# "In" or "About"? Gospel of Thomas 52 and "Hebraizing" Greek

Bentley Layton's edition and Thomas O. Lambdin's English translation of the Coptic text<sup>1</sup> present the *Gospel of Thomas* saying 52 as follows:

педат нач йої нечнаентно де доутачте йпрофитно ауфаде рй пісрана ауф ауфаде тироу рраї йритк педач нау де атетйкю йпетонр йпетййто євоа ауф атетйфаде ра нетнооут – His disciples said to him: "Twenty-four prophets spoke in Israel, and all of them spoke in you." He said to them: "You have omitted the one living in your presence and have spoken (only) of the dead."

In this article I would like to discuss the first part of the saying. The disciples state that 24 prophets spoke "in" ( $pai \ q\bar{n}$ -) Jesus. What does it mean? In the first half of the article, I will survey the interpretations that have been proposed by various scholars up until now and try to show why these proposals seem to be unsatisfactory. In the second part of the article, I will offer my own solution to the problem.

(a) The first interpretation I would like to discuss is the one of Tjitze Baarda.<sup>2</sup> Baarda suggests that <code>zpaï nounce</code> in saying 52 renders <code>πεpi σoû</code> or <code>čπì σoû</code> in the Greek *Vorlage*. While I agree with his thesis that "[t]he rendering about you' seems to be the

most appropriate, for it reflects the common early Christian idea that the Old Testament prophesy spoke about Jesus", I do not find his retranslation convincing since he does not offer any argument why the Coptic translator would render  $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i  $\sigma$ o $\hat{v}$  or  $\epsilon\pi$ i  $\sigma$ o $\hat{v}$  with cpai  $\bar{n}e$ нтк. Crum gives no example of rendering  $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i with cpai cn-.<sup>3</sup> As for the preposition  $\epsilon\pi$ í, Crum lists two Sahidic texts where it is rendered with cpai cn-, but only one of them, Wisdom 12:17, seems to be valid.<sup>4</sup>

ἰσχὺν γὰρ ἐνδείκνυσαι ἀπιστούμενος ἐπὶ δυνάμεως τελειότητι καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰδόσι τὸ θράσος ἐξελέγχεις – For on the basis of the completeness of your power you show your strength when you are distrusted, and you rebuke any insolence among those who know (you).<sup>5</sup>

1 Layton 1989, 1:72–73.

<sup>2</sup> Baarda 2003, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Crum 684b. One might add that  $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i is never translated with gpaï gū- in the Sahidic New Testament. See Wilmet 1957–9, 3:1468.

<sup>4</sup> The first instance, Ps 105:29, appeared there due to a misprint, since it is actually an example of rendering ἐν with ϩpaï ϩñ-. I should mention though that ℵ and few other witnesses read ἐπ' αὐτούς instead of ἐν αὐτοῖς. Still, we have no reason to suggest that the Sahidic translation of Ps 105:29 had ἐπί in its Vorlage.

<sup>5</sup> I altered the NRSV translation in order to present the text in a way the Coptic translator understood it.

коушыў гар евол йтекоон ете й сенарте ерос ан, граї гй тнйттелеюс йтекнонте, ектано йнооу епеканарте гй нетсооун йнок – For in the completeness of your power you reveal your strength while they do not believe in it, and you show your power among those who know you.<sup>6</sup>

Of all the numerous instances of rendering  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i$  with gpaï (or egpaï) + a preposition listed in the *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique*<sup>7</sup> I was able to find only one example where  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i$  was rendered with gpaï  $2\bar{n}$ -, Acts 3:16.<sup>8</sup>

καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τοῦτον ὃν θεωρεῖτε καὶ ὀἴδατε, ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν – And by faith in his (i.e. Jesus') name, his name itself has made this man strong, whom you see and know; and the faith that is through Jesus has given him this perfect health in the presence of all of you (NRSV).

ауш граї глітпістіс іппечрам паї ететлімау ероч ауш ететлісооулі інмоч ацтахроч лібппечрам ауш тпістіс тевох гітоотц ас† мац іппеїоухаї іппетлійто евох тнртлі – And in the faith of his (i.e. Jesus') name his name made him whom you see and whom you know firm, and the faith that is through him gave to him this health in front of all of you.

Wisdom 12:17 and Acts 3:16 appear to be the only two instances where  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i$  is rendered with gpaï g $\bar{n}$ -.<sup>9</sup> In both cases, the Coptic translators seem to understand the meaning of  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i$  with dative as "on the basis of"<sup>10</sup> and thus translated it with gpaï g $\bar{n}$ -. In neither of these cases, does  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i$  introduce the subject of speech.<sup>11</sup> If the Coptic translator of *Thomas* had  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i$   $\sigma o \hat{v}$  in the Greek *Vorlage*, it would be a very unusual and, more importantly, unmotivated decision to render it with gpaï  $\bar{n}g\mu$ TK.<sup>12</sup>

It should be noted that, according to Crum, Coptic  $2pa\ddot{i} 2n$ - usually renders Greek  $\dot{\epsilon}v$ . With the exception of Baarda, all scholars, including myself, assume that the same is the case with *Thomas* 52.

(b) Uwe-Karsten Plisch translates  $\[equation problem Plisch translates]$  with "through you" and suggests that  $\[equation problem Plink relation problem Plink relation problem Plink relation problem plane in the same instrumental meaning as$ 

έν in Hebrews 1:1–2. According to Plisch, "Jesus is addressed as the personified Wisdom of God who expressed herself through the mouth of Israel's prophets".<sup>13</sup> I do not find this interpretation possible. The concept described by Plisch is present neither in Hebrews 1:1–2<sup>14</sup> nor in *Thomas* 52.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, if we translate 2PAI  $\bar{N}$ PHTK with "through you", the disciples would state an opposite idea, that it was the prophets who spoke through Christ, not vice versa!

(c) A third option is that the prophets spoke "in" Jesus in the same sense as they spoke "in" the Spirit.<sup>16</sup> Of course, the idea that a true prophet prophesies  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu \pi\nu\epsilon\dot{\nu}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ , i.e., "by the Spirit", is quite common in early Christian literature.<sup>17</sup> Still, I cannot remember any source that states that the prophets spoke  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\hat{\omega}$ , i.e., that it was Jesus, not the Spirit, who inspired the prophets.

Moreover, in order to prove his or her case the proponent of this interpretation would need to "explain away" the wording of the quotation we find in Augustine. In *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*, Augustine quotes a heretic who in turn quotes a saying of Jesus from "apocryphal writings".<sup>18</sup> Augustine says that he does not know where his opponent got this testimony: "hoc testimonium de scripturis nescio quibus apocryphis protulit". The quotation runs as follows:<sup>19</sup>

Sed apostolis, inquit, dominus noster interrogantibus de Iudaeorum prophetis, quid sentiri deberet, qui de adventu eius aliquid cecinisse in praeteritum<sup>20</sup> putabantur, commotus talia eos etiam nunc sentire, respondit: *Dimisistis vivum, qui ante vos est et de mortuis fabulamini*.

He says, "When the apostles asked him what they should think of the prophets of the Jews who were thought to have in the past prophesied something about his coming, our Lord was disturbed that they should still have such ideas and answered them, You have abandoned the living one who is before you, and you tell stories about the dead" (trans. Roland J. Teske).

The affiliation of Augustine's anonymous adversary is unknown. John Kevin Coyle suggests that he could be a Manichaean "who has either misunderstood some of his own religion's tenets, or has consciously chosen to broaden their implications".<sup>21</sup> Coyle's suggestion is a tempting one since Thomas was quite popular among the Manichaeans.<sup>22</sup> But even if Coyle's suggestion is not right it is still quite probable that Augustine's opponent was familiar with Thomas. Not only the second part of saying 52 is close to the words of Jesus cited by Augustine's adversary, but also the first part of saying 52, the words of the disciples, has much in common with the sentence preceding the quotation in Augustine (in both cases we find the "prophets" that are somehow related to Israel/Jews, on the one hand, and to Jesus, on the other). It seems that Augustine's adversary paraphrased the text quite similar to that of saying 52, and it is noteworthy that according to this source the prophets proclaimed de adventu eius (scilicet domini), i.e. "about" Jesus, not "by" or "in" him.

(d) The last option that I would like to discuss in this section was never actually proposed by scholars, but it might be appropriate to discuss it as well in order to complete the picture. It is possible that צְאָם פָאָ- indicates connection or intimate association.<sup>23</sup> In this case, the prophets spoke "in Jesus" in the same sense as Paul spoke "in Christ".<sup>24</sup> This interpretation seems to be dubious due to the context of the saying. Jesus seems to be unhappy with the idea that someone else's witness might be necessary for the evaluation of his divine status, not with the notion that the prophets had close personal relations with him (or prophesized with his assistance as in the previous case). Moreover, Paul always applies the expression  $\dot{\epsilon}v X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\hat{\omega}$  to the present-day believers-in-Jesus and never to the Jewish prophets, i.e., the figures from the past. Finally, the wording of

- 6 The Coptic text is from Lagarde 1883, 88.
- 7 Wilmet 1957–9, 3:1467. Sadly, there are many misprints on this page.
- 8 The Coptic text is from Thompson 1932, 8.
- 9 It should be noted that  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i$  is absent in some of the early manuscripts of Acts 3:16, e.g. in  $\aleph^*$  and B. See NA<sup>27</sup>, *ad loc*. It is not clear what the reading of the Greek text un-

derlying the Coptic translation was.

- 10 See BDAG, s.v. ἐπί, 6a.
- 11 See LSJ, s.v. ἐπί, A. I. 2f.
- 12 Baarda (2003, 10), says that he is "not convinced by the retranslation ἐν σοί because then we would expect the Coptic preposition ϩӣ-", as in ϩӣ писрънλ. For my part, I am not convinced with Baarda's argument. First, ϩÑ- in ϩӣ писрънλ does not necessarily render ἐν, it could also render, e.g., εἰς. Second, the Coptic text of *Thomas* is very inconsistent. See, e.g., saying 74 where in one sentence we encounter two forms of the same Coptic word, ҳωтϵ and φω<τ>e.
- 13 Plisch 2008, 133.
- 14 According to Heb 1:1–2, God is the one who spoke first through the prophets and then through Christ. Nothing is said about Christ speaking through someone: πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἰῷ (NRSV: "Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son").
- 15 The idea of Jesus speaking through prophets is expressed in 1 Pet 1:10–11, in *Epistula apostolorum* 19, and in a saying quoted by Epiphanius: ὁ λαλῶν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἰδοὺ πάρειμι, i.e., "Behold, here I am, the one who speaks through the prophets" (Epiphanius *Panarion*, 23, 5; 41, 3; 66, 42; *Ancoratus*, 53). See Resch 1906, 207–208. Curiously enough, Epiphanius states that Jesus says this ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. I found the reference to this saying in Gärtner 1961, 153–154.
- 16 Professor Antti Marjanen kindly drew my attention to this interpretation in a letter of 11 November 2011.
- 17 E.g., 1 Cor 12:3; Did 11:7-8; Barn 10:2, 10:9.
- 18 Contra adversarium II.4.14.
- 19 The Latin text is from Daur 1985, 102.
- 20 The word is in accusative, even though one would expect it to be in ablative. For this reason, a few scholars offer alternative translations of "in praeteritum", e.g., "in Bezug auf der Vergangenheit" (Jeremias 1948, 64), "for the past" (Baarda 2003, 6). These alternative translations make the meaning of the whole sentence very obscure and, more importantly, are not necessary. In a large number of sources "in praeteritum" obviously means "in the past", see, e.g., Plinius Secundus *Epistulae* X, 97, 2 (I owe this reference to Helena Panczová); Tacitus *Annales* XIII, 14, 1; Tertullian *Adversus Iudaeos* 13, 15. See also the sources listed in Blundell 1980–95, 1017. On the interchange of "in" with ablative and with accusative in Latin, see Hofmann & Szantyr 1997, 276–277.
- 21 Coyle 2009, 306.
- 22 The Manichaean sources never mention *Thomas*, but it is very probable that they have quotations from it. See, e.g., *Kephalaia* 163, 26–29 (cf. *Thomas* 5). The church writers report that the Manichaeans read a "Gospel of Thomas" and I do not see any reason to doubt that it was a version of the text from Nag Hammadi.
- 23 See BDAG, s.v. ėv, 4c.
- 24 See, e.g., the expression ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν (2 Cor 2:17; 12:19).
- 25 See, e.g., Meyer 2007, 146; DeConick 2006, 184; Moreland 2006, 82.

the saying we find in Augustine makes this interpretation as problematic as the previous one.

It is noteworthy that not only Baarda, but a number of other scholars as well felt that the context of the saying suggests that the prophets spoke "about" Jesus and thus translated the phrase as "all of them spoke of you".<sup>25</sup> However, none of these scholars offered any explanation for such an interpretation. The problem is that 2pa"  $2\bar{n}$ - actually means "in", not "about".<sup>26</sup> In what follows I will try to argue that 2pa"  $2\bar{n}$ - appeared in the Coptic text because the translator most probably failed to understand the expression in the Greek *Vorlage*.

One of the ways to deal with the obscurity of the *Thomas* sayings is to try to imagine what word or expression Coptic translator(s) might have had in the Greek *Vorlage*. Of course, speculation in this case is to a certain degree unavoidable, but since most of the *Thomas* sayings are present in a single Coptic manuscript, and since in certain cases there is no doubt that *Thomas*' translator(s)<sup>27</sup> or scribe(s)<sup>28</sup> made mistakes, this approach could benefit to our understanding of the text of *Thomas*. Since the meaning of the Coptic text of saying 52 is unclear, it is possible that the Greek text translated into Coptic had an ambiguous expression.<sup>29</sup> I suggest that the expression was  $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu \epsilon \nu \tau tv$ .

As I have already pointed out, Coptic gpaï gnusually renders Greek ¿v. Of course, ¿v normally means "in", but surprisingly enough, in the "translation Greek" it also might mean "about". According to Takamitsu Muraoka's Lexicon, in the Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible ev sometimes "marks the object of a discourse or thought".<sup>30</sup> Muraoka illustrates this unusual use of ev with eight examples: Deuteronomy 6:7; Psalm 1:2; 47:13; 118:15; Sirach 6:37; Lamentations 3:60<sup>31</sup>, Song of Songs 8:8 in LXX, and Daniel 10:11 in Theodotion's translation. One might add several other examples to the list.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, ev is used in the same sense in Aquila's and Symmachus' translations<sup>33</sup> and probably in 2 Maccabees 1:7 as well.<sup>34</sup> It is noteworthy that we encounter the expression  $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} v \epsilon v \tau \imath v \imath$  in at least four instances.35

When we turn to the Coptic Sahidic translations of the verses listed above, we see that in most cases

έν is translated with  $\varrho\bar{N}$ -.<sup>36</sup> In turn, λαλεῖν ἐν τινι is rendered with φλ.χε  $\varrho\bar{N}$ - in Deuteronomy 6:7 and Psalm 118:46.<sup>37</sup>

καὶ ἔσται τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὄσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαί σοι σήμερον ἐν τῆ καρδία σου καὶ ἐν τῆ ψυχῆ σου καὶ προβιβάσεις αὐτὰ τοὺς νἱούς σου καὶ λαλήσεις ἐν αὐτοῖς – And these words that I command you today shall be in your heart and in your soul. And you shall teach them to your sons and talk on [literally "in"] them (NETS).

йн нейдэлсе с†гон йнооү стоотк йпооү нароүдопс гй пекент ауш гй текфүхн стректсаве некшире брооү ауш декас екедэлсе йгнтоү — And these words that I command you today shall be in your heart and in your soul in order that you teach them to your sons and speak in them.

καὶ ἐλάλουν ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις σου ἐναντίον βασιλέων καὶ οὐκ ἦσχυνόμην – And I would speak of [literally "in"] your testimonies before kings, and I was not ashamed (NETS).

אγយ Νεϊαμλχε πε εñ Νεκμήτμήτρε ቩπεμτο εβολ ῆΝερρωογ εμ†αμπε λη – And I spoke in your testimonies before the kings and I was not ashamed.

The translators of Deuteronomy 6:7 and Psalm 118:46 encountered an unusual expression  $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu \tilde{\epsilon} \nu \tau_{IVI}$  in the Greek text and translated it with  $\sigma_{DAXE}$   $\varrho \bar{n}$ -. I suggest that the same happened with the translator of *Thomas* 52, i.e. s/he rendered  $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu \tilde{\epsilon} \nu \tau_{IVI}$  with  $\sigma_{DAXE}$   $\varrho p a i \varrho \bar{n}$ - (there is no difference in meaning between  $\varrho \bar{n}$ - and  $\varrho p a i \varrho \bar{n}$ - in this case). The question remains, though, why someone would use such an unusual expression as  $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu \tilde{\epsilon} \nu \tau_{IVI}$ .

To my knowledge, the expression  $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \tilde{v} \epsilon v \tau v \tau$ meaning "to speak about someone or something" never occurs in Greek texts that are not translated from Hebrew.<sup>38</sup> Why would any author use such an expression? There are at least two plausible answers. The first option is that the author of the saying was deeply influenced by the Septuagint Greek.<sup>39</sup> The second option is that s/he intentionally used the expression. The disciples in saying 52 state that the coming of Jesus was predicted in the Hebrew Scriptures,<sup>40</sup> and it is quite possible that the author made the disciples imitate the language of the Old Testament.<sup>41</sup>

To conclude, in this article I suggested that  $2pa\ddot{i}$  $\bar{n}_RHTK$  in saying 52 renders  $\dot{\epsilon}v \sigma \sigma i$  in the Greek *Vorlage*. The Coptic translator found in the Greek text an expression  $\lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \hat{i}v \dot{\epsilon}v \tau \iota v \iota$ . The preposition  $\dot{\epsilon}v$  in this expression had an unusual meaning "about", specific to the translation Greek. Most probably the Coptic translator did not understand the meaning of the phrase and rendered  $\dot{\epsilon}v$  with its usual Coptic equivalent,  $2pa\ddot{i}2n$ . That is why in the saying 52 we read that the prophets spoke "in" Jesus, even though the context suggests that they spoke "about" him.<sup>42</sup>

- 26 See Crum 1939, 684b; Steindorff 1904, 174–175 (\$385); Layton 2004, 166 (\$206).
- 27 A number of promising insights are listed in the commentary accompanying the new edition and translation of *Thomas* prepared by the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften. See Aland 1996, 517–546. For instance, they convincingly argue that Μπκαντε Ñ- in a meaningless phrase "that man is round about the lamb" (Lambdin's translation) in saying 60 is an erroneous (or rather too literal) rendering of the Greek expression εἶναι περί τι meaning "to be engaged in" (LSJ, s.v. εἰμί, C, IV, 6). See Bethge 1998, 48.
- 28 For instance, Harold W. Attridge suggests that in saying 6, the scribe mistook με "truth" for πε "heaven", thus the Coptic text reads μπεμτο εβολ μτπε, i.e. "in the sight of heaven", while the Greek one reads [ἐνώπιον τῆ]ς ἀληθ[ε]ίας, i.e. "in the sight of truth". See Layton 1989, 1:100–101.
- 29 I agree with the vast majority of scholars who believe that the Coptic Nag Hammadi text is a translation from the Greek.
- 30 Muraoka 2009, 232.
- 31 There is a misprint in the Lexicon in this instance (2:60

instead of 3:60).

- Josh 1:8, Ps 71:6; 76:13, 118:16, 23, 27, 46, 47, 48, 78, 117, Neh 8:12, 13:7, Ezek 39:8, Job 26:14; Sir 14:20, 39:1 (all from LXX) and Dan 9:23 (Theodotionic version). Most of these additional examples come from Muraoka's *Lexicon*, s.v. ἀδολεσχέω, διανοέομαι, λαλέω, μελετάω, συνίημι.
- 33 See, e.g., the translations of Ps 1:2 and 118:15 (Field 1875, 2:87 and 271).
- 34 See Schwartz 2008, 140. It is worthy of notice that 2 Macc 1:7 is also an example of translation Greek. According to Schwartz (2008, 132), the verse belongs to a letter that was originally written in a Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic) language, hence the abundant use of καί. See also Lange 2007, 642.
- 35 Deut 6:7; Song 8:8; Ps 118:46; Ezek 39:8; all from LXX. In all these cases λαλεîν renders the Hebrew verb either in PI<sup>´</sup>EL or in PU<sup>´</sup>AL. In all cases except one (Ezek 39:8) the subject of speech is introduced by .
- 36 In Dan 10:11 έν is rendered with gpaï gñ-.
- 37 The Coptic texts are from Ciasca 1970, 1:128 and Budge 1898, 128. There is no Sahidic text of Ezek 39:8. In Song 8:8 ἐν αὐτῆ is rendered with ετβμητζ. See Worrell 1942, 154.
- 38 I believe that there is no reason to suggest that *Thomas* was initially written in a Semitic language. The ideas of Nicholas Perrin, who thinks otherwise, are open to criticism. See Williams 2009.
- 39 In this respect, *Thomas* 52 is similar to the *Testament* of *Reuben* 3:8, where another "Hebraizing" expression, συνίημι ἕν τινι ("to understand regarding something"), is used.
- 40 There are two ways to interpret the "24 prophets". Most probably they represent the Hebrew Scriptures that according to 4 Ezra 14:45 (Syriac and Arabic versions) consist of 24 books. According to Flavius Josephus, all the Hebrew Scriptures were written by the prophets alone (Contra Apionem, I, 37). Another interpretation is proposed by Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman. They suggest that saying 52 refers to the Israelite prophets, not to the books. While Vitae prophetarum (the "Lives of the prophets") list 23 prophets, "Thomas reaches twenty-four by adding John the Baptist" (John the Baptist is mentioned in Thomas 46). See Grant & Freedman 1960, 153. Be that as it may, number 24 signifies completeness (see, e.g., Rev 4:4); thus, saying 52 speaks either of all the prophets of Israel, or of all the Scriptures written by those prophets and revered by the Jews.
- 41 One might even suggest that the expression λαλεῖν ἔν τινι was used in *Thomas* not just to imitate, but to parody the oddness of the translation Greek of the Hebrew Bible. A phrase about someone speaking "in" someone or something would most probably sound "barbaric" to a Greek speaker. It is worthy of notice that the second part of the saying might also parody the Hebrew Scriptures. According to Plisch, it is probable that the "prophetic perfect" in "you have spoken of the dead" is meant ironically. See Plisch 2008, 135.
- 42 Antti Marjanen discussed with me the problems that I deal with in this article a few times, and his critical comments were incredibly helpful.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### ALAND, KURT (ED.)

- 1996 Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.
- BAARDA, TJITZE
- 2003 "The Gospel of Thomas and the Old Testament." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 26, 1–28.

#### BETHGE, HANS-GEBHARD

1998 "Werdet vorübergehende': Zur Neubearbeitung des Thomasevangeliums für die Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum." Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung für die Jahre 1995 bis 1998. Münster, Westfalen: Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 42–52.

#### BLUNDELL, JOHN

- 1980–95 "Praetereo." *Thesaurus linguae latinae, volumen X, pars altera, sectio I.* Berlin &New York: De Gruyter, 1009–25.
- BUDGE, E. A. W. (ED.)
- 1898 The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- CIASCA, AGOSTINO (ED.)
- 1970 Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.
- COYLE, JOHN KEVIN
- 2009 Manichaeism and Its Legacy. Leiden &Boston: Brill. CRUM, W. E.
- 1939 A Coptic Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- DAUR, KLAUS-D. (ED.)
- 1985 Aurelii Augustini opera, pars 15, 3: Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum; Commonitorium Orosii et sancti Aurelii Augustini contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas. Turnholt: Brepols.
- DECONICK, APRIL D.
- 2006 The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation; with a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel. London & New York: T&T Clark.
- FIELD, FREDERICK (ED.)
- 1875 Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

### GÄRTNER, BERTIL

- 1961 The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas. Transl. E. J. Sharpe. London: Collins.
- GRANT, ROBERT M. & FREEDMAN, DAVID NOEL
- 1960 The Secret Sayings of Jesus. London & Glasgow: Collins.
- HOFMANN, J. B. & SZANTYR, ANTON
- 1997 *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- JEREMIAS, JOACHIM

1948 Unbekannte Jesusworte. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag.

- LAGARDE, PAUL DE (ED.)
- 1883 Aegyptiaca. Göttingen: Hoyer.
- LANGE, NICHOLAS DE
- 2007 "Jewish Greek." A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity. Ed. A.-F. Christidis. New York: Cambridge University Press, 638–645.
- LAYTON, BENTLEY
- 2004 A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary: Sahidic Dialect. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- LAYTON, BENTLEY (ED.)
- 1989 Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7 together with XIII, 2\*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926 (1), and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655. Leiden: Brill.
- MEYER, MARVIN (ED.)
- 2007 The Nag Hammadi Scriptures: The International Edition. New York: HarperCollins.
- MORELAND, MILTON
- 2006 "The Twenty-Four Prophets of Israel Are Dead: Gospel of Thomas 52 as a Critique of Early Christian Hermeneutics." Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity: The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas. Ed. J. Ma. Ásgeirsson, A. D. DeConick, R. Uro. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 75–91.
- MURAOKA, TAKAMITSU
- 2009 A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Leuven: Peeters.
- PLISCH, UWE-KARSTEN
- 2008 The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary. Trans. G. S. Robinson. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- RESCH, ALFRED (ED.)
- 1906 Agrapha: Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente. Leipzig:J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- SCHWARTZ, DANIEL R.
- 2008 2 Maccabees. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

STEINDORFF, GEORG

1904 *Koptische Grammatik mit Chrestomathie, Wörterverzeichnis und Literatur.* Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.

THOMPSON, HERBERT (ED.)

1932 The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WILLIAMS, P. J.

2009 "Alleged Syriac Catchwords in the Gospel of Thomas." *Vigiliae Christianae* 63, 71–82.

WILMET, MICHEL

1957–9 Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique II: Les mots autochtones. Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO.

WORRELL, WILLIAM H. (ED.)

1942 *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.