The 'slave of all': a tradition-historical study of a synoptic saying

Jay McDermond

Abstract

The 'Slave of All': A Tradition-historical Study of a Synoptic Saying
Jay McDermond

This thesis is intended to be a study of the 'slave of all' saying, which is found in the Synoptic Gospels (Mk 10.35–45; Mk 9.33–7; Lk 22.24–7 and Mt 23.1–12). Our primary goal is to study how the early Christian communities employed this logion.

The saying is examined against the background of Jewish attitudes towards slavery. A comparison of the key Torah laws regulating slavery reveals the development of an anti-slavery attitude. Often this anti-slavery sentiment is associated with feelings of Jewish nationalism. Biblical and non-Biblical materials show this attitude continued into the first century CE.

Secondly, we explored the possibility that Jesus did not adhere to this anti-slavery attitude. In addition to a lack of evidence that Jesus was a Jewish nationalist, we argued that Jesus probably used slavery imagery as a positive illustration. It was argued that the 'slave of all' saying is a dominical logion.

A comparison of the various pericopes resulted in the conclusion that the saying was originally intended as a rebuke of misdirected ambition. It was probably uttered at a meal setting when the disciples had begun to argue about personal greatness.

The remainder of the thesis individually examined the pericopes where the 'slave of all' saying is used. The Gospel of Mark employs the saying twice in a major literary unit consisting of 8.22–10.52. Mk 10.35–45 uses the logion to delineate the Marcan community's attitude towards leadership. Mk 9.33–7 deals with membership in the community of faith.

It was argued that Lk 22.24–7, which is seen to be independent of Mk 10.35–45, takes up the saying and very specifically directs it at the leaders of the Lucan community.

Finally, the saying is used by Matthew when dealing with post 70 CE factionalism between his Jewish Christian community and the local Pharisees. The logion is used to summarize the Jewish Christian understanding of leadership.

'The Slave of All': A Tradition-historical Study of a Synoptic Saying

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Durham (Department of Theology)
by
Jay Elwood McDermond

Awarded the degree of M. Litt.

May, 1987

ERRATA

p. 35, line 20: 'unexplainable' should read 'inexplicable'.

p. 35, fn. 47, line 2: 'orginated' should read 'originated'.

p. 36, fn. 49 , lines 1 & 2: 'call to remember to Egypt' should read 'call to remember enslavement to Egypt'.

p. 44, fn. 70, line 1: 'Double' should read 'Doubleday'.

p. 98, line 8: 'affliation' should read 'affiliation'.

p. 159, fn. 2, line 1: '*Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Jesu*' should read '*Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu*'.

p. 192, line 13: 'authoritive' should read 'authoritative'.

For Wanda,
who by her life proves she is "the greatest of all".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Many thanks are due to people who have shown an interest, in various ways, in the production of this thesis. First and foremost, my sincere and heartfelt appreciation is extended to Prof. James D.G. Dunn, my supervisor. The staff at the Palace Green Library has been invaluable in their assistance. I would like to thank Rev. G.J. McGrath, Dr. L.J. McGregor and Dr. R.W.L. Moberly for reading parts of the thesis and offering helpful comments. I appreciated the opportunity to discuss my thesis topic, at an early stage, with Prof. Martin Hengel and to the University of Durham, I owe a debt of gratitude for helping to defray the cost of my travel to Tübingen. One needs to take "breaks" from academic work and my friends Mike and Sally Alsford and Gill and Paul Trebilco provided such "breaks". But, most of all, I owe immeasurable thanks to my spouse, Wanda. While I merely studied this topic of "service and greatness", she repeatedly proved, and continues to prove, herself to be "great" by her life of service and humility. It is to her that I dedicate this volume.

Abbreviations

AASOR	*Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. by J. Pritchard
Ant.	*Antiquities*
AB	*Analecta Biblica*
AJSLL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*
Assem. Seign.	*Assemblées du Seigneur*
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review*
Avh. Norske. Akad.	*Avhandlingar Utfitt Av Det Norske Videnskaps - academi. Oslo (Hist. filos Klase)*
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist*
BDB	Brown, Driver and Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
BDF	Blass, Debrunner and Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*
BETL	*Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTG	*Behind the Third Gospel*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CD	The Zadokite Document

CUP	Cambridge University Press
D	The Deuteronomic Code
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
EQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
ExpT	*Expository Times*
GN	*The Good News Bible*
H	The Holiness Code
HST	*The History of the Synoptic Tradition*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBS	*Irish Biblical Studies*
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. by G. Buttrick, et al.
JB	*The Jerusalem Bible*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JTS	*The Journal of Theological Studies*
LXX	Septuagint
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NEB	*The New English Bible*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OUP	Oxford University Press
P	The Priestly Code
Ps. Sol.	Psalms of Solomon
1 QH	Psalms of Thanksgiving
1 QpHab	Habakkuk Commentary

1 QpMic	Micah Commentary
4 QpPs	Psalm 37 Commentary
1 QS	The Manual of Discipline
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RSV	The Revised Standard Version
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
Sitzungber. Wien	*Sitzungberiche (der Kaiserlichen) Akademie der Wissenschaften (in Wien)*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series
Strack-Billerbeck	*Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, ed. by Strack and Billerbeck
Symb. Oslo	*Symbolae Osloenses*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (English Translation)
Theol. Beitr.	*Theologische Beiträge*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
War	*The Jewish War*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamtneliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTHK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Chapter One:
Introduction

1.1 The State of Research

Plato is reputed to have written, "How can a man be happy when he has to serve someone?" [1] Centuries and even millenia later those words ring true as a general summary of humanity's evaluation of servitude. At various points in humanity's dramatically changing history the social groups which experience the often harsh realities of servitude have arisen to cast off their "chains" in a quest for an elusive and variously defined "happiness". It would seem as though Plato has passed on a timeless and true observation on one aspect of the human condition.

A still better known individual is depicted as making a demand of his followers which runs counter to Plato's rhetorical query. Mk 10.43–4 portrays Jesus as saying, "...whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all." As one reads the Synoptic Gospels, advice similar to this will be encountered on a number of occasions. [2] These sayings and the pericopes in which they are embedded have never been, to the best of my knowledge, subjected to sustained critical examination. No monographs have focused on this particular Synoptic saying. [3] The scholarly articles which *touch* upon these passages are often brief and are primarily concerned with issues other than the function of the saying in its various Gospel

[1] *Gorgias* 491e.

[2] Mt 20.26–7; Mk 9.35; Lk 9.46; Lk 22.26 and Mt 23.11.

[3] However, a number of monographs do deal with the various pericopes in that they are part of a larger passage being examined. See, for example, K. Reploh, *Markus-Lehrer der Gemeinde* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), H.-W. Kuhn, *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), H. Schürmann, *Jesu Abschiedsrede (Lk 22,21–38)* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1977) and D. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979).

settings. [4] Commentators quite frequently give only passing attention to the various versions of the saying and the pericopes in which it is found. Bultmann's handling of this traditional material is sporadic. [5] Brandt's *Dienst und Dienen im Neuen Testament* [6] is basically concerned with the ecclesiastical role and office of the deacon ("*Diakonie*"). [7] Such an overall relatively casual approach to this element of the Synoptic tradition would seem to justify a systematic and critical examination of the material involved. [8]

Additional justification for this investigation and its particular approach comes from the fact that little consideration has been given to ancient Jewish attitudes towards slavery. While significant work has been done on Greco-Roman attitudes towards this institution and its social function, [9] the number of works

[4] M. Black, "The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst" *ExpT* 59 (1947/48), pp. 14–6; E. Haenchen, "Matthäus 23" *ZTHK* XLVIII (1951), pp. 38–63; R. Leaney, "Jesus and the Symbol of the Child (Luke IX, 36–8)" *ExpT* 66 (1954/55), pp. 91–2; F. Neirynck, "The Tradition of the Sayings of Jesus: A Discussion Based on Mk 9.33–50" *Concilium* 2 (1966), pp. 33-9; D. Hill, "The Request of Zebedee's Sons and the Johannine doxa-theme" *NTS* 13 (1967), pp. 281–85; E. Best, "Discipleship in Mark: Mark 8.22–10.52" *SJT* 23 (1970), pp. 323–37; W. Pesch, "Theologische Aussagen der Redaktion von Matthäus" in *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker: Für Josef Schmid* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973). Ed. by P. Hoffmann, B. Norbert and W. Pesch, pp. 286–99; P. Achtemeier, "Mark 9:30–37" *Interpretation* 30 (1976), pp. 178–83; J. Michaels, "Christian Prophecy and Mt 23:8–12: A Test Exegesis" in *SBL Seminar Papers 10* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976). Ed. by G. McRae, pp. 305–10; J. Radermaker, "Revendiquer ou servir? Mk 10,35–45" *Assemb Seign* 60 (1975), pp. 28–39; D. Wenham, "A Note on Mk 9:33–42 / Mt 18:1–6 / Lk 9:46–50" *JSNT* 14 (1982), pp. 113–18 and W. Kurz, "Luke 22:14–38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses" *JBL* 104 (1985), pp. 251–68.

[5] Cf. *HST* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972). While the bulk of his material is located in the section dealing with "Legal Sayings and Church Rules" (pp. 130ff), one can also locate information regarding the saying in other sections of the book as well, e.g. "Logia (Jesus as the Teacher of Wisdom)" (pp. 76,84 and 87).

[6] (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1931) Neutestamentliche Forschungen, Vol. 5.

[7] The saying we will focus on plays a very insignificant role in Brandt's work.

[8] This material is Mk 10.35–45 (and par Mt 20.20–8); Mk 9.33–7 (and parr Mt 18.1–5 and Lk 9.46–8); Lk 22.24–7 and Mt 23.1–32.

[9] Cf. the German series Forschungen zur Antiken Sklaverei ed. by J. Vogt and H. Bellen; W. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1955); I. Finley, ed. *Slavery in*

dealing with Jewish attitudes are small and general in nature. [10] Because of this general approach we will embark upon a systematic analysis of the key OT laws dealing with slaves and Jewish materials from the Post-exilic period into the first century CE, thus sketching a Jewish social context for the saying. An investigation of this background is necessary if only because the Synoptic Gospels attribute the saying to Jesus, a first century CE Jew.

1.2 Specific Focus

We must mention that this investigation has a specific focus with regards to the use of the concept of "slave". The Oxford Dictionary's primary definition of this word is "a person who is the property of another and obliged to work for him". In this study, we are fundamentally concerned with this socio-economic concept and its metaphorical use in the NT. However, an initial note must be made regarding the use of the equivalent Hebrew word (ᶜ*bd*).

As Walther Zimmerli has pointed out this OT word is diversely employed. [11] The usage falls into one of two primary categories: a) the profane and b) the sacred. Among the profane uses of ᶜ*bd* would be the reference to a person who

---

Classical Antiquity (Cambridge: Heffer, 1960); S. Bartchy, *First-Century Slavery and I Corinthians 7:21* (Cambridge, Ma: SBL Literature, 1973); J. Vogt, *Slavery and the Ideal Man* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974); and G. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co.,1981) and T. Wiedermann, *Greek and Roman Slavery* (London: Croom Helm, 1981), as well as numerous articles.

[10] Cf. E. Urbach, "The Laws Regarding Slavery as a Source for Social History of the Period of the Second Temple, the Mishnah and Talmud" in *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies*, Vol. I (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1964), pp. 1–94; S. Zeitlin, "Slavery During the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaitic Period" *JQR* 53 (1962–63), pp. 185–218; H. Wolff, "Masters and Slaves" *Interpretation* 27 (1973), pp. 259–72; N. Lemche, "The Hebrew Slave" *VT* XXV (1975), pp. 129–44; J. Van der Ploeg, "Slavery in the Old Testament" *VT* Supplement 22 (1972), pp. 72–87 and E. Hausler, *Sklaven und Personen minderen Rechts im Alten Testament* [unpublished dissertation: Universität Köln (1956)].

[11] *The Servant of God* (London: SCM, 1957), pp. 9ff.

belongs to another and the laws which regulate the rights of the enslaved individual, [12] reference to the standing army, [13] references to political submission, [14] references to personal humility within the court setting [15] and in reference to sanctuary servants. [16] Among the religious uses of ᶜ*bd*, Zimmerli identifies the following [17]: humble self-description of the faithful individual in the presence of God, [18] a pious congregation described as servants of Yahweh, [19] a reference to the nation of Israel, [20] a title for outstanding figures in Israel's history, [21] and the Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. [22]

We are specifically concerned with the profane use of the word ᶜ*bd* and in particular we will focus on the first of Zimmerli's secular references. It is interesting to note that all of his profane usages of ᶜ*bd* seem to be derivatives of this primary usage denoting the person who has become the property of another individual. In these latter uses, the ᶜ*bd* is expected to carry out the will of and serve to advance the person (or institution) to whom he is attached. It is this aspect of the word which will remain central to its literal and/or metaphorical employment in the NT study.

These two general categories of profane and sacred ought not be confused. This is especially true of the simple "social" usage describing an enslaved person

[12] Ex 21.1–6; Dt 15.12–18 and Lev 25.39–46.
[13] Cf. 1 Sam 14.52. Eventually all the king's functionaries came to be known as servants or slaves of the king. Cf. 2 Kings 22.12 and 2 Chr 34.20.
[14] 2 Sam 10.19 and 2 Kings 18.24.
[15] 2 Kings 8.13 and 2 Sam 9.8.
[16] Zimmerli notes that this category is a somewhat unique employment. Cf. Josh 9.23's reference to the Gibeonites.
[17] Pp. 13ff.
[18] Ex 4.10; Nu 11.11; Dt 3.24; 2 Kings 16.7; etc.
[19] Cf. Pss 113.1; 135.1f; 134.1; 34.22; 69.36; 79.2; 105.25; Isa 65.13ff; 56.6; etc.
[20] See Isa 41.8ff; 44.1; 45.4; 44.21 and 48.20.
[21] The patriarchs: Hos 12.3ff; Jer 9.4; Isa 43.27; Gen 26.24; Ps 105.6,42; Moses: 40x in total, including Nu 12.7 and Ex 14.31; the righteous king: 2 Sam 3.18; 1 Kings 11.34; Ezek 34.23f; Ps 89.3; Jer 33.21f; Zech 3.8 and Hag 2.23; the prophets as Yahweh's messengers: 1 Kings 18.36; 14.8; 15.29; 2 Kings 9.36; 10.10 and Job 1.8; 2.3; 42.7f.
[22] Cf. the four servant songs: 42.1–4; 49.1–6; 50.4–11 and 52.13–53.12.

(profane) and the ᶜ*bd yhwh* in Deutero-Isaiah (sacred). Despite the law codes and Deutero-Isaiah being influenced by common traditions, [23] the two usages of the word ᶜ*bd* are not similar. The law codes are simply attempting to codify and regulate one aspect of Israelite social interaction. On the other hand, Deutero-Isaiah, having associated ᶜ*bd* with the divine name, employs the category of slave more as an extended metaphor. The significance of the expression is derived from the profane image of slave or servant, but it is so far removed from this basic image that it contributes nothing to one's understanding of the profane usage. It seems probable that Deutero-Isaiah's servant figure [24] has moved quite a distance from the mundane environment of the slave markets of Palestine with which our investigation is concerned and therefore we should not confuse the two uses of the word ᶜ*bd*.

1.3 The Methodology

While *form-*, *redaktions-* and *traditionsgeschichtliche* approaches to the study of scripture are relatively old methods of analysis, the 'slave of all' saying, as we shall usually refer to it, and its Gospel settings have never been thoughly subjected to such analysis. All three approaches will be employed in the course of this thesis. Of particular importance for our study will be sociological concerns - naturally, given the topic. [25] Because the saying is found in pericopes which

[23] Cf. Von Rad's suggestion (*The Message of the Prophets* (London: SCM, 1968), pp. 207ff) that Deutero-Isaiah has been influenced by the three election traditions (Exodus, Davidic and Zion). The influence of the Exodus tradition in the various law codes seems evident.

[24] For recent the discussion regarding the servant's identity, see R. Whybray, *The Second Isaiah* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), pp. 68–78.

[25] See such recent works in this area as W. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983); H. Kee, *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspectives* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980); G. Theißen, *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983) and *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); W. Schottroff and W. Stegemann, eds., *Traditionen der Befreiung. Sozialgeschichtliche Bibelauslegungen*, Vol. I: *Methodische Zugange* and Vol. II: *Frauen in der Bibel* (Münich: Kaiser Verlag, 1980) and T. Best, "The Sociolog-

differ significantly we must ask what social factors may have been at work behind the various formulations of the pericopes which contain a 'slave of all' saying.

A key question associated with a Synoptic Gospels study is that of sources and source theories. In this thesis we have elected to use the two-source theory as a working hypothesis. Despite renewed interests in this area and challenges to this theory, [26] the relationships of the pericopes involved in this study can be best explained in light of this theory, as we will see. Therefore, the main bodies of chs. 4 and 5 will consider the appropriate Marcan passages, with the Matthean and/or Lucan parallels assuming roles as secondary focal points.

1.4 The Outline

Because we plan to study the *development* of this saying, attributed to Jesus, against a Jewish backdrop, we will follow an outline which begins with Jewish attitudes toward slavery. In chapter two, we will compare and analyze the three primary OT laws which attempt to codify general guidelines regarding slavery. [27] This analysis reveals that, as Israelite self-understanding developed, the laws became decidedly "anti-enslavement" with regards to Jewish people. A trajectory drawn from the developed attitude of Lev 25.39–46 through various OT, intertestamental and first century CE literature shows that this attitude persisted into the first century.

The third chapter asks if Jesus was in sympathy with those Jews who rejected slavery and Roman rule. Various pericopes from the Synoptic Gospels

---

ical Study of the New Testament: Promise and Peril of a New Discipline" *SJT* 36 (1983), pp. 181–94.

[26] See e.g. A. Bellinzoni, *Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* (Macon: Mercer Press, 1985) and C. Tuckett, ed. *Synoptic Studies. The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984) and *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis* (Cambridge: CUP, 1983).

[27] These laws are Ex 21.1–6; Dt 15.12–8 and Lev 25.39–46.

are employed to demonstrate that Jesus was not in agreement with this attitude, thus opening the way for the possibility that he used "slavery" as a positive image.

Chapter four will basically be a form critical analysis of the 'slave of all' saying and tradition critical comparison of the various pericopes in which it is located. Here the goal is to establish a probable original *Sitz im Leben* and oral period history for the saying. It is here that the question of the saying's dominical origin will be discussed. Once we have achieved these goals the remainder of the thesis will involve redactional studies of the various Synoptic settings in which the saying is located. In each instance a major concern will be to sketch the background social issues which contributed to that particular development of the saying.

Chapter five will focus on Mk 10.35–45 (par Mt 20.20–8). This Marcan pericope is dealt with prior to Mk 9.33–7 because the analysis of chapter four will suggest that Mk 10.35–45 contains that version of the saying, available to us, which is closest to the original version. Also, this pericope contains implicit evidence which probably points to the more original setting in which the saying was uttered. Before either Marcan pericope can be analyzed the important literary unit of Mk 8.27–10.52 [28] must be surveyed. The study of this larger unit will facilitate the interpretation of the two Marcan pericopes which contain the 'slave of all' saying.

Mk 9.33–7 (parr Mt 18.1–5 and Lk 9.46–8), in addition to being part of the Gospel's larger literary unit mentioned above, helps form a smaller and controversial section: Mk 9.33–50. Chapter six's first task is to determine whether or not this section is a pre-Marcan unit as many scholars have argued. Once

[28] The exact length of the unit is debated. For a very brief summary of the various options suggested for the length see ch. 5, fn. 1.

this task is accomplished the Marcan passage and its parallels will be examined. While the word παιδίον is translated "child" or "Kind" (v.36), evidence will be presented supporting the suggestion that the Evangelist intended this word to be understood as meaning "slave" or "young slave".

Lk 22.24–7, like the previous pericopes, is part of a larger context whose scope and character is debated. In this instance the issue is the passage's relationship to Mk 10.41–5. In chapter seven, it will be argued that Lk 22.24–7 represents a version of the tradition which is independent of, but parallel to, the Mk 10.35–45 version of the tradition. Also, this Lucan version represents a clearly developed church rule.

Chapter eight deals with Matthew's creative handling of the saying in 23.1–12. The chapter opens with a study of Matthew's understanding of "the crowds", in whose presence these words are portrayed as being uttered. This is followed by a redactional study of Mt 23.1–12 and a section sketching a historical backdrop for the pericope.

Finally, chapter nine serves as a conclusion to the thesis. Here, we will summarize the results of each individual chapter and attempt to draw together any major loose ends. This chapter will contain a brief epilogue, also.

Chapter Two:
Judaism and Servanthood

2.1 Introduction

The obvious reason for beginning this thesis with a chapter on the question of Jewish attitudes toward slavery has to do with the social background to the greatness/servant saying in the Synoptic Gospels. Since various versions of the saying speak of becoming πάντων δοῦλος, [1] we must raise the question of Jewish attitudes toward this institution. Were these attitudes positive or negative? Did any of Jesus' contemporaries share a common attitude with earlier generations? Were these "social" attitudes reenforced or supported by theological motifs?

An equally important beginning point is the Torah, for there can be no question that this body of literature has been given a central position in Jewish social and religious development. This is especially true for the period in which Jesus lived. As one reads through the various OT law codes it is evident that these laws were neither static, immutable edicts nor did they develop within a stagnant social context. As the nation developed and its self-understanding solidified, its guidelines for social intercourse developed as well. While neither Jesus nor his contemporaries, nor the generations which preceded them, would have recognized levels of development within the Torah, modern scholars have recognized that this material consists of a number of legal and literary strata. [2]

[1] In chapter four, we will argue that the original wording of the saying probably included these words.

[2] The particular laws we will look at come from three separate levels: Ex 21.1–6 (the Book of the Covenant); Dt 15.12–8 (D) and Lev 25.39–46 (H). Additionally, the laws studied have developed within a Mosaic Covenant context, which is basically egalitarian in nature. However, Mosaic Covenant configurations are not the only way of conceiving of the Covenant. For example, the Davidic Covenant, which seems to be inherently hierarchial in nature, may well have produced different attitudes towards slavery among the Jews. But it must be noted that those books which do reflect Davidic Covenant themes, such as the Psalms and the Historical Books, have not attempted to provide their own law codes which

This is especially true of the laws regulating the role of a slave or servant within Israelite society. Therefore, we shall compare Ex 21.1–6, Dt 15.12–8 and Lev 25.39–46 to see if there is significant development regarding this topic. It is quite true that other passages touch upon this theme, but the above units are selected as the primary focus because they are the most comprehensive laws regarding this institution. A number of the secondary references may be touched upon but not in any in-depth manner.

The general outline of this chapter will be to note the tentative relative dating of the three law codes which contain the three statements and then note any development and change of themes between the three particular laws. Next, I will attempt to suggest reasons for any transformations. Thirdly, we will survey other Jewish literature so as to show that a particular attitude, which is reflected by the fully developed law, persisted into the first century of the Christian Era.

2.2 Dating of the Law Codes

While the scholarly endeavours of the last few decades have resulted in alterations regarding the absolute dating of the various law codes and their constitutent elements, [3] the general consensus regarding the relative dating of the codes remains more or less unchanged. Among other things, this means that virtually

---

would challenge the Mosaic Covenant influenced laws with which we will be dealing. Therefore, we should probably see these law codes as authoritative streams within a complex Israelite society.

[3] Cf. the third edition of John Bright's *A History of Israel* (London: SCM, 1980), p. 146. He notes the changes in OT scholarly circles, which now date the Book of the Covenant as material which reflects the legal milieu of the period of the Judges, although the book itself may have been put together at the beginning of the monarchy. For the alterations of the absolute dating of the Deuteronomic and Holiness Codes see Von Rad's *Studies in Deuteronomy* (London: SCM, 1953), G.E. Wright's article in *The Interpreters' Bible*, Vol. II, pp. 323–26, K. Elliger's "Das Gesetz Leviticus 18" *ZAW* (NF) xxvi (1955), pp. 1–25 and H. Reventlow's *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1961).

all scholars continue to accept that the Book of the Covenant (Ex 21–23) is by far the oldest surviving Israelite law code. [4] The single most significant literary evidence regarding the age of this material is to be seen in its similarity to the Code of Hammurabi (ca. 1759 BCE) and the Code of Eshnunna, which has an uncertain date, but is no earlier than the eighteenth century BCE. [5] This similarity is primarily indicated by the casuistic form found in both the Book of the Covenant and the two non-Jewish codes, but there are content similarities as well. For example, both the Book of the Covenant (Ex 21.2) and the Code of Hammurabi [117] [6] limit the length of servitude for anyone forced to sell himself due to defaulting on his debts.

The relative dating of the Deuteronomic Code and the Holiness Code, which contains Lev 25.39–46, is not as clear cut as their chronological relationship to the Book of the Covenant. A major contributing element on the dating discussion regarding these two codes is the fact that they are seen as collections of laws which arise from various time periods. However, as the two codes now stand within their respective texts, there is little doubt among scholars that the final form of the Deuteronomic Code (D) is older than the Holiness Code (H). [7]

---

[4] Cf. Bright, op. cit., pp. 50 and 89; W. Oesterley and T. Robinson, *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1958), p. 56; J. Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: SCM, 1976), p. 107, identifies the *terminus ante quem* of the E material, which contains the Book of the Covenant, as 722–21 BCE. He hedges on a date for Dt, but clearly places P, which contains the Holiness Code, around 587 BCE. See also A. Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (N.Y.: Association Press, 1961), p. 95; J. Hyatt, *Commentary on Exodus* (London: Oliphants, 1971), p. 218; G. Von Rad, *Deuteronomy* (London: SCM, 1966), p. 107 and R. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (N.Y.: Harper, 1948), p. 212.

[5] See Bright, op. cit., p. 50 and Weiser, op. cit., pp. 121–25 among others.

[6] J.B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: University Press, 1955) 2*nd* ed., pp. 170–71.

[7] See B. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM, 1979), pp. 204ff and pp. 122ff. He suggests that most scholars still associate some type of connection between Dt and the seventh-century reforms under Josiah. This is typical of scholars to locate Deuteronomy's formation to the seventh-century time period. Childs earlier writes, "Nevertheless, a post-exilic

The evidence which helps locate a more specific time period for the older Deuteronomic code includes a number of significant items. First, there seems to be a significant parallel between this material and Hosea, the mid-eighth century prophet, with regards to kingship. [8] Secondly, Dt 10.12–3 bears a strong resemblance to the saying attributed to the eighth-century prophet Micah (6.8) demanding love for Yahweh. [9] Thirdly, the Deuteronomic homiletical style is much like that of Jeremiah. [10] Finally, there is Weinfeld's suggestion that the outline of Deuteronomy "has preserved the classical structure of the political treaty". [11]

In light of the above it seems safe to conclude that the bulk of the Deuteronomy material, which formed the basis for our current book, including the Deuteronomic Code, was in the process of collection from the middle of the eighth-century and into the seventh-century, prior to its discovery in the Temple during Josiah's reign. Therefore, we can set a tentative relative date of mid-eighth to

---

dating for the final shape of P (Leviticus) has continued to represent a wide consensus." (p. 123). On this matter of consensus, cf. D. Patrick, *Old Testament Law* (London: SCM, 1986), pp. 146f. Despite this wide ranging agreement, not all scholars are of this opinion. A number, led by Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1961), pp. 178ff, argue that H dates from the pre-exilic period. On this position also see A. Hurvitz, "The Usage of šēš and bûṣ in the Bible and Its Implication for the Date of P" *HTR* 60 (1967), pp. 117–21.

[8] Cf. Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 26. Both writings take a rather negative stand on the kingship subject, as can be see by comparing Dt 17.14ff and Hos 3.4; 8.4,10 and 13.11.

[9] Cf. *Ibid.*

[10] Soggin, p. 290 and M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1972), pp. 27ff.

[11] Op. cit., pp. 66f. In particular the outline reflects the structure of a "neo-Assyrian and Aramean treaty pattern" (p. 67). If this is the case, this form would be all the more significant in that Assyria held sway over Palestine during the eighth- and seventh-centuries BCE, when it seems likely that the material within the Deuteronomic Code was developing. Also, we know that Assyria's grip began to weaken in the seventh-century. The rise of renewed Jewish nationalism , for nationalism is a common theme in Deuteronomy, may well explain the Deuteronomist's choice to "rewrite" the nation's treaty by substituting Yahweh for the Assyrian kings.

mid-seventh-century for this material. This tentative relative date will be tested and confirmed later by a parallel analysis of the three law codes.

The Holiness Code (Lev 17–26) presents a greater challenge when attempting to establish a tentative relative date. This is primarily due to the fact that the code has evidently been widely edited in light of the exile experience. [12] This conclusion is arrived at with the support of a number of observations. First, Lev 17, which focuses on the cult, has clear affinities with the Book of Ezekiel. [13] Secondly, this material seems to be attempting to prepare the Israelites for the rise of the "new holy community" and it advises against the repetition of sins which may have contributed to the downfall of the nation, [14] thus drawing its dating closer to the period of the exile. Thirdly, the code's reiterated talk of Israel's uniqueness in comparison to the other nations of the world would support the second point. [15] Fourthly, Wellhausen [16] suggested that the Holiness code reflects the highly developed priestly hierarchy. Of particular importance is the stress placed on the role of the high priest in Leviticus. One final argument, also put forth by Wellhausen, is the difference between the books of Kings and Chronicles with regards to the nature of the cult. Kings, written ca 550 BCE, make little reference to worship in Jerusalem; however, Chronicles, written approximately two hundred years later, depict a very detailed cult which has definite similarities with Leviticus. [17]

There are two points to be made in favour of a pre-exilic date for the Holiness

[12] Cf. G. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1979), p. 9, fn. 7, which lists fifteen OT scholars who have argued for this position. Wenham labels this viewpoint as "The Standard Critical View".
[13] Cf. Weiser, p. 140; J. Porter, *Leviticus* (Cambridge: CUP, 1976), p. 137; Oesterley and Robinson, p. 41 and W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), pp. 44–52.
[14] Porter, p. 135.
[15] See for example 18.15; 19.1–2; 20.1–3,7; chs. 23–4 and 25.38. Such an emphasis fits well with the Fall of Jerusalem, exile and restoration.
[16] *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Cleveland: Meridian, 1957).
[17] Cf. G. Wenham, pp. 9ff for a more detailed summary of Wellhausen's position.

Code. It has been suggested that H is pre-exilic and even predates the Deuteronomic Code because it does not envision a single sanctuary. [13] However, the fact that a single sanctuary is not an issue in the Holiness Code may well point to the fact that a sole location for worship was already a settled issue and therefore presupposed in the Holiness Code. Because it was presupposed there would be no need to deal with it. We would suggest that this matter was resolved in the course of the Josiah reforms and the period immediately following them.

Secondly, it has been proposed that there are certain stylistic and thematic similarities between Deuteronomy, Jeremiah and the Holinesss Code. [19] But at best this observation would make H a contemporary of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. Additionally, those who attempt to defend a pre-exilic date are capable of identifying a *very* limited number of similarities between H and other pre-exilic material. This distinct lack of stylistic and thematic correspondence supports the suggestion that H is not primarily pre-exilic in nature.

In light of the above points, it seems best to conclude tentatively that on the whole the Holiness Code is not as old as the Deuteronomic Code. However, we must recall that these law codes are collections of statutes which originate from different time periods. [20] Having established tentative relative dating for the three codes, as well as Deuteronomy and Leviticus, we must now turn to a closer examination of the three individual ordinances. We will use the above guarded conclusions as to dating and apply these to the individual laws. If they are correct, we should be able to logically account for the change or development

[18] See L.E. Elliot-Binns, "Some Problems of the Holiness Code" *ZAW* 67 (1955), pp. 26–40.
[19] Pfeiffer, p. 129; Soggin, p. 290 and Weinfeld, pp. 27ff. Among these similarities would be the concept of the "circumcised heart".
[20] Cf. Weiser's comment on this: "A systematic arrangement strictly carried through cannot be discovered in the Holiness Law any more than it can in the Book of the Covenant or in Deuteronomy...the whole is no literary unity, but a compilation of different, smaller collections which leads us to assume for its origin a longer process of growth.", p. 140.

in this particular aspect of Jewish law.

2.3 Analysis of the Transformation

As noted in the initial section of this chapter, the scholars' recognition that these three versions of the OT law come from three different strata raises the question of development. The following section is designed to show that the Jewish attitude towards the enslavement of Jews within Israelite society did evolve over the centuries. We also intend to offer explanations for the changes. This particular analysis, if fruitful, will lead onto a search of other Jewish writings which may show that this attitude was present at various points in Jewish history up to and including the first century of the Christian Era.

THREE VERSIONS OF THE LAW

Ex 21.1–6	Dt 15.12–18	Lev 25.39–46
	a. Subject	
[1]Now these are the ordinances which you shall set before them. [2]When you buy a Hebrew slave,	[12]If your brother, a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman, is sold to you,	[39]And if your brother becomes poor beside you, and sells himself to you
	b. His Rights	
		you shall not make him serve as a slave: [40]He shall be with you as a hired servant and as a sojourner.

c. Term of Service

he shall serve six years, and in the seventh he shall go out free, for nothing.	he shall serve you six years, and in the seventh year you shall let him go free from you.	he shall serve with you until the year of the jubilee; [41]then he shall go out from you,

d. Familial Rights

[3]If he comes in single, he shall go out single; if he comes in married, then his wife shall go out with him. [4]If his master gives him a wife and she bears him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's and he shall go out alone.		he and his children with him, and go back to his own family, and return to the possession of his fathers.

e. Departing Gifts

[13]And when you let him go free from you, you shall not let him go empty handed; [14]you shall

furnish him liberally out of your flock, out of your threshing floor, out of your wine press; as the Lord your God has blessed you, you shall give to him.

f. Rationale

[15]You shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God redeemed you; therefore, I command you this today.

[42]For they are my servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as slaves. [43]You shall not rule over him with harshness, but you shall fear your God.

g. Permanent Bondage

[5]But if the slave plainly says, 'I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free,' [6]then his master shall bring him to God, and he shall bring him to

[16]But if he says to you, 'I will not go out from you,' because he loves you and your household since he fares well with you, [17]then you shall take an awl, and thrust it through

[44]As for your male and female slaves whom you may have: you may buy male and female slaves from among the nations that are round about you. [45]You may also buy from among the

the door or the doorpost, and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for life.

his ear into the door, and he shall be your bondman for ever. And to your bondwoman you shall do likewise.

strangers who sojourn with you and their families that are with you, who have been born in your land; and they may be your property. [46]You may bequeath them to your sons after you, to inherit as a possession for ever; you may make slaves of them, but over your brethren the people of Israel you shall not rule, one over another, with harshness.

h. Postscript

[18]It shall not seem hard to you, when you let him go free from you; for at half the cost of a hired servant he has served you six years. So the Lord your God will bless you in all that you do.

Let us first give our attention to the general outline of the three statements (see pages 15–8). Eight elements present themselves in the three laws:

a. First, there is the casuistic statement [21] of the subject with which the passages will deal (Ex 21.1–2a; Dt 15.12a and Lev 25.39a). All three passages deal with the possibility of a person becoming a slave. [22]

b. Leviticus alone (vv.39b–40) next mentions the person's right *not* to be treated as a slave (*ʿbd*) despite the fact that he has sold himself into slavery.

c. Thirdly, all the passages (Ex 21.26; Dt 15.12b and Lev 25.40b–41a) set a limit upon the length of time a person is obligated to serve as a slave.

d. Next, both Exodus (vv.3–4) and Leviticus (v.41b) set standards for the release of the slave's family in connection with his own release.

e. While Deuteronomy does not include this familial rights element, it alone does note the owner's obligation to provide the slave with provisions upon his release.

f. The sixth element, to be found in Deuteronomy (v.15) and Leviticus (vv.42–43), gives a rationale for the laws which had been given above. In each instance the slavery in Egypt and Yahweh's redemption of Israel is the foundation upon which the respective laws are based.

g. All three passages provide for permanent bondage (Ex 21.5–6; Dt 15.16–7 and Lev 25.44–6), but there are very significant shifts of conceptualisation here, which will be dealt with below.

h. Finally, Deuteronomy (v.18) concludes with a postscript rationalising the law on the basis of economic sense and a promise of divine blessing.

This brief survey of the passages reaffirms the generally agreed point that

[21] All three laws begin with *ky* which is characteristic of a law presented in the casuistic form. Cf. A. Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), pp. 88ff.

[22] The question of the possible slave's identity, i.e. whether or not he is an Israelite, will need to be discussed below.

the Book of the Covenant, and in particular the law in Ex 21.1–6, is older than the other two law codes and their parallel statement of the law. As noted above this particular expression of the law has affinities to similar laws found in the Code of Hammurabi and Eshnunna. [23] Additionally, the Exodus version is quite simple in its formulation compared to those in the Deuteronomic and Holiness Codes. It contains only four of the eight elements (subjects, terms of service, familial rights and provision for permanent bondage) which would eventually be associated with this law. This simplicity would certainly indicate an earlier dating in that laws, like other documents, tend to be expanded as they are developed and clarified over a period of time.

Three other items further support this chronological relationship between the Exodus version and the laws in D and H. It is suggested that the Exodus form of the law is very close to the law as it may have stood within the law codes which were formulated in Canaanite society and then assimilated into the Israelite laws after the conquest. [24] The very general nature of the Exodus form of the law, which makes no attempt to distinguish between an Israelite and a non-Israelite slave, lends support to this understanding of the antiquity of Ex 21.1–6. [25] Deuteronomy and Leviticus both attempt to differentiate between purchasing Gentile and Israelite slaves, in that they both refer to the would-be slave as "your brother" (*ʾḥyk*) thus making the distinction between the "in-group" member/Israelite and the "out-group"/Gentile.

A second indication of the Canaanite connection manifests itself in the element dealing with the provision for permanent bondage. In the process of

[23] Cf. p. 11.

[24] On this note of assimilating Canaanite and other Ancient Near Eastern laws see Soggin, pp. 150ff; Pfeiffer, p. 216 and Lemche, pp. 131ff. However, see the word of caution in A. Phillips, "The Laws of Slavery: Exodus 21:2–11" *JSOT* 30 (1984), pp. 54 and 55, about eagerly looking for non-Jewish parallels which in turn are used to interpret the Jewish texts.

[25] See the discussion below regarding the word *ʿbry*. Cf. Childs, *Exodus*, p. 447, textual and philological note on Ex 21.1 and p. 468.

identifying a slave as a permanent member of the master's household, the master, according to the RSV, is to "bring him to God". The Hebrew phrase is not, as we might expect from a firmly Israelite consciousness, *whgyšw ʾdnyw ʾl-yhwh*. Rather the text reads *whgyšw ʾdnyw ʾl-hʾlhym*, "And his lord shall bring him to the gods". This reference to *hʾlhym* is closely connected to the door or doorposts of what would seem to be the household. It seems probable that we should see in this use of *hʾlhym* a reference to the respective master's household deities and not a purely Israelite conceptualisation of Yahwistic monotheism. It should be noted that the later formulation of the law in Deuteronomy omits *hʾlhym* while retaining the mention of the door, thus reflecting a clearer Israelite identity.

The final indication of the age of the Exodus version of the law has briefly been touched upon and is bound up with the use of the word *ʿbry*. In the first half of this century there was a great amount of discussion as to the exact meaning of the word *ʿbry*. [26] Did it refer to an ethnic group (Hebrew/Israelite) or did it refer to a class or stratum within a society? In light of various texts from Nuzi and other places in the ANE, dating from ca 1500 BCE and before, scholars concluded that *ʿbry*, prior to the establishment of the nation of Israel, was the designation for people, regardless of their ethnic origin, belonging to the lower layer of ANE societies. That being the case, the Exodus law which, unlike the D version, does not qualify the term *ʿbry* with *ʾḥyk*, does reflect a very old and general statement of the subject dealing with the poorer classes who were forced to sell their services in times of financial crisis. It is therefore possible to conclude that the oldest law regarding slavery in Israel was a very general one, which made no distinctions on the basis of ethnic or tribal groupings. The one

[26] See for example, E. Chiera, "Hābirū and Hebrews" *AJSLL* XLIX (1932–33), pp. 115–124; E. Speiser, "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millenium B.C." *AASOR* XIII (1931–32), pp. 13ff and J. Lewy, "Hābirū and Hebrews" *HUCA* 14 (1939), pp. 47–58. The debate has continued even into the present time. See the above cited Phillips article, p. 54 and especially footnote 16.

law was designed to regulate all slavery transactions, regardless of the slave's ethnic background.

As we turn to the law in D, we notice a number of significant changes. To suggest that D "changes" the Book of the Covenant law carries with it the implicit notion that D draws upon the former law. This conclusion regarding the relationship between Dt 15.12–8 and Ex 21.1–6 is generally agreed upon.[27] The initial and perhaps most significant alteration is to be found in D's statement of the identity of the would-be slave. As noted above, the identity of the slave is no longer set out with the general term "*ʿbd ʿbry*". Rather, this version refers to the slave as "your brother, a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman" (*ʾḥyk hʿbry ʾw h ʿbryh*). This understanding of the slave as a brother probably helps explain D's omission of the word "master" (*ʾdny*), which is present in Exodus, when dealing with the provision for permanent bondage in vv.16–7. [28] The relationship of brothers is the dominant motif in the slave law of D and it nullifies the roles of "master" and "slave". [29]

---

[27] Cf. Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 107; M. Noth, *Exodus* (London: SCM, 1962), pp. 177–79; C. Carmichael, *The Laws of Deuteronomy* (London: Cornell University Press, 1974), pp. 86ff and Alt, p. 88.

[28] See Weinfeld, p. 283.

[29] In the initial chapter of his book, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy* (Trowbridge: Redwood Burn Ltd., 1984), pp. 19ff, J.G. McConville notes that the theme of "brothers" is a prominent motif in Deuteronomy. This brotherhood theme is not only limited to the slave law. The term *ʾhym* is characteristically used when referring to a fellow Israelite, cf. 1.16; 3.18–20; 10.9; 15.3,7,9,11 etc. Even the most politically influential person in Israelite society, the king, is "One from among your brethren..." (RSV, 17.15) Also, the role of the priest within the cultic celebration is reduced. McConville writes, "Its use, therefore, has a levelling function in Israel. Allied with this is the tendency to speak of Israel as a single whole, and what seems like a deliberate disregard for divisions within the people." (p. 19). While it may be argued, in light of this widespread usage of "brother", that the presence of the word here is due to this overarching concern, we would further note that McConville mentions this recurring theme after another important issue for the Deuteronomist: Yahweh's relationship with the nation, specifically Yahweh's prior action on behalf of Israel and the nation's response (cf. pp. 11ff). This would seem to be *the* overarching concern for the writer of Deuteronomy. A secondary point then would be that he envisaged

Also, it must be noted that the word ᶜ*bry* has shifted in meaning from the way it was used in Exodus. After the establishment of the nation of Israel and several centuries of history, the word came to identify an ethnic group as opposed to a social class. [30] We see evidence of this shift in such passages as Jeremiah 34.8; 1 Sam 4.5ff; 14.1ff and 29.2ff and Jonah 1.9. [31] By the time the Deuteronomist revised the law, Israel's ethnic and national identity had developed and solidified sufficiently for the ᶜ*bry* to be a reference to an Israelite.

This development of Israelite identity explains the presence of two elements which are not found in Exodus: the reason for the law and departing gifts. One cannot over-estimate the importance of the Egyptian bondage and deliverance as a contributing factor for Israelite self-identity. The fact that Passover became an annual celebration for Israel underscores this point. The Deuteronomist

---

Israel as a nation of brothers.

[30] See Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 107; Hyatt, p. 228 and U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), who notes that by Jeremiah's time (ca 650 BCE) "the term Hebrew slave was identical with that of Jewish slave", p. 265. Against this see A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (München: Beck, 1953), Vol. I, pp. 291ff, who suggests that ᶜ*bry* possibly never is used in the OT in reference to Israelites; Lemche follows this suggestion while noting that Alt has a very narrow understanding of ᶜ*bry*, p. 138 and Lewy, "Origin and Significance of the Biblical Term 'Hebrew' " *HUCA* 15 (1940), pp. 48ff, makes the point that Israelites are not to be confused with ᶜ*bry*. As part of his argument, pp. 5–6, Lewy suggests the use of the word in 1 Sam 4.5ff; 14.1ff and 29.2ff is to be understood as referring to a group of non-Israelite mercenaries who have banded together with the Israelites in their struggles against the Philistines. But this suggestion is unfounded. The general context of these passages makes it clear that the word is synonymous with "Israelite". Cf. R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961), p. 83, who sees, "traces of an archaic usage", but believes hābirū refers to an Israelite.

[31] Gen 39.13ff may provide a concise example of where the expression ᶜ*bry* or even ᶜ*bd* ᶜ*bry* has changed meaning. Within the original storyline Joseph, an ᶜ*bd* ᶜ*bry*, is accused of insulting the wife of his master. Originally this expression may well have meant nothing more than a lower class person reduced to slavery. However, as the story would later be told within Israelite circles, Joseph would come to be identified as one of the forefathers of the nation, which eventually was enslaved in Egypt and ultimately released by Yahweh and so he would be seen, in retrospect, as a Hebrew.

draws upon this crucial event in Israel's history and utilizes it as rationale for the alterations to the slave law. The modification from a general law to one dealing with fellow Israelites and their benevolent treatment is the outgrowth of manifest Hebrew nationalism, which developed from the bittersweet memories of former slavery to the goyim and deliverance by and separation to Yahweh, their God. This note of ethnic and national identity is even more pronounced in the H material.

This Egyptian bondage/deliverance motif also helps explain the presence of required departing gifts. The idea of receiving gifts upon manumission is present in the story of the Exodus as well. It certainly seems as though the Deuteronomist is attempting to draw parallels to or model the slave law upon the Exodus story prototype when he notes the owner's obligation to supply generously the out-going slave with provisions, just as the Egyptians gave to the Israelites upon their release. The Hebrew could do no less for his manumitted fellow Israelite than did the Egyptians for his forefathers.

The Exodus story motif emphasis may well contribute to the omission of the slave's familial rights, also. At the Exodus whole families were set free and this aspect of the release was simply presupposed by the Deuteronomist, especially since it was specifically spelled out in the Ex 21 version of the law. Therefore, it was repetitive to mention the slave's right to be released with his family.

The D version closes with the addition of a postscript which is intended to affirm the alterations and make them palatable to the nation. The postscript contains a dual rationale. On a strictly economic plane there is the argument that the law provides for six years of service, equivalent to the cost of a hired servant, for the cost of purchasing the slave. [32] On a spiritual/religious plane

[32] The RSV translates *mšnh* as "at one half". Both Von Rad, *Deuteronomy* , p. 108, and P. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967), p. 239, translate the word as "equivalent to". *Mšnh* is literally "double",

there is the promise of divine blessing for those who comply with this version of the law.

We now turn to the last remaining version of the law. Here the tendency of change which appeared in D is even more pronounced, thus leading to the affirmation that Lev 25.39–46 is the most developed of these laws. The alterations within the H version are very revealing. First, we note the *subject* of the law (a). It deals with the brother (*ʾḥyk*) from among you (*ʿmk*) who becomes poor. [33] This refers to a fellow Israelite and is supported by the rationale for the law which will be dealt with shortly. H even affirms D's alteration of the purchasing process. Whereas Exodus' emphasis was on the master purchasing a slave (*tqnh ʿbd*), without the slave seemingly able to exercise any influence over the transaction, both D and H shift the control of the sale from the buyer to the would-be slave who sells himself, as is indicated by the use of the niph'al form of the verb *mkr*. [34] This shift to emphasize the slave's control over his own

---

but that certainly does not make for a clear presentation of the advantage of having a slave for six years and then releasing him. "One half" is just as confusing in that the price of a given slave would certainly fluctuate, thus making a comparison of price nearly impossible. The suggestion of "equivalent" work of a servant for the "reduced" rate of a purchased slave makes the most sense of an otherwise obscure word.

[33] This description of the fellow-Israelite may well indicate that the H code has a narrower legal situation in mind than either E or D. The mention that the individual has become poor may reflect the attempt to apply this version of the slave law to the issue of debt. On this cf. H. Ellison, "The Hebrew Slave: A Study in Early Israelite Society" *EQ* 45 (1973), pp. 33f; G. Wenham, p. 322 and Patrick, p. 184.

[34] D reads *ky-ymkr* and H has *wnmkkr-lk*. While the niph'al conjugation can be translated either as a passive or a reflexive it is primarily the reflexive of the Qal according to *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898), p. 140. The passive nature of the niph'al is listed as a fourth meaning of this conjugation, after the reflexive, reciprocal and "the meaning of the active, with the addition of *to oneself*" (p. 140). BDB, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 1907), p. 559, translate the niph'al conjugation as a reflexive in Lev 25.39,47,48,50,; Dt 15.12; Jer 34.14 and Ne 5.8 (2x). The NEB and GN translate both Dt 15.12's *ymkr* and Lev 25.39's *wnmkr* as reflexives and the RSV and JB translate *ymkr* as a reflexive and *wnmkr* as a passive.

life arises, I believe, from the now well established religious national identity of Israel, which extended to all Israelites and was based upon the Exodus story.

Leviticus takes this concern for the Hebrew slave's rights a step beyond either the Book of the Covenant or D. In addition to his control over himself as a potential slave, H includes a legal provision regarding the manumitted slave's right to have his family freed with him (v.41b). The endeavour here is to restate explicitly the Israelite's right on this matter which the Book of the Covenant had originally outlined, but which D had omitted.

Further concern for the Israelite reduced to slavery within the H material is the addition regarding the *person's right to a particular status* (b), which is unique to the H version. Whereas Exodus and Deuteronomy assume the individual will serve in the legal capacity of a slave, H strictly forbids the imposition of that status upon a fellow-Israelite (*lᵓ-tᶜbd bw ᶜbdt ᶜbd* v.39b). Rather, the legal status of an Israelite forced to sell his services was that of a "hired servant" (*śkyr*). Such a provision would certainly limit the advantage of owning "slaves" who were Israelites.

This particular concern for the rights of the Hebrew "slave" in Lev 25.39–41 is based upon and illuminated by vv.42–3 (f). Like D, H included a rationale for the law which is set out. Both writings point to the Egyptian bondage/deliverance story; but, whereas D uses this material to justify the addition of departing gifts in particular, H utilizes and alters it as a justification for the radical change in the status of a would-be slave and a reinforcement for the list of special rights. In H, Yahweh is depicted as defending the special treatment of Hebrew "slaves" because "...they are my servants, whom I brought out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as slaves." (v.42: *ky-ᶜbdy hm ᵓšr-hwṣᵓty ᵓtm mᵓrṣ mṣrym lᵓ ymkrw mmkrt ᶜbd*). Here the concept of Israelite national self-identity has developed beyond the D seminal formulation. Here is the full-blown expression

that due to their special relationship to Yahweh, the Israelites are not to be slaves. As Noth points out,

> "In content, there is considerable tension between it (Lev 25:39ff) and the 'slavery laws' of Exodus Ex 21:1–11 and Dt 15:12–18, by which a 'Hebrew' slave was to be set free after six years of service." [35]

Much of this tension is the result of the ideological development within Israel which ultimately concluded that Israelites were to be protected from the humiliation of slavery because of their unique relationship to their national deity.[36] This unique relationship was accorded to each individual Israelite as well as having a corporate function.

Perhaps the most revealing element regarding the shift of attitudes on Israelites serving as slaves is to be found in the H provision for *permanent bondage* (g). It will be remembered that Ex 21.1–6 provided for an Israelite to decide in favour of such a status. But in H slavery, as such, for an Israelite, is outlawed, although it was quite legal to own slaves who were from non-Israelite backgrounds. Not only did Leviticus provide for permanent bondage of a Gentile slave, but a very interesting alteration is evident when one compares H with either Exodus or Deuteronomy. The latter laws strictly limit the duration of permanent bondage to correspond to the lifetime of the master (Ex 21.6 and Dt 15.17). [37] In the Book of the Covenant and in D the master/slave relationship

---

[35] *Leviticus*, p. 192.

[36] D. Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (Cambridge: CUP, 1947), p. 53. sees a similar line of development where the "ancient Hebrew social legislation on redemption" is applied to the case of Egypt and where this case is utilized to provide a basis for the social legislation.

[37] It could be argued, on the presence of ᶜ*wlm* in both Ex 21.6 and Dt 15.17, that these versions did not confine permanent bondage to the master's life time. We would point out that both E and D only direct these versions of the law to the current master. Throughout both versions the relationship envisioned is of a one-to-one nature. Ex 21.5–6 makes no mention of the master's household and only the master is mentioned in v.5, when the slave gives his rationale for requesting permanent bondage. The D version may be seen to be moving one

is limited to the life of the purchaser and the purchased. But Lev 25.45–6 allows the non-Israelite slave to be considered as property (ʾḥzh) and therefore he can be bequeathed to the master's heirs. Here the slave serves all his life while Exodus and Deuteronomy only require that he serve so long as his immediate master lived.

Prior to summarizing the above material mention must be made of the ANE environment. A brief survey of ANE law codes reveals that there was a tendency to create laws protecting one's own ethnic group from enslavement to their peers. W.L. Westermann writes, "Among the pre-Greeks the distinction between the slave and the free man was determined by the concept of 'religious tribalism' which governed the activities of the Oriental peoples." [38] The phenomenon giving rise to this conclusion is the fact that Greeks were not motivated by "polity patriotism"; instead "ruthless logic" led to a 'denationalized' understanding of slavery. [39] Whereas the oriental people attempted to protect their fellow citizens from enslavement, the Greeks freely and without hesitation enslaved other Greeks. [40] While Westermann tends to conflate the various legal texts from the ANE giving a rather distorted image of oriental slavery attitudes, he is correct in stating that there was a tendency among the orientals to protect

---

step beyond this singularly focused one-to-one relationship. Here the slave's rationale supporting his desire for permanent bondage broadens to include a love for his master *and* the master's household (Dt 15.16). But also note that the law is directed solely to the purchasing master and there is *no* mention of the slave being bequeathed to the original master's heirs. However, the H version removes any ambiguity which may have been present in the earlier versions.

[38] P. 43.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[40] Westermann's understanding of the Greeks' lack of conviction against enslaving a fellow Greek would have similar parallels in the Roman world. See R.H. Barrow's *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (London: Methuen and Co., 1968), pp. 2ff. Cf. S. Scott Bartchy, pp. 45ff, where he notes that selling oneself into slavery was questioned in Roman law circles. Still freeborn children could be sold into slavery and "exposed" free born children could be rescued and enslaved. Pirates frequently kidnapped and sold their victims during the chaotic period of the late Republic and early Empire. On this see Barrow, pp. 5ff and Westermann, pp. 63ff.

their own peoples from slavery. [41]

While an air tight case for a general oriental bias against the enslavement of one's own particular ethnic group cannot be formulated on the basis of the ANE law codes, the fact remains that a number of these documents do contain elements pointing in the direction of such a tendency within the ANE environment. For example, the prologue to the law code of Lipit Istar mentions that the prince, for whom the code is named, has

> "*procured*...the [fre]edom of the [so]ns and daughters of [Nippur], the [so]ns and daughters of Ur, the sons and daughters of [I]sin, the [so]ns and daughters of [Sum]er (and) Akkad *upon* whom...slavery *had been* imposed." [42]

The motivation for this liberation did not originate with the liberating prince; rather, the credit is given to the Sumerian god, Enlil. It was Enlil's desire that these people be free. The Sumerian prologue is not as clear as the Hebrew law code's prologue in Exodus 20.1 regarding the national deity's deliverance of his people from bondage; yet, similar motifs are at work in each section. The national deity moves to rescue his people from slavery and in the Pentateuch this rescue serves as the foundation for the anti-slavery attitudes which later developed.

When we turn to Hammurabi's code two items are worth noting. Paragraph 117 reads:

> "If an obligation came due against a seignor and he sold (the services

[41] For example, Westermann states that the Lipit Istar code, which is Sumerian and dates from ca 1975 BCE, "furnishes the explanation of paragraph one hundred and seventeen of the Code of Hammurabi" (p. 43), which is Babylonian and dates from ca 1700 BCE. This tendency to "telescope" chronological and cultural factors is Westermann's greatest shortcoming.

[42] S.N. Kramer's translation in *ANET*, p. 159. Kramer suggests the code comes from the first half of the second millennium BCE.

of) his wife, his son, or his daughter, or he has been bound over to service, they shall work (in) the house of their purchaser or obligee for three years, with their freedom reestablished in the fourth year." [43]

This law has two noteworthy elements. First is the issue of whether or not the individual is bound over to the person to whom he is indebted. As Meek translates the original, the person, as such, is *not* enslaved. The purchaser acquires the individual's "services" but not the individual himself. This law recognizes the right to require services in exchange for debt, but the person seemingly does not give up his freedom. Secondly, the Babylonian law here specifically limits the length of time for which a person can be forced to render these services. By setting a limit of three years, the code of Hammurabi essentially rules out the possibility of permanent "bondage". Both of these elements have rough equivalents in the Torah slave laws. [44]

Paragraph 280 contains the second significant Hammurabic element:

"If a seignor has purchased in a foreign land the male (or) female of a(nother) seignor and when he has arrived home the owner of the male or female slave has identified his male or his female slave, if that male and female slave are natives of the land, their freedom shall be effected without any money (payment)." [45]

In essence this forbids the enslavement of one Babylonian by another Babylonian. It was probably designed to protect the unfortunate citizen who was enslaved via capture in war or kidnapping. As soon as he or she returns to his native land he is to be set free. This freedom is received without compensation to the owner. The Babylonian citizen's right to freedom is more highly valued

[43] T.J. Meek's translation in *ANET*, p. 170. Hammurabi's code dates from ca 1700 BCE.
[44] Regarding the first see Lev 25.39–40. Ex 21.2 and Dt 15.12 touch upon the second.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

than a concern for economic justice. [46]

Finally, the Middle Assyrian law from Tablet C+G, number 3 forbids the act of selling a member of the aristocracy into bondage in another country. [47] If the person who does this is tried and convicted he "shall forfeit his money, he shall give [his equivalent in accordance with his value to] the owner of the property;" he will be flogged and forced to do forty days of labour for the king. If the victim dies in the foreign nation, the one selling him must "compensate with a life". This law did not apply to the rank and file Assyrian.

In light of this material, we can conclude that various peoples of the ANE attempted to codify laws regulating and prohibiting various types of slavery as applied to members of their own ethnic group. While these laws are not uniform, they do reflect a tendency among the ANE peoples to protect their own people from enslavement and Israel seemingly shared this oriental conviction.

Based on the analysis of these three laws, we are on firm ground if we see a general development within a complex social context, which began in the traditional material of Exodus and concluded with the Leviticus version. The tendency of Deuteronomy to alter the Book of the Covenant version in order to protect and ensure a humane treatment of the Hebrew/Israelite slave certainly comes to full expression in Leviticus. There is no good reason to date H's version before the D version, which would thus create a most unusual and unexplainable development in Israel's slave laws, as well as the nation's self-conceptualisaton.

A second conclusion relates to the impetus behind the alterations and is to be found in the developing self-identity of the Israelites. A similar point is made

[46] A Hebrew parallel regarding the taboo of one Jew enslaving another is found in Lev 25.39 and 46.

[47] T.J. Meek's translation in *ANET*, p. 187. Meek says these tablets date from about the twelfth-century BCE. The actual laws may have orginated in the fifteenth-century BCE.

by Van der Ploeg when he writes,

> "The conclusion that a growing consciousness that all Israelites were brothers contributed much to the development of the ideas that a Israelite ought not to be a slave of another one." [48]

It is quite true that the concept of brotherhood is appealed to in the development, but we can push the questioning back further to ask what contributed to this "growing consciousness".

It should not be surprising that the concept of brotherhood appears in the laws at the same time as Israel's Egyptian experience appears. [49] It was the traditions of the severity of the Egyptian bondage and the deliverance which eventually became a central event and motif which contributed to the moulding of Israel's identity. Such momentous occasions and experiences contribute to, forge and are utilised as justifications for the self-conceptualisation of a people.[50] The later slave laws appeal to this earlier experience as a common denominator among the people of Israel. [51] But it is not only the history of bondage

---

[48] P. 82.

[49] See Dt 15.12's use of *ʾḥyk* to identify the would-be slave and v.15's call to remember to Egypt. The same is true of Leviticus where "brother" is mentioned in vv.39 and 46 and the Egyptian experience is noted in v.42. In the Exodus version both concepts are absent.

[50] Cf. C.J.H. Wright's (*Living as the People of God* (Leicester: IVP, 1983), p. 179), "The first and most influential factor in Israel's theological and legal attitude to slavery was her own history. The Israelites never forgot that they started out, in terms of national origin, as a rabble of freed slaves. This in itself is unusual, if not unique, among epics of national origins. Most ethnic myths glorify their nation's ancestral past. Israel, by contrast, looked back to four centuries of slavery in a foreign land, which had become increasingly oppresive, inhumane and unbearable. The experience coloured their subsequent attitude to slavery enormously."

[51] The reason the Exodus version does not employ this motif and it is only present later is due to the nature of the development of the Jewish national identity. It is quite reasonable to accept that "the conquest" of Palestine was in fact a long, drawn-out affair as G. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine" *BA* 35 (1962), pp. 66–87, and others, have argued. If the establishment of the nation did depend as much on "conversion" as it did military

which moulded and articulated this identity and altered the laws of slavery. The Exodus eventually came to be viewed as "the beginning" of the nation. It is here that the nation of Israel, God's special people, began to develop and later came into existence. Once Israel's national identity was clearly established it would certainly have contributed to the belief that a fellow Israelite was unique and even to be seen as Yahweh's personal slave. [52] Therefore, the individual Israelite was not to be considered as a mere slave of any fellow Israelite. This tying together of the bitter tradition of Egyptian bondage and the glory of being a unique and divinely established nation eventually became so ingrained and firm within Israel's mentality and self-understanding that the slave laws would have to change. Jewish nationalism would not allow the Book of the Covenant version to stand unaltered.

A third conclusion which may be drawn from the comparison is that the role of slave and the function of servanthood was not held in high esteem by significant segments of Israelite society. Not only would the dichotomy of "former Egyptian slaves" / "now elect people of Yahweh" have contributed to the concern that Israelites not enslave one another, but equally important would be the idea that an Israelite was not to be reduced to this status at all. The Egyptian bondage eventually became so negatively embedded in the corporate self-consciousness of Israel that the mere thought of an Israelite becoming a slave was simply

---

conquest then the Israelite identity had to be in a state of flux for a considerably long period. For example, as late as Joshua 23, where Joshua is portrayed as an old man, there still remain tribes and ethnic groups which need to be "conquered". With new groups being added or the potential addition of tribes, Israel's national identity was fundamentally unsettled. It is only after a number of generations and the rise of the monarchy that Israel's self-identity solidified and the Exodus motif could be firmly applied, as fulfilled, to all "Israelites". Since the Exodus 21 version pre-dates these developments and hails from the period of uncertainty as to national identity, therefore the Exodus/nation motif is not present. It appears once the nation is established and "new tribes" have *not* been incorporated into the nation for a number of generations.

[52] Cf. Lev 25.42's "For they are my servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt;..." The Hebrew word used for servants is *ʿbd*.

unacceptable. [53] Not only was it unacceptable for one Israelite to own another, it was particularly heinous for one Israelite to kidnap and enslave or sell the victim into slavery. This type of activity was considered a capital offense and the perpetrator was to be executed. [54] But it was quite another matter for Israelites to own Gentile slaves, as we have seen in the H version of the law. Slavery and servanthood suited the non-Israelite, the pagan, the person who did not belong to the elect people of Yahweh. Slavery and servanthood did not suit Israel. Israel's only obligation of service was to Yahweh.

Finally, we must conclude that this antipathy of enslaving fellow Jews was not limited to Israelite society. Various ANE law codes reveal that the attempt to prohibit the intra-societal enslavement of the dominant ethnic group was common in the Orient. With regards to slavery, Israelite law shares a number of themes, such as the national deity's liberation of the ethnic group from slavery, strict limitations upon the duration of service and a distinction between being enslaved and requiring service to offset personal debts, with other ANE cultures.

2.4 Jewish Literature from the Exile to the First Century CE

Having identified these alterations, which became established around the sixth-century BCE, we must ask if the ideals and attitudes persisted beyond that

[53] This is not to say that Israelites were never reduced to this position. Most certainly Israelites were enslaved after any one of the many successful Gentile invasions of Palestine. Here the prisoner of war would either be put to death or sold into slavery.

[54] Dt 24.7. Cf. the earlier Ex 21.16 (the Book of the Covenant) version of this law. Ex 21.16 proscribes the death penalty for anyone who kidnaps *any* individual with the intention of enslaving that person. However, the later D version qualifies the victim's identity by substituting the words "one of his brothers, one of the sons of Israel" for the general noun "man". The crime and punishment in each case are the same, but the identity of the victim shifts significantly to protect the Israelite. This alteration parallels and echos the similar changes observed between the Book of the Covenant and D versions of the primary law with which we deal.

time. There is evidence that Israelites continued to harbour anti-Jewish slavery sentiments into the first century CE. However, the earlier study was primarily concerned with *intra*-societal enslavement of Jews, the following material tends to focus on *inter*-societal or *inter*-cultural enslavement of Jews. That is to say the following texts are primarily concerned with incidents where Jews are enslaved by non-Jews. As we will see, in the brief representative survey which follows, the strong anti-Jewish enslavement attitudes are transposed to this new configuration of involved parties. It is also true that the earlier theological motif of religious nationalism continues to provide a strong foundation for this bias.

Four bodies of literature serve as the sources for the next level of investigation: the OT, the Septuagint, Josephus and Philo. [55] While a survey of Hatch and Redpath [56] reveals that the words δοῦλος and δουλεύειν are mostly used to convey the diverse OT usage and meaning associated with ᶜ*bd* [57], a number of pertinent passages come to light. These include Ne 5.1–13; Joel 3.4–8 (RSV); 1 Macc 5.9ff and Judith 7.19–32. Also, the LXX version of Jer 17 provides an interesting omission which is related to this investigation. Rengstorf's concordance to Josephus's works [58] offers two primary passages: *Ant.* XVI, 1–5 and *War* III, 350–60.

Ne 5.1–13 testifies to at least one difficulty facing the Jews who returned

---

[55] Pseudepigraphal literature has not been dealt with for various reasons. We are primarily interested in "main stream" Jewish thought. This type of thinking is most clearly represented by the above cited bodies of literature, while the Pseudepigrapha, by and large, tend to reflect sectarian thinking. Much pseudepigraphal literature is surrounded by controversies which do not relate to our thesis and would only tend to lead us astray.

[56] *Concordance to the Septuagint* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892).

[57] See pp. 5ff above, which deal with Zimmerli's categories and usage of ᶜ*bd* in the OT. Examples of the diverse use of δοῦλος include: reference to the prophets - Am 3.7 and Zech 1.16; the patriarchs - 2 Macc 1.2; Moses - Ne 9.14, Mal 3.22 (RSV 4.4); Israel - Jer 2.14; believers before Yahweh - Ne 1.6, 2.20; Wis 9.5; David - Ezek 34.23; 37.24 and 1 Macc 4.30 and court settings - Jud 5.5.

[58] *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

to Palestine from the captivity in Babylon: severe economic hardship. [59] The opening verses suggest that food shortages resulted in inflated prices which in turn led to many people mortgaging their land or children in order to borrow money for food. Others were overburdened by royal taxation and this resulted in a similar financial dilemma. [60] The basic issue seems to be the undesirable situation, produced by economic difficulties, of Jews being forced to dispose of property and sell their children to fellow Jews in order to resolve their financial problems.

As the story is recounted, the oppressed Jews confronted Nehemiah with this problem. The situation is depicted as a split between Jews reduced to poverty and those who were financially solvent and able to lend funds to the poorer Jews (v.1). The poor Jews' *sole* argument defending their petition for justice is that all Jews are brothers and no Jews should have to sell their children in order to resolve financial difficulties. [61] As the story is told, Nehemiah immediately accepts this argument (v.7). He further reasons with the leaders of the reconstituted nation by suggesting that in light of Jewish willingness to redeem Jews in the clutches of Gentile moneylenders so also Jews ensnared by Jewish moneylenders should be redeemed (v.8). Nehemiah, who is involved in lending money, suggests that these debts be cancelled (vv.10f) and his proposal is accepted (vv.12f).

The significant evidence to be gleaned from this passage is the dilemma and

[59] See D.J.A. Clines, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), pp. 165ff and L.H. Brockington, *Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther* (London: Oliphants, 1977), pp. 122ff.

[60] So argues Clines, p. 165. Cf. Brockington, pp. 122–23, who suggests these initial verses can be interpreted in two ways: A: 1) there was an extreme shortage of food (v.2); 2) land and houses were mortgaged for food (v.3); 3) children were sold to pay the king's tax on fields (vv.4–5) or B: 1) children were given as pledges for food (v.2); 2) property mortgaged for food (v.3) and 3) fields mortgaged to pay the king's taxes (v.4). Verse 5 now is a summary of all three complaints. At any rate, the enslavement of Jews is a central issue in this situation.

[61] See Clines, p. 166.

argument offered to defend a resolution of the problem. The unpalatable problem is a loss of property and the enslavement of Jewish children. The rationale for resolving this social crisis, which Nehemiah accepts without argument and even supplements along similar lines, is that all Jews are brothers and none should be forced into such a situation. V.5 focuses specifically on the enslavement issue. The basic line of argument is that all Jewish children are brothers and no Jewish child should be enslaved to a fellow Jew. Here, in the post-exilic period, we see an intermingling of the anti-Jewish slavery and national brotherhood concepts. Because all Jews are brothers they do not enslave one another, even if a harsh economic situation may justify such activities.

From approximately 300 BCE we come across a very interesting and pertinent passage in Joel 3.4–8 (RSV). These verses contain an oracle "addressed" to the cities of Tyre and Sidon and the region of Philistia. The subject of the oracle is a promised divine requital due to the addressees' dealings with Israel. In addition to carrying off silver and gold, the Philistines, "...sold the people of Judah and Jerusalem to the Greeks, removing them far from their own border." (3.6, in the Hebrew text it is 4.6: *wbny yhwdh wbny yrwšlm mkrtm lbny hywnym lmᶜn hrḥyqm mᶜl gbwlm*). Smith, Ward and Brewer [62] suggest that the historical foundation for this oracle is to be found in the events around 350 BCE when Persian troops sold their war captives to the Philistines, who were well-known slave-traders. [63] It is evident from the passage that this activity by the Philistines was not acceptable to the Israelites. The fact of being sold as a slave was compounded by the fact that the Israelite was physically removed from the nation of his origin,

[62] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 130.

[63] Cf. Amos 1.6,9; Ezek 27.13; Homer, *Odyssey* 14:288ff; 15:402ff and Herodotus, I,1; II,54. According to 1 Macc 3.38–41 (cf. 2 Macc 8.11) the same people were involved in the same business endeavours around 165–160 BCE. During the rule of Judas Maccabaeus, Gorgias and Nicanor invaded Judea with the intention of devasting the country. Among those who followed the invading armies, with the intention of acquiring Israelite slaves, were Idumaeans and people from the area of Philistia.

which is evidenced by v.6's "Removing them far from their own border." The chances of an Israelite returning to Palestine from these distant Greek nations was quite unlikely and this compounded the heinousness of the act. [64] The divine judgment passed on the slave-traders of Tyre and Sidon is that they will be sold by the Hebrews to the Sabeans, who were Arab slave merchants.

I believe that these verses clearly reflect the Hebrew conviction that Israelites were not to be subjected to the humiliation of slavery. The use of a divine oracle to promise the fulfilment of judgement for the violation of this conviction carries forward the idea. Yahweh, Israel's national deity, will save the land and vindicate *his* people just as they were vindicated after the Egyptian bondage. [65] The additional note of separation from the borders of Israel would reinforce the belief that this anti-slavery concern was bound together with an zealous nationalism, be it cultural, religious, political or a combination thereof.

Tentative support for our investigation is found in the second century BCE Greek text of Jer 17. [66] The Hebrew text of this chapter contains four opening verses which speak of Judah's sins, which Yahweh is holding against the nation (vv.1–2). The punishment for these transgressions includes the handing over of

[64] J. Watts, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum and Zephaniah* (Cambridge: CUP, 1975), p. 45, identifies the Philistines' "crime" as involving this geographical removal of the Israelites "from the cultural and religious influence of Israel". He is quite right in this being a portion of the "crime"; yet, I believe he misses an equally significant motif by overlooking the belief that a Hebrew ought never be enslaved. The importance of the enslavement motif is further underlined by the pronounced divine judgement against the Philistines: they in turn will be sold as slaves to a distant nation. The two themes of enslavement and deportation are firmly linked in this oracle.

[65] That this prophetic book is concerned with the state of the nation is evidenced by repeated references to the land being endangered, the nations threathening the people of Israel and Yahweh's eventual vindication of the people and the nation. Cf., among others, 1.6–7; 2.1–2, 26–7 and 3.1–3 (RSV).

[66] This material is offered as "tentative support" due to the complex nature of the LXX version of Jeremiah and the hotly debated issues surrounding this text. For a summary of recent debate see S. Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985) JSOT Supp. Series 47.

Jewish treasures to plunderers, a relinquishing of Jewish heritage and *enslavement* to their enemies in an unknown country. [67] However, these verses are absent in the LXX, which begins with the equivalent to v.5 of the Hebrew text. [68]

The "missing" verses in the Greek text can be explained in one of three ways. The absence may be due to haplography. J. Gerald Janzen [69] suggests, in passing, that these verses are missing due to such an error. The mistake would have resulted by a scribe's eye jumping from 16.21's to 17.5's use of *yhwh*. Secondly, one might argue that the Hebrew text of Jer 17.1–4 was not present when the original Greek translation was made and these verses appeared only later. However, such an explanation runs totally counter to what we see developing within Jewish circles. These verses in the Hebrew text are totally out of step with the anti-Jewish slavery bias. They completely reject the intertwining of the themes of Israel's national election status and the belief that Jews were not to be enslaved. It may be that we have evidence of a minority opinion in these verses; but, it is unlikely that they would have been added to the Hebrew text after the second century BCE. This is especially true in light of the later intensification of the anti-slavery bias which is present in the first century CE. The third option is to argue that these verses were intentionally omitted by the translator(s) due to the controversial nature of the subject. The punishment noted in vv.3–4 clearly runs against the opinion that Jews were slaves only to Yahweh and not to be enslaved to anyone else. The material which follows shows that this attitude later hardened with respect to Jews enslaved to non-Jews. It is possible that this negative attitude was sufficiently widespread that

---

[67] Of key importance for our thesis is the phrase: " *wh*ʿ *bdtyk* ʾ*t*-ʾ *ybyk bb*ʾ *r*ṣ ʾ *šr* ʾ-*yd*ʿ *t*".

[68] See J. Ziegler, ed. *Septuaginta*, Vol. 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 175 and A. Rahlfs, ed. *Septuginta*, Vol. II (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935), p. 683.

[69] *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 117.

the translator(s) of Jer 17.1–4 (or later copyists) decided to omit these sentences in his recension of Jer 17. The only plausible explanations for the absence of vv.1–4 in the LXX is scribal error or intentional omission due to the subject matter. The former does not damage our investigation and the latter supports it.

Approximately two hundred years later the same ideas were recorded in I Maccabees. [70] Of particular interest is the fifth chapter, which is devoted to the recording of various conflicts in which Israel was embroiled under the leadership of Judas (d. 161 BCE). Verses 9ff relate the story of Israelites who were living in Gilead and Galilee and were subjected to harsh treatment by their Gentile neighbours. In addition to murder and pillage, the Israelite women and children of Gilead, in particular, [71] were taken into captivity, i.e. enslaved. These Israelites in Gilead and Galilee sent word to Judas and his brothers begging to be rescued. The Maccabean response was to organize a large meeting to consider the proper course of action. The final decision was to organize two expeditions (one to Galilee under Simon's leadership and a second led by Judas and Jonathan to Gilead) to emancipate the Israelites as they had requested.

The obvious motivation for the Maccabean reprisals was the request made by their fellow Jews, in light of the harsh treatment with which their Gentile neighbours were dealing with them. But it should be noted that listed among the transgressions which led to the retaliations was the fact that Israelites were taken into captivity, which meant nothing other than that they were enslaved. Additionally, one must point out that this enslavement took place in Gilead and no such captivity was mentioned in the report from Galilee. But once Simon routed the troublemakers there, he is reported to have taken "the Jews of

[70] J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (Garden City: Double & Company, Inc., 1976), suggests that 1 Maccabees was written sometime during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE), pp. 62–3.
[71] 1 Macc 5.13.

Galilee and Arbatha, with their wives and children and all their possessions, and brought them into Judaea with great rejoicing." (v.23). There can be no doubt that 1 Maccabees overstates the case regarding the evacuation of Israelites from Galilee; but, it is interesting that Simon attempted to prevent a reoccurrence of the Gilead events, namely murder, pillage and the enslavement of Jewish women and children. Behind this preventative measure lies the Hebrew hostility to the idea of Israelites being enslaved.

One passage, Judith 7.9–32 (ca 100 BCE), may be seen as running counter to the thesis which has been argued. In the seventh chapter of Judith we find the scene of the Jews of Bethulia under siege by the Assyrians. After thirty-four days of siege, the situation at Bethulia became desperate. Water was in short supply and the people began to give serious consideration to surrender. They recognized that surrender at this point would result in enslavement to the Assyrians (v.27). However, it is argued that slavery was preferable to death, especially the death of the women and children.

A number of observations offset any suggestion that this passage is indicative of a ready willingness to accept enslavement at the time in which it was written. First, note must be made of the dire situation in which the Jews found themselves. They have but two options: *surrender*, which will result in slavery or *death*. The characters are depicted as favouring the "lesser of two evils". As we will see below, in the first century CE this acceptance of slavery as preferable to death was rejected by a particular stream of Jewish thought.

Secondly, there is the fact that the Jews are willing to accept slavery *only* after the formula "Yahweh has elected Israel, we are his slaves and therefore no one else's slaves" is seen to be in serious doubt or no longer valid. The present situation had convinced the majority of the trapped Jews that God had abandoned them and delivered them into their enemies hands (v.25). It is

only then that they accept the possibility of enslavement. That this resignation and breaking of the formula led to their decision is supported by their leader's response to their petition for surrender (vv.30f). Uzziah is *not* convinced that Yahweh has abandoned them and therefore refuses to surrender the city. Because he still believed in the unique relationship between Yahweh and the Jews, he refused to accept surrender and enslavement as a solution to the dilemma.

This passage shows that, at the time of its writing, slavery was seen as an option of last resort. It was occasionally preferred only to death itself. So long as the Jews could find evidence supporting the formula which accorded themselves a special relationship with Yahweh, they refused to accept slavery as a viable option, even in the most dire of circumstances. [72]

The final piece of intertestamental evidence is located in 2 Macc 1.24–29 (ca mid-first century BCE). This book was written to Alexandrian Jews so as to inform them of various dangers facing the Temple in Jerusalem. The verses with which we are concerned are a recounting of a prayer supposedly uttered by Nehemiah and the Jewish congregation at the rekindling of the sacrifical fires in Jerusalem. The prayer is reconstructed as follows:

> "Lord, Lord God, creator of all things, dreadful, strong, just, merciful, the only king and benefactor, the only provider, who alone are just, almighty and everlasting, the deliverer of Israel from every evil, who made our fathers your chosen ones, and sanctified them, accept this sacrifice on behalf of all your people Israel, and protect your heritage and consecrate it. Bring together those of us who are dispersed, set free those in slavery

[72] It is worth noting that once the Jews were delivered by Judith a song of praise is offered to Yahweh (ch. 16). Vv.13–7 of this song are of particular interest for here the Jewish hope is expressed that all creation, not merely the Jews, would serve Yahweh, (v.14's "σοὶ δουλευσάτω πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις σου) and the nations which would rise up against Israel are warned that Yahweh will punish them for such activity (v.17's "οὐαὶ ἐθνεσιν ἐπανιστανομένοις τῷ γένει μου· κύριος παντοκράτωρ ἐκδικήσει αὐτοὺς ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως..."). Again we see the intermingling of the themes, admittedly somewhat extended in this instance, of Yahweh's worthiness as a master and Israel's unique relationship to Yahweh.

among the heathen (ἐλευθέρωσον τοὺς δουλεύοντας ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), look favourably on those held in contempt or abhorrence, and let the heathen know that you are our God. Punish those who oppress us and affront us by their insolence, and plant your people firmly in your Holy Place, as Moses promised." (JB)

Despite the apocryphal story of the sacrifical fire turned to liquid and back again upon the return of Nehemiah and the questions which are raised regarding the actual historical setting for the prayer, these verses do point out that even a part of post-exilic spirituality may well have focused on this issue of the enslavement of Jews. Whether we accept this prayer as a recollection of a prayer offered by Nehemiah or a reflection of the writer's contemporary concern and situation, the fact remains that a number of the key issues repeatedly cited are once again found in relationship with each other and in this instance found within the larger context of Jewish piety. The prayer recalls Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from "every evil" and Yahweh's call and election of the patriarchs (v.25). It focuses on the land/nation asking that the diaspora Jews may be brought home to it (v.27). There is a petition for the release of Jews enslaved (v.27). Vindication of the despised and proof of Israel's unique relationship to Yahweh is requested (v.27, cf. v.26's talk of God protecting his "heritage"/"μερίδα").

This passage is helpful in that it shows this concern over the enslavement of Jews as not being merely an issue that was limited to what would now be regarded as the secular arena of Jewish life. The topic spilled over into the realm of pious activity and the devotional life of the nation. Free Palestinian Jews prayed for the release of their enslaved fellows. They reminded their national deity of their unique relationship and his promises to them. They asked that all Jews might be returned to the land which Yahweh pledged to them.

As we turn to Josephus' works, we find a particularly illuminating passage in *Ant.* XVI, 1–5. Josephus' overall picture of Herod the Great is quite unflattering

and the first few lines of Book XVI reinforces this negative image. In an attempt to curb theft in Palestine, Herod introduced what Josephus and his contemporaries saw as a harsh and religiously offensive law. The thief was to "be sold (into slavery) and deported from the kingdom." [73] Among the objections to this legal innovation, above and beyond the fact that it blatantly ignored the earlier laws, [74] is the following:

> "For to be enslaved to foreigners and to those who did not have the same manner of life (as the Jews) and to be compelled to do whatever such men might command was an offence against religion rather than a punishment of those who were caught..." (XVI, 2).

As a result, Herod's contemporaries saw this law as "severe" (χαλεπὴν), a result of his arrogance, the act of a tyrant and an expression of contempt for them, his subjects. Josephus closes this paragraph by noting that this action, which was not out of character for Herod, contributed to his unpopularity among the Jews.

The rationale for the objection to the law of Herod is very illustrative. The alteration of the earlier laws, seemingly, was not as offensive as the fact that this law would result in the bondage of Israelites to Gentiles and the geographic separation from Palestine and its religious customs. The Herodian offense is quite akin to that of the Philistines mentioned in Joel 3.4–8. The combination of enslavement to Gentiles and separation from the nation, which was evident earlier in Israelite thought, is present in this passage. Equally evident is the strong negative Israelite reaction to the possibility of such humiliations being inflicted upon an Israelite.

These same emotive negative reactions to Israelites being enslaved by Gen-

[73] *Ant.* XVI, 1.
[74] Such as the legal code elements limiting bondage to six years and not being sold to Gentiles. See *Ant.* XVI, 3.

tiles, and in particular Romans, are present elsewhere in Josephus. For example, in *War* III, 350–60, the Israelites are described as responding to Josephus' surrender to Rome as accepting "slavery" coupled with an act of national disgrace. Similar attitudes are present in those passages where the Jews are portrayed as preferring death and war to enslavement. [75] Of particular interest, especially in light of the paraenetic tradition of Jesus' saying, "If anyone would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all" and his position on the payment of tribute to Rome, are two other passages from Josephus' writings. In *War* VII, 323, Josephus paraphrases the speech by a rebel leader, Eleazar, so as to read, "long since, my brave men, we determined neither to serve (δουλεύειν) the Romans nor any other save God, for He alone is man's true and righteous Lord;...". And according to *Ant.* XVIII, 1, the census carried out by Quirinius (6 CE) was viewed as carrying "with it a status amounting to downright slavery,...". Judas the Gaulanite and Saddok the Pharisee, used this line of argument to rouse the people's emotions and sense of patriotism and this eventually led to rebellion.

This material is clear evidence that in the first century of the Christian Era there was a widely held opinion among Jews that they were not to be reduced to the position and role of slaves. This basic attitude was intensified and aggravated by the harsh realities of the international politics in which Israel was embroiled. After Pompey's invasion and conquest of Palestine not only were individual Israelites enslaved as a result of defeat in war and carried off to Rome, but the whole population of Israel and even the land itself was reduced to a servile status. Israel's resources were extracted and utilised by Rome for its own benefit and advancement. Once entrenched in such a servile relationship, the Jews would repeatedly attempt to free themselves and their nation. The ultimate result was not national manumission; instead, the end result was national destruction. A major factor in this catastrophe was this anti-slavery attitude held by significant sections of the Jewish community in Palestine.

[75] See *War* IV, 394; V, 321 and VI, 42.

Finally one particular passage in Philo relates closely to this question of Jewish attitudes toward slavery. In his description of the Essenes, Philo makes reference to their anti-slavery thinking. The following sentence is most revealing:

> "Not a single slave is to be found among them, but all are free, exchanging services with each other, and they denounce the owners of slaves, not merely for their injustice in outraging the law of equality, but also for their impiety in annulling the statute of Nature, who mother-like has born and reared all men alike, and created them genuine brothers, not in mere name, but in very reality, though this kinship has been put to confusion by the triumph of malignant covetousness, which has wrought estrangement instead of affinity and enmity instead of friendship." [76]

This passage is interesting in that it clearly depicts one segment of Palestinian society totally rejecting slavery and not merely the enslavement of Jews. In addition to basing their rejection on "revealed" theology, [77] the Essenes also, according to Philo, appealed to natural theology, arguing that nature creates all men equal. It also seems as though the Essenes would have argued that slavery was a result of breaking the tenth commandment. [78]

This brief survey of the scattered evidence relating to the so called 'intertestamental period' is sufficient to confirm that the Jewish bias against the enslavement of Jews persisted into the first century of the Christian Era. This is supported by Safrai and Stern's suggestion that during the last century of the Second Temple period, "it is quite evident that Jewish slaves were not common. ...we have no concrete example of a Jewish slave." [79] This conspicuous

---

[76] *Every Good Man is Free*, 79. On this note of the Essene anti-slavery position, cf. *Hypothetica* 11.4 and *Ant.* XVIII, 21.

[77] The reference to "the law of equality" is possibly a reference to the Lev 25 version of the slave law, which employs such an argument.

[78] See Ex 20.17.

[79] *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* Vol. II (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976), p. 629. Despite this lack of "concrete" evidence, Philo, *On the Virtues*, 121ff, offers the following interesting note: "As for the debtors, who through temporary loans have sunk into bearing both the name and the painfulness which their cruel situation [slavery] entails, and those whom a more

absence was in part due to the disadvantage of having Jewish slaves since the Torah had endowed them with important rights. [80] Israel had its own ideas regarding slavery and these attitudes rather successfully spared the overwhelming majority of Palestinian Jews the humiliation of enslavement, at least to their fellow Jews. Various authors point out that in the Second Commonwealth period debt, which in former times was probably the major factor which led to enslavement, was no longer punished by enslavement; rather, the standard punishment became imprisonment. [81] The reason Herod elected to sell housebreakers to persons outside Judaea may well have been due to the absence of a "market" for such slaves within the country, which was the result of the above cited firm convictions. The above illustrations clearly indicate that the Israelite self-understanding which was built upon religious nationalism and resulted in an opposition to any enslavement of Israelites and which came into its original full expression in Lev 25.39ff, continued to be maintained into the first century of the Christian Era. At some points we merely recognised the negative attitude towards the institution of slavery and the value of persons reduced to that role in life. At other places the two themes of nationalism and the heinousness of an Israelite forced to be a slave are still firmly connected.

---

imperious compulsion has brought from freedom into slavery, he [God] would not allow them to remain for ever in their evil plight, but gave them total remission in the seventh year." It may be inferred that, in Philo's time, some Jews were enslaved. However, it must be noted that the institution is seen to be "cruel". Philo suggests that there are strict limitations to how long one could be enslaved and seemingly only debtors were subject to enslavement. These observations conform to our thesis that a Jewish bias against slavery persisted into the first century CE.

[80] But Safrai and Stern do not clearly indicate Lev 25.39–46 as being the legislation which granted the special rights to Jewish slaves. Elsewhere in their work there seems to be a similar oversight when in Vol. I, p. 511 the claim is made that Israelites were considered as hired servants, but no legislative reference is cited. The editors go on to conflate this element with the provision for sabbatical freedom for a "Hebrew bondman" and then cite Ex 21.2–11 as the judical basis. This certainly is not the case for as one can see Ex 21.2–11 does not mention the Jubilee.

[81] Cf. S. Zeitlin, pp. 194ff and E.E. Urbach, pp. 4–5.

2.5 Conclusion

We have observed that there has been a definite development in the Old Testament laws regarding the possession of slaves. The change moves from a very general position, which accepts the enslavement of both Jew and Gentile, to specific guidelines, which undercut the enslavement of Jews and firmly legalise permanent bondage of Gentiles. We also noted that a major motif which supported and justified the development was the theological idea of the Exodus and its attending concept of nationalism. Ultimately, Israelites came to believe that they should not be slaves because of their unique relationship with Yahweh. Furthermore, there is evidence that this thinking continued and was widespread in the first century of the Christian Era. And we saw both the themes of an anti-slavery bias and Jewish nationalism intertwined in this period. Thus the context has been established within which we can pose the question: What was Jesus' attitude to this strongly nationalist anti-slavery attitude? We turn to this issue in chapters three and four.

Chapter Three:
Religious Nationalism and Jesus

3.1 Introduction

In chapter two, it was argued that a strong anti-slavery bias was evidenced through various periods of Jewish thought, including the first century CE. It was also noted that this particular bias was strongly tied to ideas of religious nationalism. According to Josephus these two thoughts intermingled in the thinking of Jews like Judas the Gaulanite, Saddok the Pharisee and Eleazar. [1]

A major issue facing first century CE Palestinian Jews was the fact that Yahweh's elect nation had been overrun and subjugated by Gentiles. The Josephus materials cited in the previous chapter, along with the catastrophic events from the latter half of the first century CE and the earlier part of the second century CE, show that one response to Roman domination was militant Jewish nationalism. Various people who viewed Roman occupation as enslavement also determined that the Jewish nation must be set free from the Roman grasp.

Our primary focus continues to be the question of Jewish attitudes towards slavery and in particular Jesus' point of view on this topic. But since the anti-slavery bias was so clearly intertwined with Jewish nationalism, a short examination of Jesus' attitude to the broader issue of nationalistic feeling among Palestinian Jews in is order. Prior to turning to the evidence relating to Jesus' response to the slavery issue, we will briefly look at the most important texts touching upon the theme of Jewish religious nationalism.

[1] The two most relevant passages in Josephus are *War* VII, 323 and *Ant.* XVIII, 1. From Philo we need simply note that he draws his readers' attention to the Essene attitude towards slavery. This group not only rejected the enslavement of Jews; but, slavery itself was abhorred by the Essenes. See *Every Good Man is Free* 79 and *Hypothetica* 11.4.

3.2 Freyne's View of Galilee

An initial question needs to focus on the general Galilean response to Roman occupation. Were Galileans, generally speaking, to be viewed as avid religious nationalists? How did they respond to Roman rule? These questions must be asked because the environment in which Jesus grew up would certainly have had some influence upon his thinking as an adult. Therefore, what general background picture of Galilee and its response to Roman rule is available?

In the past, it has been assumed that Galilee was a centre of anti-Roman and revolutionary activity. [2] This opinion seems to be based primarily on Josephus' willingness to portray Galilee as such a centre. However, recently, such an assumption regarding Galilee has been challenged by Seán Freyne. [3]

Freyne concludes that, while Galilee certainly was not uninfluenced by the general discontentment with Roman rule, little of the volatile emotional reactions which were evident in Judaea came to expression there. [4] The material of Freyne's sixth chapter supports his general theory that the Galilean ethos was primarily "peasant" in nature. The isolated and unrelated violent outbursts against Sepphoris, Tiberias or Agrippa appear to have been unplanned emotional actions which lacked an ideological framework. This is due, in part, to the fact that is "is difficult to convince peasants that the whole world and not just their own village or lot can be changed". [5] A peasant is more likely to opt for a cautious approach to preserving loyalty to traditions, in the face of

[2] See, for example, M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (Leiden: Brill, 1961), pp. 57ff; S.F.G. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (Manchester: University Press, 1967), p. 54; G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London: Collins, 1973), pp. 46ff and G. Theißen, *Sociology*, pp. 61ff.

[3] *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980), especially chapter six, "How Revolutionary was Galilee?", pp. 208ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 245–46.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

foreign domination, than to cast his lot with a revolutionary movement. Freyne concludes that the Galileans did not see Roman rule and culture as the same intense threat to their unique manner of life and religious national identity as did the Judean Jews.

Reference is made to Freyne's socio-political sketch primarily as a counter view to the general assumption that Galilee was a first century CE centre for widespread revolutionary activity. In recent years, scholars have come to recognize the diverse nature of Judaism in the first century of the Christian Era. The socio-political opinion of Galilean Jews very probably reflected a similar diversity. A crucial question for our thesis is with which of these streams of thought would Jesus have most closely identified. In particular, did Jesus reject the thinking of those Jews who could be labelled as 'religious nationalists'? If he did so, we would expect a rejection of anti-Roman sentiment and hints of the simultaneous possibility of being a faithful Jew and Roman subject. There is very little material which bears directly on the issue thus posed, [6] and the larger issue has been throughly examined by others, [7] so we need not go into

[6] Admittedly, there are pericopes, like Mk 7.24–30 (par. Mt 15.21–28) or Mt 10.5–15, which could be used to argue that Jesus was in sympathy with the nationalistic sentiments. Yet, I believe, they are the exceptions to the norm. It should be noted that Matthew, the most "Jewish" of the Gospels, incorporates both of these pericopes while Luke, the most "universal" of the Gospels, refrains from using Mk 7.24ff, and the mission of the seventy, unlike Mt 10.5ff, is seen as unrestricted (Lk 10.1ff). Also, it is curious that Matthew's Gospel includes a number of the anti-religious nationalism sayings of Jesus. What we have behind Matthew then is a community which is in the process of altering its own attitudes on this issue. Also, one might refer to S.G.F. Brandon's suggestion that the "two swords" saying (Lk 22.35–8) (*Jesus*, pp. 203, fn. 3 and 340f, fn. 7) and the presence of Simon the Zealot among Jesus' disciples (Lk 6.15) (*Jesus*, pp. 16, 42f and 316) would indicate that Jesus was sympathetic with the Zealot cause. This use of the evidence has been rejected by almost all scholars. See, for example, G. Lampe, "The Two Swords (Luke 22:35–38)" in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), pp. 335ff.

[7] One most obviously could cite Brandon's *Jesus*, in which the author argues that Jesus was in sympathy with Jewish nationalistic resistance against Rome and this fact was later "covered up" by the Gospel writers. Brandon's thesis, however, has been soundly rejected by such scholars as M. Hengel, *Was Jesus*

great detail.

3.3 Key Passages

One piece of evidence which suggests that Jesus was not an avid religious nationalist would be his willingness to maintain amicable relationships with tax collectors, who were the first century equivalents to collaborators. [8] In the Gospel accounts [9] we are told that Jesus freely socialised with these "traitors". The Gospels further tell us that he even had a tax collector as a member of his inner circle of disciples. [10] There may be significance in the fact that the passages which depict Jesus as socialising with tax collectors, save the pericope in Lk 19.1ff, also note the Pharisees' strong opposition to this type of fraternisation. While Lane's suggestion [11] that the Pharisees objected to this social interaction on the basis of having table fellowship with those unversed in the oral tradition is not to be totally discounted, [12] we must ask if it is not equally important to

---

a Revolutionist? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), O. Cullmann, *Jesus and the Revolutionaries* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970) and G.M. Styler, "Argumentum e silentio" (pp. 101ff) and J.P.M. Sweet, "The Zealots and Jesus" (pp. 1ff) in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day.*

[8] E. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985), p. 178, identifies the tax collectors depicted in the Gospel as "quislings". Cf. A.N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 1963), pp. 125ff and R.J. Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics and Society* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1978), pp. 96ff. For a view which runs counter to these see J.R. Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners. An Attempt at an Identification" *CBQ* 33 (1971), pp. 39ff.

[9] See Mk 2.15–7 (parr Mt 9.10–3 and Lk 5.29–32); Lk 15.1–2 and 19.1–10.

[10] Lk 5.27–32 and Mt 9.9 mention Jesus calling Levi/Matthew the tax collector to be his disciple. Mt 10.1–4; Mk 3.13–9 and Lk 6.12–6 lists him as being one of the twelve.

[11] *The Gospel According to Mark* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974), p. 104.

[12] However, cf. Sanders, p. 177ff, who concludes that "the purity laws which governed everybody did not affect 'table-fellowship' but primarily access to the temple" (p. 186). He goes on to argue that Jeremias is responsible for the popular confusion which identifies the Pharisees in general with the very small purity group known as the *ḥaberim* and in particular cites Jeremias' translation of m. Demai 2.3. Sanders quickly dismisses Jacob Neusner's restatement of the more traditional view of the Pharisees, see *From Politics to Piety* (Engelwood

note that they may have objected because the tax collectors were collaborators. It is generally accepted [13] that the Pharisees were the spiritual descendants of the Hasidim and the Hasidim supported the Maccabees, who adhered to both the principles of Israelite nationalism and the widespread anti-slavery bias. [14] Further evidence for concern on the part of some Pharisees over the question of Jewish identity and Roman dominance would be Josephus' reference to Saddok the Pharisee supporting Judas the Gaulanite, who led the rebellion in response to the Quirinius census. [15] From that time onward the Palestinian Jewish sense of Gentile threat to their uniqueness continued to intensify. It is hardly possible that the Pharisees were not affected by this intensification of the Jewish identity crisis. As Schürer notes their stance on this issue could be influenced by one of two theological motifs. [16] Either the idea of "divine providence" would allow them to accept this intensification or the theme of "Israel's election" would lead them to reject Roman occupation and any institutions which supported it. The role of tax collector was one such institution which drove home the harsh reality of foreign domination.

Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973), which builds upon the three volume work, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971), in a short paragraph and a long footnote. This rejection is due to the fact that Neusner's arguments rely only on traditions about individuals or houses and do not "reflect the numerous anonymous laws which probably represent *common* belief and practice,..." (p. 386, fn. 59). But see J.D.G. Dunn ("Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus" in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, forthcoming). Space does not allow for an in depth study of this debate.

[13] See for example Lane, p. 104 and V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: MacMillan, 1969), p. 206. See also C. Rowland, *Christian Origins* (London: SPCK, 1985), pp. 69ff, who does not specifically make this connection but does refer to the Pharisees taking seriously "the obligation laid upon Israel to be a holy nation before God (Lev. 19.2)." (p. 69), which seemed to be a concern of the Hasidim and Maccabees. A similar point is made by Freyne, p. 306.

[14] See ch. 2, pp. 40ff, which deals with the Maccabees.

[15] See pp. 45ff above and *Ant.* XVIII,1.

[16] *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* Vol. II (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973ff), pp. 394-95.

The second chapter's material implies that it is probable that the concept of "election" was more influential with a segment of Jewish thinking on this matter than was "divine providence". The profane (anti-slavery) and religious (election) motifs would have fallen together in a line of thought something like: "Israel is Yahweh's elect nation and we, the Jews, are slaves only to him. However, the Romans have enslaved us; but we will not serve Rome, which is not our true master". The fact that Judas the Gaulanite, Saddok the Pharisee and Eleazar used such a line of reasoning to kindle rebellion and patriotic fervour is evidence that at least one segment of first century CE Judaism had rejected the "divine providence" reasoning in favour of following a line of logic beginning with Israel's election. That a key portion of this "election reasoning" equated taxation with enslavement to Rome would have given tax collectors a high and negative visibility. To be involved in collecting taxes was roughly the same as denying Israel's unique status as the elect nation of Yahweh. Therefore, some Jews very probably refrained from social interaction with *these* "sinners" and probably found the main motivation in a desire to safeguard Israel's identity as Yahweh's elect nation. [17] If, however, the Synoptic Gospels accurately reflect Jesus' attitude towards tax collectors, there is little support for and clear evidence against the suggestion he held to such an attitude or line of reasoning.

The Q tradition material provides another interesting incident. Mt 8.5ff and Lk 7.1ff recount the story of the centurion who makes contact with Jesus in order to secure the healing of a servant. The two accounts vary significantly and therefore one must ask which account is closer to the original version. In Matthew, the man is merely introduced as a centurion and he himself approaches Jesus with his request. However, in Luke's version the centurion twice avoids personal contact with Jesus. Initially he has the elders of the Jews contact Jesus on his behalf. As they vouch for the centurion they tell Jesus that he is

[17] Cf. Gal 2.15ff which also reflects the fact that the 'sinner' issue was a Jew/ Gentile issue, too.

worthy of the request because he loves the nation, i.e. Israel, and has built a synagogue. In the picture of the Lucan centurion he looks like a "gēr tōshab" who has discreetly made contact with Jesus.

Which version is closer to the Q original? If Luke's version is closer then we must explain why Matthew would omit the information that this man loved Israel and helped build the synagogue. Because of Matthew's "Jewish" outlook, one would expect that he would have retained such material, under-scoring the attractiveness of Judaism as he understood it. Elsewhere the Matthean community shows little interest in converting Gentiles, apart from the closing chapter. [18] If the centurion was described in Q so as to suggest he was a God-fearer surely Matthew would have retained this description, thus making the figure more acceptable.

It seems easier to explain the Lucan descriptive item as additions to the Q tradition. The characterisation fits well with Luke's attempts to depict the Christ event as having universal significance. The centurion has taken the initial steps towards accepting the one true religion. By humbly contacting Jesus, Israel's Messiah, and placing his faith in him, the centurion has taken the final steps as well. It may be likely that Luke has expanded the original pericope so as to "reach" Diaspora God-fearers who have not done the same.

Working with the assumption that the Matthean version is more original [19]

[18] This is especially clear from Matthew's version of the commissioning of the Twelve. Here the disciples are expressly forbidden to make contact with Gentiles or Samaritians. See Mt 10.5–15.

[19] Scholars who argue this is the case include J. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1981), pp. 648ff and U. Wenger, *Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum (Mt. 7,28a; 8,5–10,13 par Lk 7,1–10). Ein Beitrag zur Q-Forshung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985). G. Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1977), p. 165, argues that the Lucan version is closer to the Q form.

and based on an actual incident from the life of Jesus,[20] this story depicts Jesus as displaying a clear openness to a man who should otherwise have been seen as a questionable social contact. After all, he was the visible symbol of Roman domination.[21] Yet, as the story is told, as soon as the request is made Jesus agrees to come and heal the servant. If Jesus had harboured an anti-Roman attitude it is difficult to see how such a story could have come into existence. Regardless of which version is closer to the Q original, this man's profession would have been a major obstacle to his acceptance by any Jew who was a patriot. According to the tradition, however, Jesus readily receives this person in his time of need. Again we see no Jewish nationalism exhibited by Jesus.

At least two elements of Jesus' teaching would indicate that he was at worst neutral in his attitude towards Rome. The more obscure of the two statements is found in Mt 5.41, "...and if any one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles". What Jesus is referring to here is the practice of Roman soldiers requiring civilians to help carry their equipment for up to one mile. Evidence that this was a common practice in the Roman Empire is seen in Mk 15.21 (Mt

[20] There seems little reason why we cannot accept that at some point in his ministry Jesus was contacted by a centurion who made such a request of him. Bultmann's "hardly anybody will support the historicity of a telepathic healing" argument (p. 38 of *HST*)may work against the type of healing proposed or in favour of the idea that the church reworked the tradition, by adding the last sentence; but, it is not a very convincing argument against the likelihood of the contact between Jesus and the centurion. Cf. E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1976), pp. 213ff), who suggests that the story may go back to Jesus himself and counters Bultmann's telepathic healing argument by referring to such healings in Eastern Asia.

[21] There is little or no doubt among scholars that the centurion was a Gentile; however, questions are raised as to whether or not he was directly in Roman employment or a mercenary serving under Herod Antipas. I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1978), p. 279, suggests he was not a Roman soldier; Schweizer, *Matthew*, p. 213, says he was a Roman centurion and Fitzmyer, p. 651, and H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), p. 391, are uncertain as to his military identity. At any rate, this figure was fulfilling an important military role which made Roman control of Palestine possible.

27.32/Lk 23.26); *Ant.* XIII, 52 and Epictetus III, i, 79. What Jesus is demanding of his followers is not merely a strict adherence to the "letter" of the common custom, but he advises that one be open to giving more than a Roman had a right to expect from an Israelite. Jesus is promoting a dismantling of the xenophobic nationalism which gripped Israel. The Pharisees probably would not advise such a course of action and the Zealots certainly did not.

We see this attitudinal difference even more clearly in Mk 12.13–7 (parr Mt 22.15-22 and Lk 20.20-6). [22] Robert Stein sees this pericope as evidence that Jesus was viewed by his contemporaries as a Rabbi, engaging with scribes in debates and being asked to settle legal questions. [23] The "legal" question which sets up the confrontation revolved around the census tax which was levied upon every inhabitant from puberty to the age of sixty-five. Marshall [24] notes that

[22] Interestingly this is one of the few incidents recorded in the Synoptic Gospels which Bultmann believes to be authentic. See *HST*, p. 26. However, not all scholars would agree with Bultmann. For example, J. Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus (Mk 8,27–16,20)* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979), pp. 151ff, suggests that the tribute theme should be assigned to the Palestinian-Jewish community. This conclusion is based primarily on form-critical observations of the pericope and the flow of the story line in Mk 12. While the Palestinian community may well have elected to hand down this story in the form of an apophthegm, that does not rule out the possibility that this pericope is based on an historical incident from Jesus' ministry. While one may well raise questions regarding who actually asked Jesus about paying tribute, it seems difficult to argue he was not confronted with this question. This difficulty is especially real if one, like Gnilka, admits that v.17 is an authentic Jesus saying. Given this admission it is difficult to locate a probable situation in which the logion was uttered, if we rule out the scenario of someone confronting Jesus with a question about paying tribute. In the final analysis, we best conclude that Jesus was asked the tribute question and his response was similar to what we find in Mk 12.17.

[23] *The Method and Message of Jesus Teachings* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), pp. 1–2. Stein also is correct in noting that any attempt to organise Jesus' ethical teaching is beset with difficulties, p. 88. He cites, for example, the brevity with which Jesus deals with the question of an individual's relationship to the state and specifically mentions Mk 12.13–7. However, the brevity of the passage should not put us off as we look at Mk 12.13ff to gain insight into Jesus' attitude on the question of Israelite religious nationalism.

[24] P. 735.

the issue at hand was the fact that the tax was to be paid to a non-Israelite ruler and therefore was disdained by the Jews. Evidence of this passionate dislike and its attending overtones of enslavement is found once again in *Ant.* XVIII, 1, [25] where Josephus mentions the revolt led by Judas the Gaulanite in response to the census which instituted the tax.

That someone came to ensnare Jesus with the question regarding the payment of this tax points to the difficult position in which they hoped to place him. If Jesus answered by saying the tax should not be paid he would certainly have been a threat to Rome, but held in high esteem by his fellow Jews, who hated the tax and what it symbolised. On the other hand, if he advised the payment of the tax he would have been in good standing with the Roman authorities; yet, his credibility with the majority of the Jews would have been damaged or destroyed. If he were a true nationalist, Jesus would have affirmed the former. His solution to the question and his personal dilemma created by the query is resolved by affirming the payment of the tax and giving God the proper allegiance.

The solution reveals Jesus' attitude toward Israelite nationalism. He affirms allegiance to God; yet, he certainly does not see a narrow Israelite/anti-Roman posture as a natural outgrowth or expression of this religious allegiance. [26] For that reason he can also affirm the payment of tribute. He was willing to recognise Israel's subjection to Rome, which he affirmed in his advice to pay the tax. As some scholars note [27] for Jesus to affirm the payment of tribute was to call into question Israel's theocratic ideology. Further, it must be noted that Jesus quite readily makes this affirmation. He asks to see a coin with which the tax was

---

[25] Cf. Acts 5.37.

[26] Cf. W. Farmer's *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), pp. 175ff, where he convincingly argues that "Jewish nationalism in both the Seleucid and Roman periods was religiously motivated,..." (p. 186).

[27] See F.F. Bruce, "Render to Caesar" in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, pp. 254ff or Lane, p. 424.

to be paid and further asks whose image it bore. The obvious answer to Jesus' question is "Caesar's". As the Synoptics recount the story, Jesus' answer to the initial question is equally obvious, "Pay the tax ". It is as if this "burning question" from the first century CE is a "non-issue" for Jesus. It seems quite evident from this pericope that Jesus did not share the avid nationalism to which many of his fellow Jews, exemplified by Judas the Gaulanite, held so tenaciously. [28]

3.4 Conclusion

As Freyne argues, Galilee probably was not a centre for volatile reaction against Roman occupation; therefore, the environment in which Jesus matured was not strongly anti-Roman. The above brief analysis of the Synoptic material touching upon Jesus' attitude toward Roman rule is based on only a few passages. This handful of pericopes, however, provides sufficient material to suggest that Jesus did not adhere to a stream of thought which advocated a zealous form of Jewish religious nationalism. Perhaps like the many of his contemporaries, Jesus accepted the fact that Israel was a nation in disgrace. It was Rome's slave and religious nationalism or rebellion was not an appropriate solution to the dilemma.

The initial direction of this conclusion is established by Jesus' response to the tribute question. We can assume Jesus was aware that certain segments of the Jewish population of Palestine viewed Roman taxation as equivalent to the enslavement of the nation. We cannot find evidence that Jesus was in agreement with this view. The tribute story supports the opposite conclusion. Far from

[28] For more detailed studies of the tribute passage see: E. Stauffer, *Christ and the Caesars* (London: SCM, 1955), pp. 112–37; L. Goppelt, "The Freedom to Pay the Imperial Tax (Mark 12,17)" in *Studia Evangelica* II (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), pp. 183–94; F.F. Bruce, "Render", pp. 249–64, J.D.M. Derrett, " 'Render to Caesar...' " in *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), pp. 313–38.

being an untouchable nation under Yahweh's protection, Israel was in Rome's debt. Tribute was owed to the conquering nation. Like all nations under Rome's thumb, Israel also was to pay tribute. Jesus recognized Rome's authority over his people. This opens the door for us to conclude that he disagreed with his more militant contemporaries on this issue of religious nationalism.

A firmer conclusion may be drawn from Mt 5.41. This verse is evidence that Jesus accepted the custom allowing Roman soldiers to commandeer Jews. He instructed his listeners to accept this practice. Here we see Jesus coming to grips with the harsh realities of life under Roman rule. Rome was the ruler and Israel the ruled. By recognizing and accepting the Roman soldier's authority over any Jew, Jesus also admitted and acknowledged the Empire's authority over the nation of Israel.

We saw in chapter two that the theme of religious nationalism was often intertwined with an anti-slavery bias. The above material shows that Jesus probably rejected Jewish religious nationalism. Religious nationalism, however, is not our primary concern. Instead, we are most concerned with the question of Jesus' response to slavery. We turn to this subject in the next chapter.

Chapter Four:
An Analysis of the "Slave of All" Saying

4.1 Introduction

In light of the second chapter's survey which revealed a rather strong Jewish bias against the enslavement of the Jewish people to each other and to Gentiles, it is surprising that at various places the Synoptic Gospels record a saying, which is attributed to Jesus, that equates greatness and servanthood/enslavement. If the first century CE Palestinian Jews were committed to such an attitude, how could a public figure utter advice similar to what we find in Mk 10.43–44, "...whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all."? Moreover, what was meant by it and what gave rise to its utterance?

The questions regarding the various ways the early church employed the saying can only be dealt with after the saying itself, in its diverse forms, has been studied. In Part 4.2 we will give a brief form critical analysis of the saying with the primary goal being the isolation of the oldest recoverable pattern of the logion. In Part 4.3 we will then compare the present contexts in which it is lodged in the hope of establishing the original *Sitz im Leben* or as much information about this setting as possible. Finally, we will attempt to draw conclusions about the saying's pre-Gospel history in light of the first two parts.

4.2 Analysis of the Versions of the Saying

The saying is found in a variety of forms at six different places in the Synoptic Gospels. [1] In the process of locating the version of the adage which is to be

[1] By noting six locations of the logion, I have come into conflict with David Wenham's suggestion that this saying is to be found in seven places in the Synoptic Gospels. We agree on the six citations above in the main text, but Wenham adds Mt 18.4 as the seventh location. This addition seems to be due,

regarded as the oldest existing form [2] we can begin by eliminating those versions which arise as variations on a Marcan parallel, since in the introductory chapter we already said we will be working with the assumption of Marcan priority. On this basis Mt 20.26–7 (B(1)) and Lk 9.48 (A(1)) may be dealt with first.

When one compares the pericopes which contain Mk 10.43–4 and Mt 20.26–7, it is clear that Matthew is following closely the Marcan storyline. [3] This is especially true of Mt 20.25–8. Here we find a very high degree of verbatim agreement between the two texts. The changes to the Matthean text would include the stylistic relocation of ἐν ὑμῖν, which in the Marcan version follows

---

in part, to his twofold classification of the logion into "downhill" (Mt 20.26/Mk 10.43,Lk 22.26, Mk 9.35 and Mt 23.11) and "uphill" (Mt 18.4 and Lk 9.48) types. More importantly, he sees Matthew and Luke following a non-Marcan tradition where Mk 9.33–42 is concerned. However, it seems as though Luke (9.46–50) follows Mark (9.33–41) much more closely than does Matthew (18.1–6). Matthew changes the crucial issue by posing the disciples' question as "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?", while both Mark and Luke are merely concerned with the personal greatness of the disciples who were with Jesus. Matthew's concern for the "kingdom of heaven" separates him from the other two Evangelists. This is clear in the logion itself where both Mark and Luke *contrast* general categories of greatness with general categories of insignificance. Matthew encourages his readers to become like a child and thereby be great in the kingdom. Regarding Matthew's formulation of these verses it seems as though T.W. Manson's understanding is more appropriate than is that of Wenham. In *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1977), p. 207, Manson sees Mt 18.2–4 as a "free adaptation of Mk 10.15". This, coupled with Matthew's concern for the kingdom of heaven motif in his logion, would lead us to reject Mt 18.4 as a variation of the 'slave of all' saying. Therefore, we will be working with the six versions listed. Also, on the question of Matthean composition of Mt 18.1–4 see W.G. Thompson, pp. 69–84, who sees limited contact between these Matthean verses and Mk 9.33–7 and Lk 9.48–50.

[2] At this stage, we are working with the assumption that there was one probable original form of the logion. In Part 4.3 we will see that the evidence from the various settings would lend support to this suggestion.

[3] See T. Robinson, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937), p. 166; D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Oliphants, 1972), p. 286; J. Fenton, *Saint Matthew* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 324 and W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1971), p. 443.

CHART A: THE VARIOUS VERSIONS OF THE SAYING

A. Mk 9.35
εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος
εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων
ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων
διάκονος.

A(1). Lk 9.48
ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν
πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων
οὗτος ἐστιν μέγας.

B(1). Mt 20.26–7
ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ
ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι
ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ
ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι
πρῶτος ἔσται
ὑμῶν δοῦλος·

B. Mk 10.43–44
ὃς ἂν θέλῃ
μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν
ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ
ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι
πρῶτος ἔσται
πάντων δοῦλος·

C. Lk 22.26
ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν
γινέσθω ὡς ὁ
νεώτερος καὶ ὁ ἡγού-
μενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.

D. Mt 23.11
ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν
ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος.

γενέσθαι, and the use of ἐὰν instead of ἂν. [4] One final alteration does point to the fact that Matthew's version is not as old as that found in Mark. That change would be Matthew's substitution of ὑμῶν for πάντων in the phrase ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος. If one were to propose that Matthew's version is more original it would be difficult to explain this particular replacement. On the other hand, it is quite plausible that Matthew has taken the general form found in Mark and in order to apply it to his own community he substituted a "specific" word for the sweeping expression used in Mark. By using ὑμῶν, he has unambiguously related the saying to his community and its internal life.

A conclusion akin to that reached regarding Mt 20.26–7 applies to Lk 9.48, also. It seems clear that both Matthew and Luke were somewhat confused by the progression of thought in Mk 9.33–7 [5]; however, in the re-writing of the pericope Luke has remained closer to the Marcan original than has Matthew (cf. points of contact between Lk 9.47 and 48 with Mk 9.36 and 37). Seemingly, the basic thrust of Mk 9.33–7 is that a disciple must be willing to hold a position of lowliness and this willingness is equated with exercising care for the unimportant person. [6] Luke grasps this point, but in his attempt to clarify the method of presentation he moves the greatness saying from the middle of the pericope to the end. By this alteration he gives the adage the status and function of a climax for the scene, thus underlining its importance. [7]

In addition to the Lucan re-working of the whole pericope, there can be little doubt that Luke has re-modelled the logion in 9.48, also. Schürmann sees the

[4] Cf. Blass/Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), §107, p. 57.
[5] Cf. Marshall, p. 395 and J. Schmid, *Das Evangelium Lukas* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1960), p. 172.
[6] So Marshall, p. 397; J. Creed, *The Gospel According to Luke* (London: Mac-Millan, 1969), p. 138 and W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1971), p. 197.
[7] See Schürmann, *Lukas*, Vol. 1, p. 577 and Marshall, p. 397.

presence of ἐν ὑμῖν in 9.48c as a sign of influence from Lk 22.26. [8] Others see the possible influence for change coming from Lk 7.28 and the usage of μικρότερος. [9] Regardless of whether we follow one or the other of these suggestions we can say that Lk 9.48 is not more original than the Marcan parallel version in 9.35. Further support comes from the presence of ὑπάρχων, which is used forty times in Luke/Acts, but only three times in Matthew and not once in Mark. This would indicate that this verb is a favorite of Luke and he is responsible for its presence, thus supporting the earlier conclusion.

A third version of the logion which can be ruled out as closest to the original is that found in Mt 23.11 (D). The first twelve verses of ch. 23 serve as an introduction to the chapter [10] and it looks as though these verses have been organized by the Evangelist. A number of the sayings gathered there can be found scattered in the other Gospels. [11] The fact that Matthew has given a detailed "report" of the incident, which led up to the utterance of the greatness and service, in Mt 20.20–8 allows him now to summarize the logion and use it as a key building block in this pericope.

This employment of the saying seems clear when one discovers the balanced detail in vv.4–11. Vv.4 and 11 are summaries of Jewish and Christian attitudes towards leadership. These two verses serve as the framework to vv.5–7 and vv.8–10, both of which offer three illustrations of leadership which are either critiqued or rejected: a) vv.5–7 depict the role of leader when used for self-

[8] *Ibid.*, especially fn. 21. Cf. also, A. Schlatter, *Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas* (Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1969), p. 255.
[9] A. Leaney, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: A. & C. Black, 1958), pp. 58–9 and Marshall, p. 397.
[10] For details on this see chapter eight, which deals with Mt 23.1–12.
[11] Another version of Mt 23.5b–6 is located in Mk 12.38b–9/Lk 20.45–7; the greatness saying of Mt 23.11 is found at the places cited on Chart A and a version of Mt 23.12 is found in Lk 14.11 and 18.14. W. Trilling, "Amt und Amtsverstandnis bei Matthäus" in *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.B. Beda Rigaux* (Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, 1970), p. 31, sees this phenomenon as evidence for concluding that vv.11 and 12 are of secondary composition.

promotion and b) vv.8–10 are images of leadership which are rejected by the Matthean community. The whole of the pericope is concerned with the nature of leadership within the Christian community and this is reflected in the re-working of the 'slave of all' logion, also. [12]

Matthew has taken the detailed version of the saying (Mt 20.26–7), which he received from Mark, and abridged it for use in ch. 23. Evidence that Matthew is concerned to make the adage applicable to his community includes the dual citation of ὑμῶν. The presence of this word twice in one brief saying points in the direction of the Evangelist's intention to establish the logion's relevance to his own community and their current situation. This attempt to make the saying pertinent to his own congregation's situation is further supported by the shift in the logion's formulation from those who "wish to be great" to placing the emphasis on those who are great (ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν). To couch the saying in this manner reflects a presupposition that someone is already functioning as "great" and so the adage is specifically applied to this group of people or person within the community. [13] The more nebulous ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας..., which does not have a particular group in view, must be a piece of evidence which points to a greater antiquity than does ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν.

A final piece of evidence supporting the elimination of Mt 23.11 as the closest to the original version would be the fact that only here are the sayings of v.11 and v.12 connected. The fact that we never find these sayings combined in the other Synoptic Gospels brings us to the conclusion that we have evidence of Matthew's editorial work between these two verses. D.E. Garland argues for this same conclusion and further adds the elements of support which arise from the facts that there is no catchword association between the verses, there is the presupposition of a community situation, that vv.11 and 12 confirm the thrust

[12] This structural phenomenon is given greater attention in chapter eight.
[13] Cf. Haenchen, "Matthäus", p. 45.

of vv.8–10 and the material which follows further confirms the principles found in vv.11 and 12. [14] In light of the above evidence there can be little doubt that Mt 23.11 is a secondary formulation of the maxim.

Thus far we have eliminated three options and three versions still remain to be considered: 1) Mk 9.35; 2) Mk 10.43–4 and 3) Lk 22.26. Given our acknowledged assumption of Marcan priority, we will initially deal with Lk 22.26 and then study the texts of versions A and B. However, I would hasten to add that this particular procedural move is followed more for the sake of expediency and is not due to disagreement with Heinz Schürmann's analysis of the relationship between Mk 10.41–4.45 and Lk 22.24–6.27. [15] On the whole, I find his arguments supporting his thesis that Luke has not redacted Mk 10.41–5 to be convincing.

At least five items point in the direction of Lk 22.26 being a secondary version of the maxim: a) We can cite the fact that this version's initial phrase, ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος..., clearly presupposes that within the body of readers (ἐν ὑμῖν) someone or some group *has* achieved the status of "great one(s)". This would suggest that Luke has reworked the logion, as did Matthew, with a particular established ecclesiastical group in mind and has applied the logion to them and their functional role within the community. [16] Gone is the verb θέλῃ which is found in both the Marcan versions. In connection with this phrase we might note the presence of ἐν ὑμῖν, which would point to the idea of the gathered community in which the "great ones" are to be found. This would be further evidence of a secondary nature of this version.

b) Fitzmyer [17] points to the use of μείζων, in lieu of μέγας, as Luke's attempt to unify the pericope with regards to compositional style. The same word is

[14] P. 61.
[15] *Jesu*, pp. 64ff. In these pages Schürmann argues that Lk 22.24ff is from a tradition independent of Mk 10.41ff. For a similar position see Kuhn, p. 152.
[16] Marshall, p. 813 and Schürmann, *Jesu*, p. 74.
[17] *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1417.

used in v.24 and its presence here would hint of an attempt to tie the answer of v.26 to the introductory verse. If we accept this connection between the two uses of μείζων, we will need to accept also this version of the logion as secondary. [18]

c) We would note that ἡγούμαι is never found in Mark and only once in Matthew, while Luke uses this verb four times, [19] three of which are in the participal form, in addition to its employment here. Therefore, this is probably a sign of Lucan editorial activity. In connection with this word's usage here in the adage, we would note that it is found elsewhere in the NT and is used as a reference to persons serving as community leaders. [20] This participial usage of the verb, along with its association with service (ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν) would clearly support Fitzmyer's suggestion that the closing phrase of the adage may represent the service of the church in Luke's day. [21] However, it would be more specific than he suggests because Luke has clearly associated the two participles and the second defines the first. Luke is, in essence, defining his understanding of the nature of church leadership with this phrase.

d) The Semitic usage of ἔσται, which is found in both versions A and B, has been dropped in favour of γινέσθω. Earlier in 20.14 and 33, Luke elects to differ from Mark by substituting γένηται and γίνεται, respectively, for the Marcan ἔσται. [22]

e) Luke has allowed the larger context of this section to influence his choice of imagery which defines church leaders. As version B shows there would be two options: either δοῦλος or διάκονος. The larger context is that of the Last Supper

[18] Cf. Schürmann, *Jesu*, pp. 65ff, who has made a good case for seeing v.24 as a Lucan construction.
[19] Acts 7.10; 14.12; 15.22 and 26.2.
[20] Cf. Acts 7.10; 14.12; Heb 13.7,17 and 24. Cf. Büchsel, *TDNT*, Vol. II, pp. 907f.
[21] *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1417.
[22] Cf. Schürmann, *Jesu*, p. 75.

and it seems as though Luke opted for an expression which better fit with a meal context. Therefore, he uses ὁ διάκονων. The basic imagery of διακονέω/διάκονος evokes the activities of waiters, waiting upon tables and preparation of food. [23] By employing διακονέω he firmly associates the saying with the larger scene of the Last Supper. Further evidence of this connection is revealed in v.27 where Jesus, as the organizer of the meal, identifies himself as a servant. The role recommended to church leaders has been carried out by Jesus, himself, in this larger scene. In light of these five points it is not difficult to conclude that Lk 22.26 is a secondary formulation of the greatness saying. [24]

We are now left with only two versions: Mk 9.35 and 10.43–4:

---

[23] See, for example, Sophocles, "Philoctetes", lines 286–97; Euripides, "Cyclops", line 31; Herodotus, Book IX, 82; Aristophanes, "The Acharnians", lines 1016–17 and "The Birds", lines 59–82; Polybius, Book XXV, 26.5 and Diodorus Siculus, Book V, 28.4. Cf. E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark* (London: SPCK, 1977), pp. 219–20.

[24] One could perhaps offer the suggestion that Lk 22.24ff is older than Mk 10.43–5 in light of the now accepted theory that the passion narratives were the oldest collections of traditional material. See, however, J. Schlosser, "La genèse de Luc, XXII, 25–7" *RB* 89 (1982), pp. 52ff, who argues this is not the case. Such an argument would contend that since Lk 22.24ff is located in the midst of the Lucan passion story and Mk 10.43ff is not part of the equivalent section in Mark there is the possibility of Lk 22.24ff being an older version. In addition to the above evidence, which strongly runs counter to such a suggestion, one can point out that, in the main, it seems as though Luke is following Mark's order, while at the same time he utilizes special material. As Fitzmyer, *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1365, notes, "The twenty episodes of the Lucan passion narrative,..., correspond to fourteen of the Marcan episodes *in almost the same order.* The continuous thread of his account is based on Mark." Marshall's suggestion, p. 811, that "the whole section [Lk 22.24–7] was found by Luke in his source at this point" may give weight to the suggestion that the Lk 22.24ff version of the saying is older. However, even Marshall, recognizes the Marcan version as being more Semitic than Luke's form. Cf. Schürmann, *Jesu*, pp. 54ff, who argues that vv.24–7 were inserted into this unit. At any rate, on the basis of a linguistic comparison of the two passages, we best conclude that the Mk 10 version is older than the Lk 22 form. For more detail on the relationship between Mk 10.35ff and Lk 22.24ff see chapter seven below.

CHART B: MK 9.35 and 10.43–4

A. Mk 9.35	B. Mk 10.43–4
εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος	ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας
εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων	γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν
ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων	ἔσται ὑμῖν διάκονος,
διάκονος.	καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ
	ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι
	πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων
	δοῦλος·

Few scholars are willing to identify the Mk 9.35 version of the saying as the form which is closest to the original. Pesch sides with this position when he writes,

> "Das paradox formulierte Regelworte, das 10,43f als Doppelspruch überliefert und um die paränetische Adressierung zur *Gemeinde-Regel* erweitert (ἐν ὑμῖν) bzw. parānetisch umformuliert (V 43: ὑμῶν statt πάντων) ist, liegt als *Demuts-Regel* in 9,33–35 im primären Kontext vor (wenn auch mit εἴ τις θέλει) gegenüber ὃς ἂν θέλῃ grāzisiert)." [25]

It seems as though Pesch's sole reason for rejecting the Mk 10 version and accepting Mk 9.35, as the oldest form, is the threefold presence of ἐν ὑμῖν in the former. He gives no evidence supporting his claim that Mk 9.35 is closer to the original.

Of course, the absence of ἐν ὑμῖν in Mk 9 does support his position. And there are other shreds of evidence which may help establish such a line of argument. First, there is the presence of the Semitic use of ἔσται; but one should notice that Mk 10 uses this verb in the same way. This helps very little in an attempt to

[25] *Das Markusevangelium* Vol. II (Freiburg: Herder, 1977), p. 105.

establish the identity of the older version. A second piece of evidence would be the unusual introduction of v.35: "He sat down and called the twelve;...". [26] It is unusual because as Mark tells the story from vv.33ff the disciples are already with Jesus. So why would he need to call them again? Numerous scholars have pointed this out and concluded that here and in the verses which follow, Mark is probably incorporating a piece of earlier tradition material. However, the influence of such an observation is dulled by two other points: 1) Mark uses a similar introduction to the saying in ch. 10 and so these two versions are still on the same footing and 2) this observation does not directly touch upon the adage itself. Mark could have altered the traditional form of the saying once he decided to use it.

There is evidence that, in fact, both versions have been altered; but, the changes to Mk 9.35 seem more extensive. As to the general form of the maxim, Catchpole [27] notes that Mk 9.35 alone lacks the symmetry which the other version exhibits. Here the saying is "unbalanced" with the idea of πρῶτος being defined by ἔσχατος and διάκονος. Bultmann [28] suggests that this asymmetrical form still shows traces of parallelism in that it retains the dual explanations of πρῶτος. Another negative stroke against Mk 9's claim to primary status is found in the hellenized opening to the saying: εἴ τις θέλει. [29] Even Pesch accepts this

[26] Cf. the following scholars who point out this introduction: E. Best, "Mark's Preservation of the Tradition" in *L'Évangile selon Marc. Tradition et redaction* (Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1974), p. 28; Kuhn, p. 34; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 404; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 192 and W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1971), p. 196; Pesch, *Markus*, vol.II, p. 102; R. Schnackenburg, "Mk 9,33–50" in *Synoptische Studien. Festschrift für A. Wikenhauser* (München: Karl Zink, 1953), p. 185; Reploh, p. 141 and Gnilka, p. 55. The later three authors view the reference to the twelve as a sign of Marcan editorial work, while the former scholars see this introduction as a sign of an earlier tradition.

[27] "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven. A Re-appraisal of Matthew xxv.31–46" *BJRL* 61 (Spring, 1979), p. 365. Cf. Gnilka, p. 56.

[28] *HST*, pp. 143ff.

[29] Cf. H. Fleddermann, "The Discipleship Discourse (Mk 9:33–50)" *CBQ* 43.1

as a problem which hinders the full acceptance of the primary nature of this version. Finally, some scholars [30] have pointed out that this version has been influenced by another logion. This would explain the presence of ἔσχατος, which is not found in any of the other versions. That being the case, the influence probably came from Mk 10.31. It certainly looks as though the only evidence supporting Mk 9.35's antiquity is the absence of ἐν ὑμῖν. All the other evidence either places it on an equal footing with Mk 10.43–4 or undercuts a claim to greater antiquity.

It begins to look as though Mk 10.43–4 does show signs of being an older piece of material. These would include the Semitic employment of ἔσται and the unusual introduction in v.41. In addition to these two elements two others can be noted. The saying, itself, begins with the more Semitic indefinite noun clause, ὃς ἂν θέλῃ..., which would point us in the direction of an older version of the maxim. Here no community leaders are in mind. Similarly the whole structure of the saying reflects Semitic influence in that it is a perfectly formed parallelism. [31] It is the cumulative effect of these four points which would lead us to conclude that, in general, the Mk 10.43–4 version is the oldest version of the logion which is available to us.

Having concluded this we should immediately point out that even this version of the saying is very probably not the form which was uttered by Jesus. All along we have been working with the idea that the presence of ὑμῶν or ὑμῖν is a sign of later development and the same must apply to Mk 10.43–4. The twofold

(1981), pp. 60f and Bultmann, p. 84.

[30] See Schnackenburg, p. 148 and Fleddermann, p. 60.

[31] Cf. C. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: CUP, 1975), p. 173, "Parallelism is a well known feature of Semitic poetical style." Schnackenburg, "Mk 9,33–50", p. 199, also notices this parallelism; but, he interprets it as evidence supporting Mk 10's version as an "obviously completely developed form of the saying". While that may be true, the parallelism still suggests that this version of the saying is old and of our various options probably the oldest.

presence of ἐν ὑμῖν in the logion is probably the result of the Evangelist's attempt to fit the saying into the larger context and to a congregation's own situation. These words have been used in v.43a, where the writer is clearly establishing the congregational context for the adage by writing, οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν. This idea of corporate application is then further reinforced by the dual employment of ἐν ὑμῖν within the saying itself.

The same motive would explain the presence of ὑμῶν in the phrase ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος. This very specific formulation looks suspect next to the very general text which follows and acts as a parallel to it: ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος. It would not be out of order to suggest that ὑμῶν has replaced πάντων at this point in order to apply further the general maxim to the life of the community. Therefore, if we were to venture cautiously one step behind the present form of the adage, we would suggest the following would be closer still to the original version of the saying uttered by Jesus:

ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται πάντων διάκονος, καὶ
ὃς ἂν θέλῃ εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος

To go beyond these alterations would be to move into the realm of absolute speculation, which will not advance our understanding of the logion's original form.

In this initial section of chapter four, we have isolated the existing version which probably comes closest to the original form of the logion. As that saying presents itself, we were forced to recognize that it has been altered so as to make it more applicable to the life of a community. Once these community rule elements are removed the saying is a very general and straightforward piece of advice which equates greatness with service and even enslavement. This maxim

does not advocate that services be rendered to only fellow followers of Jesus or even to one's fellow Jew. Instead, if one is to be truly great he will render service to everyone (πάντων διάκονος) and he will act as every person's slave (πάντων δοῦλος). There are no restrictions as to who is eligible to receive the disciple's peonage.

In light of chapter two's information there can be little support for the view that such a logion could be attributed to the popular thinking or mores of first century CE Palestine. Jews were not to be enslaved to one another, let alone to people outside their own ethnic and religious group. Clearly the idea is not "Jewish" in nature, as we saw in chapter three. The maxim, however, does fit well with other Jesus sayings which touch upon this topic of servanthood. First and foremost there is Jesus' advice regarding the payment of tribute which, as we saw, was viewed by first century Jews as the equivalent to the acceptance of enslavement. It would seem as though he was willing to accept Jewish "enslavement" in relation to this issue of tribute. This acceptance is further supported by his logion recorded in Mt 5.41. Here Jesus not only admits the Roman's right to impress civilians; but he further advises that one goes beyond the minimum requirement. These two illustrations further support the image of Jesus as one who encouraged active service and an acceptance of the Jews' status as an enslaved people. This attitude of service was to be carried out on a very broad basis - even applying to Romans. It is in line with these attitudes that the general logion about greatness and service falls and this would support the claim that the maxim is an authentic Jesus saying. To even raise such an issue may well be unnecessary for very few NT scholars leave open to question the authenticity of the saying and none *explicitly* reject it as not originating with Jesus. One scholar who comes close to denying the dominical nature of the logion is Ernst Haenchen, who writes:

> "So sehr dieser Gedanke dem eigenen Urteil Jesu entspricht, so ist es doch nicht die Stimme des „historischen Jesus", die wir hier vernehmen.

Hier sehen wir in Probleme der nachösterlichen Gemeinde hinein, die groß geworden ist und in der es bereits Kämpfe um Einfluß und Geltung gibt." [32]

However, Taylor speaks for the vast majority of scholars when he writes,

"It is evident that the primitive communities preserved a lively recollection of the way in which Jesus rebuked personal ambition, for there is still another variant form of the saying [Mark 9.35] (from M) in Mt. xxiii.11,... and probably another in Lk. ix.48b,..." [33]

4.3 Search for the Original Sitz im Leben

Before we can say anything about the saying's history prior to its inclusions in the written Gospel material we would do well to look at the various versions of the stories in which it is included. To do this may show features or elements of the various storylines which are often repeated. Such repeated elements would point in the direction of the incident in which the saying was uttered. This, of course, is working with the assumption that the logion was only spoken on one occasion. However, if our analysis yields two or more sets of frequently used story elements associated with a version of the saying, but without significant overlapping with one another, we might then conclude that the saying was spoken on various occasions. If, for example, the Marcan pericopes share key elements with each other but do not have these features in common with the Lk 22 version, which is very probably following a source other than Mk at this point, we could conclude that there were two separate occasions on which

[32] *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968), p. 367. The quotation is offered as a comment on the Mk 10.43–4 version of the saying. Cf. p. 326 of the same volume where Haenchen writes, regarding Mk 9.35, "Vielleicht hat Jesus einmal seinen Jüngern, die-wie alle Juden (und nicht bloß diese)-vom Verlaugen nach Anerkennung beherrscht waren, in dieser paradoxen Form gezeigt, wie in der Wirklichkeit Gottes, die Er sah, sich die in jüdischen Volke geltenden Werte veranderten."

[33] *Mark*, p. 405. Cf. Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, pp. 105 and 164; Marshall, p. 811; Fitzmyer, *Luke Vol. II*, p. 1414; Gnilka, p. 57 and Schnackenburg, p. 199.

CHART C: MARK 9.33–7 / MATTHEW 18.1–5 / LUKE 9.46–8

Matthew 18.1–5

1 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες· τίς ἄρα μείζων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; 2 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν 3 καὶ εἶπεν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. 4 ὅστις οὖν ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὡς τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μείζων ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. 5 καὶ ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται ἓν παιδίον τοιοῦτο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται.

Mark 9.33–7

33 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ. Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε; 34 οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων· πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τίς μείζων. 35 καὶ καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος. 36 καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὸ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 37 ὃς ἂν ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέξηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχηται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Luke 9.46–8

46 Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν. 47 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰδὼς τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ' ἑαυτῷ 48 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται τοῦτο το 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.

CHART D: MARK 10.35–45 / MATTHEW 20.20–8 / LUKE 22.24–7

Matthew 20.20–8

20 Τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ
ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν
Ζεβεδαίου μετὰ τῶν
υἱῶν αὐτῆς προσκυνοῦσα
καὶ αἰτοῦσα τι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· τί
θέλεις; λέγει αὐτῷ·
εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν
οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου
εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ
εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων σου ἐν
τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. 22 ἀπο-
κριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·
οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε.
δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ
ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ μέλλω
πίνειν; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·
δυνάμεθα. 23 λέγει
αὐτοῖς· τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν
μου πίεσθε, τὸ δὲ
καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου
καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ
ἔστιν ἐμὸν τοῦτο δοῦναι,
ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται
ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου.

Mark 10.35–45

35 Καὶ προσπορεύονται
αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης
οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου
λέγοντες αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε,
θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν
αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς
ἡμῖν. 36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν
αὐτοῖς· τί θέλετε με
ποιήσω ὑμῖν; 37 οἱ δὲ
εἶπαν αὐτῷ· δὸς ἡμῖν
ἵνα εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν
καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν
καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ
σου. 38 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
αὐτοῖς· οὐκ οἴδατε τί
αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πιεῖν
τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω
ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ
βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι;
39 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ·
δυνάμεθα. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τὸ ποτήριον
ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω πίεσθε καὶ
τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ
βαπτίζομαι βαπισθήσεσθε,
40 τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν
μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ
ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς
ἡτοίμασται.

Luke 22.24–7

CHART D (continued)

Matthew 20.20–8	Mark 10.35–45	Luke 22.24–7
24καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν. 25ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς εἶπεν· οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. 26οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, 27καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος· 28ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.	41Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. 42καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. 43οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, 44καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος· 45καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.	24Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων. 25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. 26ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. 27τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.

CHART E: MATTHEW 23.1–12

1 Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν τοῖς
ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
2 λέγων· ἐπὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας
ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ
Φαρισαῖοι. 3 πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν
εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε,
κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε·
λέγουσιν γὰρ καὶ οὐ ποιοῦσιν.
4 δεσμεύουσιν δὲ φορτία βαρέα
καὶ δυσβάστακτα καὶ ἐπιτιθέασιν
ἐπὶ τοὺς ὤμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
αὐτοὶ δὲ τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτῶν οὐ
θέλουσιν κινῆσαι αὐτά. 5 πάντα
δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσιν πρὸς
τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις·
πλατύνουσιν γὰρ τὰ φυλακτήρια
αὐτῶν καὶ μεγαλύνουσιν τὰ κράσπεδα,
6 φιλοῦσιν δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν
τοῖς δείπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας
ἐν ταις συναγωγαῖς 7 καὶ τοὺς ἀσπα-
σμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ καλεῖσθαι
ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί. 8 Ὑμεῖς
δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββί· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν
ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος, πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς
ἀδελφοί ἐστε. 9 καὶ πατέρα μὴ
καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἷς
γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος.
10 μηδὲ κληθῆτε καθηγηταί, ὅτι
καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστιν εἷς ὁ Χριστός.
11 ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν ἔσται ὑμῶν
διάκονος. 12 ὅστις δὲ ὑψώσει ἑαυτὸν
ταπεινωθήσεται καὶ ὅστις ταπει-
νώσει ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.

the saying was uttered. While it is not impossible that two dissimilar stories would arise from one incident, it is more likely that two distinct stories would be due to two separate incidents. Conversely, if all three Synoptics tend to use similar elements we would need to move in the direction of accepting a single occasion on which the logion was spoken. This conclusion would be significantly strengthened if we were to locate an independent source in one of the "secondary" Gospels, i.e. Matthew or Luke, which contained elements similar to those in Mark. However, at the same time, we must be on the lookout for evidence that Christian communities within the early church took the saying giving it new settings and adding other logions so as to make the maxim applicable to their own particular needs. This task can be limited to three of the six locations where the saying is embedded (Mk 9.33–7; Mk 10.35–45 and Lk 22.24–7). The reason for eliminating Lk 9.46–8 and Mt 20.20–8 would be based on our assumption of Marcan priority. Assuming that the Marcan texts are older than the Matthean or Lucan parallels it seems logical to conclude that these versions will not substantially assist our search for evidence which will support efforts to reconstruct even a hypothetical original setting for the logion. Similarly, Mt 23.1–12 would be ineligible because the employment of the saying there is of a secondary nature.

One common element which is found in both the Marcan versions and Luke's presentation is the basic incident which gave rise to the utterance of the logion. All three versions record that the saying was part of Jesus' response to the disciples' heated discussion regarding their own greatness. Mk 9 and Lk 22 are the clearest in portraying this incident. Mk 9 depicts the disciples' silent response to Jesus' question, *τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε*. The response of silence, which is reported in 9.34, would lead us to conclude that the conversation was not merely a casual exchange of personal opinions. [34] The Lucan Last Supper

[34] Cf. Schrenk's comment, *TDNT*, Vol. II, p. 95, "In Mt.[sic] 9:34 the *πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν* of the disciples on the way indicates "disputing" as in

setting, which differs from either the Mk 9 or 10 version, would independently suport this in that the word φιλονεκία is used in Lk 22.24. Mk 10 is not as clear as Mk 9 or Lk 22; but, the same point is conveyed in this version. Once the other ten disciples hear of James and John's request for special treatment, we read they ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν (v.41). Clearly, the three versions understood the saying to have been uttered within the context of friction among the disciples. Furthermore, the issue which gave rise to this tension was the question of personal greatness (cf. Lk 22.24; Mk 9.34 and Mk 10.35–40). These two elements are constant factors in the tradition as it is conveyed to us. Thus far the general form of the logion, which we identified in Part 4.2, is associated with elements which are commonly found in various pericopes.

With regards to the more original setting, Marshall has suggested that while Mk 10 is "more Semitic in style" the setting at the table in Luke's Gospel is "more likely to be original". [35] Neither Marcan version relate much specific information regarding the original setting. Both pericopes are located in the larger section which runs from 8.22–10.52 and has a very clear structure, which is designed to teach the true nature of discipleship. Mk 9's only setting evidence is the generally unhelpful common phrase ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ and the geographical location of the city of Capernaum. As Best [36] notes the Capernaum reference is part of Mark's "artificial geography of the journey to Jerusalem" and the house theme is also part of Mark's style. While not totally ruling out the possibility that the incident was set in Capernaum and "in a house", these notes, which point to a particular Marcan style, would serve as a warning against relying heavily upon this version. At the same time, these particular elements of the presentation of

Jn. 8:1 LXX... and Jos. Ant. 7,278...,where πρὸς is also used."

[35] P. 811. Cf. Schweizer, *Mark*, pp. 219–20.

[36] *Following*, p. 76. Against this see Catchpole, p. 362, who sees the Capernaum reference arising from the tradition, since Capernaum would not have been on the direct route to Jerusalem. E. Best *Following Jesus* (Trowbridge: Redwood Burn, 1981), p. 91, fn. 2, counters with the point that Capernaum was probably the only town name appearing regularly in the tradition and the Evangelist employed it due to his need for a town in Galilee.

this incident do not directly conflict with the Lucan presentation or the later Marcan version.

According to the larger context of Mk 10, the saying was uttered ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (v.32). However, Mk 10.35–45, which follows immediately after the third prediction of Jesus' death and resurrection, may contain residual evidence that the Evangelist was aware that the incident was reputed to have occurred within the context of a meal setting. As the scene of vv.35–45 is formed there are three elements which point in this direction. The image of the cup, the note about baptism and the issue of seating suggest some connection with a meal. Grundmann [37] theorizes that the dual pronged response of Jesus in v.38 leading on from the cup present on the table and the cleansing bath, which preceded meals, may suggest the idea of baptism. Similar mention can be made of the Zebedean requests for seats of honour. As Lk 14.7–14 notes, this issue of seating at a meal was important in first century Palestine.

While these three elements are employed by Mark to stress more important issues than conveying the idea of a meal setting, [38] the point can be made that these "grander" images are not Mark's only motivation. If, as most scholars argue, Mark is responsible for connecting vv.35–40 and vv.41–5, the presence of these images may have added weight for the joining process. The strong image from vv.41–5 is that of the servant (*διάκονος*) and as noted above this role is associated with meals. If Mark was aware of the tradition's setting that was similar to that of Lk 22, the act of uniting these two pericopes would be facilitated by the strong presence of meal imagery (cup, bath, and seating arrangements) to be found in vv.35–40. While we cannot be as certain with this second conclusion as we were with the first, we would suggest there is a good probability that Marshall is correct in his suggestion that Luke's meal setting is

[37] *Markus*, p. 217.
[38] This is seen in the description of the seats as seats "in glory" and the cup and bath as depicting suffering and martyrdom.

a more original setting for the saying on greatness and service.

A third feature which is found in more than one presentation is the additional logion about the exercise of authority by the Gentile rulers (Mk 10.42 and Lk 22.25). In both instances this address is used as a negative illustration, i.e. the disciples are not to be like these men in this respect. At this point the Mk 9 version significantly diverges from the other two and totally omits this logion. Instead, the positive illustration of embracing a παιδίον and an interpretive saying regarding the action is employed. Both the action and its interpretive adage follow the 'slave of all' logion. Mk 10 and Lk 22 also add another logion after the greatness maxim; but, in both these cases the saying is designed to reinforce the previous material by appealing to Jesus' own example as a servant. The Mk 10 and Lk 22 versions both follow a neat line of thought on the subject of greatness: 1)negative illustration, 2)equation of greatness with service and 3) reinforcement example of Jesus.

The Mk 9 version is quite unique in its development: 1) the way to become first is that of lowliness and service, 2)illustrated by embracing a παιδίον and 3) interpreted by the principles of receiving. We might be able to conclude that we are facing evidence of two separate occasions when the logion was uttered; but, a brief glance at what Luke and Matthew do with the Marcan pericope points in a different direction. Matthew, in particular, seems to question the validity of the logion's presence in the Mk 9 context because he omits it altogether, preferring instead to retain it in his parallel to Mk 10.35–45. Luke also prefers to alter slightly the saying so as to support the Marcan thrust of accepting insignificant individuals. This renovated maxim is then attached to the end of the pericope in Lk 9.46–8. What Luke is attempting to do here is to remain faithful to the present Marcan text; however, he, like Matthew, is well aware of a tradition similar to Mk 10's version. He remains faithful to that version of the tradition by incorporating it into ch. 22. Schürmann's convincing analysis of

the relationship (or lack thereof) between Mk 10.41–5 and Lk 22.24–7 supports this suggestion. [39] It would seem as though neither Matthew nor Luke were totally convinced of the authenticity of Mk 9.33–7 as a setting for the 'slave of all' logion. This in turn would lead to the conclusion that the tradition reflected in Lk 22.24–7 and Mk 10.41–5 was *the* dominant version of the incident which remained in the early church's collective consciousness.

This conclusion should not be misunderstood as a suggestion that the "dominant tradition" idea inhibited free application and interpretation of the logion for the needs of the various congregations of the early church. The evidence would not support the weight of such a heavy affirmation. There is clear support, within the Synoptic usage of the saying, for the conclusion that the early church worked with a certain freedom of application when dealing with a dominical saying. For example, the very fact that the maxim itself is available in a variety of forms would suggest that the early Christians felt no need to retain a "verbatim" version of it. The form was altered and phrases were added so as to fit different literary and social contexts.

Much of this type of development probably took place in the oral period or at least one stage earlier than the texts presented to us by the Evangelists. This would be supported by the suggestion, put forward by many scholars [40] that Mk 9.33–7 is part of a larger pre-Marcan unit consisting of Mk 9.33–50. Assuming this is the case, [41] we here have an example of how the saying was associated, in the pre-Gospel tradition, with another setting and used to a different end. This in turn was employed as a valid piece of material by Mark; but, at the same

[39] See fn. 15 above.
[40] Such as H. Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark* (London: Oliphants, 1976), p. 233; Best, *Following*, pp. 75ff; Bultmann, pp. 149ff; Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 193; Lane, pp. 338f; Reploh, pp. 140ff; Schweizer, *Mark*, pp. 15ff; Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 98f and E. Tromcé, *The Formation of the Gospel According to Mark* (London: SPCK, 1963), p. 202. On the contrary see Fleddermann, p. 58; Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 324; Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, pp. 101f and Schnackenburg, p. 203.
[41] In chapter six we will argue this is the case.

time, the other two Evangelists had some reservation about using it as Mark did. In the first instance, both Luke and Matthew, but especially the later, found the Mk 10 version to be a more appropriate type of employment and both incorporated some form of it into their Gospel.

It is important to note that even the later two Evangelists were not bound by any singular ideal setting or form of the saying, despite a preference for the "Mk 10/Lk 22 type". They freely move the saying to different contexts in their Gospels and used it in different ways. For example, Luke also alters the form of Mk 9.33–7 and changes the saying so as to better fit what he thought Mark was attempting to communicate. Also, for whatever reason, he firmly places the more traditional setting of the saying squarely in the context of the Last Supper, which none of the other Evangelists do. Matthew, despite his hesitation to locate the logion in a context similar to Mk 9.33–7, freely employs it in a ***unique*** setting when he writes about the proper exercise of leadership authority within the Christian community, in ch. 23. So, at least with the usage of this logion, we have evidence of an interesting mixture of ways a saying could be used within the early church's handling of dominical material.

The analysis of the various settings' elements allow us to make a few firmer suggestions about the logion's original context and significance. In order to do this we had best rely primarily on the common elements in the two independent versions of the tradition located in Mk 10 and Lk 22. One general observation, whose support is not limited to these two versions, would be the fact that the logion was uttered in the midst of a situation of conflict. Both Mk 10 and Lk 22, as well as Mk 9.33–7; Lk 9.46–8 and Mt 20.20–8, point out very clearly that the 'slave of all' logion was used once a quarrelsome situation had arisen among the disciples. This could hardly be a mere literary device to heighten the drama of the scene. [42] To create such a scene would have had a far more serious negative

[42] Contra W. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress

affect of discrediting the "leaders" of the movement than it would in bringing about a dramatic effect. This constant theme of conflict among the followers of Jesus, which is very closely related to the greatness maxim, very probably is the result of an actual recollection and not a literary creation.

This being the case, it seems safe and logical to conclude that the logion was probably spoken as a rebuke. Seemingly, in an attempt to calm the situation, Jesus uttered this adage so as to undercut the human desire for "greatness" upon which the dispute was based. This striving after prominence and precedence is explicitly stated as the cause of the disagreement by the Mk 9 (par Lk 9) and Lk 22 versions. Mk 10 (par Mt 20) does not conflict with this; but, this portrayal of the root of the problem is not as apparent as in the other two. Here we must conclude that James and John's request for the seats of honour beside Jesus reflected their opinion of themselves as having higher claim to this reward than the other ten disciples. As the Evangelist here tells the story, the issue is still

---

Press, 1983) and T. Weeden, *Mark-Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971). With regards to the three pillars and their preceding passion/ resurrection predictions, Kelber, p. 127, writes, "The author, it seems, spares little effort to sharpen the conflict between Jesus and the disciples, and to consolidate thereby the outsider position of the later". Weeden, pp. 26ff, theorizes that the conflict between Jesus and the disciples with regards to the nature of his messiahship is a Marcan device employed to counteract a "*theios aner*" christology which confronted the Marcan community. While his theory and its general defense is quite intriguing, we would be inclined to reject his suggestions that this note of conflict is merely a Marcan literary device in this instance. First, it must be considered that the conflict cited above is limited to the disciples and not between Jesus and his followers. Despite Weeden's attempts to equate "misconception" of Jesus' messiahship on the disciples' part with a relationship of conflict with Jesus, pp. 32ff, we generally find this formula unconvincing. Secondly, and more importantly, the evidence would suggest that this note of conflict between the disciples regarding their personal importance was present in this piece of tradition prior to Mark's use of it in his Gospel. As Schürmann's *Jesu* has shown, Lk 22.24–7's version of this incident, which also reflects the theme of conflict among the disciples, was very probably from a source independent of Mark. Weeden concedes that the pre-Marcan material probably contained negative, as well as positive, traditions regarding the disciples, p. 42, and we would suggest that this piece of tradition, which is found surrounding the 'slave of all' saying, was one such "negative" tradition.

personal ambition towards greatness for he set the scene where the adage is delivered by telling his readers that the ten responded with indignation to the brothers' preemptive request.

According to the two independent traditions of Mk 10 (v.42) and Lk 22 (v.25), the 'slave of all' logion was preceded by another statement regarding the nature of the exercise of authority carried out by Gentile rulers. The image of the pagan ruler holding sway over the lives of his fellow Gentiles is used as a negative illustration of greatness in both versions. Such an illustration would have been appropriate in the politically charged atmosphere of first century Palestine. One's chances of altering a fellow Jew's behaviour and definitions of ideals would be greatly enhanced if he could associate the behaviour or ideal in question with a common Gentile activity or belief. This would be especially true in this instance. It must be doubted that any of the disciples had failed to experience the realities of Gentile rulers exercising their authority and greatness and they probably responded to such treatment in the same way as their Jewish peers. Such an expression of greatness brought misery to others; however, regardless of how much the disciples may have detested such attitudes and behaviour on the part of the Gentiles, their argument over greatness was very similar to it. Such an illustration could have been used to grasp firmly the disciples' attention prior to offering a definition of true greatness. It is not inconceivable that some form of this logion was employed in a conflict situation prior to the uttering of the 'slave of all' saying.

Having rejected the common understanding of greatness, the way is now open for an articulation of how greatness is to be understood by Jesus' followers. In chapter three, we pointed out that the tribute incident showed that Jesus could affirm allegiance to Yahweh and still reject a rigid Israelite nationalism/anti-Roman posture as a natural outgrowth or expression of that religious allegiance. Also, we showed that this nationalism was intertwined with the Jewish anti-

slavery bias. With the one half of the posture destroyed, the way was open for Jesus to reject the anti-slavery attitude as well. By verbalizing the adage, Jesus advocated an unheard of posture for his followers. He demanded that they adopt a general posture of servanthood if they wanted to achieve greatness. The image of the slave now contends with that of the king as the appropriate personification of greatness. In his book, *Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism*, [43] John Riches deals with the possible ways in which shifts of language can reflect a change in attitudes and beliefs. Riches illustrates [44] by saying the Zealots who would accept the sentence, "God alone is king", would also accept the line, "God's subjects should not pay taxes to Caesar", as part of the first saying. But to associate a new second sentence with the former one will alter the understanding of that sentence. So when Jesus can affirm the willing payment of taxes to Rome and allegiance to God he is altering the current understanding of allegiance to Yahweh. Likewise, when Jesus talks of greatness and he then associates this with slavery and not the highest levels of political office, he has altered the image of both greatness and service. Slavery is no longer a shadow of doubt cast upon either God's faithfulness to Israel or Israel's self-understanding as being set aside as Yahweh's servants only. This is clear from the very general form which the logion probably took originally: *πάντων διάκονος / πάντων δοῦλος*. [45] The suggestion one must be a "slave of all" reflects a clear deviation from the current belief that an Israelite served only God and perhaps fellow Jews on a very limited basis. The demand for boundaryless service reinforces the rejection of narrow nationalism.

A further comparison of the two independent but similar traditions would suggest that the 'slave of all' logion was followed by a positive illustrative saying. Both Mk 10.45 and Lk 22.27 appeal to Jesus' own actions as a positive example of greatness displayed in service. One must admit that the two follow-

[43] (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1980), pp. 29ff.
[44] P. 37.
[45] See 4.2 above.

up illustrations are quite different from one another in substance yet function in a similar fashion. Lk 22.27 draws heavily upon the meal context and employs the rhetorical question, "For who is greater, the one sitting at the table or the one serving?" and the obvious answer is countered by Jesus' affirmation that he was present as the server, thus implying that the role of a servant is not a disgraceful one. This illustrative saying could have been uttered by any person or anyone in a leadership position who had similar views on servanthood. There is nothing about it which even hints of a uniqueness about Jesus' function apart from the oddity that he was a Jew and a leader who willingly took on the function of a servant. This scene in Lk 22 is very plausible with its negative illustration about greatness, its redefinition and the reinforcement of the new equation. Additionally, we suggested earlier that the evidence pointed in the direction of a meal setting as the more original context and the positive reinforcement very neatly would fit such an original setting. There is not even the slightest attempt to make a christological statement in v.27. The whole point of the question and answer, which could easily have arisen from the tasks associated with a meal, is to stress the validity of the equation: service equals greatness.

While the Mk 10.45 positive illustration functions in a manner similar to Lk 22.27, it does show clear evidence of theological and literary development in the illustration which is employed. Initially, the role that 10.45 plays within 8.22–10.52 would encourage us to be careful when dealing with this verse. As will be noted in chapter five, 8.22–10.52 has a very highly developed structure. [46] We generally agree with Best's proposal [47] that the crucial issue with which the Evangelist deals in this section is: what is true discipleship and how are disciples to be faithful to Christ. Best further argues that 10.43–5 is to be seen as the central interpretive key to this section. He concludes that the "rule of discipleship is: Jesus." [48] In order to provide the best possible illustration of

[46] See Part 5.2.
[47] "Discipleship", pp. 323ff.
[48] "Discipleship", p. 325.

the discipleship which Jesus embodied, Mark probably would have selected the image of the crucified redeemer over the humble waiter. The former is more graphic and fits more appropriately with the whole flow of 8.22–10.52. A vitally important theological topic, such as discipleship, is better communicated by the use of an image which holds a central place in the Christian faith. Here the picture of service which seals the validity of the 'slave of all' equation is the messianic ransom motif. It should not be surprising that this theme is present, for in the larger section running from 8.22–10.52 the dominant motif is that of the Son of Man's suffering, death and resurrection. [49] In light of this, one can probably conclude that the Lk 22.27 illustration is closer to an original follow-up than is Mk 10.45. [50]

4.4 A Sketch of the Saying's Pre-Gospel History

Having briefly analyzed the logion versions and their settings, we are now in a position to offer an understanding of the saying's original purpose and significance, as well as to propose a general sketch of how the adage was handled prior to the written Gospels. Our understanding of how the saying was initially used and was to be comprehended is bound by somewhat specific and recurring information. For example, the information which would seem to reflect the original context of the maxim suggests that Jesus spoke the logion in response to an argument amongst his disciples. This element is associated with the adage in every Synoptic location except Mt 23.1–12. Further, the information available to us would also clearly suggest that the issue at hand was that of the disciples' personal importance and ambition. Additionally, the residual and specific evi-

[49] This theme appears with striking regularity in 8.27–33; 9.30–2 and 10.32–4 leading one to conclude that it is one of Mark's dominant concerns in this section.

[50] There is a strong body of opinion that either part or all of v.45 is to be regarded as secondary material. Cf. Bultmann, p. 144; Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, p. 162; B. Branscomb, *The Gospel of Mark* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938), p. 190; Best, *Following*, p. 125; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 223 and Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 219.

dence of a meal setting would further support the conclusion that the incident, in which the maxim was given, was of a more intimate nature than the setting of a public meeting. [51]

All of this information would imply that Jesus' general response, including the logion about greatness and service, was intended as a censure of the disciples' overactive desire for personal prestige and a dictum pr scribing the proper understanding of greatness. The initial illustration of the Gentile rulers describes that understanding of greatness which was simil ar to the disciples' own comprehension but was to be rejected by the followers of Jesus. A person's greatness is primarily expressed in freely offering acts of service. According to Jesus' standards, the truly great person is the one who acts to serve the other person. To recommend this posture to his disciples means that Jesus rejected both the common understanding of social greatness and his Jewish peers' objection to functioning as servants and slaves. Also, it should be noted that this posture was probably not initially intended as the appropriate behaviour for a particular group within the larger circle of followers; rather, the slave posture was to be practiced by all those who desired to align themselves with Jesus. It would have been a trait which would have distinguished Jesus' followers from their contemporaries and was to be modelled after Jesus' own willingness to take on such a role, assuming the logion was followed by early Christians. The slave posture of the logion only later in the development of the tradition came to be applied to a specific group within the Christian community.

While the above portrayal of the logion's significance at the original *Sitz im Leben* level is not extremely detailed, it does rule out at least one understanding

[51] By saying this I am not suggesting that Jesus never employed the maxim in a public forum; but, the fact remains that we have no evidence that this was the case. In light of this we must be cautious about affirmations such as the one made by Branscomb, p. 190: "The subject of 'service' was one of Jesus' most constant themes, judging from the number of times and slightly varying forms in which the teaching occurs in the Gospels."

of the saying's pre-Gospel history and that is the opinion put forward by some scholars [52] that it was a free-floating piece of material. Such a conclusion is often based upon the fact that the logion is found in a variety of forms and located in a number of different settings in the Synoptic Gospels. The supposition seems to be that since the present manifestations are seemingly so diverse the maxim must have always been contextless and this later forced the Evangelists to create their own unique settings for the adage. Such an approach to understanding the history of the saying overlooks the fact that the two independent versions found in Mk 10 and Lk 22 share a number of explicit or implicit elements, such as the context of an argument and attaching two illustrative logions to the 'slave of all' adage. Also, we have the explicit Lucan setting of a meal situation and the residual Marcan evidence which points to an awareness of a similar setting. This is a fair amount of evidence which runs counter to the affirmation that the saying was a free-floating logion. Just the opposite seems to be true, for we have two independent streams of tradition which come very close to being reflections of one another and these independent versions probably developed from the church's recollections of an historical incident. We must conclude that the logion was not a *Wanderlogion* prior to the recorded Gospels.

A pre-Gospel awareness of a rather explicit setting for the logion would be further supported by Matthew's handling of the Mk 9.33–7 setting of the maxim. As mentioned above, Matthew seemingly found that version to be inappropriate for he completely drops the logion and the theme of conflict when dealing with these verses. In Mt 18.1–5 the pericope is dealing with humility requirements for entering into the Kingdom of God and no longer the issue of personal prestige and greatness. Later in ch.20, however, Matthew very closely follows Mk 10.35–45. This would lead us to conclude that Matthew was probably aware of this version of the incident and viewed it as a more authentic setting for the adage

[52] Such as Bultmann, p. 143; D. Nineham, *The Gospel of St. Mark* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972), p. 280 and Schnackenburg, p. 199.

than was Mk 9.33–7.

Despite the above conclusion, which can be made with a high degree of confidence, we must also conclude that the early church was not limited to preserving one type of the tradition material in its process of transmitting information about Jesus' teaching. The evidence at hand would suggest that the early Christians freely reapplied the saying about greatness and service to community issues to which the maxim could be related with little difficulty. An initial example of this process comes from the attempt to transform what originally was a humility rule into a community rule via the addition of phrases like ἐν ὑμῖν, in the Mk 10 version.

There is available to us evidence for the church's reapplication of the logion both at the pre-Gospel level and the Evangelists' level. In the chapter dealing with Mk 9.33–7 we will argue that these verses were part of a pre-Marcan tradition which was taken up and employed by the Gospel writer. Already in the tradition which Mark receives the logion has been used to an end which differs from the original thrust and context. At some earlier point in the church's utilization of the logion it was applied to the question of who was eligible for membership in the Christian community. At the Evangelist's level, Lk 22 has probably taken the source material and slightly altered the maxim so as more clearly to apply it to the issue of leadership within the Evangelist's community, while still remaining faithful to the original context and setting. A much more lucid picture of drastic reapplication at the Evangelist's level is seen in Mt 23.1–12 where the logion is recast in a polemical context dealing with the exercise of authority in the Jewish and Christian communities. In essence, there appear to be attempts to preserve both the tradition, to some degree, and to make it relevant to the ever changing needs of the early Christian communities which were aware of the tradition and handed it on.

4.5 Conclusion

We analyzed the various forms of the adage and concluded that the version present in Mk 10.43–4 is very probably the version of those available to us which is closest to the original rendering. This is based upon the presence of a number of Semitisms and the parallelism of construction. Also, we noted that this version itself probably contains a number of changes, especially the twofold usage of ἐν ὑμῖν and a probable substitution of ὑμῶν for πάντων prior to διάκονος. In the original, the maxim probably encouraged unlimited service to anyone, regardless of social, religious or political affiliation and we suggested that this understanding of the saying fits well with other accepted Jesus sayings, thus supporting the hypothesis regarding the logion's authenticity as a Jesus saying.

Secondly, we analyzed in general terms the various settings in which the logion is found. A constant theme is that the saying was uttered in response to the disciples' argument over personal greatness. Also, Mk 10 and Lk 22, which are probably independent traditions, retain very similar forms of Jesus' response to this altercation. This form consists of the greatness maxim surrounded by two other logia, one being the negative illustration of the Gentile rulers and the second being the positive illustration of Jesus as a servant. We concluded that the Lucan setting of a meal situation was probably the more original context. This is supported by the Lk 22.27 positive illustration and residual evidence in the Mk 10 version which points in the direction of Marcan awareness of such a setting. It would appear as though the logion was a rebuke of selfish ambition and an attempt to redefine greatness so as to be applied to all followers of Jesus.

In the final section, we attempted to formulate a sketch of how the saying was originally intended to be understood and how the early churches handled it as a piece of tradition material. We concluded that the logion, which was intended as a rebuke of selfish ambition, was handled in two particular ways by the early

communities. The independent traditions found in Mk 10 and Lk 22, through their high degree of similarity in presenting the logion, would suggest that on one hand the various communities did attempt to preserve what it viewed as the original setting. On the other hand, at various times in the saying's history it was taken up and applied to a variety of pressing ecclesiastical issues. The early communities seem to have attempted to be faithful to the received tradition as well as endeavouring to make the tradition relevant to the contemporary church. The remainder of this thesis will undertake to elucidate the later process.

Chapter Five:
Mark 10.35–45: True Discipleship and True Greatness

5.1 Introduction

With chapter five, we come to the point of analyzing the various primary pericopes where the 'slave of all' adage has been used. Four units may be classified under this heading: 1) Mk 10.35–45 (par Mt 20.20–8); 2) Mk 9.33–7 (parr Mt 18.1–5 and Lk 9.46–8); 3) Lk 22.24–7 and 4) Mt 23.1–12. Matthean and Lucan parallels to the various Marcan primary pericopes will be dealt with in the chapters which study the Marcan parallel text. Therefore, in this chapter Mt 20.20–8 will be touched upon and in the next chapter, dealing with Mk 9.33–7, Mt 18.1–5 and Lk 9.46–8 will be handled in the course of the analysis of the main text.

Just as our presupposition regarding Marcan priority leads us to deal with the two Marcan pericopes prior to those embedded in Luke or Matthew, so also the material recorded up to this point has determined that Mk 10.35–45 should be discussed before Mk 9.33–7. In chapter four, we concluded that Mk 10.43–4 contained the version of the maxim, available to us, which is closest to the original. Additionally, we noted that the Marcan formulation of Mk 10.35–45 harbours implicit evidence which points in the direction of the probable original setting in which the logion was uttered. On the other hand, we concluded that both the saying and scene of Mk 9.33–7 had been altered to a greater extent than those found in 10.35–45. Therefore, we prefer to work with the more original version prior to working with Mk 9.33–7.

Before either of the Marcan pericopes can be commented upon we must first briefly deal with an important literary unit which is present in the Gospel. The section running from 8.27–10.52 is a very highly structured and widely

acknowledged literary unit of this Gospel. [1] Since both Mk 9.33–7 and 10.35–45 are part of this subdivision and make significant contributions to its overall arrangement, we will initially examine this unit prior to studying the individual pericopes. If we are able to identify a perspicuous structural organization and presentation of theme(s) in the larger segment then we may well be in possession of vital information which will aid our attempts to understand Mark's handling of the logion in the two pericopes. Once this survey has been carried out we will be in a position to begin our study of Mk 10.35–45.

5.2 Examination of the Larger Literary Unit

In light of the disagreement just alluded to (fn. 1 above), our first task will be to decide which of the various content proposals for this particular Marcan subdivision is most useful. The inclusion or exclusion of pertinent material will either facilitate or hinder the attempt to establish the overarching Marcan purpose(s) of this section. The process of drawing the literary boundaries will either facilitate or hinder the attempt to survey the overarching purposes of this section depending on whether or not appropriate and pertinent material has been included or excluded.

Lane's outlining suggestion that the unit begins with 8.31 and closes at 10.52 is most unhelpful. [2] There is the problematic threefold presence of the prediction of Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection. These three pericopes seem to serve two purposes: 1) they clearly depict the nature of Jesus' messiahship and 2)

[1] While most scholars accept the content of this unit as consisting of 8.27–10.52, there are a few writers who recognize the presence of a consistent literary unit but have elected to draw different boundaries. For example, Lane, pp. 30–1, excludes 8.27–30 and suggests that the section begins with the first of the three predictions of the suffering of the Son of man. Gnilka, p. 9, omits 10.46–52. Best, "Discipleship", pp. 323ff, elects to include the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida. Cf. W. Kelber, *Mark's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 44, who also includes this pericope.

[2] P. 30.

by way of the pericopes which immediately follow them, they draw out the implication of this messianic nature for discipleship. The first purpose of the predictions necessitates that Jesus' identity as the Messiah has been divulged. From that point one can then proceed to define and illustrate the character of this identity. Identification and definition are two sides of one coin, but Lane has attempted to separate them by placing 8.27–30, where Peter is depicted as recognizing Jesus as the Messiah, in the previous unit. For this reason, we cannot accept Lane's outline formulation.

Equally questionable is the popular position that the subdivision runs from 8.27–10.52. While correctly placing the identification and definition of Jesus' messiahship within the same literary unit, this proposal founders upon a significant literary structural point: the observation that if 8.22–6 were to be included in this section the unit would be neatly framed by two incidents of healing blind men. [3] As Best suggests these two pericopes serve as transitions and they are best understood in light of the concept of restoration of one's vision as a metaphor for spiritual insight. [4] By beginning and concluding with the healing of a blind man, Mark created an *inclusio*, thus erecting a significant signpost for interpreting the whole section. The initial healing, which takes place in two parts, parallels the following identification and definition of Jesus as Messiah, as Best notes. [5] It is widely recognized that the healing of the blind man in ch. 8 is intended to symbolize the disciples' level of faith. In particular one can note that just as the first attempt at healing the man left him half-sighted, Peter's confession is also half-sighted for he failed to see Jesus as the suffering and serving Son of Man. It is only when one is fully sighted, i.e. recognizes Jesus as this particular Messiah, that one is able to do what the second blind man does once he is able to see. It is only after Bartimaeus receives his sight that he is capable of following Jesus (10.52). The reader is told three times, in

[3] Cf. Best, "Discipleship", pp. 325ff.
[4] Op. cit., p. 325.
[5] *Ibid.*

the course of these chapters, that Jesus is the suffering and serving Messiah and that true discipleship consists of following him. It is only when this picture of Jesus' messianic nature is accepted that one can follow him. The presence of the theme of healing of a blind man fits within the larger flow and thrust of the subdivision and therefore we would reject the popular outline, which offers an "unbalanced" section. [6]

A more symmetrical, yet equally unhelpful, proposal is Gnilka's suggestion that the subsection proceeds from 8.27 to 10.45. [7] By removing the pericopes regarding the healing of the blind men, Gnilka has extracted the unit from its literary frame and has eliminated an important interpretive tool. The two blind men, who regain their sight, exist as positive contrasts to Jesus' disciples who consistently fail [8] to see the true nature of his messianic nature and the implications of this aspect of the Messiah's character upon discipleship. Furthermore, it is difficult to determine what the relationship these two pericopes might have to units before and after 8.22–10.52 if their primary function and connection is not with this unit. It seems difficult to establish any strong links between 8.22–6 and the pericopes collected around the bread motif in 8.1–21. Equally challenging is the task of demonstrating links between 10.45–52 and the following material.

Having established the literary demarcations of this unit we now direct our attention to the structure and meaning of the subsection. Reploh [9] points out that any recognition of an actual historical sequence from Jesus' life in these verses is highly improbable. The clearly structured nature of the unit should hoist a host of danger flags before anyone setting out to argue such a case.

[6] We use the descriptive word "unbalanced" in reference to the popular approach's willingness to include the later healing in the section while rejecting the former similar healing. The outline of the section is considerably more balanced when both pericopes are seen as being integral parts of the subdivision.
[7] Cf. fn. 1 above.
[8] The note of failure is clearly presented three times in 8.31/2; 9.30–2/33–7 and 10.32–4/35–45.
[9] P. 87.

In addition to the "blind men" framework, there is the threefold presentation of the prediction of Jesus' passion and resurrection which follows after Peter's identification of him as the Messiah. [10] Of equal significance is the fact that each prediction is followed by a pericope which defines discipleship. [11] There can be little doubt that Mk 8.22–10.52, as it stands before us, is primarily a literary unit and not a historical one. [12]

Given this purpose of the section, we need to establish what Mark is attempting to communicate to his readers. Reploh believes that the Evangelist's *primary* goal in 8.27–10.52 is to establish his own understanding of Jesus' death, which he is not able to do in the Passion story because, to a large extent, it came to him as part of the tradition. The application of this new understanding of Jesus' death to the community's needs [13] is only a *secondary* endeavour. This agenda is suggested by Reploh's title for this section: "Theologia crucis-Grundlage der Gemeindeunterweisung des Markus (8,27–10,52)". [14] The shortcoming of this hypothesis is the fact that the three predictions of Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection do not differ from the Passion story, nor do they reflect any theological development beyond what is provided by the Passion story. If anything, they are brief summaries of that detailed narrative. The *primary* goal in this section is to elucidate the true nature of discipleship in light of Jesus' passion and messianic nature. This undertaking is not a *secondary* effort on Mark's part. For Mark the pinnacle of Jesus' ministry, i.e. his suffering, death and res-

[10] See Mk 8.31–3; 9.30–2 and 10.32–4.
[11] Cf. Mk 8.34–8; 9.33–7 and 10.35–45.
[12] This is not to suggest that the material included in this unit has no historical foundations. For example, we have already argued that the 'slave of all' saying is rooted in a historical incident from the life of Jesus. This point is also made by Anderson, p. 208, who writes, "The materials of 8.27–10.52 have for the most part come from the tradition, and while a solid historical substratum no doubt underlies many of the sayings and incidents, the preaching and catechetical interests of the Church as well as the editorial purpose of the Evangelist appear to have played their part in the formulation of the section."
[13] Pp. 87ff.
[14] P. 87.

urrection, is the key to understanding the nature of Christian discipleship. That is why each time this aspect of Jesus' ministry is mentioned it is immediately followed by a pericope which deals with the conduct of the disciple. In between these major "structural pillars" specific issues relating to discipleship are dealt with, such as prayer (9.14ff), membership in the community (9.42ff), marriage (10.1ff), the place of children (10.13ff) and wealth (10.17ff).

H.E. Tödt [15] argues the whole section is designed as a teaching unit for the disciples. He suggests the Evangelist is here dealing with the theme of Jesus' suffering and what this means for his followers. In view in this section, according to Tödt, is the disciples' following Jesus in his suffering so as to participate ultimately in the future kingdom. Tödt's primary reason for this conclusion is that the predictions of Jesus' suffering are followed by pericopes dealing with the disciples and allusions to the kingdom. However, as we will see below, the pericopes which follow the Passion predictions do not make specific references or even allusions to the disciples' suffering. The primary theme in these pericopes is the nature of discipleship, specifically a discipleship which is oriented towards service.

On this particular issue Ernest Best's understanding of the section is more accurate than either Reploh's or Tödt's presentation. [16] Best proposes that the real questions Mark faced were along the line, "...'How are followers of the Christ called to discipleship?'; 'How are they to be faithful to their Lord?'...". [17] Best sees the primary interpretive key to the subdivision (8.22–10.52) as being located in 10.43–5 [18]:

> "The clue to the understanding of this section in respect of discipleship is made explicit almost at the end, though it is implicit from the beginning.

[15] *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (London: SCM, 1965), pp. 145ff.
[16] "Discipleship", pp. 323ff.
[17] P. 323.
[18] P. 325.

> 'But it shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all. For (notice the 'for') the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many' (10.43–45). The rule of discipleship is: Jesus."

For Best the three predictions of Jesus' passion and resurrection play the central role in this section of the Gospel. He suggests that part of discipleship is the acceptance of "the strange idea that Jesus the Lord should die,...". [19] Discipleship proper is defined as not merely a willingness to suffer, but "it is a step to fall in behind Jesus,..." [20] as 8.34 suggests. Denial of the self is the real core of discipleship. This is the thrust of the initial prediction of Jesus' suffering and the follow-up pericope. The second prediction of Jesus' suffering and the following passage, 9.33–50, deals with the disciples' relationship with one another. [21] Here discipleship is expressed as serving the needs of the unimportant person. The final prediction and attending pericope is the summary of the importance of serving others. [22] Best summarizes Mark's understanding of discipleship in this way [23]:

> "What does it then mean to follow Jesus? It means to drop in behind him, to be ready to go to the cross as he did, to write oneself off in terms of any kind of importance, privilege or right, and to spend one's time only in the service of the needs of others."

If Mk 10.35–45 is the explicit key to 8.22–10.52, as Best suggests, and this does look like a strong possibility, the section's material should line up with

---

[19] P. 328.
[20] P. 329.
[21] Pp. 331ff.
[22] P. 334.
[23] *Ibid.* Cf. E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship* (London: SCM, 1960), pp. 15ff, who would agree with Best that Mk 8.22–10.52 describes discipleship as following Jesus. Schweizer, however, suggests that the section specifies the manner in which a disciple follows Jesus is in suffering and death. As we will see below, Best's understanding of "following" in this Marcan section is more viable than is Schweizer's view.

the Marcan point that the rule of discipleship is Jesus, the model servant. It certainly looks as though Mark viewed service as the key element of true discipleship. But, it seems as though Best has failed to place enough *stress* on the significance of the three predictions and their following pericopes. He prefers to see these pericopes and their structural significance as being of an "implicit" nature. However, an examination of the section reveals that the structure is much clearer than Best suggests. All three of the discipleship pericopes, which follow the three predictions of the passion and resurrection, talk of the importance of the role of the servant/slave.

Best maintains that the first pericope is a call to "readiness to suffer". [24] But is this wholly satisfactory? 8.34b is the key to understanding this pericope: "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." To associate the "cross" motif with Jesus the Messianic figure's suffering is very probably incorrect. Mark, like many modern scholars, was probably aware of the fact that no human disciple can imitate this aspect of Jesus' life. This combination of "cross"/"follow me" must refer to some other element of Jesus' ministry. Accepting 10.43–5 as the interpretive key, we must believe that the stress here is on some type of service, for in v.45 the stress is on Jesus the servant. And for Mark the passion is viewed as a service rendered on behalf of the masses.

This suggestion is heavily reinforced by Hengel's study of crucifixion in the ancient world. [25] In the eighth chapter, Hengel strongly makes the point that in the Roman world crucifixion was "the typical punishment for slaves." [26] The evidence from Roman sources is substantial and quite convincing. [27] If the

---

[24] P. 329

[25] *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (London: SCM Press, 1977).

[26] *Ibid*, p. 51.

[27] Space does not allow for a listing of all the passages cited by Hengel. Significant ones would include Cicero's *Verrem* 5.169, which calls crucifixion "the

Gospel of Mark was written for Christians in the area of Rome, as many scholars suggest, the call to take up one's cross probably conjured up a social image, a slave's death, for the first readers, rather than a theological image. The call to take up the cross and follow Jesus would have been seen as an invitation to assume the role of a slave or servant, just as Jesus was a servant, not to accept the role of a martyr. This was the general condition for any who would be Jesus' disciple, so far as Mark was concerned.

With the second and third prediction/discipleship pericopes, this general discipleship condition is applied to the Christian community. As pointed out by Best, [28] in 9.33–50 the crowds are no longer present. Here we are dealing only with disciples and their relationship with one another. Once again, after the citation of Jesus' most significant service, the disciples are called to accept the role of servant themselves. This call is presented in the form of the 'slave of all' saying (9.35). This word of 8.38 is supported by the action of embracing a παιδίον and Jesus' personal identification with him. In the next chapter we will present evidence which suggests that at this point παιδίον should be translated "young slave". Suffice it to say now that both the context here and the papyrus materials would support such a translation. By embracing the παιδίον, Jesus is to be seen as identifying with him. The talk of receiving both figures (παιδίον and Jesus) strengthens the connection. Here again we encounter the image of Jesus the servant and the call for his disciples to accept such a role and persons filling such a role.

In the third and final prediction/discipleship complex, the 'slave of all' saying is again present, as is the clear identification of Jesus as a servant (v.45). Although not as clear as the Lk 22 version, the concern here is probably the relationship between discipleship and the exercise of authority within the Christian

supreme and ultimate penalty for slaves"; Valerius Maximus 2.7.12; Tacitus, *Histories*, 4.11 and 2.72 and *Annals*, 13.32.1 and Livy 29.18.14.

[28] Pp. 331ff.

community. The presence of the saying regarding the Gentile rulers' exercise of authority moves the pericope in this direction as we will see later in this chapter. The twelve disciples are symbolic of the community leaders in the Marcan church. They are not to be concerned with personal glory; rather, their primary goal is to act as servants to the community.

In light of this very clear triple "pillar" structure of the section and each pillar's stress upon the importance of the concept of service for the life of discipleship (see Chart A below), it would seem as though Best has promoted 10.45's significance at the expense of understating this aspect of the section. Due emphasis needs to be given to the service theme of the three "pillars". These "pillars" are as *explicit* as 10.45 in defining discipleship as a life of service; however, Best does not clearly make this point. It may be better to view 10.45 as the summary of the threefold presentation and the interspersed materials. For the Evangelist, discipleship can be summed up as servanthood. Just as Jesus came to serve, in his unique way, so too the follower of Jesus is called to a life of service. This is made clear by the first prediction/discipleship complex. In turn, the second and third complexes attempt to apply this principle to two aspects of the Christian community's life together. In the remainder of this chapter we will look at the application in Mk 10.35–45 and in the next chapter we will turn our attention to the process associated with 9.33–7.

CHART A: THE THREE PILLARS OF MK 8.22–10.52

Passion	**Passion**	**Passion**
Saying 1	**Saying 2**	**Saying 3**
Following=	παιδίον:	10.42f:
slave's death	slave	greatness=slavery

5.3 Background Issues

CHART B: MT 20.20–8/MK 10.35–45

20 Τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῆς προσκυνοῦσα καὶ αἰτοῦσά τι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ τί θέλεις; λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων σου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. 22 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ μέλλων πίνειν; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ δυνάμεθα. 23 λέγει αὐτοῖς· τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε, τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν τοῦτο δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου. 24 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν. 25 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς εἶπεν· οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. 26 οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, 27 καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος

35 Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου λέγοντες αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν. 36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῖν; 37 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου. 38 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι; 39 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· δυνάμεθα. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω πίεσθε καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε, 40 τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται. 41 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰάκωβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. 42 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατ-

CHART B (continued)

ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος· 28 ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

ἐξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. 43 οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, 44 καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος· 45 καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

We begin the study of this pericope by examining its general composition and a survey of two issues associated with the passage. These two points have a marginal bearing upon our attempt to establish the Evangelist's purpose for including this material in the larger unit dealing with the question of discipleship.

5.3.1 Conflated Pericopes in Vv.35–45

Most scholars accept that this pericope is a conflation of two originally separate units. [29] Those who overlook or make no mention of the compositional nature of Mk 10.35–45 are rare. [30] The vast majority [31] argue that at some point

[29] In the process of my secondary source research I have not located any scholarly works which actually argue Mk 10.35–45 has always been a single literary unit. One writer who comes close to this position is C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (Cambridge: CUP, 1959), p. 336, who thinks it is likely that vv.41–5 is a "historical sequel" to James and John's request. However, the possibility of such a position is weakened by Cranfield's own admission that v.41 may well be an editorial link.

[30] See Lane, pp. 376ff.

[31] This grouping would include Best, *Following*, pp. 123ff; Branscomb, pp. 187ff; Bultmann, p. 24; Grundmann,*Markus*, p. 217; Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 367; E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926),

in the development of the Gospel vv.35–40 and vv.42–5 were brought together so as to construct the larger pericope. This suggestion is based primarily upon three arguments.

First is the argument that the primary subject concern of vv.35–40 differs from that found in vv.42–5. For example, Best writes [32]:

> "Verses 35–40 relate to the position which John and James hope to attain in Christ's glory and therefore have an eschatological reference whereas vv.41–45 relate to those who hold positions of authority in the present age and in this world."

Haenchen sees vv.41ff as dealing with a "ganz anderen Thema" from that which is found in vv.35–40. [33] He sees the latter unit's subject as being a question of power within the Christian community and the former part as dealing with behaviour in the Kingdom of God. [34] Similarly, Kuhn writes [35]:

> "...V.42b–45 reden, wie wir gesehen haben, vom Vorrang in der Gemeinde, dagegen handeln v.35–40 vom Vorrang in der künftigen Herrlichkeit."

Scholars have firmly taken hold of the Zebedeans' request, δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου (v.37) and determined that this reference to Jesus' δόξα is concerned with some futuristic and probably eschatological event. How the phrase ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου is to be understood varies from author to author. Some see it as a reference to the Kingdom of God. [36] Others have identified this glory with a reference to thrones of judgement,

---

p. 121; Kuhn, p. 158; C. Mann, *Mark* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1986), p. 411; Nineham, pp. 279ff; Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, pp. 153ff; J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), p. 218 and Taylor, *Mark*, p. 442.

[32] *Following*, p. 123.

[33] *Weg*, p. 367.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] P. 158.

[36] J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1903), p. 90;

[37] the messianic banquet, [38] the parousia, [39] the eschatological establishment of David's throne, [40] the Son of man's heavenly glory [41] and others refuse to comment. [42] Despite a lack of unity regarding the exact nature of the δόξα, commentators have agreed, to a large degree, that the request is to be seen as future-oriented and that it has eschatological overtures.

Having reached this conclusion an internal literary conflict within the pericope is bound to arise because the following unit (vv.41–5) clearly deals with what was, at that point in time, to be seen as a contemporary problem. The ten remaining disciples are depicted as strongly reacting to the request of the brothers. The response of Jesus is cast so as to present a rule regarding rank and order within the community of disciples. [43] This apparent temporal difference between the two elements of the tradition which constitute Mk 10.35–45 is taken by most scholars as a key item of evidence that the pericope was created out of material which did not originally belong together.

A second argument put forth as evidence that vv.35–40 and 41–5 were separate units is the parallel to Mk 10.41–5 which exists in Lk 22.24–7. [44] The fact that Lk 22.24–7 exists in a form similar to Mk 10.41–5 without any connection

---

Nineham, p. 280; Lohmeyer, pp. 222–23; Bultmann, p. 24; and T. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge: CUP, 1945), p. 314. Along this line, but in a more specific manner, Cranfield, p. 337, sees ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου as a reference to the Messiah's rule prior to the final Kingdom of God.

[37] For example, A. Rawlinson, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Methuen, 1925), p. 144; H. Kee, *Community of the New Age* (London: SCM, 1977), pp. 116 and 173, who refers to the expectation as the "new age".

[38] Branscomb, p. 187 and Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 218.

[39] Taylor, *Mark*, p. 440.

[40] Lane, p. 378.

[41] Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, p. 155.

[42] Schweizer and Klostermann.

[43] So conclude Best, *Following*, p. 126; Branscomb, p. 190; Bultmann, p. 24; Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 367; Klostermann, p. 121 and Rawlinson, p. 146 among others. Cf. also the arguments of chapter four, which decided that originally the 'slave of all' saying was uttered in response to such a conflict.

[44] Cf. Best, *Following*, p. 123; Branscomb, p. 190; Bultmann, p. 24; Nineham, p. 280 and Schniewind, p. 108.

with Mk 10.35–40 type material is a strong point in favour of the conclusion that at some point in time Mk 10.35–40 and 41–5 were not connnected. This opinion is significantly confirmed by Schürmann's [45] and Taylor's [46] analyses of the two which conclude that Luke did not redact the Marcan material.

A third argument against the unity of vv.35–45 is the fact that v.41 or vv.41–2a contain signs of editorial work. However, despite the agreement that editorial evidence can be found here, there is no consensus as to when the activity took place. The majority defend Marcan editing, [47] while the minority see this action taking place at the pre-Marcan stage. [48] Those defending Marcan redaction in these verses would point to two items: a) the auxiliary use of ἄρχεσθαι [49] and b) the use of προσκαλεῖσθαι in a participal form in connection with a verb of saying. [50] Best sees both of these formulations as being indications of Marcan redaction because we often find them in those elements which can safely be identified as Marcan redactions. [51] Kuhn [52] challenges the suggestion that 10.41–42a are Marcan because ἄρχεσθαι is found in non-Marcan units functioning as an auxiliary (see 2.23 or 10.47) and he also claims that 12.43; 8.1 and 15.44, where προσκαλεῖσθαι appears, are also non-Marcan. However, Kuhn's citations of two places where the auxiliary use of ἄρχεσθαι is present does not totally undercut Best's point. And the three locations of προσκαλεῖσθαι, given by Kuhn as non-Marcan, are debatable. The evidence would seemingly better support Best's

[45] *Jesu*, pp. 63–98.
[46] *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke* (Cambridge: CUP, 1972), pp. 61–4.
[47] Best, *Following*, p. 123 (vv.41–2a); Bultmann, p. 330 (v.41); Lohmeyer, p. 223 (v.41); Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 219 (v.41); Anderson, p. 254 (v.42a) and Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 48 and 63f (v.41).
[48] Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, p. 153 and Kuhn, pp. 159f and 188.
[49] Best, *Following*, p. 123 and Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 48 and 63ff.
[50] Best, p. 123 and Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 219.
[51] Taylor, *Mark*, p. 48, cites 1.45; 2.23; 4.1; 5.17,20; 6.2,7,34,55; 8.11,31,32; 10.28,32,41, 47; 11.15; 12.1; 13.5; 14.19,33,65,71; 15.8 and 18 as places where Mark uses ἄρχομαι as an auxiliary verb. Best, *Following*, p. 130, fn. 8, cites 3.23; 7.14; 8.1,34 and 12.43 as redactional passages where προσκαλέομαι is found in the aorist participle followed by a finite verb of speech.
[52] Pp. 159ff.

Marcan redaction proposal than Kuhn's pre-Marcan suggestion.

The joining of the two units was facilitated by the presence of two thematic motifs found in each of the individual pieces. Initially, there is the theme of personal honour. [53] In v.37, the Zebedeans' request for the seats of honour is a request for recognition of worthiness. As Lk 14.7ff shows, the assignment of particular seats was one way in which a person's importance could be recognized and affirmed. The seats of honour were reserved for the leaders of the social group. The concern for acknowledged prestige is represented in the later pericope by way of the dominical saying on 'slave of all'. The preceding saying which specifies the Gentile rulers as the negative model reinforces the motif of importance with this theme being expressed in terms of equating greatness with leadership.

The second thematic motif which enabled the Evangelist to combine vv.35–40 and 42–5 is the usage of Jesus as a positive role model in each individual pericope. When the two brothers request the seats of honour the immediate challenge placed before them is the question of their ability to identify with Jesus. The gauntlet is thrown down in the form of the question, "Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?". Jesus' honour came from what he experienced and accomplished. The Christian standard for measuring importance and honour is now established in him. Similarly, in the second pericope, the rule by which a leader's greatness is measured is not the contemporary political rulers; rather, the true dimensions of leadership greatness are demonstrated by the standard of Jesus, the servant (v.45). In the final analysis, we agree with the general opinion that the material in vv.35–40 and vv.42–5 were originally separate.

[53] Cf. Klostermann, p. 121 and Kuhn, p. 158, also comments on the common theme of precedence in the two pericopes, but points out that the exact sphere of this concern varies in each. Contra. see Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, p. 153.

5.3.2 Verses 38–39

The second issue relating to this pericope resolves around vv.38–9: were these verses a later Marcan addition to a pre-Marcan unit consisting of vv.35–7/40? The reasons given by scholars [54] for the conclusion that these verses are a later addition can be summarized as follows:

> a) Vv.38–9 and v.40 offer two different answers to the brothers' request. [55] Vv.38–9 assume that priority in the New Age is related to a martyr's death and Jesus asks if they are willing to accept this fate. They understand the issue and agree that they are willing. Jesus further predicts this fate. This should have settled the question but v.40 reverses all this with Jesus denying that he has the authority to grant the seats. [56]

> b) These verses must be a *vaticinium ex eventu* otherwise they could not have been included. [57] The scholars draw upon various traditions, including Acts 12.2 and Philip of Side. Philip of Side's credibility as a witness rests primarily upon his supposed use of Papias [58], who is reputed to have suggested that both brothers were martyred. In support of this position the imagery of the "cup" and "baptism" are seen as references to suffering. [59]

A number of observations would undercut these points should they be employed to show the Marcan creation and addition of the verses. First, there is

---

[54] Branscomb, pp. 188f; Bultmann, p. 24; Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 217 and G. Braumann, "Leidenkelch und Todestaufe" *ZNW* 56 (1965), pp. 178ff. Against this position are Cranfield, p. 339; Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, pp. 158f; Schniewind, p. 108 and Taylor, *Mark*, p. 441.

[55] So Branscomb and Bultmann. Bultmann, of all the authors cited in the previous footnote, explicitly attributes the origin of these verses to the Evangelist (cf. *HST*, p. 24). He argues that it is unlikely these verses would have had an independent circulation. While disagreeing with his former assertion, we would be inclined to accept his latter suggestion. In the following material we will see that these verse are very probably "traditional" material and therefore are also probably to be viewed as originating within this pericope.

[56] Thus runs Branscomb's argument.

[57] Bultmann, p. 24; Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 218 and Lohmeyer, p. 223.

[58] Cf. Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 365.

[59] Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 218 and Lohmeyer, pp. 222–23. Cf. Klostermann, p. 121.

nothing in v.38a that points in the direction of the slightest amount of Marcan editorial work. [60] If vv.38–9 were additions to the original pericope we might expect to locate some type of "seam" whereby the Evangelist had united the two elements; but, this is not the case.

Secondly, if vv.38–9 were to be taken in isolation it is apparent that, as the verses now stand, they would be virtually incomprehensible without a larger storyline. If the Evangelist has taken the dialogue of this conversation from a different context to be used here it is, as Kuhn notes, [61] quite unlike the Marcan editorial style to use only bits and pieces of a unit of tradition. On the other hand, he may have created these verses *ex nihilo*. But that suggestion stands up only if the second argument for the addition theory is accurate. In other words, these verses may have been created by the Evangelist in light of the two brothers' death as martyrs. Therefore, with the advantage of hindsight, the writer is able to cast Jesus as predicting the Zebedeans' martyrdom.

For this proposal to be acceptable one must show that *both* brothers were martyred and as many [62] have pointed out the argument for John's death as a martyr is very weak indeed. Acts 12.2 is aware of only James' death at the hands of Herod. The suggestion that John was martyred is based primarily upon that single mid-fifth century report of a historian of questionable credibility. Against this late tradition we may counter that neither Irenaeus nor Eusebius, who read Papias, mention this apostle's martyrdom. In the final analysis, we must conclude that there is little evidence that John was a martyr. If one brother died such a death and the other did not, the Evangelist would hardly have created, *ex nihilo*, such a saying that would make Jesus look to be a false prophet. We conclude that the Evangelist is not responsible for the addition of vv.38–9, if

[60] Best, *Following*, p. 124.
[61] P. 158.
[62] Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 441f; Cranfield, p. 339; Schniewind, p. 108 and Lane, p. 381, fn. 87.

they were not part of the original pericope.

This conclusion leaves us with the question why Mark would retain these verses. What is their significance for the thrust of the pericope? Later we will argue, along with other scholars [63] that here the images of the "cup" and "baptism" are not to be interpreted as *mere* symbols of suffering; but, instead they are to be seen as sacramental allusions. While we can cite OT references which use the "cup" imagery as an expression for suffering, [64] OT "baptism" images are, at best, tenuous. [65] Below we will argue that Mark included these verses because of their sacramental symbolism within his community. [66]

5.4 The Goal of Mark 10.35–45

The attempt to understand Mk 10.35–45 at the Marcan level will be guided and bound by the analysis of 8.22–10.52. In Part 5.2 it was argued that the Evangelist's goal in that section was to draw a clear picture of the nature of discipleship in light of Jesus' passion and resurrection. It was further suggested that for Mark true discipleship is service, i.e. a willingness to identify with Jesus, the true servant. This point is partially advanced by way of the "three pillars", which serve as the section's foundations. These three pericopes, 8.34–8, 9.33–7 and 10.35–45, each of which follows immediately after a prediction of

[63] See Best, *Following*, pp. 124–5; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 441; Rawlinson, p. 145; Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 218; Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 221 and Lohmeyer, p. 223.
[64] Isa 51.17,22; Ps 74.9.
[65] Such symbolic usages tend to rely solely on the use of "flood" imagery such as in Pss 41.7; 68.2ff and 43.2.
[66] Far less crucial for a clear understanding of this pericope is the controversy surrounding v.45. Some scholars such as Bultmann (p. 144); Pesch (*Markus*, Vol. II, p. 162); Best (*Following*, p. 125); Schweizer (*Mark*, p. 219) and H. Tödt, (pp. 202ff) argue that either part or the whole of this verse was added by the primitive church. Others, such as Cranfield (pp. 341ff) and Schniewind (pp. 109f), affirm the authenticity of v.45. A detailed discussion of this issue will not further our understanding of the pericope. Regardless of how and when the saying in v.45 came to be associated with the pericope, it is used here by Mark because it offers a stunning example of what Christian service is like.

Jesus' passion and resurrection, stress the servant role which is an integral part of Christian discipleship. The first unit, 8.34–8, presents the presupposition that "service/slavery" is the essence of discipleship and one must be willing to accept this role, even in its extreme forms, i.e. death on a cross, in order to be one of Jesus' followers. The second and third pillars are attempts to apply this presupposition to particular aspects of the Christian community's life together. In this final section of chapter five the task at hand is to learn how Mark employed the 'slave of all' saying, in the third "pillar", so as to promote his understanding of discipleship.

In addition to the structure and purpose of the larger literary section created by the Evangelist, the common motifs in the two independent units, which Mark very probably united, [67] will render further insights as to what Mark's agenda was in this pericope. The Evangelist overlooked, or failed to recognize, the different primary subject concerns dealt with in vv.35–40 and vv.42–5. [68] At the same time there are common themes in each unit which both enable the combination of the units and commend their inclusion with the larger section of 8.22–10.52. It would be these mutual motifs which would further point in the direction of Mark's intention when uniting the material. By connecting the two smaller units the Evangelist could create a more substantial unit which appropriately stressed the theme(s) of discipleship which he wished to communicate.

Earlier the observation was made that in each independent unit two themes were present which would facilitate the joining of the two. [69] In each unit, there is present the issue of personal honour and the presentation of Jesus as the pertinent role model. In vv.35–40, the question of personal honour is found in the request of James and John for seats of honour (v.37). The brothers' overture was made in the hope of gaining recognition. A similar question of

[67] See p. 110 and fns. 47–52.
[68] Cf. pp. 107ff and fns. 29–41.
[69] Cf. p. 111.

honour is presented in vv.42–5 by way of the 'slave of all' logion (vv.43–4). Mark's transitional line in v.41 has bridged the gap between the two independent units and also ties them together along the line of this particular theme. In v.41 we are told of the indignation on the part of the other ten disciples once they heard of the brothers' request. This connection, created by Mark would seemingly attempt to stress the common desire, exhibited by "the twelve", to be in possession of personal greatness and honour. The follow-up teaching about greatness and service (vv.42–4) counters a particular understanding of personal greatness, which is best typified by the model of the Gentile rulers (v.42). The 'slave of all' saying acts as a counter to the disciples' desire for this particular form of greatness.

The second motif, which is found in both units, is that of Jesus as the appropriate role model for the disciple and this motif is related to the former theme in that it acts as a corrective to the disciples' misguided understanding of greatness. Vv.38–9 present Jesus as the acceptable role model when James and John are asked if they are able to participate in Jesus' activities. In a similar vein, v.45 functions in the same way for vv.42–4 when Jesus is depicted as the one who came to serve. The verse's use of καὶ γάρ would refer back to the preceding demand that the disciple assume the role of a servant in his relationship with others. Jesus' own acceptance of the role of servant becomes foundational for the disciples' understanding of greatness. Additionally, the model of Jesus stands in direct contrast to the role of the Gentile rulers. The Christian understanding of greatness is found in a life of service, not of dominance and being served. If one elected to align with Jesus via baptism and sharing in his "cup" (vv.38–9) [70] one also needs to accept the function of servant for (γάρ) Jesus was a servant.

[70] It would be in this respect that the image of the cup and baptism should be interpreted sacramentally. Here, for Mark, the image of baptism was probably intended to remind the reader of his initiation into the Christian community and his identification with Jesus Christ. Likewise, the "cup" would be symbolic of the Eucharist and served as a further reminder to what/whom the believer

By uniting two units which contain these themes dealing with personal greatness and Jesus as the prime role model for the Christian, the Evangelist has been able to create the third "pillar" which sets out his understanding of discipleship. Mark took the 'slave of all' saying and its larger context as it came to him from the traditional material and combined it with another unit of traditional material so as to make the case for the life of service as being typical for Christian discipleship. To be a member of the Christian community is to accept that one's life is now committed to a life of discipleship which stresses the exercise of servanthood as a central tenet.

---

had committed himself. Cf. Best, *Following*, pp. 124ff, who argues for a sacramental understanding of these two images. He argues that the Zebedeans are to be viewed as "typical believers" with all believers participating sacramentally in Jesus' passion. However, if one attempts to see these images as references to martyrdom a number of problems arise. Apart from the literal martyrdom of John as well as James, which seems unlikely, the reference must be to these men as martyr examples for the Marcan community; however, there is no reason to believe that these two were viewed as special in this respect. If one were to see James and John as martyr examples nothing significant is added to Mark's understanding of discipleship beyond 8.31–4. On the other hand, if these verses are interpreted sacramentally, thus implying a participation in Jesus' death, the Marcan theme moves forward and is rounded out. Furthermore, this sacramental interpretation leads on to vv.42–5 "where the sacramental dying to or with Christ is developed as a daily dying in service to him and to men,..." (pp. 124–5). This flow of thought, Best suggests, fits with a pattern of Early Christian catechesis. Dunn's article ("The Birth of a Metaphor–Baptized in Spirit" *ExpT* 89 (1977/78), pp. 134–8 and 173–5) points out the complex nature of this "baptism" concept. Two consistent elements found with the metaphor are the elements of *initiation* and *judgment*. While the initiation theme is offered with reference to various concepts (New Age: John the Baptist, Jesus and Post-Easter fulfilment *or* into Christ: Paul), the themes of suffering (judgment) and initiation are consistently found in the mix which contribute to the metaphor's meaning. Paul's understanding may well have been the dominant understanding for Mark. Here one is baptized into Christ and therefore into his death. One is in Christ and also shares his suffering. A similar complex mix may stand behind the "cup" image. If one is in Christ, one is able to participate in his "cup" (Eucharist); but to do so is to accept the suffering which will accompany such participation. For other arguments for the sacramental view of these images cf. Lohmeyer, p. 223 and Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 221. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 441, suggests, "The relevancy of the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist may have been in the mind of Mk;...". For an example of a scholar who interprets the cup and baptism imagery as references to martyrdom see Schniewind, p. 107.

While it is true that Mark saw the natural outgrowth of membership in the Christian community as being a commitment to a life of service, Mk 10.35-45 seems to be focusing on a narrower and more specific aspect of discipleship and life in the community of faith. Additionally, the audience to whom this message is directed has also been narrowed significantly. The tendency of the three "pillars" of section 8.22–10.52 is to move from general content *and* audiences to more specific content material and audiences. For example, 8.34–8 dealt with the idea of service and discipleship at a very general level. Here the interrelated nature of the two themes are presented to would-be disciples. The address directed at the multitude (τὸν ὄχλον) is phrased in a conditional manner, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." (v.34). In the second "pillar" the same themes of service and discipleship are present but gone are the crowds. 9.33–7 is directed at the members of the Christian community. The audience here is not specified although they are with Jesus in a private dwelling and discussing the question of greatness for the disciple. Once we turn to 10.35–45, the third "pillar" of 8.22–10.52, the audience is even more specific-the Twelve. Here the concern is to apply the dual motifs of service and discipleship to yet another aspect of the Christian community's life.

The gradual narrowing of the content and application runs counter to Best's attempts to understand vv.42–4 in a general way as opposed to being related to the question of the nature of authority within the community. [71] His only support for such an affirmation is the presence of ὑμῶν in v.43 which "prevents us drawing a sharp distinction between a group (the Twelve?) which rules and a group which is ruled." [72] But as we pointed out the previous "pillar"

[71] See *Following*, p. 126's "...although Mk 10.42–44 may deal with the behaviour of those who claim to hold some position of authority in the Christian community this has hardly occasioned their present use. In their context they describe how a Christian, or a Christian leader, ought to behave and they do not assert the status or official position of leaders within the community /34/ .".
[72] P. 132, fn. 34.

already dealt with the general application of these themes to the wider Christian community. Additionally, the fact that in this pericope, unlike in 9.33–7, the Evangelist elected to retain the Gentile rulers logion would suggest that the real issue at stake was a question of how authority was exercised within the Christian community. This is strengthened by the specific citation of the Twelve as the recipients of the teaching, thus symbolizing the community leaders.

Therefore, we must conclude, along with Lane, that Mk 10.35–45 "goes beyond the instruction given to the disciples in Ch. 9:35–7, and brings the queston of rank, precedence and service into profound pastoral and theological perspective." [73] Those scholars who see the pericope attempting to deal with issues of authority and leadership within the post-Easter community [74] therefore are probably correct; however, to attempt to "name names" is to go too far. [75] What we can say, in light of the evidence, is that the Marcan community was probably facing internal tensions over the question of how community leaders were to use their positions of authority. The threefold presence of ἐν ὑμῖν in vv.43–4 and ὑμῶν διάκονος in v.43 certainly points in the direction of a community issue. Whether or not the Evangelist saw this addressed concern as a strictly internal matter is questionable, especially in light of the presence of πάντων δοῦλος in v.44. The word πάντων may suggest that Mark expected Christian leaders to be of service to anyone in need. The use of this word clearly contrasts with the parallel in Mt 20.20–8, where Matthew substitutes ὑμῖν for πάντων. The first Evangelist narrowly restricts the realm of service to those people within his Christian community. Mark, on the other hand still sees a value in unrestricted service on the part of community leaders.

In order to deal with and resolve this particular community problem, the

[73] P. 378.
[74] See Lohmeyer, p. 223; Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 367 and Klostermann, p. 120.
[75] For example, Lohmeyer's attempt to see this as a conflict over leadership between Peter and James, Jesus' brother, p. 223 or Schweizer's view, *Mark*, p. 219, that this may be an anti-James and John polemic.

Evangelist takes the 'slave of all' logion and its larger context of other sayings from the traditional material, probably with little or no alteration to the whole unit, and attaches it to the previous unit. Since both independent units deal with the question of personal honour we are led to conclude that the wider issue which faced the Marcan community was that of prestige and arrogance associated with positions of leadership. Seemingly the leaders in that community misunderstood the foundation for and goal of ecclesiastical authority. As the Evangelist points out the foundation is Jesus and the goal is service to all. Instead, within the Marcan community, the positions of responsibility were probably in danger of being used for self-promotion and grounded upon arrogance and used selectively when the issue in question was service.

The proposal that Mark is attempting to combat an abuse of authority is reinforced by the fact that Mark has not extracted the 'slave of all' saying from its larger context, as has been done in 9.33–7. The primary significance of this is the fact that the saying regarding the Gentile rulers' abuse of their authority has been retained. [76] With the church leaders in the middle, as it were, a sharp contrast is drawn between the negative illustration of the rulers who dominated and Jesus who served. The correct exercise of leadership is not "lording over" but in "service".

By using the 'slave of all' maxim in this manner and context, the saying has been employed in a slightly different way from that in which it was originally intended to be used. While this version of the saying is still applied to the question of personal prestige and honour, as well as still being employed within the confines of a conflictual social setting, the social context has been

[76] K.W. Clark's short article, "The Meaning of [KATA]KYRIEYEIN" in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of G.D. Kilpatrick* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), which attempts to argue that κατακυριέυουσιν has no reference to "lording over" or abuse of authority here in the Synoptic Gospels, is unconvincing. To follow Clark's line of study is to miss totally any attempt at contrasting the rulers and what is expected from the Christian leaders.

moved from the area of private interpersonal relatonships to a question of ecclesiastical structures. Here in Mk 10.35–45, the saying is no longer used as a guide to personal humility and the resolution of interpersonal conflict; rather, the employment now is that of a ruling for directing one particular aspect of the life of the Christian community. The basic 'slave of all' saying is supported by a moderately developed theological v.45. When applied to the question of authority within the church, the foundation for the proper understanding of service-oriented discipleship is no longer the human Jesus but the christological figure of Jesus Christ. Here theological reflection on Jesus' identity and key events of his life has begun to determine and define the interpersonal relationships within the community of faith. The scope of service has been narrowed to the Christian community and is reinforced by the community's own theological reflection, i.e. the original Jesus saying has been interpreted and applied to the community's particular needs.

5.5 The Matthean Parallel

Finally, the parallel to Mk 10.35–45, Mt 20.20–8, will be briefly analyzed. By doing this we will see how another Evangelist has employed this material and this in turn will contribute to a larger picture of how Matthew has generally dealt with the 'slave of all' logion.

Even a very brief glancing comparison of the two pericopes will reveal that Matthew has followed the Marcan source quite closely. In addition to a number of stylistic alterations, [77] Matthew has made four changes which are worthy of attention. The four variations are:

a) The mother of the Zebedeans makes the request (v.20).

[77] For example, one such change is the result of Matthew's preference to ascribe "kingdom sayings" to Jesus. Therefore, the phrase ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου becomes ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου in Mt 20.21. Cf. R. Gundry, *Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), p. 402.

b) The baptism image is omitted in the reply (vv.22–23).

c) In v.27, the expression πάντων δοῦλος is replaced by ὑμῶν δοῦλος.

d) In v.28, the conjunction ὥσπερ is substituted for καὶ γάρ.

Not all of these alterations reflect a change in application and employment of the logion. For example, the switch from depicting the two brothers as requesting the seats of honour to placing the responsibility on the shoulders of the mother probably was due to the Evangelist's concern to depict the disciples in the best possible light. [78] However, even here one might argue that the change is significant for our purposes, as Luz has argued, [79]

> "...the only point at which Matthew has quite consistently 'improved' the picture of the disciples is in his eliminaton of the Marcan motif of their failure to understand. In Matthew the disciples do understand."

While this affirmation seems to ring true to Matthew's work, the thing which the brothers understand is probably not the need for service. Instead, they comprehend the fact that suffering is a part of the Christian life. Evidence of this understanding is seen in the change which takes place in the context of the dialogue regarding the acceptance of the cup which Jesus drinks.

This observation does raise the point regarding Matthew's decision to omit the reference to "baptism" in vv.22–3. Klostermann [80] suggests that the Evangelist retained only the "cup" imagery because of the obscure nature of "baptism"

---

[78] Cf. any of the following: Gundry, p. 401; Fenton, p. 324; Robinson, p. 166; Hill, *Matthew*, p. 287 and E. Klostermann, *Das Matthäus Evangelium* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927), p. 163. E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), p. 291, stands alone when he suggests that Matthew is actually following an older tradition at this point.

[79] "The Disciples in the Gospel According to Matthew", p. 102, in *Interpretation of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

[80] P.162.

as a symbol of suffering. However, as Dunn [81] has noted, the Baptist's use of this type of expression does provide a contemporary employment which encompasses the note of suffering via judgment. A more likely explanation for its omission may well be the fact that the Evangelist and his community have come to see "baptism" primarily as a Christian initiatory ritual. [82] It is, however, very probable that the primary reason for retaining the "cup" image is its symbolic representation of suffering. [83] Not only does Matthew use the "cup" image in this way in 26.39; but, he also attempts to unite this pericope more closely to 20.17–9, which announces Jesus' passion and resurrection, by the use of τότε instead of the Marcan καὶ.

The change in v.27 from πάντων δοῦλος to ὑμῶν δοῦλος has a direct bearing upon our question of how the 'slave of all' logion was used. By substituting ὑμῶν for πάντων, the Evangelist has significantly narrowed the scope of the logion's application. No longer are disciples called to render service to anyone with whom they come into contact. Now these deeds of service are reserved for their "fellow members" of the Christian community. The universal intention of the original saying has been given a myopic focus by Matthew. He applies the saying more narrowly than does Mark.

Finally, the Matthean preference for ὥσπερ indicates a different application of the final saying (v.28). Whereas Mark viewed Jesus as the foundational reason for the life of discipleship which serves (hence his use of καὶ γάρ), Matthew takes Jesus more as a model of service. The Matthean view leans more towards imitation than does that of Mark. [84]

---

[81] Cf. pp. 24f and fns. 65–6 above.
[82] Cf. Mt 28.16ff, especially v.19.
[83] Cf. Fenton, p. 324; F. Filson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: A. & C. Black, 1960), p. 216; Robinson, pp. 166–7; Hill, *Matthew*, p. 288 and P. Gaechter, *Das Matthäus Evangelium* (Innsbruck: Tryolia-Verlag, 1963), p. 648.
[84] Cf. Schweizer, *Matthew*, p. 398 and Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 445.

On the whole, these few alterations certainly cast the pericope in a different light than that surrounding Mk 10.35–45. Matthew expected suffering to be a part of the Christian life and this is promoted by retaining only the reference to Jesus' cup. The cup motif seems to be in direct competition with v.28 for the supreme definition of greatness. The first unit (20.20–4) calls for a willingness to share Jesus' suffering and the second unit promotes service as the role to be practised. Matthew seems to be attempting to unite the two themes, yet he has not quite been able to do this. Confusion arises particularly over the question of how can suffering and service to one's fellow disciples (ὑμῶν δοῦλος) be neatly tied together. One possible solution may be that the leaders/those serving the Matthean community had been singled out for persecution because they held positions of authority in the community; but there is very little evidence to support this hypothesis.

We can say that for Matthew, at this point, service need only be exercised within the confines of the Christian community. The 'slave of all' logion is applied very narrowly to this particular context, hence the use of ὑμῶν δοῦλος. Just as (ὥσπερ) the Son of man, the servant, gave his life as a ransom for many (the members of the Christian community?) so also the great individuals of that fellowship will imitate their leader and act as community servants.

5.6 Conclusion

After establishing 8.22–10.52 as the probable extent of the Marcan section which deals with the theme of discipleship, we argued that the structure of the subdivision consisted of material interspersed between three "pillars" consisting of three predictions of Jesus' passion and resurrection immediately followed by pericopes which stress the importance of service for discipleship. Secondly, a number of issues which have a bearing upon the interpretation of Mk 10.35–45 were analyzed. Clearly the pericope is a compilation of two originally indepen-

dent units, which were very probably unified by the Evangelist. The themes of personal honour and Jesus as a foundational model for Christian behaviour, which are present in each unit, helped make the unification possible. It was concluded that there is insufficient evidence to show that vv.38–9 were a later addition to vv.35–7/40 and the suggestion that they are an example of a *vaticinium ex eventu* is extremely unlikely. The analysis of Mk 10.35–45 was guided, in part, by the analysis of 8.22–10.52. In the third "pillar", Mark continues to set out his understanding of Christian discipleship. And again the key word is service; however, this theme is applied in a particular way to the question of community leadership. For Mark and his community, such positions of leadership are held in order to benefit the church, not for the personal prestige of the office-holder. Matthew takes this pericope and even more specifically narrows the scope of the service to the context of the Christian fellowship. Also, unlike Mark, who sees Jesus' life as a rationale for service, Matthew views Jesus as a model to be emulated.

Chapter Six:
Mark 9.33–7: Advice to a Christian Community in a Pluralistic Society

6.1 Introduction

The second of the Marcan citations of the 'slave of all' tradition is located in 9.33–7. Here, as noted in chapter four, the actual form of the logion (v.35) shows signs of being less original than the version in Mk 10.43–4. This alteration, plus the fact that the Evangelist employs the logion twice in the same literary unit, would suggest that perhaps the intended purpose of using the saying at this point differs from its later usage in ch.10.

In addition to being found within the larger literary unit of 8.22–10.52, here the saying forms part of a smaller segment, 9.33–50. It is generally agreed that these verses are a compilation of diverse sayings gathered together via catchwords and thematic motifs. However, the question of responsibility for the assembling process is debated. Is the unit a pre-Marcan or Marcan creation? The minority opinion argues for the latter, while most scholars support the position that 9.33–50, for the most part, is a pre-Marcan unit. A very few scholars see these verses as a mixture of both Marcan and pre-Marcan materials. In 6.2, we will discuss this larger issue surrounding 9.33–7. The question of pre-Marcan or Marcan origin for 9.33–50 will have implications for our work with vv.33–7. If this unit is pre-Marcan we will gain insights as to one way in which the saying on greatness and servanthood was used prior to its inclusion in the written Gospel.

In 6.3, a study of the employment of the 'slave of all' logion will be undertaken. [1] To what end does the Evangelist use this piece of traditional material? Of what significance is the omission of the saying regarding Gentile rulers [2] and the

[1] As in the previous chapter, the investigation of Mk 9.33–7 will be limited and informed by the larger literary unit of Mk 8.22–10.52.
[2] Cf. Mk 10.42 and Lk 22.25.

addition of v.37's saying, which seemingly draws upon the *shaliach* principle? In the final section, 6.4, Mt 18.1–5 and Lk 9.46–8, the parallel pericopes to Mk 9.33–7, will be analyzed.

6.2 Background Issues

As noted in the introduction, the minority of scholars [3] argue that while Mk 9.33–50 is, in fact, a collection of diverse sayings the responsibility for its consolidation rests with the Evangelist and not at the pre-Marcan level.

Awareness of this position will be gained by reviewing H.-W. Kuhn's and R. Schnackenburg's arguments. The majority position, [4] which defends the thesis that 9.33–50 is a pre-Marcan collection, will be represented by Best's case. Finally, a somewhat hybrid position, developed by two scholars, [5] will be outlined.

Kuhn, following Schnackenburg, proposes three basic arguments in support of his position advocating Mk 9.33–50 as a Marcan collection. [6] First, the

[3] Kuhn, pp. 32ff; Schnackenburg, pp. 184ff; Fleddermann, pp. 57ff; Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 324; Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, pp. 101ff and F. Neirynck, "The Tradition of the Sayings of Jesus", *Concilium* 2 (1966), p. 38.

[4] Bultmann, pp. 149ff; Best, "Mark", pp. 21ff; Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 194; Reploh, pp. 88ff; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1966), p. 92, fn. 1; Trocmé, pp. 38 and 71; W.L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. I (Cambridge: CUP, 1953), pp. 67–8; L. Vaganay, "Le schématisme du discours communautaire à la lumière de la critique des sources" *RB* 60 (1953), pp. 203ff and A. Descamps, "Du discours de Marc IX,33–50 aux paroles de Jésus", in *La Formation des evangiles* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1957). Ed. by J. Cambier, pp. 152ff. Also, leaning in this direction is Anderson, p. 233.

[5] V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: MacMillan, 1966), pp. 403ff and E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark* (London: SPCK, 1970). Trans. by D. Madvig, pp. 194ff.

[6] In fn. 131 on p. 33, Kuhn cites Schnackenburg's four points in favour of Marcan collection of the sayings but in the main text does not deal with Schnackenburg's fourth point, i.e. the unit cannot be viewed as a community catechism without difficulty.

process of gathering and connecting sayings is a Marcan, as well as pre-Marcan, process. Schnackenburg argues that this is the case in three instances in the Marcan Gospel: Mk 13.33–7; 8.34–8 and 4.21–5. [7] With regards to Mk 13.33–7, Schnackenburg argues that a comparis on with the parallel material shows that Mark "intervenes"/"eingreift" in traditional parabolic materials. However, two of the three examples of where Mark has extracted material are in fact Q parables and Mark may not have been aware of their existence, thus casting doubt on the assertion that the Evangelist extracted sayings so as to unite them in 13.33–7. As for Mk 8.34–8, Schnackenburg admits "er war vielleicht schon zeitig in der Tradition gegeben." [8] He goes on, after this seemingly serious admission, to argue that the sequence of sayings stop in v.37. The presence of parallels to v.38 in Mt 10.33 and Lk 12.9 (again Q material) leads to the conclusion that the addition of this verse "dürfte auf Rechnung des Evangelisten gehen." [9] A considerable amount of weight should not be placed on Mk 8.34–8. Finally, Schnackenburg argues that Mk 4.21 has a mysterious relationship to the previous material. Here we would concede that perhaps the saying about the hidden/revealed lamp was added by the Evangelist because it does seem to have been a free-floating logion (cf. Mt 5.15 and Lk 11.33). But this is only one probability out of three instances given as evidence for the Marcan uniting of traditional material via catchwords. Even if one was to accept the three cited "instances" one could counter that there is one significant difference between Mk 9.33–50 and 13.33–7, 8.34–8 and 4.21–5. That difference is the amount of material which supposedly was collected. Schnackenburg's three examples involve, at the most, two or three verses; whereas, in Mk 9.33–50 there is a minimum of fourteen verses collected and united by the usage of catchwords and associations of ideas.

The second argument given in support of Marcan collection is the suggestion that Mark joins sayings by using the word γάρ, despite a lack of logical connection

[7] Pp. 194ff.
[8] P. 195.
[9] *Ibid.*

between the material. Schnackenburg cites 4.22,25; 8.35,36,37,38; 9.40(?),41,49; 13.8,33,35 as places where this occurs. [10] In particular, the presence of γάρ in 9.41 and 49 was perhaps due to the Evangelist's desire to hide a lack of inner cohesion in the unit. [11] Even Schnackenburg admits this point is not a solid argument in favour of the collection taking place at the Marcan level. [12] While admitting that Mark does this on occasion, Best [13] counters that he does not do this any more than any of the other Evangelists. Mark, also, employs γάρ in narrative sections to join material that was already united in pre-Marcan material, some of which may have been present in the material prior to Mark's handling of it. [14]

Finally, Kuhn argues that the Mt 10.40–2 tradition shows that Mk 9.37 and 41 were joined and Mark has inserted vv.38–40. [15] As Best points out, Black [16] has offered a good case for a connected Aramaic substratum in vv.38, 39, 42, 45 and 48. [17] If this connected substratum existed, there is little possibility that Mark inserted vv.38–40 between vv.37 and 41. In general, the tentative nature of the minority position is best summarized by one of its advocates:

> "Die Frage, ob die Stichwortkomposition in 9,33–50 ganz das eigene Werk des Evangelisten ist oder z.T. eine schon vorgefundene Zusammenstellung benutzt, wird sich kaum ganz erhellen lassen und ist auch zweitrangig gegenüber dem Ergebnis: Der Abschnitt ist in einer gewissen - für uns ungewöhnlichen - Anordnung von einer einheitlichen Hand gestaltet." [18]

---

[10] P. 196.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] "Natürlich kann γάρ nicht als sicheres Kriterium für das Eingreifen des Evangelisten verwendet werden;...", p. 197.
[13] "Preservation", p. 29, fn. 26.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] P. 33.
[16] *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: OUP, 1979), pp. 169–71 and 218–22.
[17] P. 29, fn. 26.
[18] Schnackenburg, p. 197.

In light of the less than convincing evidence and a tentativeness on the part of the advocates for the position that the collection took place at the Marcan level, we must conclude that this proposal is not the best option for a clear understanding of how the unit developed.

Best [19] makes three points in support of the pre-Marcan collection theory. First, it is clear that the unit is held together by catchwords and phrases and not by a logical development of thought. Best cites the following words and phrases as signs of this type of connection: ὄνομα (vv.37,38,39,41); παιδίον/ μικρός (vv.36,37,42); βάλλειν and καλόν ἐστιν (vv.42,43, 45,47); σκανδαλίζειν (vv.42,43,45,47); πῦρ (vv.43,48,49) and ἅλας (vv.49,50). [20] From this emerge two notes in favour of a pre-Marcan period for the collection of the unit. Initially, such a principle for gathering material would be more typical of an oral period where mnemonic devices are useful and necessary. [21] Secondly, there is a clear parallel formation to be found in vv.43,45 and 47. [22] As has been noted in chapter four, the employment of such parallel statements to communicate a particular idea is a common Semitic device. This would suggest that these verses took on this form while still under the influence of a Jewish-Christian environment.

Closely related to the Semitic parallelism in vv.43,45 and 47, is Best's second point that there is evidence for seeing an Aramaic substratum in vv.38,39,42 and 48 which had existed as a unit. [23] Black suggests there would have been a clear poetic form in an Aramaic version of these verses. With regards to the material about the offences, a key sound would have been "QL" and/or a guttural "E". [24]

---

[19] *Following*, p. 75.
[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 90–1, fn. 2.
[21] P. 75.
[22] P. 91, fn. 2,
[23] P. 75.
[24] Black, *Aramaic*, pp. 169–71, esp. 170–71 where he presents a possible Aramaic phonetic version of Mk 9.38–45.

Finally, if Mark was responsible for the gathering of this material, Best argues, it is difficult to comprehend his exact purpose. [25] Vv.49,50a do touch upon the theme of discipleship, but a connection with the question of greatness (v.34) is quite tenuous. Equally, it is difficult to see why Mark would have added vv.42–7 at this point. As Best suggests, it is much more probable that we have here a fairly typical Marcan procedure of employing the beginning of a pre-Marcan unit, because of its relevance, and including later material from the same unit, despite its lack of applicability. [26]

While the above arguments are difficult to counter, even Best acknowledges the fact that the Evangelist was involved in some redactional activity of Mk 9.33–50. For example, the evidence in vv.33–4 clearly reveals the Evangelist's hand: a) the Capernaum reference is part of Mark's geography relating to Jesus' trip to Jerusalem, b) the motif of ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ is a repeated Marcan theme, as is c) the presence of ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, depicting the journey motif. [27] With v.35 however there is evidence which suggests that this material is probably from the tradition: a) the presence of φωνεῖν instead of the preferred Marcan word προσκαλεῖσθαι [28] and b) the introductory phrase καὶ καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα seems to be unnecessary in this chapter and therefore is probably part of the traditional material which Mark has employed. Therefore, it is probably best to conclude that vv.33–4 are Marcan redactional additions. [29] In view of the nature of the above evidence, it is best to conclude that the vast majority of the material in Mk 9.33–50 was collected prior to Mark, although the Evangelist was involved

[25] *Following*, p. 75.
[26] Cf. Best's "Mark", pp. 28ff. Best cites 4.21–5 and 11.22–5 as examples of irrelevant logia in the tradition which Mark retains in his use of a traditional unit.
[27] *Following*, p. 76.
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] Less convincing would be Best's passing concession that vv.38–40 are a "possible" insertion by the Evangelist, *Following*, p. 75. The catch word connections around the expressions τῷ ὀνόματί μου, τῷ ὀνόματί σου (vv.37.38.39) seem to be too firm to allow Marcan insertion. Additionally, Black's argument for an Aramaic substratum would run counter to this possibility.

in minor redactional work, such as vv.33–4.

An interesting hybrid position has been promoted by Taylor and Schweizer. [30] These two scholars suggest that vv.33–7 have been compiled by the Evangelist, while vv.38–50 are largely a pre-Marcan collection. [31] Taylor suggests the opening verses were compiled by Mark and the remainder of "the story consists of fragments loosely connected at 35 and 36." [32] While Taylor is certainly correct with regards to his understanding of the opening verses, he offers no evidence to support this claims regarding vv.35 and 36. As for v.35 he even accepts that Mark is using a source; however, he still supposes that vv.35ff are the result of Marcan redaction.

While Schweizer attempts to offer evidence for the Marcan redaction of vv.33–7, his case is no more convincing than is Taylor's. His first reason is a reference to the general structure of 8.22–10.52. As in 8.33ff, Mark has here constructed a discipleship unit to follow the passion and resurrection prediction in 9.30–2. Secondly, the "indoor" scene is a Marcan device. Thirdly, Mark again characterizes the disciples as blind to the purpose of Jesus' career. And finally, v.37b appears in a different context in Mt 10.40, while in Mt 18.3ff (par to Mk 9.37) Matthew uses two other aphorisms. This, according to Schweizer, shows that the "Gospel writers included the individual traditional sayings of Jesus wherever they deemed them to be appropriate (cf. 10.35–45)." [33]

In response to the first point, it is quite true that Mark has developed a very clear structure in 8.22–10.52. This does not necessarily mean he has created the whole of the material used in the sequence. He may well have used material

[30] See fn. 5.
[31] Taylor slightly differs from Schweizer at this point by suggesting that vv.37–50 are "an extract from a collection of sayings strung together by catchwords,..." which Mark used.
[32] P. 403.
[33] P. 192

from the tradition, such as vv.35–50 as major building blocks in the sequence. Simply because Mark has constructed a discipleship unit in 8.33ff does not mean we must accept 9.33ff as a second Marcan creation. Secondly, it has already been argued that the "indoor" scene was one of Mark's favorite expressions; but, this "evidence" only points to v.33 as being a Marcan redaction. It says nothing about the pericope as a whole. Additionally, it has been recognized that both v.33 and v.34 were probably Mark's contribution. Thirdly, it is difficult to identify the motif of the disciples' blindness to Jesus' career and its particular bearing on this question of Marcan compilation in vv.33–7. The fourth point of Schweizer's argument is certainly a very sweeping statement. The evidence he produces does point out one of Matthew's particular traits but it seems somewhat dangerous to observe this activity on the part of one Evangelist and then affirm that all the Gospel writers were involved in this process. All-in-all, this hybrid hypothesis looks very unlikely.

Neither the arguments supporting the collection of the material in Mk 9.33–50 at the Marcan level nor those defending a hybrid view of these verses are very convincing. The position held by the majority of NT scholars is that the process of gathering these various sayings took place at the pre-Marcan level. This particular position seems to have the support of the evidence found within vv.33–50. At the same time there can be little doubt that Mark was involved in some redactional work, especially with vv.33–4.

6.3 The Goal of Mark 9.33–7

With the above conclusion the crucial question of why the Evangelist would employ the "whole" of the unit remains. The query's significance is heightened by the often repeated observation that material included in the pre-Marcan units is quite diverse and perhaps not very pertinent to Mark's primary goal. [34] Why

[34] See among others, Best, *Following*, p. 75; Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 194;

then, should the Evangelist include this unit at this point in his Gospel?

As argued above, Mark has very clearly given 8.22–10.52 a definite structure, in his attempt to draw out the implications of the Christ event for the life of his community. Each of the "three pillars" describing the passion and resurrection predictions are followed immediately by the pericopes regarding the service oriented nature of Christian discipleship (8.34–8;9.33–7 and 10.35–45). This was probably Mark's primary reason for using this element of the tradition. Because 9.33–50 began with material which would fit his overarching literary framework, he elected to include it here. The whole unit was incorporated because, as Best notes, [35] it seems to be Mark's tendency to use a series of sayings, whose introductory material was relevant to his purpose even though the remainder of the material was not. While we would not disagree with Best's observation, there are reasons to conclude that the bulk of vv.33–50 was viewed, by the Evangelist, as being pertinent to the topic at hand.

First, there is the presence of the attempted *inclusio*. [36] The *inclusio*, which is not an uncommon Semitic literary device, [37] is formed by the presence of v.50's "be at peace with one another", which refers back to the note of conflict in v.34. [38] Mark, viewing the whole of vv.35–50 as pertinent to his purpose, probably retained the motif of conflict among the disciples (cf. Mk 10.35–45) when constructing the introduction in 9.33–7. In this way the motif of conflict is present at the beginning and end of the unit. V.34 introduces the theme of conflict over personal greatness, the intervening verses serve as a warning against such behaviour and v.50b concludes by recommending alternative community

---

Klostermann, *Markus* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926), p. 105 and Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 324.

[35] *Following*, p. 75 and "Preservation", pp. 33ff.

[36] Cf. Lane, p. 339.

[37] Cf. Pss 1; 4.1a–3b, 8, 21; Amos 1.3–5, 6–8, 9–15; Ezek 25.3–7, 8–11, 12–7 and Jer 3.1–4.

[38] This theme of conflict is present in the word διαλέγομαι. See ch. 4, fn. 34.

behaviour. The argument that Mark saw the whole of vv.35–50 as applicable to his community is strengthened if those scholars who suggest that v.50b is the Evangelist's contribution are seen to be correct. [39] In this case, Mark would have intentionally framed vv.35–50a by the theme of conflict/peace within the community, thus suggesting that the whole of the pre-Marcan section was to be applied to the particular community problem the Evangelist was addressing.

Secondly, the theme which Mark probably saw as being present in the unit was the question of who is eligible for membership in the community of faith. [40] Vv.36–7 clearly speak of accepting/receiving (δέχομαι) persons of lower social standing (a παιδίον is used as a possible illustration in vv.36–7). This same subject matter is continued in vv.38–41, which talks about openness to a person of minimal commitment to Jesus Christ. Finally, vv.42–48 warns against causing "these little ones" to stumble (referring back, at least in Mark's mind, to the individuals in mentioned v.36 and v.38). In this case personal physical maiming is preferable to the punishment awaiting the person who is the cause of such stumbling. When viewed from this perspective the vast majority of vv.35–50a directly deals with the question of accepting a particular type of individual into the community.

The Evangelist probably used the unit because it could easily be applied to a particular issue facing his community. The above material may suggest that the Marcan community was attempting to resolve a question regarding inclusion in the Christian community. Some members may have argued that persons of lower social standing, i.e. those who could not qualify as "great", or of marginal commitment were not worthy of entrance into the fellowship. On the other hand, Mark argues that in light of the Christ event all people are to be deemed eligible and worthy. The fact that such tensions did arise in the early church

[39] For example, Reploh, pp. 154ff.
[40] Cf. J. Gnilka, pp. 57–8.

is reinforced by 1 Cor 11.17–22. The point the Evangelist is attempting to address is the eligibility of the socially insignificant or unacceptable individual for membership in the community of faith. [41]

The above material outlines a general overview of Mk 9.33–50. In light of the thesis' goal to understand how the early church employed the 'slave of all' saying, attention must now be focused on the initial pericope of the unit, Mk 9.33–7, where the logion is used. By doing this a clearer picture of the hitherto vaguely described "lower social standing" will emerge. [42] The clearest information about this group at the centre of the ecclesiastical debate is to be found in v.36 (*καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὸ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς*) However, two problems are associated with this verse which hinders a proper understanding of it. First, there is the suggestion that Mk 9.36 is a Marcan creation modelled after Mk 10.16 (*καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά*) [43] Secondly, there is the question of the appropriate translation of *παιδίον*. As will be argued below the two issues are not unrelated and do contribute to a fair amount of confusion regarding the identity of the group at the centre of the conflict.

Reploh puts forward three reasons in support of his suggestion that Mk 10.16 has influenced and led to the Marcan creation of Mk 9.36. First, and most

[41] Cf. Best, *Following*, p. 88; Anderson, pp. 233ff and 236 and Haenchen, *Weg*, pp. 326ff.

[42] By focusing on vv.33–7 there is an automatic limiting of the group to be focused upon. I would argue that vv.33–7 and vv.38–41 are, in fact, dealing with two different groups of people. However, they do share one common characteristic and that is the fact that they are being considered for membership in the Christian community. The following section will only be dealing with those people whose social standing is used against their entrance into the Marcan community.

[43] See for example, Reploh, p. 143 and cf. Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 346. Other scholars, while not necessarily advocating Marcan creation of v.36, also see the influence of Mk 10.16 at this point. Cf. Lane, p. 340; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 405; Bultmann, p. 61 and Gnilka, tentatively, p. 55.

significant, is the presence of the rare word ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι in both verses. [44] Secondly, as the story unfolds the "child" (παιδίον) appears very suddenly and without warning. Finally there is the awkward nature of v.37's ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων. But as Best [45] points out, if v.36 was a Marcan addition to vv.35/7 the problem is even greater. In this case v.37 would have referred to a παιδίον who had not been introduced. In this instance Mark would have needed to create both v.36 and v.37.

However, it was noted above that v.37 is clearly connected to the following material via τῷ ὀνόματί μου. Also, Best argues that if vv.36–7 were Marcan creations then there must be a connection between v.35b and some point in the material of vv.38ff; however, there would appear to be no such connecting point. In point of fact, the only weighty evidence for any type of connection between 10.16 and 9.36 is the word ἐναγκαλισάμενος. Best explains its presence by suggesting that Mark's interest in detail led him to place the verb in 9.36, which was traditional material, having seen it in 10.16. Just as likely would be the possibility that the verb was found in both units prior to Mark's dealing with them. [46]

The suggestion that 9.36 has been cast or recast in light of l0.13–6 is probably due to the vague word παιδίον. Both conscious and subconscious connections between 9.33–7 and 10.13–6 can be made because of the presence of this word in both pericopes. Additionally, in each instance the παιδίον/παιδία are treated in the same manner (cf. 9.36 and 10.16). Therefore, the seemingly valid conclusion that in each instance Jesus received and embraced children results in the affirmation that Mk 9.33–7 has been influenced by 10.13–6. But does this word need to be, or should it be, translated in the same manner in both pericopes?

[44] Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 405.
[45] *Following*, p. 78.
[46] Best, *Following*, p. 106, accepts that Mk 10.13–6, as well as Mk 9.35–7, was a pre-Marcan unit. Why this possibility is not considered is known only to Best.

If vv.35–7 formed a pre-Marcan unit, as has been argued, and the παιδίον of v.36 was used as a symbol of something the disciple was to accept or emulate, what did it symbolize? This depends on the way the word is translated. Every commentator read in the course of this research assumes that παιδίον is to be translated as "child", "enfant" or "Kind". Therefore, the child is to be seen as the model of the disciple with regards to this context touching upon greatness (v.34). But what exactly does the παιδίον/child represent? The answers vary from neediness, [47] the weak member of the community, [48] those persons of lowest standing in society, [49] to helplessness. [50] Variously interpreted then, the point is seen to be humility, lowliness or neediness coupled with kindness and acceptance of those persons fitting into these categories.

The illustration of the παιδίον seems to be tied closely to the logion of v.35: "If one would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all." It can be asked if a child best fits as an illustration of the demand set down in v.35. Was the child a good illustration of "last of all and servant of all"? It must be said that this is not the case. Granted, the child did not hold a position of great esteem in first century Palestinian culture, where the material probably developed; yet, at the same time the child was not considered to be the absolutely lowest member of society either. Within Jewish culture, a child was viewed as gift from God. [51] There are negative attributes associated with children as well. As Oepke [52] notes Judaism seemingly saw the child as self-willed, prone to naughtiness and in need of discipline. The idea of the innocence of the child is not a Jewish

[47] See R. Brown, "Jesus and the Child as a Model of Spirituality", *IBS* 4 (1982), pp. 179–80; Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 326 and Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 193.
[48] Taylor, *Mark*, p. 405.
[49] Grundmann, *Markus*, p. 196 and Gnilka, p. 57, who see these people as being eligible for membership in the Christian community.
[50] Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 193. He also identifies the element of need as being present in the symbol. Cf. Pesch, *Markus*, Vol. II, p. 106.
[51] Pss 127.3–5; 128.3–6; Prov 17.6 and Gen 15.1–5.
[52] *TDNT*, Vol. V, pp. 646–47. Cf. 2 Kings 2.23f; Sir 30.1–13; Isa 7.14ff; Wis 12.24 and 15.14.

concept. [53]

If this is so two things are evident. First, the modern attempts to see the παιδίον as a recommended symbol of neediness, lowliness or helplessness are projections of modern conceptions of what a child is back into the first century. Such projections introduce foreign understandings into the storyline. Secondly, there do not seem to be many recognized qualities which could be referred to by using a child as an illustration of v.35's demand. Furthermore, the negative aspects of the child's nature in that time period would have probably overshadowed the relatively low social standing of the child. It begins to seem unlikely that the social group in question was children. Mk 9.33–7 is not dealing with the issue of children within the Christian community. This issue is, in fact, squarely dealt with in Mk 10.13–6. There would be no reason for the Evangelist to deal with the place of children twice in such a short space. Rather than jump to the conclusion that παιδίον should be translated "child", we ought to examine the possibility that another reference was intended.

Matthew Black, in his attempt to relate v.36 to the previous teaching on humility, [54] suggests the solution may lie in the juxtaposition of διάκονος and παιδίον and the Aramaic word "*tayla*", which possibly lies behind them. The ambiguity of "*tayla*", which can be translated as either "servant" or "child", leads Black to conclude that this pericope then uses the image of the child in the midst as a "dramatized play on the Aramaic word for child and servant." He concludes that, "The 'incident' is thus a true *mashal*, an enigmatic comparison requiring interpretation;...". [55] A similar ambiguity surrounds the Hebrew word נַעַר, [56] which can be translated either as "boy" (Cf. Gen 37.2; 1 Sam 2.13; Judges

[53] *Ibid.* Cf. Gen 8.21; Pss 58.3; 51.5; Job 25.4. See, also, Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, Vol. IV (München: Beck'sche, 1926), pp. 468f.
[54] *Aramaic*, pp. 218–23.
[55] *Ibid*, p. 221.
[56] Cf. BDB, pp. 654–5 and C. Westermann, "*ebed* æb æd Knecht" in *Theolo-*

19.3; etc.) or "servant" (Cf. Num 22.22; Judges 7.10,11; 1 Sam 9.3f; etc).

While both Semitic languages do reveal a certain ambiguity around words for "child" or "boy", this would seemingly not be the case in Greek, so far as Black is concerned. He writes that the juxtaposition of *διάκονος* and *παιδίον* is "of no significance in Greek"; [57] however, this may not be the case. There are at least eight instances, ranging from the third century BCE to the seventh century CE, where *παιδίον* is best translated "servant" or "young slave", thus revealing an ambiguous usage of the Greek word as well.

The oldest citation [58] is in a letter from an agent named Apollonius to a businessman named Zenon and the document has been dated between 246 and 240 BCE. The main concern of the letter is to inform the recipient of the status of a particular warehouse containing jars of wine. The closing paragraph contains an explanation of why a third individual, Chilon, was unable to keep an appointment with Zenon. It reads:

Χιλων δ ουκ εφη δυνασθαι
προς σε ηξειν. το[πα] γαρ παιδιον
αυτου περι αυτα εφη ειναι.
αλλον δ ομ βουλει αποστελω σοι.

The second letter [59] is another business document dated 10 Mesore, year 17–2

gische Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, Vol. II (München: Kaiser Verlag, 1976), p. 187.

[57] *Aramaic*, p. 221.

[58] W.L. Westermann, C.W. Keyes and H. Liebesny, *Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C.*, Vol. II (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1940), pp. 68ff.

[59] C.H. Roberts, and E.G. Turner, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester*, Vol. IV (Manchester: The University

(6 August, 35 BCE), from Apollonius to Thoonis. Thoonis is directed to give a large fleece to a "slave supervisor" (*τῷι ἐπιστατηι τοῦ παιδίου*) who will be coming to him with the original memorandum regarding a number of offers Thoonis had made to the sender.

The next usage is in an early second century CE letter from one Sarapion to his sister Selene. [60] The brother writes to inform her of his current plans and problems as well as giving particular directions regarding tasks that are to be carried out at their home. Empty jars are to be purchased and woven items are to be maintained. Additionally, he askes that Selene sees that their private land is sown by the *παιδία* (line 9). Grenfell and Hunt translate the line as "See...that the slaves give attention to the sowing of our private land...". That Sarapion and Selene owned slaves is evidenced by line 22, where Sarapion tells his sister that he has sent her many letters with one of his slaves (*ἐπέμψαμεν δ' ἐπιστολὰς πολλὰς καὶ διὰ τοῦ δούλου δὲ Σαραπίωνος*) serving as the courier.

Another second century CE document using *παιδίον* for "slave" or "servant" is a correspondence between a certain Heraklammon and Kallistos. [61] The letter seems to be a private one concerning a business dealing between the two men. Their transaction, with which this document deals, involves the possession and location of three slaves, who were probably entertainers. Heraklammon uses the genitive plural of *παιδίον* in line 10 and the accusative plural in line 13 when referring to them. The writer has written regarding this matter before but Kallistos has failed to answer his letters. Heraklammon informs the recipient that a third party has told him the three *παιδία* are with him. The sender wants this matter dealt with as soon as possible. It seems as though Kallistos may

---

Press, 1952), p. 66.

[60] B.P. Grenfell, and A.S. Hunt, *The Amherst Papyri* (Oxford: OUP, 1901), pp. 160–61.

[61] G. Browne, J.D. Thomas, E.G. Turner and M. Weinstein, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. XXXVIII (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1971), pp. 87–8.

have been a slave dealer who was less than reputable.

This particular letter is revealing and useful for another reason. In the same document the word τέκνον is used twice. The first instance is in line 2, which refers to the recipient (Καλλιστῳ τῷι τιμιωτάτῳ τεκνῳ) and the second is in line 19 where Heraklammon sends his greetings to Kallistos' wife and children (τεκνα σου). Here, in one document, is the use of two words which are today generally viewed as descriptive labels for children, yet the author uses the one (τέκνον) when referring to free offspring of the recipient of the letter and the other (παιδίον) when referring to the subject of his business transaction, i.e. the missing slaves.

The fifth letter, [62] which dates from the second or third century CE, was sent from one brother, Chaereas, to another, Dionysius. Again it is a business document in which the sender reminds his brother to take care of a number of financial transactions, including the sale of the "slaves' children" (line 5–7). The terminology used is τῶν παιδάρων παιδίων. This letter is even more significant than the previous one because here παιδίον is used both in the sense of "slave " and "child". In addition to the reference to the "slaves' children", line 16 uses the same word when Chaereas tells Dionysius that he is sending two strips of sealed cloth, one of which is to be given to Dionyius' children (τοῖς παιδίοις σου).

The sixth use of παιδίον, in this manner, is to be found in a fourth century edition [63] of the LXX, particularly in Judges 19.19:

[62] B.P. Grenfell, and A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part 1 (Oxford: Horace Hunt, 1898), pp. 182–83.
[63] Codex Vaticanus (B) in A. Rahlfs, ed. *Septuaginta*, Vol. I (Stuttgart: Deutshce Bibelstiftung, 1935), pp. 483–84.

καὶ γε ἄχυρα χορτασματα ἐστιν τοῖς ὄνοις
ἡμων καὶ ἀρτοι καὶ οἰνός ἐστιν ἐμοὶ καὶ τῃ
παιδίσκῃ καὶ τῷ νεανισκῳ μετὰ τῶν παιδίων σου,
οὐκ ἔστιν ὑστερημα παντὸς πραγματος·

The words παιδίων σου are used to translate the Hebrew expression ʿ*bdyk*. The fifth century CE Codex Alexandrinus (A) uses τοῖς δούλοις σου at this point. That παιδίον could be used for the word "slave" is clearly displayed here.

In the fifth century CE, a certain Timius wrote to a particular Sophia with a scheme to raise capital and thereby help him out of a financially difficult period. [64] Timius writes that Plusius found him in Alexandria and being without money Timius was unable to pay him what was due him. As an emergency fund raiser, Sophia was to mortgage one of their young slaves, named Artemidous. Again the word used in reference to the youth is παιδίον.

The final citation using παιδίον in the sense of "servant" comes from a receipt, dated 612 CE. [65] The document is some type of payslip given to a certain Ἀριθα παιδίῳ as he departed for Alexandria in the company of a banker and with a quanity of gold. Evidently the receipt was given as evidence of payment to the slave for this particular and perhaps unique task. Additionally, the document sheds light on the relative social standing of Arithas. While he is simply described as παιδίῳ, the man, Macarius by name, with whom he is travelling is a banker and further described as the "aforesaid distinguished person" (περιβλέ(πτου) ἀνδρὸ(ς)).

[64] Grenfell and Hunt, *Amherst*, pp. 176–7.
[65] *Ibid*, p. 190.

While it must be admitted that these citations are widely scattered over a millenium and none are from the first century CE, it does seem probable that παιδίον had the same dual meaning as the Aramaic word "*talya*" or Hebrew word n^{c}_{R}. This ambiguous aspect of the word may very well be found in the colloquial employment of it. This being the case, παιδίον would have functioned in a Greek-speaking culture in much the same manner as does "garçon" in France or "boy" in the United States of America.

If v.36 is making reference to a particular group which was at the centre of a discussion of church membership in the Marcan community, in light of the above evidence, the best conclusion would be that the people making up this group were probably slaves or servants. Not only can παιδίον be used in this sense, but it was also noted that Mark deals with the place of children in the community later in ch. 10. The larger context of v.35's citation of the 'slave of all' logion reinforces this translation. Jesus is depicted as asking his disciples about their argument regarding greatness. He goes on to explain that true greatness is found in the person who is servant of all (πάντων διάκονος). Immediately after this follows the illustration of the παιδίον. The context, which previously uses the 'slave of all' saying, would suggest that παιδίον, v.36, should be translated "young slave". The ambiguity surrounding παιδίον is all the stronger if the tradition envisaged a young teenage slave. While it is true that most frequently παιδίον should be translated as "child", the παιδίον/slave translation of this Greek word is clearly possible, as shown above. We must ask which translation best suits this context which employs phrases like "last of all" and "servant of all" as key teaching expressions. Clearly the context would suggest that the latter, albeit less frequent, translation is the best option for this pericope.

The fact that the Evangelist continues to follow his source in v.37 shows that he intends to employ the 'slave of all' logion to a different end than is in

view in Mk 10.35–45. [66] The usage of the "*s haliach* principle" here shows that, so far as Mark is concerned, the logion is not used to resolve an issue of leadership or authority in the community. This is further supported by the fact that some equivalent to Mk 10.42's saying about the Gentile rulers was not introduced. Such an introduction would have been to Mark's benefit if he had intended to deal with authority at this point. While narrowing the field of possible concerns which Mark had in mind, this observation does not indicate to what he was probably referring when he included 9.33–7; but, v.37 does provide a clear indication of the Evangelist's intention.

T.W. Manson, [67] following Rengstorf, has summarized the *s haliach* principle in the following manner. The *shaliach* process within its Jewish context, is the process for designating an individual to act on behalf of another individual, group (either *Beth Din* or a synagogue) or God. The *shaliach* is empowered to do whatever the sender is entitled to do himself but is not able to do. The *shaliach* is not allowed to transfer his commission to another *shaliach*, [68] nor does his commission extend beyond the particular authority given him. What makes this legal principle functional is the view that the *shaliach* was considered to be like the sender, i.e. there was seen to be an identification between the two persons involved in the transferal of authority. [69]

What then is Mark's reason for including v.37, assuming, as seems likely, the *shaliach* principle is at work here? [70] The verse clearly diverges from the

---

[66] Contra Reploh, p. 147.
[67] *The Church's Ministry* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1948), pp. 35ff. Cf. Rengstorf's article "ἀπόστολος" in *TDNT*, Vol. I, pp. 407ff and Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. III, pp. 2ff.
[68] *Ministry*, p. 36. Cf. Gittin 3.6.
[69] Cf. Ber 5.5; M^{e}kh Ex 12.4(5), 12.6(7); Qid 41b; Chag 10b; Nazir 12b and M^{e}n 93b.
[70] As Best, *Following*, p. 79, notes one needs to distinguish between Mark's understanding of the verse and its original meaning outside this context. For various handlings of the material and its *Form-* and *Traditionsgeschichte* see for example Bultmann, pp. 142ff. and Schnackenburg, pp. 199ff.

shaliach principle, as outlined by Manson and others, at a number of points. Initially, it has nothing to do with a "legal" empowering of one individual to act on the behalf of another. Secondly, the παιδίον, who is to be received, is not given any "authority" as such. Thirdly, the verse, as now set down, violates the point of not transferring one's commission. Theologically speaking God has commissioned Christ, but technically, according to the legal principle of *shaliach*, Christ in turn could not commission the παιδίον. However, v.37 clearly refers to a chain of "connections" running from the παιδίον to Christ and finally to God.

It would seem as though the only positive connection between v.37 and the *shaliach* principle is the idea of the *shaliach* being identified with the sender. In this case the παιδίον is "like" Jesus Christ. The threefold stress of "receiving" would certainly enhance this observation. By "receiving" the παιδίον, the community also "receives" Jesus and by "receiving" Jesus, God is "received", also. The emphasis on the process of reception clearly points in the direction of a theme of identification between the παιδίον and Jesus Christ/God. Furthermore, the παιδίον is received "in my name", i.e. Jesus' name. Finally, from the larger context of 8.22–10.42, this theme of identification with the παιδίον/slave is made even firmer by Mk 10.45's affirmation that Jesus came as a servant and is to be seen as functioning in this role. As it stands, the Evangelist only focuses on one narrow aspect of the *shaliach* principle when employing v.37.

The narrow focus on this aspect of the *shaliach* principle is used in support of v.36's enacted parable. Just as Jesus himself is symbolically depicted as receiving, embracing and identifying with a person of little or no social importance (παιδίον) in v.36, so also the Christian community is called upon to welcome and accept the same type of individual. The motivation for accepting slaves or servants into the fellowship comes from two directions. First, there is the example or model from Jesus' behaviour. Because he willingly accepted such a person the church should act in the same way. But equally important is the

shaliach principle which suggests that the slave is to be identified as or with Jesus. Logically then for the church to reject or refuse entrance to slaves is to reject Jesus himself and ultimately God.

The 'slave of all' logion is employed in this pericope as an authoritive saying of the Lord. Perhaps as the community members discussed the possibility of admitting slaves the mention of their "social unworthiness" was used as an argument against their acceptance. The Evangelist uses the logion to counter such claims. By recalling this saying and adding vv.33–4 he hoped to silence such arguments. The logion depicts a proper Christian attitude towards those who are, according to non-Christian standards, unacceptable social peers. Mark reminds his fellow believers that their Lord was of the opinion that the truly great person was the servant, even the lowest of all servants. The believers are reminded that Jesus saw service as a virtue. Just as Jesus is depicted as silencing those who argued about their own greatness so now Jesus' words should silence those who argued that servants and slaves are not worthy of admittance into their community of faith. True discipleship involves an openness to all people, regardless of their social standing.

In light of the above evidence, Mk 9.33–7 is best seen as the Evangelist's attempt to delineate the implications of Christian discipleship with regards to the issue of membership within his community of believers. The group at the centre of the debate was probably persons who were enslaved or were employed as servants, and not children as is generally assumed. [71] There were probably some Christians who desired to exclude these people. However, Mark, by citing the 'slave of all' saying, makes the point that Jesus highly valued the role of

[71] It seems unlikely that Mark would twice deal with the question of a child's membership within the community of faith in a short space. However, if one elects to interpret 9.33–7 as touching upon the place of children this must be the case for Mk 10.13–7, a mere twenty–four verses later, clearly focuses on this topic.

a slave and equated this with true greatness. Additionally, Jesus is depicted as embracing a "young slave" and the readers are warned that to reject these "insignificant" people was to reject Jesus and God, as well.

6.4 The Parallels

The parallel in Lk 9.46–8 appears to be Luke's attempt to clarify the story and tighten the manner of presentation. [72] Schürmann [73] provides very little evidence for his tentative suggestion that the Evangelist has here been influenced by Lk 22.26. There are a number of significant alterations in the Lucan version. First, Luke has omitted the geographic reference to Capernaum, which is given in Mk 9.33. [74] The significance of this exclusion is variously explained by scholars. Fitzmyer sees this omission and the exclusion of the Galilee reference (Mk 9.30) as resulting in a closer connection between this pericope and the transfiguration, which provides a better background to the argument. [75] Marshall sees the Lucan reworking directed at the heightening of the Passion prediction and the ignorance of the disciples. [76] What is more probable is Schürmann's suggestion that the timelessness of such material comes to light when a concrete situation is removed. [77] Additionally, the Evangelist does not seem as concerned to present geographical detail as does Mark, thus enabling him to condense the opening verses.

Another difference is the manner in which Luke portrays Jesus. He is explicitly depicted as knowing the "thoughts of their [the disciples] hearts"; whereas, in Mark's version he makes an inquiry as to the nature of their conversation. Also, Jesus no longer embraces the παιδίον, as he did in Mark's pericope. All-

[72] Cf. H. Schürmann, *Lukas*, p. 577 and J. Schmid, *Lukas*, p. 172.
[73] *Lukas*, p. 577, esp. fn. 21.
[74] Cf. Marshall, p. 395; Schmid, *Lukas*, p. 172; Schürmann, *Lukas*, p. 575 and J. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, Vol. I, p. 815.
[75] *Luke*, Vol. I, p. 815.
[76] *Luke*, pp. 394–5.
[77] *Lukas*, p. 575.

in-all, the Lucan Jesus, at this point at least, is less human and humane than the Marcan Jesus.

More important are two other alterations. First, it would seem as though Luke is attempting to connect more closely this pericope to the life of his community. For example, the argument was about "which of them was the greatest" (τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν). And the answer in v.48 is "he who is least among you all is the one who is great" (ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός ἐστιν μέγας). The idea conveyed by αὐτῶν and ὑμῖν, which are absent in Mk 9.33–7, is that this issue was actually an issue which was being dealt with by a community. By casting the question and answer in this fashion, Luke is making the point that the pericope is applicable to his community's common life.

Perhaps most important of all is the fact that Luke no longer sees the pericope as *narrowly* applying only to the question of servants and slaves. This is evidenced by the fact that he has re-written the key logion of Mk 9.35. Not only has he reversed the order of "first/last" but he also totally avoids any reference to πάντων διάκονος. Instead for him the least (μικρότερος) is the greatest. Leading on from the Lucan usage of this very general term in the logion itself, we are best advised to see the use of the ambiguous word παιδίον, in 9.47, as an attempt to identify a non-homogeneous group in the Lucan community. In this case, the pericope probably is meant to deal with a diversely composed group of people who are generally regarded as lowly or of little social significance. [78]

The issue at hand for Luke is no longer the entrance of people of insignificant standing into the Christian community. The frame of v.46's question regarding who among the disciples is great and v.48's answer to this question which

[78] On the basis of the context it is extremely difficult to determine which identity (slave/child) Luke may have had in mind when writing παιδίον in v.47. It may be that the group in question consisted of both children and slaves, as well as other persons who might be viewed as insignificant (μικρότερος).

cites "the least among you" as the greatest reveals that "socially unimportant" people were already a part of Luke's congregation. The issue for Luke was the significance and treatment of such people within the fellowship.

This framework of the greatness question in vv.46 and 48 and its definition also helps reveal Luke's primary purpose in this rewritten pericope. True Christian greatness is to be seen in a life of humility and lowliness. That is why "least" (*μικρότερος*) in the Christian community is the greatest. By reworking Mk 9.35, Luke has elevated the *μικρότερος* to a position of importance within the community. The inconsequential person is now the symbol of Christian humility and appropriate self-understanding. No longer is lowliness and service a way *to* greatness (cf. Mk 9.35); instead, lowliness *is* greatness. [79] Vv.47–8a explain why this is the case. Because Jesus has identified with *τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον*, who is the symbol of lowliness, the *παιδίον* is now significant. There is dual emphasis here for Luke. At one level, Jesus, the Son of God (cf. Lk 1.32; 2.49; 3.22 etc.), humbled himself so as to identify with the *παιδίον* (v.47) and at the same time the *παιδίον* has been elevated to Jesus' level via identification with him (v.48a). The *παιδίον* and Jesus are inextricably intertwined to present a model for Christian humility and behaviour. As Fitzmyer [80] notes, the point for Luke is not to possess a childlike nature in order to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven (cf. Mt 18.1–5); rather, the stress is that in order to accept Jesus himself one must be prepared to accept and value the people who are part of the lowest level of society. [81] By doing this, the believer, who may not belong to an insignificant social group, is able to demonstrate his humility and exhibit Christian behaviour.

Matthew's alterations to the Marcan version [82] are even more pronounced

[79] Cf. Schürmann, *Lukas*, p. 577.
[80] *Luke*, p. 817.
[81] Cf. Marshall, p. 396.
[82] That Matthew is following Mark at this point cf. F. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), p. 373; Hill, *Matthew*, p. 272; Schweizer, *Matthew*, p. 358; W. Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel* (München: Kosel-

than those rendered by Luke and therefore the Matthean parallel diverges even more significantly from Mark's original. [83] The differences might be categorized as minor, those not significantly changing the meaning of the pericope, and major, those which recast the point and thrust of the story line. The minor alterations worth noting include the Evangelist's decision in v.1 to remove the motif of debate and discussion between the disciples. [84] Here the turmoil depicted in Mark's Gospel is no longer present. Instead, the disciples come to Jesus simply requesting information regarding who is greatest in the Kingdom of heaven. Secondly, as in Luke's version, Jesus no longer embraces the child; rather, he is placed ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν [the disciples]. The human touch is removed and now the παιδίον is strictly used as an object lesson for the curious disciples. [85] Finally, Matthew elects to omit Mark's καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχηται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχηται ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με (v.37b). For Matthew the only significant point of identification is between the παιδίον and Jesus.

Two major alterations are so significant that they virtually remove any sense of parallelism between this pericope and Mk 9.33–7. Initially, there is Matthew's decision to eliminate Mk 9.35's employment of the 'slave of all' tradition. Whereas Mark has used this saying as the key to the pericope, with the παιδίον incident serving as an enacted parabolic illustration, Matthew has elected to ignore totally this theme at this point in his Gospel and to use it later in ch.20, where he very closely follows the Marcan pericope of 10.35–45. By doing this Matthew is then free to rework the Marcan story, which he probably found somewhat confusing, and adds his own key logia. The second change does precisely this,

---

Verlag, 1964), p. 106 etc.

[83] See ch. 4, fn. 1 regarding this matter. Because Matthew has diverged so significantly, especially by omitting the 'slave of all' logion, it would not seem necessary to deal with this pericope in great detail.

[84] A number of scholars fail to take this into account when interpreting Mt 18.1–5 and so seem to be guided more by the Marcan scene than the Matthean version. See J. Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1965), 5th ed., p. 267 and Gaechter, pp. 587–88.

[85] This "object lesson" nature of the παιδίον is supported by v.4.

when Matthew adds vv.3–4, which contains two sayings regarding the desirable attribute of a παιδίον , who in v.2 was set up as an example for the disciples. As Schweizer [86] notes, vv.3–4 are given as substitutes for Mk 9.35. These verses specifically recommend a change of behaviour in the disciples' lives which is to be in line with the child's humility. By substituting a logion about the necessity of humility for a saying regarding the importance of being a servant, Matthew has radically altered the thrust of the pericope.

In order to understand better Matthew's intentions for recasting this pericope, one would best look at how these verses fit with the larger unit, ch.18. As has frequently been noted, this chapter deals with issues of how various aspects of communal life are to be handled. The chapter can be divided into two primary units. The first ends at v.14 and has as its primary concern the role and care of insignificant people within the Christian fellowship. The second unit runs from v.15 to the end of the chapter and relates to the topic of relationships between members of the community. The opening verses of the chapter seem to function as an introduction to these two topics. The stress on humility is given such prominence because Matthew probably saw this attribute as a prerequisite for the successful implementation of the principles outlined in the remainder of the chapter. In this case v.5 probably serves more as a transitional statement to the first unit than as a conclusion to vv.1–4. [87] It would seem as though vv.1–4 are intended to form a single introductory unit. This suggestion that vv.1–4 form the initial unit is supported by the structure of these verses. The question that is raised in v.1 is clearly and definitively answered in v.4, thus probably drawing the pericope to a close, for v.5 does not contribute anything to the discussion or definition of who is great in the Kingdom of heaven.

Opinions are divided as to the time reference surrounding the "Kingdom of

[86] *Matthew*, p. 358. Cf. Schmid, *Matthäus*, p. 267.
[87] Cf. Hill, *Matthew*, p. 273; W. Thompson, pp. 138ff.

heaven" motif. [88] While admittedly 18.3 would seem to point in the direction of a future reference point, the question and answer formulation clearly points to the present as the Evangelist's understanding of the temporal reference. As Trilling argues, if ἔσται had been used in v.1's question then the line of thought would have been future-oriented; however, the Evangelist employs ἐστιν, thus aligning with the present orientation of v.4. This being the case, Matthew was probably attempting to apply this teaching to the life of his contemporaries, specifically the community's internal relationships. The greatest who have come under God's rule are those who are humble. Further support for the present interpretation would be that Matthew has established the attribute of humility as a prerequisite for two different aspects of community life: dealings with the insignificant church member and relationships with other Christians.

Matthew has then taken what, in Mark's Gospel, had primarily an ecclesiological concern and transformed it into a paraenetically motivated pericope. As Trilling notes, [89] for Matthew the child has become a symbol for a fundamental Christian posture. In the original pericope, Mark had attempted to define and defend the broad borders of the Christian community which willingly welcomed and accepted persons of low social standing. Matthew, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with a particular trait of Christian behaviour-humility and he uses this reworked unit to convey this teaching. The paraenetic nature of Matthew's version is further evidenced by the inverted socratic pedagogical interaction between the disciples and Jesus. The posture of humility is thereby demanded of all believers [90] and laid down as prerequisite for interpersonal relationships between believers. [91]

---

[88] For example, Trilling, *Wahre*, pp. 108ff argues that the reference is to the present and Thompson, p. 75 prefers to see it as a matter of the future.
[89] *Wahre*, p. 108.
[90] Thompson, p. 71; W. Pesch, "Die sogenannte Gemeindeordnung Mt 18" *BZ* 7 (NF) (1963), p. 221 and P. Bonnard, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Neuchatel: Editions Delachaux & Nestlé, 1963), p. 267.
[91] This Matthean concern to commend humility as an essential Christian trait

6.5 Conclusion

After arguing, along with most NT scholars, that Mk 9.33–50 was very probably a pre-Marcan unit, this chapter proceeded to analyse the Marcan usage of this pre-Marcan unit, which contained the 'slave of all' tradition. In light of the larger context of 8.22–10.52 and Mark's attempt to relate the significance of the Christ event to discipleship it was argued that the concern expressed in Mk 9.33–50 was to show that all people, regardless of their secular social standing, were eligible for membership in the Christian community. Within this larger context, Mk 9.33–7 was seen to be dealing specifically with persons who were enslaved or employed as servants. In this case, as was argued, *παιδίον* should be translated as "slave" or "young slave". Such a translation is supported by the context with the 'slave of all' logion and contemporary or near contemporary papyri documents. In Mk 9.33–7 the 'slave of all' logion was employed as an authoritative saying of the Lord supporting the community membership of slaves and servants. When Luke used this pericope, however, the issue was no longer the entrance of insignificant people into the Christian community; rather, he recasts the unit so as to elevate the "lowly" who already belong to the community. Matthew almost totally diverges from the Marcan version when reworking the pericope to make it serve as an introduction to two aspects of community life. The pericope here demands humility for believers who will deal with people of insignificance and as a general principle for interpersonal relationships between believers.

---

does have ecclesiological implications, in that the believers of a community are expected to "possess" personally this trait thus providing a foundation upon which the community's interpersonal relations can firmly rest. However, this differs from Mark's use of the pericope and the logion, where his primary attempt is to define one aspect of the church's nature - its membership.

Chapter Seven:
Luke 22.24–7: Authority Which Serves

7.1 Introduction

This chapter's attention focuses on the first of two pericopes which are independent of the Marcan μείζας/διάκονος pericopes. Lk 22.24–7 does have a rough parallel in Mk 10.41–5; however, the evidence would warrant a conclusion that this material was drawn from a source which was independent of the Marcan version. Prior to reviewing this evidence, the exact extent of the pericope will need to be established; therefore, 7.2 deals briefly with this minor issue. Once this is established, the chapter focuses on the more significant question of Lucan independence from Mark at this point (7.3). In 7.4, the passage itself is analyzed for unique features which will help clarify the Lucan goals in employing the tradition here. Finally, in 7.5, there is an attempt to explain how and to what end this pericope has been used.

7.2 Background Issues

Scholars are divided as to which verses actually constitute the pericope. Some elect to limit the unit to vv.24–7. [1] Others continue on to include vv.28–30 as an important portion of the pericope. [2] It is virtually impossible to decide whether vv.28–30 are better placed with the previous or the following material (vv.31–4) for they do have thematic connections with both pericopes. In support of its connection with the earlier unit, Fitzmyer [3] cites the link between v.27c and 28 where ὑμῶν/Ὑμεῖς is to be seen as a reference to the disciples seated with Jesus. He further cites this word as a link found in vv.16, 18, 19, 20, 26, apparently to

[1] Creed, pp. 267–68; Marshall, pp. 810ff; Grundmann, *Lukas*, pp. 400ff and others.

[2] J. Finegan, *Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Jesu* (Grießen: Töpelmann, 1934), pp. 13–4; Taylor, *Passion*, pp. 61ff; Schmid, *Lukas*, pp. 327ff; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, Vol. II, pp. 1414ff and others.

[3] P.1412.

strengthen his case. However, this usage of the personal pronoun is also found in vv.31 (also in a plural form within a context warranting the singular!), 32, 35; thus indicating that the verses which follow are also from the same context. This tends to weaken Fitzmyer's observation that vv.28–30 are to be associated with vv.24–7 as opposed to vv.31ff.

A more substantial point of connection emerges from Marshall's suggestion that the object assigned to the faithful disciple is the βασιλεία and that βασιλεία is to be understood in the dynamic sense of "rule, authority' (cf. 19:12, 15; Mt. 16:28; 20:21; Lk. 12:32)". [4] This note of authority found in vv.28–30 has a connective counterpart in vv.24–7, for in those verses the theme focuses on the exercise of authority within the community. A second bond between these two pericopes is the contrast between v.30 and v.27. In v.27 Jesus is depicted as the table waiter, while in v.30 he is the host who has "invited" the disciples to the feast and to serve as Israel's judges. The second pericope acts as a counter balance to the earlier portrayal of the disciples as self-seeking and using their roles of leadership for self-promotion. In fact, vv.28–30 argues that the leaders/disciples are only appointed to these positions.

On the other hand, there are two thematic connections between vv.28–30 and vv.31–4, also. First, there is the common theme in each pericope of trials faced or to be faced by the disciples. V.28 talks of continuing with Jesus in his trials and vv.31–2 predict that Peter will be sifted by Satan. Secondly, there is Peter as an illustration of one who initially failed only to later turn and gain a throne and admission to the "table in the Kingdom" (v.30). Here the connection would be that one's failure in the onslaught of trial does not automatically exclude one from participation in the Christian community. Because the arguments are evenly balanced, it is virtually impossible to decide for or against either proposal with any firm conviction. It is quite difficult to ascertain to which pericope the

[4] P.816.

Evangelist saw vv.28–30 most closely relating. In the light of this, vv.28–30 will only be drawn upon tentatively when attempting to interpret vv.24–7. [5]

Equally difficult to answer firmly are the questions regarding redactional responsibility and sources for the two pericopes. In order to arrive at even a tentative conclusion one must ask about the possible sources of this material. Here the problem is complex, for vv.24–7 could be derived either from Mk 10.41–5, Luke himself or his special source "L". As for vv.28–30, they may be either Luke's creation, from "Q" (cf. Mt 19.28) or from "L". As will be argued in Part 7.3, Luke was very probably not dependent upon Mark nor did he create vv.24–7, thus suggesting these verses were taken from Luke's special source material. As for vv.28–30, as Schürmann [6] has convincingly argued, there is very little evidence of Lucan style in these verses thus leaving Q and L as the possible sources. For the most part, the points of contact between Mt 19.28 and Lk 22.28–30 are restricted. Matthean redaction in 19.28 has been influenced by the Marcan context into which the first Evangelist has interjected this material. [7] The presence of διαμένω, which is found only in Lk 1.22 and 22.28, probably suggests that Luke is following a source here. Additionally, the theme of eating and drinking at the Messianic Feast is a theme of the L material (cf. 14.15; 22.16,18).

Further evidence that Luke may have been following a special source would be the fact that in ch. 18, Luke decided to omit the Marcan material (Mk 10.35–45), which is similar to Lk 22. 24–7, despite retaining the Marcan material prior to and following the omitted verses. [8] This would suggest that Luke was aware

[5] David Lull, "The Servant-Benefactor as a Model of Greatness (Luke 22:24–30)" *NovT* XXVIII (1986), pp. 289ff, suggests that these verses constitute one pericope. On the whole, as we will see below, his argument is less than convincing.
[6] *Jesu*, pp. 37–54.
[7] Cf. Taylor, *Passion*, p. 64.
[8] Manson, *Sayings*, p. 337.

of another version of the story which he preferred to use elsewhere, i.e. ch. 22. If vv.24–7 and 28–30 were attached in this special source, this would explain why Luke decided to use these verses within the context of the Last Supper. Vv.27 and 28–30 very probably facilitated the decision to locate these verses at this point. John 13 reflects the presence of some type of servant/service motif within the Last Supper tradition. If Luke was familiar with some form of this tradition, the presence of v.27 in the special source material would have moved him in the direction of including that story in his own Last Supper narrative. In this case, the Gospels of John and Luke may well be independent witnesses to such a pre-Gospel link between the servant motif and the Last Supper tradition(s).

7.3 Lucan Independence

A far more significant background issue is the question of a possible relationship between Lk 22.24–7 and Mk 10.41–5. The general analysis of the 'slave of all' saying was, in part, based on the presupposition that Lk 22.24–7 is from traditional material which is independent of the Mk 10.35–45 version. A more detailed examination of this theory is best dealt with in the context of a discussion focusing on Lk 22.24–7. Despite affirmations to the contrary, [9] it would seem as though the bulk of the evidence supports the conclusion of Lucan independence from the Gospel of Mark at this point. The points favouring Lucan dependence upon Mk 10.41–5 will be discussed first and then Schürmann's and Taylor's arguments [10] for Lucan independence will be reviewed.

[9] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, Vol. II, pp. 1412–13; Finegan, pp. 13–14 and E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1929), p. 209. The latter two authors offer little or no argumentation for their affirmations.

[10] Schürmann, *Jesu*, pp. 65–92 and Taylor, *Passion*, pp. 62–3 and *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926), pp. 41–2, Schmid, *Lukas*, pp. 327–28; Grundmann, *Lukas*, pp. 400–01; Creed, pp. 267–68 and generally, Marshall, p. 811.

Fitzmyer has argued that Lk 22.24–7 is a redaction of Marcan material. [11] However, even he recognizes that particular elements of this pericope are independent of the "parallel" in Mk 10.41–5. In particular, Fitzmyer has singled out v.24 and v.27. The first verse is seen to be a Lucan composition and evidence for this includes the characteristic Ἐγένετο δὲ beginning and the presence of an indirect question which is introduced by the accusative neuter definite article. [12] Following Jeremias, [13] Fitzmyer recognizes that v.27 differs "entirely" from the Marcan soteriological saying of 10.45 and concedes that it is "probably derived from 'L'...". [14] In reality, even Fitzmyer accepts that one half of the pericope probably has no relationship to Mk 10.41–5.

In order to locate connections between this Lucan material and Mk 10.41–5, one must focus on Lk 22.25–6. Fitzmyer's evidence for a Lucan redaction of Mk 10.42bc (par. Lk 22.25) and Mk 10.43–4 (Lk 22.26) is somewhat limited. Initially, he notes that ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (v.25) is a non-Marcan traditional introduction [15] and continues to suggest, without argumentation, that the remainder of v.25 is a redaction of Mk 10.42bc. The only proposed evidence for a Lucan redaction of Mk 10.43–4 in Lk 22.26 is the verbless clause of v.26. Here Lk 1.5c is cited as support. [16] Further general support for a Marcan-Lucan connection is the parallelism in the structure of the saying. [17]

As for Lk 22.25 being a redaction of Mk 10.42bc, there is very little firm evidence to which one can point in order to substantiate such a claim. On the other hand, it is an unusual fact that although Luke seems to prefer using

[11] Cf. fn. 9.
[12] *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1412.
[13] J. Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), p. 290. Unlike Fitzmyer, Jeremias attributes Lk 22.14–24.53 to non-Marcan material, p. 7. Cf. Jeremias' *New Testament Theology* Vol. I (London: SCM, 1971), pp. 40f.
[14] *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1412.
[15] *Ibid.* Cf. Jeremias, *Sprache*, p. 290.
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1413. Cf. Marshall, p. 811.

compound verbs [18] he here ignores Mark's κατακυριεύουσιν and κατεξουσιάζουσιν and instead writes κυριεύουσιν and ἐξουσιάζοντες. If Luke were redacting Mk 10.42bc, he probably would have retained the compound form of the verbs. [19] This observation coupled with the initial non-Lucan beginning ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς would suggest that Luke is not redacting Mk 10.42.

The verbless clause as the lone evidence supporting v.26 as a Lucan redaction of Mk 10.43–4 is less than convincing. While Fitzmyer is possibly correct to cite this as an example of Lucan style, [20] this does not mean Luke has here redacted Mk 10.43–4. He may well have been redacting another tradition. Jeremias [21] cites three other pieces of evidence which would suggest that v.26 is part of a non-Marcan tradition. First, the usage of οὕτως (cf. Lk 12.21) in the absolute sense is not a Lucan feature. Secondly, the expression οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ in immediate succession is typical of Luke's style (cf. Lk 1.60). And finally, the idea of the serving person (ὁ διακονῶν) is an idea found in the tradition used by Luke (cf. Lk 10.40).

Finally, the parallelism in the structure of the sayings in both Mk 10.43–4 and Lk 22.26 may imply some relationship between them; but, this relationship does not necessarily need to be that of Luke redacting a Marcan source. It certainly is not impossible that two separate traditions would have retained this basic structure and that Luke was drawing upon the non-Marcan version because

[18] See J.C. Hawkins, *HoræSynopticæ* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909), especially charts A (pp. 16f) and B (pp. 28ff), which compare the number of occurrences of words in Luke/Acts with their occurrence in Mark and Matthew, and pp. 174ff; H.J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), pp. 166–68 and B.S. Easton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926), p. xxiv.
[19] Cf. Taylor, *Passion*, p. 63.
[20] Jeremias, *Sprache*, p. 290 also notes this absence of the verb in the clause in v.26 and he cites Lk 1.5c as does Fitzmyer; however, Jeremias suggests that both 1.5c and v.26's use of the verbless clause are to be attributed not to Luke, but to the tradition.
[21] *Ibid.*

it better suited his particular purpose. The possibility of separate traditions retaining a similar form would be increased when a saying of Jesus, as in the present case, was the subject. If this parallelism in structure is the only evidence of Lucan redaction of Marcan material, then one can hardly affirm that Luke has redacted Mk 10.43–4.

In addition to the above points, which run counter to Fitzmyer's arguments, one could further note that it is not Luke's tendency to extract pericopes from the Marcan context and employ them at a considerably later point in his own Gospel. [22] However, if Fitzmyer is correct in affirming Lucan redaction of the Marcan text this must be the case, for Luke has retained the Marcan pericopes prior to (Lk 18.31–4/Mk 10.32–4) and following (Lk 18.35–43/Mk 10.46–52) Mk 10.35–45, while omitting the Marcan equivalent to Lk 22.24–7. While such an activity is not impossible, it is, in light of Luke's style, highly unlikely to be the case.

Schürmann's analysis of Lk 22.24–7 as a "luk Wiedergabe einer vorluk Nicht/ Mk-T" [23] is so comprehensive that space does not permit a detailed review of his arguments. Therefore, only a few points regarding vv.25–6 will be noted. [24] Taylor [25] has dealt with this material in a considerably briefer manner and his contribution will be cited after Schürmann's suggestions are presented.

The main goal of Schürmann's work is to show that vv.25–6, while showing signs of Lucan redaction, are very probably not the result of Lucan editing of Mk 10.42b–4. With regards to v.25, Schürmann focuses on five possible points of Lucan redaction. [26] At some points the assertion of Lucan redaction of Mark

[22] Cf. Marshall, p. 811 and Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 400.
[23] *Jesu*, p. 63.
[24] The full argumentation is located on pp. 63–92 of *Jesu*.
[25] *Passion*, pp. 69–73.
[26] 1) omission of Mk 10.42b's οἴδατε ὅτι; 2) Luke's preference for οἱ βασιλεῖς over Mark's οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν; 3) the presence of κυριεύουσιν in Lk 22.25 and

simply cannot be proven. [27] Elsewhere the text of Luke, if a redaction of Mark, runs counter to Lucan redactional practices. For example, the absence of οἴδατε ὅτι in Lk 22.25 does not show a Lucan dislike of this Marcan expression. In Lk 20.21, the Evangelist follows his Marcan source (12.14) and uses the expression. Luke has also used it in Acts and frequently places ὅτι after εἰδέναι as was common in Koine Greek.

Schürmann deals with Lk 22.26 in a similar fashion locating six focal points. [28] Again there is little reason to suggest a redaction of the Marcan text has taken place. If Luke were editing Mark it would be difficult to explain why he omitted θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι for Schürmann points out that Luke shows no aversion to the verb θέλειν or the expression μέγας εἶναι. [29] Nor does he avoid the expression ὃς ἂν. [30] Additionally, the presence of ὁ διακονῶν in Lk 22.26 is probably due to the influence of v.27, which is from a non-Marcan source. Instead of omitting Marcan language in v.26 at least, at this point, Luke is under the influence of a non-Marcan source, thus adding weight to the suggestion that his source for vv.24–7 was not the Gospel of Mark.

While not every individual argument in Schürmann's presentation is overwhelmingly convincing, the cumulative effect is persuasive. It does seem very probable that at various points Lucan redaction can be detected with a high

---

κατακυριεύουσιν in Mk 10.42b; 4) Mk 10.42b's οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν and Lk 22.25's ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν and 5) κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν (Mk 10.42b) and εὐεργέται καλοῦνται (Lk 22.25).

[27] One example is Luke's supposed substitution of ὁ βασιλεῖς for Mark's οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν.

[28] 1) Mk 10.43's οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν and Luke's ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως; 2) ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν (Mk) and ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν (Lk); 3) ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος (Mk) and γινέσθω ... ὁ νεώτερος (Lk); 4) the Lucan adding of ὡς; 5) Mk 10.44's καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος and Luke's καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος and 6) ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος (Mk) and ὡς ὁ διακονῶν (Lk).

[29] See Lk 9.48b and Acts 8.9.

[30] See 8.18 (2x); 9.14; 12.18; 20.18 diff Mk; 4.16; 10.8; 13.25 and 17.33 (2x) diff Mt.

degree of certainty. At the same time, it must be stressed that it is equally unlikely that Luke was redacting Mk 10.41–5 when producing 22.25–6.

Taylor's scope for possible Lucan redaction of Mark is even more restricted than Schürmann's. Taylor limits the possible field of contact to Lk 22.25–6a. [31] Here the Lucan version shares fourteen or fifteen of twenty words with the similar scene in Mk 10. On the other hand, Taylor points out that the phrase εἶπεν αὐτοῖς is much less frequent in Luke's Gospel than is the expression εἶπεν πρὸς followed by an accusative. [32] This would suggest that εἶπεν αὐτοῖς is part of a non-Marcan, pre-Lucan introduction. It is rather difficult to explain why Luke would use this introduction, which presumably was followed by a version of the story similar to Mk 10.41–5 and then revert back to the Marcan version when writing vv.25–6a. It is more likely that he would follow one source, rather than switch between two sources.

Additionally, Taylor argues that the differences in time and circumstance between Lk 22.24–7 and Mk 10.41–5 strengthen the theory that Lk 22.25–6a was not taken from Mark. [33] It is difficult to imagine that Luke would remove a passage from one narrative and recast it in an entirely new context, for this does not appear to be his custom elsewhere in the Gospel. As Taylor argues, "Every case where we have reason to think that St. Luke has inserted a Markan passage into a non–Markan context is a case of parallel versions of the same incident." [34] Taylor concludes that Lk 22.25–6a is *possibly* a Marcan borrowing; but this is not very probable.

---

[31] *Passion*, p. 63. Cf. *BTG*, p. 41.
[32] *Passion* , p. 63.
[33] *BTG*, p. 42.
[34] *Ibid.*

7.4 Analysis of the Pericope

The Lucan version of this scene diverges from the Marcan version at three significant points. The rulers, who are cited as a negative illustration of a behaviour associated with greatness, are described as being called benefactors (εὐεργέται). One issue connected with this imagery of the rulers is the word καλοῦνται, which can be translated either as a middle passive or the middle voice. This translation problem will be dealt with when referring to the title εὐεργέτης. Secondly, the logion, itself, has been altered so as to make the saying more relevant to the life of the Christian community. And finally, unlike Mk 10.45, Jesus is depicted as a waiter (v.27) in the positive illustration of true greatness. 7.4 will deal specifically with these unique elements. This analysis will, in turn, serve as a firm foundation for the interpretation of the passage.

In addition to the standard notation, which is found in the logion about the Gentile rulers holding sway over their subjects, the Lucan text mentions that they are also known as "benefactors". This dual description of these men is held up as a negative illustration, as v.26's ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως would suggest. [35] In

[35] That the Gentile rulers are used as a negative illustration has been widely accepted by scholars. However, recently David Lull, see p. 158, fn. 5 above, has challenged this consensus. In his portrayal of the consensus case, Lull follows K.W. Clark's article, see ch. 5, p. 120, fn. 76, arguing that κατακυριεύειν is not being used in the pejorative sense in Mk 10. Lull accepts Clark's position and sees this supposed misunderstanding of κατακυριεύειν as a major contributing factor to the misunderstanding of how Luke has used the Gentile ruler example. However, the word Luke uses is κυριεύω and, as noted below, the word is rarely used in the NT. Each time it is used it denotes a relationship in which one party exercises absolute control over an inferior party. Lull fails to note this aspect of κυριεύω. Secondly, he suggests that the translation of ἐθνῶν, the ambiguity of καλοῦνται and the line of argument in vv.26–7 is used as a support for the consensus position. Lull suggests that to translate ἐθνῶν as "pagan" adds a note of prejudice in v.25, which is not really present. He notes that the Evangelist sees the nations as including both Gentile nations and Israel. Therefore, Lull suggests, the word ἐθνῶν does not imply a distinction between "pagan" and Christian. It seems as though Lull has missed the rather clear line of demarcation between Gentile and Christian leaders present in v.26's ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως,

order to understand what the Evangelist is rejecting one must take a closer look at the word εὐεργέτης.

The Greek world had a long tradition of bestowing this title upon its leading citizens. The titular usage of εὐεργέτης can be found in the writings of such notable fifth century BCE authors as Plato, [36] Herodotus, [37] and Xenophon. [38] A survey of Greek inscriptions [39] will reveal that the title was used in each century up to and including the first century CE and beyond. Two splendid

---

ἀλλ'. He points out that καλοῦνται can be either a passive or a reflexive; however few commentators interpret the word as a reflexive. This, he argues, weakens their case. As will be seen below, we would be inclined to see καλοῦνται as a reflexive thus heightening the note of irony running through vv.25–7. It should be noted that Lull fails to make any reference to this use of irony. This initial ground clearing exercise, designed to reveal the inadequacies of the consensus position, has not accomplished its goals. The second section, in which Lull sets out to convince the reader that the Gentile rulers are a positive illustration, is also unconvincing. By drawing upon vv.28–30, which as we saw above may or may not have been designed to relate closely to vv.24–7, Lull argues that the argument takes on a positive nuance now that the imposed pejorative meaning has been removed from v.25. Lull assumes, without arguing for this position, that vv.28–30 relate to vv.24–7 and naturally shed light on the illustration of the Gentile rulers. Lull suggests that v.25's εὐεργέται καλοῦνται introduces the thesis that rulers are to benefit their subjects and in v.26 this theme is applied to the situation at hand. V.26a is viewed not as a prescriptive contrast between apostles and rulers, but as a descriptive one. V.26b states the thesis positively and ἀλλὰ is designed as a contrast to v.26b. In short, vv.25–6 are suggesting that "those who use their power *to benefit and serve others* are 'the greatest'" (p. 297). However, we suggest that v.26a and v.26b are to be seen as one *whole* contrast to v.25, where both δὲ (see BDF, §447) and ἀλλὰ stress the contrast between the behaviour of the rulers and Christian leaders. Lull is correct in seeing the focus of vv.24–7 as dealing with the question of how one is to exercise authority; but to suggest the Gentile rulers are a positive model fails to account for the contrast between two totally different descriptive categories: kings and servants. The disciple leaders are called to be servants of the Christian community and as community leaders they are primarily servants and not authoritarian rulers. One's greatness is in one's service not in one's authority which may then be used to serve others. On the whole, Lull's suggestions are not convincing.

[36] *Gorgias*, 506C.

[37] *Book* iii. 85.

[38] *Hellenica* 6.1.4.

[39] For example see Wilhelm Dittenberger's four volume work, *Sylloge Inscriptionium Graecarium* (Leipzig: A.S. Hirzelium, 1915 and ff.).

first century CE uses of εὐεργέτης would be one regarding Augustus and his sons and another citing the name of Tiberius.

Αυτοχρατορα Καισαρα
θεον θεου υἱον Σεβαστον
ευεργετην, και τους υἱους
Γαΐον Ἰουλιον Καισαρα.
Λουκιον Ἰουλιον Καισαρα,
ἡ πολις Ὑπατα [40]

Ἀ'ἰα πολις των Δελφων
Τιβεριον Καισαρα θεου υἱ
ον, Σεβαστον σωτηρα
εὐεγεταν Ἀπολλωνι
Πυθιω [41]

These inscriptions are positive evidence that in the first century CE Gentile rulers were referred to as "benefactors".

The word was not only used by Greeks in reference to Greek leaders. The title εὐεργέτης was in sufficient use in the ancient world that it can also be found in Jewish texts, such as the LXX and Josephus' writings. Among the LXX texts employing εὐεργέτης are Esther 8.13; 13.1; Wisdom 19.14; 2 Maccabees 4.2; 3 Maccabees 3.19 and 6.24. Josephus uses the word ten times in *The Jewish War* , twenty four times in *Antiquities* and twice in *Vita*. Of particular interest is *Vita* 259, where Galileans in the village of Gabaroth proclaimed Josephus to be their "benefactor and saviour".

This citation has dual significance. Not only does it show that both Greeks and Jews used the title, it also points out that the word was not reserved only for the Caesars or other heads of state. Fitzmyer suggests, some what narrowly, that εὐεργέτης was a title given to "gods, princes and Caesars". [42] On the other hand, A.D. Nock points out that it was, in fact, a rather common honorary title in the ancient world. [43] It was applied not only to the head of state but was used in connection with lesser officials such as generals and minor civil servants. [44] And in the classical period and afterwards it is regularly found in civic decrees denoting a person as a benefactor of the city. [45] The title was given to those who offered prolonged aid to the city or rendered unique services in the case of an emergency. [46]

Why should the Evangelist include this reference to the kings of the Gentiles being called "benefactors" as part of his negative illustration? There could be at least two possible explanations. The first would revolve around the nature of the king's rule which would be viewed as inconsistent with the honorary title "benefactor". Here, the verb κυριεύω is significant. Apart from the Lucan usage, this word is found in the NT only five times. [47] In all five instances the

[42] *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1417.
[43] "Soter and Euergetes" in *The Joy of Study* (New York: MacMillan, 1951), pp. 135ff.
[44] Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927), pp. 253–54, cites an inscription in honour of Gaius Stertinius Xenophon, who was Emperor Claudius' physican. Dittenberger's second volume, p. 436, contains an inscription in honour of Pompey.
[45] Nock, p. 135, compares this usage of the word as being similar to the lists of benefactors kept by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. On this particular use of the word he further cites, p. 135, fn. 25, material by E. Skard (*Avh. Norske. Akad.* Vol. II (1931), p. 28 and *Symb. Oslo.* XXVII (1949), pp. 11ff), A. Wilhelm (*Sitzungsber. Wien* CCXX (1942), V, pp. 11ff) and Nilsson (*Gesch.* II, p. 173).
[46] On pp. 142–43, Nock lists seven decrees which give the title εὐεργέτης to lesser public officials including four governors, one *Legatus Augusti* and *curator*, one *Legatus pro praetore* and one *praefectus praetorii* . Six of the seven titles had been bestowed by a legal body, i.e. either the city council or on behalf of the city at large.
[47] Rom. 6.9,14; 14.9; 2 Cor. 1.24 and 1 Tim. 6.15.

thought conveyed is that of one party exercising absolute control over an inferior or weaker party. The word is commonly used in the LXX for the Hebrew word *mshl* and is employed when describing "alien and oppressive rule or usurpation". [48] It would seem as though Luke's readers are being encouraged to avoid this particular aspect of the Gentile nature of leadership, i.e. a totalitarian arrogance and abuse of one's position. The repugnant nature of such a view is underlined by the added note of these rulers then being known as "benefactors". The juxtapositioning of the two images draws out the negative illustration. Not only do the Gentile rulers abuse their positions and subjects; but, they also are given honorary titles, which are designed to recognize their supposed greatness and benevolence. [49] This being the case, there would be a strong presence of irony in the verse. [50]

The second explanation focuses on the verb καλοῦνται. As noted above, this word can be interpreted either as a present passive ("they are called") or in the middle voice ("they call themselves"). In light of the larger context, it would seem as though καλοῦνται should be viewed as being in the middle voice. [51] In this case, the phrase, translated into English, would be "And those in authority over them [the Gentiles] call themselves benefactors.". If καλοῦνται were intended to be understood in the middle voice the element of irony would be heightened and a new aspect would be introduced into the verse. Since the evidence suggests that εὐεργέτης was widely used as an honourary title it would seem as though this new aspect would be the rulers' desire, or perhaps even demand, to be honoured by their subjects. They desired public recognition and affirmation, despite the fact that in many instances they were not honourable

[48] W. Foerster, "κύριος, ktl" in *TDNT*, Vol. 3, p. 1097. Foerster cities 1 Macc. 10.76 as a particularly good example of this usage.
[49] Cf. Schlatter, p. 379.
[50] Cf. Klostermann, *Lukas*, p. 211 and Marshall, p. 812.
[51] Others who see καλοῦνται as being in the middle voice include Fitzmyer, *Luke*, Vol. II, p. 1416; A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896), p. 501 and R. Rickards, "Luke 22.25-They are called 'Friends of the People"' *BT* 28 (1977), p. 446.

men. By dubiously obtaining public acclaim as "benefactors", this type of leader displays his arrogance and haughtiness.

The two explanations are not and need not be seen as mutually exclusive of one another. The ironic picture of tyrannical rulers at the same time oppressing their subjects and calling themselves "benefactors" to the very people they tyrannize may well be intended by the Evangelist. In this case, the warning of the negative illustration has to do both with the nature of exercising one's authority and understanding of one's position.

Various scholars have noted that this Lucan version of the greatness/service logion has been more clearly applied to a particular ecclesiastical problem. [52] There are two elements present in the saying which support such a statement: 1) the phrase ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν and 2) the words ὁ ἡγούμενος. The logion is now more openly addressed to the leaders of the Christian community and not the disciples/apostles who were eating with Jesus, as suggested by the context of the Last Supper.

While the Mk 10.43–4 version couches the logion in the conditional sense (ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι...ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος) the Lucan text clearly has in view a group of people who would already qualify as "great" (ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν). These people in turn are told what behaviour is appropriate for individuals in their position: they are to act as the youngest [53] member of the larger group

[52] Cf. W. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 499; C. Talbert, *Reading Luke* (N.Y.: Crossroads Publishing Co., 1982), p. 210; Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 401; Schmid, *Lukas*, p. 328 and Marshall, p. 813.

[53] With regards to the "youngest" (ὁ νεώτερος), Marshall, p. 813, is probably correct to view these people as forming a particular group in the church. The same word is located in Acts 5.6; 1 Tim. 5.1; Titus 2.6 and 1 Pet. 5.5. In none of these passages are the "young" associated with specific tasks, thus supporting Marshall's suspicion of Schürmann's desire to assign official functions to ὁ νεώτερος (cf. *Jesu*, pp. 76f.). The significance of the μείζων/νεώτερος contrast is

in question (...γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος...). The 'slave of all' tradition is no longer used to set out the way to achieve greatness for those who are not but wish to be great, as is the case in Mk 10.43–4; instead, Luke uses the logion to define the appropriate behaviour for those persons who have achieved positions of importance within the community.

The suggestion that the logion is here directed at church leaders is further supported by the usage of the words ὁ ἡγούμενος in the later half of the saying. As Büchsel [54] notes this word is used a number of times in the NT in reference to the leaders of the Christian communities. In Acts 15.22, Barsabbas and Silas are referred to as ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς at the Jerusalem Church. In Heb 13.7, the readers are encouraged to remember their ἡγουμένων, who speak the word of God to them. In Heb 13.17, the readers are told to obey and submit to these leaders (ἡγουμένοις) and in 13.24 the author greets all the ἡγουμένους and ἁγίους. This last citation clearly attempts to distinguish the person who has assumed a leadership role within the community from the average believer. There can be little doubt then that the Lucan logion has been recast so as to make its point more applicable to the leaders of the Christian community. It is also important to note that again the issue at hand is that of behaviour, for the leaders are encouraged to become like servants (ὁ διακονῶν).

Finally, the third unique difference found in Lk 22.24–7 is the positive illustration of true greatness. In Mk 10.41–5, the pericope concluded by citing Jesus as the one who gave his life as a "ransom for many". This giving of his life is an extention or logical conclusion of electing to serve rather than to be served. The Marcan positive illustration (v.45) is the implied opposite of the negative

---

probably along the lines of behaviour and humility in light of one's possession or lack of importance in the community.

[54] *TDNT*, Vol. 2, pp. 907ff. The word is used of leaders in non-NT texts as well. Cf. 1 Clement 1.3; 21.6; Hermes 2,2,6; 3,9,7; 1 Macc. 9.30; 2 Macc. 14.16; Ez. 43.7; Sir. 17.17; 30.27 and 41.17.

illustration of the Gentile rulers (v.42); however, it differs significantly from Lk 22.27 in that the theme of soteriology has crept into the illustration.

On the other hand, the Lucan positive illustration is taken from the routine of everyday life and so acts as a better balanced illustration of what is appropriate behaviour for a leader in the Christian community. In Lk 22.24–7, the individual in this position is given two role models: the Gentile rulers and Jesus. The rulers serve as the negative model because they use their positions to their own advantage. Jesus, on the other hand, who is the leader of his group, is the one who rejects traditional expressions and understandings of greatness in favour of serving the needs of those who may be considered to be less important than himself. This point is made by the rhetorical question, "For which is the greater, one who sits at table, or one who serves?" and the answer, "But I am among you as one who serves ", which counters the obvious answer to the question. This conclusion more closely fits with the logion, itself, the larger context of the pericope and the overall setting of this section of the Gospel.

The Lucan concluding verse stresses that a Christian understanding of the nature of leadership has rejected the contemporary expressions of leadership and greatness. The contemporary political system had accepted and legitimated the use of high office for personal benefit and advancement. Just the opposite understanding is to be at work in the Christian community. There the leader uses his office for the benefit of the less significant member of the community. This principle is set out in a dual manner. Within the concluding verse the currently accepted practice is rejected in favour of associating personal greatness with the individual who waits upon the needs of the other person. In the overall structure of the pericope the same process takes place in that the behaviour of the Gentile rulers and Jesus are compared with each another. The former is rejected outright (ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως) and v.27 supports the validity of v.26's logion on greatness and service.

7.5 The Goal of Luke 22.24–7

In light of the above noted unique elements associated with the logion, it seems evident that Luke has elected to employ the saying more narrowly than Mark did in either ch. 9 or 10. While Mark directed the logion and its various applications at the entire Christian community, Luke, at this point, directed the saying specifically at the leaders of the Christian community. This is supported by the contrasting role models of the rulers' and Jesus' understanding of appropriate behaviour for one in a position of authority and the alteration of the logion, which clearly directs it at the "great ones" and "leaders". The Evangelist is attempting to deal with what certainly must have been a genuine problem in the early church and that is the issue of placing self-advancement above the common good of the community and the needs of the insignificant members of the fellowship. [55] There are various and diverse NT passages which would suggest that such a human tendency was not merely limited to the Christian community for which Luke wrote his Gospel. [56] The harsh realities of life in his Christian fellowship had made Luke fully aware of the fact that one can be a disciple of Christ and still exhibit behavioural traits similar to those of the non-believer, especially if one is in a position of leadership.

The Lucan solution to the problem is to point out the inadequacy of the model currently held to by the Christian leaders. They have chosen to cast their exercise of authority along the lines established and followed by Gentile leaders. Just as the behaviour of office holders is observed and questioned in the twentieth-century, so it was probably also observed and questioned in the first century. Political leaders, from Caesar down to the local official, would have

[55] Cf. Talbert, p. 210; Marshall, p. 810 and Danker, *Jesus and the New Age*, (St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1983), pp. 221–22.
[56] See 1 Cor. 3.1–4; 11.17–22; 12–14; Phil 2.1ff; Jn 13 and Mt 23.1–12. That this was a particularly serious problem for the Lucan community may be supported by the inclusion of Lk 12.41–8.

had their administration of public affairs observed and discussed by the common people. The fact that these people are cited as the negative illustration would suggest that such behaviour would not have been unknown and very likely with the readers on the receiving end of the rulers' exercise of lordship. Here also the ironical element, which was noted earlier is present, for the victims of such an exercise of authority, who now have achieved power in the Christian community, similarly exercise authority over other believers.

Luke argues that such behaviour is alien to the Christian community. The very presupposition upon which such traits are founded is foreign to Christian principles. In the life of the believer and the social context of the community of believers, the determining factor for social interaction is the example of Jesus. Just as Jesus has rejected the common understanding of holding high office and greatness, i.e. such a position denotes personal greatness and deserves service and honour, so also must his followers. Within the Christian environment, the only valid role model is that of Jesus. Christian leaders are called to be servants to the community because the original leader was a servant. At this point, the Christian community is warned against contamination from a value held to be true in another contemporary sphere. [57]

Clearly the Lucan community was not without some form of hierarchy; however, the Evangelist envisioned a fundamental difference between his subcultural social group's understanding of authority and that of the larger society. The role of leader in the Christian community, according to Luke, is parallel to Jesus' own role. This parallelism is seen in the arrangement of vv.26 and 27, where the great ones in the Christian community are to be servants (v.26), while Jesus, who would be viewed as a great individual by the members of the community, has already proven himself to be a servant (v.27). Because of this parallel re-

[57] A similar type of warning is found in 12.22–31 regarding anxiety for the necessities of life. Interestingly enough the Gentiles are used as a negative illustration there as well.

lationship the primary task of the Christian leader is service to the community (v.26). There is no other model after which Christian leaders can style the exercise of their authority. The only other model, that of the Gentile rulers, is inconsistent with this basic principle of Jesus and therefore is an illegitimate expression of leadership.

We would tentatively suggest that this parallelism between Jesus and the leader of the Christian community could be seen as being continued in vv.28–30, in that the person(s) in question have identified with Jesus in his trials. If these verses are to be taken as continuing on from vv.24–7, which, as was noted above, is very difficult to determine, then it would seem as though they strengthen the point made there. The leaders only rule as the assigned representatives of Jesus (κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν) and do not have an authority of their own. Thus their style of leading should fall in line with that which Jesus has exercised. Furthermore, the Christian leaders' rule is limited to a realm where they are invited guests at another's table. Their presence at this table and upon their "thrones" of authority is due only to Jesus' benevolence. They have no innate claim to these positions. To reject the Jesus model of leadership will render one ineligible as a community leader.

7.6 Conclusion

In the course of this chapter it was recognized that it is virtually impossible to argue for or against Luke intentionally adding vv.28–30 to the pericope of vv.24–7, which contains a version of the 'slave of all' tradition. Because of this difficulty, these verses were only drawn upon tentatively and in a limited way when dealing with vv.24–7. It was also argued that the suggestion put forward by Schürmann and Taylor, that vv.24–7 are part of a pre-Lucan, non-Marcan tradition, is probably correct. This affirmation, however, is not to suggest that no Lucan redaction is to be found in these verses. The focus on the pericope

itself pointed out that there are three points where this passage differs from Mk 10.41–5: 1) the mention of the rulers being called benefactors, 2) the attempt to make the logion (v.26) more applicable to the community setting and 3) the illustration of Jesus as a waiter. These three alterations led to the conclusion that Luke was attempting to apply the 'slave of all' logion to a particular problem within his community. That problem was the manner in which church leaders exercised their authority. Luke, unlike Mark, actually directs the logion at one specific group within the community. The way of the Gentile rulers is rejected in favour of Jesus' own way of leading.

Chapter Eight:
Matthew 23.1-12: Two Options for the Exercise of Authority

8.1 Introduction

Upon turning to Mt 23.1–12, we find that the 'slave of all' logion has been extracted from its generally familiar surroundings. Gone is the debate on greatness among the disciples and Jesus' response to their conversation. Here all that remains of the general format of presentation is the roughly equivalent saying ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος.

Here, as in previous chapters, our ultimate concern is to see how the 'slave of all' tradition was used. In light of Matthew's compilation of this chapter, [1] we must ask why he chose to take the logion and incorporate it into this section of his Gospel. Primarily, we must ask how it functions within Mt 23.1–12. [2]

8.2 will deal with a preliminary issue raised by the presence of the phrase τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς in the initial verse. In the recent past there has been lively discussion as to the exact role of the crowds and disciples in Matthew's Gospel. The fact that vv.2–12 are "spoken" in the presence of these two groups encourages some inquiry into Matthew's use of the categories, especially the former. [3] Section 8.3 will be a redactional study of the pericope designed to

[1] The vast majority of twentieth century authors have accepted that Mt 23 is the Evangelist's product. See for example A. Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Stock, 1909), p. 313; Klostermann, *Matthäus*, p. 180; Schmid, *Matthäus*, p. 317; Schniewind, *Matthäus*, p. 224; Filson, p. 243; Hill, *Matthew*, p. 308; W. Pesch, "Theologische Aussagen der Redaktion von Matthäus 23" in *Orienterung an Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), pp. 286ff and Gundry, pp. 453ff.

[2] It is generally accepted that 23.1–12 forms a literary subunit in this section of the Gospel. The fundamental reason for this conclusion is that while the audience identified in v.1 is the τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς there is a sudden shift in v.13 where the scribes and Pharisees are addressed in the seven woes which follow despite the fact they are not mentioned in vv.1-12 as being present.

[3] Of the two groups 'the crowds' is more pertinent to our subject and therefore we will focus on it. To do this we will evaluate the contributions made by Paul

understand how Matthew has used the *μέγας/διάκονος* logion at this point. In the final section (8.4), we will attempt to illuminate the pericope by sketching an historical background to section 8.3.

8.2 The Crowds in Matthew

A proper understanding of the crowds in Matthew is important when one attempts to interpret Mt 23.1–12. The fact that the Evangelist lists the crowds and disciples, yet not the Pharisees, as the audience of the address on Pharisaism, in ch. 23, is significant. What does Matthew mean by telling us that the crowds and disciples both know the short comings of Pharisaical authority (vv.2–7) and the nature of authority in the Christian community (vv.8–12)? The disciples [4] would be aware of these options because they are within the Christian community and know, by first hand experience, the nature of the Pharisaical exercise of authority. But what about the crowds?

P.S. Minear summarizes four "provisional conclusions" on the role of the

Minear ("The Disciples and Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew" *ATR* (Supp. Series), March, 1974, pp. 28–44), Sjef van Tilborg (*The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 42–65) and Garland (pp. 34–41).

[4] The role of the disciples, as the people within the Christian community is so widely accepted that few scholars deal with their identity. However, there is some debate as to Matthew's use of this category. Some, such as R. Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium* (Münich: Kaiser, 1963), see this classification as a term used to describe generally the church. Others, such as G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), argue that the "disciples" are strictly figures of the past; cf. U. Luz, pp. 98ff. Also a recent article by R.A. Edwards,"Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples" in *Discipleship in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), pp. 47ff, which uses reader-response criticism, suggests that the disciples were inconsistent followers of Jesus. While this may be so, Edward's determination is based upon his comparison of this group with Jesus and God, as he writes, "The ambivalence of the disciples is contrasted to the stability of Jesus and his Father in heaven". (p. 59). As we will see below the crowds are one of three human groups in Matthew. While they are neutral or leaning towards Jesus, the Jewish leaders and the disciples take up the opponent and proponent roles respectively.

Matthean crowds prior to his examination of the evidence [5]:

> "1) Far from being an amorphous and neutral category the *ochloi* played a highly positive role as followers of Jesus, accepting his prophetic authority and accompanying him from the beginning to the end of his career".
>
> "2) From the standpoint of Matthew these *ochloi* represented a major objective of Jesus' ministry in all its aspects: ... They represented therefore a major purpose of God in sending his son to claim the fruits of his vineyard".
>
> "3) Matthew conceived the role of the *mathetai* as shepherds or tenants of the vineyard, ordained and trained by Jesus to continue his several ministries."
>
> "4) The basic conflict between Jesus and his adversaries issued from this concern of God for Israel, his flock. Will the *ochloi* remain under the care and authority of the Pharisees and their scribes, or will their loyalties shift over to Jesus and his *mathetai*, his scribes (23:24)? Matthew assumes that the answer to that question depends primarily upon the faithfulness of the *mathetai* to their commission as teachers".

Minear's conclusions draw both negative and positive responses. His first conclusion seems to misread the crowds' roles. Are they actually given a "highly positive role as followers of Jesus"? Furthermore, a comparison of the initial and final conclusions raises another question: if the *ochloi* are already Jesus' followers, how can one pose the question "Will the *ochloi* remain under the care and authority of the Pharisees and their scribes, or will their loyalties shift over to Jesus and his *mathetai*...?".

The conflict established by the affirmations of conclusions one and four is not diminished by the evidence submitted by Minear. His support for these conclusions is found in his analysis of the "five sermons" in Matthew. [6] These

[5] P. 31ff.

[6] See pp. 32–40. The "five sermons" are found in chs.5–7; 10.1–42; 13; 18.1–19.1 and 23.1ff.

units are singled out because the crowds are mentioned either at the beginning or conclusion of each one. Supposedly these sermons depict Jesus teaching his disciples to function as scribes to the Christian masses, i.e. the crowds. [7]

Minear fails to account for a number of themes in these "sermons" which undercut his arguments. In sermon one he plays upon the pregnant word ἀκολουθέω and suggests the crowds, who in 4.25 are described as following Jesus, are "followers" in the sense of committed disciples. In this sermon, however, there is no talk of the acceptance of Jesus' teaching. This lack of commitment is reinforced by the sermon's two closing pericopes regarding half-hearted response to or rejection of Jesus' words. The second sermon, according to Minear, offers a missionary commission, which is oriented towards the crowds, to the disciples. This sermon supports Minear's second conclusion, but conflicts with his first. Additionally, he has failed to account for the pericope prior to ch.10 [8] which describes the crowds as "harassed and helpless". The language of the harvest is used to describe the disciple/crowd relationship (ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι). The grain (crowds) waits to be gathered into the granary (community) for safe keeping. 9.36's metaphor (ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα) strengthens this observation. Since the crowds (πρόβατα) have no *shepherd*, they can hardly have Jesus as a shepherd. Minear's initial conclusion founders in the third sermon and even he admits that this attitude towards the crowds is negative. [9] This is due to Matthew's alteration of his Marcan source (3.31–5) where the crowd around Jesus is described as Jesus' family. Matthew only identifies the disciples, despite the crowd's presence, in that role. The crowds are not present for the presentation of the fourth sermon. I would suggest this is not surprising in light of the unit's content. The chapter deals with various aspects of inter-

[7] P. 32.
[8] Mt 9.35–38.
[9] Pp. 34–5, especially see p. 35's quote: "In this chapter, then, we must admit that the attitude towards the *ochloi* is more negative than we have found to be true elsewhere."

nal community relationships. Since, in Matthew's estimation, the crowds are not community members, they are not identified as being present. Rather, the disciples are the recipients of the sermon. [10] With the final sermon, Minear attempts to interpret 23.1–12 in light of his crowds thesis. While the disciples are responsible for teaching, the crowds are responsible for obeying (v.3). But the crowds are not told to obey the disciples. They are to obey the scribes and Pharisees (v.2). These verses do not mention the preaching or teaching of the disciples.

Minear cites two other passages which he thinks reinforce his theory [11] but more important would have been an adequate explanation of the crowd's behaviour at Jesus' trial. [12] It is the crowds, persuaded by the Jewish leaders, who call for Jesus' death. Minear totally overlooks this scene. On the whole we must conclude the crowds do not play "a highly positive role as followers of Jesus...".

As we will see below, Minear's second and third conclusions seem to be quite insightful and should not be received in the same way as his first affirmation. His suggestions that the ὄχλοι represent a "major objective of Jesus' ministry" and that the Matthean concern is for the disciples to continue Jesus' ministries, which focus upon the ὄχλοι, are helpful proposals when one attempts to decipher the role of the crowds in this Gospel. This is especially true with reference to 23.1–12 and we need to keep these ideas in mind.

While Sjef van Tilborg's primary interest focuses on the role of the Jewish leaders in Matthew, he arrives at a conclusion much akin to Minear's when he writes, "The ὄχλοι, in contrast to the Jewish leaders, react very positively at

[10] See 18.1.
[11] The passages are 4.23–5 (citing Isa. 9.1,2) and 8.1–13. The former, he believes, shows that Matthew saw the presence of the crowds as fulfillment of the prophecy and the latter focuses on the words about the centurion's faith.
[12] See ch. 27.

the appearance of Jesus". [13] At one point in his work, van Tilborg devotes eighteen pages to an analysis of the relationship of the crowds and the leaders to Jesus. [14] Jesus and the crowds occupy two of three positions in the triangular interactions. The third point is held by various groups of Jewish leaders. As a result of van Tilborg's investigative concerns, Jesus is always the focal point for the attention of the other parties. van Tilborg then compares their responses and concludes that the crowds have a more positive response to Jesus. However, he goes too far when he writes, "The ὄχλοι accept Jesus and whatever he teaches them." [15] If one were to move the focal point to the crowds such a conclusion could not be made. What is the crowd's response to Jesus and what is their relationship to him and the Jewish leaders?

It is interesting to note that in the six passages [16] which contain the triangular arrangement, the majority include the theme of Jesus and the leaders' authority. Frequently, the crowds are like a shuttlecock - batted back and forth between the two parties vying for supreme authority. In ch.7 we see the crowds comparing Jesus' authoritative teaching with that of the scribes. In ch.9, the issue is Jesus' authority to forgive sins against the leaders' challenge of that authority. Mt 12.22ff has striking resemblances to ch.9. Here Jesus is seen as the true authority because he works with the Spirit of God. In v.29, a challenge is issued to the listeners, including the crowds. They must decide between Jesus and his challengers. By ch.21 the crowds *seemingly* have made a commitment to Jesus by calling him the "Son of David". But as Kingsbury notes [17] a proper commitment for Matthew would be to confess Jesus as the "Son of God". Following this confession, Jesus confronts the Temple authorities' control over the

[13] P. 158.
[14] Pp. 142–60.
[15] P. 148.
[16] These pericopes include the following key verses: 7.28; 9.8; 12.23; 21.9,11,16; 22.23 and 27.20.
[17] *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 99–103.

holy precinct. In ch.22, the leaders confront Jesus' teaching authority and they are soundly defeated. Again the crowds are "placed between" the two parties claiming authority and they are astonished by Jesus. Finally, it is in ch.27 that the issue of conflicting claims to authority seems to be absent. Here Jesus, on trial, has no claim to authority. But the leaders exercise their influence over the crowds by convincing them to call out for Jesus' execution.

The picture given by Matthew then is not the one drawn by Minear and van Tilborg. The crowds are not *committed* to Jesus or his authority; yet, they are impressed by him and his authoritative acts. They represent the mass of *potential* converts [18]; but, they are like shepherdless sheep or grain awaiting the harvest. The crowds stand between two rivals for authority. They must decide to whom they will give their allegiance. They can make both impressive confessions about Jesus *and* cry for his execution. Their opinions can be influenced by external forces.

D.E. Garland devotes the opening pages of the second chapter of his book [19] to the significance of the audience noted at the beginning of Matthew 23. He points out that Mt 23.1 reflects the hand of the Evangelist and therefore should be seen as a part of Matthew's redactional concern. [20] One is hard-pressed to disagree with his concluding introductory sentence: "Since both 'the crowds' and 'the disciples' have a distinctive prominence in the Gospel, their combination is 23:1 may be a significant clue for understanding Matthew's intentions in this discourse. [21] But as Garland launches into his study his endeavours run aground in that he relies very heavily upon Minear, whose article we have found to be

[18] That Matthew and his community had a missionary concern is evidenced by Mt 28.16–20 or 9.35–38.
[19] This chapter deals specifically with the opening pericope of this Matthean chapter. Garland's discussion about οἱ ὄχλοι can be found on pp. 34–41.
[20] P. 35. Cf. fn. 3 on this same page where Garland lists the evidence for Matthean redaction of the verse.
[21] P. 36.

wanting. The fact that Garland does not totally agree with Minear calls for an evaluation of his contribuition.

Regarding the significance of the crowds, Garland wholly accepts Minear's conclusion that "far from being an amorphous and neutral category, the *ochloi* played a highly positive note as followers of Jesus, accepting his prophetic authority and accompanying him from the beginning to the end of his career." [22] The remainder of this section is a "re-emphasis" of the role of the crowds in Matthew. Garland makes five points to strengthen Minear's conclusion.

First is the mention that " 'the crowds' follow (ἀκολουθειν) Jesus". [23] As noted above this idea of following does not really lead to the conclusion that the crowds were "followers" in the same sense as the disciples. Garland, himself, calls this support into question when writing [24],

> "Ἀκολουθειν has a qualitative function in 8:19–22; 10:38–39; 16:24; and 19:21,27, but this is not necessarily applicable to 'the crowds' because this word can designate simply movement from one place to another as in 9:27; 14:13; and 26:58. Where it clearly has a qualitative function, 'the disciples' are involved; thus, it is hazardous to assume that 'the crowds' follow Jesus in the same manner as 'the disciples'".

Secondly, Garland suggests that various passages depict the crowds as witnesses and confirmers of Jesus' miracles. [25] He observes that οἱ ὄχλοι are present to witness miracles; but it seems as though his choice of the word "confirm" is too strong in every instance. The closest the crowd comes to confirming Jesus' powers is by bringing people to be healed. [26] At one point they even attempt to prohibit two blind men from gaining Jesus' attention. [27] The crowd's gen-

[22] Garland cites these words on p. 36.
[23] P. 36.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] The passages are 8.1–4; 9.1–8,32–3; 12.22–30; 15.30–1; 17.14–8 and 20.29–34. His exact words are "they witness and confirm the miracles of Jesus". (p. 36).
[26] But only once are they specifically identified as the "bearers". See 15.30–1.
[27] See 20.29–34, especially v.31's ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σωπήσωσιν.

eral response to the miracles is *amazement*, *astonishment* and *inquiry* into Jesus' identity. We would suggest these responses are more typical of standard endings to miracle stories than that they constitute confirmations.

Thirdly, we are told that the crowds "stand in direct contrast to the intransigent Jewish leaders". [28] However, it seems as though the disciples are the direct contrast to the leaders. It is a disciple who correctly identifies Jesus as the Son of God. [29] It is the disciples who are given the commissions to carry out Jesus' ministries. [30] The disciples are given special instruction regarding Jesus' teachings. [31] While the crowds generally respond differently than do the leaders, at a crucial point, the trial, the crowds follow the leaders' direction and reject Jesus. The crowds' earlier recognition of Jesus' air of authority, accolades of "prophet" and "Son of David" and glorifying God due to Jesus' acts reveal that Jesus is an impressive figure to them. The crowds are open to him but in the final analysis they do not commit themselves to him.

The fact that the crowds have seen Jesus' disputations with the Jewish leaders is Garland's fourth point of re-emphasis. [32] His fifth point is the fact that the crowds were the "object of Jesus' ministry". [33] These two affirmations are Garland's strongest points. Again, we see the emerging picture of the crowds as the group standing between Jesus'authority and the leaders' authority. [34] This observation is important for Mt 23.1–12 because, as we will see, a key issue is authority - this time that of the scribes and Pharisees on the one hand and the Christian community leaders on the other.

---

[28] P. 36.
[29] Mt 16.13ff.
[30] Mt 10.1ff; 28.16ff and in 9.35ff the disciples are called to pray that Jesus' ministry will have sufficient workers.
[31] Mt 13.10ff.
[32] Pp. 36–7.
[33] P. 37.
[34] Cf. the above section dealing with van Tilborg's proposals, pp. 181ff.

It is only at this point that Garland begins to question Minear's analysis. He disagrees with Minear's fourth provisional conclusion regarding the role of the crowds and the relationship of the disciples to the crowds. [35] Garland objects to the implication "that Matthew intends 'the crowds' to signify contemporary laymen;...". However, Garland's alternative view, that the ὄχλοι are not "Jewish crowds who are bordering on commit ment to Christ, but rather they should be understood as the Jewish crowds under the leadership of the scribes and Pharisees in the time of Jesus" [36] is equally problematic. We believe Garland misses the Matthean point of the crowds by suggesting "Matthew is not re-interpreting 'the crowds' from the vantage point of his own church situation but is reflecting upon the history of the people of Israel." [37]

In the final section, Garland challenges the identity of the crowds as contemporary Jews "bordering on committment to Christ" without strongly defending his assertion of Matthew's reflection upon the history of the people of Israel. He weakly points out that there is "subtle progression from the castigation of the leaders of Judaism,...to the implication of all Israel..., who together have turned a deaf ear to God's messengers and persecuted them". [38] But does the final pericope of Mt 23 stand as an indictment of the people of Israel or is it the climax of the judgement of the "authoritative Jewish leaders and geographic authoritative center"? The definite shift of audience in Mt 23.13 would counter Garland's desire to include the crowds in this pericope. The exclusive focus of attention from v.13 following is the leaders. The crowds and disciples are no

[35] One can justly ask if Garland has not cited the wrong conclusion from Minear's article. The fourth conclusion, cited by Garland, clearly states that the crowds are "under the care and authority of the Pharisees and their scribes..." and then asks "will their loyalties shift over to Jesus and his *mathetai*, his scribes (23:24)?" Garland's affirmation that implicit in this conclusion is the assumption that Matthew saw the crowds as "contemporary laymen" is baffling. Minear's first conclusion leads to this "laymen" role concept, but the final conclusion does not.

[36] Pp. 38–9.

[37] P. 39.

[38] *Ibid.*

longer addressed.

Does Matthew leave us with the impression that the crowds have "turned a deaf ear to God's messengers...?" [39] Admittedly they have not come into the Christian fold, but they are not deaf to the movement of God either. They confront this movement in the person of Jesus. As Garland, himself, notes they are on the "brink of acknowledging Jesus as God's son". [40] He has deeply impressed the crowds: they follow him as he moves about, [41] they find him amazing and astonishing, [42] they ask questions about him in order to identify him, [43] they glorify God as a result of Jesus' deeds and teaching [44] and they willingly bestow honourable titles upon him. [45] The crowds are not deaf to Jesus, but they can be influenced by other forces. This is especially true of the chief priests and elders, who persuaded (ἔπεισαν) them to reject Jesus.

A more accurate picture of the crowds is of Jewish people still under the influence of Jewish leaders, yet people who have moved away from the centre of this influence towards Jesus and his community. Depending upon their experiences at the hands of either group they may be swayed one way or the other. As Mt 23.2–12 indicates, the disciples must beware of their behaviour in order to exploit authoritarian developments within the Jewish community which affect the thinking of οἱ ὄχλοι. That is why the crowds are noted as present at the start of ch.23. They are still the people *caught* between two parties vying for leadership and authority in the post-70 CE Jewish context. The *modus operandi* of the Pharisees (vv.2–7) is well-known to the average Jew ("the crowds"). Just as important to the average person is the alternative model of authority and leadership - the Christian community, which has given up human authority roles

[39] *Ibid.*
[40] *Ibid.*
[41] Mt 4.25; 8.1; 14.13; 15.30; 19.2; 20.29 and 21.9ff
[42] 7.28; 9.33; 12.23 and 22.33ff
[43] 12.23.
[44] 9.8 and 15.31
[45] 14.5; 21.9, 11.46.

similar to those exercised in the local Pharisaical circles (vv.8–12). The crowds must decide to which group they will give their allegiance. Let us turn now to the two alternatives.

8.3 The Options

The above sketch of the crowds' role helps pave the way for a better understanding of this pericope and its internal tensions. [46] The picture of the crowds' neutrality and position between two claimants to the title of authority relates to Mt 23.1–12, for here again the authority issue arises. The Jewish challengers now are the Pharisees and their scribes. As v.2 admits they "possess" the seat of communal authority - Moses' seat. The alternative for the ὄχλοι is the Matthean option, where no human has such a seat (vv.8–10). It seems as though the real issue in these verses is the expression of community authority.

Matthew outlines the Pharisaical option in vv.2–7. Vv.2 and 3 establish the fact that the Pharisees and their scribes are one possible type of authority. While some debate [47] as to whether or not the reference to Moses' seat is a note regarding an actual synagogual chair, [48] the vast majority of scholars agree that

[46] For example this view of the crowds helps smooth the often noted inconsistency presented by vv.2–3a, when it is assumed vv.1–12 are directed at Christians: How can Christians be asked to obey the teachings of the Pharisees? As F. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), p. 448); Garland, pp. 46–52; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 484; Haenchen, "Matthäus 23", pp. 39ff; Klostermann, *Matthäus*, pp. 181–2; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, pp. 334 and Schweizer, *Matthew*, p. 430 note, elsewhere in Matthew these teachings are clearly denounced. Some scholars, including Filson, p. 243; Gaechter, p. 724; H. Green, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Oxford: OUP, 1975), p. 187; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, pp. 483–4 and Haenchen, *Weg*, pp. 418–19, see the solution as being a differentiation between acceptable and unacceptable teachings. But as A. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: MacMillan, 1961), p. 330, points out, if this is the thrust it is contradicted by history and the verses which follow, especially v.41.

[47] Cf. Beare, p. 448, who views this reference as a mere metaphor. Those disagreeeing include: Hill, p. 310; Filson, p. 243; Gaechter, p. 723 and Schmid, *Matthäus*, p. 319.

[48] One implicit reference to such a seat may be found as Lk 4.20ff. Strack-

the mention of it refers to the issue of teaching authority which the Pharisees had within their communities. This issue of authority is reinforced by v.3a. It is also generally agreed that usurpation of this role is not in view in v.2.

It is v.3 which initially hints at the error within the Pharisaical concept of authority, thus suggesting the central issue for the pericope. The Jewish leaders talk (λέγουσιν) but do not practice (ποιεῖτε). It seems erroneous to conclude that Matthew's charge is that of hypocrisy simply because "talk" and "practice" are placed in close proximity to one another. [49] As the next four verses show Matthew's concern is not hypocrisy; rather, it is their behaviour alone. Even v.3a (κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε) stresses that the key problem centres on their practices. V.5's "they do all their deeds to be seen by men;—" (πάντα δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσιν πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις·) lends support to this suggestion. These deeds must have some connection with their authoritive decrees. The fact that they carry out their decrees exonerates them from a charge of hypocrisy.

A graver charge, at least from Matthew's vantage point, is leveled in vv.4–7. The Pharisees abuse their positions of authority and leadership. D. Hill makes an insightful comment on v.4, when he writes, "Considerable social tension between the scribes and the people at large is implied in this saying,...and it is further reflected in what follows." [50] The words reflect a situation similar to an ignited wick on a powder key: "They bind heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they will not move them with their fingers". Those people with some connection with the Jewish community, perhaps symbolized

Billerbeck, Vol. 1, p. 909, cites a saying, regarding the seat, attributed to Rabbi Acha. Gaechter, p. 723, refers to the presence of such a seat as the ruins of the synagogue at Chorazin. E. Sukenik, *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (London: OUP, 1934), pp. 57ff, gives details of "seats of Moses" discovered at Hammath-by-Tiberias and Delos.

[49] Cf. conclusions similar to this as expressed by Beare, p. 48; Filson, p. 243; Gundry, p. 455; Haenchen, "Mt 23", p. 40 or W. Pesch, "Matthäus", p. 288.

[50] P. 310.

by Matthew's crowds, would know the burdens and the tensions and so vv.2–7 need not necessarily be a polemical outsider's view of any possible abuse of authority. [51] For the "Jewish insider" and the "Christian outsider" this situation was probably common knowledge. What we see here is not a mere Matthean polemical charge; rather, it is an attempt to record, for the sake of pedagogical contrast an accurate picture of one social tension within the Jewish community in Matthew's geographic area. This pedagogical contrast becomes clear when one compares the outline of vv.2–7 and vv.8–12. In particular, vv.5–7's notation of three deeds done for recognition are contrasted by vv.8–10's threefold denial of exalted leadership within the Christian community. Also, v.4's mention of the scribes and Pharisees refusing to lift a finger to bear the burdens is contrasted by v.11's servant/greatness saying.

Vv.5–7 focus on this authoritative position and clarify Matthew's charge. V.5's accusation of performing pious acts in order to receive recognition echoes the opinion voiced in Mt 16.1–18. The charge is that these leaders intentionally widened their phylactery straps and lengthened their garment tassles by more than what was warranted by convention. As is well-known, both items were considered elements of Jewish piety during the first century CE. [52] Seemingly, if

[51] That the scribes exercised a significant amount of authority in their social context is not open to serious doubt. Their knowledge of the law was certainly a source of power and authority. By an early age potential scribes had mastered the interpretation of the law. Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, pp. 235ff, cites Josephus' talk of mastering this activity by age fourteen (*Vita* 9). At a later period, students were taught all traditional material and halakic methodology and by age forty (b. Sot, 22b) were ordained, which allowed them to make decisions. Their ordination gave them the right to make judgements over religious and ritual questions (b. Sanh. 5a), criminal proceedings (b. Sanh, 3a) and civil cases (b. Sanh. 4b Bar.) Additionally, as Ezek 1.4ff seems to indicate, the scribes were also keepers of esoteric traditions. By virtue of their training and knowledge the scribes were the local authority figures within the Jewish communities. Mt 7.29 further highlights the contrast of Jesus' and the scribal type of authority .

[52] The basis for these adornments is found in Dt 6.6,8; 11.18 (phylacteries) and Dt 22.12 (tassles). Mt 9.20/Lk 8.44 and Mt 14.36 seem to imply that Jesus wore tassles (κρασπέδα) on his robes. *Tephillim* have been discovered at Qumran.

Matthew's charges are correct, the widened straps and longer tassles indicated a higher decree of piety on the part of the wearer. As Strack-Billerbeck [53] have noted there was no set width or length, therefore, the individual was free to decide upon the specifics of his straps and tassles. Haenchen [54] and Lohmeyer [55] are probably correct when suggesting that broad phylactery straps and long tassles were the bearer's way of displaying his piety.

On arriving at v.6, we are confronted by some scholars' claim that Matthew has touched upon new themes and that the point of v.5 is not continued in vv.6 and 7. For example, Gundry [56] suggests that since Matthew has replaced the Marcan καὶ with δὲ a contrast is intended between v.5's concern over ostensible piety and vv.6–7's striving after adulation. But Gundry draws this conclusion on the basis of one small word. As noted above, Matthew viewed the widened straps and lengthened tassles as a way of drawing attention to oneself via one's piety. As Matthew views the pious activities noted in v.5 they are not viewed merely as a particular type of piety; rather, the Evangelist sees these actions as piety exploited for the sake of self-promotion, which is designed to result in personal recognition (πάντα δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσιν πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). This is the same issue as in vv.6–7.

Haenchen [57] and Schmid [58] makes similar points regarding the lack of continuity between these verses. Schmid focuses on the "character" which is in view in each verse. V.5 deals with the Pharisees, in general, and vv.6–7 focus on the scribes. But Matthew easily mixes the categories of leaders without clear distinctions. A prime example is v.2 of this chapter. In the verses which follow Matthew attempts to make no distinction between these groups and nei-

[53] Vol. 1, p. 914.
[54] "Mt 23", P. 42.
[55] *Matthäus*, pp. 337–38.
[56] P. 457.
[57] *Weg*, p. 421 and "Mt 23", p. 42.
[58] *Matthäus*, p. 321.

ther should the reader when arriving at vv.5–7, at least not along the lines of Schmid's reasoning.

Haenchen views v.5 as a Matthean accusation of Pharisaical hypocrisy. But in vv.6–7, in his opinion, the charge becomes ambition and vanity. Thus, there is discontinuity between the two units. He also asserts that v.5's hypocrisy is Matthew's primary agenda item. If this is the case, why does Matthew then go on to spend twice as much space on the charge of vanity? Seemingly, hypocrisy is Haenchen's, not Matthew's, primary concern at this point. This is supported by what was noted in the preceding paragraph. V.5 notes these acts of piety as some people's ways of self-promotion; by displaying their devotion in this fashion they stand out as being special. Because of this uniqueness they deserve unique respect from their contemporaries. V.5 in fact deals with the same concerns as do vv.6–7.

Vv.6 and 7 are Matthew's attempt to flesh out the charges voiced in v.5 by turning to examples from the public sphere. V.6 accuses the leaders of desiring places of honour at feasts or the best seats at the synagogue. These seats would probably be conspicuously located so as to give high visibility to the occupant. [59] That such positions were "desir able" is evidenced by Lk 14.7–14. Furthermore, according to this same passage, such 'perks' for the honoured person were to be expected. Beare suggests that what is charged is not a matter of vanity; rather, the leaders were entitled to "such little marks of distinction". [60] But what is acceptable for Beare and the Lucan community was not acceptable for Matthew

[59] Sukenik, pp. 57ff, reports that in the synagogues at Ḥammath-by-Tiberias and Chorazin the seat of Moses was separated from the rest of the congregation and along the south wall (the wall oriented toward Jerusalem). The seat of Moses at Delos, while separated from congregational seating, is located on the west wall. Each of the seats is carved from a single piece of stone. Similarly the seat of honour at a feast would be one close to the person giving the banquet. To be asked to sit beside or near the host was an honour and in terms of location would offer high visibility. Cf. Lk 14.7–14.

[60] P. 450.

and his community. No one was more noteworthy than another, not even the authorities. It seems as though Matthew rejected the acceptance of a system which singled out people for preferential treatment. The point he makes in this pericope is that the role of leader does not carry with it the option for prestige or superiority. The same forces are present in v.7. The Jewish authorities are accused of exercising social options which acknowledge their "superiority" to the average layman. The use of appropriate public greetings was very important in first century Palestine. [61] Of course, the content of the greetings to which Matthew refers is open to speculation. His citation of v.7 (*καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί*) may well be more than a mere transition to the next subunit. Material roughly similar to Mt 23.5–7a can be found in Mk 12.37b–40 and Lk 20.45–7. However the latter two do not make reference to Matthew's phrase about being called rabbi. The Evangelist may well be hinting at the type of salutation which the Jewish leaders found most gratifying, "rabbi". As various scholars note the word *ῥαββί* probably comes from the Hebrew adjective *rab* meaning "great". [62] To identify an individual as "great" is to recognize that he is special or unique from the average person. Despite the debate over the significance of *ῥαββί* [63], the point is that the Jewish authorities accepted and perhaps even came to expect the bestowal of a recognition of their importance for their community. They accept, charges Matthew, their "superiority" over

[61] Cf. Mt 10.12ff; Lk 10.5f; *Ant.* 11,331; 12,172 and *War* 2,319.

[62] See Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 486 or Beare, p. 450. Lohse's TDNT article (Vol. I, p. 961) defines *rab* as "a term for someone who occupies a high and respected position". Cf. 2 Kings 25.8; Jer 39.13; Est 1.8 and Dan 1.3.

[63] The debate centres on the question of when *ῥαββί* had become accepted as a title for the office of teacher within Jewish circles. Some, such as Hill, p. 311; Filson, p. 244; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 486; Schniewind, *Matthäus*, p. 228 and A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus: seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1963), p. 670, see *ῥαββί* as a functioning title at the time of Matthew's writing. Others, including McNeile, p. 331 and Schmid, *Matthäus*, p. 321, suggest that here it means "great" and only after the NT period did it function as a title. Gundry, p. 457, sees the term in the process of developing from a general meaning to a technical term at the time of the Gospel's writing. Regardless of the position one takes on this issue, it is clear that to be addressed as rabbi would identify one as worthy of respect.

their fellow Jews via the confession of their greatness or recognition of their role in the community.

What we read in vv.2–7 is not merely a Christian polemic against Pharisaism. Instead, these verses depict a particular tension within the Jewish community. This tension probably was known by Jew and Christian. The conflict centres on the manner in which Pharisaical authority had developed in the local community in the post-70 CE period. Within this particular area, the authorities initially failed to endear themselves because of their zeal for understanding and interpreting the Law without helping the laity bear the weight of their decisions (v.4). This cleavage is then accentuated by the leaders' acceptance, promotion and perhaps demand of honour "due" them because they held these positions of authority (vv.5–7). Whilst we must allow for exaggeration [64] in Matthew's sketch of the situation, I suspect this is a generally accurate reflection of one aspect of the internal turmoil within the Jewish community which Matthew knew.

As many scholars note, there is a shift of concerns between vv.7 and 8. [65] The material in vv.8ff is directed towards the Matthean community. This is supported by the opening words Ὑμεῖς δὲ which signals a contrast with the previous unit. It has been suggested that vv.8–10 should be classified as "community rule" material. [66] V.11 fits into this same category elsewhere in the Synoptic

[64] We speak of "exaggeration" not in that Matthew is creating a false or even grotesquely distorted picture of the internal social life of the local Jewish community; rather, our concern is that the Jewish community's problems depicted in vv.2–7 seem to be neatly "tied up" in a package and almost a mirror image of the goals and internal workings of the Christian community outlined in vv.8–12. Such a neatly fitting literary work must have knocked the "rough edges" off the historical situation of both communities so as to join them together. It is in this sense that I speak of "exaggeration".

[65] Cf. Bultmann, p. 144; Green, p. 190; Gaechter, p. 727; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 486; Haenchen, "Mt 23", p. 42 and *Weg*, p. 421 and Klostermann, *Matthäus*, p. 183.

[66] Bultmann, p. 144; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 486; Haenchen, "Mt 23", p. 43;

tradition and Matthew has closely tied v.12 to v.11. What we have then is a developed unit of community rules.

V.8 not only signals a shift from Jewish to Christian community affairs. It also sets forth the basic principle of the Matthean community's organization: "But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all brethren". Since Matthew uses ῥαββί and διδάσκαλος interchangeably it seems as though he saw the rabbinic role as a teaching office. [67] V.8 seems designed to undercut the prestigiousness associated with the use of the word ῥαββί and function of the "rabbi" within the community. The Christian teacher receives his message from the one true teacher, not handed down from generation after generation of teachers. As Manson suggests, "There is no room in the community of disciples for the distinctions used as Judaism." [68] Matthew's community is not a gathering of rabbis and students; rather, it is a brotherhood. [69] All members of Matthew's community are of equal standing. It is this ideal of brotherly egalitarianism which serves as the basis of denunciation of the title ῥαββί and the two denunciations which follow.

Despite a few minor oddities, [70] v.9 has been accepted by scholars as a rejection of the title "father" within the Matthean community. J.T. Townsend [71] has challenged the consensus conclusions regarding v.9, utilizing these oddities

W. Pesch, "Matthäus", p. 288 and Schniewind, *Matthäus*, p. 221.

[67] Cf. Kingsbury, p. 92. At the same time, we must realize the word may have been in a state of flux at the time of the Gospel's writing. It is because of this uncertainty that one should be wary of accepting Haenchen's suggestion that the Matthean community rejected both the title and office ("Mt 23", p. 42 and *Weg*, p. 421). On this cf. Schmid, *Matthäus*, p. 322, and W. Pesch, "Matthäus", p. 288, who see v.8 merely as a demand for the renunciation of titles.

[68] *Sayings* (London: SCM, 1977), pp. 231-32.

[69] Cf. Trilling, "Amt", p. 31.

[70] These include: 1) the change of voice from κληθῆτε (vv.8–10) to καλέσητε (v.9), 2) the presence of ὑμῶν, which raises questions regarding proper translation and 3) the significance of πατήρ as compared to the use of ῥαββί (V.8) and καθηγηταί (V.10).

[71] "Matthew XXIII, 9" *JTS* (n.s.) Vol. XII (1961), pp. 56-69.

in presenting his case. He notes that the clause πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς can be translated as "Do not call (anyone) on earth your father" or "Do not call (anyone) of you father on earth". He suggests the different voices of the verb (κληθῆτε in vv.8 and 10 and καλέσητε in v.9) indicate that v.9 was originally intended for another context. Additionally, the early Christian church accepted the title "father". [72] Furthermore, he argues that first century Judaism did not employ "father" as a title similar to rabbi or master. Citing the fact that the Patriarchs were referred to as "father", Townsend concludes that this verse is to be seen as a rejection of relying on one's Hebrew ancestry.

This argument, however, contains a number of flaws. Townsend assumes, without cause or cited support, that v.9 had originated with Jesus. Ch.23 contains a mixture of tradition and freely composed material and this alone should serve as a caution against such an affirmation. By stating that v.9 is a dominical saying, Townsend can then argue that the early church would never have transgressed it...but obviously Paul and other writers did just this. [73] It is more likely, however, that vv.8–10 are a post-Easter community rule collection [74] which Matthew has recast. [75]

Secondly, Townsend attempts to interpret the verse by removing it from its literary context, which has a genuine historical context, and placing it in a constructed historical setting. Clearly its present literary context would lead us in the direction of accepting v.9 as a parallel prohibition to those in vv.8 and 10.

---

[72] Cf. 1 Cor 4.14f; Gal 4.19; Phil 2.22; 1 Thess 2.11; Philemon 10, etc.
[73] See the preceding footnote.
[74] Cf. fn. 66 above, as well as Trilling, p. 32.
[75] Cf. J. Michaels, "Christian Prophecy and Mt. 23:8–12: a Test Exegesis". in *SBL Seminar Papers*, Number 10, ed. G. MacRae (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976), p. 305. Gundry's detailed linguistic analysis of Matthew, pp. 457ff, lends support to this. Gundry sees the phrase "on earth" (v.9), the use of εἷς and γάρ (vv.8 and 9) and the word "father" as Mattheanisms.

Third, is the matter of πατήρ's usage in the first century CE. Even Townsend admits that Acts 7.2 and 22.1 support the claim that πατήρ was a title of honour. Sifre Dt 34 lists a number of first century figures who were called "father". In *Ant.* XII, 297, Josephus writes of the traditions of the fathers, when referring to the oral traditions observed by the Pharisees but rejected by the Sadducees. 2 Macc 14.37–46 talks of one Razis, who is described as πατὴρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 2 Kings 2.12 (LXX) suggests the student/teacher relationship was akin to a child/father relationship. And in 2 Kings 6.21 and 13.14 "father" is an honourific title.

And how does one explain the change of voice for καλέω? Lohmeyer [76] is helpful here. He sees vv.8 and 9 as thematically related, balancing one another. Just as no one will *cause* themselves to be called ῥαββί, neither will anyone *offer* titles of honour, such as πατήρ. This is strenghtened, if v.10 is, as many suggest, a doublet of v.8, added later by Matthew in the interest of clarity.

Literary evidence [77] shows that πατήρ was employed as a title of honour within Judaism. Therefore, it seems as though Matthew, in this verse, is adding one more example of what his community would reject in the realm of honours paid to its leaders. In line with vv.8 and 10, v.9 sees only one type of hierarchy in the Christian community and that is the exalted figure of God, who presides over the community of faith.

V.10 presents a minor problem in that it contains καθηγητής which is a hapax legomenon in the NT. The word is equally rare in other Greek literature. Plutarch uses it in reference to Aristotle (de.fort. Alex. ii,327ff and Symp. lib. II,643A) when describing him as a teacher. [78] At various places Philo and Josephus use its cognates when speaking of the rabbis who interpret

[76] *Matthäus*, p. 340
[77] For example, 2 Macc 14.37–46; *Ant.* 13,297; the LXX version of 2 Kings 2.12, 6.21 and 13.14.
[78] Cf. Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 487.

the Law. [79] Most scholars willingly accept that the word has been taken over from the context of Greek philosophy and should be seen as a reference to a teaching position of some type. Others [80] point out possible connections between the Greek word and the Hebrew word *moreh*, which is used as a technical term for the Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran. Even those who cannot decide upon the word's background [81] recognize that the issue in view is the use of an authoritative title. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that v.10 is the third and final rejection of titles and the use of positions as a means of achieving honour and recognition. [82] And for a third time the idea of a community of faith as an egalitarian society is reinforced by the affirmation that only the καθηγητής to be found here is the Christ.

Vv.11–12 are the least noticed elements of the pericope. Most scholars only make passing comment on them, usually noticing that they appear elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels. But they do have an important function in the pericope.

V.11 contains a version of the 'slave of all' tradition and reads ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος. When we compare this form with the Mk 10.43–4 version it is apparent that Matthew has condensed the saying in order to utilize it at this point. [83] We should rule out the possibility that v.11 is following a tradition similar to that reflected in Lk 22.26, despite the fact that both tend to be brief and use the comparative form of μέγας. [84] There may be two reasons

[79] Cf. Green, p. 190 and Manson, *Sayings*, p. 232.
[80] Hill, p. 311, in particular, mentions the Qumran usage of *moreh*. McNeile, p. 332, and C. Willoughby, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), p. 245, make the Greek-Hebrew connection as well.
[81] Cf. Haenchen, "Mt 23" pp. 44–5 and Gaechter, p. 730.
[82] This is not to rule out the idea that v.10 was also given as a clarification to v.8 and its possibly obscure or culturally inapplicable terminology. Cf. Grundmann, *Matthäus*, p. 486; Hill, p. 311; Klostermann, *Matthäus*, p. 183 and Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, p. 340.
[83] This is not the case with the manner in which he handles the tradition in 20.26–7. There he very closely follows the Marcan storyline and the form of the tradition.
[84] While Schürmann, *Jesu*, p. 75, correctly suggests Mt 23.11 is independent

for the summary of the saying. First would be the change in context from one of conflict between disciples to one of supporting an existing community ideal. The supportive note can function as well if the tradition is concise. Secondly, the "full" tradition already appeared in ch.20 and it would be repetitive to cite the whole saying again.

The verse functions as a summary of the Matthean concept of leadership in contrast to the Jewish community's exercise of leadership. Clearly it is not a rebuke, [85] rather it is a definition. [86] For Matthew, leadership and community authority, in direct contrast to v.5, is manifested in the actual expression of service to the other members of the fellowship. The "great ones" in Matthew's community are not authoritarian figures who expect honour as a side benefit of being a leader. The leadership positions in his community are used solely for serving the church.

Not only is the tradition consciously used to contrast the "Pharisaical" model, we must note that v.11 also lends a degree of emphasis to the theme of vv.8–10. The abandonment of the use of titles, not the function of 'leading' the community, for v.11 assumes there will be leaders, is supported by this word of the Lord. [87] The titles give reasons for pride or honour, but the servant leader is merely doing what is required of him.

Finally v.12 functions as a general conclusion to vv.2–11. By including these

---

of Mk 9.33–5 and 10.42b–4, we believe he is incorrect in his suggestion that v.11 and Lk 22.26 are somehow related in a pre-Lucan tradition. Apart from ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν and ὁ μείζων ὑμῖν the two have very little in common linguistically. Additionally, we must accept that Matthew is writing in a "creative" manner here. He himself probably abbreviated the earlier cited version of the logion (Mt 20.24–7) so as to fit the flow of the pericope.

[85] Cf. Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, p. 341 and McNeile, p. 332.

[86] Cf. McNeile, p. 332; Schmid, *Matthäus*, p. 322–3 and W. Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel* (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1964), p. 232.

[87] Cf. W. Pesch, "Matthäus", p. 288.

words, Matthew suggests that those people, either Jew or Christian, who attempt to use their leadership roles as a springboard for personal exaltation will be humbled. But those who deal faithfully with the Matthean vision for community leadership will be exalted. The true leader, in Matthew's opinion, is the humble servant, not the exalted authoritarian. Matthew employs what was probably a common folk saying to make this point.

The sketch we have drawn thus far reveals that the issue at stake in this pericope is that of the nature of community authority and leadership within the Christian community. [88] While the Jewish community accepts and promotes

[88] Michaels has dealt with these verses and made the following observations: the type of community envisioned by Matthew is "strongly egalitarian" (p. 310) and Matthew has rejected "the self-seeking authoritarianism which cause people to think of themselves as 'leaders' or 'bosses' ". (p. 308). These observations are side observations which result from his primary concern to answer the question, "Is the Matthean community in any sense a prophetic community?" (p. 305). He ultimately concludes that here we are dealing with distinctive Matthean traditions and formulations. I am inclined to believe Michaels commits an error when he divides and separates vv.4–7 and vv.8–12, regardless of his primary concerns. Can such a division occur and still do justice to Matthew's intention? V.1's purpose for mentioning the presence of the crowds and disciples is to note the general awareness of the type of authority used by the two communities. While vv.8ff may shed light on possible prophetic tendencies in Matthew's community, this was not Matthew's primary concern when penning this pericope. This artificial separation of the pericope leads to an erroneous understanding of vv.8–10 as well. Michaels suggests that these verses do not contain three prohibitions and this is based on the passive voice of the second "prohibition" (p. 305). Therefore, he argues that vv.8 and 10 do refer to titles applied to leaders, but v.9 is a reference to relying on Jewish ancestors (p. 306). Taken this way, v.9 then explains v.8's word "brothers". Being God's children, the disciples are brothers. Their ancestry is with God and not human ancestors. But as was dealt with above, v.9 hardly is a reference to Jewish ancestors. Surely, one must deal with the whole verse and its historical context and not simply the "voice" of one verb. Additionally, the larger context (vv.8–10, as well as vv.4–12 as we will see below) runs counter to this proposed understanding of v.9. Further evidence which counters Michaels' suggestion is the fact that each verse has similar construction. The rejected title is given and it is followed by an explanatory clause: a) "you are not to be called rabbi ... for you have one teacher", b) "do not call anyone your father ... for you have one father" and c) "neither be called masters... because you have one master". This consistent

a hierarchy, the Christian community, according to Matthew, has rejected this structure. The dangers of the hierarchical system are outlined in vv.7–9. V.4 says such a structure leads to a misunderstanding of true leadership when leaders "will not move them (community rules) with their fingers". Vv.5–7 give examples of how the leaders' role can be abused for self-promotion: a) acts of piety done in order to be seen (v.5), b) having the best seats so as to be seen (v.6) and c) being publically recognized (v.7).

The contrasting option for the Christian community is given in vv.8–11. In vv.8–10, parallels to the Jewish leadership role models are rejected: a) no one will be called ῥαββί (v.8), b) no one will be called πατήρ (v.9) and c) no one will be called καθηγητής (v.10). The Matthean understanding of leadership is summed up in v.11: "He who is greatest among you shall be your servant." V.12's "whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted" serves as a conclusion to the whole contrast and ties together the two options.

Matthew has engineered the contrasts between the styles of community authority in each group. In v.4, he notes the Jewish leaders' lack of service to the other members of the group. This is contrasted by the 'slave of all' tradition which defines greatness as servanthood, for Matthew sees greatness as equal as having a leadership role. Vv.5–7 contain three illustrations of where the Jewish model can break down and vv.8–10 note three hazardous titles, typical within the opposing community, which are rejected by Christians. Therefore, if we take vv.4–12 together as a unit, the following system of contrasts is presented by the Evangelist:

---

construction would lead one to believe Matthew intended v.9 to be understood in the same manner as vv.8 and 10.

V.4: Jewish attitude towards leadership

Vv.5–7: the role of the leader abused for self-promotion.

a) acts of piety for attention (v.5)

b) best seats so as to be seen (v.6)

c) recognition in public places (v.9)

Vv.8–10: models of Jewish leadership rejected.

a) ῥαββί (v.8)

b) πατήρ (v.9)

c) καθηγητής (v.10)

ILLUSTRATIONS

V.11: Christian attitude towards leadership

Summary: "Whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and Whoever humbles himself will be exalted." (v.12).

The Matthean concept of exercising authority within the community has been formulated, in this pericope, in response and contrast to the manner in which the local Jewish community has decided to organize its leadership affairs. [89] As far as Matthew is concerned, the proper exercise of authority is of vital importance because it can be influential upon the allegiance decisions being made by "the crowds". As we noted earlier, Matthew regards "the crowds" as the target group from which potential converts and supporters can be drawn. As he understands the situation he faced, his community was not the only group which was in the process of attempting to gain influence with "the crowds". Seemingly, the Pharisees had begun a similar undertaking. In light of the fact that "the crowds" can be swayed in either direction, Matthew calls his community to embrace a form of organisation which he believes will be more attractive than that adhered to by the Jewish community.

[89] Cf. H. Frankemölle, "Amtskritik in Matthäus-Evangelium" *Biblica* 54 (1973), pp. 249–50.

8.4 Historical Background Notes

In recent years, there has been a growing awareness and recognition of diversity within Judaism prior to 70 CE. It is also recognized that friction existed between these various groups. We need cite only a few examples to demonstrate that the vitriolic language of Mt 23 in general and of 23.1–12 in particular was not altogether untypical for the Judaism of this whole period.

For example, various passages in the DSS reflect the intensity of the struggle and use of antagonistic language when dealing with another faction. The Manual of Discipline calls for a liturgical cursing of enemies [90] The covenanters' opponent is described as a "scoffer" and is accused of leading Israel back into the wilderness. [91] The Psalms of Thanksgiving offer a clear view of the situation. The Psalmist has sided with God and his opponent(s) have abandoned God. [92] The Pesherim reflect more of the same approach to one's rivals:

> "As to the word: *I will turn Samaria into a heap in a field, a place for the planting of a vineyard; and I will roll down her stones into the valley, and uncover her foundations* [ ], this refers to the Jerusalemitan priests who are leading God's people astray. [God will thrust them forth, to become sojourners in a foreign land; and He will drive all] His enemies [into exile.]" [93]

The covenanters seemingly believed their Jewish opponents had forfeited their right to be a part of the covenant people and looked for Yahweh to remove them.

---

[90] CD 1.13ff.
[91] 1 QS 2.4–5.
[92] 1 QH 2.8ff.
[93] 1 QpMic 1.6. Quoted from T. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1957), p. 229. Cf. 1 QpHab 2.7,8 and 4 QpPs 37.32,33. While this interpretation may not seem too strident, one must recall that the presence of the theme of removing a Jew from the Promised Land was considered to be a fate roughly parallel to being outside of the covenant. See ch. 2, pp.43ff.

1 Enoch 1–5's description of the righteous and the wicked reflects an internal Jewish debate from a similar period. [94] There is no question as to what the community members behind 1 Enoch 1–5 hoped would happen to their opponents:

> "Oh, you hard-hearted, may you not find peace! Therefore, you shall curse your days, and the years of your life shall perish and multiply in eternal execration; and there will not be any mercy unto you." [95]

The Psalms of Solomon and the Testament of Moses reflect an equally critical view of the opponents of the writers, the former from the middle of the first century BCE, the latter probably from close to the time of Jesus.

> "Why are you sitting in the council of the devout, you profaner? And your heart is far from the Lord, provoking the God of Israel by lawbreaking;..." [96]

> "...then will rule destructive and godless men, who represent themselves as being righteous, but who will (in fact) arouse their inner wrath, for they will be deceitful men, pleasing only themselves, false in every way imaginable,..." [97]

Again, we see that in the midst of intense factionalism, depth of feeling left little room for refined and restrained dialogue. There can be little doubt that prior to 70 CE there was widespread factionalism within Judaism and frequently these divisions were bitter and even occasionally fatal. [98]

---

[94] See E. Isaac's introduction to 1 Enoch in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vol. I (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983). Ed. by J. Charlesworth, p. 7.
[95] 1 Enoch 5.4–5. Cf. 1.1,7–9 and 5.6–7.
[96] Ps. Sol. 4.1. Quoted from R. Wright's translation in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vol. II (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985). Ed. by J. Charlesworth, p. 655. Cf. Ps. Sol. 3.9–12; 9.3 and 13.6–12.
[97] Test. Moses 7.3. Quoted from W. Stinespring's translation in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I, p. 930. Cf. 7.9–10.
[98] On the fatal nature of the divisions we could cite *War* II, 254ff and 4 QpPs 37.32,33. On this question of factionalism in the pre-70 Judaism, see the forthcoming article by J. Dunn, "Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus".

Equally and indeed more important for the above interpretation of Mt 23.1–12 is the now general acceptance that in the post-70 CE period the Pharisees assumed the leadership role within Judaism. [99] The Pharisees, having assumed responsibililty for leading the Jewish people, focused on redefining Judaism along the narrow lines of the Torah and their oral traditions. [100] This meant that the remaining Jewish factions came under increasing pressure to conform to the Pharisees' definition of "Judaism".

But, this did not mean an end to factional polemics, as Mt 23.1–12 shows. The strongest opposition to Pharisaism in the period after the fall of Jerusalem was very probably Jewish Christianity. [101] These two groups fought over the heritage of Judaism. At stake were questions regarding the proper interpretation of the scriptures, the nature of "true" Jewish identity and positions of authority and power. Mt 23.1–12 reflects this vigorous ideological and social struggle and a desire to gain influence with the masses of "non-aligned" Jews, i.e. "the crowds".

As in the pre-70 CE period, the intensity of the struggle gave way to the use of bitter language. Matthew, who uses such language, however, is not merely accusing his opponents of hypocrisy, as some scholars argue. Instead, he is attacking their attempts to redefine Judaism in light

[99] Cf. E. Schürer's "The Pharisees and the rabbis entered into the heritage of the Sadducees and the priests. They were excellently prepared for this role, for they had been pressing for leadership during the last two centuries. Now, at one stroke, they acquired sole supremacy, as the factors which had stood in their way sank into insignificance." (*The History of the Jewish People in the Age of the Jesus Christ* Vol. I (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973). Ed. and revised by G. Vermes and F. Millar, p. 524).

[100] Cf. G. Alon, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age* Vol. I (Jerusalem: the Magness Press, 1980), pp. 206ff and Schürer, pp. 524ff, who deals with the post-70 CE zeal for studying the Torah.

[101] Cf. Beare, p. 447 and W. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: CUP, 1966), p. 315, who sees the Sermon on the Mount as a "Christian answer to Jamnia".

of their own traditions and narrowly along the lines of the Torah. They use their authority with too much zeal for Matthew's preference and they seek shelter and security within the sacrosanct confines of their hierarchy. In Matthew's opinion such activities will never gain the confidence of "the crowds". The true leaders of Judaism are those who serve their fellows. The true Jewish community is the egalitarian brotherhood. Matthew evidently hoped the non-aligned Jews, caught up in what remained of post-70 CE factionalism, would side more readily with his community and not the Pharisees.

8.5 Conclusion

Mt 23.1–12 arises out the historical context of intense rivalries between various Jewish groups prior to and following the fall of Jerusalem. In the post-70 CE period, the two main proponents were probably Pharisaism and Jewish Christianity. In light of this struggle and the Matthean community's missionary concern, [102] the Evangelist reminds his fellow community members that the manner in which they exercise authority is of the utmost importance." The crowds", whom they will attempt to influence, can be swayed by the way the Matthean community is structured and the manner in which its leadership roles are expressed. The Christian community has opted for an egalitarian brotherhood, where the leaders function as servants. This, Matthew hopes, will be more attractive than the local Jewish community's hierarchy and heavy-handed use of authority.

[102] Cf. verses such as 1.21; 10.5ff; 15.24ff; 24.13ff and 28.18ff.

Chapter Nine:
Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

This thesis began with the primary goal of examining the various versions of the 'slave of all' saying in the Synoptic tradition. More specifically, the intention was to study how various segments of the early Christian church employed this saying which equated greatness with slavery and service. What relevance did the sentence "...whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all" have for the first Christians and their fellowships? In a world where slavery was common place, what significance did this saying have for the Synoptic Evangelists? The fact that the versions differ from one another would seem to suggest that the Gospel writers did not hold to a uniform view of how the tradition should be employed.

Prior to examining the evolving ecclesiastical usage of the 'slave of all' logion, we gave our attention to two significant preliminary background issues. The first concern related to the question of Jewish attitudes toward slavery. Since the 'slave of all' saying is attributed to Jesus, a first century CE Jew, it was sensible to examine initially the literary evidence which would create a larger "Jewish backdrop" for the saying. Does this literature reflect any strong trend(s) regarding slavery and the Jewish people? The second preliminary topic focused on Jesus and the saying. Is the 'slave of all' saying dominical in nature and, if so, what was its original *Sitz im Leben*? Once these areas were explored we began the examination of the saying's developing use within the various early Christian communities.

9.2 Summary

In the second chapter, we focused our attention on the wider Jewish background to the 'slave of all' saying. Here, we selectively examined Jewish literature with a view to establishing Jewish attitudes towards slavery. The chapter began with a comparsion of the three main Law passages which regulated slavery within Israel. [1] A thorough comparison of these three passages revealed a clear development of antipathy to slavery development. While the oldest version of the Law [2] did not distinguish between Jewish and non-Jewish slaves, the newest form of the Law [3] technically outlawed the enslavement of one Jew to another. This same version of the Law allowed for the permanent enslavement of Gentiles. It was also discovered that a major idea which supported and justified this development was the theological idea of the Exodus and its attending concept of nationalism. Ultimately, Israelites came to believe that they should not be slaves because of their unique relationship with Yahweh.

The next section of the second chapter explored the possibility that this anti-slavery attitude continued from the Exilic Period and into the first century CE. Selected passages from the OT, LXX, Josephus and Philo were used as evidence to show the anti-slavery attitude did persist throughout this time period. Again in these passages we noticed the intertwined themes of an anti-slavery bias and Jewish nationalism. Thus, the context was established in which we could explore the topic of Jesus' attitude to this strongly nationalist anti-slavery attitude. The best way to approach this question was to examine separately Jesus' attitudes toward nationalism and slavery. The third chapter focused on the nationalism theme, while chapter four concentrated on the question of slavery.

A major issue facing first century CE Palestinian Jews was the fact that the

[1] Ex 21.1–6; Dt 15.12–8 and Lev 25.39–46.
[2] Ex 21.1–6.
[3] Lev 25.39–46.

elect nation of Yahweh had been overrun by Gentiles. It is well known that one response to subjugation was militant Jewish nationalism. Our particular interest in chapter three was Jesus' point of view on this topic. After referring to Freyne's view that Galilee was not a centre of intense anti-Roman activity, we looked at several key Synoptic passages which touch upon this topic of Jewish nationalism. Various pericopes, such as Mk 2.15–7 (parr); Lk 15.1–2; 19.1–10; Mt 8.5ff/Lk 7.1ff; Mt 5.41 and Mk 12.13–7 (parr), were used to show that Jesus probably rejected Jewish nationalism and accepted the Roman Empire's authority over the nation of Israel.

In the fourth chapter, we focused on the Synoptic tradition which most closely relates to the question of Jesus' attitude towards slavery: the 'slave of all' saying. [4] In this chapter, we analyzed the various forms of the saying and concluded that the saying probably was dominical in nature. The existing version closest to the original rendering is probably Mk 10.35–45. This conclusion is based upon the presence of a number of Semitisms and the parallel construction of this version. Even this form of the logion very probably contains a number of alterations, including the twofold usage of ἐν ὑμῖν and a probable substitution of ὑμῶν for πάντων prior to διάκονος. The original saying probably encouraged unlimited service to any individual, regardless of social, religious or political affiliation. This particular understanding of the logion fits well with other accepted Jesus sayings, thus supporting the hypothesis that this is an authentic Jesus saying.

The second part of chapter four focused on a general examination of the various settings in which the saying is located. A recurring theme is that the logion was spoken in response to the disciples' argument over personal greatness. Mk 10 and Lk 22, which probably are independent traditions, contain similar forms of Jesus' response to this altercation: the 'slave of all' saying is surrounded

[4] Versions of the saying are found in Mk 10.35–45 (par); Mk 9.33–7; Lk 9.48; Lk 22.24–7 and Mt 23.1–12.

by two other logia. The first is the negative illustration of the Gentile rulers and the second is the positive illustration of Jesus as a servant. Due to the Lucan positive illustration of Jesus as a waiter, the larger Lucan meal setting and residual evidence in the Mk 10 version, we concluded a meal setting was probably the more original context.

In the final section of this chapter, we attempted to formulate a sketch of how the saying was originally intended to be understood and how the early Christian communities handled it as a piece of the tradition. We concluded that the logion was intended as a rebuke of selfish ambition. The independent traditions in Mk 10 and Lk 22, with their high degree of similarity in the presentation of the logion, suggest that on the one hand, various communities attempted to preserve what was viewed as the original setting. On the other hand, at various times in the logion's history it was taken up and applied to pressing ecclesiastical issues. The remainder of the thesis then examined this dual process of faithfulness to the tradition and making the tradition relevant to the contemporary community.

The fifth chapter examined Mk 10.35–45 (par). Initially, a number of key background issues were discussed. We established that the probable extent of the literary section in which this pericope is located is Mk 8.22–10.52. This unit consists of material interspersed between three 'pillars'. These 'pillars' consist of predictions of Jesus' passion and resurrection immediately followed by pericopes stressing the importance of service for discipleship. A second topic was the fact that the pericope (Mk 10.35–45) is probably a conflation of two originally separate units. The themes of personal honour and Jesus as a foundational model for Christian behaviour, which are present in both Mk 10.35ff and 10.42ff, helped make unification possible.

The analysis of Mk 10.35–45 was guided, in part, by the analysis of 8.22–10.52. In the third 'pillar', the Evangelist sets out his understanding of Christian

discipleship. The key theme is "service". This theme, however, is applied in a particular way to the question of community leadership. For Mark and his community, positions of leadership are held in order to benefit the fellowship and not for the personal prestige of the office-holder. Matthew takes the pericope and narrows the scope of service to the context of the Christian community alone.

Chapter six analyzed Mk 9.33–7 (parr). After arguing that Mk 9.33–50 is probably, for the most part, a pre-Marcan unit, we examined the Evangelist's use of this unit, which contains the 'slave of all' saying. In light of the larger context of 8.22–10.52 and Mark's attempt to spell out the significance of the Christ event for discipleship, it was argued that Mk 9.33-7 contends that all people are eligible for membership in the Christian community. It was argued that the specific group in view was those persons who were either slaves or employed as servants. In this case, we argued that παιδίον should be translated as "slave" or "young slave". Such a translation is supported by the larger Marcan context and contemporary or near contemporary papyri evidence.

The 'slave of all' saying was used in Mk 9.33–7 as an authoritative saying of the Lord supporting the membership of slaves and servants in the Christian community. In Lk 9.46–8, however, the pericope focuses more on elevating the "lowly" person who already belongs to the community. Matthew radically diverges from the Marcan version and reworks the pericope to make it serve as an introduction to two aspects of community life. These topics are humility in persons dealing with people of little social significance and the general principle of humility in interpersonal relationships between believers.

The seventh chapter focused on the first of two pericopes which are independent of the Marcan 'slave of all' pericopes. It was argued that the suggestion put forward by Schürmann and Taylor, that Lk 22.24–7 is part of a pre-Lucan,

non-Marcan tradition, is probably correct. This affirmation was not to be seen as suggesting that no Lucan redaction is found in these verses. We concluded, however, it is very difficult to argue convincingly for or against the Lucan adding of vv.28–30 to Lk 22.24–7. Therefore, these verses were only drawn upon tentatively in this chapter.

Lk 22.24–7 differs at three points from Mk 10.35–45. First, the rulers are said to be called benefactors. Secondly, there is a clear attempt to make the logion (v.26) more applicable to a community setting. Finally, Jesus is described as a waiter and this description is used as an illustration. These alterations suggest that Luke was probably specifically applying the 'slave of all' saying to a problematic exercise of leadership authority. Luke, unlike Mark, actually directs the logion at one particular group within the community.

Chapter eight concentrated on Mt 23.1–12, the second of the independent pericopes using the 'slave of all' saying. It was argued that this passage arises out of the historical context of intense internal rivalries between various Jewish groups in the latter half of the first century CE. In this case, the antagonists were Pharisaism and the Matthean brand of Jewish Christianity. These two communities seemingly were locked in a struggle regarding influence with the crowds of "non-aligned" Jews. The Evangelist argues that the way the Matthean community is structured and the manner in which it exercises leadership are of the utmost importance. The Matthean community has opted for an egalitarian brotherhood, where the leaders function as servants. This, in Matthew's option, will be more attractive than the local Jewish community's hierarchy.

This study focused narrowly on how the early Christian communities behind the Synoptic Gospels used the 'slave of all' saying. An obvious literary gap between Jesus and the Synoptic writers is Paul. In the future, I would hope to be able to explore the possibility that Paul has also used this particular piece

of Jesus tradition when dealing with internal church struggles. I am well aware of the controversial nature of attempting to suggest that Paul knew of and used the sayings of Jesus. However, there are a few Pauline passages which beg one's attention. For example, the best known pericope would probably be the Christ hymn in Phil 2. There, like in various Synoptic passages, Jesus is described as a slave/servant and this model is offered as an appropriate type of behaviour for the followers of Jesus Christ. A second interesting verse is Gal 5.13, where Paul encourages the Galatians to "be enslaved to one another". The larger context of this verse seems to be one of intense internal rivalry between the Galatian believers. Is it possible that Paul has drawn upon the 'slave of all' saying to quell this struggle? A third Pauline verse might be Rom 15.3, which comes at the end of a passage which seems to contain a number of echoes of the Jesus tradition (Rom 14.13–8 and 15.1–2). But in each instance the particular links to the 'slave of all' saying are too tentative and the issues involved in discussing them too complex, so that any results would be too speculative to add significantly to the above analysis.

It simply remains to note how influential the saying and example of Jesus on this subject was for the early Christian churches. The fact that one brief saying is found so frequently in the Synoptics witnesses to the significance of this piece of tradition. Its repeated usage shows that as far as importance is concerned, the 'slave of all' saying was probably seen to be as valuable as Jesus' teaching on loving one's enemies, which has come to be recognized as one of the foundation stones of Jesus' ethical teaching.

We might categorize its usage into two areas of application. First, the early Christians seem to have used the saying as it was probably intended - that is, as a rebuke of misdirected ambition. Just as the churches passed on the tradition about Jesus rebuking the Twelve for arguing about their relative personal greatness, the 'slave of all' saying was taken up and used as a guideline for con-

temporary leaders in the various communities. [5] Seemingly, in the communities behind the Synoptic Gospels, the leadership roles were viewed as offices of service and not as positions of personal power and prestige. Leaders existed for the benefit of the community and not vice versa. The 'slave of all' saying was probably repeatedly used to remind current and future leaders that this was the case.

Secondly, the saying was seen as a general pattern for Christian relationships. It was not only the leaders who were expected to be good servants, putting the needs of the community above personal desires. All Christians were called to a type of discipleship which was typified by a service oriented frame of thinking. [6] Where the 'slave of all' saying is applied to Christian relationships there is no place for ecclesiastical hierarchies [7] or an exclusive church "membership policy". [8] Christians were the followers of Jesus, who was the archetypical servant [9] and so their social posture was to be one of service, also. All people, regardless of their social standing, were welcome to become part of the community of Jesus Christ, the servant.

9.3 Epilogue

Finally, I would like to add a brief note regarding one additional and personal motivation for this thesis. The type of Reformation theology with which I most closely identify is that branch commonly known as the Radical Reformation, [10] in particular a sub-group which George Williams has labelled as "Evangelical

[5] This is clearly the way the saying is used in Lk 22.24–7. Mt 23.1–12 and Mk 10.35–45 certainly touch upon this theme in their usage of the saying.
[6] This is most clearly outlined in Mk 8.22–10.52, where the Evangelist twice used the 'slave of all' saying to define his understanding of Christian discipleship.
[7] Cf. Mt 23.1–12.
[8] See Mk 9.33–7, in particular.
[9] See Mk 10.45 and Lk 22.27.
[10] Cf. G. Williams' introduction to Vol. 25 of **The Library of Christian Classics** (*Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers* (London: SCM, 1957).

Anabaptists". [11] Among their distinguishing marks Williams lists the following characteristics [12]:

> "For them, only the New Testament was normative for doctrine, ethics, and polity. ...The historic Jesus—his specific instructions, his life and his crucifixion—was for them normative. ...They understood that faith in Christ meant the fulfilling of his express commandments in every particular, that Christian faith meant progressive sanctification of every aspect of a simplified life, and that love of God meant love of the brethren not only at the Supper but also in every human relationship.

Just as the sixteenth-century Anabaptists, such as Conrad Grebel and Menno Simons, passionately approached the New Testament in their quest to fulfill these above identified goals, I believe this study shows that the various elements of the early church endeavoured, with a similar passion, to take this one aspect of Jesus' teaching seriously and to find its relevance to various contemporary church situations. I have attempted to show how the 'slave of all' saying was understood and seen to apply to a variety of issues which confronted various communities of the early church. While I have found this study to be both stimulating and fruitful on an academic level, I would hope that having completed this initial phase of study I will be able to continue and apply these skills to questions facing my denomination in the latter years of this century and into the next.

[11] Pp. 30ff. This name is offered to distinguish this particular group from other Anabaptist groups such as the "Revolutionary" or "Contemplative" Anabaptist.
[12] *Ibid.*

Bibliography

Achtemeier, P. "Mark 9:30–37" *Interpretation* 30 (1976), pp. 178–83.

Alon, G. *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1980). Trans. by G. Levi.

Alt, A. *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966). Trans. by R. Wilson.

idem. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. I (Münich: Beck, 1953).

Anderson, H. *The Gospel of Mark* (London: Oliphants, 1976).

Barrow, R. *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (London: Methuen & Co., 1968).

Bartchy, S. *First-Century Slavery and I Corinthians 7:21* (Cambridge, MA: SBL Literature, 1973).

Beare, F. *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981).

Bellinzoni, A., ed. *The Two Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* (Macon: Mercer Press, 1985).

Best, E. "Discipleship in Mark: Mark 8.22–10.52" *SJT* 23 (1970), pp. 323–37.

idem. Following Jesus (Trowbridge: Redwood Burn, Ltd., 1981).

idem. "Mark's Preservation of the Tradition" in *L'Évangile selon Marc. Tradition et redaction* (Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1974). Ed. by M. Sabbe.

Best, T. "The Sociological Study of the New Testament: Promise and Peril of a New Discipline" *SJT* 36 (1983), pp. 181–94.

Black, M. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).

idem. "The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst" *ExpT* 59 (1947/48), pp. 14–6.

Blass, F. and A. DeBrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). Trans. by R. Funk.

Bonnard, P. *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Neuchatel: Éditions Delachaux & Niestlé, 1963).

Brandon, S. *Jesus and the Zealots* (Manchester: University Press, 1967).

Brandt, W. *Dienst und dienen im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1931). Neutestamentliche Forschungen 5.

Branscomb, B. *The Gospel of Mark* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938).

Braumann, G. "Leidenskelch und Todestaufe" *ZNW* 56 (1956), pp. 178ff.

Bright, J. *A History of Israel* (London: SCM, 1980), 3*rd.* ed.

Brockington, L. *Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther* (London: Oliphants, 1977).

Brown, F., S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 1907).

Brown, R. "Jesus and the Child as a Model of Spirituality" *IBS* 4 (1982), pp. 178–92.

Browne, G., J.D. Thomas, E.G. Turner and Marcia Weinstein. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. XXXVIII (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1971).

Bruce, F. "Render to Caesar" in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984). Ed. by E. Bammel and C. Moule.

Bultmann, R. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972). Trans. by J. Marsh.

idem. Theology of the New Testament (London: SCM, 1952). Trans. by K. Grobel.

Bundy, W. *Jesus and the First Three Gospels* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955).

Büchsel, F. "ἡγέομαι" in *TDNT*, Vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964). Ed. by G. Kittel. Trans. by G. Bromiley, pp. 907ff.

Cadbury, H. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920).

Carmichael, C. *The Laws of Deuteronomy* (London: Cornell University Press, 1974).

Cassidy, R. *Jesus, Politics and Society* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1978).

Cassuto, U. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1967), Trans. by I. Abrahams.

Catchpole, D. "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven. A Re–Appraisal of Mt. XXV.31–46" *BJRL* 61 (Spring, 1979), pp. 355–97.

Charlesworth, J., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vols. I and II (London: Darton, Longman, 1983 and 1985)

and & Todd, Chiera, E. "Hābirū and Hebrews" *AJSLL* XLIX (1932–33), pp. 115–24.

Childs, B. *Exodus* (London: SCM, 1974).

idem. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (London: SCM, 1979).

Clark, K. "The Meaning of [KATA]KYRIEYEIN" in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of G.D. Kilpatrick* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976). Ed. by J.K. Elliot.

Clines, D. *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984).

Craigie, P. *The Book of Deuteronomy* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967).

Cranfield, C. *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (Cambridge: CUP, 1959).

Creed, J. *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: MacMillan, 1969).

Cullmann, O. *Jesus and the Revolutionaries* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970). Trans. by G. Putnam.

Danby, H. *The Mishnah* (Oxford: OUP, 1980).

Danker, F. *Jesus and the New Age* (St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1983).

Daube, D. *Studies in Biblical Law* (Cambridge: CUP, 1947).

Davies, W. *the Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: CUP, 1966). vskip .30in Deissmann, A. *Light from the Ancient East* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927).

Derrett,J. " 'Render to Caesar...' " in *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970).

Descamps, A. "Du discours de Marc IX,33–50 aux paroles de Jésus" in *La Formation des évangiles*(Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1957), pp. 152–77.

Dinkler, E., ed. *Zeit und Geschichte* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964).

Dittenberger, W. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarium* (Leipzig: A.S. Hirzelium, 1915 and ff.).

Donahue, J. "Tax Collectors and Sinners. An Attempt at an Identification" *CBQ* 33 (1971), pp. 39–61.

Dunn, J. "The Birth of a Metaphor-Baptized in Spirit" *ExpT* 89 (1977/78), pp. 134–38 and 173–75.

idem. "The Incident at Antioch" *JSNT* 18 (1983), pp. 3–57.

idem. "Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus" in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Fortress Press). Ed. by J. Neusner, et.al.

Easton, B. *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926).

Edwards, R. "Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples" in *Discipleship in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985). Ed. by F. Sergova, pp. 47ff.

Elliger, K. "Das Gesetz Leviticus 18" *ZAW* (NF) 67 (1955), pp. 1–25.

Ellison, H. "The Hebrew Slave: A Study in Early Israelite History" *EQ* 45 (1973), pp. 30–35.

Elliot-Binns, L. "Some Problems of the Holiness Code" *ZAW* (NF) 67 (1955), pp. 26–40.

Farmer, W. *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus* (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1956).

Fenton, J. *The Gospel of St. Matthew* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963).

Filson, F. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: A. & C. Black, 1960).

Finegan, J. *Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1934).

Finley, I., ed. *Slavery in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge: Heffer, 1960).

Fitzmyer, J. *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983).

idem. The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985).

Fleddermann, H. "The Discipleship Discourse (Mk 9:33–50)" *CBQ* 43.1 (1981), pp. 57–75.

Foerster, W. "ἄξιος","ἀνάξιος" in *TDNT*, Vol. I (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964) Ed. by G. Kittel. Trans. by G. Bromiley.

Frankemölle, H. "Amtskritik im Matthäus-Evangelium" *Biblica* 54 (1973), pp. 247–62.

Freyne, S. *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian* (Notre Dame: University Press, 1980).

Gaechter, P. *Das Matthäus Evangelium* (Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963).

Garland, D. *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979).

Gaster, T. *The Scripture of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1957).

Gnilka, J. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Vol. II (Köln: Neukirchener, 1979).

Goldstein, J. *I Maccabees* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1976).

Goppelt, L. "The Freedom to Pay the Imperial Tax (Mark 12,17)" in *Studia Evangelica II (Texte und Untersuchungen)* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964). Ed. by F.L. Cross.

Green, H. *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Oxford: CUP, 1975).

Grenfell, B. and A. Hunt. *The Amherst Papyri* (Oxford: OUP, 1901).

idem. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part 1 (Oxford: Horace Hunt, 1898).

Grundmann, W. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1971).

idem. Das Evangelium nach Markus (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1971).

idem. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1971).

Gundry, R. *Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982).

Haenchen, E. "Matthäus 23" *ZTHK* XLVIII (1951), pp. 38–63.

idem. Der Weg Jesu (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968).

Hatch, E. and H. Redpath. *Concordance to the Septuagint* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892).

Hausler, E. *Sklaven und Personen minderen Rechts im Alten Testament* [unpublished dissertation: Universität Köln (1956)].

Hawkins, J. *HoræSynopticæ* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909).

Hengel, M. *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (London: SCM, 1977). Trans. by J. Bowden.

idem. Die Zeloten (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961).

idem. Was Jesus a Revolutionist? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971). Trans. by W. Klassen.

Hill, D. *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Oliphants, 1972).

idem. "The Request of Zebedee's Sons and the Johannine doxa Theme" *NTS* (1967), pp. 281–85.

Hummel, R. *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium* (Münich: Kaiser, 1963).

Hurvitz, A. "The Usage of šēš and bûṣ in the Bible and its Implication for the Date of P" *HTR* 60 (1967), pp. 117–21.

Hyatt, J. *Commentary on Exodus* (London: Oliphants, 1971).

Janzen, J. *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973).

Jeremias, J. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1966). Trans.

by N. Perrin.

idem. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969).

idem. New Testament Theology Vol. I (London: SCM, 1971). Trans. by J. Bowden.

idem. Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

Kaufmann, Y. *The Religion of Israel* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1961).

Kautzsch, E., ed. *Gesenius' Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898). Trans. by G. Collins and A. Cowley.

Kee, H. *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980).

idem. Community of the New Age (London: SCM, 1977).

Kelber, W. *Mark's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

idem. The Oral and the Written Gospel (Phildelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

Kingsbury, J. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

Klostermann, E. *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1929).

idem. Das Markusevangelium (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926).

idem. Das Matthäusevangelium(Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927).

Knox,W. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. I (Cambridge: CUP, 1953).

Kuhn, H.-W. *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

Kurz, W. "Luke 22.14–38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses" *JBL* 104 (1985), pp. 251–68.

Lane, W. *The Gospel According to Mark* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974).

Leaney, A. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: A. & C. Black, 1958).

idem. "Jesus and the Symbol of the Child (Luke IX, 36–8)" *ExpT* 66 (1954/55), pp. 91–2.

Lemche, N. "The 'Hebrew Slave' " *VT* XXV (1975), pp. 129–44.

Lewy, J. "Hābirū and Hebrews" *HUCA* 14 (1939), pp. 587–623.

idem. "A New Parallel Between Hābirū and Hebrews" *HUCA* 15 (1940), pp. 48–58.

idem. "Origin and Significance of the Biblical Term 'Hebrew' " *HUCA* 28 (1957), pp. 1–13.

Lohmeyer, E. *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951).

idem. Das Evangelium des Matthäus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958). Ed. by W. Schmauch.

Lohse, E. *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955).

Lull, D. "The Servant-Benefactor as a Model of Greatness (Luke 22:24–30)" *NovT* XXVIII (1986), pp. 289–305.

Luz, U. "The Disciples in the Gospel According to Matthew" in *The Interpretation of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983). Ed. by G. Stanton, pp. 98ff.

McConville, J. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy* (Trowbridge: Redwood Burn Ltd., 1984) *JSOT* Supp. Series 33.

McNeile, A. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: MacMillan, 1961).

Mann, C. *Mark* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1986).

Manson, T. *The Church's Ministry* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948).

idem. The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM, 1977).

idem. The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: CUP, 1945).

Marshall, I. *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1978).

Meeks, W. *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

Mendenhall, G. "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine" *BA* 35 (1962), pp. 66–87.

Michaels, J. "Christian Prophecy and Mt. 23:8–12: A Test Exegesis" in *SBL Seminar Papers, Number 10* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976). Ed. by G. MacRae, pp. 305–10.

Milligan, G. *Selections from the Greek Papyri* (Cambridge: CUP, 1912).

Minear, P. "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew" in *Gospel Studies in Honour of Sherman Elbrigde Johnson ATR* Supp. Series III (March, 1974). Ed. by M. Shepherd, Jr. and E. Hobbs, pp. 28–44.

Moule,C. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: CUP, 1975), *2nd.* ed.

Neirynck, F. "The Tradition of the Saying of Jesus: A Discussion Based on Mk 9.33–50" *Concilium* 2.10 (1966), pp. 33–9.

Neusner, J. *From Politics to Piety* (Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973).

idem. *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971).

Nineham, D. *Saint Mark* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972).

Nock, A. "Soter and Euergetes" in *The Joy of Study: Papers on New Testament and Related Subjects to Honour Frederick Clifton Grant* (N.Y.: MacMillan, 1951). Ed. by S. Johnson, pp. 127–148.

North, C. "The Servant of the Lord" in *IDB*, Vol. IV (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962).

Noth, M. *Exodus* (London: SCM, 1962). Trans. by J. Bowden.

idem. *Leviticus* (London: SCM, 1965). Trans. by J. Anderson.

Oesterley, W. and T. Robinson. *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1958).

Patrick, D. *Old Testament Law* (London: SCM, 1986).

Patsch, H. *Abendmahl und historischer Jesus* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972).

Pesch, R. *Das Markusevangelium*, Vol. II (Freiburg: Herder, 1977).

Pesch, W. "Die sogenannte Gemeindeordnung Mt 18" *BZ* 7 (NF) (1963), pp. 220–35.

idem. "Theologische Aussagen der Redaktion von Matthäus 23" in *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker: Für Josef Schmid* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973). Ed. by P. Hoffmann, B. Norbert and W. Pesch, pp. 286–99.

Pfeiffer, R. *Introduction to the Old Testament* (N.Y.: Harper, 1948).

Phillips, A. *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970).

idem. "The Laws of Slavery: Exodus 21:2–11" *JSOT* 30 (1984), pp. 51–66.

Van der Ploeg, J. "Slavery in the Old Testament" *VT Supplement* 22 (1972), pp. 72–87.

Plummer, A. *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896).

idem. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Elliot Stock, 1909).

Porter, J. *Leviticus* (Cambridge: CUP, 1976).

Pritchard, J., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: University Press, 1955), 2*nd.* ed.

Quell, G. and W. Foerster, "κύριος, κτλ" in *TDNT*, Vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965). Ed. by G. Kittel. Trans. by G. Bromiley, pp. 1039ff.

von Rad, G. *Deuteronomy* (London: SCM, 1966). Trans. by D. Barton.

idem. The Message of the Prophets (London: SCM, 1968). Trans. by D. Stalker.

idem. Studies in Deuteronomy (London: SCM, 1953). Trans. by D. Stalker.

Radermaker, J. "Revendiquer ou servir? Mk 10,35–45" *Assemb Seign* 60 (1975), pp. 28–39.

Rahlfs, A., ed. *Septuaginta*, Vol. I (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1985).

Rawlinson, A. *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Methuen, 1925).

Rengstorf, K. "ἀπόστολος" in *TDNT*, Vol. I. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964). Ed. by G. Kittel. Trans. by G. Bromiley, pp. 407ff.

idem. A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973).

Reploh, K. *Markus-Lehrer der Gemeinde* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969).

Reventlow, H. *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1961).

Riches, J. *Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1980).

Rickards, R. "Luke 22.25 – They are called 'Friends of the People' " *The Bible Translator* 28 (1977), pp. 445–46.

Rivkins, E. *What Crucified Jesus?* (London: SCM, 1984).

Roberts, C. and E. Turner. *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester*, Vol. IV (Manchester: The University Press, 1952).

Robinson, T. *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937).

Rolff, J. "Anfänge der soteriologischen Deutung des Todes Jesu (Mk X,45 und Lk XXII, 27)" *NTS* 19 (1972/73), pp. 38–64.

Safrai, S. and M. Stern. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, 2 volumes (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974 and 1976).

de Ste. Croix, G. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1981).

Sanders, E. *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985).

Schlatter, A. *Der Evangelist Matthäus: seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1963).

idem. Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas (Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1969).

Schlosser, J. "La genèse de Luc, XXII, 25–7" *RB* 89 (1982), pp. 52–70.

Schmid, J. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1960).

idem. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1965), *5th.* ed.

Schnackenburg, R. "Mk 9,33–50" in *Synoptische Studien: Festschrift für A. Wikenhauser* (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1953). Ed. by J. Schmid and A. Vögtle.

Schneider, G. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1977).

Schniewind, J. *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).

idem. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950).

Schottroff, W. and W. Stegemann, eds. *Traditionen der Befreiung. Sozialgeschichtliche Bibelauslegungen* Vol. I: *Methodische Zugänge*, Vol. II: *Frauen in der Bibel* (Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1980).

Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973ff). Revised by G. Vermes and F. Millar.

Schürmann, H. *Das Lukasevangelium*, Vol. I (Freiburg: Herder, 1969).

idem. Jesu Abschiedsrede (Lk 22,21–38) (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1977).

Schweizer, E. *The Good News According to Mark* (London: SPCK, 1977). Trans. by D. Madvig.

idem. The Good News According to Matthew (London: SPCK, 1976).

idem. Lordship and Discipleship (London: SCM, 1960).

Sherwin-White, A. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 1963).

Smith, J., W. Ward and J. Bewer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Snaith, N. *Leviticus and Numbers* (London: Nelson, 1967).

Soggin, J. *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: SCM, 1976). Trans. by J. Bowden.

Soderlund, S. *The Greek Text of Jeremiah* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985) *JSOT* Supp. Series 47.

Speiser, E. "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millenium B.C." *AASOR* XIII (1931–32), pp. 13–49.

Stauffer, E. *Christ and the Caesars* (London: SCM, 1955). Trans. by K. and R. Gregor Smith.

idem. *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM, 1955). Trans. by J. Marsh.

Stein, R. *The Method and Message of Jesus' Teaching* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978).

Strack, H. and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, 4 volumes (München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926).

Strecker, G. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).

Styler, G. "Argumentum e silentio" in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984). Ed. by E. Bammel and C. Moule.

Sukenik, E. *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (London: OUP, 1934).

Sweet, J. "The Zealots and Jesus" in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984). Ed. by E. Bammel and C. Moule.

Talbert, C. *Reading Luke* (N.Y.: Crossroads Publishing Co., 1982).

Taylor, V. *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926).

idem. The Gospel According to Mark (London: MacMillan, 1969).

idem. The Passion Narrative of St. Luke (Cambridge: CUP, 1972). Ed. by O. Evans.

Theißen, G. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978). Trans. by J. Bowden.

idem. Studien zur Sozoiologie des Urchristentums(Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983).

Thompson, W. *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community, Mt 17,22-18,35* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970) *AB* 44.

van Tilborg, S. *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972).

Tödt, H. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (London: SCM, 1965). Trans. by D. Barton.

Townsend, J. "Matthew XXIII.9" *JTS* (NS) Vol. XII, pp. 56–69.

Trilling, W. "Amt und Amtsverständnis bei Matthäus" in *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.B. Beda Rigaux* (Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, 1970). Ed. by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux, pp. 29–44.

idem. Das wahre Israel (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1964).

Trocmé, E. *The Formation of the Gospel According to Mark* (London: SPCK, 1963). Trans. by P. Gangham.

Tuckett, C. *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis* (Cambridge: CUP, 1983) SNTSMS 44.

idem. Synoptic Studies. The Ampleforth Conference of 1982 and 1983 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984) *JSNT* Supp. Series 7.

Urbach, E. "The Laws Regarding Slavery as a Source for Social History of the Period of the Second Temple, the Mishnah and Talmud" in *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies*, Vol. I (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1964). Trans. by J. Weiss.

Vaganay, L. "Le schématisme du discours communautaire à la lumière de la critique des sources" *RB* 60 (1953), pp. 203–44.

Vaux, R. de. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (London: Darton, Longmann & Todd, 1961). Trans. by J. McHugh.

Vermes, G. *Jesus the Jew* (London: Collins, 1973).

Vogt, J. *Slavery and the Ideal Man* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974). Trans. by T. Wiedermann.

Watts, J. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah* (Cambridge: CUP, 1975).

Weeden, T. *Mark - Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).

Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1972).

Weiser, A. *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (N.Y.: Association Press, 1961). Trans. by D. Barton.

Wellhausen, J. *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Berlin: Druck and Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1903).

Wellhausen, J. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Cleveland: Meridian, 1957).

Wenger, U. *Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum (Mt 7,28a; 8,5–10,13 par Lk 7,1–10). Ein Beitrag zur Q-Forschung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985).

Wenham, D. "A Note on Mk. 9:33–42/Mt. 18:1–6/Lk. 9:46–50" *JSNT* 14 (1982), pp. 113–18.

Wenham, G. *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979).

Westermann, C. "*ebed* æb æd Knecht" in *Theologische Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, Vol. II (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976). Ed. by E. Jenni and C. Westermann.

idem. Isaiah 40–66 (London: SCM, 1969). Trans. by D. Stalker.

Westermann, W., C. Keyes and H. Liebesny. *Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C.*, Vol. II (N.Y.: Columbia Press, 1940).

Westermann, W. *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity* (American Philosophical Society, 1955).

Whybray, R. *The Second Isaiah* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983).

Wiedermann, T. *Greek and Roman Slavery* (London: Croom Helm, 1981).

Willoughby, C. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907).

Wolff, H. "Masters and Slaves" *Interpretation* 27 (1973), pp. 259–72.

Wright, C. *Living as the People of God* (Leicester: IVP, 1983).

Wright, G. "Introduction to the Book of Deuternomony" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II (N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1953). Ed. by G. Buttrick, et. al., pp. 323–23.

Zeitlin, S. "Slavery During the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaitic Period" *JQR* 53 (1962–63), pp. 185–218.

Ziegler, J., ed. *Septuaginta* Vol. 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

Zimmerli, W. *Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979). Trans. by R. Clements.

Zimmerli, W. and J. Jeremias. *The Servant of God* (London: SCM, 1957). Trans. by H. Knight.