

COMPLETING THE GOSPEL:  
*THE INFANCY GOSPEL OF THOMAS AS A SUPPLEMENT TO  
THE GOSPEL OF LUKE*

TONY CHARTRAND-BURKE

Early Christian apocryphal texts regularly take episodes from earlier texts and rework them in a variety of ways—for example, by retelling a story in light of doctrinal developments, by grounding new ideas in events from the past, or by grafting other early traditions onto well-known narratives. These transformations are forms of exegesis, for, in changing their sources, apocryphal writers also interpret and elucidate the earlier material. An example of such exegesis can be found in the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* (IGT). This second-century apocryphal gospel traces the life of Jesus from the ages of five to twelve, terminating with Luke’s story of Jesus in the Temple (2:41–52).

Aside from the author of IGT,<sup>1</sup> only a handful of early Christian writers comment on the episode of Jesus in the Temple. Yet, it appears to be a story with much exegetical flexibility, for both orthodox and heretical writers use it to support very different positions on the nature and origins of Jesus. Gnostic Christians used the age assigned to Jesus in the Temple story as an opportunity for numerological speculation.<sup>2</sup> The Valentinians, for example, connected the episode to elements of their cosmogony. According to Irenaeus, the Valentinians claimed “the production, again, of the Duodecad of the Aeons, is indicated by the fact that the Lord was *twelve* years of age when He disputed with the teachers of the law, and by the election of the apostles, for of these

---

<sup>1</sup> The story of Jesus in the Temple appears also in the *Arabic Infancy Gospel*, an eighth- or ninth-century compilation of IGT, the *Protoevangelium of James* and other infancy traditions (see J.K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993], 100). This gospel’s use of Jesus in the Temple, copied as it is from IGT, is of little value to the present discussion.

<sup>2</sup> With few exceptions, the Gnostic writers otherwise show little interest in Jesus’ childhood, and no interest in canonical childhood traditions. Rather than invoking Luke’s story, Justin the Gnostic reports a tale of incarnation in which the angel Baruch appears to a twelve-year-old Jesus who is tending sheep (Hippolytus, *Haer.* 5.26.29). The *Pistis Sophia* (8 and 61) discusses Jesus’ conception and offers another story in which the spirit unites with Jesus as a youth.

there were twelve” (*Haer.* 1.3:2).<sup>3</sup> The Marcosians, to whom Irenaeus (*Haer.* 1.20:1) credits the origin of IGT’s story of Jesus and the Teacher (IGT 6, 14, 15),<sup>4</sup> used Luke 2:49 (“Did you not know that I must be in my Father’s house?”) to claim that Jesus “announced to them the Father of whom they were ignorant” (*Haer.* 1.20:2). Orthodox doctrine is found supported also in Jesus in the Temple. Tertullian invokes Luke 2:49 in his argument against Praxeas to show that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were not one and the same (*Prax.*, 26). The *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles* (6.23) mentions Jesus’ submission to his parents (Luke 2:51), and both Tertullian (*Pud.*, 1) and Origen (*Comm. Matt.* 8.13) affirm Jesus’ humanity by mentioning his growth in wisdom (Luke 2:52).

Few scholars of IGT have made much of its use of the story of Jesus in the Temple.<sup>5</sup> The tendency has been to see IGT as nothing more than a haphazard collection of stories woodenly “filling in” information missing in the canonical gospels. Thus, Jesus in the Temple serves merely to connect the apocryphal stories with canonical traditions. But there is much to be learned from IGT’s exegesis of Luke. Careful study of IGT in its earliest recoverable form indicates that the gospel was written not to “fill in” the NT gospels as a group, but to supplement Luke in particular, for it can be argued that IGT shows no awareness of any Christian text other than Luke-Acts and appears to share some of Luke’s redactional and christological concerns. Yet, in supplementing Luke, the author of IGT reveals a dissatisfaction with Luke’s portrayal of Jesus. At the very least he must have felt something was missing in the third gospel. But the problem is more acute, for the author of IGT does not merely reproduce verbatim the Jesus in the Temple episode; rather, he alters it to emphasize aspects of Jesus’ character that he feels are lacking in the canonical account. The goal of IGT’s transformation

---

<sup>3</sup> Translation from Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers; Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to AD 325*, vol. 1 (ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson; 1885–1887; Repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994).

<sup>4</sup> For ease of comparison all citations of IGT reflect the chapter and verse divisions of R. Hock, *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas* (The Scholars Bible 2; Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1995), 104–43. Excerpts from IGT are taken from Hock’s translation except for readings from the Greek S form of the text—these are my own.

<sup>5</sup> Only two articles have appeared dealing particularly with IGT’s use of Luke: G. Schmahl, “Lk 2, 41–52 und die Kindheits Erzählung des Thomas 19, 1–5: Ein Vergleich,” *BL* 15 (1974), 249–58; and J. de Jonge, “Sonship, Wisdom, Infancy: Luke 2:41–51a,” *NIS* 24 (1978), 317–54. Both authors conclude (to no-one’s surprise) that IGT borrowed Luke’s story.

of the story, and indeed the reason for composition of the entire gospel, appears to be to increase the young Jesus' knowledge and acumen so that, together IGT and Luke can effectively compete with contemporary biographies of other eminent figures. Compared to other biographical literature, Luke was too subtle, too reserved in its portrayal of Jesus. IGT was created to fix it.

### 1. *The Transmission History of the Infancy Gospel of Thomas*

IGT is a text with a complicated transmission history—so complicated that all but a few scholars have shied away from it. Though it was reintroduced in the West in the seventeenth century, only in the past few decades has research on the text progressed to the point that its original form and contents are finally coming into view. And only with that information can something significant be said about IGT's relationship to the Gospel of Luke.

Most readers know IGT in the nineteen-chapter form made popular by Constantin von Tischendorf in his *Evangelia Apocrypha* collection of 1853.<sup>6</sup> Tischendorf established the text on four manuscripts: two complete and nearly identical (Dresden, Sächsische Bibliothek A 187 and Bologna, Biblioteca universitaria 2702) and two fragmentary (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Phil. gr. 162 and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, a.f. gr. 239). He called this form of the text Greek A. Three other forms of the text appear in Tischendorf's edition: a second, much shorter Greek text (which he called Greek B) established on a single manuscript (Sinai gr. 453),<sup>7</sup> plus an early Latin version that is extant both in a fragmentary palimpsest from the fifth century (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindobensis 563)<sup>8</sup> and incorporated

---

<sup>6</sup> C. von Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha* (Leipzig: H. Mendelsohn, 1853)—available more widely in the second edition of 1876 (pp. 140–57). For complete descriptions of all the Greek manuscripts of IGT see T. Chartrand-Burke, “The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*: The Text, Its Origins, and Its Transmission” (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2001), 101–16, or *idem*, “The Greek Manuscript Tradition of the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*,” *Apocrypha* 14 (2004), 129–51.

<sup>7</sup> Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*<sup>2</sup>, 158–63; first published in *idem*, “Rechenschaft über meine handschriftlichen Studien auf meiner wissenschaftlichen Reise von 1840 bis 1844,” *Jahrbucher der Literatur* 114 (Vienna, 1846), 51–53, and discussed in *idem*, *De evangeliorum apocryphorum origine et usu* (Verhandelingen uitgegeven door het haagsche genootschap tot verdediging van de christelijke godsdienst 12; The Hague, 1851), 210–12.

<sup>8</sup> Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*<sup>2</sup>, xlv–xlvi. Most of the text of the palimpsest was previewed in Tischendorf, *De evangeliorum*, 214–15.

in some late manuscripts of the Latin *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*,<sup>9</sup> and an unrelated late Latin version (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vat. lat. 4578), featuring a three-chapter prologue of the Holy Family's journeys in Egypt.<sup>10</sup> Several other manuscript discoveries and editions have appeared since Tischendorf's day: a third Greek recension (usually dubbed Greek D),<sup>11</sup> and versions in Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, Irish, Arabic, and Slavonic.<sup>12</sup> In 1980 Lucas van Rompay determined that the early versions (Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, and Old Latin) preserve the text in a more original form than the available Greek recensions;<sup>13</sup> this form lacks the introduction with its attribution to the apostle Thomas and several other chapters (10, 17, and 18) but includes a lengthy section of chapter six missing in Tischendorf's manuscripts.

Scholars have been surprisingly slow to incorporate van Rompay's conclusions into their treatments of the text. Time and again IGT is found in New Testament Apocrypha collections in the familiar nineteen-chapter form, often without any acknowledgement of the evidence from the early versions.<sup>14</sup> This is doubtless due in part to scholars' lack

<sup>9</sup> Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*<sup>2</sup>, 93–112.

<sup>10</sup> Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*<sup>2</sup>, 164–80.

<sup>11</sup> A. Delatte, "Évangile de l'Enfance de Jacques: manuscrit No. 355 de la Bibliothèque nationale," in *Anecdota Atheniensia*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1927), 264–71. The text is called Greek C by Malcolm Lowe ("IOΥΔΑΙΟΙ of the Apocrypha: A Fresh Approach to the Gospels of James, Pseudo-Thomas, Peter and Nicodemus," *NovT* 23 [1981]: 56–90), P.A. Mirecki ("Thomas, Infancy Gospel of," *ABD* 6.540–44), and in my own work ("The Infancy Gospel of Thomas," and *idem*, "Authorship and Identity in *The Infancy Gospel of Thomas*," *TJT* 14 [1998], 27–43).

<sup>12</sup> For a complete overview see Chartrand-Burke, "The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*," 116–33; also S. Voicu, "Verso il testo primitivo dei Παῖδικὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ 'Racconti dell'infanzia del Signore Gesù'," *Apocrypha* 9 (1998), 7–95.

<sup>13</sup> "De ethiopische versie van het Kindsheidsevangelie volgens Thomas de Israëliet," *L'enfant dans les civilisations orientales* (ed. A. Theodorides, P. Naster, and J. Ries; Leuven: Editions Peeters, 1980), 119–32.

<sup>14</sup> For example, see O. Cullmann, "The Infancy Story of Thomas," in *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1 (ed. W. Schneemelcher; trans. R.M. Wilson; rev. ed.; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 444–52; Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 68–83; M. Erbetta, *Gli apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento*, vol. 1.2 (Turin: Marietti, 1981), 78–101; L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento*, vol. 2 (Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1971), 247–79; W. Michaelis, *Die apocryphen Schriften zum Neuen Testament* (Bremen: Carl Schunemann, 1958), 96–111; and the editions of A. de Santos Otero, *Los evangelios apócrifos* (Madrid: Biblioteca de autores christianos, 1941), 302–24; P.G. Bonaccorsi, *Vangeli apocrifi*, vol. 1 (Florence: Libreria editrice Fiorentina, 1948), 110–51; and G. Schneider, *Apokryphe Kindheitsevangelien* (New York: Herder, 1995), 147–72; and used in R. Funk, *New Gospel Parallels*, vol. 2: *John and the Other Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 235–86, and A. Fuchs and F. Weissengruber, *Konkordanz zum Thomasevangelium:*

of familiarity with the languages of the versions—most scholars prefer to work with flawed Greek and Latin texts than tangle with Syriac, Ethiopic, or Georgian. What a great boon to scholarship it would be to find a Greek manuscript of IGT with the same form of the text reflected in the early versions.

Fortunately, such a manuscript has been found: Jerusalem, Patriarchate Library Sabaiticus gr. 259.<sup>15</sup> This eleventh-century manuscript (different enough from other Greek manuscripts to be assigned its own recension: Greek S) figured prominently in Sever Voicu's 1990 study of IGT.<sup>16</sup> Here Voicu noted the manuscript's affinities with the early versions and placed it in an intermediary point of development between the early versions and the later Greek recensions—it features readings closer to the versions than the other Greek manuscripts, including the expanded ch. 6, and though it includes two of the chapters found in Greek A and D (1 and 10, with the latter placed after ch. 16), it does not have chapters 17 and 18. To be fair, Sabaiticus 259 may not present IGT in a form exactly like that of the versions, but, with the removal of chs. 1 and 10, it comes pretty close. Despite its obvious value, Voicu has not worked with the manuscript in any great detail because he believes the Ethiopic text is more useful for recovering the original form of the gospel. Yet, for all its flaws, Sabaiticus 259 is the closest we can get to the original form of IGT in its language of composition.<sup>17</sup>

An additional seven Greek manuscripts of IGT were collated for a critical edition in 2001.<sup>18</sup> None of these manuscripts belong to the same recension as Sabaiticus 259, but they do help to establish the texts of the other three Greek recensions.

---

*Version A und B* (SNTSU 4; Freistadt: Plöchl, 1978). Some of these editions and translations include variant readings from non-Greek traditions only as appendices. Hock's edition (*Infancy Gospels*) is perhaps the most progressive—it follows Greek A primarily but switches to Greek D for chapter six and includes variants from other published witnesses in the apparatus.

<sup>15</sup> The manuscript was noted first by J. Noret, "Pour une édition de l'Évangile de l'enfance selon Thomas," *AnBoll* 90 (1972), 412. It was finally published in T. Chartrand-Burke, "The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*."

<sup>16</sup> "Notes sur l'histoire du texte de L'Histoire de l'Enfance de Jésus," *Apocrypha* 2 (1991), 119–32.

<sup>17</sup> Several scholars have claimed IGT was composed in Syriac, but offer no evidence for their position. The theory of Syriac origin is refuted in Voicu, "Verso il testo primitivo," 53–5, and more extensively in Chartrand-Burke, "The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*," 247–54.

<sup>18</sup> Chartrand-Burke, "The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*," and see also *idem*, "The Greek Manuscript Tradition."

## 2. *The Infancy Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament*

Greek S has the potential to significantly change scholarly assessments of IGT. The gospel has been described previously as a crude, haphazard collection of tales without any apparent order or sophistication.<sup>19</sup> Some of the tales have been characterized as imitations of synoptic-style miracle stories, adding to the perception of the text as later than and derivative of the Synoptic gospels. But all of these assessments are based on late, poor witnesses to the text. The earlier Saba manuscript presents us with a version of IGT that has far fewer borrowings of content or style from the NT and has more sophistication than has previously been allowed.

A reader of IGT in its Greek A, B or D recensions will observe few explicit parallels between IGT and NT but will come away from the text with a sense that the author is consciously evoking stories and teachings of Jesus and the apostles from the Synoptics, John, and Acts. The introduction attributes the text to Thomas, an apostle who appears only in John, and the speech of Jesus in chapter six shows several points of contact with the Fourth Gospel (particularly in the oft-repeated line “I and the one who sent me to you”). The section also quotes 1 Corinthians 13:1 (the boy says to his teacher: “To me this is like a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal,” IGT 6:17). The Synoptic gospels are evoked in two stories: Jesus and the Sparrows and Jesus Curses the Son of Annas (IGT 2–3).

So Joseph went there, and as soon as he spotted him he shouted, “Why are you doing what’s not permitted on the sabbath?” But Jesus simply clapped his hands and shouted to the sparrows, “Be off, fly away, and remember me, you who are now alive!” And the sparrows took off and flew away noisily. The Jews watched with amazement, then left the scene to report to their leaders what they had seen Jesus doing.

The son of Annas the scholar, standing there with Jesus, took a willow branch and drained the water Jesus had collected. Jesus, however, saw what had happened and became angry, saying to him, “Damn you, you irreverent fool! What harm did the ponds of water do to you? From this moment you, too, will dry up like a tree, and you’ll never produce leaves or root or bear fruit.” In an instant the boy had completely withered away. Then Jesus departed and left for the house of Joseph. The parents of the boy who had withered away picked him up and were carrying him

---

<sup>19</sup> See for example Schneider, *Apokryphe Kindheitsevangelien*, 37; Hock, *Infancy Gospels*, 85; Voicu, “Verso il testo primitivo,” 50–51.

out, sad because he was so young. And they came to Joseph and accused him, “It’s your fault—your boy did this.” (2:5–3:4)

This pericope, like Mark 3:1–6 (par.), features a combination of Sabbath controversy, withered victim, and report to the authorities. Also, the mention here of the son of Annas the scribe indicates awareness of the future High Priest’s presence in Luke 3:2, Acts 4:6, and John 18:13, 24. The Synoptics are evoked again in chapters 10, 17, and 18, which feature miracles in the Synoptic style, complete with apophthegms.<sup>20</sup> In the center of the text, a teacher named Zacchaeus questions Jesus’ birth and infancy (“What sort of womb bore him, what sort of mother nourished him? I don’t know,” 7:5) recalling Luke 11:27 (a woman says to Jesus: “Blessed is the womb that bore you and the breasts that nursed you”). Another Teacher story (IGT 15) is similar to Luke’s version of Jesus’ Rejection at Nazareth (Luke 4:16–22)—in both stories Jesus enters a room, picks up a scroll, reads, and amazes the witnesses with his teaching. The saying on seeking and finding, found in a number of places in the canonical gospels (Matt 7:7; Luke 11:9–13; John 7:34), is employed in IGT 5:3. And Paul’s encounter with a snake in Acts 28:3–6 may lie behind the story of the snake that bites James (IGT 16). Finally, chapter 19 features IGT’s only unambiguous and explicit NT parallel: Luke’s Jesus in the Temple (2:41–52). The cumulative weight of these parallels has led previous scholars to consider IGT a relatively late text, dating from as early as the end of second century to as late as the fourth.

But that assessment may change as scholars become more aware of the form of the text found in Greek S and reflected in the early versions. First, the parallels between IGT and the NT can be attributed to knowledge only of Luke and Acts. Chapter 1, with its attribution to Thomas, and the Synoptic-like apophthegms (chs. 10, 17, and 18) are late additions to the text, appearing in the tradition sometime between the sixth and eleventh centuries. The Johannine parallels in chapter six are less explicit in the earlier sources—Jesus does claim to have knowledge of when his older antagonists and their ancestors were born but nowhere in the versions does Jesus use the term “the one who sent me to you.” And the apparent quotation from 1 Cor 13:1 may arise

---

<sup>20</sup> For an examination of these apophthegms see S. Gero, “The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*: A Study of the Textual and Literary Problems,” *NovT* 13 (1971), 64–67.

from the common use of a popular proverb.<sup>21</sup> All the remaining NT parallels could be explained as use of Luke and Acts.

The new, shorter IGT is also a text of greater literary sophistication than previous scholars have allowed. Failing to find any observable principle of organization or progression linking the tales aside from the occasional indication of Jesus' age, they were befuddled as to why Jesus' character did not grow and develop as he aged. They expected, like the crowds in the tales, that the *enfant terrible* should turn from cursing to blessing. But after raising a boy to life (ch. 9), healing a man's foot (ch. 10), and assisting his parents (chs. 11–13), he relapses to his former, wicked ways by slaying a teacher (ch. 14). The problem with such expectations is that they are anachronistic; the need to rehabilitate Jesus is far more a concern of modern readers than it is of the author of IGT. The real transformation in the narrative is made in those around Jesus, not Jesus himself. Like the NT gospels, IGT is the tale of a wonderworker who must demonstrate his authority to the unbelieving masses through wondrous miracles and unearthly teachings. Whenever Jesus demonstrates his abilities, he faces incredulity, even violence, instead of acceptance. Unlike the NT Jesus, however, IGT's Jesus responds in kind, chastising those who oppose him. But once Jesus' neighbours and family begin to see that he is more than mortal, his actions change. The first realization of Jesus' divine nature is made by Zacchaeus. Humbled by the youth, Zacchaeus declares, "what great thing this boy is—either a god or an angel or whatever else I might say—I do not know" (Greek S 7:8). Thereafter, Jesus performs miracles that benefit his neighbours and family, and that elicit a more desirable response from recipients and witnesses. The crowds are amazed at his teachings (15:4), and they worship Jesus and praise God (9:6). Only when Jesus again encounters opposition, in the second Teacher episode, does he revert to cursing instead of blessing. But once the third teacher declares that Jesus is "full of much grace and wisdom" (Greek S 15:6), Jesus resumes his miracles of healing. This third Teacher story illustrates best the proper interpretation of the text. As in folklore, where triplicate episodes are quite common, the third and final version of a tale dictates the behaviour expected from the characters in the narrative. In IGT, this means that people should respond to Jesus not with incredulity or

---

<sup>21</sup> Greek S also contains a phrase from 1 Corinthians 7:2 (IGT 6:3 in Chartrand-Burke, "The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*"), but this is found neither in the early versions nor any other witness to the text.

violence, but with belief and praise. At no time does the text suggest that Jesus is rehabilitated; in fact, it is Jesus' teachers, neighbours, and parents who have a lesson to learn here.

This theme of teaching is prevalent in IGT. Indeed, the exchange between Jesus and Zacchaeus occupies a considerable portion of the text. And given the repetition of the story's principle elements in IGT 14–15, it is quite likely that IGT was built around this key episode. Just as Jesus instructs his teacher in the arcane qualities of the alpha, and ultimately his own otherworldly nature, he teaches the same lesson also to the crowds who witness all of his miracles. Therefore, Luke's Temple story, with its interaction between Jesus and teachers, makes a fitting conclusion to the collection. But IGT does not woodenly reproduce Luke's story; the author makes some changes to the tale in order to make it better fit his theme and also to improve on Luke's portrayal of Jesus as a youth.

### 3. *The Infancy Gospel of Thomas as a Supplement to Luke*

A relationship between IGT and Luke is unmistakable, but the relationship is more than simply IGT's reproduction of one of Luke's tales. When read in its earliest form, IGT stands revealed as a text with great affinities with Luke and with Luke's second volume, Acts. Indeed, IGT and Luke have similar redactional and christological interests, suggesting origins in a common milieu. But IGT's efforts to supplement Luke with new childhood tales and additions to the Temple story indicate also a dissatisfaction with Luke, as if the third gospel was in some way deficient in its portrayal of Jesus.

IGT's childhood tales come from a variety of sources. Some evoke activities of biblical figures (particularly Elijah and Elisha—*e.g.*, the young Jesus' gathering and purifying of rainwater from ch. 2 recalls Elisha's purification of water in 2 Kings 19–22), some resemble stories of the adult Jesus (*e.g.*, the Sabbath controversy story of chs. 2–3 mentioned above). Others may be drawn from a pool of folkloric motifs that appear in non-biblical tales of Ahikar,<sup>22</sup> Ezra,<sup>23</sup> and Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa

<sup>22</sup> See B. McNeil, "Jesus and the Alphabet," *JTS* 27 (1976), 126–8.

<sup>23</sup> See A. Mingana and R. Harris, "Woodbrooke Studies 2: (i) A New Jeremiah Apocryphon," *BjRL* 11 (1927), 329–447; and K.H. Kuhn, "A Coptic Jeremiah Apocryphon," *Le Muséon* 83 (1970), 95–135, 291–350.

(*t. Ber.* 3:20/*b. Ber.* 33a; and *b. Ta'an.* 25a).<sup>24</sup> But whatever their origins, the stories have been compiled and arranged by a single writer, a writer who has incorporated into his sources an element of Lukan redaction: several of the stories conclude, like Luke, with their characters either returning to their homes (IGT 14:5; 15:6 and perhaps 7:11; *cf.* Luke 1:23, 56; 2:20, 39, 51; 5:25; 7:10; 23:49; 24:12) or similarly progressing (IGT 2:7; *cf.* Luke 4:14, 30; 5:16; 7:50; 8:39; 9:56; 10:37; 17:14, 19; 24:52). Significant also is the fact that IGT's few NT parallels could be drawn entirely from Luke and Acts. This indicates not only a close tie between IGT and Luke, but also perhaps a time of composition before the wide dispersion of other NT texts.

IGT's christology also appears influenced by Luke-Acts. Previous discussions of IGT's christology have indicated that Jesus is here presented as a young Gnostic Redeemer. But that assessment was based largely on the mistaken identification of IGT with the *Gospel of Thomas*. Faced with numerous citations associating a "Gospel of Thomas" with certain gnostic groups like the Manicheans (Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* 4.36; 6.31; *Decretum Gelasianum*; Ps.-Leontius of Byzantium, *De sectis* 3.2; Timothy of Constantinople, *Haer.* [see *PG* 86/1:21C]; *Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea* 6.5; Peter of Sicily, *Historia Manichaeorum* 16; and Ps.-Photius, *Contra Manichaeos* 1.14) and the Naasenes (Hippolytus, *Haer.* 5.7.20), as well as the text's apparent use by Marcus (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.20.1) and the author of *Acts Thom.* (see ch. 79), the early scholars on the text looked in earnest for gnostic affinities in the gospel. Finding few such affinities, many concluded that the missing gnostic elements must have been removed by a Catholic reviser. Now that the true *Gospel of Thomas* has been found, there is no justification for the position that IGT is Gnostic—indeed, IGT's attribution to Thomas is a late addition to the text—nor for the identification of IGT's Jesus as a Gnostic Redeemer figure. Yet, many scholars today continue to claim IGT was originally a Gnostic text now purged of much of its heretical elements.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> See the discussion in C.A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 234. Connections have also been proposed to tales of Buddha and Krishna. The most recent discussion of these parallels is by Z.P. Thundy, "Intertextuality, Buddhism and the Infancy Gospels," in *Religious Writings and Religious Systems* (ed. J. Neusner, et al.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 1.17–73; and *idem*, *Buddha and Christ: Nativity Stories and Indian Traditions* (SHR 60; Leiden: Brill, 1993).

<sup>25</sup> Most recently, F. Lapham, *An Introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 130; and H.-J. Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels: An Introduction* (trans. B. McNeil; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 77.

This erroneous viewpoint has prevented more reasoned assessments of the text's affinities. Read appropriately, IGT looks far less heretical than has been previously proposed.

Such an appropriate reading of IGT involves study of ancient biography. In this literature, childhood stories are employed to foreshadow the protagonist's future achievements.<sup>26</sup> This was made possible by the belief that personality is inherited and remains consistent throughout one's life. Therefore, if the young Jesus is meant to evoke the Christology of an older Jesus, the author of IGT must have imagined the adult Jesus would be just as likely to curse as to bless. The model of the cantankerous wonderworker in the Jewish world is provided by Elijah and his protégé Elisha. The two prophets bless—by healing (2 Kgs 5:8–14; 13:20–21), re-animating (1 Kgs 17:17–24; 2 Kgs 4:18–36), feeding (1 Kgs 17:8–16; 2 Kgs 4:42–44), and bringing rain (1 Kgs 17:45; 2 Kgs 3:13–20)—as well as curse: among their victims are kings (1 Kgs 21:17–29; 2 Kgs 1), prophets (1 Kgs 18:40; 2 Kgs 5:20–27), messengers (2 Kgs 1:9–12), and others (2 Kgs 2:23–24; 5:20–27; 6:18). In the first century, the prophet in the style of Elijah was so popular that several Jewish luminaries were honoured for being like Elijah or even Elijah reborn, including Hanina ben Dosa (*b. Ber.* 61b), Honi the Circle Drawer (*Gen. Rab.* 13:7), John the Baptist (Mark 6:15; Luke 9:8), and Jesus himself (Mark 8:28 par; Josephus, *Ant.* 18.63).<sup>27</sup> Additional evidence suggests that some Jewish and early Christian writers had no hesitation portraying venerable figures performing curses—for example, Artapanus credits Moses with a curse and subsequent revivification (frg. 3), and though he refused, Honi was expected by the men of Hyrcanus to place a curse on Aristobulus (Josephus, *Ant.* 14.22–24). In later times, the holy men of the hills surrounding Antioch documented in Theodoret's *History of the Monks of Syria* also performed punitive miracles as displays of their power and authority, and similar tales are told of the

---

<sup>26</sup> See Hock, *Infancy Gospels*, 95–7, building principally on T. Wiedemann, *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 55. On the motif see C.H. Talbert, “Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5–4:15,” in *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou Silberman* (ed. J.L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel; New York: KTAV, 1980), 129–41; and C. Pelling, “Childhood and Personality in Greek Literature,” in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (ed. C. Pelling; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 235–40.

<sup>27</sup> Josephus describes Jesus as a performer of “marvelous deeds,” the same phrase he uses for Elijah (*Ant.* 9.182).

apostles in the Apocryphal Acts.<sup>28</sup> Though the more irascible qualities in the holy man's personality excited alarm in those around him, the divine authority behind the saint's power to curse apparently was not questioned.<sup>29</sup> Given the prevalence of curse stories in IGT, it would seem that the Christology of IGT owes much to the popular figure of the powerful, yet irascible holy man.

While all three Synoptic gospels draw upon the Elijah/Elisha narratives in their depictions of Jesus, Luke does so to greatest effect.<sup>30</sup> Luke reproduces curses from Q (Jesus pronounces woes, which may have the strength of curses, on unrepentant cities [Luke 10:13–15/Matt 11:20–24], and scribes and Pharisees [Luke 11/Matt 23], and permits the disciples to curse cities and individuals [Luke 9:5; 10:10–12/Matt 10:11–15]) and features curses of his own: the muting of Zechariah (1:20) and the antitheses of the Sermon on the Plain (6:24–36). But curses are far more plentiful in Acts. Here Judas (1:16–20), Ananias and Sapphira (5:1–11), and Agrippa (12:20–23) fall to God's wrath; Paul is blinded (9:39) and later, Paul himself blinds Elymas (13:6–11). Curses are so prevalent in Luke-Acts that O. Wesley Allen Jr. has identified a retribution theme in Luke. In *The Death of Herod*, Allen states: "Luke's use of retribution has generally been neglected by scholarship. Perhaps this neglect is due to modern sensitivities which find a theology of retribution unappealing. Nevertheless, it was a theme of some importance in the ancient world."<sup>31</sup> NT scholars in general tend to shy away from

---

<sup>28</sup> For example, the *Acts of Peter* tells the story of an unworthy woman who is paralyzed when she receives the Eucharist at Paul's hands (ch. 2); Paul destroys the Temple of Apollo in Sidon (*Acts Paul* 5) and blinds a greedy son (*Acts Paul* 4); Peter prays and the flying Simon falls and breaks his legs (*Acts Pet.* 32); an unworthy boy's hands wither when he takes the elements from Thomas (*Acts Thom.* 51), and a man dies as a result of slapping Thomas just as the apostle predicted (*Acts Thom.* 8). In the *Acts of John* the unrepentant are bitten by snakes (70–80) and John threatens the worshippers of Artemis with death, destroys their temple, and then restores life to a priest who perished in the destruction (37–47).

<sup>29</sup> See W.S. Green, "Palestinian Holy Men: Charismatic Leadership and Rabbinic Tradition," *ANRW* 19.2 (Berlin, 1979), 625; R.A. Horsley and J.S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985), 153–60. Theodoret betrays some discomfort with the curses of his holy men but he justified the imprecations with reference to the canonical stories of the cursing of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1–11) and Elisha's sending of a she-bear to maul the children who taunted him (2 Kgs 2:23–25) (*Phil. hist.* 1.5; 1.8).

<sup>30</sup> See, for example, C.A. Evans, "Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethics of Election," *JBL* 106 (1987): 75–83.

<sup>31</sup> O.W. Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 158; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 202.

canonical cursing stories, thereby marginalizing IGT's portrayal of Jesus as aberrant; but IGT's Jesus is not so peculiar at all, and likely the author of Luke-Acts would have recognized a kinship between his work and the "heretical" infancy gospel.

#### 4. *The Infancy Gospel of Thomas as an Improvement of Luke*

But the author of IGT apparently was not completely satisfied with Luke's gospel. He may have approved of Luke's rhetorical style and Christology, but his desire to supplement the gospel with additional childhood stories suggests that he felt Luke was in some way deficient. IGT's changes to the Temple story further indicate that the author wished to supply something lacking in the tale. The problem is simple: compared to other venerable figures in ancient biographies, Luke's Jesus is not powerful enough, not assertive enough, and not wise enough.

One of the functions of ancient biography was to praise the subject of the text in order to sustain or to gain devotees. In the competition between religious groups, the leader who had the most to offer his followers would be the most successful. Therefore, a biography had to affirm its protagonist's connection to the divine realm in striking ways—most typically with claims of divine paternity, omens at birth, and signs of childhood promise. The rhetoricians Quintilian and Menander reveal the process of composing such tales. In describing how to construct a panegyric, Quintilian instructs his readers to praise a subject with descriptions of his background and beauty, and with accounts of his education: "it has sometimes proved the more effective course to trace a man's life and deeds in due chronological order, praising his natural gifts as a child, then his progress at school" (*Inst.* 3.7.15).<sup>32</sup> Menander advises speakers to include in their praises such miracles as the recognition of an emperor's future role by children at play; if no such tradition is known, the speaker is instructed to invent one (*Treatise* 2.371.10–15).<sup>33</sup> Ancient writers seem to have taken the rhetoricians' advice, for there are numerous examples of biographical

---

<sup>32</sup> Translation from Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria* (trans. H.E. Butler; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969).

<sup>33</sup> See further the discussion in Wiedemann, *Adults and Children*, 53–60 (summarized also in Hock, *The Infancy Gospels*, 95–7). Wiedemann mentions both the canonical infancy narratives and IGT in connection with Greco-Roman panegyric (*Adults and Children*, 55).

literature that include childhood tales—including lives of emperors, statesmen, philosophers, and holy men.<sup>34</sup> All of these tales portray their subjects in ways consistent with knowledge of their adult careers. Even biographies of impious figures use childhood stories, but in these cases to foreshadow their future crimes.

It seems that biographers saw childhood as a choice time in a person's life for exploitation in propaganda—whether positive or negative.<sup>35</sup> The subject's true childhood experiences are not significant, perhaps because childhood was not regarded well by ancient writers. Cicero, for example, ascribes to Cato the Elder the view that if the gods were to offer him the gift of returning to the cradle and starting life over again as a child, he would refuse (*Sen.* 83). Cato and his ilk undervalued childhood, in part, because they believed children, like women, lacked the important virtue of reason. Since reason was required to participate in the rational world of the Roman citizen, those who lacked this virtue were perceived as standing outside the norm.<sup>36</sup> Children were ignorant, capricious, foolish, and quarrelsome. They spoke nonsense, lacked judgment, were physically frail, and easily frightened.<sup>37</sup> Jewish literature also often portrays childhood negatively.<sup>38</sup> In biblical texts children are characterized as ignorant, capricious, and in need of strict discipline (see 2 Kgs 2:23–24; Isa 3:4; Wis 12:24–25; 15:14; Prov 22:15; Sir 30:1–13). And Rabbinic texts associate the young with the deaf and dumb and the weak-minded, indicating that children, too, lack their full faculties (*Erub.* 3:2; *Šeqal.* 1.3; *Sukkah* 2.8; 3.10, *etc.*). Set against this background, the injunction of Jesus to receive the kingdom of God “as

---

<sup>34</sup> For an overview of the primary sources see Chartrand-Burke, “The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*,” 380–94.

<sup>35</sup> On biographies as propaganda see C.H. Talbert, *What Is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 92–109; R.A. Burrige, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 76; D.E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 35; and P. Cox, *Biography in Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), xiv–xv; as negative propaganda, *ibid.*, 10–12, and Pelling, “Childhood and Personality,” 217.

<sup>36</sup> Wiedemann, *Adults and Children*, 22–3.

<sup>37</sup> Wiedemann, *Adults and Children*, 17–19, 24; see also M. Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1990), 4–7; and S. Currie, “Childhood and Christianity from Paul to the Council of Chalcedon” (Ph. D. diss., Cambridge, 1993), 15–16.

<sup>38</sup> See further J.M. Gundry-Volf, “The Least and the Greatest: Children in The New Testament,” in *The Child in Christian Thought* (ed. M.J. Bunge; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 35.

a little child” (Mark 10:13–16 par) assumes its intended shock value. It took considerable exegetical acrobatics for early Christian writers to reconcile Jesus’ words with the writers’ culturally-derived negative valuation of childhood.<sup>39</sup>

Compared to other ancient biographies, Luke is rather bare in its description of its protagonist’s early years. Signs and miracles attend the conception, birth, and circumcision, but only one anecdote is related of Jesus’ childhood. This anecdote employs a common motif: a display of adult-like wisdom among teachers. The motif is used in biographies of gods (Osiris, Krishna), holy men (Apollonios, Pythagoras, Buddha), prophets (Daniel), heroes (Heracles), statesmen (Alexander, Augustus, Solomon), writers (Josephus), and philosophers (Demonax, Epicurus).<sup>40</sup> Often, such wisdom is displayed at the age of twelve. In many of these cases, the protagonist humbles his teachers with his display of superior knowledge. But in Luke’s version of Jesus in the Temple, Jesus sits among the teachers “listening to them and asking them questions” (2:46), and though “all who heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers” (2:47), the teachers are not humbled. IGT alters the tale at this point to report that “those listening to him were amazed how he questioned the elders and explained the main points of the law and the riddles and the parables of the prophets” (Greek S 19:5). In Luke, Jesus sits engrossed as an attentive, curious student; in IGT Jesus explains *to them* the main points of the Law. This display leads the scribes and Pharisees to declare: “such present wisdom and glory of virtue we have never seen nor heard” (Greek S 19:10). This theme of Jesus’ superior, even superhuman, knowledge is prominent in IGT, beginning with the exchange with his first teacher through to the third teacher story, but it climaxes in Jesus in the Temple. Here Jesus sits in the centre of the Jewish world, showered with the respect, honour, and awe that is his due.

Where Luke reports one childhood anecdote showing future promise and affirming divine paternity, IGT includes over a dozen—each one

---

<sup>39</sup> See the lengthy discussion of the issue in Currie, “Childhood and Christianity.” To this day the injunction continues to arouse the interests of Christian theology where most often it is taken still far too literally. As John Dominic Crossan states in *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991), 269, Jesus used children merely as a metaphor for the powerless in society, and not because he had any special regard for them.

<sup>40</sup> See particularly de Jonge, “Sonship,” and Talbert, “Prophecies of Future Greatness.”

a declaration that he is more than human, wise beyond his years, and deserving of veneration. The author of IGT, it seems, felt Luke did not go far enough in foreshadowing Jesus' adult career; thus, additional stories were required to elevate Jesus above other eminent figures. Luke's story of Jesus in the Temple also had to be modified. Other scholars have seen in IGT's changes to Jesus in the Temple evidence of docetism and Gnosticism;<sup>41</sup> in reality, IGT merely brings Luke's story into accord with the non-Christian parallels which typically have their protagonists surpass the teachers just as IGT's Jesus does. Luke seems to "dumb down" Jesus, whereas IGT is more true to the pattern.

### 5. *Conclusions*

The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* is a wonder of literature. There is no other text like it. Though childhood tales regularly appear in ancient biographies, they do so only as a prelude to the unfolding of the subject's adult career.<sup>42</sup> IGT reports no adult stories. As a result, modern readers have been left shocked by its portrayal of the young Jesus—they cannot fathom how a Christian writer, versed in the canonical gospels, could imagine Jesus this way. But that view is based on a number of misguided assumptions: 1. IGT is a loosely-assembled compilation of tales that draws upon a range of Christian literature, canonical and non-canonical (to the contrary, it does have an observable plot and arguably shows contact only with Luke-Acts); 2. the adult Jesus would not perform such wicked deeds as IGT's young Jesus (yet, Jesus and the apostles do curse, particularly in Luke-Acts); 3. the precocity and wisdom of the young Jesus must reflect Gnostic Christology (but Gnostics had little interest in Jesus' childhood and wisdom in youth is a common motif found in a variety of literary sources); and 4. no one could possibly consider IGT edifying (but some Christians did; indeed, early objections to the text were principally doctrinal—a miracle-working young Jesus contradicts John's claim that Jesus performed no miracles

---

<sup>41</sup> See, for example Currie, "Childhood and Christianity," 207.

<sup>42</sup> Onesicritus' lost work *How Alexander Was Brought Up* may have been similar. This lost text is noted in Pelling, "Childhood and Personality," 218. Similar also are the biographies of child emperors who perished before they reached adulthood. However, these texts form a class apart from the other literature as their activities cannot anticipate future accomplishments.

before his first sign in Cana [2:11]<sup>43</sup>—and the text was transmitted widely over the centuries).

Modern readers' concerns about IGT are satisfied when the text is read together with Luke. Indeed, IGT requires an account of Jesus' adult career for it to be intelligible. And Luke fills that requirement well. There is much we can learn about IGT when it is read together with Luke; similarly, we can learn also much about Luke when read together with IGT. For IGT's use of Luke-Acts illustrates that these canonical texts were well-regarded by the author of the infancy gospel—perhaps we can think of IGT as the product of a Lukan “community”—but IGT's efforts to alter and enhance Luke show that the author felt Luke required supplementation. Only together do IGT and Luke present a complete biography of Jesus, one worthy enough to compete with the literature of the day.

---

<sup>43</sup> Of all the ancient and medieval discussions of IGT not one writer objects to the behaviour of the child. See John Chrysostom, *Hom. Jo.* 17; Epiphanius of Salamina, *Pan.* 51.20.2–3; Timothy of Constantinople, *Rec. haer.* (PG 86:22C); Anastasius Sinaita, *Hodegos* 13; and Georgius Syncellus, *Chronographia* a. 5505.

## APPENDIX: JESUS IN THE TEMPLE

The Greek text and English translation of IGT, based on the manuscript Sabaiticus 259, are from my forthcoming critical edition, *Evangelium Thomae de infantia Salvatoris* (CCSA; Turnhout: Brepols). The Greek text of Luke is from B. Aland, *et al.*, ed., *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, <sup>4</sup>1993); the English translation is drawn from the NRSV.

*Infancy Gospel of Thomas 19*

**1** Ὄντος δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δωδεκαετοῦς ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα. **2** Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐπιστρέφειν αὐτοὺς ἀπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ νομίσαντες εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ. **3** Ἦλθαν ἡμέρας ὁδὸν καὶ ἐζήτησαν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς γνωστοῖς αὐτῶν. Καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες αὐτὸν ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ζητοῦντες αὐτόν. **4** Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς εὗρον αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καθήμενον ἐν μέσῳ τῶν διδασκάλων καὶ ἀκούοντα αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπερωτῶντα αὐτούς.

**5** Ἐξίσταντο δὲ οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ πῶς ἀπεστομάτιζεν τοὺς πρῶτους καὶ ἐπιλύων τὰ κεφάλαια τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν τὰ σκολιὰ καὶ τὰς παραβολὰς. **6** Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ· “Τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν <τοῦτο>; Ἴδου ὀδυνώμενοι λυπούμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε”. **7** Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· “Ἰνα τί ἐζητεῖτέ με; Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναι με;” **8** Οἱ δὲ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἶπαν τῇ Μαρίᾳ· “Σὺ εἶ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ παιδίου τούτου;” **9** Ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· “Ἐγὼ εἰμι”. **10** Εἶπαν δὲ πρὸς αὐτήν· “Μακαρία εἶ σύ, ὅτι ἠύλόγησεν Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τὸν καρπὸν τῆς κοιλίας σου”. Τοιαύτην γὰρ σοφίαν ἐνεστάς καὶ δόξαν ἀρετῆς οὐδὲ εἶδαμεν οὔτε ἠκούσαμεν ποτε.

**11** Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἐκέθηεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠκολούθησεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος τοῖς γονεῦσιν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ διετῆρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα συμβαλοῦσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν σοφία καὶ ἡλικία καὶ χάριτι παρὰ Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

*Luke*

**2 41** Καὶ ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ’ ἔτος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα. **42** Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς **43** καὶ τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτοὺς ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ. **44** Νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδὸν καὶ ἀνεζήτησαν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς γνωστοῖς, **45** καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀναζητοῦντες αὐτόν. **46** Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς εὗρον αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καθεζόμενον ἐν μέσῳ τῶν διδασκάλων καὶ ἀκούοντα αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπερωτῶντα αὐτούς·

**47** Ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ. **48** Καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεπλάγησαν, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, “Τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν οὕτως; Ἴδου ὁ πατὴρ σου καγὼ ὀδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε”. **49** Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· “Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; Οὐκ ἤδατε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναι με;” **50** Καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνήκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς.

**51** Καὶ κατέβη μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέθ καὶ ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς. Καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ διετῆρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς.

**12** Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν σοφία καὶ ἡλικία καὶ χάριτι παρὰ Θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώποις. **13** Ὡ ἡ δόξα...

**1** And when Jesus was twelve years old his parents went as usual to Jerusalem for the festival of the Passover. **2** But as they turned back, Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem. His parents did not know, assuming him to be in the group of travelers. **3** They went a day's journey and they looked for him among their relatives and friends. When they did not find him, they returned to Jerusalem to search for him. **4** After three days they found him in the Temple, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions.

**5** And those listening to him were amazed how he questioned the elders and explained the main points of the Law and the riddles and the parables of the prophets. **6** And his mother said to him: "Child, why have you done this to us? Look, we have been searching for you in great anxiety and grief." **7** Jesus said to them: "Why were you searching for me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?" **8** And the scribes and the Pharisees said to Mary: "Are you the mother of this child?" **9** And she said: "I am." **10** And they said to her: "Blessed are you, because the Lord God has blessed the fruit of your womb. For such present wisdom and glory of virtue we have never seen nor heard."

**11** And Jesus rose from there and followed his mother and was obedient to his parents. And she treasured all these things, pondering them in her heart.

**12** And Jesus increased in wisdom and in years and in human and divine favour. **13** To whom be glory...

**52** Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν <ἐν τῇ> σοφία καὶ ἡλικία καὶ χάριτι παρὰ Θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

**41** Now every year his parents went to Jerusalem for the festival of the Passover. **42** And when he was twelve years old, they went up as usual for the festival. **43** When the festival was ended and they started to return, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem, but his parents did not know it. **44** Assuming that he was in the group of travelers, they went a day's journey. Then they started to look for him among their relatives and friends. **45** When they did not find him, they returned to Jerusalem to search for him. **46** After three days they found him in the temple, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions.

**47** And all who heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers. **48** When his parents saw him they were astonished; and his mother said to him, "Child, why have you treated us like this? Look, your father and I have been searching for you in great anxiety." **49** He said to them, "Why were you searching for me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?" **50** But they did not understand what he said to them.

**51** Then he went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was obedient to them. His mother treasured all these things in her heart.

**52** And Jesus increased in wisdom and in years, and in human and divine favour.