

## AN APT STUDENT'S MATRICULATION (Lk 2,39-52)

J. DUNCAN M. DERRETT  
University of London

### *Resumen*

Al igual que Lc 2,25-38, nuestro pasaje es un presagio: la precocidad de Jesús como tal apenas tiene importancia. Sus piadosos padres, a pesar de las lecciones de la Pascua (Dt 6,21, etc.), buscan ante todo su propia conveniencia. Jesús, haciéndose *talmíd* de los maestros que discuten sobre los deberes hacia los padres terrenos y hacia el Padre celestial, opta decididamente por la parte de Dios, situándose ἐν τοῖς (υἱοῖς) (2,49), es decir, entre los que se ocupan de los "negocios" divinos, no incompatibles con los negocios seculares.

### *Summary*

Like Lk 2,25-38 our passage is a portent: Jesus' precocity as such is relatively unimportant. His pious parents, despite the lessons of Passover (Dt 6,21, etc.), put their convenience first. Establishing himself as a *talmíd* of teachers who discuss the relative duties towards the earthly parent and the heavenly Father, Jesus worthily joins the latter's devotees (2,49), i.e. among the clients who conduct divine "business", not incompatibly with secular business.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Luke's story of the twelve-year-old Jesus in the Temple was intended to be read as if it happened. Therefore issues are raised and motives inferred as in any real occurrence. To import Mal 3,1 (for example) is to distort it. But that does not exclude the portentous. Luke's hearers looked for that, especially after 2,25-38. With three exceptions (1960, 1966,

1978) scholars let this tale languish as if it were jejune legend, or, as Guignebert put it, "an intrinsically improbable anecdote"<sup>1</sup>. Most scholars fail to lend themselves to the story, or to visualize the characters as plausible, which they are. Van Iersel (1960: 172) sees this piece of "catechetical instruction" as reliable information about Jesus; and it is good to see him on his first adventure (so Laurentin).

Questions one would like to ask are nowadays rejected as pointless<sup>2</sup>. However, granted that Jesus was clever and favoured by God (2,40), how did his parents come to lose him<sup>3</sup>; why was he so inconsiderate (Mar-

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Plummer, *Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1898, <sup>5</sup>1922) 74-80; P. Temple, "What is to be understood by ἐν τοῖς (Lk 2,49)?: *IrThQ* 17 (1922) 248-263 (uncertain); B. Weiss, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas* (KEK; Göttingen <sup>9</sup>1901) 315-318; C. Guignebert, *Jesus* (EV; London 1935) 143; P. J. Temple, "'House' or 'business' in Lk 2,49?": *CBQ* 1 (1939) 342-352; J. M. Creed, *Luke* (London 1950); P. Winter, "Lc 2,49 and Targum Yerushalmi": *ZNW* 45 (1954) 145-179 (pre-qumran, pre-Neofiti defence of targums, eliminating christology); id., *ibid.*, 46 (1955) 140-141; D. Daube, *New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London 1956) 217-223; B. van Iersel, "The finding of Jesus in the Temple": *NT* 4 (1960) 161-173 (thorough); A. R. C. Leaney, *Luke* (London 1958); J. Kleusner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York 1959) 237; Eva Krafft, "Die Vorgeschichten des Lukas. Eine Frage nach ihrer sachgemässen Interpretation", in E. Dinkler (ed.), *Zeit und Geschichte* (Fs. R. Bultmann) (Tübingen 1969) 216-223; R. Laurentin, *Jésus au Temple. Mystère de Paques et foi de Marie en Luc 2,48-50* (Paris 1966) esp. 33-86, 135-171 (an exuberant study); S. Ben-Chorin, *Bruder Jesus* (Munich 1970) 37; J. K. Elliott, "Does Luke 2,41-52 anticipate the Resurrection?": *ExpT* 83 (1971-1972) 87-89; I. H. Marshall, *Luke* (Exeter 1978) 125-130; H. J. de Jonge, "Sonship, Wisdom, Infancy: Luke ii, 41-51a": *NTS* 24 (1978) 317-354 (detailed); L.T. Brodie, "A new Temple and a new Law": *JSNT* 5 (1979) 21-45; J. A. Fitzmyer, *Luke* (AB; Garden City 1980) 434-447; C. H. Talbert, *Reading Luke* (New York 1982) 35-38; E. Schweizer, *Good News according to Luke* (London 1984) 61-67; J. Newman, "The child in the first two chapters of the gospel of Luke... child development in the first century of Christianity", in *Proc. Second Int. Symp. on Medicine in Bible and Talmud, Jerusalem Dec. 18-20, 1984 = Koroth* 9, Fall 1985 (Leiden 1985); R. C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts I* (Philadelphia 1986) 53-56; D. L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern. Lucan Old Testament Christianity* (JSNT Sup. 12; Cambridge 1987); M. D. Goulder, *Luke. A New Paradigm 1* (JSNT Sup. 20; Sheffield 1989) 264-269 (bibliog.); C. F. Evans, *Luke* (London / Philadelphia 1990) 221-227. J. Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20* (Word BC; Dallas 1989) 126-135. R. D. Aus, "The Child Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2.41-51a), and Judaic Tradition on the Child Samuel in the Temple (1 Samuel 1-3)", in id., *Samuel, Saul and Jesus. Three Early Palestinian Jewish Christian Haggadoth* (Atlanta 1994).

<sup>2</sup> Fitzmyer (1980) 439; Evans (1990) 224. Goulder (1989) 265 *does* ask such questions.

<sup>3</sup> Piscator (1608) on v. 43. They gave that impression: Plummer (1922) 77. Luke

shall)? Or was he employing the discreet modesty of a Samson (Jdg 14,6), whose parents were utterly ignorant (Jdg 19,4 οὐκ ἔγινωσαν) in spite of an angel's repeated promises and admonitions? Why were they so long in finding him; was the Temple the *last* place they searched; why ought they to have looked there first; why were they amazed (stunned) when they found him; what was he doing in the interval; was there no "pound" for lost children (cf. Gen 37,15); and who fed him? Why was he so rude to poor old Joseph<sup>4</sup>; why was his impudent answer treasured by Mary, granted that neither her nor her husband's wits (σύνεσις) (cf. Lk 24,45) sufficed to understand it (v. 50: Luke's irony)<sup>5</sup>? Lastly, why did he go home and get lost to fame for much longer than twelve years? Some scholars excuse him by denying that Luke's semitic source<sup>6</sup> knew anything of the Virgin Birth<sup>7</sup>. But narrative criticism warns us that Luke's hearers knew that Jesus was conceived without Joseph's participation; in which case Jesus' celebrated ῥῆμα<sup>8</sup> seems ungracious, throwing an unexpected light on the Holy Spirit (1,35; 3,22), not to speak of the divine *charis* (cf. LXX[B] Jdg 13,24)<sup>9</sup>.

Lk 2,49b-c, in colloquial English, is hardly "gentle" (Marshall): "What's your problem? Where else would you expect to find me? You know very well I must be occupied with my real Father's affairs?" He

---

sees him as a second Samuel as depicted in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 51. So B. J. Koet, "Holy place and Hannah's prayer...", in A. Houtman et al., *Sanctity of Time and Space in Tradition and Modernity* (Leiden 1998) 45-72 at 54-56.

<sup>4</sup> Piscator on v. 49 says he is to be excused since he is the Lord (Jn 2,4). Plummer (1922: 79) says he was *surprised*, not reproving!

<sup>5</sup> S. M. Sheeley, *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts* (JSNT Sup. 72; Sheffield 1992).

<sup>6</sup> J. Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (Göttingen 1980) 99-103, esp. 102-103; R. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* (WUNT 2.7; Tübingen 1981) 212 (no generalization serves), but see de Jonge, "Sonship", 342-348; H. F. D. Spark, "The semitisms in St Luke's Gospel": *JTS* 44 (1943) 129-138; Van Iersel (1960) 163 n. 4; T. Schramm, *Der Markus-stoff bei Lukas* (SNTS Mon. 14; Cambridge 1971) 94-102, 134. On Luke's good Greek: Evans, *Luke*, 223. Ἐν μέσῳ is simply a Hebraism (*b'tok* = "among") and therefore "cynosure" (Evans, 221) is wrong.

<sup>7</sup> C. G. Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels* II (London 1909) 864; Creed, *Luke*, 44; Leaney, *Luke*, 103; Van Iersel, 164. Denied by Evans, 226.

<sup>8</sup> ῥῆμα, a favourite word of Luke's, signifies a pronouncement, a solemn statement, not a mere word, therefore *dictum*, *placitum*. As in "dixi". See Lk 1,37-38!

<sup>9</sup> J. Nolland, "Luke's use of ΧΑΡΙΣ": *NTS* 32 (1986) 614-620 (a tangible divine power).

impugns his own legitimacy (cf. Plutarch, *Alexander* 50.11), accuses his Mother (*verba reprehendendi* [Prov 10,1; 29,15]) of hypocrisy by putting Joseph's name first at v. 48<sup>10</sup>, and denies Joseph's right to question his movements, though Jesus was descended from God through Joseph (Lk 3,23-38). No doubt sanctimonious and self-righteous pronouncements have been heard from adolescents before him and since; but the reflection on Joseph is no less objectionable for being rational. Scholars cannot agree what ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου means<sup>11</sup>: one became equally a partisan for two incompatible solutions. Theodoret of Antioch (5th cent.) conjectured the right answer<sup>12</sup>, but he could not unwind it, not knowing Aramaic. By Origen's time the clue had been lost. Jewish helpers with the Gospels have seldom been Talmudists, while Palestinian Aramaic, Jesus' house language<sup>13</sup>, lies behind that famous *placitum*. It is from the Talmud that we can recover the relevant idiomatic expression, neglected by others<sup>14</sup>, though it can easily be imputed to a native Aramaic speaker twelve years old. Meanwhile the translation into Greek of 2,49 has been expertly done, by people who were not necessarily book-learned, but bilingual interpreters *ad sensum*, like our interpreters at Brussels<sup>15</sup>. In

<sup>10</sup> Montefiore following Loisy says that her phraseology is in bad taste (!). Poole says Mary's "passion deserves some indulgence". Creed, 46, accuses Luke of naivety ("unconscious of an antithesis"). No doubt to place ἐγὼ second is emphatic, but the point is that *both* parents are subordinated to God (de Jonge, 331).

<sup>11</sup> Note de Jonge, "Sonship", 331-337. It is pointless, after Laurentin, 56-72, to catalogue commentators who have opted for (1) "in the Temple" (cf. b. *Qidd.* 57b), (2) "in my Father's business / affairs" (J. Scott at *Classical Weekly* 40 [1947] 70; C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* [Cambridge 1953] 75), or (3) like Alford, Edersheim and Black, ἐν τοῖς as deliberately ambiguous. De Jonge opts for the last. Laurentin fixes on "chez mon Père", and Schweizer, *Luke*, 61-64 prefers "[the world] of my Father". The monumental study of F. Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* (Cambridge 1899, repr. Peabody 1994) 50-56 is defective for want of clues from Aramaic.

<sup>12</sup> See below, n. 98.

<sup>13</sup> E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*. *New English Version II* (Edinburgh 1979) 20, n. 68.

<sup>14</sup> M. Black, *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford 1967) 3, refers to F. C. Burkett and G. Dalman. At 4 and 14 he discusses C. C. Torrey's and C. F. Burney's theory of Aramaic origins of the gospel and leans against the hypothesis of frequent mistranslations.

<sup>15</sup> A Seleucid monarch could dictate in Greek to clerks who instantly translated into half-a-dozen languages. The fate of Asoka's Prakṛt decrees in Aramaic and Greek is

short, Jesus is found *employed* in the ambience of his patron (§ VI)<sup>16</sup>, where he had taken time to achieve what he wanted.

## II. PASSOVER

Unlike H. de Jonge (1978:336), I see Lk 2,41-42 not as a mechanical device but as an assertion of the paschal significance of the whole. Unlike Laurentin, I do not confuse Passover with the Resurrection, nor am I obsessed with the Temple as a motif in this story. In fact at Passover the head of the household must rehearse the events of the first and symbolic Exodus<sup>17</sup>, and explain that what happened *then* operates for the Hebrews now<sup>18</sup>. The father and his children were themselves redeemed on that night<sup>19</sup>. Every aspect is explained: the commandments to celebrate Passover annually (Ex 13,10), the bread, the lamb, the herbs. To encourage alertness all stages of development and temperament are addressed in the father's answers to four ritualized questions (question and answer appertaining to the ritual)<sup>20</sup>. The modern Passover Haggada hardly existed, but the *reasons* existed long before<sup>21</sup>, why questions must be posed by the wise son, the recalcitrant, the simpleton, and lastly the one too young to frame a question for himself (Ex 13,8). Passover emphasizes the family's solidarity and continuity. Step-fathers would conduct the ritual where there were widows, not to speak of divorcees, while boys under twelve lived with their mothers.

---

illuminating. P. R. Franke, "Dolmetscher in hellenistischer Zeit", in C. W. Müller et al. (eds.), *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike = Palingenesia* 36 (Stuttgart 1992) 85-96.

<sup>16</sup> On "patron" see J. J. Pilch and B. J. Malina, *Handbook of Biblical Social Values* (Peabody 1998) 151.

<sup>17</sup> Dt 6,20-25. m. *Pes.* X.4; b. *Pes.* 116a = Soncino trans. (hereafter "Sonc.") 594.

<sup>18</sup> H. Grotius (1641) directs attention to Ex 12,27; cf. 42 (13,8.14); Dt 6,20.21.24; 32,7; Ps 78,3-7.

<sup>19</sup> Ex 13,8; 10,5 MT, Tgg. J. Winter / A. Wünsche (trans.), *Mekilta* (Leipzig 1909) 72. Daube (1956) ch. 8, esp. 163-169.

<sup>20</sup> Ex 12,24.26; 20,2. *Mekilta*, *Pišha* 17.96, 100-105; 18.114-134 (ed., trans., Lauterbach, I, 149, 166-167).

<sup>21</sup> Daube, 166.

On that night thousands of fathers would make sure that every boy knew what was being celebrated, and with what implications. God is praised for his gratuitous redemption of slaves, whose descendants they all were. As B. Weiss noticed, that was enough to inflame a boy's religiosity. One day he would have to celebrate Passover for his own family, and, if he was lucky, even in Jerusalem itself.

### III. RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF FATHERS AND SONS

The father taught his son scripture and (a modicum of) oral Torah (Dt 11,19; Ps 34,12-15), also a trade, and at seventeen he arranged his marriage to suit himself, not the boy<sup>22</sup>. The first of those duties could be done by deputy, though fathers were often sons' first Torah-teachers, seconded by their mothers (Prov 1,8). Whatever secondary education might demand of the ambitious, every trade or business required accurate knowledge of basic legal rules, and some interest in their origins (see Dt 22,8). Accurate bible-knowledge was a required foundation for further studies. Achieved on a part-time basis, the father would supervise it. Meanwhile every pair of hands was productive from an early age. A boy ceases to be *qatān* ("child") at 12 years and 1 day (b. *Ber.* 24a; *Sot.* 22a; *Gitt.* 65a).

Up to the age of twelve, the father might admonish the boy, and over that age he could punish him violently<sup>23</sup>. A boy of twelve may make a valid vow without his father's consent<sup>24</sup>. At thirteen the boy is presumed fully liable in civil and criminal matters<sup>25</sup>; and he could run away and cause the parent financial loss and social disappointment. A

---

<sup>22</sup> m. Qidd. IV.14, Midr. R. Gen. LXIII.10 (Sonc. 565). Mekilta, *Bahodesh* 8.33. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar* I, 394; G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge 1958) II, 127. G. Schrenk, "πατήρ, etc.": *TWNT* V (1954) 975.

<sup>23</sup> b. *Ket.* 50a (take care the boy does not hit back!); a teacher may threaten a pupil over twelve. b. *M.Q.* 17a (Maimónides, *Code* XIV.III.vi,9 [trans A. M. Hershman, New Haven 1949, 156]). Pilch / Malina, *Handbook*, 146.

<sup>24</sup> m. *Nidd.* V.6 (twelve-year-olds and thirteen-year-olds differentiated). Twelve is not a round figure (*contra* de Jonge, "Sonship", 319, following Radermacher and M. Dibelius whom he cites).

<sup>25</sup> m. 'Avôt V.21. b. *Yôma* 82a = Sonc. 402. H. de Jonge, 319. The topic is a red herring *save as to the boy's property rights*.

boy's thirteenth year is therefore a very significant year: well managed by the parents (Eph 6,1-4!) it need not be the prelude to a defection. Moses himself, after all, was only twelve when he left a luxurious home<sup>26</sup>. On the other hand the son must revere his parents<sup>27</sup>, helping to support them in old age, tolerating their eccentricities<sup>28</sup>, and totally abstaining from contradicting his father<sup>29</sup>. So when voting became usual the votes of father and son counted as one vote<sup>30</sup>. The son holds the father in awe, and filial obedience is no less an economic than a cultural value (Mt 21,20-31). Even (some opine) if the father is a habitual transgressor, the sons must not rebuke him directly (1 Tim 5,1). One asks one's father (below, § V) whether the Torah requires something different<sup>31</sup>. If Jesus' utterance at 2,49 breaks this convention he deserves to be smacked. Of course striking or even cursing the father are capital offenses<sup>32</sup>; the "stubborn and rebellious son" (a mental deficient) may be put to death (Dt 21,18.20)<sup>33</sup>; and even to disregard the parents, to treat them inconsiderately, is an offence by biblical standards<sup>34</sup>. Mary's complaint at what Jesus *did* to them (cf. Jdg 15,11 *τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας ἡμῖν;*) and her word *ὀδυνώμενοι* (*dolentes*, "in distress") are much stronger (and more to the point) than what the flaccid English translation, "anxious", might suggest (so Plummer). However, this *respect for parents* did not mean that one

<sup>26</sup> Midr. R. Exod. V.1 = Sonc. 82.

<sup>27</sup> Lev 19,3. See below, n. 74.

<sup>28</sup> One must not comment when the father throws a purse of gold into the middle of the river! b. *Qidd.* 31b, 32a. Maimonides, *Code*, XIV.III.vi,7 (trans. Hershman, 155).

<sup>29</sup> Moore, *Judaism* II, 132-133.

<sup>30</sup> b. *'Erub.* 63a.

<sup>31</sup> b. *Qidd.* 32a = Sonc. 157 (see 30b-33b). Maimonides, XIV.III.vi,11 (trans. Hershman, 156). Under the Buddhist *vinaya* a nun must not rebuke a monk (*Vin.* II 276), and she must show respect to irregular or immoral monks (*Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya*, ed. Roth, 23 § 22).

<sup>32</sup> Ex 21,15; Mekilta, *Nez.* 5.24-25 (Lauterbach III 43); 1 Tim 11,9; Ex 21,17; Lev 20,9; Prov 30,11. Insults forbidden: Sifre Dt. § 309.

<sup>33</sup> Parents may pardon him: b. *Sanh.* 88b = Sonc. 585.

<sup>34</sup> Dt 27,16 (cursed); Ezk 22,7. Prov 30,17 (comprehensive). Lk 15,18 (J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* [London 1970] ch. 5). For Mary's question see R. Pesch, "'Kind, warum hast du so an uns getan?'" : *BZ* 12 (1968) 245-248.

had to tell one's parents *everything*: they could easily be in the dark, as Samson's parents were.

The son's rights are meagre. The Law did not spell out the father's duty to maintain the boy. There is a theoretical, if not always practical separation of goods between them. The *daughter*, whom the father may sell, is in a different position; he owns her acquisitions and compensation monies if a third party injures her<sup>35</sup>. The father has no responsibility to keep a boy over thirteen (b. *Ket.* 50a); but if such a boy lives with his father (including putative or step-father), even if the "boy" is of doubtful sex (!)<sup>36</sup>, this gives rise to liabilities. In a family firm the employed youth is not entitled to a share unless the father decides otherwise<sup>37</sup>. The latter's estate may be shared at his death (Lk 12,13): meanwhile his sons do not expect a wage. If a son *under* thirteen acquires assets, including lost property, whether or not with the father's permission, this belongs by custom to the father himself, not the acquirer, because the latter currently "ate at the former's table"<sup>38</sup>. The father might waive his rights, or he might not. If the father injured a minor son the latter was entitled to no compensation; but if a third party injured one under thirteen land (say the rabbis) must be bought with the money and he can enjoy the income until he reaches thirteen<sup>39</sup>, when the land itself is his. Such legal rules are straws in the wind.

Time is money, no less with Jews than Greeks. A family spending as long as a week on pilgrimage will return to work promptly, and the absence of an earning member will be the more noticeable the nearer they are to home. Luke, who is interested in property and whose stories have money in them somewhere (cf. Lk 7,41-42; 8,43 [var. lect.] amongst less obvious examples), cannot have been unaware of this. Coming up to thirteen, a boy likes to foresee his future, heralded by the proverbial two hairs "put forth" in the right places and to the right length<sup>40</sup>. Independen-

<sup>35</sup> b. *B.Q.* 87b = Sonc. 503.

<sup>36</sup> Earnestly discussed: Mekilta, *Bahodeš* 8.13-21 (Lauterbach II 257); *Nez.* 5.94 (Lautertach III 48).

<sup>37</sup> Lk 15,12.29-31 is expressive and accurate.

<sup>38</sup> m. *B.B.* III.3; b. *B.B.* 52a = Sonc. 213-214. Maimonides, XIII.IV.xiii, 1,9 (trans. J. J. Rabinowitz, New Haven, 1949, 241, 244). m. *B.M.* I.5; b. *B.M.* 12a-b = Sonc. 67. Maimonides, XI.III.xvii,13 (trans. H. Klein, 1954, 153).

<sup>39</sup> b. *B.Q.* 87b = Sonc. 503; Maimonides, XI.IV.iv,19 (trans. Klein, 175-176).

<sup>40</sup> Maimonides, IV.I.ii,10-17 (13 and 1 day unless the two hairs have not appeared)



dence should be planned for. To what had Joseph's arrangements for Jesus' education led? He and Mary might well fear he had made off deliberately (Prov 28,24)<sup>41</sup>. Could they have guessed he was a spiritual Samson (cf. Lk 23,1; Jdg 15,11-13)? If they are the subject of ἐξεπλάγησαν at v. 48 (the Vulgate, reasonably, leaves this in doubt) they are stunned, "thrown off balance" (so Sym. Ps 47,6 [ιδόντες... ἐξεπλάγησαν MT *rā'û kēn tāmāhû*]; Mk 11,18; Acts 13,12), and no wonder.

#### IV. EDUCATIONAL METHODS<sup>42</sup>

At six (some said five) one started bible study<sup>43</sup>. We are told they began with Leviticus. But that was not so hard as Psalms, which children chanted up and down Israel. The text was learned by rote<sup>44</sup>. Ritual aside, the teachers themselves seldom got further: that stage was looked down on by the predecessors of the rabbis<sup>45</sup>. The text, without traditional interpretation, is a trap<sup>46</sup>. But it has one advantage in the absence of critical editions. The exact readings and cantillation could be checked, as in Vedic studies in India. For example, at Is 44,26 "seeing fire" causes problems, and in a tradition known at Qumran someone had boldly substituted a word making sense<sup>47</sup>. Some Isaiah-learners will have said the "new" reading was correct. Scholars might seek out boys with good memories to confirm the reading and its pedigree<sup>48</sup>. It did not matter

---

(trans. I. Klein [New Haven-London 1972] 10-12).

<sup>41</sup> 1 Esd 4,20. Origen at J. A. Cramer, *Catena...* S. Lucae (Oxford 1841) 27. R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus ran away to study law. Mary feared Jesus would abscond (Lk 1:32-33,35!). Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentarii in IV Evangelia* (Lyon 1681) II 66. Note: according to Jewish jurisprudence if Jesus had *chosen* to be missing for more than three days he could be presumed to have absconded. Three times raises a presumption. Jn 11,39d-e.

<sup>42</sup> Jewish schooling: Schürer, *History* II, § 27 (I).

<sup>43</sup> m. 'Avôt V.21, VI.2.

<sup>44</sup> Riesner, *Jesus*, 196-197.

<sup>45</sup> b. B.M. 33a.

<sup>46</sup> Moore, *Judaism*, II 319.

<sup>47</sup> J. R. Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: a Literary Analysis* (Grand Rapids 1970) 54.

<sup>48</sup> Josephus, *Vita* 8-9 (consulted about the Law at 14).

that the boys had little idea what Isaiah meant. That came later. Precocious boys exist<sup>49</sup>; but our story (in spite of Hellenistic parallels)<sup>50</sup> is not about precocity (so van Iersel, Schweizer), even though (1) the Samuel story has influenced Luke's presentation somewhat and Samuel began to prophesy at twelve<sup>51</sup>, (2) Solomon showed remarkable intelligence at that same age<sup>52</sup>, and (3) wisdom is known to arise in young goody-goodies (Ps 119,99-100).

By twelve years of age (some said ten) another stage could commence and bible-study, not excluding mythology, would acquire its practical value, and solutions to practical problems would be learnt off. An idealistic and ambitious youth would see more than a lucrative employment at the end of this. Meanwhile bible-verses provided a fascinating source of queries and ingenuity. The natural leaders in piety and learning provided some of the native judiciary, necessarily equipped, besides, with foreign languages<sup>53</sup>. Sabbath sermons kept the public alert to the resources of the culture, including its debating skills, in which the masters held a unique prestige.

Queries and debate were, as they still are, the heart of the process<sup>54</sup>. Rote learning gave nearly every male the tools with which to work. Inadequacy was exposed, and imposture detected. The activity was not an alternative to unemployment, because full time addiction to religion-and-law was (outside the Qumran "monks") regarded as phenomenally eccentric (cf. Mt 17,26d). The procedures and etiquette of public debate would indicate who was outstanding, sorting the less from the more adept – but we cannot compare amateurs with professionals because these scholars were none the less serious for their activity being a hobby. Jerusalem

---

<sup>49</sup> tos. *Nidd.* 5,15 at Strack-Billerbeck II, 151.

<sup>50</sup> H. de Jonge, "Sonship", 340-341 elaborates, drawing attention to Plutarch, *Cicero* 2.2.

<sup>51</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 5.348 (just 12). H. de Jonge (1978) 322.

<sup>52</sup> So we are told. LXX 3 Kgs 2,12 (noticed by de Jonge). L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia 1968) IV. 59-60, 131. A version of Susanna says the same of Daniel.

<sup>53</sup> b. *Sanh.* 17b = *Sonc.* 87.

<sup>54</sup> Mk 12,18; Lk 6,9; 17,20; 20,21. The lesson of the Good Samaritan parable is taught by question and answer: R. Bauckham, "The scrupulous priest and the good Samaritan": *NTS* 44 (1998) 975-489 (a principle is raised above mere commandments).

herself (Is 2,3) was the Athens of Jewry<sup>55</sup>. There an accurate knowledge of scripture and the current consensuses on problems could be obtained<sup>56</sup>, and temple colonnades<sup>57</sup> could shelter groups of teachers who initiated debate on any Torah topic. Jews from various regions participated in the process of the Law, agreed to be the "inheritance of the Assembly of Jacob" (Dt 33,4). Greeks could admire, and even watch, a centralizing process which had no counterpart elsewhere as Jews strove to exercise themselves in traditional wisdom (Sir 6,32-37).

*Didaskalos* at Lk 2,46 is very important. Laurentin (p. 43) failed to observe this. In the centre of the passage<sup>58</sup>, where the word μέσον is no surplusage (Lk 10,3; cf. 4,30), Jesus is among friendly holders of prestige. His eventual enemies were Scribes, Pharisees and νομικοί, those engaged in defending Jewish law as they had learned it<sup>59</sup>. Whence, ultimately, they had obtained it was a mystery shrouded in myth. Διδάσκαλοι do not literally figure among those<sup>60</sup>. In due course the public will attribute that title to Jesus himself, as they had to the Baptist (Lk 3,12)<sup>61</sup>. Luke not only will see the mature Jesus as a teacher, who requires his students to act out his lessons (Lk 6,47; 8,15; 11,18), but as one who, at the outset of his public career, vindicated his title to be one of that worthy category, able to teach Jews, and even inquisitive non-Jews, what God required of his chosen people. If he is a Saviour it is through the Word (Lk 8,12c). There is no suggestion, as Eva Krafft (1964) amongst others thought, that Jesus put his διδάσκαλοι to shame. After all, they authenticate him, sociologically speaking.

<sup>55</sup> J. Dupont, "Jésus à douze ans", in *Fête de la Sainte Famille* (Bruges 1961) 31-32 calls it the Sorbonne of Judaism.

<sup>56</sup> Creed, 44. D. D. Sylva at ZNW 78 (1987) 132-140.

<sup>57</sup> Jn 18,20; m. *Sanh.* XI.2; b. *Pes.* 26a; *Sanh.* 88b = Sonc. 588. De Jonge, "Sonship", 329.

<sup>58</sup> H. de Jonge, "Sonship", 339 emphasizes this.

<sup>59</sup> Lk 7,30; 11,45.46.52; 14,3. The one at 10,15 is ambivalent. K. Bornhäuser, *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu* (BFCT 2.23; Gütersloh 1930) 140 anticipated Laurentin in the assumption that the men who marvelled at Jesus were Scribes and Pharisees and therefore his parents were justifiably alarmed. Van Iersel, "Finding", 166 n. 3 rightly dispels the idea.

<sup>60</sup> Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 130.

<sup>61</sup> O. Glombitza, "Die Titel *didaskalos* und *epistatēs* für Jesus bei Lukas": ZNW 49 (1958) 275-278. Riesner, *Jesus*, 247-249.

A teacher (*môreh*)<sup>62</sup> would not entertain inapposite questions or accept irrelevant answers<sup>63</sup>. Impertinent questions might be rejected, and permission to argue withdrawn<sup>64</sup>. One sat to argue but rose to ask questions<sup>65</sup>. A teacher claimed to have learned from his students<sup>66</sup> and scholars sharpened each other like knives<sup>67</sup>. *Lāmēd*, "to teach", also means "to argue". The eager student sat (m. 'Avôt I.4) and drank it all in. It is powerfully argued, by van Israel amongst others, that v. 47 (obviously a parenthesis) is an insertion by Luke into a preexisting story, and that without it Jesus' *intelligence* (Acts 13,7!) would have passed unnoticed. But Luke's result is well-intentioned. The process indicated by ἀκούοντα and ἐπερωτῶντα (v. 46), συνέσει and (NB lastly) ἀποκρίσεσιν (v. 47) (must these two be a *hendiadys*?), could have been drawn by an Aramaic scholar, so closely does it fit the *talmîd*, the genuine student<sup>68</sup>. This is not unknown<sup>69</sup> but it is not usually noticed that, granted his ability at *answering* (Lk 20,26), at the end of the story Jesus' enemies will never debate at that level with him (Lk 22,67-68; Is 66,4). Cf. Lk 20,26; 21,15.

After one has been recognized as a *talmîd*, and gone on to establish one's status as no dilettante, one may be described as a *talmîd hākām*<sup>70</sup>, an advanced student. What made a man διδάσκαλος (*môreh*) was not appointment, but the approbation of his students (who might be of any age). In a bizarre sequel to an intrigue an eighteen-year-old was once made head of an informal academy<sup>71</sup> — a mistake, as it emerged. In the first century no such "making a head" existed: competent people were numerous, and a natural selection could operate.

<sup>62</sup> Not *limēd* as preferred by K. H. Rengstorf, "διδάσκαλος": *TWNT* II, 142-147.

<sup>63</sup> Prov 15,28.

<sup>64</sup> b. *Šab.* 3b = Sonc. 5; *Meil.* 9b; *Sanh.* 17b. m. 'Avôt V.7 (*Ḳ'inyān*). On admitting to seats: b. *Sanh.* 40a = Sonc. 257 (relevant?).

<sup>65</sup> b. *Ber.* 27b = Sonc. 116-117; *Sanh.* 17b = Sonc. 87.

<sup>66</sup> b. *Ta'an.* 7a = Sonc. 26 (R. Ḥanīna).

<sup>67</sup> b. *Ta'an.* 7a = Sonc. 25.

<sup>68</sup> m. 'Avôt V.7. b. *Bekh.* 36a. Maimonides, *Code*, XIV.I.i,5 (trans. Hershman, 1949, 6): *liš'ôl w'le'hēšiv* (M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim...* [New York 1950] 1506, col.ii(top); 1528, col.i). Cf. Lk 10,28; 20,26.39-40.

<sup>69</sup> Strack-Billerbeck, II, 150-151. m. 'Avôt VI.5-6.

<sup>70</sup> b. *Hull.* 9a. He might be invited to sit with judges: b. *Sanh.* 40a (above, n. 64).

<sup>71</sup> b. *Ber.* 28a = Sonc. 167. See 1 Tim 4,12!

The honour due to one's *môreh* was superior to that to one's father<sup>72</sup>. The term "father" was given to an acknowledged superior (1 Sam 24,11; 2 Kgs 2,12; 5,13; 6,21; 13,4; Mt 23,9). The teacher of Torah, who gives life in this world *and* in the world to come (Lev 18,5; Neh 9,29; m. 'Avôt II.7), is superior to the natural father who has given life only in this world, unless, indeed, the latter happens to be one's *môreh* also<sup>73</sup>.

Did public instruction *cease* in Jerusalem when Passover ended (so Plummer)? Lectures at the feasts would naturally deal with their meanings. Mechanical aspects of Passover operated in Jerusalem, and Galileans must have needed tutors to see them through them; but Passover is an on-going preoccupation. Fathers' roles surfaced at Passover; attempts to standardize them occupied attention at Passover, primarily that of males. Texts would be recapitulated in Hebrew, with translations into languages including Aramaic, according to teachers' and pupils' needs as they came from the margins of Jewry to the metropolis. Considerable mental agility was on display. One might ask, "Father and mother are thirsty, water is scarce. Whom should the son satisfy first? Does one apply Dt 5,16 or Lev 19,3<sup>74</sup>?" Greeks, used to rhetorical exercises on imaginary themes, would enjoy the solution.

## V. THE LAW, OBEDIENCE, AND THE PARENTS

All families would be interested in relations between parents and children. Torah, if comprehensive, must explain how to resolve differences between them, granted children were bound to show deference to parents. Texts enjoining this respect are similar to those requiring honour to be paid to God; only the rabbinical mind sees parents and God equalized (cf. Col 3,20). What happens where they appear to be at odds? Was

<sup>72</sup> m. *B.M.* II.11; b. *B.M.* 33a.

<sup>73</sup> See last note.

<sup>74</sup> Moore, *Judaism* II, 133-134. The MT reads Lev 19,3 with "mother" first, so one of the marginal notes at Tg. Neofiti, while the Neofiti text, the LXX and therefore the Vulgate put "father" first. Leviticus here gives a variant of the Ten Commandments. B. D. Levine, *The J. P. S. Torah Commentary, Leviticus* (New York-Jerusalem 1989) 125. The parents are equal in honour: Mekilta, *Bahodeš* 8.35-36.

the father himself not bound to obey God? His ancestors accepted the Covenant, and therefore (it was accepted) he was bound; and God has laid down a quantity of laws of his own devising, the hierarchy amongst which was for the learned to discover. If the father ordered the son to do something the Law of God forbade, as for example working on the Sabbath, the son was entitled to refuse: the Mishnah puts it shortly, and the point is elaborated in the Talmud<sup>75</sup>. Therefore, further to the polite reminder I have mentioned (§ III), the son can explain his want of compliance by referring to the Torah rule to which both father and son are subject. In other cases Luke is clear that a sinner sins both against the father whom he injures and against God simultaneously, so that, in an appropriate case, both father and God should forgive the penitent delinquent<sup>76</sup>. There are, no doubt, literally conflicts, e. g. where the father's needs collide with a Torah obligation, such as taking charge of a wandering animal or helping a person to unload his beast (Ex 23,4-5)<sup>77</sup>. There if the "good deed" can be delegated to a third party the father takes priority: otherwise the stranger's *halakhic* requirements do so<sup>78</sup> – and the conclusion for us is obvious.

Lk 2,49c begins οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι... δεῖ... με, a polite question. Jewish etiquette uses questions instead of assertions or denials<sup>79</sup>. But the statement phrased in this way amounts to this: presuming learning to be possessed by his teachers, Joseph and Mary should have been aware that the group's activities took priority over their commonplace interests. He is not proposing to continue indefinitely in that class in Jerusalem. But was pursuing a course he believed incumbent on him. The study of the

---

<sup>75</sup> Sifra on Lev 19,3. m. *B.M.* II.10; b. *B.M.* 32a = Sonc. 198-199. Midr. R. Num. XIV.6 = Sonc. 590, b. *Yev.* 5b-6a = Sonc. 20-21. Ἐν κυρίῳ has been correctly inserted at Eph 6,1 (bracketed in NA<sup>26</sup>).

<sup>76</sup> Lk 15,18.19.21 are most expressive (Schrenk, *TWNT* V.994).

<sup>77</sup> See n. 75.

<sup>78</sup> b. *Qidd.* 32a = Sonc. 157. Krafft (1964) says (223) that belonging to God is separation from the earthly parents. He is bound by the commandment of his Father, not his parents. "Wann er sich gegen die Eltern entscheidet, das zu bestimmen liegt bei ihm." Quite so.

<sup>79</sup> 1 Cor 6,2; Mt 2,14; 7,9-10.16; 9,5; Lk 6,39; 13,15; 14,5; 17,9; Acts 13,10; Rom 2,21-23. A rebuke: Jdg 13,18. Nolland, *Luke*, 130 citing Gen 12,18 and other examples of reproaches. Add Gen 44,4; Lk 16,2; and b. *Qidd.* 32a. One can turn the tables on one's questioner so.

Law as an occupation was thought superior not only to worldly avocations (Lk 20,46) but even to saving a life, the building of the Temple, and honouring father and mother<sup>80</sup> – hyperbole, no doubt, but the Talmud does not challenge it. All this leads us to the peculiar situation they were in. Could they be accused of negligence?

## VI. PASSOVER, HALAKHA AND PARENTS

Passover is partly occupied with the registration of the diners, the sacrifice of the lamb, and furthermore the feast's origins including a curious feature, a son's scepticism of it all: "What do you mean by this rite (*"vodâ*, "work") (Ex 12,26)?" Because of the Exodus from Egypt (Dt 24,18.22) the Ten Commandments were given, and because of the Covenant (Ex 19,8) other commandments were communicated through Moses. The Ten derive their authority from the Exodus: "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of a *household of slaves*. Thou shalt have none other gods before me... Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy... Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee (Ex 20,2.3.8.12)." That and the next chapter provide ample material for debate at a period when the possible audience was at its maximum. God had *acquired* the Hebrews and made himself their father or patron (Dt 32,6). And all the Torah belonged to God himself (Lk 4,4.8.12): he was indebted to no one for it<sup>81</sup>.

The idea "occupation" is not written by Luke, but it hangs over our passage (2,39-52). Hebrew and Aramaic have the root *'sq*, which means "business" of every type<sup>82</sup>. One sits and occupies oneself in the Torah<sup>83</sup> and one performs commandments (e. g. charitable works)<sup>84</sup>

<sup>80</sup> b. *Meg.* 16b = Sonc. 100-101.

<sup>81</sup> Ps 1,2. "Law of the Lord" occurs 20 times in the TNK; see 1 Chr 16,40; Ps 119,1; "my Law" 9 times, e. g. Prov 3,1; Is 51,7; Jer 31,33; Hos 8,1.12; "thy Law" very frequently, e. g. Neh 9,26; Ps 119,44.97.163.

<sup>82</sup> To be occupied in religious work: Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1098.

<sup>83</sup> m. *'Avôt* VI.1 (*hā 'osēq batôrâ*); Mekilta, *Pisha* 10.133 (Lauterbach, I,167 (*yošvîn w' 'osqîn*)).

<sup>84</sup> b. *Pes.* 50b = Sonc. 244.

– both functions are recommended by the *halakha*, which is both Jewish Law and Jewish custom. Similarly one occupies oneself in commerce or handwork: both are equally occupations<sup>85</sup> with Torah-study, though not equal in esteem with it<sup>86</sup>. If the duty to learn Torah is more meritorious, as the rabbis say, than honouring father and mother<sup>87</sup>, it takes precedence over all obligations tendered by the parents<sup>88</sup>. Josephus claims (c. *Ap.* 2.277) the Law inspired more awe than *any* worldly considerations, its study was incomparably significant (*Ant.* 4.211), and the Jews held their customs inviolable, and studied on that basis (*Ant.* 16.35,41-44). The rabbis' position was ancient. But not every child is capable of becoming a *talmîd*, still less a *talmîd hākām*<sup>89</sup>. Granted that capacity, the Torah, as an "occupation", comes first, as in some circles it still does. The father has had the option to send his son to college, as it were, or to keep him in the work-place. When he is independent he may do enough handwork to survive and give his major attention to Torah, much as many of the rabbis are known to have done, while they praised the joint practice of Torah-learning and worldly pursuits together (m. 'Avôt II.2).

The adult male must place the commandments between his eyes, and on the doorposts of his house (Dt 11,18-20): he must surround his life with its blessings and commitments. He must *delight in the law*<sup>90</sup>, which combines stimulation and vocation. Instances of a poor father withdrawing his son from teachers in Israel (Jn 3,10) must have occurred (Zech 13,3); but the sarcasms of the teachers against such "people of the Land" would have to be borne.

Jesus' delicate defence of his behaviour was surely intended to be overheard. Would he ever abandon what they taught him of etiquette (Sir 23,4)? Surely they know<sup>91</sup>

*d<sup>e</sup> 'ay l<sup>e</sup> meh<sup>e</sup> wēy<sup>93</sup> d<sup>e</sup> bēy<sup>94</sup> b<sup>e</sup> nēy<sup>95</sup> 'abbā<sup>96</sup>?*

<sup>85</sup> m *Qidd.* IV.14: *la<sup>e</sup> sôq.*

<sup>86</sup> m. 'Avôt II.2; *Qidd.* I.10; cf. 'Avôt IV.10.

<sup>87</sup> b. *Qidd.* 40a = Sonc. 197.

<sup>88</sup> Moore, *Judaism* II, 239, 241, 243.

<sup>89</sup> b. *Hull.* 9a = Sonc. 37.

<sup>90</sup> Ps 1,2; 119,70.77.92. "I love thy Law": Ps 119,97.165.

<sup>91</sup> Oð expects the answer "Yes": Lk 4,12; 10,40; 11,40; 12,6; 13,15.16; 14,5; 15,4. Mñ expects "No"; Lk 6,39 illustrates both.

<sup>92</sup> *'ay* ("I was bound to be...") is more correct than either *šārik* (necessary) or



ὅτι ἐν τοῖς (υἱοῖς) τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναι με;

Τί ὅτι ἐζήτειτε με; must imply they knew his curiosity about the lecture-seminars.

That this ἐν governs here the *masculine* article<sup>97</sup> (e. g. 1 Cor 1,11; Rom 16,10-11), not the neuter, was seen by Theodoret<sup>98</sup>, approved by Döderlein<sup>99</sup>, to whose idea Farmer leaned<sup>100</sup>. It has been wrongly dismissed<sup>101</sup>. In classical and NT Greek the definite article followed by the genitive of kindred, attachment, or association (including *household*) is notorious<sup>102</sup>. The genitive is the "case of dependence" and therefore there is no ellipsis here. In Hebrew and Aramaic, on the other hand, where the article cannot be used in this way, the noun (e. g. *bānîm*) is

*hayayw* (liable). The widely-held theory that δεῖ alludes to the divine compulsion whereby the story of the Messiah must unfold (Laurentin, 102-103; Marshall; de Jonge) could be far-fetched. However, Lk 13,33 provides a parallel – his own volition is not excluded in either case.

<sup>93</sup> The special use of the verb "to be" (Aram. *h<sup>a</sup>wah*) meaning "to attend" (as a schoolboy or collegian), and therefore "to discuss" with *b<sup>e</sup>* or *'al* is found at b. *Ket.* 72b; *Ber.* 45b; *Gitt.* 4b; *Naz.* 16b; *Qidd.* 50b. *h<sup>a</sup>wēynan*, "we were at the stage of", *B. Q.* 92b. At *B. B.* 25b *kî h<sup>a</sup>'wa'an bēy Rav Kah'nā'* means "when we studied with R. Kah." Jastrow, 338 col.ii Pa (2). See Horace, *Sat.* 1.9,2; *Ep.* 1.1,11.

<sup>94</sup> Idiomatic use of *bēy*, school or college: b. *Ber.* 17a; *B. B.* 25b. It suggests family also: *Sot.* 10a; *Meg.* 12a (Jastrow, 158 col.ii).

<sup>95</sup> *Bānîm* / υἱοί for dependants-associates or clients is notorious. Mt 17,26. Sons of the prophets: 1 Kgs 20,35; 2 Kgs 2,7. Lk 11,19; Jn 1,12; 8,41.44. The superiority of *bānîm* here is obvious if one compares "*vādāyw* or *y'rē'āyw*."

<sup>96</sup> '*abbā'* is nominative as well as vocative (Mk 14,36). One should not call God "Father" *only* when one is in distress: Midr. R. Exod. XLVI.4 = Sonc. 530-532!

<sup>97</sup> Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon* sub v. ἐν I.3. Epict. 3.27,8; Sir 19,8; Diod. Sic. 19,51,1,4.

<sup>98</sup> *De incarnatione Domini* 24 (Migne, PG 75.1461CD) "domestics (οἰκεῖοις) of the Father" observed by but repudiated by Laurentin and Fitzmyer.

<sup>99</sup> J. Döderlein, "Das Lernen des Jesusknaben": *Neues Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie* 1 (1892) 606-619.

<sup>100</sup> G. Farmer at J. Hastings (ed.) *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (Edinburgh 1913) I, 225-230 at 228.

<sup>101</sup> Loisy (1907); Temple (1922); Laurentin, 42-46 (Sir 42,10 is no parallel and Is 3,6 is of no help). Nolland, *Luke*, 134-135. De Jonge unaccountably neglects this solution.

<sup>102</sup> Son: Thucydides 4.104,4; Mt 4,21; Jn 21,2; brothers: Lysias 32.24; Alciphro 2.2; associates: Xenophon, *Anabasis* 1.2,15; 1 Cor 15,23; slaves: Hippocrates, *Hum.* 20; Rom 16,10; 1 Cor 1,11.

required. As for ἐν, its meaning "amongst" is well documented<sup>103</sup>. It is right for our passage since it provides a contrast with συγγενεῖς καὶ γνῶστοί, as Laurentin admits (43).

Dependence on God is stated unequivocally at m. 'Avôt III.7(8). The concept "sons" of God, devoted to his commandments, is well known<sup>104</sup>; also, as Winter pointed out (1954: 170-1), Frg. Tg. Ex 15,2 shows children pointing to God as "our Father". Hônî was a child of God, so that the latter did miracles for him<sup>105</sup>. Into this sort of family (cf. Lk 10,22) Jesus has obtained entry. Already authenticated passively (Lk 2,34-38) he achieves an active authentication from them (cf. 2,38). They are "disciples of the Lord" (Is 54,13; cf. Dt 4,1; Ps 143,10; Is 48,17). Mal 1,6 makes it clear that God requires at least as much honour as the human father. God is "father" in later Judaism (as is well known) and Greeks might agree<sup>106</sup>. Schrenk points out that the synoptic gospels (and see Jn 2,16) show Jesus speaking of "my Father"<sup>107</sup>; and Lk 23,46 is conclusive.

However, one is not encouraged to study Torah and Mishnah and then to be contumacious towards one's parents and teachers, or towards any superior in wisdom and/or rank<sup>108</sup>! One must never "despise" one's father<sup>109</sup>. A compromise must be worked out, whereby the student consults the interests of his parents until he reaches majority, if not thereafter also. Such a compromise attracted Jesus' scepticism in due course (1 Kgs

<sup>103</sup> Mt 11,11; Lk 14,31; Acts 2,29; 4,34; 20,25; Rom 1,5; 1 Cor 5,1; 1 Pet 5,1-2; 2,12; Jude 14.

<sup>104</sup> m. 'Avôt III.14; Mt 5,45; 9,15; 10,21; 17,26; Lk 6,35; Rom 8,14; LXX Ps 88,6.8; 149,1; Dt 32,82; Wisd 5,5; 3 Macc 6,28. Winter (1954) 173-175. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, *Lexicon*, s.v. υἱός 1c. Cf. Jn 8,41-44!

<sup>105</sup> m. Ta'an. III.8; b. Ta'an. 23a. Josephns, *Ant.* 14.22-24. G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London 1973) 69-72. Prov 23,25.

<sup>106</sup> Mal 1,6; Is 1,2; Tob 13,4; 3 Macc 5,7; 6,3.8; Wisd 2,16-18; 11,10; 14,3; Sir 23,1.4; 51,10; Acts 5,93; Test. Isaac 8,10. m. Sôt. IX.15; 'Avôt V.20; VIII.9; b. Ber. 11b. "My father": Jer 3,19.22; 31,20; LXX 1 Chr 29,10; Mal 2,10; Ps 68,6(5); 73,15; 103,13; Is 63,15-16; 64,7. Plato, *Tim.* 28C, 34B, 37C, 41A; *Ep.* VI.323C-D. Schenk, *TWNT*, V, 946-1016, esp. 972, 977-978; W. Bousset / H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums* (Tübingen 41966) 377-378, esp. 377 n. 1.

<sup>107</sup> Lk 22,29; 24,49; 9,26; 11,13; 12,32.

<sup>108</sup> b. Ber. 17a (lines 40-41) = Sonc. 102 (*b't*, "to kick", "to be contumacious").

<sup>109</sup> b. Ber. 17a = Sonc. 102.

19,20-21; Lk 9,59.61-62). Obedience to the father can involve conventionality (Lk 11,48; Jn 8,41-44). It will now be up to him whether, having attained his freedom (which may or may not promise some form of progress), he should embark on higher studies. If he becomes a teacher his pupils, and female patrons (Lk 8,2-3) will support him. But for the present Jesus made the right decision, for Luke encapsulates the whole within a framework of wisdom (note σοφία at 2,40.52). Somewhat unnecessarily Laurentin sees Jesus identified with wisdom, God's first-born (ch. 7). Rather, Jesus' intelligence protected him from unwise intellectualities. His involvement with the Temple (which Laurentin inflates to include the Father's dwelling [136, 174]) would have advantaged no one, whereas Jesus has shown his wisdom in the choice of his company (cf. van Iersel, 168).

Did the boy Jesus have no cash in his purse? Did he beg? Jerusalem at Passover will have been overrun with beggars. Sitting and listening to the teachers he will, surely, have been asked by someone where he came from. Sects were on the look out for proselytes (Mt 23,15), Essenes for possible adoptees<sup>110</sup>. Hostels existed for the destitute<sup>111</sup>. Charitable funds (Dt 15,7-8.11) must have been available for *bona fide* stranded students. Jesus has now matriculated as surely as if he had signed a register. Nevertheless ὁ σοφὸς οὐδὲν πράττει τοῦ εὐδοκμεῖν χάριν (for reputation's sake). He can now submit (ὑποτάσσεσθαι: Eph 5,22; 1 Tim 3,4; Heb 12,9) to Joseph and Mary, his legal parents. No wonder he found favour in the sight of God and people (Prov 2,1.4). One can indeed be esteemed by one's earthly family *and* by any assembly of wise men<sup>112</sup>. But his eventual exposition of texts did not suit conventional minds (Lk 4,28). Did his parents then deplore his "compromise" (Jn 1,11 οἱ ἴδιοι, cf. 3,2)? The Asian easily construes originality as want of deference to parents. Jesus' relatives understandably wanted to distract

<sup>110</sup> Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* 2.120.

<sup>111</sup> The famous pre-A.D. 70 inscription of Theodotus (*Corp. Ins. Jud.* II, no. 1404). J. Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past* (Princeton 1946) 228 and fig. 105. References at K. Atkinson, "On further defining...": *NTS* 43 (1997) 4. 491-502 at 500 n. 40.

<sup>112</sup> b. *Ber.* 17a = Sonc. 99. The definition of the "good and pious men" at b. *Qidd.* 40a = Sonc. 116-117. But note Lk 21,16.

him (Lk 8,19-21)<sup>113</sup>. He was not mad (cf. Mk 3,20-21), but he had a divine mandate (Is 40,7-10 [8-11]). His affiliation to the dependents of the heavenly Father remained, even if not all of them saw eye to eye in detail with those teachers at Jerusalem.

Jesus even made a point of emphasizing the inevitable dilemma. He taught that conflict with father and mother was built into the risk which the believer will incur (Mt 10,37 / Lk 14,26; 18,29). His disciples might or might not take Levi as their precedent (Dt 33,9; cf. Ex 32,27-29). Jesus' aptitude for ἀποκρίσεις shows he did *not* accept the piety of his own day. M. Dibelius and Winter are not supported by Luke<sup>114</sup>. Indeed it was the parents, brothers, συγγενεῖς and φίλοι who will betray and kill early Christians (Lk 21,16 amplifying Mk 13,12; cf. Ps 99,9(8)), while the οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως (Gal 6,10, not noticed by Laurentin) provide the company of choice for the maturing Christ. If this is borne in mind Lk 2,39-52 seems not totally un-integrated into the gospel, as many have surmised.

Finally, it is known Luke had the Samuel story in mind, Samuel who was never troubled by parental interference (2,52 reminds us of 1 Sam 2,26 as well as Prov 3,4). It is less known that Luke raises echoes of Samson of the tribe of Dan. Samson's birth was foretold to Manoah's barren wife by an angel (Jdg 13) who described him as one who would *begin to save Israel* (ps. Philo, *LAB.* 42.3 has "will free Israel"). Jacob considered Samson a possible Messiah but rejected him in favour of the true Messiah to come, so that the medieval vision of Samson as a type of Christ is well founded<sup>115</sup>. Samson too suffered from opposition from

<sup>113</sup> De Jonge, "Sonship", 352-353. Cf. Jn 11,3.4.6.14.22.40.42!

<sup>114</sup> M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen 1933) 103-104 (EV; *From Tradition to Gospel* [London 1934] 106-107). Winter (1954) 178, n. 76.

<sup>115</sup> D. J. Harrington, "Birth narratives in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* and the gospels", in M. P. Horgan / P. J. Kobelski (eds.), *To Touch the Text* (Fs J. A. Fitzmyer) (New York 1989) 316-324. Samson as a type of Christ (*Encyclopedia Judaica* XIV [Jerusalem 1972] 774; *Anchor Bible Dictionary* V [New York 1992] 954), accepted by J. Lightfoot and S. Clark (1690), accepted and developed by Matthew Henry *ad* Jdg 14,2, follows an idea present at Tg. Neofiti, Tg. ps. Jonathan, and Frag. Tg. to Gen 49,18 (on the pre-Christian age of Frag. Tg. Gen 49,10-13 see Winter, 1954, 159) and Midr. R. Gen 97 NV = Sonc. 908-9; 98.14 = Sonc. 964; Midr. R. Num. 14.9 = Sonc. 605. Ginzberg, *Legends* IV, 48. J. Bowker, *Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge 1969) 279, 285, 291. See also M. McNamara, "The New Testament and Palestinian Targums to the Pentateuch": *VD* 43 (1965) 288-300 at 243-

his brothers<sup>116</sup>, with his habit of keeping his parents in ignorance of the authority behind his actions (Jdg 14,6; Lk 2,43)<sup>117</sup>. Furthermore, an even stranger aroma was noticed by Cornelius a Lapide<sup>118</sup>. That the Beloved should be searched for, found, and lost again is a theme of the Song of Songs. The Targum explains Cant 3,2 in terms of Israel's search round about the Tabernacle for God as the source of learning. The first three chapters of the Song have been understood by the targumist and by many rabbis as referring to the days of the Messiah and the rebuilding of the Sanctuary (so Edersheim). Such a fanciful adumbration of searching and finding Christ (Lk 24,5.23.24; Jn 20,15; cf. Jn 7,34,36; 8,21)<sup>119</sup> is no doubt Luke's doing<sup>120</sup>, though no direct allusion to the Resurrection can be found in his text<sup>121</sup>. For Luke's preparation in 2,25-38 must not be ignored. The baby Jesus was welcomed by the Tribes of Israel awaiting the Messiah, who will bring, in due course, contradictions and exposures<sup>122</sup>. That Cant 3,2 somehow lay behind our passage was noticed in the seventeenth century and entered the stream of what is now old-fashioned exegesis<sup>123</sup>. So a tale which had a strong traditional ori-

---

245; Black, *Aramaic Approach*, App.D, p. 308.

<sup>116</sup> Midr. R. Num. 14.9 = Sonc. 605.

<sup>117</sup> The coincidence of οὐκ ἔγνωσαν went unnoticed because the Textus Receptus reads ἔγνω Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, one of a cluster of corruptions noticed by H. Alford, *Greek Testament I* (Cambridge 1880) 465 n. and B. F. Westcott / F. J. A. Hort, *New Testament. Introduction* (London 1896), "Note on selected readings", pp. 56-57. On Samson's obedience to God see Augustine, *De civ. dei* i,26. Derrett at *FN* 8 (1995) 83-84.

<sup>118</sup> Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentarii* II, 67.

<sup>119</sup> A. Robert approved by Laurentin (1966) 120, n. 21, and see 137 n. 10.

<sup>120</sup> For Luke's use of the Song at Lk 7,36-50 see J. D. M. Derrett, *New Resolutions of Old Conundrums* (Shipston-on-Stour 1986) 131. S. Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (AB 36; Rome 1969) 77, n. 3-7. And Is 11,2 is messianic. For the role of Jerusalem again see Lk 24,33.52.

<sup>121</sup> J. K. Elliot's idea (1971-2) is brusquely but fairly rejected by de Jonge (1978) 326-327. Laurentin's finding of the Passion story as an example of Recovery as a parallel to the Resurrection, comparing Jesus' return to his Father in John (p. 131), and his presence in the Temple at Lk 2,46, will strike one as far-fetched. John's indebtedness to Luke is, however, worthy of further examination.

<sup>122</sup> Derrett, "Ἀντιλεγόμενον, ῥομφαία... (Lk 2:34 35)": *FN* 6 (1993) 207-218. On the conservative attitude of Joseph and Mary see P. F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* (SNTS Mono. 57; Cambridge 1989) 112, cf. 131.

<sup>123</sup> Matthew Henry *ad loc.* (1708-1710); I. H. Michaelis, *Uberiores adnotationes in*

gin, preserving semitic ideas<sup>124</sup> as well as semitic mannerisms, has been doctored by Luke to fit the scenario of the Messiah. It is hardly for us to comment on his success<sup>125</sup>.

The angel's dealings with Samson's parents and the aura of Canticles dispel the contention of van Iersel that (1) no "midrashic" quality abides in Lk 2,41-52 as it attached to earlier portions of the chapter, and (2) that the story, even as it stands (including v. 47)<sup>126</sup>, is primarily "story telling" without catechetical implications<sup>127</sup>. Indeed the motif of the child who evades his parent to follow the will of God and yet compromises with him to secure his and his spouse's welfare is highly catechetical.

## VII. APPENDED NOTE

There is a story of the Buddha Gotama's recruiting a follower which somehow resembles our story. How the resemblance arose is an affair of Buddhologists, if of any<sup>128</sup>. There is a notorious story of Yasa, the spoiled child of a rich couple. He was attracted by the Buddha's *dhamma*. His distraught parents searched for him, concerned that he might fall into a wandering ascetic's hands. The troubles of the rich were ventilated and Yasa's predicament illustrated it. In due course Yasa's father became a believer and a householder-supporter of the Buddha's mission, a fabulous conversion, a moral for conventional fathers<sup>129</sup>. His consent was obligatory for Yasa to be received as a novice (with a view to becoming a monk); and when it was granted one suspects others were at home to undertake his duties there. If one cares to compare the two stories, that in Buddhist scriptures is slightly more amusing than Luke's.

---

*Canticum Canticorum* (Halle 1720) 627.

<sup>124</sup> Winter (1954) 178.

<sup>125</sup> Imaginative handling of our passage continues: J. W. Miller, *Jesus at Thirty: a Psychological and Historical Portrait* (Minneapolis 1997).

<sup>126</sup> Van Iersel, "Finding", 169, 171.

<sup>127</sup> Van Iersel, 164-165.

<sup>128</sup> J. D. M. Derrett, "Wasserwandel": *ZRGG* 41 (1989) n.3, 193-214.

<sup>129</sup> A. Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha... de la quête de l'éveil à la conversion de Sāriputra et de Maudgalyāyana* (Paris 1963) 199-228.