CHAPTER 1 | Introduction

Why This Book?

One of the more significant lessons we have learned from biblical scholarship is that traditions about Jesus were not passed down in any kind of linear or uniform fashion. We know with certainty that the teachings of Jesus were transmitted through a variety of media including, but not exclusive to, sayings collections, rules for church order, instructional and hortatory letters, liturgies, and apostolic word-of-mouth. We know that individual writings of the New Testament and other early Jesus movement literature usually reflect not singular, but multiple sources.

The most obvious example of this latter reality comes from gospel studies. Regardless of one's theory of the source relationships between canonical gospels, it is clear that a variety of sources are involved. Even if one begins with the most fundamental and widely-held hypothesis—the two-source hypothesis (Matthew and Luke used Mark and another source, "Q")—one is still faced with the likelihood of additional "M" and "L" sources used by Matthew and Luke respectively, as well as sources used in the composition of Mark and Q themselves.

Part and parcel of the problem of identifying sources and the forms they took is discerning in what ways and to what purposes oral tradents, collectors of traditions, and gospel writers modified their sources in order to address new and different social contexts. Simply put, sayings of Jesus found in more than one gospel are rarely identical. And while some differences can be readily identified as changes befitting the individual gospel writers' stylistic or grammatical preferences, other differences reflect their theological or cultural viewpoints—perspectives that become

apparent through a close reading of the entire respective work and by comparison with other gospels.

Still other differences can be attributed to various pre-gospel stages of transmission. Form critics, beginning with Rudolf Bultmann and Martin Dibelius, have demonstrated the tendency of nascent Jesus movements to shape the sayings traditions according to their particular needs.[1] More recently, John Dominic Crossan showed how regularly the gospel writers shaped the core of aphoristic sayings by various means, such as contraction, expansion, substitution, transposition, and conversion, and then further shaped the interpretation of those sayings by combining or clustering them and then embedding them in larger speech units and narratives.[2] And so, with even the subtlest of modifications, an aphoristic saying can take different forms, such as maxim, rhetorical question, admonition, or prohibition and take on different meanings in different hermeneutical contexts.

With occasional exceptions (e.g., *The Lord's Prayer*, *Against Divorce*), Crossan deals only with gospel material. However, his arguments are appropriate to a wider range of material. Compare the following:

> "Are grapes gathered from thorn-bushes, or figs from thistles?" (Matt 7:16b)
>
> "Figs are not gathered from thorns-bushes, nor are grapes picked from a bramble bush." (Luke 6:44b)
>
> "Can a fig tree . . . yield olives, or a grapevine figs?" (Ja 3:12a)

With regard to form, Matthew and James have rhetorical questions; Luke states a gnomic truth. With regard to content: Luke and James begin with figs, Matthew with grapes. Matthew and Luke contrast fruits with prickly plants that do not bear edible fruit; James contrasts fruits with plants bearing different edible fruit.

Advances in rhetorical criticism have since confirmed many of Crossan's observations, but gone beyond them as well. By focusing on the way ancient rhetoricians worked with the chreia, rhetorical critics have demonstrated how sayings of Jesus could be and were transformed for rhetorical effect (at *any* stage of transmission) according to the methods

1. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*; Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*.
2. Crossan, *In Fragments*.

of chreia elaboration as outlined in the ancient *progymnasmata* (exercises preliminary to training in rhetoric).[3]

The relevant point for this study is that individual sayings of Jesus underwent significant transformations in form and meaning depending on how they were used—in much the same way ten Christian preachers can apply the same given lectionary passage, on the same Sunday, in ten different ways, depending upon their particular congregations' social and historical contexts and perceived needs. Compare again the previous New Testament examples, but with a little context added:

> "You will know them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thorn-bushes . . . ?"
>
> "For each tree is known by its own fruit. For figs are not gathered from thorn-bushes . . ."
>
> "Can a fig tree, my brothers, yield olives . . . ? Neither can salt water yield fresh."

The broader Matthean context has Jesus warning the crowd to beware of false prophets, who are to be identified in the metaphor as "thorn-bushes" and "thistles" that do not bear (good) fruit. Luke's context has Jesus admonishing listeners in the crowd to examine the "fruits" of their own lives and thereby consider their quality of character. The implied readers of James, who are viewed as religious family members, are exhorted to watch their tongues, because good and evil should not proceed from the same source. The contrast of the metaphor is less sharp here and more an issue of like producing like fruit. In each of the examples, however, what is essentially the same saying of Jesus—in this case an aphoristic teaching that applies a specific metaphor to express the necessary congruence between moral nature and resulting activity—is used in a different literary context, exists in a different form, and consequently has a different hermeneutic.

In subsequent chapters, I will track the development of the Treasure in Heaven saying of Jesus, a saying that is remarkable for its utility and breadth of interpretive applications in New Testament and other early Jesus movement writings. Elements of the Treasure in Heaven saying are found not only in the canonical Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and

3. An excellent introduction to the subject is found in Mack and Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion*.

John, but also in extra-canonical Q and the Gospel of Thomas. It was used in the Pauline epistolary tradition (Colossians) as well as in the Letter of James. Not only are no two of these eight versions of the saying exactly alike, but the saying is broadly applied under two vastly different *topoi*, or motifs, of the Jewish Wisdom tradition: the proper disposition of wealth and the search for divine wisdom or knowledge. These different *topoi* are not particular either to gospels or to epistles; each *topos* is found in both genres. The saying functions as exhortation or prohibition—sometimes both—as a rationale for moral behavior, and as a prophetic warning against unethical behavior. In short, it is one of the most widely used and broadly interpreted sayings of Jesus and is therefore a prime candidate for studying the development of sayings traditions in the first century of the common or Christian era.

Thesis and Approach

My primary thesis in this study is that the Q and Thomas versions of the Treasure in Heaven saying (Q 12:33; GTh 76:3) are particularly relevant to discussion concerning the development of sayings traditions. It is my contention that, on the one hand, the Thomasine Treasure in Heaven saying was well known in the first century and played a pivotal role in the early transmission of the saying, influencing or being modified in three canonical versions (Luke 12:33; John 6:27; Col 3:1–2). And on the other hand, the use of the saying in James (5:2-3) reflects knowledge of Q, which was also an early and foundational version of the saying for the gospel tradition (cf. Matt 6:19; Luke 12:33). Ironically, both extra-canonical gospel versions of the Treasure saying may have found their earliest canonical expressions *in the epistles*.

One ramification of this thesis, if it holds up under close scrutiny, is important for our reconstruction of the development of early Christian texts and communities because there is the implication that some sayings traditions (as represented in the Gospel of Thomas, for example), eventually excluded for their perceived heretical theology or for their use by groups excluded from the mainstream, were recognized as authoritative in the first century. However, the point should not be overstated. This study focuses on one saying of Jesus, not an entire collection, such as we find in the Sayings Gospel Q, the Gospel of Thomas, or in the many non-Q collections of parables and aphoristic sayings found in, for example,

Matthew 13, Mark 4, and Luke. I stress this caveat later in the chapter by comparing pairs of studies by James M. Robinson and Risto Uro that lead to apparently contradictory results—results that are only contradictory, however, if one begins with the fallacious assumption that the Gospel of Thomas as we know it represents a relatively stable, unchanging tradition throughout the history of its oral and written transmission.

The International Q Project was formed in 1983 with two goals in mind. The first goal was to provide, for the first time, a relatively objective, non-idiosyncratic reconstruction of the text of Q—as far as this is possible—by an *international team* of scholars. The other was to provide a complete history of 200 years of research on Q reconstruction. The first goal was achieved in two stages: the publication of IQP reconstructions in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*[4] and the subsequent publication of *The Critical Edition of Q*.[5] The second goal is coming to fruition in the gradual publication of Documenta Q databases. Chapter 2 is largely a product of my work on the database for Q 12:33–34.[6] The advantage of chapter 2 is that it provides a running commentary on my reconstruction of Q 12:33-34—supported by judicious use of notes—as well as a brief review of Matthew's and Luke's theological purposes in redacting Q a brief discussion of Mark's adaptation of the Treasure saying (Mark 10:21). The reader can always refer to the Documenta Q volume for a complete survey of research on any given variation unit. Reference to the Gospel of Thomas and other non-synoptic versions of the saying is minimal and mostly relegated to the footnotes—the evaluations are largely based on issues specific to Matthew and Luke and their redactional tendencies.

Chapter 3 originated as an internal International Q Project paper looking at the relationship between Matthew, Luke, Thomas, and Q. When I discovered the importance of John 6:27 for understanding the transmission history of the saying, I revised and expanded the paper, presenting it to the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. It was subsequently published in a volume of collected essays commemo-

4. See the October issues of volumes 109 (1990); 110 (1991); 111 (1992); 112 (1993); 113 (1994); 114 (1995); and 116 (1997).

5. Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q*. The text of the *CEQ* occasionally differs from the IQP text because the *CEQ* text is the result of deliberations by the managing editors in consultation with the earlier IQP decisions. Every variation between the *CEQ* and the IQP is identified in the apparatus of the *CEQ*.

6. See Johnson, *Q 12:33–34*.

rating the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Library.[7] Chapter 3 represents a significant revision of the published essay.

I discovered an epistolary version of the Treasure saying that had been adapted and used in a paraenetic section of the Letter to the Colossians (Col 3:1–2). It seemed wise to investigate this version, along with the previously recognized version in James 5:2–3, particularly for their relevance to the issue of the transmission of sayings traditions in epistolary literature. Chapter 4 is a result of this investigation, with interesting implications for gospel studies. Chapters 5 and 6 summarize the results of preceding chapters and suggest several significant implications for New Testament studies.

Before I launch into the more detailed comparative studies of chapters 2–4, however, it seems prudent to introduce those studies by a brief and limited survey of the current state of research with regard to the Gospel of Thomas and the study of the New Testament and Christian origins. The remainder of this chapter will look at research into several specific areas: (1) contemporary studies of individual Thomasine sayings of Jesus and their connection, if any, to the synoptic sayings traditions; (2) studies of the relationship, if there is one, between the gospels of Thomas and John; and (3) an overview of what comparisons have been made between Thomas and epistolary literature.

Recent History of Studies in Thomas

With Wolfgang Schrage's seminal 1964 study, Gospel of Thomas studies all but died off in Europe and North America.[8] However, Thomas studies have experienced something of a renaissance in recent years for a couple of reasons. First, Schrage's study has been reassessed and found to be methodologically lacking.[9] These reassessments have led to a reopening of the issue of Thomas' date, provenance, and relation to synoptic sayings of Jesus traditions. Second, combined with these reassessments has been a convergence of Thomas and Q studies, especially in the fields of redactional analysis and social reconstruction of communities behind texts. Because of the growing recognition of the fluidity of sayings tradi-

7. Johnson, "*Gospel of Thomas* 76:3."

8. Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*.

9. See Sieber, "Redactional Analysis"; Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas*; idem., "Gospel of Thomas."

tions both in oral and written form, the history of the composition of Thomas has become an important area of study. In tracing the methods of composition of the text, scholarship is moving in at least two different directions: the search for redactional evidence of a stratigraphical development of the text on the one hand, and on the other, an analysis of the text, either rhetorical or hermeneutical, as it stands in the extant Coptic manuscript.[10] The literature is growing fast, and several attempts have been made through the years to mark the status of Thomas scholarship.[11] It is my intention to pick up from the most recent *Forschungsberichten* and see where scholarship stands in the tracing of the relative antiquity of the Thomas tradition, the development of the text over time, and the place of the non-canonical gospel in relation to the canon.

One idea that is beginning to find wider acceptance among scholars is the notion that the Gospel of Thomas was not composed in its entirety at any one place or time. Many studies seem to assume that it was, though there have been periodic calls to analyze the gospel one saying at a time.[12] Indeed, many studies have been made of individual sayings or small groups of sayings through the years, but often with overt or covert presuppositions that predetermined the results. The primary assumption seemingly held by a broad spectrum of commentators is that the Gospel of Thomas is either a first-century, non-gnostic document embodying traditions that are independent of canonical traditions, or it is a mid- to late-second century, thoroughly gnostic document, directly or indirectly dependent upon the synoptic gospels for parallel material. But need this strict dichotomy be maintained? Is not some sapiential and philosophical literature somewhat "gnostic" in character, literature that predates the first century? Could not the traditions behind the Gospel of Thomas have

10. Recent examples of stratigraphical analysis include Arnal, "Rhetoric"; McLean, "On the Gospel of Thomas and Q"; and DeConick, *Recovering*. Some of these studies use recent work on the stratigraphy of Q as models for understanding the composition history of Thomas. Examples of recent analyses of the text as a whole include Asgeirsson, "Doublets and Strata"; Robbins, "Rhetorical Composition"; and Valantasis, *Gospel of Thomas*.

11. E.g., Haenchen, "Literatur zum Thomasevangelium"; Fallon and Cameron, "Gospel of Thomas"; Riley, "*Gospel of Thomas* in Recent Scholarship"; and Perrin, "Recent Trends."

12. E.g., Cullmann, "Gospel of Thomas," 434–35; Chilton, "Gospel according to Thomas," 164; Fallon and Cameron, "Gospel of Thomas," 4237; Hedrick, "Thomas and the Synoptics," 56; Neller, "Diversity," 18.

been interpreted, and hence shaded, in a gnostic direction in the early first century, especially if they bore resemblance to Jewish wisdom literature? And need the text in its entirety have been written in one place and time? What sets apart some recent attempts to address the issue of Thomas' relationship to canonical tradition on the basis of individual sayings is the openness to seeing broader possibilities concerning the history of the composition of the text. These studies should be examined carefully.

Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels

Though research into the Gospel of Thomas has expanded into many different directions in recent years, the issue of its place in the history of sayings of Jesus traditions continues to be debated. Several recent works suggest that some scholars are finally taking seriously the many previous calls to approach the Gospel of Thomas by analysis of one or two sayings at a time. The result of this approach is different studies, sometimes by the same scholars, that yield potentially divergent conclusions with regard to the tradition history of Thomas sayings.

Risto Uro, in his 1990 essay "Neither Here Nor There: Luke 17:20–21 and Related Sayings in Thomas, Mark, and Q," finds that both GTh 113 and Luke 17:20–21 show signs of redaction, but that GTh 113 does not include any of the redactional elements of Luke 17:20–21.[13] On the contrary, Uro finds two specific differences between the texts that shows GTh 113 to be the more primitive version of the sayings complex.[14] Uro takes this evidence to suggest that GTh 113 and Luke 17:20–21 represent use of a common tradition.[15] Uro does not go beyond this to suggest a date for the Thomas versions of the saying, and this is perhaps wise. The evidence, as Uro has laid it out, does not warrant such a conclusion.

In his 1993 *Forum* article, "'Secondary Orality' in the Gospel of Thomas? Logion 14 as a Test Case," Uro discerns evidence of synoptic redaction in at least one of the sayings included in Thomas 14 (GTh 14:5;

13. Uro, "Neither Here Nor There," esp. 13–20, 30–31.

14. Ibid., 20. On the one hand, Thomas' conclusion appears to be a redactional expansion. Uro suggests that GTh 113 comes from the same textual source as GTh 3:3a. On the other hand, Luke's lack of a second "lo" (before "there") suggests to Uro Lukan redaction. Also, the identity of the questioners differs in GTh 113 (disciples) and Luke 17:20–21 (Pharisees). Uro argues that if there were a change in the tradition, it would likely be from disciples to Pharisees, not vice versa.

15. Ibid., 30.

cf. Matt 5:11's redaction of Mark 7:15).[16] At the same time, however, the evidence is not substantial enough to suggest to Uro direct use of a synoptic gospel in the construction of the logion. In fact, he argues that the structure of GTh 14 and the order of the sayings therein rule out direct dependence on the synoptic gospels. In trying to adjudicate between these two conflicting results, Uro develops a theory of "secondary orality."[17] In other words, Uro argues that sayings of Jesus found in the canonical gospel texts often circulated independently after the gospels were written as isolated sayings of Jesus in oral transmission among Jesus communities. Uro's thesis is an attempt to respect both the pervasive influence of oral tradition in the first century and the influence of the written gospels. While Uro does not come to any conclusions about the first two sayings of GTh 14 (he thinks Luke 10:8–9, circulating independently of the written gospel, may have been the source for GTh 14:4),[18] the implication of his study would be that the brief chreia elaboration-like sayings cluster of GTh 14 is a construction that postdates the writing of the Gospel of Matthew (and maybe Luke).

While the results of Uro's earlier study need not imply a written text of GTh 3 and 113 pre-dating the writing of the synoptics, they do imply that the composition of the Gospel of Thomas involved sources for the sayings of Jesus other than the synoptic gospels. The evidence of Luke's redactional elements in Luke 17:20–21 and the lack of these elements in GTh 113 does not rule out Uro's later theory of "secondary orality" for this particular saying of Jesus, but there is no evidence to support it. To summarize, Uro has provided evidence for Thomas' use of oral tradition that ultimately goes back both to the synoptic gospels and to oral tradition that lies behind or is independent of the synoptic gospels.

James M. Robinson has likewise presented evidence that precludes any easy resolution regarding the history of traditions behind the Gospel of Thomas. In his evaluation of Q (Luke) 12:52 for the International Q Project, he argues that the Gospel of Thomas does not provide inde-

16. Uro, "'Secondary Orality,'" esp. 317–20, 22–24. This article was revised as "*Thomas* and Oral Gospel Tradition." Uro expands on the interaction of orality and textuality in *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context*, 106–33.

17. For the concept and term, Uro cites Haenchen, "Literatur," 178; Snodgrass, "The Gospel of Thomas," 27–28; and Kelber, *Oral and the Written Gospel,* 197.

18. "Uro, "'Secondary Orality,'" 20–22, 24.

pendent testimony of this saying being in Q.[19] Rather, GTh 16:3 lacks elements that would make its version of the Children against Parents pericope fully understandable, elements that are found only in Luke's redactional expansion of Q 12:51–53 (Luke 12:52's number of antagonists in the house). While Robinson concedes that the history of the transmission of GTh 16:1–2 is probably much more complicated, he finds, quite simply, that GTh 16:3 is dependent upon Luke (whether directly or indirectly he does not indicate). From this, one can conclude that the chreia elaboration-like clustering of sayings in GTh 16 postdates the writing of the Gospel of Luke, even if the traditions behind GTh 16:1–2 are potentially earlier and remain obscure.

On the other hand, Robinson, with Christoph Heil, believes he has identified a rare instance where one can actually observe the *literary* redaction of a saying of Jesus by the author of Q.[20] Central to Robinson and Heil's argument is the version of the Free from Anxiety like Ravens and Lilies pericope found in P. Oxy. 655 (GTh 36; cf. Q/Luke 12:22–31 and Matt 6:25–34; cf. esp. Q 12:27), a version that is more primitive than the abridged Coptic version and which contains two words (οὐ ξαίνει) that stand behind the version of the saying in Q 12:27 (specifically, Q 12:27's αὐξάνει). They argue that the P. Oxy. 655 version of the Free from Anxiety like Ravens and Lilies pericope shows no signs of Gnostic theological development—if anything, the P. Oxy. version of GTh 36 is *anti*-Gnostic and closer to Jesus' intention than Q—and that the Q version of the pericope shows more theological development in its parallel text (Q 12:22–24; e.g., its body-soul pairing vis-à-vis P. Oxy. 655's food-clothing pairing).[21] In constructing a chart of textual and chronological relations

19. Robinson, "Evaluation of Q 12:49–53," 119–21.

20. Robinson and Heil, "Zeugnisse."

21. Ibid., 36–39, 42–44. Robinson argues elsewhere that P. Oxy. 655 (GTh 36) preserves many details of this pericope that are more primitive than Q and can be used to reconstruct a pre-Q aphoristic core of sayings. See Robinson, "Pre-Q Text"; idem, "A Written Greek Sayings Cluster." Robinson's and Heil's findings have not gone unchallenged. Jens Schröter addressed them in "Vorsynoptische Überlieferung." Robinson and Heil responded with "Noch einmal." Stanley E. Porter challenged the thesis in "P.Oxy. 655." Robinson and Heil responded with "P.Oxy. 655 und Q"; and "The Lilies of the Field," esp. 9–21. Robinson provides a thoroughgoing English response to Schröter in "A Pre-Canonical Greek Reading." There, he also addresses the concerns of Robert H. Gundry, "Spinning the Lilies." The most recent critique comes from Dirk Jongkind, "'The Lilies of the Field' Reconsidered." All of the Robinson (and Heil) articles on this subject are contained in Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*.

among the versions of the saying of Jesus about the unconcern of the crows, Robinson and Heil date a written pre-Q text to 30–70 CE and the written Gospel of Thomas at ±100 CE, though they give no reason for this comparatively late dating of Thomas. Their own evidence, however, leaves open other possibilities, and Robinson's further expansion on the "scribal error" in Q makes a turn of the century date for GTh 36 (Oxyrhynchus version) seem even more unlikely.[22]

Uro and Robinson both demonstrate that the source and composition history of the Gospel of Thomas is complex. They provide one example of the dependence of Thomas on a synoptic gospel[23] and one of indirect dependence through secondary orality.[24] Conclusions from their other two studies are less clear.[25] Do Luke and Thomas reflect use of a common tradition?[26] Do Q and Thomas reflect independent developments of oral and literary traditions?[27] What *is* clear from these studies is that the source history of sayings in Thomas defies simplistic answers, and that perhaps we should consider the composition history of the written text of Thomas as having undergone a developmental process, not as a product of a one-time scribal effort.

Gregory J. Riley has added another dimension hitherto lacking in the discussion and certainly complicating it. Using historical-critical methods usually reserved for the study of inter-synoptic relationships, methods that are also observed, however, in the works of Uro and Robinson discussed above, Riley, in his 1996 article "Influence of Thomas Christianity on Luke 12:14 and 5:39," looked for instances where elements in the Gospel of Thomas that are indicative of Thomasine emphasis, and hence of redaction or modification of tradition, might be reflected in the Gospel of Luke.[28] He found two such instances in Luke 12:13–14 (cf. GTh 72) and Luke 5:39 (cf. GTh 47:3–4). In the first case, Riley points out that the word for "divider" in Luke 12:14 rarely occurs in known Greek literature. Its presence does not add much to the saying in Luke.[29] However, it is

22. Robinson, "Pre-Q Text."
23. Robinson, "Evaluation."
24. Uro, "'Secondary Orality.'"
25. Uro, "Neither Here nor There"; Robinson and Heil, "Zeugnisse."
26. Uro, ibid., 30.
27. Robinson and Heil, "Zeugnisse," chart.
28. Riley, "Influence."
29. Ibid., 230–31. On μεριστής, see LSJSupp, 98b.

perfectly understandable in the Gospel of Thomas, where the unification of two into one is a central theme and Jesus is most definitely not to be understood as a divider.[30] The most logical conclusion from this, considering Luke's propensity for collecting from disparate sources, is that Luke has conflated two versions of a traditional saying, one of them represented by GTh 72.[31] In the other case, Luke's redaction of Mark 2:21–22 by adding a positive statement about old wine, while creating a generally true statement about good wine, contradicts the Markan emphasis on the value of the new over the old.[32] Where did Luke get this idea? Thomas 47 provides a complex of Jesus' sayings where a decision must be made between two choices, and in GTh 47:3–5 the choice is decidedly for the value of the old over the new. Riley sees this emphasis in Thomas to be redactional, epitomized by the recasting of the New Patch saying so that one is (incredibly) more concerned for an old patch than a new garment.[33] According to Riley, Luke's contradictory complex of sayings makes most sense if one understands Luke 5:36–39 to be a conflation of GTh 47:3–5 and Mark 2:21–22.

Riley chose perhaps the clearest and strongest cases for Lukan dependence on the Thomas tradition. And, while his argument that Luke was in contact with an actual community developing a Thomasine tradition of exegesis of Jesus' sayings needs further development to be persuasive—Luke may have simply been working from a written collection of sayings that had found its way into the Lukan community from traveling apostles who had passed through a Thomasine community[34]—Riley has provided strong evidence concerning two sayings in Thomas (72, 47) which stands in sharp contrast to the findings of Uro (GTh 14:5) and Robinson (GTh 16:3). In light of Riley's findings, Luke's aggregation of two similar sayings in Luke 17:20–21, 23 might also be re-examined in light of the pos-

30. Riley, "Influence," 231–32.

31. Ibid., 232.

32. Ibid., 233.

33. Ibid., 233–34.

34. On the one hand, knowledge of a particular community privileging this sayings tradition may have given the collection more authority in the eyes of the Lukan editor. On the other hand, unlike what Riley finds in his book *Resurrection Reconsidered*, a study which provides evidence of hermeneutical polemics between communities, Luke wouldn't appear to have a particular theological bone to pick with the Thomas tradition, judging by the examples Riley gives in the *HTR* article ("Influence").

sibility that Luke has preceded the Q "Coming of the Son of Humanity" pericope (Q 17:23–37) with a saying from the Thomas tradition (GTh 113), or even with a conflation of two sayings from the tradition (GTh 3 and 113).[35] Indeed, perhaps parallel Lukan *Sondergut* material as a whole should be reconsidered on a saying-by-saying basis.[36]

An equally important implication of Riley's study is that one must reconsider the composition history of Thomas in a new light. Whereas the results of Uro's (1990) and Robinson and Heil's studies (1998) do not necessarily speak to the dating of the composition of Thomas, Riley's study suggests that at least part of a distinctly Thomasine sayings tradition predates the composition of the Gospel of Luke. Hence, even if one suggests that the sayings of the Gospel of Thomas were written down for the first time at the end of the first century or early in the second century, if Riley's study holds up under closer scrutiny, then the Gospel of Thomas as a developing tradition of sayings of Jesus transmitted *with a particular theological perspective* at the very least predates the Gospel of Luke. At the same time, the conclusions of the preceding studies also require that one consider the Thomas tradition, even the written Gospel of Thomas itself, as developing over time. A mid-to-late first century oral collection or written text of the Gospel of Thomas *did* exist, but did *not* include *all*

35. See Robinson, "The Study of the Historical Jesus after Nag Hammadi," esp. 50–53. Robinson sees GTh 3 as evidence for an early tradition perhaps taken up by Q. Patterson rules out dependence in either direction on the basis of lack of verbal correspondence (Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 71–72). However, what he shows is that neither thesis is ultimately demonstrable on the basis of verbal comparison, especially when moving between Greek and Coptic. In noting the differences in the way Luke 17:20 and GTh 113:1–2 introduce the dominical saying, however, he fails to recognize that the difference in one could be due to alteration of the text of the other to create a different literary context for a similar saying, even using a typically more complex sentence structure for the introduction For example, inasmuch as 17:21 and 17:23 could be perceived as somewhat repetitious statements to the disciples, the author of Luke, in including the Thomasine material at this point, may have placed 17:20a on the lips of another group, the Pharisees, before redactionally prefacing the Q speech on the Coming of the Son of Humanity with a reference to the disciples (17:22), creating two separate conversations. Furthermore, there is almost verbatim similarity between Luke 17:21b and P. Oxy. 654.15–16 (GTh 3:3a), with Luke using a redactional ἰδοὺ γάρ to introduce the saying in its new context as an explanation for 17:20–21a (ἰδού possibly even coming from GTh 113:3's second "behold"). Hence, Lukan conflation of two sayings in Thomas is not only *not* ruled out, but is quite plausible, despite the perceived lack of verbal correspondence between Luke 17:20–21a and GTh 113:1–2. This hypothesis would answer the question of Luke's otherwise unknown source for 17:20–21 and ought to be explored further.

36. Cf. Schürmann, "Thomasevangelium."

of the sayings of Jesus found in the fourth century Coptic manuscript bearing the gospel title.

Finally, an important implication of the previous studies, when taken as a whole, is that the Thomas text and tradition and synoptic texts and traditions did not develop in isolation from each other.

Thomas and John

While New Testament scholars have mostly focused on the relationship between Thomas and the synoptic traditions, the similarities between the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of John have long been recognized.[37] In contrast to the synoptic similarities, however, similarities between Thomas and John lie less in clear and distinct sayings parallels, and more in theological conceptuality and symbolism. Nevertheless, the parallels that exist invite comparison, and scholars have suggested a multitude of possibilities. Hugh Evelyn-White looked at the Oxyrhynchus papyri and determined that similarities to John could not come from direct use of the Gospel: "The two fragments [P. Oxy. 1, 654] do not contain a single passage which can be regarded as derived either from the Fourth Gospel or from any other Johannine work."[38] Instead, he suggested that similarities were due to the Oxyrhynchus fragments having been compiled in a pre-Johannine gospel milieu:

> I do not see why the Oxyrhynchus Collection may not have been indebted to the same source (whether traditional or documentary) as St John, or to some nearly related source. At the same time Johannine influence is distinctly traceable in the Sayings. . . .
>
> . . . Johannine influence is distinctly present, though definite dependence on any of the Johannine works or literary use of any of them is not likely . . . the Sayings were formed at a pe-

37. E.g., Evelyn-White, *Sayings of Jesus,* xxxiv–xxxvi; Doresse, *Secret Books,* 339, 342, 350, 375–83; Wilson, *Studies,* 87; Kasser, *Thomas*; Brown, "Gospel of Thomas"; Koester, "Gnostic Writings"; idem, "Dialog"; Sell, "Johannine Traditions"; Davies, "Thomas," esp. 106–16; Koester, "Gnostic Sayings"; idem, "Les discours d'adieu," esp. 269–71, 275; idem, *Ancient Christian Gospels,* 113–24, 256–67; Patterson, "Gospel of Thomas"; Koester, "Story"; Riley, "*Gospel of Thomas*," 239–40; idem, *Resurrection*; De Conick, "Blessed"; Pagels, "Exegesis of Genesis 1"; Attridge, "'Seeking' and 'Asking,'"; DeConick, *Voices of the Mystics*; idem, "John Rivals Thomas"; Pagels, *Beyond Belief*; Popkes, "'Ich bin das Licht.'" Translations and commentaries have noted similarities, be they a word, a phrase, or an idea, from Doresse to the present (Doresse, *Thomas*).

38. Evelyn-White, *Sayings of Jesus*, xxxv.

> riod when Johannism was already in the air but still nascent and undeveloped.[39]

Robert McL. Wilson, having the Coptic Gospel of Thomas at his disposal, still found Evelyn-White's proposal to be plausible, arguing that similarities between Thomas and John exist "in the realm of ideas, not citation."[40] Surprisingly, these suggestions of White and Wilson were not picked up and developed in several subsequent decades of Thomas research.

Raymond E. Brown was the first to do a systematic comparison of parallels between John and Thomas. He began with the assumption that the Gospel of John predated the Gospel of Thomas.[41] However, he also recognized that "the affinity to John in *GTh* is not nearly so clear or so strong as the affinity to the Synoptic Gospels." In fact, he argues that "many of the parallels . . . are so tenuous that they would be of significance only after a clear relationship between John and *GTh* had already been established."[42] He offered four ways of understanding the relationship between Thomas and John:

> (1) The author(s) of *GTh* may have read John in the past and have been influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by recollections. (2) The author(s) of *GTh* may have had some familiarity with memories of the oral preaching that underlay the Fourth Gospel. There have been attempts to localize both *GTh* and John in Syria. (3) The author(s) of *GTh* may have drawn on a source which in turn drew on John. . . . (4) *GTh* and John may both be drawing on a third source like Bultmann's hypothetical *Offenbarungsreden* source.[43]

In the end, Brown argues that the Gospel of Thomas originally contained a collection of synoptic-like sayings that were overlaid with Johannine themes indirectly derived from the Gospel of John itself.[44]

Jesse Sell rejected Brown's thesis (and his caution), arguing that Thomas was directly dependent upon John.[45] Unfortunately, as Riley

39. Ibid., xxxv–xxxvi.
40. Wilson, *Studies*, 87.
41. Brown, "Gospel of Thomas," 157.
42. Ibid., 174.
43. Ibid., 175.
44. Ibid., 175–77.
45. Sell, "Johannine Traditions," 25.

has pointed out, "he makes no comment on why the author of Thomas should never quote a saying or sentence from John, although the GTh is half full of such 'quotations' from the Synoptics."[46]

Helmut Koester has approached the Thomas-John relationship from the direction of genre development. Koester has argued in a series of studies that the Gospel of John represents a development of the dialogue or discourse genre two steps removed from the Gospel of Thomas—that is, two steps *beyond* the genre of Thomas, not prior to it.[47] In these studies, Koester deals especially with the gospels of Thomas and John, the *Dialogue of the Savior*, and the *Apocryphon of James*. According to Koester, the Gospel of Thomas "exhibits the first stage of transition from sayings collection to dialogue. The *Dialogue of the Savior* shows the initial stages of larger compositions."[48] Koester further argues that John "contains fully developed dialogues and discourses. Earlier stages could be reconstructed by using the analogies of the Gospel of Thomas and the *Dialogue of the Savior*, both with respect to form and structure and with respect to themes and topics."[49] Koester calls this earlier stage the Dialog as Exposition of Sayings ("Dialog als Spruchauslegung") and includes the Gospel of Thomas, the *Dialogue of the Savior*, the *Apocryphon of James*, and the *Book of Thomas* as Nag Hammadi texts belonging to this form.[50] Yet, the *Apocryphon of James* is seen by Koester as possibly dependent upon the Gospel of Thomas, and the form of the Gospel of Thomas shows us how the *Dialogue of the Savior* has combined sayings in the construction of discourses.[51] Furthermore, the *Dialogue of the Savior* is even less developed than the Gospel of John in terms of discourse development. Koester concludes:

46. Riley, "*Gospel of Thomas*," 239.

47. See esp. Koester, "Gnostic Writings"; idem, "Dialog"; idem, "Traditions"; idem, "Les discours d'adieu"; and idem, "Johannine Tradition."

48. Koester, "Gnostic Writings," 253.

49. Ibid.

50. Koester, "Dialog," 534, 544.

51. Ibid., 545–51. Koester and Elaine Pagels have argued that the *Dialogue of the Savior* is constructed using the saying found in GTh 2 as a framework, though they also state that the *Dialogue of the Savior* witnesses to a sayings tradition that "appears to be an independent parallel to the one used in *The Gospel of Thomas* and the Gospel of John" (Koester and Pagels, "Dialogue of the Savior," 244–45).

> 1. The speeches and dialogs of John's gospel are composed on a greater scale than hitherto received and transmitted sayings of Jesus. 2. The sayings dialogs from the Nag Hammadi writings as well as previously known apocryphal gospel material have preserved such sayings independently of the Gospel of John and thus provide a means to better discern the sayings that are foundational to the Johannine dialogs and speeches.[52]

At this point, Koester makes what many have considered to be a radical claim for the Gospel of Thomas: "A date in the second half of the first century C.E. can certainly be assumed for an older version of this writing."[53] What is often missed in this claim, however, is the fact that Koester is not claiming that the Gospel of Thomas *as represented by the Coptic manuscript* is to be dated this early.[54] Rather, he argues for an earlier version of the sayings collection. Such a qualified claim fits with the data collected in the recent comparisons of Thomas to synoptic sayings parallels noted above. Koester is usually careful not to make an outright claim that the Gospel of John has used the Gospel of Thomas.[55] Most recently he has suggested that Thomas and John have shared a common tradition, developing it in different directions.[56] However, he is clear that he thinks the author of John is combating gnostic responses to the teaching of Jesus and the search for life—gnostic responses reflected in the Gospel of Thomas, the *Apocryphon of James*, and the *Dialogue of the Savior*.[57] More to the point of our survey, Koester argues that "these dia-

52. Koester, "Dialog," 553–54: "1. Die Reden und Dialoge des Johannesevangeliums sind in größerem Umfang als bisher angenommen auf überlieferten Sprüchen Jesu aufgebaut. 2. Die Spruchdialoge aus den in Nag Hammadi gefundenen Schriften sowie bereits bekanntes apokryphes Evangelien-Material haben solche Sprüche unabhängig vom Johannesevangelium aufbewahrt und geben so eine Handhabe dafür, die den johanneischen Dialogen und Reden zugrunde liegenden Sprüche besser zu erkennen."

53. Ibid., 554. "Ein Datum in der zweiten Hälfte des 1. Jh. nChr. läßt sich für eine ältere Fassung dieser Schrift durchaus annehmen."

54. Koester, Gnostic Writings," 243–44: "Although the Johannine attestations [of Thomas sayings] assure a first-century date for their incorporation into the sayings tradition of Jesus, it would be hazardous to consider these Johannine occurrences as proof for a first-century date of the Gospel of Thomas *in the form in which it is preserved in its Coptic translation*. The Greek fragments from Oxyrhynchus demonstrate the instability of text and context of such sayings collections" (italics mine).

55. E.g., Koester, "Gnostic Writings," 243, 259.

56. See Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 119, 122–23.

57. See, e.g., Koester, "Les discours d'adieu," 269–75; idem, *Ancient Christian Gospels*,

logues were shaped by a theological interpretation of Jesus' sayings that is comparable to that of the *Gospel of Thomas*, a theology that emphasized the recognition of one's divine self and the return to one's heavenly origin."[58]

Stevan L. Davies returned to the thesis of Evelyn-White that the Gospel of Thomas as a saying collection derived from an early stage of the Johannine community.[59] This sayings collection was developed by the author of John (à la Koester) in the discourse material of the gospel. Where Davies appears to depart from Koester is in his insistence that the Gospel of Thomas is not gnostic but, like John, relies on and develops the Jewish wisdom tradition.[60] Rather than being about a return to one's heavenly origin, the Gospel of Thomas is about a return to the pre-Fall state of Genesis creation.[61]

Riley has argued that the Gospels of John and Thomas represented separate and distinct communities that were in dialogue, but that were also in fundamental disagreement over aspects of christology and soteriology.[62] That they were in dialogue is evident by the many similarities in cosmology, literary symbolism, and, especially, anthropology. The Gospel of John gives specific indications of the conflict, however, in its portrayal of Thomas as first doubter, then believer in the physical resurrection of Jesus. More specifically,

> The Doubting Thomas pericope is evidence within the Gospel of John for the prior existence of the community of Thomas. The elements present and positions countered in the pericope cohere well with those in the *Gospel of Thomas*, and lead to the conclusion that the *Gospel of Thomas* itself was already at some stage of completion, either written or oral, and that its contents were known to the author of John, probably through verbal contact

264–67; idem, "Johannine Tradition," 19–23.

58. Koester, "Johannine Tradition," 23.

59. Davies, *Gospel of Thomas*, 115–16.

60. Ibid., 106–16. Actually, Koester agrees that both texts develop wisdom traditions. In fact, gnostic thought clearly develops out of the wisdom tradition inasmuch as both emphasize the search for wisdom and enlightenment as the path to one's salvation. The question is how far along in the development from wisdom speculation to gnostic speculation, and from wisdom forms to gnostic interpretation of those forms, the Gospel of Thomas has moved.

61. Davies, "Christology and Protology." Cf. Koester, "Johannine Tradition," 23.

62. Riley, *Resurrection*, 69–179.

> with members of this rival community. In addition, the *Gospel of Thomas* contains evidence of reciprocal debate with the community of John, although in a form which predates the Gospel.[63]

April D. De Conick agrees wholeheartedly with Riley that analysis of John reveals "a discourse between the Thomasine and Johannine Christians"—one that reflects a dispute over soteriology.[64] However, she argues this for very different reasons. She has argued that the Gospel of John contains a polemic against Thomasine ascent mysticism.[65] In John's insistence that the disciples cannot follow Jesus where he goes, she sees an argument against Thomas' call to mystical ascension to the place where Jesus is. She also refutes Riley's understanding of John 20:24–29 as an argument for the fleshly resurrection of Jesus. She sees the exchange between Thomas and Jesus as an example of a common topos of identifying the hero through touch, and argues that John 20:29 "criticizes visionary experience in favor of faith."[66]

Ismo Dunderberg questions whether the argument has been demonstrated that the Gospel of John was written in part as polemic against a Thomas community. He is not persuaded largely because the conflict exists on an implicit level in the two gospels.[67] Dunderberg argues that there are problems with Riley's thesis related to the inconsistent use of Judas/Thomas terminology in the Thomas tradition, the lack of a distinctive characterization of Thomas in John, and problems Dunderberg sees with Riley's analysis of the Doubting Thomas pericope in John (John 20:24–29).[68] While he is right that the case has not been *proven*, none of the problems noted are decisive.

Dunderberg extends his critique of the thesis of a literary relationship between Thomas and John in two more recent articles.[69] In

63. Ibid., 178. Cf. Ron Cameron's critique of Riley's thesis in "Ancient Myths and Modern Theories," esp. 239–44.

64. De Conick, "Blessed," 397.

65. De Conick, *Seek,* 92–93. DeConick's more recent *Voices of the Mystics* contains a more extensive and thorough treatment of her thesis.

66. "Blessed," 396.

67. Dunderberg, "John and Thomas in Conflict?"

68. Ibid., 370–78.

69. Dunderberg, "*Thomas*' I-Sayings"; and idem, "Thomas and the Beloved Disciple." Dunderberg extensively critiques the theories of DeConick, Pagels, and Riley in *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict?*

"*Thomas*' I-Sayings and the Gospel of John," he surveys the different theories of Thomas' relationship to John and finds definitive evidence of a literary relationship lacking. Occasionally, he finds closer verbal or thematic parallels to John or Thomas in other literature.

In "*Thomas* and the Beloved Disciple," Dunderberg argues that the disciple Thomas in the so-named gospel is not literarily related to the Beloved Disciple of John. Rather, both reflect the use of authorial fiction to gain authority for the text. Whereas late second century writers attached the names of disciples or early apostles to the gospels to give them authority, John and Thomas reflect a more primitive tradition of placing a key figure, even the author, into the narrative itself.[70] Nevertheless, Dunderberg sees Thomas and John working in different ways and reflecting "a more broadly attested phenomenon in early Christianity."

Apart from Dunderberg's studies, what distinguishes research into the relationship between Thomas and John from Thomas-synoptic research is the broad and general recognition that the two texts/traditions are somehow related. For the most part, there is also recognition that this relationship is not simply one of direct literary influence. This latter point should again make us hesitate before making general claims concerning specific sayings of Jesus. Nevertheless, the aforementioned studies provide a number of possibilities for understanding the relationship or lack of relationship between the texts, and should be kept in mind when undertaking a saying-by-saying analysis of sayings of Jesus found in both Thomas and John.

Thomas and the Pauline Tradition

There has been relatively little discussion of connections between the Gospel of Thomas or a Thomasine tradition and the epistolary corpus of the New Testament. This is due in part to the fact that Thomas is a collection of sayings of Jesus and the bulk of its similarities to the New Testament canon are to the gospels, in part to the lack of consensus on the history and development of the Gospel of Thomas, and in part to the larger historical problem of assessing connections between gospel traditions and the Pauline tradition. The first problem should not deter

70. An earlier study argues that the author of Mark also places the author in the narrative in a similar but even more subtle way than the redactor of John (Johnson, "Identity"). Mark may have even provided the model for the redactor's work in John.

scholarship. The second problem is, of course, an on-going discussion, but perhaps can be dealt with by a study of similarities between Thomas and the New Testament letters. It is the third issue that ought to be addressed here since it is relevant to a discussion of Thomasine and epistolary traditions. Therefore, the following survey of literature on possible connections between the Gospel of Thomas and the Pauline tradition is prefaced by the review of a more basic and ongoing discussion concerning Paul's knowledge and use of sayings of Jesus.

Biblical scholarship is divided on how much acquaintance Paul had with traditions of sayings of Jesus.[71] Several problems contribute to this disagreement. For one, Paul shows little interest in the earthly Jesus outside of his death, burial, and resurrection. For another, Paul never cites sayings of Jesus by name; only occasionally does he cite sayings as words of "the Lord." These problems have not stopped many from searching for allusions to sayings of Jesus throughout the Pauline corpus. D. M. Stanley and John Pairman Brown are two good examples of this.[72] Works like theirs have largely been rejected because of the extent and lack of defensibility of their claims.

Perhaps more important, *where and how* Paul uses different sayings of Jesus in the letters is not often discussed, as though the rhetorical context makes little difference. By "where and how" I am not referring to the common observation that apparent allusions are found grouped in isolated passages such as Romans 12–14, 1 Thessalonians 4–5, or 1 Corinthians 1–4. More specifically, I am referring to the type of epistolary material in which the supposed sayings are embedded. The exceptions—some have observed that possible sayings are never found in sections where Paul is expounding upon central theological issues, but are found rather in sections of "ethical paraenesis"—are usually stated in general terms, and still leave us with the question of why Paul almost never attributes sayings tradition material to Jesus.[73] However, observing

71. For a comprehensive bibliography and overview of the discussion up to 1986, see Neirynck, "Paul."

72. Stanley, "Pauline Allusions"; John Pairman Brown, "Synoptic Parallels."

73. E.g., Walter, "Paul." Walter cites Schürmann, "'Das Gesetz des Christus' (Gal 6,2)," esp. 285–86; and Gräßer, "Der Mensch Jesus," esp. 133–36. Martin Dibelius argues that paraenetic sections of epistolary literature—even full documents like the Epistle of James—use community paraenesis, an oral form of teaching that does not usually cite Jesus directly (Dibelius, *James,* 28–29; idem, *From Tradition to Gospel,* 238–44. He also argues that texts like James are themselves examples of the genre "community paraene-

the context in which the material is used may help to explain how Paul is using it and why he does not cite Jesus, or even "the Lord," when adapting material from sayings collections.

In three cases, there is little debate about Paul's use of Jesus' teaching. Paul cites traditions of Jesus' teaching in 1 Cor 7:10–11 (divorce and remarriage), 9:14 (evangelists earning a living), and 11:23–25 (the Last/Lord's Supper).[74] In a fourth case, 1 Thess 4:15 (order of eschatological ascension), it appears that Paul is citing a saying of Jesus. In each of these cases, Paul uses teachings of Jesus as authoritative teaching within the rhetorical structure of his arguments and exhortations. To be more explicit, Paul is addressing particular problems in the Corinthian community in 1 Corinthians 5–7; 8–10; and 11:17–34. Sayings parallels (1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14; 11:23–25) are embedded within the extended arguments of these larger passages. The citations in 1 Corinthians function as appeals to authority usually do within rhetorical arguments (though Paul, to make a point about humility and other-centeredness, rejects for the commonweal the implications of the chreia in 1 Cor 9:14). First Thess 4:15 is also embedded in a discussion about the eschaton, though the context is less argumentative in structure and tone. In fact, Paul has already established his own authority at length in 1 Thessalonians 1–3.

Disagreement becomes prominent when one looks beyond these four citations for further uses of a sayings tradition. Possible scattered allusions can be found throughout Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, and disputed Pauline letters like Colossians. More cre-

sis." However, Dibelius too facilely slips between oral forms and written genres without adequately explaining *why* paraenesis—be it oral form or written genre—does not tend to cite Jesus' authority (especially when texts like James *do* cite scriptural authority). His argument that "all the sayings of Christian exhortation were regarded as inspired by the Spirit or by the Lord" cannot be taken seriously as an explanation.

74. According to Furnish, "Chapters 7 and 11 of 1 Corinthians supply firm evidence that, at the very least, Paul was acquainted with Jesus' words as mediated in the catechetical and liturgical traditions" (Furnish, "Jesus-Paul Debate," 375). That liturgy is a source is true at least for 1 Cor 11:23–25. For the other two, Neirynck observes that "there is no 'quotation' of the saying" by Paul. "Paul produces in his own formulation 'a halakah based on such a saying'" ("Paul and the Sayings of Jesus," 320; in the latter sentence quoting Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript,* 318 n. 93). Considering his largely negative assessment of other potential allusions in the letter based on a close analysis of verbal parallels, Neirynck's observation here is important. To wit, based on 1 Cor 7:10–11 and 9:14, where Paul actually cites teachings of Jesus but doesn't "quote" him, one should not expect extensive verbal parallels between Paul and synoptic sayings of Jesus elsewhere when Paul does not even cite "the Lord."

dence is gained, however, when attention is focused on clusters of potential sayings within specific sections of Paul.[75]

In Romans 12–14, alongside of the abbreviated recapitulations of teachings also found in 1 Corinthians 12 (Rom 12:3–8) and 1 Cor 6:12–11:1 (Rom 14:1—15:6), Paul compiles a number of wisdom admonitions and prohibitions to exhort his readers—some of these admonitions are very close to teachings of Jesus in the Q Sermon and Mark 12.[76] A close comparison of verbal similarities between Pauline and synoptic texts would undercut any claims to proof that Paul has used sayings of Jesus here. The similarities between individual exhortations and known sayings of Jesus usually extend as far as common theme and common form, but with only a few lexical parallels. More important than looking for lexical parallels, however, is observing the generic context in which these "allusions" are found. In Romans 12–14, Paul is clearly using a collection (or collections) of sayings, not for the purpose of defending his ministry, disputing with snobbish Gentile converts in Rome, or addressing particular ethical problems that he has heard about, but for the purpose of general exhortation; and so he appears to have the freedom to expand and adapt his source(s). Since the nature of the material in Rom 12:9–21 especially is *not* rhetorical argumentation, but rather a string of general wisdom admonitions and prohibitions, there is no need to cite the source of the admonitions in order to establish authority.[77] If the readers/hear-

75. Ferdinand Hahn lists the following as paraenetic sections in the canonical epistles: 1 Thess 4:1–9; 5:(1–11, 12–14,)15–22; Gal 5:14—6:10; Phil 4:4–9; Rom 12:9—13:14; Col 3:5—4:6; Eph 4:17—6:17; Heb 13:1–9, 17; 1 Pet 2:11—4:11; (5:1–11); Jas 1:3—5:11 (Hahn, "Die christologische Begründung," 89, n. 13).

76. E.g., cf. the following: Rom 12:14/Luke 6:27–28/Matt 5:44; Rom 12:17, 21/Luke 6:29/Matt 5:39–40; Rom 13:7/Mark 12:17 par.; Rom 13:9/Mark 12:28–30 par. (cf. Mark 10:17–22); Rom 14:10, 13/Luke 6:37/Matt 7:1. See Neirynck ("Paul and the Sayings of Jesus," 270) for a table of allusions and a number of scholars who argue for each of them. Included in this table is Rom 12:21/Luke 6:27ff/Matt 5:39ff; Rom 14:14(20)/Mark 7:15 par.; and Rom 16:19/Matt 10:16b. Romans 14:13 is usually compared to Mark 9:42 par. with their common use of σκανδαλ–. Walter and Patterson include Rom 12:18/Mark 9:50/Matt 5:9 (Walter, "Paul," 56; Patterson, "Paul," esp. 29 n. 26).

77. Even in Romans 13–14, where Paul returns to argumentative style, the "allusions" are usually the point of the rhetoric, not supportive material in the body of the argument. Rom 13:7 is a rhetorical recapitulation, giving the elaboration pattern of 13:1–7 a specific, practical focus. Rom 13:8–10 stands on its own, though it is smoothly connected to the preceding thought. Rom 14:10a is the issue subsequently defended in 14:10b–12, and this issue of judging others is the essential departure in theme from Paul's more elaborate discussion in 1 Cor 6:12–11:1.

ers have accepted Paul's claims to authority in the letter thus far, they will certainly accept these general exhortations without need of higher authority. This would also be the case for 1 Thess 5:12–22, where we find two possible sayings of Jesus, 1 Thess 5:12 (cf. Rom 12:18) and 1 Thess 5:15 (cf. Rom 12:17), embedded in a string of general exhortations that close out the letter.

In 1 Corinthians 1–4, a different situation prevails. Here Paul is at odds with opponents who seem to be preaching a message laden with eloquence, power, and a focus on words of divine wisdom. Observing that sayings collections like Q have a strong sapiential overtone, some scholars have tried to uncover parallels to Q in Paul's rhetoric against his opponents.[78]

Christopher Tuckett has questioned some of the cases cited for a Q tradition in 1 Corinthians.[79] At the same time, Robinson is right to note the importance of the wisdom orientation of the opponents and to ask whether a sayings tradition is represented in Paul's rhetoric against his opponents.

Robinson, Koester, and Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn also note certain affinities in 1 Corinthians 1–4 to the Gospel of Thomas.[80] Koester, while focusing his discussion on Q 10:23–24 (Matt 13:16–17), notes a much closer parallel to 1 Cor 2:9 in GTh 17, though a literary relationship between the texts is difficult to maintain.[81] Stevan L. Davies and Stephen J. Patterson have both picked up on these hints and argued that the collection of say-

78. E.g., Robinson, "Kerygma and History," esp. 40–46; Kuhn, "Der irdische Jesus," esp. 308–18; Koester, "Gnostic Writings," esp. 244–50.

79. Tuckett, "1 Corinthians and Q." Tuckett is right to question a Q relationship to the three citations in 1 Corinthians, as well as Koester's 1 Cor 2:9/Matt 13:16–17 (Q 10:23–24) parallel, though he appears to miss the point when he observes the different uses of νηπίοις in 1 Cor 3:1 and Q 10:21–22. If Paul's opponents understood themselves as enlightened "newborns" due to their recent baptism and spiritual instruction, then Paul's condescending use of "newborn" makes an effectively snide attack on their self-understanding. In effect, Paul is saying "Yes, they are newborns, but for that very reason they are spiritually *immature* (or, as he puts it, σαρκίνοις) and ought to be treated as such."

80. Kuhn goes as far as to suggest a tradition-historical connection between the opponents of 1 Corinthians, the tradents of Q, the opponents in the letter of Polycarp, and the Gospel of Thomas ("Der irdische Jesus," 518).

81. Koester, "Gnostic Writings," 248. But see also idem, "One Jesus," 230. On GTh 17 specifically, see Onuki, "Traditionsgeschichte." For a critique of Onuki, see Dunderberg, "John and Thomas in Conflict?" 365–70.

ings in the Gospel of Thomas, not Q, is perhaps best represented by Paul's rhetoric against his opponents in 1 Corinthians 1–4.[82] Davies cites two of the Corinthian passages most crucial to Robinson's analysis, 1 Cor 3:1 and 4:8, and finds even stronger parallels in the Gospel of Thomas.[83] In each case cited in 1 Corinthians (except perhaps 1 Cor 2:9—but even there, it is possible that Paul changes the last line of a traditional saying to bring it more in line with Isa 64:3 [LXX]), Paul appears to be using his opponents' teaching *against* them. It is certainly significant that the Gospel of Thomas provides an even better picture of Paul's rhetorical opponents than do the sapientially-oriented Q tradents. The evidence so far presented suggests the possibility that the opponents of Paul taught from a sayings collection very similar to what is found in parts of the Gospel of Thomas. For this very reason, Paul would not likely cite sayings of Jesus himself, but rather would focus—as he does—on the apparent folly of the cross and the *kerygma* with its message of divine power expressed in weakness.

In summary, detailed studies like Neirynck's help to clarify just how much can be claimed when using lexical parallels as the primary datum for determining what constitutes use of a saying of Jesus. At the same time, Romans 12–14, 1 Thessalonians 5, and 1 Corinthians 1–4 appear to provide evidence for Paul's use of sayings traditions *when one observes how and where he uses them*. Paul uses great freedom in adapting and modifying sayings traditions for his didactic needs. More to the point, Paul does not need to cite "the Lord" in the general exhortations of Romans 12–14 (or 1 Thessalonians 5) anymore than he would *want* to cite "the Lord" when condemning his opponents with their own sayings tradition in 1 Corinthians 1–4.

Regardless of how one decides for the authorship of letters such as Colossians and James, the foregoing survey has implications for the

82. Patterson, "Paul and the Jesus Tradition"; Davies, *Gospel of Thomas*, 138–45. See also Kelber, who argues that substantial similarities in the Gospel of Thomas support the existence of a sayings tradition at Corinth (*Oral and Written Gospel*, 176).

83. Davies, *Gospel of Thomas*, 141–43. "Paul writes of them, 'you are completely satisfied . . . , you have grown rich . . . , and you have begun your reign . . . .' These are three distinct metaphors for present fulfillment, and Paul's opponents apparently applied them to themselves" (141). Cf. esp. Thomas 109 and 110 on becoming rich, and 2 and 81 on becoming rulers. As discussed above, Paul's opponents may have called themselves babes in a positive sense, a self-designation that Paul derides. For an example of this kind of self-designation, Davies notes Thomas 4, 21, 22, 37, and 46 (p. 143).

present study. Chapter 4 includes a comparison of similarities between specific sections of Colossians and Thomas and suggests the use by the author of Colossians of sayings material also found in Thomas. The similar material in Colossians is found at what is almost universally recognized among commentators as the beginning of an extended section of community paraenesis.[84] As seen above with Romans 12–14, 1 Thessalonians 5, and 1 Corinthians 1–4, a collection of sayings parallels is found to be isolated in a particular section of the letter (Col 3:1–11). If Paul authored this letter, then the parallels potentially argue for a Thomasine sayings tradition that can be dated to the 50's CE. If a follower of Paul is writing in his name, then the parallels are at least indicative of a tradition dating to the second half of the century in a location where a collection of Paul's letters are known.

Summary

The foregoing survey of literature points to several issues to be addressed in the following analysis of the Treasure in Heaven saying. (1) Some of the sayings of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas may reflect a primitive, first-century sayings tradition, one that may have influenced canonical texts in some places, while other Thomas sayings may derive—directly or indirectly—from the canonical gospels. When dealing with a sayings collection that represented the traditions of living communities behind it, these two observations are not contradictory, but point to a complex history of development. (2) While a strictly literary relationship between Thomas and John probably cannot be proven, there may be either a relationship between tradent communities, or evidence of the use of one sayings tradition in the writing of two different types of literary text. (3) The use of sayings traditions in the canonical letters is an ongoing debate, one that will not be determined by reference to lexical parallels alone. Isolating possible sayings sources in specific letter sections, especially paraenetic sections, appears to be a fruitful approach. Of course, James is almost entirely paraenetic, which is why James's relationship to gospel traditions is an important topic for research today.

84. Col 3:1–4:6. See, e.g., Pokorny, *Colossians,* 157.