

CANONICAL OR NONCANONICAL: A STUDY OF THE CONTEXT OF SITUATION IN THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, LUKE, AND THOMAS

LIU Chia-En

Assistant Professor, China Evangelical Graduate School of Theology

Abstract

In Christianity's development, there was no concrete expression of canonicity until the 4th century. Apart from the canonical books, there are works classified as Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha. For a long time, the church did not pay much attention to these literary documents. This paper will employ register theory from systemic functional linguistics to argue that the Beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas and in the Synoptics belong to different registers and distinct contexts of situation. In the Synoptics, the context of situation is a proclamation by Jesus to his disciples, first delivered orally and later written down. The authors prefer particular transitivity to focus on promises and reflective behavior. Furthermore, passive and middle voices are frequently employed, while subjunctives are used to indicate certain situations. The context of situation of the Gospel of Thomas refers to sayings from Jesus, but the addressees are not clearly indicated. The author does not emphasize behavior, but focuses on doing and thinking instead. Moreover, less passive and middle voices are used and indicatives are employed to reflect the declarative nature of the book.

Keywords: Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Matthew, Gospel of Luke, Beatitude, Register

Submitted on : 2023.01.13 ; Accepted on : 2023.06.06 ; Proofreader : 潘馨逸

I. Introduction

It is not an easy task to differentiate canonical books from non-canonical ones, and most people follow the tradition of accepting the twenty-seven books as canon in the New Testament. Apart from the historical reconstruction, however, one can observe another track to deal with this issue, analyzing the use of language. There would be coherence in the canonical books to a certain degree, which may not be obvious in non-canonical ones. Therefore, applying linguistic methods to study different books will offer more linguistic evidence to deal with this problem. In the New Testament, four gospels stand as more significant marks to be different from non-canonical gospels. Among all studies, the relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament canon is a famous topic, but there is no consensus. Some scholars analyze the text to understand whether it is literary (in)dependency between them. In contrast, others attempt to reconstruct the context of the Gospel of Thomas to identify the literary (in)dependency. Nevertheless, it is not easy to fulfill this task because most scholars focus on words or topics to determine a literary relationship. This paper, therefore, will employ the register theory from a systemic functional linguistic (SFL) perspective to argue that the authors of the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics preserved the Beatitudes in their materials differently. This study will focus on the relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics in terms of distinct contexts of situation. It will employ a linguistic approach in order to argue that the authors of the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics prefer to use different linguistic expressions to state their concepts, especially in the Beatitude sayings.

II. A Brief History of Survey

A. Literary Analysis

In 1945, numerous ancient documents were found in Nag Hammadi. Many books depict a larger picture of the reconstruction of the historical Jesus, and one of them is the Gospel of Thomas. This gospel is a Coptic translation of the collection

of sayings of Jesus, containing 144 sayings but without any stories or miracles.¹ (Bruce, 1974; Turner, 1962) Most sections start with a disciple asking specific questions and Jesus answering them, or sometimes Jesus proclaiming a speech directly. Although not all the sayings can be found in Synoptics, many topics and forms are parallel. The studies of the Gospel of Thomas become important because it provides information about the complexity of Gospel traditions. From the perspective of transmission of traditions, some scholars assert that the Gospel of Thomas may preserve traditions that are different from those in the sources of the Synoptics, deriving from an independent stage of the sayings tradition.² (Meyer, 2003: 6; Meyer, 2006: 61; Quispel, 1957: 189–207; Guillaumont, 1962: 15–23; Crossan, 1971: 451–465; Crossan, 1973: 244–266; Tuckett, 1986: 6–7; Tuckett, 1988: 132–157; Cameron, 1982: 24; Wilson, 1960a: 142–144; Wilson, 1960b: 231–250; Wilson, 1960c: 36–39; North, 1962: 154–170) On the contrary, some scholars propose that these Gospels derive from similar traditions.³ (Grant and Schoedel, 1960: 102; Robinson and Koester, 1971: 133–136; Koester, 1982: 154–158; Koester, 1990: 85) Besides, some scholars provide eclectic opinions to reconsider this

¹ There are fragments of this document that were found in 1897, including the Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654, and 655. Scholars may agree that the Greek version preserves an earlier form and derives from the same tradition as the Coptic.

² Marvin Meyer proposes that the Gospel of Thomas may be “a primary text in the early Christian tradition and contains forms of previously known sayings of Jesus that antedate the canonical gospels.” Gilles Quispel employs the discipline of source criticism to argue that the Gospel of Thomas represents no literary connection with the New Testament Gospels, but indicates an independent tradition of sayings which were connected with James as an Aramaic tradition. A. Guillaumont adopts a linguistic approach to the Coptic Thomas and provides the case of Aramaic or Syriac foundation of the Gospel of Thomas.

³ Grant and Schoedel state that the Gospel of Thomas might use tradition underlying the canonical Gospels, but more probably relied on written materials. Koester insists that even though the Gospel of Thomas contains the proto-Gnostic sayings, this book still preserves a continuous link of Jesus’ own saying in the canonical tradition. The apostolic tradition can be found in the Gospel of Thomas which is under the name of the apostle Thomas in eastern Syria. Different traditions belong to distinct patterns, and they had their origin in the historical activity of the apostles. Koester states that the tradition of Thomas should be regarded as one of the primitive local traditions with authority for Syrian Christianity, and this book preserves the form of sayings or parables which is more original than its canonical parallels. This tradition may preserve materials in the 1st or 2nd century, and it may be Jewish-Christian as the sources of the Synoptic sayings.

problem.⁴ (Uro, 1998: 8–32; Goodacre, 2012: 66–153) If the Gospel of Thomas is dependent on the Synoptics, the Thomasine community may be relatively insignificant, deriving from the mainstream. On the contrary, if the Gospel of Thomas is independent on the Synoptics, this book may preserve other traditions which may reach into the fertile soil of early Christianity.⁵ Therefore, the studies of the Gospel of Thomas indeed provide an important window for us to reconsider Jesus' traditions and to rewrite the history of the Synoptic traditions. (Marjanen, 2006: 209–220; Patterson, 1993: 9; Robinson, 1988: 53)

In order to probe deeper into the issue of traditions (in)dependency, some scholars employ different methodologies to elucidate the literary relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the canonical texts. Some argue for the literary relationships, meaning that this book represents an exoticism from the mainstream of Synoptic Christianity. Others emphasize the looser relationship between John and the Synoptics to track whether the same case occurred to the Gospel of Thomas.⁶ (Patterson, 1993: 16; Dunderberg, 1998: 43; Pagels, 2003: 35–38) R. McL. Wilson, for instance, identifies differences between the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics, including differences of order, expansion, compression, and adaptation. (Wilson, 1960a: 14–15) Furthermore, Turner compares similar details of parables in the Synoptics to those in the Gospel of Thomas, and concludes that the source of Thomas may be different from that of the Synoptic tradition due to the lack of the usages of

⁴ Uro's advocates the concept of indirect influence (secondary orality), and concludes that the interaction between oral and literary traditions should be taken into consideration more. Goodacre traces the redactional signals to argue that the author of the Gospel of Thomas holds "familiarity" with the Synoptics.

⁵ Marjanen argues for the similarity and dissimilarity of the Gospel of Thomas and the canonical authors, indicating the "egalitarian type of Christology" in the Gospel of Thomas.

⁶ Patterson proposes that the relationship between John and the Synoptics provides a pattern for us to think of the case of the Gospel of Thomas. He also indicates that literary dependence should be proved by the use of "a consistent pattern of dependence" and "that the sequence of individual pericope in each text is substantially the same." Nevertheless, Patterson's source-critical approach leads to the absence of consistent dependence and of shared sequence. In addition, Dunderberg analyzes the "I-Sayings" in both the Gospels of John and Thomas, which establish a relatively cohesive group to find evidence for a direct literary relationship between these two. Also, Pagels compares the Gospel of Thomas and the Johannine work to depict the concepts within the Thomasine community.

apocalyptic imagery, allegorical interpretation, and generalizing conclusions.⁷ (Turner, 1962: 78; Schoedel, 1972: 560) John Dominic Crossan proposes that the order and the content of the Gospel of Thomas lead us to consider this book as independent of the intra-canonical tradition, since the compositional order or sequence cannot be found in the Gospel of Thomas, especially when we compare the sayings to the Synoptics. In addition, if the traditionally present materials in the canonical Gospels can be found in the Gospel of Thomas, one can conclude that they share common traditions. On the other hand, if the redactional components in the canonical Gospels can be detected in the Gospel of Thomas, the dependence of the canonical materials can be argued. Unfortunately, it is not an easy task to distinguish these two. (Crossan, 1985: 35–37) Therefore, before understanding the literary relationship between these books, some scholars try to start by identifying the original text of the Gospel of Thomas from different approaches.

After tracing the uses of the literate model, oral-literate model, and redaction model to identify the original Thomas, the core Gospel, and different strata of oral tradition, April D. DeConick employs a tradition-historical approach to seek the original Christian-Jewish core of the Gospel of Thomas.⁸ (DeConick, 2005: 39–55; DeConick, 2006: 167–199) The relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics, however, usually focuses on linear and directional influence with the traditional source-critical method. Unfortunately, no clear organizing pattern can be found in the Gospel of Thomas, and some of the links are just marked by similar topics or “catchwords.”⁹ (Ehrman, 2003: 55; Perrin, 2007: 93)

⁷ Turner proposes that the source may be the Gospel of Hebrews. Furthermore, William R. Schoedel traces the use of form criticism and Gnostic concepts in parables and concludes that there should be “doubt about the forces at work in the formation of the parables in the Gospel of Thomas.”

⁸ April D. DeConick proposes that the Gospel of Thomas contains communal memories of Jesus’ words, representing different moments in its history within the community. She proposes principles of development, responsiveness, and constituency to identify the original text.

⁹ The use of a catchword pattern may reflect a literary background, not an oral one.

B. Social-Historical Context

Since the structure of the Gospel of Thomas lacks continuity and internal coherence, scholars have proposed a different approach to understanding this book, which is to reconstruct its social-historical context. This approach, however, produces diversity among scholars in terms of various perspectives of the early church, including the views of Gnostic, Hellenistic philosophy or Jewish-Christian.¹⁰ (Quispel, 2008: 222–225; Lapham, 2003: 119; DeConick, 2008: 13–29; Grobel, 1962: 369; Higgins, 1960: 306; Beare, 1960: 102–112; Schoedel, 1960: 225–234; Baker, 1964: 215–225; Baker, 1965: 291–294; Frend, 1967: 13–26; Grant and Schoedel, 1960: 116)

Robert Grant, for instance, argues that if any author would like to represent Jesus as a Gnostic teacher, this person would have to point out that Jesus “proclaimed doctrines which were in some respects close to those set forth in the Church’s gospel; otherwise, he cannot be recognized as Jesus.” (Grant, 1960: 3) Furthermore, the Gospel of Thomas appears to be “framed within the context of later Gnostic reflections on the salvation that Jesus has brought.” (Dart, 1988: 175) Apropos Hellenistic concepts, although the Gospel of Thomas provides less information of its social context than the Pauline works do, the content of the Gospel of Thomas may reflect concepts of the Platonic and Stoic traditions. The Gospel of Thomas contains ideas of the divinity of the self and its return to heaven, and these may be the reflection of the Hellenistic interpretation of Jesus.¹¹ (Asgeirsson, 2006: 155–176) Regarding the Jewish religious view, some scholars propose that the author of the Gospel of Thomas relies on remembered texts, or some earlier traditions, but the text echoes Jesus’ canonical sayings, and reflects the insignificance of the old Jewish religious practices for the Christian.¹² (Lapham, 2003: 116; Moreland, 2006: 75–92;

¹⁰ Quispel advocates three non-canonical sources for Thomas: a Jewish-Christian gospel, an encratic gospel, and a Hermetic gnomology. DeConick proposes that the Gospel of Thomas contains communal memories of Jesus’ words, representing different moments in its history within the community.

¹¹ Asgeirsson attempts to establish intertextual connections between Platonic traditions and the Gospel of Thomas.

¹² On the other hand, Moreland asserts evidence for the rejection of Jewish traditions in the Gospel of Thomas through the study of logion 52. Luomanen also indicates evidence

Luomanen, 2006: 119–154; Perrin, 2002: 46; Perrin, 2004: 138–151; Williams, 2009: 71–82; Lincoln, 1977: 65–76; Quispel, 1964: 234; Perrin, 2007: 36) Some scholars employ the principle of criterion of dissimilarity: “the earliest form of a saying we can reach may be regarded as authentic if it can be shown to be dissimilar to characteristic emphases both of ancient Judaism and of the early Church.” (Perrin, 1967: 39) Since Jesus was a Jew, however, it is natural that Jewish customs or concepts may be reflected in his teaching; his method may not be sufficient to identify Jesus’ teachings. (Evans, 1989: 137) On the other hand, there are scholars who examine the logia of the Gospel of Thomas which have a parallel only in Luke and conclude that both Luke and Thomas represent a distance from Judaism, accept apocalyptic messages, exhibit the dangers of money, indicate Jesus to be the master of wisdom, and play with language. (Bovon, 1995: 161–171; Davies, 1983: 146) It seems to be very difficult to identify which group may actually have influenced the author of the Gospel of Thomas, and to realize the evidence of literary (in)dependency through these lenses. Although this book may provide broader insights of Jesus’ sayings and a new window for understanding traditions surrounding Jesus, there are issues that remain unsolved, such as genre and the social situation behind the text.¹³ (Patterson, 1993: 115–119) Therefore, both the approaches to analyzing the texts themselves and the methods of reconstructing the social-historical contexts of the Gospel of Thomas may be limited. In addition, the text of the Gospel of Thomas we have is in Coptic, whereas the canonical books were written in Greek. The language barrier may cause problems of analyzing literary relationships between these books. Therefore, a more applicable linguistic approach may be needed to analyze the text to objectively identify the social situation.

against Jewish traditions through the analysis of literary dependence, rather than tradition per se. Perrin states that the Gospel of Thomas does not reflect the historical Jesus, but is a witness to early Syriac Christianity, but this proposal seems to be rejected by Williams. Lincoln proposes that the Gospel of Thomas was written within communities in Edessa of the 2nd century and each section of the text is used for certain groups. Quispel states that “it is probable that the *Gospel of Thomas* was written in Edessa about 140 A.D.”

¹³ Patterson suggests that the Synoptics follow the trajectory of the settled and less social radical community, and the Thomasine community continues on the trend of social radicalism.

III. Methodology

The SFL perspective proposes that “language is as it is because of its function in social structure.” (Halliday, 1975: 65) Its model regards language as “a social semiotic, which is made up of networks of systems (interconnected groupings of choices) that establish meaningful components of language,” and provides a framework to systematize the choices of languages. (Westfall, 2005: 26–28) According to Halliday, a language is meaningful when it works in some context of situation which represents “the immediate environment in which a text is actually functioning.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 46) Since this linguistic approach deals with the use of language within context, it will be helpful for us to identify the linguistic features between the texts, although they may be in different languages (Greek and Coptic). Therefore, this study will employ a linguistic approach from SFL to prove that the authors of the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics use different patterns within distinct contexts of situation to express the beatitudes in their books.¹⁴ (Boring, 1988: 10–36; Burkitt, 1906: 147; Dahl, 1962: 153; Turner, 1971: 8–37; Stein, 1980: 248–249; Bultmann, 1968: 6–7; Polkow, 1987: 348; Carlston, 1962: 34; Perrin, 1976: 1–4)

A. Context of Situation and Contextual Configuration

Halliday has developed his register theory to identify contexts of situation and this theory serves to “interpret the social context of a text, the environment in which meanings are being exchanged.”¹⁵ (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 12) He states, “register...refers to the fact that the language we speak or write varies according to

¹⁴ Boring proposes ten principles to assess the historical method of determine the authenticity of the text, including attestations in multiple sources, attestations in forms, linguistic criterion, the environment criterion, tendency of the developing tradition, dissimilarity, modification, coherence, plausible *traditionsgeschichte*, and hermeneutical potential. Nevertheless, subjectivity remains. Therefore, a better linguistic approach will be needed.

¹⁵ For Halliday and Hasan, the use of context of situation is different from the that of context of culture or of the co-text. The context of culture refers to the social environment of the literary work, and the use of co-text is the linguistic environment of the text.

the type of situation...so that we can begin to understand *what* situational factors determine *what* linguistic features.” (Halliday, 1978: 31–32) Hallidayan models do not determine lexico-grammatical realizations directly, but deal with semantic or functional components which help listeners or readers to understand a certain text. (Porter, 2000: 200) Halliday proposes a triadic structure to analyze texts: ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings, corresponding in his register theory to field, tenor, and mode. In addition, contextual configuration refers “each context of situation corresponds to a location along the dimension of register variation— that is, to a register.” (Matthiessen, 1993: 236) In other words, a certain contextual configuration links to a particular register or a particular family of registers. For instant, when two registers contain similar tenor and mode, but may be different in field, they can be regarded as the same family of register. (Matthiessen, 1993: 236)

B. Field and Ideational Metafunction

The field of discourse activates ideational meanings and indicates what is happening, what is going on, or what is being talked about. (Thompson, 2004: 40) For Halliday, experiential and logical components determine notions of ideational meanings. Porter, on the other hand, points out that “parts of the logical semantic component can be located in and realized by structures of language.” (Porter, 2000: 206) The use of field of discourse provides access to identify actions of human experiences within the transitivity network, containing the verb and everything which depends upon it. All these elements can be divided into two categories: grammar and lexicon. In terms of the use of grammar, there are three components: transitivity, nominal groups, and circumstantial elements. Transitivity can be determined by different types of process, verbal aspects, and ergativity, while lexicon refers to lexical items in different semantic domains. The use of participles and adjectives in Greek may be used to express nominal groups. Participant, on the other hand, refers to the subject or object within a certain process. The interaction between participants may determine the use of tenor in a discourse, whereas the lexical items which are used to describe participants may be related to the usages of semantic domains. Circumstantial elements are associated with the process and realized by

adverbial groups or prepositional phrases, reflecting their background function.¹⁶ (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 175, 264–273; Thompson, 2004: 88) There are six types of process: material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioural, and existential ones, indicating doing, sensing, being, saying, behaving, and existing. (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 182–230) In Greek, while analyzing a verb, one should also consider the use of verbal aspect which contains three categories: perfective, imperfective, and stative, being identified by the form of the verb. Apart from these three, there is the future tense.¹⁷ (Porter, 1992: 92–93; Porter, 1999: 41) Ergativity focuses on the voices of verbs: active, passive, or middle in Greek. (Porter, 2000: 206) Lexical choices may be reflected by the understandings of the author in terms of semantic domains.¹⁸ (Porter, 1996: 70; Lyons, 1977: 230–269; Cruse, 1986: 15–20)

C. Tenor and Interpersonal Metafunction

The concept of tenor is related to participant structure and is realized by the interpersonal meanings, dealing with who is taking part in the discourse and his or her statuses and roles.¹⁹ (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 26; Porter, 2000: 205) The use of participants may belong to a component of types of process, but it is also strongly related to the concept of tenor, especially their interaction between different participants. According to Halliday, tenor can be determined by three components: speech role (mood), person (and number), and polarity. Regarding speech role, there are statement, question, and command. Various grammatical structures serve the function of describing different expressions: statements are related to declarative

¹⁶ There are nine types of circumstances, including circumstantial of extent, location, manner, cause, contingency, accompaniment, role, matter and angle.

¹⁷ The aorist tense form points out the perfective aspect, both the present and imperfect tense forms indicate the imperfective aspect, and the perfect and pluperfect tense forms highlight the stative aspect. The future tense is usually used for manifest one's attitude.

¹⁸ Semantic domain is a way of organizing lexical material with respect of the number and types of shared semantic features of the lexemes. The rationale of semantic domains is that since words are used in “contextual relations,” different words should be grouped not just alphabetically but “according to the fields they [words] occupy.”

¹⁹ This paper will focus on the text itself, which refers to the intra-linguistic factors.

clauses; questions are associated with interrogative clauses; and commands can be expressed by imperative clauses.²⁰ (Thompson, 2004: 47) In Greek, authors use moods of indicative, imperative, and subjunctive to represent these different speech roles. Both the reader and writer can be realized by the use of different person and number. Different usages of person represent how the author communicates with the reader, since the sentence is “not only a representation of reality,” but also “a piece of interaction between speaker and listener.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 20) Polarity contains the positive and negative expressions used in either statements or answers. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 33)

D. Mode and Textual Metafunction

The use of mode of discourse is associated with textual metafunction, which is described as a metafunction of “ensuring that each instance of text makes contact with its environment.” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2006: 528) The use of mode refers to what part the language is playing and what language is expected to do. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 12) The textual framework contains the factors of theme, cohesion, and information structure. The use of the theme is usually realized by the subjects which highlights the information flow. Although in Greek, the subject is not always explicit because it may not be grammaticalized, the choice of expressing subjects in sentences is still important for representing the author’s concept of information flow. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 35) Information flow deals with how cohesive elements are distributed within a passage, and therefore, the uses of voice, time, and place may be helpful to determine the use of focus (prominence) which also reflects information flow. (Porter, 2000: 201) Cohesion represents how the elements in a text are bound together, and is established by the uses of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical repetition (reiteration and collocation). (Porter, 1999: 304–307; Reed, 1997: 88; Thompson, 2004: 177; Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 4) Reference signals for retrieval which produces cohesion and indicates the cohesive relationship in the meaning. Substitution represents the relationship in the wording, while ellipsis

²⁰ The use of the offer is not related to any grammatical mood and is more delicate.

is “substitution by zero.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 142–225) A conjunctive system provides cohesive devices to demonstrate how they relate to each linguistic element. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 227) Reiteration stands for the “repetition of a lexical item, or the occurrence of a synonym of some kind, in the context of reference; that is, where the two occurrences have the same referent.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 318–319) Collocation is the “occurrence of a different lexical item that is systematically related to the first one, as a synonym or superordinate of it.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 285) Furthermore, cohesion is also set up by various grammatical patterns or the uses of conjunctive elements. The choice of grammatical usage and the repetition of certain grammatical patterns allow readers to develop an understanding of collocation in a discourse, and a conjunctive system provides cohesive devices to demonstrate how they relate to each linguistic element. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 227) Speech/writing differences also play an important role to understand how languages are used and determine the channel of communication. (Halliday, Hasan and Martin, 1989: 221)

E. Summary and Procedure

Hallidayan register theory concerns the context of what is talked about (field), who participates in the actions (tenor), and what language is expected to do (mode). Since we would like to trace the traditions of the Synoptics and the Gospel of Thomas, contextual configurations of these texts may be helpful in identifying their differences from a linguistic perspective, and the register theory provides important elements for us to achieve this goal.

This study will focus on the registers of the Beatitudes in both the Synoptics and the Gospel of Thomas. Regarding the field of discourse, transitivity, ergativity, verbal aspect, and lexical items will be analyzed. As to the tenor of discourse, this paper will discuss the uses of person, number, mood, and participants in these texts. Apropos the mode of discourse, time, place, cohesion, and the use of conjunction will be explored. All the elements in terms of the use of register will be summarized to argue for the linguistic distinctions between these different traditions. Although the Gospel of Thomas is in Coptic, we can find retroversion through the comparison

of the Coptic and Greek versions of the New Testament and through paralleling usages and wordings between the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics. In this paper, the Coptic version will be used as well as the retroversion. Unfortunately, the Greek version of the Gospel of Thomas is not a complete document, and as for the Beatitudes, the Greek version only contains logia 7 as an incomplete statement. In this case, the Coptic version of the Gospel of Thomas will be the only available material for study.

IV. Registers of Beatitudes in the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and Thomas

The Gospel of Thomas is composed of sayings that are developed through the creation of dialogues and question-answer units. (DeConick, 2002: 188) Among the parallels between the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics, most of them can be found in either the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew or in the Sermon on the Plain in Luke, which is used to contrast between the wise and the fool by Jesus. (Blenkinsopp, 1995: 181) Beatitudes are sayings which indicate different types of blessings, and this form may derive from ancient Egyptian literature and was used in religious cults.²¹ The Gospel of Thomas as well as Gnostic literature also employed this form. The sayings in the Gospel of Thomas, however, may be similar to but are not the same as those in the Synoptics in terms of the contents. (Gärtner, 1961: 26–27; Betz, 1995: 92–7, 578) Although not all Beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas are composed as one discourse but scattered, these statements may reflect the usage of the Gospel of Thomas. In fact, since the Gospel of Thomas is a saying document, it will not be difficult to trace the register in this gospel through different passages because loose connections may usually be the case in the text. Therefore, it is appropriate for us to start from the usages in the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics to identify the literary differences between the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics from a linguistic approach. This paper will analyze Matt 5:3–12, Luke 6:20–23, and the sayings start with “blessed are” in the Gospel of Thomas,

²¹ Beatitudes are declarative, and Jesus uses in the Sermon on the Mount/Plain to represent wisdom sayings.

including logia 7, 18, 19, 49, 54, 58, 68, 69, and 103.

A. Fields of Beatitudes in Different Gospels

(A) Transitivity

Regarding the Beatitudes of Matt 5:3–12, there are twenty-four processes, and the dominant process types are relational and behavioural. The author of Matthew, however, consistently uses the pattern of μακάριοι οἱ... with a relational process in the main clause and the pattern of ὅτι... with other types of process in the following clause, which explains the reason. The relational processes in the main clauses belong to the process of attribute, in which the author exhibits different types of people who are blessed. As to the beatitudes in Luke 6:20–23, there are fourteen processes, and the dominant process types are also relational and mental. The author of Luke employs a similar pattern of μακάριοι οἱ... with a relational process in the main clause. In both these gospels, the behavioural process is the dominant type in the relative clauses, which is the secondary type in the whole sentence. These behavioural processes are “physiological and psychological.” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 248)

Apropos the Gospel of Thomas, if we take all the clauses which begin with “blessed.....” into account, we can see there are 34 processes. The major type is still relational which usually appears in the main clause. Nevertheless, the secondary types of process are material and mental, whereas the behavioural process is used only once. Material processes refer to “doing and happening,” and mental processes are concerned with “our experience of the world of our own consciousness.” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 197) The authors of the Synoptics and the Gospel of Thomas prefer different usages of transitivity in their works. This reflects that the authors of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke put stress on the relationship between the idea of blessing and one’s behaviours. Correct or incorrect behaviours result in distinct consequences, blessings and curses. The Gospel of Thomas, on the other hand, focuses on experiences but puts less stress upon behaviours.

(B) Ergativity

Ergativity is concerned with the idea of voice, which also belongs to the network of transitivity. In Matt 5:3–12, there are seven active verbs, four passive verbs, and one middle verb. Both verbs with passive and middle voices appear in the minor clauses. These clauses explain reasons for blessings, and the only middle verb is used in the statement of seeing God in Matt 5:8. As to the passive verbs, the verb *παρακληθήσονται* in Matt 5:4 is used to promise that those who mourn will be comforted, and the verb *χορτασθήσονται* in Matt 5:6 indicates the future promise of being satisfied. Furthermore, the author employs the term *ἐλεηθήσονται* in Matt 5:7 to emphasize that mercy takes place within a mutual interaction. In Matt 5:9, those who make peace among people will be called (*κληθήσονται*) children of God.

Regarding the usages in Luke 6:20–23, there are six active and two passive verbs. Both these passive verbs are used in the explicative clauses to indicate the reasons of blessings. The passive verb *χορτασθήσεσθε* in Luke 6:21 is used to promise future satisfaction, and the passive verb *χάρητε* in Luke 6:23 is also in the imperative mood to encourage people who are persecuted for rejoicing. A similar phenomenon can be detected where all these usages may indicate that God may be the one who practices certain behaviours. (Lapide, 1986: 31–32)

There is only one passive verb and one middle verb in the Beatitudes of the Gospel of Thomas, a passive verb in saying 69b, which is strongly related to Matt 5:6 and Luke 6:21. This saying, however, indicates the suffering from hunger which may refer to physical needs because the following clause indicates that it is this person's belly which will be satisfied. There is a middle verb used in logion 103: *περιζώση* (gird), and the author employs this verb in a case of projection with another aorist subjunctive.²² (DeConick, 2006: 280; Porter, 1999: 56) Therefore, preparation is the central idea of the saying, but this idea cannot be found in the beatitudes in the Synoptics. Apart from these verbs, the Gospel of Thomas uses active verbs to indicate blessings, and this reflects that the author of the Gospel of Thomas does not usually use passive or middle verbs, but prefers active ones instead. On the contrary,

²² The phrase *νημογυρ ημοοι εσιν τεφτηε* is an idiomatic expression for arming oneself.

the authors of Synoptics use passive and middle verbs much more to indicate divine promises.

(C) Verbal Aspects

A propos verbal aspect, the distribution of verbal tenses in Matt 5:3–12 is as follows:

| Perfective | Imperfective | | Stative | |
|------------|--------------|-----------|---------|--------|
| Aorist | Present | Imperfect | Perfect | Future |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

It is plausible that in the beatitudes, the author of Matthew prefers to use the future tense to indicate what will happen to those who will be blessed. The present tense is used twice in Matt 5:12, where the author encourages readers to rejoice and be glad.²³ The non-marked form aorist tense is used three times in this passage, and all of them are used to denote the persecution. Therefore, the author leads the discussion to focus on promises and to understand persecutions as temporary and less important. (Buttrick, 2002: 38; Lapidé, 1986: 32)

In Luke 6:20–23, the distribution of the verbs is:

| Perfective | Imperfective | | Stative | |
|------------|--------------|-----------|---------|--------|
| Aorist | Present | Imperfect | Perfect | Future |
| 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |

Although the aorist tense seems to be used most frequently, this form is used with either the imperative or subjunctive in this passage. Hence, we can still see that the author frequently uses the future tense. In addition, there is an imperfect tense in Luke 6:23, where the author denotes the way, the prophets were treated to indicate the unfinished persecutions. Comparing with the uses in Matthew, therefore, we can

²³ The present tense form of εἰμί (be) is used three times to indicate the blessings, but here we focus on the use of other finite verbs.

see that the author of Luke also emphasizes the future promises much more than persecutions.

Although the Gospel of Thomas is in Coptic, we can still trace the usages of different tenses on both the bases of Coptic and Greek (retroversion).²⁴ Regarding the Beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas, the future tense is used ten times, and not all of them with a temporal perspective.²⁵ (Plumley, 1948: 96) In logion 7, two 1st future tense verbs are used to indicate the future events.²⁶ (Eccles, 1991: 15–16) In logion 18, three 1st future tense verbs are used to indicate the situation which the blessed one will experience, and one of them is used as a noun.²⁷ (Cameron, 1991:391) In logion 49, the author uses the instantaneous future tense of the verbs $\chi\epsilon$ and $\beta\omega\kappa$ to explain that the solitary ones will find the kingdom and will return from it.²⁸ (Bruce 1974: 132) The author uses the 1st future tense which may be a simple future, expressing “vivid progressive action on into the future,” but this tense does not indicate the overtones of the dynamic futurity as the 3rd future tense does.²⁹ (Wilson, 1970: 69–70; Murray, 1927: 31) In logion 68, the verb $\chi\epsilon$ is again used in the 1st future tense form.³⁰ (Wilson, 1970: 71–74) Another future tense verb $\tau\iota\omicron$ is used in logion 69b, which may be understood as $\chi\omicron\rho\tau\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$ in the Greek version.³¹ (Walters, 1972: 41) As to other tense forms, there is no future tense verb but one perfect tense verb to emphasize the priority of being in logion 19. (Valantasis, 1997:

²⁴ Scholars reconstruct the Greek version by comparing Coptic and Greek texts. Here the retroversion derives from Plisch’s work, *The Gospel of Thomas*.

²⁵ In Coptic, the future times may indicate unfulfilled actions.

²⁶ One of the verbs is conjunctive which takes the sense from the preceding verb, the future tense. In the following woe sentence, the future tense is used instead of a conjunctive form.

²⁷ In saying 18, Jesus seems to reject disciples’ questions by redirecting them with answers which adopt the aphoristic imagination of the Jesus movements.

²⁸ Comparing the sayings 4 and 23, we can see that the concept of being “single” and being “chosen” are associated.

²⁹ The 3rd person future is an emphatic form, usually used for commands.

³⁰ Nevertheless, it is not always the case that the 1st future tense in Coptic is translated into the future tense in Greek. The present, aorist, imperfect, and perfect tenses are used in certain cases. In retroversion, this term may be understood as $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\iota\nu$, which is a future form.

³¹ This is a secondary form of the 1st future tense.

88) In logion 58, the term ΝΤΑΖΖΙCΕ indicates the 2nd perfect tense, and the verb Ζε is used with a 1st perfect tense, indicating a simple past of limited duration.³² (Walters, 1972: 41) The tense form here emphasizes the retrospective concept of salvation rather than the assurance for the future.³³ (Plisch, 2008: 144; Reintges, 2004: 255)

In logion 68, the term ΕΥΥΔΑΝΜΕCΤΕ is in the habitual tense, which is another type of present tense, expressing customary or habitual action.³⁴ (Younan, 2005: 179; Goughton, 1959: 18; Walters, 1972: 30) The term ΝCΕΡΔΙΩΚΕ stands for a conjunctive tense which may indicate no connotation of time or mode, connecting the preceding clause. (Brankaer, 2010: 77; Walters, 1972: 39–40) Here this verb may take the tense as the previous verb as the habitual tense. In the retroversion, however, these two verbs are understood as the aorist tense (perfective aspect). This may be due to harmonizing the sentences in Matt 5:10–11 and Luke 6:22. Yet if we take the grammatical information in Coptic into consideration, the use of the tense may be a little different from that in both Matthew and Luke. (Plisch, 2008: 166) The tense of the term ΕΝΤΑΥΔΙΩΚΕ represents the 2nd perfect tense, and the translation ἐδίωξαν is used in the aorist tense. The tense form may represent the punishment for those who persecute others after their evil behaviours rather than the promise for the persecuted ones. (Plisch, 2008: 166) In saying 103, there is a verb in the perfect tense form: CΟΟΥΝ understood as οἶδεν (perfect tense), which serves as the central focus of the whole discussion. The verb ΤΩΟΥΠ is in the 1st future form with two conjunctive verbs CΩΟΥΖ and ΜΟΥΡ. In the retroversion, these verbs are understood differently as ἀναστὰς (aorist participle), συναγάγη (aorist subjunctive), and περιζώση (future middle). (Plisch, 2008: 224) Therefore, it is possible that this future tense is used to indicate the hypothetical case. The term ΝΗΥ represents a present tense to indicate the hypothetical case, understood as εἰσέρχονται, which is in the present tense form to describe the action of the robbers. The last verb is also used as the future tense, understood as εἰσπορεύεσθαι (present infinitive), but the temporal meaning of the

³² The 2nd perfect tense represents the secondary form of the 1st perfect tense form.

³³ The use of 2nd tense may indicate the presentational (new information) focus by the speaker and the address.

³⁴ This tense represents customary actions, linking the use of present tenses.

future time may not be clear in this verb. (Plisch, 2008: 225)

Although there may still be problems in seeing how the tense forms are used in the Gospel of Thomas because the retroversion is established on the basis of parallels of the Synoptics, it is observable that the use of tense forms in the Gospel of Thomas and that in the Synoptics is different. Whereas the Beatitudes in the Synoptics emphasize promises which may or may not be in the future, those in the Gospel of Thomas represent three dimensions: (1) the promise in the future or present (logia 7, 18, 49, 54, and 69); (2) the retrospective promise (logia 19, 58); and (3) the punishment in the future for the evil doers (logion 68).³⁵ (Robinson and Koester, 1971: 44; Koester, 1982: 153)

(D) Lexical Items

The use of words in certain semantic domains reflects the choice of the author. Apart from function words and proper names, the distribution of semantic domains in Matt 5:3–12 is as follows:³⁶ (Gee, 1961: 129)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Semantic Domain | 25 | 57 | 1 | 88 | 12 | 33 | 39 | 23 | 79 | 26 | 24 | 40 | 53 |
| Times | 14 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

The most frequently used domain is “attitudes and emotions.” This domain is closely related to many domains which deal with experiencing events and states. (Louw and Nida, 1989: 288) It is plausible that the author of Matthew uses these terms to emphasize positive emotions such as happiness, gladness, and joy. The second frequently used semantic domain is “geographical objects and features.” This

³⁵ The Gnostic group may emphasize their present situation and go further to an anticipation of the eschaton. They may focus on the present spiritual reign over the “world.” Canonical books, on the other hand, seem to propose eschatological reservation to be concomitant with earthiness. In the Gospel of Thomas, eschatological sayings seem to be missing, but represent the presence of divine wisdom.

³⁶ There are function words and content words. Function words are sometimes called grammatical words, such as determiners, pronouns, prepositions, and quantifiers. Content words are usually the major parts of speech, including nouns, verbs, and adjectives.

domain includes objects of events that are not perceptual, such as heaven and hell. (Louw and Nida, 1989: 1) The domain of “moral and ethical qualities and related behavior” is also used frequently, and this domain focuses on behaviours. (Louw and Nida, 1989: 742) The use of certain semantic domains by the author of Matthew leads us to focus on the relationship between behaviours and blessings, both in physical and spiritual respects.

In Luke 6:20–23, the distribution of the semantic domains is:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Semantic | 2 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 |
| Domain | 5 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 3 |
| Times | 8 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

The author also chooses to use the words in the semantic domain of “attitudes and emotions.” It is inferable that since this passage concerns the beatitudes, this domain will stand as the best choice. The next preferable semantic domain is the domain of “communication,” and this may indicate that the author probably wants to put stress upon those who are persecuted with a communicational means. The idea of communication, however, is a verbal behavior which connects to the domain of number 88. Therefore, the beatitudes in Luke 6:20–23 also focus on the blessings during or after certain behaviours.

Regarding the Gospel of Thomas, similar gaps between Greek and Coptic still remain. Fortunately, we can still find parallels between the Gospel of Thomas and the canonical books to trace the probable Greek translation. Firstly, since we are dealing with the statements of beatitudes, it is not difficult for us to see that terms which belong to the semantic domain of “attitudes and emotions” are used most frequently. Nevertheless, remaining usages are scattered, and there are even some words which are not used or seldom used in the New Testament. This phenomenon leads us to consider that the author of Thomas might not have particular domains of usage, not as those of the Synoptics.

B. Tenors of Beatitudes in Different Gospels

(A) Person, Number, and Mood

In Matt 5:3–12, the author seems to prefer to use a 3rd person plural form. The 3rd person plural pronoun is used many times in this passage, including Matt 5:3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Furthermore, verbs with a 3rd plural form are used, including παρακληθήσονται (Matt 5:4), κληρονομήσουσιν (Matt 5:5), χορτασθήσονται (Matt 5:6), ἐλεηθήσονται (Matt 5:7), ὄψονται (Matt 5:8), and κληθήσονται (Matt 5:9). In addition, both adjectives and participles in this passage are used with masculine plural forms. Nevertheless, there is a shift in Matt 5:11 from the 3rd person plural form to the 2nd person plural form. The pronoun ὑμῶν (ὕμᾱς) is used four times in Matt 5:11–12. It seems that Jesus begins with a general idea of blessings and now directly shifts the focus to the audience.

In Luke 6:20–23, the situation seems to be different. The author of Luke does not use the 3rd person plural form in the discussion but rather the 2nd person plural form. In Luke 6:20, the adjective ὑμετέρα (belong to you) is used. This term is seldom used in the New Testament and only twice in the Gospel of Luke.³⁷ In Luke 6:21, the verb χορτασθήσεσθε is embedded with a 2nd person plural usage, as well as the verb γελάσετε. In addition, the 2nd person pronoun ὑμῶν (ὕμᾱς) is used four times in Luke 6:22–23. This phenomenon may reflect the usage of the formula of “curse and blessing,” which is not the literary context in Matthew. (Marshall, 1978: 249)

Regarding the Gospel of Thomas, in saying 7, the 3rd person singular form is used, which refers to the lion and the man. In logia 18 and 19, the author uses the 3rd person form all the time, although the immediate co-texts represent the 2nd person usage. Both in sayings 49 and 54, a 2nd person plural form is used. If we trace sayings 50–53, it is reasonable to recognize that the usage remains the 2nd person plural because Jesus is speaking to disciples directly. In logion 58, however, it is not clear whether the author uses a 2nd or a 3rd person because there is no explanatory clause. Therefore, it is probable that the author uses a 3rd person singular form to speak of a

³⁷ In the New Testament, this term is used three times in John, twice in Luke and 1 Corinthians, and once in Act, Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians.

particular type of people in general, and this idea fits sayings 55–57, where Jesus is broadly addressing certain situations. In logion 68, a 2nd person plural form is indicated, whereas in logion 69, a 3rd person plural form is used. From the perspective of sayings 59–67, it seems that the use of person changes all the time.³⁸ A 3rd person form is used in logion 103, and probably indicates a general idea which may fit the immediate co-text. Therefore, it is plausible that the author of Thomas uses different persons at will but not consistently.

In terms of the use of mood, the imperative mood is used to direct one's action. (Porter, 1999: 53) There are two imperatives in Matt 5:3–10 and Luke 6:20–23. In Matt 5:10, both of the imperatives are used to encourage readers to have a correct attitude and emotion while facing persecution. The reason for these commands lies in the following clause: the author indicates that their reward is great in heaven. Furthermore, the author states that the prophets before them were persecuted in the same way. A parallel can be found in Luke 6:23, where the author uses a similar expression to encourage readers to rejoice and be glad, and the reason is the same as that in the Gospel of Matthew. Jesus is the one who directs people's action and points out a proper attitude through this mood. (Lapide, 1986: 31)

On the other hand, the subjunctive mood expresses a “realm not of assertion but of projection,” and this form grammatizes “a projected realm which may at some time exist and may even now exist, but which is held up for examination simply as a projection of the writer or speaker's mind for consideration.” (Porter, 1999: 56–57) There are three subjunctives in Matt 5:3–12, and 4 subjunctives in Luke 6:20–23. In Matt 5:11, the author uses subjunctives to explain the hypothetical case of persecution. It is not clear whether the situation has happened or not, but the author emphasizes that if this case takes place, they will be blessed. In Luke 6:22, a similar case is denoted. The author employs subjunctives to present the case of persecution, whether it happens or not. Both in Matthew and Luke, the authors use subjunctives to denote the cases which are followed by imperatives to teach the audience how to react while facing such situations.

³⁸ The 2nd person form is used in the sayings 59, 60 (disciples), 61(Salome), 62, and 66 (the imperative form indicates the 2nd person idea), and the 3rd person form is used in the sayings 63, 64, 65, and 67.

In the Beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas, subjunctive concepts are represented in the conjunction $\zeta\omicron\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon$, and the rest is used in the indicative mood. (Pagels, 1979: 130) The usage of indicative may reflect the author's intention to depict Jesus as a teacher. The "subjunctive" usages are also used to depict cases of persecution as well as in the Synoptics. The tense itself, however, may not represent this concept. Apart from texts which parallel the Synoptics, the subjunctive mood is used in saying 103 to indicate a projection realm. On the other hand, it is interesting to see that there is no imperative in the beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas, whereas several imperatives can be found in the Synoptics, which represent the commandments from Jesus. Although the reason for this phenomenon is not clear, it is still inferable that the author of the Gospel of Thomas does not prefer to use this mood to urge readers but to describe what the promises of blessings are instead.

(B) Participants

In the Beatitudes, nominal groups are worth noting because the authors of these gospels used to employ adjectives or participles to identify the participants. In Matt 5:3–12, there are many nominal groups which indicate participants in this passage. The first participant refers to those who are blessed by a plural adjective. Secondly, there is a composed group οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι (poor in spirit) for whom is the kingdom of heaven. The participle πενθοῦντες (mourn) serves as the next participant who will finally receive the promise of comfort. The adjective πραεῖς (meek) follows in Matt 5:5 and becomes the fourth participant.³⁹ (Boice, 1972: 37–38) In Matt 5:6, a composition of participles πεινῶντες (hunger) and διψῶντες (thirst) becomes the next participant who will be filled. In Matt 5:7, the adjective of substance ἐλεήμονες (merciful) is used to stand as the sixth participant. Those who are pure in heart (καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ) is the seventh participant, and another adjective εἰρηνοποιοί (peacemaker) is the eighth. In Matt 5:10, the participle with the perfect passive tense δεδιωγμένοι (persecute) with a prepositional phrase ἕνεκεν

³⁹ The word meek means a subservient and trusting attitude before God in biblical language, and this makes meekness generally a vertical virtue rather than a horizontal one.

δικαιοσύνης (for the sake of righteousness) is the ninth participant. In Matt 5:11, there are three participants who are indicated by nominal groups: people who are persecuted, people who persecute others, and Jesus. The subject and object of the verbs *ὀνειδίσωσιν* (reproach), *διώξωσιν* (persecute), and *εἴπωσιν* (say) indicate the first two participants, and the prepositional phrase *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ* (for my sake) denotes Jesus as the third participant. In Matt 5:12, apart from those who are persecuted, there is another group of participants who have received the same persecution: the prophets. Although there are many different participants, they can be divided into three parties: people who practice these behaviours, people who do not, and God. The interaction among these participants is interwoven within God's treatment of people with different attitudes.

In the Gospel of Luke, similar participants can be traced: the blessed ones, those who persecute followers of Jesus, and God. Similar groups can be identified in this passage, including *πτωχοί* (poor, not mentioning in spirit), *πεινῶντες* (hunger, not mentioning thirsty), *κλαίοντες* (weep), those who are persecuted, and prophets. It is not difficult to realize that the passage in Matthew emphasizes ethical issues more, whereas Luke describes the essence of disciples. In other words, Matthew focuses on what disciples ought to be, but Luke indicates what they are. (Marshall 1978: 246) The alteration of the prepositional phrase *τῷ πνεύματι* (in spirit) in Matthew is worth noting because Luke omits this phrase to emphasize the associations between ethical and spiritual associations. (Marshall, 1978: 250) In addition, although there is a difference between “hunger” in Luke and “hunger and thirsty for righteousness” in Matthew, both of them are satisfied by God. In the third blessing in Luke, the author uses the term *κλαίω*, whereas Matthew uses *πενθέω*. Although these two terms are different, they belong to the semantic domain of “laugh, cry, and groan (25.135–25.145).” Furthermore, in the next blessing, Luke uses four elements to describe the situation of persecution, whereas Matthew contains three. In Luke, the subject *οἱ ἄνθρωποι* is indicated, referring to the non-Christian world and echoing the usage in Luke 6:26. All these usages indicate a similar register in both Matthew and Luke, although there are minor diversities.

Regarding the Gospel of Thomas, the participant which refers to those who are

blessed can be seen as well. The poor, the persecuted and those who are in hunger can be seen in the Gospel of Thomas. Nevertheless, the way the author states it may be different from that in Matthew or in Luke. In logion 49, the solitary ones (ΝΜΟΝΑΧΟC) are the blessed people who are also depicted as the elect (ΕΤCΟΤΠ). Nevertheless, the word ΝΜΟΝΑΧΟC is correlated to the term μοναχός, which is never used in the New Testament.⁴⁰ (Koester, 1982:154) Also, the term ΕΤCΟΤΠ is understood as ἐκλεκτός, which is only used once in the New Testament.⁴¹ It is clear that these two participants are similar to almost nothing in the New Testament. These two groups of people are stated as coming from and returning to the kingdom.⁴² (Valantasis, 1997: 126–127; Koester, 1982:154) The saying in logion 54 is similar to Matt 5:3 and Luke 6:20. It is plausible, however, that the author of Thomas uses the phrase in Luke, but changes the term into the kingdom of heaven which is the same as Matthew. The use of the kingdom of heaven indicates the spiritual entity, whereas “the poor” may refer to the economic status. According to the Gospel of Matthew, both the ideas of the kingdom of heaven and the phrase τῷ πνεύματι may represent the tendency of a spiritual perspective. In the Gospel of Luke, on the other hand, it is not necessary to understand the kingdom of God only through a spiritual view, and the omission of the phrase “in spirit” may reflect the stress upon the economic status, though not inevitably. It seems that the author of Thomas combines the expressions from the Synoptics to emphasize the connection between these two. This may influence the understanding of the participant in the Gospel of Thomas, neither the same as that in Matthew, nor in Luke. In addition, this expression seems to indicate the readers to be the poor, which means that “anyone who reads the text has become ‘the poor.’” (Valantasis, 1997: 132) Both in Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, it

⁴⁰ This term may imply participation in the unity of those who are with their divine origin (logia 16, 23, 61, and 75).

⁴¹ This term is used in Luke 23:35.

⁴² In logion 50, it says that “they come from the light, from the place where the light came into being by itself...we are the chosen of the living Father.” If the co-text of the Gospel of Thomas serves for the interpretation of the text, the concept of “kingdom” in logion 49 may refer to the kingdom of the living Father. In addition, this saying may reflect the theme at the beginning of the gospel: whoever finds the interpretation of these sayings will not experience death (logion 1).

is clear that the disciples are indicated in the literary context, but it is not necessarily the case in Thomas. In logion 58, it seems that the last sentence of the blessing (he has found life) can be understood as a dependent relative clause since “find life” is a blessing from the perspective of the Gospel of Thomas. Therefore, the participant is stated as those who struggle and they would find life. (Plisch, 2008: 145)

In logion 69a, both the terms ΝΤΑΥΔΙΩΚΕ and ΝΕΝΤΑΞΟΓΩΝ represent the 2nd perfect tense, while in the retroversion, these two terms are understood into participles, one with the perfect tense and the other with the aorist tense. These usages of tenses may reflect the sentences in Matt 5:8 and Luke 6:21. (Plisch, 2008: 168) The author of Thomas seems to interpret the persecution mentally or spiritually with the phrase ΖΜ ΠΟΧΗΤ, understood as ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν. The phrase ΝΕΝΤΑΞΟΓΩΝ ΠΕΙΩΤ ΖΝ ΟΥΜΕ, as known as οἱ ἀληθῶς γνόντες τὸν πατέρα, also leads the discussion into the concept of abstraction.

In logion 69b, the term ΝΕΤΚΑΕΙΤ is in present tense and the Greek participle πεινῶντες reflects this idea. This term is also used in both Matthew and Luke. In the relative clause, however, the subject of being satisfied is indicated as ΜΘΖΗΜΠΕΤΟΓΩΨ, understood as ἡ κοιλία τοῦ θέλοντος. This phrase is rarely used in the New Testament, and each time it refers to one’s stomach.⁴³ This is a brand new entity (participant) which is not indicated in the previous context, and the use of stomach depicts a concrete image of hunger. Putting the discussions together, we may find that the author seems to be inconsistent while stating these sayings: in 69a, a more imaginable picture is offered, whereas in 69b, a more real depiction is indicated. In addition, the logion 69a uses the term “Father” to express God, which is a canonical Gospel term. Nevertheless, in the Beatitudes in Matthew and Luke, the authors use the term “God” instead. This also reflects that the authors of the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics have different understandings in terms of the attitudes toward God from distinct people.⁴⁴ (Summers, 1968: 80–81)

In logion 7, the participants are the lion and man, and the interaction between

⁴³ This term is used ten times in the New Testament, including Matt 12:40, Luke 1:41, 44, 2:1, 11:27, Rom 16:18, 1 Cor 6:13, Phil 3:19, and Rev 10:10.

⁴⁴ It seems that the author of the Gospel of Thomas prefers to use the term “Father,” and sometimes is reluctant to use the unutterable name of God.

them is the man consuming the lion.⁴⁵ (Robinson, 1995: 39–46; Crislip, 2007: 609; Valantasis, 1997: 64–65; Pagels, 1979: 26–27) In logion 18, it seems that the concept of standing in the beginning and knowing the end are connected, and people who fit this description may not experience death.⁴⁶ (Koester, 1990: 127; DeConick, 2002: 15) In logion 19, one who exists before this person is born is blessed. In the saying 103, the participant is stated as those who are well prepared. Although these sayings may not find parallels in the Synoptics, similar concepts can be tracked. Participants in these sayings may be concerned with deeper knowledge, and these expressions of participants seem to be particular in the Gospel of Thomas.

In addition, there is another point which is worth noting. Comparing all the beatitudes, we can see that in the Synoptics, there are several participants who care about the relationship with others by showing good deeds or friendly attitudes to others. In Matt 5:7 and 5:9, the terms ἐλεήμονες (merciful) and εἰρηνοποιοί (peacemaker) imply that there will be objects of these actions or attitudes. Nevertheless, in the Gospel of Thomas, we can see that the author seldom addresses the interaction between the participants, and this phenomenon may fit the concept in logion 49 where the solitary person seems to be extolled. On the other hand, both the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics indicate the situation of persecution. In Matthew and Luke, however, when the persecution statements are addressed, it seems that the authors describe the persecutions with different terms: ὀνειδίσωσιν, διώξωσιν, and εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν in Matt 5:11; μισήσωσιν, ἀφορίσωσιν, ὀνειδίσωσιν, and ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν in Luke 6:22. These terms indicate the interaction between the persecutor and the persecuted. On the contrary, in the Gospel

⁴⁵ Robinson proposes that this bipartite distinction may reflect the concept of the tripartite soul in the Platonic tradition. Valantasis, on the other hand, states that a quasi-Platonic allegory for the soul should be considered in this saying. Nevertheless, Crislip suggests that this saying should be understood through the lens of early Christian discourse concerning the resurrection. Some scholars hold the presupposition of the Gnostic background of the Gospel of Thomas to argue that this book reflects the Greek philosophic tradition in terms of the use of symbolic language.

⁴⁶ “Knowing” seems to be the key for the “right understanding of the believers’ existence in the world.” On the other hand, “experience death” or “taste death” represents a Semitic expression, meaning “to die.”

of Thomas, only *μῆσιωσιν* and *διώξωσιν* are used. Again the interaction between participants seems to be less focused. Self-knowledge and self-consciousness are more important than the relationship with others, and this phenomenon is also reflected in the selections of different semantic domains and distinct types of transitivity.⁴⁷ (Pagels, 1979: 146)

C. Modes of Beatitudes in Different Gospels

(A) Time and Place

The passage Matt 5:3–12 belongs to the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:1–7:29).⁴⁸ (Tuttle, 1997: 229) The text says that as the crowds follow Jesus from different places, Jesus goes up on a mountain and begins to teach.⁴⁹ (Allison, 1999: 28; Harrington, 1991: 78; Cousland, 2002: 246–247) Therefore, it is possible that the beatitudes were preserved as a part of a speech, but later were written as a text. On the other hand, Luke 6:20–23 is located within the Sermon on the Plain. In Luke 6:17, the text says that Jesus comes down and stands on a level place, and a great crowd comes to him. Although there are many discussions concerning the connection between the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain, it is inferable that the beatitudes belong to a larger discourse.⁵⁰ The adverb *ἄνω* is used

⁴⁷ Orthodox Christianity may be more concerned with the relationship with others, but it seems that the Gnostics may not.

⁴⁸ 5:3 may be related to 6:19–21 (and possibly 7:21–23); 5:6 may be elaborated in 6:24–34 (especially 6:33); 5:7 may find its counterpart in 6:12, 14–15, and 5:9 may correspond with 5:43–48.

⁴⁹ In Matthew, it represents a collection of material addressed to the inner circle, the disciples. However, *δέ* in 5:1 connects the speaking of Jesus to the ministry in Galilee of Jesus at the end of chapter four. And this connection set up the circumstance of Jesus' sermon. Other scholars thought that the crowds should not be only the disciples. But no matter how the crowds could be understood, it is definite that the disciples must be among them and this fits some of the features of the Wisdom Tradition. On the other hand, the crowds are regarded as recipients of Jesus' halachah in 5–7 and of Jesus' warnings about the Pharisees. They are notably absent from the other discourses.

⁵⁰ The relationship between these two sermons was noticed in antiquity, and many scholars have proposed diverse opinions, including Origen, Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylactus, Augustine, etc.

in Luke 6:21 to emphasize precise time, while it does not appear in the Beatitudes in Matthew. Furthermore, both in Matthew and Luke the authors use the conjunction ὅταν to point out that the moment of persecution would be the time for people to be blessed.

Nevertheless, the time and place of the Gospel of Thomas seem to be very difficult to identify for two major reasons. Firstly, as mentioned above, the Beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas are located in different places. At one time, Jesus seems to speak to his disciples, but at another, Jesus is discussing general rules. Secondly, the sayings in the Gospel of Thomas seem to be a composite of wisdom literature or analects. The immediate literary context may not be necessarily associated with the text in terms of interpretation of temporal and spatial settings. Therefore, we can conclude that the author does not clearly indicate the spatial and temporal information.

(B) Cohesive Devices

Cohesion can be detected by repetitions of lexical and grammatical items. In Matt 5:3–12, it is clear that the word μακάριοι (25.119) is repeatedly used eight times.⁵¹ There are three words in this passage which belong to the same semantic domain: πενθοῦντες (25.124), χαίρετε (25.125), and ἀγαλλιᾶσθε (25.133). These items which belong to the domain of “happy, glad, and joyful” establish a semantic chain. In addition, the term οὐρανός (heaven) is used three times in this passage, and two of them are combined with the phrase ἡ βασιλεία (the kingdom). On the other hand, several grammatical patterns are worth noting. Firstly, the author of Matthew employs the pattern μακάριοι + noun, adjective or participle without finite verbs to point out what kind of people will be blessed. Secondly, the grammatical pattern μακάριοι...ὅτι is repeatedly used in this passage so that the reasons for the blessings will be indicated. Thirdly, in the relative clause, the 3rd person will be used to signify the object blessing. In the last beatitude in Matt 5:11–12, the author shifts the

⁵¹ This word is used in Matt 5:3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

personal pronoun from 3rd to 2nd, and the pattern is a little different.⁵² (Buttrick, 2002: 75) The author uses a finite verb ἐμί to emphasize the blessing, and this verb is omitted in the previous verses. In addition, although the pattern μακάριοι...ὅτι still exists, two imperatives are inserted in the middle to highlight the proper reactions while facing persecution. Thirdly, a comparison can be seen in the last clause which functions to encourage readers to be glad after the examples of the prophets.

In Luke 6:20–23, similar patterns and items can be found. Firstly, the term μακάριοι (25.119) is used four times alongside the patterns of μακάριοι + noun and μακάριοι...ὅτι. The personal pronoun, however, is not used all the time in this passage, especially in the clauses which explain reasons. In addition, the author adds the term νῦν twice in the blessings to indicate the same temporal concept, and this mark may serve the function of cohesion as well. Besides, the author of Luke does not use the 3rd person pronoun, but the 2nd person pronoun instead. Although there are only four blessings, the 2nd person pronoun is used consistently which may provide another element of cohesion.

Regarding the Gospel of Thomas, cohesion is very difficult to identify. The first reason is what has been pointed out is that the sayings are scattered. Secondly, as what has been represented above, the lexical items in these beatitudes do not belong to the same semantic domains. Thirdly, not all these sayings follow the pattern of μακάριοι...ὅτι to exhibit both the blessing and the reason. In logion 7, the author does not indicate reasons for blessings after stating the situation, as well as sayings 18 and 19. Saying 58 indicates that man who has struggled is blessed. The author does not denote whether the next statement “he has found life” is the reason or is the status quo of this person. Furthermore, the sayings 69b and 103 represent the pattern of μακάριοι... ἵνα (ἕνεκα), which refers to the purpose or result of the previous clause, but not the reason. Therefore, cohesion may be established on the basis of the phrase “blessed are...” in terms of the use of grammatical patterns. The sayings 68–69, however, may offer more clues for us to identify cohesion. These two sayings contain three blessing statements, and the term ΔΙΩΚΕ (διώκω) is used three times. In addition, the phrase ΕΥΨΑΛΜΕΣΤΕ ΤΗΤΝ ΝΣΕΡΔΙΩΚΕ (hate and persecute)

⁵² The term “you” may refer to the community being persecuted because of loyalty to Jesus.

in logion 68 seems to connect the idea of ΝΤΑΥΔΙΩΚΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΗ ΠΟΧΕΗΤ (persecute in their heart) in logion 69a because the action “hate” may result in persecution in one’s heart. Apart from these elements, the three sayings in logia 68–69 may be with different usages, especially saying 69b. Therefore, it is inferable that the sayings in the Gospel of Thomas are less cohesive than those in the Synoptics, both due to the scattered form and the choice of lexical items.

The conjunction ὅτι is used all the time in both Matt 5:3–12 and Luke 6:20–23. This conjunction is used nine times in Matthew and three times in Luke. Another conjunction γὰρ is also used in these two passages to indicate reasons, once in Matthew and twice in Luke.⁵³ (Marshall, 1978: 254) Nevertheless, the conjunction which points out reasons does not always appear in the beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas. The term καί is used three times in these blessing sayings in the Gospel of Thomas, including sayings 49 and 54. This conjunction, however, may be used for introducing direct or indirect discourse, and occasionally for indicating reasons.⁵⁴ (Murray, 1927: 45) There are two sentences in the logion 58, but the author uses asyndeton in this saying. In the saying 68, the conjunction introduces a relative clause, sometimes with a temporal meaning. (Walters, 1972: 70; Brankaer, 2010: 90; Plisch, 2008: 166; Reintges, 2004: 480) When we understand this term, ὅταν is usually preferred, which is used in temporal clauses with the subjunctive mood, (Porter, 1999: 240) and this usage is similar to that in the Synoptics. In the latter sentence in this saying, however, the author uses the conjunction αὐτω to connect two statements, which does not indicate reasons.⁵⁵ (Murray, 1927: 46) Similar cases can also be seen in the sayings 18 and 19, where the common conjunction αὐτω is used. The usage in sayings 69a and 69b are extraordinary. In logion 69a, the author uses an asyndeton clause which follows the blessing clause, whereas in logion 69b, the conjunction ὡς is used which serves similar functions of ἵνα in Greek to point

⁵³ In Luke 6:23, the reason is introduced by the phrase ἰδοὺ γὰρ, which is frequently used in Luke. Although this term is employed instead of ὅτι, they serve the same function of indicating reasons.

⁵⁴ This term can be used to express the intention if it is followed by the 2nd or 3rd future tenses.

⁵⁵ This conjunction is used for connecting sentences.

out the purpose or result.⁵⁶ (Layton, 2004: 183) These analyses represent the phenomenon that the authors of the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics prefer to use different conjunctions to connect clauses, and this may reflect distinct understandings of Jesus' sayings in terms of the beatitudes.

V. Conclusion

This study represents the case of the Beatitudes in both the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics with the tool of Hallidayan register theory. The field, tenor, and mode of both groups of Gospels are analyzed. Regarding the fields of the Gospels, we can see that the authors employ different types of transitivity and ergativity, and they prefer different forms of tense to draw the attention of readers while reading these books. In addition, the choices of lexical items are also different to emphasize their distinct foci. The authors of the Synoptics prefer to use relational and behavioural processes, whereas the author of the Gospel of Thomas frequently uses relational, mental, and material processes. Synoptics employ the passive or middle voices to indicate divine promises, but the Gospel of Thomas usually uses the active voice. Concerning the tense form, although they are in different languages (Greek and Coptic), we can still see that the future tense form is adopted in the Synoptics much more than the Gospel of Thomas, representing that the former focuses on the aspectual future, whereas the latter emphasizes the aspectual present. In addition, the choices of semantic domains are diverse in the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics. As to the tenors in these texts, different usages of person, number, and mood can also be detected. The ways they address the interaction between participants are not the same. It is plausible that the author of the Gospel of Thomas does not use the same person form consistently, but the Synoptics use 3rd person more. Furthermore, there is no imperative form in the beatitudes of the Gospel of Thomas. On the contrary, the indicative form is usually used to represent the declarative nature of this book. On the other hand, Jesus uses imperatives in the Synoptics. Apropos the modes of

⁵⁶ Asyndeton expresses linkage as $\alpha\upsilon\omega$ or $\Delta\epsilon$, which is common conjunctions as “and” or “but.”

CANONICAL OR NONCANONICAL: A STUDY OF THE CONTEXT OF ITUATION IN
THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, LUKE, AND THOMAS 75

these Gospels, the data of time and place are dissimilar. In the Synoptics, it is indicated that the beatitudes are given in the Sermon on the Mount/Plain. Yet in the Gospel of Thomas, there seems to be no clue for us to identify the time and place where the beatitudes are addressed. The authors also employ distinct conjunctions to represent the relationship between clauses. In the Synoptics, the causal relationship is much clearer in the beatitudes, but in the Gospel of Thomas, distinct relative clauses are employed. After the analysis of each component of the registers in these texts, we can conclude that the beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas and in the Synoptics belong to different registers, meaning that they may belong to distinct contexts of situation. In the beatitudes in the Synoptics, the context of situation would be a proclamation of Jesus to disciples, first delivered orally and later written. In addition, the authors prefer to use particular transitivity to focus on promises and behavior of reflection under certain circumstances. Furthermore, passive and middle voices are frequently employed to highlight promises, while subjunctives are used to indicate certain situations. On the contrary, in the Beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas, the context of situation refers to sayings from Jesus, but the addressees are not clearly indicated. The use of transitivity reflects that the author does not emphasize behavior, but focuses on doing and thinking instead. Moreover, less passive and middle voices are adopted and indicatives are employed to reflect the declaration nature of the Gospel of Thomas.

According to this study, one can see a comparison between the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and Thomas. Although this study analyzes the Beatitudes which is a small part of the whole book, the outcome can open a door for further study. Based on the study of field, tenor, and mode, one can find the whatness, whoness, and howness within these books to provide more details for differentiating canonical from non-canonical books.

Appendix: Beatitudes in the Gospel of Thomas

Logion 7

ΟΥΜΑΧΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΜΟΥΕΙΠΑΧΙΕΤΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΑΙΟΥΟΜΩ ΑΥΩ ΝΤΕ ΠΜΟΥΕΨΩΠΕ
ΡΡΩΜΕ

Blessed is the lion that a person will eat, and the lion will become human.

Logion 18

ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕΤΝΑΖΩΖΕ ΕΡΑΤΦΕΝΤΑΡΧΗ ΑΥΩ ΦΝΑΟΟΥΩΝΘΕΣΗ ΑΥΩ
ΦΝΑΔΙΤΠΕΑΝ ΜΜΟΥ

Blessed is he who will stand at the beginning, and he will know the end, and he will not taste death.

Logion 19

ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕΝΤΑΨΩΠΕ ΖΑ ΤΕΣΗ ΕΜΠΑΤΕΨΩΠΕ

Blessed is he who was before he came into being.

Logion 49

ΖΕΝΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΝΕ ΝΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ ΑΥΩ ΕΤΣΟΤΠ ΧΕ ΤΕΤΝΑΞΕ ΑΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΧΕ ΝΤΩΤΝ
ΖΝΕΒΟΛ ΝΖΗΤΣ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΤΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΜΑΥ

Blessed are the solitary ones, the elect. For you will find the kingdom. For you come from it (and) will return to it.

Logion 54

CANONICAL OR NONCANONICAL: A STUDY OF THE CONTEXT OF ITUATION IN
THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, LUKE, AND THOMAS 77

ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΖΗΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΝΕ ΝΕΗΚΕ ΧΕ ΤΩΤΝΤΕ ΤΗΝΤΕΡΟ ΝΜΠΗΥΕ

Blessed are the poor. For the kingdom of heaven belongs to you.

Logion 58

ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΠΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΤΑΞΙCΕ ΑΦΕ ΑΠΩΝΞ

Blessed is the man who has struggled. He has found life.

Logion 68

ΝΤΩΤΝ ΖΗΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΥΨΑΝΜΕCΤΕ ΤΗΥΤΝ ΝCΕΡΔΙΩΚΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΑΥΩ
CΕΝΑΞΕ ΑΝ ΕΤΟΠΟC ΖΗ ΠΜΑ ΕΝΤΑΥΔΙΩΚΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΕΥΤΥ

Blessed are you when they hate (and) persecute you. But they will find no place at the site where they have persecuted you.

Logion 69a

ΖΗΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΝΕ ΝΑΕΙ ΝΤΑΥΔΙΩΚΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΗ ΠΟΧΞΗΤ ΝΕΤΗΜΑΥ
ΝΕΝΤΑΞCΟΥΩΝ ΠΕΙΩΤ ΖΝ ΟΥΜΕ

Blessed are those who have been persecuted in their heart. They are the ones who have truly come to know the Father.

Logion 69b

ΖΗΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΝΕΤΞΚΑΕΙΤ ΩΙΝΑ ΕΥΝΑΤCΙΟ ΝΘΞΗ ΜΠΕΤΟΗΩΨ

Blessed are those who suffer from hunger so that the belly of the one who wishes will be satisfied.

Logion 103

ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΠΑΕΙ ΕΤΣΟΟΥΝ ΧΕ ΖΗΝ ΔΥΜΜΕΡΟΣ ΕΝΛΗΣΤΗΣ ΝΗΥ
ΕΖΟΥΝ ΩΙΝΑ ΕΦΝΑΤΩΟΥΝ ΝΥΣΩΟΥΣ ΝΤΕΦΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΔΥΩ ΝΥΜΟΥΡ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΣΝ
ΤΕΦΠΕ ΖΑ ΤΕΣΗ ΕΜΠΑΤΟΥΕΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ

Blessed is the person who knows at which point the robbers are going to enter, so that [he] may arise, gather together his [domain], and gird his loins before they enter.

輔仁
宗教研究

Reference

- Allison, Dale C. (1999). *The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination*. Companions to the New Testament. New York: Crossroad Press.
- Asgeirsson, Jon Ma. (2006). Conflicting Epic Worlds. (Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, April D. Deconick, and Risto Uro eds.), *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity: the Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas* (pp.155–176). Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 59. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Baker, Dom Aelred. (1964). Pseudo-Macarius and the Gospel of Thomas. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 18: 215–225.
- Baker, Dom Aelred. (1965). Fasting to the World. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84: 291–294.
- Beare, F. W. (1960). The Gospel According to Thomas: A Gnostic Manual. *Canadian Journal of Theology*, 6: 102–112.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. (1995). *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matt 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. (1995). *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism*. Oxford Bible Series. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boice, James Montgomery. (1972). *The Sermon on the Mount: An Exposition*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Press.
- Boring, M. Eugene. (1988). The Historical-Critical Method's 'Criteria of Authenticity': the Beatitudes in Q and Thomas as a Test Case. *Semeia*, 44: 9–44.
- Bovon, François. (1995). *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 36. PA.: Pickwick Press.
- Brankaer, Johanna. (2010). *Coptic: A Learning Grammar (Sahidic)*. Subsidia et Instrumenta Linguarum Orientis 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Bruce, F. F. (1974). *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Press.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. (1968). *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. New York:

- Harper & Row Press.
- Burkitt, F. C. (1906). *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark Press.
- Buttrick, David. (2002). *Speaking Jesus: Homiletic Theology and the Sermon on the Mount*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Cameron, Ron. (1982). *The Other Gospels: Non-Canonical Gospel Texts*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Cameron, Ron. (1991). The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Origins (Birger A. Pearson ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (pp.381–392). Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Carlston, Charles E. (1962). A Positive Criterion of Authenticity. *Biblical Research*, 7: 33–44.
- Cousland, J. R. C. (2002). *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 102. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Crislip, Andrew. (2007). Lion and Human in Gospel of Thomas Logion 7. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 126: 595–613.
- Crossan, John Dominic. (1971). The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 90: 451–465.
- Crossan, John Dominic. (1973). The Seed Parable of Jesus. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 92: 244–266.
- Crossan, John Dominic. (1985). *Four Other Gospels: Shadows on the Contours of Canon*. Minn.: Winston Press.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. (1962). The Problem of the Historical Jesus. (Carl E. Braaten and Roy Harrisville eds.), *Kerygma and History: A Symposium on the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann* (pp. 138–171). Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Dart, John. (1988). *The Jesus of Heresy and History: the Discovery and Meaning of the Nag Hammadi Gnostic Library*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Press.
- Davies, Stevan L. (1983). *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom*. New York: Seabury Press.

- DeConick, April D. (2002). The Original Gospel of Thomas. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 56: 167–199.
- DeConick, April D. (2005). *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and Its Growth*. Early Christianity in Context Library of New Testament Studies 286. New York: T. & T. Clark Press.
- DeConick, April D. (2006). *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation with A Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel*. Library of New Testament Studies 287. New York: T. & T. Clark Press.
- DeConick, April D. (2008). The Gospel of Thomas. (Paul Foster ed.), *The Non-Canonical Gospels* (pp. 13–29). T. & T. Clark Biblical Studies. New York: T. & T. Clark Press.
- Dunderberg, Ismo. (1998). Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition. (Risto Uro ed.), *Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas* (pp. 33–64). Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Press.
- Eccles, Lance. (1991). *Introductory Coptic Reader: Selections from the Gospel of Thomas with Full Grammatical Explanations*. Kensington: Dunwoody Press.
- Ehrman, Bart D. (2003). *Lost Christians: the Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never New*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Craig A. (1989). *Life of Jesus Research: An Annotated Bibliography*. New Testament Tools and Studies 13. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Frend, W. H. C. (1967). The Gospel of Thomas: Is Rehabilitation Possible? *Journal of Theological Studies*, 18: 13–26.
- Gee, James Paul. (1961). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routedge Press.
- Goodacre, Mark S. (2012). *Thomas and the Gospels: the Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Press.
- Goughton, Herbert Pierrepont. (1959). *The Coptic Verb: Bohairic Dialect*. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Grant, Robert McQueen. (1960). Two Gnostic Gospels. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 79: 1–11.

- Grant, Robert McQueen and William R. Schoedel. (1960). *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. New York: Doubleday Press.
- Grobel, Kendrick. (1962). How Gnostic is the Gospel of Thomas? *New Testament Studies*, 8: 367–373.
- Guillaumont, A. (1962). NHSTEUEIN TON KOSMON (P. Oxy. 1, verso, 1.5–6). *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 11: 15–23.
- Gärtner, Bertil E. (1961). *The Theology of the Gospel According to Thomas*. New York: Harper Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language*. Explorations in Language Studies Series. London: Edward Arnold Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1988). On the Language of Physical Science. (Mohsen Ghadessy ed.), *Registers of Written English: Situational Factors and Linguistic Features* (pp. 162–178). New York: Pinter Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. English Language Series 9. London: Longman Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. (1989). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social–Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- M. A. K. Halliday, Ruqaiya Hasan, and J. R. Martin. (1989). *Language Development: Learning Language, Learning Culture. Advances in Discourse Processes*. Meaning and Choice in Language: Studies for Michael Halliday 1. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar. 3rd ed.* London: E. Arnold Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. (2006). *Construing Experience through Meaning: A Language-Based Approach to Cognition*. New York: Continuum Press.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (1991). *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina Series 1.

- Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Higgins, A. J. B. (1960). Non-Gnostic Sayings in the Gospel of Thomas. *Novum Testamentum*, 4: 292–306.
- Koester, Helmut. (1982). *Introduction to the New Testament: History and Literature of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. New York: Fortress Press.
- Koester, Helmut. (1990). *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM Press.
- Lapham, F. (2003). *An Introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha. Understanding the Bible and Its World*. New York: T. & T. Clark Press.
- Lapide, Pinchas. (1986). *The Sermon on the Mount, Utopia or Program for Action*. New York: Orbis Books Press.
- Layton, Bentley. (2004). *A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary: Sahidic Dialect*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag Press.
- Lincoln, Bruce. (1977). Thomas-Gospel and Thomas-Community: A New Approach to a Familiar Text. *NovT*, 19: 65–76.
- Louw, J. P., and Eugene A. Nida. (1989). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. New York: United Bible Societies Press.
- Luomanen, Petri. (2006). ‘Let Him Who Seeks, Continue Seeking:’ The Relationship between the Jewish Christian Gospels and the Gospel of Thomas. (Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, April D. Deconick, and Risto Uro eds.), *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity: the Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas* (pp. 119–154). Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 59. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Lyons, John. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marjanen, Antti. (2006). The Portrait of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas. (Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, April D. Deconick, and Risto Uro eds.), *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity: the Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas* (pp. 209–220). Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 59. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Marshall, I. Howard. (1978). *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek New Testament 3. Exeter: Paternoster Press.
- Matthiessen, Christian M. I. M. (1993). Register in the Round: Diversity in a Unified

- Theory of Register Analysis. (Mohsen Ghdeesy ed.), *Register Analysis: Theory and Practice* (pp. 221–292). London: Pinter Press.
- Meyer, Marvin W. (2003). *Secret Gospels: Essays on Thomas and the Secret Gospel of Mark*. Pa.: Trinity Press.
- Meyer, Marvin W. (2006). *The Gnostic Discoveries: the Impact of the Nag Hammadi Library*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Press.
- Moreland, Milton. (2006). The Twenty-Four Prophets of Israel Are Dead: Gospel of Thomas 52 as a Critique of Early Christian Hermeneutics. (Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, April D. Deconick, and Risto Uro eds.), *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity: the Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas* (pp. 75–92). Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 59. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Murray, Margaret Alice. (1927). *Elementary Coptic (Sahidic) Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Bernard Quaritch Press.
- North, Robert. (1962). Chenoboskion and Q. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 24: 154–170.
- Pagels, Elaine H. (1979). *The Gnostic Gospels*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson Press.
- Pagels, Elaine H. (2003). *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas*. New York: Random House Press.
- Patterson, Stephen J. (1993). *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus. Foundations & Facets*. Reference Series. Sonoma: Polebridge Press.
- Perrin, Nicholas. (2002). *Thomas and Tatian: the Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*. Academia Biblica 5. Society of Biblical Literature. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Perrin, Nicholas. (2004). NHC II, 2 and the Oxyrhynchus Fragments (P. Oxy 1, 654, 655): Overlooked Evidence for a Syriac Gospel of Thomas. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 58: 138–151.
- Perrin, Nicholas. (2007). *Thomas, the Other Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Perrin, Norman. (1967). *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row Press.

- Perrin, Norman. (1976). *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Plisch, Uwe-Karsten. (2008). *The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Plumley, J. Martin. (1948). *An Introductory Coptic Grammar: Sahidic Dialect*. London: Home & von Thal Press.
- Polkow, Dennis. (1987). Method and Criteria for Historical Jesus Research. (K. H. Richards ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (pp. 336–355). Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1981). The Gospel of Thomas Revisited. (B. Barc ed.), *Colloque International sur les Textes de Nag Hammadi* (pp. 218–266). BCNH 1. Louvain: Peeters Press.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1993). *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Peter Lang Press.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1996). *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice*. Studies in Biblical Greek 2. New York: Peter Lang Press.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1999). *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.
- Porter, Stanley E. (2000). Dialect and Register in the Greek of the New Testament: Theory. (M. Daniel Carroll R. ed.), *Rethinking Contexts, Reading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation* (pp.190–208). Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.
- Quispel, Gilles. (1957). The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament. *Vigiliae christiana*, 11: 189–207.
- Quispel, Gilles. (1964). The Syrian Thomas and the Syrian Macarius. *Vigiliae christiana*, 18: 226–235.
- Quispel, Gilles. (2008). The Gospel of Thomas Revisited. (Gilles Quispel and Johannes van Oort eds.), *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica: Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel* (pp. 175–225). Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies 25. Leiden: Brill Press.

- Reed, Jeffrey T. (1997). *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. JSNTSup 136. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.
- Reintges, Chris H. (2004). *Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic Dialect): A Learner's Grammar*. Study Book of African Languages 15. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Press.
- Robinson, James McConkey. (1988). The Study of the Historical Jesus after Nag Hammadi. *Semeia*, 44: 45–55.
- Robinson, James McConkey and Helmut Koester. (1971). *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Robinson, T. M. (1995). *Plato's Psychology*. 2nd ed. Phoenix Supplementary 8, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Schoedel, William R. (1960). Naassene Themes in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas. *Vigiliae christiana*, 14: 225–234.
- Schoedel, William R. (1960). Parables in the Gospel of Thomas: Oral Tradition or Gnostic Exegesis. *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 43: 548–560.
- Stein, Robert. H. (1980). The 'Criteria' for Authenticity. (Richard Thomas France and David Wenham eds.), *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels* (pp. 225–263). Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.
- Summers, Ray. (1968). *The Secret Sayings of the Living Jesus: Studies in the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas*. Waco: Word Press.
- Thompson, Geoff. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder Education Press.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. (1986). *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Press.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. (1988). Thomas and the Synoptics. *Novum Testamentum* 30: 132–157.
- Turner, H. E. W. (1962). *Thomas and the Evangelists*. Studies in Biblical Theology 35. Naperville: A. R. Allenson Press.
- Turner, H. E. W. (1971). *History and the Gospel*. London: Mowbray Press.

CANONICAL OR NONCANONICAL: A STUDY OF THE CONTEXT OF ITUATION IN
THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, LUKE, AND THOMAS 87

- Tuttle, Gary A. (1997). Sermon on the Mount: Its Wisdom Affinities and Their Relation to Its Structure. *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*, 20: 213–230.
- Uro, Risto. (1998). Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition. (Risto Uro ed.), *Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas* (pp. 8–32). Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Press.
- Valantasis, Richard. (1997). *The Gospel of Thomas. New Testament Readings*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Walters, C. C. (1972). *An Elementary Coptic Grammar of the Sahidic Dialect*. Oxford: Blackwell Press.
- Westfall, Cynthia Long. (2005). *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning*. Literary of New Testament Studies 297. New York: T. & T. Clark Press.
- Williams, Peter J. (2009). Alleged Syriac Catchwords in the Gospel of Thomas. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 63: 71–82.
- Wilson, Marvin R. (1970). *Coptic Future Tenses: Syntactical Studies in Sahidic*. Janua Linguarum. Series Practica 64. Hague: Mouton Press.
- Wilson, R. McL. (1960a). Studies in the Gospel of Thomas. London: Mowbray Press.
- Wilson, R. McL. (1960b). Thomas and the Growth of the Gospels. *Harvard Theological Review*, 53: 231–250.
- Wilson, R. McL. (1960c). Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels. *Expository Times*, 72: 36–39.
- Younan, Sameh. (2005). *So, You Want to Learn Coptic? A Guide to Bohairic Grammar*. Coptic Psalmody Book. Sydney: St. Mary, St. Bakhomious and St. Shenouda Coptic Orthodox Church Press.

正典文獻與典外文獻： 馬太福音、路加福音、多馬福音之情境語境

劉加恩

中華福音神學研究學院助理教授

提要

在基督教的發展過程中，直到西元第四世紀才有關於正典的具體表述，除了正典中的書卷，新約時代亦有許多文本被稱為次經、偽經。在很長一段時間裡，教會對這些文獻並沒有給予太多的重視。本文將運用系統功能語言學的語域理論，嘗試論證《多馬福音》和《對觀福音書》中的八福，事實上乃屬於不同的語域和不同的語境：在《對觀福音書》中，情境的設置乃是耶穌對門徒的宣講，以口頭為始，後書寫成文字，作者有其偏好的及物性動詞，並且關注對應許和反思行為。此外，作者也常用被動和關身語態，並以假設語氣來表示某些情境；《多馬福音》的上下文則直接指出耶穌所說的話，但沒有明確指出收件人的身分，同時，該文本的作者不強調行為，而是注重「行動」和「思想」。此外，作者也較少採用被動語態和觀身語態，並使用直說語氣來體現書的宣言性。

關鍵詞：《多馬福音》、《馬太福音》、《路加福音》、八福、語域分析