New Test. Stud. 57, pp. 114–144. © Cambridge University Press, 2010
doi:10.1017/S002868851000024X

Luke in the *Gospel of Thomas*

SIMON GATHERCOLE
Faculty of Divinity, West Road, Cambridge CB3 9BS, England.
email: sjg1007@cam.ac.uk

This article argues that Luke influences the *Gospel of Thomas*, on the basis of an examination of those places where redactional material in Luke not in Mark is found in *Thomas*. This has been argued already by various scholars, but the present study aims (a) to refine further the method used to argue this position and (b) to expand the catalogue of those *Thomas* sayings which can be shown to indicate Lukan influence. Furthermore, it proposes (c) to respond to recent scholarship arguing that *Thomas* influences Luke, as well as to scholars maintaining the independence of *Thomas* and the Synoptics.

Keywords: Luke, *Gospel of Thomas*, dependence, literary, oral, influence

The influence of the Gospel of Luke was already an emotive matter in antiquity. In the course of his *Homilies on Luke*, Origen commented that *innumerabiles quippe haereses sunt, quae evangelium secundum Lucam recipiunt*: 'to be sure, there are innumerable heresies which accept the Gospel according to Luke' (*Hom. in Luc.* 16.5). Irenaeus had already had similar concerns: Marcion's followers, mutilating (*decurtantes*) Luke, boast that they have the real Gospel, whereas the Valentinians, venturing to understand Luke in bad ways (*interpretari audentes male*), were guilty of a different crime (*AH* 3.14.3–4).

Rather more recently, the relationship between Luke and the *Gospel of Thomas* specifically has been of interest since the beginnings of *Thomas* scholarship. The patriarchs of *Thomas* research—such as R. McL. Wilson, Bertil Gärtner, E. Haenchen and Oscar Cullmann—commented upon the remarkable commonalities between *Thomas* and Luke.[1] Since then, there has been a good deal of discussion of the problem, but there is still more that can be said. This article will argue that Luke influences the *Gospel of Thomas*, and the treatment here is in

1 See e.g. R. McL. Wilson, *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* (London: Mowbray, 1960) 49; B. E. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (London: Collins, 1961) 67; E. Haenchen, 'Literatur zum Thomasevangelium' (Part I), *ThR* 27 (1961) 147–78 (175); O. Cullmann, 'The Gospel of Thomas and the Problem of the Age of the Tradition Contained Therein: A Survey', *Interpretation* 16 (1962) 418–37 (436).

broad sympathy with one of the best previous studies of this general theme, that of Christopher Tuckett.[2] The present study does, however, seek both to offer some methodological refinements and to extend the range of sayings in *Thomas* which can be seen to evince Lukan influence.[3] Additionally, there will be criticism of some recent scholarship which has argued that there is a relationship between Luke and *Thomas*, but that the influence is in the opposite direction; similarly, a response will be given to a recent argument for the priority of *Thomas*'s version of the parable of wicked tenants over against the Lukan version.

The structure of this article is as follows. The first section (1) will provide a taxonomy of approaches to the Luke/*Thomas* relationship. This leads into an attempt in Part 2 to provide the aforementioned refinements of previous approaches which identify *Thomas*'s incorporation of Lukan redactional features as the most secure evidence for *Thomas*'s dependence upon Luke, in particular clarifying why the influence of Luke on *Thomas* is more likely than the reverse, and providing further consideration of the interpenetration of oral and literary factors in Luke's influence. Part 3 seeks, in comparison with previous studies, to expand the number of passages in *Thomas* which can be identified as influenced by Luke. Hence the aim here is to advocate methodological caution, while at the same time to provide evidence for Lukan influence on a wider range of sayings in *Thomas* than has usually been noted. A final Part 4 adds further responses to recent claims made by Gregory Riley and Steven Johnson for the influence of *Thomas* upon Luke.

1. Approaches to Substantive Luke/*Thomas* Parallels

1.1. *The Influence of* Thomas *upon Luke (GTh → Lk)*

As noted, the first part of this article provides an analysis of the various positions held. At one end of the spectrum is Riley's argument for the influence of GTh 47 upon Luke 5.36-39 (the wine + wineskins/patch + garment pericope) and of GTh 72 upon Luke 12.13-14 (where Jesus is asked to divide an inheritance).[4] Riley adopts the standard approach to identifying secondary features: 'where Thomas redaction is found in the text of Luke, then the text of Luke must post-date and be dependent on sayings formed in Thomas Christianity'.[5] As we shall see in Part 4, however, despite the weakness of Riley's arguments,

2 C. M. Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', *NovT* 30 (1988) 132–57.

3 For example, Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', refers to GTh 5 and 31 (145–6, 143), but not to the other passages discussed below: his article is not so narrowly focused on Luke as the present study; rather it claims to deal with 'some examples' (145) across the whole Synoptic tradition.

4 G. J. Riley, 'The Influence of Thomas Christianity on Luke 12:14 and 5:39', *HTR* 88 (1995) 229–34.

5 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 229.

his conclusions have been enthusiastically taken up by Johnson, who extends Thomasine influence to include GTh 76.3 → Luke 12.33 ('treasure in heaven').[6]

1.2. *The Independence of Luke and* Thomas *(Lk | GTh)*

Other scholars have argued for the independence of *Thomas*. In earlier scholarship, the most forcefully advanced version of this thesis was Quispel's theory that *Thomas* was influenced not by the Synoptics, but by the independent *Gospel of the Hebrews* (see on GTh 99 below).[7] More influential has been Sieber's unpublished dissertation,[8] and also widely discussed is Schramm's thesis that since *Thomas* contains Synoptic-like material but is free of the secondary elements found in other Gospels, it is independent of the Synoptics and relies upon a different written source.[9] A decade later, Patterson's monograph contended vigorously that *Thomas* had independent access to oral tradition, rather than written Gospels.[10]

Arguments for independence are now very often conducted along such lines, rather than relying on additional documents as did Quispel and Schramm. Another thoroughgoing account of the commonalities and differences between *Thomas* and the Synoptics as arising from different oral performances can be found in DeConick's 2006 commentary.[11] DeConick notes particularly how the extensive overlap among Matthew, Mark and Luke is very different in kind from the parallels between *Thomas* and the Synoptics: 'The exact verbal agreement, lengthy sequences of words, and secondary features shared between the Triple Tradition versions and the Quelle versions *far* exceed anything we find in the *Gospel of Thomas*'.[12]

We will consider later how this applies in particular cases, but one of the general difficulties with the independence theory is that it can only ever be provisional: 'it is virtually impossible to demonstrate non-use, never mind

6 S. R. Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure: Wealth, Wisdom, and a Jesus Saying* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2008) esp. 58–79.

7 See e.g. (among many other places), the clear statement in G. Quispel, 'The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament', *VC* 11 (1957) 189–207 (194); also Quispel, 'L'Évangile selon Thomas et les Clémentines', *VC* 12 (1958) 181–96; Quispel, 'Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas', *NTS* 5 (1958–59) 276–90; Quispel, 'L'Évangile selon Thomas et le Diatessaron', *VC* 13 (1959) 87–117.

8 J. Sieber, 'A Redactional Analysis of the Synoptic Gospels with regard to the Question of the Sources of the Gospel according to Thomas' (PhD diss., Claremont University, 1965).

9 T. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1971) esp. 10–21 (16, 20–1).

10 S. J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1993).

11 A. D. DeConick, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel* (London/New York: Continuum, 2006).

12 DeConick, *Original*, 23.

non-knowledge of a text'.[13] One can *suspect* independence from the Synoptics, but no more. An additional difficulty attends the view that 'the Thomasine-Synoptic parallels derive from the oral sphere' because *Thomas* displays 'strong features of oral transmission':[14] it is by definition impossible for us now to define the specific features of oral transmission in ancient texts from the particular geographical, cultural and chronological context of *Thomas* and the Synoptics. To use the similarities among the Synoptics as a basis of comparison, and conclude that the *Thomas*/Luke relationship is exclusively an oral one because they are not so close, fails to recognise that the situation with the Synoptics is extraordinary, rather than an everyday instance of literary dependence. In fact, there is positive evidence for a literary relationship (which does not necessarily exclude oral factors as well) in the extremely close similarity in parts of the Greek (see on GTh 26 below).

1.3. *The Influence of Lukan Special Material upon Thomas (L → GTh)*

The first extended study of *L → GTh* came from Schürmann in 1963, provoked by Cullmann's suggestion of a common Jewish-Christian source behind the Lukan special material and *Thomas*.[15] Schürmann works through various passages in the Lukan special material, and concludes that *Thomas* is dependent upon Luke via a harmony of the Synoptics: he concedes the possibility of additional complicating factors such as a Jewish-Christian Gospel, but states that they cannot be demonstrated.

These criticisms of Cullmann's enthusiasm for an independent source were renewed ten years later in Dehandschutter's 1973 article, which criticises Schramm for positing additional sources.[16] In a nutshell, where Schramm sees common sources, Dehandschutter simply sees Lukan editorial work and Lukan influence upon *Thomas*.

Most recently, François Bovon has provided a fresh examination of the Lukan special material also found in *Thomas*, concluding that some sayings display dependence on Luke, and some independence.[17] GTh 3, for example, contains

13 A. F. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (WUNT 2/169; Tübingen: Mohr, 2003) 353.

14 DeConick, *Original*, 23. The phrase appears in italics in the original.

15 H. Schürmann, 'Das Thomasevangelium und das lukanische Sondergut', *BZ* 7 (1963) 236–60.

16 B. Dehandschutter, 'L'Évangile selon Thomas: Témoin d'une tradition prélucanienne?', *L'Évangile selon Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques. Memorial Lucien Cerfaux* (ed. F. Neirynck; BETL 32; Gembloux: Duculot, 1973) 287–97, 324–6.

17 F. Bovon, 'Les sentences propres à Luc dans l'*Évangile selon Thomas*', *Colloque internationale: 'L'Évangile selon Thomas* et les Textes de Nag Hammadi', *Québec, 29–31 Mai 2003* (ed. L. Painchaud and P.-H. Poirier; Louvain: Peeters, 2007) 43–58; now also in English translation: 'Sayings Specific to Luke in the *Gospel of Thomas*', *New Testament and Christian Apocrypha: Collected Studies* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2009) 161–73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

a feature of Lukan redaction according to Bovon, in its inclusion (and modification) of Luke's own introduction to Jesus' statement about the presence of the kingdom.[18] *Thomas*'s version of the saying about two lying on a couch (GTh 61.1) looks suspiciously to Bovon like a 'de-apocalypticising' of the Lukan parallel (Luke 17.34): *Thomas* replaces 'will be taken' and 'will be left' with the more prosaic 'will die' and 'will live'.[19] On the other hand, in the case of GTh 79 (the macarism on barren women), 'on ne peut pas affirmer que Thomas subisse ici l'influence de la version écrite de Luc'; rather, *Thomas* knows the saying in oral form.[20] Overall, Bovon emphasises (albeit not strongly) the dimensions of dependence, and considers that in general some of the theological concerns of Luke are carried further by *Thomas*.[21]

In response to Bovon, however, arguments for identifying the influence of Lukan special material need to be treated cautiously because of the difficulty of deciding in favour of the presence of Lukan redaction where there is no Markan parallel. Arguments for the influence of Lukan special material upon *Thomas* depend on demonstrating either (a) that the piece of special material is pure Lukan creation, such that Luke's and *Thomas*'s formulations could not go back to a common source, or (b) that the piece of special material is clearly Luke's redaction of L. Neither of these is at all easy to identify. Gregory has emphasised the fact that we cannot rule out the possibility of sources common to both *Thomas* and the material distinctive to Luke, a point also made in more general terms independently by DeConick.[22]

1.4. Thomas*'s Incorporation of Luke's Redaction of Q (Q → Lk → GTh)*

The study of *Thomas*'s incorporation of Luke's redaction of Q has been a less clearly demarcated field of research, even though *Thomas* has since its discovery been closely associated by scholars with Q. The approach can be illustrated, however, by two examples.

First, on the 'dog-in-the-manger' saying about the Pharisees and the Scribes taking the keys of knowledge (GTh 39.1-2), Tuckett rightly notes the similarities between Luke and *Thomas* over against Matthew, but questions whether one can simply opt for *Q → Lk → GTh*: since some Q specialists prefer the theory that Matthew and Luke employed different versions of Q (Q^{mt} and Q^{lk}), the different formulations in the two written Gospels might be a consequence of the form of

18 Bovon, 'Les sentences', 47.
19 Bovon, 'Les sentences', 49–50.
20 Bovon, 'Les sentences', 53.
21 Bovon, 'Les sentences', 55.
22 Gregory, *Reception*, 14; DeConick, *Original*, 190.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

their Q source, rather than of the evangelists' redaction.[23] This is one potential obstacle to *Q → Lk → GTh*.

To take an apparently more robust case, Schürmann and Tuckett have argued that GTh 16.2 ('...I have come to cast divisions upon the earth—fire, sword and war') betrays Lukan redaction of Q in *Thomas*'s reference to 'divisions' (as in Luke 12.51; cf. Matt 10.34's 'sword' *tout simple*). But here too the same difficulty applies: it might be replied by a multiple-Q enthusiast that Q^{lk} is closer to Q^{th} than either is to Q^{mt}. To be sure, the διαμεριζ- root is frequent in Luke–Acts,[24] but division is also a very common theme in *Thomas*.[25] Since both *Thomas* and Luke are (for different reasons) interested in the motif, it is in principle possible that they could be independently using similar versions of Q. *Thomas* could in theory preserve early tradition in other instances as well. Finally, *Q → Lk → GTh* arguments will of course be rejected out of hand by the growing number of Q sceptics.[26]

1.5. Thomas*'s Incorporation of Luke's Redaction of Mark (Mk → Lk → GTh)*

The most widely accepted instances of *Thomas*'s secondary character are those where Luke's redaction of *Mark* (rather than of L or Q) is incorporated into *Thomas*. Here we are to a greater extent on *terra firma* because we are dealing with three more or less known quantities. This approach to the influence of the Gospels is commonly seen as finding its foremost expositor in Helmut Koester,[27] and its best application to *Thomas* is Tuckett's 1988 article, somewhat neglected in North America, but perhaps the most influential recent work on *Thomas* in European scholarship.[28] Tuckett sets out powerful arguments for *Mk → Lk → GTh* in GTh 5 in particular. Recently, Gregory has highlighted GTh 5 and 31 as useful examples because they appear to show dependence in the Greek text of *Thomas*.[29] Tuckett and Gregory both show appropriate

23 Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', 142.

24 Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', 146 and n. 49.

25 See the stress on unity/division in GTh 4, 22, 23, 48, 61, 106, and perhaps 11, 47, 89, 108.

26 Currently, M. Goodacre is probably the most prominent Q sceptic. See especially his *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002). In addition, one could note the various contributors to M. Goodacre and N. Perrin, eds., *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique* (London: SPCK, 2004), and now F. B. Watson, with his 'Q as Hypothesis: A Study in Methodology', *NTS* 55 (2009) 397–415. There are important precursors to these in the work of A. Farrer, M. Goulder and E. P. Sanders.

27 H. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).

28 Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics'; cf. also Tuckett, 'Sources and Methods', *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (ed. M. Bockmuehl; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2001) 121–37 (129).

29 Gregory, *Reception*, 155–6.

reserve, recommending that one talk of a *measure* of Thomasine dependence, rather than influence in any thoroughgoing way.[30]

2. Some Methodological Remarks

The present study proceeds along this tried and tested method of identifying Lukan redaction of Mark in the *Gospel of Thomas*. There is one point, however, at which it is vulnerable, and some further aspects of method which need to be clarified.

2.1. *Relative Datings: An Unquestioned Assumption in the 'Redactional Method'*

The weak point in most applications of this method is that it takes for granted the *direction* of influence: if *Thomas* shares a redactional feature with Matthew or Luke, then this is almost automatically taken as a sign of Thomasine dependence. This is a logical *non sequitur*, however: there is no *a priori* reason why it should be *assumed* that the line of influence must be from *Lk* → *GTh*. There is an unstated presupposition that Luke predates *Thomas*. Is this because *Thomas*, as the most recent discovery, must prove itself? Or are the clearly later features of *Thomas* (such as GTh 83-84, or 114) taken to mean that a literary relationship between *Thomas* and a canonical work must inevitably amount to Thomasine dependence? Perhaps for some, if *Thomas* is 'Gnostic', then it is inevitably later. This assumption about the direction of influence has been maintained, however, even now that a number of scholars considers *Thomas* at least as early as Luke,[31] and the Gnostic character of *Thomas* is widely rejected.[32]

While it is impossible here to consider in any comprehensive way the question of *Thomas*'s date, it will be helpful to reflect on concrete reasons why one might suppose that redactional features shared between *Thomas* and Luke are much more likely to mean Thomasine rather than Lukan dependence, that is to say,

30 Although n.b. 'the undoubted presence' of LkR in *Thomas* (Gregory, *Reception*, 150).

31 See e.g. S. Davies and K. Johnson, in their argument that *Thomas* is the earliest of the Gospels: 'Mark's use of the Gospel of Thomas', Parts 1 & 2, *Neot* 30 (1996) 307–34; and 31 (1997) 233–61; DeConick has argued that the core of *Thomas* was composed prior to 50 CE (*Original Gospel of Thomas*, 8). See also Riley and Johnson (to be discussed below), whose view of *Thomas*'s influence upon Luke clearly implies the priority of *Thomas*. H. Koester comments that it 'may well date from the first century': J. M. Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library* (Leiden: Brill, 3rd ed. 1993) 125.

32 See e.g. DeConick's strong resistance to a Gnostic characterisation, favouring instead that of 'early Syrian religiosity' (*Original Gospel of Thomas*, 4). The most recent substantial discussion of the question, by Marjanen, also gives a negative answer. See A. Marjanen, 'Is Thomas a Gnostic Gospel?', *Thomas at the Crossroads* (ed. R. Uro; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998) 107–39.

why *Lk* → *GTh* is more likely than the reverse. There are four reasons which might be adduced.[33]

First, the later features such as those mentioned above do play a legitimate role, even if now any idea of *Thomas* being 'Gnostic' should almost certainly be abandoned.

Secondly, the presence in *Thomas* of reference to Matthew's Gospel surely makes the *Lk* → *GTh* order much more likely than the reverse. Matthew's influence upon *Thomas* is rather clearer in one respect than that of Luke, because *Thomas* actually *names* Matthew in a context which implies a reference to the Gospel of Matthew (GTh 13.1),[34] a context which moreover itself betrays signs of Matthean redaction (GTh 13.4-8).[35] A chronology of Mk–Mt–GTh–Lk would give a very tight window for dating *Thomas*, making a *GTh* → *Lk* relationship unlikely, even if not impossible.

Thirdly, a Lukan redactional feature is sometimes extended further by *Thomas*. As we shall see, Luke's version of the parable of the wicked tenants adds a 'perhaps' into the narrative, and two instances of 'perhaps' appear in *Thomas*; analogously, into the discussion about fasting Luke adds a reference to 'prayer', while *Thomas* shares this addition, and contributes another as well. Similarly, in the light-under-a-bushel saying, Luke adds the point that the

33 The present study assumes the *substantial* unity of *Thomas*, rather than a very long development over the course of nearly a century, as argued by DeConick. This does not necessarily rule out some instability, although the substantial similarity between the Greek fragments and the Coptic version suggests that forms of the text like our extant texts were those which circulated in antiquity. The similarity in the texts consists in (a) substantial similarity in order, with one exception (Gk GTh 30 = Co GTh 30 + 77.2-3); (b) substantial similarity in extent of sayings, with one exception (Co GTh 36 is an abbreviation of its Greek counterpart). That the Coptic translation was made from a Greek text closely resembling those Greek texts which have survived is evident from (c) the fact that where the Coptic text and the extant Greek manuscripts overlap, the Greek loan words in the Coptic text almost all have correspondingly similar Greek words in the Greek fragments. Of the 27 cases, the only exceptions are a case of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ (←καί in GTh 3.3), an unparalleled use of ⲏ in GTh 30.2, and GTh 32's preference in Coptic for ⲟⲩⲇⲉ over the Greek's οὔτε … οὔτε …. In the latter two cases the discrepancy arises from a different syntax in the surrounding context, and the variation between ⲟⲩⲇⲉ and οὔτε is insignificant when one considers that Coptic frequently does not distinguish between ⲇ and ⲧ. If one leaves the ⲏ and ⲟⲩⲇⲉ out of account, then one is left with only one exception out of 25 (ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/καί), and particles are the elements least predictably rendered in other Greek-to-Coptic translations.

34 E.g. E. Pagels, *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas* (New York: Random House, 2003) 47, and more forcefully R. J. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006) 236–7.

35 R. Uro, *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context of the Gospel of Thomas* (New York: T&T Clark, 2003) 88: 'Only in Matthew and *Thomas* does Jesus' response contain a reference to the divine source of the confession (cf. the blessing in Matt 16:17 and Thomas' intoxication in *Gos. Thom.* 13:5) which is affirmed with the unique role that Jesus assigns to the disciple who has given the appropriate answer.'

illumination is 'for those who come in'; *Thomas* says it is for 'all who come in *and go out*'. This expansionist tendency, if one can call it such, adds a further argument.

Finally, albeit negatively, we have concrete proposals from scholars, discussed below, for instances of the influence running *GTh* → *Lk* (GTh 31, 47, 76). In these instances where such arguments have been made, the cases can be shown to be highly problematic. In sum, on the strength of the evidence currently available, the influence of Luke upon *Thomas* is far more likely than the reverse.

2.2. *Literary and Oral Influence*

The present study also aims to clarify, as far as is possible, how the influence of Luke upon *Thomas* took place. One of the problems in the debate in the past has been a polarisation of the options. In the first place, both Cullmann and Schürmann have one point in common, namely that similarities must be accounted for by direct literary dependence, whether that involves just Luke and *Thomas*, or other sources as well. Both probably make the mistake of construing dependence as too mechanically scribal. On the other hand, DeConick's mistake is to go to the other extreme. Although she mentions complex solutions as possibilities, she more often resorts to antithetical conclusions. On GTh 26, for example, she comments that 'the variant is the result of oral transmission rather than literary development'.[36] It is this either/or which is unnecessary. This antithesis has been widely recognised by scholars in other fields to be a false dichotomy, whether it is in Ruth Finnegan's studies of Eskimo, Malay, South African and other oral poetry or, closer to home, in Rosalind Thomas's treatment of ancient Greece.[37] The problems identified in wider scholarship with what Finnegan has called the 'radical divide' raise the question of whether similar problems also attend a one-sided treatment of *Thomas*.[38]

One common way to avoid this polarity in the study of *Thomas* is by means of appeal to 'secondary orality'.[39] This refers to the way in which, after a first phase of oral transmission, a saying is then written down in (let us say) Luke's Gospel. After being written down, however, the Lukan formulation is then read out in a setting

36 DeConick, *Original*, 129.

37 R. Finnegan, *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1977); R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Key Themes in Ancient History; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992).

38 The phrase appears in Finnegan, *Oral Poetry*, 258.

39 Cf. K. R. Snodgrass, 'The Gospel of Thomas: A Secondary Gospel', *SecCent* 7 (1989–90) 19–38 (28); Uro, *Seeking the Historical Context*, 88–9; Uro, *'Thomas* and Oral Gospel Tradition', *Thomas at the Crossroads* (ed. Uro) 8–32 (10); J. H. Wood, 'The New Testament Gospels and the *Gospel of Thomas*: A New Direction', *NTS* 51 (2005) 579–95 (589). The term is seemingly first applied to gospels scholarship in W. Kelber, *The Oral and Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 197.

such as a Christian assembly, such that that Lukan formulation then shapes the way in which the particular saying is used thereafter (in a second oral phase).[40] A 'hard' version of secondary orality might suppose that the saying reaching the author or community responsible for *Thomas* simply *stems* (albeit indirectly) from the formulation in Luke's Gospel. On a softer version, one might more modestly suppose a partial influence, involving 'interference' from the formulation in Luke's Gospel. In either case, appeal to secondary orality can be usefully combined with the 'redactional method', so that a saying shared between Mark and Luke does not come to the *Gospel of Thomas* in its earlier Markan form but arrives, albeit orally, having been shaped by Luke's formulation.

There are some problems with the terminology of 'secondary orality',[41] but as long as it is understood what is meant by the phrase, it is still useful. It is generally taken to be unlikely, or at least unproveable, that the author of *Thomas* had recourse to actual manuscripts of the Gospels for the composition of the work; thus *direct* influence is unlikely or impossible to demonstrate.[42] At the other end of the spectrum, it has already been noted, and will be argued for further in Part 3, that the view that *Thomas* goes back to independent oral tradition without any influence from a canonical Gospel is highly questionable. This leaves us with *indirect* influence, implying either the 'hard' and 'soft' versions of secondary orality noted above. It should be emphasised that the present argument is not advocating the view that the author of *Thomas* used a *text* of Luke (or even knew it directly). Rather, the most likely scenario is that *Thomas* is influenced by a second oral phase which has itself been influenced by Luke. This is still the influence of the written form of Luke, even if that influence is only indirect.

40 This is not to suggest the phases are merely sequential, with the first finishing when the second begins.

41 The reason it is perhaps an inappropriate phrase is that when it was originally coined by Walter Ong in 1971, it applied not to the relationship between two pieces of literature but rather referred to a whole cultural mentality: premodern 'primary orality' in contrast with modern 'secondary orality'. W. J. Ong, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University, 1971) 20. Between these two epochs came the interposition of 'the individualised introversion of the age of writing, print, and rationalism' (285, where Ong also refers to his belief that he coined the phrases). See further Ong's *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London/New York: Methuen, 1982) 136–8 and passim. Although not strictly a pre-modern vs. modern contrast, Ong gives the informative illustration by way of a contrast between the hour-long speeches of the presidential debate between Lincoln and Douglas and the 'domesticated' contemporary debates (*Orality and Literacy*, 137). Secondary orality is a very wide cultural phenomenon 'with which we are going to have to live through the foreseeable future' (Ong, *Rhetoric*, 303).

42 Uro, '*Thomas* and Oral Gospel Tradition', 31.

2.3. *Further Methodological Comments*

Additionally, as has been recognised by some scholars, but not by many, textual criticism is also an essential component in the discussion (see e.g. on GTh 5, 26 and 100 below): it is not merely a matter of comparing the text of *Thomas* with that of NA[27] (which is in any case soon to be replaced) or with that of a standard Synopsis.[43] The full range of textual variants needs to be taken into account, indeed rather more than just those which are noted in the Nestle-Aland apparatus.

Rather than claiming with absolute certainty the influence of original Luke upon original *Thomas*, this article shares the concern of Tuckett to recognise the limits of what our current texts allow us to conclude. In the end, what can be stated with reasonable confidence is that *Thomas* as we have it is influenced by Luke as we have it.[44] Tuckett also rightly resists any attempt to argue for a comprehensive influence of Luke upon *Thomas*. Both of these concerns, shared by the present article, are echoed in one of his concluding remarks: 'the fact that Th sometimes shows parallels with redactional material in the Synoptics indicates that there is a *measure of dependence between our version(s) of Th and our synoptic gospels*'.[45] How might we describe this 'measure of dependence'? On the basis of the evidence to be presented in Part 3, it is tolerably clear that Lukan redactional features have exercised some influence upon the phraseology of the *Gospel of Thomas* as we have it. It needs to be remembered, however, what cannot be demonstrated here. For example, the evidence of Lukan redaction in *Thomas* does not necessarily mean that the author of *Thomas* was conscious that it came from Luke. Nor does it mean that the author knew the whole of Luke's Gospel, or that the author has a first-hand knowledge of the written text of Luke which would mean that the influence was direct. (Still less would one want to argue that the author of *Thomas* knew only Luke and nothing else.) It is also hard to know whether *Thomas*'s source for any particular saying is Luke *tout simple* (the 'harder' version of secondary orality noted above), or whether the Lukan elements come from interference by the Lukan version of a saying with another version known to the author (the 'softer' version). Despite these caveats, it is nonetheless evident that the phraseology of Luke's written Gospel has exerted an influence on the phraseology of *Thomas* at various points.

43 A good example of attention to textual variants is DeConick's commentary (*Original*, passim), which appends very useful references to 'Agreements in Syrian Gospels, Western Text and Diatessaron' in the discussion of each saying. See also earlier e.g. G. Quispel, 'L'Evangile selon Thomas et le "Texte Occidental" du Nouveau Testament', *VC* 14 (1960) 204–15.

44 It is possible in theory that Lukan influence comes in not (only) (a) at the stage of *Thomas*'s composition, but also (b) in the course of its transmission in Greek, (c) at the point of translation, or (d) in its Coptic transmission. We will note in the conclusion, however, that there is good evidence for influence (a) and (b).

45 Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', 157.

The overall rhetorical aim of the present article is not to rest too much on any individual cases. Some presentations of *Thomas*'s dependence perhaps are too focused upon GTh 5 and 31. The present argument aims to be cumulative, and indeed the arguments within the discussions of individual sayings are themselves cumulative (e.g. on GTh 65, 100).

Finally, on the mode of presentation, since in most cases we are comparing works in different languages (the Greek of Luke and the Coptic of *Thomas*), for ease of comparison and for accessibility, the parallel passages in the synopses will simply be presented in English translation; the exceptions are GTh 5, 26 and 31 where Greek texts of *Thomas* are extant.[46]

3. Specific *Thomas* Sayings

3.1. *GTh 5.2/Luke 8.17*

Mark 4.22	Luke 8.17	GTh 5.2
οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ...	οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται.	[οὐ γάρ ἐσ]τιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανε[ρὸν γενήσεται]

Although the amount of text here is small, it is clear that *Thomas* agrees exactly with Luke, but not with Mark.[47] As such, many have seen this as a near-certain example of influence.[48] We need, however, to recognise the lack of certainty available here. This may look to some like a smoking-gun proof, but the fragmentary nature of the Greek of GTh 5 must be considered: there may be other options for the reconstruction.[49] One reason why the argument for secondariness looks so plausible above is that *Thomas* has been restored not only on the basis of the Coptic, but also (almost certainly) on the basis of Luke 8.17. It remains possible, too, that DeConick's theory of different versions arising through oral performance also explains the text-form in *Thomas* here.[50] The closeness of Luke and *Thomas* should not merely be waved away, however. In particular, if the number of parallels to Lukan redaction in other sayings begins to mount up, then the theory of shared Lukan variations emerging in oral performances will look more shaky.

46 In the interests of full disclosure, it should be noted that this article is based on the assumption of Markan priority but assumes neither Q nor the Farrer hypothesis.

47 Here and below, words of interest for the comparison of the different versions of the sayings in *Thomas* and the Synoptics are underlined.

48 E.g. Tuckett, 'Sources and Methods', 129: 'This seems to be clear evidence that, at this point at least, *Thomas* presupposes Luke's finished Gospel.'

49 E.g. ... ὃ οὐ φανε[ρωθήσεται], which is what Clement has in *Strom.* 1.13.3.

50 DeConick, *Original*, 61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.2. *GTh 31.1/Luke 4.24*

Mark 6.4	Matt 13.57	Luke 4.24	John 4.44	GTh 31.1
οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.	οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.	προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει.	οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[ο]ῦ.

The substance of GTh 31.1 is the same as the versions in the four canonical Gospels: this saying is noteworthy for appearing also in John. There are features in *Thomas*'s version, however, which are suspiciously Lukan. First, *Thomas* shares with Luke (and John) a simple negative statement, rather than the Matthean and Markan 'not … except…'.[51] Secondly, *Thomas* shares with Luke the word δεκτός. This is not a particularly common word: it occurs only five times in the NT (3× in Luke–Acts, 2× in Paul). Thirdly, excepting Luke's opening οὐδείς and *Thomas*'s οὐκ, Luke and *Thomas* share all the same words, which differ only in their order. It is also possible that *Thomas* is dependent on Luke in pairing GTh 31.1 with 31.2.[52] DeConick here appeals to an exclusively oral source influencing both Luke and *Thomas*.[53] But again, if more agreement appears in different sayings, one is faced with the increasing likelihood of Luke's written Gospel exerting an influence, even if that influence is indirect, and mediated by oral transmission as well.

51 As such, *pace* Gregory, *Reception*, 155, it is not merely a matter of the shared word δεκτός.

52 So e.g. F. F. Bruce, 'The Gospel of Thomas', *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1974) 110–56 (127). The second part of the saying in *Thomas*, 'no doctor heals those who know him', is a very peculiar proverb, contradicted by the almost universal practice of doctors in antiquity. Prof. Sir Geoffrey Lloyd has remarked to me as follows: 'Very curious. No parallels for that remark about doctors not treating those who know them come to mind, and plenty of texts that contradict the principle' (email communication, 28/02/2008). The combination of the sayings in *Thomas* may, however, be indebted to the pairing of Luke 4.23-24 or Mark 6.4-5. Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 31–2, followed by Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 77 n. 50, argue that the *Thomasine* pairing is more original. This is little more than form-critical guesswork, however: assuming that Mark adopts a 'softening tendency', replacing the harsh GTh 31.2. Johnson's additional argument for the priority of *Thomas* is particularly difficult to accept: 'Note that Luke has Jesus himself stating that this is a common proverb and therefore probably not an original saying of Jesus.'

53 DeConick, *Original*, 141.

3.3-4. *GTh 65-66/Luke 20.9-17*

This developing pattern can be seen further in the parable of the wicked tenants in *Thomas*:[54]

Mark 12.1-11	**Luke 20.9-17**	**GTh 65**
1 A man planted a vineyard, placed a fence around it, dug a vat, and built a tower; then he leased it to tenants and went away.	9 A man planted a vineyard, and leased it to tenants, and went away for a long time.	1 A [a usurer][55] owned a vineyard. He leased it to tenant farmers so that they might work it and he might collect the produce from them.
2 When the season came, he sent a slave to the tenants to collect from them his share of the produce of the vineyard. 3 But they seized him, and beat him, and sent him away empty-handed. 4 And again he sent another slave to them; this one they beat over the head and insulted. 5 He sent another; him they killed. He sent many others; some of them they beat, others they killed.	10 When the season came, he sent a slave to the tenants so that they might give him his share of the produce of the vineyard; but the tenants beat him and sent him away empty-handed. 11 Next he sent another slave; that one also they beat and insulted and sent away empty-handed. 12 And he sent still a third; this one also they wounded and threw out.	2 He sent his servant so that the tenants might give him the produce of the vineyard. 3 They seized his servant and beat him, all but killing him. The servant went back and told his master. 4 His master said, 'Perhaps he did not recognize them'.[56] 5 He sent another servant. The tenants beat this one as well.
6 He had one left to send, a son, whom he loved. He sent him last of all, saying, 'They will respect my son'.	13 Then the owner of the vineyard said, 'What shall I do? I will send my son, whom I love; perhaps they will respect him'.	6 Then the owner sent his son and said, 'Perhaps they will respect my son'.
7 But the tenants said to one another, 'This is the heir. Come, let's kill him, and the inheritance will be ours'.	14 But when the tenants saw him, they talked the matter over. 'This is the heir', they said. 'Let's kill him, so that the inheritance will be ours'.	7 When those tenants realised that it was he who was the heir to the vineyard, they seized him and killed him.

54 There are no compelling reasons for questioning the priority of the Markan version of this parable.

55 The reading 'a good man' (χρн[сто]с, rather than χρн[стн]с) is also possible.

56 This should perhaps be emended to: 'Perhaps they did not recognise him.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mark 12.1-11	Luke 20.9-17	GTh 65
8 So they took him and killed him, and threw him out of the vineyard.	15 So they threw him out of the vineyard and killed him.	8 Let him who has ears hear.
9 What then will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the farmers and give the vineyard to others.	What then will the owner of the vineyard do to them? 16 He will come and kill these farmers and give the vineyard to others. Those listening said, 'May it never be!'	
10 Have you not read this scripture? 'The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner. 11 This is from the Lord! And it is marvellous in our eyes!'	17 He looked at them and said, 'What is the meaning of what is written, "The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner"?'	GTh 66 Jesus said, 'Show me the stone which the builders rejected. It is the corner-stone'.

It is virtually certain that there is a literary relationship of some sort between the parable in the Synoptics and GTh 65-66, because of the way in which the parable is in all four (Matthew, Mark, Luke and *Thomas*) followed by a quotation of Psalm 118/117. Some additional features reinforce the impression that *Thomas*'s version is generally secondary to that of the Synoptics. For example, *Thomas* has a strange explanation of the killing of the son: 'When those tenants realised that it was he who was the heir to the vineyard, they seized him and killed him'. The Synoptics' explanation may not make psychological or legal sense, but it at least makes narrative sense. The *Thomas* version is less clear, and looks like it might be an abbreviation which has made the narrative no longer make good sense: there is a missing presupposition here. Moreover, the use of the Psalm in GTh 66 reflects a greater distance from the Psalter than do the Synoptic quotations, both in its initial statement ('Show me…') and in its attribution of the statement straightforwardly to Jesus. Identifying the likelihood of a literary relationship between *Thomas* and the Synoptics in general is of course not yet to prove Lukan influence in particular. Several commonalities specifically between *Thomas*'s and Luke's versions can be noted, however:

1. In the setting of the parable in GTh 65.1 and its parallels, *Thomas* shares in common with Luke a lack of reference to Isaiah 5 as a theological backdrop, in contrast to Mark and Matthew.[57]

57 Isaiah 5 also surfaces in Mark 12.9 and parallels, but *Thomas* has ended the parable by this time.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. In connection with GTh 65.2, Mark and Matthew have the owner sending the servants to collect the produce (ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος [Matt: λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ]), whereas Luke and *Thomas* have their final clause with the reverse syntax, 'so that the tenants might give him the produce of the vineyard': ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος δώσουσιν αὐτῷ / ϫεκααϲ ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ ⲛⲁϯ ⲛⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲉⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ.[58]
3. Mark and Matthew have the servants seized, beaten, insulted and killed. Luke and *Thomas*, however, have the servants beaten and sent back, but reserve the killing for the son alone.
4. In Luke 20.13, the owner of the vineyard says to himself, '*Perhaps* (ἴσως) they will respect my son'. That Luke alone of the Synoptics has 'perhaps' is noteworthy because ἴσως is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT. Then *Thomas* actually has 'perhaps' (ⲙⲉⲱⲁⲕ) twice.[59]
5. To return to the presence of Psalm 118/117 in all the versions, it is notable that Luke and *Thomas* end their appended references to the Psalm with v. 22, omitting Mark's and Matthew's continuation into v. 23.

Response to Objections

DeConick considers these common features as trifling, 'since we do not find sequences of words or phrases longer than five or six', and concludes in favour of oral factors.[60] The choice of 'five or six' as requisite seems rather arbitrary, however, and indeed five or six *phrases* might well be rather considerable. Again, as noted in Part 1, it is wrong to use the degree of similarity among the Synoptics as a base-line of comparison.

The most substantial attack on the theory of Thomasine dependence has come from John Kloppenborg.[61] There is not space here to discuss Kloppenborg's whole argument for the primacy of the basic structure and contents of *Thomas*'s version, even though there are difficulties with his arguments for, e.g., *Thomas*'s more realistic reflections of viticulture and law.[62] On the

58 K. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983) 52.

59 M. Hubaut, *La parabole des vignerons homicides* (Paris: Gabalda, 1976) 134; Snodgrass, *Parable*, 52–3.

60 DeConick, *Original*, 215, though she allows for the possibility of secondary orality.

61 J. Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2006).

62 An example of each can be mentioned. (1) The idea that Mark's φραγμός ('palisade', 'wall', 'fence') is a specifically Egyptian viticultural item derived from the LXX (Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 168, 172) is puzzling: 'The reference to the building of a palisade (καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμόν) reflects a specifically Septuagintal addition to the MT and mirrors the Egyptian viticultural practice that had influenced the LXX translators' (168). But *m. Kil.* 4.2 discusses the boundary-fence, and the גדר. The biblical occurrences of this Hebrew word are translated in the LXX most frequently by φραγμός: moreover, Kloppenborg's references to various Greek writers' uses of this noun (*Tenants*, 159 n. 25) prove that it is by no

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

matter of *Thomas*'s connecting the parable with Psalm 117, Kloppenborg argues that the linking of parable and psalm predated both Mark and *Thomas*.[63] Since Kloppenborg does not think this link original, however, the connection has been consigned to a no-man's-land; the problem has been moved, rather than solved. Almost all scholars, including those who generally prefer Thomasine independence, see a literary relationship here.[64] On the specific issues pertaining to Lukan influence:

1. On *Thomas*'s and Luke's shared lack of reference to Isaiah 5 as a theological backdrop in the introduction, Kloppenborg is surely right that this is unlikely to be a matter of a Gnostic tendency to de-Judaise the parable. Nevertheless, many will find it hard to accept Kloppenborg's proposal that (a) *Thomas*'s version reflects the earliest form of the parable without Isaiah, and (b) Mark inserts the Isaianic material into the introduction, and (c) Luke removes most of it again, leaving an introduction coincidentally similar to that of *Thomas*.
2. On the differences in the purpose clauses between Mark 12.2/Matt 21.34 and Luke 20.10/GTh 65.2, Kloppenborg argues that λαμβάνειν and διδόναι are 'stereotypical verbs used in the description of leasing arrangements' and so 'little can be made of the agreements between Thomas and the Synoptics'.[65] It is important, however, that one does not say that *nothing* can be made of it, but that is what it amounts to in Kloppenborg's rhetoric. This is a minor agreement, to be sure, but it has a place in a cumulative case.
3. On the point of Luke's and *Thomas*'s difference from Mark in reserving the killing for the son alone, I have not been able to discover a comment in Kloppenborg's monograph.
4. On the instances of 'perhaps' in Luke and *Thomas*, Kloppenborg argues that the 'perhaps' is 'fundamental to Thomas's redactional purpose and only incidental to Luke's'; as such, 'one might well conclude that Luke reflects

means specifically Egyptian. So both the item (the fence) and the terminology for it (φραγμός) are clearly unproblematic in a Palestinian context. (2) On the legal side, Kloppenborg argues (*Tenants*, 330–4) that *Thomas*'s reference to the killing of the heir better reflects law in contrast to Mark 12.7's apparently ludicrous claim that the tenants would inherit. But the reasoning of *Thomas*'s tenants is just as ludicrous: the heir is not the owner of the vineyard, so why should the tenants maintain their ownership by killing the heir? Moreover, as noted above, *Thomas* gives less of an explanation than do the Synoptics.

63 Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 269–76.

64 Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas*, 51.

65 Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 258–9.

knowledge of a parable such as Thomas's'.[66] It is hard to know how seriously Kloppenborg is putting forward this option, given that he has previously insisted on Luke's redaction exclusively of Mark. He muddies the waters further by saying how difficult the situation is to assess given that Luke only uses ἴσως here (in fact, as noted above, it is a *hapax* in the NT) and that this is *Thomas*'s only use of ⲙⲉⲱⲁⲕ. But this is surely the point: Luke's use of a relatively unusual word (and indeed *Thomas*'s adding a further 'perhaps') is all the more reason to suspect that *Thomas* is here incorporating a Lukan redactional feature.

5. On the matter of Luke and *Thomas* ending their uses of the Psalm with v. 22, Kloppenborg notes the point, without further explanation.[67] In sum, Kloppenborg's monograph, for all its massive learning, does not explain away the evidence for *Mk* → *Lk* → *GTh*.

3.5. *GTh 33.2-3/Luke 11.33*

Mark 4.21	Matt 5.15	Luke 8.16	Luke 11.33	GTh 33.2-3
A lamp does not come	Nor do they light a lamp	No one lights a lamp	No one lights a lamp	For no one lights a lamp
in order to be put under the bushel or under the couch.	and put it under the bushel.	and hides it with a vessel or puts it under a couch.	and puts it in a hidden place [ℵBCD et al. + or under a bushel]	and puts it under a bushel, or puts it in a hidden place.
Is it not to be put on its lampstand?	No, on its lampstand, and it will give light to everyone in the household.	No, he puts it on a lampstand, so that those who go in may see the light.	No, on its lampstand, so that those who go in may see the light.	No, he puts it upon its lampstand, so that everyone who goes in *and comes out* will see its light.

GTh 33 has not been sufficiently probed for its potential links with this Lukan doublet. The similarity between Luke and *Thomas* can be seen first in the opening phrase. (1) In contrast to Mark's quasi-personification of the lamp (μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος), and Matthew's anonymous 3rd pers. pl. (οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον), Luke has the more straightforward οὐδεὶς [8.16 + δὲ] λύχνον ἅψας.... *Thomas*'s phrasing (ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲭⲉⲣⲉ ϩⲛⲃ̅ⲥ̅) is essentially

66 Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 259.

67 Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 269.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same, and so they are closest to each other. (2) In the next section of text, Luke 11.33 and *Thomas* are again closest, sharing the location 'in a secret place' (εἰς κρύπτην [P45: εἰς κρυπτόν] / ϩⲙ̄ ⲙⲁ ⲉⲣϩⲛⲡ); Luke 8.16 does not have the 'hidden place' but does have the verb καλύπτει. Two further elements look even more like Lukan redactional features incorporated into *Thomas*. (3) *Thomas*'s reference to 'everyone who goes in and comes out' (ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ) looks like an incorporation, and expansion, of Luke's redactional 'those who go in' (οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι). Finally, (4) there is the shared reference to them seeing the light (τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν / ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲡⲉⲣⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ). Together, these features constitute solid evidence in favour of Luke's influence (specifically that of Luke 11.33) upon *Thomas*.[68]

3.6. *GTh 99/Luke 8.20-21*

The following Synoptic parallels also overlap with a dialogue attributed to the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (Epiphanius *Pan.* 30.14.5), as well as a much abbreviated version of less account in 2 *Clement* 9.11.

Mark 3.32-35	Matt 12.47-50	Luke 8.20-21	GTh 99	G. Eb.
'Behold, your mother and your brothers [and your sisters] are outside seeking you'.	'Behold, your mother and your brothers are standing outside, seeking to speak to you.	'Your mother and your brothers are standing outside, wanting to see you'.	'Your brothers and your mother are standing outside'.	'Behold, your mother and your brothers are standing outside'.
And he replied and said to them,	He replied and said to the one who had spoken to him,	He replied and said to them,	He said to them,	
'Who are my mother and my brothers?' And looking around at those sitting in a circle around him, he said,	'Who is my mother and who are my brothers?' And stretching out his hand to his disciples, he said,			'Who are my mother and [my] brothers?' And stretching out his hand to his disciples, he said,

68 If one were heavily committed to Occam's razor, one could appeal to the text-form found in Luke 11.33 ℵBCD et al. as sufficient to account for *Thomas*'s phraseology. This would perhaps impose too narrow constraints upon the sources available to *Thomas*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mark 3.32-35	Matt 12.47-50	Luke 8.20-21	GTh 99	G. Eb.
'Behold my mother and my brothers.	'Behold my mother and my brothers.			
[For] whoever does the will of God, he is my brother and sister and mother'.	For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven, he is my brother and sister and mother'.	'My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and carry it out'.	'Those here who do the will of my Father, these are my brothers and my mother. They it is who will enter the kingdom of my Father'.	'These are my my brothers and mother, who do the will of God'.

First, there is a relatively insignificant point: *Thomas* shares with Matthew and Luke the plus, '*standing* outside', but this is not particularly noteworthy because 'standing' is also mentioned in the scene-setting in Mark 3.31 and Matt 12.46. Only marginally more significant is that *Thomas*, with Luke alone, lacks 'behold' at the beginning: this is perhaps interesting because *Thomas* likes using 'behold' (GTh 3, 9, 10, 113, 114), but in general shared *minuses* are probably less significant than shared *pluses*. However, Luke 8.21 and *Thomas* share a quite substantial *minus* in Jesus' reply which is rather more noteworthy. Finally, again on a minor note, the end of the saying in *Thomas* shares Luke's plurals (as opposed to indefinite singulars) in 8.21. It is possible that the Lukan and the Thomasine versions developed these features in parallel in oral tradition, but equally the written form of Luke's Gospel may have made an impact upon this oral tradition.[69]

3.7. *GTh 104/Luke 5.33-35*

Here we have a saying which even some who vigorously advocate *Thomas*'s independence concede has features of Lukan redaction.[70]

69 Quispel, 'The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament', 190–1, thinks that the version in *G. Eb.* is related to *Thomas* via the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, but the similarities between *Thomas* and *G. Eb.* here are unremarkable.

70 Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 80–1, 92–3 (reasons on p. 81); C. W. Hedrick, 'An Anecdotal Argument for the Independence of the *Gospel of Thomas* from the Synoptic Gospels', *For the Children Perfect Instruction: Studies in Honor of Hans-Martin Schenke* (ed. H.-G. Bethge et al.; NHMS 54; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 113–26 (118–19).

Mark 2.18-20	Luke 5.33-35	GTh 104
John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting; and they came and said to him,	They said to him,	They said to Jesus,
'Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but your disciples do not fast?'	'John's disciples often fast and pray, and so do the disciples of the Pharisees, but yours go on eating and drinking'.	'Come, let us pray today, and let us fast'.
And Jesus said to them, 'While the bridegroom is with them, the attendants of the bridegroom cannot fast, can they? So long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.	Jesus answered, 'Can you make the guests of the bridegroom fast while he is with them?	Jesus said, 'What sin have I committed, or how have I been defeated?
'But the days will come when the bridegroom is taken away from them, and then they will fast in that day'.	'But the time will come when the bridegroom will be taken from them; in those days they will fast'.	'But when the bridegroom comes out of the bridal chamber, then let there be fasting and prayer'.

This saying has obviously been substantially altered in *Thomas.* Nevertheless, *Thomas* includes an element of Lukan redaction—the reference to *prayer* as well as fasting. *Thomas* in fact includes two instances of this pairing, the first reversing the Lukan order, the second (no doubt quite unconsciously) restoring the Lukan order in Jesus' reply.[71]

3.8. *GTh 100/Luke 20.22–24*

Before considering an important final example (3.10), we can consider briefly here two more speculative cases.

Mark 12.14-16	Luke 20.22,24	GTh 100
'Is it right to pay the poll-tax to Caesar or not? Do we pay or do we not pay?'...	'Is it right for us to pay tax to Caesar or not?'...	They showed Jesus a gold coin and asked him, 'Caesar's men demand taxes from us.'...

71 On a more minor note, *Thomas*'s version also contains an abbreviation of the Markan version similar to that of Luke.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mark 12.14-16	Luke 20.22,24	GTh 100
[Jesus said,] 'Bring me a denarius so that I can see it'. And they brought it...	[Jesus said,] 'Show me a denarius'. [א *א^{c} C L N* f^{1} f^{13} *et al.*: And they showed it to him.]...	

There are some 'minor agreements' between Luke and *Thomas* here. First, Luke and *Thomas* both share a generalised reference to 'tax' (φόρος/ϣωʍ), in contrast to the more specific 'poll-tax' of Matthew and Mark (κῆνσος).[72] Secondly, *Thomas* and Luke have greater visuality, in their references to *showing* (over against 'bringing' the denarius in Mark).[73] It may be relevant that this is even stronger in certain texts of Luke.[74]

3.9. *GTh 26/Luke 6.42*

Matt 7.5 (NA^{27})	Luke 6.42 (NA^{27} = P^{75} B W)	Luke 6.42 (אAC go etc.)	GTh 26
καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου	καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν	καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου	καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου

If one merely compared *Thomas* with NA^{27} or the standard synopses, it would be very difficult here to say that *Thomas* is dependent on either Matthew or Luke, or any of the other possible ways round—the forms of the saying are all just too similar to each other. DeConick concludes that independent oral development is evident from the 'common words and phrases with varying sequences and inflections'.[75]

This is quite possible, but if Nestle-Aland is right about the original or earliest recoverable form of the text (and this is a big if), then we may have three stages: (1) the second column representing the earliest form of Lukan text; (2) a second-

72 S. Arai, 'Caesar's, God's and Mine: Mark 12:17 par. and Gos. Thom. 100', *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte. FS Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Preissler and H. Seiwert; Marburg: Diagonal, 1994) 43–8 (46).

73 Matt 22.19 also has the imperative ἐπιδείξατε, however.

74 On a very minor note indeed, Matthew, Luke and *Thomas* (but not Mark) have a pronominal reference to Jesus in the final apophthegm; only Mark has ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς.

75 DeConick, *Original*, 129.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

century scribal modification, perhaps under the influence of knowledge of Matthew; (3) *Thomas*'s reproduction of this 'Luke2' form of the saying. This is not necessarily a particularly persuasive example, and is offered more as a speculative possibility, but this field of study is certainly one which merits further attention.

What this saying does confirm is the extreme likelihood of a literary relationship between *Thomas* and the Synoptics at the Greek stage: the striking string of very similar Greek words is surely instructive on this point. It is at the very least an indication of a literary relationship (without thereby excluding orality as well) between *Thomas* and the Synoptics, but this saying on its own probably cannot make clear either the direction of the influence among the three versions.

3.10. *GTh 47.3-5/Luke 5.36-39*

This example has been left to last because it leads into Part 4, and consideration of the *GTh* → *Lk* position. *Thomas*'s versions of the brief 'parables' of the old-and-new-wine, and the patch-on-the-garment, are of interest here because Riley claims that they supply evidence for the influence of *Thomas* on Luke. What attracts Riley's attention is Luke's addition to the Markan (and Matthean) version, in which the Lukan Jesus says, 'And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for he says, "The old is better." ' (Luke 5.39). This appears to contradict what Jesus has been saying. He has been stressing that the new cannot merely be sewn onto, or poured into, the old: rather, the new requires a whole new setting. On the other hand, the Lukan addition then, rather confusingly, praises the old. Riley understandably asks: 'Why did Luke add this sentence to the Markan saying about the Patches and Wineskins?'[76] Examination of the saying in *Thomas* turns up an interesting fact, according to Riley: the version in GTh 47 'values the old over the new throughout'.[77] This is questionable,[78] but in any case, it leads Riley to give the following account of the Mark–*Thomas*–Luke relationship:

76 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 233.

77 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 234.

78 Rather, following the theme of the first half of GTh 47, it seems that the over-riding concern is the incompatibility of opposites. GTh 47.1-2 note the impossibility of riding two horses, drawing two bows and serving two masters. Similarly, GTh 47.3-4 simply refer to the incongruity of an old patch on a new garment, and of new wine in old skins and *vice versa*; the old is not valued over the new in these cases. It is quite possible that GTh 47.5 values the old wine over the new, but only if one already knows that old wine is preferable.

Mark 2.21-22 →	GTh 47.3-5 →	Luke 5.36-39
[A] No one sews a patch of unshrunk cloth on an old garment. If he does, the new piece will pull away from the old, making the tear worse.	**[C]** No man drinks old wine and immediately desires to drink new wine. **[B]** And new wine is not put into old wineskins, lest they burst; nor is old wine put into a new wineskin, lest it (the wineskin) spoil it. **[A]** An old patch is not sewn onto a new garment, because a tear would result.	**[A]** No one tears a patch from a new garment and sews it on an old one. If he does, he will have torn the new garment, and the patch from the new will not match the old.
[B] And no one pours new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the wine will burst the skins, and both the wine and the wineskins will be ruined. No, he pours new wine into new wineskins.		**[B]** And no one pours new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the new wine will burst the skins, the wine will run out and the wineskins will be ruined. No, new wine must be poured into new wineskins.
		[C] And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for he says, 'The old is better'.

The complexity of Riley's theory is evident from the series of verbs in his summary of what happened: 'Thomas Christianity inherited … it redacted … reversing … emphasized … introducing … conflated':[79] *Thomas* takes the Markan version, adds a new preface, and reverses the original order. Luke then takes both the Markan and the Thomasine version. He keeps the Markan order and overall sense, but takes *Thomas*'s preface and puts it at the end, introducing a contradictory saying.

Elegant this solution is not. There is a solution which is more economical, involving only two steps: supplementation and reversal. Luke supplements the Markan version with his postscript, and *Thomas* takes the Lukan version and reverses the order of the elements as follows:

Mark 2.21-22 →	Luke 5.36-39 →	GTh 47.3-5
[A] No one sews a patch of unshrunk cloth on an old garment. If he does, the new piece will pull away from the old, making the tear worse.	**[A]** No one tears a patch from a new garment and sews it on an old one. If he does, he will have torn the new garment, and the patch from the new will not match the old.	**[C]** No man drinks old wine and immediately desires to drink new wine.

79 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 234.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mark 2.21-22 →	Luke 5.36-39 →	GTh 47.3-5
[B] And no one pours new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the wine will burst the skins, and both the wine and the wineskins will be ruined. No, he pours new wine into new wineskins.	**[B]** And no one pours new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the new wine will burst the skins, the wine will run out and the wineskins will be ruined. No, new wine must be poured into new wineskins.	**[B]** And new wine is not put into old wineskins, lest they burst; nor is old wine put into a new wineskin, lest it (the wineskin) spoil it. **[A]**An old patch is not sewn onto a new garment, because a tear would result.
	[C] And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for he says, 'The old is better'.	

As such, the simple solution would be: AB → ABC → CBA. Of course a great many complexities attend the transmission of Synoptic sayings, but this is all the more reason not to multiply complexities unnecessarily.

The difficulty with the Lukan addition is not nearly so extreme as Riley suggests: probably a majority of commentators—who cannot merely be dismissed in a footnote—consider Luke 5.39 to be a comment on Jesus' interlocutors being reluctant to change their ways and embrace the new.[80] This corresponds well with the question about fasting which has just been addressed to Jesus, and especially with the two pericopes following at the beginning of Luke 6. As such, we have here a good case for *Thomas* incorporating Lukan redaction.[81]

4. The Influence of *Thomas* upon Luke?

Finally, we can briefly consider two more examples of alleged *GTh → Lk*, which can both be shown to be problematic. The intention in the treatment of these two cases is not to argue positively for the influence of Luke upon

80 E.g. G. B. Caird, *Saint Luke* (Pelican New Testament Commentaries; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963) 98; H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar 3; Freiburg: Herder, 1969) 1.300; I. H. Marshall, *Commentary on Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 228; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel of Luke I–IX* (AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1982) 597; J. Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20* (WBC 35A; Waco: Word, 1989) 250; E. Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 3rd ed. 1993) 73–4.

81 DeConick again emphasises the process of oral transmission (*Original*, 175), but this need not be pitted against literary influence.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thomas, but rather simply to show that Thomasine influence on Luke cannot be sustained in either instance.

4.1. *GTh 72/Luke 12.13-14*

GTh 72	Luke 12.13-14
A m[a]n said to him,	Someone from the crowd said to him,
'Tell my brothers to divide my father's property with me'.	'Teacher, tell my brother to divide the inheritance with me'.
He (Jesus) said to him, 'O man, who has made me a divider?'...	He (Jesus) said to him, 'Man, who appointed me a judge or divider (μεριστήν) over you?'...

A generation ago, the complex debate between Quispel and Baarda on whether *Thomas* was dependent here upon Luke reached something of a stalemate,[82] but Riley has reopened the case, arguing for Luke's dependence upon *Thomas*.[83] He claims that Baarda's Achilles heel is his lack of attention to Luke's quirky word μεριστής. According to Riley, 'the word itself is until the time of Luke a *hapax legomenon* [*sic*], occurring here for the first time in extant Greek literature'. Riley continues, noting the 'strange word', and claiming that 'there was no such office or title in any court or system of arbitration ... neither in Greco-Roman nor Jewish culture'. Moreover, 'the Lukan story certainly has no need of it; the text reads more naturally without the new and awkward expression'.[84] Hence Riley's question: 'Why was the term coined and why is it in the text of Luke?'[85]

Enter the *Gospel of Thomas*, where 'divider' (ⲣⲉⲕⲡⲱϣⲉ) fits perfectly naturally in GTh 72, and more generally with *Thomas*'s Jesus, who 'comes from the undivided' (GTh 61.3). This anomalous word crept into Luke because the original saying had 'judge'; *Thomas* replaced this with 'divider', and Luke conflated the two.[86]

The fundamental problem with Riley's theory, however, is in the claim that μεριστής is a Lukan neologism. One might gain this impression from the main text of LSJ, though second-century references in Pollux Grammaticus and

82 G. Quispel, 'The Discussion of Judaic Christianity', *VC* 22 (1968) 81–93 (85–6); T. Baarda, 'Luke 12:13-14: Text and Transmission from Marcion to Augustine', *Early Transmission of the Words of Jesus: Thomas, Tatian and the Text of the New Testament* (Amsterdam: Free University, 1983) 117–72; repr. from *Judaism, Christianity and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 107–62.

83 Similarly DeConick, *Original*, 230, taking account of a parallel in an Islamic text.

84 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 230.

85 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 231.

86 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 232.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Vettius Valens might give pause for concluding that 'the word appears to be a coinage arising in this very saying'.[87]

However, the 1968 LSJ supplement includes a third-century BCE inscription mentioning μεριστaί, glossed 'financial officials at Istria'.[88] After being noted in the *Bulletin épigraphique* for 1955 (to which the LSJ supplement refers), it was published in Pippidi's edition of the Istria inscriptions, which also contains another partially reconstructed, and two fully reconstructed, instances of μεριστής.[89] These appear in a formula assigning duties to the οἰκονόμος and the μεριστής respectively: 'The *oikonomos* is to pay out the cost, the *meristai* are to distribute it'.[90]

Another almost complete example comes in a second-century BCE Magnesian inscription: 'Three envoys from all the craftsmen are to be despatched both now and for all time, and the *meristai* (τοὺς μερι[σ]τά[ς]) are to give them whatever the assembly commands for the sacrifice…' (*IMagn* 54, ll. 34–37).[91] Unfortunately the inscription breaks off shortly after this notice. Perhaps they were, as above, responsible for the distribution of funds, in this case for sacrifices.[92]

There are also two cases in technical writings from the first century CE. The first comes in Apion's glossary of Homeric terms, which appears to flout the golden rule of lexicography by explaining an obscure word by other words just as obscure: δαιτρός (*Od.* 1.141): ὁ μάγειρος καὶ ὁ μεριστής ('carver': 'butcher' and 'divider').[93] So μεριστής is acceptable as an equivalent of two terms which are known to refer to meat-cutting, a rather different sense from that above.

Finally, the first-century CE astrologer Dorotheus of Sidon says that a son has an ill-starred destiny if there is a 'divider of the periods' (μεριστὴς τῶν χρόνων) in

87 Riley, 'Influence of Thomas Christianity', 230.

88 LSJ Suppl., 98, citing '*Bull. épigr.* 1955. 163 (p.57)'.

89 D. M. Pippidi, *Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graecae et Latinae. Volumen Primum: Inscriptiones Histriae et Viciniae* (Bucharest: Typis Academiae Scientiarum Dacoromanae, 1983).

90 *IHistriae* 6, ll. 3–5: τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα δοῦναι τὸν οἰκονόμον, μερίσαι δὲ τοὺς μεριστάς; cf. *IHistriae* 19, ll. 3–5: … [μερὶσα]ι δ[ὲ τ]οὺς μερ[ιστάς]. Cf. the fully restored instances in *IHistriae* 21, l. 5 and *IHistriae* 40, l. 2.

91 See O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1900) 45, and xxx-xxxi for the date.

92 For more on the μεριστaί, see M. W. Baldwin Bowsky, 'Epigrams to the Elder Statesman and a Young Noble from Lato Pros Kamara (Crete)', *Hesperia* 58 (1989) 115–29 (122); A. S. Henry, 'Provisions for the Payment of Athenian Decrees: A Study in Formulaic Language', *ZPE* 78 (1989) 247–95 for references to the οἱ μεριζόμενοι and the annual μερισμός in Athens (261, 263), and further references to the verb μερίσαι in contexts similar to those of the Istria and Magnesia inscriptions (268–9, 273–92).

93 A. Ludwich, 'Ueber die Homerischen Glossen Apions', *Philologus* 74 (1917) 205–47 (228, ll. 22–23).

his horoscope.[94] Although the meaning of this designation is not obvious, it also occurs in LSJ's example from Vettius Valens in the second century CE. There the μεριστὴς χρόνων ζωῆς is the lord of the horoscope,[95] and so the sense is probably the same in Dorotheus. Pollux Grammaticus provides the other example from the second century cited by LSJ.

In sum, then, the word is used in a variety of settings in the pre-Christian period and the first century CE. While it could not be claimed that μεριστής is a common word, it is certainly—*pace* Riley—no Lukan or Thomasine invention either.[96] This does not of course prove Lukan influence upon *Thomas*, but it does remove the basis for Riley's argument that *Thomas* has contributed to the form of Luke 12.

4.2. *GTh 76.3/Luke 12.33*

A further instance of *GTh → Lk* has recently been proposed by Steven Johnson.[97] He begins by enthusiastically taking up Riley's conclusions above: he considers Riley to have 'demonstrated' Lukan use of GTh 47, and comments that 'Riley chose perhaps the clearest and strongest cases for Lukan dependence on the Thomas tradition'.[98] Be that as it may, Johnson suggests a further instance, in which GTh 76 is influential as one of a number of sources for Luke 12.33:

Gospel sources:		**Luke 12.33**
Mark 10.21	Go, sell (sing.) what you have and give (sing.) to the poor.	Sell (pl.) your possessions and give (pl.) alms.
Q 12.33	Store up for yourselves	Make for yourselves purses which do not wear out,
GTh 76.3	<his> treasure which does not fail	unfailing treasure
GTh 76.3 Q 12.33	which remains in heaven	in heaven,
Q 12.33	where neither worm nor rust destroys, and where thieves neither break in nor steal.	where no thief approaches and no worm destroys.

94 *Dor.* 2.33.4. D. Pingree, ed., *Dorothei Sidonii Carmen Astrologicum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1976) 359–60.

95 LSJ, 1104a.

96 Riley ('Influence of Thomas Christianity', 230–2) does not state whether he thinks that the actual term μεριστής was the word used in Greek *Thomas*. On the basis of his emphasis on Luke's apparent coinage of the word, he might think some other wording was used; on the other hand, Riley may be speaking rhetorically of the situation for the analysis of the Lukan language when one leaves *Thomas* out of consideration.

97 Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, esp. 58–79.

98 Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 77, n. 50; cf. 12.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

In sum, according to Johnson, Luke 'recomposed Q 12:53 with the aide of Mark 10:21 and GTh 76:3'.[99]

Leaving aside the questions of the influence of Mark and Q, the key point for our purposes is the theory of GTh 76.3 as a source, and here a number of problems surface. First, in Johnson's main synopsis, the word in *Thomas* for 'which does not fail' (ⲉⲙⲁⲭⲱⲭⲛ̄) is retroverted into the very odd Greek phrase μὴ τὸν ἀπολλύμενον, surely a solecism.[100] Secondly, it is perhaps peculiar that Johnson posits a retroversion employing a form of ἀπολλύναι, when *Thomas*'s ⲉⲙⲁⲭⲱⲭⲛ̄ is closer to Luke's ἀνέκλειπτον: Crum's first equivalent for ⲱⲭⲛ̄ is ἐκλείπειν (Crum 539a),[101] and conversely Luke's ἀνέκλειπτον is translated in Luke 12.53 as ⲁⲧⲱⲭⲛ̄. Thirdly, more strange, is the answer to the question, 'What does *Thomas* contribute to the Lukan saying?' In Johnson's view, it is not what appears closest in the synopsis above, because of his purported Greek for *Thomas*'s 'which does not fail'. Rather, it is 'the idea for a qualifier of "treasure"';[102] Luke did not get the actual qualifier itself: this Luke changes from μὴ τὸν ἀπολλύμενον to ἀνέκλειπτον. So what *Thomas* contributes to Luke, according to Johnson, is merely the *idea* of a second qualifier. This is clearly quite a paltry contribution.

Johnson's puzzlement at those who argue for the canonical Gospels' influence on *Thomas* is expressed as follows: '*why* would the composer of GTh 76:3 go to such trouble picking out individual words here and there from *three*, or even *all four* canonical Gospels?'[103] Irrespective of how many sources are needed (as we have seen, Johnson's Luke requires three here: Mark, Q and *Thomas*), this question assumes that other scholars think of composition taking place in the same woodenly scribal manner as does Johnson.[104] Much more likely is an oral tradition combining numerous converging traditions. Johnson claims that other theories are more complicated than his view of Luke's use of three sources, and rejects a view positing 'secondary orality' because he considers that John 6.27 would have to be included in the oral tradition influencing *Thomas*.[105] This is spurious, however, as the connections between John and *Thomas* are thin here: Johnson generally overemphasises the commonality.[106]

99 Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 76.

100 Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 63.

101 There are, however, a number of possible equivalents, including ἀπολλύναι (539b).

102 Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 72–3.

103 Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 69.

104 Johnson, in his inquiries as to why *Thomas* would use 'Matthew's order of adversities … but Luke's verbs' (*Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 70), etc. is too insistent upon theological reasons for small differences among versions. Such variation might easily be the result of the vagaries of oral transmission. Johnson, however, operates with a highly scribalised model of dependence, in which every variation needs to be justified.

105 Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 71.

106 Johnson's 'μὴ τὸν ἀπολλύμενον' is similar to John's language, but only because Johnson's retroversion has made it so. As noted, *Thomas*'s ⲉⲙⲁⲭⲱⲭⲛ̄ is just as close to Luke's

In sum, there are so many difficulties with this theory that it is hard to see how it could find acceptance: the same goes for the other cases alleging *GTh* → *Luke*. As mentioned above, however, these two sayings discussed here in Part 4 are not proposed as evidence pointing in the other direction (*Lk* → *GTh*); the arguments here are simply negative.

5. Conclusion

The *Gospel of Thomas*, then, constitutes an interesting chapter in the reception-history of Luke. This is not 'reception' in the sense in which Origen uses *recipiunt* in *Hom. in Luc.* 16: it is too strong to say, with Gärtner, that 'the school of thought which collected and shaped the Gospel of Thomas had a distinct preference for Luke'.[107] On the other hand, although we have not had space here to compare with Matthew, Luke is almost certainly the closer to *Thomas* in many respects.

This influence is very probably *indirect*. It may possibly come via a written Gospel harmony, but this can only remain, like the Jewish-Christian sources of Cullmann and Schramm, a speculative possibility.[108] What *Thomas* is almost certainly dependent upon, however, is a harmony in the sense of an oral tradition shaped by the written forms of Matthew, Mark and Luke (and perhaps other Gospels as well): as already mentioned in Part 2, this has come to be known as 'secondary orality'. Tuckett's formulation neatly avoids a nihilism that can come from absolutising textual fluidity in his claim that our form of *Thomas* is influenced by our form of the Synoptics.[109] Moreover, this influence results in a *measure* of dependence as we defined this in Part 2 above.

Can we know when in the textual transmission of *Thomas* this influence might have happened? There seems to be no problem with supposing this influence to have happened, at least in part, at the Greek stage of transmission. This is suggested at least by the items of Greek syntax or vocabulary which turn up in the Greek fragments of *Thomas*—witness δεκτός, for example, and the remarkable near-identical sequences in Greek GTh 26 and its Synoptic parallels. As such, Luke's influence on *Thomas* 'as we have it' is on the original Greek *Thomas*, not only on the Coptic translation.[110] As to location, this is extremely

ἀνέκλειπτον; on the other hand, *Thomas*'s ϵqмнн ϵвол is a standard equivalent for a participle of μένω, as in Johnson's retroversion, and in John 6.27. The perishing/enduring contrast is conventional, however (e.g. Eccl 7.15's righteous ἀπολλύμενος and wicked μένων).

107 Gärtner, *Theology*, 67.

108 Gärtner, *Theology*, 66.

109 Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', 157.

110 I avoid here the debate over the original language of *Thomas*, taking it to be Greek.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868851000024X Published online by Cambridge University Press

difficult: we do not know for sure where *Thomas* was written; theories about the place of composition of Luke are even more uncertain, and very little can be said with precision about the early geographical dispersion of Luke.

The examples above are not claimed as the *only* cases of Lukan influence. The method applied here is limited in the results it can produce. In addition to the influence from the Lukan material paralleled in Mark, *Thomas* may be influenced by special Lukan material (as Bovon attempted to show) and/or by Lukan material paralleled only in Matthew (as Tuckett has argued). Arguments along these lines, however, are much more open to doubt. Perhaps this will always be the case, although it remains possible that new methods might be formulated which enable greater certainty to be had. It is equally possible that new excavations of papyri, or even discoveries in the unopened boxes of Oxyrhynchus material, will open new doors for this field of study.