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THE parable of the sheep and the goats, with which Matthew brings his presentation of the teaching of Jesus to a resounding climax, has attracted widespread scholarly interest in recent years. Intense though this interest has been, the range of agreement on issues of interpretation and tradition-history has proved remarkably narrow and hardly extends beyond the unanimous opinion that Matthew xxv. 31–46 is not, strictly speaking, a parable. While it is likely that most will agree with the recent proposal of Johannes Friedrich to classify this material...


as an "apocalyptic revelation-discourse", views remain sharply opposed on several key questions: Does the reference to the Son of man (Matt. xxv. 31) belong integrally to the discourse, or is it a Matthaean insertion? Does the substance of the discourse as a whole derive from Matthew himself, or from pre-Matthaean but post-Easter tradition, or even from Jesus? Do the persons assembled before the judge consist of Gentiles and/or Jews, or Christians and/or non-Christians? Does the term "one of the least of these my brethren" denote a member of the Christian community, or a Christian missionary, or simply and without restriction any needy person? Finally, how does this discourse integrate with Jewish traditions such as those in 1 Enoch xxxvii–lxxi, and with Christian traditions, often cited as parallels, in Matthew x. 40–42, Mark ix. 37 and Luke x. 16, or Matthew xix. 28 = Luke xxii. 28–30?

In order to try and establish an answer to some of these questions, we shall discuss in sequence the similar Christian traditions, then the Jewish ones, and finally the internal problems of Matthew xxv. 31–46 itself.

I

1. Matthew x. 42 is clearly very similar to Matthew xxv. 35, 37, 42, 44 in declaring: "Whoever gives to one of these little ones even a cup of cold water because he is a disciple, truly, I say to you, he shall not lose his reward." The discussion of this saying has to keep an eye firmly on Matthew x. 40 = Luke x. 16 and on Mark ix. 41. This is because of the occasional suggestion that Matthew x. 40, 42 together preserve material which was linked in pre-Markan tradition (thus, E. Schweizer1), and the quite common suggestion that Matthew x. 42 itself is more primitive than Mark ix. 41 (thus, J. A. T. Robinson2). In such a situation consideration must also be given to Matthew x. 41 which lacks any formal parallel, but which contributes to the section with which Matthew brings his version of the mission


charge to a climax. Our own concern will be not only with the interrelationships of traditions and with their most primitive forms, but also to prepare the ground for a proper comparison of one primary tradition with another primary tradition. As will become clear, the discussion of Matthew xxv. 31–46 has all too often been damaged by a tendency to appeal to a secondary form of one tradition when engaging with the primary form of another.

(i) Matthew x. 40/Luke x. 16

Matthew’s version is

\[ \delta \ \delta e\chi\omega \nu \ \pi \mu \alpha \varsigma \ \epsilon \mu \epsilon \ \delta \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha \ \tau \alpha \ \alpha \ \pi \alpha \sigma \sigma \iota \iota \lambda \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \ \mu \epsilon \]  

while Luke’s version is

\[ \delta \ \alpha \kappa \omega \nu \ \pi \mu \omega \nu \ \epsilon \mu \omega \ \alpha \kappa \omega \nu \epsilon \iota \]  

The presence of Q material here is indicated by the agreement of \( \pi \mu \alpha \varsigma \) (Matthew) \( \pi \mu \omega \nu \pi \mu \alpha \varsigma \) (Luke) over against the comparable Markan phrase \( \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi \alpha \delta \iota \nu \) (Mark ix. 37), and above all by the schematic agreement between Matthew and Luke in positioning the saying at the end of the mission charge.¹

There are, however, variations between the two forms of the Q saying which call for explanation². Thus, Matthew has two statements of equivalence as against three in Luke; in Matthew both statements deal with positive response whereas in Luke the second and third are negative; in Matthew the crucial verb is \( \delta \chi \omicron \omicron \mu \alpha i \) whereas Luke uses \( \alpha \kappa \omega \nu \) and \( \alpha \theta e\tau \epsilon \omega \).

The case for Matthaean primitiveness when the two versions diverge can appeal to (a) the \( \alpha \kappa \omega \nu / \alpha \theta e\tau \epsilon \omega \) antithesis in Luke vii. 30 (compare Matt. xxi. 32) as supposed Luke R,³ and (b) the correspondence with \( \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \pi \omega \) in the similar saying, John xiii. 20.

³ For the sake of brevity the following abbreviations are used: “Matt R” for “Matthaean redaction” etc., and “diff” for an alteration to source material or a variation between two versions of common source material.
But the case for Lukan primitiveness is far stronger: (a) Elsewhere Luke retained \( \mu \gamma \delta \varepsilon \chi \omicron \mu \alpha \nu \) at ix. 5 (Mark iii. 11), ix. 48 (Mark ix. 37) and x. 10 (= Matt. x. 14). He shows no tendency towards \( \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \omega \), which occurs nowhere in Acts and whose sole occurrence in Luke (vii. 30) probably preserves the Q wording.¹

(b) The occurrence of \( \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \acute{\alpha} \nu \) in John xiii. 20 is counterbalanced by the only Johannine use of \( \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \omega \) in a similar saying in a similar context (xii. 48, cf. xii. 44 f.). We can also note four Pauline instances of which the most important is 1 Thessalonians iv. 8: \( \dot{o} \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{k} \acute{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \rho \omega \tau \nu \nu \dot{a} \theta \varepsilon \tau \dot{e} \dot{i} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \acute{\alpha} \tau \nu \nu \theta \acute{e} \alpha \nu \ldots \). The closeness of this to Luke x. 16 is clear.² (c) Influences bringing pressure to bear on Matthew to make a change can be discerned along two lines. Firstly, \( \delta \varepsilon \chi \omicron \mu \alpha \nu \) had been used immediately beforehand in Matthew x. 14 = Luke x. 10. Secondly, Mark ix. 37b, which uses \( \delta \varepsilon \chi \omicron \mu \alpha \nu \), was to be dropped by Matthew in his immediate parallel (xviii. 5), thus creating the expectation that it would turn up elsewhere. This brings us naturally to (d): the points of disagreement between Matthew x. 40 and Luke x. 16 are precisely the points of agreement between Matthew x. 40 and Mark ix. 37.

The evidence suggests, therefore, that Matthew x. 40 is a conflation of Mark ix. 37 and Luke x. 16. Further, the original Q tradition brought the mission charge to an end and ran as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{o} \dot{\alpha} \kappa \omega \nu \nu \nu \acute{o} \mu \omega \nu \acute{e} \mu \omega \dot{\acute{o}} \dot{\alpha} \kappa \omega \nu \\
\kappa \acute{a} \iota \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{\mu} \acute{a} \acute{s} \acute{e} \acute{m} \acute{\acute{e}} \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \dot{\acute{e}} \dot{\acute{e}} \\
\dot{o} \dot{\acute{e}} \acute{e} \acute{\acute{m}} \dot{\acute{e}} \dot{\acute{\alpha}} \theta \varepsilon \tau \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \dot{\acute{e}} \dot{\acute{e}} \dot{\tau} \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \acute{p} \alpha \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\acute{e}} \iota \lambda \alpha \tau \acute{a} \dot{\acute{e}} \dot{\mu}.
\end{align*}
\]

Both setting and content indicate that this equivalence-formula corresponds to the Jewish shaliah principle that "the one sent by a man is as the man himself" (Ber. v. 5).³

² A. Polag, Die Christologie der Logienquelle (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977), p. 70, notes the implication of refusing a claim, which is common to Luke x. 16, John xii. 48 and 1 Thess. iv. 8.
⁴ See K. H. Rengstorf, \( \acute{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\acute{e}} \lambda \lambda \omega \), TDNT, 1 (1964), p. 424 f.
(ii) Matthew x. 42/Mark ix. 41

Matthew’s saying runs

καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ποτίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τοῦτων
ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ,
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

This must be compared with Mark’s saying:

ὁς γὰρ ἐὰν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος
ἐν ὄνοματι ὅτι Χριστὸν ἐστε,
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

This time the evidence suggests strongly that Matthew’s sole source is Mark ix. 41. (a) The range of common features is wide: the ἀμὴν introduction, the reference to giving a drink, the allusions to the “name”, and the promise of no loss of reward. (b) Distinctive Matthaean features are congruent with Matt R. Thus, firstly, the shift from ὃς ἐὰν to ὃς εἶναι is in line with Matthew xviii. 5 diff Mark ix. 37a. Secondly, εἰς τῶν μικρῶν τοῦτων is in line with Matthew xviii. 10, 14 diff Luke xv. 7, and, in this case, is encouraged by the discussion of the child in Mark ix. 36f. and by the occurrence of the same phrase in Mark ix. 42a. Thirdly, ψυχρός brings in more vivid and specific details showing awareness of conditions in a hot country1 (cf. Ned. viii. 7). Fourthly, several, if not all, other instances of μόνον in Matthew are redactional: v. 47 diff Luke vi. 33; viii. 8 diff Luke vii. 7; ix. 21 diff Mark v. 28; xiv. 36 diff Mark vi. 56; xxi. 19, 21 diff Mark xi. 13, 23. Fifthly, the only other εἰς ὄνομα formulations in the synoptic gospels (apart from Matt. x. 41) are in Matthew xviii. 20 and xxviii. 19, both of which are very probably Matt R. (c) The immediate Matthaean context shows an awareness of Mark ix. 41. It is hardly coincidental that two verses after Matthew x. 42 there occurs the Matt R phrase τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (xi. 2 diff Luke vii. 18) which is therefore very probably a reminiscence2 of Mark’s ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε. (d) That Mark ix. 41, with whose contents Matthew agrees, should be missing from the Matthew xviii context in which the adjacent Mark ix material is

1 Cf. J. Friedrich, op. cit. p. 96.
2 On the general phenomenon of reminiscence, see H. Schürmann, Traditionsgeschichtiche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien (Düsseldorf, 1968), pp. 111–25.
incorporated, makes it likely that it would appear at some point elsewhere in Matthew and therefore that x. 42 is that point.

We can add to these arguments some further considerations which tell against Schweizer's view that Matthew x. 40, 42 provide evidence of a pre-Markan combination of traditions. (a) Since Luke x. 16 is the counterpart of Matthew x. 40 and stems from Q, the proposal requires that any counterpart of x. 42 should have been in Q. But there is neither verbal nor schematic evidence to that effect. (b) While the verb δέχομαι can stand for hospitality¹ and therefore permit a link with the "giving of water" theme in x. 42, the absence of δέχομαι from the Luke x. 16 Vorlage makes possible no such link.

The evidence therefore suggests that Matthew x. 42 is exclusively dependent on Mark ix. 41. Moreover, there is no evidence in Matthew of a traditional association between x. 40 and x. 42.

(iii) Matthew x. 41:

\[ \begin{align*}
\delta \delta \chi \circ \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ \nu \pi \rho \circ \gamma \tilde{t} \eta \nu & \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \ \bar{o} \nu \mu \circ \mu \ \pi \rho \circ \gamma \tilde{t} \nu \mu \\
\mu \iota \sigma \theta \nu \ \pi \rho \circ \gamma \tilde{t} \nu \ & \lambda \mu \iota \nu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota \nu \\
\delta \delta \chi \circ \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ \nu \ \\
\delta \iota \kappa \iota \alpha \iota \nu & \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \ \\
\mu \iota \sigma \theta \nu \ \delta \iota \kappa \iota \alpha \iota \nu & \lambda \mu \iota \nu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota \nu.
\end{align*} \]

This saying, which has no parallel in Mark or Luke, could in principle be traced to special Matthaean tradition,² or to Q,³ or to Matt R. Of these possibilities the third is the strongest, for the following reasons: (a) Matthew x. 41 corresponds to x. 40 in respect of its structural parallelism, its use of δέχομαι (itself Matt R in x. 40), and its concern with mission. (b) Matthew x. 41 corresponds to x. 42 in respect of the theme of hospitality, the eis όνομα formulation, the matching of the double prophet/righteous man references and the eis τῶν μικρῶν τοῦτον = μαθητῆς reference (based on the equivalence of the two terms), and the promise of future reward. This double overlap with two sayings which, in the history of tradition, were originally separate, sug-

² J. Friedrich, op. cit. p. 94.
³ D. Lüthmann, Die Redaktion der Logienquelle (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969), p. 110, uses the rather imprecise term "die Q tradierende Gemeinde" but does not clarify its relationship to Q as a document.
gests that the intervening saying (x. 41) is the product of their having been brought together, which is itself the achievement of Matt R. This is confirmed by a consideration of the προφήτης καὶ δίκαιος combination, which turns out to be present in other Matthaean passages drawing upon but also modifying Q: xiii. 17 diff Luke x. 23 f. and xxiii. 29, 35 diff Luke xi. 47, 50. Moreover, the insertion of these references to particular persons in x. 41 gave content to the following word τῶν τῶν (x. 42) which, even if it is a Semitism, needs some clarifying point of reference.

We can conclude, consequently, that the material in Matthew x. 40-42 is drawn from Q (cf. Luke x. 16), from Mark (ix. 37b, 41) and from Matt R (x. 41 and details of x. 40, 42). The guiding concern at the Matthaean stage of tradition-history was mission, in which Matthew followed Q while amplifying for a situation in which itinerant preachers are named prophets and righteous men. It remains to be seen whether or not in adding a redacted form of Mark ix. 41 at this point he also imposed the mission theme on material having originally no such concern. This brings us to the question of the tradition-history of Mark ix. 37b, 41 and the associated Markan material.

2. Mark ix. 41 is particularly close to Matthew xxv. 35, 37, 42, 44 and a study of its tradition-history therefore promises to be very fruitful for any approach to Matthew's apocalyptic revelation-discourse.

The discussion must take account of two possibilities: the saying may be an isolated one, needing to be considered without reference to context, or it may belong to a recoverable context which could have a bearing on its meaning. In its present context it belongs to a Markan section introduced by the second major passion prediction (ix. 30-32), developing by way of the "Dispute about Greatness" (ix. 33-37) and the "Strange Exorcist" (ix. 38-40) material, on beyond ix. 41 into a series of catchword-linked sayings about offences (ix. 42-48, 49-50). The material about offences does not contribute to our present investigation. As for ix. 38-40, it is widely recognized that this is an interruption produced by Mark's own "sandwich structure" technique, and that the tradition-history does not lead back as far
as the pre-Easter situation. This leaves us with ix. 33-37, 41, all of which needs careful scrutiny.

(i) Mark ix. 33:

\[ \text{καὶ ἠλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ.} \]
\[ \text{καὶ ἐν τῇ οἶκῳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτοῦς;} \]
\[ τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίσθη; \]

The widespread tendency to regard this whole verse as Mark R seems entirely justified up to a point: (a) \( \text{ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ} \) is typical of the Markan secrecy scheme, cf. vii. 17, 24; ix. 28; x. 10.
(b) \( \text{ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ} \) is typical of the Markan journey pattern, cf. viii. 27; ix. 30; x. 17, 32. (c) That Jesus should ask a question in order to initiate discussion of an earlier occurrence but do so only later in time may well indicate a secondary construction.
(d) The verb \( \text{ἐπερωτάω} \) is typical of Mark, cf. vii. 5, 17; viii. 29; ix. 28, etc.

One detail, however, may be pre-Markan: \( \text{Καφαρναοῦμ.} \) Certainly this has on occasion been treated as Mark R on the grounds that it tends to occur in the introductions to pericopae, i.e. at points where editorial activity is often pronounced. But against this: (a) Jesus' activity in Capernaum is attested outside narrative traditions, cf. Matthew x. 23 = Luke 10, 14, and details of setting have of necessity to occur at the beginning. (b) This particular Capernaum reference does not fit smoothly into the developing Markan sequence, as W. Wrede hinted long ago. Mark has Jesus go through (not into) Galilee in ix. 30 and into the Judaean hills in x. i. Since Capernaum is well inside the

---

5 *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen, 1901), p. 36 f. Since the secrecy theme in ix. 30b is clearly Mark R it is no argument for Mark R in ix. 33 that there is "the difficulty of reconciling the stay in Capernaum with a secret journey through Galilee", as argued by Nineham, op. cit. p. 252.
northern area of Galilee it is scarcely reached after a journey through the region as a whole, nor is it any kind of base for a movement into the hill country of Judaea. The dislocation to the Markan scheme brought about by Καφαρναοῦμ (ix. 33) suggests pre-Markan tradition.

(ii) Mark ix. 34:

{oj δὲ ἐσιώτων: πρὸς ἄλληλος
γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ τίς μείζων.}

Again we must allow for substantial Markan interference: (a) The silence motif is typical of Mark and, as the response to a challenging question, similar to οἰ δὲ ἐσιώτων in iii. 4. (b) Mark several times uses πρὸς ἄλληλος, cf. iv. 41; viii. 16; xv. 31. (c) ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ is as suspect here as in ix. 33.

But there are also some small hints of pre-Markan tradition:
(a) διελέχθησαν is an aorist doing duty here as a pluperfect, which is certainly possible but which also raises the question of whether it should be seen as a more normal straightforward aorist. More significantly, the verb διαλέγομαι occurs nowhere else in the synoptic gospels and contrasts with Mark's normal tendency to use διαλογίζομαι (seven times, all probably editorial: see especially ix. 33). (b) The focusing of the debate on τίς μείζων uses language which the final declaration of Jesus on the subject ignores. I shall argue later2 that πρῶτος (ix. 35) is secondary, and the possibility therefore needs to be considered that μείζων belongs to an earlier stratum.

(iii) Mark ix. 35a:

καὶ καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς
διώδεκα καὶ λέγει αὕτοῖς:

Once again there are signs of Mark R and of pre-Markan tradition: (a) καθίζω is probably Mark R. E. Best3 has suggested that Mark does not normally have Jesus sitting in order to teach (he cites only iv. 1 and xiii. 3 where κάθημαι rather than καθίζω is used). But xii. 41 is parallel in the use of καθίζω and, moreover,

---

1 Cf. again Légasse, op. cit. pp. 23-25.
2 See p. 365.
in using a traditional structure much like ix. 33 ff. (b) φωνέω occurs comparatively rarely in Mark (i. 26; ix. 35; x. 49; 30, 68, 72 bis and xv. 35) and never in situations where Jesus calls a group of persons together to receive authoritative teaching: in such situations the standard word used is προσκαλέωμαι, cf. iii. 13, 23; vii. 14; viii. 1, 34; x. 42; xii. 43. Therefore Best is probably right that in ἐφώνησεν there is a hint of earlier material. (c) οἱ δώδεκα are frequently introduced by Mark R² and correspond here to 2+10 in Mark x. 41. But the awkwardness of the position of this specific reference some way into the narrative suggests that in the context there is pre-Markan material which is being edited. (d) καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς could be either pre-Markan, as probably in ii. 25, iii. 4; vi. 50, or Mark R, as probably in i. 37 f., 44; iv. 35; v. 19; vii. 18; viii. 1, 17; x. 11; xi. 21.⁸ The decision about ix. 35a will depend therefore on whether there is in ix. 35b traditional material needing an introduction.

(iv) Mark ix. 35b:

εἰ τις θέλει πρώτος εἶναι,
ἐσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος.

Four versions of this saying occur in the synoptic tradition,⁴ although the language varies from one to another.

Mark x. 43 f.: synonymous parallelism involving a double contrast μέγας/διάκονος and πρώτος/δοῦλος.


Matthew xxiii. 11: simple contrast μείζων/διάκονος.

Mark ix. 35b: intermediate form contrasting πρώτος/ἔσχατος-διάκονος.

The strongest possibility of a literary dependence relationship

---

² H.-W. Kuhn, Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium (Göttingen, 1971), p. 159.
³ See ibid. p. 131.
⁴ For the present, Luke ix. 48c (μικρότερος/μέγας) can be discounted because Mark ix. 35, supplemented by reminiscences of μικρὸς (ix. 42) and μέγας (x. 43), is the only source. Cf. T. Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas (Cambridge, 1971), p. 140 f.
between any two of these four is between Mark ix. 35ab and Matthew xxiii. 11 since (a) there is no corresponding Lukan parallel for Matthew xxiii. 11 in a predominantly Q context; (b) Matthew xviii. 1-5 drops Mark ix. 35 as part of an extensive remodelling process but thereby raises the possibility of its transference elsewhere; (c) the wording of Matthew xxiii. 11 corresponds closely to Mark ix. 35. But apart from this one possibility we seem to be dealing with variant forms of an archetypal which has made a deep impression on the gospel tradition.

For our present purpose it is important to note: (a) The πρῶτος/ἔσχατος language does not, as one might expect, take up the wording (μείξων, ix. 34) with which the discussion of rank began: contrast Luke xxii. 24–27. (b) The πρῶτος/ἔσχατος wording corresponds to the antithetical saying in x. 31, a saying whose capacity for movement out of one pericope into another is demonstrated by Matthew xx. 16, and whose link with Mark x. 30 is itself editorial. (c) Mark ix. 35b is the only member of this family of traditions whose present form does not exhibit exact symmetry. (d) Movement of πρῶτος/ἔσχατος language from elsewhere into the "Dispute about Greatness" tradition would be encouraged by the occurrence of πρῶτος in x. 44 (as well as x. 31) and be rendered all the more likely by the rarity of έσχατος in Mark (elsewhere only in xii. 6, 22 with different, i.e. chronological, sense).

The most straightforward inference from these data would seem to be the secondariness of the πρῶτος/ἔσχατος contrast in ix. 35b. This would leave διάκονος, the constant factor in all variants of the antithesis, functioning as a response to μείξων (ix. 34b), and it would mean that Matthew in xxiii. 11 has correctly judged the substance of the basic material.

As for the rest of Mark ix. 35b, Mark R is very probable: (a) εἰ τις θέλει is extremely rare as an introduction to a discipleship saying, but the use of θέλω is matched by x. 35 f., 43 f., and the formulation εἰ τις θέλει by viii. 34. Since viii. 34 and ix. 35 (and x. 35-45) are positioned identically in relation to their controlling Son of man sayings, viii. 31 and ix. 31 (and x. 33 f.), a Markan literary relationship is probable. (b) The generalizing πάντων is exactly in line with well-attested Mark R tendencies.
(v) Mark ix. 36:

\[ \text{kai \ la\beta\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\alpha\iota\delta\iota\upsilon\ \varepsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\varepsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \varepsilon\nu\ \mu\acute{e}\nu\psi\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon,} \\
\text{kai \ \epsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\sigma\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \ \epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\iota\varsigma.} \]

Is ix. 36 an artificial Markan creation, drawing on x. 13–16, designed to introduce ix. 37, and therefore no original sequel to the tradition preserved beneath ix. 33–35? Three arguments support this view: (a) \( \epsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\sigma\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\upsilon \) occurs nowhere in the NT apart from Mark ix. 36; x. 16. (b) The logic of Mark’s material as it stands is demonstrably obscure to such an extent that both Matthew and Luke were forced to remould by dropping (Matthew) or shifting (Luke: ix. 48c) Mark ix. 35b. (c) As a climactic pronouncement ix. 35b brings its unit of tradition to an end.

Let us, however, submit these arguments to critical scrutiny. (a) \( \epsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\sigma\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\upsilon \) is awkward in ix. 36, especially after the child has been “put in the midst of them”, and a straightforward narrative emerges if we, like Matthew and Luke, drop it as a Mark R interruption as well as reminiscence of x. 16. (b) Difficulties experienced by Matthew and Luke cannot be allowed to be determinative. Matthew insists on discussing the problem by treating the child as an example for the disciples to follow: hence, \( \omicron\varsigma \ \tau\alpha\iota\upsilon \ \tau\alpha\iota\delta\iota\upsilon\alpha \) (xviii. 3 = Mark x. 15) and \( \omicron\varsigma \ \tau\alpha\iota\upsilon \ \tau\alpha\iota\delta\iota\upsilon\upsilon \ \tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon \) (xviii. 4). But he cannot extricate himself from the logical tangle of his own making when, in xviii. 5, he returns to the Markan source according to which the child is to be received, not emulated. The confusion attendant on the attachment of the humility theme to the child is well highlighted by R. Schnackenburg: “Sind Kinder wirklich so demütig, und insbesondere dieses Kind?” Scarcely better is the Lukan situation where the sequence uniting ix. 46 to ix. 48 by means of ix. 47 is no improvement on Mark. (c) While undoubtedly

---

1 R. Bultmann, op. cit. pp. 64, 66.
2 S. Légage, op. cit. p. 27, also regards this detail as a supplementary addition in this present context.
3 Matthew was at least correct in sensing the separability of Mark x. 15 from its setting in x. 13–16, in that x. 14 is a complete and sufficient climax for the “Suffer little children” pericope.
Mark ix. 35b *could* be the ending of a pericope it is still worth exploring the logical viability of some proposed linkages with what follows: The first sees a parallelism between *diákovos* and *paídoi*ν and again, of course, must take the child as an example of what disciples should be. It would gain in cogency if, following M. Black,¹ we could appeal to an Aramaic link-up based on the translation of *talja*’ as both *diákovos* and *paídoi*ν. But, as Schnackenburg points out, ‘*abda*’ is the Aramaic word more probably underlying *diákovos,*² and in any case the *paídoi*ν-*diákovos* equivalence leads inexorably to the confusion all too amply exhibited in Matthew’s version. So that avenue looks like a cul-de-sac. But there is a second linkage, namely that which sees the parallelism as between the recipients of *paídoi*ν (cf. Mark’s *pán̂tes*) and the *paídoi*ν. This makes the child the recipient of exemplary action rather than an example to be copied, and it has the merit of matching the content of ix. 37a (“Whoever receives one such child . . .”) while permitting ix. 36, minus ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτό, to play its part as a neat and secure bridge from ix. 35 to ix. 37a.

(vi) Mark ix. 37:

\[\text{ōs áv éν τῶν τοιο̣ύτων παιδίων} \]
\[\text{ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.} \]

J. Friedrich³ treats Mark ix. 37 as an isolated saying, whose *Vorlage* corresponded to Luke X. 16 and probably had ψῆφις where Mark has substituted ἐν τῶν τοιο̣ύτων παιδίων. On this showing the saying dealt originally with the disciples/messengers of Jesus, while its present Markan form shows the influence of Mark x. 14. Such a view can with some justification appeal to the linguistic correspondence with x. 14 in *παιδία . . . τοιο̣ύτων . . . δέξηται,* and we have already seen similar verbal movement of ἐναγκαλιζομαι (cf. also κωλύω, used in ix. 38 f and x. 14, but nowhere else in Mark). Nevertheless, this view creates unease and may well not

be the most promising route out of a confused situation. (a) We have already seen reason to regard ix. 36 as not wholly a Markan creation. But if it were Mark R and designed to provide a sequel for ix. 33–35 and a setting for a remodelled saying, i.e. ix. 37 in its present form, it would mean that Mark is wholly responsible for a confused sequence and for the child/messenger parallelism which is neither envisaged by x. 13–16 (or ix. 42 for that matter) nor intrinsically appropriate. Why, after all, should a child be the counterpart of a messenger? (b) While Mark ix. 37b depends logically on the shaliah principle and requires δέχομαι to stand exclusively for reception of the message and claim of the messenger rather than provision of hospitality, ix. 37a can only refer to the provision of hospitality precisely because the child is a typical child and not a typical messenger. The only element in ix. 37a which pushes the saying towards the shaliah scheme is ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι μου in view of similar language in, for instance, Mark xiii. 6. But even here we must note that ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι μου qualifies reception rather than sending, and we must ask whether in any case it is an original part of the saying. Four ὄνομα occurrences crop up in ix. 37, 38, 39, 41 as against two with similar connotations in the rest of Mark (xi. 9; xiii. 6). Since, as already noted, ix. 38 f. (40) is secondarily positioned here by Mark, and since ὄνομα is the catchword link at either end of the insertion, the suspicion grows that the easily detachable references in ix. 37, 41 are dependent on the pre-Markan and non-detachable references in ix. 38 f. Once ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι μου is removed from ix. 37a, confusion and unclarity diminish and the comment of R. Schnackenburg becomes especially germane: "9, 37a breathes the spirit of Mt 25, 34–40 while δέχεσθαι in 9, 37b can only have the sense of believing acceptance".1 Put otherwise, δέχεσθαι presupposes the shaliah scheme in ix. 37b, but did not originally in ix. 37a; that form of ix. 37a could be set alongside, for instance, Proverbs xix. 17, "He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord", whereas ix. 37b could not. Correspondingly, the present form of ix. 37ab documents a tradition-historical tendency to "Christianize" and "missionize".

(vii) Mark ix. 41:

\[ \text{δό} \, \text{γὰρ} \, \text{ἀν} \, \text{ποτίσῃ} \, \text{ὑμᾶς} \, \text{ποτήριον} \, \text{ὐδατος} \]
\[ \text{ἐν} \, \text{ὁνόματι}, \, \text{ὁ} \, \text{Χριστὸς} \, \text{ἐστε}, \, \text{ἀμήν} \, \text{λέγω} \, \text{ὑμῶν} \]
\[ \text{ἀτι} \, \text{οὐ} \, \text{μὴ} \, \text{ἀπολέσῃ} \, \text{τὸν} \, \text{μισθὸν} \, \text{αὐτοῦ}. \]

There is widespread agreement that the words \( \text{ὁ} \, \text{Χριστὸς} \, \text{ἐστε} \) (with \( \text{Χριστὸς} \) lacking the definite article and standing for a title) are secondary within this saying, though less than firm agreement about whether they replaced an original \( \text{μοῦ} \)\(^1\) or simply came in with \( \text{ἐν} \, \text{ὁνόματι} \) as an insertion.\(^2\) The preceding arguments about \( \text{ὁνόμα} \) in ix. 37-41 suggest that the whole phrase \( \text{ἐν} \, \text{ὁνόματι} \, \text{ὁ} \, \text{Χριστὸς} \, \text{ἐστε} \) is an insertion. As far as \( \text{ὑμᾶς} \) is concerned, an underlying \( \text{ἐνα} \, \text{τῶν} \, \text{μικρῶν} \, \text{τούτων} \), providing a link with Mark ix. 42, may well have been replaced,\(^3\) though it is no longer possible to use Matthew x. 42 as evidence.

Above all in any reconstruction of the Urform of ix. 41 it is important to take into account not only the proximity of ix. 37 and ix. 41, especially when ix. 38–40 is removed, but also their remarkable correspondence in content. In their Markan forms this extends to the \( \text{ἐπὶ} \, \text{τῷ} \, \text{ὁνόματι} \, \text{μοῦ} \)/\( \text{ἐν} \, \text{ὁνόματι} \) wording, while at the probable pre-Markan stage it includes (a) the likely \( \text{ἐν} \, \text{τῶν} \, \text{τοιούτων} \, \text{παιδίων} \)/\( \text{ἐνα} \, \text{τῶν} \, \text{μικρῶν} \, \text{τούτων} \) wording, (b) the formal opening \( \text{δό} \, \text{ἐν} \ldots \) and (c) the hospitality theme expressed in the words \( \text{δέχεται} \, / \, \text{ποτίσῃ} \ldots \, \text{ποτήριον} \, \text{ὐδατος} \). The last is the most important of all since ix. 41 “breathes the spirit of Mt. 25, 34–40” just as much as ix. 37a.

We are now in a position to discern the shape and content of a possible pre-Markan tradition approximately as follows:

33a \ldots \text{Καφαρναουμ} \ldots \]
34 \ldots \text{διελέχθησαν} \ldots \text{τὶς} \, \text{μεῖζων} \]
35a \ldots \text{ὁ} \, \text{Ἰησοῦς} \, \text{ἐφώνησεν} \ldots \text{καὶ} \, \text{λέγει} \, \text{αὐτοῖς} \]
35b \ldots \text{μεῖζων} \ldots \text{διάκονος} \]
36 \text{καὶ} \, \text{λαβὼν} \, \text{παιδίων} \, \text{ἐστηκεν} \, \text{αὐτὸ} \, \text{ἐν} \, \text{μέσῳ} \, \text{αὐτῶν} \]
\text{καὶ} \, \text{ἐπεν} \, \text{αὐτοῖς} \]
37a \, \text{δό} \, \text{ἐν} \, \text{τῶν} \, \text{τοιούτων} \, \text{παιδίων} \, \text{δέχεται} \]
\text{έμε} \, \text{δέχεται} \]
37b \ldots \text{δοῦν} \, \text{ποτίσῃ} \ldots \text{ἐνα} \, \text{τῶν} \, \text{μικρῶν} \, \text{τούτων} \, \text{ποτήριον} \, \text{.FindGameObjectWithTag} \ldots \]
\text{ἀμήν} \, \text{λέγω} \, \text{ὑμῖν} \, \text{ἐδιε} \, \text{οὐ} \, \text{μὴ} \, \text{ἀπολέσῃ} \, \text{τὸν} \, \text{μισθὸν} \, \text{αὐτοῦ} \].

\(^2\) J. Friedrich, op. cit. p. 100 f.
\(^3\) R. Bultmann, op. cit. p. 142.
Three questions must now be asked about this reconstructed tradition: (i) Is it unified and meaningful? (ii) How is it related to the teaching of Jesus? (iii) What detectable tendencies in its tradition-history have a bearing on Matthew xxv. 31-46?

(i) The topic under discussion is greatness: τίς μείζων (34). This could be interpreted as a discussion of relative rank within the disciple group, though we ought to note that nothing in the pre-Markan material suggests it, and that the concerns of Mark x. 35-45 should not be injected here. A discussion of greatness can be more theoretical (cf. the discussion about the commandments in Mark xii. 28-34) and is likely to presuppose one of the two perspectives involved in such discussions in contemporary Judaism, i.e. relative greatness in either the present situation or the future age. Typical of the first perspective is the outlook stretching back to Job iii. 19: "The small and the great are there" and provoking A. Schlatter's reference to "das Bestreben, 'gross' zu sein, die ganze palästinische Frömmigkeit durchdrang" (cf. Mark xii. 38f.; Matt. xxiii. 6/Luke xi. 43; Luke xiv. 7-10). Representative of the second perspective is the comment on Job iii. 19 in b.B.M. 85b: "He who humbles himself for the sake of the Torah in this world is magnified in the next: and he who makes himself a servant for Torah in this world becomes free in the next" (cf. Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan 11.2), or the interpretation of Zechariah xiv. 6 in b.Pes. 50a: "R. Joshua b.Levi said: This refers to people who are honoured in this world but will be lightly esteemed in the next". However, we cannot yet determine which of these perspectives is involved in the Jesus-material: we simply note that the reference to διακονία shows that 34-35b matches the Jewish traditions.

There follows the παιδίον material in 36-37a-41. It has already been suggested that the child functions as an example of the person to whom service is rendered. Now it must also be noted that texts describing the comparative rank of children

1 The comment of D. E. Nineham, op. cit. p. 252, that "we can hardly imagine grown men discussing their relative greatness quite in the way suggested here" is perhaps unduly innocent!

2 Der Evangelist Matthäus (Stuttgart, 1963), p. 543.

require us to see the child as someone at the lowest end of the scale of human valuation. This is clear in Aboth 3.11: "R. Dosa b.Harkinas said: Morning sleep and midday wine and children’s talk and sitting in the meeting-houses of the amme-haarez put a man out of the world". Equally clear and even more cutting is the comment of R. Johanan in b.B.B. 12b: "Since the Temple was destroyed, prophecy has been taken from prophets and given to fools and children", and the same slight estimate of the young produces R. Jose b.Judah’s observation in a teaching context: "He who learns from the young, to what is he like? To one who eats unripe grapes and drinks wine from his own winepress.”

The presupposition of the disciples’ conduct in the pre-Markan tradition, x. 13f., 16, is the same. If this is the background scheme in the Mark ix material, and if the child functions as a visual aid in the story (cf. the coin in Mark xii, 15), and if διακονία can be exhibited in the action of δέχεσθαι (as is indeed the case), we do not risk falling under M. Black’s strictures about “inability to recognize a non sequitur where one is manifestly present”, i.e. between 35 and 37, nor are we pressed towards a purely formal linguistic connection between διακονος and παιδίων. The connection is conceptual, logical and strong.

The argument therefore follows a continuous and straightforward line of thought which incorporates the references to the reception of the child (37a) and the hospitable provision of a cup of water (41). In form, too, the material is balanced and complete, in that the word μικρός, standing in parallel with παιδίων, heightens the contrast with μείζων and rounds off the unit.

There remain, however, the two crucial features of “receiving me” and “not losing a reward”. The first indicates that a reaction to Jesus is determinative for any decision about human actions, and that it is expressed in the treatment of needy and apparently insignificant persons; the second expresses the idea of eschatological judgement/reward which rounds off the unit of tradition in such a way as to indicate (a) that the τίς μείζων

---

discussion involved the future eschatological perspective, and (b) that response to Jesus is a determining criterion for final judgement.

In sum, I believe it is fair to say that the reconstructed pre-Markan tradition is both unified and meaningful.

(ii) A connection between the pre-Markan tradition and Jesus has to be taken very seriously in the light of several factors. Firstly, the presuppositions and patterns of thought evident in this pericope have been shown to fit the environment to which Jesus, as well as the earliest Christians, belonged. Secondly, especially in connection with the παιδιῶν theme we encounter a degree of radicalism which fares well when subjected to the dissimilarity test. A. Oepke remarked that Jesus “opposed to the low estimation of children common among his people an emphatically high evaluation”, and the role of the child in 36–37a–41 is in line with this general verdict. Thirdly, the substance of this tradition coheres with other material which very probably comes from Jesus. With the reversal of the positions of great and small we may compare Mark x. 31, Matthew xxiii. 12 and Luke xiv. 11; xviii. 14b. With the use of the child as a type in declarations about the new age we may compare Mark x. 14, 15. With the use of the idea of hospitality as an indication of authentic response we may compare Mark vi. 10 and Matthew x. 11 = Luke x. 7. With the suggestion that a response to Jesus is eschatologically determinative we may compare Matthew vii. 24–27 = Luke vi. 47–49 and Matthew x. 32f = Luke xii. 8f. Finally, with the reference to “reward” as an expression of eschatological blessing we may compare Luke vi. 35.

(iii) Tradition-historical tendencies have had constantly to be borne in mind in our investigation so far. For our overall purpose our results can usefully be measured against R. Bultmann’s conclusions. For him, the original tradition underlying Mark ix. 37, 41 was Jewish, had no reference to the person of Jesus, and declared that “kindness to the least of men was reckoned by God [sic] as done to him”. This later became a rule imposed by the exalted Christ upon his people and adapted to missionary

---

concerns. Most significantly for us, Bultmann affirms that "in the source and in the revision there is a precise parallel to Matt. xxv. 31-46".

The thrust of the present argument is somewhat different, though not wholly so. Bultmann's proposed first stage, a transformation of a saying about God into a saying about Jesus, receives no support, and therefore we do not have here any precedent which might be cited in connection with Matthew xxv. 31-46. On the other hand, we certainly do see in Mark ix. 33-41, as in the Matthew x. 40-42/Luke x. 16 traditions, a developing tendency to "Christianize" material which did not originally refer to followers of Jesus at all, and to "missionize" by superimposing the shaliah pattern on sayings which (apart from Luke x. 16) did not originally contain it. It will therefore be all the more necessary to be alert to any such tendencies in the evolution of Matthew xxv. 31-46.

3. Matthew xix. 28 clearly matches the introduction to the revelation-discourse. This correspondence, is, first of all, verbal: xix. 28 includes the clause ἐὰν καθιστῇ ὁ γίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ while xxv. 31 declares that ἐὰν δὲ ἐλθῇ ὁ γίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . καθισε ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ.

The implications of this verbal correspondence have to be drawn out in the light of a second, namely schematic, correspondence. That is, in the Lukan sequence there is no Q material between the parable of the pounds (xix. 12-27) and xxii. 28-30, the counterpart of Matthew xix. 28; in the Matthaean sequence there is no material at all between the parable of the talents (xxv. 14-30) and xxv. 31. Since the parable of the talents/pounds has a Q Vorlage, and since Matthew xix. 28 and xxv. 31 correspond so closely in wording, and since the present Matthaean position of xix. 28 inside the Markan block x. 17-31 (= Matt. xix. 16-27, 29-30) is necessarily secondary, it appears likely that in Q the parable of the talents/pounds was followed immediately by the Utform of Matthew xix. 28 = Luke xxii. 28-30. This likelihood is increased by a series of correspondences in content between the parable and the saying. Both forms of the parable and both forms of the saying (a) deal with reward and (b)
promise that reward to those who have shown persevering faithfulness, while (c) interpreting it in terms of rule or authority (cf. Matt. xxv. 21, 23/Luke xix. 17, 19). Moreover, (d) both forms of the parable and of the saying conclude on a note of judgement. (e) Both forms of the parable see authority as exercised supremely by a person other than God, i.e. the κυρίος of Matthew xxv. 19/Luke xix. 16, while both forms of the saying see primary authority as exercised supremely by another, i.e. the "Son of man" in Matthew xix. 28 or the "I" of Luke xxii. 29. This makes it possible (f) for both forms of parable and saying to have the final judgement implemented by persons depending on the intervening person (cf. Matt, xxv. 28, 30/Luke xix. 24).

Now if the parable was followed immediately in Q by the "thrones" saying we can in new ways make progress towards a reconstruction of the Urform of the saying and ultimately to a decision about the origin of the reference to the Son of man and his sitting on the throne of his glory.

In Matthew xxv. 21, 23 each of the faithful servants is told εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαράν τοῦ κυρίου σου. In these words there is a double correspondence with Luke xxii. 30a ἵνα ἔσοθε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου. That is, both speak of a celebratory meal and both see that celebratory meal as belonging to the speaker. Evidence bearing on the Q contents of these traditions is as follows: (a) The χαρά reference in Matthew xxv. 21, 23 is unlikely to be Matt R since other Matthaean occurrences do not have this celebratory sense, nor does Matthaean use of χαίρω show any tendency towards it. (b) The use of χαρά for joy expressed in a celebratory meal is paralleled in Q at Luke xv. 6f. (cf. χαίρει, Matt. xviii. 13; see also Luke xv. 9f., 24, 29, 32). (c) Luke has so strong a tendency towards the use of χαρά—χαίρω that it is most unlikely he would drop it from a source unless there were some adjacent compensation. (d) The secondariness of Luke xxii. 30a at some stage in its

1 In this respect it does not matter whether the underlying Q tradition of the saying used ἀκολουθεῖ (Matt.) or διαλέγεται (Luke) in its introduction.

present context has often enough been noticed. Thus, “eating and drinking” gives a rather different emphasis from “judging” (Matt. xix. 28 = Luke xxii. 30b); βασιλεία stands for kingly function in xxii. 29 over against kingly realm in xxii. 30a; the present subjunctives ἐσθήτε καὶ πίνητε (following ἵνα) fit awkwardly with the future indicative καθήσεσθε. While this secondariness could theoretically stem either from pre-Lukan or from Lukan redaction, the latter looks much more likely. (e) Encouragement for Lukan editorial work in xxii. 30a is several times provided in the context. Thus, ἵνα ἐσθήτε καὶ πίνητε can be seen as provoked by the χαρά theme of Matthew xxv. 21, 23 but also by the non-Q Eucharistic material and the non-Q saying about festive celebration in the kingdom of God (Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 16, 18). Further, ἐπὶ τῆς τραπεζῆς μοῦ not only overlaps with the same phrase in xxii. 21 but may be provoked by the nearby τραπεζίται/τράπεζα language of Matthew xxv. 27/ Luke xix. 23 as well as by the χαρά theme. Finally, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μοῦ can be seen as a response to the “kingship of Jesus” theme presented already in xxii. 29 and inserted by Lukan redaction in xix. 12, 14, 15, 27.

The most probable inference from this evidence is therefore that Luke xxii. 30a is Luke R but that Luke xxii. 29 derives from Q. Because this would mean that Matthew’s ὅταν καθίσῃ διὰ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ is Matt R it is important to broaden the base of the argumentation: (a) The Q Vorlage will have contained some christological material with a kingly flavour since Matthew xix. 28 and Luke xxii. 29 agree about that. (b) In a promise of kingly–judicial rule to disciples of Jesus (Matt. xix. 28a/Luke xxii. 28) it is improbable that the presupposed christology could have to do with anyone other than Jesus, or that Jesus’ role should be less than kingly. We cannot therefore follow the proposal that the Son of man in Matthew xix. 28 is not identified as Jesus and that therefore Matthew’s

---


2 Dislocations between verses 29 and 30a make it difficult to see in a combination of the two a pre-Lukan saying secondarily inserted into verses 28, 30b, as suggested by J. Schmid, Lukas, p. 330.
form is more primitive than Luke’s. The difficulties of such a proposal are in any case well illustrated by Bultmann’s swift admission that “such a distinction in a saying of the risen Lord cannot be seriously meant”. (c) It is extremely unlikely that Luke would ignore such a Son of man reference if he encountered it because, firstly, he never drops Markan Son of man material if he uses at all the tradition containing it, and, secondly, its contents are wholly palatable to him (cf. xxii. 69 = Mark xiv. 62). (d) It is certainly true that the reference to “the Son of man sitting on the throne of his glory” in a judicial context fits the christology of Q and a Daniel vii-based expectation of the coming and judging Son of man (cf. Matt. xxiv. 37–39 = Luke xvii. 26f.), so that the Matthaean form in xix. 28 would provide an appropriate climax for Q. But allusions to Daniel vii are also present in Luke xxii. 29, 30b in the gift of the kingship (Dan. vii. 18, 27), the thrones (Dan. vii. 9), and the function of disciples as assessors in the heavenly judgement (Dan. vii. 9f.). Therefore the Lukan form fits equally well as a climax for Q and contains implicitly what Matthew draws out explicitly. (e) The much discussed use of διατίθημι (Luke xxii. 29) could be seen as Luke R in view of its occurrence in Acts iii. 25—though nowhere else in the gospels and Acts—and the occurrence of διαθήκη in Luke i. 72; xxii. 20 (cf. Mark xiv. 24); Acts iii. 25; vii. 8. All of those other references, however, have an Abrahamic or Mosaic covenant connotation whereas the words καθὼς διέθετο μοι ὁ πατὴρ μου and the theme of kingship suggest that Luke xxii. 29 has its closest parallels in 2 Chronicles vii. 18; xxi. 7; xxiii. 3; Psalm lxxxviii (lxxxix). 4 and Isaiah lv. 3 where the kingly succession within the Davidic covenant is in mind. So the tendency towards the covenant connotation of διατίθημι in the exegesis of Luke xxii. 29 should be delimited in this way and

---

4 Schulz, Spruchquelle, p. 331. 
the meaning taken to be “establish”, “determine”, “arrange” or “appoint”, with an additional subordinate hint of testamentary ideas which will do justice to the position of the saying at the end of Q and following the preceding reference to the departing one (Matt. xxv. 15/Luke xix. 12). While the testamentary flavour should not be exaggerated, in view of xxii. 29b it does appear that the scheme of Luke xxii. 29 is in line with Q and the wording in this respect hardly normal in Luke.

Once the remaining word-studies are completed it appears likely that the Q wording of this “eschatological promise of the parting Jesus” to the disciples ran

... διαστήματος ἕως καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλεῖαν καὶ καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ τρόπους κρίνοντες τᾶς δῶδεκα φυλᾶς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. This means that “when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory” is indeed Matt R and our resultant task is to trace out the implications for the almost identical language in xxv. 31. There are just two possible situations: 1. That this language is Matt R in xxv. 31 as well as in xix. 28. This would mean that when Matthew placed the apocalyptic revelation-discourse after the parable of the talents in his order, and shifted the “thrones” saying to an earlier point (xix. 28) he edited both in the light of the implicit content of the Q version of the latter. This possibility is supported somewhat by precedent in Matthew xvi. 27f. = Mark viii. 38–ix. 1, where Matthew remodels the

1 Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 159 who, however, takes Luke’s I-form of the saying as a whole to be secondary.

2 (1) Matthew’s καὶ αὐτοὶ (diff Luke: καὶ) is the product of Matt R assimilation of the disciples’ sitting on thrones and the Son of man's enthronement. (2) ἐπὶ+Accusative (Matt. diff Luke) is probably original since it does not fit with ἐπὶ+Genitive (Matt R). (3) δωδεκα qualifying “thrones” (Matt. diff Luke) is likely to be Matt R in spite of the counter-argument that this word is more likely to be removed than inserted so as to prevent such a promise including Judas Iscariot: thus, J. Schmid, Lukas, p. 331; T. W. Manson, Sayings, p. 339; J. Friedrich, op. cit. p. 64. Against this, the objection to Matt R applies less in a Matt. xix context than in a passion narrative setting since the specific problem of Judas is not in mind there. Moreover, Q does not elsewhere know about ὅλη δωδεκα and the link between the Q saying and the preceding Q parable indicates that a promise to disciples in general is in mind. The concentration upon the twelve in Matt. xix. 28 is a natural consequence of its attachment to Matt. xix. 27 (= Mark x. 28) in which Peter acts as spokesman for the closer circle of disciples.
language bringing it into line with xix. 28/xxv. 31 language while adding absolutely nothing to an already Daniel vii-based tradition. In merely making implications explicit Matthew would on this showing force us to take seriously in any tradition underlying xxv. 31–46 the probability of implicit christological ideas which Matt R could then draw out. 2. That the language of xxv. 31 is in fact the pre-Matthaean basis for Matt R in xix. 28. This would mean that when Matthew inserted the “thrones” saying into its new “Markan” context he edited it in the light of the apocalyptic revelation-discourse which he would later place after the parable of the talents, and it would also presuppose the general principle that Matt R in one setting can take place in the light of pre-Matthaean tradition in another. For both these possibilities there is precedent: in the first case, we have already seen Matt R taking place in x. 40, 42 in the light of the material in Mark ix. 37, 41 which he would later use in xvii. 1–5 while, in the second case, we can see Matt R taking place in the post-discourse transition in xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, and xxvi. 1 in the light of a Q formulation underlying vii. 28 = Luke vii. 1, just as we can see Matt R taking place in the insertion of ἐκεῖ ἐστιν ὁ καλοθυμὸς καὶ ὁ βραγμὸς τῶν ὀ δόντων in xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51 and xxv. 30 in the light of its occurrence in Q at Matthew viii. 12 = Luke xiii. 28.

We have then two situations in which the material in xxv. 31 can be understood as either pre-Matthaean and giving rise to xix. 28, or Matt R in the same way as xix. 28. Can we choose firmly in favour of one and against the other? The answer is that we cannot, but that we can see evidence in the tradition-history of xix. 28 which points away from the idea of christology’s being superimposed in xxv. 31 on to a tradition which spoke only of God.

II

After an examination of related synoptic traditions and the tradition-historical tendencies they exhibit, it is possible to press forward our investigations of Matthew xxv. 31–46 by examining related Jewish apocalyptic material. In particular, the enthronement scene depicted in 1 Enoch lxii–lxiii and that portrayed by
Matthew are highly reminiscent of one another, and this comparability deserves critical assessment.

Now at this point one might appear incautious and adventurous in using 1 Enoch at all. The absence of chapters xxxvii–lxxi from among the Qumran finds reinforces already existing doubt about dating, and the possibility of Christian interference with the text only increases uncertainty. Nevertheless, I do not believe that 1 Enoch is unusable nor that the parallelism between lxii–lxiii and Matthew xxv. 31–46 can be discounted, provided the argument is protected in the following way: (a) Even if 1 Enoch xxxvii–lxxi were, to put it most unfavourably, post-Matthaean in date and demonstrably Christianized in content it could still be used as a means of comparison bringing about a sensitivity to the possibility of similar patterns of thought in Matthew. The existence of such patterns in Matthew would not thereby have been proved, but the possibility of their providing an entrée into the essential structure of the Matthaean material would have been kept open. (b) The age of a document and the age of the traditions contained in it are not necessarily identical, and in this instance we do appear to be dealing with a scheme which is much older than both 1 Enoch and Matthew. In other words, form-criticism makes a significant contribution here and, in particular, reference must be made to the work of G. W. E. Nickelsburg which uncovered the existence of a long-established pre-Enochian scheme describing the exaltation of formerly persecuted persons and the passing of judgement on their erstwhile persecutors. This scheme, which draws on Isaiah xiii–xiv, lii–liii, is picked up in Daniel vii. xii–xiii and can be seen emerging in Wisdom ii. iv–v as well as in 1 Enoch lxii–lxiii and elsewhere. We can, therefore, be open to the possibility of discovering via 1 Enoch the scheme, and therefore the meaning, of the developing tradition within which Matthew xxv. 31–46 fits.

On such a basis a very extensive list of Matthew/1 Enoch

---

1 I am grateful to Dr. G. Vermes and others who contributed to the discussion of this problem when parts of this article were read as a paper for the Oxford Society of Historical Theology.

parallels can be assembled: 

(a) Both start with the moment of enthronement. In Matthew xxv. 31 the Son of man's coming leads to his sitting on the throne, while in 1 Enoch lxii. 2 the initial invitation to the audience to see if they can recognize the Elect one leads immediately to his enthronement by the Lord of Spirits. Agreement at this point is the more arresting in that the phrase "the throne of his glory" (in itself a not uncommon term in Jewish tradition) is used in a setting, without parallel in pre-Christian literature, where a "messianic" figure is placed on the throne of divine glory.1 (b) Both see enthronement as issuing in judgement: Matthew xxv. 32 and 1 Enoch lxii. 1. (c) Both envisage the assembling of persons from all the world for judgement: Matthew xxv. 32f. with πάντα ἐλθόντας and 1 Enoch lxii. 1 with "the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who dwell on the earth". (d) Both see the assembly as divided into two groups, with one group labelled "the righteous": Matthew xxv. 32f., 37 and 1 Enoch lxii. 3, 8, 13. (e) Both see judgement as issuing in ultimate and final separation of the two groups: Matthew xxv. 34, 41 with the contrast "Come... Depart from me" matching 1 Enoch lxii. 13; lxiii. 11. (f) Both see the destiny of the righteous as life and the enjoyment of the Son of man's heavenly presence: Matthew xxv. 34, 46 and 1 Enoch lxii. 14. (g) Both see the judge as the Son of man: Matthew xxv. 31 and 1 Enoch lxii. 5, 7, 9, 14; lxiii. 11. At the same time (h) both keep God in mind as the ultimate judge, even though the leading role is played by his authorized agent: Matthew xxv. 34, 41 hints at this by means of the passives "blessed... prepared... cursed... prepared" and 1 Enoch lxii. 10; lxiii. 2-10 by the direct involvement of the Lord of Spirits. (i) Both involve angels in judicial activity: Matthew xxv. 31 and 1 Enoch lxii. 11; lxiii. 1. Three further similarities are of the utmost importance for the interpretation of Matthew's revelation-discourse: (j) Both scenes hinge on the idea of recognition: Matthew xxv. 37, 38, 39, 44 and 1 Enoch lxii. 1, 3, 5. Correspondingly, (k) both narratives present an equivalence of those who suffer and the one who judges: Matthew xxv. 40, 45 and 1 Enoch lxii. 11. Completing this pattern, (l) the criterion of

judgement is in each case the manner in which those being judged have treated those with whom the judge associates himself: Matthew xxv. 40, 45 and 1 Enoch lxiii. 11.

Against the background of (a)–(i), let us follow up (j)–(l). The form of the questions addressed to the judge in Matthew xxv. 37, 38, 39, 44 is crucially significant: not “When were you hungry . . .?” but “When did we see you hungry . . .?”. Four times the words πότε σε εἰδομεν . . .; are voiced, and even when the second round of questioning brings about certain abbreviations in content these words survive and retain their dominance. Now the person questioned is the Son of man who is subsequently called “king”, just as in 1 Enoch he is the Son of man who is also called “the Elect one”. The addressing of the question πότε σε εἰδομεν . . .; to this figure means that the Son of man is not an earthly figure whom they have seen and either cared for or neglected as the case may be. To the contrary, he is a heavenly figure whom they all, whether righteous or unrighteous, have not seen in person and in respect of whom, therefore, all talk of care or neglect is incomprehensible. This means that Matthew and 1 Enoch incorporate in identical fashion the Daniel vii scheme in which the “one like a son of man” is an exclusively heavenly figure belonging, as it were, on the upper level of the apocalyptic double-decker framework.

These observations can be followed up in terms of the recognition theme. That we are dealing with an enthronement-judgement scene which is also a recognition scene follows clearly from what has been said above and, of course, disposes of any attempt to interpret the material in terms of good acts performed unconsciously rather than consciously. How, though, does the recognition scheme work? Nickelsburg describes its modus operandi in 1 Enoch as follows:

In 1 Enoch lxiii. 1b we find the element of recognition, “Open your eyes and lift up your horns if you are able to recognize the Elect One.” Recognition of which the audience might or might not be capable surely means re-cognition in the sense of ascertaining the identity of someone they formerly knew. Since the Similitudes nowhere indicate that the Elect One is a person whom the kings and the mighty formerly knew (and persecuted), the line must mean that the audience is to recognise in the Elect One, the elect ones whom they persecuted.1

Is this the way in which Matthew xxv. 31-46 works? In part it is. Those being judged show by the form of their question that they are thinking in terms of re-cognition, whereas the judge insists on recognition. His repeated announcement (verses 40, 45) sets out an equivalence, a correspondence but not an identity, of himself and the poor. The heavenly Son of man is now recognized in the earthly persons to whom he corresponds.

In attempting to be sensitive to the nuances of Matthew xxv. 31-46 by way of the scheme which can be discerned beneath the surface of 1 Enoch ixii-lxiii, it is important to take account of dissimilarities within the context of similarities. Two of these are of special concern: (i) Whereas in 1 Enoch those who stand before the throne are “the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who dwell on/hold/possess/rule the earth”, in Matthew xxv. 32 the corresponding phrase is πάντα τὰ ἐθνη with follow-up references to οἱ ἐκ δεξιῶν/οἱ δυσκολοί (verses 33, 34/37, 46) and οἱ εὑρωνύμου (verses 33, 41). We shall have to consider later the meaning and origin of the phrase πάντα τὰ ἐθνη, but for the present it is sufficient to note that the more “democratized” and generalized form of the material in Matthew suggests that his version voices a demand which is general, rather than comfort in the face of specific harassment. Consonant with this, (ii) 1 Enoch envisages active and deliberate persecution of the people of God by their more powerful and prosperous enemies, but in Matthew the treatment of other persons that is in mind is not persecution. The thrust of the praise (verses 35f., 40) or the criticism (verses 42f., 45) concerns the presence or the absence of active beneficence, and not the occurrence of evil deeds as such. This concern in the content of the material is reinforced by its form which, by symmetry, gives equal attention to the case of the righteous as well as the case of the rest.

We have, therefore, in 1 Enoch ixii-lxiii a yardstick by which to measure Matthew xxv. 31-46. It emerges that in the latter we have an apocalyptic judgement scene which is above all a recognition scene. More strictly, it sets recognition over against re-cognition and in so doing not only insists on the demand for caring action but also sets up a correspondence between the poor.

1 See pp. 387-89.
on earth and the Son of man in heaven. This Son of man is exclusively heavenly, so that he personally has not been seen on earth by anyone, whether righteous or otherwise.

III

Following the discussion of data provided by related synoptic tradition and 1 Enoch for the study of Matthew xxv. 31-46 it is now possible to turn attention to certain selected internal problems which have a decisive effect on the tradition-history of the whole.

1. The Son of man (xxv. 31)

As it stands the introduction is dominated by the figure of the Son of man, but the reference to him is very frequently assigned to Matt R on the following grounds: (a) There is allegedly a "striking exchange between δυνάμει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and δυνάμει θεοῦ verses 34, 40). When support is found elsewhere in a tradition-historical development from Luke xii. 8f. to Mark viii. 38-ix. 1 and finally Matthew xvi. 27f., and from Luke xxi. 29f. to Matthew xix. 28, it is affirmed that in this context the Son of man has changed his function from witnessing to judging, and that he has here been super-imposed upon a tradition in which the judge was God. (b) Further evidence of strong Matt R activity in xxv. 31 is provided by the "the progressive detachment alike of the glory and of the angels from the Father to the Son". Parallels this time are not only the sequence beginning with Luke xii. 8f. but also the references to the Son of man in Matthew xiii. 41 (Matt R) and xxiv. 31 (diff. Mark xiii. 27).

The proposed secondariness of the "Son of man" reference should, however, be resisted on the following grounds: (i) The

---

2 J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit. p. 79.
3 Given the variation between "Son of man" and "king", the assumption that, if a choice has to be made between them, that choice should favour the primariness of the "king", should be qualified in view of a Matt R tendency to introduce kingship: xviii. 23-25 begins with a "king" (verse 23) and continues with "lord" (verses 25, 27, 31, 32, 33), while xxi. 1-14 refers to the "king" at points of divergence from Luke xiv. 15-24 and assimilation to xxi. 33-42 (43).
development from "Son of man" to "king" is not a striking exchange, for the kingship motif is mentioned already in the introductory reference to "the throne of his glory". Indeed that is the major point of concern since the main clause of xxv. 31 deals with it. Moreover, as T. Preiss pointed out long since, the tradition is merely following Daniel vii. 13f. where, after the coming of the "one like a son of man" to his enthronement, all the emphasis is on the exercising of kingship by him. Furthermore, the recurrent insistence in Old Testament and related material on interpreting kingship functionally in terms of the exercise of judgement means that all we have in xxv. 34, 40 is a concentration on a role which is characteristically kingly and contextually exactly right. To put it bluntly, had xxv. 34, 40 referred to "the judge" no one would have batted an eyelid. But to blink at the term "king" is to presume quite inaccurately some difference between the two. (ii) Within the discourse the king distances himself from God by the words τοῦ πατρὸς μου (verse 34). These cannot be relied on, since in the similar context in xx. 23 diff Mark x. 40 the words ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου are Matt R, and this is likely to be true also in xxv. 34. However, if xx. 23 is comparable, the Markan source contains already in οὐκ ἔστω ἐμὸν δοῦναι ἀλλ' ὦς ἥτοιμασται an implicit reference to God by another person (this time, Jesus). And that is the cue for us to take seriously the passive participles used by the judge: εὐλογημένοι ... ἡτοιμασμένη ... κατηραμένοι (verses 34, 41). Each of these seems to be, in Jeremias's phrase, a "divine passive". In the LXX there appear to be no parallels for the passive "cursed" in any statement made by God himself about his actions, and the overwhelming majority of instances of "blessed" occur in statements by someone other than God himself. Notice may also be taken of the situations, closely

4 Thus Gen. xiv. 19; xxvi. 29; xxvii. 29; Deut. xxvii. 3, 4, 5, 6; xxxii. 20, 24; Judg. xviii. 2; Ruth iii. 10; 1 Kgs. xxiii. 21; xxv. 33; xxvi. 25; 2 Kgs. ii. 5; 3 Kgs. iii. 1 (ii. 45); Tobit xi. 17; xiii. 12; Judith xiv. 7; xv. 10; Ps. cxii. 23; cxvii. 26. The exceptions are Gen. xii. 3; xxvi. 4; Num. xxii. 12; Isa. xix. 25; lxv. 23 and Jer. xvii. 7.
analogous to xxv. 34, 41, in 2 Enoch ix. 1, x. 4 where the destinies "prepared" for persons who give (or do not give) bread to the hungry and who cover (or do not cover) the naked with clothing are described not by God but by the angelic interpreters, and in 2 Enoch xlii. 7–9 (B) where the same actively caring person is declared "blessed", a blessing bestowed by God but announced by Enoch. (iii) The correspondence between a person on the heavenly level and persons on the earthly level within an apocalyptic structure requires that the person above should be someone other than God, for with him there can be no 1:1 correspondence. (iv) As he stands, the Son of man in xxv. 31–46 is a being belonging exclusively to the heavenly world, a being who has not personally suffered hardship even though he stands in a 1:1 apocalyptic correspondence with those who have suffered, a being who comes to kingship only in the ultimate eschatological setting. Because he is all too easily viewed in the light of what has been said in earlier parts of Matthew's gospel he tends to be assimilated to the Matthaean Son of man. But the Matthaean Son of man operates on the earthly level (ix. 6; xi. 19); he has experienced hardship and suffering (viii. 20; xvii. 22f.; xx. 18f., 28); he is due to be enthroned in resurrection (xxviii. 18) and thus will come in, but not to, his kingship (xvi. 28). In this light, the Son of man in xxv. 31 is non-Matthaean and therefore pre-Matthaean. (v) There is no movement from witness to judge within the Son of man traditions. Luke xii. 8f. speaks of the Son of man's confession before the angels of God of the person who confesses Jesus before men. F. Hahn has argued persuasively that the confessing Son of man is in fact the judge, and one may add the evidence of other traditions showing that the roles of eschatological witness and judge merge. It is precisely this merger which allows the witnessing function of the men of Nineveh and the queen of the south to be described as κατακρίνει (Matt. xii. 41f. = Luke xi. 31f.). Similarly, the enthronement of the righteous in Wisdom involves standing (v. 1: ορθοστάσις cf. ἀναστήσουσα, Matt. xii. 41 = Luke xi. 32) and judging (iii. 8: κρίνειν, cf. iv. 16: κατακρίνειν) but all under the aegis of the
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supreme kingship of God (iii. 8). Similarly, in Revelation iii. 5 it is the judging figure of i. 12–18, iii. 1 who promises, in words echoing Luke xii. 8, to confess the victor. In Matthew vii. 23 = Luke xiii. 27 it is the judge who declares τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς. Especially when the judge himself states the evidential basis for his decision it is appropriate to describe his words as ὁμολογία, and since this is what happens in xxv. 35f., 40, 42f., 45 the wedge driven between xxv. 31 and Luke xii. 8f. should be decisively removed. (vi) While there was reason to believe that “the Son of man sitting on his glorious throne” in xix. 28 was Matt R, there was also reason to believe that the underlying tradition contained an implicit Daniel vii pattern and an intermediate kingly figure as well as God. So if Matthew xix. 28 = Luke xxii. 28–30 is taken to be analogous (and there are similarities involving the rest of Matthew xxv. 31–46, e.g. the matching of the legal bequest metaphors of κληρονομεῖον and διαστόθημι, and the assignment of kingship and the exercising of judgement), the analogy does not support the view that the revelation-discourse originally referred to God alone as judge. (vii) While the angels sent out by, or accompanying, the Son of man in Matthew xiii. 41 and xxiv. 31 (diff Mark xiii. 27) are said to be αὐτοῦ, they are no more than μετ’ αὐτοῦ in xxv. 31. This is no different from Luke xii. 8f. where the Son of man acts as judge on God’s behalf ἐμπροσθεὶν ἐνώπιον the angels of God. Therefore, to talk (inaptly) of a transference of the angels from God to the Son of man is to allow insufficiently for the closeness of the functional association between the Son of man and God. The case is no different in respect of the glory. Since glory was given to the “one like a son of man” in Daniel vii. 14 without thereby being detached from the Ancient of Days, the discussion of Matthew xxv. 31 is better protected from distinctions which are not differences. (viii) Finally, there is the supporting evidence, whether weak or strong, of 1 Enoch. Whether late, and therefore only formal, or early, and therefore a parallel development, at least 1 Enoch alerts us to a scheme which also involves the Son of man and also varies the terminology between “Son of man” and an alternative, this time “the Elect One”. But arguments (i)–(vii) are, I believe, quite able to stand on their own feet without argu-
ment (viii), while, if argument (viii) has its strongest potential, so much the better.

So the Son of man in xxv. 31 shows every sign of being non-Matthaean and pre-Matthaean. More than that, this instance belongs with material like Luke xii. 8f. which presents the Son of man as exclusively heavenly and therefore distinct from the earthly Jesus. Since post-Easter convictions are therefore lacking, it is necessary to pick up here the echoes of the authentic voice of Jesus himself.¹

2. The assembly of the nations (xxv. 32)

In Joel iii. 11f. a summons is issued: "Hasten and come, all you nations (LXX: πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) round about, gather yourselves (συνάχθητε) there... Let the nations bestir themselves... for I will sit to judge all the nations (καθὼς τοῦ διακρίναι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη...)."

In this, the closest Old Testament approximation to Matthew xxv. 31f., πάντα τὰ ἔθνη stands for Gentiles who have oppressed Israel. A similarly sharp distinction is drawn between Israel and the rest in 1 Enoch lxii-lxiii. Does Matthew’s πάντα τὰ ἔθνη presume such a distinction, and what is the relationship between this and the rest of xxv. 31-46?

Five of Matthew’s references to τὰ ἔθνη are preceded by πάντα, and all the passages concerned deal with missionary preaching or suffering or both. The sense of "Go nowhere among the ἔθνη" (x. 5) is clear from the contrast with Israel and Samaritans: Gentiles alone are in mind. In x. 18 (= Mark xiii. 9) the missionaries are "dragged before governors and kings for my sake for a testimony to them and to the nations (καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν)", the last phrase being drawn from πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in Mark xiii. 9. Mark’s context makes plain that the πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

¹ This position is markedly different from the currently influential proposal of G. Vermes that "Son of man" is itself a circumlocution for "I", cf. "The use of bar nash/bar nasha in Jewish Aramaic", in M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford, 1967), pp. 310-28, and esp. pp. 320-8. But the texts cited by Vermes seem to use bar nash or bar nasha in statements of general principle which are then within the context brought to bear on the experience of a particular individual. If so they are not exact parallels for the usage in the synoptic tradition where none of the "Son of man" sayings has primarily a general reference and then derivatively a reference to "I" = Jesus.
to whom the gospel is preached are the πάντες who hate the preachers and that these persons are represented by συνεδρία καὶ συναγωγαί (xiii. 9) as well as ἡγεμόνες καὶ βασιλεῖς, that is, by Jewish as well as Gentile persons. For Mark xiii. 10, therefore, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is genuinely universal and brings together Jews and Gentiles. Matthew x. 18 follows the same line, in that τὰ ἔθνη are formally distinguished from the αὐτοῖ when testimony is given, while the preceding phrase ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν appears to define the αὐτοῖ as Jewish. Hence τὰ ἔθνη in x. 18 are non-Jewish. But by the omission of Mark’s preceding πάντα Matthew probably drops a hint that for him the stronger term πάντα τὰ ἔθνη includes all without distinction. This is made all the more likely by even some of the τὰ ἔθνη passages which lack πάντα. Thus Γαλιλαία τῶν ἔθνων (iv. 15) defines the area of work of that Jesus who touches primarily Jews (cf. xv. 24) and who constantly meets Jews in Galilee, so Galilee is a microcosm of the whole world and not simply the non-Jewish world (cf. similarly xii. 15, 21). Again, the phrase ἔθνος ἐπ’ ἔθνος (xxiv. 7 = Mark xiii. 8) relates to a conflict which, according to material later in the chapter, includes the Jewish experience of a.d. 66–73, so that the second ἔθνος reference must denote Jews and correspondingly any πάντα τὰ ἔθνη reference include them.

Mark xiii. 9–13 is again before the evangelist in xxiv. 9–14, and the use he makes of it here confirms our early impressions. Mark’s persecuting πάντες (xiii. 13) become πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (Matt. xxiv. 9), while Mark’s εἰς μαρτύριον (xiii. 9) is drawn across into the statement about gospel preaching (Matt. xxiv. 14) which also drew from Mark xiii. 10 the same phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. This time, however, Matt R amplifies by means of ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ. It could scarcely be clearer that Matthew has in mind all humanity, Jews as well as Gentiles. Indeed it is a case of, as it were, viewing the whole world from above rather than the outside world from inside Israel.¹ In consequence, no sur-

¹ Compare (1) Matt. iv. 8 = Luke iv. 5, where κόσμος and οἰκουμένη are equivalents, both being viewed from above (Matt.: the high mountain; Luke: ἀναγάγων); (2) Matt. v. 13–16, where γῆ = κόσμος = the total sphere of men; (3) Matt. xxiv. 30 diff Mark xiii. 26 where πᾶσα αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς see the coming of the heavenly Son of man.
prise is occasioned by Matthew xxvi. 13 when it paraphrases xxiv. 14 by using the synonymous phrase ἐν ὀλίγῳ τῷ κόσμῳ. Finally, the same view of the entire world from above is maintained in xxviii. 16–20—note the references to the mountain (verse 16) and to heaven (verse 18)—where the heavenly Son proclaims an authority which is to be exerted ἐν τῆς γῆς in missionary preaching. It would be damaging to the concerns of Matthew's gospel for the commission of the exalted one to extend to the Gentiles and exclude the Jews.

We conclude, therefore that the occurrences of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in Matthew, and the one instance of his dropping πάντα but retaining τὰ ἔθνη, and the three usages of τὰ ἔθνη by derivation from the Old Testament (iv. 15; xii. 15, 21), all combine to show that for Matthew πάντα τὰ ἔθνη stands for all humanity, Jews as well as Gentiles. A corollary which follows equally from the above evidence, in which πάντα τὰ ἔθνη may stand for both persecutors of the preachers and recipients of the preaching, is that for Matthew πάντα τὰ ἔθνη stands for all humanity, believers as well as unbelievers. So no subdivisions of any sort qualify the all-inclusiveness of this terminology.

Finally, is πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in xxv. 32 Matt R? (a) Other instances are sometimes Matt R and sometimes drawn from sources, so the statistical evidence is inconclusive. (b) Even if πάντα τὰ ἔθνη here is Matt R the character of the discourse as a whole, with its emphasis on the ultimate judgement and on the basic demand for positive acts of service, makes it unlikely (though perhaps not impossible) that any attempt to delimit the personnel involved would belong to its concern. If so, either conclusion about the origin of the specific phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη probably makes very little difference.

3. The criterion of judgement

As previously mentioned, the Matthaean and Enochian discourses differ in that persecution and oppression figure in one but not in the other. In Matthew, men are divided, not on the basis of whether they belong to the people of God or their persecutors, but on the basis of whether they have or have not done anything to alleviate human need. In 1 Enoch there is a flavour
of earthly prosperity in the description of those under judgement; in Matthew this is not present except in so far as it is presumed that they possess the resources to meet human need. The main thrust remains clear: failure to pass the ultimate test is the result, not of having done anything wrong but rather of having done nothing at all. In other words, failure to do good is in fact to do evil.

The list of six typical actions of kindness to the needy belongs to a deeply rooted tradition evidenced in and binding together Jewish and non-Jewish material.¹ The latter is represented by the Egyptian Book of the Dead and Persian sources, but the former clearly represents the established and developing tradition in which Matthew’s discourse stands. This tradition repeatedly summarizes the items in Matthew’s list as “righteousness” or “mercy”, describes the recipients as “the poor”, and in varied ways insists on the actions themselves as absolutely fundamental to and definitive of a firm relationship with God. Thus: (i) Isaiah lviii. 6–10, citing items 1, 3, 4 and implicitly 6, sees item 3 as directed towards the poor (verse 7), defines the observance of all such requirements as “righteousness” (verses 2, 8), and places the whole demand in the context of promise. (ii) Ezekiel xviii. 7, 16, citing items 1 and 4, again sums the matter up as “righteousness” and promises life to the one who obeys, but also insists that these two obligations are intrinsic to covenant commitment by including them in a longer list influenced by the decalogue, and by adding a warning to keep Israel’s faith. (iii) Job xxxi. 16–20, 31f., citing items 1, 3 and 4, is in later times echoed by Aboth d’Rabbi Nathan vii. 1, citing items 1, 2 and 4. Here too the setting is one of judgement and the general heading “righteous” treatment of the “poor”. (iv) In Tobit, items 1 and 4 are twice cited, that is, in i. 16f. and iv. 16. In the first case these actions are linked with the paramount and sacred obligation to bury the dead,² and this time the summarizing concept is ἐλεημοσύνη which, for Tobit, stands alongside δικαιοσύνη (ii. 14; vii. 6; ix. 6) and opposite δικία (xiv. 11). In the second
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case the inclusion of these items in an Abschiedsrede (iv. 3–21) is itself an indication of their inseparability from commitment to Israel’s God. Important also is the adjacent reference to the negative form of the Golden Rule (iv. 15), which is therefore complemented positively, and the setting in the promise of reward (iv. 6, 9f., 19). And when the final Abschiedsrede in Tobit comes to be spoken by the angel (xii. 6–10), all such good deeds are defined as δικαιοσύνη and ἀγαθοποίητα. (v) Testament of Joseph i. 4–7, citing items 1, 5 and 6 along with seven others, also adopts the literary form of the Abschiedsrede, though this time it is God who acts for the benefit of his faithful servant: “I was sick and the Lord visited me...”. There is no pressure to follow God as is the case in b. Sota 14a, which cites items 4 and 5 along with blessing the sorrowful and burying the dead. (vi) Testament of Benjamin iv. 4, citing item 5, is closer to the normal trend and promises divine reward to those who “show mercy to all men, even though they be sinners”. It may also be useful to mention (vii) 2 Enoch passages: ix. 1, where Enoch is shown the “place for eternal inheritance prepared for the righteous”, whose piety includes items 1 and 4; x. 5, where the opposite destiny is envisaged for those who hold back from compassionate action; lii. 8f, where items 1 and 4 are again cited and the beatitude form adopted in connection with the promise; and lxiii. 1, 3 where the promise of divine reward or forgiveness is again attached. One could go on and mention (viii) Derek’erez rabbah ii. 21 which, citing items 1, 2 and 4, again uses the list to fill out the concept of righteousness on the basis of Isaiah iii. 10, “Tell the righteous that it shall be well with them for they shall eat the fruit of their deeds.” (ix) Midrash Tehillim cxviii. 9 is very similar and defines the reward as entry to the future world. Finally, reference must be made to (x) Midrash Tannaim xv. 9 in which God says to Israel, “My children, when you gave food to the poor I counted it as though you had given it to me.”

It can be readily appreciated that a series of direct lines connect this material to Matthew xxv. 31–46 as a whole as well as to the lists of caring actions in particular. Apart from the lists there are concepts such as righteousness, life, the blessing, the prepared inheritance, and there is the insistence on the
fundamental necessity of such care in action. Similar also is the judicial setting which is envisaged by some of the texts. But does this series of direct lines make it possible to see in the demand for such acts of love and care a connection with Jesus?

When tradition-historical processes are applied to the gospel tradition the Jesus who emerges is one who insists on precisely such acts of love. It is the Jesus of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke x. 25-37) who insists that God's displeasure falls not simply on those who do evil but specifically on those who do nothing at all. It is the Jesus of Mark iii. 4 who insists that not to do good is in fact to do evil. It is the Jesus whose Golden Rule requires not simply avoidance of what one would not like done to oneself but positive action in terms of what one would like. It is, as argued above, the Jesus of the earlier tradition underlying Mark ix. 33-37, 41 who insists on διακονία and interprets it in terms of unrestricted care for the insignificant and needy. In all those respects the Son of man in Matthew xxv. 31-46 is of one mind with Jesus.

4. The recipients of service (xxv. 40, 45)

In the source material surveyed earlier there are variations in emphasis when the scope of charitable actions is indicated. Thus, Testament of Benjamin iv. 4 confronted critically the idea of any limit: "Show mercy to all men, even though they be sinners." On the other hand texts which deal with persecution naturally tend towards a limitation to the people of Israel, and that is true from time to time in other texts, too. Thus in a non-Israelite setting Tobit directs acts of charity towards "my brethren" or "whatever poor man of our brethren you may find who is mindful of the Lord" (i. 16f.; ii. 2). Controversy rages over the question of whether Matthew veers towards or away from any restriction in the two climatic sayings: "Truly, I say to you, as you did it (not: verse 45) to one of the least of these (my brethren: verse 40) you did it (not: verse 45) to me." The interpretation of the whole unit depends on our understanding of these words whose crucial role is clear on formal grounds in that (a) the authoritative word of the judge here takes the place of that confession by the guilty which is normally the climax of
enthronement-recognition scenes; (b) here alone the mystery of the initial declarations of the judge is solved; (c) here alone, but twice, there occurs the resounding ἰ' ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν.

(i) οἱ ἐλαχιστοί. Apart from Matthew xxv. 40, 45 the distribution of ἐλαχιστος in the synoptic tradition extends to Matthew ii. 6, v. 19 (twice) and Luke xii. 26, xvi. 10 (twice) and xix. 17. Matthew ii. 6 and Luke xii. 26 are irrelevant to our present inquiry but the phrase μία τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων (Matt. v. 19) is formally so close to εἰς τούτων τῶν ἄδελφῶν μοι τῶν ἐλαχίστων as to arouse strong suspicions of Matt R in either or both. This is confirmed by way of the phenomenon of proximity which appears in groups of the ἐλαχιστος references. Thus, Matthew v. 19 occurs within the Matthaean complex v. 17, 18, (20), 32 which is paralleled in Luke xvi. 16, 17, (14f.), 18, which is in turn shortly after xvi. 10 in the Lukan sequence. The direction of the reminiscence here need not presently detain us, since more interest attaches to Luke xix. 17. This belongs to the parable of the pounds/talents whose relationship to Matthew xxv. 31–46 has already proved significant. Since the proximity of Luke xix. 17 and Matthew xxv. 40, 45 can hardly be coincidence, the two possible explanations are that ἐλαχιστος in Luke xix. 17 is a reminiscence of a pre-Matthaean form of xxv. 31–46 (which is ruled out by the fact that Luke shows no knowledge of this tradition as a whole which did not figure in Q) or that ἐλαχιστος in Matthew xxv. 40, 45 is a reminiscence of the language of the parable of the talents/talents which, on this showing, was most exactly preserved by Luke. The conclusion is therefore that τῶν ἐλαχίστων in Matthew xxv. 40, 45 is Matt R. In view of the equivalence of ἐλαχιστος and μικρός, the Matthaean (xviii. 10, 14) and pre-Matthaean (Mark ix. 42) term for a disciple, the further corollary must be that in its present form the judge’s climatic saying refers to Christians.

(ii) οἱ ἄδελφοι μοι. Two current, though divergent, interpretations of Matthew xxv. 31–46 or its Vorlage are at one in taking this phrase as original. (a) U. Wilckens¹ proposes the removal of “the Son of man” as Matt R, the equation of “the king” and God, and the notion of “God’s least brethren” as so

distinctive that, on grounds of dissimilarity, it must be traced right back to Jesus. This proposal, however, is fragile and unconvincing because, firstly, the Son of man is not so easily banished; secondly, the attribution of οἱ δὲ Χριστοῦ to Matt R establishes a concern in the evangelist’s mind which will also account very naturally for οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μου; thirdly, Wilckens himself has to admit the extreme difficulty of integrating the concept of “God’s least brethren” with other authentic Jesus-material. He writes: “Unter den sonstigen echten Stoffen der Jesusüberlieferung findet sich zwar keine direkte Parallele für diese gewagte Aussage der Identifikation Cottes mit den Armen und Elenden. Gott ist sonst durchweg der Vater nie der Bruder der Menschen.”

(b) J. R. Michaels and others have proposed that the recipients of acts of care and compassion be understood as Christian missionaries, on the grounds that the six sorts of hardship listed in verses 35–39, 42–44 match those mentioned in Matthew x. 9f. = Luke x. 4, Acts xvi. 30–34, 1 Corinthians iv, 2 Corinthians vi and xi, and 3 John 5f. The argument also requires the Jewish shaliyah pattern as the basis of the equivalence affirmed in verses 40, 45. Attractive at first sight, this proposal is also fragile and unconvincing because, firstly, the tradition behind the six-fold list knows no limitation to missionaries; secondly, the ignorance/recognition theme which is central to the whole discourse simply will not work on the basis of the shaliyah pattern, because the righteous persons would know that in receiving the sent ones they were receiving the sender; thirdly, the overall apocalyptic character of the material requires an apocalyptic correspondence between judge and suffers. That is, the Son of man does not send the sufferers but is their heavenly counterpart.

If neither of these proposals succeeds in preserving the words τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου as pre-Matthaean, not all attempts at excising them as Matt R have been securely grounded. Thus, it is not correct to require a strict symmetry between verses 40 and 45 and in consequence to remove τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου from verse 40.

3 J. Friedrich, op. cit. p. 238.
Narratives moving forward in two stages frequently show a shortening and summarizing tendency in the second part. This is so in other respects in verses 31-46. The "king" is mentioned in verses 34 and 40 but not in the corresponding verses 41 and 45; the full statement "I was sick and you visited me, I was in prison and you came to me" (verse 36) is shortened to "sick and in prison and you did not visit me" (verse 43); the question asked by those on the left (verse 44) corresponds to, but is considerably shorter than, that of the righteous (verse 37).

In spite of the inadequacy of that argument it is still probable that the words τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου are Matt R. Matthew has a habit of limiting material with a broad reference so that it is applied to the community. For example, (i) in v. 23f. it is a complaint by an ἀδελφός which delays an offering, whereas in the similar tradition in Mark xi. 25 the complainant is unrestrictedly τις; (ii) in v. 47 the example of greeting another is introduced secondarily (diff Luke vi. 33) and brings with it the restricted community reference to οἱ ἀδελφοί υμῶν (iii) in xviii. 35 the parable of the unmerciful servant is applied in terms of forgiving the brother, whereas the original parable probably applied as unrestrictedly as in the related tradition in vi. 15: "If you do not forgive men (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις) their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses"; (iv) in xxiii. 7b-10 the greeting theme introduced by xxiii. 6-7a (= Mark xii. 38f.) is amplified by a triple καλέω-complex which includes the affirmation πάντες δὲ υμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε (verse 8b). While it is true that Matthew found a certain amount of encouragement for this line in his sources (cf. vii. 3-5 = Luke vi. 41f.; xii. 50 = Mark iii. 35), the degree of concern he shows for intra-communal application of traditions makes it extremely probable that τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου (verse 40) derives from Matt R. In that case, the original words from the judge were άμην λέγω υμῖν, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐπαινήσατε τούτους ἐμοί ἐπαινήσατε. This means that the tradition-historical development here matches those tendencies which were at work to produce Matthew x. 40-42 and Mark ix. 33-41 out of Luke x. 16 and the reconstructed pre-Markan form of the pericope about Jesus and the child.
The results of our tradition-historical investigations can now be assembled.

Matthew’s apocalyptic revelation-discourse belongs to a genre to whose form we can become sensitive by way of 1 Enoch lxii–lxiii and related traditions. Its character as a description of an enthronement/recognition scheme enables us to establish both its essential features at the pre-Matthaean stage and also the meaning of some details which would otherwise remain ambiguous. Recent attempts to interpret this discourse in the light of the Jewish shalih pattern or Christian community-consciousness are not supported by the primary forms of the discourse or of comparable gospel traditions. Such attempts merely continue and endorse secondary trends. By contrast, the primary version set up an apocalyptic 1 : 1 correspondence between the Son of man in heaven and the poor on earth.

The primary version of the discourse and the primary tradition underlying Mark ix. 33–41 are related very closely indeed. When the poor and needy as such are seen at the heart of the discourse, and when the form of the material is taken into account, it becomes clear that the listeners are not being invited to identify themselves with the sufferers (as was normal in such apocalyptic contexts) against whom is ranged just one oppressing group, but rather to check whether they should be identified with one or the other of two groups who have in different ways responded to the suffering of others. In other words, the discourse voices demand rather than consolation, just as Jesus had done in the background of Mark ix. 37a, 41. Moreover, in both cases the essential demand is defined as διακονία. In both cases service shows itself as δέχεσθαι and the satisfying of physical needs. In both cases such service is performed for all in need without restriction. In both cases eschatological blessing is promised to the person who takes the role of the servant. In both cases this is affirmed by the speaker with all the authority inherent in Ἀμήν. And in both cases a similarly expressed declaration affirms the equivalence of the needy and the speaker.

Here, however, we encounter a variation. The speaker is in
one case the earthly Jesus and in the other case the heavenly Son of man. If the equivalence of the needy and the earthly Jesus and that of the needy and the heavenly Son of man form, as it were, two sides of a triangle, the equivalence of the earthly Jesus and the heavenly Son of man forms the third side. That equivalence is built into the authentic saying in Luke xii. 8 (diff Matt. x. 32): "Whoever acknowledges me before man, the Son of man also will acknowledge before the angels of God." But the triangle does more than its third side alone could do. It makes clear that, in Jesus' view, acknowledging him means more than stubborn loyalty to convictions about him or even highly-prized personal attachment to him. It means active recognition that into the offer of grace is built the demand for unlimited love.