

Gospel of Thomas Commentary

ΝΑΕΙ ΝΕ ΝΨΑΧΕ ΕΘΗΠ ΕΝΤΑΙϞ ΕΤΟΝΖ ΧΟΟΥ ΑΥΩ ΑΨΟΖΑΙϞΟΥ
ΝΟΙ ΔΙΔΥΜΟϞ ΙΟΥΔΑϞ ΘΩΜΑϞ

BLATZ

[Prologue.] These are the secret words which the living Jesus spoke, and which Didymus Judas Thomas wrote down.

LAYTON

[Prologue.] These are the obscure sayings that the living Jesus uttered and which Didymus Jude Thomas wrote down.

DORESSE

[Prologue.] Here are the secret words which Jesus the Living spoke, and which Didymus Jude Thomas wrote down.

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

Here are the [secret] words which Jesus the Living spoke an[d which were transcribed by Didymus Jude] Thomas.

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

(Prologue) These are the [secret] sayings [which] the living Jesus [spoke, and which Judas, who is] also Thomas, [wrote down].

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “The incipit, or opening of the document, provides what is most likely the earlier version of the title. A second, later title is given at the end of the document: ‘The Gospel According to Thomas.’ A similar incipit opens another document from the Nag Hammadi Library, Book of Thomas 138, 1-4: ‘The hidden sayings that the savior spoke to Judas Thomas, which I, Mathaias, in turn recorded. I was walking, listening to them speak with each other.’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 67)

Marvin Meyer suggests that “the living Jesus” is “probably not the resurrected Christ as commonly understood, but rather Jesus who lives through his sayings.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 67)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “*logoi*: The use of this word to designate the ‘sayings’ of Jesus in these fragments should be noted. Nowhere do we find *logia* used of these sayings; Grenfell and Hunt were, therefore, not accurate in entitling the preliminary publication of Oxy P 1 *Logia Iesou*, which did not, of course, become apparent until the discovery of Oxy P 654. From the time of Herodotus on *logion* meant ‘oracle’, ‘a saying derived from a deity’. In the LXX it denotes the ‘word of God’, having lost the Greek nuance of ‘oracle’ and acquired that of OT revelation. In this sense we find it in Acts 7:38; Rom 3:2; 1 Pt 4:11; Heb 5:12 (see G. Kittel, *TDNT* 4, 137-41). In A. Resch’s collection of *Agapha* (TU 30 [1906]) we find the word used only twice, and in each case it refers to the OT. See further J. Donovan, *The Logia in Ancient and Recent Literature* (Cambridge, 1927). The use of *logoi* here for the sayings of Jesus can be compared to Mt 15:12 and especially to Acts 20:35, *mnemoneuein te ton logon tou Kyriou Iesou hoti autos eipen*. See also Clement of Rome, *Ad. Cor.* 13:1; 46:7 (ed. K. Bihlmeyer, pp. 42, 60) for the use of this word to designate the sayings of Jesus. Now that we know that the Greek fragments belong to a text of the *Gospel according to Thomas*, there is no longer room for the speculation that possibly they contain part of the *Logia* on

which Papias wrote his commentary or of the *Logia* that Matthew collected (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 39, 1 and 16). Consequently, it is better not to refer to the sayings either in the Oxyrhynchus fragments or in the Coptic *Gospel According to Thomas* (where the word used is *sage*, ‘word, saying’) as *logia*, *pace* R. North (*CBQ* 24 [1962] 164, etc.).” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, pp. 366-367)

F. F. Bruce writes: “‘Jesus the living one’ probably means ‘Jesus the ever-living one’. It is common form in Gnostic Gospels to represent the esoteric teaching or *gnosis* which they contain as delivered by Jesus to his chosen disciples during his appearances to them after he was raised from the dead. But there is no esoteric flavour about the sayings collected in the *Gospel of Thomas*; many of them can be paralleled from the canonical Gospels (especially Luke) and many others are of the same matter-of-fact order. Perhaps it was not the sayings themselves but their interpretation in the circle from which the *Gospel of Thomas* came that the compiler regarded as ‘secret’. As for the threefold name Didymus Judas Thomas, Didymus is the Greek word for ‘twin’ and is used in the Gospel of John (11.16; 20.24; 21.2) to explain Thomas, which is the Aramaic word for ‘twin’ (*t’oma*). In Syriac Christian tradition he is identified with the ‘Judas not Iscariot’ who belonged to the company of the Twelve: in the Old Syriac Gospels the question of John 14.22 is said to have been put to the Lord by ‘Judas Thomas’.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 112)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Of the general character of the text it must suffice to say for the moment that it was found in a Gnostic library and contains little or nothing which could not be adapted to a Gnostic use. The opening words, again, might be thought to suggest a Gnostic origin: ‘These are the secret words which the living Jesus spake.’ The work, that is, purports to contain esoteric teaching delivered, like other similar revelations, by the risen Lord in the period between the Resurrection and the Ascension. It may be, however, that too much should not be made of this, since the Greek word APOKRUFOS did not always have the disparaging sense which later became attached to it. In Gnostic circles it was used of books the contents of which were too sacred to be divulged to the common herd, and it was in fact the heretical associations which it thus came to possess which led to its use as a term of disparagement. In the Nag Hammadi library, for example, one document bears the title Apocryphon or Secret Book of John, another that of Apocryphon of James, and several Gnostic gospels contain solemn warnings against imparting their contents to any save the deserving, or for the sake of material gain.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 11-12)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “We may ask in what sense the sayings of Jesus in this collection are to be regarded as ‘secret’ (for it is obvious that *apokryphos* does not have the later pejorative meaning of ‘apocryphal’ here), when many of the sayings contain words which Jesus pronounced openly and publicly. The ‘hidden’ character is rather to be found in the manner of interpretation which is found in this collection. The quotation from Hippolytus [Elenchus 7, 20] above tells us of ‘hidden words’ that Matthias had learned from the Saviour in private. This reveals a tradition which undoubtedly is to be traced to Mt 13:10-11, where Christ himself distinguished between the comprehension of the disciples and that of the crowd. The thirteenth Coptic saying illustrates this idea, moreover, when Jesus takes Thomas aside to tell him three words which he is not allowed to repeat to the other disciples. In this very saying we learn that eternal life is promised to him who succeeds in discovering the real meaning of the sayings in the collection. This probably refers to the different application or interpretation which is given to even the canonical sayings that are set in a different context. Such shifts in meaning were undoubtedly part of the esoteric interpretation which is intended by ‘hidden’ or ‘secret’.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 368)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 Prologue](#), [Matt 1:1](#), [Mark 1:1](#), [InThom 1](#), [Book of Thomas the Contender II 138.1-4](#), [ApJas 1:1-2](#).

1. ΑΥΩ ΠΕΧΑΘ ΧΕ ΠΕΤΑΖΕ ΕΘΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΝΝΕΕΙΩΑΧΕ ΘΝΑΧΙ
†ΠΕ ΑΝ ΜΠΜΟΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(1) And he said: He who shall find the interpretation of these words shall not taste of death.

(1) And he said, "Whoever finds the meaning of these sayings will not taste death."

[1.] And he said: "Whoever penetrates the meaning of these words will not taste death!"

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

And he said: ["Whoever penetrates the meaning of these words will not taste [death!"]]

(1) And he said, "[Whoever finds the interpretation] of these sayings will not experience [death]."

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Sirach 39:1-3 as a parallel: "But one who devotes one's soul and studies the law of the Most High will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients and will be concerned with prophecies. That person will keep in mind the discourse of reputable men and will go into the subtleties of parables. That person will seek out the hidden things of proverbs and will be occupied with the enigmas of parables." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 68)

F. F. Bruce writes: "This confirms the impression made by the preamble, that the deeper interpretation of the sayings, not their surface meaning, pointed the way of salvation to initiates. The saying is quite similar to John 8.51, where Jesus says, 'If any one keeps my word, he will never see death' - a statement which is taken up and repeated by his interlocutors in the form: 'If any one keeps my word, he will never *taste* death' (verse 52). But 'keep my word' means basically 'obey my commandment', not 'find its interpretation' - the intention of the Fourth Gospel is essentially ethical, whereas that in the *Gospel of Thomas* is mainly intellectual." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 113)

Funk and Hoover write: "It is not altogether clear that this saying should be considered a saying of Jesus. The pronoun 'he' could refer either to Jesus or the ostensible compiler of the sayings, Didymos Judas Thomas. At any rate, it refers to the collection of sayings comprising this gospel, and this gospel could not have been known to Jesus. Furthermore, the final line ('not taste death') is a recurring theme in Thomas (18:3; 19:4; 85:2; 111:2) and therefore probably reflects the editorial interest of the compiler." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 471)

Funk's Parallels

[POxy654 1](#), [GThom 111](#), [John 8:48-59](#).

2. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΜΝΤΡΕCΛΟ ΝCΙ ΠΕΤΩΙΝΕ ΕCΩΙΝΕ ΩΑΝΤΕCΘΙΝΕ
 (2) ΑΥΩ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕCΩΑΝΘΙΝΕ CΝΑΩΤΡΤΡ (3) ΑΥΩ ΕCΩΑΝΩΤΟΡΤΡ
 CΝΑΡ ΩΠΗΡΕ (4) ΑΥΩ CΝΑΡ ΡΡΟ ΕΧΜ ΠΤΗΡC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(2) Jesus said: He who seeks, let him not cease seeking until he finds; and when he finds he will be troubled, and when he is troubled he will be amazed, and he will reign over the All.

(2) Jesus said, "Let one who seeks not stop seeking until that person finds; and upon finding, the person will be disturbed; and being disturbed, will be astounded; and will reign over the entirety."

1 [2]. Jesus says: "Let him who seeks cease not to seek until he finds: when he finds he will be astonished; and when he is astonished he will wonder, and will reign over the universe!"

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

[Jesus says:] "Let him who see[ks] cease not [to seek until he] finds: when he finds, [he will wonder; and when he wond]ers, he will reign, and [reigning, he will have r]est!"

(2) [Jesus said], "Let him who seeks continue [seeking until] he finds. When he finds, [he will be amazed. And] when he becomes [amazed], he will rule. And [once he has ruled], he will [attain rest]."

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes two parallel passages in the Book of Thomas the Contender (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 68-69). The first: "[Fortunate is] the wise person who has [sought truth, and] when it has been found, has rested upon it for ever, and has not been afraid of those who wish to trouble the wise person." (Book of Thomas 140,41 - 141,2) The second: "Watch and pray. . . . And when you pray, you will find rest. . . . For when you leave the pains and the passions of the body, you will receive rest from the Good One, and you will rule with the king, you united with him and he united with you, from now on, for ever and ever." (Book of Thomas 145,8-16)

A somewhat similar statement is found from Clement of Alexandria: "Being baptized, we are illuminated; illuminated we become sons; being made sons, we are made perfect; being made perfect, we are made immortal." (*Instructor*, 1.6.26.1)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thom 2:2-4 is a gnostic expansion: the gnostic quest leads to being disturbed, which causes one to marvel, and that ends in reigning. The Greek fragment of this same verse adds a fifth stage: the reign of the gnostic results in 'rest,' which is the gnostic catchword for salvation. Gnostic insight into the 'real world,' as opposed to the world of appearances, is what brings all this about. The term 'rest' is employed in the book of Revelation, on the other hand, for future salvation: those who die in the Lord 'may rest from their labors' (Rev 14:13)." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 471)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "'Rest' is mentioned not in the Coptic text but in the Greek fragment; but 'rest' or 'repose' occurs in Sayings 51, 52, 60, 61, 86, and 90. It is found in the Gospel of the Hebrews (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, 2, 45, 5; 5, 96, 3), from which this saying is taken; presumably the author of Thomas changed the saying in order to lay emphasis on the idea of becoming a king. Compare 2 Timothy 2:11-12: 'Trustworthy is the saying, "If we have

died with him, we shall also live with him; if we have endured, we shall reign with him.’ The difference, once more, is between the action of the Christian and the knowing of the Gnostic.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 120)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The restoration of the Greek text in Oxy P 654, of which only the first half of each line is extant, is relatively secure due to its citation by Clement of Alexandria (Fitzmyer, 1974:372-373; Hofius: 27; Marcovich: 56). In form it is a quadruple-stich saying climactically word-linked from one stich to the next: seeks/finds//finds/astounded//astounded/reign//reigned/rest (see Hennecke and Schneemelcher: 1.164).” (*In Fragments*, pp. 99-100)

J. D. Crossan writes: “On the other hand, the version in *Gos. Thom. 2* breaks both the form and content of that Greek version: seeks/finds//finds/troubled//troubled/astonished// -- / reign. The result is that the Coptic version climaxes with “rule” while the Greek text climaxes with “rest” (see Bammel, 1969). It is fairly certain that the Greek version is more original, but it is difficult to explain the Coptic deviation since ‘rest’ is one of *Thomas*’s major themes (Vielhauer, 1964:297). The best explanation is probably some form of misreading of his Greek original by the Coptic translator (see Marcovich: 57; or Menard, 1975:79).” (*In Fragments*, p. 100)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 2](#), [GThom 92:1](#), [GThom 94](#), [Luke 11:9-13](#), [Matt 7:7-11](#), [Matt 21:18-22](#), [John 14:12-14](#), [John 15:16-17](#), [John 16:20-28](#), [Mark 11:20-25](#), [GHeb 4a](#), [GHeb 4b](#), [DialSav 9-12](#), [DialSav 20](#), [DialSav 79-80](#).

3. (1) πεχε ιϭ γε ευψαχοοc νητν̄ ν̄σῑ νετρωκ̄ ζητ̄ τηγτν̄
 γε ειcζηητε̄ ετμν̄τερο̄ ζν̄ τπε̄ εειε̄ ν̄ζαλητ̄ ναρ̄ ωορπ̄
 ερωτν̄̄ ν̄τε̄ τπε̄ (2) ευψανχοοc νητν̄̄ γε cζν̄̄ θαλαccā εειε̄
 ν̄τβτ̄ ναρ̄ ωορπ̄ ερωτν̄̄ (3) αλλᾱ τμν̄τερο̄ cμπετν̄̄ζογν̄̄ αγω̄
 cμπετν̄̄βαλ̄ (4) ζοταν̄̄ ετετν̄̄ωανcογων̄̄ τηγτν̄̄ τοτε̄
 cεναcογων̄̄ τηνε̄ αγω̄ τετναειμε̄ γε̄ ν̄τωτν̄̄ πε̄ ν̄ωηρε̄
 μ̄πειωτ̄ ετονζ̄ (5) εωωπε̄ δε̄ τετναcογων̄̄ τηγτν̄̄ αν̄ εειε̄
 τετν̄̄ωοοπ̄ ζν̄̄ ογμν̄τζηκε̄ αγω̄ ν̄τωτν̄̄ πε̄ τμν̄τζηκε̄

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(3) Jesus said: If those who lead you say to you: See, the kingdom is in heaven, then the birds of the heaven will go before you; if they say to you: It is in the sea, then the fish will go before you. But the kingdom is within you, and it is outside of you. When you know yourselves, then you will be known, and you will know that you are the sons of the living Father.

(3) Jesus said, “If those who lead you (plur.) say to you, ‘See, the kingdom is in heaven,’ then the birds of heaven will precede you. If they say to you, ‘It is in the sea,’ then the fish will precede you. But the kingdom is inside of you. And it is outside of you. “When you become acquainted with yourselves, then you will be recognized.

2 [3]. Jesus says: “If those who seek to attract you say to you: ‘See, the Kingdom is in heaven!’ then the birds of heaven will be there before you. If they say to you: ‘It is in the sea!’ then the fish will be there before you. But the kingdom is within you and it is outside of you!” 3 [3]. “When you know yourselves, then you will be known, and you will know that it is you

But if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty, and you are poverty. And you will understand that it is you who are children of the living father. But if you do not become acquainted with yourselves, then you are in poverty, and it is you who are the poverty.”

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

Je[sus] says: “[If those] who seek to attract you [say to you: ‘See,] the Kingdom [is] in hea[ven, then] the birds of hea[ven will be there before you. If they say: ‘It] is under the earth!’ [then] the fishes of the sea [will be there be]fore you. And the Kingd[om of heaven] is within you! [He who? . . .] knows this will find [. . .] [When] you know yourselves, [then you will know that] it is you who are [the sons] of the [living] Father. [But if you do not] know yourselves, then [. . .] and it is you <who will be> the poverty!”

(3) Jesus said, “[If] those who lead you [say to you, ‘See], the kingdom is in the sky,’ then the birds of the sky [will precede you. If they say that] it is under the earth, then the fish of the sea [will enter it, preceding] you. And, the [kingdom of God] is inside of you, [and it is outside of you. Whoever] knows [himself] will discover this. [And when you] come to know yourselves, [you will realize that] you are [sons] of the [living] father. [But if you] will [not] know yourselves, [you dwell] in [poverty] and it is you who are that poverty.”

Scholarly Quotes

Funk and Hoover point out a similar text in Baruch 3:29-30: “Has anyone climbed up to heaven and found wisdom? Has anyone returned with her from the clouds? Has anyone crossed the sea and discovered her? Has anyone purchased her with gold coin?” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 472)

Marvin Meyer quotes a similar expression from the Manichaean Psalm Book 160,20-21: “Heaven’s kingdom, look, it is inside us, look, it is outside us. If we believe in it, we shall live in it for ever.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 69)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The Greek version of Thomas says that the kingdom is within; the Coptic adds that it is also outside, perhaps because the Naassenes spoke of the kingdom as ‘hidden and manifest at the same time.’ According to Saying 111, the kingdom ‘is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see it.’ It should be noted that Thomas does not speak of ‘the kingdom of God.’ Indeed, ‘God’ is mentioned only in Saying 97, where he is evidently subordinated to Jesus (‘gods’ occurs in Saying 31). Wherever the synoptic parallels speak of God, Thomas deletes the word or substitutes ‘heaven’ or ‘the Father’ or ‘my Father.’ Like other Gnostics, he prefers not to use the ordinary term ‘God’; he may be reserving it for use as the name of an inferior power.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 121)

J. D. Crossan writes: “most likely, the correct restoration for the fragmented line 15 of Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 654 is ‘king[dom of God],’ the same phrase that appears in lines 7-8 of Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1. Both those expressions from the Greek fragments of the *Gospel of Thomas* met with, according to Harold Attridge, ‘deliberate deletion’ in their respective Coptic translations at *Gospel of Thomas* 3 and 27” (*The Historical Jesus*, p. 284).

Stevan Davies writes: “When people actualize their inherent ability to perceive through primordial light, they perceive the world to be the kingdom of God (Gos. Thom. 3, 113).” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The Kingdom of God is no longer an eschatological reality. It has become a present, ‘spiritual’ phenomenon. It is ‘spread out upon the earth and men do not see it’ (113/111). It is not in the heaven or in the sea (3/2; cf. Rom. 10:6-7) but ‘within you and outside you.’ The inwardness of the Kingdom is derived, in Gnostic exegesis, from Luke 17:21; the outwardness probably refers to its heavenly or incomprehensible nature. In any event, it is *not* future, but present.” (*Gnosticism & Early Christianity*, p. 187)

Funk and Hoover write: “This phrase [‘know yourselves’] is a secular proverb often attributed to Socrates. It is used here to refer to the self as an entity that has descended from God - a central gnostic concept. ‘Children of the living Father’ (v. 4) is also a gnostic phrase (compare Thomas 49-50), which refers to people who, by virtue of their special knowledge, are able to reascend to the heavenly domain of their Father. Parallels in more orthodox Christian texts indicate that followers of Jesus are also called ‘children.’ The use of the term ‘poverty’ for life outside true knowledge (v. 5) is typical of gnostic writings.” (*The Five Gospels*, pp. 472-473)

Bruce Chilton writes: “In fact, the closest analogy in the Synoptic Gospels to the rhetoric of the argument in *Thomas 3* is attributed not to Jesus but to his Sadducean opponents (Matt. 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40). They set up a hypothetical question of a woman who marries a man, who then dies childless. Following the practice commanded in Deut. 23:5-6, his brother marries her to continue the deceased’s name, but then he dies childless as well, as do his five remaining brothers. The point of this complicated scenario is to ridicule the idea of the resurrection of the dead by asking whose wife the woman will be in the resurrection. As in *Thomas 3*, the syllogism is designed to provoke mockery of the position that is attacked, and it depends on the prior acceptance of what it is reasonable to say and of how logic should be used. In short, both the Sadducees’ argument and the argument of the ‘living Jesus’ commend themselves to schoolmen and seem as far from the ethos of Jesus himself as the concern for what the leaders of churches might say. Those who would attribute the form of *Thomas 3* to Jesus reveal only their own uncritical attachment to a source that is fashionable in certain circles simply because it is not canonical.” (*Pure Kingdom*, p. 72)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 3](#), [GThom 113](#), [GThom 51](#), [Luke 17:20-21](#), [Luke 17:22-25](#), [Matt 24:23-38](#), [Mark 13:21-23](#), [DialSav 16](#), [DialSav 30](#).

4. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΦΝΑΧΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΝΟΙ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΖΛΛΟ ΖΝ ΝΕΦΖΟΟΥ
ΕΧΝΕ ΟΥΚΟΥΕΙ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΩΗΜ ΕΦΖΝ CΑΩΦ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΤΟΠΟC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(4) Jesus said: The man aged in days will not hesitate to ask a little child of seven days about the place of life, and he shall live; for there are many first who shall be last, and they will become a single one.

(4) Jesus said, “A person advanced in days will not hesitate to question a little child seven days old about the place of life. And that person will live. For many that are first will be last, and they will become one.”

4 [4]. Jesus says: “Let the old man heavy with days hesitate not to ask the little child of seven days about the Place of Life, and he will live! For it will be seen that many of the first will be last, and they will become a <single thing!”>

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

[Jesus says:] “The ma[n heavy with da]ys will not hesitate to ask the little [child of seven da]ys about the Place of [Life! For you will] see that many of the fi[rst] will be [last, and] the last first, and [that they will] be [a <single thing!>”]

(4) [Jesus said], “The [man old in days] will not hesitate to ask [a small child seven days old] about the place [of life, and] he will [live]. For many who are [first] will become [last, and] the last will be first, and [they will become one and the same].”

Scholarly Quotes

Jack Finegan refers to a quote by Hippolytus from a Gospel according to Thomas used by the Naassenes: “He who seeks me will find me in children from seven years old; for there in the fourteenth age, having been hidden, I shall become manifest.” (*Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*, p. 243)

Jack Finegan writes: “The saying ascribed by Hippolytus (Text 85 §282) to the Gospel according to Thomas, as used by the Naassenes, bears at least some similarity of the present text, and this makes it probable that the work to which Hippolytus referred was the same as that with which we are dealing, although the Naassenes may have had their own revision of it. Likewise the Manicheans may have made use of the Gospel according to Thomas, which would account for Cyril’s statements (§285) connecting it with them; but since the Gospel must now be dated well prior to Hippolytus (230) it could not have been written, as Cyril claimed, by a disciple of Mani, since the latter only began to preach in 242 (§115).” (*Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*, p. 246)

Marvin Meyer writes of the words “a little child seven days old” in the Gospel of Thomas: “This phrase probably indicates an uncircumcised child (a Jewish boy was to be circumcised on the eighth day), otherwise a child of the sabbath of the week of creation (compare Genesis 2:2-3).” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 70)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse contains the Gnostic theme of the child as a revealer (cf. 22.1-2). In Gnostic texts Jesus appears as a little child (Acts of John 88), or Gnostic teachers claim to have seen a little newborn child which is identical with the divine Word (Valentinus).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 592)

Jean Dorese writes: “Jesus, ‘he who was not born of woman’ (16), is also frequently called ‘Jesus the Living’. Could it also perhaps be Jesus who is referred to under the appearance of ‘the child of seven days’ (4)?” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 344)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “If knowledge about the ‘place of life’ can be given to an old man by an infant, it is evident that the knowledge is not ordinary human wisdom but something derived from revelation. This saying is probably the Gnostic explanation of the words of Jesus in Mark 10:14-15: ‘Let the children come to me and do not hinder them, for of such is the kingdom of God; verily I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a child will not enter into it’ (cf., Matthew 19:14; cf. also Matthew 11:25; Luke 10:21). A little farther on in both Mark and Matthew we find the words which Thomas has added to the statement about the old man and the infant. ‘Many who are first will be last’ (Mark 10:31; Matthew 19:30; 20:16; and Luke 13:30). The Coptic version has omitted the words, found in the synoptic gospels and in the Greek Thomas, ‘and the last, first.’ These words are necessary in order to lead to the conclusion, ‘And they will become a single one.’ Those who have been last will become first and will be united in the

unity which means transcending differences of age and of sex (cf., Sayings 10, 16, 24, 49, 50, 75, 103, 112). It means returning to the original unity of creation (if one can speak of creation in a Gnostic system).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 122-123)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The point of this saying is at least superficially similar to that of the canonical sayings about children, such as ‘whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it’ (Mark 10.15). After the words ‘many that are first will be last’, the Greek text (P. Oxy. 654.4) adds ‘and the last, first’ (cf. Mark 10.31, etc.); this has probably been omitted by accident from our Coptic text. The ‘single one’ at the end of the saying is the personality that has finally transcended differentiation of age and sex - the latter is an ideal which finds recurring expression in the *Gospel of Thomas* (cf. Sayings 11, 16, 23, 49, 75, 106, 114). The underlying thought is that Adam, as first created, was androgynous, before being divided into male and female (Genesis 2.21-23); the pristine arrangement will be restored in the life to come. [This belief is ascribed to the Naassenes by Hippolytus, *Refutation* v. 6.5; 7.14 f.]” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 114)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “Evelyn White (p. 16) has a remark that is worth quoting here. ‘The Saying - however we restore it - is a remarkable instance of that salient characteristic of the Oxyrhynchus collection as a whole - the mixture of elements at once parallel to and divergent from the Synoptics. For while the first part of the Saying has nothing exactly similar in the Synoptics, it nevertheless seems related to a clearly marked group of episodes in the Gospels. On the other hand the second part of the Saying corresponds exactly with the Synoptic version. . . . The Synoptics and the Saying are indeed so close that it is incredible that the two are independent, and the evidence . . . goes to show that it is the writer of the Sayings who is the borrower.’” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, pp. 380-381)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “The heavily Gnostic character of many of the sayings in the Coptic Gospel has already led to the conclusion that the latter is most likely the Manichean version of which Cyril speaks. The deliberate change of ending in the fourth saying, which is paralleled in the Manichean *Kephalaia*, is certainly evidence in this direction, as H.-Ch. Puech has already pointed out.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 418)

Funk and Hoover write: “Its affinity with other sayings in Thomas relate the status of a child to salvation. In Thom 22:2, Jesus says, ‘These nursing babies are like those who enter the <Father’s> domain.’ The image of the baby or child appealed to the gnostic sensibility as an appropriate image for salvation. The quest for life is also a Thomean theme: ‘Congratulations to the person who has toiled and has found life’ (Thomas 58). The similarity of theme and language suggests that Thomas has revised the saying to his own perspectives.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 473)

J. D. Crossan writes: “Marcovich (60; see Schrage, 1964a:258) concludes that the Coptic translator or copyist has omitted ‘and the last first’ by simple oversight. This means that the two-stich aphorism was originally in *Thomas*, and in the Markan sequence and opening rather than in the Q formulation. It also means that the original chiasmic two-stich aphorism was expanded by the addition of a third stich: ‘and they will become one and the same’ (Lambdin: 118) or, possibly better, ‘and they shall become a single one’ (Guillaumont, 1959:5; Wilson, 1973:511).” (*In Fragments*, pp. 45-46)

J. D. Crossan writes: “Klijn (271) has noted that ‘three different words are used to render the word “single one”’ in *Thomas*: (1) *wa* (11, 22, 106); (2) *wa wot* (4, 22, 23); (3) *monachos* (16, 49, 75). The meaning is the same, and that last (Greek) expression ‘cannot have its usual meaning “monk” in this early text’ (Till: 452 note 2). The meaning of this very important Thomistic theme has been summarized by Klijn (272) as follows: ‘(a) The word “single one” is equivalent to the elect and

saved ones. (b) Originally man was a “single one,” but he became “two.” In order to be saved he has to become a “single one” again. This means that he has to return to his original state. (c) The original “single one” has become “two” by becoming male and female. This means that originally man was not male and female. As a result we may say that the Gospel of Thomas speaks about salvation as a return to the original state and that it rejects the division of man into male and female.’ When *Gos. Thom.* 4 is compared with *Gos. Thom.* 22, one can conclude that ‘becoming as a child, and entering the kingdom, and achieving a state of asexuality are very nearly interchangeable terms’ (Kee, 1963:313; see also Menard, 1975:83).” (*In Fragments*, p. 46)

Stevan Davies writes: “A person who has actualized the primordial light has become (is reborn as) an infant (saying 22) precisely seven days of age (saying 4), for he dwells in the seventh day of Genesis.” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk and Hoover write: “Becoming ‘a single one’ (v. 3) is a motif that appears elsewhere in Thomas. In Thom 22:5, male and female are turned into a single one; in Thomas 23, one and two become a single one; the two made into one become children of Adam in Thom 106:1. The last reference suggests the androgynous state before the creation of human beings, when male and female had not yet been differentiated. In gnostic theory, Adam and Eve were created by a lesser god, who bungled the job in making two sexes. These ideas are foreign to Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 473)

Marvin Meyer writes: “This theme (becoming one, the two becoming one) occurs in Gospel of Thomas sayings 4, 22, 23, 48, and 106, as well as elsewhere in ancient literature. It is often associated with the primordial union achieved in sexual intercourse (for the Hebrews, heterosexual intercourse; for the Greeks, homosexual or heterosexual intercourse) as the two joined together at the beginning become one again (compare Genesis 2:21-24; Plato, Symposium 192DE). By extension, this oneness can designate an integrated existence beyond all the divisive features of human life.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 70)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 4](#), [Luke 10:21-22](#), [Luke 13:30](#), [Matt 11:25-30](#), [Matt 19:27-30](#), [Matt 20:16](#), [Mark 10:27-31](#), [InThom 7:1-4](#).

5. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC COYΩN ΠΕΤΜΠΜΤΟ ΜΠΕΚΖΟ ΕΒΟΛ ΔΥΩ ΠΕΘΗΠ
ΕΡΟΚ ΦΝΑΘΩΛΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΚ (2) ΜΝ̄ ΛΑΔΥ ΓΑΡ ΕΦΖΗΠ
ΕΦΝΑΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΔΝ

BLATZ

(5) Jesus said: Recognize what is before you, and what is hidden from you will be revealed to you; for there is nothing hidden that will not be made manifest.

LAYTON

(5) Jesus said, “Recognize what is before your (sing.) face and what is obscure to you (sing.) will become disclosed unto you. For there is nothing obscure that will not become shown forth.”

DORESSE

5 [5]. Jesus says: “Know what is before your face, and what is hidden from you will be revealed to you. For nothing hidden will fail to be revealed!”

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

Jesus says: ["Know what is be]fore your face, and [what is hidden] from you will be revealed [to you. For there] is [nothing] hidden which [will] not be revealed, nor <anything> buried which [will not be raised up!"]

(5) Jesus said, "[Recognize what is in] your (sg.) sight, and [that which is hidden] from you (sg.) will become plain [to you (sg.). For there is nothing] hidden which [will] not [become] manifest, nor buried that [will not be raised]."

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes a parallel in a saying of Jesus from Manichaean Kephalaia LXV 163,26-29: "Understand what is in front of your face, and then what is hidden from you will be disclosed to you." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 71)

Funk gives the citation from the Oxyrhynchus Shroud inscription: "Jesus says, 'Nothing has been buried that will not be raised.'" (*New Gospel Parallels*, v. 2., p. 107) Doresse gives the translation: "Jesus says: 'There is nothing buried which shall not be raised up.'" (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 356)

Fitzmyer gives the Greek of the inscription found on the shroud discovered in Behnesa, "legei Ihsous: ouk estin teqamme non ho ouk egerqhsetai." Joseph A. Fitzmyer says that the inscription "is dated palaeographically to the fifth or sixth century A.D." (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 383)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "But it seems hard to believe that this is the sense here, where - as in the rest of Thomas - there is no mention of resurrection. Perhaps one might regard the inscription as an orthodox, or semi-orthodox, revision of the saying in Thomas." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 125)

Jean Doresse writes: "In its Coptic edition, the work does contain Gnostic additions or corrections; but the work as a whole contains elements which are scarcely consonant with Gnosticism. There is, for example, the allusion to the resurrection of the body, in Saying 5 of the Greek edition - no doubt this is suppressed in the Coptic edition because it so blatantly scandalized the Gnostics who used the work." (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 348)

Funk and Hoover write of the saying "there is nothing hidden that will not be revealed" as follows: "The meaning assigned to the saying varies with the context in which it appears. In Mark 4:22 it refers to Mark's theory about the enigmatic character of the parables. In Luke 12:2 and Thom 6:5 it cautions against hypocrisy or speaking falsely. In Matt 10:26, which is the parallel to Luke 12:2, cited about from Q, it enjoins the disciples to preach boldly. Luke also records a version in 8:17, which he has taken from Mark; in its context in Luke 8, it legitimizes the mission of the Christian movement." (*The Five Gospels*, pp. 475-476)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "Logion 5 calls for a somewhat fuller notice. Discussing a saying quoted by Clement of Alexandria from the Traditions of Matthias (QAUMASON TA MARONTA), Puech compares this logion in Thomas and remarks that it may perhaps derive from the Gospel of the Hebrews; in which case it would afford no proof of a Gnostic origin. More important is the point which emerges from a comparison with the Oxyrhynchus fragments: in POx 654, unfortunately fragmentary, the saying is slightly longer than in the Coptic. After the words just quoted, both continue 'For there is nothing hidden which will not be manifest,' but the Greek alone has a further line, completing a parallelism, 'and buried which . . .'. An inscription on a shroud, also found at

Oxyrhynchus, reads ‘Jesus says, There is nothing buried which will not be raised,’ and on the basis of this Puech restores the text to include a reference to the resurrection. Other scholars had done the same before him, but without the support of the shroud inscription. As a mere conjecture this restoration would have to be regarded as uncertain, but the shroud inscription, quite recently discovered, adds materially to its probability. Now the saying is quoted in the shorter (Coptic) form in the Manichean Kephalaï, and Puech argues that the reference to the resurrection has been excised by a Gnostic editor in whose theology the doctrine of the resurrection had no place. If this be so, we should have here an instance of a gnosticizing redaction of an originally more orthodox document. Fitzmyer, following Bultmann and Jeremias, prefers to consider the longer version as a secondary expansion of the canonical saying, noting that the short version is the one found in our Gospels, but this is to raise a different question: which of the two forms represents the authentic words of Jesus. It is not entirely impossible that the short and canonical version is original, but has been expanded in POx 654, and that subsequently the reference to the resurrection has been removed by a Gnostic editor. Such an example may serve to indicate the complexity of the problems raised by the new document.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 28-29)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 5](#), [POxy 654 6:4](#), [GThom 6:4](#), [Luke 8:16-17](#), [Luke 12:1-3](#), [Matt 10:26-33](#), [Mark 4:21-23](#), [Oxyrhynchus Shroud](#).

6. (1) ΑΥΧΝΟΥÇ Ν̄ΣΙ ΝΕÇΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑÇ ΧΕΚΟΥΩΩ
ΕΤΡΝ̄ΡΝΗÇΤΕΥΕ ΑΥΩ ΕΩ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΝΑΨΛΗΛ ΕΝΑ† ΕΛΕΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ
ΑΥΩ ΕΝΑΡ̄ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΕΙ ΕΟΥ Ν̄ΣΙΟΥΩΜ (2) ΠΕΧΕ ΙÇ ΧΕ Μ̄ΠΡ̄ΧΕ
ΔΟΛ (3) ΑΥΩ ΠΕΤΕΤ̄ΜΜΟÇΤΕ Μ̄ΜΟÇ Μ̄ΠΡ̄ΔΑÇ (4) ΧΕ ΣΕΔΟΛΠ
ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ Μ̄ΠΕΜΤΟ ΕΒΟΛ Ν̄ΤΠΕ (5) Μ̄Ν ΛΑΔΥ ΓΑΡ ΕÇΖΗΠ
ΕÇΝΑΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΔΝ (6) ΑΥΩ Μ̄Ν ΛΑΔΥ ΕÇΖΟΒ̄Ç ΕΥΝΑΔΩ
ΟΥΕΩ̄Ν ΔΟΛΠÇ

BLATZ

(6) His disciples asked him (and) said to him: Do you want us to fast? And how shall we pray (and) give alms? What diet should we observe? Jesus said: Do not lie, and what you abhor, do not do; for all things are manifest in the sight of heaven; for there is nothing hidden which will not be revealed, and there is nothing covered which will remain without being uncovered.

LAYTON

(6) His disciples questioned him and said to him, “Do you want us to fast? And how shall we pray? Shall we give alms? And what kind of diet shall we follow?” Jesus said, “Do not lie, and do not do what you hate. For all things are disclosed before heaven. For there is nothing obscure that will not be shown forth, and there is nothing covered that will remain without being disclosed.”

DORESSE

6 [6]. His disciples asked and said to him: “Do you want us to fast? How shall we pray, how shall we give alms, what rules concerning eating shall we follow?” Jesus says: “Tell no lie, and whatever you hate, do not do: for all these things are manifest to the face of heaven; nothing hidden will fail to be revealed and nothing disguised will fail before long to be made public!”

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

[His disciples] asked [and] say to him:
“How shall we fa[st and how shall we pr]ay,
and how [. . .], and what rules shall [we]
follow [concerning eating]” Jesus says: [“. . .
.] do not [. . .] of truth [. . .] hidden [. . .]”

(6) [His disciples] questioned him [and
said], “How [shall we] fast? [How shall we
pray]? How [shall we give alms]? What
[diet] shall [we] observe?” Jesus said, “[Do
not tell lies, and] do not do what you [hate,
for all things are plain in the sight] of truth.
[For nothing] hidden [will not become
manifest].”

Scholarly Quotes

Funk and Hoover write: “The answers Jesus is represented as giving in 6:2-6 appear to be unrelated to the questions about fasting, praying, and giving posed by the disciples in v. 1. Jesus does answer these three questions directly in 14:1-3. The discrepancy between Thom 6:1 and 2-6 has led some scholars to speculate that the texts of Thomas 6 and 14 have somehow been confused.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 476)

Fitzmyer reconstructs the lines appended to saying six in the Greek fragment as follows: “[Ha]ppy is [he who does not do these things. For all] will be mani[fest before the Father who] is [in heaven.]” Fitzmyer writes: “Is this part of the same saying? If so, then we have a different ending in the Greek that is not found in the Coptic. J. Doresse (*Thomas*, p. 91) treats this as part of a distinct saying. He has in his favour the fact that *makarios* is preserved in the Coptic of the following saying. But it would then seem that we must either shorten our restoration of l. 39 and the beginning of l. 40 or suppose that the usual introduction, ‘Jesus says’, has been omitted. Neither seems possible. Moreover, the letters that remain on the following lines do not seem to agree with any possible reconstruction of the Greek of the following Coptic saying. For an attempt to reconstruct it as a separate saying, see M. Marcovich, *JTS* 20 (1969) 66-7.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 387) Other scholars consider this part of P. Oxy. 654 simply to represent the saying concerning the lion who is fortunate to be eaten by man.

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The disciples’ question is about fasting, prayer, almsgiving and the food laws. The first three also appear in the regulations about piety in Matt. 6.1-18 (cf. Tobit 12.8) and are discussed once again later (Thomas 14; cf. 104). In the present verse the question about food completes the sphere of the Jewish law.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 593)

Jean Doresse writes: “‘nothing hidden will fail to be revealed’ no doubt refers to hidden virtues such as those mentioned by Jesus: they are preferable to ostentatious practices of piety, and will one day be made public.” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 371)

Jack Finegan writes: “The reply of Jesus in Line 19, ‘and what you hate, do not do,’ is evidently derived from Tob 4:15, ‘And what you hate, do not do to any one,’ with omission of the words, ‘to any one,’ which reduces the saying from a form of the ‘Golden Rule’ to a self-centered saying.” (*Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*, p. 247)

F. F. Bruce writes: “In this and other sayings (cf. Sayings 14, 27, 104) it is insisted that true fasting is abstinence from evil words and actions, not from indifferent things like food. The negative form of the golden rule, ‘Do not [to others] what is hateful to yourselves’, appears repeatedly in early Jewish ethics, e.g. Tobit 4.15 (‘What you hate, do not to any one’) and Hillel’s words in TB

Shabbath 31a (‘What is hateful to you, do not to your fellow; this is the whole law; everything else is commentary’).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 115)

J. D. Crossan writes: “This somewhat truncated version of the rule’s negative formulation [‘do not do what you hate’, compared to Mt 7:12, Lk 6:31, Did 1:2b] has the following context. ‘His disciples questioned Him and said to Him, “Do you want us to fast? How shall we pray? Shall we give alms? What diet shall we observe?” Jesus said, “Do not tell lies, and do not do what you hate, for all things are plain in the sight of Heaven. For nothing hidden will not become manifest, and nothing covered will remain without being uncovered.”’” (*In Fragments*, p. 52)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The text is found not only in the Coptic translation of *Thomas*, but also among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri fragments of the Greek *Thomas* in Oxy P 654. The badly mutilated Greek text has been restored from the Coptic version as follows: [*ha mis*]eite me poiet[e] or ‘[what you [ha]te do not do’ (Hofius: 41; see also Fitzmyer, 1974:385; Marcovich: 65). The Coptic version is a close translation of that sequence: ‘that which you hate, do not do’ (with Wilson, 1973:511; rather than Guillaumont, 1959:5; or Lambdin: 118). Thus the sequence here is as in Tob. 4:15, *ho miseis, medeni poiases*, although the former is plural ‘you’ while this latter is singular ‘you.’ Those differences are dictated primarily by context. It is, of course, quite unlikely that *Thomas* is in any way quoting directly from Tobit (Menard, 1975:87). But his negative version says: What you hate (done to you) do not do (to others).” (*In Fragments*, pp. 52-53)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 6](#), [GThom 14:1](#), [POxy1 27](#), [GThom 27](#), [GThom 104](#), [POxy654 5:2-3](#), [GThom 5:2](#), [Tob 4:15](#), [Luke 11:1-4](#), [Luke 6:31](#), [Luke 8:16-17](#), [Luke 12:1-3](#), [Matt 6:2-4](#), [Matt 6:5-15](#), [Matt 6:16-18](#), [Matt 7:12](#), [Matt 10:26-33](#), [Mark 4:21-22](#), [Did 8:1-3](#), [POxy1224 2](#), [Did 1:1-2](#).

7. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΠΕ ΠΜΟΥΕΙ ΠΔΕΙ ΕΤΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ
 ΝΑΟΥΟΜC ΔΥΩ ΝΤΕΠΜΟΥΕΙ ΩΩΠΤΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ (2) ΔΥΩ CΒΗΤ ΝCΙ
 ΠΡΩΜΕ ΠΔΕΙ ΕΤΕ ΠΜΟΥΕΙ ΝΑΟΥΟΜC ΔΥΩ ΠΜΟΥΕΙ ΝΑΩΩΠΤΕ
 ΠΡΩΜΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(7) Jesus said: Blessed is the lion which the man eats, and the lion will become man; and cursed is the man whom the lion eats, and the lion will become man.

(7) Jesus said, “Blessed is the lion that the human being will devour so that the lion becomes human. And cursed is the human being that the lion devours; and the lion will become human.”

7 [7]. Jesus says: “Blessed is the lion which a man eats so that the lion becomes a man. But cursed is the man whom a lion eats so that the man becomes a lion!”

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: “The point of this seems to be that a lion, if eaten by a man, is ennobled by rising in the scale of being, whereas a man, if eaten by a lion, is degraded to a lower status than was originally his and may even risk missing the goal of immortality. It is not that we become what we eat but that what we eat becomes part of us (as in Walter de la Mare’s poem ‘Little Miss T-’). Whether, in addition, there is any special symbolism in the lion, as in 1 Peter 5.8 (‘Your adversary

the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking some one to devour'), is exceedingly difficult to determine." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 115)

Funk and Hoover write: "This saying is obscure. In antiquity the lion was known to be powerful and ferocious. Hunting lions was the sport of kings. The lion was often the symbol of royalty. The winged lion figures in apocalyptic visions, sometimes as the consort of God, at other times as a symbol of evil. In Rev 4:7, the four figures that surround the throne are the lion, the young bull, the human figure, and the eagle. These images were later adopted as symbols of the four canonical evangelists; the winged lion specifically became the symbol for the Gospel of Mark." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 477)

Funk and Hoover continue: "The lion was also used to symbolize human passions. Consuming the lion or being eaten by the lion may therefore have had to do with the relation to one's passions. Understood this way, the saying embodies an ascetic motif. At any rate, Jesus, who was reputed to be a glutton and a drunkard, probably did not coin this saying." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 477)

Marvin Meyer writes: "This riddle-like saying remains somewhat obscure. In ancient literature the lion could symbolize what is passionate and bestial. Hence this saying could suggest that although a human being may consume what is bestial or be consumed by it, there is hope for the human being - and the lion. In gnostic literature the ruler of this world (Yaldabaoth in the Secret Book of John) is sometimes said to look like a lion. This saying may ultimately be based upon statements in Plato, for instance his comparison (in Republic 588E-589B) of the soul to a being of three parts: a many-headed beast, a lion, and a human being. Plato recommends that the human part of the soul (that is, reason) tame and nourish the leonine part (that is, the passion of the heart)." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 71-72)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "Verse 1 is about the humanization of bestial forces in human beings, v. 2 about human beings lapsing into a bestial nature. Because of the parallelism, I have emended the text in v. 2b, 'and the lion will become man', to the text above ['and the man will become lion']. The logion fits well with the ascetic-Gnostic circles which are interested in taming or humanization of bestial passions. They are often concerned with taming bestial natures, of which that of the lion is the strongest." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 593)

Jean Doresse writes: "No doubt the lion here represents human passions, or more precisely, the lying spirit of evil. This is suggested by a passage from a Coptic Manichaean Psalm (CCLVII): 'This lion which is within me, which defiles me at every moment, I have strangled it and cast it out of my soul. . . .'" (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 371)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "This saying, as Doresse notes (page 134), is extremely obscure. From other sayings in Thomas we may infer that the lion can be eaten only if it is killed and becomes a corpse (60), and that knowing the world is equivalent to finding a corpse (57) - the world is not worthy of those who find such a corpse. The Gnostic who has eaten what is dead has made it living (Saying 10). Therefore, by eating the dead lion, which may be the hostile world (cf., 1 Peter 5:8: 'Your adversary the devil, like a raging lion . . .'), you can overcome the world by assimilating it to yourself. If the true inner man is consumed by the lion, and the lion becomes the man, the world has overcome the Gnostic (cf., Clement, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 84)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 126)

Funk's Parallels

[POxy654 7.](#)

8. (1) ΑΥΩ ΠΕΧΑΥ ΧΕ ΕΠΡΩΜΕ ΤΝΤΩΝ ΑΥΟΥΩΖΕ ΡΡΜΝΖΗΤ
 ΠΑΕΙ ΝΤΑΖΝΟΥΧΕ ΝΤΕΦΑΒΩ ΕΘΑΛΑΚΚΑ ΑΥΩΩΚ ΜΜΟC ΕΖΡΑΙ ΖΝ
 ΘΑΛΑΚΚΑ ΕCΜΕΖ ΝΤΒΤ ΝΚΟΥΕΙ (2) ΝΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΑΥΖΕ ΑΥΝΟΘ
 ΝΤΒΤ ΕΝΑΝΟΥΥ ΝΔΙ ΠΟΥΩΖΕ ΡΡΜΝΖΗΤ (3) ΑΥΝΟΥΧΕ ΝΝΚΟΥΕΙ
 ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΒΤ ΕΒΟΛ Ε(ΠΕ)CΗΤ ΕΘΑΛΑΚΚΑ ΑΥΩΩΤΠ ΜΠΝΟΘ ΝΤΒΤ
 ΧΩΡΙC ΖΙCΕ (4) ΠΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΜΑΛΧΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΕCΩΤΜ ΜΑΡΕΥCΩΤΜ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(8) And he said: Man is like a wise fisherman who cast his net into the sea; he drew it up from the sea full of small fish; among them he found a large good fish, the wise fisherman; he threw all the small fish into the sea, he chose the large fish without difficulty. He who has ears to hear, let him hear!	(8) And he said, "What human beings resemble is an intelligent fisherman who, having cast his net into the sea, pulled the net up out of the sea full of little fish. The intelligent fisherman, upon finding among them a fine large fish, threw all the little fish back into the sea, choosing without any effort the big fish. Whoever has ears to hear should listen!"	8 [8]. Then he says: "A man is like a skilled fisherman who cast his net into the sea. He brought it up out of the sea full of little fishes, and among them the skilled fisherman found one that was big and excellent. He threw all the little fishes back into the sea; without hesitating he chose the big fish. He who was ears to hear, let him hear!"

Scholarly Quotes

Funk cites Aesop as follows: "A fisherman drew in the net which he had cast a short time before and, as luck would have it, it was full of all kinds of delectable fish. But the little ones fled to the bottom of the net and slipped out through its many meshes, whereas the big ones were caught and lay stretched out in the boat. / It's one way to be insured and out of trouble, to be small; but you will seldom see a man who enjoys great reputation and has the luck to evade all risks. (Perry, 1965: 9-10)" (*New Gospel Parallels*, v. 2, p. 110)

Funk refers to Philoxenas as follows: "Then one will see the fisherman cast his net into the sea of the world and fill it with fish, small and great. . . . At that time he will draw his net and bring it up to the shore of the sea, as he set it, and he will choose the good fish and will put them in his vessels, . . . and he will throw away the wicked ones into utter darkness, where there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. (IDB Supplement: 903a)" (*New Gospel Parallels*, v. 2, p. 110)

Ron Cameron refers to Herodotus, History 1.141: "Once, he [Cyrus] said, there was a flute-player who saw fishes in the sea and played upon his flute, thinking that so they would come out on to the land. Being disappointed of his hope, he took a net and gathered in and drew out a great multitude of the fishes; and seeing them leaping, 'You had best,' said he, 'cease from your dancing now; you would not come out and dance then, when I played to you.'" ("Parable and Interpretation in the Gospel of Thomas," *Forum* 2.2 [1986], p. 29)

Ron Cameron quotes a parallel in Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 6.11.95.3: “the kingdom of heaven is like a person who cast a net into the sea and, from the multitude of fish that were caught, chose the better.” (“Parable and Interpretation in the Gospel of Thomas,” *Forum* 2.2 [1986], p. 28)

John Dart writes: “One scholar, Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, says ‘the Man’ [in Guillaumont’s translation] can be understood as a gnosticizing substitute for ‘the kingdom of heaven.’” (*The Laughing Savior*, pp. 94-95)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “‘Man’ is a keyword link to ‘man’ in 7.1, 2. Instead of ‘man’, originally ‘kingdom of the Father/God’ probably stood in v. 1.” (*Jesus After 200 Years*, p. 594)

Ron Cameron writes: “The opening words of The Fishnet (‘the person [P.RWME] is like a wise fisherman’) are striking, for the making of a comparison to a person is generally assumed to be anomalous in the parables of the Jesus tradition. It is the overwhelming consensus of scholarship that the reference to ‘the person’ in Thomas has supplanted the original, more familiar reference to ‘the kingdom.’ This is particularly the judgment of those who consider this ‘person’ a gnosticizing substitution for that ‘kingdom.’ Accordingly, ‘the person’ (frequently translated ‘the man’) who is said to be compared to a ‘wise fisherman’ in GThom 8.1 has been variously identified as (1) the ‘Son of Man,’ (2) the gnostic ‘Primal Man’ (ANQRWPOS), (3) the individual Gnostic, or (4) the gnostic Redeemer.” (“Parable and Interpretation in the Gospel of Thomas,” *Forum* 2.2 [1986])

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Thomas contains a parable about a ‘wise fisherman’ who threw away all the little fish he caught and kept only a large and good one (Saying 8/7); this may be contrasted with the parable of the Dragnet in Matthew 13:47-50, where good and bad fish are kept together until the end of the age.” (*Gnosticism & Early Christianity*, pp. 188-189)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This, the first of many parables in the *Gospel of Thomas*, bears a superficial resemblance to the parable of the dragnet in Matthew 13.47-50., but its point is closer to that of the parables of the treasure concealed in a field (Saying 109) and the pearl of great price (Saying 76), to gain which a man sells all that he has (Matthew 13.44-46). In this context the big fish is either the true Gnostic, whom Christ chooses above all others, or the true knowledge for which the Gnostic abandons everything else.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 115-116)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “We should expect to read that ‘the kingdom’ is like a fisherman (cf., Sayings 20, 76, 93-95, 104, 106); but for Thomas, true, inner man is *equivalent* to the kingdom. Moreover, Thomas sharply modifies the meaning of the parable in Matthew 13:47-48, on which he relies for some details. There the kingdom is like the net which brings in fish of all sorts, good and bad alike (a very un-Gnostic notion!). Thomas tells of the ‘experienced’ fisherman who can select the best one of his catch (compare the ‘sheep’ of Saying 104). The parable ends with the admonition, ‘He who has ears to hear, let him hear’; Matthew uses a similar admonition twice in the chapter in which he tells the parable of the dragnet (13:9, 43). Like Matthew, Thomas wants to show that there is a hidden meaning in the parable (see Sayings 22, 25, 64, 66, 93). The meaning is that only Gnostics are selected by Jesus or the Father, or that Gnostics select Christ.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 126-127)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “By printing the opening words in the form ‘The Man is like a wise fisherman,’ the official translation inevitably suggests an association with the Gnostic Anthropos, in which case the parable would refer to the election of the Gnostic. He is the large and good fish which is selected while all the rest are thrown back into the sea. It is also possible, however, to interpret this story as a parable of the Gnostic, the fish in this case being *gnosis* and the parable constructed on the model of the synoptic parables of the pearl of great price and the hidden treasure,

both of which also occur in Thomas, to teach that the Kingdom of God (or in Thomas *gnosis*) is of such supreme value as to be worth any sacrifice.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 40-41)

Helmut Koester writes: “One may wonder whether Thomas refers to the synoptic parable of Matt. 13:47-48 at all. There is an almost exact parallel to SAYing 8 in the poetic version of the Aesopic fables by Babrius, who, in the first century A.D., dedicated his work to the son of King Alexander, whose tutor he was.” (*Trajectories through Early Christianity*, p. 176)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “The catch varies. When the fisherman throws his casting-net into the shallow water by the bank, weighted with lead round the edge, it falls into the water like a bell. The net often remains empty several times running. A modern observer counted twenty to twenty-five fish in one catch. In the parable, when the fisherman drew his net to shore he found a great number of small fish in it, but among them one fine large fish. Although he might have hesitated about keeping a few of the small fish in his bag, yet in his joy over the CALLICQUS [Thus Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, I, 16.3 with reference to our parable.] he cast aside all such hesitations and threw all the small fish back into the lake. Thus it is when a man is overwhelmed with joy over the glad Good News; all else becomes valueless compared with this surpassing value.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 201)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 21:5](#), [GThom 24:2](#), [GThom 63:2](#), [GThom 65:2](#), [GThom 96:2](#), [Luke 8:8](#), [Luke 14:35b](#), [Matt 13:47-50](#), [Matt 11:15](#), [Matt 13:9](#), [Matt 13:43](#), [Mark 4:9](#), [Mark 4:23](#), [Aesop Fable 4](#), [Philoxenas Homilies I.9](#), [Rev 2:7a](#), [Rev 2:11a](#), [Rev 2:17a](#), [Rev 3:6](#), [Rev 3:13](#), [Rev 3:22](#), [Rev 13:9](#).

9. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΕΙCΖΗΗΤΕ ΑΦΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ Ν̄ΟΙ ΠΕΤCΙΤΕ ΑΦΜΕΖ
 ΤΟΟΤ̄ ΑΦΝΟΥΧΕ (2) ΑΖΟΕΙΝΕ ΜΕΝ ΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν ΤΕΖΙΗ ΑΥΕΙ Ν̄ΟΙ
 Ν̄ΖΑΛΑΤΕ ΑΥΚΑΤΦΟΥ (3) Ζ̄ΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΑΥΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν ΤΠΕΤΡΑ ΑΥΩ
 Μ̄ΠΟΥΧΕ ΝΟΥΝΕ ΕΠΕCΗΤ ΕΠΚΑΖ ΑΥΩ Μ̄ΠΟΥΤΕΥΕ Ζ̄ΜC ΕΖΡΑΙ
 ΕΤΠΕ (4) ΑΥΩ Ζ̄ΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΑΥΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν Ν̄ΨΟΝΤΕ ΑΥΩCΤ Μ̄ΠΕΘΡΟC
 ΑΥΩ ΑΠΦ̄ΝΤ ΟΥΟΜΟΥ (5) ΑΥΩ ΑΖ̄ΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν ΠΚΑΖ
 ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΦ ΑΥΩ ΑΦ† ΚΑΡΠΟC ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΤΠΕ ΕΝΑΝΟΥΦ ΑΦΕΙ Ν̄CΕ
 ΕCΟΤΕ ΑΥΩ ΨΕΧΟΥΩΤ ΕCΟΤΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(9) Jesus said: Look, the sower went out, he filled his hand (and) cast (the seed). Some fell upon the road; the birds came, they gathered them. Others fell upon the rock, and struck no root in the ground, nor did they produce any ears. And others fell on the thorns; they choked the seed and the worm ate them. And others fell on the good earth, and it

(9) Jesus said, “Listen, a sower came forth, took a handful, and cast. Now, some fell upon the path, and the birds came and picked them out. Others fell upon rock, and they did not take root in the soil, and did not send up ears. And others fell upon the thorns, and they choked the seed; and the grubs devoured them. And others fell upon good soil,

9 [9]. Jesus says: “See, the sower went out. He filled his hand and scattered <the seed.> Some fell on the path: birds came and gathered them. Others fell on rocky ground: they found no means of taking root in the soil and did not send up ears of corn. Others fell among thorns; <these> stifled the grain, and the worm ate the <seed.> Others fell on good soil, and

produced good fruit; it yielded sixty per measure and a hundred and twenty per measure.

and it sent up good crops and yielded sixty per measure and a hundred and twenty per measure.

this <portion> produced an excellent crop: it gave as much as sixty-fold, and <even> a hundred and twenty-fold!”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “In each occurrence of the parable in the New Testament, the author has added an allegorical interpretation of the parable and placed it on the lips of Jesus (Matthew 13:18-23; Mark 4:13-20; Luke 8:11-15). Stories similar to the parable are known from Jewish and Greek literature. Thus Sirach 6:19 says, ‘Come to her (that is, Wisdom) like one who plows and sows, and wait for her good crops. For in her work you will toil a little, and soon you will eat of her produce.’ In his Oratorical Instruction 5.11.24, Quintilian writes, ‘For instance, if you would say that the mind needs to be cultivated, you would use a comparison to the soil, which if neglected produces thorns and brambles but if cultivated produces a crop. . . .’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 72-73)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This is another version of the parable of the sower (or the parable of the four soils), recorded in all three Synoptic Gospels (Mark 4.3-8; Matthew 13.3-8; Luke 8.5-8). The worm that attacked the seed sown among thorns is peculiar to this version. The ‘rock’ instead of ‘rocky ground’ is distinctively Lukan; the statement that the seed sown there ‘sent forth no ears up to heaven’ has been recognised as a Naassene thought. [Hippolytus (*Refutation* v.8.29) reproduces the Naassene interpretation of the parable.] The statement that the first lot of seed fell ‘on’ (not ‘by’) the road probably reflects the sense of the Aramaic preposition used by Jesus in telling the parable (the preposition may be rendered ‘on’ or ‘by’ according to the context).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 116)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “Here, as additions to the synoptic form of the parable, we have the antithesis ‘(did not strike root in the earth and sent up no ears to heaven)’, the mention of the worm and the increase in number, 120.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 28)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Thomas adds a few details. The sower ‘filled his hand’ before he cast the seed; this looks like no more than an attempt to indicate the fullness or completeness of the sowing (of souls or spirits). But when we read that the seed which fell on ‘the rock’ (so only Luke) not only had no root but also ‘put forth no ear up to heaven’ we are confronting a combination of this parable with the Naassene doctrine of the heavenward ascent of the good seed. The seed which fell upon thorns was not only choked but also eaten by the worm - presumably the worm of Gehenna (cf., Mark 9:48), though Thomas does not say so, since, like other Gnostics, he doubtless holds that hell is on earth. The good fruit, unlike the bad, is brought forth ‘up to heaven,’ sometimes sixty-fold, sometimes one-hundred-twenty-fold. Thomas feels free to give these figures since Matthew has one hundred, sixty, and thirty; Mark has thirty-sixty-one hundred; and Luke has simply one hundred. His figure is more logical; one hundred twenty is twice as much as sixty.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 127-128)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “In particular he [Quispel] claims as evidence [for primitivity] the reading ‘on the road,’ for which he has found parallels in Justin Martyr and in the Clementine literature. Moreover, Clement of Rome quotes the opening words in this form rather than that of our Gospels. Bartsch, however, argues that the chance is a corection of the synoptic version, and regards the differences in Thomas as the result of condensation in the paraenetic tradition. Luke’s version indeed is an intermediate stage between those of Mark and of Thomas. The correction is certainly very natural, and scholars have long recognized that the synoptic ‘by the wayside’ goes back to a

misunderstanding of the Aramaic; but this does not necessarily preclude the possibility that two Greek versions were current. The question should probably be left open, since the evidence is scarcely decisive either way. Grant and Freedman see here only a few additions to the canonical parable, and quote the Naassene exegesis; the form in which the Naassenes cited the parable was apparently not exactly that of Thomas, but ‘based on a mixture of Matthew and Luke.’ In this connection it is interesting to see what the Gnostics, or others like them, could make of an apparently innocuous parable: Puech quotes in another connection, and Doresse adduces at this point in his commentary, an interpretation given by the Priscillianists, to the effect that this was not a good sower, or he would not have been so careless; in fact, he was the God of this world, sowing souls into bodies. The passage is quoted by Orosius (c. A.D. 414) from the *Memoria Apostolorum*, a work of uncertain date, and it is not clear how far back this interpretation can be traced. We cannot say that this was how Thomas understood the parable, but such an exegesis is certainly in the Gnostic tradition.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 98-99)

Funk and Hoover write: “Thomas has preserved what the Fellows take to be the form of the parable that is closest to the original. The seed is first sown on three kinds of ground that fail to produce: the road, the rocky ground, and among the thorns. When sown on good soil, the seed produces yields at two different levels: sixty and one hundred twenty. Originally, the yields were probably thirty, sixty, one hundred, as Mark records them, although the doubling of sixty to one hundred twenty may have been original. The structure probably consisted of two sets of threes: three failures, three successes.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 478)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The comparison between the versions of Mark and Thomas indicates that there is a far-reaching agreement, with two exceptions: *first*, the conclusion differs in that Mark speaks of fruit thirtyfold and sixtyfold and one hundredfold, while Thomas speaks of sixty and one hundred and twenty measures. *Secondly*, in mentioning the rocky ground on which the seed fell Mark additionally writes that the rising sun contributed to the withering (Mark 4.6), whereas Thomas is silent about this. On the whole we must regard the version of Thomas as older than that of Mark, because it is simpler.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 28)

Funk’s Parallels: [Luke 8:4-8](#), [Luke 8:11-15](#), [Matt 13:3-9](#), [Matt 13:18-23](#), [Mark 4:2-9](#), [Mark 4:13-20](#), [InThom 12:1-2](#), [ApJas 8:1-2](#), [1 Clem 24:5](#).

10. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΔΕΙΝΟΥΧΕ ΝΟΥΚΩΖΤ ΕΧΝ ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΔΥΩ
ΕΙCΖΗΗΤΕ †ΑΡΕΖ ΕΡΟC ΨΑΝΤΕCΥΕΡΟ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(10) Jesus said: I have cast a fire upon the world, and see, I watch over it until it is ablaze.

(10) Jesus said, “I have cast fire upon the world, and see, I am watching over it until it blazes.”

10 [10]. Jesus says: “I have cast a fire onto the world, and see, I watch over it until it blazes up!”

Scholarly Quotes

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Logion 10 has a parallel in Luke xii. 49, but with a change of emphasis. The canonical version looks to the future: ‘I came to cast fire upon the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled!’ In Thomas the fire *has* been kindled: ‘I have cast fire upon the world, and behold, I guard it until it is ablaze.’ This raises an interesting problem in relation to the common source of Matthew and Luke, since Matthew (x. 34) records a saying, ‘I came not to cast peace, but a sword.’ As already observed, something like this appears in logion 16, but in the saying in Thomas ‘division’ and ‘fire’ are paralleled in Luke, ‘sword’ in Matthew. The question is whether in Thomas

we have a conflation of the two synoptic versions, or a form of the saying derived from an independent tradition.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 110-111)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “A similar saying in Luke 12:49 is clearly eschatological. ‘I came to cast fire on the earth, and how I wish that it were already kindled.’ Thomas changes future to past and present. The fire has been ignited, and Jesus keeps the world until it burns up; to be near the fire is to be near Jesus and the kingdom (Saying 82).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 128)

Marvin Meyer writes: “The gnostic document Pistis Sophia 141 has Jesus utter a nearly identical saying. Jesus, who is called Aberamentho, says, ‘For this reason I said to you, ‘I have come to throw fire upon the earth,’ that is, I have come to cleanse the sins of the whole world with fire.’ See also Gospel of Thomas saying 15.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 73)

Funk and Hoover write: “Both the context and the form of the saying in Thomas distinguish it from the Lukan version (‘I came to set the earth on fire, and how I wish it were already ablaze!’). In Luke, the saying is part of a cluster probably already formed in Q, and reflects the early Christian community’s mythologized view of Jesus as one who came into the world for its redemption. In Thomas, the saying appears as a single aphorism, not part of a cluster, and with none of the Christianizing language of the Lukan version. The saying in Thomas is thus probably not dependent on Q or Luke, but represents an independent tradition.” (*The Five Gospels*, pp. 478-479)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion is similar to Luke 12.49, but can hardly have come from there (cf. by contrast the adoption and interpretation of Luke 12.49 in the Gnostic writing Pistis Sophia IV 141: it means the cleansing of the sins of the whole world by fire). The key to its understanding is ‘world’ (Luke: earth), a word which appears sixteen times alone in the Gospel of Thomas and in it has a predominantly negative sense (cf. Logion 56). In Logion 82 ‘fire’ is connected with the nearness of Jesus. So the meaning seems to be that Jesus’ presence will set on fire the world, understood in negative terms.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 595)

Funk’s Parallels: [GThom 16](#), [Luke 12:49-53](#), [Matt 10:34-39](#).

11. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΕΕΠΤΕ ΝΑΡΠΑΡΑΓΕ ΔΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΤΠΕ ΜΜΟC
 ΝΑΡΠΑΡΑΓΕ (2) ΔΥΩ ΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ CΕΟΝΖ ΔΝ ΔΥΩ ΝΕΤΟΝΖ
 CΕΝΑΜΟΥ ΔΝ (3) ΝΖΟΟΥ ΝΕΤΕΤΝΟΥΩΜ ΜΠΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ ΝΕΤΕΤΝΕΙΡΕ
 ΜΜΟC ΜΠΕΤΟΝΖ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝΩΠΕ ΖΜ ΠΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΟΥ
 ΠΕΤΕΤΝΑΔC (4) ΖΜ ΦΟΥ ΕΤΕΤΝΟ ΝΟΥΑ ΔΤΕΤΝΕΙΡΕ ΜΠCΝΔΥ
 ΖΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΩΠΕ ΝCΝΔΥ ΟΥ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΝΑΔC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(11) Jesus said: This heaven will pass away, and the one above it will pass away; and those who are dead are not alive, and those who are living will not die. In the days when you ate of what is dead, you made of it what is living. When you come to be

(11) Jesus said, “This heaven will pass away, and the one above it will pass away. And the dead (elements) are not alive, and the living (elements) will not die. In the days when you (plur.) used to ingest dead (elements), you made them alive. When

11 [11]. Jesus says: “This heaven will pass away, and the hevaen which is above it will pass: but those who are dead will not live, and those who live will not die!” 12 [11]. “Today you eat dead things and make them into something living: <but>

<p>light, what will you do? On the day when you were one, you became two. But when you have become two, what will you do?</p>	<p>you are in the light, what will you do? On the day that you were one, you made two. And when you are two, what will you do?"</p>	<p>when you will be in Light, what will you do then? For then you will become two instead of one; and when you become two, what will you do then?"</p>
---	---	--

Scholarly Quotes

Jean Doresse writes: "The first part of this paragraph is quoted and commented on by the *Philosophumena* (V, 8, 31). According to this work, the Naassenes explained it as follows: 'If you have eaten dead things and made them living things, what then will you do when you eat living things? These *living things* are rational beings, intelligences, men - pearls which the great Being without form has cast into the work of here below!'" (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 371)

Marvin Meyer writes: "The two heavens will pass away. Presumably the third heaven (the realm of God; compare 2 Corinthians 12:2-4) will not. On the heavens passing away, compare Matthew 24:35; Mark 13:31; Luke 21:33; Matthew 5:18 (Q); Luke 16:17 (Q)." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 73)

F. F. Bruce writes: "The first part of the saying reminds us of Matthew 24.35 (cf. Matthew 5.18; Luke 16.17): 'Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away' - but it is not a close parallel. As for eating dead things, this probably means that when the flesh of dead animals is eaten by human beings it becomes part of a living body (cf. Saying 7). [A similar Naassene saying is quoted by Hippolytus, *Refutation* v.8.32.] The eating of flesh was probably discouraged, as making it more difficult to attain the light of immortality; the views of a vegetarian Syrian sect called the Encratites may have influenced the tradition in this and some other regards. The words about being one and becoming two refer to the dividing of man into male and female (cf. Saying 4). If sex was to be transcended in the life to come, it was felt best that it should play no part in the present life (this may be a further Encratite trait)." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 117)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "The third part of the saying describes the condition of the Gnostic believer. Those who were formerly divided have been united; they have worked together (Saying 59); they are at peace (49); they have become one (103). Unfortunately, it looks as if becoming 'two' were regarded as the believer's goal. Perhaps it would be best to hold that the present unity of the believers represents their goal, and - in spite of the parallelism of the saying - that the becoming 'two' is something they should avoid. Jesus is not a divider (Saying 72), except in the sense that he divides families into Gnostics and non-Gnostics (Saying 16)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 130)

Stevan Davies writes: "Those who achieve the excellence Thomas commends are people who live from the living one immortally (sayings 11, 111), while those who do not do so live from the dead and will die (sayings 7, 11, 60, 87)." (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk and Hoover write: "A number of themes in this complex led the Fellows to conclude that these sayings derive from a form of Christianity exhibiting mild gnostic tendencies. This appears to be the form of Christianity Thomas espoused. The speculative cosmology in 11:1 has parallels in other gnostic texts. The obscure statements regarding life and death in 11:2-3a seem typical of Thomas (Thom 4:1; 58; 101:3; 7; 60), as does the theme of light (11:3b; compare with 24:3; 50:1; 61:5; 83:1-2). 11:4 may refer to a common gnostic idea that humanity has fallen from an original,

perfect state of undifferentiated unity (22:4-7). All these considerations suggest that the Thomas tradition is the origin of this complex rather than Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 479)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 111:1](#), [Ps 102:25-27](#), [Isa 34:4](#), [Luke 16:16-17](#), [Luke 21:32-33](#), [Matt 5:18](#), [Matt 24:34-35](#), [Mark 13:30-31](#), [DialSav 56-57](#), [Hippolytus Refutatio 5.8.32](#), [Heb 1:10-12](#), [Rev 6:12-14](#).

12. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΜΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΝΙC ΧΕ ΤΝCΟΟΥΝ ΧΕ ΚΝΑΒΟΚ ΝΤΟΟΤΝ
 ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΕΤΝΑΡ ΝΟC ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΩΝ (2) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΠΜΑ
 ΝΤΑΤΕΤΝΕΙ ΜΜΑΥ ΕΤΕΤΝΑΒΟΚ ΩΑ ΙΑΚΩΒΟC ΠΔΙΚΑΙΟC ΠΑΕΙ
 ΝΤΑ ΤΠΕ ΜΝ ΠΚΑΖ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΤΒΗΤΨ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(12) The disciples said to Jesus: We know that you will depart from us; who is it who will be great over us? Jesus said to them: Wherever you have come, you will go to James the Just, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being.

(12) The disciples said to Jesus, “We are aware that you will depart from us. Who will be our leader?” Jesus said to him, “No matter where you come it is to James the Just that you shall go, for whose sake heaven and earth have come to exist.”

13 [12]. The disciples say to Jesus, “We know that Thou wilt leave us: who will <then> be the great<est> over us?” Jesus says to them: “Wherever you go, you will turn to James the Just, for whose sake heaven as well as earth was produced.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer refers to the quote of Hegesippus on James the Just in Ecclesiastical History 2.23.4-7 and quotes from Secret James 16:5-11 on his authority: “So, not wishing to give them offense, I sent each one of them to a different place. But I myself went up to Jerusalem, praying that I might acquire a share with the beloved ones who will appear.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 74)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The answer which Jesus gives is again related to the conversation in the Gospel of John, where Jesus tells the disciples that he is going away to prepare a ‘place’ for them (John 14:2-3). In Thomas, however, the ‘place’ is apparently earthly rather than heavenly; it is a place in which they are to go to James the Just, ‘for whose sake the heaven and the earth came into existence.’ This exaltation of James is characteristic of Jewish-Christian and Naassene tradition . . . it may be derived from the Gospel of the Hebrews. Doresse suggests (page 140) that James may here be regarded as a supernatural power, but there is nothing in Thomas which could favor such an interpretation.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 131)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion recalls the disciples’ conversations about status which we know from Mark 9.33-34. To be precise, the saying regulates the succession to Jesus (cf. the Paraclete in John 14.16, 26; 15.26; 16.7 and Peter as the follower of Jesus in John 21.15-17). James is not only given the predicate ‘righteous’ (cf. Acts 7.52), but is also assigned a role in creation. All these sayings came into being in Jewish-Christian circles where James later became ‘the pope of Ebionite fantasy’ (H. J. Schoeps).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 596)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This saying originated in a Jewish-Christian setting where James the Just, Jesus’ brother, was regarded as the natural leader of Jesus’s disciples after Jesus’s departure. James was actually leader of the Jerusalem church for fifteen to twenty years, until his death in A.D. 62; his memory was revered and enhanced by legendary embellishments. Here a high estimate is placed on his person: in Jewish thought the world was created for the sake of the Torah, [Assumption of Moses 1.2; Genesis Rabbah 1.25.] although in one rabbinical utterance ‘every single person is obliged to say: “The world was created for my sake.”’ [TB Sanhedrin 37b]” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, pp. 117-118)

Robert Price writes: “So to be called the Pillars indicated quite an exalted status. We can see the same sort of godlike veneration reflected in Thomas, saying 12 . . . ‘Wherever you come from’ refers to the obligation of missionary apostles to check in with a report to James in Jerusalem, another measure of his importance.” (*Deconstructing Jesus*, p. 53)

Funk’s Parallels: [Luke 9:46-48](#), [Luke 22:24-27](#), [Matt 18:1-4](#), [Mark 9:33-35](#).

13. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΝΝΕCΜΑΘΗΤΗC ΧΕ ΤΝΤΩΝΤ ΝΤΕΤΝΧΟΟC ΝΑΕΙ
 ΧΕ ΕΕΙΝΕ ΝΝΙΜ (2) ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΝCΙ CΙΜΩΝ ΠΕΤΡΟC ΧΕ ΕΚΕΙΝΕ
 ΝΟΥΑΓΓΕΛΟC ΝΔΙΚΑΙΟC (3) ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΝCΙ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟC ΧΕ
 ΕΚΕΙΝΕ ΝΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΜΦΙΛΟCΟΦΟC ΝΡΜΝΖΗΤ (4) ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΝCΙ
 ΘΩΜΑC ΧΕ ΠCΑΖ ΖΟΛΩC ΤΑΤΑΠΡΟ ΝΑΨ(Ψ)ΑΠC ΑΝ ΕΤΡΑΧΟΟC
 ΧΕ ΕΚΕΙΝΕ ΝΝΙΜ (5) ΠΕΧΕ ΙΗC ΧΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕΚCΑΖ ΑΝ ΕΠΕΙ
 ΑΚCΩ ΑΚ†ΖΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΤΠΗΓΗ ΕΤΒΡΒΡΕ ΤΔΕΙ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΤΑΕΙΨΙΤC
 (6) ΑΥΩ ΑCΧΙΤC ΑCΑΝΑΧΩΡΕΙ ΑCΧΩ ΝΑC ΝΨΟΜΤ ΝΨΑΧΕ (7)
 ΝΤΑΡΕΘΩΜΑC ΔΕ ΕΙ ΨΑ ΝΕCΨΒΕΕΡ ΑΥΧΝΟΥC ΧΕ ΝΤΑΙC ΧΟΟC
 ΧΕ ΟΥ ΝΑΚ (8) ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑΥ ΝCΙ ΘΩΜΑC ΧΕ ΕΙΨΑΝΧΩ ΝΗΤΝ
 ΟΥΑ ΖΝ ΝΨΑΧΕ ΝΤΑCΧΟΟΥ ΝΑΕΙ ΤΕΤΝΑCΙ ΩΝΕ ΝΤΕΤΝΝΟΥΧΕ
 ΕΡΟΕΙ ΑΥΩ ΝΤΕΟΥΚΩΖΤ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΝΩΝΕ ΝCΡΩΖΚ ΜΜΩΤΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(13) Jesus said to his disciples: Compare me, tell me whom I am like. Simon Peter said to him: You are like a righteous angel. Matthew said to him: You are like a wise philosopher. Thomas said to him: Master, my mouth is wholly incapable of saying whom you are like. Jesus said: I am not your master, for you have drunk, and have become drunk from the bubbling spring which I have caused to gush forth (?). And he took him, withdrew, (and)

(13) Jesus said to his disciples, “Compare me to something and tell me what I resemble.” Simon Peter said to him, “A just angel is what you resemble.” Matthew said to him, “An intelligent philosopher is what you resemble.” Thomas said to him, “Teacher, my mouth utterly will not let me say what you resemble.” Jesus said, “I am not your (sing.) teacher, for you have drunk and become intoxicated from the bubbling wellspring that I have personally measured

14 [13]. Jesus says to his disciples: “Compare me, and tell me whom I am like.” Simon Peter says to him: “Thou art like a just angel!” Matthew says to him: “Thou art like a wise man and a philosopher!” Thomas says to him: “Master, my tongue cannot find words to say whom thou art like.” Jesus says: “I am no longer thy master; for thou hast drunk, thou art inebriated from the bubbling spring which is mine and which I sent forth.” Then he took him aside; he

<p>spoke to him three words. Now when Thomas came (back) to his companions, they asked him: What did Jesus say to you? Thomas said to them: If I tell you one of the words which he said to me, you will take up stones (and) throw them at me; and a fire will come out of the stones (and) burn you up.</p>	<p>out. And he took him, withdrew, and said three sayings to him. Now, when Thomas came to his companions they asked him, “What did Jesus say to you?” Thomas said to them, “If I say to you (plur.) one of the sayings that he said to me, you will take stones and stone me, and fire will come out of the stones and burn you up.”</p>	<p>said three words to him. And when Thomas came back to his companions, they asked him: “What did Jesus say to thee?” And Thomas answered them: “If I tell you <a single> one of the words he said to me, you will take up stones and throw them at me, and fire will come out of the stones and consume you!”</p>
---	---	---

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “These three sayings or words are unknown, but presumably they are powerful and provocative sayings, since stoning (mentioned by Thomas) was the Jewish punishment for blasphemy. Worth noting are the following examples of three words or sayings: Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies* 5.8.4, cites the three words Kaulakau, Saulasau, Zeesar, derived from the Hebrew of Isaiah 28:10, 13; Pistis Sophia 136 mentions Yao Yao Yao, the Greek version (with three letters, given three times) of the ineffable name of God; the Gospel of Bartholomew and the Secret Book of John provide statements of identification with the father, the mother (or the holy spirit), and the son. Acts of Thomas 47 and Manichaean Kephalaia I 5,26-34 also refer to the three sayings or words but do not disclose precisely what they were.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 74-75)

Robert Price writes: “In Thomas’ version (saying 13), the false estimates of Jesus are even more interesting. Jesus spurns the opinion of those self-styled believers who consider him ‘a wise philosopher.’ Bingo! A wandering Cynic. (Thomas also has Jesus reject the idea, widely held by many early Christians, that he was an angel in human form.)” (*Deconstructing Jesus*, p. 51)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “the Old Testament and its eschatology have been eliminated; Jesus is no Messiah but ‘like a righteous angel,’ ‘like a wise philosopher,’ or simply incomparable.” (*Gnosticism & Early Christianity*, p. 186)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “As Grant and Freedman note, the idea is similar to that of John xv. 15, while the reference to ‘bubbling spring’ also recalls Johannine texts. It may be, however, that we have also some connection here with the Philonic idea of a ‘sober intoxication.’ Thereafter Jesus takes Thomas aside and speaks to him three words. When the other disciples ask what Jesus said, Thomas replies, ‘If I tell you one of the words which He said to me, you will take up stones and throw them at me; and a fire will come out of the stones and burn you up.’ It may be significant that while there are several references in the New Testament to stoning or casting stones it is only John who speaks of taking up stones to throw (viii. 59, x. 31). About the three words we can only speculate, but they were evidently blasphemous to Jewish ears. Puech suggests that they were the names ‘Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,’ Grant and Freedman the three secret words of the Naassenes (Hippol., *Ref.* 5.8.5). The whole passage is at any rate a substitute for the canonical narrative of Peter’s confession, designed to give to Thomas the pre-eminence.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 111-112)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This conversation begins like that at Caesarea Philippi, recorded in all three Synoptic Gospels, where Jesus asks his disciples ‘Who do men say that I am?’ and then: ‘But who

do you say that I am?’ (Mark 8.27-29). But the answers given here are quite different from what we find in the canonical tradition, which is consistent with the historical circumstances of Jesus’s ministry. Here the answers are attempts to depict Jesus as the Gnostic Revealer. Those who have imbibed the *gnosis* which he imparts (the ‘bubbling spring’ which he has spread abroad) are not his servants but his friends, [Cf. John 15.14] and therefore ‘Master’ is an unsuitable title for them to give him. As for the three words spoken secretly to Thomas, conveying Jesus’s hidden identity, they are probably the three secret words on which, according to the Naassenes, the existence of the world depended: *Kaulakau*, *Saulasau*, *Zeesar*. [Hippolytus, *Refutation* v.8.4. *Kaulakau*, they said, was Adamas, primal man, ‘the being who is on high’ . . . *Saulasau*, mortal man here below; *Zeesar*, the Jordan which flows upward.] (In fact, these three words are corruptions of the Hebrew phrases in Isaiah 28.10, 13, translated ‘Line upon line, precept upon precept, there a little’ - but their origin was probably forgotten.) The followers of the Gnostic Basilides are said to have taught that Jesus descended ‘in the name of *Kaulakau*’. [Irenaeus, *Heresies* i.24.6.] The fire that would come out of the stones is perhaps the fire of Saying 10. There is in any case ample attestation of the belief that the untimely divulging of a holy mystery can be as destructive as fire.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, pp. 118-119)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “In the synoptics, various erroneous interpretations precede the correct one. Jesus is John the Baptist, or Elijah, Jeremiah, or some other prophet risen again. So in Thomas, Simon Peter wrongly compares Jesus with an angel (a belief widespread in early Jewish Christianity) and Matthew wrongly compares him with a wise philosopher. Thomas rightly says that to compare Jesus with anything is impossible; but as he does so, he addresses him as ‘Master.’ Thomas, like the man in Mark 10:17 (cf., Luke 18:18) who calls Jesus ‘Good Master,’ is rebuked because of the title he uses. Because he is a disciple of Jesus, he is not a slave but a friend, for Jesus has made known everything which he heard from his Father (John 15:15). The idea expressed in Thomas is quite similar to that found in John. Jesus is not Thomas’s master because Thomas has drunk from the bubbling spring which Jesus has distributed. This thought too is Johannine in origin. ‘The water which I will give him will become in him a spring of water bubbling up to eternal life’ (John 4:14; cf., 7:37-38).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 132-133)

J. P. Meier writes: “An intriguing point here is that in the one work of ‘the school of St. Thomas’ that clearly dates from the 2d century, namely, the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas*, Thomas is actually a peripheral figure who hardly belongs to the traditional material in the book. He is introduced as the author of the work in the clearly redactional opening sentence, but figures prominently in only one other logion, the lengthy saying 13, where Simon Peter and Matthew are also mentioned but Thomas is exalted as the possessor of the secret knowledge of Jesus’ nature. This logion stands in tension with the rival logion just before it, saying 12, where James the Just (the brother of Jesus) is exalted as the leader of the disciples after Jesus departs. On this tension, see Gilles Quispel, “‘The Gospel of Thomas’ and the ‘Gospel of the Hebrews,’” *NTS* 12 (1965-66) 371-82, esp. 380. Hence the *Gospel of Thomas*, the earliest apocryphal and gnosticizing work that was put under the name of Thomas, does not present a tradition really rooted in that person and does not clearly inculcate the idea that Thomas is Jesus’ twin brother.” (*A Marginal Jew*, v. 3, pp. 255-256, n. 17)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 28](#), [Luke 9:18-22](#), [Luke 21:34-36](#), [Matt 16:13-20](#), [John 4:13-15](#), [John 7:38](#), [Mark 8:27-30](#).

14. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝΡΗΗCΤΕΥΕ ΤΕΤΝΑΧΠΟ ΝΗΤΝ
 (3) ΑΥΩ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝ† ΕΛΕΗΜΟCΥΝΗ ΕΤΕΤΝΑΕΙΡΕ ΝΟΥΚΑΚΟΝ
 ΝΝΕΤΜΠΝΑ (4) ΑΥΩ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΚΑΖ ΝΙΜ ΑΥΩ
 ΝΤΕΤΜΜΟΩΕ ΖΝ ΝΧΩΡΑ ΕΥΩΑΡΠΑΡΑΔΕΧΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ
 ΠΕΤΟΥΝΑΚΑΑ4 ΖΑΡΩΤΝ ΟΥΟΜ4 ΝΕΤΩΩΝΕ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ
 ΕΡΙΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ (5) ΠΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΓΑΡ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΖΝ ΤΕΤΝΤΑΠΡΟ
 4ΝΑΧΩΖΜ ΤΗΥΤΝ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΠΕΤΝΝΗΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΤΕΤΝΤΑΠΡΟ
 ΝΤΟ4 ΠΕΤΝΑΧΑΖΜ ΤΗΥΤΝ

BLATZ

(14) Jesus said to them: If you fast, you will put a sin to your charge; and if you pray, you will be condemned; and if you give alms, you will do harm to your inner spirits. And if you go into any land and walk about in the regions, if they receive you, eat what is set before you; heal the sick among them. For what goes into your mouth will not defile you; but what comes out of your mouth, that is what will defile you.

LAYTON

(14) Jesus said to them, “If you (plur.) fast, you will acquire a sin, and if you pray you will be condemned, and if you give alms, it is evil that you will do unto your spirits. And when you go into any land and travel in the country places, when they receive you eat whatever they serve to you. Heal those among them who are sick. For, nothing that enters your mouth will defile you (plur.). Rather, it is precisely what comes out of your mouth that will defile you.”

DORESSE

15 [14]. Jesus says to them: “When you fast, you will beget sin for yourselves; when you pray, you will be condemned; when you give alms, you will do evil to your souls! <But> when you enter any land and travel over the country, when you are welcomed eat what is put before you; those who are ill in those places, heal them. For what enters into your mouth will not defile you, but what comes out of your mouth, it is that which will defile you!”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Positive proof that he did so [copy from the canonical gospels] seems to be provided in Saying 14. . . . The statement about healing the sick has nothing to do with the context in Thomas; it is relevant only in Luke’s collection of sayings. Therefore, Thomas copied it from Luke.” (*Gnosticism & Early Christianity*, pp. 185-186)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This develops the notion of v. 4 about eating all that is set before one, and gives a reason for it. The dependence on Luke 10.7-8 in v. 4 also decides positively the dependence of v. 5 on Mark 7.15. For the invitation to heal the sick does not fit in v. 4 at all, and is best explained by the use of Luke 10.9.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 597)

F. F. Bruce writes: “Fasting, prayer and almsgiving (cf. Saying 6) are three forms of piety mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 6.1-18), but the instructions given here are quite different from those given there. Such pious activities, it appears, are superfluous and indeed

harmful for the true Gnostic. (Similar sentiments about prayer and fasting are expressed in saying 104.) The second and third sentences in the saying are respectively parallel to Luke 10.8 f. and Matthew 15.11 (cf. Mark 7.15). The addition of the injunction 'eat what is set before you' of the words denying that food conveys defilement underlines the relevance of the injunction to the Gentile mission (cf. Acts 10.15; 1 Corinthians 10.27)." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 119)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "This saying deals with subjects already brought up in Saying 5: fasting, prayer, almsgiving, and dietary observances. Here the statements ascribed to Jesus are more explicit than they were before. Fasting produces sin; prayer results in condemnation; almsgiving harms the spirit. Some ground for Thomas's notion is given in Mark 2:18-20 (Matthew 9:14-15; Luke 5:33-35), where Jesus says that the sons of the bridechamber cannot fast while he is with them. Since Thomas regards the kingdom as present rather than future, fasting (a fortiori, prayer, almsgiving, and dietary laws) is pointless and, indeed, sinful." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 134-135)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "As Grant has pointed out, the condemnation at the beginning of this saying takes up three phrases from the Sermon on the Mount [Matt. vi. 16 (fasting), 5 (prayer), and 2 (alms)] in the reverse order; and such reversal of the order is characteristic of Naassene usage. In the passage quoted the opening words are a general summary of the charge to the Seventy in Luke x. 1, followed by Luke x. 8-9 ('if they receive you . . .'). The final sentence has its parallel in Matthew xv. 11, but it may be added that Luke x. 2 is logion 73. In this case Grant and Freedman would appear to be correct in suggesting that the saying 'seems to prove that Thomas used our gospels.' The significant feature is the inclusion of Luke x. 9, the injunction to heal the sick, which is quite out of place in a saying concerned with dietary restrictions, but is easily explained from the Lucan context. There is, however, one point which they have overlooked: in the Gospels the specific injunction 'eat what they set before you' is peculiar to Luke, but Creed notes that there is 'striking resemblance in language' in the Lucan passage to 1 Corinthians x. 27, and that 'it is not unlikely that St. Paul's language is an echo of this injunction,' although the application is quite different. If Paul is quoting and adapting a saying of Jesus, this would point us back to the tradition underlying Luke." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 71-72)

Kurt Rudolph writes: "Even more trenchantly the Jewish laws mentioned in logion 14 are made out to be of no consequence, indeed as detrimental to salvation: Fasting gives rise to sin, praying to condemnation, the giving of alms to harming one's spirit; one should eat everything that is set before one. It is important to heal the sick, by which probably the ignorant are referred to. The saying concludes with a quotation from Mark's Gospel; later still Luke's as well as Matthew's Gospel are brought in on this question. Of sole importance is the 'fast as regards the world' because only that leads to the 'kingdom'. The 'great fast' is taken in this sense also by the Mandaeans: It is no external abstention from eating and drinking but a cessation from inquisitiveness, lies, hatred, jealousy, discord, murder, theft, adultery, the worship of images and idols." (*Gnosis*, p. 263)

Helmut Koester writes: "The basic difference between Thomas and Mark is that Mark states the second half in general terms ('what comes out of a human being'), while Thomas specifies 'what comes out of your mouth.' In this respect Thomas agrees with the form of this saying in Matt 15:11 ('but what comes out of the mouth defiles a human being'). This might argue for a dependence of Thomas upon Matthew. However, the Matthew/Thomas form of this saying is most likely original: the first half of the saying requires that the second half speaks about words which the mouth utters, not excrements (see Mark 7:19). Moreover, what the *Gospel of Thomas* quotes here is the one single saying from the entire pericope that can be considered as a traditional piece and that formed the basis of the original apophthegma - consisting of vss. 1-2, 5, and 15 - out of which the present complex text of Mark 7:1-23 has been developed." (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 111-112)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The Thomastic version is obviously closer to the Matthean-Lukan [Mt 23:25-26, Lk 11:39-40] than to the Markan [Mk 7:15] since it has the *going into the mouth/coming out of the mouth* dichotomy rather than the *outside/inside* distinction. It has been argued that this proves that ‘the Gospel of Thomas here follows Matthew’ and is dependent on him (McArthur 1960:286; see Schrage: 55; Menard, 1975:101). But this does not explain why the Synoptic texts are in the third person while the Thomistic version is in the second person (Sieber: 193).” (*In Fragments*, pp. 253-254)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The accusation concerning *washing* is made against Jesus in Q (= Luke 11:38) and he replies, naturally, in the second person in Q/Luke 11:39-40 = Matt. 23:25-26, but this has become an accusation against Jesus’ disciples in Mark 7:1-2, 5 to which the aphorism in 7:15 speaks in the third person. The general tendency of the tradition is to change an attack on Jesus into an attack on his disciples (Bultmann: 48). This development appears concerning *washing* as Q (= Luke 11:38) reappears in Mark 7:1-2, 5, and also concerning *eating* as *Gos. Thom.* 4c reappears in Matt. 15:11 (17, 18). ‘It seems more likely, therefore, that the second person, a defence of Jesus himself, is the original’ (Sieber: 193).” (*In Fragments*, p. 254)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy 654 6:1](#), [GThom 6:1](#), [POxy1 27](#), [GThom 27](#), [GThom 104](#), [Luke 11:1-4](#), [Luke 9:1-6](#), [Luke 10:1-12](#), [Matt 6:2-4](#), [Matt 6:5-15](#), [Matt 6:16-18](#), [Matt 10:5-15](#), [Matt 15:10-20](#), [Mark 6:7-13](#), [Mark 7:14-23](#), [Did 8:1-3](#), [POxy 1224 2](#), [1 Cor 10:27](#), [Acts 10:9-16](#), [Acts 11:1-10](#).

15. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝΝΑΥ ΕΠΕΤΕ ΜΠΟΥΧΠΟC
ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΤCΖΙΜΕ ΠΕΖΤ ΤΗΥΤΝ ΕΧΜ ΠΕΤΝΖΟ ΝΤΕΤΝΟΥΩΥΤ ΝΑC
ΠΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΠΕ ΠΕΤΝΕΙΩΤ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(15) Jesus said: When you see him who was not born of woman, fall down upon your faces and worship him; that one is your Father.	(15) Jesus said, “When you (plur.) see one who has not been born of woman, fall upon your faces and prostrate yourselves before that one: it is that one who is your father.”	16 [15]. Jesus says: “When you see Him who has not been born of woman, bow down face to the earth and adore Him: He is your father!”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer says that “Manichaeon Psalm Book 121,25-33 also declares an identity between the father and the one not of human birth” and quotes: “[I] hear that you are in your father (and) your father hidden in [you]. My Master. [When I say], ‘The son was [begotten],’ I [shall] find [the] father also beside him. My master. Shall I destroy a kingdom that I may provide a womb of a woman? My master. Your holy womb is the luminaries that conceive you. In the trees and the fruit is your holy body. My master Jesus.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 75-76)

Funk and Hoover write: “There are no parallels to this saying in early Christian or gnostic tradition. Among some gnostic groups, the highest god is referred to as the ‘unbegotten’ (one not born), since birth would imply that the god was finite. This may be the background of the saying. Another

possibility is this: Jesus may here be equating himself with the Father, as he sometimes does in the Gospel of John (10:30; 14:9). In either case, the Fellows took this to reflect later Christian or gnostic tradition.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 482)

Robert M. Grant: “Man who is born of woman is subject to sin, according to Job 14:1, as Doresse notes (page 143). The greatest of those born of women was John the Baptist (Matthew 11:11; Luke 7:28). Therefore, for our Gnostic (as for other Gnostics), Jesus cannot have been born of a woman (in spite of the fact that Paul says he was - Galatians 4:4). Of course it is possible that like some Gnostic teachers he held that while Jesus was born of a woman, the spiritual Christ descended upon him at the time of his baptism; the Naassenes believed that the threefold being descended upon Jesus. In any event, the one not born of woman is to be worshipped, since he is the (heavenly) Father. This conclusion seems to reflect the words of John 14:9: ‘He who has seen me has seen the Father’ (cf., John 10:30: ‘I and the Father are one’).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 135)

F. F. Bruce writes: “But for the last clause, we might have interpreted this saying to mean that Jesus - unlike John the Baptist (cf. Saying 46) - was not born of woman. But whatever the compiler or editor believed about the mode of Jesus’s coming into the world (see Saying 19a), this is probably not in view here, since Jesus and the Father are distinguished (cf. Saying 3). Even so, he would no doubt have drawn his own conclusions from such a saying of Jesus as that of John 10.30: ‘I and the Father are one.’ The Father is in any case the unbegotten One.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, pp. 119-120)

Funk’s Parallels: [Manichaean Psalm Book 121,25-33](#).

16. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΑΧΑ ΕΥΜΕΕΥΕ Ν̄ΟΙ Π̄ΡΩΜΕ ΧΕ Ν̄ΤΑΕΙΕΙ
 ΕΝΟΥΧΕ Ν̄ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΕΧ̄Μ ΠΚΟCΜΟC (2) ΑΥΩ CΕCΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΧΕ
 Ν̄ΤΑΕΙΕΙ ΑΝΟΥΧΕ Ν̄ΖΝ̄ΠΩΡΥ ΕΧ̄Ν ΠΚΑΖ ΟΥΚΩΖΤ ΟΥΧΗΕ
 ΟΥΠΟΛΕΜΟC (3) ΟΥΝ̄ ΤΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν ΟΥΗΕΙ ΟΥΝ̄ ΩΟΜΤ
 ΝΑΩΩΠΕ ΕΧ̄Ν CΝΑΥ ΑΥΩ CΝΑΥ ΕΧ̄Ν ΩΟΜΤ ΠΕΙΩΤ ΕΧ̄Μ ΠΩΗΡΕ
 ΑΥΩ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΕΧ̄Μ ΠΕΙΩΤ (4) ΑΥΩ CΕΝΑΩΖΕ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΥΟ
 Μ̄ΜΟΝΑΧΟC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(16) Jesus said: Perhaps men think that I am come to cast peace upon the world; and they do not know that I am come to cast dissensions upon the earth, fire, sword, war. For there will be five who are in a house; three shall be against two and two against three, the father against the son and the son against the father, and they shall stand as solitaries.

(16) Jesus said, “People probably think that it is peace that I have come to impose upon the world. And they do not recognize that it is divisions that I have come to impose upon the earth - fire, sword, battle. Indeed, there will be five in a house. There will be three over two and two over three, parent over child and child over parent. And they will stand at rest by being solitaries.”

17 [16]. Jesus says: “Men indeed think I have come to bring peace to the world. But they do not know that I have come to bring the world discord, fire, sword, war. Indeed, if there are five <people> in a house, they will become three against two and two against three - father against son and son against father - and they will be lifted up, being solitaries.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “The theme of standing, or stability, is found in Gospel of Thomas sayings 16, 18, 23, 28, and 50. According to accounts concerning the famous gnostic teacher Simon the Magician, he referred to himself as the standing one. The Nag Hammadi tractate entitled Three Steles of Seth applies this epithet to the divine, and adds that God ‘was first to stand’ (119,17-18).” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 76)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This saying is surprising when compared with the others which speak of peace and unity, for here Jesus plainly speaks of himself as a ‘divider.’ The two ideas can be reconciled, however, for peace and unity are characteristic of believers, Gnostic or Christian, while the division is that which comes into existence between them and outsiders. The saying is based on Luke 12:51-53 (Matthew 10:34); Luke 12:49 has already been paraphrased in Saying 9. ‘Perhaps men think’ is derived from Luke’s question, ‘Do you suppose . . . ?’ ‘I came to cast peace’ comes from Matthew, while ‘I came to case division’ is composed by the author of Thomas as a parallel to the preceding line, and to Luke 12:49, from which he derives the mention of ‘fire’ (‘sword’ comes from Matthew). The next sentence is an almost exact quotation of Luke 12:52-53, though references to divisions among women are omitted because ‘women are not worthy of life’ (Saying 112). Those who ‘stand’ (and will not taste death, cf., Saying 18 and Commentary) are those who have broken their ties with earthly families and are ‘single ones’ (cf., Sayings 50 and 75). They must hate father, mother, brothers, and sisters (Sayings 56 and 98).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 136-137)

Helmut Koester writes: “Thomas’s version of these sayings [10 and 16] lacks Luke 12:50, certainly an addition by the author of the Gospel. Also missing in the *Gospel of Thomas* is the pedantic, and certainly secondary, enlargement of the family relationships at the end of Luke 12:53. Instead of Luke’s “division” (vs. 51), *Gos. Thom.* has ‘fire, sword, and war,’ probably an expansion of the original reading of Q, ‘sword,’ which is preserved in Matt 10:14.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 94)

Funk and Hoover write: “The saying has been varied in the three sources: Luke appears to be the middle term between Matthew and Thomas. All three versions are ‘I have come’ sayings, which, in the judgment of most Fellows, is a Christian formulation: Jesus is represented as sent from God to fulfill a specific mission (‘I have come to . . .’). The Fellows doubt that Jesu spoke of himself in this way, because they doubt that he thought of himself as having been assigned a messianic role. Further, part of this passage is based on Mic 7:5-6. Thomas has considerably revised this group of sayings from its Q form, which the Fellows took to be the more original. It is the form, not the content, of this complex that Fellows could not attribute to Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 482)

Funk’s Parallels: [GThom 10](#), [Mic 7:5-6](#), [Luke 12:49-53](#), [Matt 10:34-39](#), [Mark 13:12](#).

17. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ †ΝΑ† ΝΗΤΝ ΜΠΕΤΕ ΜΠΕΒΑΛ ΝΑΥ ΕΡΟC ΑΥΩ
 ΠΕΤΕ ΜΠΕΜΑΔΧΕ CΟΤΜΕC ΑΥΩ ΠΕΤΕ ΜΠΕCΙΧ ΘΜCΩΜC ΑΥΩ
 ΜΠΕCΕΙ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΖΙ ΦΗΤ ΡΡΩΜΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(17) Jesus said: I will give you what no eye has seen and what no ear has heard and what no hand has touched and what has not entered into the heart of man.

(17) Jesus said, "I shall give you (plur.) what eyes have not seen, what ears have not heard, what hands have not touched, what has not come upon the human heart."

18 [17]. Jesus says: "I will give you what eye has never seen, and what ear has never heard, and what hand has never touched, and what has never entered into the heart of man."

Scholarly Quotes

Funk quotes Turfan Fragment M 789 as follows: "I will give you what you have not seen with your eyes, nor heard with your ears, nor grasped with your hand." (Hennecke 1:300)" (*New Gospel Parallels*, v. 2, p. 119)

Marvin Meyer writes: "This saying is also cited in 1 Corinthians 2:9, perhaps as a wisdom saying in use among the enthusiasts of Corinthians. Compare Isaiah 64:4. The saying occurs frequently in Jewish and Christian literature, and sometimes it is said to come from the Apocalypse of Elijah or the Secrets (or, apocrypha) of Elijah. At other times it is said to be a saying of Jesus. A variant of the saying is also found in Plutarch, *How the Young Person Should Study Poetry* 17E: 'And let these (words) of Empedocles be at hand: "Thus these things are not to be seen by men, nor heard, nor comprehended with the mind." . . .' The parallels have been collected by Michael E. Stone and John Strugnell, *The Books of Elijah: Parts 1-2*, pp. 41-73." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 76)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "The apostle Paul quotes something very close to this saying, perhaps from a lost document, in 1 Corinthians 2:9: 'As it is written, What eye has not seen and ear has not heard, and what has not entered into the heart of man, such things God has prepared for those who love him.' By the end of the second century these words were ascribed to Jesus, as in the *Martyrdom of Peter* (chapter 10) and the *Acts of Peter with Simon* (chapter 39). Thomas adds a unique reference to the sense of touch. The joys of the kingdom are completely unrelated to sense perception. (We should add that, like other Gnostics, he undoubtedly rejected the accounts in the gospels which speak of Jesus's risen body as tangible - Luke 24:39; John 20:27). His phrasing of this saying is the exact reverse of 1 John 1:1, which speaks of 'What we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we beheld and our hands handled.'" (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 137)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "As Jeremias observes, a considerable number of the Agrapha arise from the erroneous attribution to Jesus of sayings which actually belong to others. An example, indeed, occurs in the New Testament itself, since the words ascribed to John the Baptist in the Gospels (Matt. iii. 11 and par.) are in Acts (i. 5, xi. 16) attributed to Jesus. For logion 17 the New Testament parallel is 1 Corinthians ii. 9, where Paul introduces these words by the formula 'as it is written.' This has long presented a problem, since the saying is not an exact quotation of any Old Testament text (the nearest is Isa. lxiv. 3-4, but not in LXX). It is not, of course, impossible that Paul is quoting a saying of Jesus, but in that case we should have expected him to indicate the fact, as in other passages (e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14, 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff.); moreover, the introductory formula

suggests a written source, and would be quite unusual in a reference to tradition. On the whole, therefore, we should probably see in logion 17 a Pauline saying growing into a word of Jesus. As Puech and others have noted, the saying is attributed to Jesus also in the Acts of Peter (39). P. Prigent has drawn attention to a series of quotations of this text, some of them apparently independent of Paul, in various early Christian sources, and suggests that it may go back ultimately to the liturgy of the synagogue.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 102-103)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This saying has no parallel in the canonical Gospels, but it is very similar to the quotation in 1 Corinthians 2.9 which Paul introduces by ‘as it is written’ - a clause which normally indicates an Old Testament source. Here, however, we have no Old Testament quotation (the resemblance to Isaiah 64.4 is superficial); according to Origen and others it is a quotation from the *Secrets* (or *Apocalypse*) of *Elijah*. [Origen, *Commentary on Matthew* 27.9; Jerome, *Commentary on Isaiah* 64.4; Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 2.9.] Like the *Gospel of Thomas*, the second-century work called the *Acts of Peter* ascribes the saying to Jesus. [*Acts of Peter* 39.] In its present context it perhaps belongs to a Naassene formula of initiation. Whereas Paul quotes the words with reference to the hidden wisdom which his Corinthian converts are unable to grasp because of their spiritual immaturity and lack of brotherly love, here they are probably intended to recommend that kind of ‘knowledge’ on which the Corinthians, in Paul’s judgment, concentrated too much. It has also been suggested that they were used by Gnostics as a counterblast to the anti-Gnostic claim in 1 John 1.1 to bear witness only to that ‘which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands’. (The clause ‘what hand never touched’, unparalleled in 1 Corinthians 2.9, may echo 1 John 1.1.)” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 120-121)

John S. Kloppenborg, Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser state: “In view of the fact that Paul in this letter is struggling *against* the kind of esotericism promoted by this saying, it is not likely that he has quoted it here simply because he liked it. Rather, he must have drawn it from the repertoire of his opponents, only to fill it with new content amenable to his version of the gospel. According to Paul, that which has been revealed is not the knowledge (GNWSIS) that has ‘puffed up’ the ‘wise’ in Corinth, but the crucifixion, the ‘word of the cross’ as Paul himself puts it (1:18). Paul in a sense co-opts the methods of his opponents in order to correct their message.” (*Q-Thomas Reader*, p. 113)

Stevan Davies writes: “That which previously was unseen, unheard, untouched, unthought is now available, according to sayings 18 and 19, for it is the end that is the beginning. A person who takes his place in the beginning will know the end and not experience death; thus the beginning is a state of being that can be comprehended in the present. Heretofore hidden, the beginning now is revealed (sayings 5, 6, 108). Thomas’s saying 17 refers to the kingdom of God in the physical world, a visible, audible, tangible, experienced reality (sayings 3, 51, 113). When Paul quotes a scripture paralleled in saying 17 (1 Cor 2:7-9), he too understands that what is now revealed has existed from the beginning: ‘a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages for our glorification.’ Similarly, when 1 John 1:2 alludes to what evidently is saying 17, or Paul’s scripture, what has happened in the present is associated with the beginning: ‘That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands, concerning the word of life....’”
(<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk’s Parallels

[Isa 64:4](#), [Luke 10:23-24](#), [Matt 13:16-17](#), [1 Cor 2:9](#), [1 Clem 34:8](#), [2 Clem 11:7](#), [Turfan Fragment M 789](#), [Acts of Peter 39](#), [DialSav 57](#), [The Prayer of the Apostle Paul 25-29](#).

18. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΜΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΝΙC ΧΕ ΧΟΟC ΕΡΟΝ ΧΕ ΤΝΖΑΗ
 ΕCΝΑΩΩΠΕ ΝΑΩ ΝΖΕ (2) ΠΕΧΕ IC ΑΤΕΤΝΘΩΑΠ ΓΑΡ ΕΒΟΛ
 ΝΤΑΡΧΗ ΧΕΚΑΑC ΕΤΕΤΝΑΩΙΝΕ ΝCΑ ΘΑΖΗ ΧΕ ΖΜ ΠΜΑ ΕΤΕ
 ΤΑΡΧΗ ΜΜΑΥ ΕΘΑΖΗ ΝΑΩΩΠΕ ΜΜΑΥ (3) ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC
 ΠΕΤΝΑΩΖΕ ΕΡΑΤC ΖΝ ΤΑΡΧΗ ΑΥΩ CΗΑCΟΥΩΝ ΘΖΑΗ ΑΥΩ CΗΑΧΙ
 †ΠΕ ΑΝ ΜΜΟΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(18) The disciples said to Jesus: Tell us how our end will be. Jesus said: Since you have discovered the beginning, why do you seek the end? For where the beginning is, there will the end be. Blessed is he who shall stand at the beginning (in the beginning), and he shall know the end, and shall not taste death.

(18) The disciples said to Jesus, "Tell us how our end will come to pass." Jesus said, "Then have you laid bare the beginning, so that you are seeking the end? For the end will be where the beginning is. Blessed is the person who stands at rest in the beginning. And that person will be acquainted with the end and will not taste death."

19 [18]. The disciples say to Jesus: "Tell us what our end will be." Jesus says: "Have you then deciphered the beginning, that you ask about the end? For where the beginning is, there shall be the end. Blessed is the man who reaches the beginning; he will know the end, and will not taste death!"

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: "This saying is reminiscent of 2 Esdras 7.30 ('the world shall be as it was at the first beginnings'), but perhaps it is to be understood in the sense of Revelation 22.13, where Jesus says: 'I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end.'" (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 121)

Marvin Meyer writes: "To return to the beginning is to attain the end; compare Gospel of Thomas saying 49. Also compare Manichaean Psalm Book 155,9-12: 'Holy ones, rejoice with me, for I have returned again to my beginning. I [have] received my clean garments, my robes that do not become old. I have rejoiced in their joy, I have been glad in their gladness, [I have rested] in their rest from everlasting to everlasting.' Secret Book of John II 9,5-8 makes a similar point: 'And he spoke, and glorified and praised the invisible spirit, saying, "Because of you everything has come into being, and everything will return to you.'" (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 77)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "The beginning and the end correspond (cf. Logion 4). Brought back to the beginning, the Gnostic will not taste death. The latter is meant in a metaphorical sense. The non-Gnostic does not live at all (cf. 11.2)." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 599)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thomas consistently opposes speculation about the end (compare Thomas 3; 51; and 113). The idea that one returns in the end to one's beginning has parallels in gnostic texts: the goal of the gnostic's existence is to escape the created world of evil and return to the state of primordial perfection that existed at the beginning. Aspects of this concept are also reflected in Thomas 49. The final phrase in 18:3 is particularly Thomean (compare Thom 1; 91:4; 85:2; 111:2). All these factors led the Fellows to designate the saying black." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 483)

Stevan Davies writes: “The light that is within people and outside of them exists now. As a result, those who search for the end are told that the end (i.e., the kingdom of God) is present already (Gos. Thom. 51, 113). When asked about the end, Jesus responds in terms of the beginning (Gos. Thom. 18); when asked about the kingdom to come, Jesus responds in terms of the kingdom which is already here (Gos. Thom. 113).” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy 654 1](#), [GThom 1](#), [GThom 85](#).

19. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΠΕ ΝΤΑΖΩΠΕ ΖΑ ΤΕΖΗ
 ΕΜΠΑΤΕCΩ (2) ΠΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝΩΠΕ ΝΑΕΙ ΜΜΑΘΗΤΗC
 ΝΤΕΤΝCΩΤΜ ΑΝΑΩΑΧΕ ΝΕΕΙΩΝΕ ΝΑΡΔΙΑΚΟΝΕΙ ΝΗΤΝ (3)
 ΟΥΝΤΗΤΝ ΓΑΡ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΩΗΝ ΖΜ ΠΑΡΑΔΙCΟC ΕCΕΚΙΜ ΑΝ
 ΝΩΩΜ ΜΠΡΩ ΑΥΩ ΜΑΡΕΝΟΥCΩΒΕ ΖΕ ΕΒΟΛ (4) ΠΕΤΝΑCΟΥΩΝΟΥ
 CΝΑΧΙ †ΠΕ ΑΝ ΜΜΟΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(19) Jesus said: Blessed is he who was before he came into being. If you become disciples to me (and) listen to my words, these stones will minister to you. For you have five trees in Paradise which do not change, either in summer or in winter, and their leaves do not fall. He who knows them shall not taste of death.

(19) Jesus said, “Blessed is that which existed before coming into being. If you exist as my disciples and listen to my sayings, these stones will minister unto you. Indeed, you have five trees in paradise, which do not move in summer or winter, and whose leaves do not fall. Whoever is acquainted with them will not taste death.”

20 [19]. Jesus says: “Blessed is the man who existed before he came into being!”
 21 [19]. “If you become my disciples and if you hear my words, these stones will serve you.”
 22 [19]. “For you have there, in Paradise, five trees which change not winter nor summer, whose leaves do not fall: whoever knows them will not taste death!”

Scholarly Quotes

Jean Doresse writes: “Cf. the *Gospel of Philip* (Coptic text of Codex X of Chenoboskion) where this formula also appears; and St Irenaeus, who quotes it under the form: ‘Happy is He who was before becoming man.’ And in the New Testament, *John VIII*, 58: ‘Before Abraham was, I am.’” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 372)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The one who existed before he was born is Jesus himself, who ‘came from the Father and entered into the world’ (John 16.28). Saying 19a is quoted by other early Christian writers: Irenaeus and Lactantius quote it as a prophetic utterance of Jeremiah. [Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* 43; Lactantius, *Divine Institutions* iv.8. The words may have occurred in an apocryphal work, no longer extant, ascribed to Jeremiah.]” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 121)

Marvin Meyer writes: “Perhaps compare John 8:58. Lactantius, *Divine Institutes* 4.8 writes, ‘For we especially testify that he (that is, Christ) was born twice, first in the spirit and afterwards in the flesh. Whence it is thus said in Jeremiah, “Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you.” And also in the same work, “Fortunate is one who existed before being born,” which happened to no one else except Christ.’ Irenaeus, *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* 43, offers the following: ‘And again he says, “Fortunate is one who existed before becoming human.”’ Gospel of Thomas saying 19 may not be referring to Christ at all in this beatitude. Rather, the sense of the saying could be that anyone who existed before being born should be declared fortunate. Compare the saying of Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Gospel of Philip 64,10-12: ‘Fortunate is the one who exists before coming into being. For one who exists has been and will be.’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 77)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The fourth-century apologist Lactantius treats the first sentence of this saying as a prophecy uttered by Jeremiah (*Div. inst.*, 4, 8); in the *Epideixis* (43) of Irenaeus, however, it is ascribed to Jesus (cf., J. P. Smith, *St. Irenaeus: Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, page 182, note 207). Like Jesus, who ‘was’ (John 1:1-2) before he ‘became’ incarnate (John 1:14), his disciples, who hear his words because they themselves are ‘of God’ (John 8:47), remain in him and have his words remaining in them; therefore whatever they ask will take place for them (John 15:8). Stones can become bread (Matthew 3:3; Luke 3:3), or fire can come out of stones (Saying 13). Thomas probably has in mind the creation of food out of stones (cf. also Matthew 7:9: ‘What man of you, if his son asks him for bread - will he give him a stone?’), for he goes on to speak of the five never-failing trees in paradise. These trees, mentioned in *Pistis Sophia* (chapters 1 and elsewhere) and among the Manichees, are probably trees which give spiritual sustenance to the five spiritual senses. They are the trees of life like the single one mentioned in Revelation 22:2 (cf., the Gospel of Eve[?] in Epiphanius, *Pan.*, 26, 5). They must be spiritual, since Thomas says that ‘he who will understand them will not taste death.’ To understand them is thus equivalent to ‘keeping the word’ of Jesus (John 8:52).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 139)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Grant and Freedman interpret the somewhat cryptic logion 19 by referring to Johannine texts, but while this is certainly illuminating for our understanding of the saying it is doubtful whether we have here genuine allusions or only a similarity of thought. The comparative absence of Johannine elements may indeed be significant, particularly in a Gnostic document. The associations of this saying are, however, with the later Gnostic and Manichaean literature rather than with our Gospels, although part of it was known to Irenaeus.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 83)

Helmut Koester writes: “For the Gnostic understanding it is crucial to know that one’s own origin lies before the beginning of earthly existence. John [8:58] consciously avoids this application of divine origin to all believers and restricts it to Jesus as the revealer.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 118)

On p. 108 of *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, MacDonald quotes this passage (Odyssey 7.114-21 [Fagles 132-40]):

“Here luxuriant trees are always in their prime,
pomegranates and pears, and apples growing red,
succulent figs and olives swelling sleek and dark.
And the yield of these trees will never flag or dwindle,
neither in winter nor in summer, a harvest all year round
for the West Wind always breathing through will bring
some fruits to the bud and others warm to ripeness --
pear mellowing ripe on pear, apple on apple,
cluster of grapes on cluster, fig crowding fig.”

Marvin Meyer writes: “The five trees in paradise are mentioned frequently in gnostic texts, ordinarily without explanation or elaboration. In Manichaean Psalm Book 161,17-29, it is said that various features of life and faith are put together in groups of five. This section opens with the statement, ‘For [five] are the trees that are in paradise [. . .] in summer and winter.’ On the trees in paradise according to Genesis, see Genesis 2:9.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 77-78)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The reference to the stones in Saying 19b is reminiscent of the turning of stones into bread in the temptation narrative (Matthew 4.3; Luke 4.3). The five trees have the property of the unfailing ‘tree of life’ in Revelation 22.2; they are five in number perhaps because they are envisaged as spiritual counterparts to the five natural senses. [The Gnostic treatise *Pistis Sophia* makes repeated mention of the ‘five trees’ in the ‘treasure of the light’.]” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 122)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy 654 1](#), [GThom 1](#), [GThom 85](#).

20. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΜΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΝΙC ΧΕ ΧΟΟC ΕΡΟΝ ΧΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ
 ΝΜΠΗΥΕ ΕCΤΝΤΩΝ ΕΝΙΜ (2) ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΕCΤΝΤΩΝ ΑΥΒΛΒΙΛΕ
 ΝΨΛΤΑΜ (3) (C)CΟΒΚ ΠΑΡΑ ΝΟΡΟC ΤΗΡΟΥ (4) ΖΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ
 ΕCΨΑΝΖΕ ΕΧΜ ΠΚΑΖ ΕΤΟΥΡ ΖΩΒ ΕΡΟC ΨΑCΤΕΥΟ ΕΒΟΛ
 ΝΝΟΥΝΟC ΝΤΑΡ ΝCΨΩΠΕ ΝΚΕΠΗ ΝΖΑΛΛΑΤΕ ΝΤΠΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(20) The disciples said to Jesus: Tell us what the kingdom of heaven is like. He said to them: It is like a grain of mustard-seed, the smallest of all seeds; but when it falls on tilled ground, it puts forth a great branch and becomes shelter for the birds of heaven.

(20) The disciples said to Jesus, “Tell us what the kingdom of heavens resembles.” He said to them, “What it resembles is a grain of mustard seed. It is smaller than all other seeds, but if it falls upon plowed terrain it puts forth an enormous foliage and is a shade for birds of heaven.”

23 [20]. The disciples say to Jesus: “Tell us what the Kingdom of heaven is like!” He says to them: “It is like a grain of mustard: it is smaller than all the <other> seeds, but when it falls on ploughed land it produces a big stalk and becomes a shelter for the birds of heaven.”

Scholarly Quotes

Joachim Jeremias writes: “The conclusion of the parable of the Mustard Seed in the Gospel of Thomas (20) runs as follows: ‘. . . it produces a large branch and becomes shelter (sceph) for the birds of heaven’. This is possible a free allusion to Dan. 4.9, 18; Ezek. 17.23; 31.6; 3.9, 18 Th., while in Matthew (13.32) and Luke (13.19) it is a free quotation from Dan. 3.18 Th. The unrealistic description of the mustard-seed as a tree, which only occurs in Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark or the Gospel of Thomas, is also derived from Dan. 3.17.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 31)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “In the Gospel of Thomas (20), too, a similar introduction to the parable of the Mustard Seed: ‘The disciples said to Jesus: Tell us what the Kingdom of Heaven is like’, is

secondary by comparison with Mark 4.30, where Jesus himself puts the question, since such questions from the disciples are characteristic of the Gospel of Thomas.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 98)

Helmut Koester writes: “The emphasis upon the contrast of the small seed and the large plant is missing in the Q form of this parable (Luke 13:18-19), which differs from the Markan version also in other respects: it speaks of the ‘garden’ into which the seed is thrown, and it says that it becomes a ‘tree’ (dendron) and that ‘the birds are nesting in its branches.’ Mark and Thomas use the appropriate term ‘vegetable’ (laxanon), and they correctly describe birds as nesting under the branches. One could also argue that the contrast ‘small seed / large plant’ is a structural element of the original parable that is lost in Q/Luke’s version. In any case, Thomas’s parallels with Mark do not require the assumption of a literary dependence; what both have in common are original features of the parable.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 109)

Funk and Hoover write: “The Fellows judged the version in Thomas to be the closest to the original. It was therefore given a red designation. The three synoptic versions have been accommodated to a greater or lesser degree to the apocalyptic tree theme and so were designated pink. This parable is a good example of how the original Jesus tradition, perhaps shocking in its modesty or poorly understood, is revised to accommodate living and powerful mythical images drawn from the Hebrew scriptures.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 485)

J. D. Crossan quotes Pliny’s *Natural History* 19.170-171 as saying: “Mustard . . . with its pungent taste and fiery effect is extremely beneficial for the health. It grows entirely wild, though it is improved by being transplanted: but on the other hand when it has once been sown it is scarcely possible to get the place free of it, as the seed when it falls germinates at once.”

J. D. Crossan comments: “There is, on other words, a distinction between the wild mustard and its domesticated counterpart, but even when one deliberately cultivates the latter for its medicinal or culinary properties, there is an ever-present danger that it will destroy the garden. And, apart from those domesticated types, such as *brassica nigra* or *sinapis alba*, there is, as Douglas Oakman emphasizes, the wild mustard, charlock, or *sinapis arvensis*, whose ‘plants have from time immemorial been found as weeds in grain fields’ (1986:124). The mustard plant, therefore, is, as domesticated in the garden, dangerous and, as wild in the grain fields, deadly. The point is not just that it starts small and ends big but that its bigness is not exactly a horticultural or agricultural desideratum.” (*The Historical Jesus*, p. 278)

J. D. Crossan concludes: “The point, in other words, is not just that the mustard plant starts as a proverbially small seed and grows into a shrub of three or four feet, or even higher, it is that it tends to take over where it is not wanted, that it tends to get out of control, and that it tends to attract birds within cultivated areas where they are not particularly desired. And that, said Jesus, was what the Kingdom was like: not like the mighty cedar of Lebanon and not quite like a common weed, like a pungent shrub with dangerous takeover properties. Something you would want in only small and carefully controlled doses - if you could control it.” (*The Historical Jesus*, pp. 279-279)

Funk’s Parallels

[Ezek 17:22-24](#), [Dan 4:20-22](#), [Matt 13:31-42](#), [Mark 4:30-32](#), [DialSav 88-89](#).

21. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΜΑΡΙΖΑΜ ΝΙC ΧΕ ΕΝΕΚΜΑΘΗΤΗC ΕΙΝΕ ΝΝΙΜ (2)
ΠΕΧΑC ΧΕ ΕΥΕΙΝΕ ΝΖΝΨΗΡΕ ΨΗΜ ΕΥΘΕΛΙΤ ΛΥCΩΨΕ ΕΤΩΟΥ
ΑΝ ΤΕ (3) ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΥΨΑΕΙ ΝΟΙ ΝΧΟΕΙC ΝΤCΩΨΕ CΕΝΑΧΟΟC ΧΕ
ΚΕ ΤΝCΩΨΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΝ (4) ΝΤΟΟΥ CΕΚΑΚ ΑΖΗΥ ΜΠΟΥΜΤΟ
ΕΒΟΛ ΕΤΡΟΥΚΑΑC ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΥ ΝCΕ† ΤΟΥCΩΨΕ ΝΑΥ (5) ΔΙΑ
ΤΟΥΤΟ †ΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΧΕ ΕΨΑΕΙΜΕ ΝΟΙ ΠΧΕCΖΝΗΕΙ ΧΕ ΨΗΗΥ ΝΟΙ
ΠΡΕΨΙΟΥΕ ΨΝΑΡΟΕΙC ΕΜΠΑΤΕΨΕΙ ΝΨΤΜΚΑΑΨ ΕΨΟΨΤ ΕΖΟΥΝ
ΕΠΕΨΗΕΙ ΝΤΕ ΤΕΨΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΕΤΡΕΨΨΙ ΝΝΕΨΚΕΨΟC (6) ΝΤΩΤΝ ΔΕ
ΡΟΕΙC ΖΑ ΤΕΖΗ ΜΠΚΟCΜΟC (7) ΜΟΥΡ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΕΧΝ ΝΕΤΝ†ΠΕ
ΖΝΝΟΥΝΟC ΝΔΥΝΑΜΙC ΨΙΝΑ ΧΕ ΝΕΝΑΗCΤΗC ΖΕ ΕΖΙΗ ΕΕΙ
ΨΑΡΩΤΝ ΕΠΕΙ ΤΕΨΡΕΙΑ ΕΤΕΤΝΨΩΨΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΤC CΕΝΑΖΕ ΕΡΟC
(8) ΜΑΡΕΨΩΨΠΕ ΖΝ ΤΕΤΝΜΗΤΕ ΝΟΙ ΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΝΕΠΙCΤΗΜΩΝ (9)
ΝΤΑΡΕΠΚΑΡΠΟC ΠΩΖ ΑΨΕΙ ΖΝΝΟΥΘΕΠΗ ΕΠΕΨΑCΖ ΖΝ ΤΕΨΘΙΧ
ΑΨΖΑCΨ (10) ΠΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΜΑΑΧΕ ΜΜΟΨ ΕCΩΤΜ ΜΑΡΕΨCΩΤΜ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(21) Mariham said to Jesus: Whom are your disciples like? He said: They are like little children who have settled in a field which does not belong to them. When the owners of the field come, they will say: Leave us our field. They are naked before them, in order to leave it to them and give them (back) their field. Therefore I say: If the master of the house knows that the thief is coming, he will keep watch before he comes, and will not let him dig through into his house of his kingdom to carry off his things. You, then, be watchful over against the world; gird your loins with great strength, that the robbers may find no way to come at you. For the advantage for which you look, they will find. May there be among you a man of understanding! When the fruit ripened, he came quickly, his sickle in hand,

(21) Mary said to Jesus, "What do your disciples resemble?" He said, "What they resemble is children living in a plot of land that is not theirs. When the owners of the land come they will say, 'Surrender our land to us.' They, for their part, strip naked in their presence in order to give it back to them, and they give them their land. Thus I say that the owner of an estate, knowing that a bandit is coming, will keep watch before the bandit comes and not let the bandit break into the house of the estate and steal the possessions. You (plur.) , then, be on your guard against the world. Arm yourselves with great power lest the brigands find a way to get to you; for the trouble that you expect will come. Let an experienced person dwell in your midst! When the crop had matured, that person came in haste, sickle

24 [21]. Mary says to Jesus: "Who are your disciples like?" He says to her: "They are like little children who have made their way into a field that does not belong to them. When the owners of the field come, they will say: 'Get out of our field!' They <then> will give up the field to these <people> and let them have their field back again." 25 [21]. "That is why I tell you this: If the master of the house knows that the thief is coming, he will watch before he comes and will not allow him to force an entry into his royal house to carry off furniture. You, then, be on the watch against the world. Gird up your loins with great energy, so that the brigands do not find any way of reaching you; for they will find any place you fail to watch." 26 [21]. "Let there be among you <such> a prudent man: when the fruit arrived, quickly, sickle in

and reaped it. He who has ears to hear, let him hear.

in hand, and harvested it. Whoever has ears to hear should listen!"

hand, he went and harvested it. He who has ears to hear, let him hear!"

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin quotes Hippolytus in *Refutation of All Heresies* 5.8.44 as a relevant passage: "For this, he says, is 'the gate of heaven,' and this is '<the> house of God,' where the good God dwells alone, into which no one will enter, he says, who is unclean, physical, or carnal, but it is reserved for the spiritual alone, where it is necessary for them, when they have come there, to cast off their clothing and all become bridegrooms, having been made male through the virgin spirit." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 78)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Here Mariham (the Mariamme of the Naassenes - Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 7, 1 - also mentioned in Saying 112), asks a question and is told that the disciples are 'like little children' (Matthew 18:3; cf., 1 Corinthians 14:20). The children live in an alien field, which must be the world, as in Matthew 13:38. 'Leave our field to us!' recalls the command of the farmer in Matthew 13:30: 'Leave both to grow up together until the harvest.' Moreover, in Matthew 24:40-42 there are mysterious references to 'two in a field,' to one's being left, and to the coming of a master. Whatever synoptic reminiscences there may be, these have been subordinated to the notion of being naked (see Saying 38). The true Gnostic wants to strip off the body (contrast 2 Corinthians 5:4: 'not to be stripped but to be clad upon') and leave the world." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 141)

Jack Finegan writes: "Here the little children who live in the field are presumably the disciples who live in the world. When they give back the field to its owners they 'take off their clothes before them' which, in the present context, must mean that they strip themselves of their bodies in death, an end, to the Gnostic, eminently desirable (cf. §§236, 357)." (*Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*, p. 254)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "These verses are unique among the Jesus traditions and are hard to understand. If we begin with the evident recognition that the children symbolize the Gnostics, it is manifestly being said that they are staying in a strange field, namely the evil world, and that they are asking the owners for their own field. To this end, the exchange of fields, they bare themselves, which probably refers to baptism." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 601)

Funk and Hoover write: "The conclusion in v. 4 is a metaphor with several possible interpretations: (1) It may be an allusion to Christian baptism, which would reflect the concerns of the emerging Christian community. (2) It may refer to gnostic and other early Christian notions that upon death the soul sheds the body (clothing) and proceeds to the heavenly realm from whence it has come (compare Thomas 29; 87; 112). (3) Or it may symbolize the return to a primordial state of sexual non-differentiation, to an androgynous state (compare Thomas 37). At all events, the parable in its present form reflects theological concerns that did not originate with Jesus." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 485)

Robert Price writes: "This passage in Thomas is in turn derived from a vague memory quotation of two canonical gospel texts. The first is the parable of the wicked tenants in Mark 12:1-9 ('A man planted a vineyard . . . and lent it out to tenants, and went away into another country. When the time came, he sent a servant to the tenants, to get from them some of the fruit of the vineyard . . .'). The second is the parable of the unfaithful steward toward the end of the Markan Apocalypse, 13:34-37, which ends with the exhortation, 'Watch therefore, for you do not know when the master of the house will come . . ., lest he comes suddenly and find you asleep.' Thomas' version makes the

tenants into the disciples rather than the enemies of Jesus and bids them acknowledge the claim of the field's/vineyard's true owner (perhaps Satan or the Gnostic Demiurge). Likewise, the owner of the house has become, not the one whose coming is awaited, but rather the one who awaits the coming of another - a thief. Again, the allegorical counterparts have shifted roles. One awaits not God but the devil (cf. Mark 4:15)." (*Deconstructing Jesus*, pp. 131-132)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "From the same context in Luke (as in Saying 100) comes the counsel, 'Gird your loins!' Thomas explains that this means to gird yourself with 'a great power' (the power of the kingdom) so that no robber may come to you (Luke 12:33). You will be given what you need (Luke 12:22-32). An 'understanding man' is mentioned in Luke 12:42. Because of such parallels, it is hard to believe that Thomas is doing anything but creating a mosaic of sayings chiefly derived from Luke." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 142)

Joachim Jeremias writes: "But the application of the parable to the return of the Son of Man is strange; for if the subject of discourse is a nocturnal burglary, it refers to a disastrous and alarming event, whereas the *Parousia*, at least for the disciples of Jesus, is the great day of joy. In fact the christological application is missing from the Gospel of Thomas. Here the parable of the night-burglar has been preserved in two versions. The one contained in logion 21b resembles the Matthaean version, while the one which appears as logion 103 seems to be a very free repetition in the form of beatitude and exhibits some affinity with Luke 12.35 ff. Both versions agree in the fact that neither of them compares the breaking in of the burglar to the return of the Son of Man." (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 49)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "On this Bartsch comments that not only is the text, and therefore the translation, at some points uncertain, the whole passage seems to resist a uniform interpretation. The Synoptic parallels are first Luke xii. 39, with a change of tense and the addition of 'of his kingdom'; then Mark iii. 27 (the specific reference to vessels (SKEUH) here and in Matthew xii. 29 has no parallel in Luke); the call to watchfulness, of course, can be readily paralleled from our Gospels, but the warning to beware of the world is not Synoptic. Bartsch thinks this, and the addition of 'with great strength' after Luke xii. 35 in the next line may be due to Gnostic influence; so also he explains the following words, which have no Synoptic parallel. Finally the reference to the sickle is an adaptation of Mark iv. 29; since this passage is peculiar to Mark this would seem to add the final proof that if Thomas used our Gospels he employed all three Synoptics, and not merely Matthew and Luke. Luke xii. 40, it may be added, is an exhortation to readiness, but has been replaced by words from another context (e.g. Matt. xxiv. 42) before xxi. 35 is used. If this is a mosaic based on our Gospels, the author has ranged very widely. Bartsch, however, sees in this logion and in logion 8 (the parable of the Fisherman) a version of the Synoptic parables which over against the tradition hitherto known is thoroughly independent." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 73-74)

Helmut Koester writes: "The Q version has shortened the parable, leaving out the purpose of the coming of the thief, i.e., to steal the goods of the owner of the house. That Q's parable presupposed such a continuation of the parable and was not simply an expansion of the metaphor of the 'day of the Lord coming like the thief in the night' (1 Thess 5:2; Rev 3:3), is evident in the phrase 'to be dug into.' Thomas's version suggests that the parable was cut short in Q in order to add the reference to the coming of the Son of man." (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 98)

J. D. Crossan writes: "The *metaphor* is clear enough and similar to that in Q/Matt. 24:43 = Luke 12:39. The awkward phrase, 'his house of his domain' (Lambdin: 120) or 'his house of his kingdom' (Guillaumont, 1959:14-15; Wilson, 1973:513) is probably a Coptic mistranslation for an original 'the house of his domain/kingdom' (Quecke; Menard, 1975:112)." (*In Fragments*, pp. 61-62)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The *application* is more difficult since its translation is not too certain (Bartsch, 1959-1960:260). It is clear, however, that it warns about the world rather than the parousia. And therein lies the difficulty: The *image* actually works better for the unexpected and momentary irruption of the end than for the expected and permanent onslaught of the world. Hence the concluding sentence’s translation could be: ‘for the difficulty which you expect will (surely) materialize’ (Lambdin: 120) or ‘because they will find the advantage which you expect’ (Guillaumont, 1959:16-17) or ‘since the advantage for which you look they will find’ (Menard, 1975:60).” (*In Fragments*, p. 62)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying [Sickle & harvest] is an allusion to Joel 3:13. In Mark 4:29 it is attached to the parable of the seed and harvest. Its appearance in two different contexts suggests that it circulated independently at one time. Both Mark and Thomas have given it an arbitrary location. The image is usually associated with the last judgment, which is what prompted some of the Fellows to vote black. However, it may also refer to the bountiful harvest that Jesus anticipates as a result of the providence of God who causes grain to grow (this is one way to read Mark’s parable of the seed and harvest, 4:26-29). This possibility induced other Fellows to vote pink or gray.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 486)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy 655 37](#), [GThom 37](#), [GThom 35](#), [GThom 103](#), [Joel 3:12](#), [Luke 12:39-40](#), [Luke 11:21-22](#), [Matt 24:37-44](#), [Matt 12:29](#), [Mark 3:27](#), [Mark 4:26-29](#), [Rev 16:15](#), [1 Thess 5:2](#), [2 Pet 3:10](#), [Rev 3:3](#).

22. (1) ΔΙC̄ ΝΑΥ ΔΖΝΚΟΥΕΙ ΕΥΧΙ ΕΡΩΤΕ (2) ΠΕΧΔΑϞ
 ΝΝΕϞΜΑΘΗΤΗC̄ ΧΕ ΝΕΕΙΚΟΥΕΙ ΕΤΧΙ ΕΡΩΤΕ ΕΥΤΝΤΩΝ ΔΝΕΤΒΗΚ
 ΕΖΟΥΝ ΔΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ (3) ΠΕΧΔΑΥ ΝΑϞ ΧΕ ΕΕΙΕΝΟ ΝΚΟΥΕΙ ΤΝΝΑΒΩΚ
 ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ (4) ΠΕΧΕ ΙΗC̄ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΔΑΡ̄
 ΠC̄ΝΑΥ ΟΥΑ ΔΥΩ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΔΑΡ̄ ΠC̄Α ΝΖΟΥΝ ΝΘΕ ΜΠC̄Α ΝΒΟΛ ΔΥΩ
 ΠC̄Α ΝΒΟΛ ΝΘΕ ΜΠC̄Α ΝΖΟΥΝ ΔΥΩ ΠC̄Α ΝΤΠΕ ΝΘΕ ΜΠC̄Α ΜΠΙΤΝ̄
 (5) ΔΥΩ ΩΙΝΑ ΕΤΕΤΝΑΕΙΡΕ ΜΦΟΥΤ ΜΝ ΤC̄ΖΙΜΕ ΜΠΙΟΥΑ ΟΥΩΤ
 ΧΕΚΑΔC̄ ΝΕΦΟΥΤ Ρ̄ ΖΟΥΤ ΝΤΕΤC̄ΖΙΜΕ Ρ̄ C̄ΖΙΜΕ (6) ΖΟΤΑΝ
 ΕΤΕΤΝΩΔΑΕΙΡΕ ΝΖΝΒΑΛ ΕΠΜΑ ΝΟΥΒΑΛ ΔΥΩ ΟΥΟΙΧ ΕΠΜΑ
 ΝΝΟΥΟΙΧ ΔΥΩ ΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ ΕΠΜΑ ΝΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ ΟΥΖΙΚΩΝ ΕΠΜΑ
 ΝΟΥΖΙΚΩΝ (7) ΤΟΤΕ ΤΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ Ε(Τ)ΜΝ(ΤΕΡ)Ο

BLATZ

(22) Jesus saw some infants who were being suckled. He said to his disciples: These infants being suckled are like those who enter the kingdom. They said to him: If we then become children, shall we enter the kingdom? Jesus said to them: When you make the two one, and when you make the inside as the outside, and the outside as the inside, and the upper as the lower, and when you make the male and the female into a single one, so that the male is not male and the female not female, and when you make eyes in place of an eye, and a hand in place of a hand, and a foot in place of a foot, an image in place of an image, then shall you enter [the kingdom].

LAYTON

(22) Jesus saw some little ones nursing. He said to his disciples, "These little ones who are nursing resemble is those who enter the kingdom." They said to him, "So shall we enter the kingdom by being little ones?" Jesus said to them, "When you (plur.) make the two one and make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside and the above like the below, and that you might make the male and the female be one and the same, so that the male might not be male nor the female be female, when you make eyes in place of an eye and a hand in place of a hand and a foot in place of a foot, an image in place of an image - then you will enter [the kingdom]."

DORESSE

27 [22]. Jesus saw some children who were taking the breast: he said to his disciples: "These little ones who suck are like those who enter the Kingdom." They said to him: "If we are little, shall we enter the Kingdom?" Jesus says to them: "When you make the two <become> one, and when you make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside, and the upper like the lower! And if you make the male and female one, so that the male is no longer male and the female no longer female, and when you put eyes in the place of an eye, and a hand in the place of a hand, and a foot in the place of a foot, and an image in the place of an image, then you will enter [the Kingdom!]"

Scholarly Quotes

Clement of Alexandria states in *Stromata* iii.13.92-93 (J.E.L. Oulton's translation): "On this account he [Julius Casinos] says: 'When Salome asked when she would know the answer to her questions, the Lord said, When you trample on the robe of shame, and when the two shall be one, and the male with the female, and there is neither male nor female.' In the first place we have not

got the saying in the four Gospels that have been handed down to us, but in the Gospel according to the Egyptians.”

Second Clement 12:2-6 says (Lightfoot’s translation): “For the Lord Himself, being asked by a certain person when his kingdom would come, said, When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male or female. Now the two are one, when we speak truth among ourselves, and in two bodies there shall be one soul without dissimulation. And by the outside as the inside He meaneth this: by the inside he meaneth the soul and by the outside the body. Therefore in like manner as they body appeareth, so also let thy soul be manifest by its good works. And by the male with the female, neither male nor female, he meaneth this; that a brother seeing a sister should have no thought of her as a female, and that a sister seeing a brother should not have any thought of him as a male. These things if ye do, saith He, the kingdom of my father shall come.”

Martyrdom of Peter 9 says: “Concerning this the master says in a mystery, ‘If you do not make what is on the right like what is on the left and what is on the left like what is on the right, and what is above like what is below, and what is behind like what is before, you will not recognize the kingdom.’”

Marvin Meyer writes: “In this last passage Peter, who is crucified upside-down, compares his position with that of the first human being. Philip makes a similar comparison in Acts of Philip 140, where he also cites a variant of this saying. For a New Testament statement bearing some resemblance to this saying, see Galatians 3:27-28. On the two becoming one, see saying 4 and the note on becoming one.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 80)

Marvin Meyer quotes an account of creation in the Letter of Peter to Philip 136:5-11 that says: “So he, the arrogant one, became haughty because of the praise of the powers. He became a rival, and he wanted [to] make an image in place [of an image] and a form in place of a form.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 80)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Infants (as in Sayings 3, 21, and 38) may be compared with those who enter into the kingdom (cf., John 3, 3.5). But entering the kingdom means more than becoming childlike. The two must become one; all earthly differences must be obliterated, including - especially - those of sex. Sayings very much like this one are preserved in the Gospel of the Egyptians, in 2 Clement 12:2, and in the Martyrdom of Peter (see pages 78-79). The unity of Christian believers in the body of Christ is, of course, based on the New Testament. Doresse (pages 155-56) cites John 17:11, 20-23; Romans 12:4-5; 1 Corinthians 12:27; Ephesians 2:14-18; and he points out that in Ephesians 5:32 the unity of Adam and Eve (i.e., of human marriage) is referred to ‘Christ and the Church.’ It is perhaps more important to notice that in Galatians 3:28 Paul says that ‘there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free men, *neither male nor female*; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.’ This kind of unity looks back to the first creation story in Genesis, where ‘man’ is male and female; it is the second creation story that sharply differentiates Eve from Adam. The original state of creation is to be reached through spiritual union. Man is not to be man; woman is not to be woman (though according to Saying 112 she is to become man - i.e., fully human in a spiritual sense).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 143-144)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The idea that only the childlike can enter the Kingdom of God is, of course, familiar from the canonical Gospels. It may be added that this saying is one of the few which have anything in the nature of a narrative setting, although whether the words which introduce the saying derive from genuine tradition or were constructed for the purpose is matter for debate. Certainly all that follows the disciples’ question is far removed from the canonical portrait

of Jesus. Yet even here there is a basis in the New Testament: as Grant and Freedman note, listing passages cited by Doresse, the unity of believers in the body of Christ is based on New Testament teaching. They also quote Paul's words in Galatians iii.8: There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is *neither male nor female*; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. Such a passage as this must serve to confirm the view that one element at least in the development of Gnosticism is a re-interpretation of Christian teaching." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 31)

F. F. Bruce writes: "This is an expansion of the canonical saying: 'whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it' (Luke 18.17; cf. Matthew 18.3). But the expansion suggests the abolition of sex distinction (cf. Sayings 4, 11, 106): as infants are devoid of sex awareness or shame, so should the disciples be. In the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* words like these are spoken by Jesus to Salome. We may recognize a Gnostic interpretation of Paul's words: 'there can be no male and female' (Galatians 3.28). The replacement of physical eyes, hand and foot by corresponding spiritual members is probably a gloss on the saying in Mark 9.43-48 (cf. Matthew 5.29 f.; 18.8 f.), which similarly follows words about children." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 123-124)

Bruce Chilton writes: "The ascetic emphasis of Christianity in Edessa was a profound influence on *Thomas*; a central saying (saying 22), for example, stipulates that one must be neither male nor female in order to enter the kingdom. A denial of sexuality is manifest." (*Pure Kingdom*, p. 69)

Funk and Hoover write: "The initial saying (v. 2), which is earlier than any of the written gospels, is followed, in Thom 22:4-7, by interpretive rephrasing. One enters life by recovering one's original self, undivided by the differences between male and female, physical and spiritual. The theme of unifying opposites is well known from later gnostic texts. This surrounding commentary on v. 2 was designated black as the work of the Thomas community." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 487)

J. D. Crossan writes: "You will recall from earlier that the *Gospel of Thomas* derided the idea of looking into the future for apocalyptic salvation. Instead, it advocated looking back to the past, not only to an Edenic moment before Adam and Eve sinned but to an even more primordial moment before they were split into two beings. Its gaze was not on a male but on an androgynous Adam, image of its Creator in being neither female nor male. And it was in baptism, precisely in the primitive form of nude baptism, that the initiate, reversing the saga of Genesis 1-3, took off 'the garments of shame' (Smith 1965-66) mandated for a fallen humanity and assumed 'the image of the androgyne' (Meeks). This theology, which is the basic unifying vision of the *Gospel of Thomas*, can be seen not only in *Gospel of Thomas* 22:1-4 but also in 21:1-2 and 37:1-2 and in all those sayings, such as 4:2, 11:2, 16, 23, 49, 75, 106, about being or becoming one, a single one, or a solitary (Klijn)." (*The Historical Jesus*, p. 267)

Stevan Davies writes: "In summary, Thomas presents a dualism of perspectives and urges people to 'seek and find' a new view of the world, a view it claims Jesus himself advocated and embodied. Insofar as the world in its perfect condition, the kingdom of heaven, is thought to be above, that conception of the world is to be applied to the world below: 'make that which is above like that which is below' (saying 22). Yet the kingdom is not really a place above (saying 3) but a primordial time, a time that persists in the present. All things, all people came from it, for all were created as specified in Gen 1:1-2:4. All can return there now by actualizing primordial light within themselves and seeing that light spread throughout the world, thus making the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside (saying 22). To return to the kingdom one remains standing on the earth, but with an altered conception of it. The theme of a salvific or restorative return to the time of primordial mythic origins is, of course, a theme commonly encountered in religious throughout the world." (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes: “A person who has actualized the primordial light has become (is reborn as) an infant (saying 22) precisely seven days of age (saying 4), for he dwells in the seventh day of Genesis. Reflecting the fact that the kingdom of God, like the light, is within and outside of people, such ‘infants’ have made what is inside like the outside and the outside like the inside and have restored the primordial condition of the image of God; this is the meaning of Gos. Thom. 22.” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

J. D. Crossan writes of 22b: “Robinson has shown most persuasively how the original *Kingdom and Children* aphorism has moved along two hermeneutical trajectories. One is the ‘orthodox’ baptismal interpretation represented by John 3:1-10 and developed in later patristic texts (1962a:106-107). The other is the ‘unorthodox’ and gnostic interpretation represented here by *Gos. Thom. 22b*: ‘When one considers that repudiation of sex was a condition to admission to some Gnostic groups, somewhat as baptism was a condition of admission into the church at large, it is not too difficult to see how a logion whose original *Sitz im Leben* was baptism could be taken over and remolded in the analogous *Sitz im Leben* of admission to the sect’ (1962a: 108). Thus Jesus’ reply in *Gos. Thom. 22b* involves a fourfold ‘when you make,’ each of which contains the obliteration of bodily differences, and each of which is known by itself or in various combinations from other gnostic sources (save the fourth). Thus ‘when you make the two one’ reappears in *Gos. Thom. 106* and combined as ‘when the two become one and the male with the female (is) neither male nor female’ in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (Hennecke and Schneemelcher: 1.168). These, and Robinson’s more detailed examples (1962a: 108, 281-284), show that the setting and saying in *Gos. Thom. 22a* have been redactionally expanded in typically gnostic terms by the dialogue of 22b. ‘The result is a logion all but transformed beyond recognition, were it not that the hint provided by the basic structure is confirmed by the introduction, in which it becomes clear that the logion grew out of the saying about the children’ (Robinson, 1962a: 109).” (*In Fragments*, p. 323)

J. D. Crossan continues: “The only factor not adequately explained in all this is the meaning of the fourth and final ‘when you make’ concerning eye-hand-foot. ‘It is tempting to propose an emendation of the text’ (Kee: 312) so that it would recommend eye to replace eyes, hand hands, and foot feet. But that, as Kee admits, is but a plausible guess, and Robinson can only note Mark 9:43, 45, 47 and add a question mark. But however one explains that final ‘when you make (fashion),’ it is clear that ‘a collection of various traditions’ (Robinson, 1962a: 283 note 46) has been appended to the *Kingdom and Children* aphorism. This means that one cannot dismiss the possibility of independent tradition in *Gos. Thom. 22a* simply because of the gnostic interpretation(s) now attached to it in 22b (against Kee: 314). Any decision on 22a must be made apart from its present much longer dialogic conclusion in 22b.” (*In Fragments*, p. 324)

J. D. Crossan writes of the form of 22a: “Here is a classic example of an *aphoristic story*, that is, of an *aphoristic saying* developed into narrative. A setting or situation is given with ‘Jesus saw infants being suckled.’ But this situation is already verbally contained within the aphorism itself: ‘He said to His disciples, “These infants are being suckled like those who enter the Kingdom.”’ On the one hand, this adds little to the aphorism itself, but, on the other, it significantly chooses the narrative mode (situation) over the discourse mode (address) to develop the aphorism. Notice also that the incident begins with Jesus, with something *from* Jesus rather than something *to* Jesus. It begins when ‘Jesus saw.’ This recalls Bultmann’s observation that, ‘It is characteristic of the primitive apophthegm that it makes the occasion of a dominical saying something that happens to Jesus (with the exception of the stories of the call of the disciples). It is a sign of a secondary formation if Jesus himself provides the initiative’ (66).” (*In Fragments*, p. 324)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The aphoristic saying in Mark 10:15; Matt. 18:3; John 3:3, 5 appears as a double negative (‘unless . . . not’), but the *dialectical story* in Mark 10:14 and the *aphoristic story*

in *Gos. Thom. 22a* are positive. The shift from saying to story has involved a shift from negative to positive as well.” (*In Fragments*, pp. 324-325)

J. D. Crossan concludes: “The whole unit of 22 involves three steps. First, the *aphoristic saying* is developed into an *aphoristic story* in 22a. Second, this is hermeneutically expanded by means of *aphoristic dialogue*. A single exchange is created between disciples and Jesus. Their question simply picks up the language of Jesus’ original saying in 22a. Three, the reply of Jesus almost overpowers the original saying in length, but it is an *aphoristic commentary* in form. If one leaves aside 22a and the opening question of 22b, the rest of 22b could be taken as an originally independent saying. It is, however, an *aphoristic commentary*, that is, a unit that looks like an independent aphorism but is appended as interpretative commentary to a preceding aphorism.” (*In Fragments*, p. 325)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 46](#), [GThom 114](#), [Luke 9:46-48](#), [Luke 18:15-17](#), [Matt 18:1-4](#), [Matt 19:13-15](#), [John 3:1-10](#), [Mark 9:33-37](#), [Mark 10:13-16](#), [DialSav 7](#), [GEgy 6](#), [Gal 3:28-29](#).

23. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΝΑCΕΤΤ ΤΗΝΕ ΟΥΑ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ̄ ΩΟ ΔΥΩ
CΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ̄ ΤΒΑ (2) ΔΥΩ CΝΑΩΖΕ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΥΟ ΟΥΑ ΟΥΩΤ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(23) Jesus said: I shall choose you, one out of a thousand and two out of ten thousand, and they shall stand as a single one.	(23) Jesus said, “I shall choose you (plur.) - one out of a thousand and two out of ten thousand. And they will stand at rest by being one and the same.”	28 [23]. Jesus says: “I will choose you, one from a thousand and two from ten thousand, and those <whom I have chosen> will be lifted up, being one!”

Scholarly Quotes

Funk quotes *Pistis Sophia* 134: “‘There shall be found one among a thousand and two among ten thousand . . .’ (Gartner: 229)” (*New Gospel Parallels*, v. 2, p. 123)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The Gnostic community is very small. It consists of those chosen by Jesus, ‘one out of a thousand and two out of ten thousand’ (23/24) - a saying quoted by the Gnostic followers of Basilides [Adv. haer. I. 24. 6] and in *Pistis Sophia*. To be sure, this element of exclusiveness is not absent from early Christianity (‘many are called, but few are chosen’), but in Christianity it is balanced by the call to mission and discipleship, omitted in Thomas. The Gospel of Thomas thus offers no hope, eschatological or other, to mankind as a whole, or to any considerable numbers of men.” (*Gnosticism & Early Christianity*, p. 189)

Funk and Hoover write: “The use of the phrase ‘one from a thousand’ may indicate that the gnotsics thought of themselves as an elite, relatively rare species among humankind. The phrase ‘single one’ (v. 2) points to undifferentiated existence prior to creation.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 487)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 49](#), [GThom 75](#), [GThom 106](#), [Matt 23:15](#), [Pistis Sophia 134](#), [Ecclesiastes 7:28](#).

24. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΝΕΦΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ ΜΑΤΣΕΒΟΝ ΕΠΤΟΠΟΣ ΕΤΚΜΜΑΥ
 ΕΠΕΙ ΤΑΝΑΓΚΗ ΕΡΟΝ ΤΕ ΕΤΡΝΩΙΝΕ Ν̄ΩΨ (2) ΠΕΧΑΨ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ
 ΠΕΤΕΥΝ̄ ΜΑΑΧΕ ΜΜΟΨ ΜΑΡΕΨΩΤΜ̄ ΟΥΝ̄ ΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΨΟΟΠ̄ Μ̄ΦΟΥΝ
 Ν̄ΝΟΥΡΜΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΔΥΩ Ψ̄ ΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΤΗΡΨ ΕΨΤΜ̄ ΟΥΟΕΙΝ
 ΟΥΚΑΚΕ ΠΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(24) His disciples said:
 Teach us about the place
 where you are, for it is
 necessary for us to seek it.
 He said to them: He who has
 ears, let him hear! There is
 light within a man of light,
 and he lights the whole
 world. If he does not shine,
 there is darkness.

(24) His disciples said,
 “Show us the place where
 you are, for we must seek it.”
 He said to them, “Whoever
 has ears should listen! There
 is light existing within a
 person of light. And it
 enlightens the whole world:
 if it does not enlighten, that
 person is darkness.”

29 [24]. His disciples say to
 him: “Instruct us about the
 place where thou art, for we
 must know about it!” He
 says to them: “He who has
 ears, let him hear! If a light
 exists inside a luminous one,
 then it gives light to the
 whole world; but if it does
 not give light, <it means that
 it is> a darkness.”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The disciples ask to be shown where Jesus is, just as in John 13:36 Simon Peter asks where he is going, in John 14:5 Thomas asks about the way, and in John 14:8 Philip asks to be shown the Father. Jesus replies by urging them to ‘hear’ the hidden meaning of his words. They already possess spiritual illumination within themselves, for they have spiritual ‘eyes’ (Saying 23). Thomas paraphrases a saying of Jesus about the eye in Matthew 6:22-23; Luke 11:34-36. For the ‘luminous’ body of the gospels he substitutes the Gnostic conception of the ‘luminous-man’ (*Pistis Sophia*, chapter 125). Their light illuminates the whole world because they are ‘the light of the world’ (Matthew 5.14; another quotation of this verse is in Saying 33).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 145-146)

Jean Doresse writes: “Or better, ‘the place where thou art’ may be intended to refer to God Himself; in Hebrew God is often referred to by the paraphrase *Maqom*, which means ‘the Place’. In this case, the disciples will be asking him how close he is to the Godhead, and Jesus replies, alluding to himself, that the light which he sends into the world is the proof that the divine Light is present in him.” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 373)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “Concerning the idea of the ‘inner light’ which shines from within a man, cf. Gospel of Thomas 24: ‘Within a man of light there is light and it [or: he] lights the whole world.’ Incidentally, the same idea is behind the rabbinical rule not to look at the priests while they pronounced the priestly blessing; in doing so they had to hold their hands before their eyes with the fingers spread out like a screen, because, as it was said, the divine glory ‘glanced through the lattice [Cant. 2.9].’” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 163)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The disciples do not need to look outside themselves, but as people of light they have light in themselves just as much as the light figure Jesus (cf. 77.1). Indeed, without this particle of light there would be darkness in the world. This statement seems to contain an indirect command to engage in mission in the world (cf. 33.1-3).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 602)

Funk and Hoover write: “The concept of a person bearing a spark of light that recalls one’s origin and determines one’s nature is a gnostic commonplace. While reminiscent of other sayings about light, especially in the Gospel of John, it is here clearly a gnostic formulation.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 487)

Stevan Davies writes: “According to saying 24 people may actualize the light within them and thus see the world and themselves in terms of the light of creation. They will see the world in reference to its beginning perfection, stand at the beginning (saying 18), and need no future attainment. They will know themselves to be sons of the living Father (saying 3) -- that is, the image of God, no longer male or female and having made the male and female into a single one, they will enter the kingdom of heaven (saying 22).” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes: “According to Gos. Thom. 24 one learns that those seeking the place where Jesus is ought not seek Jesus himself, but will find what they seek within themselves, the primordial light which, when actualized, illuminates the world.” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The six uses [of ‘let him hear’] in Thomas have the double ‘hear’ in *Gos. Thom.* 8, 21 (as in Mark and Luke), but the single ‘hear’ in 24, 63, 65, 96 (as in Matthew). It is used mostly to conclude parables (8, 21, 63, 65, 96), but once to introduce an aphorism (24). Since Coptic has no participle, the opening is the equivalent of the Greek *relativ* format.” (*In Fragments*, p. 70)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy655 24](#), [Luke 11:33-36](#), [Matt 6:22-23](#), [Matt 5:14-16](#), [John 14:2-7](#), [John 8:12-16](#), [John 12:27-36](#), [John 1:6-13](#), [DialSav 27-28](#), [DialSav 60-63](#), [DialSav 77-78](#), [DialSav 8](#), [DialSav 14](#).

25. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΜΕΡΕ ΠΕΚCΟΝ ΝΘΕ ΝΤΕΚΨΥΧΗ (2) ΕΡΙΤΗΡΕΙ
ΜΜΟC ΝΘΕ ΝΤΕΛΟΥ ΜΠΕΚΒΑΛ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(25) Jesus said: Love your brother as your soul; watch over him like the apple of your eye.

(25) Jesus said, “Love your (sing.) sibling like your own soul; look out for that person like the apple of you eye.”

30 [25]. Jesus says: “Love thy brother like thy soul; watch over him like the apple of thine eye.”

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse [2] does not occur in the New Testament. However, the mode of expression does have parallels in the Old Testament: Deut. 32.10; Ps. 17.8; Prov. 7.2.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 603)

Marvin Meyer writes: “Gospel of the Hebrews 5 has the savior say, ‘And never rejoice except when you look upon your brother with love,’ and Didache 2:7 commands that ‘some you shall love more than your soul.’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 81)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “As Grant and Freedman say, this is ‘purely jewish,’ and Leipoldt and Guillaumont had already drawn attention to the Semitism involved in the use of ‘as thy soul’ for ‘as

thysself.’ Quispel finds a parallel in the Person Diatessaron. All the biblical passages have ‘they neighbor,’ but ‘brother’ occurs in Leviticus xix. 17; the one ground for hesitation over ascribing this saying to early and good tradition is that for Thomas ‘thy brother,’ in the words of Grand and Freedman, ‘means not an Israelite or another human being, but another Gnostic.’ It is difficult to avoid the suspicion that the scope of the saying has been deliberately narrowed. By an orthodox Christian it would, of course, be understood in the New Testament sense, but if Jesus were known to have quoted Leviticus it is difficult to account for the change. This may serve to remind us that the same words might be very differently interpreted in orthodox and in Gnostic circles.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 113-114)

Funk’s Parallels

[Lev 19:18](#), [Deut 6:5](#), [Luke 10:25-29](#), [Matt 22:34-40](#), [Mark 12:28-34](#), [Rom 13:8-10](#), [Gal 5:13-15](#), [Did 1:2](#), [Barn 19:5](#).

26. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΧΗ ΕΤΖΜ ΠΒΑΛ ΜΠΕΚCΟΝ ΚΝΑΥ ΕΡΟC
 ΠCΟΕΙ ΔΕ ΕΤΖΜ ΠΕΚΒΑΛ ΚΝΑΥ ΔΝ ΕΡΟC (2) ΖΟΤΑΝ
 ΕΚΩΔΑΝΝΟΥΧΕ ΜΠCΟΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΕΚΒΑΛ ΤΟΤΕ ΚΝΑΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ
 ΕΝΟΥΧΕ ΜΠΧΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΒΑΛ ΜΠΕΚCΟΝ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(26) Jesus said: You see the mote which is in your brother’s eye; but you do not see the beam which is in your own eye. When you cast out the beam from your own eye, then you will see (clearly) to cast out the mote from your brother’s eye.	(26) Jesus said, “You (sing.) see the speck in your sibling’s eye, but you do not see the beam in your own eye. When you expel the beam from your own eye then you will be able to see to expel the speck from the eye of your sibling.”	31 [26]. Jesus says: “The straw that is in thy brother’s eye, though seest; but the beam that is in thine own eye, thou seest not! When thou hast cast out the beam that is in thine own eye, then thou wilt see to cast out the straw from thy brother’s eye.”
DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus		ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus
[“. . .] then thou wilt see to cast out the straw that is thy brother’s eye.”		(26) [. . .] and then you (sg.) will see clearly to cast the mote from your (sg.) brother’s eye.

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes ‘Arakin 16b in the Babylonian Talmud for a comparable story: “It was taught: Rabbi Tarfon said, ‘I wonder whether there is a person of this generation who accepts admonition? If someone says to him, “Remove the chip from between your eyes (or, eye teeth),” he would say to him, “Remove the beam from between your eyes (or, eye teeth).”’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 81)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The saying is very slightly modified from a saying related in Matthew 7:3, 5 and in Luke 6:41-42. In the Coptic version it leads without a break

into Saying 28, and thus seems to imply that the beam in the Gnostic's eye is his absolute rejection of fasting and Sabbath observance. He ought to explain the spiritual meaning of these actions to his Jewish, or Jewish-Christian, brothers, or potential brothers." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 146)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "Fitzmyer notes some differences between the Greek and the Coptic, but thinks what is preserved of the Greek is nearer Luke (vi. 42) than Matthew. This passage poses a somewhat delicate problem for the investigator: Is this merely an abbreviation of the Synoptic saying or has elaboration taken place in the Synoptic tradition as early as the hypothetical Q? Both Matthew and Luke put the first sentence in the form of a question, and both add a further question before the final 'Thou hypocrite! first cast out the beam. . . .' The Coptic here has a temporal clause instead of the imperative, but as Fitzmyer notes the Greek appears to have corresponded to that of the canonical Gospels. This raises once again the question of the relation between the Coptic Thomas and the Oxyrhynchus fragments, and in this case it is difficult to see why the change should have been made. As it is, the version in Thomas is terse and to the point, and a case might be made out for expansion in the canonical tradition. But a decision here is extremely difficult." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 58)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thomas' version of this humorous comparison is simpler than the form found in Q, which suggests that the latter has been expanded. . . . Thomas does not use the word 'phony' - someone who pretends to be someone he or she isn't - so this element may be secondary. The Q version is also redundant (lines 4-5 in the Q version repeat lines 1-2)." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 488)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "The key words 'brother' and 'eye' link Logia 26 and 25. Logion 26 corresponds to Q (Matt. 7.3-5/Luke 6.41-42) and as the simpler construction may also represent the earliest stage. But it is also conceivable that Thomas has simplified an earlier saying, the centre of which was reproof of the brother, and put self-correction at the centre." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 603)

Funk's Parallels

[POxy1 26](#), [Luke 6:37-42](#), [Matt 7:1-5](#).

27. (1) ΕΤΕ(ΤΝ)ΤΜΡΝΗCΤΕΥΕ ΕΠΚΟCΜΟC ΤΕΤΝΑΖΕ ΑΝ ΕΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ
 (2) ΕΤΕΤΝΤΜΕΙΡΕ ΜΠCΑΜΒΑΤΟΝ ΝCΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ ΝΤΕΤΝΑΝΑΥ ΑΝ
 ΕΠΕΙΚΩΤ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(27) <Jesus> said: If you do not fast to the world, you will not find the kingdom; if you do not keep the Sabbath as Sabbath, you will not see the Father.

(27) <Jesus said>, “If you (plur.) do not abstain from the world, you will not find the kingdom. If you do not make the sabbath a sabbath you will not behold the father.”

32 [27]. “If you do not fast from the world, you will not find the Kingdom. If you do not make the Sabbath the <true> Sabbath, you will not see the Father.”

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

Jesus says: “If you do not fast from the world, you will not find the Kingdom of God. And if you do not make the Sabbath the <true> Sabbath, you will not see the Father.”

(27) Jesus said, “If you do not fast as regards the world, you will not find the kingdom of God. If you do not observe the Sabbath as a Sabbath, you will not see the father.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* (‘Stromateis’) 3.15.99.4, incorporates a beatitude with similar content: ‘Those who have castrated themselves from all sin for the sake of heaven’s kingdom are fortunate: They are the ones who fast from the world.’ Fasting from the world means abstaining from the material things that the world has to offer; keeping the sabbath a sabbath seems to imply that one should rest in a truly significant way and separate oneself from worldly concerns. Thus ‘Macarius’ of Syria is cited by Aelred Baker (‘Pseudo-Macarius and the Gospel of Thomas,’ p. 220) as making the same sort of statement: ‘For the soul that is considered worthy from the shameful and foul reflections keeps the sabbath a true sabbath and rests a true rest. . . . To all the souls that obey and come he gives rest from these . . . impure reflections . . . , (the souls) keeping the sabbath a true sabbath.’ The words ‘observe the sabbath as a sabbath’ in saying 27 could also be taken to derive from the idiom ‘keep the sabbath (in reference to) the sabbath,’ as in the Septuagint. Further, since the Coptic employs two different spellings for the word translated ‘sabbath’ in saying 27 (*sambaton* and *sabbaton*), it is conceivable - but probably too subtle - that the text could be translated ‘observe the (whole) week as the sabbath’; compare Tertullian, *Against the Jewish People* 4: ‘We ought to keep a sabbath from all servile work always, and not only every seventh day, but all the time.’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 81-82)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “‘Fasting to the world’ must mean withdrawal from a worldly or secular outlook; it is an abstention from the world that involves becoming a ‘solitary’ (*monarchos*).” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 391)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “Being a construction with a cognate accusative (lit., ‘to sabbatize the sabbath’), it explains the peculiar Coptic construction, where the repeated word is really superfluous, *etetntmeire mpsambaton ensabbaton*. (The dissimilation of *bb* to *mb* in the first occurrence of the word in Coptic, but not the second, should be noted.) The Greek expression occurs in the LXX at Lv 23:32; 2 Chr 36:21. C. Taylor (*op. cit.*, pp. 14-15) showed that it does not simply

mean 'to observe the (weekly) sabbath'. In Lv 23:32 it refers to the Day of Atonement, which is to be kept as a real sabbath. Hence, it is likely that we should understand the expression in this saying in a metaphorical or a spiritual sense. Cf. Heb 4:9 and Justin (*Dial. w. Trypho* 12, 3; *PG* 6, 500), who uses *sabbatizein* in the sense of a spiritual sabbath opposed to the formal Jewish observance; for him it consisted in abstention from sin." (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 392)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "A literal understanding, namely sabbath observance, is to be excluded. Rather, 'sabbath' here may be synonymous with 'world'. In that case v. 2 symbolizes abstinence from worldly values. For 'seeing the Father' cf. Matt. 5.8 ('see God')." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 604)

M. A. Williams writes: "In the *Gospel of Thomas*, Jesus says, 'If you do not fast with respect to the world, you will not find the Kingdom' (saying 27). But another saying in that gospel (14) seems to reject external acts of piety, including fasting, as things that can lead to sin, possibly because of pride or hypocrisy. The fasting 'with respect to the world' in saying 27 could therefore be intended as a metaphor for general withdrawal from involvement in the world (which itself implies other forms of ascetic denial). It is possible that it is not fasting per se which is rejected in saying 14 of *Gos. Thom.* but only hypocritical or empty fasting, which does not reflect a *genuine* indifference to the world." (*Rethinking "Gnosticism"*, p. 142)

F. F. Bruce writes: "This saying (whose Greek text is preserved in P. Oxy. 1. 2) seems to have been widely known in the church of the second and third centuries; its substance appears in Justin, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. [Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 12.3; Clement, *Miscellanies* iii. 99.4; Tertullian, *Against the Jews* 4.] While literal fasting and sabbath-keeping are deprecated (cf. Sayings 14, 104), the spiritual counterpart to these religious exercises is recommended (cf. Saying 6)." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 125)

Funk's Parallels

[POxy1 27](#), [POxy654 6:1](#), [GThom 6:1](#), [GThom 14:1](#), [GThom 104](#), [Matt 9:14-17](#), [Matt 12:1-8](#), [Mark 2:18-22](#), [Mark 2:23-28](#).

28. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΔΕΙΩΖΕ ΕΡΑΤ ΖΝ ΤΜΗΤΕ ΜΠΚΟCΜΟC ΔΥΩ
ΔΕΙΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΥ ΖΝ CΑΡΞ (2) ΔΕΙΖΕ ΕΡΟΥΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΥΤΑΖΕ
ΜΠΙΖΕ ΕΛΑΔΥ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΕΦΟΒΕ (3) ΔΥΩ ΑΤΑΨΥΧΗ † ΤΚΑC ΕΧΝ
ΝΩΗΡΕ ΝΡΡΩΜΕ ΧΕ ΖΝΒΛΛΕΕΥΕ ΝΕ ΖΜ ΠΟΥΖΗΤ ΔΥΩ CΕΝΑΥ
ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΧΕ ΝΤΑΥΕΙ ΕΠΚΟCΜΟC ΕΥΨΟΥΕΙΤ ΕΥΨΙΝΕ ΟΝ
ΕΤΡΟΥΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΕΥΨΟΥΕΙΤ (4) ΠΑΗΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ
CΕΤΟΖΕ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΥΨΑΝΝΕΖ ΠΟΥΗΠ ΤΟΤΕ CΕΝΑΡΜΕΤΑΝΟΕΙ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
<p>(28) Jesus said: I stood in the midst of the world, and I appeared to them in the flesh. I found them all drunk; I found none of them thirsting, and my soul was afflicted for the sons of men; for they are blind in their heart, and they do not see that they came empty into the world, (and) empty they seek to leave the world again. But now they are drunk. When they have thrown off their wine, they will repent.</p>	<p>(28) Jesus said, "I stood at rest in the midst of the world. And unto them I was shown forth incarnate; I found them all intoxicated. And I found none of them thirsty. And my soul was pained for the children of humankind, for they are blind in their hearts and cannot see. For, empty did they enter the world, and again empty they seek to leave the world. But now they are intoxicated. When they shake off their wine then they will have a change of heart."</p>	<p>33 [28]. Jesus says: "I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh I manifested myself to them. I found them all drunk; I found none athirst among them. And my soul was afflicted for the children of men. Because they are blind in their heart and do not see, because they have come into the world empty, <that is why> they seek still to go out from the world empty. But let someone come who will correct them! Then, when they have slept off their wine, they will repent."</p>

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

<p>DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus [Not included in Doresse.]</p>	<p>(28) Jesus said, "I took my place in the midst of the world, and I appeared to them in flesh. I found all of them intoxicated; I found none of them thirsty. And my soul became afflicted for the sons of men, because they are blind in their hearts and do [not] have sight [. .]</p>
--	--

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "In the synoptic gospels Jesus expresses appeals not unlike this one; cf., Matthew 11:25-30; 23; 37; Luke 13:34. Drunkenness is likened to ignorance of God in 1 Corinthians 15:34. In 1 Timothy 3:16 we read that 'he was manifested in flesh.' But as a whole this saying is closer to the description of the revealer given in the *Hermetica*, semi-Gnostic theosophical literature of the second or third century." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 147-148)

F. F. Bruce quotes a parallel saying from the *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.27, attributed to Hermes the prophet of God: “I have begun to proclaim to men the beauty of piety and knowledge: ‘O ye peoples, earth-born men who have given yourselves over to drunkenness and sleep and ignorance of God, sober up and cease to be intoxicated and bewitched by irrational sleep.’” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 126)

John Dart writes: “The Jewish Wisdom of Proverbs, too, came down to the world and attempted to present truth and knowledge to a largely unmindful mankind.” (*The Laughing Savior*, p. 96)

Stevan Davies writes: “Thomas is replete with sayings contrasting the condition of people who do and who do not apprehend the world through the primordial light of the beginning. Those who do are full; those who do not are empty (Gos. Thom. 28).”
(<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “Though there is no direct parallel to this saying in the canonical Gospels there is nothing in it that prevents it from being regarded at least as substantially authentic.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 396)

Funk and Hoover write: “In this miniature discourse, Jesus speaks in highly theological terms about himself. He depicts himself as the redeemer who descends to earth and ascends to heaven, in terms very similar to those in the old hymn recorded in Phil 2:5-11 or in the prologue to the Gospel of John 1:1-5, 9-14, 16-18. However, here there are specifically gnostic twists: the spiritual state of humanity, according to numerous gnostic texts, is stupefied with passion and drunkenness, blind to any spiritual understanding. The savior comes to awaken such persons to their true origins. This complex, accordingly, is a summary version of gnostic redeemer myths that depict the human condition and the possibility for salvation.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 489)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “At most, it may be a development in a Gnostic direction on the basis of an authentic saying. The exposition provided by Jeremias must give pause to any who would claim it as entirely spurious. The striking feature is, however, the statement *in this gospel* that Jesus ‘appeared in flesh,’ since as Doresse observes the Coptic version elsewhere absolutely rejects the flesh. This must be held to support the theory of Puech, that the document was not originally Gnostic, although he himself has noted other possibilities, such as a Docetic interpretation of the words in question, or an orthodox revision of an originally Gnostic work.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 42)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy1 28](#), [Luke 21:34-36](#), [John 1:14](#).

29. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΕΩΧΕ ΝΤΑΤCΑΡΞ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΝΑ ΟΥΩΠΗΡΕ
 ΤΕ (2) ΕΩΧΕ ΠΝΑ ΔΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΠCΩΜΑ ΟΥΩΠΗΡΕ ΝΩΠΗΡΕ ΠΕ (3)
 ΑΛΛΑ ΔΝΟΚ †Ρ ΩΠΗΡΕ ΜΠΑΕΙ ΧΕ ΠΩC ΔΤΕΕΙΝΟC ΜΜΝΤΡΜΜΑΟ
 ΑCΟΥΩZ ΖΝ ΤΕΕΙΜΝΤΖΗΚΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(29) Jesus said: If the flesh came into existence because of the spirit, it is a marvel. But if the spirit (came into existence) because of the body, it is a marvel of marvels. But as for me, I wonder at this, how this great wealth made its home in this poverty.

(29) Jesus said, “It is amazing if it was for the spirit that flesh came into existence. And it is amazing indeed if spirit (came into existence) for the sake of the body. But as for me, I am amazed at how this great wealth has come to dwell in this poverty.”

34 [29]. Jesus says: “If the flesh was produced for the sake of the spirit, it is a miracle. But if the spirit <was produced> for the sake of the body, it is a miracle of a miracle.” But for myself (?), I marvel at that because the [. . . of] this (?) great wealth has dwelt in this poverty.”

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

[“ . . .] the poverty.”

(29) [. . . makes its home in this] poverty.

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: “‘Flesh’ is a link by key word to 28.1. The whole is a praise of the spirit which has taken up its abode in human bodies or in the flesh. For ‘spirit’ as an element of light in human beings cf. 24.3.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 605)

F. F. Bruce writes: “Flesh and spirit are antithetical: spirit does not need flesh as its vehicle, and it is unthinkable that spirit exists to aid flesh. In the conditions of earthly life, spirit is the ‘great wealth’ that resides in the ‘poverty’ of a mortal body (cf. Sayings 85, 87, 112).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 126)

Helmut Koester writes: “Jesus even marvels over how it is that something so glorious as the spirit has become mired in the flesh” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 126).

Funk and Hoover write: “This group of sayings has a strongly ascetic tone. The depreciation of the body is a frequent theme in Thomas (note especially sayings 87 and 112, but also see the remarks on Thom 28:1-4). Such ideas are not confined to Thomas, but appear elsewhere in early Christian literature (John 3:6; Gal 5:16-18; Rom 8:3-11). However, the profile of Jesus as one who willingly associates with outsiders and the unclean and is remembered as a drunkard and a glutton (Matt 11:19//Luke 7:34) does not square with these remarks that belittle the body and recommend asceticism.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 489)

Marvin Meyer writes: “This saying expresses surprise at the close relationship between the spirit, the immortal dimension of human beings, and the flesh or body. Inasmuch as the saying intimates that the spirit within may actually exist for the benefit and salvation of the body, it resembles saying 7.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 82)

Funk’s Parallels: [POxy1 29](#), [GThom 87](#), [GThom 112](#), [Rom 8:1-8](#), [Gal 5:16-26](#).

30. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΜΑ ΕΥΝ ΨΟΜΤ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΜΑΥ ΖΝΝΟΥΤΕ
 ΝΕ (2) ΠΜΑ ΕΥΝ CΝΑΥ Η ΟΥΑ ΔΝΟΚ †ΨΟΟΠ ΝΜΜΑϸ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(30) Jesus said: Where there are three gods, they are gods; where there are two or one, I am with him.

(30) Jesus said, "Where there are three divine beings they are divine. Where there are two or one, I myself dwell with that person."

35 [30]. Jesus says: "There where there are three gods, they are gods. Where there are two, or <else> one, I am with him!"

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

Jesus says: "Where there are [two (?) they are] not without God, and where there is one, I say <to you>, I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou wilt find me; split the wood: I am even there!"

(30 + 77b) [Jesus said], "Where there are [three], they are without God, and where there is but [a single one], I say that I am with [him]. Lift up the stone, and you will find me there. Split the piece of wood, and I am there."

Scholarly Quotes

J. D. Crossan writes: "Put mildly, that is not very clear, and we are cast back on the Greek of Oxy P 1, lines 23-27. Harold W. Attridge's recent study of that papyrus under ultraviolet light led him to the following restored translation: 'Jesus said, "Where there are three, they are without god, and where there is but a single one I say that I am with him."' He concludes that, 'instead of an absolutely cryptic remark about gods being gods, the fragment asserts that any *group* of people lacks divine presence. That presence is available only to the "solitary one." The importance of the solitary (monachos) is obvious in the Gospel. Cf. Sayings 11, 16, 22, 23, 49, 75, and 106. This saying must now be read in connection with those remarks on the "monachose.'" (156)." (*Four Other Gospels*, p. 78)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "This saying is found in different versions, Greek and Coptic. The Greek speaks of some number of persons - more than one - who are not without God (if the fragmentary text has been correctly restored; perhaps it should read, 'Wherever there are two, they *are* without God'), and goes on to say, 'And where there is one alone, I say, I am with him.' Then it adds the last sectino of Saying 77 (Coptic). The Coptic, on the other hand, says that three gods are gods, and that where there are two or one, Jesus is with him. The second half of the saying is fairly easy to explain. It looks like a Gnostic version of 'Where there are two or three gathered in my name, there am I in their midst' (Matthew 18:20); as a Gnostic, Thomas reduces the numbers. Which version is really the original can hardly be determined; the medieval Cathari seem to have quoted a combination of both versions. 'Where there was one of his little ones, he would be with him; and where there were two, similarly; and where there were three, in the same way' (v. Dollinger, *Beitrag zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, II, page 210). The remark about the gods may possibly involve a criticism of Christian doctrine as tritheism; according to the Coptic text, Christians may be worshipping three (mere) gods (for 'God' as possibly inferior to Jesus, see Saying 97)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 149)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "The Greek is fragmentary, but Blass emended it to read 'Where there are two, they are not without God,' a restoration which Evelyn White calls 'certainly final.' It may be

that the Coptic proves Blass wrong, but as Fitzmyer observes it is this saying more than any other which shows that the Coptic is not a direct translation from the Greek, for in Thomas the second part occurs in a completely different saying (logion 77). It is possible that the Greek and the Coptic represent independent versions, but we must also reckon with the possibility suggested by Grant and Freedman, that the differences are due to a Gnostic editor. If Guillaumont is right, however, the latter view would appear to be ruled out. In the *Pirke Aboth* (3.7, a passage already quoted, as White notes, by Taylor in connection with the Greek), Rabbi Halafta cites Psalm lxxxii. 1 as proof that the Shekinah is present wherever three study the Torah. The psalm speaks of God judging among the *elohim*, but this last word was interpreted in terms of Exodus xxi. 6, where it must be taken to mean 'judges' (LXX paraphrases 'to the judgment seat of God'). Logion 30 therefore would seem to have some connection with this rabbinic saying, and more particularly to reflect a Jewish background. The obvious Gospel parallel is Matthew xviii. 20, to which White adds Matthew xxviii. 20 and John xvi. 32, but these 'show no more than the elements out of which the saying probably grew.' White's further discussion of references in Clement of Alexandria and in Ephraim must now be reconsidered in the light of the Coptic text. It is tempting to conclude that the Greek fragments and the Coptic Thomas are independent translations of an Aramaic text, but this is exposed to the objection that Clement quotes the saying presumably from a Greek document; moreover, Fitzmyer has shown that it is possible to restore the Greek to a comparatively close agreement with the Coptic." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 121-122)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thom 30:1-2 is the Thomean version of Matt 18:20 ('Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, I will be there among them'). Here, however, the solitary one merits God's presence, not the two or three gathered together. This Thomean idea is found also in thom 4:3; 22:5; 23:2 (also compare 16:4; 49:1; 75). In this respect, the Gospel of Thomas is obviously anti-institutional: it rejects the community (the minimum requirement for which was two or three) as the basic unit in favor of the solitary individual." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 490)

Beate Blatz writes: "The second part of this saying is transmitted as logion 77 in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas. This - and also the deviations of the two versions from one another in the first part - proves that the Coptic version cannot be a direct translation of a Greek version such as is handed down in POx 1." (*New Testament Apocrypha*, v. 1, p. 131)

Marvin Meyer writes: "In the New Testament, compare Matthew 18:19-20. In other early Christian literature, compare Ephraem Syrus, Exposition on the Harmony of the Gospel 14: 'Where there is one, there also am I, or someone might be sad from lonely things, since he himself is our joy and he himself is with us. And where there are two, there also shall I be, since his mercy and grace overshadow us. And when we are three, we assemble just as in church, which is the body of Christ perfected and his image expressed.' In a medieval inquisition record that recounts the confession of Peter Maurinus, it is said that 'where there was one little one of his, he himself would be with him, and where there were two, similarly, and where there were three, in the same way.'" (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 82-83)

Funk's Parallels

[POxy1 30 + 77b](#), [GThom 22](#), [GThom 23](#), [GThom 49](#), [GThom 75](#), [GThom 106](#).

31. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΜΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΩΗΠ ΖΜ ΠΕC†ΜΕ (2) ΜΑΡΕCΟΕΙΝ
 ΡΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΕ ΝΝΕΤCΟΟΥΝ ΜΜΟC

LAYTON

DORESSE

BLATZ

<p>(31) Jesus said: No prophet is accepted in his own village, no doctor heals those who know him.</p>	<p>(31) Jesus said, “A prophet is not acceptable in that prophet’s own native town. A physician does not heal people who are acquainted with that physician.”</p>	<p>36 [31]. Jesus says: “A prophet is not accepted in his <own> city, and a doctor does not heal those who know him.”</p>
--	---	---

Oxyrhynchus Greek Fragment

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

<p>Jesus says: “A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, and a doctor does not heal those who know him!”</p>	<p>(31) Jesus said, “No prophet is accepted in his own country; no physician heals those who know him.”</p>
---	---

Scholarly Quotes

Funk and Hoover write: “The earliest form of the saying is probably the aphorism consisting of a single line found in Thom 31:1; Luke 4:24; and John 4:44 (the simpler form is usually the earlier). This adage is characteristic of the short, easily remembered, and, in this case, ironical remark that lent itself to oral transmission, and was typical of Jesus as a sage and prophet.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 491)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The saying about the prophet is found in the Synoptic and Johannine traditions alike (Mark 6.4; John 4.44). The saying about the physician resembles ‘Physician, heal yourself’, a proverb quoted in Luke 4.23 immediately before the Lukan occurrence of the saying about the prophet; Luke 4.23 f. may therefore be the source of this composite formulation.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 127)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “The first part of this saying should be considered as authentic as the canonical parallels. The second may be authentic, or may be merely a saying constructed as an answer to the retort, ‘Physician, heal thyself’.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 402)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Logion 31 has long been known from its appearance in the Oxyrhynchus fragments: A prophet is not accepted in his own village; a physician does not cure those who know him. This is regarded by Jeremias and others as simply an expansion of Luke iv. 24, and indeed a clue to the formation of the saying might be found in the preceding verse in Luke, which contains the ‘proverb’: Physician, heal thyself. On the other hand, Jesus odes elsewhere (Mark ii. 17 and par.) make use of the figure of the physician with reference to His own ministry, and it would certainly seem to produce an effective parallelism. Leipoldt has justly expressed his doubts as to some of the ‘parallelisms’ which occur in Thomas, particularly those which merely reverse the first member, sometimes with almost unintelligible results; but this is in a different category. This saying would appear to have some claim to be considered as authentic.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 60-61)

Funk and Hoover write: “The two [doctor and prophet sayings] are connected in Thomas 31 as a proverb consisting of two lines. It is interesting to note that Luke seems to connect the two ideas also: the crowd asks Jesus to do in his hometown what he had done in Capernaum: namely, to cure people, which follows from the secular proverb they quote him, ‘Doctor, cure yourself.’ It is possible that Luke was aware of the two-line proverb preserved in Thomas but decided to revamp it to suit the story he was developing.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 491)

Helmut Koester writes: “This is a particularly instructive parallel. When the Greek text of *Gos. Thom.* 31 (*Pap. Oxy.* 1.6) was discovered, Emil Wendling demonstrated that Mark 6:4-5 was constructed on the basis of this saying. While Mark quoted the first part of the saying at the end of his apophthegma about Jesus’ rejection in Nazareth, he changed the second part into narrative. Rudolf Bultmann confirmed this observation through form-critical analysis. This saying, in the form in which it is preserved by Thomas, was the nucleus of the later development of the apophthegma that appears now in Mark’s text.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 111)

Gerd Theissen writes: “Form criticism shows that this logion is more original than the apophthegmatic garb which Mark 6.1-6 gives to the first half in the framework of Jesus’ visit to Nazareth; it cannot in any way be a secondary derivation from Mark 6.1-6 par.” (*The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, p. 39)

J. D. Crossan writes: “In comparing the twin versions [Coptic and Greek] of *Gos. Thom.* 31 with one another, three points may be noted. (a) ‘No prophet is’ and ‘a prophet is not’ in Greek may be translated by the same impersonal negative verb preceding the word ‘prophet’ in Coptic - that is, by (em)men, ‘there is no. . . .’ Both Mark 6:4 (‘a prophet is not’) and Luke 4:24 (‘no prophet is’) are so translated in the Coptic New Testament. (b) Similarly, there is probably no difference between ‘village’ and ‘homeland,’ since the Greek word *patris* (homeland) is translated *time* (village) in the Coptic versions of Mark 6:4, Matt. 13:54, 57, Luke 4:24, and John 4:44. In effect, *at least originally*, whatever term was used, it was ‘village’ that was intended. (c) Finally, there is the difference between ‘heals’ and ‘works cures.’ But, once again, the difference is inconsequential since the Coptic has the Greek loan-word *therapeuein* (‘to cure, heal’) in Coptic format as *eptherapeue* while the Greek version has *poiei therapeias* (‘work cures’). In other words the two versions are probably as identical as texts in totally different languages can be.” (*In Fragments*, p. 283)

J. D. Crossan writes: “When one compares the different versions of the *prophet* saying in Joh, Mark, Luke, and *Thomas*, it seems evident that we are dealing with performancial variations that do not allow or need any further decision concerning the oral original. Thus, for example, the use of ‘honor’ in Mark and Luke and of ‘acceptable’ in Luke and *Thomas* are free performancial variations that allow of no further direct choice between them. I tend, however, to prefer the Luke-*Thomas* term because of a major indirect consideration. This has to do with the far more interesting question of whether we are dealing with a single-stich aphorism about a prophet or a double-stich aphorism concerning a *prophet/physician* parallelism. If one accepts the double-stich saying as the more original, one tends also to prefer its wording as well.” (*In Fragments*, pp. 283-284)

J. D. Crossan writes: “But, in everything seen so far, the main difference is the prophet/physician parallelism, which appears only in *Thomas*. Even before the 1945 discovery of the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas*, Bultmann had followed Emil Wendling’s 1908 thesis that the aphorism in Oxy P 1 was more original than that in Mark 6:4 (Bultmann: 31; see also Robinson and Koester: 129-131). His argument was that ‘it is hardly likely that the double proverb has grown out of Mk 6:1-6, the reverse is on the other hand probable: the second half of the twin proverb is transposed in the story, and the *ginoskontes auton* becomes the *syggeneis* of Mk 6:4” (31). This *is* more probable than Jeremias’s suggestion that *Gos. Thom.* 31a ‘is expanded by the addition of the parallel saying’ in 31b (1964:

36; see also Menard: 127). The reason for the greater probability was already noted by Bultmann, and it can be strengthened since the discovery of the Coptic version. Both Mark 6:5 (*etherapeusen*) and Luke 4:23 (*therapeuson*) mention ‘curing’ in either the succeeding or preceding verse to their prophet aphorism. And Luke cites another proverb in 4:23 that invites a counter-proverb such as that in *Gos. Thom.* 31b. In other words both the Markan and Lukan tradition, and here independently of each other, (a) kept the prophet saying (b) removed the physician saying, but (c) let its earlier presence be seen residually in Mark 6:5 and Luke 4:23. It could even be suggested, against Bultmann but following his basic intuition, that the *ginoskontes auton* of Thomas reappears in Mark’s ‘in his house’ (*en te oikia autou*.)” (*In Fragments*, p. 284)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy1 31](#), [Luke 4:16-30](#), [Matt 13:53-58](#), [John 4:43-45](#), [Mark 6:1-6](#).

32. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΠΟΛΙC ΕΥΚΩΤ ΜΜΟC ΖΙΧΝ ΟΥΤΟΟΥ
ΕΧΧΟCΕ ΕCΤΑΧΡΗΥ ΜΝ ΣΟΜ ΝCΖΕ ΟΥΔΕ CΝΑΩΖΩΠ ΑΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(32) Jesus said: A city that is built on a high mountain and fortified cannot fall, nor can it be hidden.

(32) Jesus said, “A city built upon a high hill and fortified cannot fall. Nor can it become hidden.”

37 [32]. Jesus says: “A city built on a high mountain, and which is strong, it is not possible that it should fall, and it cannot be hidden!”

Oxyrhynchus Greek Fragment

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

Jesus says: “A city built on the summit of a high mountain, and fortified, can neither fall nor be hidden.”

(32) Jesus said, “A city built on a high mountain and fortified cannot fall, nor can it be hidden.”

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The saying has a precise equivalent in Greek. It seems overloaded by comparison with the parallel Matt. 5.14. Therefore Logion 32 may be of later date in terms of tradition. Gnostics had no difficulties in seeing themselves as inhabitants of a fortified city which could not be shaken.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 606)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “The saying is meant to encourage Jesus’ disciples, and preserve them from despondency. They are citizens of the lofty, eschatological city of God (Isa. 2.2-4; Micah 4.1-3), a city which no earthquake, nor hostile onslaught, nor even the Powers of Hell (Math. 16.18), can shake, and whose light streams through the night, needing no human efforts. Having the gospel, they have all they need.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 217-218)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “There is no reason why the saying could not be regarded as authentic, but it is more likely a secondary expansion of Mt 5:14. I find it hard to see any connection between

this saying and Mt 7:24-25, which has been suggested by various commentators.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 403)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Fitzmyer also regards it as a secondary expansion of Matthew, while Grant and Freedman think it based on Matthew, but that ‘it has become mixed up with something else in the course of transmission.’ On the other hand Puech notes that Vaganay, working on the basis of the Greek fragment, had already suggested that it came from independent tradition, and he himself suggests that it may be older and more complete than Matthew. Quispel has detected several parallels in other writings, some of them already noted by Harnack and others in their studies of the Greek, and these must lend support to the view that we have here an independent tradition.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 61)

Funk and Hoover write: “The underlying saying about a city that cannot be concealed probably goes back to Jesus. It is based on a common sight in the Near East: one sees mounds protruding from the plain or valley floor everywhere; they mark the sites of ancient cities. When a city succumbed to an enemy seige, the new occupants simply leveled off the stones and clay bricks of which the walls and buildings of the previous city had been constructed, and built on top of the debris. Over the centuries the mound (it is called a ‘tell’) would grow to considerable height since it was held together by the outer walls that were continually reconstructed to fortify the city. The saying about the fortified city on a hill is preserved by both Greek Thomas and Coptic Thomas as an independent saying. Since the original context has been lost in both Matthew and Thomas, we cannot determine what it meant on the lips of Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 492)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy1 32, Matt 5:14-16.](#)

33. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΠΕΤΚΝΑCΩΤΜ̄ ΕΡΟC ΖΜ̄ ΠΕΚΜΑΑΧΕ ΖΜ̄
 ΠΚΕΜΑΑΧΕ ΤΑΩΕ ΟΕΙΩ ΜΜΟC ΖΙΧΝ̄ ΝΕΤΝ̄ΧΕΝΕΠΩΡ (2)
 ΜΑΡΕΛΑΑΥ ΓΑΡ ΧΕΡΕ ΖΗΒC Ν̄CΚΑΑC ΖΑ ΜΑΑΧΕ ΟΥΔΕ ΜΑCΚΑΑC
 ΖΜ̄ ΜΑ ΕCΖΗΠ (3) ΑΛΛΑ ΕΩΑΡΕCΚΑΑC ΖΙΧΝ̄ ΤΛΥΧΝΙΑ ΧΕΚΑΑC
 ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΒΗΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΑΥΩ ΕΤΝΝΗΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΥΝΑΝΑΥ
 ΑΠΕCΟΥΟΕΙΝ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(33) Jesus said: What you hear with your ear (and) with the other ear, proclaim it on your roof-tops. For no one lights a lamp to set it under a bushel, or to put it in a hidden place; but he sets it on the lamp-stand, that all who go in and come out may see its light.	(33) Jesus said, “Whatever you (sing.) hear with your ear, proclaim upon your (plur.) rooftops into the other ear. Indeed, no one lights a lamp and puts it under a vessel, nor puts it in a hidden place. Rather it is put on a lampstand so that each who enters and leaves might see its light.”	38 [33]. Jesus says: “What thou hearest with thine ear, and the other ear, proclaim from the roof-tops! For no-one lights a lamp and puts it under a bushel or in a hidden place: but he puts it on the lamp-stand so that all who come in or go out should see the light.”

Jesus says: “You hear with one of your ears (33) Jesus said, “<That which> you (sg.) [...]”
hear in one of your (sg.) ears, [preach...]”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Clement of Alexandria in *Miscellanies* 6.15.124.5-6 for an esoteric interpretation of a similar saying: “‘And what you hear in the ear’ - that is, in a hidden manner and in a mystery, for such things are said, figuratively, to be spoken in the ear - ‘proclaim,’ he says, ‘upon the rooftops,’ receiving nobly and delivering loftily and explaining the scriptures according to the canons of truth. For neither prophecy nor the savior himself declared the divine mysteries in a simple manner, so as to be easily comprehended by ordinary people, but rather he spoke in parables.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 83)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying is probably a corruption of the saying found in Q and incorporated into Luke 12:3/Matt 10:27. The Q saying was judged to be a Christian formulation (further, consult the notes on the verses in Luke and Matthew). The saying in Thomas makes no sense as it stands.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 492)

Jack Finegan writes: “Here the completion of the saying [compared to the Greek fragment] enables us to see that the entire text combined the materials of Mt 10:27 = Lk 12:3 in the first part, with the materials of Mt 5:15 = Lk 11:33 and Lk 8:16 in the second part, with additional variations of a minor character. Not only are two separate Synoptic sayings, one about hearing and one about lighting a lamp, brought together but the respective versions of Mt and Lk are interwoven to provide a specially good example of the phenomenon which is frequent enough not only in these texts but also in the church fathers of this period, the phenomenon which has been called that of the ‘compound text.’ Whether this means that the materials were quoted from memory, or that there was a deliberate attempt at harmonization of the NT text, is difficult to say.” (*Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*, p. 251)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “According to the context (4.22) Mark and Thomas relate it to the Gospel, Matthew to the disciples (cf. 5.16), Luke to the inner light (cf. 11.34-36, see below, pp. 162 f.). From the exegesis a conjecture may be hazarded as to what was the original meaning. What is the meaning of, ‘neither do they place the lamp under a bushel’? If a bushel-measure were placed over the small clay lamp, it would extinguish it. In the little, windowless, one-roomed peasants’ houses which have no chimney, this might well have been the customary method of putting out the lamp; since blowing it out might cause unpleasant smoke and smell, as well as the risk of fire through sparks (cf. Shab. 3.6).” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 120)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The simile of the lamp often occurs in the New Testament: Matt. 4.21/Matt 5.15; Luke 8.16; 11.33. ‘Hidden place’ takes up ‘hidden’ from Logion 32. This is likely to have been conditioned by the Matthaean sequence, for there we have the same word from Thomas 32 in Matt. 5.14, whereas it does not occur in the verse (Matt. 5.15) which corresponds to Thomas 33.2.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 607)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Grant and Freedman see here nothing but a combination of sayings from our Gospels, and note that the Naassenes used the same combination in the reverse order. It should be observed, however, that the second part occurs definitely in the Lucan form. If Thomas drew logion 32 from Matthew, why did he switch to Luke for his version of a saying contained in the next verse? Quispel has noted parallels to the Diatessaron here, and suggests that it is simpler to

assume that Tatian knew either logion 33 or something like it than that he borrowed bits and pieces here and there from all three Synoptics.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 75)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy1 33](#), [Luke 12:2-3](#), [Luke 8:16-17](#), [Luke 11:33-36](#), [Matt 10:26-27](#), [Matt 5:14-16](#), [Mark 4:21-23](#).

34. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΒΛΛΕ ΕΦΩΑΝCΩΚ ΖΗΤC ΝΝΟΥΒΛΛΕ ΩΑΥΖΕ
ΜΠΕCΝΑΥ ΕΠΕCΗΤ ΕΥΖΙΕΙΤ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(34) Jesus said: If a blind man leads a blind man, they both fall into a pit.	(34) Jesus said, “If a blind person leads a blind person both will fall into a hole.”	39 [34]. Jesus says: “If a blind man leads another blind man, both of them fall into a ditch.”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This saying is derived from Matthew 15:14; for its substance is presented as a question in Luke 6:39. It follows Saying 34, because the mention of ‘light’ in that saying leads Thomas to think of sight or the lack of it.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 151)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying has the earmarks of a proverb. As prudential wisdom, it would be appropriate on the lips of almost any sage and it could have entered the tradition at almost any point.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 492)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 6:39](#), [Matt 15:10-20](#).

35. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΜΝ ΔΟΜ ΝΤΕΟΥΑ ΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΗΕΙ
ΜΠΧΩΩΡΕ ΝCΧΙΤC ΝΧΝΑΖ ΕΙ ΜΗΤΙ ΝCΜΟΥΡ ΝΝΕCΘΙΧ (2) ΤΟΤΕ
CΝΑΠΩΩΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΠΕCΗΕΙ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(35) Jesus said: It is not possible for anyone to go into the strong man’s house (and) take it by force, unless he binds his hands; then will he plunder his house.	(35) Jesus said, “No one can enter the house of the strong man and wreck it without first tying that person’s hands. Thereafter, one can ransack the person’s house.”	40 [35]. Jesus says: “It is not possible for someone to enter the house of a strong man and do him violence if he has not tied his hands: <only> then will he plunder his house.”

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: “At the level of redaction the logion recalls 21.5-8, and at the level of tradition it strongly recalls both Mark 3:27 and Matt. 12:29/Luke 11:21-22 (= Q). It has a genetic connection with these passages. However, in contrast to the parallels mentioned it does not indicate the context, which there consists in the overcoming of Satan by Jesus.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 607)

Crossan writes: “This version is extremely close to Mark 3:27, much more than to Matt. 12:29 (against Schrage: 87). With regard to *form*, the external format is assertion rather than question in Mark and *Thomas*, against Matthew; (b) the internal format has three sections: general negation (‘not’/‘no one’), specific exception (‘unless’), direct result (‘then’), in Mark and *Thomas*, but only the last two in Matthew. With regard to *content*, and allowing for the syntactical and translational differences between Greek and Coptic, the main differences are that *Thomas* lacks ‘his goods’ and ‘first’ but contains ‘his hands,’ as against Mark. The Coptic text is ambiguous on the object of the intruder’s force: ‘him (or: it)’ in Guillaumont (1959:23), ‘it (or: him)’ in Wilson (Hennecke and Schneemelcher:1.515). But the meaning seems to demand the translation ‘take it by force,’ as in Lambdin (122), and this is again close to Mark. In summary, then, the differences between Mark and *Thomas* are performancial variations in content within a remarkably similar format.” (*In Fragments*, p. 190)

Funk and Hoover write: “Thomas preserves this saying, like many others, without any context. In Mark 3:27, the saying is related to the exorcism of demons. However, that may not have been its original reference. The Fellows gave the saying a pink rating because it is not likely to have been attributed to Jesus by the Christian community inasmuch as it is an image of violence. Further, it is attested in three independent sources, Mark, Q, and here in Thomas.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 493)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 21:3](#), [GThom 103](#), [Luke 11:14-23](#), [Matt 12:22-30](#), [Mark 3:23-27](#).

36. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΜΝCΙ ΡΟΟΥC ΞΙΝ ΖΤΟΟΥΕ ΩΑ ΡΟΥΖΕ ΔΥΩ ΞΙΝ
 ΖΙΡΟΥΖΕ ΩΑ ΖΤΟΟΥΕ ΧΕ ΟΥ ΠΕ(Τ)ΕΤΝΑΤΑΔC ΖΙΩΤΤΗΥΤΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(36) Jesus said: Be not anxious from morning to evening and from evening to morning about what you shall put on.

(36) Jesus said, "Do not worry from dawn to dusk and from dusk to dawn about what you (plur.) will wear."

41 [36]. Jesus says: "Have no care, from morning to evening and from evening to morning, about what you shall put on."

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

["...] from morning to [evening and] from evening [to mor]ning, nor for [yo]ur [food] that you shall ea[t, nor for your] cloth[ing] that you shall put on. [You are mu]ch super[ior] to the lilies which gor and do [not sp]in. If you have a garment, what do you la[ck?] Who can add to your height? He himself will give you your clothing!"

(36) [Jesus said, "Do not be concerned] from morning [until evening and] from evening [until] morning, neither [about] your [food] and what [you will] eat, [nor] about [your clothing] and what you [will] wear. [You are far] better than the [lilies] which [neither] card nor [spin]. As for you, when you have no garment, what [will you put on]? Who might add to your stature? He it is who will give you your cloak."

Scholarly Quotes

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: "The thirty-sixth Coptic saying, which corresponds to this Oxyrhynchus fragmentary text, is much shorter than the Greek. It may represent a different Greek recension of the Gospel or a deliberate shortening of the text in the Coptic. At any rate, we can only use the Coptic as a control for the restoration of the first few lines of the Greek text." (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 406)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Do not worry about what you will wear (Matthew 6:25; Luke 12:22). 'Morning and evening' are presumably Thomas's substitutes for 'the morrow' of Matthew 6:34. In the Greek version more quotations from the gospels are provided (Matthew 6:25, 28, 27; Luke 12:22, 27, 25). This fact may suggest that the editor of Coptic Thomas wanted to remove such obvious traces of his sources." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 152)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: "There is no reason why this form of the saying should not be given the same degree of authenticity that is accorded the canonical versions. E. Jacquier (*RB* 15 [1918] 116) regarded it as authentic, but J. Jeremias (*Unknown Sayings*, 86) would consider only the last three lines as authentic. He rejects the rest because he makes of this and the following saying but one unit. Since the following saying is marked with Gnostic ideas on sexual asceticism, it is not to be regarded as authentic (*ibid.*, 17). However, I do not believe that these two sayings should be treated as one. The change of subject in line 17 is the beginning of a new saying, as is now evident from several similar cases in the Coptic version. See note on Oxy P 654:32. This saying deals only with excessive solicitude for food and clothing and the correct dependence that the Christian should have on the Father." (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 407)

Funk and Hoover write: "Verses 3-4 are gnostic additions. Thomas 37 is actually an expansion on these remarks, although 36:3-4 are preserved only in Greek Thomas. The notion that humans will

return to the primordial state of sexual non-differentiation when they put off the body (their clothes) is congenial to the developing gnostic trend. These additions provide a peculiar setting for the sayings in vv. 1-2, but they seem not to have led to the revision of the primary sayings.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 493)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The key to the history of the tradition is provided by that part of the Greek version which goes beyond the Coptic translation. It contains, first, a modification of the Coptic version (underlined); secondly, at the end (= vv. 3-4), a Gnostic interpretation (the symbol of the garment); and thirdly, before that, a part (= v. 2) which recalls Matt. 6.25-31/Luke 12.22-29). As the Gnostic part is certainly secondary, the same conclusion may be drawn about the other pieces. The Coptic translation is probably an abbreviation of a Greek version.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 608)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy655 36](#), [Luke 12:22-34](#), [Matt 6:25-34](#), [DialSav 51-52](#).

37. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΝΕΦΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ ΑΥ ΝΖΟΥ ΕΚΝΑΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ
 ΝΑΝ ΑΥΩ ΑΥ ΝΖΟΥ ΕΝΑΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΚ (2) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΖΟΤΑΝ
 ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΚΕΚ ΤΗΥΤΝ ΕΖΗΥ ΜΠΕΤΝΩΠΤΕ ΑΥΩ ΝΤΕΤΝΦΙ
 ΝΝΕΤΝΩΤΗΝ ΝΤΕΤΝΚΑΑΥ ΖΑ ΠΕCΗΤ ΝΝΕΤΝΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ ΝΘΕ
 ΝΝΙΚΟΥΕΙ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΩΗΜ ΝΤΕΤΝΧΟΠΧΠ ΜΜΟΥ (3) ΤΟΤΕ
 (ΤΕΤ)ΝΑΝΑΥ ΕΠΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΕΤΟΝΖ ΑΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΑΡ ΖΟΤΕ ΑΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(37) His disciples said: On what day will you be revealed to us, and on what day shall we see you? Jesus said: When you unclothe yourselves and are not ashamed, and take your garments and lay them beneath your feet like the little children (and) trample on them, then [you will see] the Son of the Living One, and you will not be afraid.

(37) His disciples said, “When will you be shown forth to us and when shall we behold you?” Jesus said, “When you strip naked without being ashamed, and take your garments and put them under your feet like little children and tread upon them, then [you] will see the child of the living. And you will not be afraid.”

42 [37]. His disciples say to him: “On what day wilt thou appear to us, and what day shall we see thee?” Jesus says: “When you strip yourselves without being ashamed, when you take off your clothes and lay them at your feet like little children and trample on them! Then [you will become] children of Him who is living, and you will have no more fear.”

Oxyrhynchus Greek Fragment

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

His disciples say to him: “When wilt thou appear to us, and when shall we see thee?” He says <to them:> “When you strip yourselves and are not ashamed [...]”

(37) His disciples said to him, “When will you become revealed to us and when shall we see you?” He said, “When you disrobe and are not ashamed [...afraid].”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “Compare Gospel of the Egyptians 5 (cited at saying 22); Hippolytus, Refutation of All Heresies 5.8.44 (cited at saying 21); Gospel of Thomas 21; especially Manichaean Psalm Book 99,26-30; ‘The saying (or, word) of Jesus the redeemer came to [me (?), as] is appropriate: “The vain garment of this flesh I have stripped off, and I am saved and purified; I have caused the clean feet of my soul to trample upon it confidently; with the gods that are clothed with Christ have I stood in line.”’ This list text, like saying 37, combines referenecs to stripping and to trampling. In his article ‘The Garments of Shame,’ Jonathan Z. Smith argues that such stripping and trampling reflect early Christian baptismal practice.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 84-85)

Gospel of Philip 75:21-25 states: “The living water is a body. It is fitting that we put on the living person. For this reason, when one is about to go down to the water, one strips so that one may put on that one (that is, the living person).”

Cyril of Jerusalem in Mystagogical Catechesis 2.2 states: “So then, once you entered, you took off your garment, and this was an image of taking off the old person with its deeds. Having taken this off, you were naked. . . . How marvelous! You were naked in the sight of all and were not ashamed. For truly you were bearing a copy of the first-formed Adam, who in paradise was naked and not ashamed.”

Augustine in Sermon 216.10-11 states on prebaptismal instruction: “In such great masses of troubles, then, clothe yourselves with goatskin and humble your souls through fasting. What is denied to pride is restored to humility. Indeed, when you were examined and the one who instigates flight and desertion was duly rebuked by the omnipotence of the awesome trinity, you were not clohted with goatskin, yet your feet sotod mystically upon it. Vices and skins of she-goats are to be trampled under foot; cloth from perverse kids is to be torn apart.”

Marvin Meyer writes: “As is hinted at by Cyril of Jerusalem, the ultimate source of these motifs of stripping and trampling may be the book of Genesis (2:25; 3:14-15). In their article ‘Stripped before God,’ April D. De Conick and Jarl Fossum concur that these motifs derive from the Genesis story, but they challenge Smith’s suggestion that saying 37 provides an interpretation of early Christian baptism. Instead, they note that stripping commonly refers to the removal of the fleshly body (compare saying 21), and trampling clothes ina childlike way may be understood as the renunciation of the flesh, so that the one who strips off and tramples upon clothes behaves like a child and achieves a childlike purity and innocence. De Conick and Fossum observe that in two Nag Hammadi documents, On the Anointing and Reality of the Rulers (‘Hypostasis of the Archons’), such trampling is said to aid in overcoming the world and the powers of the world, and in these two texts trampling is discussed in the context of anointing. Thus, they conclude, saying 37 describes the means employed (perhaps including anointing) for embracing purity and attaining a vision of the divine.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 85-86)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “This question recalls that put in the mouth of ‘Judas, not the Iscariot’ (most likely Judas Thomas, the alleged compiler of this Gospel), by the writer of the fourth canonical Gospel, ‘Master, how does it happen that you are going to show yourself to us and not to the world?’ (Jn 14:22).” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 410)

F. F Bruce writes: “The disciples’ question is reminiscent of the questions of Matthew 24.3 (cf. Mark 13.4; Luke 21.7) and Luke 17.20; but the answer is quite different from anything found in the canonical Gospels. As the primal sin in Eden was followed by a sense of shame at the awareness of being naked, so (it is implied) the restoration of primal innocence will be marked by the removal of

such a sense of shame. For the reference to small children cf. Saying 22; for ‘sons of the Living One’ cf. Saying 3.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 128)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Whereas in the Church’s gospels such questions are not really answered, Thomas answers them by stating that the kingdom has come; it need only be recognized. Here the disciples are to become ‘naked’ (Saying 21) by stripping off the body; they are to become ‘like little children.’ Such stripping is mentioned by the Naassenes (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 8, 44); while treading on the grament of shame was found in the Gospel of the Egyptians (Clement, *Strom.*, 3, 92, 2). The disciples will be ‘sons of the Living Father’ (see Saying 2).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 153)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “In this saying, at least as it is preserved for us in the Coptic version, we find the characteristic Gnostic ideas about sexual asceticism that were current in the second and third centuries A.D. These ideas force us to classify this saying in the category of J. Jeremias’ ‘tendentious inventions’.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 410)

Funk and Hoover write: “The removal of one’s clothes can be understood in different ways, as we noted in the comments on Thom 21:4. It may be interpreted as an allusion to Christian baptism, where the naked candidate is reborn; it may be understood as a return to the heavenly state in which humans have shed their bodies; or it may denote the primordial state of androgyny in which the sexes are not differentiated. It is striking that in 37:3 Jesus speaks about himself; this is rare among sayings attributable to Jesus. His response is, of course, correlative with the question posed in the introduction in 37:1, which presupposes an understanding of Jesus as the messenger from heaven - a typical Thomean perspective. These sayings are not correctly attributed to Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 494)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy655 37](#), [GThom 21:1-2](#), [DialSav 51-52](#), [DialSav 84-85](#).

38. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΖΑΖ ΝCΟΠ ΔΤΕΤΝΡΕΠΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ ΕCΩΤΜ
 ΔΝΕΕΙΩΔΧΕ ΝΔΕΙ ΕΓΧΩ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΝΗΤΝ ΔΥΩ ΜΝΤΗΤΝ ΚΕΟΥΑ
 ΕCΟΤΜΟΥ ΝΤΟΟΤΦ (2) ΟΥΝ ΖΝΖΟΟΥ ΝΔΩΩΠΕ ΝΤΕΤΝΩΙΝΕ
 ΝCΩΕΙ ΤΕΤΝΑΖΕ ΔΝ ΕΡΟΕΙ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(38) Jesus said: Many times have you desired to hear these words which I speak to you, and you have no other from whom to hear them. Days will come when you will seek me (and) you will not find me.

(38) Jesus said, "On many occasions you (plur.) have wanted to hear these sayings that I am saying unto you. And you have no one else to hear them from. Days will come when you will seek me, and you will not find me."

43 [38]. Jesus says: "You have desired many times to hear these words which I say to you, but you could not find anyone else from whom to hear them. The days will come when you will seek me, and when you will not find me."

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

"(only a few letters of this passage remain)."

(38) [Jesus] said, "[Many times have you desired to hear these words of mine], and [you have no one else to hear (them) from. There will be] days [when you will look for me and will not find me]."

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "The second-century Marcosians, according to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.*, 1, 20, 2), quoted this saying in a slightly different form. 'Many times they desired to hear on of these words, and they had no one to tell them.' The saying may be based on Luke 17:22: 'The days will come when you desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and you will not see.' As usual, Thomas - or a predecessor - changes what is future in the gospels to present and past. 'The days will come' (Luke) when 'you will seek me and will not find me' (John 7:34). Here the gospel picture of something future is retained, perhaps because to Gnosticism the eschatological emphasis of Christianity could not be entirely dropped." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 153-154)

Manichaean Psalm Book 187:28-29 states: "I have something to say, I have no one to whom to say it."

Acts of John 98 states: "John, there must be one person to hear these things from me, for I need one who is going to hear."

Cyprian in Three Books of Testimonies to Quirinius 3.29 states: "For a time will come and you will seek me, both you and those who will come after, to hear a word of wisdom and understanding, and you will not find (me)."

Funk and Hoover write: “In v. 1, Jesus speaks as the redeemer who has descended to earth and ascended to heaven, a scenario central to gnostic myth and speculative wisdom theology. This saying indicates that at a very early date followers of Jesus began to think of him in highly developed mythological terms. The judgment of the Fellows about Thom 38:1 was a unanimous black designation.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 494)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Verse 1 has an approximate parallel in Matt. 13.16-17/Luke 10.23-24 (=Q). For v. 2 cf. John 7.34. The logion tried to cope with the absence of Jesus (v. 2) and the disciples’ wish to hear the words of the living Jesus (cf. Prologue; 2; 92.1). It fits the situation of the Thomas community well.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 609)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy655 38](#), [Luke 10:23-24](#), [Luke 17:22](#), [Matt 13:10-17](#), [John 7:32-36](#), [Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.20.2](#).

39. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΜΦΑΡΙCΑΙΟC ΜΝ ΝΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥC ΑΥΧΙ
 ΝΨΑΨΤ ΝΤΓΝΩCΙC ΑΥΖΟΠΟΥ (2) ΟΥΤΕ ΜΠΟΥΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΑΥΩ
 ΝΕΤΟΥΩΨ ΕΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΜΠΟΥΚΑΑΥ (3) ΝΤΩΤΝ ΔΕ ΨΩΠΕ
 ΜΦΡΟΝΙΜΟC ΝΘΕ ΝΝΖΟΨ ΑΥΩ ΝΑΚΕΡΑΙΟC ΝΘΕ ΝΝΩΡΟΜΠΕ

BLATZ

(39) Jesus said: The Pharisees and the scribes have taken the keys of knowledge (and) have hidden them. They did not go in, and those who wished to go in they did not allow. But you, be wise as serpents and innocent as doves.

LAYTON

(39) Jesus said, “The Pharisees and the Scribes have taken the keys to acquaintance and hidden them. They have neither entered nor let those who want to enter enter. You (plur.), then, be as shrewd as snakes and as innocent as doves.”

DORESSE

44 [39]. Jesus says: “The Pharisees and the scribes have taken the keys of knowledge and hidden them: they have not entered, and neither have they permitted <entry> to those who wished to enter. But you, be prudent as serpents and simple as doves!”

ATTRIDGE - Oxyrhynchus

DORESSE - Oxyrhynchus

[...have] taken [the key] of [knowledge <gnosis> and have] hidden [it:] they [have not] entered; [and those who wished] to enter, [they] have not [...]

(39) [Jesus said, “The pharisees and the scribes have taken the keys] of [knowledge (gnosis) and] hidden [them. They themselves have not] entered, [nor have they allowed to enter those who were about to] come in. [You], however, [be wise as serpents and as] innocent [as doves].”

Scholarly Quotes

Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 2.30.1 states: “Similarly also he attacks the scribes and Pharisees during the last period of his teaching, charging them with improper actions and incorrect teaching,

and with hiding the key of knowledge that they received, handed down from Moses, by which the gate of the heavenly kingdom may be opened.”

F. F. Bruce writes: “The saying (the Greek original of which is preserved fragmentarily in P. Oxy. 655. 3) is practically identical in its first part with Luke 11.52 and in its second part with Matthew 10.16b. The ‘knowledge’ (*gnosis*) of the first part was probably interpreted in a Gnostic sense; the same idea is expressed in Saying 102. As for the second part, the Naassenes or Ophites (from the Hebrew and Greek words for ‘serpent’, *nahash* and *ophis* respectively) may have seen special significance in the ‘prudence’ of the serpent.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 129)

J. D. Crossan writes: “Of the twelve lines in this saying’s Greek version, the first two are totally missing and the others contain only from two to five letters at the start of each line. Nevertheless, when the Greek text is restored in the light of the Coptic translation, it agrees substantially with its content (Hofius: 191; Kraft: 255; Fitzmyer, 1974:413-414). I give it in Fitzmyer’s restoration and translation, but indicating the lacunae involved: [‘Jesus says, “The Pharisees and the scribes have] re[ceived the keys] of [knowledge and have] hid[den them; neither have they] enter[ed nor permitted those who would] enter. [But you] bec[ome wi]se a[s the serpents and g]uileless [as the do]v[es]’ (see also Hennecke and Schneemelcher: 1.112-113).” (*In Fragments*, p. 33)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “While E. Jacquier (*RB* 15 [1918] 117) was inclined to regard this saying as authentic, it is much more likely that in its present form it is a conflation of two canonical sayings.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, p. 414)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Fitzmyer thinks this a conflation of two canonical sayings, but once again it may be doubted if the solution is quite so simple. The scribes and Pharisees (in that order) come from Matthew, the key (singular) of knowledge from Luke; but Luke has ‘taken away the key’ and the saying is addressed to the scribes. Moreover, the final sentence of this section again comes from Matthew; Luke has ‘prevented’ for ‘did not allow.’ In addition, the text of Thomas shows some relation to the quotations of this saying in various documents of early Christian literature. Harnack and Michelson had already linked the Greek fragment with the ps.-Clementines. Here the possibility of independent tradition would accordingly appear to merit further investigation.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 75-76)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse [wise as serpents] derives from Matt. 10.16b, for that passage is redactional. But in that case it is also probable that vv. 1-2 are dependent on Matt. 23.13, all the more so as in both Thomas and Matthew this saying is directed against the Pharisees and scribes (Luke: against experts in the law).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 609)

Funk and Hoover write: “Matthew and Thomas direct this saying against Pharisees and scholars; Luke against legal experts. In Thomas the saying is a warning; in Matthew and Luke it is a condemnation. Matthew accuses the Judean leaders of slamming the door of Heaven’s domain in people’s faces; in Luke and Thomas the leaders are accused of confiscating the key or keys of knowledge and preventing others from discovering them. The ‘keys of knowledge’ probably referred to special rules used to interpret scripture, possibly to confirm a particular sectarian understanding.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 495)

Helmut Koester writes: “In this saying, Thomas mentions explicitly the Pharisees and scribes. ‘Scribes and Pharisees’ (Matt 23:12) is most likely the designation used in Q, rather than the typically Lukan ‘lawyers.’ On the other hand, the notorious Matthean addition ‘hypocrites’ (fourteen times in Matthew) is missing in *Gos. Thom.* 39. Thomas preserves the original form of this saying.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 92)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying [Sly as a snake], which may have been proverbial, is a paradox: it advises one to be both a dove and a snake at the same time, which is a combination of two incompatible things. Its paradoxical character commended it to the Fellows as something Jesus might have said. On the other hand, the contexts in both Matthew (10:16) and Thomas afford no clues to how Jesus may have applied it. The admonition may refer to the combination of shrewdness combined with modesty.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 495)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy655 39](#), [GThom 102](#), [Luke 11:52](#), [Matt 23:13](#), [Matt 10:16](#).

40. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΟΥΒΕΝΕΛΟΟΛΕ ΑΥΤΟC ΜΠCΑ ΝΒΟΛ ΜΠΕΙΩΤ
 (2) ΑΥΩ ΕCΤΑΧΡΗΥ ΑΝ CΕΝΑΠΟΡΚC ΖΑ ΤΕCΝΟΥΝΕ ΝCΤΑΚΟ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(40) Jesus said: A vine has been planted outside of the Father; and since it is not established, it will be plucked out with its roots (and) will perish.

(40) Jesus said, “A grapevine has been planted outside the father. And because it is not sound, it will be plucked out by the root and will perish.”

45 [40]. Jesus says: “A vine shoot was planted outside the Father. It did not grow strong: it will be plucked up from the root and it will perish.”

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: “These verses come close to Matt. 15.13. Verse 2a is not contained in Matt. 15.13, but can well be understood as an elaboration by Gnostics who are concerned with inner fortification. Similarly, the use of ‘vine’ instead of ‘planting’ is not a reason for dismissing a genetic relationship to the text of Matthew. A dependence of this logion on Matthew is virtually certain, for Matt. 15.13 derives from Matthean redaction.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 610)

Funk and Hoover write: “This is another illustration of a proverb that Jesus may have adopted. Vines planted without the assistance of the Father will not survive; they will be pulled up by the roots. The reference to being pulled up by the roots gives a slight apocalyptic tinge to the saying. This nuance is, of course, alien to Thomas.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 495)

Funk’s Parallels

[Matt 15:10-20](#), [John 15:1-17](#), [Ign. Trall. 11.1-2](#), [Ign Phld. 3.1-3](#).

41. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤΕΥΝΤΑÇ ΖΝ ΤΕÇΘΙΧ CΕΝΑ† ΝΑÇ (2)
 ΑΥΩ ΠΕΤΕ ΜΝΤΑÇ ΠΚΕΩΗΜ ΕΤΟΥΝΤΑÇ CΕΝΑÇΙΤÇ ΝΤΟΟΤÇ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
<p>(41) Jesus said: He who has in his hand, to him shall be given; and he who has not, from him shall be taken even the little that he has.</p>	<p>(41) Jesus said, "The person who possesses will be given more. And the person who does not have will be deprived of even the little that that person has."</p>	<p>46 [41]. Jesus says: "To him who has in his hand, <more> will be given. But from him who has not, <even> the little he has will be taken away!"</p>

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: "These verses have parallels in Mark 4.25 and Matt. 25.29/Luke 19.26 (= Q). Thomas diverges from them in two points: (a) in v. 1 he reads 'in his hand' (cf. 9.1; 17; 21.10; 22.6; 35.1; 98.2) and (b) in v. 2 'the little'. The saying is a common proverb. How it was read by Gnostics is shown for example by Gospel of Philip 105: 'Is it not fitting for all who have all this also to know themselves? But some, if they do not know themselves, will not enjoy what they have. The others, who have come to know themselves, will enjoy them (= their possessions).'" (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 610)

J. D. Crossan writes: "The addition of 'in his hand' may be redactional, since *Thomas* seems to have a particular liking for 'hand' (17, 21c, 22b, 35, 98; see Menard, 1975: 142). The other change is of more significance. The negative stich is again qualified: 'even the little he has.' It is also possible that *Gos. Thom.* 70 is a much more gnostic version of this saying (Grant and Freedman: 147)." (*In Fragments*, p. 201)

Funk and Hoover write: "This saying in Thomas betrays no dependence on the canonical gospels; it represents an independent tradition. The Q form is recorded by Luke at the conclusion of the parable of the money in trust (Luke 19:26): 'I tell you, to everyone who has, more will be given; and from those who don't have, even what they do have will be taken away.' Mark has a slightly different version in Mark 4:25: 'In fact, to those who have, more will be given, and from those who don't have, even what they do have will be taken away!' Thomas exhibits two minor additions: the words 'in hand' in the first line, and the phrase 'the little' in the last line are unique to Thomas. The additional words do not help clarify the original context of the saying, if indeed it is more than a general maxim that was universally applicable." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 496)

Funk's Parallels

[GThom 70](#), [Luke 8:18](#), [Luke 19:11-27](#), [Matt 13:10-13](#), [Matt 25:14-30](#), [Mark 4:24-25](#).

42. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΡΠΑΡΑΓΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(42) Jesus said: Become passers-by!

(42) Jesus said, “Be passersby.”

47 [42]. Jesus says: “You must be <as> passers-by!”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “This saying may also be translated ‘Be wanderers’; compare descriptions in early Christian literature of wandering teachers and missionaries. Another possible but less likely translation is, ‘Come into being as you pass away’; compare the use of the same word *parage* as ‘pass away’ in the first riddle in saying 11, and other statements similar to this translation of saying 42 (for example, 2 Corinthians 4:16; Acts of John 76: ‘Die so that you may live’). Tjitze Baarda, ‘Jesus Said: Be Passers-By,’ suggests yet another possible translation, ‘Be Hebrews,’ with the understanding of Philo of Alexandria that the word ‘Hebrews’ may be taken as ‘migrants.’ A medieval author, Petrus Alphonsi, preserves a saying much like saying 42 in his Clerical Instruction: ‘This world is, as it were, a bridge. Therefore, pass over it, only do not lodge there.’ A very similar saying attributed to Jesus is preserved in the form of an Arabic inscription at the site of a mosque at Fatehpur-Sikri, India.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 87)

William R. Schoedel translates, “Jesus said: Come into being as you pass away.” Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Presumably the saying has much the same meaning as Paul’s words (2 Corinthians 4:16): ‘If our outer man is perishing, our inner man is renewed day by day.’” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 155)

Bentley Layton writes: “participle of the Greek verb *paragein*, ‘to go past (something or someone).’ Epitaphs on Greek tombstones of the period often salute the ‘stranger’ or ‘passerby’ (usually called *ksenos* or *parodites*), as though in the words of the corpse buried in the tomb. Cf. no. 56. The saying may also be a recommendation of the life of a wandering ascetic, like St. Thomas in *The Acts of Thomas*.” (*The Gnostic Scriptures*, p. 387)

M. A. Williams writes: “Saying 42 of *Gos. Thom.* offers the laconic admonition ‘Become passersby,’ which might be read as advocating the lifestyle of the solitary, itinerant ascetic, and this may favor the conclusion that we should hear the connotation of solitary asceticism in at least the Greek term *monachos* in this gospel.” (*Rethinking “Gnosticism”*, p. 140)

Helmut Koester writes: “There are many sayings in Thomas (a number of these shared with the canonical Gospels) which specify the kind of behavior and mode of living in the world that is appropriate to those who are truly ‘children of the Father.’ At the heart of this life style is a social radicalism that rejects commonly held values. The sayings speak of rejecting the ideal of a settled life in house and home, and they require itineracy: [42].” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 127)

F. F. Bruce writes: “In other words, do not settle down here. These words are later ascribed to Jesus in some strands of Muslim tradition (although in other strands they are ascribed to Muhammad or to one of his companions). The most famous instance of their ascription to Jesus in Muslim tradition is on the main gateway of the mosque erected in 1601 at Fathpur-Sikri, south of Delhi, by the Moghul Akbar the Great; it bears the inscription: ‘Jesus, on whom be peace, said: “This world is a bridge. Pass over it; but do not build your dwelling there.”’” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 130)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “In favour of its primitive character Jeremias quotes a saying from the Mishnah, while Bauer adduces a parallel in the *Disciplina Clericalis* of Petrus Alfonsi in the twelfth century. Bauer also refers to 1 John ii. 17 and I Corinthians vii. 31 for the idea of the transitory character of this world and its desires; it may be appropriate to recall those passages in the New Testament which speak of Christians as strangers and sojourners, whose citizenship is in heaven (e.g. I Peter i. 1, ii. 11, Phil. iii. 20).” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 104)

J. D. Crossan writes: “As with the saying in *Gos. Thom.* 42, ‘Become passers-by,’ so also does this saying [86] bespeak a homelessness for humanity within this world.” (*In Fragments*, p. 241)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying is short, pithy, aphoristic in tone, and open to plural interpretations. It coheres with other sayings attributed to Jesus in which he advocates a mendicant or countercultural lifestyle: ‘Be passersby’ suggests to some a life spent consorting with toll collectors and sinners, in eating and drinking, in homeless itinerancy. These aspects prompted half of the Fellows to vote red or pink.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 496)

Funk and Hoover write: “The saying occurs only in Thomas. It can therefore also be understood as a creation of Thomas in which this evangelist counsels detachment from the world, one of his favorite themes (21:6; 27:1; 56:1-2; 80:1-2; 110; 111:3). On this understanding, it does not merely reflect a certain lifestyle, it dictates one. The other half of the Fellows were therefore inclined to the view that this saying represents an attempt on the part of the community to define its patterns of social behavior, as a way of distinguishing itself from the rest of the world. The Fellows who took this view voted gray or black.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 496)

Funk’s Parallels

[2 Cor 4:16](#), [Acts of John 76](#), [Petrus Alphonsi](#).

43. (1) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑϞ Ν̄ΟΙ ΝΕϞΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ Ν̄ΤΑΚ ΝΙΜ ΕΚΧΩ Ν̄ΝΑΙ
 ΝΑΝ (2) Ζ̄Ν ΝΕΨΩ Μ̄ΜΟΟΥ ΝΗΤ̄Ν Ν̄ΤΕΤ̄ΝΕΙΜΕ ΑΝ ΧΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΙΜ
 (3) ΑΛΛΑ Ν̄ΤΩΤ̄Ν ΑΤΕΤ̄ΝΩΠΕ Ν̄ΘΕ Ν̄ΝΗΟΥΔΑΙΟΣ ΧΕ ΣΕΜΕ
 Μ̄ΠΩΗΝ ΣΕΜΟΤΕ Μ̄ΠΕΚΑΡΠΟΣ ΑΥΩ ΣΕΜΕ Μ̄ΠΚΑΡΠΟΣ
 ΣΕΜΟΤΕ Μ̄ΠΩΗΝ

BLATZ

(43) His disciples said to him: Who are you, that you say these things to us? <Jesus said to them:> From what I say to you, do you not know who I am? But you have become like the Jews; for they love the tree (and) hate its fruit, and they love the fruit (and) hate the tree.

LAYTON

(43) His disciples said to him, “Who are you, since you say these things to us?” <Jesus said to them>, “Do you (plur.) not understand who I am from the things I am saying to you? Rather, you have come to be like Jews. For they love the tree, and hate its fruit. And they love the fruit, and hate the tree.

DORESSE

48 [43]. His disciples said to him: “Who art thou, who tellest us these things?” “By the things that I tell you, do you not recognise who I am? But you yourselves have become like the Jews: they like the tree and detest the fruit, they like the fruit and detest the tree!”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “In this saying we have a highly artificial construction. It takes its point of departure from John 8:25, where the Jews ask Jesus who he is; they know neither him nor his Father (John 8:19). Thomas has transferred the question to the disciples so that Jesus can say that they are ‘like the Jews.’ The Jews do not understand that the nature of the tree is identical with that of the fruit (Matthew 7:16-20; Luke 6:43-44). And in both Matthew and Luke the discussion of trees and fruits is followed by a rebuke to those who call Jesus ‘Lord’ but do not obey him. It looks as if Thomas has consciously tried to make his meaning more mysterious than that reflected in the gospels.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 156)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This disciples’ question is like that of the Jews to Jesus in John 8.25; Jesus’s answer, with its implied insistence that tree and fruit are of the same kind (cf. Saying 45), may be derived from the saying in Matthew 7.16-20 and Luke 6.43 f. The anti-Jewish sentiment recognizable in several places throughout the *Gospel of Thomas* becomes quite explicit here.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 130)

Funk and Hoover write: “This exchange between Jesus and his disciples is polemical, as the hostile question in v. 1 indicates. Jesus responds by comparing the disciples to Judeans. The figure of speech employed draws on a common proverb to the effect that there is no separating the fruit from the tree it grows on. A comparable figure of speech is employed in Thom 45:1-4 and its many parallels.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 497)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “With an image corresponding to 45.1, in v. 3 Jesus compares the disciples with Jews who want to separate tree and fruit or fruit and tree. However, for the disciples it is a matter of knowing Jesus exclusively from his words (v. 2) as they are to be found in the Gospel of Thomas.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 611)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 6:43-45](#), [Matt 7:15-20](#), [Matt 12:33](#).

44. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤΑΧΕ ΟΥΑ ΔΠΕΙΩΤ CΕΝΑΚΩ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑϢ
(2) ΑΥΩ ΠΕΤΑΧΕ ΟΥΑ ΕΠΩΗΡΕ CΕΝΑΚΩ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑϢ (3)
ΠΕΤΑΧΕ ΟΥΑ ΔΕ ΔΠΠΝΑ ΕΤΟΥΑΔΒ CΕΝΑΚΩ ΔΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑϢ
ΟΥΤΕ ΖΜ ΠΚΑΖ ΟΥΤΕ ΖΝ ΤΠΕ

BLATZ

(44) Jesus said: He who blasphemes against the Father will be forgiven, and he who blasphemes against the Son will be forgiven; but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either on earth or in heaven.

LAYTON

(44) Jesus said, “Whoever utters blasphemy against the father will be forgiven. And whoever utters blasphemy against the son will be forgiven. But whoever utters blasphemy against the holy spirit will not be forgiven - neither on earth nor in heaven.”

DORESSE

49 [44]. Jesus says: “He who has blasphemed the Father will be forgiven, and he who has blasphemed the Son will be forgiven: but he who has blasphemed the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven either on earth or in heaven.”

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: “This is a development of the saying found in Luke 12.10 (cf. also Mark 3.28 f.; Matthew 12.32). Whereas the canonical saying contrasts the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit with the relatively venial sin of blasphemy against the Son of Man, the *Gospel of Thomas* (surprisingly) adds blasphemy against the Father as relatively venial. The formulation is trinitarian, as that in the canonical Gospels is not. For the phrase ‘neither on earth nor in heaven’, cf. Matthew 12.32: ‘neither in this age nor in the age to come’. The *Gospel of Thomas* prefers a form of words which is not eschatological.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 131)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Blasphemy against the Father is presumably included in the ‘every blasphemy’ mentioned in the synoptic gospels (Matthew 12:31; Mark 3:28), and these gospels go on to state that blasphemy against the Son of Man is forgivable, while that against the Holy Spirit is not (also Luke 12:10). Thomas has changed ‘Son of Man’ to ‘Son’ (retained in Saying 86), and has changed Matthew’s eschatological words, ‘in this age or in the one to come,’ to ‘either on earth or in heaven’ (as in the Lord’s Prayer, Matthew 6:10). The sequence Father-Son-Holy Spirit reflects Christian teaching (cf., Matthew 28:19).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 156)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Grant and Freedman here assume a literalistic interpretation of the synoptic saying, which is to the effect that every blasphemy will be forgiven except that against the Holy Spirit. In this case, as they rightly say, the sequence Father-Son-Holy Spirit reflects Christian teaching. It may be, however, that there is more to be said on this subject, that the Gnostics in fact reversed the order of the sequence. In some systems at least ‘Father’ is a title of the Demiurge, while in the Apocryphon of John the supreme God is described as the Holy Spirit. Moreover, one of the Nag Hammadi texts bears the title ‘The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit,’ which seems to point in the same direction. If this be correct, the meaning would be that every blasphemy will be forgiven save that against the supreme God, which is at least consistent—despite the initial shock to orthodox Christian readers. Elsewhere, it is true, we seem to have a triad of Father, Mother and Son, in which the Holy Spirit is the Mother, but it may be that we have here two different theories emanating from different systems of thought. In any case some Gnostics were not slow to adopt any views which might serve their purpose, without regard for absolute consistency.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 39-40)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “These verses have a tripartite symmetrical structure. The logion has parallels in Mark 3.28-29 and Matt. 13.32/Luke 12.10 (= Q). Only v. 1, the blasphemy against the Father, is not contained in any of the parallels mentioned. It may well have been added for reasons of symmetry and because of the doctrine of the Trinity which was developing in orthodoxy. Thomas can keep the focus on the impossibility of forgiving blasphemy against the Holy Spirit because for him this is the spark of light which guarantees the redemption of the Gnostic.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 612)

Helmut Koester writes: “Luke 12:10 is considered to be closest to the original Q version by most scholars; however, ‘Son of man’ as a title of Jesus would have to be assigned to a later stage of Q. But even here it remains extremely awkward. The best solution is to assume that Q, like Mark, was originally speaking about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, uttered by ‘a son of man’ = any human being, and that ‘son of man’ was later misunderstood as a title of Jesus. In the collection of sayings used by the *Gospel of Thomas* this saying probably was formulated like Mark 3.28-29; the elaboration in *Gos. Thom.* 44 is then best explained as an independent development. The final phrase which *Gos. Thom.* 44 and Matt 12:32 share may have been an original part of Q.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 93)

Funk and Hoover write: “According to Thomas, blasphemies against the Father and against the son will be forgiven; only blasphemies against the holy spirit will not be forgiven. Thomas agrees with the other versions regarding blasphemies against the holy spirit, and Thomas supports the Q version in making blasphemies against the son (of Adam) forgivable. Unique to Thomas is the assertion that blasphemies against the Father are forgivable. This runs counter to the Israelite and Judean respect for God and the divine name. Note especially the provisions of the Community Order (cols. 6-7) found among the Dead Sea Scrolls . . . The Thomas version mentions Father, son, and holy spirit, which appears to reflect the trinitarian formula of emerging orthodox Christianity.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 497)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 12:10](#), [Matt 12:31-32](#), [Mark 3:28-30](#), [Did 11:7](#).

45. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΜΑΥΧΕΛΕ ΕΛΟΟΛΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΨΟΝΤΕ ΟΥΤΕ
 ΜΑΥΚΩΤC ΚΝΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ CΡΘΑΜΟΥΛ ΜΑΥ† ΚΑΡΠΟC ΓΑΡ (2)
 ΟΥΑΓΑΘΟC ΠΡΩΜΕ ΨΑΧΕΙΝΕ ΝΟΥΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΕΧΕΖΟ (3)
 ΟΥΚΑΚ(ΟC) ΠΡΩΜΕ ΨΑΧΕΙΝΕ ΝΖΝΠΤΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΕΧΕΖΟ
 ΕΘΟΟΥ ΕΤΖΝ ΠΕΧΖΗΤ ΑΥΩ ΝΨΧΩ ΝΖΝΠΤΟΝΗΡΟΝ (4) ΕΒΟΛ ΓΑΡ
 ΖΜ ΦΟΥΟ ΜΦΗΤ ΨΑΧΕΙΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΖΝΠΤΟΝΗΡΟΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(45) Jesus said: Grapes are not harvested from thorn-bushes, nor are figs gathered from hawthorns, [f]or they yield no fruit. [A go]od man brings forth good from his treasure; a bad man brings forth evil things from his evil treasure, which is in his heart, and he says evil things, for out of the abundance of his heart he brings froth evil things.

(45) Jesus said, “Grapes are not harvested from thorn trees, nor are figs gathered from thorn bushes, for those do not bear fruit. Good people produce good from their store. Evil people produce wicked things from their evil store within their hearts, and say wicked things. For out of the heart’s abundance they produce wicked things.”

50 [45]. Jesus says: “Grapes are not gathered from thistles, and figs are not gathered from thorns: they do not give fruit! [. . . a] good man brings out of his barn what is good, but a wicked man brings out of his wicked barn—which is in his heart—evil <things>, and from them he sows evil, because <they are> evil <things that> he brings out of the abundance of his heart.”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “From the fruits mentioned in Saying 44, Thomas goes on to give other sayings on the same subject, beginning with Matthew 7:16 then continuing with its parallel Luke 6:44-45. Luke 6:45 is parallel to Matthew 12:35, which also puts the saying about “treasure” in the context of “saying things”; but the saying in Thomas can be explained simply on a combination of Matthew 7:16-19 with Luke 6:44-45. The Gnostic is presumably the one who brings forth good things.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 157)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Verses 1-3 have a close parallel in Luke 6.44b-45b and in Matt. 7.16b; 12.35; 12.34b. The sequence grapes/figs agrees with Matt. 7.16b against Luke 6.44b (figs/grapes). Verse 4 recalls Luke 6.45c. As this part of the verse derives from Lukan redaction, the same thing may be presumed for the whole Thomas logion, which is to be designated a mixed quotation.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 612)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 6:43-45](#), [Matt 7:15-20](#), [Matt 12:33-37](#).

46. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΧΙΝ ΑΔΑΜ ΩΑ ΙΩΖΑΝΝΗC ΠΒΑΠΤΙCΤΗC ΖΝ
 ΝΧΠΟ ΝΝΖΙΟΜΕ ΜΝ ΠΕΤΧΟCΕ ΔΙΩΖΑΝΝΗC ΠΒΑΠΤΙCΤΗC ΩΙΝΑ ΧΕ
 ΝΟΥΩΩΠ ΝΟΙ ΝΕΧΒΑΛ (2) ΔΕΙΧΟΟC ΔΕ ΧΕ ΠΕΤΝΑΩΩΠΕ ΖΝ
 ΤΗΥΤΝ ΕCΘ ΝΚΟΥΕΙ CΝΑCΟΥΩΝ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΔΥΩ CΝΑΧΙCΕ
 ΔΙΩΖΑΝΝΗC

LAYTON

DORESSE

BLATZ

(46) Jesus said: From Adam to John the Baptist there is among the children of women none higher than John the Baptist, for his eyes were not destroyed (?). But I have said: Whoever among you becomes small will know the kingdom and will be higher than John.

(46) Jesus said, “From Adam unto John the Baptist there has been none among the offspring of women who has been more exalted than John the Baptist, so that such a person’s eyes might be broken. But I have said that whoever among you (plur.) becomes a little one will become acquainted with the kingdom, and will become more exalted than John.”

51 [46]. Jesus says: “From Adam to John the Baptist, among those who have been born of women, there is none greater than John the Baptist! But for fear that the eyes <of such a one> should be lost I have said: He who among you shall be the small<est> shall know the Kingdom and be higher than John!”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This saying is adapted from Matthew 11:11-12 (Luke 7:28), where we read that ‘No one has arisen, among those born of women, greater than John the Baptist; but the least [smallest] in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he’; the next saying begins with the words ‘From the days of John the Baptist’ - Thomas seems to have used these words as the model for his expression, ‘From Adam to John the Baptist.’ Thomas also changes ‘in the kingdom of heaven’ to ‘will understand the kingdom.’ The words, ‘so that his eyes will not’ (Doresse supplies ‘lose themselves’) are incomprehensible.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 158)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The Synoptic parallels here are Matthew xi. 11 and Luke vii. 28, but the words here rendered ‘so that his eyes will not be broken’ have so far baffled the commentators. Grant and Freedman plausibly suggest that the opening words are modelled on the following verse in Matthew (xi. 12), in which case Thomas has re-written the saying. One possible line of interpretation may be to link this saying with logion 22 and with the Synoptic sayings about children and the Kingdom. The enigmatic words about eyes may, perhaps, have some connection

with Matthew vi. 22 f., the passage about the ‘single eye’; eyes that are broken (or divided?) are no longer ‘single.’ If this be so, the saying would be a mosaic of Synoptic elements, but here we have clear signs of redaction, possibly of textual corruption, and almost certainly of confusion on the part of the translator. It must be remembered that our present Coptic text is probably a translation of a translation, and that in both versions it has been subjected to the vagaries of the scribe; moreover, the sayings have passed through a process of oral tradition, whether or not they are derived from our Gospels, and were originally uttered neither in Greek nor in Coptic, but in Aramaic. When we add the probability of redaction at the hands of one or more editors, who had ends of their own in view, the difficulties in the path of the investigator are manifest.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 62)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying is another version of a Q saying that appears in Matt 11:11//Luke 7:28. Fellows designated this saying gray, as they did the Q version. The first part of this saying, praising John, could well come from Jesus (his followers, who became rivals of the followers of John, would probably not have inveted it), but the second half suggests a time when John the Baptist was being devalued by the Christian movement.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 498)

J. D. Crossan writes: “This is another version of the saying found in Q/Matt. 11:11 = Luke 7:28, where the ‘least’ in the Kingdom is ‘greater’ than John. Baker has drawn attention to other versions of this aphorism in ‘the homilies that pass under the name of Macarius’ and which ‘continue to perplex scholars as to their true author, place of origin and sources’ although ‘recent work has brought strong arguments for Asia Minor and perhaps Syria as the place and the last quarter of the fourth century as the time of composition’ (215). Pseudo-Macarius’ versions speak first of the ‘least one’ (*mikroteros*) as being greater than John, then equate such with the ‘apostles,’ and conclude that such a ‘little one’ (*mikros*) is greater than John (Migne: 713CD). That final text is the same as the one found in *Gos. Thom.* 46b, since the Coptic word *kwi* can be translated either as ‘a child’ or ‘a little one.’ *Gos. Thom.* 46b therefore translates either ‘whichever one of you comes to be a child’ (Lambdin; see also Guillaumont *et al.*) or ‘he who shall be among you as a little one’ (Wilson, 1973:515). This change from ‘least one’ to ‘little one’ is significant, ‘for the New Testament wishes to say that all in the Kingdom are greater than John, therefore, even the least - *mikroteros*. Whereas the Gospel of Thomas and Macarius mean that only those who are small - *mikros* - are greater than John’ (Baker: 218) Quispel (1964) has explained the relationship between *Thomas* and Macarius by proposing ‘that Macarius most probably knew the *Gospel of Thomas* and alluded to it in his writings’ (227), and he concludes by asserting that he is ‘not in the least astonished that Macarius used the *Gospel of Thomas*, because so many Syrian writers before him had done the same’ (234).” (*In Fragments*, pp. 325-326)

J. D. Crossan concludes: “I consider, therefore, that there has been an infiltration from *Gos. Thom.* 22 into 46b, which (a) mitigates the denigration of John and (b) substitutes ‘shall know (be acquainted with) the Kingdom’ for ‘shall enter the Kingdom.’” (*In Fragments*, p. 326)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 22:2](#), [Luke 7:24-30](#), [Luke 18:17](#), [Matt 11:7-15](#), [Matt 18:3](#), [Mark 10:15](#).

47. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΜΝ ΘΟΜ ΝΤΕ ΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΤΕΛΟ ΑΖΤΟ CΝΑΥ
 ΝΦΧΩΑΚ ΜΠΙΤΕ CΝΤΕ (2) ΑΥΩ ΜΝ ΘΟΜ ΝΤΕ ΟΥΖΜΖΑΛ ΩΜΩΕ
 ΧΘΕΙC CΝΑΥ Η ΦΝΑΡΤΙΜΑ ΜΠΟΥΑ ΑΥΩ ΠΚΕΟΥΑ ΦΝΑΡΖΥΒΡΙΖΕ
 ΜΜΟΦ (3) ΜΑΡΕ ΡΩΜΕ CΕ ΡΤΑC ΑΥΩ ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ ΝΦΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ ΔCΩ
 ΗΡΤ ΒΒΡΡΕ (4) ΑΥΩ ΜΑΥΝΟΥΧ ΗΡΤ ΒΒΡΡΕ ΕΔCΚΟC ΝΑC ΧΕΚΑΔC
 ΝΝΟΥΠΩΖ ΑΥΩ ΜΑΥΝΕΧ ΗΡΤ ΝΑC ΕΔCΚΟC ΒΒΡΡΕ ΩΙΝΑ ΧΕ
 ΝΕΦΤΕΚΑΦ (5) ΜΑΥΧΑΘ ΤΘΕΙC ΝΑC ΑΩΤΗΝ ΝΩΔΕΙ ΕΠΕΙ ΟΥΝ
 ΟΥΠΩΖ ΝΑΩΩΠΕ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
<p>(47) Jesus said: It is not possible for a man to ride two horses or stretch two bows; and it is not possible for a servant to serve two masters, unless he honours the one and insults the other. No one drinks old wine and immediately desires to drink new wine. And new wine is not poured into old wineskins, lest they burst; nor is old wine poured into a new wineskin, lest it spoil. An old patch is not sewn on a new garment, for a rent would result.</p>	<p>(47) Jesus said, "A person cannot (at the same time) mount two horses or draw two bows. And a slave cannot serve two masters, but truly will honor the one and scoff at the other. No person drinks vintage wine and immediately desires to drink new wine. And new wine is not put into old wineskins lest they burst. And vintage wine is not put into new wineskins lest it go bad. And old patches are not sewed to new garments, for a rip will develop."</p>	<p>52 [47]. Jesus says: "It is not possible for a man to ride two horses, nor to draw two bows. And it is not possible for a servant to serve two masters: otherwise he will honour the one and the other will treat him harshly! Never does a man drink old wine and desire at the same instant to drink new wine; new wine is not poured into old wine-skins, in case they should burst, and old wine is not poured into new wine-skins, in case it should be spoiled. An old piece of cloth is not sown onto a new garment, for a tear would result."</p>

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: "The canonical saying about the impossibility of serving two masters (Matthew 6.24; Luke 16.13) is here amplified by two illustrations from life, and followed by sayings contrasting the old order and the new, sufficiently similar to Luke 5.36-39 (cf. Mark 2.21 f.; Matthew 9.16 f.), but with secondary deviations. The canonical counterparts do not speak of pouring old wine into new wine skins, or of patching a new garment with an old piece of cloth. These deviations are probably deliberate: the true Gnostic will not allow his new doctrine to be encumbered with relics from the past." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 132)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "An old patch is not put on a new garment; here Thomas changes the thought from that of the new patch and the old garment (Luke 5:36; Matthew 9:16; Mark 2:21), presumably because he is thinking of life in the new world (Saying 52)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 159)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "As v. 3 *certainly* came about from the use of Luke [5.39], the same conclusion follows for vv. 4-5. Thomas has reversed the order of Luke, which he has in front of him, as he had placed v. 3 with the key word 'wine' after vv. 1-2, and now Luke 5.37 automatically presented itself as

the next sentence with the same key word.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, pp. 613-614)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Quispel argues that the first part of this saying is not dependent on Q, but offers an independent translation from Aramaic. Bartsch, however, points out that the Coptic preserves a hint, obscured in the English translation, that the statement about the servant originally contained two members; *either* he will honour the one . . . (cf. Luke xvi. 13). Moreover, the words ‘honour’ and ‘offend,’ which Quispel takes as ‘elegant translations’ of the Aramaic underlying Matthew and Luke, could be regarded as summaries of the two words used in each case by the Synoptists. The claim that here we may have independent tradition is therefore in this case open to question.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 78)

Comparing Thomas to Matthew and Luke, Koester finds that the Thomas form is more original: “Most scholars would argue that ‘servant’ in Luke 16:13 is a later addition, while Matthew’s ‘no one’ is an accurate reproduction of the text of Q. However, the version of *Gos. Thom.* 47a-b stays completely within the limits of natural expansion of a popular proverb by prefixing the analogous examples of mounting two horses or stretching two bows. Thomas’s version, at the same time, shows no sign of the unnecessary duplication ‘hate the one and love the other’ and of the secondary application of the proverb (serving God and mammon). Both of these appear already in Q; thus *Gos. Thom.* 47b presents the form that this proverb would have had before it was incorporated into Q. Had Thomas read the final phrase in his text, he would certainly have incorporated it (cf. the rejection of worldly possessions in *Gos. Thom.* 110).” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 90)

Funk and Hoover write: “The order of sayings about patch and garment and wine wineskins is reversed in Thomas from the way they appear in the synoptic gospels. According to the saying in Thom 47:3-4, one does not pour young wine into old wineskins, since the old skins might burst, and one does not trust mature wine to young wineskins, since new skins tend to make the wine spoil. The synoptic version has undergone a Christian transformation, because the new has now been equated with the new Jesus movement. The version found in Mark 2:22 exhibits that transformation: ‘And nobody pours young wine into old wineskins, otherwise the wine will burst the skins, and destroy both the wine and the skins. Instead, young wine is for new wineskins.’ Concern for mature wine, such as we find in Luke 5:39 (‘nobody wants young wine after drinking aged wine’), has disappeared; attention is riveted on the fate of the new. The old wineskins represent the Judean religion, new wine the spirit-filled headiness of the Christian movement. The Thomas version was given the highest weighted average because there is no hint of a Christian revision of the saying.” (*The Five Gospels*, pp. 499-500)

J. D. Crossan writes of 47b: “From the combination of Mark and *Thomas* there arises the strong possibility that this double aphorism was originally a double-diptych or quadruple-stich aphorism with each diptych in reversed parallelism (abb’a’). This must be considered not only for *Gos. Thom.* 47b(2) on wine (Turner and Montefiore: 65; and see especially Nagel), but for both *Gos. Thom.* 47b(2 and 3) on wine and on cloth (Quispel, 1957:194-195). Thus the double diptych involved (a) a combination of two metaphors: cloth-patching and wine-storing; (b) with a different set of categories for each; (c) in chiastic arrangement: unshrunk/shrunk//shrunk/unshrunk and new/old//old/new. Two processes worked upon the original structure: (d) an internal process whereby the new/old categories eventually prevailed over the unshrunk/shrunk, and (e) an external process that found it appropriate to retain the new/old aspect but not the old/new side of each diptych. Finally, (f) the internal process has changed *Thomas* even more than Mark (where ‘unshrunk’ is still present), but the external process, with its concern for Jesus as the new, has changed Mark and Luke much more than *Thomas* (where ‘old/new’ is twice present). The only vestiges of old/new still visible in Mark or Luke is its residue within that concluding and unnecessary comment about ‘new win/new wineskins.’ But here, of course, old/new has become new/new.” (*In Fragments*, pp. 125-126)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 16:10-13](#), [Luke 5:33-39](#), [Matt 6:24](#), [Matt 9:14-17](#), [Mark 2:18-22](#), [2 Clem 6:1-6](#).

48. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΕΡΩΑ CΝΑΥ Ρ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΜΝ ΝΟΥΕΡΗΥ ΖΜ ΠΕΙΗΕΙ
ΟΥΩΤ CΕΝΑΧΟΟC ΜΠΤΑΥ ΧΕ ΠΩΩΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΛΥΩ ΧΝΑΠΩΩΝΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(48) Jesus said: If two make peace with one another in this one house, they will say to the mountain: Be removed, and it will be removed.

(48) Jesus said, “If two make peace with one another within a single house they will say to a mountain ‘go elsewhere’ and it will go elsewhere.”

53 [48]. Jesus says: “If two people are with each other in peace in the same house, they will say to the mountain: ‘Move!’ and it will move.”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “In form this saying is quite similar to Saying 103, where two, becoming one, become sons of men; they say, ‘Mountain, be removed!’ and it moves. We should infer that making peace with one another is the same thing as becoming one, and it also means becoming ‘sons of men.’ Doresse (page 175) notes that the combination then resembles Matthew 5:9; ‘Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.’ (Thomas as usual removes a mention of God.) There is another way of viewing Saying 49 by itself. It clearly begins with something like Matthew 18:19 (‘if two of you agree on earth’), and this verse is parallel to Mark 11:24; but the second part of the saying is parallel to the preceding verse in Mark. One must suppose that the author of Thomas gave close study to gospel parallels, or that he relied on an earlier document in which the parallels had been combined - such as the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, probably written between 150 and 170.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 160)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “In point of fact, Matthew xviii. 19 is not parallel to Mark xi. 24, and Quispel has claimed that neither Thomas nor the Diatessaron is dependent on the other; both rather go back to a common tradition. A pre-Tatianic harmony, if one existed, might have been used by Thomas, but the Diatessaron itself would in fact appear to be too late, considering the general character of the sayings in this gospel. Moreover, account must be taken of the point made by Puech, that this saying might appear to be no more than a combination of Matthew xviii. 19 and xxi. 21, but for the fact that it occurs also in the Syriac Didascalia, and therefore seems to belong to a distinct tradition. Quispel ascribes this form of the saying to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and a variant form which appears in logion 106 to the Gospel of the Egyptians: ‘When you make the two one, you shall become sons of man, and when you say: “Mountain, be moved,” it will be moved.’” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 79)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This is reminiscent of the promise of an affirmative answer to the prayer of any two who ‘agree on earth about anything they ask’ (Matthew 18.19). A similar promise in Mark 11.24, which does not specify ‘two’, is preceded by the words: ‘whoever says to this mountain, “Be taken up and cast into the sea”, and does not doubt in his heart, but believes that what he says will come to pass, it will be done for him’ (Mark 11.23). The *Gospel of Thomas* either conflates the two passages, or depends on an earlier compilation or Gospel harmony which conflated them.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 132)

J. D. Crossan writes: “Both *Gos. Thom.* 48 and 106 retain the apodosis concerning moving the mountain, but each has changed the protasis in different ways. My hypothesis is that the original protasis was about combined (double) prayer but (a) in 48 it now concerns peaceful coexistence and (b) in 106 it now concerns primordial undifferentiation, both of which are hermeneutical variations

on that original theme. Neither text has any mention of the mountain being cast into the sea, which was also omitted from Matthew's conflation of Aphorism 122 (Q/Matt. 17:20b = Luke 17:5-6) and Aphorism 23 (Mark 11:23 = Matt. 21:21) in Matt. 17:20. I do not see any direct contact between Matt. 17:20 and *Gos. Thom.* 48 or 106, but simply a common tendency to mute just a little the startling hyperbole of the aphorism's promise." (*In Fragments*, pp. 107-108)

Funk's Parallels

[GThom 106](#), [Luke 17:5-6](#), [Matt 17:19-20](#), [Matt 21:18-22](#), [Mark 11:20-25](#), [1 Cor 13:2](#), [Ign Eph 5.2](#).

49. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΖΕΝΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΝΕ ΝΜΟΝΑΧΟC ΑΥΩ ΕΤCΟΤΤ
 (2) ΧΕ ΤΕΤΝΑΖΕ ΑΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΧΕ ΝΤΩΤΝ ΖΝΕΒΟΛ ΝΖΗΤC ΠΑΛΙΝ
 ΕΤΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΜΑΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(49) Jesus said: Blessed are the solitary and the elect, for you will find the kingdom, for you came forth from it, (and) you will return to it again.

(49) Jesus said, "Blessed are those who are solitary and superior, for you (plur.) will find the kingdom; for since you came from it you shall return to it."

54 [49]. Jesus says: "Blessed are the solitary and the elect, for you will find the Kingdom! Because you have issued from it, you will return to it again."

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "The 'single' or 'solitary' ones will find the kingdom or, in Saying 75, will enter the bridechamber. They are no more from the world than Jesus himself is (John 17:16); they are one as Jesus and the Father are one (John 17:23). Where Jesus is, they will also be (John 17:24)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 160)

Helmut Koester points out a parallel to John 16:28: "I have come out from the Father and I have come into the world. I am again leaving the world and return to the Father." (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 121)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "The beatitude moves from the third person plural to the second person plural in the same way as the beatitude in Logion 54. For the 'solitary ones' cf. 4.2; 16.4; 75, etc. For the notion that the solitary ones are the elect cf. 23.1-2." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 614)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thomas 49 and 50 constitute a miniature catechism for Thomean Christianity. Thomas 49 depicts Thomas Christians as those who have come into the world from another realm, to which they will one day return. This is a central tenet of the mythology of gnosticism." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 502)

Funk's Parallels

[GThom 23](#), [GThom 75](#), [GThom 106](#), [GThom 16](#).

50. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΕΥΩΑΝΧΟΟC ΝΗΤΝ ΧΕ ΝΤΑΤΕΤΝΩΠΕ
ΕΒΟΛ ΤΩΝ ΧΟΟC ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΝΤΑΝΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΠΜΑ
ΕΝΤΑΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΩΩΠΕ ΜΜΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤ4 ΟΥΑΑΤ4 Δ4Ω2(Ε
ΕΡΑΤ4) ΔΥΩ Δ4ΟΥΩΝ2 Ε(Β)ΟΛ ΖΝ ΤΟΥΖΙΚΩΝ (2) ΕΥΩΑΧΟΟC
ΝΗΤΝ ΧΕ ΝΤΩΤΝ ΠΕ ΧΟΟC ΧΕ ΔΝΟΝ ΝΕ4ΩΗΡΕ ΔΥΩ ΔΝΟΝ
ΝCΩΤΠ ΜΠΕΙΩΤ ΕΤΟΝ2 (3) ΕΥΩΑΝΧΝΕ ΤΗΥΤΝ ΧΕ ΟΥ ΠΕ
ΠΜΑΕΙΝ ΜΠΕΤΝΕΙΩΤ ΕΤ2Ν ΤΗΥΤΝ ΧΟΟC ΕΡΟΟΥ ΧΕ ΟΥΚΙΜ ΠΕ
ΜΝ ΟΥΑΝΑΠΑΥCΙC

BLATZ

(50) Jesus said: If they say to you: Whence have you come?, say to them: We have come from the light, the place where the light came into being of itself. It [established itself], and it revealed itself in their image. If they say to you: Who are you?, say: We are his sons, and we are the elect of the living Father. If they ask you: What is the sign of your Father in you?, say to them: It is movement and rest.

LAYTON

(50) Jesus said, "If they say to you (plur.), 'Where are you from?' say to them, 'It is from light that we have come - from the place where light, of its own accord alone, came into existence and [stood at rest]. And it has been shown forth in their image.' If they say to you, 'Is it you?' say 'We are its offspring, and we are the chosen of the living father.' If they ask you, 'What is the sign of your father within you?' say to them, 'It is movement and repose.'" "

DORESSE

55 [50]. Jesus says: "If people ask you: 'Where have you come from?' tell them: 'We have come from the Light, from the place where the Light is produced [. . .] outside itself <or: of itself?>. It [. . .] until they show (?) [. . .] their image.' If someone says to you: 'What are you?' say: 'We are the sons and we are the elect of the living Father.' If <people> ask you: 'What sign of your Father is in you?' tell them: 'It is a movement and a rest.'" "

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "This saying continues the thought of Saying 50. The disciples are the light of the world (Matthew 7:14) because Jesus is the light of the world (John 8:12). They are from above, from the place where the light shines in the darkness (John 1:5). They are sons of the light (?), and the elect. If men ask for a sign, as they asked Jesus (Mark 8:11-12; Matthew 16:1-4; Luke 11:16, 29-30), no startling miracle can be shown them, but only 'a movement and a rest.' The 'rest' must be the rest characteristic of the kingdom (Sayings 1 [Greek], 52, 90); the 'movement' is ultimately that of the unmoved mover, according to the Naassenes (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 7, 25)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 160-161)

F. F. Bruce writes: "The subject-matter of this saying is much the same as that of Saying 49; for the place of light cf. Sayings 24, 77. The relationship to the living Father has been mentioned in Saying 3 (cf. Saying 37). For the 'image' see Saying 83. The 'movement' may be the re-ascent to the realm of light; the 'rest' is probably that which is the goal of the true Gnostic (Sayings 1 [Greek], 51, 90)." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 133)

Stevan Davies writes: "In Gos. Thom. 50 'they' are perhaps people to whom Thomasine Christians may chance to speak, possible converts to a missionary movement. But more likely, since questioning 'disciples' are specified in sayings 51, 52, 53, the questioning 'they' of saying 50 are

probably intended to be leaders who appeal to the tradition of the disciples. That Thomas is engaged in dispute with 'those who lead you' is evident from saying 3." (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes of 50a: "As all things came from the light (saying 77), so those who came from the light are distinguished not by their manner of origin but by their realization of the fact. the place in which the light came into being is the place of Gen 1:3. Because the light persists in the world as the kingdom of God, there is no idea here of a fall of the light. A person who is the restored unmanifest image of God will manifest to himself the primordial light which is upon the world (sayings 22, 24, 83, 84)." (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes of 50b: "Light is the creative force in Thomas (Gos. Thom. 77; Gen 1:3). As people are created through the light of the Father, they are children of the light or sons of the living Father (saying 3) or, equivalently, the elect of the living Father. Whereas all people are potentially children of the light, only those aware of this fact are in actuality children, elect, sons, etc." (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes of 50c: "The seven days of Genesis begin with the Spirit moving upon the waters, continue through six days of the movement of creation, and conclude with a day of repose. If the state of actualized humanity is that of the beginning--insofar as the beginning is movement and repose--then the sign of the Father in actualized humanity is the same." (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes: "The colloquy found in saying 50 between people who know their origins and people who interrogate them, asking 'Where do you come from?' 'Is it you?' and asking for 'the sign of your father within you,' is not unlike colloquies found in the Gospel of John. In John 8:12-59, for example we find such statements as 'I am the light of the world,' 'I know where I came from and where I am going. But you do not know where I came from or where I am going,' as well as such questions as 'they said to him, "Where is your father?"'; 'they said to him, "Who are you?"; and 'how can you say, "You will become free?"' The rather well-established similarities between Thomas and John should lead one to look to John for clues to the understanding of Thomas's enigmas." (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk and Hoover write: "The miniature catechism of Thomas 49 is continued in this complex of sayings. The antecedent of the pronoun 'they' in v. 1 is unspecified, but the pattern of hypothetical questions followed by appropriate responses is often repeated in gnostic instructional materials, such as many of the tractates found in the Nag Hammadi library. In these materials, the 'they' often refers to the various rulers (or powers) who guard the way heavenward - the way back to the region of light - through which those who are saved must pass. The responses are passwords designed to placate these heavenly guardians. Both the language and the ideas in this miniature catechism are far removed from the language and ideas of Jesus." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 502)

Marvin Meyer writes: "This saying is one of the most overtly mythological sayings in the Gospel of Thomas. Much of what is recounted here is familiar from ancient descriptions of the life of the soul, particularly gnostic descriptions (for example, the Hymn of the Pearl in Acts of Thomas 108-13). Many of the specific features of this saying resemble the myth that is presented in more detail in the Secret Book of John. The question asked and the answers given in the saying also recall accounts of the heavenly powers interrogating the soul as it passes through the spheres of heaven. According to Irenaeus, Against Heresies 1.21.5, the soul is to respond, 'I am a child of the father, the father who is preexistent, a child, moreover, is the one who is preexistent. . . . I trace my origin from the one who is preexistent and back to what is my own, from where I have come.' Then, Irenaeus observes,

it is thought that the soul can escape from the powers.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 89)

John S. Kloppenborg, Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser state: “In this sequence of sayings the Gospel of Thomas has moved beyond the realm of conventional wisdom and into a perspective more akin to Gnosticism. Gnostics believed that they were ultimately not of the present, evil world at all, but rather were descended from the one high God who lies aloft in heavenly remove from the cosmos. Their presence in the world is due to a great tragic mistake whereby the demiurge, a rebellious angel, sought to create something of its own volition apart from God. The result was the creation of the earth, and at the same time a rupture in the primeval perfection of the divine realm. In this rupture, parts of the divine realm became trapped in the evil creation of the demiurge, spirits (PNEUMATA) embodied in persons, who someday must win their release from the evil world, and return to the divine realm from whence they have come. This, or a similar mythological framework, is presupposed in Sayings 49-50. The Thomas Christian is told of his/her origin and ultimate destiny, and finally, is given the secret passwords to be used in the re-ascent past the many heavenly guardians who would block their path.” (*Q-Thomas Reader*, pp. 96-97)

Helmut Koester writes: “The religious perspective represented in such Thomas sayings as these [49 and 50] has often been associated with Gnosticism. Gnostics believed that both their origin and their destiny lay in the supreme deity who dwells in a heavenly place removed from the evil world, the creation of a rebellious angel or demiurge. Though this demiurge seeks to hold humans in ignorance of their true identity, in sleepiness and intoxication, a divine messenger will come and awake them and relieve them from the bonds of ignorance by bringing true knowledge about themselves. In saying #28 of the *Gospel of Thomas*, Jesus speaks with the voice of this heavenly messenger . . . However, this moment of return to which the Thomas Christians aspire requires preparation beyond the simple memorization of passwords, about which *Gos. Thom.* 50 speaks. One must also cultivate the proper understanding of the world in order to be ready to leave its confines when the time comes: [56 and 80].” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 125-126)

Stevan Davies writes: “Koester and Patterson’s often-published perspective on sayings 49 and 50 is plain wrong. They believe that one may justly infer that these sayings especially, but others as well, derive from the thought world of those Gnostics who ‘believed that both their origin and their destiny lay in the supreme deity who dwells in a heavenly place removed from the evil world, the creation of a rebellious angel or demiurge...’ and that saying 50 speaks of ‘the simple memorization of passwords’ to be delivered to archons so as to enable Thomasine Christians to ascend from the confines of this world when the time comes . . . These ideas apply to the Apocryphon of John but not to the Gospel of Thomas in whole or in part. Thomas urges individuals to seek and find the kingdom of God spread upon the earth now (sayings 3, 113). Those who come from the light come from light here now (sayings 24, 77). The light of the beginning is here now (saying 18) and Thomas’s references to the beginning are consistent with first-century exegesis of Genesis 1 and 2. Thomas nowhere refers to any demiurge or to any rebellious angel or any place for the kingdom apart from this world). Thomas knows nothing of archons to whom passwords are to be delivered, nor does Thomas mention any ascent by anyone to anywhere.” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 84](#), [GThom 83](#).

51. (1) ΠΕΧΛΑΥ ΝΑΥ Ν̄ΟΙ ΝΕΦΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ ΑΥ Ν̄ΖΟΥΥ
 ΕΤΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙC Ν̄ΝΕΤΜΟΥΥΤ ΝΑΥΩΠΕ ΑΥΩ ΑΥ Ν̄ΖΟΥΥ
 ΕΠΚΟCΜΟC Β̄ΒΡΡΕ ΝΗΥ (2) ΠΕΧΛΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΤΗ ΕΤΕΤΝ̄ΩΥΤ
 ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΤ̄C ΑCΕΙ ΑΛΛΑ Ν̄ΤΩΤ̄Ν ΤΕΤ̄ΝCΟΥΥΝ ΑΝ Μ̄ΜΟC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(51) His disciples said to him: On what day will the rest of the dead come into being, and on what day will the new world come? He said to them: What you await has come, but you do not know it.

(51) His disciples said to him, "When will the repose of the dead come to pass, and when will the new world come?" He said to them, "That (repose) which you (plur.) are waiting for has come, but for your part you do not recognize it."

56 [51]. His disciples said to him: "On what day shall rest come to those who are dead, and on what day shall the new world come?" He said to them: "This <rest> that you wait for has (already) come, and you have not recognised it."

Scholarly Quotes

Treatise on the Resurrection 49:9-25 also presents resurrection as something that has already happened: "So do not think in a partial fashion, Rheginos, nor conduct yourself in accordance with this flesh for the sake of oneness, but flee from the divisions and the bonds, and already you have the resurrection. For if one who will die knows about oneself that one will die - even if one spends many years in this life, one is brought to this - why not regard yourself as risen and brought to this?" (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 90)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "The question is Thomas's equivalent for the Pharisee's question about the coming of the kingdom in Luke 17:20; the answer is like the answer in Luke 17:21: 'The kingdom of God is within you.' Because, like the earthly Jerusalem (Luke 19:42, 44), the disciples are still blind, they do not (fully) recognize its presence - in Jesus." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 161)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "Of the latter Bartsch observes that Gnostic *Umbildung* is unmistakable, and that the idea of the 'new world' comes from such works as 2 Peter (iii. 13) and Revelation (xxi. 1); but the motif of the disciples' lack of understanding is definitely old. Bauer at one point offers an interpretation which would explain logion 51 in the context of the earthly life of Jesus, but quotes also a Naassene text which shows how the version in Thomas might have developed." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 82)

F. F. Bruce writes: "The theme of 'rest' is carried on from Saying 50. But the expectation of rest after death is here transformed into an assurance that the Gnostic has attained true rest already. This kind of transformation, not unlike that which Paul describes ironically in 1 Corinthians 4.8, is sometimes referred to as an 'over-realised eschatology' (cf. 2 Timothy 2.18)." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 133)

Funk and Hoover write: "The question posed in v. 1 employs the characteristic Thomean term 'rest': this term is a synonym for salvation in Thomas (see 50:3; 60:6; 90; in addition, the Greek fragment of Thomas 2 adds the additional verse: 'and having reigned, one will rest.') The term 'rest' with a similar meaning is not unknown in other texts, both Christian (Matt 11:28-29; Rev

14:13) and Judean (Sir 51:26-27), but it carried special significance among gnostic Christians and Platonists. To achieve 'rest' meant to find one's place again in unity with the highest God. (In developed gnostic systems, at the beginning was the incomprehensible, invisible, eternal, and ungenerated Forefather, Depth; Depth gave rise to a female counterpart, Silence. Together they produced the next pair of Aeons, which eventuate in fourteen such pairs, each pair with lesser power and memory of its origin than the previous pair. At the lowest level is Wisdom and the creator God. Salvation consists in reascending the ladder of divine emanations and rejoining the godhead.)" (*The Five Gospels*, p. 502)

Funk's Parallels

[GThom 113](#), [POxy654 3](#), [GThom 3](#), [Luke 17:20-21](#), [Luke 17:22-25](#), [Matt 17:9-13](#), [Matt 24:23-28](#), [Mark 9:9-13](#), [Mark 13:21-23](#), [DialSav 16](#).

52. (1) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑϞ Ν̄ΟΙ ΝΕϞΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ ΧΟΥΤΑϞΤΕ
 Μ̄ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΑΥΨΑΧΕ Ζ̄Μ ΠΙΣΡΑΗΛ ΑΥΩ ΑΥΨΑΧΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ
 Ν̄ΖΗΤΚ (2) ΠΕΧΑϞ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΑΤΕΤΝ̄ΚΩ Μ̄ΠΕΤΟΝΖ Μ̄ΠΕΤΝ̄ΜΤΟ
 ΕΒΟΛ ΑΥΩ ΑΤΕΤΝ̄ΨΑΧΕ ΖΑ ΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ

BLATZ

(52) His disciples said to him: Twenty-four prophets spoke in Israel, and they all spoke of you. He said to them: You have abandoned the living one before your eyes, and spoken about the dead.

LAYTON

(52) His disciples said to him, "Twenty-four prophets spoke in Israel, and they all spoke by you." He said to them, "You (plur.) have abandoned the one who is living in your presence, and you have spoken of those who are dead."

DORESSE

57 [52]. His disciples said to him: "Twenty-four prophets spoke in Israel, and they all spoke through you!" He said to them: "You have passed over Him who is living in front of your eyes, and have spoken of the dead!"

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Gartner has well identified the twenty-four as the authors of the canonical books of the Old Testament, contrasted with seventy secret books in the apocalypse of Ezra (2 Esdras [4 Ezra] 14:44-48). Perhaps, as I have elsewhere suggested, they consist of twenty-three prophets and John the Baptist. In any case, the Old Testament revelation is completely outmoded. What counts is the new revelation of the Gnostic Jesus." (*Gnosticism & Early Christianity*, p. 186)

F. F. Bruce writes: "The number of prophets corresponds to the number of books in the Hebrew Bible. [Another, but less probable, view is that the twenty-four prophets are the twenty-three listed in the old Jewish *Lives of the Prophets*, edited by C. C. Torrey (Philadelphia, 1943), with the addition of John the Baptist (Grant and Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 153).] Throughout the New Testament it is emphasized that Christ has fulfilled the Old Testament Scriptures: 'To him all the prophets bear witness' (Acts 10:43). [Some translators and commentators treat 'in you' as though it meant 'concerning you'; it includes this, but goes beyond it. Christ, as the Logos, is the one in whom they prophesied - which is the reverse way of putting the New Testament statement that 'the Spirit of Christ within them prophesied' (1 Peter 1.11). Cf. A. A. T. Ehrhardt, 'The Disciples of Emmaeus', *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963-64), p. 192; he

compares the apocryphal *Epistle of the Apostles* 19 ('all the words which were spoken by the prophets were fulfilled in me, for I myself was in them'.)] But this saying reflects a disparaging attitude to the Old Testament comment to several of the Gnostic schools. Augustine knew the saying, and dismissed it as an invention. [*Against an Adversary of the Law and the Prophets* 2.14.]” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 134)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The saying is quoted by Augustine who, as Grant and Freedman say, has no hesitation about declaring it fictitious, but Jeremias shows very clearly how it could find a place within the context of the historic ministry. Here we have a case of a saying recorded only in an apocryphal document, as Augustine says, which may yet have some claim to consideration as possibly authentic. Even if not authentic, it would appear to reflect a period of controversy with the Jews about the Messiahship of Jesus, such a situation as is envisaged, for example, in Ignatius’ letter to the Philadelphians (chap. 8), and this may justify its inclusion at this point.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 127)

Funk and Hoover write: “in the question, the number twenty-four is significant: in later Jewish tradition, this was the number of sacred or scriptural books. The saying therefore masks a polemic against the Hebrew scriptures. One might expect to find such a polemic in the works of Marcion or his followers in the mid-second century C.E., but not among the sayings of Jesus. The saying appears to reflect a time when Christianity was no longer a Judean sect, but had become largely gentile.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 503)

Marvin Meyer writes: “Augustine, *Against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets* 2.4.14, provides a close parallel to this saying: ‘You have rejected the living one who is before you, and you speak idly of the dead.’ Also noteworthy is Acts of Thomas 170: ‘Since you do not believe in the living, how do you wish to believe in the dead? But do not fear. Jesus the Christ, through his great goodness, treats you humanely.’ Compare also John 5:37-40; 8:52-53.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 90)

Funk’s Parallels

[1 Pet 1:10-12](#), [GHeb 2](#).

53. (1) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑϞ Ν̄ΟΙ ΝΕϞΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ Π̄ΣΒΒΕ Ρ̄ΩΦΕΛΕΙ Η
 Μ̄ΜΟΝ (2) ΠΕΧΑϞ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΝΕϞΡ̄ΩΦΕΛΕΙ ΝΕΠΟΥΕΙΩΤ ΝΑΧΠΟΥ
 ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄Ν ΤΟΥΜΑΑΥ ΕῩΣΒΒΗΥ (3) ΑΛΛΑ Π̄ΣΒΒΕ Μ̄ΜΕ Ζ̄Μ Π̄ΝΑ
 ΑϞΘ̄Ν Ζ̄ΗΥ ΤΗΡϞ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(53) His disciples said to him: Is circumcision useful or not? He said to them: If it were useful, their father would beget him from their mothers (already) circumcised. But the true circumcision in the Spirit has proved useful in every way.

(53) His disciples said to him, “Does circumcision help or does it not?” He said to them, “If it helped, people’s fathers would beget them from their mothers already circumcized. But true circumcision in spirit has become very profitable.”

58 [53]. His disciples said to him: “Is circumcision useful or not?” He said to them: “If it was useful, their father would beget them from their mother <already> circumcised. But <only> the true circumcision in the spirit gives all profit!”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “According to a Jewish tradition, a governor of Judea once commented to Rabbi Akiba, ‘If he (that is, God) takes such pleasure in circumcision, why then does not a child come circumcised from his mother’s womb?’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 90-91)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Along with fasting, prayer, almsgiving, and dietary regulations, Thomas rejects circumcision, as most early Christians did. A singular argument perhaps from radical Hellenistic-Jewish sources, is advanced against it; it is unnatural (elsewhere Thomas does not appeal to the law of nature). What counts is true, spiritual circumcision (cf., Philippians 3:3).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 162-163)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Grant and Freedman plausibly suggest that the argument in the reply may be drawn from radical Hellenistic-Jewish sources. Perhaps more important is the point made by Bauer, that if no such an authoritative word as this had been known Paul would never have had to contend against the Judaisers. As Bauer observes, the saying was probably understood by the Gnostics on the basis of Colossians ii. 11, where the true circumcision is linked with the stripping off of the body of flesh. A circumcision ‘in Spirit not in letter’ is mentioned in Romans ii. 29, and the question here assigned to the disciples is asked by Paul himself in Romans iii. 1 - but with a very different answer. Other passages to which reference may be made include Romans ii. 25, 1 Corinthians vii. 19, and Galatians vi. 15. This saying accordingly would appear to reflect the conditions of a period later than the time of Jesus, if indeed it is not a Gnostic invention.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 104-105)

F. F. Bruce writes: “Literal circumcision is rejected, like literal fasting and other religious exercises (cf. Saying 6). What counts is the spiritual counterparts of these, the elements of true heart-religion. That spiritual circumcision was the important thing was emphasized even in Old Testament times (cf. Deuteronomy 10.16; Jeremiah 4.4); Paul speaks to the same effect in Romans 2.29; Philippians 3.3; Colossians 2.11.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 134)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Like Paul (Rom. 2.25-29; 1 Cor 7.7-19; Gal. 6.5; Phil. 3.3), this verse understands circumcision in the metaphorical sense and thus provides further argument against the benefits of circumcision. The negative attitude to circumcision in the Gospel of Thomas corresponds to that towards fasting, almsgiving and dietary regulations (cf. 6; 14; 104), and also to the Old Testament, as it was documented in the analysis of the preceding logion, Logion 52.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, pp. 616-617)

Funk’s Parallels

[Rom 2:25-29](#), [1 Cor 7:17-19](#), [Gal 6:16](#), [Phil 3:3](#), [Col 2:11-14](#).

54. ΠΕΥΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΖΝΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΝΕ ΝΖΗΚΕ ΧΕ ΤΩΤΝ ΤΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡ
ΝΜΠΗΥΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(54) Jesus said: Blessed are the poor, for yours is the

(54) Jesus said, “Blessed are the poor, for yours (plur.) is

59 [54]. Jesus says: “Blessed are the poor, for the

kingdom of heaven.

the kingdom of heavens.”

Kingdom of heaven is yours!”

Scholarly Quotes

R. McL. Wilson writes: “On logion 54: ‘Blessed are the poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven,’ Grant and Freedman say that it combines Luke vi. 20 with Matthew v. 3, but it may, perhaps, be doubted if Matthew comes into question at all. The only difference between Luke and Thomas lies in the use of the phrase ‘kingdom of heaven,’ and Thomas, as already noted, habitually avoids the name of God. It is at least possible that Thomas here preserves the original form, which Luke has altered by substituting ‘God’ and Matthew interpreted by adding ‘in spirit’ after ‘the poor.’ There are, however, other possibilities: deliberate alteration of Luke by Thomas, or the transmission of the saying from Luke to Thomas through a Jewish-Christian milieu in which the change was made.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 55-56)

Funk and Hoover write: “There is no question about Jesus’ consorting with the poor, the hungry, and the persecuted. He announced that God’s domain belonged to the poor, not because they were righteous, but because they were poor. This reverses a common view that God blesses the righteous with riches and curses the immoral with poverty.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 504)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion corresponds to Luke 6.20 and Matt. 5.3, but derives from Luke 6.20, because ‘yours’ corresponds to Lukan redaction. This conclusion is all the more compelling as in Luke 6.20 the Coptic translation of the New Testament reads ‘their’ instead of ‘yours’ - no doubt an assimilation to Matt. 5.3.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 617)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 6:20](#), [Matt 5:3](#).

55. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤΑΜΕCΤΕ ΠΕΦΕΙΩΤ ΑΝ ΜΝ ΤΕΦΜΑΑΥ
ΦΝΑΨΡ ΜΑΘΗΤΗC ΑΝ ΝΑΕΙ (2) ΑΥΩ ΝΦΜΕCΤΕ ΝΕΦCΝΗΥ ΜΝ
ΝΕΦCΩΝΕ ΝΦΦΕΙ ΜΠΕΦCΡΟC ΝΤΑΖΕ ΦΝΑΨΩΠΕ ΑΝ ΕΦΟ ΝΑΞΙΟC
ΝΑΕΙ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(55) Jesus said: He who does not hate his father and his mother cannot be a disciple to me. And (he who does not) hate his brothers and sisters and take up his cross like me, will not be worthy of me.

(55) Jesus said, “Those who do not hate their fathers and their mothers cannot be disciples of me, and those who do not hate their brothers and their sisters and take up their cross like me will not become worthy of me.”

60 [55]. Jesus says: “He who does not hate his father and mother cannot be my disciple; and if he does not hate his brother and sister and does not take up his cross like me, he will not become worthy of me!”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Manichaean Psalm Book 175:25-30 as saying: “I have left father and mother and brother and sister. I have come a stranger for the sake of your name. I have taken up my cross,

and I have followed you. I have left the things of the body for the sake of the things of the spirit. I have disregarded the glory of the world for the sake of your glory that does not pass away.”

J. D. Crossan writes (*In Fragments*, p. 136):

Matt. 10:37-38 had retained three stichs, but Luke 14:26 had reduced the former double-stich saying into one. *Gos. Thom.* 55 also reduces the three stichs to two, but he does so by incorporating the *cross* saying within the second stich of the *family* saying:

Whoever does not hate his father and mother
cannot become a disciple to Me,
And whoever does not hate his brothers and sisters
[cannot become a disciple to Me,]
And [whoever does not] take up his cross in My way
will not be worthy of Me.

Those lines in parentheses and italicized have dropped from *Thomas*'s version in a different mode of amalgamation from either Matthew's or Luke's.

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion is a mixed quotation made up of Matt. 10.37(-38) and Luke 14.26(-27). Thomas has woven the saying about taking up the cross (cf. Mark 8.34 parr.) into the parallelism.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 617)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This saying is a combination of Luke 14:26-27 (hating father and mother, brothers and sisters, carrying cross, becoming disciple) with Matthew 10:37-38 (being worthy of me). From Luke, Thomas omits mention of wife and children, perhaps because the Gnostic will have neither; he adds to carrying the cross ‘as I do’ (or ‘like me,’ Doresse, page 177), perhaps because as in John 19:17, Jesus bears his own cross (Simon of Cyrene carries it in the synoptic gospels).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 163-164)

J. P. Meier writes: “A mixed text resulting from the conflation of Matt 10:37-38 and Luke 14:26-27 is found in the Coptic *Gos. Thom.* saying 55: ‘Whoever will not hate his father and his mother cannot become a disciple to me; and whoever will not hate his brothers and his sisters and will not carry his cross as I have will not be worthy of me.’ Here we have a parade example of how the *Gospel of Thomas* melds various phrases from various Synoptic Gospels to create its own form of a Gospel saying. On the whole, the saying is closer to Luke than to Matthew. The phrases ‘will not hate’ [as opposed to Matthew’s ‘love’], ‘his father and his mother’ [with possessive pronouns, reflecting Luke’s *heautou*, which is not in Matthew], ‘brothers and sisters’ [Matthew has ‘son or daughter’], and ‘cannot become a disciple to me’ comes from Luke. Yet at the end of the saying we see a clear trace of the redactional tendency of Matthew or his M tradition: ‘will not be worthy of me.’ The key words *mathetes* (disciple), *stauros* (cross), and *axios* (worthy) appear in Greek in the Coptic text. The theme of imitating Jesus carrying his cross, which is implicit in the passages of the Synoptic Gospels, is made explicit by the addition in the *Gospel of Thomas*: ‘... carry his cross as I have.’ On the whole saying, see Fieger, *Das Thomasevangelium*, 165-67. A similar saying, with a similar conflation of Matt 10:37 and Luke 14:26 and a similar addition of ‘as I,’ is found in *Gos. Thom.* saying 101. The text, however, is fragmentary, and there is no mention of carrying one’s cross; see Fieger, *ibid.*, 256-57. Fieger’s analysis of the parallels in *Gos. Thom.* to Mark 8:34-35 parr. shows that it is highly unlikely that *Thomas*'s versions of these sayings are independent of the Synoptics.” (*A Marginal Jew*, v. 3, pp. 105-106 n. 75)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The wording is certainly nearer to Luke, who alone speaks of ‘hate.’ The differences lie in the omission of any reference to wife and children, and in the substitution of ‘in

My way' (or 'like Me') for 'and come after Me.' Matthew and Luke evidently give variant translations of the same original saying, and it is therefore possible that what seems at first sight to be a conflation is, in fact, another rendering. If this be so, the substitution noted is not difficult to explain. Moreover, as Creed has observed, Luke has added 'and his own soul' from the sequel in his source. It is therefore possible that the references to wife and children do not derive from the source, but are due to the intensification of the Evangelists; it should be noted that they differ on this point. According to Bartsch the differences compel the assumption of a special tradition independent of the Synoptics, a statement the more remarkable in that he is critical of some of Quispel's other examples." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 57)

Funk's Parallels

[GThom 101](#), [Luke 14:25-33](#), [Luke 9:23-24](#), [Matt 10:34-39](#), [Matt 16:24-25](#), [Mark 8:34-35](#).

56. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤΑΖCΟΥΩΝ ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΑCΖΕ ΕΥΠΤΩΜΑ
 (2) ΑΥΩ ΠΕΝΤΑΖΖΕΕ ΑΠΤΩΜΑ ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΜΠΩΑ ΜΜΟC ΔΝ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(56) Jesus said: He who has known the world has found a corpse; and he who has found a corpse, the world is not worthy of him.	(56) Jesus said, "Whoever has become acquainted with the world has found a corpse, and the world is not worthy of the one who has found the corpse."	61 [56]. Jesus says: "He who has known the world has fallen into a corpse; and he who has fallen into a corpse, the world is not worthy of him!"

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Knowing the world is equivalent to finding a corpse (or, in the parallel Saying 80, a body); this knowledge and this discovery are evidently regarded as good, for the world is not worthy of the discoverer (cf., Hebrews 11:38, and page 77). Knowing the world, then, must be truly knowing it for what it is. But we must also consider one more saying (109). The world is not worthy of the one 'who will find himself.' We conclude that Saying 57 [56], like these variants we have cited, is based on the verse which in Matthew (10:39; cf., Mark 8:34-35) follows the verses cited in Saying 56 [55]. 'He who finds his soul [life] will lose it, and he who loses his soul for my sake will find it.' Either Thomas simply mystifies his readers by speaking of a corpse or he uses 'corpse' as the equivalent for 'body' and hence for 'self.' The Naassenes used 'corpse' of the spiritual man (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 8, 22)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 164)

F. F. Bruce writes: "To say that the world is not worthy of someone (cf. Hebrews 11.38) is to commend him; therefore (strange as it may seem) to find a corpse is praiseworthy. The Naassenes, according to Hippolytus, spoke of the spiritual body as a 'corpse'. [The reason for this strange use of 'corpse' was that the spiritual essence is 'buried' in the body as a corpse is buried in a tomb (Hippolytus, *Refutation* v.8.22).] But the analogy of Saying 111 ('as for him who finds himself, the world is not worthy of him') suggests that here 'corpse' means 'body' as used in the sense of 'self'. If so, we may have a cryptic parallel to the canonical saying about gaining the world and losing one's own self, or *vice versa* (Luke 9.24f.; Matthew 16.25f.), which follows a saying about denying self and taking up the cross (cf. Saying 55)." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 135)

Stevan Davies writes: “Gos. Thom. 56 is a scribal alteration of saying 80, the word ptoma having been substituted for soma.” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Kurt Rudolph says of Saying 56: “in saying 80 the same is said, but instead of ‘corpse’ the reference is to the ‘body’ of the world).” (*Gnosis*, p. 264)

Funk and Hoover write: “The fact that there are two versions suggests that some such saying might have circulated previously in an oral form. Yet both sayings deprecate the created world in a way that is typical of Thomas (27:1; 110; 111:3) and atypical of Jesus. Furthermore, the notion that the world is evil, or corrupt, and is to be shunned is common in other gnostic writings. The Fellows therefore concluded that this saying, in both its forms, originated in early Christian circles such as the one that produced the Gospel of Thomas. It represents gnostic tendencies of one branch of the Christian movement.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 505)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Thomas 80 corresponds to Thomas 56, the only difference being that there we have ‘body’ instead of ‘corpse’. For Thomas this world is a sphere opposed to God. So the commandment is to abstain from it (21.1). But the Gnostic must first recognize it as an anti-world in order to be able to turn to the true life. Cf. Gospel of Philip 93: ‘This world is an eater of life. Because of this, none of those who are nourished on the [truth] will die. Jesus came from that place and brought food from there. And to those who wished he gave [life, so that] they will not die.’” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 618)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 80](#), [GThom 111](#), [Luke 17:37](#), [Matt 24:28](#), [Manichaean Kephalaia XLVII 120:31-121:2](#).

57. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΜΠΕΙΩΤ ΕCΤΝΤΩΝ ΑΥΡΩΜΕ
ΕΥΝΤΑϸ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΝΟΥΘΡΟC ΕΝ(ΑΝΟ)Υϸ (2) ΑΠΕϸΧΑΧΕ ΕΙ
ΝΤΟΥΩΗ ΑϸCΙΤΕ ΝΟΥΖΙΖΑΝΙ(Ο)Ν ΕΧΝ ΠΕΘΡΟ(C Ε)ΤΝΑΝΟΥϸ (3)
ΜΠΕΠΡΩΜΕ ΚΟΟΥ ΕΖΩΛΕ ΜΠΖΙΖΑΝΙΟΝ ΠΕΧΑϸ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΜΗΠΩC
ΝΤΕΤΝΒΩΚ ΧΕ ΕΝΑΖΩΛΕ ΜΠΖΙΖΑΝΙΟΝ ΝΤΕΤΝΖΩΛΕ ΜΠCΟΥΟ
ΝΜΜΑϸ ΖΜ ΦΟΥΥ ΓΑΡ ΜΠΩΖC ΝΖΙΖΑΝΙΟΝ ΝΑΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ
CΕΖΟΛΟΥ ΝCΕΡΟΚΖΟΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(57) Jesus said: The kingdom of the Father is like a man who had [good] seed. His enemy came by night and sowed weeds among the good seed. The man did not allow them to pull up the weeds. He said to them: Lest you go and pull up the weeds, (and) pull up the wheat with it. For on the day of the harvest the weeds will be manifest; they will be

(57) Jesus said, “What the kingdom of the father resembles is a man who had a [good] (kind of) seed. His enemy came at night and scattered grass seed in with the good seed. The man did not let them pluck out the grass, saying to them, ‘Do not, lest you (plur.) go to pluck out the grass and then pluck out the wheat along with it. For, on the day of the

62 [57]. Jesus says: “The Kingdom of the Father is like a man who has [good] seed <in his field.> By night his enemy came and sowed tares over the seed which is good. <But> this man did not allow them <his servants> to pluck up the tares, ‘for fear’, he told them, ‘that in going to take away the tares, you carry off the wheat with it. But on the harvest day the

pulled up and burned.	harvest the grass will be obvious, and it will be plucked out and burned.”“	tares will be recognisable; they will be taken away and burnt.”“
-----------------------	---	--

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This saying is a summary of the parable found in Matthew 13:24-30, without any significant variants - except that Thomas substitutes ‘kingdom of the father’ for ‘kingdom of heaven.’ It is odd that the tares are allowed to grow up with the wheat, since the little fish are thrown away in Saying 7; but this problem is explained in the parable itself. Thomas omits the explanation of the parable which is given in Matthew 13:37-43, no doubt because he has his own.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 165)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The Matthean parable is one of those ‘so vividly told that it is natural to assume that they arise out of some actual occurrence.’ In Thomas the vivid detail has been omitted, and only the main points retained. This condensation would appear to indicate a later stage of development than that represented by the canonical parable, but does not decide the question whether we have here a summary made from Matthew or independent access to the same tradition at a later point. Grant and Freedman see no significant variants except the substitution of ‘Father’ for ‘heaven,’ but Quispel finds four agreements with the Diatessaron against Matthew. For Gnostic use of the parable Bauer refers to the eschatological ‘harvest,’ which provided the occasion for many Gnostic speculations. The passage of Heracleon’s commentary to which he points had already been noted in this connection by Cerfaux.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 91-92)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “It will be seen that the ending is shorter than in Matthew, who, anticipating his allegorical interpretation, may . . . have somewhat over-elaborated the separation of wheat from tares (v. 30).” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 224)

Funk and Hoover write: “Although the version in Thomas lacks the appended allegorical interpretation, there is a distant echo of the final apocalyptic judgment made explicit in Matthew. This note is alien to Thomas, so it must have been introduced into the Christian tradition at an early date, probably by the first followers of Jesus who had been disciples of John the Baptist. Thomas retained the parable because it suggested, for his readers, that there were two kinds of persons in the world, those ‘in the know’ (members of the sect) and those dull of hearing.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 505)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion has a close parallel in Matt. 13.24-30. Here Thomas 57 clearly presupposes the Matthean version. *First*, the course of events is told more succinctly and is to be understood as an abbreviation, for *secondly*, there is no mention of the sowing of the seed (Matt. 13.24), the process of growth (Matt. 13.30a), and especially the suggestion of the servants that they should pull up the weeds immediately (Matt. 13.27), although a remnant of that has been left, namely the owner’s answer (v. 3). In other words, this answer presupposes the conversation with the servants (Matt. 13.27-28). Thomas twists the parable to see non-Gnostics and Gnostics depicted in the weeds and in the good seed in order to emphasize the dualism between the two. Thomas has preserved the reference to the harvest (v. 4) in order to emphasize the lasting separation.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, pp. 618-619)

Funk’s Parallels

[Matt 13:24-30](#), [Mark 4:26-29](#).

58. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΠΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΤΑΖΖΙCΕ ΔΑΖΕ
ΑΠΩΝΖ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(58) Jesus said: Blessed is the man who has suffered; he has found life.

(58) Jesus said, "Blessed is the person who has labored and found life."

63 [58]. Jesus says: "Blessed is the man who has laboured; he has found Life!"

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "If this is a saying about those who work hard, as is likely, mention may be made of Proverbs 8:34-36, with its commendation of a person who continually observes the ways of Wisdom, or Sirach 51:26-27, with its injunction that one labor under the yoke of Wisdom, or the Cynic author 'Crates,' Epistles 15 and 16, with the observation that a Cynic is one who works hard at philosophy." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 92)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Here we find an equivalent, in the form of a blessing, to the invitation repeated in Saying 90 from Matthew 11:28-30; in that saying Matthew's reference to 'labor' is omitted, perhaps in order to be placed here. 'Finding rest' in Saying 90 is equivalent to 'finding life' here. See also Saying 10, on 'working together.'" (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 165)

Funk and Hoover write: "In form, this aphorism mimics the beatitudes found in Matthew (5:3-12) and Luke (6:20-22). But in content it recalls the 'labors' of Hercules. In early Christian times, Cynics and Stoics, two dominant schools of philosophy during the Greco-Roman period, 300 B.C.E. - 300 C.E., looked to Hercules as a kind of heroic founder. This sort of borrowing from popular culture was common in the early Christian movement as the followers of Jesus added to the legacy of their teacher. Also, the promise of life echoes the prologue to Thomas and related motifs elsewhere in this gospel (101:3; 114:1; further, 18:3; 19:4; 85:2; 111:2)." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 506)

Funk's Parallels

[1 Pet 3:14a](#), [Jas 1:12](#).

59. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΘΩΨΤ ΝCΑ ΠΕΤΟΝΖ ΖΩC ΕΤΕΤΝΟΝΖ ΖΙΝΑ ΧΕ
ΝΕΤΜΜΟΥ ΔΥΩ ΝΤΕΤΝΨΙΝΕ ΕΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΦ ΔΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΑΨΟΜ ΔΟΜ
ΑΝ ΕΝΑΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(59) Jesus said: Look upon the Living One so long as you live, that you may not die and seek to see him, and be unable to see him.

(59) Jesus said, "Consider the one who is alive while you (plur.) are alive, lest you die and then seek to behold that one - and you will not be able to behold."

64 [59]. Jesus says: "Seek to see Him who is living, while you are living; rather than to die and to seek to see Him <only> when you can no longer see Him!"

Scholarly Quotes

Funk and Hoover write: “The ‘living one’ in this saying can refer only to Jesus himself (compare Thom 52:2 and the prologue). Here Jesus speaks of himself as the revealer who has the power to save from death those who seek him (Thomas 49-50 reflect this same notion). This language is that of Thomean Christianity, not Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 506)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The key word ‘living’ links the present logion with the previous one (‘found life’). Jesus is speaking of himself as the living one (cf. Prologue; 52.2) and emphasizing the either-or between (spiritual) life and (spiritual) death.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 619)

Funk’s Parallels

[John 7:33-34](#), [John 8:21](#), [John 13:33](#), [John 14:8-11](#).

60. (1) (ΑΧΝΑΥ) ΑΥΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΗΣ ΕΧΘΙ ΝΝΟΥΖΙΕΙΒ ΕΧΒΗΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ
ΕΤΟΥΔΑΙΑ (2) ΠΕΧΑΘ ΝΝΕΦΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ ΠΗ ΜΠΚΩΤΕ ΜΠΕΖΙΕΙΒ
(3) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑΘ ΧΕΚΑΑΣ ΕΦΝΑΜΟΟΥΤΘ ΝΦΟΥΟΜΦ (4) ΠΕΧΑΘ
ΝΑΥ ΖΩΣ ΕΦΟΝΖ ΦΝΑΟΥΟΜΦ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΦΩΑΜΟΟΥΤΘ ΝΦΩΩΠΕ
ΝΟΥΠΤΩΜΑ (5) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΧΕ ΝΚΕΣΜΟΤ ΦΝΑΨΑΣ ΑΝ (6) ΠΕΧΑΘ
ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΝΤΩΤΝ ΖΩΤΤΗΥΤΝ ΨΙΝΕ ΝΣΑ ΟΥΤΟΠΟΣ ΝΗΤΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ
ΕΥΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ ΧΕΚΑΑΣ ΝΝΕΤΝΨΩΠΕ ΜΠΤΩΜΑ ΝΣΕΟΥΩΜ ΤΗΥΤΝ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
<p>(60) <They saw> a Samaritan carrying a lamb, who was going to Judaea. He said to his disciples: (What will) this man (do) with the lamb? They said to him: Kill it and eat it. He said to them: While it is alive he will not eat it, but (only) when he kills it (and) it becomes a corpse. They said to him: Otherwise he cannot do it. He said to them: You also, seek a place for yourselves in rest, that you may not become a corpse and be eaten.</p>	<p>(60) <THEY SAW> a Samaritan carrying a lamb as he went into Judaea. He said to his disciples, “This <. . .> . . . the lamb.” They said to him, “So that he might slaughter it and have it to eat. He said to them, “He will not eat it while it (or he) is alive, but rather when he has slaughtered it so it becomes a carcass.” They said, “Otherwise, he cannot do it?” He said to them, “You (plur.), too, seek for yourselves a place of repose, lest you become a carcass and be devoured.</p>	<p>[60. Doresse 64 continued.] Just then a Samaritan was going into Judea carrying a lamb. He <=Jesus> said to His disciples: “What <will> this man <do> with the lamb?” They answered: “He will kill it and eat it!” But he said to them: “He will not eat it as long as it is still alive, but only if he kills it and it becomes a corpse.” They said to him: “In no other way will he hurt it!” <Then> he said to them: “You yourselves, then, seek a place of rest so that you do not become corpses and are eaten!”</p>

Scholarly Quotes

Jean Doresse writes: “This dialogue recalls a notion found in the apocryphal *II Epistle of Clement*: ‘The Lord said indeed: You shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves! Peter replied: And if the wolves rend the lambs? And Jesus said to Peter: After their death, the lambs have nothing further to fear from the wolves. You also, fear not those who kill you and cannot then make you suffer anything further. But fear him who after your death has power to cast your soul and your body into the gehenna of fire! Know then . . . that the promise of Christ is great . . . as also the Repose of the Kingdom . . .!’” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 375)

Helmut Koester writes: “But at least one correction in the translation of the parable of the Samaritan Carrying a Lamb, suggested by Hans-Martin Schenke, needs to be emphasized: *Gos. Thom.* 60 is usually translated ‘They saw a Samaritan carrying a lamb on *his* (i.e., *the Samaritan’s*) way to Judaea.’ But the text should certainly be restored to provide the following translation: ‘*He* (i.e., *Jesus*) saw a Samaritan carrying a lamb, when *he* (i.e., *Jesus*) was on his way to Judaea.’” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 106)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “It may be that Jesus is the lamb, but the details of the saying remain incomprehensible. More probably, the lamb is the world (see Saying 6 and Commentary). Note that the ‘place’ of rest is ‘within,’ as in Saying 25.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 166-167)

Funk and Hoover write: “This is a complex dialogue culminating in the obscure saying in v. 6. The words attributed to Jesus in vv. 2 and 4 are probably incidental dialogue (holes in the manuscript make the text difficult to interpret) and so are the creation of the storyteller. The meaning of the pronouncement in v. 6 is unknown. The term ‘rest’ is a special Thomean or gnostic category, meaning ‘salvation’ (the term is discussed more fully in the comments on Thom 51:1-2). The saying as a whole is reminiscent of Thomas 7, which is also probably the invention of Thomas or his community. For the Thomean use of the term ‘carcass’ compare Thomas 58. All of these are reasons for thinking Thomas 60 is the special language of Thomas and not Jesus. In addition, there is no trace of this kind of language elsewhere in the words attributed to Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 506)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The meaning of this logion consisting of a dialogue between Jesus and his disciples is obscure. Nevertheless it is certain that ‘alive’ (v. 4) is a key word linking it to Logion 59 and Logion 58. The Gnostics are to seek a place of rest (= salvation) for themselves (v. 6), so that they are not consumed by the world, like the lamb, and become a corpse. As the living beigns that they are they cannot be eaten and become corpses (v. 4).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 620)

Stevan Davies writes: “This theme is peculiar to Thomas in early Christian writing. It stems from the observation that people do not eat living animals but dead ones (saying 60), an observation contrasted with the possibility of eating that which is living, which would entail living from the living one rather than from dead animals (saying 111).”
(<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 11:1](#), [POxy654 7](#), [GThom 7](#).

61. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΟΥΝ CΝΑΥ ΝΑΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΑΥ ΖΙ ΟΥΘΛΟΘ ΠΟΥΑ
 ΝΑΜΟΥ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΑΩΝΖ (2) ΠΕΧΕ CΑΛΩΜΗ ΝΤΑΚ ΝΙΜ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΖΩC
 ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΟΥΑ ΑΚΤΕΛΟ ΕΧΜ ΠΑΘΛΟΘ ΑΥΩ ΑΚΟΥΩΜ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ
 ΤΑΤΡΑΠΕΖΑ (3) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΝΑC ΧΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΕΤΩΟΟΠ ΕΒΟΛ
 ΖΜ ΠΕΤΩΗΩ ΑΥ† ΝΑΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΝΑ ΠΑΕΙΩΤ (4) ΑΝΟΚ
 ΤΕΚΜΑΘΗΤΗC (5) ΕΤΒΕ ΠΑΕΙ †ΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΧΕ ΖΟΤΑΝ
 ΕΦΩΑΩΩΠΕ ΕΦΩΗ(Ω) ΦΝΑΜΟΥΖ ΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ
 ΕΦΩΑΝΩΩΠΕ ΕΦΠΗΩ ΦΝΑΜΟΥΖ ΝΚΑΚΕ

DORESSE

LAYTON

BLATZ

<p>(61) Jesus said: Two will rest upon a bed; one will die, the other live. Salome said: Who are you, man, whose son? You have mounted my bed and eaten from my table. Jesus said to her: I am he who comes forth from the one who is equal; I was given of the things of my Father. <Salome said:> I am your disciple. <Jesus said to her:> Therefore I say: If he is equal, he is full of light, but if he is divided, he will be full of darkness.</p>	<p>(61) Jesus said, "Two will repose on a couch: one will die, one will live. Salome said, "Who are you, O man? Like a stranger (?) you have gotten upon my couch and you have eaten from my table." Jesus said to her, "It is I who come from that which is integrated. I was given (some) of the things of my father." < . . . > "I am your female disciple." < . . . > "Therefore I say that such a person, once integrated, will become full of light; but such a person, once divided will become full of darkness.</p>	<p>65 [61]. Jesus says: "Two will lie down there on one bed: one will die, the other will live." Salome says: "Who art thou, man; from whom hast thou <come forth,> that thou shouldst lie on my couch and eat at my table?" Jesus says to her: "I am he who has been brought into being by Him who is equal <to me:> I have been given what belongs to my Father!"—"I am thy disciple!" Because of that, I say this: When <a person> finds himself solitary, he will be full of light; but when he finds himself divided, he will be full of darkness.</p>
---	--	---

Scholarly Quotes

Excerpts from Theodotus 36:1-2 state: "Indeed, our angels were put forth in unity, they say, being one, because they came forth from one. Now since we were divided, for this reason Jesus was baptized, that the undivided might be divided, until he unites us with them in the Fullness, so that we, the many who have become one, may all be mingled with the One that was divided for us."

Marvin Meyer writes: "'as if you are from someone': literally, 'as from one.' The meaning of the Coptic is unclear. It may possibly be understood to mean 'as if you are from someone special' (so Harold W. Attridge, 'Greek Equivalents of Two Coptic Phrases,' pp. 30-32). Bentley Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2-7, 1.74, notes two additional possibilities: The Greek for 'as a stranger' may have been mistranslated 'as from one,' or the Greek fr 'as from whom' may have been mistranslated 'as from someone.'" (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 93)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Unfortunately we do not know what Salome, prominent in the Gospel of the Egyptians, meant by her question, or what Jesus meant by his answer, though it may contain reminiscences of John 5:18 ('He called God his own Father, making

himself equal to God'; cf., Philippians 2:6) and Matthew 11:27 ('All things have been delivered to me by my Father' cf., Luke 10:22). If it is the deserted bed which is full of light, we may have a reflection of the Naassene rejection of sexual intercourse (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 7, 13); see Saying 23 and Commentary." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 167-168)

Jean Doresse writes: "The main part of this paragraph is taken from some apocryphal gospel (perhaps the *Gospel of the Egyptians?*). It centres on Salome's question to Jesus: 'Who art thou? Where have you come from, to sit on my couch and eat my table?' (the couch of course being the place where they reclined at table). Then, this reference to the *couch* probably led to the artificial addition at the beginning of the sentence, of the passage: 'Two will lie down on one bed . . .' The next step was an addition by the editor (another example of such a commentary introduced by the editor is found in 115): from the association of these two texts, he tried to bring out the idea that duality is the source of death and darkness, while unity - isolation, solitariness - leads to light and life. Thus the phrase: 'Because of that . . .' no doubt introduces the editor's comment: 'Because of those two sayings ("Two will lie down . . ." and "Salome says . . ."), I will give you the following teaching. . . .'" (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 375)

Funk and Hoover write of 61:1, "Live or die": "Most of the Fellows were of the opinion that the version in Thomas was older than the Q version because it is simpler. However, in its Thomean form it was probably a piece of common wisdom: death strikes when we least expect it and rather arbitrarily. Two on a couch probably refers to a dinner party or symposium - a place one is least likely to anticipate death. This context is confirmed by the remark of Salome in v. 2: 'Who are you, mister? You have climbed onto my couch and eaten from my table as if you are from someone.' Jesus is here represented as an intruder at a dinner party." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 507)

Gerd Ludemann writes of 61:3: "Jesus comes from the One, who is equal. Jesus has a divine origin and is equal to God (cf. John 5.18)." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 620)

F. F. Bruce writes: "The translation of Jesus's conversation with her [Salome] is uncertain, but the main point seems to be that the perfect state involves a return to the pristine unity of male and female (cf. Saying 4). 'He who is the Same' (others render 'who is my equal') is synonymous with the Father of Jesus, who is unchanging perhaps in the sense of being undifferentiated." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 137)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thom 61:5 has no parallels. It picks up themes that are important elsewhere in Thomas, especially the theme of 'light' (Thom 11:3; 24:3; 50:1; 83:1-2) and the concept of unity as opposed to division (Thom 11:4; 22:4; 106:1). The remark here is reminiscent of the claim, in 24:3, that 'there is light within a person of light.' Persons of light come from the light, that is, they come from the Father who is light (83:1-2). These themes are characteristic of Thomean Christianity; since they do not have echoes elsewhere in the gospels, they are foreign to Jesus." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 507)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "This verse presents two possibilities: either one is - like God - equal (cf. v. 3) and is filled with light or one is separated from God. Then one is filled with darkness. On the concept of light cf. 11.3; 24.3; 50.1; 83.1-2. The theme of division is mentioned in 72.1-3." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 621)

Funk's Parallels

[Luke 17:26-35](#), [Luke 10:21-22](#), [Matt 24:37-44](#), [Matt 11:25-27](#), [John 3:31-36](#), [John 13:1-4](#), [Excerpts from Theodotus 36:1-2](#).

62. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΕΙΧΩ ΝΝΑΜΥCΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΝΝΕ(ΤΜΠΨΑ)
 Ν(ΝΑ)ΜΥCΤΗΡΙΟΝ (2) ΠΕ(Τ)Ε ΤΕΚΟΥΝΑΜ ΝΑΑϸ ΜΝΤΡΕΤΕΚΖΒΟΥΡ
 ΕΙΜΕ ΧΕ ΕCΡ ΟΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(62) Jesus said: I speak my mysteries to those [who are worthy of my] mysteries. What your right hand does, let not your left hand know what it does.

(62) Jesus said, “it is to those [worthy] of [my] secrets that I am telling my secrets. Do not let your (sing.) left hand understand what your right hand is doing.

66 [62]. Jesus says: “When I tell my mysteries to [. . .] mystery: [what] your right hand does, let your left hand not know <that> it does it.”

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: “The first sentence is similar to the canonical saying about the disciples receiving the mystery of the kingdom of God which remains a riddle to outsiders (Mark 4.11 f.; cf. Matthew 13.11 ff.; Luke 8.10); but here the esoteric doctrine of the Gnostics is meant. The second sentence in the canonical tradition (Matthew 6.3) enjoins secrecy in generous giving; here it forbids the spreading of the esoteric doctrine beyond the privileged circle.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 137-138)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 8:9-10](#), [Matt 13:10-17](#), [Matt 6:2-4](#), [Mark 4:10-12](#), [Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 19.20.1](#), [Clem. Alex. Strom. 5.10.63.7](#).

63. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΝΕΥΝ ΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΜΠΛΟΥCΙΟC ΕΥΝΤΑϸ ΜΜΑΥ
 ΝΖΑΖ ΝΧΡΗΜΑ (2) ΠΕΧΑϸ ΧΕ †ΝΑΡΧΡΩ ΝΝΑΧΡΗΜΑ ΧΕΚΑΑC
 ΕΕΙΝΑΧΟ ΝΤΑΩCΖ ΝΤΑΤΩΘΕ ΝΤΑΜΟΥΖ ΝΝΑΕΖΩΡ ΝΚΑΡΠΟC ΨΙΝΑ
 ΧΕ ΝΙΡ ΘΡΩΖ ΛΛΑΑΥ (3) ΝΑΕΙ ΝΕΝΕϸΜΕΕΥΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΖΜ ΠΕϸΖΗΤ
 ΑΥΩ ΖΝ ΤΟΥΨΗ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΑϸΜΟΥ ΠΕΤΕΥΜ ΜΑΧΕ ΜΜΟϸ
 ΜΑΡΕϸCΩΤΜ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(63) Jesus said: There was a rich man who had many possessions. He said: I will use my possessions to sow and reap and plant, to fill my barns with fruit, that I may have need of nothing. Those were his thoughts in his heart; and in that night he died. He who has ears, let him hear.

(63) Jesus said, “There was a rich man who had considerable wealth. He said, ‘I shall invest my wealth so as to sow, reap, plant, and fill my barns with crops, lest I run short of something.’ These things are what he was thinking in his heart, and that very night the man died. Whoever has ears should

67 [63]. Jesus says: “There was a rich man who had many possessions. He said <to himself:> ‘I will use my wealth to sow my field, to plant, to fill my barn with harvest, so that need will not touch me.’ Such were the things that he thought in his heart. But during that night, he died. He who has ears to

listen!”

hear, let him hear!”

R. McL. Wilson writes: “This is clearly a shorter version of Luke xii. 16-21, a passage peculiar to Luke; the preceding verses in Luke, which in that Gospel are the occasion of the saying, appear in Thomas as logion 72; those which follow, about anxiety over the things of this world, in logion 36. Formally, this should probably be considered a later development of the Lucan parable, but this does not necessarily mean that it was derived from Luke. Grant and Freedman suggest that the words ‘this night they will require your soul of you’ are omitted ‘perhaps because something like them will recur in saying 88,’ but the similarity is rather remote and, moreover, this would seem to presuppose a rather closer literary dependence than is justified by the gospel as a whole. In some cases we can indeed speak of intentional or unintentional harmonization, words or phrases occurring to the mind of the author by association with what he is writing, but in others it is difficult to imagine him selecting a word here, a saying there, and keeping part of another saying for use at a later stage. Explanations which are to be valid must take account of what we can learn of the writer’s methods, and free citation from memory would appear to be nearer the mark than an extensive use of scissors and paste.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 99-100)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “The closing sentence, too, of the parable of the Rich Fool: ‘So (foolishly behaves the man) who heaps up treasure for himself and does not gather wealth toward God’ (Luke 12.21), must be an addition; it is missing from the Gospel of Thomas (63), and gives a moralizing meaning to the parable, which blunts the sharp edge of its warning.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 106)

Helmut Koester writes: “There are two secondary features in the narrative of Luke: the conclusion and the moralizing discourse. Both are missing in Thomas’s version which presents this story in the more original form of a reversal parable. On the other hand, Thomas has also transferred the parable into a different milieu. The rich man is no longer a wealthy farmer but a decurion from the city who wants to invest his money successfully. The maxim at the end of *Gos. Thom.* 63 is of course secondary, but it does not reveal any knowledge of Luke’s conclusion.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 98)

Funk and Hoover write: “Whether Luke’s version of this parable is drawn from Luke’s special material or from Q is debated by scholars, but Thomas’ version is drawn from neither. It is a simpler form of the parable, containing none of Luke’s moralizing tone, and has an abrupt, uninterpreted conclusion rather than Luke’s pronouncement (v. 20: ‘God said to him, “You fool! This very night your life will be demanded back from you”’) and generalizing application (v. 21 ‘That’s they way it is with those who save up for themselves, but aren’t rich where God is concerned’). Thomas also lacks the sequence of sayings on possessions that forms the context of the parable in Luke (12:13-15, 22-34).” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 508)

Funk and Hoover write: “As a single, unelaborated tale the Thomas version retains more of the characteristics of orally transmitted tradition and is probably an earlier form of the parable than Luke’s. Thomas has nevertheless shifted the social location of the parable. His rich man is no longer a farmer. He is an investor who seeks such a high return that he will lack nothing. But on very day he has such thoughts he dies and thus loses everything. Thomas’ version seems to turn on its incongruity between his thoughts and his end, whereas Luke’s version focuses on the farmer’s folly.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 508)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This exemplary narrative is related to Luke 12.16-20. But the economic circumstances are slightly different. In Luke we have a farmer who wants to ‘save’, here a businessman who wants to put his money to work. The meaning of the two parables is the same. Sudden death can overtake even the shrewdest of rich men.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, pp. 621-622)

64. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΝΕΥΝΤΑC ΖΝΩΜΜΟ ΑΥΩ
 ΝΤΑΡΕCΟΒΤΕ ΜΠΔΙΠΝΟΝ ΑCΧΟΟΥ ΜΠΕCΖΜΖΑΛ ΩΙΝΑ
 ΕCΝΑΤΩΖΜ ΝΝΩΜΜΟΕΙ (2) ΑCΒΩΚ ΜΠΩΟΡΠ ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΧΕ
 ΠΑΧΟΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ (3) ΠΕΧΑC ΧΕ ΟΥΝΤΑΕΙ ΖΝΖΟΜΤ
 ΑΖΕΝΕΜΠΟΡΟC CΕΝΝΗΥ ΩΑΡΟΕΙ ΕΡΟΥΖΕ †ΝΑΒΩΚ ΝΤΑΟΥΕΖ
 CΑΖΝΕ ΝΑΥ †ΡΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ ΜΠΔΙΠΝΟΝ (4) ΑCΒΩΚ ΩΑ ΚΕΟΥΑ
 ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΧΕ ΑΠΑΧΟΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ (5) ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΧΕ
 ΔΕΙΤΟΥ ΟΥΗΕΙ ΑΥΩ CΕΡΑΙΤΕΙ ΜΜΟΕΙ ΝΟΥΖΗΜΕΡΑ †ΝΑCΡΨΕ ΑΝ
 (6) ΑCΕΙ ΩΑ ΚΕΟΥΑ ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΧΕ ΠΑΧΟΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ (7)
 ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΧΕ ΠΑΩΒΗΡ ΝΑΡ ΨΕΛΕΕΤ ΑΥΩ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΤΝΑΡ
 ΔΙΠΝΟΝ †ΝΑΩΙ ΑΝ †ΡΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ ΜΠΔΙΠΝΟΝ (8) ΑCΒΩΚ ΩΑ
 ΚΕΟΥΑ ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC ΧΕ ΠΑΧΟΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ (9) ΠΕΧΑC ΝΑC
 ΧΕ ΔΕΙΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΚΩΜΗ ΕΕΙΒΗΚ ΑΧΙ ΝΨΩΜ †ΝΑΩΙ ΑΝ
 †ΡΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ (10) ΑCΕΙ ΝΟΙ ΠΖΜΖΑΛ ΑCΧΟΟC ΑΠΕCΧΟΕΙC ΧΕ
 ΝΕΝΤΑΚΤΑΖΜΟΥ ΑΠΔΙΠΝΟΝ ΑΥΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ (11) ΠΕΧΕ ΠΧΟΕΙC
 ΜΠΕCΖΜΖΑΛ ΧΕ ΒΩΚ ΕΠCΑ ΝΒΟΛ ΑΝΖΙΟΟΥΕ ΝΕΤΚΝΑΖΕ ΕΡΟΥ
 ΕΝΙΟΥ ΧΕΚΑΔC ΕΥΝΑΡΔΑΙΠΝΕΙ (12) ΝΡΕCΤΟΥ ΜΝ ΝΕΨΟΤ(Ε
 CΕΝΑΒ)ΩΚ ΑΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΝΤΟΠΟC ΜΠΑΙΩΤ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(64) Jesus said: A man had guests; and when he had prepared the dinner, he sent his servants to invite the guests. He went to the first, and said to him: My master invites you. He said: I have money with some merchants; they are coming to me this evening. I will go and give them my orders. I ask to be excused from the dinner. He went to another (and) said to him: My master invites you. He said to him: I have bought a house, and I am asked for a day. I shall not have time. He went to another (and) said to him: My master invites you. He said to him: My friend is about to be married, and I am to arrange the dinner. I shall

(64) Jesus said, "A man was receiving out-of-town visitors. And having prepared the dinner, he sent a slave to invite the visitors. The slave went first and said to that one, 'My master invites you.' That person said, 'Some wholesale merchants owe me money; they are coming to me this evening, and I shall go and give them instructions. I must decline the dinner invitation.' The slave went to another and said to that one, 'My master invites you.' That person said to the slave, 'I have bought a building, and I am needed for a time. I am not free.' The slave went to another and said to that one, 'My master invites you.'

68 [64]. Jesus says: "A man had guests. When he had prepared the feast, he sent his servant to call these guests. He went to the first and said to him: 'My master invites thee!' <The other> replied: 'I am due to receive some money from some merchants; they are coming to see me this evening and I am going to give them orders. I ask to be excused from the feast.' <The servant> went to another and said to him: 'My master has invited thee.' <He> said to him: 'I have bought a house and I am needed for the day: I am not free.' He went to another and said to him: 'My master invites thee!' <He> replied: 'My friend is being

<p>not be able to come. I ask to be excused from dinner. He went to another, he said to him: My master invites you. He said to him: I have bought a farm; I am going to collect the rent. I shall not be able to come. I ask to be excused. The servant came back (and) said to his master: Those whom you have invited to dinner have asked to be excused. The master said to his servant: Go out to the roads, bring those whom you find, that they may dine. Traders and merchants [shall] not [enter] the places of my Father.</p>	<p>That person said to the slave, 'My friend is about to get married, and it is I who am going to give the dinner. I cannot come; I must decline the dinner invitation.' The slave went to another and said to that one, 'My master invites you.' That person said to the slave, 'I have bought a village; I am going to collect the rents. I cannot come, I must decline.' The slave came and said to its master, 'The people you have invited to the dinner have declined.' The master said to his slave, 'Go outside into the streets; bring in whomever you find, to have dinner.' Buyers and traders [will] not enter the places of my father."</p>	<p>married and I am giving a feast <for him>. I will not come; I ask to be excused from the feast!" He went to another and said to him: 'My master invites thee!' <He> said to him: 'I have bought a field (?) and I have not yet been to receive the revenue <from it>. I will not be coming; I ask to be excused from the feast!' The servant returned and said to his master: 'Those whom you invited to the feast have excused themselves.' The master said to his servant: 'Go out into the streets and those whom you find, bring in to dine.' The buyers and mer[chants will not enter] into the places of my Father."</p>
--	--	---

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "The Palestinian Talmud recounts a similar story about the rich tax-collector Bar Ma'jan, who arranged a feast for the city officials; when they did not come, he invited the poor instead." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 94)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Here Thomas rewrites the parable of the banquet in Luke 14:16-24, adding some minor details from a similar story in Matthew 22:1-10. Much of the narrative differs from the gospel parables, however. According to Luke, the first man to be invited had bought a field which he had to see; another had bought five yoke of oxen and had to test them; the third had just been married. In Matthew only two are mentioned: one goes away to his own field, the other to his own business. As it is told in Thomas, the parable develops the notion of business dealings from Matthew, and the mention of a wedding (also in Matthew, but not as an excuse), as well as the recurrent sentence, 'I excuse myself from the banquet,' from Luke. The excuses offered in the Lucan parable reflect the rural atmosphere (field, oxen); those in Thomas seem to be more urban in character, and the idea of buying a village is alien to the environment of the synoptic gospels." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 170)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "In Thomas the first guest invited must settle with merchants who owe him money, the second has bought a house, a third a village (the official translation reads 'farm', but the word is KWMH) and must go to collect the rent. The remaining excuse does mention a wedding, but here the man has to arrange a dinner for his friend who is about to be married, or possible (in Schoedel's translation) to direct the wedding banquet. Here Grant and Freedman see only a re-writing of Luke with some minor details from Matthew, but it may be questioned if this is a sufficient explanation. On the other hand they would seem to be correct in suggesting that the excuses in the Lucan parable reflect a rural background, while those in Thomas are more urban in character. The true explanation may rather be that here we have a parable developing in the course

of transmission, on its way, in fact, from a Palestinian to a Hellenistic environment.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 101)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “The *parable of the Great Supper* in the Gospel of Thomas 64 ends with the sentence, ‘Tradesman and merchants shall not enter the places of my Father.’ Even if the reference is, in the first place, to the prosperous who decline the invitation, its generalized terms convey the idea of a sharp attack on the rich. This attitude of class-consciousness is to some extent in line with that of Luke in this parable (14.16-24) which he introduces as a sequel to the warning not to invite the richer and prosperous, but the poor, lame, halt, and blind (14.12-14). By his repetition of this list in 14.21 he indicates that the parable is intended to be a hortatory illustration of 14.12-14: one should behave like the host in the parable who symbolically invites to his table the poor, the lame, the blind, and the halt. But that is surely not the original intention of the parable: in it, as we shall see, Jesus should rather be regarded as vindicating before his critics his preaching of the good news to the poor: he is saying, in effect, ‘While you are refusing salvation, God is calling the despised to share the salvation of the people of God.’” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 44-45)

Funk and Hoover write: “In place of the three initial invitations, Thomas has four and they vary somewhat from the invitations found in Luke. The first wants to be excused because some merchants are coming to repay a debt that evening; the second has just bought a house; the third has to arrange a marriage banquet for a friend; and the fourth has just purchased an estate. Thomas appears to have exaggerated the commercial basis for rejecting the invitations, which accords with his own concluding generalization in v. 12: ‘Buyers and merchants will not enter the places of my Father.’ As in Luke, the slave then goes out into the streets and brings back whoever happens to be about at that hour. However, Thomas does not describe them as poor and handicapped.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 510)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “By comparison with the related parable Luke 14.15-24 (Matt. 22.1-14), Thomas offers an allegory-free version which may stand closest to the original parable. (For the secondary features in the present parable see on Luke 14.15-24.) This is the case despite the fact that as in Thomas 63 an urban milieu has taken the place of the rural one. The invitation expressed in the same words (vv. 2, 4, 6, 8) is in popular narrative style.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 622)

Helmut Koester writes: “The absence of secondary apocalyptic motifs is also evident in Thomas’s version of the parable of the Great Banquet (Q/Luke 14:16-23 = *Gos. Thom.* 64). Matt 25:2-10 has allegorized this parable. Luke also added some allegorical features when he appended the second invitation to those ‘on the roads and hedges’ of the countryside (Luke 14:23), apparently a reference to the Gentile mission. At the end of his parable Thomas reports only the invitation to those on the streets of the city, and there are no traces of any allegorization in his version. This version is based unquestionably upon the original form of the parable and not on either Matthew or Luke. On the other hand, Thomas has changed the excuses of the first invited guests so that they reflect more closely the milieu of the city. There are four invitations, instead of three, and the excuses are ‘I have claims against some merchants,’ ‘I have bought a house,’ ‘My friend is to be married,’ and ‘I am on the way to collect rent from a farm.’ At the end Thomas adds, ‘Businessmen and merchants [will] not enter the places of my Father.’ No doubt, this is a secondary application.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 99)

Funk’s Parallels

[Deut 20:5-7](#), [Deut 24:5](#), [Luke 14:15-24](#), [Matt 22:1-14](#), [Sirach 26:29](#).

65. (1) ΠΕΧΑÇ ΧΕ ΟΥΡΩΜΕ Ν̄ΧΡΗ(ÇΤΟ)Ç ΝΕΥΝΤ(ΑÇ) Ν̄ΟΥΜΑ
 Ν̄ΕΛΟΟΛΕ ΑÇΤΑΑÇ Ν̄ΖΝ̄ΟΥΟΕΙΕ ΩΙΝΑ ΕΥΝΑΡ̄ ΖΩΒ ΕΡΟÇ Ν̄ÇΧΙ
 Μ̄ΠΕÇΚΑΡΠΟÇ Ν̄ΤΟΟΤΟΥ (2) ΑÇΧΟΟΥ Μ̄ΠΕÇΖΜ̄ΖΑΛ̄ ΧΕΚΑΑÇ
 ΕΝΟΥΟΕΙΕ ΝΑ† ΝΑÇ Μ̄ΠΚΑΡΠΟÇ Μ̄ΠΜΑ Ν̄ΕΛΟΟΛΕ (3) ΑΥΕΜΑΖΤΕ
 Μ̄ΠΕÇΖΜ̄ΖΑΛ̄ ΑΥΖΙΟΥΕ ΕΡΟÇ ΝΕΚΕΚΟΥΕΙ ΠΕ Ν̄ÇΕΜΟΟΥΤÇ
 ΑΠΖΜ̄ΖΑΛ̄ ΒΩΚ ΑÇΧΟΟÇ ΕΠΕÇΧΟΕΙÇ (4) ΠΕΧΕ ΠΕÇΧΟΕΙÇ ΧΕ
 ΜΕΩΑΚ Μ̄ΠΕÇÇΟΥΩΝΟΥ (5) ΑÇΧΟΟΥ Ν̄ΚΕΖΜ̄ΖΑΛ̄ ΑΝΟΥΟΕΙΕ
 ΖΙΟΥΕ ΕΠΚΕΟΥΑ (6) ΤΟΤΕ ΑΠΧΟΕΙÇ ΧΟΟΥ Μ̄ΠΕÇΩΗΡΕ ΠΕΧΑÇ
 ΧΕ ΜΕΩΑΚ ÇΕΝΑΩΠΕ ΖΗΤÇ Μ̄ΠΑΩΗΡΕ (7) ΑΝΟΥΟΕΙΕ ΕΤ̄Μ̄ΜΑΥ
 ΕΠΕΙ ÇΕÇΟΟΥΝ ΧΕ Ν̄ΤΟÇ ΠΕ ΠΕΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΟÇ Μ̄ΠΜΑ Ν̄ΕΛΟΟΛΕ
 ΑΥΔΟΠÇ ΑΥΜΟΟΥΤÇ (8) ΠΕΤΕΥΜ̄ ΜΑΑΧΕ Μ̄ΜΟÇ ΜΑΡΕÇÇΩΤ̄Μ̄

DORESSE

BLATZ

LAYTON

69 [65]. He said: “An [important] man had a vineyard which he gave to cultivators so that they should work it and he should receive the fruit from them. He sent his servant so that the cultivators should give him the fruit of the vineyard: <but> they seized his servant, beat him and almost killed him. The servant came back and told this to his master. His master said <to himself> ‘Perhaps he did not recognize them?’ He sent another servant: the cultivators beat this one also. Then the master sent his son: he said to himself: ‘No doubt they will respect my child?’ But when they realized that this was the heir to the vineyard, these cultivators seized him and killed him. He who has ears let him hear!”

(65) He said: A good man had a vineyard; he leased it to tenants, that they might work in it (and) he receive the fruits from them. He sent his servant, that the tenants might give him the fruits of the vineyard. They seized his servant, beat him, (and) all but killed him. The servant went away (and) told his master. His master said: Perhaps <they> did not know <him>. He sent another servant; the tenants beat the other also. Then the master sent his son. He said: Perhaps they will have respect for my son. Those tenants, since they knew that he was the heir of the vineyard, they seized him and killed him. He who has ears, let him hear.

(65) He said, “A kind man owned a vineyard, and put it in the hands of cultivators for them to cultivate, so that he might get its produce from them. He sent his slave so the cultivators might give the produce of the vineyard to the slave. They seized, beat, and all but killed his slave, and the slave went and spoke to its owner. Its owner said, ‘Perhaps they did not recognize it (the slave),’ and he sent another slave. The cultivators beat the other slave. Next the owner sent his son and said, ‘Perhaps they will show respect for my son.’ Those cultivators, since they recognized that it was he who was heir to the vineyard, seized him and killed him. Whoever has ears should listen!”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This parable, like the preceding two, is derived from the synoptic gospels (Matthew 21:33-41; Mark 12:1-9; Luke 20:9-16), with a few additions, as well as the significant deletion of an allusion to Isaiah 5:1-2 - ‘planted a vineyard, set a wall about it, dug a ditch, built a tower.’ This deletion seems to indicate the lateness of Thomas’s version, for Luke (who was certainly following Mark at this point) has already left out some of the phrases derived from Isaiah. Thomas continues the process.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 172)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “As Dodd and Jeremias have observed, this parable has in its Synoptic form undergone some expansion, and has been converted into an allegory in which the servants represent the prophets. The striking thing about the version in the Gospel of Thomas only appears when we compare it with Dodd’s reconstruction of the original story, in which we should have ‘a climactic series of three’ - two slaves and then the son. This is, in fact, precisely what we find in Thomas. For Grant and Freedman, once again, this parable is derived from the Synoptic Gospels, with the ‘significant’ deletion of the quotation from Isaiah, which in their view indicates the lateness of this version; Thomas is merely continuing a process already begun by Luke. It would, however, be at least equally possible to argue that Thomas presents a more primitive version, and that the Old Testament allusion is a Marcan or pre-Markan addition. Thomas may have a tendency to avoid reference to the Old Testament, or to excise Old Testament quotations, but he does preserve some, one indeed in the next saying. If Thomas is dependent on our Gospels, logion 66 is of course easily explained since it follows immediately upon the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen; but it is quite possible that we have here a genuine case of material growing together in the tradition. As Jeremias observes, the quotation introduces one of the primitive Church’s favourite proof-texts; if he is right in holding that the insertion of this text is pre-Markan, this section in Thomas might be extremely old, but it has none the less been subjected to some redaction.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 101-102)

John S. Kloppenborg, Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser state: “When one compares this version of the Parable of the Tenants to those which occur in Mark, Matthew, and Luke, one notices immediately its distinguishing characteristic: this version is a true parabolic story, not an allegory. Form critics have long held that allegorization of the parables was a relatively late development in the history of their interpretation. In fact, even without access to the Coptic Gospel of Thomas, the great parables scholar C. H. Dodd had offered a conjectural reconstruction of the Parable of the Tenants as it would have been read before the synoptic tradition had allegorized it. His reconstruction matched Saying 65 almost to the word.” (*Q-Thomas Reader*, p. 102)

Gerd Theissen writes: “Even before the discovery of the Gospel of Thomas, Jeremias had demonstrated that the allegorization of the parable, beginning before Mark and increasing in the Synoptics, is a sign of its secondary interpretation in terms of salvation history and christology (*Parables of Jesus*, 1954, 55ff.). The discovery of the Gospel of Thomas confirmed this interpretation (cf. the revised version, 66-89, and Patterson, *Gospel*, 48-51). A Lindemann, ‘Zur Gleichnisinterpretation im Thomas-Evangelium’, *ZNW* 71, 1980, differs; he wants to explain Gospel of Thomas 65 as a de-allegorized form of the Synoptic original used for the Gnostic interpretation.” (*The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, p. 39)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “With regard to *the introduction to the parable* it is to be observed that the description in Mark 12.1 and Matt. 21.33 of the careful construction of the vineyard is in close agreement with the Song of the Vineyard in Isa. 5.1-7. The hedge, the wine-press, and the tower are derived from Isa. 5.1 f. It is at once apparent from these allusions to scripture in the first sentences that the reference is not to an earthly owner of a vineyard and to his vineyard, but to God and Israel, and that we are therefore confronted with an allegory. This allusion to Isa. 5 is, however, omitted by Luke (20.9). More significant is the fact that it is absent from the Gospel of Thomas, where the

beginning of the parable runs: 'A good man had a vineyard. He gave it to husbandmen so that they would work it and that he would receive its fruit from them.' Most significant is the fact that the LXX has been used. The connection with Isa. 5 must therefore be due to secondary editorial activity." (*The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 70-71)

Joachim Jeremias writes: "This description [of the beating of the servants] does not transgress the limits of a straightforward story; there is no indication of a deeper allegorical meaning. It is specially noticeable that in the Gospel of Thomas only *one* servant at a time is sent. This feature also reappears in Mark - at least at first (12.2-5a) - although there the number of sendings is increased to three [and the third is killed]." (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 71)

Joachim Jeremias notes that christological interpretations are absent from the Gospel of Thomas. Jeremias writes: "It is interesting to observe that the Gospel of Thomas merely furnishes a starting-point to the process of interpretation described above to the extent that it allows the saying about the Cornerstone to be attached as an independent logion (66) to the completed parable (65)." (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 74)

Joachim Jeremias writes: "With regard to *the final question* which occurs in all three synoptists (Mark 12.9 par.), but is missing from the Gospel of Thomas, it refers back (see pp. 70 f.) to Isa. 5.5, again not to its Hebrew text (which is not in the form of a question), but following the LXX. If the final question is secondary (the Gospel of Thomas has instead the call to hear, see p. 72), then so is the answer to the question. Neither of them is part of the original parable." (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 74)

Helmut Koester writes: "In Mark 12 as well as in *Gos. Thom.* 65, the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen is connected with the saying about the rejection of the cornerstone (Mark 12:10-11 = *Gos. Thom.* 66). This is not a Markan addition to the parable; Mark's own redactional connection, leading back into the previous context that was interrupted by the insertion of the parable, appears in 12:12-13 with an explicit reference to the parable ('they understood that he said this parable about them'). Thus the saying about the rejected cornerstone was already connected with the parable in Mark's source. However, Thomas does not reflect Mark's editorial connection of parable and saying but cites the saying as an independent unit. Mark's source may have contained more than one parable. The introduction (Mark 12:1) says: 'And he began to speak to them in parables' but only one parable follows. Whether or not this parable of Mark 12 derives from the same collection as the parables of Mark 4, it is evident that the sources of Mark and the *Gospel of Thomas* were closely related." (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 101-102)

Funk and Hoover write: "The following allegorical elements are not found in the simpler version of Thomas: (1) The allusions to the song in Isa 5:1-7 (about someone who planted a vineyard, put a hedge around it, dug a winepress, and built a tower). (2) The repeated sending of slaves and groups of slaves in the synoptic version is omitted; Thomas employs a simple, triadic structure that is a typical feature of oral storytelling. (3) No one is killed prior to the son; in Matthew some are killed in each group. (4) No mention is made of throwing the son outside the vineyard (a reference, presumably, to Jesus' death outside the walls of Jerusalem). (5) There is no concluding question addressed to the audience and therefore no punishment of the tenants. To be sure, some of these traits are missing from Mark and Luke as well. It is Matthew who carried the allegorization to its ultimate degree. Nevertheless, it is striking that Thomas has virtually no allegorical features." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 511)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "The owner ('man') from 64.1 provides the link to this parable (v. 1). By comparison with Mark 12.1-9 parr. it does not contain any element which *must* be interpreted allegorically. However, one would hesitate to conclude from this that 65.1-7 is the basis of the

Markan version. *First*, Logion 66, the content of which appears in Mark 12.10-11 directly attached to Mark 12.1-9, suggests dependence on the Synoptics. *Secondly*, v. 4, which is peculiar to Thomas, may contain a Gnostic interpretation. If we follow the text which has been handed down, the servant did not know the labourers and went to the wrong people. By contrast, v. 7 says that the labourers knew the son and killed him immediately. If the reading handed down is correct, the author is here playing on the word 'know'." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 623)

Burton Mack writes: "*The Tenants*. Most scholars agree that the story in Mark bears literary allusions to the Septuagint of Isa 5:1-5. Since that, plus the citation of Ps 118:22-23 in Mark 12:10-11, betray the signs of literary activity, several scholars have made the attempt to reconstruct an earlier, less allegorical form of the story. Crossan especially, *In Parables*, 86-96, argues strongly on the basis of the variant in GThom 93:1-18 that the story was originally not allegorical, either with respect to Israel's destiny, or with respect to Jesus' destiny, and that it was authentic, 'a deliberately shocking story of successful murder' (p. 96). Crossan does not go on to explain the 'parabolic effect' this might have created, except to say it may have been a commentary upon the times. To follow Crossan in this attempt to retrieve the parable for Jesus, one has to imagine a situation in which listeners would not have been tempted to pick up on allusive suggestions to other stories and histories at all. The tightly constructed story, however, with its motifs of 'sending,' 'servants,' in series, to 'tenants' of a 'vineyard' for its 'produce,' to say nothing of the negative fates of the servants, that the tenants knew who the servants were, that the last one sent is different (the son), and that he was killed, is literally packed with invitations to think of Israel's epic history from a Christian point of view. Images and narrative schemes that come immediately to mind include the vineyard as a traditional metaphor for Israel (even if the literary allusion to Isaiah in Mark 12:1 is deleted), the sending of the prophets, the rejection and killing of the prophets, and perhaps wisdom's envoys (Wis 7:27). The parable betrays a reflection on Israel and the negative fate of the prophets that is greatly advanced over Q. Because the special status and destiny of the last emissary is both emphatic and climactic, the story is surely a product, not of the historical Jesus, but of a much later Christian claim. The story fits best just in Mark's milieu where Jesus traditions, including Q, were combined with meditations upon Jesus' death as a crucial event. Mark's additions merely explicate the allegorical significance contained within the story itself." (*A Myth of Innocence*, pp. 168-169, n. 24)

John S. Kloppenborg, Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser state: "But what does this ancient Christian parable mean? Its interpretation is complicated by a troublesome lacuna, or hole in the papyrus, in its very first line. The missing word is an adjective which would have modified the word 'person' in some way. The extant letters around the edges of the hole permit a reconstruction of the word 'good,' so that one could speak here of a 'good person' who rented the farm to 'evil' tenants, just as one finds in the synoptic versions of the story. But the extant letters also permit the reconstruction of the word for 'creditor' or 'usurer,' which would make this person one of the absentee landlords so much hated among the land-poor peasants of Galilee. One wonders, in the rural areas of Palestine and Syria among the dispossessed and poor - the tenant class - how this parable would have been heard. Were these evil tenants, or were they brave tenants?" (*Q-Thomas Reader*, p. 102)

John S. Kloppenborg, Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser state: "we have seen how easily wisdom speculation of the sort found in Thomas could modulate into a more gnostic understanding of the sayings tradition. This may in fact have been the reason, according to James. M. Robinson, that no sayings collections seem to have survived in orthodox Christian circles, and that Q only survived as it was imbedded in the narratives of Matthew and Luke. This gnosticizing tendency, built into the wisdom sayings tradition, may well have cast a pall of suspicion over all sayings collections within orthodox circles. Embedding the sayings of Jesus

into a narrative context would have ‘protected’ them from this sort of free-wheeling gnostic interpretation.” (*Q-Thomas Reader*, p. 104)

John S. Kloppenborg, Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser state: “In this instance one might well suppose that Thomas’ anti-apocalyptic stance is late, the result of the failure of early Christianity’s apocalyptic expectations to materialize. But this may not necessarily be the case. John Kloppenborg’s recent study of Q has argued that this synoptic sayings collection may have undergone considerable editing at some point in its history. The first draft of Q would not have contained the apocalyptic and angry tones of judgment to be found in the final copy used by Matthew and Luke. This first edition, rather, was a collection of wisdom speeches, a ‘wisdom gospel’ not unlike the Gospel of Thomas. The addition of apocalyptic material to Q would have occurred only after the initial Q community had begun to realize how small it really was, and how few had taken their proclamation of Jesus’ words seriously.” (*Q-Thomas Reader*, pp. 104-105)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 20:9-19](#), [Matt 21:33-46](#), [Mark 12:1-12](#).

66. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΜΑΤΣΕΒΟΕΙ ΕΠΩΝΕ ΠΑΕΙ ΝΤΑΥCΤΟC ΕΒΟΛ ΝΟΙ
 ΝΕΤΚΩΤ ΝΤΟC ΠΕ ΠΩΩΝΕ ΝΚΩΖ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(66) Jesus said: Show me the stone which the builders rejected; it is the cornerstone.

(66) Jesus said, “Show me the stone that the builders rejected: that is the building stone.”

70 [66]. Jesus says: “Would that thou couldst tell me about the stone which the builders have rejected! It is that one, the cornerstone.”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Just as in the synoptic gospels (Matthew 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17), the saying about the stone which the builders rejected is appended to the parable of the vineyard. (The Naassenes too were impressed by this mysterious saying; cf., Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 7, 35.) But Thomas deletes the synoptic reference to ‘reading’ this saying (Matthew, Mark) or to the fact that it is ‘written’ (Luke) - actually in Psalm 118 (117):22-23 - because he is avoiding mention of the Old Testament. See Sayings 53 and 66 and Commentaries.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 172)

F. F. Bruce writes: “In all three Synoptic Gospels the parable of the vineyard is followed by the quotation of Psalm 118:22: ‘The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner’ (i.e. top of the pediment). The point is that Christ, rejected by the leaders of Israel, is exalted by God (cf. Acts 4.11). Here no reference is made to its being an Old Testament quotation. Hippolytus tells us that the Naassenes spoke of the archetypal heavenly Man (whom they called Adamas) as ‘the chief corner stone’. [*Refutation* v.7.35.]” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 139)

Funk and Hoover write: “The fact that the allusion to Ps 118:22 follows on the parable of the leased vineyard in Thomas as it does in the synoptics, even though Thomas lacks the allegorical overlay of the synoptic edition, indicates that the connection may have been the first step in reading the

parable as an allegory, since the rejected stone was probably understood to refer to Jesus in Christian circles: the rejected stone that has become the keystone stands for the rejected Jesus, who has become the centerpiece of the new movement.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 511)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This piece also appears in Mark 12.10-11 par. and fits in well there, because the verses give the reason for the rejection of Israel. But as they do not fit with Thomas here, it follows that they have been taken over, together with Mark 12.1-9, from the Synoptics.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 624)

Funk’s Parallels

[Ps 118:22](#), [Luke 20:9-19](#), [Matt 21:33-46](#), [Mark 12:1-12](#), [Acts 4:11](#), [1 Pet 2:4](#), [1 Pet 2:7](#).

67. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤCΟΟΥΝ ΜΠΤΗΡC ΕCΦ̄ ΟΡΩZ ΟΥΑΑC (C)P̄
 ΟΡΩZ ΜΠΜΑ ΤΗΡC

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(67) Jesus said: He who knows the all, (but) fails (to know) himself, misses everything.	(67) Jesus said, “If anyone should become acquainted with the entirety and should fall short of all (?), that person falls short utterly.”	71 [67]. Jesus says: “He who knows the All, but has failed to know himself, has failed completely to know, <or: to find> the Place!”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This saying is incomprehensible. Presumably Jesus is ‘the All,’ and ‘everywhere’ is where Jesus is, as in Saying 77. If - as is most uncertain - the saying is related to Jesus’ words to Martha in Luke 10:41, ‘There is need of few things or of one,’ it would mean that to know Jesus is all that the believer needs. Perhaps the saying was garbled during transmission.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 173)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Logion 67 Grant and Freedman, using a different translation, found incomprehensible, and they suggest that it may have been garbled in the transmission. The clue, however, had already been provided by Dr. Till, who after observing ‘For him who wants to be saved it is necessary above all to recognize the vanity of the material world,’ and quoting sayings to that effect, continues ‘It is by no means sufficient to know the worthlessness of the material world. The indispensable perfection of knowledge is knowing oneself. For even ‘he who knows all the universe but does not know himself has mised everything’.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 28)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying is as difficult to translate as it is to understand. The first clause may refer simply to one who is very knowledgeable - a know-it-all. In this case, the saying recalls the famous dictum of Socrates, ‘Know thyself.’ However, the word for ‘all’ is also a technical term in gnostic circles and refers to the whole of cosmic reality; it is usually translated as ‘All,’ with a capital A. Elsewhere in Thomas this term seems to carry this technical sense (note 2:4 and 77:1). The Fellows took the term here to be technical gnostic language also. They gave it a black designation as the result. Thomas 70 is a related saying.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 512)

Gerd Ludemann gives the translation, “Jesus said, ‘Whoever knows the All (but) is deficient in himself is deficient in everything.’” Ludemann writes: “The ‘All’ is a technical term which relates to the universe, embracing the earth and the cosmos (cf. 2.4; 77.1). ‘Know’ takes up the same expression from 65.4, 7. According to Thomas, knowledge of the All and self-knowledge condition each other. The reason lies in the consubstantiality of the All with the Gnostic self. Thus according to Logion 77 Jesus is the light and at the same time the All. Whoever knows himself is Christ and himself becomes a person of light.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 624)

Funk’s Parallels

[Book of Thomas the Contender 138:16-18.](#)

68. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΝΤΩΤΝ ΖΜΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΥΩΑΝΜΕCΤΕ
 ΤΗΥΤΝ ΝCΕΡΔΙΩΚΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ (2) ΔΥΩ CΕΝΑΖΕ ΑΝ ΕΤΟΠΟC ΖΜ
 ΠΜΑ ΕΝΤΑΥΔΙΩΚΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(68) Jesus said: Blessed are you when you are hated and persecuted, and they will find no place where you have been persecuted.

(68) Jesus said, “Blessed are you (plur.) whenever they hate you and persecute you. And wherever they have persecuted you, they will find no place.”

72 [68]. Jesus says: “Blessed are you when you are hated and persecuted; but they will not find a position in that place to which they shall pursue you!”

Scholarly Quotes

Comparing Thomas to Matthew and Luke, Koester finds that the Thomas form is more original: “The phrase ‘and cast out your name as evil on account of the Son of man’ is certainly Lukan; it is missing in the parallel passage Matt 5:11. Moreover, the reference to persecution has disappeared in the Lukan redaction of this saying, but is preserved in Matt 5:11.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 89)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The meaning [of v. 2] is unclear. Is this talk of the lack of success of the ones who are acting? But in what sense? Perhaps it helps to note that ‘place’ also appears in other passages of the Gospel of Thomas (4.1; 24.1; 60.6; 64.12) and each time denotes the place of salvation. In that case v. 2 says that the persecutors have forfeited salvation.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 625)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 6:22-23](#), [Matt 5:10-12](#), [1 Pet 4:12-19](#), [Clem. Alex. Strom. 4.6.41.2](#).

69. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC̄ Ζ̄ΜΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC̄ ΝΕ ΝΑΕΙ Ν̄ΤΑΥΔΙΩΚΕ Μ̄ΜΟΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ
 Ζ̄Μ̄ ΠΟΥΖΗΤ ΝΕΤ̄ΜΜΑΥ ΝΕΝΤΑΖCΟΥΩΝ ΠΕΙΩΤ Ζ̄Ν̄ ΟΥΜΕ (2)
 Ζ̄ΜΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC̄ ΝΕΤΖΚΑΕΙΤ ΩΙΝΑ ΕΥΝΑΤCΙΟ Ν̄ΘΖΗ Μ̄ΠΕΤΟΥΩΩ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(69) Jesus said: Blessed are those who have been persecuted in their heart; these are they who have known the Father in truth. Blessed are the hungry, for the belly of him who desires will be filled.

(69) Jesus said, "Blessed are those who have been persecuted in their hearts. It is they who have truly come to be acquainted with the father. Blessed are they who hunger for the belly of the needy to be satisfied."

73 [69]. Jesus says: "Blessed are those who are persecuted in their hearts. They are those who have known (?) the Father in truth! Blessed are those who are hungry, because they will satisfy their bellies to <their> content!"

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "In *Who Is the Rich Man?* 25, Clement of Alexandria asserts that 'the most difficult persecution is from within,' from pleasures and passions: 'The one being persecuted cannot escape it, for he carries the enemy around within himself everywhere.'" (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 96)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Like Saying 69 [68], this one is based on gospel Beatitudes. From the blessing on those who are persecuted (Matthew 5:10), Thomas turns to add materials taken from Matthew 5:8: 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God'; for him the vision of God is equivalent to knowing 'the Father in truth' (knowing and worshiping the Father in truth, John 4:22-23). Then he goes back to Matthew 5:6 (hungering for righteousness, being filled), though with the parallel verse in Luke (6:21) he omits 'for righteousness.'" (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 174)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "In both cases [68 and 69] Grant and Freedman see only development from our Gospels; if they are right it is interesting, in view of the Naassene tendency to reversal of order, to note that we have in logion 69 elements from Matthew v. 10, 8 and 6 in that sequence. Bartsch sees in logion 68 a type of expansion which has already begun in Matthew, and notes further development in 1 Peter iv. 14-16. Quispel, however, finds parallels in the Clementines and in Polycarp, which may point to a common tradition, but these must be closely scrutinized." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 81)

Funk and Hoover write: "There were probably at least four beatitudes in Jesus' repertoire (poor, hungry, weeping, persecuted: Luke 6:20-22). The formulation of the fourth in Q, which has been preserved here in Thomas in slightly different forms (Thom 68, 69:1), has been influenced by the persecution of the members of the Christian community after Jesus' death. In both its Thomean versions, the saying has been modified to suit the perspectives of Thomas. Scholars have not determined what 'and no place will be found, wherever you have been persecuted' means, and so cannot determine whether it could have originated with Jesus. The term 'place,' however, appears elsewhere in Thomas with special significance (for example, Thom 4:1; 24:1; 60:6; and 64:12, where Jesus is made to say, 'Buyers and merchants will not enter the places of my Father'). The

wording in 69:1 is clearly Thomean, since knowing the Father is the goal of Christians for Thomas.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 512)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The statement about persecution in the heart is unclear; perhaps the Coptic translator has mistranslated the text ‘Blessed are the persecuted who are of a pure heart’ (cf. Matt 5.8). Thomas has here introduced the key word ‘persecute’ from Logion 68. The second part of v. 1 certainly comes from him since to attain the ‘knowledge of the Father’ is one of the goals of Thomas (cf. 50.2-3).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 625)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 6:22-23](#), [Luke 6:21a](#), [Matt 5:10-12](#), [Matt 5:6](#).

70. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΧΠΕ ΠΗ ΖΝ̄ ΤΗΥΤΝ̄ ΠΑΙ
 ΕΤΕΥΝ̄ΤΗΤΝ̄ ̄ ̄ΝΑΤΟΥΧΕ ΤΗΥΤΝ̄ (2) ΕΩΩΠΕ ΜΝ̄ΤΗΤΝ̄ ΠΗ ΖΝ̄
 Τ(Η)ΥΤΝ̄ ΠΑΕΙ ΕΤΕ ΜΝ̄ΤΗΤΝ̄ ̄ ΖΝ̄ ΤΗΝΕ ̄(ΝΑ)ΜΟΥΤ ΤΗΝΕ

DORESSE

BLATZ

LAYTON

(70) Jesus said: If you have gained this within you, what you have will save you. If you do not have this in [you], what you do not have in you [will] kill you.

(70) Jesus said, “If you (plur.) produce what is in you, what you have will save you. If you do not have what is in you, what you do not have [will] kill you.”

74 [70]. Jesus says: “When you have something left to share among you, what you possess will save you. But if you cannot share [among you], that which you have not among you, that [... ? ... will ...] you.

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: “This Gnosticizing variant of Saying 41 may refer to the heavenly light, which is the salvation of those who possess it but the destruction of those who lack it.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 140)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This is a Gnostic version of the synoptic saying already reproduced in Saying 42 [41]. The Gnostic ‘begets’ within himself the kingdom or Jesus or light and will be saved by what he begets; the non-Gnostic has nothing and will be killed by this nothing(ness).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 174)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying reminded the Fellows of the gnostic idea that one’s salvation depends on possessing - and recognizing in oneself - a piece of the divine, sacred spark, a fragment of the ‘light,’ which signals one’s true origin in the one high God, the ultimate source of other divinities, including the creator God. If one possesses it and recognizes it, salvation is assured (note Thom 24:3, where this same idea is explicit). If one does not possess the divine spark, there is nothing one can do about it. Such a deficiency is also alluded to in Thomas 67. Because of the affinities of these ideas with gnostic views and their remoteness from what is otherwise known of Jesus, the Fellows designated the saying black by common consent.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 513)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Thomas’s formulation is dualistic. It is a matter of life (= salvation) and death. Salvation is manifestly connected with knowledge of one’s own self, one’s heavenly origin,

which is light. Otherwise, if the knowledge is not attained, the result is death.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 626)

Funk’s Parallels: [GThom 41](#).

71. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ †ΝΑΩΟΡ(ΩΡ ΜΠΕΕ)ΙΗΕΙ ΔΥΩ ΜΝ ΛΑΔΥ
ΝΑΩΚΟΤ4 (.....)

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(71) I will des[troy this] house, and none shall be able to build it [again].	(71) Jesus said, “I shall throw down [this] building, and no one will be able to build it [...].”	75 [71]. Jesus says: “I will [...] and no one will be able [...]”

Scholarly Quotes

R. McL. Wilson writes: “If this is independent, it must confirm the synoptic version (‘I will destroy’) against John (imperative). If, however, it is dependent we may ask if it is intended as deliberate opposition to John ii. 21: ‘He spake of the temple of His body.’ It is at any rate notable that no reference is made to the resurrection; on the contrary, the possibility of restoration is emphatically denied. This must indicate either a rejection of the doctrine of the resurrectino or perhaps a period after the final destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, when no hope remained of its rebuilding.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 115)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The saying is reminiscent of John 2.19, where a similar saying is spoken by Jesus, and Mark 14.58, according to which a saying of Jesus to this effect has been wrongly put on the lips of Jesus. However, in the New Testament parallels there is always a reference to a rebuilding, whereas there is none in Thomas. Hence Logion 71 might be about the destruction of the world or matter in a metaphorical sense. There is no eschatological perspective at work here. Thomas presupposes the New Testament texts and on that basis formulates an ascetic-dualistic saying of Jesus about the temple.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 626)

Funk and Hoover write: “The Fellows conceded that Jesus could have predicted the destruction of the temple and its replacement by another ‘not made with hands.’ And they agreed that some such saying must have circulated as an independent remark during the oral period, since it appears in three independent sources. Yet they were hesitant to identify its original form. The saying in Thomas, unfortunately, is fragmentary.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 513)

Gerd Theissen writes: “Gospel of Thomas 71 knows the prophecy in the first person: ‘Jesus said: I shall destroy this house, and no one will be able to build it (again).’ Here the positive part of the prophecy is directly denied. It had not been fulfilled and had become a problem.” (*The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, p. 433)

Stephen Patterson writes: “it structural similarity [to other sayings about the Temple] permits the assumption that it is indeed a version of the so-called ‘temple word’. . . . Whether the lack of any referenc to the temple in 71 is a secondary feature, or a primitive touch is difficult to decide. I would suspect, however, that Thomas’ ending: ‘and no one will be able to rebuild it’ is secondary over against references to rebuilding the Temple in the various other versions. The fact that the Temple was never rebuilt would eventually prove awkward for such predictions. One way to ease off the problem would be to allegorize it, as does John, in terms of the resurrection (2:21); another

way would be to ease off the prediction itself (so Thomas)” (*The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, pp. 109-110)

J. D. Crossan writes: “I agree with the first two points of that analysis [by Patterson] but not with its third one. Despite its ambiguities, ‘house’ is best seen as referring originally to the Temple at Jerusalem, even if the *Gospel of Thomas* may now understand it in some other way. Next, the structural balance of destroying/rebuilding is common to all three sources in the complex and must be taken very seriously. But I reverse the sequence presumed by Patterson’s analysis. I take *Gospel of Thomas* 71 as the most original version we have, and it simply states emphatically: I will destroy this house so utterly that rebuilding will be impossible. The rebuilding does not, initially, reflect any spiritual substitution but is merely an emphatic way of stating utterly, completely, totally, and forever. It is not this version that has eased off the rebuilding, taken negatively, but the other versions that have developed the rebuilding, taken positively. It is most significant, therefore, that the *Gospel of Thomas*, which has no interest in the passion of Jesus, still retains this saying. But that cuts both ways. It may mean that it is very good historical Jesus tradition but also that the connection with the passion was not at all on the same level.” (*The Historical Jesus*, p. 356)

Funk’s Parallels

[Matt 26:59-68](#), [Matt 27:39-40](#), [John 2:13-22](#), [Mark 14:55-65](#), [Mark 15:29-30](#), [Mark 13:1-4](#), [Acts 6:12-14](#).

72. (1) (ΠΕ)ΧΕ ΟΥΡ(ΩΜ)Ε ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΧΟΟC ΝΝΑCΝΗΥ ΩΙΝΑ
 ΕΥΝΑΠΩΥΕ ΝΝΖΝΑΑΥ ΜΠΑΕΙCΩΤ ΝΜΜΑΕΙ (2) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ Ω
 ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΝΤΑΖΑΑΤ ΝΡΕΥΠΩΥΕ (3) ΑΥΚΟΤΥ
 ΑΝΕΥΜΑΘΗΤΗC ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΜΗ ΕΕΙΩΟΟΠ ΝΡΕΥΠΩΥΕ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(72) [A man said] to him: Speak to me brothers, that they may divide my father’s possessions with me. He said to him: O man, who made me a divider? He turned to his disciples. He said to them, I am not a divider, am I?	(72) Some person [said] to him, “Tell my siblings to share my father’s possessions with me.” He said to that person, “My good fellow, who has made me into an arbitrator?” He turned to his disciples and said to them, “So am I an arbitrator?”	76 [72]. [Someone (?) said] to him: “Speak to my brothers, that they may share with me my father’s possessions!” He answered him: “Man, who made me a sharer?” He turned to his disciples and said to them: “Let me not be a sharer!”

Scholarly Quotes

‘Abd al Jabbar in the Book on the Signs of Muhammed’s Prophecy states: “A man said to him, ‘Master, my brother (wishes) to share (with me) my father’s blessing.’ (Jesus) said to him, ‘Who set me over you (in order to determine your) share?’” (from Shlomo Pines, *The Jewish Christians of the Early Centuries of Christianity According to a New Source*, p. 13)

Marvin Meyer writes: “Gilles Quispel, ‘The *Gospel of Thomas* Revisited,’ p. 243, proposes that in this saying ‘divider’ may be understood to mean ‘schismatic,’ so that Jesus denies being a

schismatic or heretic. Such an understanding may be related to the Eighteen Benedictions (‘Shemoneh `Esreh’) used in Jewish worship, since Benediction 12 was a prayer against Nazarenes and Minim, or heretics, and was meant to exclude such heretics (who included Jewish Christians) from the synagogue.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 97)

Funk and Hoover write: “The unit in Thomas consists of two parts, a dialogue (vv. 1-2) and a question addressed to disciples (v. 3). The dialogue portion in Luke and Thomas is quite similar; Jesus rejects the requested role. The second element in each version is strikingly different. The dialogue in Luke ends with this general admonition: ‘Guard against greed in all its forms; after all, possessions, even in abundance, don’t guarantee someone life.’ The subject in Luke is evidently the dangers of wealth, while for Thomas the final words of Jesus appear to be focused on division, in spite of the request made in 72:1. This theme is reminiscent of Thom 61:5: ‘If one is <whole>, one will be filled with light, but if one is divided, one will be filled with darkness.’ Division appears to be a Thomean motif.” (*The Five Gospels*, pp. 513-514)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The final question is added by Thomas. Jesus is not really a divider (in spite of Sayings 16, 56, and 98); he comes to restore man’s lost unity.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 175)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 12:13-21.](#)

73. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΩΖC ΜΕΝ ΝΑΨΩΨ ΝΕΡΓΑΤΗC ΔΕ ΣΟΒΚ ΣΟΠC
ΔΕ ΜΠΧΟΕΙC ΨΙΝΑ ΕΨΝΑΝΕΧ ΕΡΓΑΤΗC ΕΒΟΛ ΕΠΩΖC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(73) Jesus said: The harvest is indeed great, but the labourers are few. But pray the Lord, that he send forth labourers into the harvest.

(73) Jesus said, “The harvest is plentiful but the workers are few. So plead with the lord to dispatch workers for the harvest.”

77 [73]. Jesus says: “The harvest is great but the labourers are few. Pray the Lord to send labourers for the harvest.”

Scholarly Quotes

Rabbi Tarfon in Pirke Aboth 2.20 says: “The day is short, and the work is great, and the laborers are slow, and the wages are high, and the master of the house is insistent.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 97)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying evidently originated in the context of the Christian movement, at a time when missionary endeavor was a major activity. In addition, the image of the harvest is usually associated with the threat of judgment, a theme that was not characteristic of Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 514)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion corresponds to Matt. 9.37-38/Luke 10.2 (=Q), but does not read ‘of the harvest’ after ‘the lord’ as Matthew and Luke do. There is no evidence of dependence on the Synoptic parallels.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 627)

Funk's Parallels

[Luke 10:1-16](#), [Matt 9:35-38](#), [John 4:31-38](#).

74. ΠΕΧΑϞ ΥΕ ΠΧΟΕΙϞ ΟΥΝ ΖΑΖ ΜΠΚΩΤΕ ΝΤΧΩΤΕ ΜΝ ΛΑΑΥ
ΔΕ ΖΝ ΤΩΩ(Τ)Ε

BLATZ

(74) He said: Lord, there are many about the well, but no one in the well.

LAYTON

(74) He said, "O lord, there are many around the drinking trough but nothing in the cistern."

DORESSE

78 [74]. He said: "Lord, many are round the opening but nobody in the well!"

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: "This appears to be said by one of the disciples to Jesus. The well is the well of truth: many approach it without getting into it. Celsus, the anti-Christian writer of the second century, quotes the saying (in Greek) from the *Heavenly Dialogue* of the Ophite Gnostics. [As quoted by Origen, *Against Celsus* viii. 16. For the general idea compare Saying 23 (p. 124). The form is similar to that of a Greek mystery-saying quoted by Plato: 'The wand-bearers are many, but the initiates are few' (*Phaedo* 69c).]" (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 141)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "This remarkable aphorism, which Thomas probably attributes to Jesus (or is Jesus the Lord who is addressed?), has an equivalent in the anti-Christian philosopher Celsus (c. 180 CE), who read it in a writing with the title 'Heavenly Dialogue'. It was in circulation among the Gnostic group of the Ophites (serpent worshippers). There it runs, 'Why are there many around the well and no one in the well?' Evidently the aphorism is meant to encourage the Gnostic to stop being a bystander and enter, in order also to be able to drink the water of knowledge." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 627)

Funk's Parallels

[Heavenly Dialogue in Origen Against Celsus 8.15](#).

75. ΠΕΧΕ ΙϞ ΟΥΝ ΖΑΖ ΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΖΙΡΜ ΠΡΟ ΑΛΛΑ ΜΜΟΝΑΧΟϞ
ΝΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΜΑ ΝΩΕΛΕΕΤ

BLATZ

(75) Jesus said: There are many standing at the door, but it is the solitary who will enter the bridal chamber.

LAYTON

(75) Jesus said, "There are many standing at the door, but it is the solitaries who will enter the bridal

DORESSE

79 [75]. Jesus says: "Many stand outside at the door, but it is only the solitaries who will enter into the bridal

chamber.”

chamber.”

Scholarly Quotes

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The use of the word MONACOS in logion 75 and other sayings has led some of the scholars who first discussed the new document to the conclusion that it must be a late work, at least in its present form, since this seemed to imply monasticism. This view, however, seems now generally abandoned, and the word is taken in the sense of ‘solitary’ or ‘single one.’” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 33)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The many who stood before the door are probably the foolish virgins of Matthew 25:1-13; they have no oil for their lamps, and hence no light. Only the wise virgins enter in with the Bridegroom.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 176)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This is another variation on the theme ‘Many are called but few are chosen’ (Matthew 22.14). The ‘bridal chamber’ figures in several Gnostic texts as the place where the soul is reunited with its proper element; it is accessible only to the ‘single’ (in the sense of 4, 49). [The Valentinian Gnostics observed a sacrament of the bridal chamber, through which light was received. According to the *Gospel of Philip* (a Valentinian collection of sayings identified, like the *Gospel of Thomas*, among the Nag Hammadi papyri), ‘if any one becomes a son of the bridal chamber, he will receive the light; if any one does not receive it while he is in this place, he will not receive it in the other place’ (Saying 127).] There is a superficial resemblance to the parable of the ten virgins (Matthew 25.1-13), but it is to the wedding feast, not to the bridal chamber, that the wise virgins are admitted.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, pp. 141-142)

Funk and Hoover write: “In later practice among some gnostic groups, the ‘wedding suite’ appears to refer to an established ritual, although the procedures and significance attached to it are not known. In the *Gospel of Philip*, a Christian gnostic instruction manual of the third century C.E., the ‘bridal suite’ plays an important role. Only ‘free men’ and ‘virgins’ can enter it; ‘animals’ (in human form), ‘slaves’ (those who commit sin), ‘and defiled women’ (those who have participated in sexual intercourse), may not. Since the *Gospel of Philip* is oriented to sacramental practice, it is likely that the ‘bridal suite’ falls into this category. There is another reference to the bridal suite in Thom 104:3.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 514)

Stevan Davies writes: “The comments found in several sayings that advocate people ‘make the two one’ or celebrate the solitary monachos may refer to the union of the sexes characterizing humanity in Gen 1:27 and Gos. Thom. 22. References to a bridal chamber in sayings 75 and 104 may also be references to this primordial union of the sexes. There are no grounds in Thomas to presume that the references are to an actual bridal chamber ritual.”

(<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 23](#), [GThom 49](#), [GThom 106](#), [Matt 25:1-13](#), [DialSav 49-50](#).

76. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΜΠΕΙΩΤ ΕCΤΝΤΩΝ ΑΥΡΩΜΕ
 ΝΕΨΩΩΤ ΕΥΝΤΑϸ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΟΥΦΟΡΤΙΟΝ ΕΑϸΖΕ ΑΥΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤΗC (2)
 ΠΕΨΩΩΤ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΟΥCΑΒΕ ΠΕ Αϸ† ΠΕΦΟΡΤΙΟΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΑϸΤΟΟΥ
 ΝΑϸ ΜΠΙΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤΗC ΟΥΩΤ (3) ΝΤΩΤΝ ΖΩΤΤΗΥΤΝ ΨΙΝΕ ΝCΑ
 ΠΕϸΕΖΟ ΕΜΑϸΩΧΝ ΕϸΜΗΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΜΑ ΕΜΑΡΕΧΟΟΛΕC ΤΖΝΟ
 ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΜΑΥ ΕΟΥΩΜ ΟΥΔΕ ΜΑΡΕϸϸΝΤ ΤΑΚΟ

BLATZ

(76) Jesus said: The kingdom of the Father is like a merchant who had a load (of goods) and found a pearl. That merchant was wise. He sold the load and bought for himself the pearl alone. You also, seek after his treasure which does not fail (but) endures, where moth does not come near to devour nor worm to destroy.

LAYTON

(76) Jesus said, "What the kingdom of the father resembles is a merchant who owned some merchandise, and then learned about the existence of a certain pearl. That merchant was shrewd, sold the merchandise, and bought the single pearl. You (plur.), too, seek the ceaseless and enduring treasure, where moth does not approach to eat nor worm to destroy."

DORESSE

80 [76]. Jesus says: "The Kingdom of the Father is like a man, a merchant, who has a burden and found a pearl. This merchant is a wise man: he sold the bundle and bought the pearl alone. You also seek his treasure which does not perish, which lasts, into which the moth does not enter to consume and <where> the worm does not destroy."

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "Perhaps read *p{ef}eho*, 'the treasure.' Antoine Guillaumont and the other editors of *The Gospel According to Thomas*, p. 42, note that the scribe initially wrote *pefho*, 'his face,' then added a supralinear *e*, but neglected to delete *ef*." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 98)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "This saying is a revised version of the parable of the pearl in Matthew 13:45-48. Since in Matthew the parable is preceded by the parable of the hidden treasure, Thomas adds a statement about treasure, derived from Matthew 6:20 (Luke 12:33). Matthew mentions moth and *broxis*, which means 'rust'; Thomas takes *broxis* very literally to mean 'eating,' and therefore adds a word about worms. The treasure is the inner man; what worms eat is the body." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 177)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "The situation, however, is not quite so simple [as Grant and Freedman suggest], since the words are not an exact parallel to Matthew vi. 19 f., but, as Cerfaux pointed out, introduce an element derived from John (vi. 27), while the 'worm' seems to come from Mark (ix. 48). Doresse suggests that we may have the beginnings of a synthesis already in Luke (xii. 33 f.). The most obvious explanation here is free quotation by an author familiar with all four Gospels, but as already noted this does not seem to account for the phenomena presented by the gospel as a whole. It may be that we must reckon with the possibility that the several sayings are of diverse origin: some perhaps from genuine early tradition, others based on our Gospels directly, others again the result of free quotation and harmonization, and still others merely tendentious inventions. It is, however, interesting to note that Jeremias brings Matthew vi. 19 ff. and Luke xii. 33 f. into his discussion of these two parables. For Gnostic use of the concept we need only recall the famous 'Hymn of the Pearl' in the Acts of Thomas." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 92-93)

J. D. Crossan writes: “Luke 12:33 and *Gos. Thom.* 76b. Both Luke and *Thomas* are totally positive and lack Matthew’s antithetical parallelism. . . . I prefer to consider Luke as the Q version, a tradition reflected more brokenly by *Thomas*.” (*In Fragments*, p. 130)

Funk and Hoover write: “This parable appears also in Matt 13:45-46, where it takes the form: ‘Heaven’s imperial rule is like some trader looking for beautiful pearls. When that merchant finds one priceless pearl, he sells everything he owns and buys it.’ Thomas has edited the parable slightly to accommodate his disapproval of mercantilism. So the merchant sells the merchandise and buys the one pearl he has found. The small differences in the two versions do not affect the basic point: God’s imperial rule is worth a priceless pearl, which one will do well to acquire no matter what the cost. The Fellows thought that Jesus probably told a parable of this type.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 515)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse [3] contains an interpretation of the parable in vv. 1-2. It is similar to Matt. 6.19f./Luke 12.33 (=Q) and calls on the reader to preserve the inner treasure which in the context of the Gospel of Thomas can mean only the self (= Jesus as light; cf. 50.1). In this Gnostic interpretation I presuppose that v. 3 is dependent on the Synoptic parallels mentioned (for ‘treasure’ cf. further Matt. 13.44).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 628)

Ron Cameron writes: “This imperative [seek the treasure] is virtually identical with that which prefaces the application of the Ear of Grain (ApJas 12.27-28). However, whereas the similarities of language and style in the secondary frames which conclude each parable in the Apocryphon of James suggests that those frames have been composed by the same circle, one which is closely related to the final stages of editing the entire text, the application in GThom 76.2 constitutes a traditional piece of aphoristic wisdom, ‘appended interpretatively’ [Crossan] to The Pearl, that has no vestige of a distinctive language or style attributable to the author of this gospel. Instead, the aphorism about the treasure which Thomas has preserved as the application (76.2) of The Pearl (76.1) is a version of an independent unit of tradition. A similar thematic - but not formal - juxtaposition is attested in the Gospel of Matthew, whose author seems to have assembled The Treasure (13:44//GThom 109) and The Pearl (13:45-46) from two separate sources. Although that arrangement may be attributed to the editorial activity of Matthew himself, the secondary collocation of ‘pearl’ and ‘treasure’ in GThom 76 betrays no earmarks of the author’s own redaction. Since this marks the only instance in the Gospel of Thomas in which such a saying is used to interpret the parable, the addition of this application is to be regarded as the product not of the author himself but of an earlier stage of the tradition.” (“Parable and Interpretation in the Gospel of Thomas,” *Forum* 2.2 [1986])

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 12:33-34](#), [Matt 13:45-46](#), [Matt 6:19-21](#).

77. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΔΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΠΔΕΙ ΕΤΖΙΧΩΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ
 ΔΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΤΗΡC ΝΤΑ ΠΤΗΡC ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΖΗΤ ΔΥΩ ΝΤΑΠΤΗΡC
 ΠΩΖ ΨΑΡΟΕΙ (2) ΠΩΖ ΝΝΟΥΨΕ ΔΝΟΚ †ΜΜΔΥ (3) CΙ ΜΠΩΝΕ
 ΕΖΡΑΙ ΔΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΑΖΕ ΕΡΟΕΙ ΜΜΔΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(77) Jesus said: I am the light that is above them all. I am the all; the all came forth from me, and the all attained to me. Cleave a (piece of) wood; I am there. Raise up a stone, and you will find me there.

(77) Jesus said, "It is I who am the light (that presides) over all. It is I who am the entirety: it is from me that the entirety has come, and to me that the entirety goes. Split a piece of wood: I am there. Lift a stone, and you (plur.) will find me there."

81 [77]. Jesus says: "I am the light which is on them all. I am the All, and the All has gone out from me and the All has come back to me. Cleave the wood: I am there; lift the stone and thou shalt find me there!"

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "Compare Ecclesiastes 10:9; perhaps Habakkuk 2:18-20, on wooden and stone ianges. Note also the philosophical position presented by the Greco-Roman author Lucian of Samosata, *Hermotimus* 81: 'God is not in heaven but rather permeates all things, such as pieces of wood and stones and animals, even the most insignificant.'" (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 98)

Jean Doresse writes: "Cf. the Gnostic *Gospel of Truth* (Codex XIII of Chenoboskion, p. 17): 'The All has been in search of Him from whom he came forth; and the All was within him, unseizing, unthinkable!' One might also mention the *Acts of Peter*, Chapter XXXIX: 'Thou art the All, and the All is in thee, and thou art! And there is nothing else that exists, except thou alone!' The same allusion is found in *Col. III*, 11: 'Christ is all and in all.'" (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 376)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "As the All, Jesus is everywhere present. He is in wood and under stones. We cannot agree with Doresse (pages 188-189) that Thomas is referring to the cross and the stone at his tomb. A much closer parallel is provided in the Gnostic Gospel of Eve (Epiphanius, *Pan.*, 26, 3, 1): 'In all things I am scattered, and from wherever you wish you collect me.' At this point Thomas's doctrine is pantheist, not Christian. The Greek version inserts the words about wood and stone at the end of Saying 31 to indicate that Jesus is present with his disciples, or with one disciple. The meaning is approximately the same: Jesus is everywhere." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 178)

Stevan Davies writes: "Gos. Thom. 77b: 'Split a piece...' etc, is appended to Gos. Thom. 30 in POxy. 1. This probably means that 77b once existed independently of 77a, but whether this means that 77a existed once independently of 77b in Thomas we do not know. It is possible that 77b was appended both to 77a and to 30 in POxy 1."
 (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes: "From him, primordial light, all comes forth, and to him all extends. As the light, he is everywhere, for example, within logs and under stones."
 (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk and Hoover write: “In this complex, Jesus speaks of himself in highly exalted terms, as he often does in the Gospel of John (for example, John 8:12; 10:7). But such self-reference is not characteristic of the Jesus of the synoptic parables and aphorisms. The term ‘light’ has special significance in the Gospel of Thomas (11:3b; 24:3; 50:1; 61:5; 83:1-2), and the ‘All’ is a technical gnostic term for the whole of cosmic reality (note Thomas 67). Such ideas, of course, had currency elsewhere in early Christian circles as well (note John 8:12; Rom 11:36; 1 Cor 8:6). But they are not characteristic of Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 515)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Jesus identifies himself with light (cf. John 8.12; 9.5), which is tremendously important in Thomas: 11.3b; 24.3; 50.1; 61.5; 83.1-2. Jesus claims to be mediator at creation (cf. Romans 11.36; 1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16). All this recalls the role of wisdom. The presence of Jesus as it is described in vv. 2-3 echoes Matt. 18.20; 28.20 - but in that passage, too, there is a wisdom background.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 629)

Jack Finegan writes: “The first sentence in this saying is doubtless to be recognized as thoroughly Gnostic in character. The theme of light is prominent in Gnostic writings (e.g., §113), and the ‘All,’ presumably meaning the totality of being, is also mentioned in such works as the Gospel of Truth (§341). The second sentence, which is the part common to the Coptic and the Greek texts, can be interpreted most simply as promising the invisible presence of Christ to the believer in his daily work, involved with stone and wood, the common materials of human labor. But with the introductory sentence in the Coptic, where Jesus is the ‘All,’ the promise seems to be set within the framework of pantheism or, more precisely stated, of panchristism.” (*Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*, p. 250)

F. F. Bruce writes: “Jesus is not only the light of the world (cf. John 1.9; 8.12); all things cohere in him (Colossians 1.17) and he embodies the fulness of deity (cf. Colossians 2.9). This is presented here in pantheistic terms going far beyond the sense of a canonical saying as Matthew 18.20.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, pp. 142-143)

Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes: “In what sense is this second part of the saying to be understood? It has often been interpreted in a pantheistic sense, or more precisely a ‘panchric’ sense, asserting the ubiquity of Jesus in the world. Cf. Eph 4:6. J. Jeremias (*Unknown Sayings*, 96, n. 2) gives a convenient list of those who so explained it. He rejects this interpretation and prefers that first suggested by H. Lisco and adopted by A. von Harnack, H. B. Swete, and Evelyn White. According to this interpretation, two pictorial illustrations are given to explain *how* Jesus is present to the individual - two kinds of strenuous work, lifting stones and splitting wood. The combination of these two types of work was probably suggested by Eccl 10:9, ‘He who quarries stones may be hurt by them, while he who splits logs is endangered by them.’ In contrast to the pessimism of the Preacher, Jesus promises his abiding presence even in the most strenuous type of work.” (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, pp. 400-401)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy1 30 + 77b](#), [Matt 18:20](#), [John 8:12-20](#), [1 Cor 8:4-6](#), [Manichaean Psalm Book 54:19-30](#).

78. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥ ΑΤΕΤΝΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΤCΩΨΕ ΕΝΑΥ
ΕΥΚΑΨ ΕΨΚΙΜ Ε(ΒΟΛ) ΖΙΤΜ ΠΤΗΥ (2) ΑΥΩ ΕΝΑΥ ΕΥΡΩΜ(Ε
Ε)ΥΝΨΤΗΝ ΕΥΘΗΝ ΖΙΩΩΒ Ν(ΘΕ ΝΝΕΤ)ΝΡΡΩΟΥ ΜΝ
ΝΕΤΜΜΕΓΙCΤΑΝΟC (3) ΝΑΕΙ ΕΝ(Ε)ΨΤΗΝ Ε(Τ)ΘΗΝ ΖΙΩΟΥ ΑΥΩ
CΕΝ(Α)ΨCCOΥΝ ΤΜΕ ΑΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(78) Jesus said: Why did you come out into the field? To see a reed shaken by the wind? And to see a man clothed in soft raiment? [Look, your] kings and your great men, these are the ones who wear soft clothing, and they [will] not be able to know the truth.

(78) Jesus said, “Why have you (plur.) come out into the countryside? To see a reed shaken by the wind? And to see a person dressed in fine apparel [like your] governors and your members of court, who wear fine apparel and cannot recognize truth?”

82 [78]. Jesus says: “Why did you go out into the country-side? <Was it> to see a reed shaken [by] the wind, and to see a m[an with soft] garments clothing him? [But they are in the dwelling-places of] kings and your great ones, those whom [soft garments] clothe, and they do not know the truth!”

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: “In the canonical tradition similar words are spoken with reference to John the Baptist (Luke 7.24 f.; Matthew 11.7 f.). Here the reference to John is lost (see Saying 46) and the saying serves to point to a contrast between being well-to-do and knowing the truth.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 143)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse addresses the readers and calls for asceticism. Only those who do not wear soft clothing will recognize the truth.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 629)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Kings and MEGISTANES are mentioned together in Revelation vi. 15, one of the three passages only in the New Testament where the latter word is used. The variation in the position of the verb ‘to see,’ which in the Synoptic parallels is included in the question, is easily explained; commentators have often noted that the Greek text here can be punctuated in two different ways. This brings us to a point which may be of some significance. The Bohairic and Sahidic versions, both in Matthew and in Luke, agree against Thomas in placing the stop after the verb, which shows that at this point at least they and Thomas present independent translations. Such a variation, however, is possible only on the basis of a written ancient document in which, as was usual in ancient manuscripts, there were no marks of punctuation; if the words were spoken the division of the sentences would be made clear. We have thus two different interpretations of the same Greek text. It may be that the ambiguity can be traced still further back, but this is a question to be decided by specialists in another field. If the ambiguity exists only in the Greek, Thomas in this saying must have drawn either on our Gospels or on a parallel Greek text. In the latter case we may have an extract from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, but this document is something of an unknown quantity.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 63-64)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 46](#), [Luke 7:24-30](#), [Matt 11:7-15](#).

79. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΟΥCΖΙΜ(Ε) ΝΑϞ ΖΜ ΠΜΗΨΕ ΧΕ ΝΕΕΙΑΤC (Ν)ΘΖΗ
 ΝΤΑΖϞΙ ΖΑΡΟΚ ΑΥΩ ΝΚΙ(Β)Ε ΕΝΤΑΖCΑΝΟΥΨΚ (2) ΠΕΧΑϞ ΝΑ(C)
 ΧΕ ΝΕΕΙΑΤΟΥ ΝΝΕΝΤΑΖCΩΤΜ ΑΠΛΟΓΟC ΜΠΕΙΩΤ ΑΥΑΡΕΖ ΕΡΟϞ
 ΖΝ ΟΥΜΕ (3) ΟΥΝ ΖΝΖΟΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΨΩΠΕ ΝΤΕΤΝΧΟΟC ΧΕ
 ΝΕΕΙΑΤC ΝΘΖΗ ΤΑΕΙ ΕΤΕ ΜΠCΩ ΑΥΩ ΝΚΙΒΕ ΝΑΕΙ ΕΜΠΟΥ†
 ΕΡΩΤΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(79) A woman in the crowd said to him: Blessed is the womb which bore you, and the breasts which nourished you. He said to [her]: Blessed are those who have heard the word of the Father (and) have kept it in truth. For there will be days when you will say: Blessed is the womb which has not conceived, and the breasts which have not given suck.

(79) A woman in the crowd said to him, "Blessed are the womb that bore you and the breasts that nourished you!" He said to [her], "Blessed are those who have heard the father's utterance (or Word) and truly kept it! For days are coming when you (plur.) will say, 'Blessed are the womb that has not conceived and the breasts that have not given milk!'"

83 [79]. In the crowd a woman says to him: "Blessed is the womb which bore thee and the breast which fed thee!" He said to her: "Blessed are those who have heard the word of the Father and keep it! In truth, days are coming when you will say: Happy is the womb that has not brought forth and those breasts which have not given suck!"

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "The first part of this saying comes from Luke 11:27-28, though the word 'nourished' is derived from Luke 23:29, which Thomas uses as the second part of the saying. The word of the Father, then, is that sterility is better than pregnancy. Just so, in the Gospel of the Egyptians, Salome says to Jesus, 'I did well, then, by not bearing [children]' (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, 3, 66, 2). For Jesus really came 'to destroy the works of the female' (*Strom.*, 3, 63, 2)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 179)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "Once again, as Grant and Freedman show, it is not difficult to find a Gnostic explanation, but this does not mean the association of sayings from entirely different contexts. The obvious suggestion is association by key-words, the references to womb and breasts having caused the attraction of the second saying of the first; yet the whole fits well together, and it might be argued that it was originally a unity." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 81)

F. F. Bruce writes: "Two quite independent sayings are conflated here. Jesus's reply to the woman who says how wonderful it must be to be his mother indicates that to do the will of God is more wonderful still (Luke 11.27 f.), but this is merged with his words to the weeping woman on the Via Dolorosa (Luke 23.29). The two sayings are linked by the common theme of bearing and suckling children, but the historical perspective of the second (the impending siege and capture of Jerusalem in A.D. 70) is here replaced by a suggestion that motherhood is incompatible with 'hearing the Father's word and keeping it in truth'. As regularly (except in Saying 100), 'God' in the canonical text is here replaced by 'the Father'." (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 143)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thom 79:3, which has a parallel in Luke 23:29, has possibly been retained by Thomas because of its ascetic interest: the procreation of the race is not necessarily a good thing.

This kind of asceticism seems to have been shared by the Qumran community, which some scholars believe was celibate, although it must be noted that not all Essenes were celibate.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 516)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The basis of these verses is Luke 11.27-28, as v. 28 derives from Lukan redaction and ‘word of the Father’ (v. 2) clearly derives from the redaction of Thomas. ‘Word of the Father’ is typical of Thomas, as he avoids the term ‘God’. ‘Truth’ (v. 2) picks up the same word from 78.3.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 630)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 11:27-28](#), [Luke 23:29](#).

80. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΖΟΥΩΝ ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΔΥΖΕ ΕΠCΩΜΑ
 (2) ΠΕΝΤΑΖΖΕ ΔΕ ΕΠCΩΜΑ ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΜΠΩΔ ΜΜΟϢ ΔΝ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(80) Jesus said: He who has known the world has found the body; and he who has found the body, the world is not worthy of him.	(80) Jesus said, “Whoever has become acquainted with the world has found the body, and the world is not worthy of the one who has found the body.”	84 [80]. Jesus says: “He who has known the world has fallen into the body, and he who has fallen into the body, the world is not worthy of him.”

Scholarly Quotes

Bentley Layton writes: “This saying is nearly identical with no. 56, which likens the world to a ‘corpse’ (Greek *ptoma*) rather than the body (Greek *to soma*).” (*The Gnostic Scriptures*, p. 394)

Helmut Koester writes: “Understanding the world - a thing that is really dead - leads inevitably to a proper understanding of the body and corporeal existence. Becoming superior to the world involves deprecation of the flesh in favor of the spirit.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 126)

Funk and Hoover write: “Jesus did not depreciate the world, so far as we can tell from the body of lore identified as coming from him. But in Thomas’ version of Christianity, this seems to be a standard theme. Note, for example, the saying recorded in Thomas 110: ‘The one who has found the world, and has become wealthy, should renounce the world’ (further, compare Thom 27:1 and 111:3). These sayings represent a branch of the Christian movement that grew increasingly ascetic as time passed. Asceticism does not comport with the Jesus who was accused of being a glutton and a drunk (Luke 7:34).” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 517)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 56](#), [GThom 111](#), [Luke 17:37](#), [Matt 24:28](#).

81. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΝΤΑ2P PΜΜΑΟ ΜΑΡΕ4P ΡΡΟ (2) ΑΥΩ
 ΠΕΤΕΥΝΤΑ4 ΝΟΥΔΥΝΑΜΙC ΜΑΡΕ4ΑΡΝΑ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(81) Jesus said: He who has become rich, let him become king, and he who has power, let him renounce (it).

(81) Jesus said, “The one who has become rich should reign. And the one who has power should renounce.”

85 [81]. Jesus says: “Let him who has become rich reign, and let him who has strength refrain <from using it>!”

Scholarly Quotes

F. F. Bruce writes: “This saying either disparages material wealth and power, or commends true wealth and power in the spiritual realm (cf. Saying 2); he who has the latter will renounce the world.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 144)

Funk and Hoover write: “This paradoxical saying is a puzzle to interpreters of the Gospel of Thomas. The first half seems to condone worldly values, the second half to condemn them. Thom 110 is similar, except that the paradox is lacking. The term ‘reign’ in v. 1 may be a key to understanding the saying. ‘Reign’ elsewhere in Thomas is a technical term (in Thom 2:4, those who seek will find, they will then be disturbed and marvel, and finally, they will ‘reign over all,’ a final state that corresponds to salvation), but, even so, the meaning of the saying is far from clear. The use of paradox fits generally into the Thomean pattern, which is also characteristic of some of the genuine sayings of Jesus. However, the Fellows could not fit the first part of the saying into what is known about Jesus from other sayings and parables, so it was designated black. The second half sounded more like something Jesus might have said; this possibility produced a gray vote.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 517)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “‘Become rich’ refers in a metaphorical sense to knowledge (cf. 3.5). The one who has knowledge should be king (cf. 2.3).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 630)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse requires renunciation on the part of the one who has worldly power, so that he enters into the state denoted in v. 1.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 631)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 110](#), [Luke 18:24](#), [Matt 19:23](#), [Mark 10:23](#), [1 Cor 4:8](#), [Dialogue of the Savior 20](#).

82. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤ2ΗΝ ΕΡΘΕΙ Ε42ΗΝ ΕΤCΑΤΕ (2) ΑΥΩ
 ΠΕΤΟΥΗΥ ΜΜΟΕΙ 4ΟΥΗΥ ΝΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(82) Jesus said: He who is near to me is near the fire, and he who is far from me is far from the kingdom.

(82) Jesus said, “Whoever is near me is near fire, and whoever is far from me is far from the kingdom.”

86 [82]. Jesus says: “He who is near me is near the fire, and he who is far from me is far from the Kingdom.”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The fire is that which Jesus came to cast on the earth (Sayings 9 and 16); it is a symbol of the kingdom and therefore of the Father. We find something rather like this saying in the letter of Ignatius of Antioch to the Smyrnaeans (4, 2). ‘Why have I given myself up to death, to fire, to sword, to wild beasts? But near sword is near god, with wild beasts is with God.’ Perhaps Ignatius alludes to this saying; on the other hand, this saying may be based on the words of Ignatius.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 180)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The fire is a symbol of the ‘kingdom of the Father’ (cf. Sayings 10, 16). We may recall that, according to Justin Martyr and others, a fire was kindled on Jordan when Jesus was baptized. [Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 88.3: ‘When Jesus went down into the water a fire was kindled in the Jordan.’ Cf. the ‘light’ which shone on the same occasion according to the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (p. 107).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 144)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “To be near Jesus is dangerous. It offers no prospect of earthly happiness, but involves the fire of tribulation and the test of suffering. But it must indeed be borne in upon every one who, yielding to fear, turns away from the call of Jesus, that he excludes himself from the Kingdom of God. Only through fire may the Kingdom be attained.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 196)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying is also known from later writers such as Origen . . . However, the aphorism is thought by many scholars to approximate the proverb of Aesop: ‘Whoever is near to Zeus is near the thunderbolt.’ To approach the divine is to risk danger. Some of the Fellows were attracted by the short, aphoristic nature of the saying and its reference to the Father’s domain. On the other hand, assigning popular sayings to Jesus is a common practice of the early Christian community. Further, Jesus speaks here of himself in rather exalted terms, as though he were equal to God. This aspect suggested to the Fellows an early Christian origin.” (*The Five Gospels*, pp. 517-518)

Funk’s Parallels

[Mark 9:49](#), [Mark 12:34](#), [Origen In Jerem. hom. lat. 20.3](#), [Armenian Ms. Monestary of St. Lazzaro, Ign Smyr. 4.2](#).

83. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΝΖΙΚΩΝ CΕΟΥΟΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ ΔΥΩ
ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΤΝΖΗΤΟΥ 4ΖΗΤ ΖΝ ΘΙΚΩΝ ΜΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΜΠΕΙΩΤ (2)
4ΝΑΔΩΛΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΔΥΩ ΤΕ4ΖΙΚΩΝ ΖΗΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΝ ΠΕ4ΟΥΟΕΙΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(83) Jesus said: The images are revealed to man, and the light which is in them is hidden in the image of the light of the Father. He will reveal himself, and his image is hidden by his light.

(83) Jesus said, “Images are visible to human beings. And the light within these (images) is hidden by the image of the father’s light; it will be disclosed. And his image is hidden by his light.”

87 [83]. Jesus says: “Images are visible to man, but the light which is in them is hidden. In the image of the light of the Father, it <this light> will be revealed, and his image will be veiled by his light.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Philo of Alexandria in *Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 1.31-32* commenting on Genesis 2:7 as follows: “‘And God formed humankind by taking clay from the earth, and he breathed into the face the breath of life, and humankind became a living soul.’ There are two kinds of human beings: One is heavenly, the other earthly. Now the heavenly is made in the image of God and is completely free of corruptible and earthly substance; but the earthly was constructed from matter scattered about, which he (that is, Moses) calls clay. Therefore he says that the heavenly human was not molded but was stamped in the image of God, while the earthly human is a molded thing, but not an offspring, of the Artisan. One must deduce that the human being from the earth is mind admitting but not yet penetrated by the body.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 100)

Marvin Meyer writes: “Elsewhere, in his tractate *On the Creation of the World* 134, Philo describes the heavenly human, created in God’s image, as ‘an idea or kind or seal, an object of thought, incorporeal, neither male nor female, incorruptible by nature.’ In the gnostic *Secret Book of John II* 15,2-5 the demiurge Yaldabaoth may even distinguish between the image and the likeness when he says to his authorities, ‘Come, let us create a human being in the image of God and in our likeness, so that the image of the human being may become a light for us.’ In general, compare also 2 Corinthians 3:18; 4:4-6; 1 Timothy 6:14-16.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 100)

Jean Doresse writes: “The doctrine of images is of Platonic origin; they are the models or primordial unattainable ideas, which exist in the mind of God. Here, however, it is the images which are visible, while the light which is within them is invisible. It becomes visible, however, through the Father’s light, while his image remains veiled by his light.” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 377)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The ‘image of the Father’s light’ is presumably Christ (cf. 2 Corinthians 4.4; Colossians 1.15), who cannot be adequately perceived by those who are still in mortal body. When mortality is at last sloughed off, he will be fully manifest (cf. Colossians 3.4; 1 John 3.2).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, pp. 144-145)

Stevan Davies writes: “I read for saying 83 not ‘he will be manifest...’ but ‘It [the light of the Father] will be manifest...’ That the Father Himself becomes manifest while His image does not is, I think, an absurdity in the context of Thomas.”
(<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion defines the relationship between image, light and Father. Cf. *Gospel of Philip* 67: ‘The truth did not come naked into the world, but came in types and images. It (= the world) will not (be able to) receive it otherwise.’ See further 50.1-2.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 631)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying makes use of the language of the Platonic schools, which were active at the time the Christian movement began. According to Plato, God or the Demiurge brought the world into being, but crafted it according to an eternal archetype or ‘image’ (sometimes called a ‘form’). The sensory world was contrasted in Platonism with the world of ‘images’ or ‘forms,’ which were eternal and fixed. Platonism influenced Philo, a Jewish philosopher of considerable stature living in Alexandria, Egypt, at the time of Jesus. A little later, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, another Egyptian Christian philosopher-theologian, began to integrate Platonism and Christian thought. This saying in Thomas thus reflects early Christian attempts to

formulate its theology in Greek philosophical terms, something entirely alien to Jesus, but quite common in many parts of Christendom.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 518)

Stephen Patterson writes: “*Thom.* 83 probably also has to do with instruction on what to look for when one encounters God in the beatific vision. It deals with the theme of ‘light,’ or the experience of luminosity that is often associated with visionary experience. In distinction from the light that is hidden within the human likeness, God’s light is overwhelming.” (*The Fifth Gospel*, p. 64)

Funk’s Parallels

[1 Tim 6:15-16](#), [2 Cor 3:18](#), [2 Cor 4:4-6](#).

84. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΝΖΟΥ ΕΤΕΤΝΝΑΥ ΕΠΕΤΝΕΙΝΕ ΩΑΡΕΤΝΡΑΩΕ
 (2) ΖΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝΝΑΥ ΔΑΝΕΤΝΖΙΚΩΝ ΝΤΑΖΩΩΠΕ ΖΙ
 ΤΕΤΝΕΖΗ ΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΜΟΥ ΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΤΕΤΝΑΦΙ ΖΑ
 ΟΥΗΡ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(84) Jesus said: When you see your likeness, you rejoice. But when you see your images which came into existence before you, which neither die nor are made manifest, how much will you bear?	(84) Jesus said, “When you (plur.) see your resemblance you are happy. But when you see your images that came into existence before you and are neither mortal nor visible, how much you will have to bear!”	88 [84]. Jesus says: “Now, when you see your appearance, you rejoice. But when you see your images which came into being before you, which do not die and do not show themselves, how will you be able to bear such greatness?”

Scholarly Quotes

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Like Irenaeus and some other Fathers, Thomas distinguishes between the ‘image’ and the ‘likeness’ in Genesis i. 26. Man on earth possesses only the likeness; the image (for Thomas) is his heavenly counterpart, the pattern on which he was made. Now we see only the likeness, as in a mirror (Doresse quotes 1 Cor. xiii. 12, 2 Cor. iii. 18), but when Christ shall appear we shall be like Him (1 John iii. 2, quoted by Grant and Freedman). Logion 24 speaks of the light that is in a man of light (cf. Matt. v. 14, vi. 22-23), logion 50 of the disciples (or the Gnostics) as coming from the Light, and the Pistis Sophia (chaps. 2-6) of a light descending upon Jesus, so bright that the disciples were blinded and could not see Him. Christ is the image of God (Col. i. 15 etc.), and Paul speaks of ‘the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ’ (2 Cor. iv. 4, 6, quoted by Grant and Freedman). Colossians iii. 3 speaks of our life as ‘hid with Christ in god,’ and we may also recall the Pauline formula ‘in Christ.’ Finally, the opening words of logion 83 may owe something to reflection on Romans i. 20 ff., the ‘invisible things of God’ being interpreted as the archetypal patterns, the ‘images’ or Platonic ideas of all created things. Such speculations seem to belong to a period later than the New Testament, and certainly long after the time of Jesus.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 108-109)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This carries on the thought of the previous saying. Since men are created in the divine image (Genesis 1.26 f.), Christ, who is himself the divine image, is the archetypal man, the true Adam.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 145)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying is closely related to Thomas 83 and reflects the same early Christian attempt to employ Platonic categories. Some gnostics believed that each person has a heavenly twin, or image, which never perishes, but which awaits the moment of death, when the gnostic’s soul is reunited with that twin.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 518)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse introduces the eternal heavenly likenesses to which the readers have not yet become assimilated. Thomas raises the question how long the readers can bear it, i.e. can be reminded of their earthly existence, without failing.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 632)

Helmut Koester writes: “Separating the soul from corporeal existence does not mean that the soul would henceforth exist as a disembodied spirit, wandering abstractly through the cosmos without form and identity; rather, the soul freed from its prison would enter a new kind of corporeal existence which awaits her in the heavenly realm. This new ‘body’ is often spoken of as one’s heavenly ‘image,’ which awaits the soul, but remains guarded and enclosed in the safety of the godhead until it can be properly claimed. Thus Thomas speaks of ‘images,’ for the present concealed in the Father, but waiting for the moment when their splendor will be revealed to the utter astonishment of those by whom they will be claimed: [83 and 84].” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 126-127)

Stevan Davies writes: “For Thomas the world can be conceived in two ways, from the perspective of the primordial light and the beginning, or from the everyday perspective. The difference between these two perspectives is discussed in Thomas’s sayings 50a, 83 and 84 . . . Unfortunately, however, these sayings presuppose an underlying metaphysics that is hinted at so briefly and that is so dependent on unclear pronoun references that certainty in regard to their interpretation may be impossible. Still, it is hard to deny that these sayings refer ultimately to a form of Platonism wherein there is a highest reality, an image of that reality, and an image of that image which is, evidently, the world as it is ordinarily perceived.”
(<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Stevan Davies writes: “In sayings 50a, 83, and 84, it appears that the images which constitute the world as ordinarily perceived are seen through the image of the primordial light (or, alternatively, the image of the light of the Father). The image of primordial light is our ordinary sunlight. Seeing always in an ordinary way, by ordinary sunlight, precludes seeing the primordial light that permeates all things. In this way the light of the Father is concealed by the image of the light of the Father.” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk’s Parallels

[Gen 1:26-28.](#)

85. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΝΤΑΑΔΑΜ ΩΩΠΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝΝΟΥΝΟC
 ΝΔΥΝΑΜΙC ΜΝ ΟΥΝΟC ΜΜΝΤΡΜΜΑΟ ΔΥΩ ΜΠΕCΩΩΠΤΕ Ε(CΜ)ΠΩΔ
 ΜΜΩΤΝ ΝΕΥΑΞΙΟC ΓΑΡ ΠΕ (ΝΕCΝΑΧΙ) †Π(Ε) ΔΝ ΜΠΜΟΥ

LAYTON

DORESSE

BLATZ

<p>(85) Adam came into being out of a great power and a great wealth, and he was not worthy of you; for if he had been worthy, [he would] not [have tasted] of death.</p>	<p>(85) Jesus said, "It is from a great power and a great wealth that Adam came into being: and he did not become worthy of you (plur.). For, had he been worthy [he would] not [have tasted] death."</p>	<p>89 [85]. Adam was produced by a great power and a great wealth; but he did not receive (?) [. . .] worthy (?) of you, for he was not worthy [to (?)] be preserved from [being subject (?)] to death."</p>
---	---	--

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "On 'great power' compare Acts 8:9-10, which refers to Simon the Magician, who was said to be 'the power of God that is called great.' The Nag Hammadi tractate *Concept of Our Great Power* also discusses the 'great power,' the Secret Book of John alleges that Yaldabaoth took 'great power' from his mother, Wisdom, and magical texts likewise employ the phrase 'great power' to refer to a supernatural force. In the tractate *On the Creation of the World* 148, Philo uses the same Greek word for 'power' (*dynamis*) that is used in the Coptic text of Gospel of Thomas saying 85 when he suggests that 'there was probably a surpassing power about that first human.'" (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 100-101)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Doresse (pages 192-93) treats his equivalent of Sayings 83 and 84 together, but it would be better to treat 83, 84, and 85 as a unit. We begin with Saying 85. We know that Adam originated from a great power and great wealth because he was a copy of the 'image' and 'likeness' of god; he was both male and female (Genesis 1:26-27). He was not worthy of Gnostic believers, however, for he sinned - by increasing and multiplying, by being divided into male and female when Eve was taken from his rib. (Eve must return to Adam, as in Saying 112 [114].) Apparently (Saying 84), men in general can see the 'likeness,' which they still retain. Not all can see the 'images,' for to see the image is to see Christ, which means to see the kingdom and, indeed, the inner man. This true image neither dies nor is openly manifest. At this time the image cannot be seen openly or perfectly; it is fully seen only after death (1 Corinthians 13:12, quoted by Doresse). Saying 83 explains why the image cannot be fully seen now. The image contains light (see Saying 51), but this light is overshadowed by the image of the light of the Father (cf., 2 Corinthians 4:4, 6). Later, however, 'If he is manifest we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is' (1 John 3:2). If this is what these sayings mean, Thomas has expressed it rather obscurely, using image terminology perhaps like that of the Naassenes (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 8, 10)." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 181-182)

Funk and Hoover write: "In developing the significance of Jesus, early Christians often used the mythic figure of Adam as a point of comparison. One finds this especially in Paul (Rom 5:12-14; 1 Cor 15:21-22, 42-50): in contrast to Adam, whose sin led to death, stands Jesus, whose obedience leads to life. The fate of Adam, according to Thom 85:2, was death; the fate of those who find the meaning of Jesus' words will be not to taste death, according to Thomas 1. The phrase 'not taste death' is a favorite of Thomas (Thom 1; 18:3; 19:4; 111:2), although it was also known to the Gospel of John (8:51-52)." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 518)

Stevan Davies writes: “Death occurs to Adam, not to the image of God (Gos. Thom. 85; Gen 3:19). The compiler of the Gospel of Thomas understands the first chapters of Genesis in their plain sense, that there are two creations of primordial humanity: the image of God brought forth in Gen 1:1-2:4, Adam created in Gen 2:5-3:24. For the first, the image of God, there is neither law nor sin, nothing that would require prayer or fasting or giving of alms (Gos. Thom. 14, 104). The image of God has dominion over the perfect kingdom of God, living through the light of creation (Gen 1:3-4) in a condition of rest and immortality.” (<http://www.misericordia.edu/users/davies/thomas/jblprot.htm>)

Funk’s Parallels

[Gen 1:26-28](#), [Gen 3:17-19](#).

86. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ (ΝΒΑΩΟΡ ΟΥΝΤ)ΑΥ ΝΟΥ(Β)ΗΒ ΔΥΩ
 ΝΖΑΛΑΤΕ ΟΥΝΤΑΥ ΜΜΑΥ ΜΠΕΥΜΑΖ (2) ΠΩΗΡΕ ΔΕ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ
 ΜΝΤΑϢ ΝΝ(Ο)ΥΜΑ ΕΡΙΚΕ ΝΤΕϢΑΠΕ ΝϢΜΤΟΝ ΜΜ(Ο)Ϣ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(86) Jesus said: [The foxes have] the[ir holes] and the birds have [their] nest, but the Son of Man has no place to lay his head and rest.

(86) Jesus said, “[Foxes have] their dens and birds have their nests. But the son of man has nowhere to lay his head and gain repose.”

90 [86]. Jesus says: “[The foxes have holes] and the birds have [their] nests but the Son of Man has no place to lay his head and rest.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Plutarch’s Life of Tiberius Gracchus 9.4-5 on the homeless soldiers of Italy: “The wild animals that range over Italy have a cave, and there is a lair for each of them to enter, but those who fight and die for Italy have a share in the air and the light and nothing else, but, having no house or abode, they wander about with wives and children.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 101)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Something has been lost at the beginning, but this saying is nothing but a repetition of the gospel statement about the Son of Man and his life of detachment from the world (Mathew 8:20; Luke 9:58). What is characteristic of the Son of Man must also be characteristic of his disciples, who are ‘sons of men’ (Saying 103). The place of ‘rest’ (Thomas adds ‘to rest’ to the saying; cf., Sayings 51, 52, and 90) is not on earth but within.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 182)

J. S. Kloppenborg Verbin writes: “Koester notes that *GThom* 86 (=Q 9:58) uses ‘Son of Man’ in a nontitular way, and with Bultmann (1968:98; also Todt 1965:122) argued that this saying is a proverb in which *Son of Man* is no honorific title, but simply means ‘man,’ as contrasted with the animals. He wonders: ‘The decisive question is whether *Thomas* presupposes a stage of the Synoptic tradition in which a titular usage of the term *Son of Man* had not yet developed’ (1971:170-71 n 34).” (*Excavating Q*, p. 384)

Funk and Hoover write: “As in Q, the version in Thomas employs the phrase ‘son of Adam.’ In addition to its well-known technical sense, it can also mean simply ‘human being.’ Since Thomas probably does not empty that phrase in its technical, apocalyptic sense, the translators of the Scholars Version have rendered it simply as ‘human beings’ (the plural form makes it refer unambiguously to persons rather than to the heavenly figure of Daniel 7, who will come on the

clouds at the end of time to pass judgment on the world). If Jesus is referring to himself in this saying, as some scholars think, it suggests that Jesus is homeless - a wanderer, without permanent address, without fixed domicile. Jesus thus ranks himself even below the animals, much less below settled, civilized human beings. In Q, Jesus makes this saying a warning to potential followers. In Thomas, the saying has been modified in a very subtle way to refer to the gnostic notion of salvation, which was summed up in the term 'rest.' Compare saying 51, where the disciples ask Jesus when the dead will achieve 'rest.' The Greek fragment of Thomas 2 states that the ultimate goal of the gnostic is to find 'rest.'" (*The Five Gospels*, p. 519)

J. D. Crossan writes: "There is, first of all, the immediate formal difference in that, while Q was an *aphoristic dialogue* [Mt 8:19-20 // Lk 9:57-58], this is an *aphoristic saying*. And, since this eliminates any discrepancy between comment and response, that is between voluntary wandering and involuntary rejection, the meaning of *Gos. Thom.* 86 is not and was not necessarily that of Q. Therefore what Bultmann said long before *Thomas* was discovered must now be recalled: 'it is plain that the dominical saying could have circulated without any framework. That must indeed have been the case if *ho huios tou anthropou* has been incorrectly substituted for 'man.' And 'man' must have been in fact the original meaning; man, homeless in the world, is contrasted with the wild beasts' (28). Koester, citing Bultmann, notes that *Thomas* never 'uses the title "Son of Man" for Jesus or any other figure,' so that 'the decisive question is whether *Thomas* presupposes a stage of the synoptic tradition in which a titular usage of the term *Son of man* had not yet developed' (Robinson and Koester: 170, 171 note 34). As with the saying in *Gos. Thom.* 42, 'Become passers-by,' so also does this saying bespeak a homelessness for humanity within this world. And, although this has been denied (Strobel: 223), the addition of 'and rest' after 'to lay his head' points the aphorism towards a gnostic interpretation (Gartner: 60-61). This is true not so much of the text itself, even with that addition, but of its contextual association with the theme of Rest or Repose in *Gos. Thom.* 2 (Oxy P 654.2), 50, 51, 60, and 90 (Vielhauer, 1964:292-299). Indeed, there are 'two terms, the Place and the Rest (or Repose)' brought together in *Gos. Thom.* 86, and even though 'both are found in the New Testament, though usually in a general and non-technical sense,' they are used in *Thomas* in a more specific and gnostic understanding (Turner and Montefiore: 110). In other words, *Gos. Thom.* 86 is much more contextually than textually gnostic (Robinson and Koester, 140-141)." (*In Fragments*, pp. 241-242)

J. D. Crossan writes: "The first version [Thomas 86], however, retains the earlier format of a Jesus saying without any dialogue framework. It also retains, more significantly, a saying in which 'son of man' is neither titular nor circumlocutionary. It does not mean Jesus but the generic or indefinite 'human being.' We can be relatively sure on this point because, while the *Gospel of Thomas* is, as we saw earlier, emphatically anti-apocalyptic, that apocalypticism did not contain the theme of Jesus as the Son of Man, else that Gospel would surely have avoided or glossed this present saying. In other words, *Gospel of Thomas* 86 uses 'son of man' for 'human being' without any fear of apocalyptic misunderstanding, just as *Gospel of Thomas* 106 uses the plural 'sons of man' for 'human beings' (Koester 1989a:43). The saying in *Gospel of Thomas* 86 asserts, and it is an assertion capable of diverse interpretations, that the human being, unlike the animal or the bird, has no fixed abode on earth. I leave aside, by the way, that terminal 'and rest,' which is, in the light of other sayings on rest and repose such as *Gospel of Thomas* 2, 50, 51, 60, a major theological theme within the redaction of that Gospel (Vielhauer). Apart from that final gloss, the saying goes back to Jesus, although, as just mentioned, its meaning will demand much further context for final interpretation. But its existence means that the *Sayings Gospel Q* had at least one traditional unit in which Jesus spoke of 'the son of man' and that, in conjunction with the other traditional theme of Jesus as apocalyptic judge from Daniel 7:13, facilitated the creation of Jesus speaking of himself as the apocalyptic Son of Man." (*The Historical Jesus*, p. 256)

Funk's Parallels: [Luke 9:57-62](#), [Matt 8:18-22](#).

87. (1) ΠΕΧΛΑϞ Ν̄ΟΙ ῙϞ ΧΕ ΟΥΤΑΛΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΝ ΠΕ ΠΩΜΑ ΕΤΑΨΕ
 ΝΟΥΨΩΜΑ (2) ΑΥΩ ΟΥΤΑΛΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΣ ΤΕ ΤΨΥΧΗ ΕΤΑΨΕ Ν̄ΝΑΕΙ
 ΜΠCΝΑΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(87) Jesus said: Wretched is the body which depends on a body, and wretched is the soul which depends on these two.

(87) Jesus said, “Wretched is the body that depends upon a body. And wretched is the soul that depends upon these two.”

91 [87]. He said, he, Jesus: “The body which depends on a body is unfortunate, and the soul which depends on these two is unfortunate!”

Scholarly Quotes

Funk and Hoover point out that speculation about the relation of body and soul is presented in Gal 5:16-18, Rom 8:3-11, and John 3:6.

Marvin Meyer quotes Macarius of Syria, Homily 1.11: “Damn (or, Shame on) the body whenever it remains fixed in its own nature, because it becomes corrupt and dies. And damn (or, shame on) the soul if it remains fixed only in its own nature and relies only upon its own works, not having communion with the divine spirit, because it dies, not having been considered worthy of the eternal life of divinity.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 101)

Jean Doresse writes: “No doubt this is to be explained by *Luke IX, 57-60* and *Matt. VIII, 21-2*: ‘Let the dead bury the dead.’ In this case, ‘the body which depends on a body’ is a living person who, through care for earthly obligations, wishes to bury his dead person. ‘The soul which depends on these two’ is the soul of such a person, a living body depending on a dead body.” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 377)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Since Saying 86 is a quotation from Matthew and Luke, we may expect that the present saying is related to something in the context those gospels provide (cf., Sayings 69-70). Indeed, it may well be a Gnosticizing interpretation of the mysterious words reported in Matthew 8:22 (Luke 9:60): ‘Leave the dead to bury their own dead.’ All earthly ties must be broken, as in Sayings 80 and 110. So Doresse, page 194. To know the world is to find a corpse (Saying 57).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 183)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This cryptic saying (cf. Saying 112) disparages the mortal body, which is given birth from another body. It is best for the soul to be as independent as possible of bodily life.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 145)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 112](#), [GThom 29](#).

88. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΝΑΓΓΕΛΟC ΝΗΥ ΩΑΡΩΤΝ ΜΝ ΝΠΡΟΦΗΤΗC
 ΑΥΩ CΕΝΑ† ΝΗΤΝ ΝΝΕΤΕΥΝΤΗΤΝCΕ (2) ΑΥΩ ΝΤΩΤΝ ΖΩΤΤΗΥΤΝ
 ΝΕΤΝΤΟΤΤΗΝΕ ΤΑΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΝΤΕΤΝΧΟΟC ΝΗΤΝ ΧΕ ΑΩ ΝΖΟΟΥ
 ΠΕΤΟΥΝΝΗΥ ΝCΕΧΙ ΠΕΤΕ ΠΩΟΥ

LAYTON

DORESSE

BLATZ

(88) Jesus said: The angels and the prophets will come to you, and they will give you what is yours. You also, give them what is in your hands, and say to yourselves: On what day will they come to take what is theirs?

(88) Jesus said, “The messengers and the prophets are coming to you (plur.), and they will give you the things that you possess. And you, too - give them the things that you have, and say among yourselves, ‘When are they coming to take their own?’”

92 [88]. Jesus says: “The angels and prophets are coming to you; they will give you the things that belong to you. You, give them what you possess, and say: ‘When will they come and take what is theirs?’”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Angels are the messengers of the Son of Man, e.g., in Matthew 13:41. They give man his true self, the kingdom. It is not clear what the prophets have to do with this. Perhaps the emphasis is on what men give the prophets, for ‘many prophets . . . desired to see what you see and did not see it’ (Matthew 13:17; Luke 10:24). The day on which they come and take their own is presumably the day of death; compare Luke 12:20 (in the parable of the rich fool, Saying 64): ‘This night they will require your soul [life] from you.’” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 183)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The question at the end is reminiscent of the message received by the rich fool in Luke 12.20: ‘This night your soul is required of you’ (cf. Saying 63). On the day when mortal life ends the heavenly messengers give men their proper heritage (the kingdom of the Father).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 146)

Marvin Meyer writes: “This saying may discuss interactions with itinerant prophets or with heavenly messengers. The word *angelos* used in the Coptic may be translated either ‘messengers’ or ‘angels.’ In the Jewish scriptures and the New Testament, this word may designate either sort of messenger; at times it may indicate a prophet or a human emissary. In the Discourses of Epictetus a Cynic philosopher may be called a ‘messenger’ of Zeus to humankind.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 102)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 12.20.](#)

89. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥ ΤΕΤΝΕΙΩΕ ΜΠCΑ ΝΒΟΛ
 ΜΠΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ (2) ΤΕΤΝΡΝΟΕΙ ΔΝ ΧΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΖΤΑΜΙΟ ΜΠCΑ ΝΖΟΥΝ
 ΝΤΟC ΟΝ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΤΑΜΙΟ ΜΠCΑ ΝΒΟΛ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(89) Jesus said: Why do you wash the outside of the cup? Do you not understand that he who made the inside is also he who made the outside?

(89) Jesus said, “Why are you (plur.) washing the inside of the cup? Don’t you think that the one who made the inside is the very same one who made the outside?”

93 [89]. Jesus says: “Why do you wash the outside of the cup, and do not think that he who made the inside made the outside also?”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “Note also the Babylonian Talmud, Berakoth 51a, with its provisions for rinsing the inside and washing the outside of a cup; also Kelim 25.1-9, with its discussion of laws concerning the inner and outer sides of various vessels.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 102)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This saying, directed against ritual observances, is based on Luke 11:39-40. The reversal of inside and outside in the second half of the saying is also found in some early manuscripts of Luke, and in patristic quotations.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 184)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The parallel here is Luke xi. 39-40, which itself has often given rise to perplexity. It can be punctuated as a question, ‘Did not he who made the outside make the inside also?’, in which case the meaning may probably be summed up in the words of verse 42: this ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone. The merely external and ritual observances are worthless without purity of heart. It is also possible, although perhaps less probable, that we should punctuate as a statement: ‘He who sets the outside right does not set the inside right’; but this seems flat and tautologous. More important is the fact that some of our authorities in Luke reverse the order of ‘inside’ and ‘outside,’ exactly as in Thomas. This raises questions of textual criticism, which will be considered later. Quispel has suggested that Luke, as presented by the majority of our manuscripts, has preserved one half of an original parallelism, Thomas and the remaining manuscripts the other; and he adds the further suggestion that this logion may be from the Gospel of the Hebrews, and may be the text underlying logion 22, which, as already noted, has been identified as from the Gospel of the Egyptians. The suggestion has much to commend it, but if it is correct Luke must have adapted the saying for his own purposes; the relation of Luke to Matthew here, and to their common source, has been variously interpreted. On the other hand it may be doubted if the parallelism is really authentic and not the result of a playing with words by a later hand. The textual variant might be merely accidental; the one fact which gives it a claim to further consideration is that it occurs not in Thomas only but in other sources.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 83-84)

Helmut Koester writes: “This is the first of the two sayings which Thomas shares with the synoptic speech against the Pharisees. However, it can be understood as a community rule rather than a polemical saying. There is no reference to the Pharisees; the accusation that those who practice such purification ‘are full of extortion and wickedness’ is missing, as is the slanderous ‘You fools!’ That *Gos. Thom.* 89 reverses the order ‘outside/inside’ in the second part of the saying is of no consequence because there is no polemical intent.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 92)

Funk and Hoover write: “This saying was voted pink in its Thomas form, while the Q version preserved by Matt (23:25-26) and Luke (11:39-41) was designated gray. Matthew and Luke have turned the original aphorism into a mixed metaphor about cup and self: the outside of the cup concerns ritual purity, the inside of the self is full of greed and evil. In Thomas, however, the aphorism is recorded without context or moralizing conclusion. The outside and inside are made equal, because they are both made by the same creator. The aphorism thus appears to have been a criticism of the ritual washing of vessels such as cups. In this form, it could well have come from Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 520)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion has a parallel in Matt. 23.25-26/Luke 11.39-41 (=Q). But it seems original by comparison with the Synoptic parallels, as it emphasizes one notion (and does not, like Matthew/Luke, include the inside of the person as well as the outside of the cup). Because the one who created the outside of the cup and what is inside is the same, washing the inside and the outside are made equal. Hence the following conclusion suggests itself: if the inside is not washed, the outside does not need to be washed either.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 634)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 11:39-41](#), [Matt 23:25-26](#).

90. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙΗC ΧΕ ΑΜΗΕΙΤΝ̄ ΨΑΡΟΕΙ ΧΕ ΟΥΧΡΗCΤΟC ΠΕ
ΠΑΝΑΖΒ ΑΥΩ ΤΑΜΝΤΧΟΕΙC ΟΥΡΜΡΑΨ ΤΕ (2) ΑΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΑΖΕ
ΑΥΑΝΑΥΠΑCΙC ΝΗΤΝ̄

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(90) Jesus said: Come to me, for my yoke is easy and my lordship is gentle, and you will find rest for yourselves.	(90) Jesus said, “Come (plur.) to me, for my yoke is easy (to use) and my lordship is mild, and you will find repose for yourselves.”	94 [90]. Jesus says: “Come to me, for my yoke is excellent and my authority is sweet, and you will find rest for yourselves!”

Scholarly Quotes

Funk and Hoover quote Sir 51:26-27 as the basis of this saying: “You should put your neck into the yoke, and you should accept instruction, which you will find near at hand. See for yourself how little I have labored; rather, I have found a great deal of rest for myself.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 520)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Matthew 11:28-30, has a different order and some different implications. ‘Come to me, *all you who labor and are burdened* [Thomas omits the italicized words], and I will give you rest [Thomas changes this to ‘you will find rest for yourselves’]. *Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am meek and humble of heart* [omitted], and you will find rest for your souls [selves]; for my yoke is easy and my burden [Thomas substitutes ‘rule’] is light.’ Thomas wants the invitation to be addressed to Gnostics, not to those burdened by the world (he twice omits ‘burden’) and he wants the emphasis to be placed on the reward of rest, not on the yoke of Christ.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 184)

J. D. Crossan writes: “*Thomas*’s version is not dependent on that of Matthew (Sieber:139, as against Schrage, 1964:173). Instead, ‘both go back to wisdom traditions which have been subjected to gnosticizing transformations’ (Betz, 1967:20). Koester has suggested that ‘except for “lordship”

instead of “burden” (Matt. 11:30) this shorter version could be more original than Matthew’s (1980b:246). Bauer would agree and even consider that ‘lordship’ could be more original (1961:105). I prefer to follow Koester rather than Bauer primarily because ‘burden’ reappears in *Pist. Soph.* 95 and *Dial. Sav.* 141:3-6. Indeed, the force of the aphorism seems intensified if there is some comparison made between heavy or difficult burdens (from elsewhere) and light or easy burdens (from Jesus). I propose, therefore, that, while *Thomas’s* version is more original than that of Matt. 11:28-30, it is not more original than Matt. 11:28 + 30 since *Thomas* lacks any equivalent to Q’s ‘all who labor and are heavy laden (burdened).’“ (*In Fragments*, pp. 257-258)

Funk’s Parallels

[Matt 11:25-30](#), [DialSav 65-68](#).

91. (1) ΠΕΧΛΥ ΝΑΨ ΧΕ ΧΟΟC ΕΡΟΝ ΧΕ ΝΤΚ ΝΙΜ ΨΙΝΑ
 ΕΝΑΡΠΙCΤΕΥΕ ΕΡΟΚ (2) ΠΕΧΛΨ ΝΑΨ ΧΕ ΤΕΤΝΡΠΙΡΑΖΕ ΜΠΖΟ
 ΝΤΠΕ ΜΝ ΠΚΑΖ ΑΨΩ ΠΕΤΝΠΕΤΝΜΤΟ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΠΕΤΝCΟΥΩΝΨ ΑΨΩ
 ΠΕΕΙΚΑΙΡΟC ΤΕΤΝCΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΝΡΠΙΡΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΨ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(91) They said to him: Tell us who you are, that we may believe in you. He said to them: You test the face of the sky and of the earth, and him who is before you you have not known, and you do not know (how) to test this moment.

(91) They said to him, “Tell us who you are, so that we might believe in you.” He said to them, “You (plur.) are testing the face of heaven and earth, and you have not recognized the one who is in your presence! And you do not recognize how to test the present time.”

95 [91]. They said to him: “Tell us who thou art that we may believe in thee.” He said to them: “You examine the appearance of heaven and earth, but He who is in front of you you do not recognise, and this moment you know not how to examine!”

Scholarly Quotes

R. McL. Wilson writes: “The actual saying is most closely parallel to Luke xii. 56, a passage omitted from some manuscripts of Matthew; but the opening suggests that the author knew Matthew xvi. 1-4 with the ‘Western interpolation.’ If this be so, the specific reference to Pharisees and Sadducees has been omitted, and this would suggest an advanced stage of the tradition. Grant and Freedman, like Doresse before them, interpret of the disciples, quoting John viii. 25 ff., which may be correct for *Thomas* as it stands; but we may also recall such texts as John x. 24: ‘If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly,’ and the many challenges put to Jesus by His opponents, who demanded a ‘sign.’ The words inserted into the Lucan saying recall logion 5 (Know what is in thy sight . . .), in which Puech has suggested that we should read a masculine rather than a neuter. The Greek of logion 5 is unfortunately fragmentary, and Coptic has no distinct neuter form, but confirmation for Puech’s suggestion may perhaps be found in logia 52 (the Living One who is before you) and 59 (Look upon the Living One as long as you live . . .). Altogether, such sayings as logion 91 seem to present excellent specimens of the development of the early tradition: floating sayings, detached from their original context, the specific references smoothed away, so that they could later be employed for quite a different purpose. Sometimes the shorter versions which appear in *Thomas* have an appearance of originality, and one is tempted to suggest that it is the Synoptic version

which has suffered elaboration; but such cases as this give warning against hasty conclusions.”
(Studies in the Gospel of Thomas, pp. 65-66)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The disciples’ request is similar to that of the man cured of his blindness in John 9.36 (cf. John 8.25-30); Jesus’s answer is based on his words in Luke 12.54-56, but in this context the original historical reference has been replaced by an exhortation to self-knowledge.”
(Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament, p. 146)

Helmut Koester writes: “There is no trace in Thomas of the first part of this saying (Q/Luke 12:54-55). The secondary address ‘hypocrites’ of Luke 12:56 (no parallel in Matt 16:3b) is missing in Thomas as is Matthew’s expansion ‘the signs of the time.’”
(Ancient Christian Gospels, pp. 94-95)

J. D. Crossan writes: “In terms of form the *Thomas* text is an aphoristic dialogue, as in Matt. 16:1-3, rather than an aphoristic saying, as in Q/Luke 12:54-56.”
(In Fragments, p. 249)

J. D. Crossan writes: “In terms of content, there are two important differences between *Gos. Thom.* 91 and Q/Luke 12:54-56. *Thomas* gives no concrete examples of weather indications, yet he does mention ‘the face of the sky and of the earth,’ and this fits with the types of indications mentioned in Luke: cloud and wind. But the more significant change is that, corresponding to the opening question - ‘They said to him, “Tell us who You are so that we may believe in You”’ - the *aphoristic dialogue* contains ‘but you have not recognized the one who (or: that which) is before you.’ This is best seen as ‘a gnosticized reworking of the saying we have known from Luke 12:56’ (Sieber: 220).”
(In Fragments, pp. 249-250)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 12:54-56](#), [Matt 16:1-4](#).

92. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΨΙΝΕ ΛΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΑΘΙΝΕ (2) ΑΛΛΑ
 ΝΕΤΑΤΕΤΝΧΝΟΥΕΙ ΕΡΟΥ ΝΝΙΖΟΥ ΕΜΠΙΧΟΥ ΝΗΤΝ ΜΦΟΥ
 ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΖΝΑΙ ΕΧΟΥ ΛΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΨΙΝΕ ΑΝ ΝCΩΟΥ

DORESSE

BLATZ

LAYTON

(92) Jesus said: Seek, and you will find; but the things you asked me in those days and I did not tell you then, now I desire to tell them, but you do not ask about them.

(92) Jesus said, “Seek and you (plur.) will find. Yet, now I am willing to say the things which you used to ask me about and which I did not say to you; and you are not seeking them.”

96 [92]. Jesus says: “Seek and you will find! But the things you have asked me about during these days and which I have not told you up till now, I now want to tell you, so that you will not have to seek them any longer.”

Scholarly Quotes

Helmut Koester points out a parallel with John 16:4b-5: “Those things I did not tell you from the beginning when I was with you. Now I am going to the one who sent me, and none of you asks me, ‘Where are you going?’”
(Ancient Christian Gospels, p. 121)

J. D. Crossan writes: “As in the preceding instance, only the *seek/find* stich is present; but now it is accompanied by another saying whose meaning is not exactly clear. More significant for my own purpose is the fact that the stich’s version here is in imperative/future format and thus in the second person.” (*In Fragments*, p. 100)

Funk and Hoover write: “Just as Thom 2:2-4 is an expansion of the basic saying in 2:1, so here 92:2 is an editorial comment on 92:1: it apparently refers to Jesus’ earlier refusal to tell the disciples all his secret knowledge, coupled with the reprimand that his current disciples are not seeking true knowledge. The editorial comment undoubtedly refers to the knowledge (*gnosis* in Greek) that was important in this branch of the Christian movement.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 521)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “This verse calls on the reader not to give up the search, even though signs of neglect are becoming evident (v. 2b). Gnostic existence is grounded in a ‘religion of searching’.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 635)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 2](#), [GThom 2](#), [GThom 94](#), [Luke 11:9-13](#), [Matt 7:7-11](#), [Matt 21:18-22](#), [John 15:16-17](#), [John 14:12-14](#), [John 16:20-28](#), [Mark 11:20-25](#), [GHeb 4b](#), [DialSav 9-12](#), [DialSav 20](#).

93. (1) ΜΠΡΤ ΠΕΤΟΥΑΔΒ ΝΝΟΥΖΟΟΡ ΧΕΚΑϸ ΝΟΥΝΟΧΟΥ
ΕΤΚΟΠΡΙΑ (2) ΜΠΡΝΟΥΧΕ ΝΜΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤΗ(ϸ Ν)ΝΕΩΔΥ ΩΙΝΑ ΧΕ
ΝΟΥΑΔϸ ΝΛΑ(...)

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(93) <Jesus said:> Do not give what is holy to the dogs, lest they cast it on the dung-heap. Do not cast the pearls to the swine, lest they make it [. . .].

(93) <JESUS said>, ‘Do not give holy things to dogs, lest they throw them upon the dunghill. Do not throw pearls to swine lest they [. . .].’

97 [93]. “Give not that which is holy to dogs, in case they throw it onto the dunghill; and cast not pearls to swine, for fear that they should make it [. . .]

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “Several possible restorations of this passage have been suggested, but none has proven to be convincing. Bentley Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2-7, 1.86-87, notes the following suggestions: ‘or they might make [mud] of it’; ‘or they might bring it [to naught]’; ‘or they might grind it [to bits].’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 103)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The disciples are to seek and to find; but they are not to make public what they have found. The holy is not to be given to dogs; pearls are not to be cast to swine (outsiders are dogs and swine, as the Basilidians taught: Epiphanius, *Pan.*, 24, 5, 2). Gnostics and Christians alike were fond of this mysterious saying (Matthew 7:6). Both Gnostics (Basilidians; Elchasaites in Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 9, 17, 1) and Christians (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, 1, 55, 3; 2, 7, 4; Origen, *Homily on Joshua*, 21, 2; Tertullian, *De praescriptione*, 26 and 41) applied it to secret doctrines, while in the second-century *Didache* (9, 5) it is referred to the Eucharist, in Tertullian (*De baptismo*, 18, 1) to baptism. The Naassenes took it to refer to sexual

intercourse (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 8, 33), but Thomas probably does not have this interpretation in mind, at least not here.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 186)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “As Grant and Freedman note, Gnostics and Christians alike were fond of this saying, and it was applied to secret doctrines, to Baptism, and to the Eucharist. For present purposes, however, Bartsch’s comment is perhaps more to the point, that the interpretation of the saying is no longer determined by the lesson it was meant to convey. It has become a proverb, and the explanator additions are suggested by the saying itself, whereas in the Synoptic parables it is the lesson that is dominant, even to the point of producing such ‘impossible’ illustrations as those of the beam in the eye or the camel passing through the eye of a needle.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 67)

Funk and Hoover write: “The version recorded in Thomas differs both in substance and in form from the Matthean version. First, the lines are not arranged chiasmatically. Second, the dogs ‘throw them on the manure pile,’ which appears to fit better with what pigs were said to do; the saying may have become garbled in transmission. Unfortunately, the fourth line in Thomas is defective, so we can’t reconstruct what pigs do.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 522)

Funk’s Parallels

[Matt 7:6](#), [Did 9:5](#).

94. (1) (ΠΕΥ)Ε ΙC ΠΕΤΩΙΝΕ QΝΑQΙΝΕ (2) (ΠΕΤΤΩ2Μ Ε)2ΟΥΝ
CΕΝΑQΟΥΩΝ ΝΑQ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(94) Jesus [said:] He who seeks will find, [and he who knocks], to him will be opened.

(94) Jesus [said], “One who seeks will find. The door will be opened to one [who knocks].”

98 [94]. Jesus [says:] “He who seeks will find, [and to whomever wishes to enter (?)] it will be opened.”

Scholarly Quotes

J. D. Crossan writes: “There is a lacuna in this text because the left bottom center of the manuscript page is missing. But the restoration is probably as certain as such things can be. The restored ‘[he who knocks]’ presumes the Coptic [*pettohm e]hun* (literally, ‘knocks inward,’ see Crum: 458b), and this is still residually visible in the final tip of the -h- and the complete -un. And ‘will be let in’ is, literally, ‘they will open to him,’ which is normal circumlocation for Coptic’s absent passive voice (see Guillaumont, 1959:49; Wilson, 1973:520).” (*In Fragments*, p. 100)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy654 2](#), [GThom 2](#), [GThom 92:1](#), [Luke 11:9-13](#), [Matt 7:7-11](#), [Matt 21:18-22](#), [John 15:16-17](#), [John 14:12-14](#), [John 16:20-28](#), [Mark 11:20-25](#), [GHeb 4b](#), [DialSav 9-12](#), [DialSav 20](#).

95. (1) (πεχε ῑc χε) ε̄ωωπε ο̄ῡν̄τη̄τ̄ν̄ ζο̄μ̄τ̄ μ̄π̄ρ̄τ̄ ε̄τ̄μ̄η̄cε
 (2) ᾱλ̄λ̄α † (μ̄μ̄ο̄ϑ) μ̄π̄ε̄τ̄(ε)τ̄ν̄ᾱχ̄ῑτ̄ο̄ῡ ᾱν̄ ν̄τ̄ο̄ο̄τ̄ϑ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(95) [Jesus said:] If you have money, (p. 49) do not lend at interest, but give [. . .] to him from whom you will not receive it back.

(95) [Jesus said], “If you (plur.) have money, do not lend it out at interest. Rather, give [it] to one from whom you will not get it back.”

99 [95]. [Jesus says: “If (?) you have money, do not lend it at interest, but [. . .] who (?) will not take them from him.”

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: “the logion has a parallel in content in Matt. 5.42b/Luke 6.30. But the theme of interest recalls the antipathy of Thomas to merchants (cf. 64.12). However, this does not exclude the possibility that it was already contained in the tradition that Thomas is using.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 636)

Comparing Thomas to Matthew and Luke, Koester finds that the Thomas form is more original: “The ending of Luke 6:34 (‘Even sinners lend to sinners . . .’) is a secondary addition in analogy to the ending of the preceding saying Luke 6:33 (‘Even sinners do that’). Matt 5:42 reads, ‘Give to the one who asks you, and do not refuse one who wants to borrow from you.’ This may have preserved the wording of the original saying better than Luke 6:34, and Thomas’s version can be best explained as a development of this form.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 90)

Funk and Hoover write: “Thomas records a saying that is parallel to Matt 5:42b: ‘Don’t turn away the one who triest to borrow from you.’ Thomas’ version may well be the earlier version since it is absolute: lend to those from whom you can’t expect to get your capital back.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 522)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 6:27-36](#), [Matt 5:38-42](#).

96. (1) π̄(ε̄χ)ε̄ ῑc χε τ̄μ̄ν̄τ̄ε̄ρ̄ο μ̄π̄ε̄ῑω̄τ̄ ε̄c̄τ̄ν̄τ̄ω̄(ν̄ ᾱγ)c̄z̄ῑμ̄ε̄
 (2) ᾱc̄χ̄ῑ ν̄ο̄ῡκ̄ο̄ῡε̄ῑ ν̄c̄ᾱε̄ῑρ̄ ᾱ(c̄z̄)ο̄π̄ϑ̄ ζ̄ν̄ ο̄γ̄ω̄ω̄τ̄ε̄ ᾱc̄ᾱᾱϑ̄
 ν̄z̄ν̄ν̄ο̄(σ̄ ν̄)ν̄ο̄ε̄ικ̄ (3) π̄ε̄τ̄ε̄γ̄μ̄ μ̄ᾱᾱχ̄ε̄ μ̄μ̄ο̄ϑ̄ μ̄ᾱ(ρ̄ε̄)ϑ̄c̄ω̄τ̄μ̄

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(96) Jesus [said:] The kingdom of the Father is like a woman. She took a little leaven, [hid] it in dough, (and) made large loaves of it. He who has ears, let him hear.

(96) Jesus [said], “What the kingdom of the father resembles is [a] woman who took a small amount of leaven, [hid] it in some dough, and produced huge loaves of bread. Whoever has ears should listen!”

100 [96]. Jesus says: “The Kingdom of the Father is like a woman who put a little yeast [into three] measures of flour and made some big loaves with it. He who has ears let him hear!”

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This parable about the kingdom of the Father, like the one which follows it (Saying 94), compares the kingdom with a woman. The original version, in Matthew 13:33 and Luke 13:20-21, compared the kingdom of heaven or of God with the leaven which she used. Thomas’s emphasis, as usual, is on the action of the Gnostic, not on the work of God.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 187)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Here the kingdom is likened not to the leaven, as in the Synoptics, but to the woman. Grant and Freedman see here a change of emphasis, from the work of God to the action of the Gnostic, but it may be no more than a transmission-variant. More important is the pointing of the contrast between the little leaven and the large loaves; here it is possible that, as Cerfaux suggests, we have an echo of the Synoptic twin parable of the Mustard Seed, but this presupposes that Thomas made use of our Gospels.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 96-97)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “Again we are shown a tiny morsel of leaven (cf. 1 Cor. 5.6; Gal. 5.9), absurdly small in comparison with the great mass of more than a bushel of meal. The housewife mixes it, covers it with a cloth, and leaves the mass to stand overnight, and when she returns to it in the morning the whole mass of dough is leavened.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 148)

Funk and Hoover write: “This is a one-sentence parable in its Q version (Matt 13:33//Luke 13:20-21): ‘God’s imperial rule is like leaven which a woman took and concealed in fifty pounds of flour until it was all leavened.’ Matthew and Luke agree word-for-word in taking the parable over from Q. Thomas, on the other hand, seems to have edited it slightly: the explicit contrast between a little leaven and large loaves has been introduced into the parable. This contrast, found also in Thomas’ version of the parable of the lost sheep (107:1-3) and the parable of the fishnet (8:1-3), is alien to the genuine parables of Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 523)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “These verses have a parallel in Matt. 13.33/Luke 13.20-21 (=Q). Their dependence on the Q parable emerges from the abnormal expression that the woman hid (one would have expected the verb ‘knead’) the leaven in the flour. Moreover in the parable in Thomas the woman and her activity are at the centre, and she is meant to be the model for the readers. Finally, at the end the size of the loaves is emphasized (cf. 8.1-3; 107.1-3).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 636)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 13:20-21](#), [Matt 13:35](#).

97. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΜΠΕ(ΙΩΤ Ε)CΤΝΤΩΝ ΔΥCΖΙΜΕ
 ΕCΘΙ ΖΑ ΟΥΘΑ(ΜΕΕΙ) ΕCΜΕΖ ΝΝΟΕΙΤ (2) ΕCΜΟΟΥΕ Ζ(Ι ΟΥ)ΖΙΗ
 ΕCΟΥΗΟΥ ΑΠΜΑΔΧΕ ΜΠΘΑΜ(Ε)ΕΙ ΟΥΩΘΠ ΑΠΝΟΕΙΤ ΨΟΥΟ ΝCΩC
 (2)Ι ΤΕΖΙΗ (3) ΝΕCΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΝΕΜΠΕCΕΙΜΕ ΕΖΙCΕ (4)
 ΝΤΑΡΕCΠΩΖ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΕCΗΕΙ ΔCΚΑ ΠΘΑΜΕΕΙ ΑΠΕCΗΤ ΔCΖΕ
 ΕΡΟC ΕCΨΟΥΕΙΤ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(97) Jesus said: The kingdom of the [Father] is like a woman carrying a jar full of meal. While she was walking [on a] distant road, the handle of the jar broke (and) the meal poured out behind her on the road. She was unaware, she had not noticed the misfortune. When she came to her house, she put the jar down (and) found it empty.

(97) Jesus said, “[What] the kingdom of the [father] resembles [is] a woman who was conveying a [jar] full of meal. When she had traveled far [along] the road, the handle of the jar broke and the meal spilled out after her [along] the road. She was not aware of the fact; she had not understood how to toil. When she reached home she put down the jar and found it empty.”

101 [97]. Jesus says: “The Kingdom of the Father is like a woman who takes a vessel of flour and sets out on a long road. The handle of the vessel broke: the flour spilled out on the road behind her without her knowing it and stopping it. When she arrived at the house she put the vessel down and found it was empty.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “This parable is known only here in early Christian literature, although ‘Macarius’ of Syria tells a somewhat similar story of a bag full of sand that is leaking out through a tiny hole in the bag.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 103)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “This parable also compares the kingdom with a woman; it is not found in the gospels. Perhaps its meaning is given in the parable of the secretly growing seed in Mark 4:26-29. Doresse (page 198) cannot decide whether it refers to the imperceptible loss of the kingdom or to the contrast between its coming and the woman’s failure to notice her loss; neither can we.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 187)

F. F. Bruce writes: “Here is a parable of the kingdom which has no canonical parallel. The point seems to be a warning against self-confidence, against thinking that one possesses the saving knowledge when in fact it has trickled away.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 148)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The parable is preserved only here in the early Christian tradition. But its images do not match. Why should all the flour pour out of a jar if only a handle breaks? How is it that the woman did not observe this? So the parable must be interpreted in the light of these contradictions. In that case Thomas wants to say that knowledge (v. 3) is important at any point in time. The reader should always be on guard. . . . The parable is inauthentic, as it is an admonition to the individual Gnostic.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 637)

Jack Finegan writes: “This is a relatively simple, direct parable, introduced much as are parables in the Synoptic tradition, e.g., Mt 13:31, ‘The kingdom of heaven is like . . .’ The peril of inattention

and unnoticed loss is stressed, a teaching well enough in harmony with the teaching of Jesus otherwise in the Synoptic Gospels about the value and the possible loss of the kingdom.” (*Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*, p. 260)

Funk and Hoover write: “The structure of this parable, recorded only by Thomas, is similar to that of the parable of the leaven (Thom 96:1-2//Matt 13:33//Luke 13:20-21). It has a surprising and provocative ending: the woman comes home with an empty, rather than a full, jar. A full jar would be the expected metaphor for God’s imperial rule, so this ending is startling. The symbolism may fit with Jesus’ tendency to portray the kingdom as having to do with the unnoticed or unexpected or modest (this is true also of the parable of the mustard seed, Thom 20:2//Mark 4:31-32//Matt 13:31-32//Luke 13:19).” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 524)

Christan Amundsen writes: “Like people who are unaware that they are leaking the stuff of their being, they walk along a road mindless until they find themselves empty. . . . Our lives, Jesus is saying, are lived by accident. We become ‘broken jars,’ with nothing inside. Finding ourselves empty is a devastating affair. . . . This story, like any good parable, leads us up to a question. What does the woman do when she finds her jar broken and empty? It is like seeing that one’s life is meaningless and without true substance. What now? This is where the true drama unfolds, and so we are left to fill in the blank. The meal that was contained in the jar is the important thing. Perhaps the spirit cannot escape its bondage until the jar is broken, until all our avenues of material reality are discovered to be simply a ‘broken jar.’ Many responses and interpretations are possible and necessary.” (*Insights from the Secret Teachings of Jesus*, pp. 274-275)

Funk’s Parallels

[Thom 96.](#)

98. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΜΠΕΙΩΤ ΕCΤΝΤΩΝ ΕΥΡΩΜΕ ΕΦΟΥΩΩ
 ΕΜΟΥΤ ΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΜΜΕΓΙCΤΑΝΟC (2) ΑΦΩΩΛΜ ΝΤCΗCΕ ΖΜ ΠΕCΗΕΙ
 ΑΦΧΟΤC ΝΤΧΟ ΧΕΚΑΑC ΕΦΝΑΕΙΜΕ ΧΕ ΤΕΦΘΙΧ ΝΑΤΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ
 (3) ΤΟΤΕ ΑΦΩΩΤΒ ΜΠΜΕΓΙCΤΑΝΟC

LAYTON

DORESSE

BLATZ

(98) Jesus said: The kingdom of the Father is like a man who wanted to kill a powerful man. He drew the sword in his house and drove it into the wall, that he might know his hand would be strong (enough). Then he slew the powerful man.

(98) Jesus said, “What the kingdom of the father resembles is a man who wanted to assassinate a member of court. At home, he drew the dagger and stabbed it into the wall in order to know whether his hand would be firm. Next, he murdered the member of court.”

102 [98]. “The Kingdom of the Father is like a man who wants to kill an important person. In his house he unsheathed the sword and stuck it in the wall to assure himself that his hand would be firm. Then he killed the person.”

Scholarly Quotes

Joachim Jeremias writes: “Just as this political assassin first makes a trial of his strength before he embarks on his dangerous venture, so should you test yourselves to see whether you have strength to carry the adventure through.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 197)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “It is better to compare the kingdom of the Father with a man (as here) than with a woman (as in the two sayings preceding this one); see Saying 112 [114]. The parable vaguely reminds us of Saul’s throwing his spear at David, in the Old Testament, but Thomas is not interested in Old Testament allusions. It is more like the parable of the king going into battle who first makes an estimate concerning his prospects (Luke 14:31). He who would find the kingdom must first count the cost. If he is strong enough, he can slay the ‘great man’ (probably the world; see Saying 78).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 188)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This parable, also unparalleled in the canonical tradition, may have come from a period when Zealot activity gave it contemporary relevance. The point seems to be that any one who embarks on a costly or dangerous enterprise must first make sure that he has the necessary resources to carry it out. There may be a link with the strong man whose house is ransacked in Saying 35.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 148)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The parable appears only at this point in the early Christian Jesus tradition. It has a high degree of offensiveness, since as in Luke 16.1-7; Matt. 13.44; Matt. 24.43-44/Luke 12.39 Jesus uses an immoral hero to make a statement about the kingdom of God. Cf. in addition the original version of the saying about ‘men of violence’ in Matt. 11.12/Luke 16.16 (= Q) as a further example of Jesus being deliberately offensive in what he says. . . . The parable is authentic. Because of its offensiveness it probably fell victim to moral censorship at an early stage and therefore does not appear in any other text.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 637)

Funk and Hoover write: “It appeared to some of the Fellows that the story line of the parable originally had to do with reversal: the little guy beats the big guy by taking the precautions a prudent person would take before encountering the village bully. This, together with the scandalous nature of the image, prompted a majority of the Seminar to vote red or pink on the third ballot.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 525)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 14:31](#).

99. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΜΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΝΕΚΚΝΗΥ ΜΝ ΤΕΚΜΑΔΥ
 ΣΕΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΖΙ ΠΣΑ ΝΒΟΛ (2) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΝΕΤΝΝΕΕΙΜΑ
 ΕΤΡΕ ΜΠΟΥΩΩ ΜΠΑΕΙΩΤ ΝΑΕΙ ΝΕ ΝΑΚΝΗΥ ΜΝ ΤΑΜΑΔΥ (3)
 ΝΤΟΥΥ ΠΕ ΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΜΠΑΕΙΩΤ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
<p>(99) The disciples said to him: Your brothers and your mother are standing outside. He said to them: Those here who do the will of my Father, these are my brothers and my mother; they are the ones who will enter into the kingdom of my Father.</p>	<p>(99) The disciples said to him, “Your brothers and your mother are standing outside.” He said to them, “It is those who are here and who do the will of my father that are my siblings and my mother. It is they who will enter the kingdom of my father.”</p>	<p>103 [99]. The disciples said to him: “Thy brethren and thy mother are there outside.” He said to them: “You and (?) those (?) who do the will of my Father, they are my brethren and my mother; it is they who will enter the Kingdom of my Father.”</p>

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes from Gospel of the Ebionites 5: “Furthermore, they (that is, the Ebionites) deny that he (that is, Christ) was a human being, apparently from the saying that the savior spoke when it was reported to him, ‘Look, your mother and your brothers are standing outside’: ‘Who are my mother and brothers?’ And extending his hand toward the followers, he said, ‘These are my brothers and mothers and sisters, who do the will of my father.’” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 99)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “Quispel claims a parallel in the Gospel of the Ebionites, but to this Bauer objects. Comparing the whole saying, he concludes that there is nothing which could not have come from the canonical Gospels. Nevertheless there are differences: Jesus’ informants, anonymous in the Synoptics, are here the disciples; the saying as a whole is shortened, a process already begun in Luke; there is no reference to sisters, again as in Luke, and ‘brethren’ are mentioned first, against all our Gospels; finally Thomas reads the plural with Luke (‘those who do the will’), but retains the order of Matthew and Mark; the closing words may be no more than explanatory expansion. Here, as elsewhere, it would probably be wrong to think of direct literary dependence; for an author to piece together the Synoptic material in this way, for no apparent purpose, would be a monumental waste of time and trouble. The most probable explanations once again are either the use of a Gospel harmony of some kind, free quotation from memory, or independent tradition.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 115-116)

Helmut Koester writes: “As in the previous example, Thomas’s text is a brief chria, lacking any of Mark’s elaborate introductory setting of the stage and discourse. Thomas also does not share Mark’s peculiarity of stating the answer in the form of a rhetorical question. Thus Thomas’s version of this pericope, except for the secondary conclusion, corresponds to its more original form.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 110)

Funk and Hoover write: “‘Mother and brothers’ may refer to the gentiles, who became Jesus’ true relatives, in contrast to the Judeans, who rejected him and thus became outsiders. Or, Jesus’ true relatives may reflect the competition in the early movement between Jesus’ blood relatives, such as his brother James, who became leaders of the group, and those who were not blood relatives, who claimed direct commission from the risen Jesus. The apostle Paul would be an example of the latter.

Finally, the contrast may point to an actual incident during Jesus' life. On one occasion his family may have attempted to take him away because they thought he had lost his mind (in Mark 3:20 we are told that his family thought he was demented). The Fellows were divided on which of these three scenarios should be used to interpret the saying. A healthy majority chose the third, which produced a pink vote here, as in the corresponding version in Matthew (12:46-50)."

Funk's Parallels

[Luke 8:19-21](#), [Matt 12:46-50](#), [Mark 3:20-22](#), [Mark 3:31-35](#), [GEbi 5](#).

100. (1) ΔΥΤΟΕΒΕ ΙC ΔΥΝΟΥΒ ΔΥΩ ΠΕΧΔΥ ΝΔΥ ΧΕ ΝΕΤΗΠ
 ΔΚΑΙCΑΡ CΕΩΠΙΤΕ ΜΜΟΝ ΝΝΩΩΜ (2) ΠΕΧΔΥ ΝΔΥ ΧΕ † ΝΔ
 ΚΑΙCΑΡ ΝΚΑΙCΑΡ (3) † ΝΔ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ (4) ΔΥΩ ΠΕΤΕ
 ΠΩΕΙ ΠΕ ΜΑΤΝΝΔΕΙΥ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(100) They showed Jesus a gold piece and said to him: Caesar's men demand tribute from us. He said to them: What belongs to Caesar, give to Caesar; what belongs to God, give to God; and what is mine, give it to me.

(100) They showed Jesus a gold coin and said to him, "Caesar's agents are exacting taxes from us." He said to them, "Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, give unto god the things that are god's, and give unto me that which is mine."

104 [100]. They showed Jesus a piece of money and said to him: "The people who belong to Caesar ask us for taxes." He said to them: "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, give to God what is God's, and what is mine give me!"

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "The complexities of Jesus's discussion of the tribute money in the gospels (Matthew 22:15-22; Mark 12:13-17; Luke 20:20-26) are left behind as Thomas relegates what belongs to Caesar and to God to a place of inferiority, compared with the inner man, who belongs to Jesus. Note that God seems to be inferior to Jesus; see Saying 31 [30] and Commentary." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 189)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "Grant and Freedman rightly note that Thomas does not speak of the kingdom of God, and that indeed 'God' is mentioned only once (logion 100), and there evidently as subordinate to Jesus. Their inference that Thomas may be reserving the name 'God' for use as that of an inferior power is also probably correct, and serves to confirm the Gnostic character of the book; as already noted, the God of the Old Testament is in the Gnostic systems degraded to the status of creator and ruler of this present evil world." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 27)

F. F. Bruce writes: "This is the incident of the tribute money recorded in Mark 12.13-17 and parallels, but the historical setting is a thing of the past and the silver denarius has become a gold coin. What is specially important, however, is the addition of 'give me what is mine' to the canonical saying. 'God', who is thus placed higher than Caesar but lower than Jesus, is not the Supreme Being who is always called the Father in the *Gospel of Thomas*, but the demiurge, the creator of the material world. Like Caesar, he must receive his due, but it is more important to give

Jesus, the unique revealer, *his due.*” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 149)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The logion has a parallel in Mark 12.13-17 parr. In contrast to the Synoptics, it is the disciples and not the opponents of Jesus who show Jesus a coin; this represents a further development. The whole logion has its climax in v. 4, which is without parallel in the Synoptics. Evidently ‘Jesus’ expects of his disciples their own offering, i.e. in the framework of the Gospel of Thomas, that they should be aware of their own sparks of light and thus become one with Jesus, the personification of light (cf. 77.1-3; 108.1-3).” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 638)

Helmut Koester writes: “In this brief chria of the *Gospel of Thomas* all of the narrative and discourse sections are missing which tie the Markan parallel to the context of Mark 12 where various people come to Jesus in order to trap him. Thomas preserves what must have been the basis of the elaborate exchange in Mark’s extended apophthegma. The last phrase in Thomas (‘and give me what is mine’), on the other hand, is a later expansion emphasizing the commitment to Jesus.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 112)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 20:20-26](#), [Matt 22:15-22](#), [Mark 12:13-17](#), [PEger 2 3](#), [Sentences of Sextus 20](#).

101. (1) ΠΕΤΑΜΕΣΤΕ ΠΕΦΕΙ(ΩΤ) ΑΝ ΜΝ ΤΕΦΜΑΑΥ ΝΤΑΖΕ ΦΝΑΩΡ
 Μ(ΑΘΗΤ)ΗC ΝΑΕΙ ΑΝ (2) ΑΥΩ ΠΕΤΑΜΡΡΕ ΠΕΦ(ΕΙΩΤ ΑΝ Μ)Ν
 ΤΕΦΜΑΑΥ ΝΤΑΖΕ ΦΝΑΩΡ Μ(ΑΘΗΤΗC ΝΑ)ΕΙ ΑΝ (3) ΤΑΜΑΑΥ ΓΑΡ
 ΝΤΑC(.....)ΟΛ ΤΑ(ΜΑΑ)Υ ΔΕ ΜΜΕ ΑC† ΝΑΕΙ ΜΠΩΝΖ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(101) <Jesus said:> He who does not hate his father and his mother like me cannot be a [disciple] to me. And he who does [not] love [his father] and his mother like me cannot be a [disciple] to me. For my mother [. . .], but [my] true [mother] gave me life.

(101) <Jesus said>, “Those who do not hate their [father] and their mother as I do cannot be [disciples] of me. And those who [do not] love their [father and] their mother as I do cannot be [disciples of] me. For my mother [. . .] But my true [mother] gave me life.”

105 [101]. “He who has not, like me, detested his father and his mother cannot be my disciple; and he who has loved h[is father a]nd his mother as much as he loves me cannot be my disciple. My mother, indeed, has [. . .] because in truth she gave me life.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “‘my true [mother]’: perhaps the holy spirit, who may be described as the mother of Jesus in such texts as the Secret Book of James, the Gospel of the Hebrews, and the Gospel of Philip. Thus the conundrum presented in the saying (hate parents and love parents) is resolved by positing two orders of family and two mothers of Jesus.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 105)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “The substance of this saying has already been provided in Saying 56 [55]. Here, however, Jesus explicitly states that he himself hates his (earthly)

father and mother (see Saying 96). The repeated phrase, ‘cannot be my disciple,’ comes, like most of the saying, from Luke 14:26. What he said about his mother (who gave him life?) cannot be recovered from the broken text. Perhaps he said, as in the Gospel of the Hebrews, that his mother was the Holy Spirit. The statement about loving father and mother may refer to loving the Father and the Holy Spirit. Verbally it is quite close to Matthew 10:37: ‘He who loves father or mother more than me cannot be my disciple.’ The sense is quite different, however. On ‘father and mother’ see Saying 102 [105].” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 189-190)

Funk and Hoover write: “Verse 1 of this saying, by itself, could have been voted pink, as a similar saying was in Luke 14:26. But here the first saying is joined by its opposite (v. 2), which makes it a paradox. One cannot both hate and love parents at the same time. The rest of the saying in Thomas is fragmentary, but enough remains to suggest that Thomas was making a distinction between two different kinds of mothers and fathers. The Fellows had to conclude that Thomas has revised an authentic tradition and developed it in some new but unknown direction.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 527)

J. D. Crossan writes: “In all cases where *Thomas* has two or more versions of a synoptic aphorism, one is usually more gnostic than the other. So also here. *Gos. Thom.* 101 ‘is a doublet of Saying 55. That part of its text which is parallel to the Lukan account of hating is almost identical with Saying 55. Its additional material seems clearly to be a more developed gnostic interpretation of the saying: hat this world, love the spiritual’ (Sieber: 121). For my present purpose, it is less important to discuss this gnosticizing tradition of the triple-stich aphoristic compound than to note that, now the *cross* saying has completely disappeared inside the *family* one, save for the common Coptic term behind ‘in My way’ (55) and ‘as I do’ (101). But *Gos. Thom.* 101 still retained the triple-stich format of the *aphoristic compound*. He even retained the double-stich parallelism of Aphorism 113 [Mt 10:37 // Lk 14:26], but the second stich is now in antithetical (*hate/love*) parallelism rather than in the original synonymous parallelism (*hate/hate*). *Gos. Thom.* 101 is a gnosticized redaction of *Gos. Thom.* 55.” (*In Fragments*, p. 136)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 55](#), [GThom 105](#), [Luke 14:25-33](#), [Luke 9:23-27](#), [Matt 10:34-39](#), [Matt 16:24-28](#), [Mark 8:34-9:1](#).

102. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC (ΧΕ Ο)ΥΟΕΙΝΑΥ ΜΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΣ ΧΕ ΕΥΕΙΝΕ
(ΝΝ)ΟΥΟΥΖΟΡ ΕΦΝΚΟΤΚ ΖΙΧΝ ΠΟΥΟΝΕΦ ΝΖ(Ν)ΝΕΖΟΥΥ ΧΕ ΟΥΤΕ
ΦΟΥΩΜ ΑΝ ΟΥΤΕ ΦΚ(Ω) ΑΝ ΝΝΕΖΟΥΥ ΕΟΥΩΜ

BLATZ

(102) Jesus said: Woe to the Pharisees, for they are like a dog lying in the manger of the cattle; for he neither eats nor does he let the cattle eat.

LAYTON

(102) Jesus said, “Woe unto the Pharisees. For what they resemble is a dog sleeping in the manger of some cattle, for it neither eats nor [lets] the cattle feed.”

DORESSE

106 [102]. Jesus says: “Cursed are they, the Pharisees, because they are like a dog which has lain in the cattle manger, but will neither eat <the food there> nor allow the oxen to eat it.”

Scholarly Quotes

J. D. Crossan writes: “Strictly speaking this is not, of course, a definite variation of *Gos. Thom.* 39a. But Quispel has said that ‘these words have the sensuousness of good tradition’ (1957:204). And Wilson described it as ‘a similar saying against the Pharisees’ to *Gos. Thom.* 39a. He even goes on to say that ‘the fact that it is a proverbial saying need create no difficulty: the originality lies not in the saying, but in its application, in the rapier-like thrust of the attack. These would seem to be grounds for including this among those apocrypha with some claim to authority’ (1960a:76-77).” (*In Fragments*, pp. 33-34)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The ‘dog in the manger’ is apparently a Greek proverb going back to ‘very ancient times’ (Moravcsik: 85). (1) It is included among the Greek proverbs attributed to Aesop: ‘a dog lying in the manger who does not eat himself but hinders the donkey from doing so’ (Perry, 1952:276). (2) It is also among the Latin fables as follows: ‘A dog without conscience lay in the manger full of hay. When the cattle came to eat of the hay he would not let them, but showed his teeth in ugly mood. The oxen protested: “It is not right for you to begrudge us the satisfaction of indulging our natural appetite when you yourself have no such appetite. It is not your nature to eat hay, and yet you prevent us from eating it”’ (Perry, 1952:696; 1965:597). (3) Lucian of Samosata (c. A.D. 125-180) gives the following version in ‘Timon, or The Misanthrope’: ‘Not that they were able to enjoy you themselves, but that they were shutting out everyone else from a share in the enjoyment, like the dog in the manger that neither ate the barley (*ton kithon*) herself nor permitted the hungry horse to eat it’ (Harmon: 2.342-343). (4) Again, in ‘The Ignorant Book-Collector,’ he says: ‘But you never lent a book to anyone; you act like the dog in the manger, who neither eats the grain (*ton kithon*) herself nor lets the horse eat it, who can’ (Harmon: 3.210-211). One notes, of course, the inevitable oral variations on dog (male or female), the fodder (hay or grain), and the hindered animals (donkey, cattle, horse).” (*In Fragments*, pp. 34-35)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “This is of course a familiar fable, and Grant and Freedman give references which show that it was proverbial in the second century. As they say, however, its occurrence in literary or semi-literary sources does not mean that it was otherwise unknown. Thomas might have picked it up anywhere. More important is the question raised by Bauer, as to whether it may not be an authentic saying of Jesus. As Bauer says, Jesus often made use of popular proverbs, and a possible context in which this saying might have been uttered can be found in Luke xvii. 1 ff. The fact that it is a proverbial saying need create no difficulty; the originality lies not in the saying, but in its application, in the rapier-like thrust of the attack. There would seem to be grounds for including this among those agrapha with some claim to authenticity.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 76-77)

Funk’s Parallels

[POxy655 39:1](#), [GThom 39:1](#), [Luke 11:52](#), [Matt 23:13](#).

103. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΜΑ(ΚΑ)ΡΙΟC ΠΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΠΑΕΙ ΕΤCΟΟΥΝ ΧΕ
 Ζ(Ν̄ ΛΩ) ΜΜΕΡΟC ΕΝΑΗCΤΗC ΝΗΥ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΩΙΝΑ (ΕΦ)ΝΑΤΩΟΥΝ
 Ν̄CΩΟΥΖ Ν̄ΤΕCΜΝΤΕ(ΡΟ) ΛΥΩ Ν̄CΜΟΥΡ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΧΝ ΤΕC†ΠΕ Ζ(Λ)
 ΤΕΖΗ ΕΜΠΑΤΟΥΕΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(103) Jesus said: Blessed is the man who knows [in which] part (of the night) the robbers are coming, that he may rise and gather his [. . .] and gird up his loins before they come in.

(103) Jesus said, “Blessed is the man who recognizes [which] district the brigands are going to enter, so as to arise, gather (the forces of) his domain, and arm himself before they enter.”

107 [103]. Jesus says: “Blessed is the man who knows [where] the robbers are going to enter, so that he watches, he gathers his [. . .] and girds his loins before they enter.”

Scholarly Quotes

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The beatitude picks up the woe from the previous logion. The logion is a free version of 21.5-7; Matt. 24.43-44/Luke 12.39-40 (=Q). It puts a new emphasis on the Q parallel by indicating the place (and not the time) of the attack. Perhaps Thomas could interpret this logion in a Gnostic way, starting from ‘know’.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, pp. 639-640)

J. D. Crossan writes: “There are five major differences between this version [103] and the preceding one [21]. (a) The form of 21c was metaphor succeeded by application, that of 103 is beatitude, beginning with the Greek loan-word *makarios*. (b) In 21c the protagonist is a *householder*, but in 103 he is simply a *man*, and there is no mention at all of a house. (c) In 21c the metaphor mentions a singular *thief*, but the application mentions the plural *brigands* or *robbers*. In 103 there is only mention of brigands or robbers, using the same Greek loan-word as earlier in 21c. (d) In 21c it is a question of knowing the *time* of attack, but in 103 it is the *place* of attack that is in question. There is, however, a textual problem here. The Coptic reads literally: ‘Blessed is the man who knows in what part the robbers are coming’ (Wilson, 1973:521). The problem is whether ‘part,’ using the Greek loan-word *meros*, is to be taken as ‘part (of the property),’ that is, ‘where’ (so Lambdin: 129), or ‘part (of the night),’ that is, ‘when’ (so Guillaumont, 1959:52-53). I am accepting the Lambdin interpretation because there are enough *other* differences between *Thomas* and Q on this saying to render intrusions from Q into *Thomas* on this point at least doubtful. (e) This is also an important point but it depends on an even greater textual problem, one of restoration rather than interpretation. In 21c the phrase ‘his house of his domain’ (*tefmentero*) appears, as was seen earlier. In 103 the protagonist sets out to ‘muster his *menet* [. . .].’ That is, the object of that action is uncertain because of a bad tear in the manuscripts outside top corner. Most translators attempt no reconstruction after ‘his.’ They simply leave a gap. But Lambdin proposes reading ‘muster his domain,’ presuming *menter* (domain, kingdom) as the missing word. If that reconstruction is correct, it is an important connection between 21c and 103, and it would indicate that 103 has infiltrated the application not only by the plural ‘robbers’ or ‘brigands,’ but also by the term ‘domain’ or ‘kingdom.’ I find this reconstruction very appealing, *but* there is a major problem in that the manuscript’s photographic copy evidences a fourth letter after that opening triad (*mnt*), a fourth letter that is mostly lost in the lacuna but which could not be e or r. Accordingly, although I accept Lambdin’s ‘muster his domain,’ I do so with some doubts.” (*In Fragments*, pp. 62-63)

J. D. Crossan continues: “But even apart from that reconstruction, it is now clear that there are important content differences between *Gos. Thom.* 21c and 103. (a) That latter text concerns a *man knowing the place where brigands will invade his property*. Place, not time, is what is important.

The former text concerns *a householder knowing that a thief is going to attack his house*. One could presume here that time (when) rather than place (where) is the significant point. But I would emphasize that time is not explicitly mentioned within the metaphor itself and that place would seem even more indicated in the application ('find a way to come to you'). (b) That application in 21c links even more closely with the distant image in 103 than with the proximate and preceding one in 21c itself. One sees, in other words, a slight movement from explicit place in 103 to implicit time in 21c's metaphor, but with 21c's application still capable of moving in either direction." (*In Fragments*, p. 63)

Funk's Parallels

[GThom 21:3](#), [Luke 12:39-40](#), [Matt 24:37-44](#), [1 Thess 5:2](#), [2 Pet 3:10](#), [Rev 3:3](#), [Rev 16:15](#).

104. (1) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΙC ΧΕ ΑΜΟΥ ΝΤΝΨΛΗΛ ΜΠΟΥΟΥ ΑΥΩ
 ΝΤΝΡΗCΤΕΥΕ (2) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΒΕ ΝΤΑΕΙΔΑC Η
 ΝΤΑΥΧΡΟ ΕΡΟΕΙ ΖΝ ΟΥ (3) ΑΛΛΑ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΡΨΑΝΠΝΥΜΦΙΟC ΕΙ
 ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜ ΠΝΥΜΦΩΝ ΤΟΤΕ ΜΑΡΟΥΝΗCΤΕΥΕ ΑΥΩ ΜΑΡΟΥΨΛΗΛ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(104) They said [to him]:
 Come, let us pray today and
 fast. Jesus said: What then is
 the sin that I have done, or in
 what have I been overcome?
 But when the bridegroom
 comes out from the bridal
 chamber, then let them fast
 and pray.

(104) They said [to Jesus],
 "Come, let us pray today,
 and let us fast." Jesus said,
 "What is the sin that I have
 committed? Or how have I
 been overcome? Rather,
 when the bridegroom leaves
 the bridal chamber then let
 people fast and pray."

108 [104]. They said [to
 him:] "Come, let us pray and
 fast today!" Jesus says:
 "What then is the sin that I
 have committed, or in what
 have I been at fault? But
 when the bridegroom comes
 out of the bridal chamber,
 then they must fast and
 pray!"

Scholarly Quotes

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Jesus is asked to pray and fast (see Sayings 5 and 14). Since he has committed no sin, he refuses, just as in the Gospel of the Hebrews (see page 33) he does not wish to be baptized, and in John 7:3-9 Jesus does not wish to go to the Feast of Tabernacles. However, fasting and prayer are permissible 'when the bridegroom comes out of the bridechamber' (cf., Matthew 9:14; Mark 2:19-20; Luke 5:34-35). Since no Gnostic leaves the bridechamber (see Saying 75), this means that the Gnostic will never fast or pray." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 191)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "Prayer and fasting are more or less emphatically condemned in logia 6 and 14. The obvious canonical parallel is the saying in Mark ii. 18-20, spoken in reply to a criticism that the disciples of Jesus, unlike the Pharisees and the followers of John, were not engaged in fasting. The introduction has been re-written, and indeed we can see the beginnings of such re-writing in Matthew and Luke as compared with Mark; all that has survived is a modified form of the prophecy that the day will come when the bridegroom is no longer present, and then will be the time for fasting. The first sentence of Jesus' reply here, however, is quoted by Jerome as occurring in 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews . . . which the Nazarenes use,' which gives further support to the

view that there is some connection between the two documents. The passage in the Gospel of the Hebrews, however, refers to the baptism of John: Jesus declines to go because He has no consciousness of sin, and therefore no need of baptism for remission of sins. Moreover, some scholars attribute the quotation to the Gospel of the Nazarenes. In the present state of our knowledge the relation between these two documents is by no means clear. Bauer notes that at one point, where we can check Thomas against both the Gospel of the Nazarenes and that of Matthew (logion 39), Thomas by reading ‘wise as serpents’ instead of ‘wiser than serpents’ agrees with Matthew.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 84-85)

F. F. Bruce writes: “The saying expresses the same negative attitude to external acts of piety as Sayings 6, 14 and 27. It is similar to Jesus’s reply to the criticism of his disciples for not fasting in Mark 2:18-20, but prayer is here added to fasting. The canonical mention of the bridegroom, which is purely parabolic, is amplified here by reference to the bridal chamber, which (as we have said in the comment on Saying 75) played an important part in the special vocabulary of some Gnostic groups. The opening words of Jesus’s reply (‘What sin have I committed . . . ?’) resemble his reply in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* that he should join his family in seeking baptism at John’s hands.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 150)

J. D. Crossan writes: “I distinguish between *dialogue* and *story* even though the latter may easily contain the former. What is significant, however, is that the former *need not* contain the latter. And this becomes especially important for the gnostic transmission of the Jesus tradition. Compare, for example, how the *dialectical dialogue* of *Gos. Thom.* 104 appears as a *dialectical story* in Mark 2:18-20 and is heightened there by the presence of Mark 2:18, which is omitted in Matt. 9:14 = Luke 5:33.” (*In Fragments*, p. 205)

Helmut Koester writes: “The first part of Jesus’ answer in *Gos. Thom.* 104 is evidently a later expansion. The second part corresponds to the last sentence of this pericope in Mark, albeit without the explicit reference to ‘that day’ with which Mark points to the day of Jesus’ death. There is no reference in Thomas to the disciples of John and the Pharisees. At least with respect to the latter, there would have been no reason for Thomas to delete it, had it been a part of his text or tradition.” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 110)

Stephen Patterson writes: “Initially the saying seems to be in agreement with *Thom.* 14:1-2 in rejecting fasting and prayer. One is reminded here of the tradition in which Jesus is accused of being ‘a glutton and a drunkard’ (see Luke 7:34; Matt. 11:19 [Q]). But then 104:3 seems to shift the position of the text: at some point fasting will be appropriate. But when? Does the “bridal chamber” refer to that ritual of initiation known from Syrian and later Gnostic Christianity? Could it be that although Jesus did not fast, here initiates into *Thomas* Christianity are encouraged to do so? Or does *Thom.* 104:3 refer in some enigmatic way to the death of Jesus (cf. the parallel tradition in Mark 2:20), so that one may fast after Jesus’ death? Perhaps. Still, fasting is not uncommon as a pious practice; even if it is somehow encouraged in 104:3, this is hardly indicative of a full-scale asceticism among *Thomas* Christians.” (*The Fifth Gospel*, pp. 61-62)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 6:1](#), [GThom 14:1](#), [POxy1 27](#), [GThom 27](#), [Luke 5:33-39](#), [Matt 9:14-17](#), [Mark 2:18-22](#).

105. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤΝΑCΟΥΩΝ ΠΕΙΩΤ ΜΝ ΤΜΑΔΥ CΕΝΑΜΟΥΤΕ
ΕΡΟC ΧΕ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΟΡΝΗ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(105) Jesus said: He who knows father and mother will be called the son of a harlot.

(105) Jesus said, "Whoever is acquainted with the father and the mother will be called the offspring of a prostitute.

109 [105]. Jesus says: "He who knows father and mother shall he be called: Son of a harlot!?"

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "This saying may be interpreted as a recommendation that one despise one's physical parents; compare sayings 55; 101. Book of Thomas 144,8-10 declares, 'Damn you who love intercourse and filthy association with womankind.' In Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.23.2, evidence may be provided for another interpretation of the saying. There Irenaeus explains that Simon the Magician's associate Helena, a prostitute from Tyre, was understood to be the divine thought that was incarnated in body after body and that even became a whore, though she is actually 'the mother of all.' In a similar vein, the myth of the soul as presented in the Nag Hammadi text *Exegesis on the Soul* explains how the soul is raped and abused in the body and how the soul falls into prostitution. Origen may give reason to consider yet another interpretation of the saying. In *Against Celsus* 1.28; 32 Origen cites the tradition that Jesus was the illegitimate child of Mary, who 'bore a child from a certain soldier named Panthera.' It is known from a gravestone that a Sidonian archer named Tiberius Julius Abdes Pantera was in fact stationed in Palestine around the time of the birth of Jesus. In this regard perhaps compare John 8:41." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 106)

F. F. Bruce writes: "The point of this saying may be quite problematical. It may imply the denial that Jesus entered the world by such a supposedly unworthy manner as being born of woman. On the other hand, Jesus may be complaining that he himself, who knows his true Father and to be God (cf. John 8.18 ff.) - and possibly his true mother to be the Holy Spirit, as in the *Gospel according to Hebrews* - is nevertheless stigmatised as being 'born of fornication' (according to a probably mistaken interpretation of John 8.41). [The Jews' protest in John 8.41 ('we were not born of fornication') arises from their suspicion that Jesus was repeating Samaritan calumnies about the origin of the Jewish people (cf. verse 48, 'you are a Samaritan').]" (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside of the New Testament*, p. 151)

Funk and Hoover write: "Parentage played a more important role in individual identity in antiquity than it does in modern Western societies. In Jewish-Christian disputes over Jesus, the charge was often made that Jesus was the illegitimate child of Mary and a Roman soldier. Most of the Followers took Thomas 105 to refer to that charge and dispute. If this is indeed the allusion, then Jesus is made to speak here about himself and the special relation that he has to the Father (Thom 61:3) and the Mother (101:3), in both the literal and metaphorical senses. The saying then expresses early Christian reflection on the parentage of Jesus in the context of disputes with rival Judean groups." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 526)

Funk's Parallels

[John 8:39-47.](#)

106. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΡ ΠCΝΑΥ ΟΥΑ
 ΤΕΤΝΑΩΩΠΕ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ (2) ΑΥΩ ΕΤΕΤΝΩΑΝΧΟΟC ΧΕ
 ΠΤΟΟΥ ΠΩΩΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΧΝΑΠΩΩΝΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(106) Jesus said: When you make the two one, you will become sons of man, and when you say: Mountain, move away, it will move away.

(106) Jesus said, “when you (plur.) make the two into one you will become sons of man, and when you say, ‘O mountain, go elsewhere!’ it will go elsewhere.”

110 [106]. Jesus says: “When you make the two one, you will become sons of Man and if you say: ‘Mountain, move!’, it will move.”

Scholarly Quotes

Bentley Layton writes of the phrase “sons of man”: “Perhaps extending to all Christians of either sex. ‘Son of man’ or ‘child of the human being’ was a traditional eschatological title applied to Jesus in some early Christian circles; the arrival of the heavenly ‘son of man’ would signal the arrival of god’s kingdom.” (*The Gnostic Scriptures*, p. 398)

J. D. Crossan writes: “Turner has suggested that the ‘spirituality implied in the Gospel of Thomas is a type of unitive mysticism. The theme of unity runs through the document as a whole. In two sayings it replaces the synoptic “faith” as the force which removes mountains (Sayings 48 and 106). The second saying has a more distinctively gnostic ring than the first’ (Turner and Montefiore: 105). Quispel has even said that 106 has ‘targumized’ 48 by ‘hinting at the reunion of opposites, male and female, above and below, inner and outer’ (1958-1959:288). But it is probably also true that *Thomas* now reads 48 in light of 106 (Menard, 1976: 150), since there is already a thematic complex in 46-49 on this subject (see Turner and Montefiore: 80).” (*In Fragments*, p. 207)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 22:4](#), [GThom 23](#), [GThom 49](#), [GThom 75](#), [GThom 48](#), [Luke 17:5-6](#), [Matt 17:19-20](#), [Matt 21:18-22](#), [Mark 11:20-25](#), [1 Cor 13:2](#), [Ign Eph. 5.2](#).

107. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΕCΤΝΤΩΝ ΕΥΡΩΜΕ ΝΩΩC
ΕΥΝΤΑC ΜΜΑΥ ΝΩΕ ΝΕCΟΟΥ (2) ΛΟΥΑ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ CΩΡΜ ΕΠΝΟC
ΠΕ ΛΚΩ ΜΠCΤΕΨΙΤ ΛCΩΙΝΕ ΝCΑ ΠΙΟΥΑ ΩΑΝΤΕCΖΕ ΕΡΟC (3)
ΝΤΑΡΕCΖΙCΕ ΠΕΧΑC ΜΠΕCΟΟΥ ΧΕ ΤΟΥΩΚ ΠΑΡΑ ΠCΤΕΨΙΤ

BLATZ

(107) Jesus said: The kingdom is like a shepherd who had a hundred sheep; one of them, the biggest, went astray; he left (the) ninety-nine (and) sought after the one until he found it. After he had laboured, he said to the sheep: I love you more than the ninety-nine.

LAYTON

(107) Jesus said, "What the kingdom resembles is a shepherd who had a hundred sheep. One of them, the largest, strayed away. He left the ninety-nine and sought the one until he found it. After having toiled, he said to the sheep, 'I love you (sing.) more than the ninety-nine.'"

DORESSE

111 [107]. Jesus says: "The Kingdom is like a shepherd who has a hundred sheep. One of them, the biggest, went astray. He left the ninety-nine others and looked for this single <sheep> until he found it. After taking this trouble, he said to the sheep: 'I love you more than the ninety-nine <others>!'"

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: "In the Babylonian Talmud, a contrast is made between ninety-nine people who urge one thing and one person who is more on the side of the law; and in the Midrash Rabbah of Genesis, a person is described leaving eleven cows to find the one that wandered away." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 106)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "Accustomed as we are to the familiar story in the Synoptic Gospels, this version must come as something of a surprise, the more particularly since in the Synoptics it is not a parable of the kingdom at all. As Cerfaux observes, however, the parable was a favourite with the Gnostics, who adapted it for their own purposes. He finds an explanation in the Gospel of Truth (32.18-25), which links the lost sheep of this parable with that of Matthew xii. 11 f., the sheep fallen into the well. This, with some other features, would provide clear evidence of Gnostic redaction. For Bartsch the addition of 'the largest' is merely an explanatory expansion to explain the shepherd's search, but if the analogy of the fish and the pearl is borne in mind it may, perhaps, be suggested that the point is somewhat more significant: the sheep would seem to be either the Gnostic, for whose sake Christ the shepherd labours, or the kingdom (identified as elsewhere with *gnosis*) for which the Gnostic must strive. Bauer draws attention to the Valentinian interpretation recorded by Irenaeus and, like Doresse before him, to the speculations on the number ninety-nine in the Gospel of Truth, but Grant and Freedman see no reason to suppose that Thomas had such calculations in mind; of this it can only be said that all the available evidence must be collected for examination, even if some of it may eventually prove irrelevant. Finally there is the variant in the closing words: 'I love thee more . . .' for Matthew's 'he rejoiceth.' Guillaumont's suggestion that these are different versions of the underlying Aramaic is certainly attractive, but this must be left to the specialists in that field. As it is, there has been some development of this parable in the Synoptic tradition itself, as comparison of the Matthean and Lucan versions will suffice to show." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 95-96)

Funk and Hoover write: "Thomas' version of the lost sheep has moved away from the original: the lost sheep here is the largest of the flock - a motif repeated elsewhere in Thomas (in the parable of the leaven, Thom 96:1-2, and in the parable of the fishnet, 8:1-3). The shepherd loves the large

sheep more than the ninety-nine, according to Thomas. In the version of Matthew (18:12-13), the shepherd loves the single sheep simply because it is lost. The themes and interests that have prompted Thomas to revise the story are alien to the authentic parables and aphorisms of Jesus.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 529)

F. F. Bruce writes: “In the canonical versions of the parable of the lost sheep (Luke 15.3-7; cf. Matthew 18.12 f.), the owner puts himself to exceptional trouble over the hundredth sheep just because it is lost. This is unacceptable to our present editor, who rationalizes the situation by explaining that the lost sheep was the biggest (and presumably the most valuable) in the flock. Either the shepherd is Jesus and the hundredth sheep the true Gnostic, or the shepherd is the Gnostic and the sheep the true knowledge (like the big fish in Saying 8 and the pearl in Saying 76).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 151)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “The parable has a parallel in Matt. 18.12-13/Luke 15.4-6 (=Q) and represents a further development of the Q parable. For the lost sheep has now become the largest (v. 2). This is a motif which corresponds to 8.1-3 and 96.1-2. Two interpretations of the parable in Gnostic terms are possible: (a) the shepherd stands for the Saviour, who in the large sheep seeks and finds the Gnostic self which has gone astray in the world. (b) The shepherd represents the Gnostic himself, who seeks and finds himself.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 641)

Helmut Koester writes: “*Gos. Thom.* 107 lacks the secondary applications found in Matt 18:14 (‘So it is not the will of my father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish’) and Luke 16:7 (‘There will be more joy in heaven over one sinner repenting than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance’).” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 99)

Funk’s Parallels

[Luke 15:3-7](#), [Matt 18:12-14](#).

108. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΤΑCΩ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΤΑΤΑΠΡΟ CΝΑCΩΠΕ
 ΝΤΑΖΕ (2) ΑΝΟΚ ΖΩ †ΝΑCΩΠΕ ΕΝΤΟC ΠΕ (3) ΑΥΩ ΝΕΘΗΠ
 ΝΑΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΡΟC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(108) Jesus said: He who drinks from my mouth will become like me, and I will become like him, and the hidden things will be revealed to him.

(108) Jesus said, “Whoever drinks from my mouth will become like me; I, too, will become that person, and to that person the obscure things will be shown forth.”

112 [108]. Jesus says: “He who drinks from my mouth will become like me. As for me, I will become what he is, and what is hidden will be revealed to him.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “Compare saying 13; John 4:13-14; 7:37-39; 1 Corinthians 10:1-4; Sirach 24:21, on drinking of Wisdom. In Odes of Solomon 30:1, 5, it is said that living water flows from the lips of the Lord.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 107)

Gerd Ludemann writes of 108:1, “This is a commentary on 13.5.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 642) For the other two verses, Ludemann connects them to the prologue.

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Jesus is the source of the water of life, as in Saying 12 (cf., John 4:14 and 7:37; Revelation 22:17); the person who drinks from his mouth becomes one with him, as in various Gnostic writings (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, 1, 13, 3; *Pistis Sophia*, chapter 96; Gospel of Eve in Epiphanius, *Pan.*, 26, 3, 1: ‘I am you and you are I’).” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 193)

Funk’s Parallels

[John 4:7-15](#), [John 7:37-39](#), [Rev 22:17](#).

109. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΕCΤΝΤΩΝ ΕΥΡΩΜΕ ΕΥΝΤΑÇ
 ΜΜΑΥ ΖΝ ΤΕÇΩΩΕ ΝΝΟΥΕΖΟ ΕÇΖΗ(Π Ε)ÇΟ ΝΑΤÇΟΟΥΝ ΕΡΟÇ
 (2) ΑΥΩ Μ(ΜΝΝÇΑ Τ)ΡΕÇΜΟΥ ΑÇΚΑΑÇ ΜΠΕÇ(ΩΗΡΕ ΝΕ)ΠΩΗΡΕ
 ÇΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΑÇΙ ΤÇΩΩΕ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΑÇΤΑΑÇ (ΕΒΟ)Λ (3) ΑΥΩ
 ΠΕ(Ν)ΤΑΖΤΟΟΥÇ ΑÇΕΙ ΕÇΚΑΕΙ Α(ÇΖ)Ε ΑΠΕΖΟ ΑÇΑΡΧΕΙ Ν†
 ΖΟΜΤ ΕΤΜΗÇΕ Ν(ΝΕ)ΤÇΟΥΟΥΟΥ

BLATZ	LAYTON	DORESSE
(109) Jesus said: The kingdom is like a man who had in his field a [hidden] treasure, of which he knew nothing. And [after] he died he left it to his [son. The] son also did not know; he took the field and sold it. The man who bought it came (and) as he was ploughing [found] the treasure. He began to lend money at interest to whomever he wished.	(109) Jesus said, “What the kingdom resembles is a man who possessed a hidden treasure in his field without knowing it. And [upon] dying he left it to his [son]. The son [was] not aware of the fact. He assumed (ownership of) the field and sold it. And the person who bought it came plowing, [found] the treasure, and began to lend out money at interest to whomever he wished.”	113 [109]. Jesus says: “The Kingdom is like a man who [has] a [hidden] treasure in his field and does not know it. He did not [find it before] he died, and he left his [property to his] son who did not know it <either>. He took the field, sold it, and the man who bought it went to till it: [he found] the treasure, and he began to lend at interest to those [whom he] wanted (?).”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Aesop’s Fable 42 as a parallel: “A farmer who was about to die and who wished to familiarize his sons with farming summoned them and said, ‘Sons, in one of my vineyards a treasure is hidden.’ After his death they took plows and mattocks and dug up all of their farmed land. They did not find the treasure, but the vineyard repaid them with a harvest many times greater. The story shows that what is gotten from toil is a treasure for people.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 107)

Joachim Jeremias quotes a parallel in *Midr. Cant.* 4.12: “It (i.e. the quotation from Cant. 4.12) is like a man who inherited a place full of rubbish. The inheritor was lazy and sold it for a ridiculously small sum. The purchaser dug therein industriously and found in it a treasure. He built therewith a great palace and passed through the bazaar with a train of slaves whom he had bought with the treasure. When the seller saw it he could have choked himself (with vexation).” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 32)

Joachim Jeremias writes: “Whereas in Matthew the parable of the Treasure in the Field describes the overwhelming joy of the finder . . . in the Gospel of Thomas, under the influence of the rabbinic story, the point is entirely lost: the parable now describes the rage of a man who has failed to seize a unique opportunity.” (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 33)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “It might mean that the kingdom which the Jews, or people in general, could have known was given to others [cf. Mt 8:11-12, Lk 13:29] . . . The ‘lending at interest’ at the end of the story would then be spiritual, for taking interest is rejected in Saying 92. On the other hand, it might mean that unless you look for the treasure within your own field it will pass to others who will profit from it. The second interpretation seems more probable.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 194)

R. McL. Wilson writes: “As Cerfaux noted, this version departs radically from that of Matthew and finds a closer parallel in a Rabbinic story of the second century. Grant and Freedman find it difficult to see what the story meant to Thomas, but a Gnostic interpretation is not hard to discover. If the kingdom be identified with *gnosis*, the knowledge that is latent in every man, but which only the Gnostic can truly be said to possess, we have a treasure hidden from the original owner and his son (the psychic or the hylic?), awaiting the coming of the Gnostic who was able to receive it. An alternative is offered by Bauer, who with Doresse refers to the Naassene use of the parable. Like the mustard seed and also the leaven (logion 96), the treasure is the kingdom, understood in a Gnostic sense. The purchaser is Christ, who bought the field in His Incarnation, laboured in it in His Passion, and by casting off the body of flesh in His return to heaven has found the treasure. The taking of interest is forbidden in logion 95 (cf. Matt. v. 42, Luke vi. 34), but is plausibly explained by Bauer as the imparting of *gnosis* by Christ to his followers. Of this parable Bartsch observes that it has undergone a transformation and shows no relation either in form or in content to the synoptic version.” (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 93-94)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This version of the parable of the hidden treasure (cf. Matthew 13.44) has a novel ending. The treasure, like the pearl in Saying 76, is the true knowledge; if those who have this within their grasp do not avail themselves of it, it will pass to others who will profit by it.” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, p. 152)

Funk and Hoover write: “In Matthew, by covering up the treasure and buying the field, the man deceives the original owner. But he sells all his possessions in order to acquire the field with the hidden treasure. In Thomas’ version, the ultimate purchaser of the field launches a despicable occupation: moneylender. Thomas 92 specifically prohibits moneylending as an acceptable practice. In both versions of the parable, the treasure comes into the possession of someone with dubious moral credentials. This is comparable to the behavior of the shrewd manager in another of Jesus’ parables (Luke 16:1-8a), who swindles his master in order to provide for his own future. Surprising moves such as this, in which Jesus employs a dubious moral example, appear to be characteristic of Jesus’ parable technique.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 530)

Charles W. Hedrick writes: “The Treasure in the Gospel of Thomas is easily understandable in the cultural context of first-century Judaism (or early Jewish Christianity) and has parallels to be found in other parables of Jesus that emphasize transversion, or reversal, of values. Thomas’ parable

stresses the sudden finding of the treasure and seems to commend the resourceful response of the individual who found the treasure, i.e., the loaning at usury, by making it the climax of the parable. The loaning of money for interest would certainly conflict with Torah where one is not permitted to loan at interest to a fellow Israelite. In that sense the motif becomes a shocking element in the parable, assuming that it was addressed to Jewish audiences, and such language is attributed to Jesus elsewhere. The point of Thomas's version of The Treasure in a Jewish context would seem to have been the impact of suddenly, unexpectedly finding a fabulous treasure (=the kingdom of God). I suppose it would correspond to winning a lottery with a large purse. Such an event completely reverses values. It turns the world upside down. It challenges and changes the old customs and former values, religious and otherwise. Farmers (peasants) become bankers, heirs are abruptly disenfranchised and cherished religious beliefs are discarded. Other parables of Jesus that reflect a similar twist are The Good Samaritan, Pharisee and Publican, The Vineyard Laborers, The Palm Shoot, and Grain of Wheat." ("The Treasure Parable," *Forum* 2.2 [1986], pp. 52-53)

Joachim Jeremias writes: "Both parables [109 and 76] make use of a favourite theme in oriental story-telling. The audience expected that the story of the treasure in the field would be about a splendid palace which the finder built, or a train of slaves with whom he promenades through the bazaar (see p. 32), or about the decision of a wise judge that the son of the finder should marry the daughter of the owner of the field. In the story of the pearl it would expect to hear that its discovery was the reward of special piety, or that the pearl would save the life of a merchant who had fallen into the hands of robbers. Jesus, as always, surprises his audience by treating the well-known stories (pp. 178 ff., 183, 188) in such a way as to emphasize an aspect quite unexpected by his hearers. The question is, what aspect?" (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 200)

Joachim Jeremias writes: "The decisive thing in the twin parable is not what the two men give up, but the reason for their doing so; the overwhelming experience of the splendour of their discovery. Thus it is with the Kingdom of God. The effect of the joyful news is overpowering; it fills the heart with gladness; it makes life's whole aim the consummation of the divine community and produces the most whole-hearted self-sacrifice." (*The Parables of Jesus*, p. 201)

Helmut Koester writes: "The original parable of the Hidden Treasure, however, is not actually quoted by Thomas. If one considers *Gos. Thom.* 109 as a quotation of that parable, one arrives at a judgment like Jeremias's, who called it 'utterly confused.' But Jeremias already recognized that *Gos. Thom.* 109 is actually a reproduction of a rabbinic parable where the story describes how angry one can get if one misses such an opportunity. The story, otherwise widespread in folklore and in the complex legal Talmudic discussion about ownership of treasures found, has been deliberately changed by the *Gospel of Thomas*. It says nothing about the angry reaction of the first owner of the field (who is actually dead when the treasure is discovered!), but emphasizes that the two original owners of the field 'did not know about the treasure.' The contrast in the parable is, therefore, between not knowing and finding, that is, 'knowing.' Since 'treasure' has at this point in the story clearly become a metaphor, the following 'lending money at interest to whomever he wished' must be understood metaphorically as the communication of knowledge." (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 105)

Charles W. Hedrick writes: "Matthew and Thomas have in common all the parables in Matthew 13, and when one compares the structures of the parables in Matthew 13 to their parallels in Thomas one discovers that it is only The Treasure whose structure in Thomas differs radically from that version of the parable to be found in Matthew's tradition. In the light of the identity between The Pearl in Matthew and Thomas and the striking, even verbatim, agreement between Matthew's versions of The Treasure and The Pearl, it would appear that Matthew has assimilated The Treasure to The Pearl, and it is Thomas that preserves the traditional parable. . . . If Thomas has modified an original parable of Jesus along the lines of the rabbinic tradition so as to create the structural order

of ‘receiving, selling, buying and finding,’ why did he not make a comparable adjustment in The Pearl and The Fishnet, which seem according to Crossan, to reflect a different sequence of motifs (i.e., finding, selling, buying)? On the other hand, no such questions arise if one assumes that it is Matthew who has adapted a parable with rabbinic features to fit his versions of The Pearl and The Fishnet.” (“The Treasure Parable,” *Forum* 2.2 [1986], pp. 46-47, 52)

Funk’s Parallels

[Matt 13:44.](#)

110. ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΖΩΙΝΕ ΜΠΚΟCΜΟC ΝΨΡ ΡΜΜΛΟ
ΜΑΡΕΨΑΡΝΑ ΜΠΚΟCΜΟC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(110) Jesus said: He who has found the world (and) become rich, let him renounce the world.

(110) Jesus said, “The one who had found the world and become rich should renounce the world.”

114 [110]. Jesus says: “He who has found the world and become rich, let him renounce the world!”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer writes: “Compare saying 81. The teaching on renunciation of the world also occurs in the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles, and Pistis Sophia. See also Gospel of Thomas saying 27 on fasting from (or, abstaining from) the world.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 107)

Helmut Koester writes: “To be ‘children of the living Father’ is to be free from the society and not to be bound to the world and its values. ‘Blessedness’ does not depend upon the marks of success in this world. One’s identity should not be determined by whatever is valuable for personal status in the social fabric of the world: householder, family member, religious leader, successful business person: [110].” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 128)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Like Logia 56; 80; 111.3, the logion is about the renunciation of the world. This time Jesus is addressing those who like the man from Logion 109 have profited from the world, but should now withdraw from it as rapidly as possible.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 641)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 81.](#)

111. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΜΠΗΥΕ ΝΑΘΩΛ ΔΥΩ ΠΚΑΖ ΜΠΕΤΝΜΤΟ
ΕΒΟΛ (2) ΔΥΩ ΠΕΤΟΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΠΕΤΟΝΖ ΦΝΑΝΔΥ ΔΝ ΕΜΟΥ (3)
ΟΥΧ ΖΟΤΙ ΕΙC ΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΧΕ ΠΕΤΑΖΕ ΕΡΟΦ ΟΥΔΔΑΦ ΠΚΟCΜΟC
ΜΠΩΔ ΜΜΟΦ ΔΝ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(111) Jesus said: The heavens will be rolled up and likewise the earth in your presence, and the living one, (come forth) from the Living One, will not see death or <fear>, because Jesus says: He who finds himself, of him the world is not worthy.

(111) Jesus said, “The heavens and the earth will roll up in your (plur.) presence. And the living from the living will not see death.” - Doesn’t Jesus mean that the world is not worthy of a person who has found the self?

115 [111]. Jesus says: “The heavens and the earth will open (?) before you, and he who lives by Him who is living will not see death”, because (?) Jesus says this: “He who keeps to himself alone, the world is not worthy of him.”

Scholarly Quotes

Bentley Layton writes of the last sentence here: “probably a comment added to the text by an ancient reader and later erroneously incorporated in the text.” (*The Gnostic Scriptures*, p. 399)

Jean Doresse writes that the last part “introduces an explanation or conclusion of one of the editors of the *Gospel of Thomas*; cf. 65. He draws a comparison between the person who lives by ‘Him who is living’ (the Risen Jesus) and the person who has achieved solitude and unity.” (*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, p. 377)

Funk and Hoover write: “In vv. 1-2, Jesus speaks as the redeemer sent from God to reveal the secrets of the universe. Such an understanding of Jesus’ identity belongs to the early Jesus movement, not to Jesus himself.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 530)

Gerd Theissen describes one theological motive of Thomas: “Dualistic anthropology: the world and with it the human body are devalued and become a synonym for death. The Father’s kingdom of light, knowledge and eternal life are to be attained only by radical ‘fasting from the world’ (27): ‘Whoever finds himself is superior to the world’ (111).” (*The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, p. 40)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 11:1](#), [Ps 102:25-27](#), [Isa 34:4](#), [Luke 16:16-17](#), [Luke 21:32-33](#), [Matt 5:18](#), [Matt 24:34-35](#), [Mark 13:30-31](#), [DialSav 56](#), [Heb 1:10-12](#), [Rev 6:12-14](#).

112. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΟΕΙ ΝΤCΑΡΞ ΤΑΕΙ ΕΤΩΕ ΝΤΨΥΧΗ (2)
 ΟΥΟΕΙ ΝΤΨΥΧΗ ΤΑΕΙ ΕΤΩΕ ΝΤCΑΡΞ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(112) Jesus said: Woe to the flesh that depends on the soul; woe to the soul that depends on the flesh.

(112) Jesus said, “Woe to the flesh that depends upon a soul. Woe to the soul that depends upon flesh.”

116 [112]. Jesus says: “Cursed is the flesh that depends on the soul, and cursed is the soul that depends on the flesh!”

Scholarly Quotes

Helmut Koester writes: “Flesh and spirit, body and soul, are two different components in a human being, joined in an unholy mix which spells doom for both” (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 126).

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 87](#), [GThom 29](#).

113. (1) ΠΕΧΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΝΟΙ ΝΕΦΜΑΘΗΤΗC ΧΕ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΕCΝΝΗΥ
 ΝΑΩ ΝΖΟΟΥ (2) ΕCΝΝΗΥ ΑΝ ΖΝ ΟΥΘΩΩΤ ΕΒΟΛ (3) ΕΥΝΑΧΟΟC
 ΑΝ ΧΕ ΕΙCΖΗΗΤΕ ΜΠΙCΑ Η ΕΙCΖΗΗΤΕ ΤΗ (4) ΑΛΛΑ ΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ
 ΜΠΕΙΩΤ ΕCΠΟΡΩ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΧΜ ΠΚΑΖ ΑΥΩ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΕΡΟC

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(113) His disciples said to him: On what day will the kingdom come? <Jesus said:> It will not come while people watch for it; they will not say: Look, here it is, or: Look, there it is; but the kingdom of the father is spread out over the earth, and men do not see it.

(113) His disciples said to him, “When is the kingdom going to come?” <Jesus said>, “It is not by being waited for that it is going to come. They are not going to say, ‘Here it is’ or ‘There it is.’ Rather, the kingdom of the father is spread out over the earth, and people do not see it.”

117 [113]. His disciples said to him: “On what day will the kingdom come?” “It will not come when it is expected. No one will say: ‘See, it is here!’ or: ‘Look, it is there!’ but the Kingdom of the Father is spread over the earth and men do not see it.”

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Gospel of Mary 8,11-22 for comparison: “When the blessed one had said these things, he greeted them all, saying, ‘Peace be with you. Acquire my peace for yourselves. Watch that no one mislead you, saying, “Look, here,” or “Look, there,” for the child of humankind is within you. Follow him. Those who seek him will find him. Go, then, and preach the gospel of the kingdom.”” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 108)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: “Once more, as in Sayings 2 and 52, Thomas turns to the favorite text of the Naassenes, Luke 17:20-21 (cf. Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 7, 20-21; 5, 8, 8). This time, however, his emphasis is not on the inwardness of the kingdom but on its presence

among men. It is ‘spread out upon the earth,’ just as in Saying 2 it is both within men and outside them (Coptic; Greek has ‘within’ only). It may be that Thomas has in mind the mysterious ‘sign of extension’ mentioned in the second-century *Didache* (16, 6) as destined to come in the sky before the end of the world. Other second-century writers (e.g., Justin) find the ‘sign of extension’ (the shape of the cross) present in nature. Perhaps this is what Thomas has in view.” (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 196-197)

J. D. Crossan writes: “The first unit [3] is an implicit dialogue but an explicit antagonism. Jesus and his unspecified hearers are on one side, and ‘your leaders’ are on the other side. Those hearers can hear from their leaders incorrectly but from Jesus correctly. The second unit is an explicit dialogue but an implicit antagonism. Presumably those who ‘do not see’ the kingdom’s presence fail because they are ‘watching/looking’ for its advent. But 113:1-4 taken even by itself implies that ‘the disciples’ are among those ‘people’ who cannot see the kingdom’s presence; otherwise, they would not have asked that question.” (*The Birth of Christianity*, pp. 314-315)

J. D. Crossan writes: “In 113:1-4 there is a double ‘behold/here’ and ‘behold/there,’ followed by a contrasting alternative ‘rather [or: but].’ In 3:1-3 that structure appears as a single but unablanced ‘behold/heaven’ and ‘-/sea’ followed by ‘rather [or: but].’ Is that common construction just coincidence, or are both those sayings diversified versions of the same basic unit? I answer tentatively in the affirmative because of the delicate parallels in form and structure just mentioned. Furthermore, the move seems to be from 113:1-4 toward 3:1-4 - that is, from criticism of ‘people’ to criticism of ‘leaders’ and from the somewhat clearer ‘the kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth’ to the somewhat more enigmatic ‘the kingdom is within you and it is outside you.’” (*The Birth of Christianity*, p. 314)

J. D. Crossan concludes: “In terms of content, it is possible that 3:1-3 and 113:1-4 are two totally separate sayings making, each in its own way, a similar point. But I think it is more probably that they are two versions of the same structural unit: the kingdom of God is not here or there in the future but here and now in the present. But some, be they ‘people’ or ‘leaders,’ do not accept that position.” (*The Birth of Christianity*, p. 315)

Funk and Hoover write: “There are other echoes [besides Thom 113 and Luke 17:20-21] of this way of putting the arrival of God’s imperial rule. In Thom 3:3, Jesus says, ‘The <Father’s> imperial rule is within you and it is outside you.’ Thom 51:2 is closer to Thom 113:4, ‘What you are looking forward to has come, but you don’t know it.’ In the Gospel of Mary, there is this admonition: ‘Be on guard so that no one deceives you by saying, ‘Look over here!’ or ‘Look over there!’ For the seed of true humanity exists within you.’ All these echoes reinforce the conclusion that a cluster of sayings that departed from the customary apocalyptic view was known to emanate from Jesus. It is fortunate for the quest of the historical Jesus that the gospel tradition vacuumed up a great many items that were not entirely congenial to the evangelists and communities that preserved these traditions. The contradictions and disagreements provide the historian with the elementary means of sorting the gospels out.” (*The Five Gospels*, p. 531)

Gerd Ludemann writes: “Like 3.1-3, this logion, which echoes Luke 17.20-21, is concerned with the coming of the kingdom of God. It rejects all speculation about the date of its arrival, giving the reason that the kingdom of God is already spread out over the earth, but is not seen by people. Other passages in which Thomas speaks of the presence of the kingdom of God are 46.2; 51, etc.” (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 644)

Funk’s Parallels: [POxy654 3:1](#), [GThom 3:1](#), [GThom 51](#), [Luke 17:20-21](#), [Luke 17:22-25](#), [Matt 24:23-28](#), [Mark 13:21-23](#), [DialSav 16](#).

114. (1) ΠΕΧΕ CΙΜΩΝ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΜΑΡΕΜΑΡΙΖΑΜ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ
 ΝΖΗΤΝ ΧΕ ΝCΖΙΟΜΕ ΜΠΩΑ ΔΝ ΜΠΩΝΖ (2) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ
 ΕΙCΖΗΗΤΕ ΔΝΟΚ †ΝΑCΩΚ ΜΜΟC ΧΕΚΑΔC ΕΕΙΝΑΔC ΝΖΟΟΥΤ ΩΙΝΑ
 ΕCΝΑΩΩΠΤΕ ΖΩΩC ΝΟΥΠΝΑ ΕΦΟΝΖ ΕΦΕΙΝΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΝΖΟΟΥΤ (3)
 ΧΕ CΖΙΜΕ ΝΙΜ ΕCΝΑΔC ΝΖΟΟΥΤ CΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ
 ΝΜΠΗΥΕ

BLATZ

LAYTON

DORESSE

(114) Simon Peter said to them: Let Mariham go out from among us, for women are not worthy of the life. Jesus said: Look, I will lead her that I may make her male, in order that she too may become a living spirit resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter into the kingdom of heaven.

(114) Simon Peter said to them, "Mary should leave us, for females are not worthy of life." Jesus said, "See, I am going to attract her to make her male so that she too might become a living spirit that resembles you males. For every female (element) that makes itself male will enter the kingdom of heaven."

118 [114]. Simon Peter says to them: "Let Mary go out from our midst, for women are not worthy of life!" Jesus says: "See, I will draw her so as to make her male so that she also may become a living spirit like you males. For every woman who has become male will enter the Kingdom of heaven."

Scholarly Quotes

Marvin Meyer quotes Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies* 5.8.44 for comparison: "For this, he says, is 'the gate of heaven,' . . . where it is necessary for them, when they have come there, to cast off their clothing and all become bridegrooms, having been made male through the virgin spirit." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 109)

Marvin Meyer quotes Clement of Alexandria, Excerpts from Theodotus 79 for comparison: "As long, then, as the seed is still unformed, they say, it is a child of the female, but when it was formed, it was changed into a man and becomes a son of the bridegroom. No longer is it weak and subject to the cosmic (forces), visible and invisible, but, having become male, it becomes a male fruit." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 109)

Marvin Meyer quotes First Apocalypse of James 41:15-19 for comparison: "The perishable has gone [up] to the imperishable, and [the] element of femaleness has attained to the element of this maleness." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 110)

Marvin Meyer quotes Zostrianos 131:2-10 for comparison: "Do not baptize yourselves with death, nor give yourselves into the hands of those who are inferior to you instead of those who are better. Flee from the madness and the bondage of femaleness, and choose for yourselves the salvation of maleness. You have not come [to] suffer, but rather you have come to escape your bondage." (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 110)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "As in the Gospel of Mary (pages 17-18 of the papyrus) and in *Pistis Sophia* (chapter 146), Simon Peter is not enthusiastic about the presence of Mariham (mentioned in Saying 21), just as in John 4:27 the disciples of Jesus are amazed because he is speaking with a woman. Male and female must become one (Saying 23 and Commentary). Jesus will 'draw' her (John 12:32) so that she will become 'one spirit' with him (1 Corinthians

6:17). She will become a man; just so, Ignatius of Antioch says that when he receives the pure light he will 'become a man' (*Romans*, 6, 2; for another parallel to Ignatius see Commentary on Saying 82). In order to enter into the kingdom of heaven, women must become men. We might be tempted to take this notion symbolically were it not for the existence of Gnostic parallels, for example in the Gospel of Mary (page 9), in Clement of Alexandria (*Excerpta ex Theodoto* 21, 3), and among the Naassenes. The 'house of God' is reserved 'for the spiritual ones alone; when they come there they cast off their garments [see Saying 38] and all become bridegrooms [Saying 75], having been made male by the virginal Spirit' (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5, 8, 44). The high point of Thomas's eschatology is thus reached, at the end of his gospel, with the obliteration of sex." (*The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, p. 198)

Gerd Ludemann writes: "The logion contrasts with 22.5. For that speaks of the dissolution of sexuality, whereas this logion speaks of a transformation of the female into the male, of a kind that occurs in numerous Gnostic ascetic texts. Perhaps Logion 114 was added to the Gospel of Thomas only at a relatively late stage. In the framework of the version of the Gospel of Thomas which has been preserved, Logion 114 is principally to be read as a polemic against procreation and the world (cf. 79.3; 27.1, etc.)." (*Jesus After 2000 Years*, p. 644)

Helmut Koester writes: "But the ideal of the itinerant man, who is independent of all social and family bonds, also seems to imply that women engaged in the pursuit of common values and social conventions likewise are not fit for this role unless they accept the ideal of the ascetic man: [114]." (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 128)

Funk and Hoover write: "In v. 3 Jesus is not suggesting a sex-change operation, but is using 'male' and 'female' metaphorically to refer to the higher and lower aspects of human nature. Mary is thus to undergo a spiritual transformation from her earthly, material, passionate nature (which the evangelist equates with the female) to a heavenly, spiritual, intellectual nature (which the evangelist equates with the male). This transformation may possibly have involved ritual acts or ascetic practices." (*The Five Gospels*, p. 532)

Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman write: "Indeed, Jesus says of Mary (presumably Mary Magdalene, as in most Gnostic revelations) that he will make her a male so that she may become a 'living spirit' like the male apostles: 'for every woman who makes herself a man will enter into the Kingdom of Heaven' (114/112). According to the Naassenes, spiritual beings will come to 'the house of God'; there they will cast off their garments and all of them will become bridegrooms, having been made male by the virginal Spirit. [Hippolytus *Ref.* V. 8. 44.] This teaching is close to that of Thomas." (*Gnosticism & Early Christianity*, p. 188)

R. McL. Wilson writes: "To quote the same authors [Grant and Freedman] yet again, 'the high point of Thomas' eschatology is thus reached, at the end of his gospel, with the obliteration of sex.' It should, however, be added that this is a point of difference among the Gnostic sects. In Valentinianism, for example, the souls of the elect enter into the Pleroma not as bridegrooms but as the brides of the angels. The basic conception is, however, the same." (*Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, p. 32)

Bentley Layton writes: "it was a philosophical cliché that the material constituent of an entity was 'female,' while its form (or ideal form) was 'male.'" (*The Gnostic Scriptures*, p. 399)

John Dart writes: "But actually, as James Brashler explains it, 'to become a male' is standard (albeit 'chauvinistic') language of the Hellenistic world for becoming pure, spiritual. The phrase was used also, he said, to describe what a teacher does for a student. In that context, woman is given an equal chance for salvation." (*The Laughing Savior*, p. 129)

F. F. Bruce writes: “This is not the only place in Gnostic literature where Peter expresses impatience at the presence of Mary Magdalene in their entourage. [In *Pistis Sophia*, when Mary has expounded the ‘mystery of repentance’ in a Gnostic sense and been congratulated by Jesus for her insight, Peter protests: ‘My Lord, we are not able to bear with this woman, speaking instead of us; she has not let any of us speak but often speaks herself’ (54b). In the John Rylands University Library of Manchester there is an early third-century Greek papyrus fragment (P. Ryl. 463) of a *Gospel according to Mary (Magdalene)*, in which the disciples discuss revelations which the Saviour is said to have given exclusively to Mary. Peter is unwilling to believe that the Saviour would have committed privately to a woman truths which he did not impart to his male disciples, but Levi rebukes him and defends Mary. (Part of the same work survives in a Coptic version in the Berlin papyrus 8502.) For Mary cf. Saying 21 (p. 122).] The general rabbinic idea that women were incapable of appreciating religious doctrine - compare the disciples’ astonishment at Jacob’s well when they found Jesus ‘talking with a woman’ (John 4.27) - was reinforced in Gnostic anthropology, where woman was a secondary and defective being. Yet none could deny Mary’s fidelity: to an objective observer, it surpassed that of the male disciples. Jesus’s promise that she will become a man, so as to gain admittance to the kingdom of heaven, envisages the reintegration of the original order, when Adam was created male and female (Genesis 1.27). Adam was ‘the man’ as much before the removal of Eve from his side as after (Genesis 2.18-25). Therefore, when the primal unity is restored and death is abolished, man will still be man (albeit more perfectly so), but woman will no longer be woman; she will be reabsorbed into man. [This is the point of the mystery of the bridal chamber (cf. Saying 75, p. 141); it was a form of initiation calculated to reverse the process by which death entered. ‘When Eve was in Adam, there was no death; but when she was separated from him, death came into being’ (*Gospel of Philip* 71).” (*Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, pp. 153-154)

John S. Kloppenborg, Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser state: “Now, as is obvious, this saying does not really free itself from the mistaken notions of its day about the relative worth of men and women. Nonetheless, what it says, in its own ‘back-handed’ way, is very important for the history of early Christianity. First, it probably indicates that not all were in agreement on whether women should be allowed to participate fully in the Jesus movement. The opposition to women voiced by Peter in this saying is not isolated, but reminds one of later evidence of a similar dispute in the *Gospel of Mary* (BG 8502 17,7 - 18,15) and *Pistis Sophia* (I, 36; II, 72). This dispute was likely one which would be carried on within early Christianity for many years to come. The *Gospel of Thomas*, of course, comes down here in favor of women’s participation, provided they engage in the same sort of regimen required of the men in the group. What is more, Mary (it is not clear which Mary is intended here) is taken as the predecessor of all women who would become disciples. This stands in contrast to the more traditional feminine roles assigned to Mary in the synoptic and Johannine traditions (whether one speaks of Mary the mother of Jesus or of Mary Magdalene). In *Thomas*, Mary is presented as the first female disciple of Jesus. Thus, Paul may well have had good precedent, even from out of the sayings tradition, for including both women and men in the organization of the Christian communities he founded.” (*Q-Thomas Reader*, pp. 111-112)

Marvin Meyer writes: “The transformation of the female into the male is discussed extensively in ancient literature (the transformation of the male into the female is also discussed, in the context of the acts of self-castration within the mysteries of the Great Mother and Attis). A few ancient accounts, in authors like Ovid and Phlegon of Tralles, communicate fantastic stories of women sprouting male genitals and thus becoming male, but most of the accounts use the gender categories in a metaphorical sense. Often the transformation of the female into the male involves the transformation of all that is earthly, perishable, passive, and sense-perceptible into what is heavenly, imperishable, active, and rational. In short, what is connected with the earth Mother is to be transformed into what is connected with the sky Father. If this is a correct interpretation of Gospel

of Thomas saying 114, then the saying is intended to be a statement of liberation, although the specific use of gender categories may be shocking to modern sensitivities.” (*The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, p. 109)

Funk’s Parallels

[GThom 22](#), [GEgy 6](#), [Gal 3:28-29](#).

Source: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/thomas/>