarity

"Dissimilarity," Perrin once observed, "is the fundamental criterion."[67] Jesus' sayings must stand out amongst the characteristic views of his time. The obvious drawback of this criterion is "it misses material in which Jesus is at one with his Jewish heritage ... and ... may present a distorted picture of the message of Jesus."[68]

On the basis of this criterion alone the aphorism would be rendered authentic.[69] The elevation of children resulting from an identification of children and the kingdom is at odds with the negative or demeaning views of children in the ancient Mediterranean culture as seen in Chapter One. The children of antiquity were viewed as unimportant in and of themselves. Their value lay, rather, in serving a social function (e.g., progeny). Although not all images of child within classical literature are pejorative, the treatment of children certainly did not tend to such elevation as is inherent in this metaphor.

The reconstructed aphorism calls for some form of radical transformation which involves, in a sense, "growing down" in the return to the state of a child. This demand

is at odds with normal growth process of moving out of childhood. To those of antiquity Jesus is calling for regression.

In the reconstructed aphorism, however, the emphasis lies in a transformation that is not solely figurative. The radical change demanded by the saying involves alteration on various levels (e.g., pyschological, social, physical, economic levels). Although the saying is used in coherence with the authors' respective salvific agendas in the canonical and extra-canonical works, the demand of radical transformation can still be seen. And paradoxically, salvation lies in becoming like a child, the least of the expected salvific models.

It is perhaps in other Christian writings that the elevation of children in aphorism finds its greatest contrast. In 1 Cor 3:1-3 Paul links children with immaturity in spiritual development, a far cry from the high status given to children in the original saying. And later, the Shepherd of Hermas interprets the sayings stereotypically. Hermas links children with innocence and unworldliness (e.g., Sim. 9.19.1, 3), very much akin to this images of children in antiquity. These usages writings are shifts back to established views of children, and definitely shift away from Jesus' unusual emphasis. Viewing the criteria of environment and coherence will help to clarify the radical nature of the child saying and, paradoxically, render it more explicable within its milieu.[70]

6. Coherence and the Environmental Test

The criterion of coherence demands that the identified Jesus saying or pericope is consistent with Jesus' other pronouncements.[71] First, we will assume the basic correctness of Perrin's definition of tensive symbols. The child metaphor, and its accompanying abstract verbs, engender a multitude of meanings. This is apparent in the varying interpretations of children as humble (Matt 18:3), asexual (Gos. Thom. log. 22), innocent (Hermas, Sim. 9.29.1, 3; Man. 27.1). Second, that Jesus would use the metaphor of children, in light of its tensive nature, is significant. It is from this perspective that the child saying in its reconstructed matrix can both illuminate and be illuminated by a sociological perspective of the early

Jesus movement.[72]

The concept of a permanently liminal structure is significant to this study. In 1908 Arnold van Gennep first depicted the transitional rites of passage which accompany "changes of pace, state, social position, and age in culture."[73] In the tripartite process of these movements amidst social strata are involved separation, marginalization (or removal to the limen), and reaggregation into the society. Victor Turner, in a subsequent analysis of this process determined that although the second or "liminal" phase is most often transitional, it can in certain circumstances be permanent. "Liminality" is marked by "unstructured or rudimentarily structured and relatively undifferentiated 'communitas,' community, or even communion of equal individuals who submit together to the general authority of the ritual elders."[74]

Especially significant is the possible factor of status elevation or the transitional or permanent limen. Whether permanent or temporary, this change in socially allocated status involves a structural reconfiguration. The resultant social form can be one devoid of any status gradations (i.e., non-hierarchical), or one marked by a reversal of "normal" social patterns. In the latter instance "persons who habitually occupy low status positions in the social structure are positively enjoined to exercise ritual authority over their superiors."[75] The individual of formerly low status is raised to an elite position. Evidently, then, a liminal group operating under this auspice of status reversal would employ structures that function as a mirror image to the macro-society.

It is within this context that the elements of the reconstructed aphorism linking children and the kingdom become not only more clear, but more intriguing. The identified matrix suggests that children have a special relationship to the "reign" of God. Jesus reevaluates the categories of his society and elevates a marginal group.

Werner H. Kelber, asserting that the nature of oral transmission presumes that those transmitting the material find it worthy of propogation, would no doubt suggest that those of the early Jesus movement were attracted by the elevation of children explicit in the saying. Such a group could not exist within the "normal" structures of the Graeco-

Roman world where children were not, on the whole, ascribed special significance. By definition those maintaining the saying comprise a liminal group who here invert cultural norms. And in their mirror image of society, this group found it worthy to maintain this child aphorism where children were elevated, rather than denigrated. In the maintenance of the saying this liminal group made a strong social and theological statement.

The concept of liminality can not only shed light upon the group who maintained such sayings, but can create a window opening onto the historical Jesus. There is ample testimony both within and without the canon that the elevation of a socially denigrated group is consistent with Jesus' ideologies. Jesus gives credence to the marginalized. He associates with sinners and tax collectors (Q/Luke 7:34) and elevates the humble (Matt 23:12-14). He advocates love of enemy (Matt 5:43-48), turning the other cheek (Matt 5:38-42), and even comments on expectations regarding economic reparation (Matt 20:1-6). Ordinarily accepted social codes and transactions are criticized, exploded and/or inverted by Jesus.

Of more direct relevance to our reconstructed aphorism is Q/Luke 10:21. Here Jesus declares that the secrets of the kingdom are revealed by God to babes. In Q/Luke 6:20b the poor are especially blessed for their relationship with the kingdom. The reconstructed aphorism coheres with Jesus' concerns. It is characteristic of Jesus in light of his elevation of those marginalized by society, especially children.

In conclusion, Jesus' concern with children as a marginal group is not unexpected by virtue of what is attested in canonical and extra-canonical literature. Nor is it surprising in the light of recent sociological studies. That Jesus would explicitly link children with the kingdom has more radical overtones. Children as models by which to have access to such a kingdom must have appeared as almost incomprehensible to those of early Palestine. Undoubtedly the recovered aphorism coheres with the radical teachings of the historical Jesus.

7. Plausible Traditiongeschichte and Hermeneutical Potential

The criterion of "plausible Traditiongeschichte" attempts to reconstruct a genealogy of forms in order to gain some semblance of the trajectory followed by the aphorism. However, the diachronic view contributed by the criterion of "plausible Traditiongeschichte" presumes that a cheirographic linear development is not necessarily applicable to the dynamics of orality. The test of hermeneutical potential attempts to trace the aphorism's development synchronically, looking "at the variety of forms generated by the original form."[76]

In a broad sense, it can be further elucidated that the aphorism did in fact operate on other levels, even further varying in form. As has already been demonstrated, the form of the aphorism varied slightly through time, specifically through the processes of conflation of the protasis, and/or omission of the metaphorical allusion. An example of conflation of the verb and the metaphor is found in the Johannine version where "born" encompasses both the metaphorical allusion to children and the verb of inner transformation. Hermas Sim. 9.12.8 is indicative of both omission of the metaphor, as well as substitution of a verb, thereby rendering the aphorism almost unrecognizable. Similarly, within both the early stages of the tradition, and within its later manifestation, the tendency to interpret the saying led to the substitution of verbs which contained editorial intent. Thus arose allusions to baptism, and the uses of the child as a cipher for some esteemed quality.[77] From the interpretations arose a variety of forms, previously mentioned. It is significant that the metaphorical allusion within the aphorism was most probably the primary cause of the variety of interpretations of the saying, and directly or indirectly, the resultant forms.

E. Conclusions

The criteria for authenticity developed by the historical critical method offers many contributions for attempting to authenticate an identified aphorism. It is significant that recent studies in orality will shape the historical critical methodology, but will by no means obviate it.

From this study, then, several conclusions may be drawn. The *form* of the reconstructed child saying stands against the proposed criteria. The metaphor of child stands amidst a conditional sentence. Central to the protasis is a verb connoting radical transformation. And central the protasis is a verb of external movement in regards to a fixed "kingdom" reference. Furthermore, the tests for authenticity show overwhelmingly that the child saying itself most likely can be traced back to the historical Jesus. Of all of the extant variants the form of Matt 18:3 reflects most closely the dynamics of the reconstructed aphorism. In the conditional formulation of Matthew's saying can be seen an explicit child metaphor, verbs of radical transformation and entrance to the kingdom. Mark and Luke echo original saying while omitting the verb of inner and outer transformation in the protasis. The emphasis on "reception" signals the contamination of the child aphorism by another saying. Other variants exclude the child metaphor (e.g., John 3:3, 3:5), an omission which shows a further the domesticaton of the saying.

The criteria of authenticity make clear that the tendency to domestication grows in direct proportion to linear distance from the actual saying. Editorial and hermeneutical concerns obscure the the harsh, unique and rather raw nature of the saying. Although the reconstructed aphorism coheres with other pronouncements of Jesus, it also adds a new emphasis to the dominical sayings. Children are central to Jesus' message of the kingdom. Our final task will be looking at the actual meaning of the reconstructed aphorism, relevant to the world of Jesus and to our twentieth century context.

[1]The child sayings located in Clement of Alexandria (d. <u>ca.</u> 215 C.E.), and noted in Appendix II, do not <u>continue</u> a trajectory. Rather they can display a strongly Matthean version of the saying. Three of Clement's texts follow Matt 18:3 closely, differing merely on minute points. It is significant that <u>Paed.</u> 1.5.12 is in complete agreement with the Matthean form of the saying, adding an additional pronominal reference ταῦτα (<u>Strom.</u> 5.1.1.3 and <u>Paed.</u> 1.5.16). The presence of "these" in Clement immediately recalls the reference to "this child" τὸ παιδίον of Matt 18:4. See Appendix II.

[2]According to Perrin the reference to children in the aphorism is literarily that of a simile utilizing the form "as" or "like." A metaphor makes a direct comparison (i.e, the kingdom of God is like...). See Norman Perrin, <u>Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom</u> (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 202. By Perrin's definition the child aphorism can be considered as having symbolic nuance. On tensive and steno-symbols see Norman Perrin, "Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom," <u>The Kingdom of God,</u> ed. Bruce Chilton (Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SCM, 1984) 97; Philip Wheelright, <u>Metaphor and Reality</u> (Bloomington, In.: Indiana Univ. Press, 1962) 12. Paul Ricouer makes a similar distinction between sign and symbol in <u>The Symbolism of Evil</u> (Boston: Beacon, 1969) 15.

[3]See <u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 46, John 3:3, 3:5, <u>Acts of Philip</u> 34, and Hermas <u>Sim.</u> 9.12.8; <u>Sim.</u> 9.16.2 which omit the child metaphor. For further discussion of this see Section 6.

[4]The thematic coherence and the fundamental similarity between these two variants militates against the possibility of determining which form is more authentic and undoubtedly signals the common source of the sayings. "(T)his saying also may have reached ... [John] ... in a form similar to, but not identical with, that which reached Matthew" (C.H. Dodd, <u>Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel</u> [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1963] 359). It has been observed, however, that the phrases βαπτίζειν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ are "common to John and the Synoptics and are certainly primitive." Dodd, <u>Historical Interpretation,</u> 276 n. 1. In fact, it is probable that John had access to an alternative tradition. Within Christian scripture only 1 Pet 1:3, 23 and perhaps Jas 1:18 likewise portray interest in this motif (Dodd, <u>Historical Tradition,</u> 358). See also <u>Corpus Hermeticum</u> 13. Dodd notes although rebirth has no roots in Hebrew Scripture, or within any contemptory Jewish thought, it can be traced to Hellenistic motifs. The use of ἄνωθεν, on the other hand, recalls Matthew's "turn and," and may represent an idiomatic translation of the Aramaic derivative. See Barnabas Lindars, "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case." <u>NTS</u> 27 (1980-81) 292. Lindars also notes that similarly, the term "born" in John can be linked (by means of confusion) to the future and aorist forms of "become" in Greek. Note that Lindar also holds that Mark preserves the more original form of the saying (p. 204 n. 7). Although a strong argument exists for "born" being merely a Johannine motif, it will become later apparent that the verb herein John is consistent with those of other variants.

[5]See Robert Kysar (<u>The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel</u> [Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1975) 259) who concludes that the "early form of the gospel... had no sacramental reference because the johannine community was essentially non-sacramental." Raymond Brown, however, understands John to have been committed to the sacraments. And the redactor, in line with the evangelist, reinforces this sacramentalism (Raymond Brown, <u>The Gospel According to John</u> [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), 1.cxiii-cxiv). Taking the stance between Kysar and Brown is G. C. H. McGregor ("The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel," <u>NTS</u> 9 (1963) 114-118) who holds that John offers a spiritual interpretation of the sacraments. Helmut Koester ("History and Cult in John and Ignatius of Antioch, <u>The Bultmannian School of Biblical Interpretation</u> ed. J. M. Robinson [New York: Harper and Row/ Tübingen: J.

J. C. B. Mohr, 1965] 118), acknowledges the hand of the redactor in "water and," but nonetheless notes that v. 3 is connected with baptism. Ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι relates to ἀναγέννησις (1 Pet 1:23) and παλιγγεννησία (Tit 3:6) which are baptismal. See also Justin <u>Apol.</u> 61.3-4 which most probably offers an independent tradition from John. Justin uses this following saying to support baptism: Ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν (as cited in Koester, "History and Cult," 118). See also λοῦτρον which is found in both Tit 3:6 and Justin <u>Apol.</u> 61.3-4; see also Dodd (<u>Historical Tradition,</u> 358) who supports the baptismal inference of v. 3.

[6]See Lindars ("John," 292) who attributes "anew," "of water and the spirit" and "see" to John. It is debatable whether or not the apodosis verb "see" in John 3:3 can be ascribed to a Johannine or a pre-Johannine tradition. Viewed as a Semitism, ἰδεῖν, connotes, in a rather broad sense, "experience" (Dodd, <u>Historical Interpretation,</u> 359 n. 3). This term recalls John 3:36 and Luke 2:26, 30.

[7]Resch (<u>Aussercanonische Parallel,</u> ad. loc.) identifies <u>Sim.</u> 9.29.1; 9.29.3 and <u>Man.</u> 2.1 as parallels to the aphorism. To these <u>Sim</u> 9.12.8 can be added. (See note below). The texts read: <u>Man.</u> 2.1 "He said to me, 'Have simplicity and become innocent, and you will be as little children who do not know the evil that destroys the life of men.'"; <u>Sim.</u> 9.29.1; LCL: 287-89. "They are as innocent as babes, and no evil enters their heart, nor have they known what wickedness is, but have ever remained in innocence."; <u>Sim.</u> 9.29.3; LCL: 287-89 "All of you, then, as many as shall continue,' he said, 'and shall be as babes, with no wickedness, shall be more glorious than all those who have been mentioned before, for all babes are glorious before God, and are in the first place by him. Blessed are you then who put away evil from yourselves, and put on guiltlessness, for you shall be the first of all to live in God."; <u>Sim</u> 9.12.8; LCL: 289 "Whoever does not receive his name cannot enter the kingdom of God." Graydon F. Snyder (<u>The Apostolic Fathers: The Shepherd of Hermas</u> [London/ New Jersey/ Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1968], 6.14-15) observes that it is unlikely that there exists any literary dependence of the Shepherd of Hermas upon the synoptics or upon John. Charles Taylor (ULThe Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels [London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1892] 9-11, 146-148) suggests otherwise, but his argument is unconvincing. Although no formal relationship exists between Hermas and the canonical gospels, numerous references throughout the <u>Similitudes</u> recall Mark 10:15b, Matt 18:3b and John 3:5b. See also <u>Acts of Philip</u> 34b.

[8]LCL: 289. <u>Sim.</u> 9.12.8 provides an interesting parallel to the child saying of Mark 10:15b. It conforms formally to the structure of the Markan saying. Agreements exist between the verb "receive" in the protasis and the whole of the apodosis. What lacks from this variant is the metaphorical reference to children in the apodosis. As the absorption of the metaphor is one degree of mutuation of the saying, <u>Sim.</u> 9.12.8 may depict the furthering of this trend. Here the non-existant metaphor may indeed attest to an even greater domestication of the saying. Secondly, if viewed in this context, and if independent of Mark, then the "receive" refrain not only recalls, but supports Mark's use of the verb. Since Mark 10:15 is most likely an aphoristic compound, the "receive" emphasis in this Hermas parallel may similarly reflect the presence of combined and conflated aphorisms. It is also possible that both <u>Sim.</u> 9.12.8 and Mark 10:15 appeal to a pre-Markan variant of the the aphorism. On the other hand, the link with Mark 10:15 may be explicable in view of the overwhelming interest in "name" present in the 9th and rather mystical chapter of the <u>Similitudes.</u> See <u>Sim.</u> 9.12.4, 6 which reflect the same motif. "Receive" may be identified as a baptismal concern.

[9]<u>2 Clement</u> is homiletic in intent, and probably dates about 150 C.E. from either

Alexandria or Corinth.

[10]John Dominic Crossan, Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986) 77. [Emphasis mine]. Verses 3-5 which separate the two components of the saying act as interpreters of the variant (vv. 2, 6), and thus provide a clue as to the intentions of the editor(s). See Appendix II for the full passage.

[11]See, for example, the commentary and interpretation contained in vv. 3-5, particularly the references to "bodies without dissimulation" in v. 3, the soul and the body (v. 4) and the male/female interpretation of v. 5. The asexual state associated with "monachos" is earlier dealt with in Chapter Five: Thomas. See especially "The Meaning of Logion 22."

[12]Trans. by Throckmorton, Gospel Parallels: A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels (Toronto/ Camden, N.J./ London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1949) 129. The text reads in Greek 'Ἐὰν μὴ ποιήσητε ὑμῶν τὰ κάτω εἰς τὰ ἄνω, καὶ τὰ ἀριστερὰ εἰς τὰ δεξιά, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν μου. Generally considered a gnostic text, it is probable that the Acts of Philip is "dependent on older legends." Hennecke-Schmeelmelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, trans. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 2:571-72, esp. 577. See the document itself found in Acta apostolorum apocrypha, 1-90; later digest in 91-98.

[13]Snyder, Apostolic Fathers, 6:154. See also Sim. 9.29.3 where "... all babes are glorious before God... So blessed are you who cast off evil from yourselves and put on innocence; you will be the first of all to live to God" (Snyder, Apostolic Fathers, 6.154).

[14]See Hennecke-Schmeelmelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, 2:79, 83.

[15]For this brief survery of the field I am indebted to M. Eugene Boring's "historical perspective" encompassing the pre-Enlightenment era to present tendencies in biblical scholarship. See "Criteria of Authenticity: The Lucan Beatitudes as a Test Case," Forum 1 (1985) 3-38, esp. 3-7.

[16]See Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teachings of Jesus (New York: Harper & Row, 1967) 38-49; also Reginald H. Fuller, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1966) 94-99. For a summary of the two early works see Perrin, The New Testament: An Introduction, 281-284.

[17]Perrin, The New Testament, 281. See also Rediscovering, 40-43.

[18]As the words of Jesus and stories about him passed through tradition the tendency was to elongate them and to include more detail. Semitisms were reduced, the material was formulated within direct, rather than indirect discourse, and variant versions were conflated. See Boring, "Criteria," 11.

[19]Boring furthers Perrin's studies in the area by noting that when taken as a whole, the hisitory of a saying may argue for the earliest form of a saying. See, for example, M. Eugene Boring, "The Unforgivable Sin Logion in Mark 3:28-29/Matt 12:31-32/Luke 12:10: Formal Analysis and History of the Tradition" NovT 17 (1976) 258-79 (as cited in Boring, "Criteria," 19).

[20]In a synchronic approach (i.e., looking at the texts without distinguishing between older and younger forms) the variety of forms of a saying or text assists the exegete in identifying, through hermeneutical analysis, the original text generating the various variants. For an excellent summary of the relevant principles involved in a historical-critical methodology see Boring, "Criteria," 7-20. Both modification and plausible development have been added by Boring.

[21]John G. Gager, "The Gospels and Jesus: Some Doubts about Method" JR 54 (1974) 261.

[22]Ernest L. Abel, "The Psychology of Memory and Rumor Transmission and their Bearing on Theories of Oral Transmission in Early Christianity," JR 51 (1971) 276. [Emphasis original].

[23]Crossan, In Fragments, 37, 40.

[24]Crossan, "Divine Immediacy," 6.

[25]See the full details of Mark's polemic in Chapter Two.

[26]The aphorism of "Leader as Servant" can be found in Matt 20:26; 23:11; Mark 9:33-37; 10:43; Luke 9:48; 22:26; John 13:16. It incorporates the polarites of leader and servant within an obviously paradoxical framework. Crossan, Sayings Parallels, 195. See also Polycarp Phil 5:4.

[27]John Dominic Crossan, "Kingdom and Children: A Study in the Aphoristic Tradition," Semeia 29 (1983) 75-96, esp. 85. Crossan does not explicitly assert that Mark 9:36 presents any variation on the aphorism of "becoming a child." However, according to Crossan's own analysis the narrative format of Mark 9:36 could correspond to an "aphoristic story" arising out of the tradition of Jesus' interest in children (as seen through the child saying itself). This pericope is an exemplary attestation to the creativity of Mark who frames the child reference by the chiastic balance of vv. 35 and 37 by means of a positive and negative sequencing.

[28] Crossan, "Kingdom and Children," 87. He also notes that Jesus' "seeing" in Mark 10:13b-14 parallels the use of the same verb in the introductory narration in Thomas log. 22a.

[29]Although vv. 13-14a,b and v. 16 have often been seen as one unit of tradition v. 16 may arise from an tradition independent of vv. 13-14a, b.

[30]See the discussion of Matt 18:1-4, 5 and 19:13-15 in Chapter Three. Although Matt 18:1-4 functions as one unit it is interesting to note that in John 13:16-20 is found a similar juxtaposition of the themes of greatness and reception bound together in Matt 18:4, 5.

[31]Crossan, "Kingdom and Children," 88. Crossan, on one hand, identifies v. 4 as an "aphoristic commentary, that is, a unit which looks like an aphorism but which is appended to a preceding independent aphorism in order to comment on it." On the other hand, the similarity in theme between the variants of Mark 9:35 and Matt 18:4 is undeniable. Matthew here has most probably incorporated the aphorism of Mark 9:35 and the kingdom proclamation of Matt 18:3 (previously Mark 10:15) into a maxim dealing with humility.

[32]For a discussion of Luke's use of Mark see Chapter Four.

[33]See earlier redactional analysis of log. 22 in Chapter Five.

[34]See Appendix I. Note that the definite relative (rendered ὅς in Mark 10:15) is commonly combined with the participle ἄν (seen in Mark 10:15). A second form of combindation with particles renders the resulting combination as ἐάν (see Matt 18:3; John 3:3; 3:5). See BAGD 587-588.

[35]Robert H. Funk, A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek, 2d. ed. (Montana: University of Montana, 1973), 2:679. See especially 679-688 [855.1-861.4] on the form and typology of conditional sentences. See, for example, the severe tone of "unless"

in Matt 18:3, Acts of Philip 34, Clement of Alexandria's writings, John 3:3 and John 3:5. Less forceful renditions are found in Thomas (logia 22a/b/c; 37 and 46) and 2 Clem. 12:2, 6.

[36]An aorist subjunctive following ἐάν constitutes the most common form of an "if-clause." See, for example, Matt 5:20; 6:15; 12:29; (18:3); 21:21; Mark 3:27; 4:22; John 4:48; 6:44; 7:51; Ro 10:15; 1Cor 9:16; 14:6. W. Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. Wm. Arndt and F. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957) 210.

[37]It is significant that Mark, in importing the saying regarding receiving the sender in Mark 9:37, takes over the introductory pronounal reference ὅς. This usage is common to Mark. See, for example Mark 3:29; 35; 6:11; (9:37); 9:42; 10:11; (15) 35; 11:23. For Matthean editing of such usage compare Mark 10:43, 44 with Matt 20:26, 27.

[38]It is worth noting that Thomas is not adverse to such a formulation, and in fact has Coptic equivalents to the English "if-clause," signalled by ὅταν in log. 3, 11, [24], 14, [20], 21, (22), 26, 28, (37), 61, 68, 70, and 84. Other formulations of the same type of clause which do not utilize ὅταν can be viewed in log. 13, 21, 24, 27, 29, 34, 48, 50.

[39]The address is to "you" as well in Acts of Philip 34 and Herm. Man. 2.1. 2 Clem., addresses the saying to "the two."

[40]Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament, (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1974) 57, 140.

[41]As noted "like" and "as" are similes. See also Clement Paed. 1.5.12; Herm. Man. 2.1; Sim. 9.29.1; Sim. 9.29.3; 2 Clem 12:2. Neither the Johannine variants nor Acts of Philip 34 retain the metaphor of child.

[42]Mark and Matthew both utilize the second aorist subjuntive of the infinitive ἔρχομαι, to enter.

[43]Unlike the synoptics Thomas retains a consistently positive formula in the conditional phrasing. Thomas is not unfamiliar with negative formulation but nonetheless exhibits a pronounced tendency to use positive formulae thereby evidencing, perhaps, a distinctive style. See log. 27, 55, and 101 for Thomas' use of negative components in bipartite phrasing, and logia 24 and 55 for a negative/positive correlation. It is the case that Thomas prefers such positive formulations. See logia 3, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, (22), 26, 29, 34, (37), 41, 44, (46), 48, 49, 50, 53, 56, 61, 67, 80, 82, 84, 92, 94, 101 and 106 for examples of bipartite phrasing involving positive formulations. Although not all of these involve elements of conditional sentences, (e.g., logia 41, 44, 49, 50, 80, 82, 92, 94), explicitly or otherwise, they are bipartite in form.

[44]See likewise the Johannine and 2 Clem. variants which are imbedded in teaching discourses and do not carry argumentative nuances. Finally, the tradents found in Clement of Alexandria and the Shepherd of Hermas are notably exhortatory. The contexts of Acts of Philip 34 and many of the Clement sayings are difficult to establish as the works are untranslated.

[45]For a summary of the aphorisms in these canonical and non-canonical parallels see Appendix II.

[46]For juxtaposition of form and content of the various elements of the aphorism, see Appendix III.

[47]The nature of the protasis verb has been such that in both Gos. Thom. log. 46,

John 3:3, 5 and <u>Acts of Philip</u> 34 there appears to be assimilation of the metaphor within the verb. In Thomas we find "comes to be a child" which implicitly recalls the child metaphor of both log. 22 and log. 37. John's "born" reflects inner transformation. It is notable that in John the motif of children is retained, at least weakly, by John's use of a verb that has to do with birth. "Change" in <u>Acts of Philip</u> results in a figurative action, similar to "born" in John 3:3 and 3:5. Note also that "the kingdom" is described as "of God" (a Marcanism, also found in both John excerpts), "of heaven" (a Mattheanism, and perhaps more authentic than the Marcan form, similarly found in <u>Acts of Philip</u> 34), "of my Father" (in <u>2 Clem.</u>). Thomas retains merely "the kingdom" (see also log. 27, 49, 107, 109), although elsewhere within the text the descriptors "of heaven" (log. 20, 54, 114) and "of the Father" (log. 57, 76, 96, 97, 98, 99, 113) are present. The definition of "kingdom" is relative to the writer/compiler of the material. This allows for that same writer/compiler to approach "kingdom" sayings in such a way as to substantiate certain eschatological and soteriological assumptions. See, for example, Matthew's two part eschatology, and how this affects Matthean kingdom sayings in Bruce Chilton's "God in Strength," <u>The Kingdom of God</u> ed. Bruce Chilton (Philadelphia: Fortress Press/ London: SPCK, 1984) 129. For a brief treatment of synoptic concepts of kingdom see Richard H. Hiers, <u>The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition</u> (Gainsville: Univ. of Florida, 1970) esp. 93-97. For a thorough presentation of the place of "kingdom" in the life and intentions of Jesus see E. P. Sanders, <u>Jesus and Judaism</u> (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 123-237.

[48]John's presentation of the aphorism hints at the presence of both the elements of inner transformation and action. John 3:3 and 3:5 invoke ambiguity as they could function in both a literal (i.e., connoting action) or a figurative (i.e., suggesting inner transformation) fashion. In fact, being "born" anew (John 3:3) does encounter interpretative problems within the text itself as Nicodemous says "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?" (John 3:4) It is perhaps at this point that the presence of the second aphorism, in such close proximity to the first, becomes clear in the Johannine agenda. In vv. 3:5-6 John interprets the first aphorism by means of the second. The birth in John 3:3 and 3:5 signifies both a biological and a spiritual event. The verb "born" (conjugated as $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\theta\hat{\eta}$ in both John 3:3, 5), then, functions literally and figuratively. As noted a literal interpretation of "born" is problematic in this context. The difficulty is not diminished by the descriptive clause "of water and the Spirit" (John 3:5) or the qualifying term "anew" (John 3:3). John's use of the aphorism is a good example of the tendency to emphasize one of the aspects of the protasis verb over another.

[49]Th log. 37 may implay conversion of the initiates. Taken in this way, then, the verbs "disrobe... take up... place... [and] tread" may be seen to thematically concur with motif of transformation/conversion.

[50]In an analysis of the Markan aphorism Perrin argues that Mark 10:15 should be regarded as authentic. In the manner of authentic proverbial sayings this verse serves to "jolt the hearer out of an effort to make a continuous whole out of existence in the world and into a judgement upon that existence." (Norman Perrin, <u>Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom</u> [Philadelphia: Fortress Presss, 1971] 53). Perrin, of course, applies to this saying the historical-critical criteria, as a means to further authenticate the saying). Herm. <u>Sim.</u> 9.12.8 employs the same verb. On the other hand, Mark's use of "receive" can be ascribed to that author's redactional agenda regarding discipleship and to the presence of an aphoristic compound. First, references to "reception" are not common in Mark, but the thematic coherence between this comportment and Mark's definition of discipleship is significant. Second, the similarity in theme between Mark 9:37 and Mark

10:15 would suggest an importation of the theme of "reception" into the latter verse. This is further supported by the Mark's linking of the themes of greatness, children and reception in Mark 9:33-37. Notable, too, is the fusion of various *verbs* in the Marcan aphoristic compounds. Such an explanation may also account for the parallel in Sim. 9.12.8. It is very likely that the aphorism lent itself to such combinations, due to the flexibility of the bipartite form, the confusion generated by the metaphor (not apparent in Sim. 9.12.8), and the editorial intents of both Mark and Hermas.

[51]At first blush this verb stands in isolation to the other thematically coherent verbs in Thomas. However, upon further analysis it can be seen that the "suckling" of 22a is congenial with the asexual exhortation found in the protasis of log. 22c. This congeniality and the strong agreement betwen the respective apodoses (i.e., entrance into the kingdom) quite possibly resulted in their alignment in logion 22.

[52]See Appendix III.

[53]In the writings of the Shepherd of Hermas can be seen the contamination of the apodosis with the fixed metaphor of the the protasis. Consequently, the metaphorical verb of the apodosis is lost. Thus those who are innocent will "be as little children" (Sim. 9.29.1), and "be the first of all to live in God" (Sim. 9.29.3) Again, Lindars suggests that John's and Matthew's usage may be linked linguistically, "although... they are not of the same root." Lindars, "John," 292.

[54]See Hans Dieter Betz ("Matt. 6:22-23 and Ancient Greek Theories of Vision," in Essays on the Sermon on the Mount [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985] 71-88) for an excellent treatment of ancient theories of vision. See Plato, Rep. 6.507B-509C on the Parable of the Sun; Rep. 6.510B-511B for the Parable of Parallel Lines; and Rep. 7.514A-518B for his famous Parable of the Cave in which vision is marked as an element of cognition. "[A]nyone who is to act wisely in private or public must have caught sight of this... [region of truth and goodness]..." (Rep. 517C as cited in Betz, "Ancient," 82). In De Post. Caini. 126 Philo follows in the Platonic tradition by noting that it is not the eye that sees, but it is the mind that sees through the eye.

[55]John's use of both "see" in v. 3 and "enter" in v. 5 supports the integral connection between the verbs. For John the metaphorical allusions are apparently quite similar.

[56]See "Criteria," 7-19.

[57]On the independent nature of Thomas see G. W. MacRae, "Nag Hammadi and the New Testament," Gnosis: Fetschrift fur Hans Jonas, ed. B. Aland (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 152. MacRae notes that "[i]t now appears that a majority of scholars who have seriously investigated the matter have been won over to the side of "Thomas" independence of the canonical Gospels, though these scholars hold a variety of views about the actual history of the ... "Gospel of Thomas" (p. 152). See also Helmut Koester, Introduction to the New Testament: History and Literature of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 2:68.

[58]See Crossan, "Kingdom," 91. Herein Crossan defines the terms "aphoristic dialogue," "aphoristic story," "dialectical dialogue," and "dialectical story."

[59]The fixed form of the aphorism "kingdom" found in the apodosis is most probably dominical, although the point is still disputed. Perrin (New Testament, 288-289) cites four "kingdom" sayings (Mark 1:15a; Luke 11:20; 17:20-21; Matt 11:12) as having strong claims to authenticity. Although Perrin notes that "(f)rom the point of view of linguistic usage the form "kingdom of God" is comparatively late; it may even be specifically Christian"

(Perrin, Jesus, 81 n.9). On the linguistic possibilities regarding "kingdom" see Perrin who observes that the Jewish circumlocution of "God" would have resulted in "heaven." He further states that the "roots of the symbol Kingdom of God lie in ancient Near Eastern myth of the Kingship of God" (Perrin, Jesus, 16). Similarly, Lief E. Vaage observes that the authors of Q, Wisdom of Solomon, 4 Maccabees, Philo, Epictetus and the Sentences of Sextus "understood their way of life in terms of the kingdom viz. the kingdom of God." See Lief E. Vaage, "The Kingdom of God in Q" (unpublished paper delivered at Fall 1986 Meeting of the Jesus Seminar, Notre Dame, IN.) 11. Vaage provocatively suggests that a textual and other search for the "kingdom" may be analagous to attempting to ascertain the Emporer's new clothes! The concept of the "kingdom," then is not anachronistic to the time of Jesus, and has strong probabilities as being uttered by Jesus. In the child aphorism "kingdom" can be seen as linguistically possible.

[60]Crossan, "Kingdom," 90. Crossan further concludes that, "having become a triple dialogue in 3:2b-10, [the aphorism] is located as an *aphoristic story* within the overall narrative of John's gospel by 3:1-2a" (p. 90).

[61]P. Joüon, "Notes philologiques," RSR 18 (1928) 347-348 first noted the parallel. See also Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gosels and Acts (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967) 126; Joachim Jeremias, The Message of the Parables of Jesus (London: SCM, 1963) 190 n. 75 who suggests that στρέφω appeals to the Aramaic term, and means "again." Were the meaning "to be converted" (found elsewhere only in John 12:40) Matthew would most probably have used the more common term έπιστρέφειν.

[62]Jeremias, Parables, 190 n. 76.

[63]See, for example, Tertullian, De Baptismo 18.5; Justin Apol. 1:61.4; Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 11.26.2; Recognitions 6.9; and Const. Apost. 7:15.5. See Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries (London: SCM, 1960) 48-52 for an outline of the significance of these texts in reference to the practice of infant baptism. See Kurt Aland's refutation in Did the Early Church Baptize Infants? (Philadelphia: Westminster; London: SCM, 1963) 95-99.

[64]Gager, "The Gospels," 253. Gager cites the work of Gordon W. Allport and Leo Postman The Psychology of Rumour (New York: H. Holt & Co., 1947, repr. 1965) 75-158.

[65]See John "born," Acts of Philip "change," 2 Clem. "shall be."

[66]Some omission renders the variant more domestic than do others. For example, the "born" of John is still fairly radical, as is the "change" demanded in Acts of Philip "Receive" in Herm. Sim. 9.12.8, however, both fully omits and subdues the radical nature of the aphorism. For the importation of domesticating verbs see Th. log. 37 (i.e., "trample," etc.), Mark 10:15 (i.e., "receive").

[67]Perrin, New Testament, 281.

[68]Perrin, New Testament, 381. For a further critique of this issue see Gager, "Gospels," 256-259.

[69]Bultmann includes the child saying (identified as Mark 10:15) in a compilation of sayings "which demand a new disposition of mind ... sayings, which ... contain something characeristic, new, reaching out beyond popular wisdom and piety and yet are in no sense scribal or rabbinic nor yet Jewish apocalyptic. So here if anywhere we can find what is characteristic of the preaching of Jesus." (see also Mark 7:15; Luke 14:11 and 16:15; Matt 5:39b-41; Matt 5:44-48). Bultmann, History, 105.

[70]Boring adds yet another criterion. Boring presumes that "when there are variant forms ... the more radical variants is usually the early form" (Boring, "Criteria," 17). As our task was to identify the earliest form of the saying, this criterion is redundant. It is signficant to note that the recovered aphorism is more radical than the subsequent trajectories.

[71]Werner H. Kelber further observes that "the oral matrix of the material corresponds with the sociological identity of the early Jesus movement," a movement characterized by rural, rather than urban concerns, and one imbedded in a lower soci-economic strata. Any Jesus sayings rendered non-relevant to this group would be not be transmitted in the oral genre, and would consequently be lost. Werner H. Kelber, The Oral and the Written Gospel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 17.

[72]Recently there has develped a trend toward the implementatin of sociological analyses upon those groups generating the Christian Scriptures. See, for example, Gerhard Theissen, Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity, trans. J. Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortresss Press, 1977). The field of sociology can not only provide some information about who maintained the sayings, but can in turn shed light upon the historical Jesus and his intentions.

[73]Victor Turner, Image and Pilgrimage, (New York: Columbia Press, 1978) 249.

[74]Victor Turner, The Ritual Process (Chicago: Adeline Press, 1969), 96. "Communitas" or community is not defined here as a "religious" phenomenon as colloquially known in twentieth century North America. However, such a connection is not excluded by the term.

[75]Turner, Ritual, 167.

[76]Boring, "Criterion," 19-20. See "stemma" diagram in Appendix V for an outline of the saying's tradition-history.

[77]Again, see John, Herm. Sim. 9.6.12, Gos. Thom. log. 22, 37, 46, etc. See, for example Matt on humility; Herm. on innocence; Thomas on asexuality and asceticism; Luke on economic and social abasement. The latter phenomenon notably retains the elevation of children, and their association with the kingdom, but removes the children as direct models for comportment. In this sense the children merely functioned as fronts by which the editor/ redactor revealed an agenda.

Chapter Seven: Some Conclusions Regarding the Meaning of the Aphorism

A. Summary of Findings

It is apparent that the tradition does not completely obscure the radical nature of the child saying. It is clear that the inter-related motifs of children and the kingdom are central to the saying. First, to the extent that the aphorism can be recovered, it is clear that Jesus demands radical transformation, a transformation that incorporates an inward and an outward change, a transformation modelled upon children. Second, for Jesus, the kingdom is comprised of children. In the saying Jesus links children and the kingdom in a surprising manner. And finally, it is by being as children that salvation, that is, entrance to the kingdom, is obtained.

As the saying reaches the evangelists the tradition witnesses a slight domestication. Although Mark, Matthew, Luke and Thomas utilize the tradition at hand, their respective employment of the child saying does not incorporate Jesus' full meaning. Elements of the saying, significantly that of the elevation of children, remain unexploited and unrealized. In Mark the saying falls within a polemical agenda against the disciples. In Matthew the saying is used to reinforce the virtue of humility which, for Matthew, is essential to discipleship. Luke employs the aphorism to emphasize social and economic humility. In the Gos. Thom. the saying is found within the contexts of the renunciation of the worldly elements of sexuality and possessions. Log. 37 also may reflect baptismal interests. The progressive domestication of the saying leads to the separation of the motifs of kingdom and child. Eventually the radical nature of the saying is rendered invisible. It notable that as the more radical aspects of the saying were obscured those who maintained the saying (i.e., Christian church) were themselves undergoing progressive institutionalisation, Romanisation and hierarchicalization.

B. Jesus and the Child Saying

1. Child

It is significant that Jesus spoke of children as recipients of the kingdom. It is unlikely that Jesus understands children in the same way as did his contemporaries. Children in the aphorism are not elevated as asexual. Indeed, nowhere else does Jesus equate children and asexuality. Nor are children valued because of their continuance of the family line by means of name and inheritance. The saying does not present children as valuable because of their labour potential. It seems equally unlikely that Jesus is reinforcing the social dyad of parent-child here. The children in the saying stand alone as a social group, and although the dyad may be assumed it is by no means reinforced in the saying.

And so we are faced with the questions as what Jesus meant when he spoke of children and what children were to Jesus that he elevated them in such a surprising fashion? Again, Perrin's use of steno- and tensive symbols is helpful here. Were the "child" a steno-symbol the child reference would have only one meaning. As a tensive symbol, however, the child metaphor is polyvalent. The variety of interpretations of the aphorism itself in both the canonical and non-canonical texts, as well as throughout the history of biblical studies supports the presence of a tensive symbol.

The reference to child is open to a variety of meanings. It is unwise to assume that Jesus was not marked by the cultural assumptions of his time regarding children, even if his stance on children was radical for his era. However, it is also obvious that Jesus uses the metaphor of children in a counter-cultural manner. It is essential that any interpretation of the saying cohere with Jesus' other dominical sayings.

Although it is possible that Jesus may have intended the saying to have more than one meaning it is more probable that the aphorism originally was meant to have few interpretations. A variety of interpretations would arise in the passing of time. Indisputably Jesus lifts up children specifically as models by which to achieve entrance into the kingdom (i.e., salvation). On another level, Jesus' "children" are linked with the poor, the down-trodden, the trusting, the dependent. Elsewhere Jesus speaks of the poor (Q 6:20b) and

the marginalized (Q 6:21-23; 7:22) in close relationship with the kingdom. Like the poor and the marginalized, children are dependent upon the good will of others and are vulnerable to the workings of a hierarchal world.

Common to children, the poor and the marginalized are a lack of wealth, power and status. Obviously children do not possess material wealth. As has been seen, children were low on the social ladder in antiquity, and were given neither power over their own lives nor power over others' lives. Similarly, descriptions of childhood in antiquity suggest that there was little, if no, positive social status given to children. In this common ground of lack of wealth, power and status lies the key to understanding Jesus' use of the child saying. Viewing children as representative of those who lack wealth, power and status best interprets the metaphor and most clearly coheres with Jesus' teachings. Indeed, Jesus characteristically esteems those who are unconnected with either wealth, power and/ or status.

It is essential that this interpretation of the saying coheres with Jesus' other dominical sayings. And common to these sayings is the valuing of those who do not possess, use or esteem wealth, power, and status. Jesus' message of the intrinsic worth of eery human person, even for the those not considered valuable by mainstream culture, is once again apparent. The child saying, rather than being peripheral to the message of Jesus, is indeed central his teachings.

2. Kingdom

The association of children with the kingdom is unusual given the negative and demeaning views regarding children in antiquity. Of what type of "kingdom" does Jesus speak? How is this "kingdom" associated with children?[1] Perhaps John Dominic Crossan speaks most clearly to the topic. Crossan suggests that Jesus proclaims divine immediacy. In his message Jesus rejects religious influences which competed against the unmediated presence of God in the midst of the people. The permanent availability of God is not dependent on doctrine, book, "power or wealth, family, rank or status."[2] Jesus proclaims that God is in the immediate, in the here and the now. And this immediacy necessarily

extends into the human realm where individuals relate in an unmediated fashion. It is this unlimited immediacy within both the human and the divine realms that explains how Jesus could eat with the wealthy and yet condemn wealth. The presence of one person to another is not to be inhibited by either wealth, power or status.

In the light of Crossan's suggestions it is possible to view the child aphorism as proclaiming a kingdom of divine immediacy, a kingdom defined by the unmediated presence of God, self and other. Wealth, status and power inhibit both divine and immediacy by establishing artificial relational boundaries. In fact Jesus characterizes the kingdom of divine and human immediacy by children, by those who lack these social qualities. Linking of children with the kingdom coheres with his message of the intrinsic worth of all people. [3]

3. Children, Kingdom and Transformation

Through the aphorism Jesus demands a conversion which is signalled by an absence of wealth, power and status, and one which allows for divine and human immediacy. This immediacy characterizes the kingdom. The unmediated presence of persons to each other and to God entails relating without concern for hierarchal social structures, especially those of wealth, status and power. People are intrinsically of worth, and are not valuable or valueless because of rankings in an artificial social schema.

Becoming like children, making ourselves like children, changing like children, involves a radical alteration. Matthew 18:3, which best reflects all of the aspects of the original saying, incorporates both an inner change ("turn") and an outer manifestation of that change ("become"). It is only then that entrance to the kingdom is assured. As indicated by the protasis of the reconstructed aphorism, the demand for valuing all without regard for wealth, power or status must be able to be measured inwardly and outwardly. Thoughts, feelings and actions must reflect the reality of intrinsic valuation of people. Jesus demands that the people of his time recognize the value of children, and those like children, those who have neither wealth, nor power, nor status. The two facets of conversion, an inner and an outer transformation, are necessary to transcend personal and social boundaries

which inhibit relating to each other and to God. Human and divine immediacy are facilitated when conversion on both levels occurs.

C. The Twentieth Century and the Child Saying

1. Child

Placing the child in a twentieth century North American context must begin first with an overview of the place of child through Western history. Lloyd de Mause notes

> "The history of childhood... is a nightmare... The further back in history one goes, the more archaic the mode of parenting, and the more likely children are to be routinely abandoned, killed, beaten, emotionally and physically starved, and sexually molested."[4]

Christianity, at the very least, declared the sacredness of life. Consequently, the Christian prohibitions against infanticide affected those of Western Europe who would abandon rather than kill their new-borns. In the Middle Ages, for example, the monied people of France or England would "regularly send all their children away at the age of 7 to other homes, and bring other children into their homes as servants, as apprentices, or whatever."[5]

However, in the development of western civilization children were economic necessities for the lower socio-economic classes. Rural families needed children for farm work. As society industrialized, and more people moved to urban centers, children worked in the mines, the factories and the streets to supplement the family's income.[6] In situations where both parents were factory workers, children too young to contribute financially were left in primitive "day care" centers where sedation by laudanum or opium were common.[7] Children were streamed into the work force as soon as possible.

It was the middle class reformers of the nineteenth century who developed the concept of societal protection for the children of the industrialized world.[8] Child labour laws became common although both parents and employers were often reluctant to abide by the restrictions.[9] And with the increase of public awareness of the horrors of employed children, the push for mass education, and the developing power of workers themselves,

the state of children in western civilization became less of a nightmare.

The place of the child in the late half of our century is one of changing status and continuing ambivalence. In the Western world development of nations is signalled by the onset of democracy (initiated by early Greek thought) wherein all are ideally given the right to speak. Democracy has generalized from a governmental principle into the sphere of social and economic institutions. We of the twentieth century witness how prevalent are organizations concerned about the welfare of children both within and outside of the industrialized world. On a familial level, advocates of children's rights encourage parents to adopt parenting practices that allow for the childrens' unfolding in the direction of human growth, meaning and fulfillment.[10]

The child saying is relevant to the child and the culture of today at the very least on a literal level. The saying demands the valuing of children beyond cultural norms and expectations. In early Palestine the valuing of child as labourer was challenged. Perhaps for the middle-class North America of our time this may demand reviewing our implicit considerations of children as possession, status symbol or mere extension of ourselves. And we are challenged to reflect upon the place of children within our culture. Does our "consumer" mentality extend into our attitudes toward children? How often are children the helpless subjects of adult feelings of powerlessness, fear and hostility? Certainly we must address the high rate of child abuse within our society. The demands of this saying also involve accepting the responsibility for raising our children within a milieu suitable to their growth and their best interests, a responsibility that has ramifications on almost every social institution of our day (e.g., media, educational systems, family structures).

On a metaphorical level children still represent those without wealth, without power, and without status. Jesus' valuation of children coheres with the valuation of the disenfranchised of our own day: the homeless, the institutionalized, those suffering religious, social or economic persecution. Exclusive structures which are based on the arbitrary demarcations of wealth, power and status must be replaced with alternative social and

relational patterns cohering with the message of Jesus.

2. Kingdom

Characterizing the kingdom in terms of children is still radical nineteen centuries later. The divine immediacy of which Crossan writes, and of which Jesus speaks, calls us of the twentieth century to question our concept of a God and persons as dynamic or static, as fundamentally separate or fundamentally relational. Jesus calls us to being inclusive rather than exclusive. Valuing wealth, power and status hinder unmediated relationships with God and others and maintains patterns of exclusivity.[11] In conclusion, the kingdom is characterized by an immediacy that has concern for neither wealth nor power nor status.

3. Children, Kingdom and Transformation

What the child saying means in a twentieth century context is indeed questionable. The transformation of which Jesus speaks assumes first a positive concept of children. Second, the alteration necessitates both an inward and a behavioral change.

D. Further Questions

Attempting to determine the meaning of the recovered child saying is a difficult task. Some questions do arise from such a study. First, the centrality of the child saying has been avoided or misinterpreted through the ages. What institutional, religious or other agendas have been served by these hermeneutical tendencies? Because of the nature of our study, wherein the original words of Jesus cannot be uncovered, intepretations of the child saying will be many and will undoubtedly serve hermeneutical agendas. Can these agendas be either avoided or, at the very least, admitted without skewing attempts to interpret what Jesus intended?

Second, how can we measure "becoming" like children, if indeed the multilevel conversion demanded is achieved. Can either inner transformation or external transformation exist alone? Or does conversion necessitate both aspects of Jesus' demands?

Third, what place do children have in our social or religious institutions? Given the centrality of the child saying, are we not called at the very least to begin with a visible valuing of children? For example, have children the right to be their own persons within family systems? Can this be accomplished without catering to children's whims and demands? Alternatively, can the goal of teaching a child responsiblity be fully attained when the children have a limited voice in the family? On a broader social level, is there tangible support for those adults who chose the career option of raising their own children? Perhaps most unsettling is the question of the expression of our valuing of children. Are we not culpable for the systems and structures which betray (or even express) our underlying estimation of children?

Jesus challenged those of antiquity in his elevation of children. It is obvious that the child saying has relevance even today and presents similar challenges. Through the aphorism Jesus demands a radical valuation of children and proclaims a kingdom of permanent immediacy. This kingdom is characterized by the absence of wealth, status and power. The child saying stands central to the radical message of Jesus, heralding a kingdom of divine and human immediacy.

[1]In Luke 17:21 Jesus says that "the kingdom of God is *within* you." See R. D. Hiers, The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition (Gainesville, Fl.: Univ. of Florida, 1970) 23, esp. 22-29. Albert Nolan [Jesus Before Christiantity: The Gospel of Liberation (Tiptree, G.B.: Darton, Longman and Todd/ South Africa: David Philip, 1976) 46] notes that all serious scholars recognize that ἐντός translates as "within" or "among." In Luke 17:20 the latter translation is best.

[2]John Dominic Crossan, "Divine Immediacy," 7. Crossan also proposes that these three elements of immediacy were "profoundly paradoxical, religiously provocative, and politically explosive (p. 8).

[3]See, for example, John MacMurray [The Clue to History London: SCM, 1938] 79) who notes that "the principle of equality appears in the teaching of Jesus as one of the structural principles of human relationship. It is not an ideal, nor is it a mere fact. It is a principle of human action."

[4]For this brief survey of the place of child within Western history I am indebted to a the radio series featuring children within the ancient, midieval and modern world. See David Cayley, Lloyd de Mause, John Lee, et al, "Idea Series: The World of the Child," CBC Radio (March 1983) 1-40.

[5]Cayley, de Mause et al, "The World," 6.

[6]See, for example Leonard Horner, On the Employment of Children, in Factories and Other Works in the United Kingdom and in Some Foreign Countries (London: Longman, Orme, Bron, Green and Longmans, 1840, repr. Shannon: Irish Univ. Press, 1971). In 1837 children, as young as age six years, were employed in the factories of England (p. 27), working more than twelve hour straight shifts (p. 14 n.1). Even more startling is the fact that in 1819, in one of the largest mills in Manchester, England, forty percent of the work force was children. In this same era children of the factories might contribute one quarter of the family income. See Marjorie Cruickshank, Children and Industry (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1981) 19. Note that these problems were not confined to England and western Europe. The Pennsylvania mines of the early 1900's employed more than ten thousand children illegally to drive mules, tend gates, and perform other necessary duties. On this data, and the history of child labour in the United States see Walter I. Trattner, Crusade for the Children (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970), esp. 71.; also Edward N. Clopper, Child Labor in City Streets, intr. Louis A. Romano (New York: Macmillan, 1912; repr. New York: Garrett, 1970). In 1923 Raymond G. Fuller (Child Labor and the Constitution, intr. John H. Finley [New York: Thomas Y. Corwell, 1923; repr. New York: Arno Press, 1974) 2-3] categorized child labour as "the work that interferes with a full living of the life of childhood and with the best possible preparation for adulthood."

[7]Cruickshank, Children, 67.

[8]Cayley, de Mause, et al, "The World," 6.

[9]Cruickshank, Children, 94.

[10]On a psychological level see, for example, Alfred Adler, The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler ed. Heinz L. Ansbacher and Rowna R. Ansbacher (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), esp. 126-154. This school of thought encourages consensual family systems to facilitate the child's growth. On a philosophical level see John MacMurray (Persons in Relation [New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1961] 44-63) who asserts the fundamental personhood of the child. MacMurray also notes that co-operation and mutuality affect all levels of relating and relationship (The Structure of Religious Experience [London: Faber and Faber,

1936] 75).

[11]Ignatius of Loyola suggests that wealth, power and status keep us from relationshps with both God and others in his Spiritual Exercises (c. 1558). See The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola, trans. John Roothaan et. al. (Westminster, M.D.: Newman, 1943) 47-49. Humility involves three steps: the first, poverty, opposed to riches; the second, reproaches and contempt, opposed to worldly honour; the third, humility, opposed to pride: and from these three steps let them conduct them to all other virtues" (p. 47). On a more recent interpretation of these three attributes see Karl Rahner, Spiritual Exercises, trans. Kenneth Baker (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965) 186-195.

Appendix I: Primary Variants

1. Mark 10:15: Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it.

2. Matt 18:3: Truly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.

3.1 Gos. Thom. log. 22

  a. These infants being suckled are like those who enter the kingdom

  b. Shall we then, as children, enter the Kingdom?

  c. then you will enter [the Kingdom]

3.2 Gos. Thom. log. 37: When you disrobe without being ashamed...take up your garments...place them under your feet like little children and tread on them ...then you will see the Son of the Living one, and you will not be afraid.

3.3 Gos. Thom. log. 46: whichever one of you comes to be a child will be acquainted with the Kingdom.

Appendix II: Secondary Variants

1. John 3:3: Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.[1]

2. John 3:5: Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.

3. Clement of Alexandria, Paed. 1.5.12 Unless you turn and become like these children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.[2]

4. Acts of Philip 34: Unless you change your 'down' to 'up' (and 'up' to 'down' and 'right' to 'left') and 'left' to 'right', you shall not enter my kingdom (of heaven).

5. 2 Clem. 12:2, 6: When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female" ... When you do this, he says, the kingdom of my Father will come.

6. Shepherd of Hermas:

    a. Man. 2.1 He said to me, "Have simplicity and become innocent, and you will be as little children who do not know the evil that destroys the life of men."[3]

    b. Sim. 9.29.1 They are as innocent as babes, and no evil enters their heart, nor have they known what wickedness is, but have ever remained in innocence.[4]

    c. Sim. 9.29.3 "All of you, then, as many as shall continue,' he said, "and shall be as babes, with no wickedness, shall be more glorious than all those who have been mentioned before, for all babes are glorious before God, and are in the first place by him. Blessed are you then who put away evil from yourselves, and put on guiltlessness, for you shall be the first of all to live in God."[5]

    d. Sim 9.12.8 "Whoever does not receive his name cannot enter the kingdom of God."

Appendix III: The Structure of the Aphorism

A. Protasis

1. Introduction
Truly I say to you, whoever does not... * (Mark 10:15) [6]
Truly, I say to you, unless you... * (Matt 18:3)
Truly, truly I say to you, unless one... * (John 3:3)
Truly, truly I say to you, unless one... * (John 3:5)
Unless... * (Acts of Philip 34)
These infants... (Gos. Thom. log. 22a)
Shall we then... (Gos. Thom. log. 22b)
When you... * (Gos. Thom. log. 22c)
When you... * (Gos. Thom. log. 37)
whichever one of you... * (Gos. Thom. log. 46)
When the two... * (2 Clem. 12:2)
Whoever... * (Herm. Sim. 9.12.8)
Have simpliciy and become innocent... (Herm. Man. 27.1)
They are as innocent... (Herm. Sim. 9.29.1)
All of you then, as many as shall continue... (Herm. Sim. 9.29.3)

2. Verbs

2.1 Contaminated

If you . . . . .   receive/ the kingdom of God [negative]like a child (Mark 10:15) [7]

2.2 Inner and/or Outer Transformation

┌ turn and become [negative] / like children
│   (Matt, Clement of Alexandria)
│ born [negative] / anew (John 3:3)
┤ born [negative] / of water and Spirit (John 3:5)
If you . . . . change [negative] / down to up, etc.
│   (Acts of Philip 34)
│ suckle [positive] / (like a child) (Gos. Thom. log. 22a)
│ make [positive] / male-female, female-male, etc. (Gos. Thom. log. 22c)
│ disrobe [positive] / without shame, etc. (Gos. Thom. log. 37)
│ comes [positive] / to be a child (Gos. Thom. log. 46)
└ shall be [positive] / one (inside:outside, etc.) (2 Clem. 12:2)

3. <u>Metaphor</u>

like... a child (Mark 10:15)
like... children (Matt 18:3, Clement of Alexandria)
like... these infants (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 22a)
as... children (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 22b)

Conditional phrase
+
verb of inner
transformation

like... inside:outside, above:below, etc.
    (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 22c)

(implicit) (John 3:3, 5)
as... inside:outside, male:female, etc. (<u>2 Clem.</u> 12:2)
(absent) (<u>Acts of Philip</u> 34)
as... little children (Herm. <u>Man.</u> 2.1)
as... babes (Herm. <u>Sim</u> 9.19.1, 3)

B. Apodosis

1. <u>Verbs</u>

enter [negative] .... kingdom (Mark 10:15)
enter [negative] .... kingdom (Matt 18:3)
enter [negative] .... kingdom (John 3:5)
see [negative] kingdom (John 3:3)
enter [negative] .... kingdom (<u>Acts of Philip</u> 34)
come [positive] .... kingdom (<u>2 Clem.</u> 12:6) [postive]

then you will .... enter [positive].......... the kingdom (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 22a, b, c)

(a) see [positive] .... Son of the Living One
(b) be afraid [negative] .... (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 37)
(a) aquainted [positive]....... with the kingdom (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 46)
(b) be superior [positive]............ to John (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 46)

2. <u>Reward</u>

kingdom of God (Mark 10:15)
kingdom of heaven (Matt 18:3)
kingdom of God (John 3:5)
kingdom of God (John 3:3)

...then you shall
enter/ see/ know, etc.

kingdom of heaven (<u>Acts of Philip</u> 34)
kingdom of my Father (<u>2 Clem.</u> 12:6)
the kingdom (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log. 22a, b, c)
a. Son of the Living One (<u>Gos. Thom.</u>log.37)
b. and not be afraid (<u>Gos. Thom.</u>log.37)
(a) kingdom (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log.46)
(b) be superior to John (<u>Gos. Thom.</u> log.46)

Appendix IV: The Recontsructed Aphorism

The original aphorism appears in its conditional form as,

If [you] . . . .
- disrobe (Gos. Thom. log. 37)
- come up... set aside (Herm. Sim. 9.16.2)
- turn and become (Matt 18:3) . . . . like children
- make (Gos. Thom. log. 22c)
- change (Acts of Philip 34)
- shall be (Herm. Sim. 9.16.2)
- have (Herm.Man. 2.1)
- come to be (Gos. Thom. log. 46)

then (you shall) . . . . .
- see (Gos. Thom. log. 37)
- see (John 3:3)
- [be] acquainted [with] (Gos. Thom. log. 46)
- enter (Mark 10:15) . . . . the kingdom.
- enter (Matt 18:3)
- enter (Gos. Thom. log. 22 a, b, c)
- enter (John 3:5)
- enter (Acts of Philip 34)
- enter (Herm. Sim. 9.12.8)

"CHILD" - "KINGDOM" SAYING

"RECEIVING THE SENDER" SAYING

Verb of Transformation

CONTAMINATION

MORALIZING
TRAJECTORY

BAPTISMAL
TRAJECTORY

ASCETIC
TRAJECTORY

Mark 10:15
Mark 9:37
Matt 18:5
Luke 9:48

Matt 10:40
Luke 10:16
John 5:23
John 5:44
John 13:20
Ign. Eph. 6:1
Did. 11.4

Matt 18:3
Clem. Paed.
1.5.12

Gos. Thom.
log. 37

Gos. Thom.
log. 22a,b,c

John 3:3,5+

Acts of Philip 34+

Herm. Sim. 9.29.3*
Herm. Sim. 27.1*

Herm. Sim. 9.29.1*
Herm. Sim. 9.16.2+
Herm. Sim. 9.12.8+

2 Clem. 12:2,6+

* loss of "kingdom" reference

+ loss of "children" reference

[1]Note that Resch (_Ausserkanonische_, ad. loc.) suggests that 1 Cor 14:20, "Brethren, do not be children in your thinking; be babes in evil, but in thinking be mature" is a variant. The link to the original aphorism is weak, at best.

[2]Note that Clement of Alexandria's other variants are conflations or mere portions of Matt 18:3. See also _Strom._ 5.1.13; _Strom._ 4.25.162; _Paed._ 5.16; _Protrept._ 9.82.

[3]Unless otherwise noted, the translations for the variants of the Shepherd of Hermas are derived from Snyder's text, _Apostolic_, 140, 141, 144, 145, and 156 respectively. For sayings which signal entrance to the kingdom metaphor see _Sim._ 9.12.3; 9.12.4; 9.12.5; 9.15.2; 9.16.2; 9.16.3; 9.31.2. Most of these sayings are used within a baptismal context.

[4]LCL: 287-89.

[5]LCL: 289.

[6]An asterisk denotes the common conditional format.

[7]Square brackets indicate the positive or negative phrasing of the conditional sentence.

1. Primary Literature

Bauer, W. Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. Wm. Arndt and F. Gingrich. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1957.

Bennett, C. E., trans. Horace: The Odes and Epodes. LCL 33. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1968.

Butler, H. E., trans. Propertius. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1952.

Cary, Ernest, trans. Dionysius of Halicarnassus: The Roman Antiquities. LCL 1. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1948.

Cohoon, J. W., trans. Dio Chrysostom. LCL 1. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1961.

Crossan, John Dominic. Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Evelyn-White, Hugh, trans. Hesiod: The "Homeric Hymns and Homerica. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1959.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. The Gospel According to Luke: I-IX. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1981.

————————. ed. "The Oxyrhynchus 'logoi' of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas," Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971. 355-434.

Funk, Robert H. A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek, 2d. ed. Montana: Univ. of Montana, 1973.

Goold, G. P., ed. and trans. Catullus. London: Duckworth, 1893.

Griffiths, J. Gwyn ed. Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride. Wales: Univ. of Wales, 1970.

Guillaumont, A., H. Peuch, G. Quispel, W. Till, and Y. 'Abd al Masih. Ed. and trans. J. Robinson. The Gospel According to Thomas. Leiden: E. J. Brill/ New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

Hennecke, Edgar and W. Schneemelcher, ed. The New Testament Apocrypha, trans. R. McL Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.

Hock, Ronald and Edward O'Neil, ed. The Chriea in Ancient Rhetoric. Atlanta: Scholars, 1976.

Jackson, John, trans. Tacitus: Histories. LCL 4, 5. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1979.

Jones, W. H. S., trans. Pausanius: Description of Greece. LCL 1, 3, 4. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1966.

Lambdin, O. trans., intro. Helmut Koester. "The Gospel of Thomas," The Nag Hammadi Library in English, ed. James M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1977. 118-130.

Lutz, C. E., trans., ed. Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates. Yale Classical Studies 10. New Haven: Yale Univ., 1947.

Magie, David, trans. The Scriptores Historae Augustae. LCL 1, 2. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1960.

McCracken, George E., trans. Arnobius of Sicca: The Case Against the Pagans. Vol. 2. Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1949.

Rolfe, J. C., trans. Suetonius. LCL 1. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1960.

Rolfe, J. C., trans. The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius LCL 1. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1961.

Resch, Alfred. Ausserkanonische Parelleltexte zu den Evangelien gesammelt und untersucht. Vol. 10.1-2. Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs' sche Buchhandlung.

Roothaan, John et. al., trans. The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola. Westminster, M.D.: Newman, 1943.

Sage, E., trans. Livy. LCL 10. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1958.

Snyder, Graydon F., ed. The Apostolic Fathers: The Shepherd of Hermas. London/ New Jersey/ Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1968.

Taylor, A. E., trans. The Collected Dialogues of Plato, ed. E. Hamilton and H. Cairns. Bollingen Series 71. New York: Pantheon Books, 1961.

Taylor, Thomas, trans. Iamblichus. London: 1818, repr. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Univ. Microfilms, 1963.

Thesleff, Holger, ed. The Pythagorean Text of the Hellenistic Period. Acta Academie Aboensis Ser. A. Humanoriora 30. Abo: Abo Akademie, 1965.

Thompson, H. J., trans. Prudentius: Contra Orationem Symmachi. LCL 1. Cambridge, Mass.,: Harvard Univ., 1949.

Throckmorton, P. Gospel Parallels: A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels. Toronto/ Camden, N.J./ London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1949.

Zerwick, Maximilian. Biblical Greek, trans. Joseph Smith. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.

Zerwick, Max and Mary Grosvenor. A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament. Rome. Biblical Institute, 1974.

2. Secondary Literature

Abel, Ernest L. "The Psychology of Memory and Rumor Transmission and their Bearing on Theories of Oral Transmission in Early Christianity," JR 51 (1971) 270-281.

Achtemeier, Paul. "Mark as Interpreter of the Jesus Tradition," Int 32 (1978) 339-352.

Adler, Alfred. The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler ed. Heinz L. Ansbacher and Rowna R. Ansbacher. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

Aland, Kurt. Did the Early Church Baptize Infants?. Philadelphia: Westminster/ London: SCM, 1963.

Allport, Gordon W. and Leo Postman. The Psychology of Rumour. New York: H. Holt & Co., 1947, repr. 1965.

Ambrozic, Aloysius M. The Hidden Kingdom. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1972.

Balch, David L. Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter. SBLMS 26. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1981.

Balz, Horst. "φοβέω," TDNT 9 (1974) 189–219.

Baer, Richard A. Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Barth, Gerhard. "Matthew's Understanding of the Law," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Philadelphia: Westminster/ London: SCM, 1963. 58–164.

Beasley-Murray, George R. Baptism in the New Testament. London: MacMillan, 1963.

Ben-Sasson, H. H. ed. A History of the Jewish People, trans. George Weidenfeld. Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1969, repr. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1976.

Best, Ernest. Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. JSNTSup 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

—————. "Matthew V:3," NTS 7 (1960/1961) 255–57.

—————. "Mark's Preservation of the Tradition," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. R. Telford. Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985.

—————. "Mark's Use of the Twelve," ZNW 69 (1978) 11–35.

—————. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Narrative Soteriology, ed. Matthew Black. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1965.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "Matt. 6:22–23 and Ancient Greek Theories of Vision," in Essays on the Sermon on the Mount. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985. 71–88

Bird, C. H. "Some γάρ Clauses in St. Mark's Gospel," JTS 4 (1953) 171–187.

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3d ed. Oxford: Univ. Press, 1967.

Boring, Eugene M. "The Historical-Critical Method's 'Criteria of Authenticity': The Lucan Beatitudes as a Test Case," Forum 1 (1985) 3–38.

—————. "The Unforgivable Sin Logion in Mark 3:28–29/ Matt 12:31–32/ Luke 12:10: Formal Analysis and History of the Tradition," NovT 17 (1976) 258–79.

Bornkamm, Gunther. "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel; The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel," The Interpretation of Matthew, ed. Graham Stanton. Philadelphia: Fortress Press/ London: SPCK, 1983.

—————. "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Philadelphia: Westminster Press/ London: SCM, 1963. 15–51.

Branscombe, B. Harvie. The Gospel of Mark. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937, 7th repr. 1964.

Brown, Raymond. The Gospel According to John. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

Brown, Raymond, K. P. Donfried and J. Reumann. Peter in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars. Minneapolis: Augsburg/ New York: Paulist Press, 1973.

Brown, Robert. "Jesus and Child," IBS 4 (1982) 178–192.

Buckley, Jorunn Jacobsen. "An Interpretation of Logion 114 in The Gospel of Thomas," NovT 27 (1985) 245-272.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh. New York/ Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963.

Cadbury, Henry J. The Style and Literary Method of Luke. London: Oxford Univ./ Mildford, G.B.: Cambridge Univ./ Massacheusettes: Harvard Univ., 1920; New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969.

Cameron, Ron. "Gos. Thom. 46, 78 and their Q Parallels (7:28, 24,25)." Unpublished paper presented to SBL Q Consultation, Chicago 1984. 1-18.

Carlson, Charles E. "Proverbs, Maxims, and the Historical Jesus," JBL 99 (1980) 87-105.

Cassidy, Richard J. Jesus, Politics and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1980.

Chilton, Bruce. "God in Strength," The Kingdom of God, ed. Bruce Chilton. Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1984. 121-32.

Cayley, David and Lloyd de Mause, John Lee, et al. "Idea Series: The World of the Child," CBCRadio (March 1983) 1-40.

Clopper, Edward N. Child Labor in City Streets, intr. Louis A. Romano. New York: Macmillan, 1912; repr. New York: Garrett, 1970.

Crossan, John Dominic. "Divine Immediacy and Human Immediacy: Towards a New Fist Principle in Historical Jesus Research." An unpublished paper delivered at the Fall of 1985 meeting on the National Seminar on the Sayings of Jesus, St. Meinrad's, IN. 1-28.

—————————. In Fragments. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.

—————————. "Kingdom and Children: A Study in the Aphoristic Tradition," Semeia 29 (1983) 75-96.

—————————. "The Relatives of Jesus," NovT 15 (1973) 81-113.

Cruickshank, Marjorie. Children and Industry. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1981.

Dart, John. "The Two Shall Become One," TToday 35 (1978) 321-325.

Davies, S. The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom. New York: Seabury, 1983.

—————————. "Thomas: The Fourth Synoptic Gospel," BA 46 (1983) 6-9, 12-14.

Dibilius, M. Studies in Acts, trans. M. Ling and P. Schubert. New York: Scribner's, 1956.

Donfried, Karl Paul. The Dynamic Word. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981.

Doran, Robert M. Psychic Conversion and Theological Foundations: Toward a Reorientation of the Human Sciences. AARS 25. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981.

Downing, F. Gerald. "Cynics and Christians," NTS 30 (1984) 584-593.

Drury, John. Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel. Atlanta: John Knox, 1976.

Dupont, Jacques. Les Béatitudes. Paris: J. Gabalda,1969.

Eerdman, Charles R. The Gospel of Mark: An Exposition. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

Finley, Moses. I. Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology. New York: Viking Books, 1980.

Ford, J. Massyngbaerde. My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke. New York: Orbis, 1984.

Frend, H.C. "The Gospel of Thomas: Is Rehabilitation Possible?" JTS 8 (1967) 13-26.

Fuller, Raymond G. Child Labor and the Constitution, intr. John H. Finley. New York: Thomas Y. Corwell, 1923; repr. New York: Arno Press, 1974.

Fuller, Reginald H. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1966.

Gager, John G. "The Gospels and Jesus: Some Doubts about Method," JR 54 (1974) 244-273.

Grant, F. C. The Economic Background of the Gospels. London: Oxford Univ., 1926.

Grobel, Kendrick. "How Gnostic is the Gospel of Thomas" NTS 8 (1961-2) 367-73.

Guelich, Robert A. "The Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance-Requirements' or Eschatological Blessings?" JBL 95 (1976) 415-34.

Halliday, W. R. The Pagan Background of Early Christianity. New York: Cooper Square, 1970.

Hare, D. R. A. The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew. SNTS 6. Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Press, 1976.

Held, Heinz Joachim. "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963. 165-300.

Hiers, Richard. The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition. Gainsville: Univ. of Florida, 1970.

Horner, Leonard On the Employment of Children, in Factories and Other Works in the United Kingdom and in Some Foreign Countries. London: Longman, Orme, Bron, Green and Longmans, 1840, repr. Shannon: Irish Univ. Press, 1971.

Jeremias, Joachim. Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries. London: SCM, 1960.

————————. The Message of the Parables of Jesus. London: SCM, 1963.

————————. New Testament Theology. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1971.

————————. Parables of Jesus. London: SPCK, 1963.

Johnson, Luke T. The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts. SBLDS 39. Montana: Scholars Press, 1977.

Karris, Robert J. "Poor and Rich: The Lukan 'Sitz im Leben'," Perspectives on Luke-Acts, ed. C. H. Talbert. Virginia: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/ Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978. 112-125.

Kealy, Sean P. Mark's Gospel: A History of Interpretation: From the Beginning until 1979. New York: Paulist, 1982.

Keck, Leander E. "The Poor Among the Saints in Jewish Christianity," ZNW 57 (1966), 54-78.

————————. "The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament," ZNW 56 (1965) 100-129.

Kee, Howard Clark. "Becoming a Child in the Gospel of Thomas," JBL 82 (1963) 307-14.

——————. Community of the New Age. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.

——————. Jesus in History. New York/ Chicago/ Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Kelber, Werner H. The Oral and the Written Gospel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

King, Karen. "Kingdom in the Gospel of Thomas," Foundations & Facets Forum 3 (1987) 42-97.

Kingsbury, J. C. "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem," JBL 98 (1979) 67-83.

——————. Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

——————. The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13. London: SPCK, 1969; repr. St. Louis, Missouri: Clayton Publishing House, 1977.

Klein, C. Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology, trans. Edward Quinn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Klijn, A. F. J. "The 'Single One' in the Gospel of Thomas," JBL 81 (1962) 271-78.

Kloppenborg, John S. "Blessing and Marginality: The 'Persecution Beatitude' in Q, Thomas and Early Christian Tradition," Foundations and Facets Forum 2 (1986) 36-56.

Koester, Helmut. "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," HTR 73 (1980) 105-130.

——————. "History and Cult in the Gospel of John and in Ignatius of Antioch," The Bultmanning School of Biblical Interpretation: Journal for Theology of Church, ed. J. M. Robinson. 111-123.

——————. Introduction to the New Testament: Vol. 1. History and Literature of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

——————. "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels," Trajectories through Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971. 154-204.

Kysar, Robert. The Fourth Evangelist. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1975.

Lambrecht, Jan. The Sermon on the Mount. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1985.

Légasse, S. Jésus et L'Enfant. Paris: Gabalda, 1966.

Lincoln, Bruce. "Thomas Gospel and Thomas Community: A New Approach to a Familiar Text," NovT 19 (1977) 65-76.

Lindars, Barnabas. "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case," NTS 27 (1980-81) 287-94.

Luz, Ulrich. "The Disciples in the Gospel According to Matthew," The Interpretation of Matthew, ed. Graham Standon. Philadelphia: Fortress Press/ London: SPCK, 1983. 98-128.

Malina, Bruce J. The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981.

Maly, Eugene. "Women and the Gospel of Luke," BTB 3 (1980) 99-104.

Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM, 1949, repr. 1971.

Marshall, I. Howard. The Gospel of Luke. Exeter: Pater Noster, 1978.

McGregor, G. H. C. "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel," NTS 9 (1963) 114-118.

MacMurray, John. Persons in Relation. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1961.

—————. The Structure of Religious Experience. London: Faber and Faber, 1936.

McNeile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1980.

Mealand, David. Poverty and Expectation in the Gospel. London: SPCK, 1980.

Meeks, Wayne O. "Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," HR 13 (1974) 165-208.

Meier, John P. Matthew. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1980.

Meye, Robert P. Jesus and the Twelve. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968.

Meyer, Marvin. "Making Mary Male: The Categories 'Male' and 'Female' in the Gospel of Thomas," NTS 31 (1985) 554-570.

Ménard, J. E. "La Fonction Soteriologique de la Mémoire chez les Gnostiques," RevScRel 54 (1980) 298-310.

Montefiore, C. G., ed. The Synoptic Gospels. Vol. 2. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968.

Neirynck, Frans. Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of Markan Redaction. Leuven: Leuven Univ., 1981.

Nock, Arthur D. "Eunuchs in Ancient Religion," Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, ed. Zeph Stewart. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1972.

Nolan, Albert. Jesus Before Christiantity: The Gospel of Liberation. Tiptree, G.B.: Darton, Longman and Todd/ South Africa: David Philip, 1976.

O'Toole, Robert F. "Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts," Political Issues in Luke-Acts, ed. Richard Cassidy and Philip Scharper. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1983. 1-17.

Oepke, Albrecht. "παῖς," TDNT 5 (1967) 636-654.

Perkins, Pheme. "The Pronouncement Stories in the Gospel of Thomas," Semeia 20 (1981) 121-132.

Perrin, Norman. Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

—————. "Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom," The Kingdom of God, ed. Bruce Chilton. Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SCM, 1984. 92-106.

—————. The New Testament: An Introduction. Chicago: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.

—————. Rediscovering the Teachings of Jesus. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Peterson, N. "The Composition of Mk 4:1 - 8:26," HTR 73 (1980) 185-217.

Pryke, E. J. Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978.

Rahner, Karl Spiritual Exercises, trans. Kenneth Baker. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Rengstdorf, Karl Heinrich. "ἀποστέλλω..." TDNT 1 (1964) 398-446.

Rhoads, David and David Mickie. Mark as Story. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Richardson, Cyril C. "The Gospel of Thomas: Gnostic or Encratite?" The Heritage of the Early Church, ed. D. Nieman and M. Schatkin. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1973) 65-77.

Ricoeur, Paul. The Symbolism of Evil. Boston: Beacon, 1969.

Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: SCM, 1957.

Safrai, S. and M. Stern, ed. The Jewish People of the First Century. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, Assen., 1976.

Sanders, E. P. Jesus and Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Schilling, Frederick. "What Means the Saying about Receiving the Kingdom of God as a Little Child? Mark X:15; Lk XVIII:17," ExpT 77 (1965) 56-58.

Schussler-Fiorenza, Elizabeth. In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Schweizer, Eduard. The Good News According to Mark, trans. Donald H. Madvig. Virginia: John Knox, 1970.

Scroggie, Graham. The Gospel of Mark. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1979.

Senior, Donald. What are They Saying about Matthew? New York: Paulist Press, 1983.

Sheridan, Mark. "Disciples and Discipleship in Matthew and Luke," BTB 3 (1973) 235-55.

Smith Jonathan Z. "The Garments of Shame," HR 5 (1966) 217-238.

Stanton, Graham. "Introduction," The Interpretation of Matthew, ed. G. Stanton. Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1983. 1-18.

Sweeten, Margaret Mary. Child Talk: Exploration of the Child Passages of the Gospel of Mark Against the Background of Norman Perrin's Structural Outline of Mark 8:22-10:52. M.A. Thesis. Windsor: Univ. of Windsor, 1981.

Talbert, Charles H. "Discipleship in Luke-Acts," Discipleship in the New Testament, ed. F. F. Segovia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985. 62-74

——————, Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts. SBLMS 20. Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1974.

Tannehill, R. C. "The Disciples in Mark: the Function of a Narrative Role," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. R. Telford. Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985. 134-157.

Taylor, Charles. The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels. London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1892.

Taylor, V. The Gospel According to Mark. London: MacMillan, 1953.

Telford, William R. "Introduction: The Gospel of Mark," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. R. Telford. Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985. 24-25.

Theissen, Gerhard. Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity, trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Thompson, William G. Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Mt 17:22-18:35. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970.

Tripp, David H. "The Aim of the Gospel of Thomas," ExpT 92 (1980) 41-44.

Trattner, Walter I. Crusade for the Children. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970.

Trocme, Etienne. The Formation of the Gospel According to Mark. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Turner, Victor. Image and Pilgrimage. New York: Columbia Press, 1978.

—————. The Ritual Process. Chicago: Adeline Press, 1969.

Tyson, Joseph B. "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," JBL 80 (1961) 261-268.

—————. The New Testament and Early Christianity. New York: MacMillan/ London: Collier MacMillan, 1984.

—————. A Study of Early Christianity. New York: Macmillan/ London: Collier-Macmillan, 1973.

Vaage, Lief E. "The Kingdom of God in Q." Unpublished paper delivered at Fall 1986 Meeting of the Jesus Seminar, Notre Dame, IN. 1-53.

Weber, Hans-Reudi. Jesus and the Children. Atlanta: John Knox, 1979.

Weeden, Theodore J. "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel," The Interpretation of Mark, ed. W. Telford. Philadelphia: Fortress/ London: SPCK, 1985. 64-78.

Willoughby, H. R. Pagan Regeneration. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1929.

Wrede, William. The Messianic Secret, trans. J. C. G. Greig. Cambridge and London: James Clarke, 1971.

Wheelwright, Philip. Metaphor and Reality. Bloomington, IN: Indiana Univ. Press, 1962.

VITA AUCTORIS

1980   Graduated from Huron Heights Secondary School, Newmarket, Ontario

1980   Ontario Scholar, Huron Heights Secondary School,
            Newmarket, Ontario

1981   Dean's Honour List, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario

1984   University of Windsor Bursary

1984   Graduated from the University of Windsor,
            Bachelor of Arts (Religious Studies)

1984-
   1987   Graduate Teaching Assistantship, University of Windsor

1985   Rotary Club and University of Windsor Bursary,
            University of Windsor

1985   Tuition Scholarship, University of Windsor

1986   C. P. Crowley Scholarship, University of Windsor

1986   Assumption University Scholarship, University of Windsor

1987   Summer Research Scholarship, University of Windsor

1987   Graduate from University of Windsor, Master of Arts (Religious Studies)