T&T CLARK JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN TEXTS SERIES

Johnson Thomaskutty

Saint Thomas the Apostle: New Testament, Apocrypha, and Historical Traditions

BLOOMSBURY

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN TEXTS IN
CONTEXTS AND RELATED STUDIES

Saint Thomas the Apostle

New Testament, Apocrypha, and Historical Traditions

Johnson Thomaskutty

Foreword by
James H. Charlesworth

Bloomsbury T&T Clark
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
BLOOMSBURY
LONDON • OXFORD • NEW YORK • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury T&T Clark
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
Imprint previously known as T&T Clark

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

First published 2018

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-0-5676-7284-1
ePDF: 978-0-5676-7285-8

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Thomaskutty, Johnson, author.
Title: St Thomas the Apostle: New Testament, Apocrypha, and historical traditions/Johnson Thomaskutty; foreword by James H. Charlesworth.
Description: New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017032308 (print) | LCCN 2017058681 (ebook) | ISBN 9780567672858 (epdf) | ISBN 9780567672841 (hb: alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Thomas, Apostle, Saint, active 1st century. | Bible. John–Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Gospel of Thomas (Infancy Gospel)–Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Acts of Thomas–Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Gospel of Thomas (Coptic Gospel)–Criticism, interpretation, etc.
Classification: LCC BS2520.T45 (ebook) | LCC BS2520.T45 T46 2018 (print) | DDC 226/.092–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017032308

Series: Jewish and Christian Texts, volume 25

Typeset by Deanta Global Publishing Services, Chennai, India

Contents

Foreword: The Apostle Thomas and Christianity's Mission to the East

According to Mackinder's Heartland Theory of 1904, he who controls the "Heartland" of Europe controls the world island. This slogan helped to define the twentieth century. Primarily, Eurasia was in focus. What was important was "the West"; this theme even defined the expansion of America as in the well-known slogan "Move West, young man, move West."

In terms of biblical research, I see this Eurocentric vision as beginning with a Christian devotion to Paul who led missionary journeys to the West and to the far West, or Spain, by his own expectations expressed in Romans 15:24. Too many introductions to Christian origins focus on Peter and Paul, both of whom were probably martyred in Rome. Thomas and movement eastward are often neglected in such publications. The devotion to Mary, Mary Magdalene, and other Apostles, including Philip, John, and Thomas are, in contrast, scarcely mentioned. The documents later canonized and especially the additional early Christian writings show Christian fascination and preoccupation with each of these women and men who were so close to Jesus of Nazareth. Such early Christian compositions are too quickly dismissed as documents of the "Apocryphal New Testament." Texts such as the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Acts of Thomas* are fundamental for understanding Christian origins. However, the word "apocryphal" does not mean unimportant. As such, the present book by Professor Thomaskutty, who teaches in India, brings back into focus not only the apocryphal compositions but one of the lost figures of Christian origins: Thomas, the Twin.

Christianity began in the East in ancient Palestine. Jesus originated from the easternmost portions of the Roman Empire. He was a devout Jew whose vision was the Holy Land, and, as a prophet, he called Israel to repent and to prepare for God's rule. According to Mt. 6:10, Jesus taught his followers to pray for God's will to be observed on earth. The prayer was originally spoken in Aramaic, and "on earth" would thus most likely mean "in the Land" promised

to Abraham (Greek: γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς·). Recall also that according to Matthew, Jesus returns from Egypt "into the land of Israel" (εἰς γῆν Ἰσραήλ· 2:20).

Scholars of Christian origins often recite how Tertullian (c. 160–250), Cyprian (c. 200–258), and Origen (c. 185–c. 254) exhorted Christians to recite the "Lord's Prayer." Attention is thence drawn to the West; Tertullian represented North Africa (esp. Carthage) and Italy, Cyprian also represented Carthage, and Origen lived in Egypt and Caesarea Maritima, a city in Palestine defined by the West. But what about the East? What about the evidence of Nestorians in China before the sixth century CE and what about India? How did the Thomas traditions migrate to that large and complex continent?

According to Acts 2, the majority of those who heard the apostles, including Thomas, were from the East, as the following peoples were present: Parthians, Medes, Elamites, residents of Mesopotamia, Egyptians, and Arabians. This report also seems to indicate that there were many people from the East in Jerusalem before 70 CE.

Thomas has been maligned and branded as "doubting Thomas." The source text for this misinterpretation is John 20; yet, in this chapter, Thomas asks a question, indicating that he is a good disciple, and supplies the criteria for resurrection belief. He never doubts Jesus; he asks to experience what the other disciples have experienced and supplies data seen only by the Beloved Disciple. Many experts perceive that John is the greatest drama in the New Testament; if so, we should recognize that dramatically, only Thomas and Jesus appear in the final scene. Throughout this masterpiece, the author of John seeks to demonstrate the proper confession; it is thus significant that he allows only Thomas to express the perfect confession and positions it at the end of the Gospel of John: "my Lord and my God." The importance and position of this confession is lost to those who do not recognize that Chapter 21 was added as an appendix to bring the East and West closer together. In my *The Beloved Disciple*, I was surprised that I was unable to falsify the hypothesis that Thomas was "the Beloved Disciple" in John. Surely I in the West could not be oblivious to the claim that others in the East had imagined long ago that Thomas was certainly the Beloved Disciple.

From the second to the fourth centuries CE, many documents were composed under the name of Thomas and in honor of him. In this book,

critical scholars' opinions are judiciously analyzed by Thomaskutty. They include the erudite discussions of the following compositions:

The Gospel of Thomas
The Book of Thomas the Contender
The Acts of Thomas
The Infancy Gospel of Thomas

In my *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications*, I drew attention to more compositions highlighting Thomas: The *Minor Acts of Thomas*, the *Apocalypse of Thomas*, and the *Consummation of Thomas*. But these compositions are not nearly as important for this exploration as those chosen by Thomaskutty.

In the West, Thomas is not considered an ideal disciple because of a misinterpretation of John 20 in which Thomas is maligned as a "doubting Thomas." The interpretation misrepresents the Greek language, the narrative, and the rhetoric. In the West, especially in Rome, Peter is saluted as the head of the Church, and this thought is grounded in an exegesis of Matthew 16.

In the Gospel of John, we find innuendos that Thomas—especially if he is the Beloved Disciple—is superior to Peter. From Jerusalem through Edessa, and certainly in India, Thomas was honored. He was the ideal follower of Jesus Christ. According to John, when Thomas first spoke and urged others, he may have been the leader among the Twelve. Thomas counsels that all disciples should follow Jesus until his death, words that foreshadow the setting at the cross. The male disciple, called "the Beloved Disciple," is placed by the Fourth Evangelist at the foot of the cross. He sees the spear go into Jesus's side. Thomas refers to it as one of the criteria, something he would have known if he was the Beloved Disciple. Finally, Thomas alone is chosen to make the perspicacious and concluding confession: "My Lord and my God."

Beginning in the fifteenth century CE, the Church in India was sometimes persecuted by European "Christians," especially the Portuguese, who burned all the ancient Indian writings they could find. The Europeans may also have judged that Indian Christians did not approve of images, read scripture in Syriac not Latin, and did not subscribe to the Christology of the West.

It is imperative to rethink New Testament scholars' and early church historians' conclusion that there cannot be any history in the *Acts of Thomas*.

Here are my seven reasons that indicate such a reopening of research is warranted:

1. Scholars have been influenced by Walter Bauer's brilliant examination of earliest Christianity. In *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, he argued that in almost every city in which Christianity appeared before 200 CE, Christians imagined that a famous apostle is the one who brought the Good News about Jesus to their own city. Many of these legends are devoid of reliable history. Yet, we now know that the bones of Peter and Paul have been found most likely, according to archaeologists, in ancient Rome. We scholars admit that we do not know who brought Jesus's message to many of the capitals; not even Paul knew who brought "Christianity" to Athens and Rome. No such confusion and lack of knowledge is associated with India; all the early records attribute this action to only one disciple: Thomas.
2. Alexander the Great opened up the routes from West to East and from Palestine to India which he entered. Trade between West and East began to flourish on land and sea.
3. The *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (*Periplus of the Red Sea*) is a Greek composition (Περίπλους τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς Θαλάσσης) that describes the circumnavigation (*periplus*) that led from the coast of Egypt to the coast of southwestern India, the home of "the Thomas Christians." Scholars now tend to date the original composition to the time of Thomas or the middle of the first century CE. The description of the voyage proves that trade flourished along the Red Sea (Ἐρυθρά Θάλασσα) to India. Any apostle or missionary could have also taken this journey from Palestine to Egypt and finally to India. The zeal of the earliest Christians would have fuelled the excitement of sharing the claim that God raised Jesus from the dead and that Jesus was about to return to earth.
4. In *Ant* 3.151-87, Josephus supplies ample information that commodities from Persia and India reached Jerusalem and were valued. The high priest wore linen and sardonyx; the finest examples come from India (see *War* 5.228-37). Some Persian loanwords, such as "paradise," and concepts, such as a dualistic paradigm defined by "light" and "darkness," reached and influenced Jewish thinkers in Palestine, including the celibate Essenes who lived at Qumran.

5. As far as I know, archaeologists have found no synagogue from the Roman era in southwest India, but legends abound that Jews were present on the Malabar Coast long before Thomas. The skills and prosperity of Jewish merchants, who moved from West to East, add credence to such conclusions. Scholars have shown that, from at least the sixth century BCE, Jews were thriving in "Babylon," Tus, Ctesiphon, Kish, Susa, Ahwaz, Hamadan, and Nahavand.
6. One of the most famous Indian emperors was Ashoka (c. 273 to c. 232 BCE) of the Maurya dynasty. Not so well known, and incorrectly considered a creation of a medieval novelist, is the Indo-Parthian king named Gondophares (Gundaphoros). We now know that he existed during the time of Thomas as proved by his coins. The Parthian invasion of Palestine in 40 BCE is obvious from archaeological work in Palestine and seems to be referenced in the *Parables of Enoch* (1En 37-71). Such invasions and the constant flow of caravans bringing goods from East to West would have enhanced the link between both regions. Gondophares I may have died in 10 BCE long before Thomas's mission, but there were other kings by that name as proved by a rock inscription of 46 CE at Takht-i-Bahi in Pakistan (using today's terms).
7. According to Matthew, the resurrected Lord ordered his disciples to carry his message to all areas of the known world. Paul planned to reach the farthest western area, Spain, according to Romans 15. If Thomas made the definitive confession, "My Lord and my God," and if he knew this commission when he was among the disciples in the Holy Land, he could have been the one who went East. That was the area of the world not yet visited by the Twelve. As all other disciples were heading to Rome, Turkey, Greece, Egypt, and Carthage, Thomas was the one who was heralded as the Apostle to the East. The risen Lord was remembered to have instructed his disciples to "go into all the world." Thomas is the only one who was remembered to have gone East.

Consequently, while the Thomas legend known to us from the third-century *Acts of Thomas* has been too often relegated from discussions on history, we are presently seeing a change among scholars, even New Testament experts. We have learned that within legends, reliable and insightful history may be

hidden. Thomaskutty's monograph is a call to rethink Thomas traditions and the movement of God's good news to the East. I have been intimating this insight since the 1960s with my work on the *Odes of Solomon*. Syriac, the successor to Jesus's Aramaic, was the language of Eastern Christianity, and many ancient documents composed in Syriac mirror the success of Jesus's message in the East. A love for Paul's genius should not be myopic and hide our global perspective. The world should be in focus, especially as we all endeavor to represent a global perspective.

What I find most attractive is Thomaskutty's interdisciplinary methodology. It is both revolutionary and refreshing. He examines the four selected texts using textual criticism, biblical criticism, narrative criticism, and theological reflections. He is well read and knows the strengths of the leading scholars. His review includes the so-called canonical texts, the apocryphal compositions, and historical traditions in both collections.

In summary, is there any truth in the claim that Thomas made it to India? Many in India, notably "the Thomas Christians," would answer "yes." Migrations of Jews from Babylonian captivity continued from the sixth century BCE to the first century CE. Jewish pilgrims poured into Jerusalem from the East, including Persia and India. The *Periplus* provides data about first-century CE trade routes from Egypt to India. The trail of compositions devoted to Thomas and the caravan routes from Jerusalem to Edessa, along routes that led from one synagogue to another, lies behind such legends. However, we have far less information about caravan routes from Edessa to India. Legends are not myths; there may be some residual history in them. Thus, thanks to the research of many scholars, especially Thomaskutty, it is obvious that Thomas proves to be an ideal disciple. Our traditions also claim he took Jesus's good news to India and to the East.

James H. Charlesworth
Princeton

Acknowledgments

This monograph is the final outcome of a postdoctoral research project undertaken in four different institutions: École Biblique de Jerusalem, Israel, as a Foundation on Judaism and Christian Origins (FJCO) scholar; Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, as a Global Research Institute (GRI) scholar; Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, as a FJCO scholar; and South Asia Institute of Advanced Christian Studies (SAIACS), Bangalore, India, as a Center for South Asia Research (CSAR) scholar. I wish to express my gratitude to the Union Biblical Seminary, Pune, India, for awarding me sabbatical leave during the period of October 2015 to November 2016, which allowed me to complete this project. I am grateful to Prof. James H. Charlesworth for his continuous encouragement and support toward this project, even from the days of my studies as a Th.M. student (2004–2005) in the Princeton Theological Seminary. He deserves great appreciation for his continuous efforts in shaping my thoughts and painstakingly going through the entire manuscript several times, writing a foreword for the book, and accepting the work into the prestigious *Jewish and Christian Texts* series of Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

I would also like to acknowledge and express my gratitude to many of those who provided sincere engagements with the content of the manuscript and insights into the biblical and historical personality of Thomas in different occasions and places: in Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Prof. Jan G. van der Watt; in Fuller Seminary, Profs. Marianne Meye Thompson, Joel B. Green, David J. Downs, Amos Yong, Donald A. Hagner, Frederick Bruner, and many others; in Princeton Seminary, Profs. Clifton C. Black, Dale C. Allison, and George L. Parsenios; in Boston University, Profs. Dana L. Robert, and Jesudas M. Athyal; in Harvard Divinity School, Profs. Karen L. King, Francis X. Clooney, and Charles M. Stang; in George Fox University, Prof. Paul N. Anderson; in Yale University, Prof. Harold W. Attridge; and in Duke University, Prof. Mark Goodacre. I remain thankful to all of you.

The academic institutions at which I delivered presentations on parts of this monograph, such as the Fuller Seminary, Princeton Seminary, Harvard Divinity School, Union Biblical Seminary, and SAIACS, and churches such as Rock of the Nations, Sadhana Sangat Hind-O-Pak Church, and the India Christian Fellowship in California deserve special mention. Church historians and biblical scholars in Dharmaram Vidhya Kshetra and St. Peter's Pontifical Seminary in Bangalore, Jnana Deepa Vidyapeeth in Pune, Orthodox Theological Seminary, Mar Thoma Theological Seminary, and St. Thomas Apostolic Seminary in Kerala are also worthy of special mention. Special interviews with Dr. Peter C. Pothen in Bangalore, Dr. Deivanayagam in Chennai, and many others provided me with insights into Thomas from their vast knowledge on the subject.

I must also thank my friends, Dr. Douglas Estes, Dr. Brian Small, and Ms. Shakina Mohol for their editorial work and professional assistance.

I am deeply indebted to my students and colleagues, and the administration of the Union Biblical Seminary, Pune, for their moral and intellectual support. I thank my wife Shyni, daughter Jemimah, and son Jeremiah for their continuous support. This monograph is dedicated to all the Thomas Christians in India and around the world for their unique faith and identity.

Johnson Thomaskutty
Pune, India

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABC-CLIO	American Bibliographic Company Clio Press
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
ABS	Anchor Bible Series
ACT	Ancient Christian Texts
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
ALCWE	Asia Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization
ASI	Archaeological Survey of India
ATF	Australian Theological Forum
ATh	*Acts of Thomas*
ATLA	American Theological Library Association
ATLABS	American Theological Library Association Bibliography Series
ATT	Ancient Texts and Translations
BBC	Blackwell Bible Commentaries
BCBC	Believers Church Bible Commentary
BCE	Before Common Era
BECNT	*Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*
BINS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL	*Bulletin for John Ryland Library*
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BTh	*Book of Thomas the Contender*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBS	Classic Bible Series
CCSS	Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture
CE	Common Era
CHAI	Church History Association of India
CHI	Cambridge History of India
CLS	Christian Literature Society
DJG	*Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*

DJVP	Dharma Jyoti Vidya Peeth
DLNTD	*Dictionary of Later New Testament and its Development*
DNTB	*Dictionary of New Testament Background*
DPL	*Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*
EBC	Expositor's Bible Commentary
EEC	*Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*
EEOC	*Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*
Ed.	Edited by (single editor)
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*
Eds.	Edited by (multiple editors)
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FG	Fourth Gospel
FTR	*Faith Theological Review*
GTh	*Gospel of Thomas*
HDB	*Harvard Divinity Bulletin*
HDSCIPM	*Historical–Developmental Study of Classical Indian Philosophy of Morals*
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ICNT	India Commentary on the New Testament
IDB	*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
IDTRS	*Introductory Dictionary of Theology and Religious Studies*
IGTh	*Infancy Gospel of Thomas*
Intro	Introduction
ISBE	*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*
ISPCK	Indian Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
ITL	Indian Theological Library
IVP	Inter-Varsity Press
IVPNTCS	Inter-Varsity Press New Testament Commentary Series
JAET	*Journal of Asian Evangelical Theology*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSS	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

JSP	*Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha*
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
MSS	Manuscripts
NBD	*New Bible Dictionary*
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
NCS	Newport Commentary Series
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NT	New Testament
NTC	New Testament Commentary
NTL	New Testament Library
NTR	New Testament Readings
OESAC	*Oxford Encyclopedia of South Asian Christianity*
OHCA	*Oxford Handbook of Christianity in Asia*
OIRS	Oriental Institute of Religious Studies
OT	Old Testament
PCNT	Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
PTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
SAIACS	South Asia Institute of Advanced Christian Studies
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SCEPTRE	Senate Center for Extension and Pastoral Theological Research
SJC	Studies in Judaism and Christianity
SNT	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SOTDD	School of Theology Doctoral Dissertation
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
TENTS	*Texts and Editions for New Testament Study*
TL	Thomas Literature
TPI	Theological Publications in India
Tran.	Translator
Trans	Translators

UBSJ	*Union Biblical Seminary Journal*
Vol.	Volume
Vols.	Volumes
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WBP	Word Books Publishers
WCIU	William Carey International University
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Introduction

Rationale, aim, and task

Thomas traditions in John and in the so-called apocryphal works, such as the *Gospel of Thomas* (*GTh*), the *Book of Thomas* (*BTh*), the *Acts of Thomas* (*ATh*), and the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* (*IGTh*), have long been misunderstood. They have been explained from the perspective of Jesus's disciples who went to the West, especially to Rome. These documents were composed long before there was any canon of the NT, and they must not be branded as "noncanonical."[1] The present monograph examines all the traditions focused on Thomas from an interdisciplinary perspective.[2] The insights and conclusions have proved surprising and challenge the well-known claim that there is no history in some of these very early traditions. The focal question is the following: Are the Thomas references in the Gospel of John, the Thomas compositions, and the early Thomas traditions in northwestern and southern India purely legendary as biblical scholars have assumed or do they preserve unexamined historical traditions intermittently as the Thomas Christians in India have believed? Thus, this study is an endeavor to understand the person and work of Didymus Judas Thomas from a comprehensive perspective using an interdisciplinary methodology.

Thomas appears as one of the most misunderstood characters from the early stages of NT history and interpretation.[3] The nickname ascribed to him, "doubting Thomas," is mostly accepted as a synonym for doubt, unbelief,

[1] See Charlesworth, 2017: xiii–xx; McDonald, 2017.
[2] This is discussed in detail in the Research Methodology section.
[3] Meyer (2012: 23) says, "In the New Testament, Thomas assumes his place as one of the disciples of Jesus, though not a particularly prominent one in the Synoptic gospels." Also see Most, 2005: 88–100; Bonney, 2002: 1–2; Pelkmans, 2013: 35; Wilkins, 1992: 180.

and lack of devotion.[4] The usual practice of studying the character of Thomas from the NT, apocrypha, and historical traditions independently has kept interpreters from reaching a broader understanding of the character.[5] The limitation of studying the character of Thomas independently within the limits of canonical, extracanonical, and historical disciplines has created gaps within Thomas studies. This situation persuades us to review the Thomas Literature (hereafter abbreviated as TL) integratively to understand the character from a broader purview.[6] The current study addresses the following questions: Was Thomas merely a "doubting Thomas" or was he a "believing Thomas"? How will a study of Thomas that bridges the NT, apocrypha, and historical traditions provide a broader understanding of the character? How is a disciplinary perspective limited in its scope in the study of Thomas, and can an interdisciplinary perspective enable us to perceive the character comprehensively? How was Thomas connected to Eastern Christianity and how does the TL support this link? Can we understand the Thomas traditions related to Judea, East Syria, Persia, Indo-Parthia, and South India with the help of canonical, extracanonical, and traditio-historical documents? These questions must be dealt with adequately in the process of exploring the TL. Thus, the task of the study is threefold: to investigate the development of the TL from the earliest stages, to understand the peculiar approaches and methodologies of interpreting Thomas documents, and to analyze the TL integratively to understand the character and his mission involvements.

Relevance of the study

Recent studies on Thomas lack either breadth (i.e., they understand him based on certain portions of texts or a few documents) or depth (i.e., they only

[4] In several of the English dictionaries and thesauruses, Thomas is used as a synonym for a "doubtful," "cynical," "suspicious," "wary," "skeptical," "hesitant," or "uncertain" personality. See *Oxford Desk Dictionary and Thesaurus*, 2002: 235; *The American Heritage College Thesaurus*, 2004: 250; *Oxford American Dictionary and Thesaurus*, 2003: 430. The biblical character Thomas is mostly exemplified as an unbelieving character who lacks devotion. Also see Wilkins, 1992: 180.

[5] See McDowell (2015: 157–73) who attempts to integrate the Johannine, apocryphal, and traditio-historical materials for discussing the martyrdom of Thomas.

[6] The entire monograph is divided into three parts: first, Thomas in the Gospel of John; second, Thomas in the apocryphal documents; and third, Thomas in the historical traditions. The concluding chapter analyzes the data derived from the three parts integratively.

provide a cursory analysis of his presence), or both. This is obviously owing to the limitations set by each author's project or emphasis.[7] Certain gaps in current scholarship can reveal these limitations. First, a good number of studies are incomprehensive as the authors treat Thomas's character with reference to only biblical or individual apocryphal documents, or some traditio-historical details.[8] Because of this, a holistic picture of the character is not adequately presented.[9] Second, in the majority of cases, Thomas's character is looked at from either diachronic or synchronic perspectives. As such, looking at his character from the lenses of diachronic and synchronic approaches is a pressing need.[10] Third, in several cases, Thomas the literary character is distinguished from his historical person.[11] A study that supplements the literary character with details of his historical person will enable us to understand the image of Thomas from an ideological as well as a historical perspective.[12] Finally, Thomas is mostly analyzed in a regular sense or without exclusive focus on his character, especially in the case of commentary writers.[13] The current study aims to treat his character with an exclusive focus, and filling these gaps requires necessary effort from the Thomasine interpreters so that his character may receive adequate attention.[14]

As the existing studies lack a comprehensive understanding of the person and work of Thomas, the current research has become relevant and necessary. The following details are important when studying this connection. First, a renewed interest was prompted by James H. Charlesworth's groundbreaking work, *The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?*[15] In this work, Charlesworth advances beyond the existing propositions and suggests a

[7] See Bennema's analysis (2009: 10–12).

[8] Those who study Thomas from disciplinary perspectives mostly understand his character within the purview of that discipline.

[9] The three parts of the current study attempt to combine the biblical, apocryphal, and historical traditions to reach certain conclusions.

[10] In the study, I first attempt to see how Thomas is narrativized in the Gospel of John, and then, I analyze other documents to derive geographical and chronological details in relation to the Johannine framework.

[11] This refers to the real Thomas of history.

[12] As the study integrates the narrative-critical and historical-critical aspects together, Thomas as a literary character is conceptualized with several historical intents in mind.

[13] In the majority of the commentaries on John or other documents, the character of Thomas is treated alongside other characters within the extended narrative framework(s) of the text(s).

[14] For more details regarding the *gap theory*, see Lategan, 2009: 478; Greimas and Courtés, 1979/1982: 127–28.

[15] Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995. The explorations have been stimulated by Charlesworth's demonstration, in *The Beloved Disciple*, that Thomas is not a "doubting Thomas,"

new paradigm in understanding Thomas's character through an integration of biblical, apocryphal, and traditio-historical details.[16] The current research takes insights from Charlesworth's propositions and attempts to advance its scope in a different direction.[17] As will become obvious, an interdisciplinary approach lies at the root of the research. Second, the Thomas communities of India and the pertinent traditio-historical materials have been taken into account.[18] In this way, the study advances beyond the usual exegetical and interpretative tendencies. Third, the following questions receive adequate attention in the study: Do the Johannine and other canonical traditions provide adequate details to reconstruct a history of Thomas? Can the Eastern traditions related to Thomas be linked to the NT perception of Thomas? Attention to these questions will enable us to establish the connection between the NT texts and the Eastern traditions.[19] Fourth, the study will also attempt to answer the following queries: Do the *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh* enable their readers to facilitate an understanding of Thomas traditions with Eastern eyes? Can the Eastern traditions related to Thomas be linked to the so-called extracanonical traditions?[20] Finally, the researcher will consider the South Indian and Indo-Parthian traditions suggested in the *ATh* and the traditio-historical and theological explorations of the scholars.[21] Attending to these aspects will help us to understand the contextual aspects efficaciously. The study also explores the contextual relevance of the TL that is pertinent to Jerusalemite, East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian realities.[22]

but an ideal disciple who doubts the other disciples who are hiding from fear of being crucified. Furthermore, only Thomas is given the supreme and climactic confession: "My Lord and my God."

16 The main difference between Charlesworth's work and the current project is that while Charlesworth's main concern was to understand Thomas as the Beloved Disciple, the current work does not advance in that direction. The concern of the current project is to foreground Thomas as a key figure in the Jesus movement using several layers of available materials.

17 The insights are sought primarily to develop an integrative methodology.

18 To achieve this, I engage with historical documents of the Indian church.

19 While the first four chapters focus on the characterization of Thomas within the narrative framework of John's Gospel, the last two chapters (Chapters 9 and 10) attempt to see how a history of Thomas can be reconstructed.

20 Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 attempt to see Thomas from the perspective of extracanonical TL.

21 Chapters 7 and 9 deal with how Thomas is characterized in the ATh and the traditio-historical details.

22 TL here means all the materials directly or indirectly connected to Thomas the literary character and the historical figure.

Thomas literature and traditions

Thomas Literature here refers to all the ancient writings either directly or indirectly related to the person and work of Didymus Judas Thomas.[23] Thomas writings can be broadly divided into three categories: canonical references, apocryphal documents, and traditio-historical materials. The canonical writings contain a few references concerning Thomas. In the Synoptic Gospels, he appears in the list of the Twelve disciples (Mt. 10:1-4; Mk 3:16-19; Lk. 6:13-16); and in the Book of Acts, he is one of the eleven disciples present during the post-resurrection context (1:13). As Collins (1992a,b: 6: 528) says, none of these texts attribute any specific role to Thomas. However, in John's Gospel, on four different occasions, Thomas comes on stage as a dialogue partner with Jesus and the other disciples (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-28; 21:2).[24] Moreover, the name "Thomas" appears seven times in the Fourth Gospel (FG) (11:16; 14:5; 20:24, 26, 27, 28; 21:2).[25] While the Synoptics and the Acts include Thomas as one among the Twelve, John places him at significant narrative intervals of the Gospel.[26] All details about Thomas are restricted within these passages and hence he is only mentioned in the first five books of the NT. In that sense, Thomas's character can be perceived based on these references and passages. While the Synoptics and the Acts limit the scope of Thomas's character within the list of the disciples, John pays attention to him and he becomes a significant character through his phenomenal on-stage appearances.[27] In the NT, the FG is the only document that provides explicit clues concerning Thomas's personality.[28] In that sense, TL in the NT refers to those passages about him in the first five books.[29] At the same time, some of the implicit references also help us to understand his personality and whereabouts.[30]

[23] Here, the noun *literature* is used in a plural sense.
[24] See Wilkins, 1992: 180; Collins, 1992a,b: 6: 528.
[25] See Ruckstuhl, 1991: 2: 164.
[26] Thomas is linked with Matthew in Mt. 10:3 and with Philip in Acts 1:13. The name is always in the middle group in these lists, to which Philip, Bartholomew, and Matthew also belong. See Ruckstuhl, 1991: 2: 164; Nixon, 2000: 1182; Blomberg, 1988: 4: 841.
[27] See Chapter 10 for more details.
[28] See Blomberg, 1988: 4: 841; Collins, 1992a,b: 6: 528.
[29] In another sense, the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel of Luke, the Gospel of John, and the Book of Acts are considered here as TL due to the fact that Thomas's name appears in these five books of the NT either as a reference or as an active character.
[30] See Chapter 10 to learn more concerning the implicit references about Thomas.

The allegedly "apocryphal documents" such as the *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh* are some of the most significant treasures within the category of TL. These documents provide an understanding of how Thomas's character was perceived in the Thomas community.[31] An investigation of these materials will help us build our understanding of the NT further. The so-called extracanonical materials give us knowledge about Thomas's mystical and esoteric relationship with Jesus.[32] They stand next to the NT in demonstrating the character of Thomas and showing his influence in a wider geographical area over an extended period of time.[33] Aside from these so-called canonical and extracanonical materials, there are several traditio-historical records delineating Thomas's role as a missionary theologian in the Eastern part of the world. Among them are the writings of the church fathers, historians, travelers,[34] and geographers.[35] Especially important are the traditions found in Eusebius of Caesarea,[36] Origen,[37] St. Jerome,[38] St. Ephrem,[39] St. Gregory of Nazianzen,[40] St. Ambrose of Milan,[41] John Chrysostom,[42] and Gregory of Tours.[43] Also included for examination are records of Thomas's significance in the history of Christianity. According to many ancient writings, Thomas is none other than the Apostle to the East.[44] Some of the East Syrian writings

[31] See Blomberg, 1988: 4: 842.

[32] Collins (1992a,b: 6: 529) observes, "According to some later texts, especially the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Apocalypse of Thomas*, Thomas was the beneficiary of secret revelations from the Lord. The third (or fourth) century *Acts of Thomas* tells of his evangelization and his being martyred in India, a tradition maintained by Syro-Malabar Christians today."

[33] Recent scholarship does not include the *Apocalypse of Thomas*, the *Manichaean Psalm-Book*, and other such documents in the category of TL. Charlesworth (1995: 380) states, "The *Apocalypse of Thomas* is a very late work. It is most likely attributed to the Thomas who was one of the leading disciples of Mali. It is based on RevJn (esp. chs. 5–8). It should not be confused with the products of the School of Thomas. The 'Thomas' of the Psalms of Thomas is also not Didymus Thomas, but one of the first disciples of Mali who died in 276."

[34] Egeria, a pilgrim lady, wrote in her travel narrative, entitled *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta*, details concerning the transfer of Thomas's mortal remains from Mylapore to Edessa.

[35] See Chapter 9 for more details.

[36] Eusebius is famous for his *Ecclesiastical History*.

[37] Origen's *Commentary on Genesis*.

[38] St. Jerome's writings include *Epistola ad Marcellam* and *De Viris Illustribus*.

[39] In particular, Ephrem's works such as *Carmina Nisibene 42*, *Madrasha 1, 2 and 3*, *Hymni Dispersi*, and *Memre for New Sunday* also provide a lot of information concerning Thomas.

[40] See *Contro Arianos* and others.

[41] Ambrose is famous for his book entitled *De Moribus Brahmanorum*.

[42] Some of the writings of John Chrysostom include *Homilies of St. Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist*, and *Homily 4 on the Acts of the Apostles*.

[43] Gregory of Tours was famous for his work entitled *Gloria Martyrum*.

[44] See Chapter 9; see Blair, 1962: 4: 632.

such as *Didaskalia Apostolorum*[45] and *Doctrina Addai*[46] also have traditions pertaining to Thomas.[47] Many of the ballads or folksongs developed in the Malabar area such as *Ramban* (*Rabban*) *Thoma Pattu*, *Margan Kali Pattu*, and *Veeradian Pattu* are based on traditions regarding Thomas. Together, all of these canonical, extracanonical and traditio-historical documents provide a broader understanding of the identity of Apostle Thomas.[48] Some of the Jerusalemite, Edessan, Persian, Indo-Parthian, South Indian, and other traditions, including the oral and archaeological details, create an overarching view regarding him. In the upcoming chapters, the study analyzes representative views and documents from all of the literary and traditional materials discussed here.

Twin motif of the Thomas Literature

The name Thomas is a derivation of the Aramaic *tôma*, meaning "twin." In the FG, he is referred as "Thomas, who was called *Didymus*" three times (11:16; 20:24; 21:2), utilizing the Greek word for twin.[49] However, in none of these instances does John explain what it means.[50] The Greek word for twin, *didymus*, is a well-attested name and may be the name by which Thomas was known in the Greek-speaking Christian circles.[51] At the same time, it is observable that John does not use the name "Judas" for him. Stang (2013: 44) comments,

> One possibility is that "Thomas" and "Didymus" are *both* titles—one in Aramaic, the other in Greek—in which case the Gospel of John does not record the proper name of this apostle, but simply refers to him by his Aramaic title, *tôma*, and then provides the Greek version, *didymus*. If this is right, the unnamed apostle was known simply as "the twin."

[45] A Syrian document of the early third century (200 BCE–50 CE).
[46] See Klijn, 1962: 30–1; Ramelli, 2009; Johnson, 2012: 175–78; Younan, 2009: 65–7.
[47] See Chapter 10 for more details.
[48] There were other works referring to Thomas such as *De Miraculis Beati Thomae* and *Passio Thomae*.
[49] Blomberg (1988: 4: 841) says, "Later Syriac and gnostic traditions knew him as Judas Thomas; this development is reflected in the NT by two Syriac MSS that replace the reference to 'Judas (not Iscariot)' in John 14:22 with 'Thomas' and 'Judas Thomas.'" See Nixon, 2000: 1182.
[50] See Collins, 1992a,b: 6: 528.
[51] See Collins, 1992a,b: 6: 528.

John's Gospel does not provide information about his twin or how Thomas acquired this name.[52] The apocryphal documents answer some of the questions that are left unattended in John. The *ATh* states that Thomas was Jesus's twin and the *GTh* suggests that his real name was "Judas" (*GTh* 1).[53] In *BTh*, Thomas is explicitly called the "brother" and "double" of Jesus (138:7-10; 139:19-20).[54] Although the twin motif is mostly expressed in relation to Thomas's spiritual companionship with Jesus, there are a few exceptional views that connect Thomas with Jesus as his biographical twin.[55] Layton (1987: 359) comments,

> The twin motif was important in the ancient literary genre called the "romance." But in the Thomas tradition, far from being only a romantic exaggeration, this relationship provided a profound theological model for the reciprocal relationship of the individual Christian and the inner divine light or "living Jesus": to know oneself was to know one's divine double and thence to know god; to follow the living Jesus was to know and integrate one's self. (BTh 138:7-20)[56]

Thomas's twinship with Jesus is probably based on a deeper understanding of the concept of the spiritual twin known in the *Hymn of the Pearl* and in the *ATh*. Moreover, in *GTh* 13, Thomas's character is even elevated above the role and position of Peter and Matthew and at the same time he is portrayed as a disciple with unique spiritual insights and as one who shares divine revelation with Jesus.[57] For Stang, a distinguishing feature of the *GTh* is its "theology of twinning," perhaps our very earliest witness to a Christian tradition of the divine double.[58] In TL, the real interest of the twin motif is in Thomas's spiritual twinning with Jesus. In the so-called apocryphal traditions, Thomas is portrayed as Jesus's twin and spiritual companion (*BTh* 138:1), fellow-initiate into the hidden words of Christ, fellow-worker of the Son of God (*ATh* 39),

[52] See Witherington, 2004: 96.
[53] See Collins, 1992a,b: 6: 528; Layton, 1987: 359.
[54] See Charlesworth, 1995: 244–48; Layton, 1987: 359.
[55] This latter view is mostly developed based on Jn 14:22 and Jude 1.
[56] Layton (1987: 359–60) says, "Thus the twinship and companionship of Jesus and Thomas metaphorically expressed a general model of salvation through acquaintance (*gnōsis*) with god, emphasizing both practical discipleship and self-awareness."
[57] Meyer (2010: 83–84) says, "The designation of Judas the Twin rehearses the common preoccupation in Syrian literature that Judas was the twin brother of Jesus. According to the New Testament gospels, Jesus had a brother named Judas, and the Syrian Christian heritage continues this tradition and adds that Judas is the twin brother."
[58] See Stang, 2016: chapter 2.

and the apostle who knows Jesus best and most resembles him.[59] According to Miller (2004: x), "Becoming a Thomas Believer, a twin of Jesus, means entering on a path that will end only with our last breath, and perhaps not even then."[60] Thus, TL develops a "theology of twinning" that can be described in three ways: first, as an understanding of the spiritual union developed based on the ideal relationship between Thomas and Jesus; second, as one of the earliest spiritual models and a unique discipleship paradigm, mostly developed in the early Christian circles and furthered as an Eastern manifestation; and third, as a relationship that Jesus explained through his words that would have been used as a measuring rod to consider Thomas as his "twin."[61] In the upcoming chapters, I will explore how the twin motif is perceived in the TL.

Research methodology

This monograph is an attempt to expound a holistic understanding of the person and work of Thomas by combining the information about him in the NT, the so-called apocryphal documents, and the traditio-historical materials. The task, therefore, is to identify how Thomas is perceived in the TL. I take up this research with the hope that a dynamic interwovenness of the three major layers of documents and traditions will provide an overview of his personality.[62] In order to achieve the expected goal, I treat the character of Thomas using an integrated dynamic of interpretation.

Exegetical analysis of the canonical and extracanonical materials, with the help of literary, historical, and theological explanations, lies at the base of the current study.[63] As a primary step, I will attempt to foreground Thomas's character within the narrative framework of the Gospel of John. As Thomas is presented from a different vantage point, John's narrative rhetoric will be

[59] Bauckham (2015: 36) says, "It is possible that a tradition of Thomas' physical twinship to Jesus was later exploited theologically, but it is at least equally possible that an interpretation of his name as implying his spiritual twinship with Jesus later brought with it the idea of physical twinship."

[60] See Stang, 2016: chapter 2.

[61] Jesus's statement in Luke 8:21 (cf. Mt. 12:49-50; Mk 3:35) is: "My mother and brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it." Thomas as the one "who hear[s] the word of God and do[es] it" would have been perceived as the "Twin" of Jesus.

[62] The three layers of documents and traditions are: the NT; the so-called apocryphal documents, such as the *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh*; and the traditio-historical materials.

[63] See Counet, 2000: 15–48.

analyzed using the available literary tools.[64] Through this process, his character and role in the significant narrative intervals of the FG can be established. From there, I move on to explore the mannerisms of the character explained further in the so-called apocryphal documents.[65] This will later help to expound the way traditions concerning Thomas developed over an extended duration of time and within a wider geographical area. In that sense, historical-critical questions are unavoidable in the process of exegetical analysis.[66] Then, the study will move on to the traditio-historical materials to understand how Thomas's character was perceived through the means of social memory, including the living traditions of Thomas Christianity.[67] The present study's analyses of the apocryphal documents, patristic traditions, and other related materials will provide clues concerning the continuity of the traditions regarding Thomas's apostleship to India. Thus, the following three layers are obvious in the study: first, the perception of the character of Thomas within the Johannine narrative artistry; second, the development of the Johannine character in the so-called apocryphal traditions; and third, its further expansion through the geographically widespread and chronologically prolonged traditio-historical materials.

Both the literary- and historical-critical questions regarding Thomas's character are given prominence throughout the study.[68] At the same time, many of the theological questions related to the character and his community receive adequate attention.[69] These demands aptly explain the literary, historical, and theological focus of the study.[70] As Anderson (2008: 118) says, it is a "synthesizing of the best of various approaches, realizing that no

[64] For more details about the narrative-critical approach, see Van Aarde, 2009: 381–418; De Boer, 1992: 35–48. Also see Genette, 1972/1980; Chatman, 1978; Funk, 1988; Thomaskutty, 2015.

[65] I restrict our study to the four major apocryphal documents: *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh*.

[66] Here, historical-critical questions such as authorship concerns, date of writing, and destination of the written composition are discussed. In doing so, some aspects of the source, form, and redaction-critical questions will also be addressed. Moreover, I will expound the traditions of the so-called apocryphal documents and their development in closer interaction with the Jewish and Greco–Roman thought-worlds.

[67] The perception of Thomas's character in the social memory and in the folkloric traditions can be understood through a treatment of both the so-called apocryphal and traditio-historical documents. The development of the traditions in the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* and *Sitz im Leben Kirche* will be discussed in brief.

[68] In a personal, one-on-one interaction I had with biblical scholar Paul N. Anderson, Anderson commented: "I think literary and historical approaches can and should be conducted together."

[69] These theological aspects are discussed according to the demands of the texts under consideration.

[70] See Thomaskutty, 2015: 26.

reading stands alone—in isolation from others." As Anderson states here, an interdisciplinary approach to the person and work of Thomas takes into consideration different layers of materials and different methodologies.[71] The following questions are also given prominence in the analysis: How does Thomas develop as a literary character within the TL? How is the character perceived as a historical person in the TL? And how is his character instrumental in orchestrating a theological paradigm in the TL?[72] Moreover, I evaluate these questions with the help of extensive evidence from various sources (canonical, extracanonical, and traditio-historical), geographical locations (Jerusalemite, East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian), chronological spans (from the first-century apostolic period until the time of the living tradition), and participants of the discourse (apostles, church fathers, historians, geographers, travelers, and others).[73] In that sense, the study takes the reader through several sources, locations, ages, and people to arrive at certain conclusions.

A coherent analysis of the various documents will provide a broader understanding of Thomas and his community.[74] A complementary understanding of the literary character and the historical figure will enable us to foreground his role and status in society.[75] Reconstructing a history of the character based on the literary, historical, and theological highlights of the TL will enhance the scope of the study.[76] Furthermore, the study will explore the conceptualization of the twin motif and the significance of the living tradition of Malabar and the tomb of Mylapore. In short, the study is an attempt to implement an interdisciplinary analysis as an overarching approach to pull things together in understanding the overall picture of Thomas's character. This analysis contributes to the advancement of a thorough interpretation of the identity of Thomas both as a literary character and as a historical figure.

[71] See Tan, 1993: 26–49; Thomaskutty, 2015: 26.

[72] These questions are addressed to grasp an understanding about the development of Thomas's character in the narrative-critical and historical-critical analyses and the reception of his character in various geographical and chronological contexts.

[73] I hope that all these together will give an overarching perspective about Thomas's character.

[74] See Chapters 9–10.

[75] Through a synthesis of the literary- and historical-critical approaches, we can merge the "literary character" as well as the "historical figure."

[76] See Chapter 10.

Research plan

Having discussed the rationale, aim, and task; the relevance of the study; the literature and traditions; the twin motif of the TL; and the methodology of the research, I will now set a theoretical framework to explore the person and work of Thomas in the NT, apocryphal documents, and historical traditions. In Part One (Chapters 1–4), the study will foreground the character of Thomas within the framework of John's Gospel through a narrative-critical analysis. In this section, I trace how Thomas appears in the four episodes of the Gospel (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-29; 21:2) and how the explicit and implicit aspects of the Gospel together bring his character into the limelight. Part Two (Chapters 5–8) throws light on how Thomas appears in the *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh* and how the apocryphal documents further advance the Johannine portrayal. Part Three (Chapters 9–10) investigates how the historical traditions can be integrated together to build further upon the canonical and extracanonical details. Chapter 10 attempts to reconstruct a history of the person and work of Thomas by combining the perspectives from the Synoptic Gospels, the FG, the Book of Acts, the apocryphal documents; the traditions from the church fathers; the communitarian perspectives; and the traditions of the Thomas Christians. In the conclusion, I signal how a comprehensive understanding of Thomas becomes possible through a scientific reading of all these materials.

Part One

Thomas in the Gospel of John

Didymus Judas Thomas appears four times within the narrative framework of John's Gospel (see 11:16; 14:5; 20:24-28; 21:2). His presence in the Gospel introduces some of the strategic transitions within the macro-narrative structure.[1] The following are some of the crucial moments that are introduced through the entry of Thomas: first, Thomas's character is brought to the foreground toward the end of Jesus's public ministry, where a transition is underway through Lazarus's death and raising to Jesus's death and resurrection (11:16);[2] second, he appears as a significant interlocutor engaged in dialogue so that Jesus's identity as "the way, the truth, and the life" may be revealed to the disciples during his private ministry (14:5; see also v. 6); third, Thomas's character appears toward the climax of the Book of Glory as he is instrumental in revealing the identity of Jesus as "Lord" and "God" (20:24-29); and fourth, he appears as one of the seven disciples during the post-resurrection context in Galilee (21:2). Although Thomas's character is absent at the beginning of the Gospel, his presence is significantly noticeable in these stated transitions.

The narrator orchestrates the extended story of the Gospel with a view of Thomas at these transitions. The unique placement of Thomas communicates something significant about the character and his development within the

[1] Skinner (2009: 43) observes that "the reader has not been provided with a comprehensive list of the disciples called by Jesus or following him. Instead, at various turns in John's presentation, new voices emerge from the small band of Jesus followers. In chap. 11, Thomas is just such a voice. At nearly the halfway point of the Gospel, the reader meets Thomas for the first time."

[2] Skinner (2009: 55) states further: "Here, Thomas serves as a foil, being used by the narrator to create a situation where narrative tension, irony, and misunderstanding point forward to the illumination given by the 'light of the world.'"

narrative. A careful analysis of the four appearances of Thomas, that is, within the episodes they appear, as well as within the extended narrative framework of John, calls the attention of the reader toward some of the vital areas in the story. In the following sections, we will consider these aspects through an exegetical analysis.

1

From Lazarus's Death to Jesus's Death (11:1–12:11)

Introduction

John 11:1–12:11 holds together as the same characters remain on the stage.[1] While the various exchanges function at the *micro*-level, the Lazarus story functions as a single whole at the *meso*-level.[2] But, at the same time, the story of Lazarus attunes the reader toward the *macro*-level story of Jesus. Thomas's utterance at the micro-level impacts the whole story of Lazarus, as the narrator emphasizes that one's death and resurrection leads to another's death and resurrection.[3] Thomas's statement appears crucial at the extended level of the story as the death of Jesus develops as a central theme thereafter. Chapter 11 begins with Jesus's elusiveness (10:40-42) and ends with further elusiveness (11:54-57). Another *inclusio* is drawn between the two statements with indications of Jesus's death: first, the statement of Thomas in v. 16, and second, the statement of Caiaphas in v. 50.[4] Swartley (2013: 277) states that "Thomas' dour comment prepares us for Caiaphas' 'solution' (v. 50)." According to Moloney (1998: 325), "The words of Jesus in v. 4 and the comments of Caiaphas and the narrator in vv. 49–52 frame the story of a resurrection that will lead to death. Jesus will die in Jerusalem and his death will reveal the glory of God; the

[1] Köstenberger (2009: 228) observes that "John 11-12 appear as a bridge between the signs and the Passion Narrative in that the death of Jesus looms ever larger in the narrative, with Lazarus' death and raising, as well as Mary of Bethany's anointing of Jesus, foreshadowing Jesus' own death, burial, and resurrection later in the narrative." Cf. Tenney, 1981: 114–25; Thompson, 2015: 237–62; Beasley-Murray, 1999: 183–87.

[2] At the micro-level, various exchanges between the characters in particular settings are in focus. At the meso-level, the episodic structure of the individual narratives is emphasized. For more details about the micro-, meso-, and macro-structural analysis, see Thomaskutty, 2015: 368–404.

[3] See Byrne, 1991: 29–36.

[4] Cf. Von Wahlde, 2010: 2: 486–87.

Son will be glorified by means of it (v. 4)."[5] In that sense, Thomas's utterance in v. 16 is a pointer to the glorification. Furthermore, the first and the last glory statements of Jesus in v. 4 and v. 40 form another significant *inclusio*.[6] As Jesus's glorification is partially revealed through the performance of signs, it directs the attention toward the death and glorification of the Son of Man.

The section in 12:1-11 is well connected to 11:1-57 in three different ways: first, the anointing scene in 12:1-8 creates an analeptic connection with 11:2; second, the aftermath of the resurrection of Lazarus is well narrated in 12:9-11; and third, the resurrection of Lazarus paves a concrete way for Jesus's death, as mentioned by Thomas (11:16) and Caiaphas (11:50).[7] A careful reading of the story will enable us to observe 11:1–12:11 as a close-knit narrative.[8] Thomas's utterance in 11:16 is significant on the following grounds: first, it shifts the attention of the reader from Lazarus's death to the emerging death of Jesus; second, it cautions the interlocutors and readers to be prepared, even to the point of death; and third, it begins a series of involvements by Thomas as a disciple who moves from the background to the foreground.[9]

Narrative setting

The narrator of the story of Lazarus arranges the material in a typical way. The first six verses of ch. 11 provide details of the setting within which the narrator incorporates a dialogue in an implicit manner.[10] At the outset, three of the main characters are introduced in a succinct fashion: first, a man named

[5] Tarazi (2004: 199–208) finds the sequence of events as follows: the death of Lazarus (11:1-30); Mary weeps (11:31-37); Lazarus is brought to life (11:38-44); the plot to kill Jesus (11:45-57); and the anointing at Bethany (12:1-11). Also see Morris, 1995: 473–84; Michaels, 2010: 612–58; Bernard, 1928/1963: 2: 327–409; Neyrey, 2007: 192–94.

[6] Ball (1996: 102) states, "This whole episode is set up as a revelation of God's glory in Jesus. Jesus' first words are: 'This illness is not unto death; it is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it' (v. 4). The theme of glory is resumed at the climax of the chapter when Jesus says to Martha, 'Did I not tell you that if you would believe you would see the glory of God?' (v. 40)."

[7] For more details about the resurrection and its implications for John's language, see Hamid-Khani, 2000: 333–37; Morris, 1995: 473; Michaels, 2010: 612–58.

[8] See Byrne, 1991: 12–89.

[9] Waetjen (2005: 275) states, "Like other characters in the narrative world of the Fourth Gospel, Thomas, 'the one called Didymus,' serves as a purposeful figure to fulfill the rhetorical objective of the implied author in his role as a narrator." Also see Thompson, 2015: 243.

[10] Moloney (1998: 324–25) divides 11:1-54 into six sections, vv. 1–6, 7–16, 17–27, 28–37, 38–44, and 45–54. The first two sections discuss the following details: vv. 1–6: Introduction. The place, time, characters, situation, and major themes of the narrative are introduced; vv. 7–16: Two decisions

Character(s)	Verse	Speech unit
Martha and Mary	3	Lord, he whom you love is ill.
Jesus	4	This illness does not lead to death; rather it is for God's glory, so that the Son of God may be glorified through it.

Lazarus is ill and is a resident of Bethany;[11] and second, Bethany is known as the village of Mary and Martha whose brother is Lazarus.[12] Lazarus is further introduced in relation to Mary, the one who anointed Jesus with perfume and wiped his feet with her hair (see 12:1-8).[13] The narrator's special interest in introducing Lazarus in close connection with Mary is established through the expression "her [Mary's] brother Lazarus was ill."[14]

The narrator further describes that the sisters sent a message to Jesus: "Lord, he whom you love is ill" (κύριε, ἴδε ὃν φιλεῖς ἀσθενεῖ, v. 3).[15] Jesus's response to the message from a distant location, and to a different audience (i.e., to the disciples), is recorded in v. 4: "This illness does not lead to death; rather it is for God's glory, so that the Son of God may be glorified through it." Thereafter, the narrator mentions that, "Accordingly, though Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus, after having heard that Lazarus was ill, he stayed two days longer in the place where he was" (vv. 5–6).[16] This introductory section prepares the reader for the succeeding narrative sections of the story, and especially the most significant utterance of Thomas in 11:16. The initial narrative setting provides the following clues: first, Mary is mentioned in relation to the anointing of Jesus which in turn refers to the burial of his

are made. Jesus decides he must go to Judea, and Thomas announces that the disciples should accompany him. Cf. Thomaskutty, 2015: 368–70.

[11] See Haenchen, 1984: 2: 56–57; Köstenberger, 2004: 322.

[12] See Moloney, 1998: 325; Waetjen, 2005: 270–80.

[13] Moloney (2005: 214) comments, "John 11-12 must be read together, as the author uses these chapters to bridge the accounts of Jesus' ministry (1:19–10:32) and his death and resurrection (13:1–20:31). Read together, chs. 11–12 lead the reader to focus more intensely upon the Johannine understanding of Jesus' death by crucifixion." Thompson (2015: 239) states, "Even though the actual narrative of the anointing comes later in the Gospel, the reference to Mary calls on the reader's familiarity either with her or the anointing itself to identify one by means of the other (11:2; cf. 12:1-8)." Also see Moloney 1998: 325; Bruner, 2012: 654–64.

[14] See Barnhart, 1989: 152–65.

[15] Moloney (1998: 326) states, "The disciples address Jesus as 'Rabbi,' indicating the limitations of their understanding of him (cf. 1:38, 49; 3:2, 26; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2)." See Cyril of Alexandria, 2015: 2: 83.

[16] For more information about Jesus's delay, refer to Meyer, 1987: 183–87; Michaels, 2010: 617–18; Ball, 1996: 101–10; Beasley-Murray, 1989: 65–68.

body (11:2; 12:7); second, the glorification of God and God's son are given more significance (11:4); and third, Jesus's delay, irrespective of his love for the family, shows his determination to reveal himself as the resurrection and life. These significant points convey something beyond Lazarus's death and resurrection. Here, Thomas's emphasis lies in the death of Jesus.

The section in vv. 7–16 builds upon the preliminary narrative section in vv. 1–6. In vv. 7–16, a proper dialogue takes place between Jesus and his disciples. It begins with an imperative of Jesus, "Let us go to Judea again" (v. 7). The response of the disciples was antithetical to the plan of Jesus. They respond: "Rabbi, the Jews were just now trying to stone you, and are you going there again?" (v. 8). Jesus's metaphorical speech in vv. 9–10 (also see 9:4-5) shows the urgency to work and make use of the time.[17] Then he adds a double entendre: "Our friend Lazarus has *fallen asleep*, but I am going there to awaken him" (v. 11).[18] This leads to a misunderstanding among the disciples as they respond: "Lord, if he has *fallen asleep*, he will be all right" (v. 12).[19] The disciples' misunderstanding enables Jesus to clarify the situation plainly: "Lazarus is dead. For your sake I am glad I was not there so that you may believe. But let us go to him" (vv. 14–15).[20] This is the situation in which Thomas is first introduced to the scene with his unusual statement: "Let us also go, that we may die with him" (v. 16).[21] The narrator singles Thomas out from the Twelve and gives him a special voice, on the one hand, antithetical to the voice of his fellow disciples, and on the other hand, synonymous with the voice of Jesus.[22]

[17] Thompson (2015: 241) states, "Jesus' remarks indicate that there is still daylight enough for him, to carry out his work and that, although he is fully aware that some seek his death, darkness will not prevent him from doing that work (cf. 9:4-5)." Also see Thomaskutty, 2015: 375; Moloney, 1998: 326; Tarazi, 2004: 201–02.

[18] For more details about Jesus's usage of figurative language, refer to Cadman, 1969: 125.

[19] Cf. Neyrey, 2007: 194; Morris, 1995: 480–83.

[20] See Haenchen, 1984: 2: 60.

[21] Cyril of Alexandria (2015: 2: 85) says, "So Thomas, perhaps with a gentle smile, said, 'Let us go,' that is, 'Let us die.' Or he is saying this: If we go, we will surely die. . . . After all, if he raises the dead, fear is superfluous, since we have one who is able to raise us after we have fallen." Also see Keener, 2003: 2: 841–42; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 60; Tenney, 1981: 116; Michaels, 2010: 623–24; Bernard, 1928/1963: 2: 380–82; Beasley-Murray, 1999: 189.

[22] Moloney (1998: 327) states, "The reason for the two decisions to go to Bethany, one from Jesus and the other from Thomas, are at cross-purposes. Misunderstanding intensifies among the disciples." Also see Theodore of Mopsuestia, 2010: 102–03; Carson, 1991: 410; Tenney, 1981: 114–18; Morris, 1995: 483–84; Beasley-Murray, 1999: 189; Bruner, 2012: 662; Von Wahlde, 2010: 2: 486–87; Bernard, 1928/1963: 2: 380–82; Thompson, 2015: 243. In the words of Michaels (2010: 623), "As in 6:68, the disciples respond through a spokesperson, not Simon Peter this time but someone not named before, 'Thomas, the one called Didymus' (v. 16)."

Character(s)	Verse	Speech unit
Jesus	7	Let us go to Judea again.
Disciples	8	Rabbi, the Jews were just now trying to stone you, and are you going there again?
Jesus	9–10	Are there not twelve hours of daylight? Those who walk during the day do not stumble, because they see the light of this world. But those who walk at night stumble, because the light is not in them.
Jesus	11	Our friend Lazarus has fallen asleep, but I am going there to awaken him.
Disciples	12	Lord, if he has fallen asleep, he will be all right.
Jesus	14–15	Lazarus is dead. For your sake I am glad I was not there so that you may believe. But let us go to him.
Thomas	16	Let us also go, that we may die with him.

The narrator's involvement in the story is very strong. Even when the narrator attempts to mediate the varied views of Jesus and the disciples, his voice is almost always identical to the voice of Jesus the protagonist.[23] The narrator attunes the story of Jesus to the realities of the reader in a very specific way. The introduction of Thomas toward the end of the exchange is purposeful. Through Thomas's voice, the narrator diverts the attention of the reader from the story of Lazarus to the story of Jesus.[24]

Thomas within the narrative framework of Jn 11:1–12:11

The narrator introduces Thomas in ch. 11 and the reader gets the impression that he was there with Jesus right from the beginning of his public ministry. Further, that means that he was following Jesus passively until now as an implicit and backgrounded character.[25] In 11:16, the passive, implicit, and backgrounded Thomas emerges as an active, explicit, and foregrounded

[23] See Köstenberger, 2004: 325–28; Tenney, 1981: 114–18.

[24] Bonney (2002: 137) considered Thomas as "one who is loyal to Jesus, one who is ready to follow him (cf. 10:27)." He (2002: 137) says, "Thomas' statement in 11:16 clearly indicates that he sees the proposed journey to Judea in a completely different light from that in which Jesus sees it." Also see Carter, 2006: 75.

[25] Skinner (2009: 43) states, "The reader of the Fourth Gospel sees the calling of a handful of disciples (Andrew in 1:40; Simon Peter in 1:41-42; Philip in 1:43; Nathanael in 1:45-50) as well as their repeated appearances in the narrative. However, the reader has not been provided with a comprehensive list of the disciples called by Jesus or following him."

character. The narrator of the story uses Thomas's question in v. 16 as a significant statement in order to tell the story of Jesus dynamically.[26] Thomas's saying about *going* and *dying* (ἄγωμεν . . . ἀποθάνωμεν) and Jesus's references about *dying*, *living*, and *resurrection* (vv. 24–27) are integrally connected.[27] But why is Thomas introduced at the high point of the public ministry of Jesus? Sylva (2013: 11) states, "Thomas appears first at the turning point of the narrative, at the point where John is making clear that the significance of Jesus' signs is that they show that he is the one who gives eternal life."[28] Thomas appears here as a foil character to bring to the fore the aspects of the "death" of Jesus without shifting the attention of the reader away from the protagonist.[29]

The narrator attempts to reveal a truth through constellations of words and expressions within the narrative framework. The network of expressions such as going, dying, faith, glory, love, and others are significant to note within the narrative masterplan.[30] According to Popp (2013: 504), "the Thomas texts are not conclusive but are, rather, through their polyvalence, open to diverse interpretive possibilities."[31] As in the case of the first episode (1:19–2:12) and the first sign (2:1-12), here a glory-focused revelation is emphasized.[32] In this way, things have come full circle.[33] Though Martha appears as the key character

[26] Byrne (1991: 67–68) considered 12:1-11 as a well-connected pericope to the story of Lazarus in 11:1-57. Also see Cadman, 1969: 122–32; Byrne, 1991: 12–89; Calvin, 1994: 291–95; Eller, 1987: 53–73; Cullmann, 1975; Elson, 2001: 153–56; Duke, 1985: 59–61.

[27] Collins (1990: 84–85) states, "In accordance with the dramatic techniques of Johannine composition, Thomas represents the doubt entertained by the disciples with regard to Jesus' resurrection. Alone he is made to bear the burden of their corporate disbelief. The demands of Johannine dramatization, however, set Thomas over and against the 'other disciples.'" Also see Collins, 1990: 84–85; Byrne, 1991: 46–67; Derrett, 1993: 20; Countryman, 1987: 70–81; Hendriksen, 1954: 144–45.

[28] Also see Calvin, 1994: 274–75.

[29] It is the ultimate aim of the narrator to present Jesus's death and resurrection as significant points, not Lazarus's death and resurrection. He actualizes this through the utterance of Thomas. Thompson (2015: 242) states, "John does not use his typical words for raising the dead, *anastasis* or *anistanai* (5:29; 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:24), because Jesus' 'awakening' (*exypnisō*, v. 11) of Lazarus is a resuscitation, rather than the resurrection anticipated 'at the last day.'" Popp (2013: 505) observes, "On the text-internal level, Thomas is led step-by-step on the path of salvation and is drawn into the salvific acts of Jesus. On the text-external level, the narrator draws the readers into the story, thereby enabling them to be transformed by Thomas' journey of faith." Cf. Casey, 1996: 42; Byrne, 1991: 46; Skinner, 2009: 55; Davies, 1992: 330; Köstenberger, 2004: 331–32; Neyrey, 2007: 191–94; Kruse, 2003: 249–50; Bruner, 2012: 663–64.

[30] See Duke, 1985: 59–61; Köstenberger, 2004: 331–32.

[31] Also see Collins, 1990: 84–85.

[32] See Calvin, 1994: 282; Culpepper, 1998: 187; Elson, 2001: 153–56; Hendriksen, 1954: 144–45; Davies, 1992: 330; Countryman, 1987: 70–81. For more details about glory-focused revelation in 1:19–2:12 and 11:1-53, see Thomaskutty, 2015: 368–404.

[33] As in the case of the first episode (1:19–2:12), the Lazarus episode functions as a *glory-focused revelatory dialogue*. See Thomaskutty, 2015: 368–404; Popp, 2013: 506.

and confessor of Jesus in the following sections (11:17-44), her role as a whole is restricted within the present episode. But Thomas advances from here until the end of the extended Johannine story.[34] Thomas is said to have prepared the rest of the disciples for Jesus's forthcoming death.[35] In the following sections, we will see how a network of expressions helps us to understand the very essence of Thomas's statement in 11:16.

Let us also go . . .

The theme of *going* appears continuously within this narrative framework. It begins with the utterance of Jesus in v. 7: "*Let us go* to Judea again" (ἄγωμεν).[36] Jesus's statement here is filled with missional implications as he is stepping forward to accomplish a task. Jesus's very movement was at stake as the disciples pose a question: "Rabbi, the Jews were just now trying to stone you, and are you *going* there again?" (ὑπάγεις, v. 8).[37] Going ahead, irrespective of growing oppositions or the threat of death, is part and parcel of Jesus's mission initiatives.[38] But the disciples do not understand this very fact. The metaphor used in vv. 9–10 clearly depicts the nature of Jesus's involvement.[39] It is not done during times of darkness but during daylight.[40] Brant (2011: 173) states that "Jesus says he knows what he is doing and that he is not making a misstep." The growing oppositions do not hinder Jesus from his active involvement in

[34] See Derrett, 1993: 183; Byrne, 1991: 46–47.

[35] See Bowman, 1975: 246; Hendriksen, 1954: 144–45.

[36] The subjunctive plural verb is a derivation of ἄγω, which means "to lead." Newman and Nida (1980: 358) observe, "Technically this is a 'hortatory' expression, but there is certainly no exhortation involved. It is a kind of polite command in the first person plural." Thompson (2015: 243) states, "Jesus' determination to go to Judea induces Thomas to exhort his fellow disciples to follow Jesus, even if they must also die with him." Also see Fortna, 1988: 99; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 58; Brant, 2011: 172–73.

[37] The indicative present active singular verb is a derivation of ὑπάγω, which means "to depart." See Borse, 1990: 1: 24–25; Newman and Nida, 1980: 358; Neyrey, 2007: 192–94; Swartley, 2013: 276–77; Brant, 2011: 172–74; Gill, 2003: 357–58.

[38] Howard-Brook (1997: 77) states, "Whereas Jesus speaks of 'us going,' they respond in terms of 'you going' (11:7-8). They are amazed at Jesus' bold recklessness but are not about to include themselves in the plan. Their attitude illustrates the second option in the face of impending death threats: *avoid taking risks that might arouse the opposition*." Also see Harrison, 1962: 67–73; Neyrey, 2007: 192–94; Probst, 1993: 3: 393–94; Herzog, 1972: 153–54; Harrison, 1962: 67–73.

[39] See Odeberg, 1968: 333.

[40] Hunter (1968: 83) states, "As we have it now, the parable is part of the Lazarus story, i.e., it belongs to that stage in Jesus' ministry when events were moving to their inexorable climax and his life began to be in real danger (11:8, 53)." Cf. Herzog, 1972: 153–54; Harrison, 1962: 67–73.

public.[41] His boldness is revealed through the following expressions: "I am going" (πορεύομαι, v. 11) and "Let us go to him" (ἄγωμεν, v. 15).[42] Fortna (1988: 95) observes, "Without delay he determines to *go to him*, presumably not merely from human sympathy or loyal concern, but because of what he can do."[43] After these preliminary remarks based on the *going* language, the narrator introduces Thomas to the foreground with his significant utterance.

The utterance of Thomas in v. 16, "Let us also go" (ἄγωμεν), introduces a radical step at this critical juncture.[44] On the one hand, he takes on a challenge to go against the majority view, and on the other hand, he decides to align himself with the view of Jesus that was not pleasant to the rest of his companions (v. 16).[45] Popp (2013: 507) argues, "His [Thomas's] entrance is unmediated and abrupt. He is suddenly present as an acting character and addresses his 'fellow disciples' (συμμαθηταῖς, 11:16a). This description designates Thomas as a member of the group of disciples, thus also implying his obligation to follow Jesus."[46] In that sense, Thomas's statement takes the spirit of Jesus's missional concerns at its highest esteem.[47] His utterance is in the sense that *as Jesus goes, let us also go with Him*.[48] While Martha and Mary *went* to meet Jesus to convey

[41] Cadman (1969: 125) states, "Jesus now explains to the disciples, first in ambiguous language and then, when that is misunderstood, in plain speech, the purpose of His journey to Judea (vv. 11–14)." Also see Howard-Brook, 1997: 77–78; Guilding, 1960: 143–53; Siebald, 1997: 53–57; Herzog, 1972: 153–54.

[42] See Byrne, 1991: 46; Gill, 2003: 360.

[43] Voorwinde (2005: 147) comments, "Thomas' resigned and sullen reaction may have spoken for them all (11:16). The danger of going to Bethany is strongly accented in this section." Culpepper (1983: 124) considers Thomas "as the clear-eyed realist who knows that following Jesus back to Judea means risking death."

[44] See Bultmann, 1971: 400; Carter, 2006: 75.

[45] Sylva (2013: 12) states, "There is a pragmatism and a cynicism about this character that appears incompatible with what would be, in the view that 11:16 is fatalistic, a call to group suicide." Cf. Fortna, 1988: 100; Swartley, 2013: 276–77; Howard-Brook, 1997: 78; Newman and Nida, 1980: 361–62.

[46] Popp (2013: 509) says, "While Peter functions as the spokesperson for the disciples vis-à-vis Jesus, Thomas takes the initiative when compared to his fellow disciples (συμμαθηταῖς). Additionally, the words of Thomas (11:16) are reflected in the words of Peter at the beginning of Jesus' first farewell discourse (13:36-38). Both of them convey their readiness to die with Jesus." Cf. Bennema, 2009: 164–65; Gill, 2003: 360.

[47] Sylva (2013: 11) states, "His [Thomas's] courageous commitment to Jesus carries him over from one realm to the next, and it helps to carry the other disciples over as well." Also see Fortna, 1970: 78–79.

[48] Bennema (2009: 164) says, "Thomas' exclamation, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him' in 11:16 reveals that he misunderstands Jesus, fearing that 'the Jews' would kill them all. Despite the misunderstanding, Thomas' declaration speaks of courage, loyalty and the willingness to die with Jesus (cf. 15:13)." Thomas demonstrates both courage and a deficiency of faith. See Sylva, 2013: 11; Brown, 1966: 1: 424.

their grievances concerning their brother's death (vv. 20, 29),[49] Thomas shows a superior missional model as he encourages his colleagues to go with Jesus even if there is danger ahead.[50] The language of *going* is significant and crucial at the climax of the episode as Jesus commands the people: "Unbind him [Lazarus], and let him *go*" (ὑπάγειν, v. 44).[51] The success of Jesus's movement is further measured through the fear of the chief priests and the Pharisees: "If we *let him allow* [or *go on*] like this, everyone will believe in him" (ἀφῶμεν, v. 48).[52] The following trends are significant to note here: first, the disciples were not pleased about Jesus's decision *to go* to Bethany; second, Martha, and to a certain extent Mary, were more concerned about their brother Lazarus;[53] and third, the chief priests and the Pharisees were afraid of/antagonistic to the success of Jesus in his *going*. But Thomas stands apart and understands the real meaning of Jesus's *going*. He was able to perceive Jesus's *going* as synonymous with his death. As Bonney (2002: 138) states, "The journey *will* lead to the crucifixion of Jesus (cf. 11:45-53)." Thomas acts here as the spokesman for the Twelve. Furthermore, Thomas shows a willingness to go with Jesus, who was leading them to death, and to share the danger ahead.

. . . that we may die with him

As we have seen, the linguistic phenomena help us to understand the characterization. The speech and behavior of Thomas are important narrative clues to perceive his personality.[54] Thomas's utterance, "that we may *die* with him [Jesus]" (ἀποθάνωμεν), works in a dynamic rhythm with other narrative and utterance units.[55] Charlesworth (1995: 238) states, "He [Thomas] exhorts

[49] Though Mary's exemplary activity is narrated in 11:2 and 12:1-8, her role, as in the case of Martha, is restricted within this episode.

[50] Haenchen (1984: 2: 60) states, "The words of Thomas in verse 16 give expression to his fidelity; at the same time, there is an undertone of resignation that betrays the blindness of this disciple to the power of Jesus. In the third place, however, there lies hidden in this saying of Thomas the truth that the way to Bethany will lead ultimately to the death of Jesus." Cf. Von Wahlde, 2010: 2: 484–502.

[51] The infinitive present active of ὑπάγω is used here. Cf. Collins, 1990: 58–60; Fortna, 1988: 96.

[52] Here "Let him go" means "Let him permit." Cf. Byrne, 1991: 66–67.

[53] Even though Mary's anointing in 12:1-8 (also 11:2) symbolically relates to the death and burial of Jesus.

[54] Cf. Petersen, 1993.

[55] Byrne (1991: 47) states, "He [Thomas] is the realist who understands well enough that to follow Jesus means risking death. His statement underlines once again the fact that Jesus is putting his own life in mortal danger by going to Judea." Cf. Quast, 1991: 83–84; Derrett, 1993: 93.

his fellow disciples to follow Jesus back into Judea, even if it means martyrdom: 'Thomas, called the Twin, said to his co-disciples, *Let us also go, that we may die with him* (ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, 11:16).'"[56] The episode as a whole uses the illness and death language in order to divert the attention from one to the other. While Mary, Martha, and the Jews speak the language in relation to Lazarus, Thomas introduces a radical step from Lazarus to Jesus. Duke (1985: 59) states, "His [Thomas's] prediction that the journey will result in death is true enough (11:53)."[57] The narrator draws the attention of the reader toward that end. At the beginning, the narrator brings to focus the illness of Lazarus repeatedly (vv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6).[58] When Jesus said that "This illness does not lead to death" (v. 4), the protagonist intends to guide the interlocutors/readers toward the forthcoming events that will evoke faith among the people.[59] The double-meaning statement of Jesus in v. 11 that "Lazarus has fallen asleep" brings into focus two significant aspects: first, Lazarus is dead; and second, that his death is temporary (cf. vv. 12, 13).[60] The misunderstanding that is created among the disciples is later on corrected by Jesus himself (v. 14). The narrative explanations, such as Lazarus had already been in the tomb (v. 17), the activities of consolation (vv. 19, 31), the sisters' repetitive utterance as a family confession (vv. 21, 32), and Jesus's weeping (vv. 33–35), confirm the death of Lazarus.[61] Through these various narrations about Lazarus's illness and death, a reader can be shifted away from the main story of the Gospel.[62] Thomas's utterance is a narrative clue that reminds the reader that the death of

[56] Collins (1991: 36–37) also stresses, "11:16 presents Thomas as the courageous one and as a leader among the disciples of Jesus." Carson (1991: 410; cf. Metzger, 2010: 136–42) likewise points out Thomas's "raw devotion and courage." Cf. Talbert, 2005: 176; Blomberg, 2001: 164–79; Martin and Wright, 2015: 203.

[57] Thompson (2015: 243; cf. Quast, 1991: 83–84) comments, "That is an ironic comment: this journey to Judea will indeed lead to Jesus' death, yet when that moment comes, none of the disciples die with him. The Gospel foresees a time when Jesus' followers will be put to death for their allegiance to him (16:2; 21:19)."

[58] Cf. Morris, 1988: 3: 402–04; Metzger, 2010: 136–42.

[59] Morris (1988: 3: 403) comments, "Lazarus is described as 'a man who was sick,' though the nature of his sickness is not told us either here or elsewhere. That it was very serious is clear from the fact that Lazarus died from it, but we know nothing of the nature of the ailment." Also see Powell, 1962: 233–34; Ringe, 1999: 78–79; Moloney, 1996: 156–57.

[60] Powell (1962: 235) states, "That Christ should refer to death as 'sleep' seems to be in keeping with Scripture. It has been well said that no man ever died in the presence of Christ. Had such happened it would have been an irrefutable challenge to the Lord of Life." Also see Byrne, 1991: 46–47; Kysar, 1976: 80–86; Orchard, 1998: 143–48; Blomberg, 2001: 164–79.

[61] See Morris, 1988: 3: 410–11.

[62] Skinner (2009: 44) states, "The raising of Lazarus reveals Jesus' power over death and, more importantly, foreshadows his own resurrection in ch. 20."

Lazarus is told as a "minor story" in order to present the "major story" of Jesus with symbolical effect.[63]

Other expressions in the narrative, such as the criticism of the Jews (v. 37), addressing Martha as "sister of the dead man" (v. 39), Martha's mention that "there is a stench" and "he [Lazarus] has been dead for four days" (v. 39), and Lazarus's coming out of the tomb (v. 44), make the point even stronger.[64] This evokes a discussion on resurrection between Jesus and Martha.[65] While Martha believes in resurrection in a traditional way, Jesus reveals that he is the resurrection and the life (vv. 24–25).[66] Jesus's two utterances in that regard are significant: first, "Those who believe in me, even though they die, will live" (v. 25); second, "everyone who lives and believes in me will never die" (v. 26).[67] The development of the language from illness to sleep, and from sleep to death, and further from death to resurrection, is well developed with the utterance of Thomas.[68] Though some of the answers are addressed to Martha, Thomas's very utterance is symbolically responded through the mediation of the role and status of Martha. Lazarus's death and resurrection are strategically placed toward the end of the Book of Signs in order to prepare the way for the dénouement of John's story in the Book of Glory where Jesus's death and resurrection are the pivotal points.[69] Culpepper (1998: 187) observes, "The first conversation . . . interprets death as being like sleep. Jesus is going to Bethany

[63] Bonney (2002: 137–38) views the story from a different perspective. He says, "Jesus clearly sees the journey as a way to glorify God (11:4) and to bring faith to his disciples (11:15). Thomas, on the other hand, sees the journey in a much dimmer light." He (2002: 138) further says, "He [Thomas] assumes that he, along with Jesus and the other disciples, will die at the hands of Jesus' adversaries (11:8). Thomas has no comprehension that the journey to Jerusalem will end not in death, but life (11:44; 20:11-29)." See Therath, 1997: 217–23; Burke, 2003: 63.

[64] For more details, see Moloney, 1996: 172; De Jonge, 1977: 117–36; Painter, 1993: 367–74.

[65] See Scott, 1992: 198–203.

[66] Cf. Burke, 2003: 63–64.

[67] Chennattu (2006: 78) comments, "The narratives of chs. 11–12 show that all—Mary, Martha, the disciples, and the Jews—fail to respond positively and fully to the dramatic acting out of the summons to transcend death and believe in Jesus as 'the resurrection and the life' (11:25)." Cf. Moloney, 1996: 159–63; Painter, 1993: 367–74.

[68] Morris (1988: 3: 408) concludes, "Let us remember Thomas as the man who at least on one occasion looked danger in the face and chose death with Jesus rather than life without him." Also see Blomberg, 2001: 164–79; O'Grady, 1999: 34–35.

[69] Moloney (1996: 157) comments, "The reader searches for solutions, but Jesus' words about his hour (see 2:4; 7:7-8, 30; 8:20) and his being 'lifted up' (see 3:14; 8:28) suggest that his glorification will be linked to his death. The events surrounding Lazarus will set in motion the glorification of the Son of God (v. 4)." Orchard (1998: 144) states, "The reader is reminded of the physical danger that travelling to Bethany will pose for Jesus (vv. 8, 16), with Thomas evidently believing that death was imminent for all of them." Cf. Painter, 1993: 367–74; Ringe, 1999: 78–79; Martin and Wright, 2015: 200–14; Nicholson, 1983.

to wake Lazarus up. Thomas sees clearly what this means and challenges the others, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him.'"[70] The resolution of John's story takes shape in the current episode as it merges Lazarus's death and resurrection symbolically with the death and resurrection of Jesus. The entire narrative is developed within an *inclusio* of Jesus's elusiveness: in 10:39, an arresting plan followed by Jesus's escape, and in 11:54, an escape of Jesus followed by an arrest plan.[71] Within this violence-ridden *inclusio*, the story of Lazarus's raising is narrated. The analeptic statement in v. 2 (as a reference to 12:7) attunes the reader's attention toward the death and burial of Jesus. In Jesus's statement in v. 4, it is made clear that Lazarus's death and resurrection are for God's glory, so also for the glory of the Son of Man. Here, Jesus's death and the glorification of the Son of Man are in view. Thomas's utterance in 11:16 is a great pointer toward that extended story of the Gospel.[72]

The Jews attempted to stone Jesus (10:31) and arrest him (10:39), but Jesus plans to go to Bethany again (v. 8).[73] Jesus's death awaits ahead, but the disciples are not prepared enough to face that and even they are not happy that Jesus goes there. But Jesus's determination to go to his own death and his glorification is strongly supported by the remarkable voice of Thomas.[74] Lincoln (2005: 322) says, "Thomas' comment is truer than he suspects. In the case of Jesus what he does not yet know but what the narrator will recount is that it is precisely Jesus' act of raising Lazarus that will trigger off the events that finally lead to his death."[75] The revelatory utterance of Jesus, "I am the resurrection and the

[70] Powell (1962: 236) states, "Thomas believed that life without Christ would have been worse than death." O'Grady (1999: 34; also see Talbert, 2005: 177) says, "Thomas appears in this gospel as one of the disciples in 11:16 and in this episode joins the resurrection of Lazarus to the approaching death of Jesus."

[71] See Stibbe, 1994: 24–25.

[72] Stibbe (1993: 125) states, "If Thomas really knew what kind of death was in prospect he would surely not have said this. His comments manifest naivete at best, insincerity at worst." Cf. Bonney, 2002: 138.

[73] See Quast, 1991: 78–86; Palmer, 1978: 101–04.

[74] Moloney (1996: 159) comments, "Thomas, recognizing that Jesus is leading them back into the violence of Judea, recommends that the disciples not abandon their Master in his moment of danger, but join him, even if it might cost them their lives." Also see Painter, 1993: 367–74; Palmer, 1978: 102.

[75] Bultmann (1971: 400) concludes that "Thomas' statement, which incidentally is directed not to Jesus but to his companions, is not a warning but signifies a resignation to the fate that threatens alike the disciples and Jesus. For the first time the truth emerges that the disciples must accept for themselves the destiny that lies ahead of Jesus; the farewell discourses are to develop this theme, and the resigned submission is to give place to a firm resolution." Quast (1991: 83–84; also see Palmer, 1978: 102) says, "Whenever Thomas speaks (11:16; 14:5 and 20:24-29) it is difficult to discern whether his frank comments are pessimistic or sincere, but always they present a call to faith."

life" (v. 25), has to be interpreted as a reaction to the utterance of Thomas in 11:16.[76] Another statement of Jesus to Martha in 11:40 functions as a double-meaning statement: first, the glory of Jesus/God is revealed through Lazarus's resurrection; and second, Lazarus's resurrection opens the way for Jesus's death and thereupon the climax of Jesus's glorification (v. 40).[77] Here once again there is an implicit response to the statement of Thomas. The resurrection of Lazarus paved the way for Jesus's death (v. 50), the urgency of his death (v. 51), and the council's plan for his death (v. 53).[78] In the latter part of the story, the narrator engages Martha (explicitly) and Thomas (implicitly) with Jesus.[79] Thus, the narrator's intention of developing the story of Lazarus in relation to the story of Jesus is rhetorically performed. Waetjen (2005: 275) says, "For Thomas, as the Twin, by exhorting his fellow disciples to join him in following Jesus into death confronts the reader with a radical discipleship that identifies with Jesus so completely that it is willing and ready to die with him." In the process, the narrator uses Martha and Mary as key figures in developing the story of Lazarus. On the other hand, he uses Thomas as the key figure to attune the story to the extended level.[80]

Other significant aspects

Along with the Thomasine utterance in 11:16, other themes also work coherently. Themes such as belief, love, the glory of God, and the titles of Jesus must be analyzed in relation to the statement of Thomas. This attempt will help us to understand the network of words used in the Johannine stories to convey specific ideas.

[76] Also see Rensberger, 1988: 120; Reinhartz, 1992: 34–35; Chennattu, 2006: 78; Neyrey, 2007: 191–211; Kysar, 1976: 45–48; De Jonge, 1977: 124–27.

[77] See Orchard, 1998: 150–53; Scott, 1992: 198–206.

[78] For more details about the theology of Jesus's death from a Johannine perspective, see Kysar, 1976: 49–54; O'Grady, 1999: 102–09; Nicholson, 1983; Ringe, 1999: 78–79; Burke, 2003: 188–92; Moloney, 1996: 158–59; Painter, 1993: 374.

[79] Smith (1995: 109) writes, "That Jesus' gift of life to Lazarus (11:1-44) then leads directly to his enemies' plotting his own death (11:45-53) cannot be coincidental. The giver of life will be done to death. Thus Jesus' signs are rich with a symbolic meaning which the evangelist must have intended." Also see Burke, 2003: 188–92.

[80] Story (1997: 243) says, "The exhortation of Jesus to the disciples 'let us go' (11:7, 15) is an invitation to continue walking in the light with him. And the reply of Thomas in using the same exhortation (11:16), however melancholy its tone may have been, constitutes, nonetheless, a positive response and hence, must have given courage to Jesus as the days of his passion loomed ahead."

Belief

The Gospel of John advances the theme of belief in relation to unbelieving Jews and misunderstanding disciples.[81] Thomas, as one among the Twelve, attunes the attention of the reader toward the death of Jesus more than to the death of Lazarus. Martha was concerned about the death of Lazarus and hence her role and status are restricted within the present episode. As a person who was concerned with the death of Jesus, Thomas's role is extended to the end of the story. Jesus's utterance in vv. 14–15 plainly stated that "Lazarus is dead. For your sake I am glad I was not there, so that you may believe. But let us go to him."[82] Jesus's response, "that you may believe," is adequately addressed with the very utterance of Thomas in the following verse (v. 16). Barrett (1955/1956: 327) states, "If Jesus had been present Lazarus (it is presumed) would not have died, and the disciples' faith would not have been quickened and confirmed by his resurrection." At this level, Thomas's utterance cannot simply be considered as a statement of bravery but as a statement from the heart of an authentic believer.[83] Jesus's major concern through the performance of the sign is to lead the disciples to faith. In v. 21, Martha shows her confidence in Jesus, but she fails to exemplify her faith in a mature way (cf. v. 24).[84] Though Martha makes a convincing Christological utterance in v. 27, later on she fails to show her mature faith (v. 40).[85] In that way, Martha shows gullibility in her personality as a disciple of Jesus. While one group of Jews exemplify their unbelief (v. 37), a large number of Jews believe and follow Jesus (v. 45).[86] Even when he prays at the tomb of Lazarus, the goal of Jesus is revealed in terms of belief in that "they may believe that you sent me" (v. 42).[87] On the other hand, the chief priests and the Pharisees thought that "if we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him" (v. 48). While the protagonist intends to generate faith in

[81] Cf. Boice, 1970: 96–100; Kysar, 1976: 78–86.

[82] See Bultmann, 1971: 400; Stibbe, 1994: 75–106; Temple, 1975: 192–93; Story, 1997: 238–52; Smith, 1995: 93–99, 109; Staley, 1995: 55–84.

[83] See Sylva, 2013: 6–9; Bonney, 2002: 137–38.

[84] Cf. Barrett, 1955/1956: 328; Blomberg, 2001: 164–79; Esler and Piper, 2006; Bouyer, 1964: 153–66; Bultmann, 1971: 402.

[85] See Chennattu, 2006: 78; Esler and Piper, 2006.

[86] Trumbower (1992: 106) argues that, "In 11:45-46 the by now familiar schism arises: some 'believed in him,' while some others went to the Pharisees and told them what Jesus did. The action of this latter group may have been done with innocent intentions, but its effect is the same as the healed man's report of 5:15: it leads to a plot to kill Jesus." Also see Martyn, 1968/1979: 36, 94; Staley, 1995: 55–84.

[87] See Bultmann, 1971: 408; Yeung, 2013: 259–62; Esler and Piper, 2006.

his followers, the antagonists go against the very plan.[88] Against all odds, right from the introduction of his character, Thomas stands with the decision and plan of Jesus.[89]

Love

The theme of love plays a significant role in Lazarus's story. It works in rhythm with the general theme of the Gospel that Jesus, the agent of God, comes to reveal the love of God the Father (3:16).[90] The theme of love both in the Lazarus episode and in the general framework of the Gospel can be understood in closer affinity with the utterance of Thomas in 11:16. In 11:3, it is indicated that the sisters sent a message to Jesus: "Lord, he whom you love is ill."[91] Turner and Mantey (1964: 226) consider it as "a persuasive way to urge Jesus' immediate concern and presence."[92] Jesus's intimate love for Lazarus is made clear through this very utterance of the sisters. Later on, the narrator clearly states that Jesus loved Martha, Mary, and Lazarus (v. 5).[93] From this narrative, note the reader can understand that Jesus had a cordial love relationship with the family. In 11:36, it is stated that the Jews exclaimed, "See how he loved him [Lazarus]."[94] Human emotions such as being disturbed, moved, and weeping are to be understood in relation to Jesus's love for the family of Lazarus.[95]

[88] Painter (2011: 88–89) argues that, "The sign itself, though spectacular, may build faith for those who are open (cf. 11:37, 45; also 12:9, 18), but certainly does not ensure faith, especially to those who are hostile to Jesus (cf. 11:46-53 and 12:11, 19)."

[89] Stanley (1986: 166–67) says, "Throughout his public ministry Jesus has shown concern for the strengthening of his followers' faith in himself which was initiated at the wedding in Cana (2:11)—shortly to be shaken by his own passion and death." Cf. Thompson, 2013: 460–72; Stibbe, 1994: 75–106; Ridderbos, 1997: 386–411.

[90] Bultmann (1971: 395) states, "The Evangelist deliberately selected this sign; as a raising from the dead it is not only the greatest of the miracles he recounts, but standing at the beginning of the passion of Jesus it makes him appear as the *anastasis* and the *soē* (v. 25)." Also see Esler and Piper, 2006; Whitacre, 1999: 276–95.

[91] Carson (1991: 406) comments, "The sisters' reference to their brother as the one Jesus loves is touching. It hints at friendships and relationships that are barely explored in the Gospels, and it suggests that some at least felt particularly loved by him." Also see Bruce, 1983: 240; Bouyer, 1964: 153–66; Esler and Piper, 2006; Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 264; Ridderbos, 1997: 386–87; Howard-Brook, 1994: 248–72; Popkes, 2013: 535–40.

[92] Carson (1991: 405) says, "That he comes is not only testimony to his love for the Bethany family (cf. vv. 5, 8), but also that he sees this challenge as some kind of signal from his heavenly Father (cf. vv. 9, 10)." Cf. Bouyer, 1964: 153–66; Burke, 2003: 188–92; Whitacre, 1999: 276–95.

[93] Turner and Mantey (1964: 228) say, "The same word for 'love' is used for Jesus' regard for his disciples prior to the last supper (13:1) and to designate the bond between Father, Son, and believer in the Lord's prayer (17:26)." Also see Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 264; Popkes, 2013: 535–40.

[94] See Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 273; Howard-Brook, 1994: 248–72; Sylva, 2013: 11–4; Turner and Mantey, 1964: 235; Carson, 1991: 416–17.

[95] See Bultmann, 1971: 394–412; Bauman, 1971: 53–55.

This love is extended more specifically at another level to the disciples in the Farewell Discourse. Thomas, as a key figure both in the Lazarus story as well as in the Farewell Discourse, understands the spirit of Jesus's message and mission. He realizes the essence of the mission of Jesus to extend his Father's love, even to the point of death. With recognition of this missional role of loving unto the point of death, Thomas now expresses his commitment with the very utterance: "Let us also go, that we may die with him." Burke (2003: 63) states, "In his [Thomas's] summons to his fellow disciples: 'Let us also go that we may die with him,' the evangelist resumes vv. 7–10 in their implication that Jesus' road to death lies through Bethany. The evangelist's redactional strategy is to link Lazarus' death to Jesus'."[96] Thus, Thomas's utterance plays a significant role within the narrative framework by aligning the missional commitment of the disciples with the mission agenda of God through Jesus.

Glory of God

In John, the theme of glory accelerates after ch. 11.[97] An important question to be asked is: How is Thomas's utterance in 11:16 connected to the glorification of Jesus in the Gospel? Calvin (1994: 282) writes, "Observe that a miracle is called 'the glory of God,' because God, by displaying in it the power of his hand, glorifies his name."[98] The glory of God is prefigured through the signs as they attune attention toward the final glorification on the cross. If the death of Jesus is the glory of God, then Thomas's utterance "that we may die with him" brings to focus the glorification that is lying ahead.[99] To give a rhetorical punch to the final event of glorification, John 11 prepares the readers and directs their attention through a glory-focused revelatory dialogue.[100] In v. 4, Jesus says: "This illness [i.e., Lazarus's] does not lead to death; rather it is for God's glory, so that the Son of God may be glorified through it."[101] Thomas's statement in v.

[96] Gench (2007: 85) says, "We do not know whether Thomas speaks out of courage or exasperation. But of one thing we may be sure: this story will bring us closer to Jesus' own death." Also see Witherington, 1995: 202; Whitacre, 1999: 276–95; Ridderbos, 1997: 392; Howard-Brook, 1994: 248–72; Sylva, 2013: 11–14.

[97] See more details about the theme in Byrne, 1991: 18–20; Smith, 1995: 120–21.

[98] Also see Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 275.

[99] See Skinner, 2009: 47–48.

[100] See more details about the glory-focused revelatory format of the dialogue in ch. 11 in Thomaskutty, 2015: 368–404.

[101] Turner and Mantey (1964: 227) comment, "The word glory (*doxa*) is a prominent one in this gospel. It occurs 19 times in the 21 chapters." Also see Bultmann, 1971: 395; Witherington, 1995: 201–02;

16 is a significant clue concerning the death of Jesus that is closely connected to glory at the extended level of John's narrative.[102] In v. 40, Jesus asks Martha: "Did I not tell you that if you believed, you would see the glory of God?"[103] Burke (2003: 180) takes the view that "In 11:4, the first half, 'This sickness is not unto death, but for the sake of the glory of God (11:4a),' applies to the raising of Lazarus. The 'glory of God' phrase is echoed in 11:40. But the second half, 'that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it (11:4b),' applies to 11:45-12:50."[104] Thomas's statement introduces this shift of emphasis within the narrative framework.[105] Smith (1995: 115) further states, "The resurrection of Jesus, which of course presupposes his death, is the precondition and basis of revelatory knowledge about him. But apart from the death of Jesus, there is no resurrection, and therefore no revelation of God." As Smith rightly states, John gives strong emphasis to the death of Jesus. The shift of emphasis from Lazarus's death to Jesus's death is introduced through the very utterance of Thomas in v. 16.[106] That Lazarus's death is a foil to reveal the death of Jesus is brought to the fore through the voice of Thomas.[107] In another sense, the glory that is revealed through the resurrection of Lazarus accelerates toward the glorification at the pivotal level of the Gospel.[108]

Titles of Jesus

Though Thomas's utterance is one of the significant statements that decide the Christological development of the Gospel, it does not include any messianic titles. Thomas's speech contains a reference about Jesus merely in a third

Ridderbos, 1997: 387; Sloyan, 1988: 140–51.

[102] Bennema (2015: 288) states, "Despite the misunderstanding, Thomas' declaration speaks of courage, loyalty, and the willingness to die with Jesus. Thomas seems prepared, perhaps more than Peter in 13:37, to lay down his life for his master, since Jesus does not comment on Thomas' suggestion (unlike with Peter)."

[103] See Carson, 1991: 417–18; Bruce, 1983: 239–49.

[104] Cf. Dennis, 2013: 313–15.

[105] See Painter's (2011: 90–91) reference about "the cross as sign."

[106] Cf. Gench, 2007: 83–91; Whitacre, 1999: 276–95.

[107] See Sylva, 2013: 11–62; Bonney, 2002: 137–38.

[108] Lincoln (2005: 319; also see Sloyan, 1988: 140–51) comments, "As earlier in the narrative, the glory of God is linked to the glory of Jesus—so that the Son of God may be glorified through it. The saying thus makes clear that what will unfold in this episode is a further disclosure of Jesus' identity which is in turn a disclosure of God . . . Lazarus' illness will not end with his death, but it will be a catalyst for Jesus' death."

person personal pronoun, αὐτοῦ.[109] In this way, Thomas's character and his statement are at odds with the rest of the characters and their utterances. In v. 16, the interlocutor utters an unflavored statement with ample messianic connotations. The function of the utterance is efficacious as it leads the reader toward the dénouement of the story. Contrary to that, other characters use messianic titles in the speech units attributed to them. The narrator of the story introduces Jesus with a title "Lord" (v. 2).[110] It is the most used title in the story as it is repeated in the mouths of the sisters (v. 3).[111] Moloney (1998: 325) states, "The sisters are able to communicate directly with Jesus, addressing him as 'Lord' (κύριε)."[112] The title is also used by the two sisters independently as Martha addresses him on three other occasions (vv. 21, 27, 39) and Mary on one other occasion (v. 32).[113] The same title appears in the mouth of the disciples (v. 12) and the people (v. 34).[114] Though Thomas's later utterances use that title with significance (14:5; 20:28), in the Lazarus episode it is not used. Martha's utterance in v. 27 includes three significant titles of Jesus: first, Messiah; second, the Son of God; and third, the one coming into the world.[115] But the title Son of God was first used by Jesus as part of his self-revelatory statement (v. 4).[116] While the chief priests and Pharisees considered him merely as "this man" (οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, v. 47), Caiaphas called him "one man" (εἷς ἄνθρωπος, v. 50).[117] Over against the trends of the other characters, Thomas's

[109] The Thomasine utterance uses a genitive masculine singular personal pronoun to refer to Jesus. Skinner (2009: 54) states, "Just as their resurrections are connected, the deaths of Lazarus and Jesus are intimately bound to one another in the broader literary tapestry of the Fourth Gospel." He (2009: 54–55) says further, "it seems plausible to assert that the words 'Let us also go, that we may die with him' are intentionally unclear and are supposed to nudge the reader into reflecting not only on the death of Lazarus but also on the imminent death of Jesus."

[110] See Moloney, 1998: 336.

[111] Skinner (2009: 47) states, "This confession sets them squarely within the tradition of the Johannine disciples and other believers who refer to Jesus as κύριε throughout the narrative."

[112] Also see Kruse, 2003: 246–57.

[113] See Hendriksen, 1954: 2: 153–54; Neyrey, 2007: 191–203; Kruse, 2003: 246–57; Ridderbos, 1997: 386–411; Lincoln, 2005: 317–37.

[114] See Moloney, 1998: 327, 328, 332, 339, 340–41; Swartley, 2013: 275–83; Sloyan, 1988: 140–51.

[115] Hendriksen (1954: 2: 151; cf. Neyrey, 2007: 191–203) views that "Martha's confession here is positive, heroic, and comprehensive. It is, indeed, very touching, all the more remarkable because it was made under such trying circumstances. The I AM of Jesus had helped her considerably." Also see Howard-Brook, 1994: 259–60.

[116] Köstenberger (2004: 327; see Haenchen, 1984: 2: 57) says, "Here as elsewhere in the Gospel, God's self-disclosure takes place preeminently in his Son." Refer to 13:31; 14:13; 17:4; also see Carson, 1991: 406; Ridderbos, 1997: 387; Howard-Brook, 1994: 249–72; Hendriksen, 1954: 2: 139–40.

[117] See Hendriksen, 1954: 2: 161–64; Neyrey, 2007: 191–203; Köstenberger, 2004: 347–52; Kruse, 2003: 258; Swartley, 2013: 284–87.

character does not attribute any title to Jesus (v. 16).[118] But his utterance mainly functions as a messianic statement in the following ways: first, it shifts the focus of the hearers/readers from Lazarus to the Messiah; second, it shifts the focus from Lazarus's death to Jesus's death; and third, it introduces the real dénouement of the Johannine story. While Lazarus, Martha, Mary, Caiaphas, and others recede from the stage, Thomas emerges as one of the significant characters of the story hereafter.[119]

Concluding remarks

The narrative in 11:1–12:11 is rhetorical as it invites the readers' attention. Within the extended framework of John's story, the utterance of Thomas creates a prolepsis with the passion and death of Jesus. Thomas's entry from the background to the foreground spearheads one of the dramatic initiatives of the narrator to develop the story with suspense and surprise. The narrative setting provides special punch for the involvement of Jesus as the life-giving savior in the family of Lazarus. A reader who sinks deep into the narrative details later on realizes that it is not a story of Lazarus's death and resurrection but the death and resurrection of Jesus. The utterance of Thomas is the major statement that directs the attention of the reader from the minor story of Lazarus to the glorification of Jesus/God.[120] The passive Thomas in the previous chapters is now explicit by means of his current involvement as a speaker. Thomas shifts the attention of the reader away from Lazarus and his death and resurrection to the upcoming event of Jesus's death. The narrator develops a constellation of themes such as going, dying, believing, loving, and glorification, and Christological titles in order to foreground and distinguish Thomas from the rest of the characters. By doing so, the narrator aligns the

[118] Kruse (2003: 249) comments, "Thomas distinguished himself from those disciples who tried to dissuade Jesus from returning to Judea (8) by his exhortation to them to follow him and die with him." Here, Thomas addresses Jesus merely with a personal pronoun *him*. Also see Haenchen, 1984: 2: 60; Ridderbos, 1997: 392–93; Swartley, 2013: 276–77; Howard-Brook, 1994: 254.

[119] Again, Caiaphas appears in the passion narrative without any significant utterance. Rather, as a character, he appears according to the narratorial demands of the story. Refer to 18:13-32.

[120] Whitacre (1999: 283) says, "This [i.e., Thomas's] is the response of a true disciple. Just as Peter sticks with Jesus even though he does not understand what Jesus is talking about regarding eating his flesh and drinking his blood (6:68), so Thomas is willing to go with Jesus to death (v. 16)."

ideas of the story and circumscribes them around the utterance of Thomas. While Martha and other characters recede to the background, Thomas advances as a key figure within the plot structure of the story of Jesus. While the narrator uses Mary and Martha as key figures to develop the story of Lazarus, s/he uses Thomas as the key figure to attune the story at the extended level. The willingness of Thomas to go with Jesus irrespective of the risk of death is heroic. As Charlesworth (1995: 125) says, "The leadership role of Thomas was made clear in ch. 11, when he exhorted his fellow disciples to follow Jesus even if it meant death (11:16)." The death of Jesus and the climax of John's story are prefigured through the utterance of Thomas. Thomas stands against all odds and confirms his reaction positively to Jesus and his plans. While Jesus manifests his love through his death on the cross, Thomas shows his willingness to follow Jesus irrespective of the unpleasant situations ahead. The glorification aspect accelerates toward its climax as Thomas shifts the focus from Lazarus to Jesus. Moreover, although Thomas does not add any Christological title in his speech, his utterance makes a crucial Christological turn within and beyond the episode.

2

Knowing the Way (13:1–17:26)

Introduction

After introducing Thomas to the reader in 11:16, the Johannine narrator foregrounds him again in 14:5.[1] The utterance of Thomas within the Farewell Discourse resonates with other themes, character utterances, and narrative comments. It causes the reader to think that an isolated treatment of the character of Thomas and his speech unit may not adequately do justice to the meaning of the text. Aspects such as going, belief, love, glory, and the Christological titles must be treated adequately in order to see both the implicit and explicit connotations of the speech unit. The *knowing-and-unknowing* contrast within the narrative framework opens up rhetorical opportunities for the reader to engage with the narrator and the narrative world.[2] Thomas appears as a figure of unknowing over against the all-knowing protagonist of the story.[3] Though unknowing within the narrative setup, Thomas's character is instrumental in revealing some of the mysteries of the extended story world. The utterance of Thomas opens up myriad possibilities of engagement in the process of reading the text as follows: first, Thomas develops in his Christological recognition from the previous utterance (11:16) to the latter (14:5); second, his unknowing condition is made clear through his plain statement in front of the all-knowing teacher;[4] third, the going of Jesus takes a

[1] See Bruce, 1983: 298–99.

[2] Skinner stated that Thomas is presented as an uncomprehending character on the basis of the community-conflict hypothesis. Skinner (2009: 67) says, "the Fourth Gospel does not seem to be directing a polemic against Thomas alone. Rather, the disciples in general seem to be spiritually dull in regard to the teaching of Jesus." Also see Sylva, 2013: 63–81; Bultmann, 1971: 603–67; Bruce, 1983: 298–99; Bennema, 2009: 164–70; Barrett, 1955/1956: 382.

[3] Barrett (1955/1956: 382) argues that "Thomas appears in John as a loyal but dull character, whose misapprehensions serve to bring out the truth." Also see Ridderbos, 1997: 493; Sylva, 2013: 63–81.

[4] Here Thomas's unknowing is used as a means to develop the recognition scene in ch. 20.

shift from the previous (to Jerusalem and to death) to the latter (to the Father) level; fourth, the utterance of Thomas is instrumental for one of the most significant revelatory utterances of Jesus in John (14:6);[5] fifth, the question of Thomas increases the chances of knowing the way; sixth, it is another instance where Thomas stands as a representative of the whole body of disciples through his reference "we" (14:5b);[6] and seventh, his utterance here has both backward and forward movements as it connects well with the Book of Signs and the resurrection narratives, and even beyond.[7] While Thomas's first utterance was a significant one toward the end of Jesus's public ministry in the Book of Signs, his second utterance in the private ministry section provides additional punch to the previous utterance.[8] In the following sections, we will analyze how the utterance of Thomas resonates within the Farewell Discourse of John's Gospel.

Narrative setting

Thomas's act and speech in 14:5 introduce him a second time before the reader. In order to understand the way Thomas is foregrounded, a reader should understand the way the Farewell Discourse as a whole is structured.[9] The Farewell Discourse (chs. 13–17) begins with the foot-washing activity of Jesus (13:1-30).[10] Before the festival of the Passover, Jesus knew that his hour had come to depart from this world and go to the Father (13:1a).[11] Mlakuzhyil

[5] Bruce (1983: 298) claims that "Thomas' bewildered question, like many questions in the Fourth Gospel, provides Jesus with the opportunity of expanding and elucidating what he has just said." Also see Howard-Brook, 1994: 315.

[6] As Bennema (2009: 165) concludes, "Thomas' exclamation, 'Lord, we do not know where you are going. How can we know the way?' shows that he does not grasp what Jesus says, and the use of a plural suggests that he speaks on behalf of the other disciples." Also see Ridderbos, 1997: 493.

[7] See Howard-Brook, 1994: 315; Bultmann, 1971: 603–67; Ridderbos, 1997: 493.

[8] Sylva (2013: 64) says, "Thomas' statement and question in 14:5 is a significantly braver articulation than was even his last exhortation in 11:16. This is because of what occurs, and what does not occur, in the part of the night before Thomas speaks and because of what Jesus had just said about this night less than a week before the events recorded in John 13:1-18:27."

[9] Stibbe (1993: 154) comments that "Thomas' words in 14:5 must begin a new unit because 14:1-4 is the introduction to the chapter. His words should therefore be taken seriously as an indication of the kind of construction which signifies the start of a unit."

[10] Carson (1991: 455, 476, 510, 550) divides the Farewell Discourse into four major parts: *first*, The Last Supper (13:1-30); *second*, The Farewell Discourse: Part One (13:31–14:31); *third*, The Farewell Discourse: Part Two (15:1–16:33); and *fourth*, The Prayer of Jesus (17:1-26). Also see Haenchen, 1984: 105, 117, 131, 150.

[11] See Mlakuzhyil, 1987: 324–25; Keener, 2003: 2: 899, 920.

(1987: 325) comments that "it is in this context of 'the hour' of Jesus and of the revelation of Jesus' immense love for his own that his washing the disciples' feet must be interpreted." From this we can draw a line by interlinking the hour of Jesus, his glorification, his love for the disciples, and the disciples' perplexities regarding the departure of Jesus.[12] The foot-washing event comprises the following dramatic plot elements: first, revealing the antagonistic identity of Judas Iscariot (13:2; cf. 13:21-22, 26-30); second, Peter's encounter with Jesus during the foot-washing event (13:6-11); third, Jesus's address to the disciples during the foot washing (13:12-20); and fourth, Peter and the Beloved Disciple (13:23-30).[13] The first Farewell Discourse (13:31–14:31) includes several encounters between Jesus and his disciples: first, Jesus's new commandment to the disciples (13:31-35); second, Peter's decision to lay down his life for Jesus (13:36-38); third, Jesus's encounter with Thomas about the way (14:1-7); fourth, Philip's encounter with Jesus about the Father (14:8-14); and fifth, Jesus's promise of the Holy Spirit and encounter with Judas (not Iscariot; 14:15-31).[14] Popp considers ch. 14 to be a three-part discourse of comfort and exhortation.[15] He (2013: 510) says, "Thomas makes his appearance in the first part (14:5).[16] At the conclusion of the discourse, the ἄγωμεν found in the disciples' dialogue in the Lazarus story (11:7, 15-16) is taken up and employed."[17] Thus, the language of *going* connects well with the Lazarus episode where Thomas appears for the first time (11:16; cf. 11:7, 15) and the first Farewell Discourse where he appears for the second time (14:5; cf. 14:31).

[12] See the way Thomas is linked to Jesus's hour in Bonney, 2002: 141–42.

[13] Ridderbos (1997: 451–79) considers 13:1 as a transition and extends the final meal from v. 2 to v. 38. He divides vv. 2–38 as follows: first, the foot washing (vv. 2–11); second, Jesus's interpretation of the foot washing (vv. 12–17); third, the betrayal predicted and Judas dismissed (vv. 18–30); and fourth, the approaching Farewell and Peter's denial foretold (vv. 31–38). Also see Keener, 2003: 2: 899.

[14] While Philip appears in the narrative mostly in the Book of Signs and in the Farewell Discourses (1:44; 6:5-8; 12:21-22; 14:8), his absence is noticed in the significant sections toward the end of the extended narrative. Culpepper (1983: 120) states, "Although he [Philip] begins well by bringing Nathanael to Jesus, he fails both his 'bread' test and his 'Greek' test." Similarly, Judas (not Iscariot) appears only here. See the structural pattern of 13:31–14:31 in Mlakuzhyil, 1987: 327–30; Keener, 2003: 2: 930; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 117–28.

[15] The three parts are described as follows: first, Jesus's departure to the Father as prelude to the post-Easter salvation era (14:1-14); second, the promise of the coming of the Spirit-Paraclete, the return of Jesus, and the indwelling of the Father and the Son (14:15-24); and third, the conclusion to the discourse with a second promise of the Spirit-Paraclete (14:25-31). See Haenchen, 1984: 2: 124-28.

[16] Cf. Keener, 203: 2: 940.

[17] Popp (2013: 510) further comments, "Both the disciples' dialogues during the Lazarus story and the first Farewell Discourse end with a call to depart. In this way, as far as the character analysis is concerned, Jesus and Thomas (explicitly in 14:5 and implicitly in 14:31) are brought into contact with one another."

The second Farewell Discourse (15:1–16:33) further describes the themes of the hour of Jesus, his glorification, his love for the disciples, and the perplexities of the disciples. It records the events in the following order: first, the vine and the branches (15:1-16); second, opposition from the world (15:17–16:4a); third, the work of the Holy Spirit (16:4b-15); and fourth, the prospect of joy beyond the trouble of this world (16:16-33).[18] Here, Jesus encourages the disciples to be attached to him as branches are attached to the vine, irrespective of worldly oppositions. At the same time, he comforts them through the assurance of the coming of the Holy Spirit and hope for the future. The large narrative block (chs. 13–17) ends with the Farewell Prayer of Jesus (17:1-26) that recapitulates many of the themes and ideas already dealt with in the previous four chapters.[19] In that sense, Thomas's utterance is strategically placed with intent. Ridderbos (1997: 492–93) comments,

> The internal structure of vv. 4–11 [i.e., 14:4-11] becomes clear only on close scrutiny. Jesus begins by saying that the disciples know the *way* he is going. The theme is still that of encouragement with a view to the approaching separation (v. 1), but now not on the basis of his return but on the basis of the disciples' knowledge of where he is going as he leaves and hence also of the place where from now on they will be moving toward, the Father's house. (v. 6)[20]

Thomas's role as an interlocutor at the departure of the protagonist is introduced with the help of a significant utterance coupled with a question (14:5). The plot structure of all five chapters (13–17) can be circumscribed around Thomas's significant utterance.[21] His utterance is strategically placed to advance the extended discourse with a twist. The suspense statement of Thomas leads the reader toward Jesus the protagonist and his surprising revelation of realities. Thomas's utterance ushers in a new series of revelations

[18] See Carson, 1991: 510–50.

[19] Carson (1991: 550–71) divides the prayer into four parts: first, Jesus prays for his glorification (17:1-5); second, Jesus prays for his disciples (17:6-19); third, Jesus prays for those who will believe (17:20-23); and fourth, Jesus prays that all believers may be perfected so as to see Jesus's glory (17:24-26). Also see Ridderbos, 1997: 546.

[20] Ridderbos (1997: 493) further comments, "With 'you know the way' Jesus is telling them that, however much they may regret his leaving, they need not be in doubt about the destination of their own way on earth. By this departure they are given a clear indication of that goal." Also see Haenchen, 1984: 2: 124–25.

[21] Thomas further advances from hereafter as the most significant utterance of him lies ahead (20:28) in congruence with the opening statement of the Gospel (1:1).

and mysterious truths. After Thomas's question, the narrator brings to the fore the following significant events through the protagonist: the departure of Jesus with clarity, the glorification of the Son of Man with convincing evidence, the descent of the Spirit of Truth, the coming of the ruler of the world, the upcoming persecution against believers and their expulsion from the synagogue, the love of God/Jesus extended to the disciples and the necessity of having it as a virtue among them, and the way and destination of believers. The perplexity of Thomas is used as a rhetorical means through which to develop the discourse to the expected levels. The following sections discuss those aspects in detail.

Thomas within the narrative framework of Jn 13:1–17:26

As in the case of 11:16, the utterance of Thomas in 14:5 requires a focused reading. The narrator of the story foregrounds realities through a constellation of words and a network of semantic domains. This narratorial trend of the gospel necessitates a special treatment of the Thomasine speech within the narrative framework of the Farewell Discourse.

Lord, we do not know where you are going . . .

The second utterance of Thomas (14:5) is yet another enigmatic statement that has to be explored alongside several other factors. While Thomas does not use any Christological titles to address Jesus (only αὐτοῦ) in his previous utterance (11:16), in 14:5 he uses one of the most extensively used titles, κύριος.[22] This explicitly states that there is a development from the former appearance and utterance to the latter. The Farewell Discourse uses the title κύριος either as an address of the disciples to Jesus or as a self-revelatory description by Jesus himself. In the first two occasions, Peter addresses Jesus as Lord during the

[22] Fitzmyer (1981/1991: 2: 329) says, "κύριος occurs 719 times in the NT, in every book except Titus and 1–3 John . . . Luke makes the greatest use of κύριος: There are 104 occurrences in the Gospel and 107 in Acts. The noun appears 189 times in the seven undisputed letters of Paul . . . Mark uses it 18 times, John 53, Matthew 80, Hebrews 16, James 14, 1 Peter 8, 2 Peter 14, Jude 7, and Revelation 23." Also see Anderson, 1962: 3: 150–1; Johnson, 1962: 3: 151; Sylva, 2013: 63; Bennema, 2009: 165.

foot-washing event (13:6, 9; vocative masculine singular).[23] In 13:13, 14, and 16, Jesus uses the same title to teach a lesson to the disciples. On another occasion, the beloved disciple uses the same title to address Jesus (v. 25). Toward the close of ch. 13, Peter again addresses Jesus twice with the same title (vv. 36, 37). This pattern is maintained through Thomas's address of Jesus with the same title (14:5).[24] It is further repeated through the mouths of other disciples, such as Philip (14:8) and Judas (not Iscariot; 14:22).[25] In his teaching to the disciples, Jesus uses it as a self-explanatory title (15:15 and 20).[26] In that sense, Thomas uses a title that was familiar: first, it was used by Jesus as a self-revelatory description, and second, it was used by his colleagues to address their master.[27]

In the Farewell Discourse, the contrast between knowing and unknowing functions as a rhetorical device to interlock the reader with the text.[28] Thomas's utterance coherently functions within the overall framework to make this contrast once again explicit to the reader.[29] The unknowing nature of Thomas contributes semantic domains within the *statement-misunderstanding-clarification* narrative framework.[30] Sylva (2013: 80–81) states, "Thomas' understanding is found deficient because, loyal as he is, he has not come to

[23] Witherington (1992: 490) states, "Peter's address of 'Lord' in John 13:6, 9, the narrative of Jesus' washing the disciples' feet, may have some Christological implications in light of Peter's earlier use of the term in 6:68-69. But we should not discount the possibility κύριε is here used as a term of respect for one's teacher. The same can be said of Peter's words in 13:36-37 and Thomas' address in 14:5." See Fitzmyer, 1981/1991: 2: 328–31; Moloney, 1988: 394–98.

[24] Cf. Witherington, 1992: 490; Swartley, 2013: 343.

[25] For more details about the title κύριος, see Foerster, 1965: 3: 1039–98; Sylva, 2013: 63.

[26] Out of the thirteen occurrences of the title κύριος, on eight occasions it is used in the vocative masculine singular κύριε (see 13:6, 9, 25, 36, 37; 14:5, 8, 22), three times it is in nominative masculine singular ὁ κύριος (see 13:13, 14; 15:15), and two times it is in genitive masculine singular τοῦ κυρίου (see 13:16; 15:20).

[27] See Bruner, 2012: 811–12.

[28] Keener (2003: 2: 939) writes, "When Jesus tells the disciples that they 'know' the way he is going, he alludes to his previous announcements of his impending death (12:23-25, 32-33), announcements that, however, they have not understood and hence do not now understand (14:5)."

[29] Sylva (2013: 66) argues that "Thomas professes in 14:5 an ignorance as to Jesus' destination. It is argued that the discussion in John 7-8 and the repetition of this theme in 13:33-38 have clearly prepared the way so that the statements in 14:2-3 do not come out of the blue." Cf. Bennema, 2009: 164–70.

[30] Neyrey (2007: 243; also see Bennema, 2009: 164–70) claims that "Jesus addresses named disciples: Thomas (14:5), Philip (14:8), and Judas, not Iscariot (14:22). Thus, we do not take their challenges and questions to Jesus as seriously as in other contexts, for here each disciple receives a rich, full response, not a riposte or insult. Moreover, they receive unique, esoteric insider information, not fit for outsiders to hear." The pattern of statement-misunderstanding-clarification occurs as follows: statements (14:1-4, 7, 21), misunderstanding (14:5, 8, 22), and clarification (14:6, 9-12, 23-24). Also see Popp, 2013: 512–13; Blomberg, 2001: 198; Bennema, 2014: 288–89; Neyrey, 2007: 243; Sylva, 2013: 71.

know the essence of Jesus' being and the Father that this essence reveals."[31] What Sylva states here is true as Thomas reflects his character in his own idiom. John depicts the aspect of knowing at three levels: first, the all-knowing nature of Jesus; second, the ignorant nature of the world from below; and third, Thomas and his colleagues as progressive as they begin to know. The narrator explains that Jesus knew several things, that his hour had come (13:1), that the Father had given all things into his hands, that he had come from God and was going to God (13:3), the one whom he has chosen to betray (13:11, 18), and what the disciples wanted to ask him (16:19).[32] On one occasion, Jesus speaks of the necessity to relate knowing with doing (13:17). He also makes it clear that knowing him means knowing the Father, and vice versa (14:4, 7, 20; 15:15-16, 21; 16:3; 17:6-8, 23). In contrast, the world from below is presented as a realm of ignorance and darkness (17:25). The disciples are delivered from the ignorant world and transformed as God's people. They live in this world and become followers of the agent of God. This tension is narrated through the statement-misunderstanding-clarification formula.[33] Thomas's expression "we do not know" reveals this fact explicitly to the reader.[34] As a person lives in the world from below and understands the mysteries of the things from above, Thomas's character shows dullness and progress at the same time.[35]

The disciples are portrayed at a different level. Thomas represents a leading person among them, but at the same time he expresses his views

[31] Sylva (2013: 80–1; also see Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 64) concludes that "Thomas uses two 'know' verbs to find out where and how to proceed. Jesus responds to Thomas with three 'know' verbs that point to persons: himself and the Father (14:5, 7)." Tolmie (1995: 139; also see Bonney, 2002: 138–39), on the other hand, considers Thomas as being a pessimistic/realistic character. Tolmie (1995: 169) further says, "*Thomas*, *Philip* and *Judas* (not Iscariot) are characterized indirectly by their actions: By raising objections or by asking questions, the trait of being unable to understand is illustrated."

[32] The following Greek expressions are used in these occurrences: εἰδὼς (13:1, 3), ᾔδει (13:11), οἶδα (13:18), and Ἔγνω (16:19). See Bruce, 1983: 278–80, 282–87, 32.

[33] Skinner (2009: 67) observes, "In chap. 14, Thomas is again presented as an uncomprehending character just as he was in chap. 11. The difference here is that Thomas is one of three named disciples to misunderstand Jesus' teaching and to be characterized with a slant of negativity." Skinner (2009: 67) further stated: "It is nonetheless safe to conclude that the developing portrait of Thomas is a negative one." See Blomberg, 2001: 198; Sylva, 2013: 71.

[34] Popp (2013: 512–13) points out, "His (Thomas's) current lack of understanding serves as an opportunity to provide a further Christological explanation. The 'I am' statement of Jesus stands in the center of the dialogue with Thomas (14:6)." Also see Bruce, 1983: 298; Sylva, 2013: 64–65; Barrett, 1955/1956/1962: 382; Brouwer, 2000: 90; Bennema, 2009: 164–70.

[35] See Barrett, 1962: 382; Blomberg, 2001: 198.

in his own terms.[36] Even after their continuous acquaintance with Jesus, the disciples are unable to understand him (14:9) and his deeds (13:7).[37] The disciples' unknowing nature is brought to light on several occasions through different expressions: οὐδεὶς ἔγνω (13:28), οὐκ οἴδαμεν . . . εἰδέναι (14:5), and οὐκ οἴδαμεν (16:18).[38] Jesus enquires about their knowledge (γινώσκετε, 13:12) and in an anticipatory tone reveals that everyone will know that they are his disciples (13:35).[39] Though the disciples show their ignorance and misunderstanding, they also reflect their knowing nature. Jesus says that eternal life means knowing the Father (17:3). Now, the disciples are brought to the Father by him. The Father, the agent of God, and the Spirit of Truth are recognized only by the disciples, not the world (14:17; 17:25).[40] In 16:30, it is made explicit that the disciples know that Jesus knows all things (νῦν οἴδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα, 16:30). The missional purpose of Jesus is revealed through his expression in 17:26: "I made your name known and I will make it known."[41] Thus, Thomas's perplexities in 14:5 can be understood in the following ways: first, as a human, he *was* thinking and knowing things from the point of view of this world; second, as a follower of Jesus, he *is* aware of the things from above (because Jesus makes things known to him, 17:26); and third, as a person who has a dual identity, he is perplexed (but Jesus *will* make things known to him, 17:26).[42] These past, present, and future aspects reveal some of the significant features of the characterization of Thomas.[43] Thomas as a person under training was

[36] See Popp, 2013: 512; Brouwer, 2000: 90.

[37] Jesus's all-knowing power is manifested in several ways: through knowledge of his hour and glorification (13:1, 31-32; 17:1-5), things above (14:2), connection with the Father (14:6-7, 10-14, 20; 15:1-2, 8-9, 15, 23; 16:5, 30; 17:1-5, 11-12, 20-26), the Holy Spirit (14:15-17, 25-26; 15:26-27; 16:7-8, 13), things below the world (15:18-21; 16:8, 20-22; 17:14-18), the ruler of the world (14:30; 16:11; 17:15), human hearts and destiny (13:36-38), the one who betrays him (13:18-19, 21, 26-30; 17:12), and the disciples' future and persecution (16:1-4, 20-21, 32).

[38] See Sloyan, 1988: 179; Brouwer, 2000: 90.

[39] See Sylva, 2013: 63–81.

[40] See Bennema, 2009: 168; Blomberg, 2001: 198; Popp, 2013: 512; Sylva, 2013: 81.

[41] See Bruce, 1983: 337; Brouwer, 2000: 90.

[42] Popp (2013: 512) concludes, "As in his first appearance Thomas expresses his determination to follow Jesus; though this time he articulates his wish to continue the journey with Jesus with a phrase that does not require an exclamation, but rather a question mark." Also see Barrett, 1955/1956/1962: 382.

[43] Sylva (2013: 81) concludes, "Although none of the disciples will understand Jesus fully until after his resurrection when the Spirit will guide them into all truth, Thomas is emblematic of the disciple who knows little of Jesus but who loves him nonetheless." Cf. Bennema, 2009: 164–70.

not able to perceive mysterious things, but Jesus promises that he will make all things known to him later (17:26).[44]

The vocabulary of *going* is another significant aspect in the Farewell Discourse to reckon with. Thomas's statement, "we do not know where you are going" (οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις), should be looked at from the constellation of that linguistic phenomenon. In 13:1, the narrator describes how Jesus knew that his hour had come to *depart* from this world and to *go* to the Father (13:1; 17:11, 13).[45] This is further supplemented with the clause, "he [Jesus] had come from God and going to God" (13:3; 16:5, 7).[46] The difficulty Jesus explains is that "where I am going, you [i.e., the disciples] cannot come" for the present time (13:33, 36).[47] The ultimate purpose of his going is to prepare a place for his followers (14:2). He will come again to receive his people so that he and his own will be in the same place (14:3). The destination of Jesus's ὑπάγω is known to the disciples (14:4).[48] Thomas's utterance in 14:5 is a clear mark of his misapprehension regarding Jesus's going (cf. 13:36, 37).[49] Here, we see an integral relationship between the Father and the Son and the agency of Jesus among the disciples (14:6, 12, 23-24; 15:21; 17:8, 21, 23, 25).[50] Upon Jesus's departure, the sending/coming of the Holy Spirit is promised (14:26; 15:26; 16:7, 8, 10, 13). Jesus invites his disciples to go toward the climax of the chapter (14:31). Popp (2013: 510) says, "Both the disciples' dialogues during the Lazarus

[44] Popp (2013: 512) further states, "The goal of Jesus' journey had not been understood (7:33-34) or, alternatively, had not been stated (13:33). That the way to Jesus' goal would lead through his death, has already (in typical Johannine irony) been stated by Thomas (11:16), even though Thomas himself was not aware of the deeper Christological meaning of his words." Also see Bruce, 1983: 298; Bennema, 2009: 165.

[45] Newman and Nida (1980: 427; also see Bennema, 2009: 165) claim, "*To leave this world and go to the Father* is more literally 'to go from this world to the Father.'"

[46] The ascending and descending of the Son of Man motif describes this very well (14:18, 28; 15:22; 16:10, 17, 27-28; 17:8, 11, 13).

[47] See Newman and Nida, 1980: 448–50.

[48] Blomberg (2001: 198) states, "In John 14:4 Jesus almost 'baits' his disciples by declaring that they know the place to which he is going. Given their frequent misunderstandings, especially in Mark, we should not be surprised to read of Thomas protesting that he does not know (v. 5)." Newman and Nida (1980: 456) explain, "*You know the way that leads to the place where I am going* is more literally 'and where I am going you know the way.'"

[49] Sylva (2013: 78) argues that "Thomas couches his own obstinacy behind the veil of the entire group of disciples, claiming that none of them understand Jesus' words (14:5). Earlier he had also couched his criticism of Jesus' call to go to Lazarus behind the plural usage indicative of the disciples as a whole." Also see Bennema, 2009: 165; Popp, 2013: 510–13; Bruce, 1983: 298–99.

[50] Swartley (2013: 343) states, "Thomas, whose intuition has earlier sensed what lies ahead in his dour comment . . . This question, put with some frustration, prompts Jesus' memorable pronouncement, *I am the way, and the truth, and the life*." Cf. Edward, 2004: 140; Thompson, 2015: 308–09.

story and the first farewell discourse end with a call to depart. In this way, as far as the character analysis is concerned, Jesus and Thomas (explicitly in 14:5 and implicitly in 14:31) are brought into contact with one another."[51] From Thomas's utterance, three things are significant to note: first, in 11:16, Thomas recognizes that Jesus's going is for his death; second, Thomas is not able to see beyond Jesus's death and perceive the connection between his death and going to the Father; and third, while Thomas recognizes that Jesus is going to die in 11:16, he fails to understand Jesus's death as a marking point for him to go to the Father.

. . . How can we know the way?

Thomas's utterance in 14:5 ends with a significant question: "How can we know the way?" (πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι).[52] Carson (1991: 490) maintains that "his [Thomas's] question sounds as if he interpreted Jesus' words in the most crassly natural way: he wants an unambiguous destination, for without such a destination how can one meaningfully speak of the route there?"[53] Thomas's identity, which is caught between the world from below and the world from above, makes him ask this question.[54] In John, the hour of Jesus is connected to the way to the cross (13:1; 17:1). At the same time, it marks his departure from this world (13:1; 16:5). It is the hour/death/glorification of Jesus that marks the completeness of his mission and the crucial point for him to reveal himself as the way to God (13:31-33; 17:1, 4-5).[55] As Jesus has come from the Father, he is returning back to the Father.

[51] See Blomberg, 2001: 198; Newman and Nida, 1980: 449–56; Bennema, 2009: 165. The disciples are assured that Jesus came from God (16:30). The going out of Judas and the coming of the ruler of the world are antagonistic (13:30; 14:30). Furthermore, going and bearing fruit are considered as marks of genuine discipleship (15:16).

[52] See Brant, 2004: 105; Ridderbos, 1997: 493.

[53] Bultmann (1971: 603–04) says, "His [Thomas's] question is typical of the mythological standpoint, which can only conceive of the goal and the way as things within the world. And yet to this extent the question has been put correctly: it makes clear that the disciples' knowledge of his own way depends on knowledge of Jesus' ὑπάγειν." Also refer to Barrett, 1955/1960: 382; Boice, 1985: 4: 940; Howard-Brook, 1994: 315; Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 64–65; Keener, 2003: 2: 939–41; Bruner, 2012: 811–12.

[54] Bonney (2002: 139) states, "Thomas hears Jesus' words from a worldly point of view and fails to comprehend the truth of which Jesus speaks. . . . The sarcastically confident tone of his words only serves to emphasize how solidly he stands (or thinks he stands) upon the foundation of worldly reason."

[55] Barrett (1955/1960: 382; also see Ridderbos, 1997: 493) comments, "The second half of the verse [v. 6] shows that the principal thought is of Jesus as the way by which men come to God; that is, the way which he himself is now about to take is the road which his followers must also tread."

In that sense, the way refers to the way to the Father (13:3; 16:28).[56] DeConick (2001: 73) states as follows:

> The author, by deliberately characterizing Thomas as a fool in this passage, condemns the hero of the Thomasine Christians. Moreover, his articulation of the discourse points to a particular feature of the dispute: the journey or ascent to heaven. John tells us that such ascent is not necessary, that Jesus himself is the only "way" into heaven. This is stated in contradiction to the Thomasine belief which, from Thomas' answer in 14:5, appears to have encouraged proleptic heavenly ascents.

From Jesus's utterance in 14:7, "None comes to the Father except through me," one perceives that Jesus is the way that God opened to the world.[57] Similarly, Jesus is the one who prepares a way back to the Father. Jesus's mission of preparing a home for the faithful is in the process of its realization (14:3).[58] Peter's question in 13:36 ("Lord, where are you going?") and Thomas's question in 14:5 ("How can we know the way?") are to be perceived from this ideological constellation.[59] The conversation between Philip and Jesus in 14:8-14 strengthens this subject matter further. Jesus speaks figuratively in saying that "in my Father's house there are many dwelling places" (14:2), "Where I am, you also may be" (14:3), and "You know the way to the place where I am going" (14:4). The narrator highlights the utterance of Jesus, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (14:6), as the epitome of the extended discourse.[60] The coming

[56] Haenchen (1984: 2: 124) says, "Thomas explains that they do not know where he is going and thus accordingly do not know the way. That is not as incomprehensible as it sounds, since it is the conviction of the Evangelist that no one has ever seen the Father: he is simply inaccessible in his transcendence."

[57] Barrett (1955/1960: 382) states, "He [Jesus] himself goes to the Father by way of crucifixion and resurrection; in future he is the means by which Christians die and rise. The expression also calls to mind the description of the Christian faith and life as ἡ ὁδὸς (Acts 9:2; 22:4; 24:14); and the Jewish term *halakah*." Cf. Bultmann, 1971: 604–05; Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 321–22; Howard-Brook, 1994: 315; Keener, 2003: 2: 939–41.

[58] See Barrett, 1955/1960: 381–82.

[59] Moloney (1998: 393) states, "He [Jesus] tells the disciples that they know the way, and the question of Thomas is a rhetorical device that allows Jesus to reveal himself by means of an *egō eimi* statement with a predicate: Jesus is the way leading to the Father." Also see Boice, 1985: 4: 940; Carson, 1991: 490–91; see Bultmann, 1971: 604–05; Ridderbos, 1997: 493.

[60] Moloney (1998: 394–95) says, "Thomas' question (v. 5) reflects an ongoing unwillingness to face all the implications of the end of Jesus' story (cf. 13:33, 36). They should know where he is going but a request for further instruction on 'the way' is justifiable, and it opens the possibility for Jesus' self-revelation as 'the way.'" Also see Charlesworth, 2001: 493; Carson, 1991: 490–91; Barrett, 195/1960: 382; Boice, 1985: 4: 944–49; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 124–25; Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 322.

of the Holy Spirit (14:16-17, 26; 15:26-27; 16:7-8, 13-15) further assures that Jesus had opened the way to/from heaven.

John also describes the antagonistic movement against the way when he narrates the following things: Satan (13:2, 18, 21, 26-30; 17:12), the coming of the ruler of the world (14:30; 16:11), the hate of the world toward the children of God (15:18-25; 17:15), and the hour of the enemy (16:2-4).[61] The disciples are commanded to do the following things over against the antagonistic ways of Satan and his cohorts: you also should do as I have done to you (13:15), love one another (13:34; 15:17), love Jesus and keep his commandments (14:15, 21, 23-24; 15:12-14), believe in God and believe in Jesus (14:1), abide in Jesus and bear fruit (15:1-11), be on the way as a sent one (17:18), and be faithful even in the context of suffering and expulsion from the synagogue (16:2).[62] Jesus as the way to God introduces a new ethical paradigm in contrast to the ways of Satan. Through the mediation of Jesus, the *world from above* ushers in the *world from below*. In this context, Thomas's question functions in the following ways: first, it provides a pointer for the reader to understand the sharp contrast between the from-below and from-above ideologies; second, it is used as a rhetorical device to draw the attention of the reader toward Jesus the protagonist and his revelation as the way, truth, and life;[63] and third, it helps the reader to identify him/herself with Thomas in order to develop from the *going to die* aspect (11:16) to the *going to the Father* aspect (14:5).[64]

Other significant aspects

Along with the utterance unit in 14:5, it is important to deal with some of the significant themes that are well connected to the person and ideology of Thomas. The themes such as belief, love, glory of God, and the titles of Jesus are analyzed to foreground the character.

[61] See Brant, 2004: 220–24; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 124–25.
[62] See Carson, 1991: 455–510.
[63] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 64) says, "After Thomas' uncertain question, Jesus' answer sounds like an extremely important revelation, a unique statement that has lost none of its sovereign power even now. The revelatory formula *ἐγώ εἰμι* is what gives the statement its majestic sound, but this impression is strengthened by the three predicates." See Howard-Brook, 1994: 315; Bultmann, 1971: 603–07.
[64] See DeConick, 2001: 72–73; Waetjen, 2005: 339; Carter, 2006: 77.

Belief

The belief language of the Farewell Discourse has much to contribute to the characterization of Thomas. Thomas's character emerges not as an easy believer, but as one who requires evidence (14:5).[65] The narrator introduces a divide between believing and unbelieving right from the beginning of the Gospel. Thomas's character reveals that he is a person firmly rooted in this world and at the same time ignited by the teachings of Jesus. In his prayer, Jesus categorizes the people of the world into two categories: those who belong to the world and those who do not belong to the world (17:14-16).[66] His commands to the disciples are: "believe in God, believe also in me" (14:1) and "believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father is in me; but if you do not, then believe me because of the works themselves" (14:11; 17:21).[67] Those who believe in Jesus are assured to be performers of the works that Jesus does. Moreover, he confirms that "in fact, [the one who believes] will do greater works than these" (14:12).[68] While addressing a closed community in which Thomas appears as a brave but dull character, Jesus's ultimate intention is to transform the inner circle.[69] Jesus says to the disciples: "The Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from God" (16:27, 30).[70] On the other hand, the world does not believe in Jesus (16:9). In his prayer, Jesus emphasizes the belief of both his present followers (17:8) and future believers (17:20).[71] Jesus's emphasis on faith in him is presented as a necessary requirement. Irrespective of this emphasis, Judas turned out to be a betrayer (13:2, 18, 21) and Peter became a denier (13:37-38). But

[65] Ridderbos (1997: 493) comments that "Thomas' radical objection to Jesus' statement, though expressed with all respect, is not only characteristic of his own role in the Gospel (11:16; 20:24-29) but also conveys the uncertainty of his fellow disciples ('*we* do not know')." Also see Bultmann, 1971: 603; Carson, 1991: 490–94; Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 64.

[66] Cf. Ridderbos, 1997: 554–55; Boice, 1985: 4: 1153–58.

[67] Keener (2003: 2: 931; also see Barrett, 1960: 380) says, "It is likely that both uses of the verb πιστεύω in 14:1 should be taken in the same mood; probably either both are indicative or both are imperative; in either case, taking both the same way links Jesus with the Father as the supreme object of faith."

[68] Barrett (1960: 384) comments, "The construction with πιστεύειν changes; we now have εἰς with the accusative, indicating the true believer who trusts in Christ." Also see Keener, 2003: 2: 946–47; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 125–26.

[69] Bonney (2002: 139) states, "Thomas will not understand . . . until Jesus bridges the gap and brings him to faith (20:27b)." Also see Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 64; Bultmann, 1971: 603–67; Boice, 1985: 4: 940.

[70] See Howard-Brook, 1994: 355–56.

[71] The belief aspect is also connected to the passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus. In that sense Jesus says: "When it does occur you may believe that I am he" (13:19; 14:29). See Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 376.

Thomas's characterization is slightly different from that of the other disciples. The following things are evident from Thomas's character: first, his faith was not based on superficial things, but on evidence; second, he was a seeker of wisdom and truth and a believer of *seen* things, not a believer of *heard* things; and third, his experiential life proves that faith is not merely an internal attitude but rather action-oriented and progressive.[72]

Love

The Farewell Discourse exhibits Jesus's love for his disciples. It is understood that Thomas as a member of this group had a loving relationship with Jesus and he was in a leadership role. The discourse as a whole begins with a narrative statement that "having loved his [i.e., Jesus's] own who were in the world, he loved them to the end" (13:1; 15:9).[73] Thomas's utterance in 14:5 can be well placed in relation to the love statements of Jesus. Expressions such as Jesus is in the Father and the Father is in Jesus describe the love relationship at the apex level (14:10-11, 20, 31; 15:10; 17:10). The disciples are invited to engage in such a love relationship between themselves and God/Jesus and among themselves.[74] Jesus gives a new commandment to the disciples "that [they] love one another" (13:34-35; 14:15, 21, 23-24; 15:10, 12, 17).[75] Jesus's prayer is "that they may be one as we are one" (17:11, 21-23, 26).[76] In this regard, the works of Jesus are well connected to love (14:11-12).[77] When Jesus says that he will not leave them as orphans (14:18), the readers infer eternal parenthood (14:21, 23-24). Jesus's love is greater because he laid down his life for his friends (15:13-15).[78] His love for the disciples is proved through

[72] For more details about the belief language, refer to Bonney, 2002: 140–41.

[73] Carson (1991: 461) states, "The object of the love of God in Christ, in these chapters, is . . . not the lost world, but the newly forming people of God, the disciples of the Messiah, the nascent church, the community of the elect. Jesus had loved his own all along; *he now showed them the full extent of his love*." Also see Haenchen, 1984: 2: 105–06; Bultmann, 1971: 464, 486–89.

[74] The Father loves his Son and the Son loves the Father (14:21-24; 15:9; 16:27; 17:21-23, 24, 26), and the Father loves the disciples (14:21, 23; 16:27). Cf. Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 331–33.

[75] Haenchen (1984: 2: 117–18) says, "Verses 34-38 give the commandment of mutual love—in this situation as a new commandment—the love with which Jesus has loved them and has just exemplified in the foot washing. Everyone will know by this love that they are his disciples. In this passage, John does not have in view the worldwide church, but the small band of disciples for whom his Gospel was written." Also see Howard-Brook, 1994: 311–12.

[76] See Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 180–81.

[77] Cf. Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 323–24; Bultmann, 1971: 609–10; Carson, 1991: 495–96.

[78] Barrett (1960: 397) says, "The eternal divine love reached its complete and unsurpassable expression in the death of Christ, which was at the same time the death of a man for his friends."

his keeping of them until the end (17:12).[79] The disciples are taught to abide in Jesus (14:10-11, 20; 15:4-5, 7, 9) and bearing fruit is considered a mark of true discipleship (15:8).[80] The world hates and persecutes the loved ones, both the disciples and Jesus (15:18-20, 23-25; 17:14). Moreover, they put the loved ones out of the synagogue and consider killing the loved ones as an offering to God (16:2, 32).[81] Thomas's question in 14:5 reflects his love toward his teacher. The esoteric wisdom Jesus imparts to Thomas in 14:6 brings him closer to his master.[82] Thomas's character reveals the following things: first, Thomas was not counted among the antagonists of the extended story, but rather among the loved ones; second, at the same time, his character shows his own tension between the ideologies of the world from above and the world from below; third, his plain expression "we do not know" reveals his frankness and representative role as one who loves his colleagues; fourth, his expression "where you are going" shows his role as a seeker of wisdom and truth; fifth, his question "How can we know the way?" exemplifies his (and hence their) readiness to follow Jesus's instructions; sixth, he stands tall as a character who was loved by Jesus, one who was willing to die with Jesus, and one who represented his colleagues; and seventh, above all, his character proves that he requires time to understand Jesus and his eternal message.

Glory of God

Thomas's response in 14:5 again connects well with the glorification theme of the Farewell Discourse. At the outset of the discourse, the narrator recounts that "Jesus knew that his hour had come to depart from this world and go to the Father" (13:1).[83] Bonney (2002: 141) comments, "Notably, in all the scenes in which he appears, Thomas is linked to Jesus' final hour. . . . With Thomas,

[79] Howard-Brook (1994: 322) says, "the Father's and Jesus' love comes to those who love Jesus. It is *not necessarily* universal *or* unconditional but is an aspect of *mutuality* in relationship. Love that finds no reciprocity is not love in the Johannine sense. Although we heard that 'God so loved the world that he gave his only son' (3:16), that act is complete and past." Also see Barrett, 1960: 424–25.

[80] Barrett (1960: 396) comments, "To bear fruit is a proof of the reality of discipleship." Also see Ridderbos, 1997: 495–96.

[81] Haenchen (1984: 2: 142) comments, "The world sees the disciples as—at best—a small minority being led astray and leading astray, to which one cannot afford to give free reign. One is not to be limited merely to casting them out of the synagogue, but is to kill them, and in so doing to think oneself especially pious." See Carson, 1991: 530–31.

[82] Cf. Barrett, 1960: 382.

[83] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 15) observes, "The previously determined hour of his death (7:30; 8:20) at the same time also leads to his glorification (12:23)."

the evangelist fuses the uncomprehending point of view of those who judge by worldly reason to their role in the unfolding of Jesus' 'hour.'" Thomas's misunderstanding question has a rhetorical thrust at this juncture. The earthly ministry of Jesus manifested his glory among the people.[84] Hence, it is told that "now the Son of Man has been glorified, and God has been glorified in him. If God has been glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself and will glorify him at once" (13:31-32; 16:14; 17:3-5).[85] Thomas's lack of a full understanding concerning the hour/lifting up/glorification of Jesus led to his utterance in 14:5. He openly admits that "we do not know where you are going" and asks "How can we know the way?" Thomas's question is rhetorical as it guides the reader toward what Jesus says and how the narrator responds. The misunderstanding question is fundamentally answered through the famous revelatory statement of Jesus, "I am the way and the truth and the life" (14:6).[86] Jesus is the truthful Messiah, the way to God, and the life-giving savior.[87] Thus, Jesus himself is the glorious Son of God. The Father glorifies the Son and the Son glorifies the Father (17:1, 3-5).[88] Jesus says to the disciples that "I will do whatever you ask in my name, so that the Father may be glorified in the Son" (14:13).[89] In the high priestly prayer, Jesus says, "The glory that you have given me I have given them, so that they may be one, as we are

[84] Thompson (2015: 308) states, "The answer to Thomas' immediate question is that Jesus is going to the Father; he goes by means of his own death and resurrection."

[85] Haenchen (1984: 2: 117) comments, "The oldest manuscripts have already omitted the words 'if God is glorified in him,' on the basis of an original scribal error: the scribe skipped from the first 'God is glorified in him' to the second 'God is glorified in him.' That is to say, the scribe intended to write the second phrase when he wrote the first one." Haenchen (1984: 2: 17) further says, "The text is therefore to be explained as follows: If God has been glorified in him, then God will be glorified in him, and glorify him at once." Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 49–52, 136, 173–74; Ridderbos, 1997: 473–74, 536, 549–50.

[86] See Thompson, 2015: 308–09.

[87] Jesus further said: "If you abide in me, and my words abide in you, ask for whatever you wish, and it will be done for you. My Father is glorified by this, that you bear much fruit and become my disciples" (15:7-8). See Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 101–02; Boice, 1985: 4: 1028–38.

[88] Bultmann (1971: 490) comments about v. 1 as follows: "This is the last time the Revealer appears in a purely human posture; for after the words *nun edoxasthē* in 13:31, which express the granting of the prayer, everything human is laid aside from him; in the discourses that follow he speaks as the *doxastheis*, and it is also as *doxastheis*, that he moves through the event of the passion." Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 172) says, "This verse (i.e., v. 3) and the next provide an insight into the meaning of the important Johannine concept of 'eternal life,' which is not explicitly mentioned again in the rest of the prayer. It is replaced by the *doxa*, in which this fulfilled eternal life is manifested (see v. 24)."

[89] Ridderbos (1997: 498) comments, "The glorification of the Father in the Son will continue on earth even after Jesus has gone to the Father. But the works are still his, and he continues to bear responsibility for them, even though he has involved and authorized his disciples to assist therein as his apostles."

one" (17:2, 24).[90] The glory of Jesus continues in the mission of the disciples, including Thomas (17:10).[91] Thomas played a significant role in making the disciples stand together as "one," just as Father and Son are one.[92] He did that by functioning as a leader of the disciples, posing a question to the teacher in order to get an answer for a significant quest, and emerging as a character that proffers a worthy utterance/question in a difficult situation. In sum, Thomas is placed at a critical situation to convey the message of glorification adequately to the rest of the disciples/readers.[93]

Titles of Jesus

The Fourth Evangelist uses the title "Lord" more often for Jesus than any other title. The advancement of Thomas's address to Jesus from the former event (i.e., αὐτοῦ in 11:16) to the latter (i.e., κύριος in 14:5) is noticeable. In the Farewell Discourse, the title appears through the mouth of the disciples: Simon Peter, four times (13:6, 9, 36, and 37); the Beloved Disciple, one time (13:25); Thomas, one time (14:5); Philip, one time (14:8); and Judas (not Iscariot), one time (14:22).[94] Thomas's addressing of Jesus as Lord can be distinguished from the rest on the following grounds: first, while other disciples use the title mostly in the sense that Jesus is their teacher, Thomas uses the title in a developmental way; second, his pairing of the title "Lord" with "God" in 20:28 exemplifies the way he understood "Jesus as Lord" on par with "Jesus as God"; and third, the progressive aspect foregrounds the fact that his address "Lord and God" in 20:28 is far beyond the normal addressing of the disciples (i.e., "Teacher and Lord").[95] In his self-revelatory utterances, Jesus uses other titles such as "Son of Man" (13:31), "Son" (14:13), "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (14:6), and

[90] Cf. Keener, 2003: 2: 1053; Boice, 1985: 4: 1107–12; Carson, 1991: 555; Barrett, 1960: 429.

[91] Haenchen (1984: 2: 153) says, "Jesus is glorified in his own, insofar as the chosen believe in Jesus and live in this faith. Jesus' possibilities on earth are limited by the fact that they, and only they, have been given to him."

[92] Keener (2003: 2: 1057) comments, "Jesus is glorified in his followers (17:10; cf. 2 Thess. 1:12) the same way the Father is: by their fruitfulness (15:8), especially by their love for one another (13:35) expressed in unity (17:21-23)." Keener (2003: 2: 1057) further says, "Although the idea is less central to this chapter, he may also be glorified in their sufferings (21:19) and in their triumph following such sufferings (11:4; cf. 9:3)." Cf. Bultmann, 1971: 500–01.

[93] See Thompson, 2015: 308.

[94] Barrett (1960: 378) comments about 13:37 as follows: "κύριε was probably added by assimilation to v. 36."

[95] Jesus says to the disciples: "You call me Teacher and Lord—and you are right, for that is what I am. So if I, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet" (13:13-14). See Barrett, 1960: 369; Bruce, 1983: 298–99.

"I am the true vine" (15:1, 5).[96] Thomas uses none of the above titles, but rather slowly emerges as a character with worthy addresses and idioms of his own. The utterance of Jesus in 13:13-14 makes it clear that "Teacher and Lord" (or in Jesus's way of ordering it, "Lord and Teacher") was one of the most common titles used by the disciples to address Jesus.[97] There is a distinction between the normal practice of the disciples' modes of address ("Teacher and Lord") and Thomas's preference (i.e., "Lord and God"). A reader may notice the way in which Thomas emerges as a stable character from 11:16 to 14:5, that is, from no title to title.[98] From there, he further advances to deliver the most significant Christological utterance in 20:28.

Concluding remarks

The utterance of Thomas in John 14:5 provides further understanding about his person and his ideological framework. The shift of emphasis from the previous utterance (11:16, going to Jerusalem and to death) to the latter (14:5, going to the Father) becomes obvious in the process of reading the text. The narrator places the utterances of Thomas in 14:5 in order to develop the plot structure with suspense and surprise. Thomas's question adds rhetorical punch to the Farewell Discourse and it has both analeptic and proleptic functions within the narrative masterplan. Thomas's role as a character that represents the rest of the disciples initiates some of the significant revelatory aspects in the Gospel. As we have already noted, the speech unit of Thomas has the following emphases: first, the title *Lord* has a specific emphasis when it is compared with the rest of the usages; second, the narrator explores the narratorial technique of the *knowing-and-unknowing* contrast to full effect; third, the aspect of *going* is introduced with a different emphasis when it is compared with 11:16; and fourth, the question "How can we know the Way?" conveys some of the revelatory and mysterious truths related to the heavenly realities and the existential struggles of the believers. Thomas is unique in his

[96] See Barrett, 1960: 375, 382, 384, 393–96; Thompson, 2015: 308–09.

[97] Bultmann (1971: 474) says, "V. 13 stresses firstly the paradoxical nature of what has taken place: it is actually their teacher and lord, who has washed the disciples' feet. If so, v. 14 continues a maiore ad minus, has done this for them, they are bound to perform the same service for each other."

[98] See Bennema, 2009: 165; Blomberg, 2001: 198; Popp, 2013: 510–03; Sylva, 2013: 63–81.

approach to belief as he is a seeker of truth through evidence, as he believes on the basis of seeing, and as he shows an inclination toward an action-oriented and progressive movement. His character shows love and concern toward Jesus and his utterances, exemplifies frankness in speech, is willing to die for Jesus and to represent his colleagues in crucial junctures, and requires time to accept the truth of Jesus. Thomas stands tall as a character who takes the initiative to communicate the glorification aspect convincingly to the rest of the disciples/readers. Thus, Thomas emerges as a stable character and one who adds rhetorical force to the plot structure of the story.

3

Recognizing Jesus as "Lord" and "God" (20:1-31)

Introduction

John 20:1-31 is the last episode of the Book of Glory in which Thomas appears for the third time. The whole chapter can be broadly divided into five sections: first, the resurrection and related events (vv. 1–10); second, the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene (vv. 11–18); third, Jesus's appearance to the rest of the disciples (excluding Thomas; vv. 19–23); fourth, his appearance to Thomas (vv. 24–29); and fifth, the purpose statement of the Gospel (vv. 30–31). Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 301) comments about the structure of the chapter as follows:

> The division of the Johannine Easter chapter in its present form, is simple and clear; even a well-considered, well-proportioned, well-balanced structure is recognizable. In general, the development is emphasized in that vv. 1-18 tell of occurrences on the *morning* of the first day of the week (=Easter Sunday), and against that, vv. 19-23 describe Jesus' appearing to the disciples during the *evening* of the same day. The Thomas narrative (vv. 24-29) follows this appearance, and is transferred to the Sunday after.

The narrator places the Thomas event, with his profoundest utterance, "My Lord and my God," toward the climax of the Book of Glory and just before the purpose statement (vv. 30–31) in order to foreground his narrative plans.[1] In the episode, the character of Thomas can be fully understood only in comparison to the rest of the characters and their utterances. The utterances of Mary Magdalene and the other disciples are to be compared

[1] See more details in Thompson, 2015: 423; Bonney, 2002: 145–67.

with those of Thomas to understand his unique presence. The extreme statements made by Thomas, one to the rest of the disciples (v. 25b) and one to Jesus (v. 28), make his appearance convincing within the episode. On the one hand, he says to the disciples that "unless I see . . . put my finger . . . I will not believe," and on the other he utters to Jesus "My Lord and my God!" The narrative dynamism of Thomas's appearance will be studied first through the narrative setting of ch. 20 and second within the story world of Jn 20:1-31.

Narrative setting

In John 20, the narrator presents two constant characters in relation to Jesus the protagonist. The appearance of the other disciples is narrated either in relation to Mary Magdalene and Thomas or in relation to Jesus. In vv. 1–18, Mary takes the lead and draws Peter and the other disciple to the scene.[2] In vv. 19–23, the disciples (except Thomas) are the focus, but none of their names are specified.[3] In vv. 24–29, Thomas appears in two scenes: first, a scene in which Thomas and the rest of the disciples appear (vv. 24–25); and second, a scene in which Thomas, the other disciples, and Jesus appear (vv. 26–29).[4] In sum, Mary Magdalene and Thomas and their interactions with Jesus are the focus in ch. 20. In vv. 30–31, the narrator concludes the chapter with the purpose statement of the entire Gospel. The chapter as a whole is narrated within three time frames: early on the first day of the week (vv. 1–18);[5] the evening on that day, the first day of the week (vv. 19–25);[6] and a week later when Jesus's disciples were again in the house (vv. 26–29).[7] Spatially, the whole chapter develops in several places: first, at the tomb (vv. 1, 4, 6); second, the place where Mary went and conversed with Peter and the other disciple,

[2] Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 68–118; Carson, 1991: 631–60; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 207–10.
[3] See Keener, 2003: 2: 1196–1208.
[4] See Haenchen, 1984: 2: 211; Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 618–19; Blomberg, 2001: 265–71; Sylva, 2013: 82–107; Stibbe, 1993: 198–200.
[5] Haenchen (1984: 2: 213) comments, "The 'we know' (*oidamen*) of verse 2 shows that other women had also gone to the tomb and had seen more than Mary Magdalene had, but only Mary Magdalene had run to the house where Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved lived."
[6] See Carson, 1991: 646–56; Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 613–16; Bruce, 1983: 390–93.
[7] See Keener, 2003: 2: 1210; Bennema, 2009: 165–66; Blomberg, 2001: 265–71.

that is, the place where Peter and the other disciple were (vv. 2, 3);[8] third, at the tomb in the garden where Mary stood and wept (v. 11); fourth, the place where Mary went and told the disciples about Jesus (v. 18); fifth, the house where the disciples (excluding Thomas) met (v. 19); sixth, the place where other disciples conversed with Thomas (vv. 24–25); and seventh, the house where Jesus met the disciples (including Thomas, v. 26).[9] Thus, the spatial setting of the story provides a seven-scene drama in which Thomas appears in the last two scenes.

The narrator places the event of Jesus's appearance to the disciples (vv. 19–23) after the events around Mary Magdalene (vv. 1–18) and before the events around Thomas (vv. 24–29). This section can be considered as an interlude as it marks a transition from Mary Magdalene to Thomas.[10] As the story around Mary develops in two major blocks (vv. 1–10, 11–18),[11] the Thomas story also develops in two blocks (vv. 24–25, 26–29). The blocks of the Thomas incident develop as follows:

Character(s)	Verse	Speech unit
Other disciples	25a	We have seen the Lord.
Thomas	25b	Unless I see the mark of the nails in his hands, and put my finger in the mark of the nails and my hand in his side, I will not believe.

There is a one-week gap between the first block of dialogue and the second block of dialogue. In the first block, the interlocutors are Thomas and the rest of the disciples, that is, those who have seen Jesus (i.e., those

[8] Ridderbos (1997: 629) states, "The report of the two disciples going to the tomb (vv. 3–10) is . . . an interlude in which the Evangelist lets his readers know that, within the general framework of the events of that morning, which were undoubtedly familiar to them, something else took place that, as the sequel will show, is of special significance for an understanding of everything that happened that morning."

[9] Sylva (2013: 82) states, "John 20 is comprised of a concatenation of three accounts of Jesus' absence and three resurrection appearances. The former triad involves Mary Magdalene, Peter and Beloved Disciple, and Thomas. The latter involves Mary Magdalene, all the disciples except Thomas, and all the disciples including Thomas." Also see Ridderbos, 1997: 647; Popp, 2013: 513–29.

[10] Popp (2013: 515) says, "The constellation of characters in John 20 is purposefully configured. Thomas is one of the four explicitly named main characters within the narrative concept of the final chapter. After Mary Magdalene (20:1-2, 11-18), Peter, and the Beloved Disciple (20:3-10), he is the fourth and last individual disciple mentioned, and he is also the third character out of the circle of the Twelve (20:24-29)." Cf. Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 613–16; Bennema, 2009: 165.

[11] These two major blocks develop in four geographical scenes.

Character(s)	Verse	Speech unit
Jesus (to all)	26	Peace be with you.
Jesus (to Thomas)	27	Put your finger here and see my hands. Reach out your hand and put it in my side. Do not doubt but believe.
Thomas (to Jesus)	28	My Lord and my God!
Jesus (to Thomas)	29	Have you believed because you have seen me? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have come to believe.

who proclaim: "We have seen the Lord") and one who did not see him.[12] In the second block, a direct dialogue develops between Jesus and Thomas in the presence of the rest of the disciples.[13] The utterances of Thomas and Jesus in vv. 25b and 27 direct the attention of the reader toward the passion narratives (chs. 18–19).[14]

Thus, the two-block narrative of the Thomas incident in vv. 24–29 develops with the help of both dialogues and narratives.[15] While the first block (vv. 24–25) is comprised of an eye-witness testimony (of the other disciples, v. 25a) and Thomas's bold statement of faith (v. 25b), the second block (vv. 26–29) develops with the help of Jesus's three utterances (a greeting in v. 26, a challenging statement to Thomas in v. 27, and his final makarism in v. 29) and Thomas's convincing Christological vision in v. 28.[16] As in the case of other exchanges and episodes in the Gospel, the narrator here also adds literary flavor to advance the dialogue with a rhetorical punch.

Thomas within the narrative framework of Jn 20:1-31

As in the case of 11:16 and 14:5, the speech units of Thomas in 20:25b and 28 must be analyzed in contrast to his interlocutors' utterances in ch. 20. Thomas's

[12] Keener (2003: 2: 1167) comments, "Parallel confessions unite the resurrection narratives: 'I have seen the Lord' (20:18 in 20:11-18); 'We have seen the Lord' (20:25 summarizing 20:19-23); 'My Lord and my God!' (20:28 in 20:24-29); the epilogue follows the same pattern in 21:1-14, where the beloved disciple is permitted the final confession, 'It is the Lord' (21:7)." Also see Carson, 1991: 656.

[13] Cf. Haenchen, 1984: 2: 211.

[14] Mlakuzhyil (1987: 233–34) sees several parallelisms between ch. 20 and other sections of the Gospel.

[15] Newman and Nida (1980/1993: 617) comment, "The first resurrection scene was concluded with the appearance of Jesus to Mary, and this second scene reaches its climax in the revelation of Jesus to Thomas."

[16] See Ridderbos, 1997: 647–49.

utterances within the narrative framework of ch. 20 and their relationship with some of the significant themes are discussed in the following sections.

Seeing and putting finger in the mark of the nails

The vocabulary of *seeing* is rich in John 20 and must be analyzed carefully to understand the utterances of Thomas in vv. 24–29. Thomas's determination to see tangible evidence is made clear through his conditional statement in v. 25b ("Unless I see").[17] His conviction about his faith in Jesus compels the reader to evaluate him in relation to the rest of the characters. In the first part of the chapter, Mary Magdalene is present in the following ways: she *saw* (βλέπει) that the stone had been removed from the tomb (v. 1); she bent over to look into the tomb and *saw* (θεωρεῖ) two angels (vv. 11–12); she turned around and *saw* (θεωρεῖ) Jesus standing (v. 14);[18] and she comes out with her announcement that "I have *seen* the Lord" (ἑώρακα, v. 18).[19] Jesus's question to her is "For whom are you *seeking*" (ζητεῖς, v. 15).[20] Peter and the other disciple come next for our observation. The other disciple bent down to look in and *saw* (βλέπει) the linen wrappings lying there (v. 5); and as he went in, he *saw* (εἶδεν) and believed (v. 8). Simon Peter *saw* (θεωρεῖ) the linen wrappings (τὰ ὀθόνια) lying there and the soudarion (τὸ σουδάριον) rolled up in a place by itself (vv. 6–7).[21] The rest of the disciples come as a third category: Jesus shows his hands and side to them and they rejoice when they *see* (ἰδόντες) the Lord (v. 20), and that further helps them to declare to Thomas that "We have *seen* the Lord" (ἑωράκαμεν, v. 25). In these three categories, all of them believed after seeing the evidence. Mary's reactions show that until she saw

[17] Bruce (1983/1994: 393; cf. Sylva, 2013: 84–87) comments, "Seeing would not be enough for him; only if he put his finger into the nail-prints and his hands into the spear-wound would he be convinced. Optical illusions were not unknown, but he reckoned that the evidence of touch would show whether there was solid flesh there or not."

[18] Haenchen (1984: 2: 14) says, "This motif—the risen Jesus is unrecognizable (cf. Luke 24:16; John 21:4)—is designed to show that the risen Jesus is not accessible like he once was."

[19] Bennema (2009: 198) states, "Mary's quest for the missing body of Jesus (20:15b) is in essence a quest 'from below' and needs redirecting." Also see Carson, 1991: 641; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 209; Ridderbos, 1997: 635–40; Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 610.

[20] Blomberg (2001: 264) comments, "Still assuming the body has been taken and placed somewhere else, Mary asks where she can find it (v. 15)." Cf. Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 610; Bruce, 1983/1994: 388.

[21] Charlesworth (1995: 69) states, "Nothing is said about Peter's reaction, but the conclusion is clear: both disciples did not know the Scripture (not plural) that Jesus must rise from the dead, so they went home." Also see Blomberg, 2001: 261–63; Howard-Brook, 1994: 448.

Jesus face-to-face, heard his voice, and clung on to him, she did not believe that he was indeed resurrected.[22] Peter and the other disciple saw the empty tomb and believed that his body was not there (vv. 6–8).[23] The rest of the disciples (excluding Thomas) believed after seeing his hands and side (v. 20) and hearing his voice (vv. 19, 21–23).[24] The final declaration of Mary ("I have seen the Lord," v. 18) and the rest of the disciples ("We have seen the Lord," v. 25a) are to be considered their faith reactions on the basis of either sight or touch, or both.[25]

While the leading characters of John 20, Mary Magdalene and the disciples (including Peter and the other disciple), declare both in the individual and corporate life that they have seen the Lord, Thomas stands out at a different level.[26] Thomas did not see Jesus like Mary and the other disciples. He declares that unless he *sees* (ἴδω) and touches tangible evidence that Jesus is alive, he will not believe (v. 25).[27] Jesus takes the challenge, comes to him in the presence of others, and says to him: "put your finger here and *see* (ἴδε) my hands" (v. 27). Jesus's question in v. 29a ("Have you believed because you have *seen* [ἑώρακάς] me?") cannot be considered as an exclusive response to Thomas, but has to be looked at as one to Thomas, Mary Magdalene, Peter, the other disciple, and the rest of the disciples.[28] Similarly, his makarism in v. 29b cannot be interpreted

[22] Sylva (2013: 85) states, "Thomas morbidly conjoins the touch of Mary and the visual verification by the disciples of Jesus' wounds in a need to touch these wounds in order to believe." Also see Bennema, 2009: 196–201; Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 602–12.

[23] Popp (2013: 516; see Carson, 1991: 645–56) comments, "He [Thomas] expects no more than what has been bestowed upon his fellow disciples and before them Mary Magdalene (20:25; see 20:18, 20)."

[24] Popp (2013: 515) states, "The final encounter with the Risen One is introduced by Thomas' surprising contact with his fellow disciples (20:24-25). He is described with the attribute 'one of the Twelve' (20:24). Because of this the readers are prompted to establish an association with the first appearance of the circle of Twelve."

[25] Sylva (2013: 84) comments, "There is a pattern in John 20 of the one who has had a resurrection appearance telling those who have not, 'I (We) have seen the Lord' (20:18a, 25a). Mary Magdalene first utters this statement. Immediately following it, the Fourth Gospel says, 'and she told them that he had said these things to her' (20:18b). The disciples sans Thomas utter the second statement about seeing the Lord to Thomas." Also see Keener, 2003: 2: 1196, 1209; Ridderbos, 1997: 640, 646; Bennema, 2009: 196–201; Charlesworth, 1995: 68–79.

[26] Sylva (2013: 82–83; see Haenchen, 1984: 2: 211) states, "Thomas does not believe the other disciples' testimony of meeting the risen Lord (20:24-25). This is a courageous response. Already ostracized by the larger society and having just lost Jesus, Thomas is willing to stand against the small group that still accepts him."

[27] See the expression ἐὰν μὴ in Thomas's utterance. Refer to Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 617; Sylva, 2013: 86–87.

[28] In order to foreground the aspect of *seeing*, the narrator uses a wide variety of vocabularies. See Bruce, 1983/1994: 383–94; Blomberg, 2001: 265–67.

as an exclusive criticism of Thomas, but has to be understood as a criticism of the disciples and Mary Magdalene.[29] Thomas emerges here as a figure who can better conclude the story of Jesus in the Gospel. By placing Thomas, one of the leading figures of early Christianity, at center stage, the narrator deciphers the early Christian trend of *seeing and believing*.[30]

Thomas's demand to touch the marks of the nails in Jesus's hands requires special attention. While there is no indication about Peter, the other disciple, and the rest of the disciples touching the body of Jesus, there is a mention that Mary Magdalene was clinging onto his body (20:17).[31] Though Thomas demands to touch the body of Jesus, there is no mention that he literally touched the body.[32] But a reader can infer that Jesus's command to put his finger in his hands would have been wholeheartedly accepted by Thomas (v. 27; cf. v. 25b).[33] Theodore of Mopsuestia (2010: 166) comments: "And when [Thomas] ever so carefully touched him and accurately ascertained the truth, he confessed his fault saying, *My Lord and My God!*"[34] Thomas's statement makes it clear that Jesus's hands were nailed and that he himself was a witness of the incident. In the passion narratives, we see the following indications with regard to the violent atmosphere: the soldiers, police, chief priests, and Pharisees came with lanterns and torches and weapons (18:3); Jesus was arrested and bound (18:12); Jesus was struck on the face (18:22); Annas sent him bound to Caiaphas the high priest (18:24);[35] Pilate took Jesus and had

[29] Bennema (2009: 167) says, "Jesus' response in 20:29 should be considered as a mild rebuke directed at Thomas and as an exhortation for later generations of believers to progress towards a belief that is less dependent on sight or signs." But our analysis reveals that it was not only a rebuke to Thomas but also one to Mary Magdalene and the rest of the disciples. Cf. Popp, 2013: 522; Haenchen, 1984: 212; Swartley, 2013: 462–64; Thompson, 2015: 427–28.

[30] For more details about the connection between "seeing" and "believing," refer to Thompson, 2015: 243–44.

[31] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 318) states, "John has a different verb for touching Jesus (*haptesthai*) from Matthew (*kratein*), presumably an indication that the scene is not directly borrowed from Matthew. The verb *haptesthai* does not otherwise occur in John's gospel, only again in 1 John 5:18. It means 'touch, get hold of'; but when the act of touching has already begun, the negative present imperative can also mean, 'Do not hold on to me any longer, let me go!'" Also see Bultmann, 1971: 686–88; Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 427–29; Von Wahlde, 2010: 867–68.

[32] Barrett (1955/1960: 476) states, "Thomas required the grossest and most palpable evidence that the body he knew to have been killed in a specific manner had indeed been reanimated." Cf. Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 435–36.

[33] Bultmann (1971: 694) comments, "This time he [Jesus] speaks only to Thomas, and Jesus asks that Thomas convince himself of the reality of the Risen Person before him, as he had in fact demanded (v. 27); and he tells Thomas to be no longer unbelieving but believing." Cf. Mopsuestia, 2010: 166; Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 331–32; Boice, 1985: 5: 1431–32.

[34] Cf. Köstenberger, 2004: 578–80.

[35] See Moloney, 1998: 484–85, 486, 491; Neyrey, 2007: 289–96; Cyril of Alexandria, 2013: 2: 372–75.

him flogged (ἐμαστίγωσεν, 19:1; cf. Mt. 27:26; Mk 15:1, 15; Lk. 23:16, 22);[36] the soldiers wove a crown of thorns (πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, 19:2) and put it on his head (cf. Mt. 27:29; Mk 15:17); Pilate handed him over to be crucified (σταυρωθῇ, 19:16; cf. Mk 15:15); Jesus carried the cross (19:17); and they crucified him, with two others, one on either side of Jesus (ἐσταύρωσαν, 19:18; cf. Mt. 27:35; Mk 15:24a; Lk. 23:33).[37] Both the Synoptic Gospels and John do not give details concerning nailing the hands (and also the legs) of Jesus.[38] In all these passages, there is no mention of the nail marks in his hands and legs. Thomas is the first and only person who talks about the marks of the nails in Jesus's hands (τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων, v. 25).[39] In his response to Thomas, Jesus also asks: "Put your finger here and see my hands" (ἴδε τὰς χεῖράς μου, v. 27a).[40] In Jesus's action in v. 20 and his speech in v. 27, there is no indication about τῶν ἥλων.

Thomas's utterance concerning seeing and putting his finger in the marks of the nails is the only explicit reference about marks in the hands of Jesus.[41] His statement leads us to the following observations: first, there is every possibility that Thomas was an eye-witness of the crucifixion and that he saw how Jesus's hands were literally nailed by the soldiers;[42] second, while the other disciples

[36] The Greek verb ἐμαστίγωσεν (indicative active third person singular) means "to scourge" or "to flog."

[37] While σταυρωθῇ (subjunctive aorist passive third person singular) is the verbal form used in v. 16, in v. 18 ἐσταύρωσαν (verb indicative aorist active third person plural) is used. Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 270) states, "The crucifixion of Jesus is described as briefly as in the synoptics. This grim occurrence was known to the people of those days, and the Christians avoided a description of this martyrdom of their Lord due to delicacy of feelings." Also see Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 405–06; Von Wahlde, 2010: 798.

[38] In Lk. 24:39, Jesus says to his interlocutors: "Look at my hands and my feet; see that it is I myself. Touch me and see; for a ghost does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have." Carroll (2012: 491; cf. Edwards, 2015: 730–31) considers it as a "tangible demonstration." Further, in Lk. 24:50, the narrator indicates that Jesus lifted up his hands and blessed them (see Parsons, 2015: 355; Edwards, 2015: 740).

[39] In both the references of Jesus showing his hands (20:20 [ἔδειξεν τὰς χεῖρας] and 20:27 [ἴδε τὰς χεῖράς μου]), no marks from the nails are indicated. But Thomas in his utterance specifically uses the term mark/print of "the nails" (τῶν ἥλων). Bultmann (1971: 694) states, "The others explain to him (v. 25) that they have seen the Lord; but he refuses to believe without being convinced by the evidence of his own eyes, and indeed without physical contact." Also see Cyril of Alexandria, 2013: 2: 372–75; Barrett, 1955/1960: 476; Köstenberger, 2004: 578; Moloney, 1998: 539; Bruner, 2012: 1185.

[40] Brant (2004: 88; also see Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 331–32) says, "When Jesus directs Thomas, 'Put your finger here and see my hands' (20:27), Jesus ought to hold out first one hand with its wounds for Thomas to touch and then both hands for him to see."

[41] Moloney (1998: 539; cf. Brown, 1970: 2: 1025) comments, "The use of the verb *ballein* ('place') is much stronger than a simple 'placing' of the finger or the hand. It conveys the idea of an energetic thrust."

[42] Cf. Boice, 1985: 5: 1431–32.

took the matter of Jesus's crucifixion in a regular sense, Thomas took it in a more serious sense; third, the wounded psyche of Thomas led him to keep himself away from the other disciples and to take an altogether different stand in his faith and discipleship; fourth, as one who was willing to go and die with Jesus and one who wanted to know the "way," he was perplexed in his faith journey for a genuine reason; fifth, the narrator presents Thomas on par with Mary Magdalene as both of them saw, touched, and declared their faith reactions, while others could only see and declare in unison; sixth, he represents all those who are determined for a good reason and proves himself and his faith through seeing, touching, and proclaiming; and seventh, the narrator wanted to present Thomas even above Mary Magdalene as his character emerged remarkably at the climax of the story. These factors prove that Thomas was placed above all (even above Peter, the Beloved Disciple, and Mary Magdalene) and brings a convincing climax to the story of Jesus in John.[43]

Putting hands in the side and believe

As a matter of belief, Thomas also wanted to put his hands in the side of Jesus.[44] His utterance directs the attention of the reader once again to the passion of Jesus.[45] In that sense, Thomas's utterance in 20:25 forms an analepsis with 19:31-37. The narrator describes the events of the passion in the following fashion: first, the Jews got permission from Pilate to break the legs of the crucified ones (v. 31b), the soldiers came to break their legs, they broke the legs of the ones on either side of Jesus (v. 32), and because Jesus was already dead they did not break his legs (οὐ κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη, v. 33);[46] and second, they did not pierce the sides of those on either side (vv. 31–34), but one of the soldiers pierced the side of Jesus with a spear (ἀλλ᾽ εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξεν), and at once, blood and water poured out (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν

[43] As Bruner (2012: 1185) comments, "Thomas is every generation's 'modern man,' sincere inquirer, and honest seeker. The Gospel is giving all such people, in Thomas' person and through his present insistence, some space, time, and respect."

[44] Morris (1995: 752) says, "No skepticism could be more thoroughgoing than this, and it is perhaps worth noting that nobody else in the New Testament makes demands like these before believing."

[45] See Theodore of Mopsuestia, 2010: 165–66; Bruner, 2012: 1123–32; Bernard, 1929: 2: 642–52.

[46] Swartley (2013: 443) states, "Jesus' legs are not broken (19:33) just as the bones of the Passover lambs are not to be broken (Exo 12:10, 46; Num 9:12; cf. Psalm 34:19-20). Even in the scriptural detail, Jesus is the unblemished Lamb slain for the sins of the people." Also see Beasley-Murray, 1999: 353–54; Morris, 1995: 723.

εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, v. 34).[47] Talbert (1992/2005: 245) suggests that the soldier "doubtless aimed at the heart to be sure of his death."[48] John connects these two incidents with Old Testament prophesies. The first prophesy is that "none of his bones shall be broken." The narrator records that while the legs of the ones on either side are broken, Jesus's legs are left unbroken (cf. Exod. 12:46; Num. 9:12; Ps. 34:20).[49] The second prophesy is that "they will look on the one whom they have pierced." While Jesus's side was pierced, the other two were left without being pierced (cf. Zech. 12:10).[50] From the scriptural as well as the situational evidence, a reader can infer that Jesus indeed died in a unique manner.[51] Brant (2004: 244) comments, "In the Fourth Gospel, the fact that Jesus' hands and side are narrated with wounds is made explicit; his sores are the proof of his identity (20:20, 25, 27). He is the one who has endured a painful death, and in standing before them, he becomes the object of rejoicing." These events are not recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.[52] Thomas's demand in 20:25 (i.e., βάλω μου τὴν χεῖρα εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτου) is purely Johannine as the narrator records the event of piercing the side of Jesus.[53] The Johannine Jesus accepts the demand of Thomas by stating "reach out your hand and put it in my side" (βάλε εἰς τὴν πλευράν μου, 20:27).[54] Thus, the Thomasine demand is purely Johannine and the Johannine event of the passion is purely Thomasine.

Thomas demands three things for his belief in Jesus's resurrection: first, seeing the marks of the nails in Jesus's hands; second, putting his finger in the marks of the nails; and third, putting his hand in his side.[55] All of this

[47] Morris (1995: 723) comments, "In view of the following verse it is plain that John wants us to take this as a record of what actually happened. He is not manufacturing an edifying piece of symbolism but describing an event. The author was struck by it, and therefore included it in his Gospel." Also see Beasley-Murray, 1999: 354.

[48] Cf. Swartley, 2013: 443.

[49] It is against the usual practice and contrary to the situational practice.

[50] Köstenberger (2004: 553–54) comments, "Though the Hebrew of this passage appears to refer to the piercing of Yahweh himself (figuratively, with sorrow), later messianic interpretation developed this notion into the belief that the Messiah would be pierced and people would look to Yahweh (*b. Sukkah* 52a; but see 5/6 *HevPsalms*: 'They have pierced my hands and feet')." Also see Borchert, 2002: 2: 312; Bernard, 1929: 2: 651–52.

[51] Theodore of Mopsuestia (2010: 157) comments, "Indeed these events happened just as they had been written. This then is how the death of our Lord occurred."

[52] Brown (1970: 2: 1031; cf. Bruner, 2012: 1190) says, "No other Gospel account of a post-resurrectional appearance pays so much attention as does the Thomas story to an individual's attitude toward the risen Jesus. This is because Thomas has become here the personification of an attitude."

[53] See Swartley, 2013: 463; Köstenberger, 2004: 577–78; Borchert, 2002: 2: 312; Morris, 1995: 752.

[54] See Bruner, 2012: 1190–91.

[55] Bernard (1929: 2: 682) comments, "Thomas is represented as knowing of the lance-thrust in Jesus' side, which suggests that he was a witness of the crucifixion. As has been pointed out on v. 20, no

evidence is obvious in the Johannine passion narrative.[56] His determinative statement begins with a conditional phrase and ends with a strong negation, "Unless . . . seeing the mark . . . putting the finger . . . putting the hand . . . I will not believe" (ἐὰν μὴ . . . οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω).[57] Jesus's response (γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός) is a confirmatory statement (v. 27). His response cannot be taken as an unpleasant answer of a teacher, but as an acceptance of the demand of Thomas before others.[58] A reader cannot demarcate between Thomas and the rest of the disciples (as well as Mary Magdalene) in their faith responses. All of them believed either after seeing or after seeing and touching the evidence.[59] At the same time, there is a distinction between Thomas and the rest of the characters of the story. In John 20, Thomas puts forward detailed evidence as strong cause for his faith.[60] Thomas demands to see and touch the body of Jesus, especially two marks that are specified only in the Fourth Gospel. In that sense, the narrator of John's story attunes his passion in a Thomasine way. While recording the event of piercing the side in the passion narrative, the narrator would have foreseen Thomas at the climax of his story.[61]

My Lord and my God!

The Book of Glory ends with the conversation between Jesus and Thomas in vv. 27–28. Alongside Thomas's significant utterance (v. 28), Jesus's makarism

mention is made of any nailing of the *feet*." Cf. Beasley-Murray, 1999: 384–85; Bruner, 2012: 1190; Neyrey, 2007: 330–1.

[56] Swartley (2013: 463) comments, "Jesus' command to Thomas is sharp, sparring with Thomas' strong language in verse 25: *Put* [lit., 'throw,' *ballō*] *your finger here . . . put* [your hand] *into my side* (v. 27)." Also see Brown, 1970: 2: 1045–46; Moloney, 1998: 539.

[57] Swartley (2013: 462; also see Neyrey, 2007: 330–31) states, "He [Thomas] needs his own encounter with the postresurrection Jesus, whom he cannot comprehend in terms different from how he has known Jesus before the devastating Friday crucifixion event."

[58] Köstenberger (2004: 578; cf. Brown, 1970: 2: 1045–46) states, "From the evangelist's perspective, Thomas' objection becomes a welcome foil for forestalling the incipient Gnostic notion that Jesus only appeared to be human (the heresy later termed 'Doceticism,' from *dokēo*, seem)."

[59] Thompson (2015: 425) states, "'Thomas' problem is not doubt in the sense of struggling with perennial obstacles or challenges to faith. Rather, Thomas faces the alternative posed to all figures in the Gospel and to its readers as well: belief *or* unbelief." Thompson (2015: 425) further states, "Jesus' death threatens to end Thomas' faith because Thomas cannot accept the reports that Jesus has risen; he cannot believe on the basis of the testimony of others; and faith cannot be directed toward a dead man."

[60] The narratorial comment in 19:35 states: "he who saw this has testified so that you also may believe."

[61] Skinner (2009: 76) argues, "He [Thomas] goes from a stage of missing the point altogether ('Let us go also that we may die with him,' 11:16; 'We do not know where you are going, how can we know the way?' 14:5) to a middle stage of imposing his own standards upon belief in Jesus' resurrection ('Unless I see the wounds . . . ,' 20:25) to a final stage of complete Johannine faith ('My Lord and my God,' 20:28)."

(v. 29) brings the story to its climax.[62] While the narration about the previous week mentions the fear of the disciples (v. 19a), the narration about the latter week does not refer to the disciples' fear (cf. vv. 26–27).[63] But in both contexts the doors of the house are locked. The narrator also describes how Jesus came and stood among the disciples (vv. 19b, 26b) and blessed them (vv. 19b, 26b). While on the previous occasion Jesus addresses the entire body of disciples, in the latter case the focus is exclusively on Thomas. From these shifts, a reader can infer that the narrator intended to bring the focus of the reader toward the significant exchange between Jesus and Thomas. The presence of Mary with individual focus (vv. 1–18) provides several clues with regard to Thomas at the climax of the story (vv. 24–29). Mary Magdalene addresses Jesus as "Lord" in the following ways: first, she says to Simon Peter and the other disciple, "they have taken the *Lord* out of the tomb" (ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου, v. 2);[64] second, she repeats the same utterance of v. 2 to the angels (ἦραν τὸν κύριόν μου, v. 13); and third, she announces to the disciples, "I have seen the *Lord*" (ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον, v. 18).[65] On the one hand, in v. 15 she addresses Jesus as "Sir" (κύριε); on the other hand, in v. 16 she addresses him as "Rabboni" (ραββουνι, ὃ λέγεται διδάσκαλε, which means "Teacher"; v. 16).[66] Jesus's response to Mary in v. 17 is: "I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God" (v. 17).[67] These details concerning Mary's usage of titles to address Jesus and her attitudes in the process help us to understand Thomas and his utterances and attitudes in the later stage.

[62] Howard-Brook (1994: 462) states, "As the Samaritans' confession of Jesus as 'the Savior of the world' expressed their belief in him as greater than Caesar, so Thomas' proclamation challenges the supremacy of the emperor. Domitian, the Roman ruler enthroned from 81–96 C.E., is described in literature of the time as *dominus et deus noster*, 'our lord and god.'" Also see Morris, 1995: 753; Moloney, 1998: 537–40; Sanders and Mastin, 1968: 438; Keener, 2003: 2: 1211–12; Thompson, 2015: 427.

[63] Sanders and Mastin (1968: 437) state, "There is no mention in the rest of the NT of an appearance in Jerusalem after eight days, i.e., on the Sunday after Easter Sunday; once again there may be a conscious attempt to depict Jesus present with the assembled Church." Cf. Michaels, 2010: 1015–18; Von Wahlde, 2010: 2: 867–70.

[64] See Michaels, 2010: 987–88.

[65] See Barrett, 1960: 467–68, 471.

[66] Barrett (1960: 469) says, "That the form here transliterated, *rabbuni*, was that of early Palestinian Aramaic is shown by its appearance in the Targum fragments from the Cairo Genizah." Also see Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 317; Morris, 1995: 741; Mlakuzhyil, 1987: 338; Newman and Nida, 1980: 610–11; Carson, 1991: 646.

[67] Sylva (2013: 91) states, "Thomas' 'my Lord and my God' (*ho theos mou*) mirrors the form and some of the terminology of Jesus' 'my Father' and 'my God' (*theon mou*). By so doing, Thomas has assented to the journey that in 20:17 Jesus says he is about to make: the journey that Thomas opposed in 11:16; 14:5 and 20:25b as being impossible." See Barrett, 1960: 470; Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 330–31; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 210–11.

In v. 20, the narrator brings to the fore the reaction of the disciples as they rejoiced when they saw the *Lord* (v. 20).[68] As a repetition of Mary's first person singular utterance in v. 18, the disciples in unison proclaim "We have seen the *Lord*" (ἑωράκαμεν τὸν κύριον, v. 25). The utterances and reactions of Mary Magdalene and the other disciples provide a platform to compare other characters of the story with Thomas. Thomas at the beginning addresses Jesus with third person personal pronouns as follows: "in *his* hands . . . in *his* side" (αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτοῦ, v. 25).[69] But Thomas's utterance in v. 28, "My Lord and my God" (Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου), is unique in several ways.[70] While Theodore of Mopsuestia taught that Thomas said the words in v. 28 not to Jesus but to God, Bruner (2012: 1191–92) condemned it by saying that "John's Greek text says that '*Thomas responded and said autō* [*to him*, i.e., to Jesus, who is the most recent antecedent in v. 27],' not '*Thomas responded and said theō* [*to God*].'"[71] Boice (1985: 5: 1435) says, "'Lord' was sometimes used of Christ by others, often with less than its full meaning. But here it must have all the content it will bear—'Jehovah, Master, Sovereign.'"[72] Further, Beasley-Murray

[68] See Morris, 1995: 746.

[69] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 330) comments, "The progression from 'seeing' the prints caused by the nails, to 'placing' his finger in them and, over and above that, placing his hand in the wound in Jesus' side, is clear. . . . The double negative particle is, in John's gospel, where it occurs seventeen times, almost always a mark of assurance (confirmation of an assurance)." Also see Hendriksen, 1953/1972: 463–64; Bruce, 1983: 393; Keener, 2003: 2: 1208–09; Bonney, 2002: 145–67.

[70] Sanders and Mastin (1968: 438) comment, "Lord is a title used by the earlier Christian community after the resurrection to express its veneration for Jesus, but the NT evidence for calling him God is at best sparse." Larsson (2001: 183; see Barrett, 1960: 476–77) says, "The confession of Thomas, 'My Lord and my God,' is appropriate, because it sees God himself in Jesus (20:28)." Michaels (2010: 1018; also see Morris, 1995: 753; Neyrey, 2007: 330–31) says, "The disciples have routinely called Jesus 'Lord' (see 13:13), and Mary Magdalene has spoken of him as 'my Lord' even in death (v. 13), but this is the first time anyone (aside from the Gospel writer) has called him 'God,' or 'my God.' Finally the introduction of Jesus to the reader as 'God' (1:1), or 'God the One and Only' (1:18), is confirmed from within the narrative." Also see Bultmann, 1971: 694–5; Howard-Brook, 1994: 461–62; Boice, 1985: 5: 1435; Beasley-Murray, 1999: 385–86.

[71] Bruner (2012: 1191) states, "The Council of Constantinople rightly condemned this teaching" (i.e., of Theodore of Mopsuestia). Theodore of Mopsuestia (2010: 166) comments, "The knowledge of the resurrection had, in fact, not taught him that he who had risen was God. Rather, it was as though he was praising God for the miracle that he had seen performed, astonished at the miracle he saw." Also see Cyril of Alexandria, 2015: 377.

[72] Boice (1985: 5: 1435; cf. Bennema, 2009: 166; Sylva, 2013: 91) says further: "'God' is a new form of address; no one had previously addressed the Lord in this way. It represents a great insight of faith, perhaps even greater than that similar confession of the apostle Peter for which he was commended by Christ (Matthew 16: 13-17)." Barrett (1960: 476) comments, "When this confession was interpreted in terms of the Old Testament, where kurios = theos, the fuller formula was close at hand." Bennema (2009: 166–67) comments, "Thomas' recognition of Jesus' deity is the Christological climax of the entire gospel. Nowhere in the gospel is Jesus called 'God,' except for the Prologue where John identifies the Logos as (being in nature) God (1:1)." Bultmann (1971: 694–95) comments, "That confession is wholly appropriate to him (Jesus) who has risen; going far beyond

(1999: 385) comments, "His (Thomas's) utterance does not simply acknowledge the reality of the resurrection of Jesus, but expresses its ultimate meaning, i.e., as revelation of who Jesus is."[73] As Bruner, Boice, and Beasley-Murray argue, Thomas's utterance in v. 28 has both theological and Christological significance.[74] As a concluding statement of the Book of Signs, v. 31 adds two more titles of Jesus, the Messiah and the Son of God.[75] But, Thomas's utterance in v. 28 supersedes all other titles and utterances in the Gospel.[76]

Thomas's utterance in v. 28 brings a clear dénouement to the story. The U-shaped plot structure of the story develops in the following fashion based on the utterance of Thomas: first, at the beginning, the story as a whole starts with the reference that the "Word was God" (θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, 1:1); second, in the middle, "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," that is, Jesus's mission and ministry in the world; and third, at the end, the resurrected Jesus reveals that he is "Lord and God" through the utterance of Thomas (Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου).[77] Larsson (2001: 120) comments, "Thomas, by his confession in 20:28, shows that the faith expressed by the Evangelist in 1:1 was in the end 'gained in the actual intercourse of the disciple with Christ.' The incarnate Son is on the same level as the Father in his deeds."[78] Keener (2003: 2: 1211) further states, "Thomas' very skepticism makes him the ideal proponent of

the earlier confession, 'My Master' (v. 16), it sees in Jesus God himself. 'He who has seen me has seen the Father,' Jesus had said in 14:9." Also see Cyril of Alexandria, 2015: 377; Michaels, 2010: 1018; *contra* Theodore of Mopsuestia, 2010: 166.

[73] Moloney (1998: 537; cf. Von Wahlde, 2010: 2: 868) comments, "A confession that recognizes Jesus as Lord and God at a climactic moment in the narrative corresponds to the christology developed across the earlier parts of the story. It recognizes the implications of the narrator's teaching on the logos in 1:1-2, Jesus' unique use of the absolute *egō eimi* (cf. 4:26; 8:24, 28, 58; 13:19), and his claim, 'I and the Father are one' (10:30; cf. also 10:38)." Von Wahlde (2010: 2: 868) states, "Thomas combines the two titles used of God in the LXX: 'Lord' (used for Hebrew *YHWH*) and 'God' (used for *Elohim*) and then applies them to Jesus." Also see Köstenberger, 2004: 579–80; Thompson, 2015: 426–27.

[74] But Howard-Brook (1994: 461) comments, "His (Thomas's) confession, which should be seen not as a theological but as a relational statement uttered from the depth of the moment of conversion, restores Jesus as the master of Thomas' heart." Cf. Bultmann, 1971: 694–95; Keener, 2003: 2: 1211; Bruce, 1983: 394.

[75] See Morris, 1995: 755–56; Köstenberger, 2004: 581–82.

[76] Bonney (2002: 145) comments, "Jesus completely overturns Thomas' mode of comprehension as he manifests himself, not as Thomas' merely human teacher who died and is somehow come back to life, but as his God, his source of life (cf. 11:25)."

[77] Witherington (1995: 344) comments, "The confession 'My Lord and my God!' recapitulates some of the claims about God's Son/Wisdom made in the prologue in John 1. Jesus is not just the believer's Lord but also the believer's God, and so an appropriate object of worship, even before the ascension." Also see Thompson, 2015: 425; Newman and Nida, 1980: 619.

[78] Larsson (2001: 152; cf. 224–25) further states, "The whole FG points from the prologue on towards the confession of Thomas: his 'klimaktische Bezeichnung' in 20:28." Also see Mlakuzhyil, 1987: 336–37.

a high Christology by indicating the greatness of the revelation by which he was convinced."[79] Thomas's utterance in the Gospel is the strongest and profoundest of all the utterances.[80] It brings to the fore the Christological apex of the entire Gospel narrative.[81]

Other significant aspects

As we have already seen, the characterization of Thomas can be determined not only on the basis of his appearance and utterances, but also on the basis of themes that are integrally connected to him and the narrator's masterplan. As the titles related to Jesus have already been discussed in an earlier section, we will now expound only themes such as belief, love, and the glory of God.

Belief

The aspect of *believing* develops both explicitly and implicitly in John 20. In the resurrection narrative of John, "seeing" (and "touching") and "believing" are mostly presented in relational terms.[82] This characteristic of ch. 20 comes to its zenith in the conversation between Jesus and Thomas (vv. 24–29).[83] It develops as follows: first, the narrator reports that the other disciple "saw and believed" (εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν, v. 8b);[84] second, Mary saw Jesus, held on to him (Jesus says to her μή μου ἅπτου), and later proclaimed that "I have seen

[79] Keener (2003: 2: 1211; also see Bruce, 1983: 394) further states, "Thomas has spoken for the disciples in this Gospel before (11:16), and his revelation elicits the Gospel's climactic Christological confession, 'My Lord and my God' (20:28), which forms an *inclusio* with the prologue (1:1, 18)."

[80] Thompson (2015: 423) states, "Although elsewhere people have spoken of Jesus or addressed Jesus as Lord, and even 'my Lord,' here is the first instance where someone explicitly acknowledges him as 'my God.'" See Bruce, 1983: 394; cf. Blomberg, 2001: 268.

[81] Carson (1991: 659) comments, "The repeated pronoun *my* does not diminish the universality of Jesus' lordship and deity, but it ensures that Thomas' words are a *personal* confession of faith. Thomas thereby not only displays his faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, but points to its deepest meaning; it is nothing less than the revelation of who Jesus Christ is. The most unyielding skeptic has bequeathed to us the most profound confession." For more details regarding 'Jesus as God,' see Thompson, 2001: 19; Bonney, 2002: 145–59; Ridderbos, 1997: 648.

[82] Cf. Sylva, 2013: 91.

[83] Sylva (2013: 89) says, "Jesus places Thomas in a situation in which chagrin over his lack of loyalty to the presence of Jesus would supercharge this characteristic so that it empowers faith."

[84] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 312; also see Brant, 2011: 266–68) says, "The verbs of seeing in John's gospel have no recognizable semantic value of their own, but are used alternately and synonymously. But the change from present historic to aorist and the rapid succession of the two verbs without any kind of object, produce in the situation the meaning."

the Lord" (ἑώρακεν τὸν κύριον, vv. 15-18);[85] third, Jesus showed the disciples (excluding Thomas) his hands and side, the disciples rejoiced when they saw the Lord (ἐχάρησαν . . . ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον, v. 20), and later they declared, "We have seen the Lord" (ἑωράκαμεν τὸν κύριον, vv. 19-25b);[86] and fourth, Thomas declared that "Unless I see . . . and put my finger . . . I will not believe" (ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω . . . βάλω τὸν δάκτυλόν . . . οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω, v. 25b, 27).[87] The phenomenon of "believing" as a result of "seeing" (and "touching") is brought to the attention of the reader throughout the narrative.[88] In that case, Jesus's command in v. 27 (μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός) cannot be considered as an exclusive critique of Thomas, but has to be considered a critique of all the characters in the story.[89] Thomas does not appear as a character to be blamed, but as a representative character the narrator uses to foreground the reality. In that sense, Thomas's appearance in the last scene and his great confession in v. 28 place him above all other characters within the extended Johannine story.[90] Jesus's question, "have you believed because you have seen me?" (ὅτι ἑώρακάς με πεπίστευκας;), functions as a critique of the entire body of Johannine characters by means of Thomas.[91] However, the makarism in v. 29 (μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες) cannot be understood in relation to any of the aforementioned characters.[92] When the readers decipher the meaning of the makarism in relation to the purpose statement (vv. 30–31), they will

[85] Howard-Brook (1994: 453; see Brant, 2011: 271) comments, "The narrator focuses . . . on her classic proclamation, 'I have seen the Lord!' Her faithful conveyance of Jesus' message is reduced to a narrative aside in the face of this primal Christian affirmation. For all time, the news of the resurrection is brought to the community by a word of a woman, the first apostle of the risen Christ."

[86] Bultmann (1971: 694) comments, "The others explain to him (Thomas, v. 25) that they have seen the Lord; but he refuses to believe without being convinced by the evidence of his own eyes, and indeed without physical contact." Also see Barrett, 1960: 473–76; Witherington, 1995: 343–44.

[87] Bennema (2009: 166; also see Bultmann, 1971: 694) comments, "Like Mary Magdalene, Thomas' desire for a tangible presence of Jesus indicates that he has not understood that Jesus' ongoing presence with his disciples will be by means of the Spirit—as Jesus had mentioned to his disciples in 14:17-23."

[88] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 333; also see Howard-Brook, 1994: 460–61) says, "Thomas confirms in his own person that now he also, like the other disciples (cf. v. 25a), believes in the resurrection of the Lord. But he adds the divine predicate so as to leave no doubt as to the greatness of his faith."

[89] See Bultmann, 1971: 694–95.

[90] Howard-Brook (1994: 462) states, "Both the formerly 'outsider' Samaritans and the 'insider' twelve have produced confessions of Jesus that extol him as supreme leader, the one whose kingdom is both *not of* and *greater than any in* the world." Also see Bultmann, 1971: 694–95; Bennema, 2009: 166.

[91] Barrett (1960: 477) comments, "The words do not convey a reproach to Thomas; the beloved disciple and Mary Magdalene also believed when they saw."

[92] Bennema (2009: 167) says, "Considering John's stated purpose for writing his gospel in 20:31, Thomas' belief is certainly adequate. Nevertheless, Jesus encourages people to adopt a different approach—one of belief without sight." Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 335–39; Talbert, 1992: 257–58.

understand that it refers to those who never saw the resurrected Jesus and yet believed.[93]

Alongside the concept of belief, the narrator develops a contrast between knowing and unknowing within the story. Jesus's all-knowing nature is contrasted with the unknowing nature of his interlocutors. This phenomenon can be better understood from the following narrative asides: first, Mary states that "*we do not know* (οὐκ οἴδαμεν) where they have laid him" (v. 2);[94] second, the narrator comments about Peter and the other disciple: "for as yet *they did not understand* (οὐδέπω . . . ᾔδεισαν) the scripture" (v. 9);[95] third, Mary's second utterance is "*I do not know* (οὐκ οἶδα) where they have laid him" (v. 13); fourth, the narrator says: '*she did not know* (οὐκ ᾔδει) that it was Jesus' (v. 14);[96] and fifth, though the narrator does not attribute a phrase of unknowing/misunderstanding to Thomas, his statement in v. 25b connects him well with the other characters. The unknowing natures of the characters were assuaged by either seeing or both seeing and touching the body of Jesus. Sylva (2013: 89) considers Thomas's utterance in 20:28 as "the highest confession of faith of any character in this gospel."[97] While the final utterances of Mary (ἑώρακεν τὸν κύριον, v. 18) and other disciples (ἑωράκαμεν τὸν κύριον, v. 25a) prove that their resurrection belief was based on seeing the Lord, Thomas's final utterance (Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου, v. 28) proves that his belief statement not only accepted Jesus as Lord but also as God.[98]

[93] The narrator states: "These are written (signs) so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name" (vv. 30–31). See Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 335–39.

[94] Barrett (1960: 468) comments, "Only Mary brings the message and the plural verb is out of place. It is another trace of the synoptic narrative in which several women visit the tomb, but it is not simply borrowed from the synoptic narrative." Brant (2011: 266) says, "In a diachronic reading, the plural pronoun becomes an aporia that produces hypotheses, such as surmising that John has edited an account including several women. In a synchronic reading, one looks for logic and examines such things as the reaction to her words."

[95] Sanders and Mastin (1968: 422) comment, "Although the use of proof-texts was to assume great importance in the life of the early church and was a powerful argument in the age of fundamentalism (cf. e.g., Acts 17:2-5, 11-15; 1 Cor 15:3-5; Luke 24: 44-46), it was only after more reflection that the disciples were able to relate the happenings of Jesus' life to the Old Testament." Cf. Brant, 2011: 268; Bultmann, 1971: 685.

[96] See Howard-Brook, 1994: 449.

[97] Sylva (2013: 89; also see Bonney, 2002: 131–32) comments, "This exalted confession is a function of his loyalty striving for redemption." Bennema (2009: 166–67; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 332) states, "Thomas' recognition of Jesus' deity is the Christological climax of the entire gospel. Nowhere in the gospel is Jesus called 'God,' except for the Prologue where John identifies the Logos as (being in nature) God (1:1)." *Contra* Stibbe, 1993: 206.

[98] Sylva (2013: 91) states, "Thomas' 'my Lord and my God' (ὁ θεός μου) mirrors the form and some of the terminology of Jesus' 'my Father' and 'my God' (θεόν μου). By so doing, Thomas has assented to

Love

Jesus's love for the disciples is conveyed profoundly in the Farewell Discourse (chs. 13–17) where the narrator records the presence of Thomas as an interlocutor (14:5). His resurrection appearances to the disciples (including Mary) further reveal his love for them. On one occasion, the narrator mentions that Jesus loved one of the disciples with special concern (v. 2).[99] Jesus loved them and in return they also showed their regard for him. In ch. 20, the love of the disciples is brought to the fore. Mary's coming to the tomb early on the first day of the week (v. 1), running to Simon and the other disciple (v. 2), her speaking out of love (v. 2), weeping outside the tomb (v. 11),[100] mourning as "they have taken away my Lord" (v. 13), addressing Jesus as "Rabboni" (v. 16),[101] holding on to him (v. 17),[102] and proclaiming that "I have seen the Lord" (v. 18) show her love at its apex.[103] The disciples (other than Thomas) show their love for Jesus through their rejoicing (v. 20) and their proclamation that "we have seen the Lord" (v. 25a). Thomas's conditional statement in v. 25b marks another level of love as he aspires to see and believe.[104] Jesus's coming on the next Sunday serves only to convince Thomas about his resurrection (v. 27).[105] This marks Jesus's unique love for Thomas. While the events on the latter Sunday are just a repetition of those

the journey that in 20:17 Jesus says he is about to make: the journey that Thomas opposed in 11:16; 14:5 and 20:25b as being impossible." Also see Thompson, 2015: 423; Larsson, 2001: 74; Sylva, 2013: 89; Bultmann, 1971: 694–95; Witherington, 1995: 344; Talbert, 1992: 256.

[99] Köstenberger (2004: 562) comments, "This means that the person reclining close to Jesus at the last supper in the upper room; the person providing Peter with access to the high-priestly courtyard; the person to whom care for Jesus' mother is entrusted at the foot of the cross; the person featured along with Peter in chapters 20 and 21; and the Fourth Evangelist (21:24; 21: 20) are all one and the same individual."

[100] See Witherington, 1995: 330.

[101] Witherington (1995: 331; also see Brant, 2011: 270) comments, "In her initial reply she calls Jesus *Rabbouni* (my teacher), which suggests that she still thinks of Jesus in terms of her past relationship with him, as her teacher."

[102] Talbert (1992: 250–51; also see Barrett, 1960: 470) states, "The present imperative with a negative (*mē*) in a prohibition normally signifies the breaking off of an action already in progress, or sometimes of the attempt to perform an action."

[103] Brant (2011: 270; cf. Chennattu, 2006: 150–55) states, "The personal address 'Mariam' calls for a more personal response. She has not been prepared to see Jesus by any prior witness. The response is a pure outpouring of joy."

[104] Barrett (1960: 476) states, "Thomas required the grossest and most palpable evidence that the body he knew to have been killed in a specific manner had indeed been reanimated. . . . The risen Christ must be both visibly and palpably identical with the old. Such hesitation, so conclusively removed, had of course high apologetic value."

[105] Talbert (1992: 256) comments, "Vv. 26-29 provides a resurrection appearance to satisfy Thomas' demands. Again a mysterious appearance of Jesus (Jesus came and stood among them) is experienced in spite of closed doors (v. 26)." Also see Anderson, 2011: 10, 26; Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 328–35.

of the previous Sunday, a reader can understand that Jesus came exclusively to confirm Thomas's faith. While Jesus says to Mary "My Father and your Father, my God and your God" (v. 18) and directs her attention to the Father, Thomas uses similar titles to address Jesus (i.e., "My Lord and my God") and directs the attention of the reader toward him (v. 28).[106] As the loving Father (3:16) sends his only begotten son to exemplify his love in this world, Jesus "loved them to the end" (13:1). Thomas's love for Jesus through the very expression "My Lord and my God" (v. 28) takes us to the level of Jesus's love for the Father (v. 18).[107] Thomas's utterance in v. 28 confirms that Jesus's utterances such as "the Father and I are one" (10:30) and "whoever sees me sees him who sent me" (12:45) are true.[108]

Glory of God

The Book of Glory ends with ch. 20 and the resurrection of Jesus is narrated as one step further to the glorious death in ch. 19.[109] Through the death of Jesus, the narrator brings to the fore the glorification of the Father through the Son.[110] In that sense, the hour of Jesus, the lifting up of the Son of Man, and the glorification are one and the same. After the delineation of Jesus's glorification in ch. 19, the narrator concludes the Book of Glory with the resurrection and recognition scenes (20:1-29) and the purpose statement (20:30-31).[111] The interlocutors of the story move from unrecognition to recognition as they realize that Jesus is the glorious Son of God.[112] The narrator moves the recognition scenes on three levels: Mary Magdalene (vv. 1–18), the disciples (excluding Thomas, vv. 19–25a), and Thomas (vv. 25b–29). At the first level,

[106] See Talbert, 1992: 256; Köstenberger, 2004: 579–80.

[107] Chennattu (2006: 165) states, "The announcement of the disciples that 'we have seen the Lord' (20:25) and the confession of Thomas, 'My Lord and my God' (20:28), fulfill the hope of the knowledge of God promised in the age of the new covenant (cf. Jer 31:34). By confessing Jesus as his Lord and God, Thomas is taking up the covenant language of the OT." Also see Anderson, 2011: 10, 26, 64, 102, 136, 226; Thompson, 2015: 426–27; Smith, 1999: 381–84; Schneiders, 2008: 168

[108] Smith (1999: 382) states, "His (Thomas's) determination (11:16) could be construed as laudable, his question (14:5) as crucial, and his need for proof of the resurrection at least as understandable."

[109] Carson (1991: 631) states, "the ultimate glorification of the Son with the Father is accomplished through the paradoxical glorification on the cross (12:23-28)."

[110] See Haenchen, 1984: 2: 192–202.

[111] Carson (1991: 631) comments, "The dramatic 'It is finished' (19:30) did not mean that *everything* connected with the 'lifting up' of the Son was finished, but only that Jesus' suffering was finished, his obedience perfect and the will of the Father accomplished up to the decisive juncture of Jesus' death."

[112] See Keener, 2003: 2: 1212.

the glorified and risen Jesus appears to Mary. She addresses him in an unusual manner (Rabboni) that leads the reader to grasp his figure as glorious (v. 16).[113] Mary's enthusiasm is further revealed through her clinging onto him (v. 17). Her utterance, "I have seen the Lord," is not an ordinary statement but one of amazement.[114] At the second level, the narrator reports the appearance of Jesus in a closed room and the disciples' rejoicing when they see the Lord (vv. 19–20).[115] Jesus's giving of the Holy Spirit unto them reveals it further (v. 22). Their utterance "we have seen the Lord" is not an ordinary statement but one of amazement (v. 25a).[116] At the third level, Thomas appears as a character who changes from one extreme to the other. His movement from his first utterance ("I will not believe" without proof, v. 25b) to the second utterance (his strongest utterance, "My Lord and my God!" v. 28) reveals this reality.[117] Thomas's utterance in v. 28 makes the reader aware that the glory of Jesus was fully revealed to him.[118] Thomas identifies him as Lord and God, a shift of his own viewpoint from the pre-resurrection perspective (11:16; 14:6) to the post-resurrection perspective (20:28).[119] While Mary Magdalene and the rest of the disciples settle with "I/we have seen the Lord" as the culminating point of their faith reaction, Thomas goes far beyond their conviction and even his own previous utterances and proclaims in a profoundest fashion, "My Lord and my God!"[120]

[113] Haenchen (1984: 2: 209; cf. Black, 1946/1954: 21) comments, "the form 'Rabboni' preserved in v. 16 and Mark 10:51 appears to reflect precisely the real pronunciation in the time of Jesus, according to recent finds."

[114] See Keener, 2003: 2: 1195–96.

[115] See Carson, 1991: 646–47.

[116] Keener (2003: 2: 1196; also see Blomberg, 2001: 267–68) comments, "Mary's message (20:18) is precisely that of the male disciples after her (20:25), the sort of witness on which the Spirit would summon subsequent generations to faith (20:30-31)."

[117] Keener (2003: 2: 1212; cf. Haenchen, 1984: 2: 211) further views, "as Thomas' confession demonstrates, the true, resurrection faith requires more than commitment to Jesus (11:16); it requires in addition the recognition of Jesus' divine role."

[118] See more details in Thompson, 2015: 426–27.

[119] Newman and Nida (1993: 619; cf. Blomberg, 2001: 269) comment, "In languages in which the use of the conjunction *and* would imply two individuals, it may be necessary to translate 'you are my Lord, even my God.' In certain languages one cannot possess such terms as 'Lord' or 'God.' If so, it may be necessary to translate 'you are the one who rules over me, and you are God whom I worship.'"

[120] In the words of Thompson (2015: 426), "Thomas now articulates the Gospel's Christology as personal confession." Also see Carson, 1991: 658; Newman and Nida, 1993: 619; Keener, 2003: 2: 1211–12.

Concluding remarks

The discussion in this chapter helps us to gain a comprehensive view of the role and character of Thomas within the narrative framework of Jn 20:1-31. In 20:1-31, there is a steady progression from the earlier Thomasine appearances (11:16 and 14:5). A comparison between the utterances of Thomas and the rest of the disciples (and Mary Magdalene) reveal that he moved away from one extreme understanding (v. 25b) to the other (v. 28). His earlier conviction was to believe in Jesus's resurrection and glorification only on the basis of seeing him and putting his finger in the marks of the nails. By bringing Thomas toward the climax of the story with his revelatory utterance ("My Lord and my God"), the narrator places him above all other characters. Thomas's demand to see the marks of the nails, put his hands into the marks of the nails, and put his hands into Jesus's side (v. 25b) attune the attention of the reader toward his Christological utterance (v. 28). The reader of the story cannot demarcate Thomas on the basis of his demand because all other characters along with him saw (some even saw and touched) and believed. His determination that "I will not believe" (v. 25b) must be placed in contrast to his phenomenal proclamation (v. 28). Through the proclamation of Thomas (v. 28), the narrator brings to the foreground the theological apex of the story. Thomas's utterance in v. 28 brings the attention of the reader analeptically to 1:1 (i.e., the Word was God). His character enables the extended story of John to progress with a convincing plot structure as follows: at the beginning, the Word is God (1:1); in the middle, the Word becomes flesh and lives among humanity (the entire Gospel story); and at the end, the resurrected Jesus is introduced as God himself (20:28).[121] Thomas transforms radically from his earlier conviction that "I will not believe" to his current belief that Jesus is "My Lord and my God." While Jesus's coming a week later with an exclusive focus on Thomas reveals his special love for Thomas, Thomas's confession reveals his love and devotion to Jesus. Thomas saw the glorified Jesus and that persuades him to utter his perception about the divine.

[121] Thompson (2015: 425) comments, "the acclamation of the risen one as 'my Lord and my God!' acknowledges the inclusion of Jesus, the Word made flesh, in the identity of that one called 'the only true God' (1:1, 14), thus making the other end of the confessional arc begun in the Gospel's opening verses (1:1, 14)."

4

Jesus Shows Himself (21:1-25)

Introduction

In the epilogue of the Gospel of John (21:1-25), Thomas's name appears in a fourth context. Whereas Thomas's role is active on the first three occasions (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-28), he appears as a passive character in 21:2. In this case, he is counted as one among the seven disciples. At the same time, a reader can only understand the characterization of ch. 21 as a whole in relation to Thomas's immediately preceding appearance (20:24-28). Thompson (2015: 431) comments,

> Thomas has confessed the risen Jesus as "Lord and God," forming an inclusion with the opening sentences of the Gospel (1:1; 20:28); and a summary statement, addressing the Gospel's readers, has invited them to share the faith of the disciples that Jesus is indeed Messiah and Son of God (1:41, 49; 4:25-26; 11:27; 20:30-31). With that invitation, the Gospel comes to a fitting conclusion: it does not seem unfinished; the reader does not anticipate more.

Thomas is the connecting link between the ending of the Book of Glory (20:24-28) and the beginning of the epilogue (21:2).[1] The transition and linkage through the appearance of Thomas contribute toward the narrative development of the overall story of John. The following chapter will provide insights about the person and work of Thomas in ch. 21 first in terms of the narrative setting and second in terms of Thomas within the narrative framework of Jn 21:1-25.

[1] Stibbe (1993: 206) comments, "The continuity between John 21 and John 20 is not only suggested by '*meta tauta*' but also by the reappearance of Simon Peter and Thomas (called Didymus) in v. 2 and the beloved disciple in v. 7. These three men were among the most prominent characters in John 20."

Narrative setting

The expression "after these things" (Μετὰ ταῦτα, v. 1) is an attempt to connect ch. 21 with the previous chapter.[2] The structure of Jn 21:1-25 enables us to understand the semantic domains of the concluding chapter in relation to Thomas.[3] The text is structured in the following way: first, *Jesus shows himself again* (v. 1); second, the narrator introduces a list of seven disciples including Thomas who went fishing (vv. 2–3);[4] third, Jesus shows himself and the disciples misunderstand (vv. 4–8); fourth, Jesus appears a third time to the disciples (second time to Thomas); fifth, Jesus and Peter converse in the presence of Thomas and the other disciples (vv. 15–19); sixth, Jesus and the Beloved Disciple appear in the presence of Thomas and the other disciples (vv. 20–23); and seventh, the narrator offers a second conclusion to the gospel, an expansion of 20:30-31 (vv. 24–25).[5] While the narrator presents Thomas only at the beginning of the chapter, a reader can infer his presence all throughout the narrative discourse. The extended setting of the chapter is based on Jesus's showing of himself to the disciples by the Sea of Tiberias (v. 2). The plot of the story is structured by several minor events and movements as follows: first, the seven disciples (including Thomas) of Jesus gather by the Sea of Tiberias (v. 2);[6] second, they go out to sea to fish and become frustrated

[2] Keener (2003: 2: 1219) states, "Johannine scholarship has traditionally regarded John 21 as an addition distinct from the original gospel, often for stylistic reasons and nearly always (even by those who believe it was added later by the same author) because the chapter is anticlimactic following the conclusion of 20:30-31." Keener (2003: 2: 1219) further comments, "This chapter is a literary unit; and undeniably it is anticlimactic to the primary narrative of the Gospel. Nor would 20:30-31 (or even 20:29) constitute too abrupt a conclusion for the Gospel; ancient books often had abrupt endings." Also see Thompson, 2015: 431; Bultmann, 1971: 700; Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 350; Carson, 1991: 665; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 221.

[3] Sylva (2013: 93) says, "The words 'After this Jesus revealed himself again to the disciples . . .' in 21:1 call to mind Thomas' recent obstinacy in not believing until he sees. The words 'after this' refer the reader to the prior episode, which was about this obstinacy of Thomas overcome."

[4] Bruce (1983/2004: 399; also see Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 624) states, "On this occasion there were seven disciples in all. Simon Peter, as usual, is named as their leader; Thomas ('Twin') has already figured in the resurrection narrative (John 20:24-29), while the call of Nathanael was recorded in 1:45. It is only here that Nathanael is said to have belonged to Cana, the scene of Jesus' first sign (2:1-11). The sons of Zebedee have not previously been mentioned in this Gospel—not, at least, as such." Also see Thompson, 2015: 436; Keener, 2003: 2: 1225–26; Blomberg, 2001: 273–74.

[5] Brant (2011: 279) makes the following observation: "'The phrase 'Jesus showed himself again to the disciples' forms an inclusio with the line 'This was now the third time Jesus showed [himself] to the disciples' in 21:14, thereby demarcating 20:1-14 as the theophany to which the next verse refers: 'on the sea [shore] of Tiberias, and he showed [himself] in this way (21:1).'" Also see Newman and Nida, 1980/1993: 638–39.

[6] See Thompson, 2015: 436; Bruce, 1983/2004: 398.

(v. 3); third, Jesus stands on the beach (v. 4a), the disciples do not recognize him (v. 4b), they cast the net into the sea as Jesus commands (v. 6a), they struggle to haul in the net (v. 6b), they recognize Jesus (v. 7), and they struggle further to drag in the net (v. 8);[7] fourth, the disciples go ashore (v. 9), Jesus prepares a charcoal fire with fish on it (v. 9), Simon Peter hauls in the net (a third attempt, v. 11), and they have breakfast with Jesus (vv. 12–13);[8] fifth, Jesus converses with Peter in a context in which Thomas is present (vv. 15–19);[9] sixth, Jesus, Peter, and the Beloved Disciple gather in the presence of Thomas (vv. 20–23); and seventh, the narrator makes some final remarks (vv. 24–25). In v. 14, the narrator records that this was Jesus's third appearance to the disciples (second to Thomas). This framework of the chapter provides clues with regard to the final appearance of Thomas in the Gospel.

Thomas within the narrative framework of Jn 21:1-25

In the following discussion, we will explore the ways Thomas is characterized in 21:1-25, both in explicit and implicit terms. After expounding upon Jesus's appearance to the disciples and the place of Thomas among those who gathered, we will look into the character of Thomas in relation to themes such as belief, love, and the glory of God and Jesus, followed by the titles used for Jesus.

Jesus shows himself (v. 1)

In ch. 20, Mary Magdalene (vv. 16–18), Peter and John (vv. 2–10, 19–25a), Thomas (vv. 24–29), and the rest of the disciples (vv. 19–25a) see and believe that Jesus has been raised.[10] In chs. 20–21, the narrator reports conversations of the resurrected Jesus with the key figures in the following sequence: Mary Magdalene (20:1-18), Thomas (20:24-29), Peter (21:15-19), and John

[7] Bruce (1983/2004: 400; also see Haenchen, 1984: 2: 222–23) says, "Their casting net immediately became so full of fish that they could not haul it into the boat; they had to let it drag along behind."

[8] See Carson, 1991: 672–75.

[9] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 361; also see Carson, 1991: 675) argues that vv. 1–14 constitute "a disciple pericope," and vv. 15–19 "a Peter fragment."

[10] Smith (1999: 391; also see Bennema, 2009: 164–70) says, "Thomas is known from all lists of the disciples (in the Synoptics and Acts), but as we have seen he plays an active and important role only in John (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-29)."

(21:20-25).[11] In ch. 21, Peter, John, Thomas, and Nathanael appear as the key figures.[12] After concluding the main body of the Gospel with Thomas's conversation with Jesus (20:24-29), the narrator invites the reader to compare Peter and John with Thomas.[13] A symbolic gesture is employed as Thomas keeps silent after the pivotal utterance in ch. 20 and Peter and John continue the discourse.[14] In 21:1, the narrator reports that Jesus showed himself again to the disciples by the Sea of Tiberias.[15] While the disciples already *saw* (and also *touched*) and *believed* in ch. 20, here it is told that Jesus shows himself to the disciples once again.[16] The use of repetitive expressions such as "Jesus showed himself again" (ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς) and "he showed in this way" (ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ οὕτως, v. 1) catch the attention of the reader.[17] Here, the showing is intended to make the resurrection more explicit.[18] Jesus shows himself "after the daybreak" (πρωΐας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης, v. 4). The expression, "Jesus stood on the beach" (ἔστη Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν, v. 4), is determinative as the narrator depicts for us how Jesus appeared.[19] The unknowing nature of the disciples is expressed here over against the all-knowing nature of Jesus. In v. 5, Jesus asks them, "Children, you have no fish, have you?" (παιδία, μή τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε;). His fondness toward the disciples (a group of which

[11] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 352; also see Newman and Nida, 1993: 624) says, "If we follow the notion that an editor from Johannine circles made additions, the reason for Thomas is easy to find: he wanted, in this way, to make a connection to the Thomas-story (20:24-29). With Nathanael, it can be surmised that he wanted to remind the reader of his confession (1:49), which stands at the beginning of the gospel as Thomas does at the end."

[12] Sylva (2013: 93; also see Bruce, 1983/1994: 399) states, "The indicator of another revelation to the disciples also connects the reader to the other resurrection appearances, the last of which involved Thomas so prominently."

[13] See Thompson, 2015: 436; Carson, 1991: 656–69; Köstenberger, 2004: 588.

[14] Blomberg (2001: 272) comments, "The emphasis in chapter 21 is on seeing and believing, whereas in chapter 20 it was on not seeing but still believing." Also see Chennattu, 2006: 165–66; Keener, 2003: 2: 1225–26.

[15] See Brant, 2011: 279.

[16] See Witherington, 1995: 328–51.

[17] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 351; see Bultmann, 1971: 700–02) states, "Only it is to be asked whether the reflective φανεροῦν indicates the hand of the evangelist or that of an editor. The word is relatively frequent with John (John: 9 times; 1 John: 9 times; in the rest of the NT: 31 times, of which 22 times in the Pauline writings), yet it is not used otherwise for the resurrection of Jesus."

[18] Carson (1991: 668; see Ridderbos, 1987/1997: 658–59) states, "Such 'revelation' or 'manifestation' is a common theme of the Fourth Gospel, but more commonly in reference to Jesus' manifestation in the days of his flesh: *e.g.* John the Baptist came that Jesus might *be revealed* to Israel (1:31); in the first sign, Jesus *revealed* his glory (2:11), and throughout his ministry, climaxing in the cross/exaltation, Jesus *revealed* his Father's name (17:6)." Carson (1991: 668; see Barrett, 1958/1960: 481) further states, "Here, in resurrection body, he reveals himself. The implication of the wording seems to be that this resurrection appearance (undertaken, like all the others in the Fourth Gospel, at Jesus' initiative) is itself a revelatory act." Also see Haenchen, 1984: 2: 222; Barrett, 1958/1960: 480–1.

[19] See Newman and Nida, 1993: 625; Brant, 2011: 280.

Thomas is a member) is revealed through his use of "children" (παιδία) as a mode of address.[20] The response from the disciples is collective and Thomas is one among them (v. 5). Expressions such as, "he said to *them*" (λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς, v. 5), "*they* cast it," and "[*they*] were not able to haul" (ἔβαλον οὖν, καὶ οὐκέτι αὐτὸ ἑλκύσαι ἴσχυον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἰχθύων, v. 6b) show the collective response of the disciples of whom Thomas is a key figure.[21] In vv. 7–8, Peter and John are brought to the foreground and the rest of the disciples are backgrounded. The other disciples were dragging the net full of fish with an implicit understanding that it was done under the leadership of Thomas.

Thomas as one among those gathered

The narrator introduces the disciples with the following phrase: "gathered there together were."[22] Then he provides the list of the disciples in the following sequence: Simon Peter, Thomas (called the Twin), Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two more of his disciples.[23] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 352) argues that "the number 7 (the number of fullness in Semitic thought), can have a symbolic value: this group of disciples represents the future community, the Church (cf. also the seven churches in Rev 2-3)."[24] The first and third person plural pronouns in the narrative structure (v. 3) direct the attention of the reader toward the disciples, among whom Thomas is a key figure: Simon Peter said to *them*, *they* said to him, *we* will go with you, *they* went out and got into the boat, and that night *they* caught nothing.[25]

[20] See Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 354.

[21] See Sylva, 2013: 93–9.

[22] Ridderbos (1987/1997: 658–59) says, "The beginning of the story, however brief, clearly assumes the resurrection situation. Against the background of v. 1, that Simon Peter and six other disciples 'were together' obviously does not just refer to an undefined 'once upon a time' when the disciples decided to go fishing but to the continuation of the unity they recovered after Jesus' resurrection."

[23] Bonney (2002: 172) argues, "More than simple proximity connects chap. 21 to the resurrection narratives in chap. 20. The three disciples explicitly singled out in chap. 20 (Peter, Thomas, and the beloved disciple) are again mentioned in chap. 21." Also see Thompson, 2015: 436; Ridderbos, 1987/1997: 658–59; Haenchen, 1984: 2: 222; Köstenberger, 2004: 588; Bultmann, 1971: 707.

[24] See Sylva, 2013: 93–94; Carson, 1991: 669; Ridderbos, 1987/1997: 659.

[25] Haenchen (1984: 2: 222) says, "It is not surprising that the group of twelve is not mentioned, unlike 20:24: it is really only a story about Peter (and according to v. 14, also about the beloved disciple)." As Thomas's story is already told in convincing terms in the presence of the other disciples in ch. 20, here Peter's and John's stories are told in the presence of "other disciples" (excluding Peter and John, where Thomas is the leader).

On all these occasions, Peter takes the leadership role and Thomas stands only second to him.[26] Thomas's role is reflected through his utterance in the Judean context in ch. 20 and now his presence with Peter is signified in the Galilean context. Peter appears for the first time in 1:40-42. Bennema (2009: 53–54) comments, "Peter's story is one about leadership and there are various indications that he has a leading position among 'the Twelve': he speaks on their behalf (6:68-69 uses plurals); he takes initiative (13:24; 18:10; 21:3); he is sometimes approached or named first (18:15; 20:2; 21:2); he often responds first (6:68-69; 13:6, 36; 21:11)."[27] The initiative of Andrew to bring Peter to Jesus is reflected in 1:41-42. Peter's rhetorical question ("Lord, to whom shall we go?") is accompanied by his twofold confession in 6:70-71: first, Jesus has words of eternal life; and second, Jesus is the Holy One of God.[28] But after Peter's denial in 18:15-18, he appears as follows: first, on the morning of the resurrection with the Beloved Disciple (20:1-10); second, in the company of the other disciples declaring "we have seen the Lord" (20:19-25); and third, in the company of seven disciples (21:1-23).[29] Nathanael appears in chs. 1 and 21, exactly at the beginning (1:45-51) and at the end (21:2) of the Johannine story.[30] In 1:45-51, Nathanael is introduced in four ways: first by Jesus as "a true Israelite, in whom there is no deceit"; second as one whom Jesus found even before they met each other; third, as one who utters "Rabbi, you are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel"; and fourth, as one who was promised to "see the heavens opened and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man."[31] Thomas appears here with these two named characters. It is

[26] Köstenberger (2004: 588) says, "Of the seven, Simon Peter is named first, as would be expected (6:68; 13:6, 9; 20:2-7). The readers are by now familiar with Thomas ('the twin'; see 11:16; 20:24). Nathanael, who has not been heard from since 1:45-51, is here said to come from Cana, the site of the first two of Jesus' signs (2:1-11; 4:46-54)."

[27] Cf. Haenchen, 1984: 2: 222.

[28] See Bennema, 2009: 54.

[29] Bennema (2009: 61) says that Peter is a "complex character whose traits include outspokenness and zeal (6:68-69; 13:6, 36), impetuousness (13:6-9; 18:10; 21:7), loyalty (6:68-69; 13:37), love (21:15-17), perceptiveness (6:68-69) misunderstanding (13:8-9, 37; 18:10), ambition (cf. his rivalry with the Beloved Disciple), failure/disloyalty (18:15-27), and ability to take initiative (13:24; 21:3, 11)." Bennema (2009: 62) further comments, "The story of Peter is essentially the story of *a shepherd in the making*. Both in his commission (21:15-17) and in the foretelling of his death (21:18-19), the shepherd imagery comes to the fore."

[30] See Smith, 1999: 391.

[31] See Bultmann, 1971: 103–08; Blomberg, 2001: 82–5.

clear that Thomas did not detach from the group of disciples, even after Jesus's death and resurrection.[32]

On the basis of the discussion thus far, the presence of Thomas in 21:2 can be understood as follows: first, in the "gathered there together" group, Thomas is counted second only to Peter; second, Thomas's connection with Peter and other figures of early Christianity is brought to the fore; third, Thomas is one among the three disciples whose names are specified (i.e., Simon Peter, Thomas [called the Twin], and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee); fourth, he was one among those who witnessed the post-resurrection revelation of Jesus in the Galilean context; and fifth, Thomas's silence in the chapter is meant in the context of his encounter with Jesus in 20:24-28. While the Gospel as a whole begins with the strongest utterance of Nathanael, it ends with the strongest of all the utterances, that of Thomas in 20:28. Peter appears more often from 1:40-42 until ch. 21. But Peter's character develops through various ups and downs. The unsettled nature of his character is brought to the forefront more convincingly in ch. 21. While the references to Nathanael create an *inclusio* with his appearance at the beginning and end of the story, Thomas creates another *inclusio* by linking the two resurrection stories (i.e., the resurrection of Lazarus with the resurrection of Jesus, 11:16; 20:24-28).

Other significant aspects

Themes such as belief, love, and the glory of God, and the titles of Jesus appear in ch. 21.[33] First, although the vocabulary of belief does not appear, belief language overshadows the narrative framework. This chapter discusses the current position of the disciples: Simon Peter says to the rest of the disciples, "I am *going* fishing," and the rest of them say, "We will *go* with you" (21:3).[34] This departure of the disciples is significant at this point to direct the attention

[32] As Barrett (1960: 481) righty says, John has more to say about Thomas than any other evangelist.

[33] Barrett (1955/1960: 482; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 341–5) argues, "If chap. 21 is an addition to an originally complete gospel it is of course possible that this event is chronologically earlier than 20:21–23; though it is difficult to see how this can in fact be so."

[34] Schnackenburg (1982: 3: 353) states that "Peter's decision to go fishing and the other disciples' willingness to join him, give rise to the impression, in this post-Easter situation, that these men are returning to their accustomed trade, because they know nothing of Jesus' resurrection and the commission of preaching and mission."

of the reader from "going fishing" to "going to be fishers of men."[35] The emphasis of the story is not on the backslidden nature of the disciples, but on the rhetorical punch of missional harvest among the people.[36] Jesus attunes the disciples toward that end from v. 15. The theme of going appears both in Peter's statement and the others' response (21:3). It draws the attention of the reader toward Thomas's statements in 11:16 and 14:5. Thomas's utterances, such as "Let us also *go*" (11:16) and "We do not know where are you *going*" (14:5), align well with the response here, that is, "We will *go* with you" (21:3).[37] As Thomas's leadership role is proved in 11:16, one can infer that the response would have been initiated by him. Thomas, as a man who moves in the company of the other disciples, responded positively to Peter because he was also in a leadership role.[38] Here, instead of reinstating Thomas or other disciples, Jesus reinstates Peter, the one who initiated the backward movement. Jesus realizes that through the reinstatement of Peter, others can also be reinstated. While Thomas's character is used as a representative to address the whole body of disciples in 20:24-28, here Peter appears as a representative that is corrected of a wrong notion of discipleship. The narrator places "Jesus as God" statements right at the beginning (1:1) and toward the end through the mouth of Thomas (20:28) and attunes the disciples toward that end.[39] In that sense, Thomas is placed at a peak moment of narrative development in 20:24-28. In ch. 21, Peter and the other disciples are invited to reach that point.[40] Second, the theme of love appears once again in convincing terms. Jesus's three questions to Peter (Do you love me?) and his three responses (You know that I love you) are rhetorically introduced to strengthen the love relationship between the master

[35] Keener (2003: 2: 1226; also see Bruce, 1983: 398–406) states, "This passage reflects knowledge of the tradition that Peter and at least some of his colleagues (21:3)—here presumably the sons of Zebedee (21:2)—were fishermen, a tradition undoubtedly widely known in the early church (cf. Mark 1:16-20)."

[36] Witherington (1995: 354) states, "It is an interesting fact that the Fourth Gospel, before John 21, does not include any of the Synoptic material about Peter or others being fishermen. Nor is there any mention of Jesus making them fishers of people in this Gospel. Yet knowledge of such traditions seems to be presupposed here." Witherington (1995: 354) further says, "Here then is a tradition that seems to have circulated in the Johannine community and was originally written for knowledgeable Christians, not for unbelievers."

[37] Cf. Barrett, 1955/1960: 482.

[38] See Keener, 2003: 2: 1225–33.

[39] Cf. Barrett, 1955/1960: 127–30.

[40] Sylva (2013: 88–89) states, "It appears that Jesus is intentionally exposing the weakness of Thomas' faith as a way for Thomas to make amends for not following through earlier on his exhortation to die with Jesus (11:16). What is going on is similar to John 21 where Peter's failure is exposed with an opportunity for him to make amends."

and the disciples.[41] This was done already with Thomas in 20:24-28 where Jesus comes for a second time only to confirm Thomas and invite him to God's love. While Thomas was brought to conviction in front of Peter and the other disciples, Peter is reinstated in the love of Jesus before Thomas and the other disciples.[42] Similarly, the one whom Jesus loved is also brought to the center of focus toward the end of the story (21:20-25). Jesus's love toward them fulfills the narrator's earlier statement, "he loved them to the end" (13:1).[43]

In John, as a third aspect, signs are usually used as means to reveal God's/Jesus's glory. In that sense, the theme of the glory of God and Jesus comes to the forefront through the miraculous catch of fish. After the grand sign of Jesus's glorification on the cross in ch. 19 and the resurrection in ch. 20, another sign is introduced in ch. 21 to show the post-resurrection manifestation of glory. The event of Jesus's showing (21:1), the miraculous catch of fish (21:4-13), his third appearance to the disciples (21:14), and the symbolic dialogue between Jesus and Peter are revelatory in nature.[44] In ch. 21, the narrator brings to the fore the glory that continues, even after the death and resurrection of Jesus. The expression "we have seen his glory" (1:14) manifests through the presence of Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, and the other disciples in the post-resurrection context.[45] The titles of Jesus, as the fourth aspect, are introduced after the apex utterance of Thomas (20:28). The general tendency of the disciples to address Jesus as Lord is shown on several occasions in ch. 21: the Beloved Disciple's "It is the Lord" (21:7) and the narrator's recollection about him from the previous context (21:20); Peter's threefold address "Lord" (21:15-17), a fourth address in another context (21:21), and his hearing that it was the Lord (21:7); and the disciples' knowledge that it was the Lord (21:12).[46] Mostly, Jesus is understood as Lord in a regular sense. But Thomas uses the title Lord in an extraordinary

[41] See Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 360–67.
[42] Cf. Carson, 1991: 668–72.
[43] See Keener, 2003: 2: 899–901.
[44] See Schnackenburg, 1982: 3: 351–74.
[45] In 21:19, the narrator indicates the kind of death by which Peter would glorify God. Cf. Keener, 2003: 2: 1225–26; Sylva, 2013: 98.
[46] Keener (2003: 2: 1228–29) states, "If the disciple whom Jesus loved is assumed to be one of the disciples of 21:2 (which is almost certainly understood to be the case), he could be Thomas or Nathanael if willing to name himself; otherwise he is one of Zebedee's sons (as church tradition holds) or one of the two anonymous disciples (protecting still more fully his anonymity, more in accordance with most contemporary scholarly views)." Also see Bruce, 1983: 398–411; Witherington, 1995: 354–58.

way on par with Jesus as God (20:28). In that sense, Thomas's utterance in 20:28 surpasses all other utterances in the Fourth Gospel.[47] Thus, the whole of ch. 21 provides clues concerning Thomas's priority and significance within the Jesus circle.

Concluding remarks

This analysis has enabled us to comprehend the role and function of Thomas in ch. 21 in relation to the other characters of the story. This is done by way of establishing the sequence and hence the transition between the Book of Glory and the epilogue. Thomas's role and his utterance in 20:24-28 are more meaningful when we relate them with the role and utterances of the other characters in 21:1-25. Sylva (2013: 93-94) comments as follows:

> Thomas' recent experience is brought to the forefront in John 21, and it is done so specifically in relation to the experiences of Peter and Nathanael. These are the only three disciples who are identified by their names. They are the first three disciples mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Thomas is the second named, connecting him proximately to both Peter and Nathanael. There are indicators that this order conveys a Johannine feature of commenting on Thomas by means of relating him to other characters.

Thomas appears as one among the seven disciples in ch. 21. At the same time, he continues to be the profound declarer of the peak statement of the Gospel. In that sense, his silent presence symbolically foregrounds him in contrast to all other characters in the story. The narrator reaches the goal of his thesis statement ("the Word was God," 1:1) through the very utterance of Thomas in 20:28 ("My Lord and my God," 20:28).[48] The section 21:1-25 can be considered as a narrative expansion to stabilize the role and function of Thomas even more convincingly through the lagging natures of Peter and the Beloved Disciple. Thus, we note the grand *inclusio* that connects ch. 20 with ch. 1.[49]

[47] Cf. Sylva, 2013: 93–98.
[48] See Bonney, 2002: 172–73.
[49] See Thompson, 2015: 431.

The analysis of the four passages (11:1–12:11; 13:1–17:26; 20:1-31; 21:1-25) in this chapter provides us with an extended understanding of the character of Thomas within the framework of John's Gospel. A reader of the Gospel develops an understanding of Thomas's character with the help of a constellation of phraseologies and expressions embedded within the narrative masterplan. While the character of Thomas is backgrounded in the first half of the Gospel, he emerges as a developing character from ch. 11 onward. The narrator advances his story to actualize the thesis statement in 1:1 through the persuasive utterances and performative acts of Thomas in the second half. The presentation of Thomas alongside his metaphorical utterances foregrounds his role and status in a unique fashion. Thomas's appearances in the transition episodes make him a figure with symbolical significance. The development of Thomas alongside his persuasive speeches unlocks some of the key aspects of the extended story in the following fashion: first, Thomas's utterance in 11:16 directs the attention of the reader from the minor story of Lazarus to the major story of Jesus, that is, a transition of the story from the death of Lazarus to the death of Jesus; second, his subsequent utterance in 14:5 enables the reader to attune him/herself to *the way* that connects the world from below with the world from above, that is, with an exclusive claim that Jesus himself is the way to the Father; third, his utterances in 20:24-28 further direct the reader to understand the identity of Jesus not only as *Lord* but also as *God* in a Thomasine idiom; and fourth, his appearance as one among the seven disciples in 21:2 and the other disciples' deficient natures make the reader aware of Thomas's unique role within the narrative framework. As the narrator actualizes the thesis statement of the Gospel (1:1) through the character of Thomas in 20:28, Thomas's placement in the Gospel must be interpreted as having rhetorical significance. As the narrator projects Thomas's character as a loyal, inquisitive, and developing model, his character advances toward a new level of faith commitment. As we have already analyzed the Thomasine passages in John, our next attempt is to look at him in the apocryphal documents. In the following section of this volume, we will analyze Thomas's development in *The Gospel of Thomas*, *The Book of Thomas the Contender*, *The Acts of Thomas*, and *The Infancy Gospel of Thomas* in order to elucidate our understanding of the Johannine text.

Part Two

Thomas in the Apocryphal Documents

Didymus Judas Thomas not only appears in the Johannine and other New Testament traditions, but also influences the so-called apocryphal traditions. Several noncanonical documents describe the influence of Thomas in early Christianity. The apocryphal traditions such as the *Gospel of Thomas* (*GTh*), *Book of Thomas the Contender* (*BTh*), *Acts of Thomas* (*ATh*), and *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* (*IGTh*) provide us with extended knowledge concerning the early traditions of Thomas as a person and his work. These documents inform us of his significance and influence among the communities of faith. The *GTh* presents Jesus and his utterances through the perspective of Thomas. A reader can perceive the way traditions developed from the utterance units in the *GTh* to dialogues and discourses in the *BTh*. In the *ATh*, the traditions further developed into the form of a romance where a literary advancement can be observed. The *IGTh* is shaped by the influence of other early infancy gospels. The literary genres of the four documents explicitly show how traditions developed in accordance with the literary and historical demands of the community/ies. Moreover, the chronological and literary advancement of the four documents clearly depict the way Thomasine traditions were understood in antiquity.

The four documents help us to understand the development of traditions concerning Thomas. Analyzing these documents helps us to visualize a broader spectrum of his literary character. An understanding of him in the

apocryphal traditions can also enable us to perceive his significance in the post-Johannine context. Therefore, it is hoped that the following analysis of the *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh* will help us to advance our earlier knowledge of Thomas. In the process, we will look at the chronological details and literary developments available for examination.

5

The Gospel of Thomas

Introduction

The *Gospel of Thomas* (*GTh*) is the foremost document within the category of Thomas Literature. It contains a collection of 114 sayings attributed to Jesus.[1] The features of the Gospel as an independent apocryphon—that is, its Jewish traditions, its collection of authentic sayings of Jesus, and its collection of traditional sayings, prophesies, proverbs, and parables about Jesus—make it a unique literary masterpiece.[2] It is believed that the Greek form of the earlier fragments of the *GTh* (i.e., three Oxyrhynchus papyri; P. Oxy 1, 654, and 655) were written between 130 and 250 CE.[3] Valantasis (1997: 29) comments that "the Greek fragments are the earliest text we have of the Gospel of Thomas, but, because they are fragmentary, they have been relegated a lesser place in

[1] Koester (1989: 38) states, "In fact, the *GTh* is composed of sayings which originally circulated as oral literature under the authority of Jesus. The closest parallels to such compositions are found in Jewish wisdom literature. Several writings of this type existed in early Christianity, but of these only the *GTh* has survived in its original form." According to the early Gnostic work entitled *Pistis Sophia*, Thomas was commissioned by the Lord, along with Matthew and Philip, to write down his words. Also see Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 278; Lapham, 2003: 114.

[2] Cameron (1982: 23) comments, "The Gospel of Thomas is a collection of traditional wisdom sayings, parables, prophesies, and proverbs attributed to Jesus." Goodacre (2012: 3; also see Gathercole, 2014: 262–81; *contra* Patterson, 2014: 251–61) argues for the familiarity of Thomas with the Synoptic Gospels. Cf. Meyer, 2007: 133; Evans, 1992: 166; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 283; Koester, 1977: 117; Goodacre, 2014: 282–93.

[3] Cameron (1982: 23) states, "The existence of three different copies of the Greek text gives evidence of rather frequent copying of this gospel in the third century." Cameron (1992: 6: 535) further comments, "The discovery of the Coptic text enabled scholars to identify the Greek papyri as fragments of *GTh* and, in turn, assess the relationship of the Greek to the Coptic text. *P. Oxy*. 654 corresponds to the prologue and sayings 1-7 of *GTh*; *P. Oxy*. 1 corresponds to *GTh* 26-30, 77, and 31-33; and P. Oxy. 655 corresponds to *GTh* 24 and 36-39." Cf. Meyer and Bloom, 1992: 7; Charlesworth, 1995: 370–77; Klauck, 2003: 107; Ehrman and Pleše, 2011: 303; Pokorný, 2009: 4; Perrin, 2007: 8; Bauckham, 1992: 286; Attridge, 1989: 96–97; Goodacre, 2012: 154–71; Gathercole, 2014: 262–81.

recent study than the more complete Coptic sayings."[4] An extended historical analysis helps us to understand the widespread use of these documents in the early periods of Christian origins. In the East Syrian traditions, centered in Edessa, the Gospel was attributed to "Didymus Judas Thomas."[5] Didymus Judas Thomas was identified within the Syrian church as the apostle and twin brother of Jesus.[6] This factor enables some scholars to argue for an earlier Aramaic or Syrian version/s of the *GTh*.[7] Hippolytus quoted the Gospel around 230 CE in his account of the Naassenes (*Refutatio* 5.7.20; 5.8.32) and shortly after 233 CE Origen mentioned it in the first of his homilies on Luke (*in Luc. Hom.* 1).[8] Eusebius made mention of it decades later (*Eccl. Hist*. 3.25.6).[9] Cyril of Jerusalem indicated that the Gospel was popular among the Manichaeans (*Catecheses* 4.36; 6.31).[10] Thus, the *GTh* was one of the earliest gospel traditions, a geographically widespread document possibly sustained in multiple languages and versions, a tradition known to historians and church fathers, a tradition attributed to Didymus Judas Thomas (one of the twelve disciples of Jesus), and an independent tradition.

[4] Valantasis (1997: 4) observes, "The Greek fragments found at Oxyrhynchus and the Coptic version found at Nag Hammadi have both similarities and differences. The Coptic sayings comparable to the Greek do not seem to be a direct translation of the same Greek text, and the Greek seems to witness to another version of the gospel than the one on which the Coptic translation is based." Also see Goodacre, 2012: 26–27; Gathercole, 2014: 262–81.

[5] Koester (1989: 40; also see Cameron, 1992: 6: 535–38) states, "The name of the apostle Thomas is well attested in the East (Syria, Persia, India). . . . A possible place of composition is Edessa (modern Urfa, Turkey), in the kingdom of Osrhoëne in northern Mesopotamia, which was an important center of early Christianity." Cf. Bauckham, 1992: 287; Montefiore and Turner, 1962.

[6] Uro (2003: 27; also see Layton, 1987: 361, 364) comments, "Individual readings and traditions to be found in the gospel can be detected in works which are largely considered to be of Syrian origin, for example in Tatian's *Diatessaron*, *Liber Graduum*, the *Odes of Solomon*, and the *Gospel of Philip*." See Meyer 2003: 44–45; Ehrman and Pleše, 2011: 308; Koester, 1977: 117; Cameron, 1982: 23.

[7] On the basis of several factors, Patterson (1993: 120) concludes that the date of Thomas is in the vicinity of 70–80 CE. Klauck (2003: 105) comments, "All these texts (Nag Hammadi Codices) are translations from Greek (only a few scholars have suggested that a text such as the Gospel of Thomas may have been written in Syriac)." Koester (1977: 117) contends that "the Greek (or even Syriac or Aramaic) collection was composed in the period before about 200 CE, possibly as early as the second half of the first century (i.e., 50-70 CE), in Syria, Palestine, or Mesopotamia." Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 370–77; DeConick, 2006: 8; Gathercole, 2012: 17–110.

[8] Lapham (2003: 114) states, "Until the appearance of this document (GTh) at Nag Hammadi, nothing was known of the content of a work by this name, though the Gospel had been mentioned as being heretical by Hippolytus and Origen, and by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*." Also see Koester, 1989: 38–39; Klauck, 2003: 107; Meyer, 2003: 41; Pokorný, 2009: 3; Perrin, 2007: 8; Attridge, 1989: 103–04; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 278; Koester, 1989: 38–39.

[9] Attridge (1989: 105) quotes Eusebius (*HE* 3.25.6) as follows: "in order that we might know them and the writings which are put forward by heretics under the name of the apostles containing *Gospels* such as those of Peter, and of Thomas, and of Matthias, and of some others besides." See Ehrman and Pleše, 2011: 304; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 278.

[10] See Attridge, 1989: 103–09.

Synoptics and the *Gospel of Thomas*

The *GTh* exemplifies the way "saying materials" would have been preserved in antiquity, especially in the first-century context.[11] It further suggests the probable existence of a saying material in the first-century Christian context, such as "Q" (German *Quelle* or "source").[12] DeConick (2006: 2; cf. 7–8) states regarding the *GTh* that "We have before us a real gem, a 'found' early Christian Gospel that indeed may contain a kernel of Jesus' sayings predating Quelle."[13] There were several scholarly explorations undertaken to reconstruct a "Q" hypothesis based on the repetitive phenomenon of around 235 common verses in Matthew and in Luke (but not found in Mark).[14] If the *GTh* is identified as a first-century document, then it is plausible to assume the availability of sources such as "Q."[15] The unpolished and unnarrativized literary style and nonecclesiastical compositional aspects of the *GTh* make the reader think of its closeness to the incipient Christian traditions including the oral traditions (and even to *Ipsissima Verba Jesu* [or at least *Ipsissima Vox*

[11] Klauck (2003: 107) states that it is "strikingly reminiscent of Q, the lost logia collection which scholars postulate as the second source (alongside Mark) for Matthew and Luke; most of Q consists of words of Jesus (though Q has narrative components too)." Jenkins (2001: 59) says, "*Thomas* was composed independently of the canonical gospels, the order of sayings in *Thomas* does not appear to rely on the structure of those works. In some cases, too, the forms of the stories presented in *Thomas* arguably (but not definitely) look more primitive than the better-known forms we find in Q." Also see Meyer, 2003: 49–51; Catchpole, 1993: 1–7; Charlesworth, 1995: 370; Tuckett, 1996: 1–39; Patterson, 2014: 251–61; Kloppenborg, 2014: 199–239.

[12] Meyer and Bloom (1992: 5) comment, "Unlike other early Christian gospels, which typically consist of narrative accounts interpreting the life of Jesus of Nazareth and culminating in descriptions of his death, the Gospel of Thomas focuses specifically upon sayings of Jesus." Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 370; Meyer, 2007: 134–37; Browning, 1996/2004: 378; Cameron, 1982: 24; Jenkins, 2001: 54; Pokorný, 2009: 6–7.

[13] Ménard (1975) maintains the position that the Gospel of Thomas was written by a Gnostic author who revised Synoptic sayings of Jesus in order to convey an esoteric message to elite religionists. He also considered it as dependent and hence irrelevant to the study of Christian origins. Quispel (1957) and Koester (1971) maintain the independent entity of the Gospel of Thomas. Also see Perrin, 2007: 13; DeConick, 2006: 2.

[14] Valantasis (1997: 13) argues, "The first means of dating the Gospel of Thomas emerges from a comparison to primitive and formative Christian literature. Parallels with other New Testament literature (especially the Synoptic Sayings Source Q) and sections of authentic Pauline literature suggest that parts of the material collected in these sayings come from the period of Christian origins and reflect some of the earliest written forms of the sayings of Jesus from around 60 CE." Cf. Dunn, 2013: 80–108; Martin: 1975: 1: 143–60; Chilton, 1995: 37–60; Stein, 1987/2001: 50, 89–90, 97–123; Catchpole, 1993: 1–7; Tuckett, 1996: 1–39; Meyer, 2003: 45–51; Jenkins, 2001: 54.

[15] Meyer and Bloom (1992: 13; *contra* Goodacre, 2012: 9–14) state, "an excellent case can be made for the position that the Gospel of Thomas is not fundamentally dependent upon the New Testament gospels, but that it preserves sayings that at times appear to be more original than the New Testament parallels." Cf. Patterson, 1992: 2: 1080; Evans, 1992: 166; also see Patterson, 2014: 251–61; Kloppenborg, 2014: 199–239.

Jesu] and *Sitz im Leben Jesu*).[16] It has been argued on form-critical grounds that the *GTh* sometimes preserves sayings, especially parables, in a more primitive form than the Synoptics.[17] The contrasting of Thomas's authority with that of Peter and Matthew (log 13; cf. Gal. 1:18; 2:7-9, 11-14; Mt. 16:15-19; Jn 21:15-23) might direct our attention toward such possibilities.[18] The *GTh* excludes details concerning Jesus's crucifixion, death, and resurrection as it was written from the perspective of his ethical and philosophical pedagogy. In that sense, the *GTh* as a whole focuses on the pre-crucifixion/pre-resurrection utterances and verbal interactions of Jesus.[19] While the canonical gospels narrate events with the help of both the *external proofs*[20] and the *internal* or *artistic proofs*,[21] the *GTh* presents Jesus *mostly* with the help of internal or artistic proofs.[22] In that sense, Jesus's "artistic" utterances in the *GTh* evidence his character as a pedagogue within the matrix of *Sitz im Leben Jesu*.[23]

While the *GTh* introduces Jesus's sayings in abbreviated formats (see log 4b, 6b, 8, 9, 14c, 16a, 16b, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26), the Synoptic evangelists narrate them as *pronouncement stories* (cf. Taylor, 1933; also called *paradigms*, cf. Dibelius, 1934: 37–68; and *apophthegms*, cf. Bultmann, 1963).[24] The paradigms/apophthegms/pronouncement stories of the Synoptic Gospels

[16] The Latin expression *Ipsissima Verba Jesu* means "the very words of Jesus himself," an expression used by commentators making a claim for the authenticity of such words, as opposed to words attributed to him by the evangelists. The Latin expression *Ipsissima Vox Jesu* means "the very voice of Jesus himself." While those who argue for the former see "very words of Jesus" in the gospel narratives, those who argue for the latter see concepts that Jesus expressed, but not exact words. *Sitz im Leben Jesu* means understanding the sayings and events of the gospels in relation to the "life setting" of Jesus. Cf. Stein, 1987/2001: 168, 174, 183–84, 209–11, 216–17, 228–29; Pokorný, 2009: 8–9; Dunn, 2013: 80–104; Patterson, 2014: 251–61; Kloppenborg, 2014: 199–239; *contra* Goodacre, 2012: 126–53; Gathercole, 2014: 262–81.

[17] Koester (1989: 39) comments, "the *GTh* is similar to the sources of the canonical gospels, in particular the synoptic sayings source (Q). This similarity, as well as the type of appeal to apostolic authority and the lack of any influence from canonical literature, suggests a date well before Justin, possibly even in the first century CE." Cf. Bauckham, 1992: 287; Catchpole, 1993: 1–7; Tuckett, 1996: 1–39; Kloppenborg, 2014: 199–239; *contra* Goodacre, 2012: 126–53; Gathercole, 2014: 262–81.

[18] Cf. Koester, 2007: 9–14; Cameron, 992: 535–36.

[19] The *GTh* is unique as it focuses on the sayings of Jesus without showing any interest in the death and resurrection narratives.

[20] The authors use but do not invent external proofs such as quotations of scripture, the evidence of miracles, and the naming of witnesses, for example, John the Baptist or the disciples of Jesus.

[21] The author is said to invent these. Cf. Kennedy, 1984: 14–15.

[22] See Kennedy, 1984: 14–15. Goodacre (2012: 66–108) argues that *GTh* was dependent on the canonical gospels.

[23] In order to understand the independence, dependence, and familiarity theories, see Goodacre, 2012: 5–7; Gathercole, 2014: 262–81; *contra* Patterson, 2014: 251–61; Kloppenborg, 2014: 199–239.

[24] See Stein, 1987/2001: 180–84.

are short narratives with didactic points that conclude or summarize the account.[25] Thomas included the Synoptic type of logia only on two occasions (see log 64, 65; cf. Mt. 22:1-14; 21:33-41). The mention of Matthew and Thomas together in log 13 (also see Matthew and Thomas paired in Mt. 10:3) and the parallels between the gospels attributed to them are noticeable. While the *GTh* has more agreement with Matthew, it has considerable agreement with Luke, and less agreement with Mark.[26] Some of the passages in Matthew have striking parallels with the *GTh*.[27] The *makarisms* of the *GTh* (log 18c, 49, 54, 58, 68, 69, 103) are similar to the *beatitudes* of Matthew (5:3-12).[28] Though there are several striking similarities between Matthew and Thomas in terms of wording and content, there are considerable differences in terms of order.[29] While the makarisms of Thomas are scattered throughout the Gospel, Matthew makes an intentional attempt to arrange them together as a pericope (see Mt. 5:3-12).[30] In summation, this discussion enables the reader to observe the following features: first, though there are similarities with the Synoptics, the *GTh* has its own distinctive emphasis, arrangement of content, and presentation of the sayings; second, while the Synoptic evangelists reflect their stories from the *Sitz im Leben der Kirche* (or the "life settings" of the individual evangelists) perspective, the *GTh* attempts to reflect the "very own words" (or even "voice") from the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* perspective;[31] third, while the *GTh* reflects primitive elements through its hard readings, it maintains an independent nature, an apostolic attachment with Jesus as well as the gospel traditions, and a direct utterance format, whereas the Synoptic narrative format reflects a later literary composition; and fourth, while the *GTh's* distance with Mark (in comparison to Matthew and Luke) is observable, the closeness of Thomas with Q (and thus to Matthew and Luke) is noticeable.[32]

[25] See Bock, 1991: 181–82.
[26] Cf. Montefiore and Turner, 1962: 31; Koester, 2007: 9–14.
[27] See log 8 [13:47-51]; log 9 [13:3-23]; log 13 [16:13-16]; log 14c [15:11]; log 16 [10:34]; log 20 [13:31-32]; log 24b [5:14]; log 26 [7:1-5]; log 32 [5:14b]; log 33 [5:15-16]; log 34 [15:14]; log 36 [6:25-27] and others.
[28] See detailed comparisons in Dunn, 2013: 80–108.
[29] See Stein, 1987/2001: 29–47.
[30] Also see Dunn, 2013: 83.
[31] *Sitz im Leben der Kirche* means "life setting" of the church. While the Synoptic evangelists narrate the story of Jesus with embellishments, *GTh* reflects the story of Jesus in the primitive fashion.
[32] See Koester, 2007: 9–14; Martin: 1975: 1: 143–60.

These factors help us to understand Thomas as a distinct, independent, and primitive gospel tradition.[33]

In the *GTh*, the name of Thomas appears only on two occasions (log 1 and 13). A detailed analysis of log 1 and log 13 will give us certain insights into the character of Thomas in relation to other characters.

Log 1

As already discussed, the *GTh* is considered one of the earliest Christian compositions.[34] The prologue of the *GTh* (log 1) develops as follows:[35]

> These are the secret sayings that the living Jesus spoke and Didymus Judas Thomas recorded. And he said, "Whoever finds the meaning of these sayings will not taste death."

The prologue of the *GTh* is comprised of three subsequent clauses: first, "these are the secret sayings"; second, "that the living Jesus uttered"; and third, "which Didymus Judas Thomas wrote down."[36] Meyer (1992: 67) comments, "The incipit, or opening of the document, provides what is most likely the earlier version of the title. A second, later title is given at the end of the document: 'The Gospel according to Thomas.'"[37] While the message is described as "obscure sayings," the messenger is referred to as "living Jesus."[38] The receiver of the

[33] For more details concerning the relationship between the Synoptics and the *GTh*, see Pokorný, 2009: 16–20.

[34] Meyer and Bloom (1992: 5) state, "The Coptic text of the Gospel of Thomas came to light with the discovery of the Nag Hammadi library, within which the Gospel of Thomas is to be found as the second tractate, or document, of Codex II." Valantasis (1997: 1) states, "Two discoveries of papyri at two different sites in the Egyptian desert (Oxyrhynchus and Nag Hammadi) bear particular relevance on the Gospel of Thomas."

[35] Meyer (2003: 41–43) comments, "The *Gospel of Thomas* finds its generic place among the early Christian traditions, oral or written, frequently described as *logoi* (e.g., in the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles [20:35], the *Didache*, *1 Clement*) or *logia* (so Papias, who also employs the term logoi) of Jesus."

[36] Pokorný (2009: 35) states, "The reader of the first lines in fact hears three voices and the witness of three persons: Jesus, Thomas, and the narrator. Jesus is proclaiming the words of life, while the two others make the reader aware that it is Jesus who is speaking. All three invite the reader to become their fellow."

[37] Also see Klauck, 2003: 109. For Gathercole (2014a: 191), "These opening words are more a prologue than an incipit."

[38] Gathercole (2014a: 193) comments, "The epithet 'the living one' can be applied to Jesus in Gnostic and related literature, but it is also used in the sense of 'alive (from the dead)' in Rev 1:17-18; cf. Luke 24:5." Also see *GTh* 37, 52, 59, 99, and 111.

message and composer of the text is Didymus Judas Thomas. The messenger-message-receiver connection is brought to the fore right at the beginning.[39] Foster (2009: 36) comments, "From the outset it is clearly stated that Thomas is the medium through whom the sayings of Jesus are transmitted. This provides Thomas with a certain authoritative function as interpreter of the Jesus tradition." As the narrator connects the traditions of Jesus with Didymus Judas Thomas at the beginning and at the end of the Gospel, a reader can perceive him as a significant figure. In that sense, the name Didymus Judas Thomas forms a larger *inclusio* within which the 114 sayings of Jesus are organized.

The *GTh* (log 1) as a whole begins as follows: "these are the secret sayings which the living Jesus spoke and Didymus Judas Thomas recorded."[40] This makes the reader think about the direct and face-to-face interaction between Jesus, the one who shares the secret knowledge, and Didymus Judas Thomas, the one who records the knowledge.[41] Valantasis (1997: 53) states, "The fact that Jesus is 'living' draws attention to itself. It implies that for others, there are sayings from a 'dead' Jesus, that is, their Jesus is not really present to them in speaking the sayings.[42] But for this community, the one to which the narrator extends the invitation, their Jesus lives, speaks, and continues to challenge."[43]

After the brief prologue, the name of Thomas appears in log 13 where he is placed as a dialogue partner of Jesus along with Simon Peter and Matthew.[44] If we attest the Gospel as a first-century document, then it is easier to consider it as firsthand information. According to Meyer (2007: 133), "Judas Thomas

[39] Koester (2000: 2: 38) comments, "The *Gospel According to Thomas* (*GTh*), sayings of Jesus ostensibly collected by Didymus Judas Thomas, was written in Syria in the early post-apostolic period."

[40] See Zinner, 2011: 44–64.

[41] The beginning of the *GTh* is preserved in two versions: the Greek version of P. Oxy 654 and the Coptic version (almost certainly translated from a Greek original) found within Codex II of the Nag Hammadi library. See Meyer, 2003: 41; Pokorný, 2009: 35.

[42] See Gathercole, 2014a: 193.

[43] Layton (1987: 359) comments, "The twin motif was important in the ancient literary genre called the 'romance.' But in the Thomas tradition, far from being only a romantic exaggeration, this relationship provided a profound theological model for the reciprocal relationship of the individual Christian and the inner divine light or 'living Jesus.'" Meyer (2003: 43) states, "The incipit of *Thomas* continues its specification by indicating that the secret sayings are those not simply of Jesus, but rather of 'the living Jesus.' The use of this phrase in early Christian literature suggests that 'the living Jesus' typically refers to the spiritual, divine Christ, who is to be associated with life and truth and whose sayings thus take on the character of revealed wisdom." Also see Foster 2009: 31; Klauck, 2003: 110; Pokorný, 2009: 36.

[44] See Meyer and Bloom, 1992: 74–75.

was thought in some circles, particularly within Syriac Christianity, to be the twin brother of Jesus and as such the perfect person to function as guarantor of sayings of Jesus."[45] Along with Jesus the primary speaker and Thomas the recorder, the involvement of the extended group of disciples is noticeable (i.e., log 6, 12, 18, 20, 22, 24, 37, 43, 51, 52, 53, 60, 91, 99, 100, 104, and 113).[46] On certain occasions, individuals other than Thomas (log 13, 21, 61, 79, and 114) also appear as dialogue partners with Jesus.[47] But, in the overall structure of the Gospel, Thomas appears as the one who shares the secret knowledge of Jesus.[48]

The details below help us to understand the general trend of the *GTh*. In log 1, Jesus says: "Whoever discovers the interpretation of these sayings will not taste death."[49] The profundity of the message and the necessity of interpreting the gospel are highlighted here (cf. Rev 1:3). Valantasis (1997: 54) states, "Death does not prevent Jesus from speaking or Didymus Judas Thomas from recording."[50] In log 2, Jesus emphasizes: "the Kingdom is within you and it is outside you." The statement of Jesus does not contradict the Kingdom concerns of other evangelists on the following grounds: first, the initial phrase "within you" has parallels within the Synoptic Gospels (Lk. 17:21); and second, the last phrase "outside you" connotes the universality of the Kingdom.[51] Both perceptions are present in the canonical gospels. At the same time, one must understand that the *GTh* states a specific Kingdom concern from Jesus's own mouth (i.e., "within and outside"; as similar to the Synoptic "this age and the age to come" and Johannine "from above and from below") in a categorical way. Ehrman and Pleše (2011: 305) comment,

[45] Valantasis (1997: 53) states, "The sayings originate with Jesus, and they find expression in the world which the narrator and the readers share, but they are transmitted under the authority of Judas, and of Thomas, and of the one who was the twin, all of which has eventually been subsumed under the generic name 'Thomas' whose treatise is no longer identified by its content (the sayings), but by its redesignated genre of literature, a 'gospel.'"

[46] Meyer (2003: 43) states, "the sayings of the *Gospel of Thomas* are identified as 'hidden' or 'secret' sayings. This identification of the esoteric quality of the sayings corresponds to statements emphasizing the revelation of what is hidden throughout the text."

[47] Meyer (1992: 67; see Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 278) comments, "In the New Testament and early Christian literature mention is made of Judas the brother of Jesus and the apostle Thomas. Among Syrian Christians Judas Thomas is said to have been the twin brother of Jesus and is thus an ideal figure to function as guarantor of the sayings of Jesus."

[48] See Pokorný, 2009: 35–36.

[49] See a similar expression in Jn 8:51-52; Sirach 39:1-3; cf. Meyer and Bloom, 1992: 68.

[50] See Pokorný, 2009: 36.

[51] Also see Pokorný, 2009: 38.

"The sayings of Jesus recorded in this book are 'hidden' or 'secret'—not available to people at large; and understanding their meaning will bring eternal life." As Thomas is the recorder and interpreter, he will not taste death. In that sense, while "living Jesus" speaks, Thomas as one who never tastes death writes his words down. This suggests that Thomas was a mature disciple to whom Jesus shared insightful wisdom for the proclamation of the Kingdom logia. Thomas's role as the one who receives the revelation of Jesus is emphasized here.

The prologue of the *GTh* provides the following insights concerning the character of Thomas: first, there is an intentional attempt to connect the sayings of Jesus with Didymus Judas Thomas;[52] second, Thomas shares the "hidden" and "secret" revelation of the "living" Jesus; third, Thomas is an authoritative figure who functions as a recorder and interpreter of the sayings of Jesus;[53] fourth, the twin tradition formed around Jesus and Thomas stabilizes the claims of his apostleship to the East more strongly; fifth, Thomas is introduced as one who never tastes death (i.e., "living Thomas") and writes down the eternal message of "living Jesus";[54] sixth, the passion of Thomas to proclaim the Kingdom logia directs the attention of the reader to the essence of Jesus's teaching; and seventh, the extended *inclusio* between the beginning and the end of the *GTh* establishes the relationship between Jesus and Thomas. A reader who concentrates on the *GTh* can find these aspects significant in the process of reading and interpreting the Gospel.

Log 13

After the prologue, the character of Thomas appears more convincingly in log 13. Valantasis (1997: 75) mentions that "there are three parts to the saying: the conversation of Jesus with the disciples generally and Simon Peter, Matthew, and Thomas specifically; the narrative relating the private

[52] This is not explicit in the canonical gospels as in the case of the *GTh*.

[53] Gathercole (2014a: 194) comments, "The function of Thomas here is to guarantee the authenticity of these 'words': his modest role as a mere scribe does not detract from this. To define him as a scribe is to guarantee a pure and uncontaminated voice of Jesus. The effect of this, together with the form of the rest of *Thomas*, is to create an immediate relationship between Jesus and the reader."

[54] See Charlesworth, 1995: 374.

revelation to Thomas; and the conversation between the disciples and Thomas":[55]

> *Jesus* said to his disciples, "Compare me to someone and tell me whom I am like."
> *Simon Peter* said to him, "You are like a righteous angel."
> *Matthew* said to him, "You are like a wise philosopher."
> *Thomas* said to him, "Master, my mouth is wholly incapable of saying whom you are like."
> *Jesus* said, "I am not your [sing.] master. Because you [sing.] have drunk, you have become intoxicated from the bubbling spring which I have measured out."
> And he took him and withdrew and told him three things.
> When Thomas returned to his companions, they asked him, "What did Jesus say to you?"
> *Thomas* said to them, "If I tell you one of the things which he told me, you will pick up stones and throw them at me; a fire will come out of the stones and burn you up."

Jesus asks his disciples: "Compare me to someone and tell me whom I am like" (log 13a). Three of his disciples respond differently.[56] While Simon Peter replies to Jesus that "You are like a righteous angel" (log 13b),[57] Matthew responds "You are like a wise philosopher" (log 13c).[58] But Thomas plainly states: "Master, my mouth is wholly incapable of saying whom you are like" (log 13d).[59] Jesus responds back only to Thomas on this occasion: "I am not your master. Because you have drunk, you have become intoxicated from the

[55] DeConick (2005: 68) considers log 13 as one of the dialogues of the *GTh*. Also see Perrin, 2007: 8.
[56] Meyer and Bloom (1992: 74) state, "This dialogue is the version in the Gospel of Thomas of a story that is told in the synoptic gospels (Matthew 16:13-23; Mark 8:27-33; Luke 9:18-22), and that recounts in those gospels what happened on the road to Caesarea Philippi."
[57] Pokorný (2009: 54; also see Perrin, 2007: 108–09) comments, "He [Peter] compares Jesus to a *messenger*. It must, nevertheless, be noted that the term *angelos*, taken over from Greek, may be used here in the specific sense of angel as a celestial being, a meaning quite common in the Hellenistic period (cf. Luke 2:9)."
[58] Pokorný (2009: 54; also see Perrin, 2007: 108–09) further comments, "Here philosophy is (a) a wise teaching, and it may already be (b) a special kind of scholarly dispute. But even Matthew's answer is insufficient."
[59] Valantasis (1997: 75; cf. Pokorný, 2009: 54–55) states, "The first two responses [of Simon Peter and Matthew] locate Jesus within the spectrum of understandings of divine figures as angelic or as transcendently philosophical. These two understandings of Jesus operate within the spectrum of commonly understood religious figures."

bubbling spring which I have measured out."[60] Thomas's response to Jesus must be seen from the point of view of his surprising nature (cf. John 20:28). His inability to answer the question is not because of his "unknowing," but because of his "awful" condition.[61] Log 13f mentions that "And he [Jesus] took him [Thomas] and withdrew and told him three things."[62] Jesus's special concern toward Thomas is reflected through his corrective expression, withdrawal, and the speaking of the three sayings in secret.[63] Klauck (2003: 114) states, "In many passages in Mark (e.g., 10:10-12), after teaching the *crowd*, Jesus takes his *disciples* aside and gives them a private interpretation; in *GTh* 13, *Thomas* is taken aside from the group of the other *disciples* for this secret revelation."[64] The other disciples come back and ask Thomas about what Jesus revealed to him (log 13g). Thomas responded to them: "If I tell you one of the things which he told me, you will pick up stones and throw them at me; a fire will come out of the stones and burn you up " (log 13h).[65] Meyer (1992: 74–75; cf. Acts 7:54, 58-59) states that "three sayings or words are unknown, but presumably they are powerful and provocative sayings, since stoning (mentioned by Thomas) was the Jewish punishment for blasphemy."[66] The most significant point here is that Jesus is closer to Thomas than to the other disciples. Thomas's expression

[60] See log 13e. Cameron (1992: 6: 540) concludes, "*GTh* took Jesus seriously as a teacher who spoke with authority. It celebrated his memory by preserving sayings in his name that sanctioned the formation of a distinctive community." *Contra* Gathercole, 2014a: 264.

[61] Valantasis (1997: 75; also see Pokorný, 2009: 54–55) commented, "Thomas' response addresses not the location of Jesus within known categories of revelation, but the mystery that surrounds Jesus and renders him beyond the categories. Jesus' ineffability takes precedence over any other categories of description."

[62] Meyer and Bloom (1992: 75) describe, "Worth noting are the following examples of three words or sayings: Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies* 5.8.4, cites the three words Kaulakau, Saulasau, Zeesar, derived from the Hebrew of Isaiah 28:10, 13; *Pistis Sophia* 136 mentions Yao Yao Yao, the Greek version (with three letters, given three times) of the ineffable name of God; the *Gospel of Bartholomew* and the *Secret Book of John* provide statements of identification with the father, the mother (or the holy spirit), and the son. *Acts of Thomas* 47 and *Manichaean Kephalaia* 1.5.26-34 also refer to the three sayings or words but do not disclose precisely what they were."

[63] Gathercole (2014a: 260) states that "the important thing in the narrative here seems to be that Jesus reveals the truth to Thomas, and that this is the same mysterious truth which is on offer in Thomas' Gospel."

[64] Valantasis (1997: 76–77) states, "Clearly this indicates a special revelation to Thomas, so that Thomas' positive response warrants also a private revelation. The language of 'withdrawal' implies a sort of drawing back, retiring, rest: it certainly suggests that the special revelation requires a special locus, if not a different frame of mind so that the receiver of the revelation will be prepared to understand."

[65] Cf. *Gospel of Bartholomew* 2:5; also see Meyer and Bloom, 1992: 75.

[66] Klauck (2003: 115; also see Pokorný, 2009: 55) states, "This reflects the experience of the adherents of this esoteric form of the Christian faith and life, who were unable to communicate their most important insights to the communities. Such insights were too provocative, and pious ears might even find them blasphemous." Cf. Valantasis, 1997: 76–77.

in log 13h shows that Jesus shared esoteric wisdom with him that he didn't share with the other disciples (including Peter and Matthew).[67]

In log 12a, the disciples ask: "We are aware that you will depart from us. Who will be our leader?" Jesus says to the disciples: "No matter where you come it is to James the Just you shall go" (log 12b).[68] When we compare log 12 with log 13, we can construe the following possibilities: first, there would have been a development from James's leadership to Thomas's leadership; second, Thomas would have been a leader on par with James, but at a different level; and third, Thomas would have had a unique role to play as leader.[69] In each case, one can understand the leadership role of Thomas.[70] Valantasis (1997: 78) states that, "by placing this saying immediately after the one in which Jesus points toward the authority of James the Just, the narrator corrects that earlier instruction: now James the Just simply becomes the leader prior to Simon Peter and Matthew, but just as secondary to Thomas."[71] As Thomas was considered to have shared in the secret knowledge of Jesus, in the early Eastern traditions he was regarded even above James the Just, Peter, and Matthew.[72] While Peter and Matthew restrict Jesus's being as a "righteous angel" and a "wise philosopher," Thomas understands the ineffable and incomprehensible nature of Jesus.[73] The narrator records the dialogue with the help of irony.[74]

[67] Klauck (2003: 115) explains, "The metaphors in v. 5 of 'drinking' (cf. John 7:37-38) and the 'bubbling spring' (cf. John 4:14) 'measured out' by Jesus himself show that Thomas already shares in the hidden wisdom. Log 108, towards the end of *GTh*, clarifies the meaning of 13e by affirming that this 'drinking' produces a configuration to Christ in which one receives revelation." *Contra* Keizer, 2009: 98.

[68] Gathercole (2014a: 254) comments that, "At the literal level, within the framework of the dialogue, this saying 'gives to James the authority at the centre to which, wherever their missionary travels take them, they are to look.'"

[69] Zinner (2011: 5; cf. Gathercole, 2014a: 251–63) comments that, "The situation in *Thomas* 13, insofar as it contrasts the figures of Matthew and Peter, is paralleled by Paul's open opposition to James and Peter in *Galatians* 2. Indeed, Paul condemns James and Peter outright, whereas *Thomas* 13 merely represents Thomas as having been more insightful upon one occasion than Peter and Matthew."

[70] See Pokorný, 2009: 53; Gathercole, 2014a: 251–63.

[71] Koester (1989: 40–41) comments that, "Thomas' authority is contrasted with that of Peter, which was well established in Syria (Gal 1:18; 2:7-9; Matthew 16:15-19), and that of Matthew, whose name may have been associated with the sayings tradition at an early date. The authority of figures such as James and Peter (as also of Paul) would have been recognized during their lifetime in areas where they actually worked."

[72] Koester (1989: 41) states further, "*GTh* 12 and 13 are intended to confirm Thomas' authority in contrast to claims made in behalf of ecclesiastical traditions under the authority of James, Peter, and Matthew." Also see Gathercole, 2014a: 251–63.

[73] See more details in Pokorný, 2009: 54–55.

[74] Valantasis (1997: 7) says that, "In this saying, Thomas' perspective contrasts positively with the perspectives of other disciples who use more worldly categories for interpreting the sayings of

First, Jesus reveals the *knowing* of Peter and Matthew as indeed *unknowing*, and second, the *unknowing* of Thomas as indeed *knowing*. Jesus's response to Thomas in log 13e reflects the following points at a deeper level: first, even without Jesus's own teaching, Thomas understands his master's ineffable and incomprehensible nature; and second, Thomas is drunk and has become intoxicated from the bubbling wellspring that Jesus has personally measured out.[75] "According to the *GTh*," Meyer (2003: 45) states, "it is Thomas who becomes spiritually intoxicated (*log* 13e) and who hears from Jesus' 'three sayings' (*log* 13f) that elucidate a oneness with Jesus."[76] Jesus's use of the metaphor states that Thomas's character is like one drunk in the wisdom of Jesus and God.[77] This further helps Jesus to impart the secret wisdom to him. Log 13g makes it clear that the other disciples depended on Thomas to know the mysteries of Jesus at length. Log 13h further reveals the nature of Jesus's revelation and the urgency for Thomas to keep them all without sharing. The twin-brother motif of the gospel traditions comes to its concentrated form in log 13.[78]

Log 13 of the *GTh* helps us to observe the following things: first, Thomas realizes the incomprehensible nature of Jesus; second, Thomas is placed even above Peter and Matthew (and also above James; see log 12); third, Thomas understands the ineffable nature of Jesus, even without a teaching from his

Jesus. These sayings are a locus of contestation and conflict, even though the perspective of Thomas assures both private revelation and a new locus of revelation." Also see Pokorný, 2009: 54–55.

[75] Gathercole (2014a: 263) comments, "We will see from Jesus' response (13.5) that the title 'master' or 'teacher' is not deemed appropriate, but the ineffability of Jesus' identity seems to be the point on which Thomas is correct."

[76] Pokorný (2009: 55) comments that, "*Drinking from a spring* means obtaining true knowledge (*log.* 108; cf. John 4:10-14). In *Acts of Thomas* 147 the sober *drunk*enness (Lat. *sobria ebrietas*) mentioned is evidently mystical knowledge (Acts 2:13; 15-16). What Jesus says about Thomas in sentence 5 means that he has already reached the presence of God. Therefore, Jesus can say, 'I am not your teacher.'" Cf. Meyer, 2003: 45.

[77] Valantasis (1997: 76) comments that, "The metaphor of the bubbling spring or fountain may be part of the stock characterization of the relationship of initiant to the divinized spiritual guide." He (1997: 76) states further, "The correlative traditions in the Gospel of John of the living water for the thirsty, both to the woman at the well (4:13-15) and at the great feast (7:38), underscore the possibility of a cultural discourse about spiritual direction as metaphorized as active water, bubbling water that activates the revelatory process in the seeker. That all three of these texts have the same element witnesses to the existence of such a metaphor for spiritual direction."

[78] Charlesworth (1995: 374) observes that, "According to *log* 13, Thomas knows the meaning Jesus sought; consequently, Jesus replies that he is no longer Thomas' master. Jesus then states that Thomas has drunk from the spring he has measured out, thus fulfilling the requirement of *log* 108 which also stipulated that such a disciple would receive the revelation of the hidden meaning of Jesus' words." Charlesworth develops an ideological connection between log 1, 13, and 108.

master; fourth, Thomas is drunk on the wisdom of Jesus and God;[79] and fifth, Thomas receives a special revelation from Jesus that cannot be shared with others. From these observations, a reader can understand Thomas's unique leadership role, his special knowledge about Jesus, and his unparalleled position in early Christianity.[80]

Thomas's character: An analysis

The characters such as James the Just (log 12), Simon Peter (log 13, 114), Matthew (log 13), Thomas (prologue, log 13, postscript), Mary (log 21, 114), and Salome (log 61) appear as interlocutors either explicitly or implicitly within the framework of the *GTh*. But Thomas's character appears superior in discipleship, leadership, and esoteric wisdom. Peter and Thomas appear together in log 13 and John 21:2. While log 13 mentions the connection between Thomas and Matthew, this connection is also seen in Matthew 10:3.[81] While Mary is one of the significant characters in log 21 and 114, Thomas and Mary are paired in John 20. While the Synoptic evangelists mention the name of Thomas within the list of the disciples, John's narrative masterplan develops along the line of Thomas's character.[82] As in the case of the Gospel of John, the *GTh* foregrounds the character of Thomas as a superior figure.[83] The common name given for Thomas in the Synoptics is "Thomas" (Mk 3:18; Mt. 10:3; Lk. 6:15). In John and the *GTh*, the character is introduced with extended

[79] Valantasis (1997: 75–76) states, "Jesus' response is a mixed metaphor: one part of it relates to drinking and intoxication, the other part of it relates to a bubbling spring. The metaphor indicates Thomas has drunk too much of Jesus, that his characterization of Jesus as ineffable results from Thomas' too free an imbibing in Jesus' presence."

[80] Klauck (2003: 114) states, "Logion 13 leaves no doubt that the real leader is Thomas." Cf. Mt. 16:13; Mk 8:27; Lk. 9:18.

[81] In Luke's Gospel, he mentions his dependency on several traditions: "just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (Lk. 1:2). When he uses expressions such as "those who from the beginning," "eyewitnesses," and "servants of God," readers can infer aspects of apostolic traditions. In the case of Thomas, he was a witness of the most important event, the resurrection of Jesus (John 20)

[82] Cf. Skinner, 2009: 227.

[83] Our attempt here is not to deal with the *community-conflict hypothesis* (i.e., a conflict between the Thomasine community and Johannine community), but to deal with the commonalities in the presentation of the character Thomas. Skinner (2009: xx) states that Riley, Pagels, DeConick, and others based their propositions "partially upon a community conflict that reveals itself through the not-so-subtle 'polemic' of Thomas' negative characterization in the Fourth Gospel." See Riley, 1995; Pagels, 1999: 477–96; DeConick, 2001: 303–12; Skinner, 2009.

names: in John, he is named "Thomas the Twin" or "Didymus Thomas" (except in 14:5); in the *GTh*, he is called "Didymus Judas Thomas" (log 1).[84] Here, we see the resemblances between John and the *GTh* in capturing the character of Thomas.[85] Meyer (2007: 779) states, "In Syria, particularly in the region of the Osrhoëne in Eastern Syria, with its dynamic community of Edessa, the tradition of the Twin was revered, and Thomas was referred to as Judas Thomas or Didymus Judas Thomas."[86] This common information emphasizes the significance of the Johannine and Thomasine traditions.[87] This analysis enables us to observe the following features common to both texts: first, Thomas is addressed with an extended name; second, Thomas is affirmed as a leader; third, the character appears as a unique personality; and fourth, Thomas affirms his superior knowledge about Jesus.[88]

The *GTh* is revelatory as it reveals Jesus's sharing of esoteric wisdom with Thomas (log 1, 13).[89] If we consider Jesus as a philosopher (as Matthew does in log 13) who practiced the social norms of his day and shared both the exoteric and esoteric wisdom with his disciples, then Jesus would have followed the social practices of Mediterranean antiquity where philosophers shared esoteric wisdom only with their *mature* disciples (i.e., *ho teleios*).[90] The disciples who followed a master had to prove their progress in the moral and spiritual arena by passing through the first two stages (i.e., *ho archomenos* [beginner] and *ho prokoptoōn* [one who was making progress]).[91] If Jesus was sharing the esoteric wisdom with Thomas, then he would have presumably reached the third and last stage of his discipleship under Jesus. The exchange of knowledge in the *GTh* exemplifies Jesus's sharing of esoteric wisdom with Thomas. Here, we see similarities between the presentations of Thomas in John 20 and in the *GTh*,

[84] Cf. Layton, 1987: 359; Charlesworth, 1995: 370–77.

[85] In the Eastern Syrian traditions, he is called "Judas Thomas" (see *Acts of Thomas*). Moreover, in some old versions of the Syriac New Testament (third/fourth centuries), the Judas of John 14:22 is mentioned either simply as 'Thomas' (in the *Sinaitic*) or as 'Judas Thomas' (in the *Curetonian*). See Meyer, 2007: 779.

[86] If Thomas is proved to be the literal twin brother of Jesus and brother of James, and if James of Jude 1 is proved to be the brother of Jesus, then it is easier to prove that the Epistle of Jude was also a written composition of Judas Thomas. Cf. Meyer, 2007: 779; Layton, 1987: 359.

[87] Cf. Skinner, 2009: 227–33.

[88] Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 370–77; Skinner, 2009: 227–33.

[89] Cameron (1982: 24) states, "Fundamentally, the Gospel of Thomas is an esoteric book which, according to catechetical instruction imparted in saying 50, reveals one's origin ('the light'), identity ('elect' 'children'), and destiny ('repose')."

[90] Cf. Talbert, 1989: 6.

[91] See Talbert, 1989: 6.

that is, between one who believed only after seeing tangible evidence (John 20) and one who receives direct sharing from Jesus (*GTh*).[92] Charlesworth (1995: 376) comments, "As the Gospel of John presents Thomas as the one true disciple who grasps who Jesus is—confessing him in the grand climax as Lord and God—so the *Gospel of Thomas* elevates Thomas above all the apostles." While the Synoptic evangelists place Peter as the leading disciple of their story, John introduces Thomas as a leading figure and the profoundest proclaimer.[93] Similarly, in the *GTh*, it is Thomas who comes to insight.[94] As Thomas was considered to be a figure who was sharing esoteric wisdom from Jesus, a reader can infer the following things: first, Thomas's superior knowledge about the person of Jesus; second, his influence among the early Christian circles; third, his access to the traditions and the "life situation" of Jesus; and fourth, his prominence as a proclaimer (oral traditions) and appointed figure for writing down traditions (cf. *Pistis Sophia*).

Concluding remarks

I would like to wrap up this discussion of the *GTh* with the following observations. Didymus Judas Thomas was one among the twelve apostles (i.e., the nucleus of the church), one who was distinct from others in comprehension and status, and one who was sharing the esoteric wisdom of Jesus. Jesus's confidence in Thomas to reveal the secret wisdom is an important aspect to consider. While esoteric wisdom was usually shared among the mature disciples, Jesus shares it with Thomas. The constant interactions between Jesus and Thomas made the latter develop from "beginner" to

[92] See more similarities in Charlesworth, 1995: 372–73. But, Dunderberg (2006) argues that John and *GTh* were developed independently from one another.

[93] Lapham (2003: 115) states, "Inconsequential variations in text would seem to point not only to the fact that 'Thomas' was not slavishly following the Synoptic text, but also that his Gospel was dependent either upon remembered Synoptic text, or upon an early tradition (written or oral) which the Synoptic writers also knew."

[94] Patterson (1993: 170) states, "While in the synoptic tradition one sees their influence only through the veil of the more pressing interests of the communities in which those texts were written, in Thomas one encounters the tradition of wandering radicalism more clearly. As the communities of synoptic Christianity gradually settled into a more conventional style of living, Thomas Christianity did not. It continued the tradition of marginal social behavior as an expression of its negative evaluation of the world and of its hope in a salvation gained through careful attention to Jesus' words." Cf. Meyer and Bloom, 1992: 74.

"mature," from "incomprehension" to "comprehension," from "unknowing" to "knowing," and from "doubting" to "believing."[95] Thomas's expression of surprise in log 13d, "Master, my mouth is wholly incapable of saying whom you are like," is in several ways similar to his expressions in John's Gospel (11:16; 14:5; 20:25b, 28).[96] His single utterance in log 13 makes us aware of his genuine and non-hypocritical nature. While Simon Peter and Matthew categorize Jesus within their limited sense (as "righteous angel" and "wise philosopher"), Thomas finds him ineffable. For Thomas, faith and knowledge are progressive and evidential (as in the case of Jn 20:24-28; cf. log 13d). Thomas's determination to see, seek, and believe (as in John) exemplifies him as a person "who seeks until he finds . . . disturbed . . . marveling . . . and reigning over all" (cf. log 2). While Peter is elevated as the key figure among the disciples in the Synoptics, Thomas is heightened as the leading figure in the *GTh*. While James the Just is respected, Thomas is the receiver of the secret wisdom. As Cameron (1992: 535) suggests, "though James is respected (log 12; cf. Gal 1:19; 2:9, 12), his authority is succeeded in *GTh* by that of Thomas (log 13)." Thomas's constant conversation with Jesus as his master's twin and his sharing of the secret wisdom with others made him a "key personality" in the first-century Christendom. This point can be substantiated with the multiple traditions related to the person and work of Thomas.

[95] Cf. Skinner, 2009: xxi–xxii.

[96] See more details concerning the relationship between the Gospel of John and the *GTh* in Charlesworth, 1995: 374–77; Pokorný, 2009: 15–16.

6

The Book of Thomas the Contender

Introduction

The *Book of Thomas* (*BTh*) purports to be a revelation dialogue between the Savior Jesus and Didymus Judas Thomas (138:4–142:21); then it evolves into a discourse of Jesus (from 142:21 to the end). The story as a whole is set between the post-resurrection and pre-ascension time frame.[1] It occupies the final eight pages of Nag Hammadi Codex 2 and is complete except for a few, often restorable, lines at the bottom of each page.[2] Turner (2000: 2: 173) stated: "The present Coptic version was doubtless translated from Greek. The existence of the text is otherwise unattested in antiquity. But one of its sources was apparently a collection of sayings of Jesus attributed to Mathaias."[3] The text begins with the mention of three figures (i.e., the Savior Jesus, Didymus

[1] Klauck (2003: 176) states, "No title is found at the head of this work in the codex, but two titles are given in the *subscription*: 'The Book of Thomas. The Contender writing to the Perfect.' These are two syntactically independent units, which ought not to be fused into one single title, even if we admit the probability that the last hand to work on this text equated 'Thomas' and the 'Contender.'" Turner (2000: 2: 174) comments, "Stylistically and in terms of its constituent material the work falls clearly into two major sections. These are approximate representations of two distinct and once independent literary works or sources that were subsequently combined—without perfect consistency—by a later author." Also see Layton, 1987: 400–1; Ehrman, 2013: 412.

[2] Turner (1992: 6: 529) states, "The subscripted title designates the work as the 'book' of 'Thomas the athletes [i.e., "one who struggles" against the fiery passions of the body] writing to the perfect,' while the opening lines designate the work as 'secret sayings' spoken by Jesus to Judas Thomas and recorded by Mathaias as he heard them speaking." See Klauck, 2003: 176–77; Layton, 1987: 400–41; Lapham, 2003: 126–29; cf. Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 307.

[3] Sayings collections attributed to such a person are mentioned by Papias (ca. 130 CE), Clement of Alexandria (late second century), and Hippolytus (early third century). Layton (1987: 402) observes, "The original Greek apparently does not survive. The text is known only in Coptic translation, attested by a single manuscript from Nag Hammadi, MS NHC 2 (138–45), which was occupied just before 350 CE and is now in the Cairo Coptic Museum." Marjanen (1998: 83–84) comments, "The Book of Thomas differs from the Gospel of Thomas in making a clear distinction between the recipient (Thomas) and the scribe (Mathaias). In fact, this distinction is obscured by the title given to the writing at its end ('The Book of Thomas,' 145:17). The double ascription of the writing, along with other factors, has led scholars to assume multiple layers behind the Book of Thomas." Also see Lapham, 2003: 126; Ehrman, 2013: 412; Layton, 1987: 400–41.

Thomas, and Mathaias) and a narrative description of how they are connected to one another. Layton (1987: 400) argued: "The date of composition of the *BTh* is unknown; in any case, it must be before 350 CE, the approximate date of the manuscript, and later than that of *GTh*, to which (*GTh* prologue, 1) allusion is made in *BTh* 138:1-3."[4] Considering Layton's statement as a general observation, a date between the second half of the second century and the first half of the third century CE is widely proposed.[5] Turner (2007: 236) states:

> The *Book of Thomas* seems to be a product of the late second century, occupying a median position between the Gospel of Thomas—a saying collection probably originating in the first century—and the Acts of Thomas—a third-century Greek romance about Thomas' exploits as a missionary in India—in three respects: (1) date of composition; (2) relative predominance of the role played by Thomas in these works; and (3) increasing predominance of narrative features as one moves from sayings collection to dialogue to romance.[6]

As Turner points out, all these traditions together (including the Gospel of John and the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas [IGTh]*) set a strong foundation for the "Thomasology" of the early Christian centuries. Though the text is usually called "The Book of Thomas," the Coptic text (NHC 2:7: 138:1-145:19; 145:20-23) includes a secondary title in the manuscript: "The Contender Writing to the Perfect."[7] In the text, Mathaias appears as one who walks, listens, and records the conversation that occurs between Jesus and Thomas (138:1-3).[8] While the name Mathaias resembles the name of disciple Matthew and the replacement apostle Matthias (Acts 1:26),[9] a more probable identification is in favor of the disciple Matthew on account of the repeated pairing of Matthew and Thomas

[4] See Klauck, 2003: 177.

[5] Lapham (2003: 126) comments, "Since it may display some acquaintance with both the Gospel of Thomas and the Acts of Thomas, however, the book is unlikely to have been written much before the beginning of the third century." Also see Layton, 1987: 400–41.

[6] Cf. Germond, 1996: 352; Layton, 1987: 400–41; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 308; Barnstone and Meyer, 2006: 396.

[7] Cf. Turner and Meyer, 2007: 239; Klauck, 2003: 176–77.

[8] Marjanen (1998: 84) further states, "However, the 'tension' between its incipit and its title is more apparent than real, for the title indicates only that Thomas, the interlocutor, was regarded as a more prominent figure for its hermeneutic than its alleged author, Mathaias; the latter has obviously assumed the secondary role of being merely the scribe in this writing. For this reason it is in fact not at all surprising that the writing is entitled 'the Book of Thomas.'" Also see Lapham, 2003: 126–29; Layton, 1987: 400–01.

[9] Cf. Turner and Meyer, 2007: 239.

in several accounts (see Mt. 10:3; cf. Mk 3:18; Lk. 6:15; *GTh* 13).[10] Thomas and Matthew are also connected in other writings, such as the *Pistis Sophia*, where Mariam exclaims that Jesus secretly taught his revelation to Philip, Thomas, and Matthew (1:43).[11] As in the case of the prologue of the *Gospel of Thomas* (*GTh*), in the *BTh,* Jesus is introduced as the revealer of the "hidden sayings" (138:1-4, 4-21; 138:21–139:31).[12] Thomas is also introduced as one who knows himself and hence is eligible to share knowledge with the Savior (138:4-21). The relationship between Jesus and Thomas is one of the peculiar features in all the aforementioned writings, especially the *BTh*.

Ideological world of the *Book of Thomas*

A careful analysis of the *BTh* reveals several inferences about its thought-world. The religious and philosophical framework reflects the ideological world that the text represents. Turner (2000: 173–78) argues that the ideology of the *BTh* is derived from the Thomasine school.[13] Its integral connection with the *GTh* and the *Acts of Thomas* (*ATh*) strengthens this argument.[14] Lapham (2003: 129) states, "The Thomasine tradition . . . undoubtedly belongs to Mesopotamia; and the earliest section of the book—the dialogue between Thomas and the Savior—focuses on that encratite ideal which was

[10] But Layton (1987: 400–01) has the following observation: "In the opening paragraph of *BTh*, the author states that he is a certain Mathaias, and claims to have compiled it by editing eyewitness records of conversations between the apostle Jude Thomas and 'the savior' (Jesus); the work is thus probably an example of pseudepigraphy." Cf. Barnstone and Meyer, 2006: 395; Lapham, 2003: 126–29; Turner, 1992: 529.

[11] When talking about Mathaias, Klauck (2003: 178) says, "At any rate, he too is one of the twelve apostles, and he is directly linked, as narrator, to the transformation of an underlying monologue into a dialogue: not only does he hear what 'the Savior spoke to Judas Thomas,' but he also hears them 'speak with one another.' Purely by chance, he overhears their dialogue and bears witness to it." Marjanen (1998: 83) states, "The *Book of Thomas* does not only identify its author, Mathaias, but it also includes a brief account of an incident in which he happened to hear Jesus' discussion with Thomas and wrote it down." See Ehrman, 2013: 412; Layton, 1987: 400–01.

[12] Klauck (2003: 176–77) states, "It is usually supposed that the *risen* Jesus speaks to Thomas, and that the dialogue takes place during an apparition; one indicator in favor of this hypothesis is Thomas' request to Jesus, 'Therefore I beg you to tell me what I ask before your ascension' (138:21-25). However, we are not told explicitly that Jesus 'appears,' nor does the text end with his 'departure.'"

[13] See Perrin, 2000: 4.

[14] Riley (1995: 157) says further: "It is in many ways a continuation and development of the Thomas Christianity found in the *Gospel of Thomas*, displaying several parallels and dependencies of both theme and specific content."

the prevailing ethic of these regions during the second century."[15] From these arguments, one can understand the immediate ideological milieu of the *BTh*.[16] Moreover, the *BTh* also shows some resemblances with the Platonic and Hellenistic variants of wisdom.[17] In the text, like some of the philosophical and religious traditions of the time, the body is considered as part of the visible realm and therefore is perceived as impermanent and mutable.[18] For Turner (2007: 601), the major theme of the *BTh* is the "unbending asceticism that condemns anything to do with the flesh, supplemented by the Platonic-Hermetic-Gnostic theme of salvation by self-knowledge."[19] Even some of the Jewish sapiential texts maintained strong tendencies of sexual asceticism.[20] The narrator employs *erotapokriseis* ("question and answer" genre) as the prevalent form in order to frame the ideology of the text.[21]

The monologue section of the *BTh* reflects several literary influences of the early centuries. Layton (1987: 401) states, "The second half, or sayings section, continues the topic of the wise and the fool, now in the form of an eschatological monologue or *sermon*. Here the savior describes the punishment of hell that awaits the fool in the *underworld*, comparable to traditional Greek underworld (*nekyia*) literature. The sermon concluded with traditional *woes and blessings* and an eschatological *call to wakefulness*."[22] The

[15] There are other apocryphal writings (some of them are gospels) that sustain the dialogue form, such as *The Sophia Jesu Christi*, *Epistula Apostolorum*, *The Gospel of Mary*, *The Apocryphon of John*, and *The Dialogue of the Savior*. See Klauck, 2003: 145–91; Barnstone and Meyer, 2006: 395–96.

[16] As Schenke (1991: 232–40) states, behind the present *BTh* may be a Jewish source in the form of a letter said to be authored by Jacob the contender. Cf. Barnstone Meyer, 2006: 395.

[17] Klauck (2003: 184) comments, "We encounter an extraordinary number of Platonic commonplaces in BTh . . . the world of BTh is no longer the down-to-earth, practical wisdom of the Book of Proverbs, but the Platonizing, Hellenistic variant of this wisdom." It could possibly refer to Platonic traditions generally, or to Jewish wisdom traditions that have been associated with or interpreted through Plato—as, for example, in the Wisdom of Solomon.

[18] See Layton, 1987:400; Riley, 1995: 159, 163.

[19] See Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 308; Ehrman, 2013: 412.

[20] Klauck (2003: 177) states, "When we bear in mind the character of the underlying work—a Jewish saliently text with a strong tendency to sexual asceticism—we see that the *athlete* is the *ascetic*." Klauck (2003: 177) further says, "In the Jewish tradition, the model 'athlete' in this sense was Jacob, primarily because of the nocturnal struggle related at Gen 32:23-32." Also see Price, 2011: chapter 19.

[21] Turner (2000: 2: 173–74) states, "This type of dialogue is not the same as Plato's, where one discovers truth by a maieutic dialectic of statement, counterstatement, and clarification—in which knowledge is recalled or 'delivered to birth.' Rather it is closely related to the literature now sometimes called *erotapokriseis* ('questions and answers'), for in it a would-be initiative elicits revealed truth from a revealer figure or similar spiritual authority in the form of a catechetical question (topic) and interpretative answer (commentary)." Cf. Liebenberg, 2001: 522.

[22] Lapham (2003: 127) states further: "What is clear is that the second part—the woes and blessings—owes a great deal to the apocalyptic visions of the second-century Judaeo-Christian writings, and especially, perhaps, to the *Apocalypse of Peter*." See Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 308.

continuous "woes" (143:8–145:1) and "blessings" (145:1-19) from the mouth of the Savior are reminiscent of many of the passages of the canonical Gospels (cf. Lk. 6:20-26 [Q]).[23] This evidence makes the reader aware that the narrator of the *BTh* was influenced by his surroundings.[24] Based on this information, a reader of the *BTh* can derive the following observations: first, the narrator of the text engages himself with the religious and philosophical ideologies of his time; second, the text foregrounds the character of Thomas as a "laborer" and "learner" of the secret wisdom of God (138:34-35); third, it reflects the widespread engagement of the Thomasine community with the ideologies of the early centuries; and fourth, these aspects reveal that Thomasine Christianity emphasized both divine and worldly knowledge.

Thomas in the *Book of Thomas*

In the *BTh*, Thomas appears as Jesus's interlocutor right from the beginning. The work as a whole opens with a short introduction: "The obscure sayings that the Savior uttered to Judas Thomas, and which I, Mathaias, also wrote down. I used to travel and listen to them as they were talking to one another" (138:1-3).[25] The three characters in the introductory statement appear as follows: first, Jesus, the Savior who shares secret wisdom with his spiritual twin brother; second, Thomas, the active interlocutor of Jesus in the story; and third, Mathaias, one who walks with them, listens to them, and records their speech. Layton (1987: 401) comments, "The style of the *BTh* is often obscure, perhaps in keeping with the author's characterization of the work as 'obscure sayings' (138:1-3)."[26] In the monologue section, Thomas is in the background

[23] See Klauck, 2003: 183.

[24] Butcher (2000: 147) comments, "Looking for continuities between . . . teachings in *The Book of Thomas the Contender* and those of the historic Jesus, one might notice the similarity in literary form in the Beatitudes." See Turner, 2000: 2: 174–77.

[25] When commenting about the title, Turner (2000: 2: 173) states, "Two titles occur: (1) the subscript title, which designates the work as a 'book' of 'Thomas the *athlētēs* writing to the perfect'; and (2) the incipit (138:1-4), which designates it as 'secret sayings' spoken by Jesus to Judas Thomas and recorded by Mathaias as he overheard them speaking." See Hennecke, 1959/1963: 307; Barnstone and Meyer, 2006: 395; Klauck, 2003: 176–77.

[26] The *Secret Book of John* and the *Book of Thomas the Contender* lay claim to representing the secret teaching of the savior, namely the risen Christ, with the same term "secret words." See Roukema, 2010, 132.

as Jesus takes full control over the speech (142:26–145:15). Whether Thomas appears in the text as a figure of authentication is a significant question.[27] Marjanen (1998: 82–83) comments, "The use of Jesus' disciples as figures of authentication is, of course, not confined to the Gospel of John and the *Gospel of Thomas*. On the contrary, this notion has been embraced by various early Christian writers . . . *Book of Thomas* and *Pistis Sophia* provide us with prime examples of this tendency."[28] The narrator of the extended story intends first to delineate Jesus's closeness with Thomas and second to authenticate the voice of Thomas as a prominent character of the early Christian centuries. In the text, the narrator describes a conversation between the Savior and Thomas (138:1-3). The Savior admonishes Thomas for not having acquaintance with his own self (138:4-15).[29] He makes it plain that acquaintance with the Savior is acquaintance with the self,[30] and thus he inspires him to "be called the man who knows himself."[31] By being acquainted with his own self, Thomas can be acquainted with the Savior and with "the depth of the entirety."[32] Moreover, Jesus promises a disclosure to him concerning what Thomas has thought

[27] Butcher (2000: 149) comments, "The continuities and extensions of the teachings of Jesus seem clear in *The Book of Thomas the Contender*." Hennecke (1959/1963: 308) states, "The last two pages reproduce a long discourse by Jesus, which closes with an 'Amen!' It is divided into two parts, of which the first contains threats and maledictions ('Woe to you who . . .') and the second benedictions ('Blessed are ye who . . .')."

[28] In many others, the disciples appear as narrators of the story (e.g., the *Gospel of Peter*, the *Apocryphon of John*, the *Apocalypse of Peter*) or as writers of the story (e.g., the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, the *Protevangelium of James*).

[29] Klauck (2003: 178–79) comments, "The summons to self-knowledge need not automatically be interpreted in Gnostic terms, since Jesus goes on to tell Thomas, 'And you will be called *the one who knows himself*' (138:15-19). These words recall the famous maxim, 'Know yourself,' which stood above the entrance to the temple of the oracular god Apollo at Delphi."

[30] Layton (1987: 400) comments, "The first half of the work concerns acquaintance or self-knowledge (*gnōsis*) and the valuelessness of the flesh. The second half (142:21 till the end) is harshly ascetical and sermonlike, describing in detail the punishment that awaits the foolish person in hell and condemning the fool, who is subject to the influence of flesh." At the same time, Butcher (2000: 149) comments, "There are also some serious discontinuities. For example: 'Woe to you who love intimacy with womankind and polluted intercourse with it!' (*BTh* 144:9). Chalk this one up to the writer of Thomas the Contender's own inner battles." Barnstone and Meyer (2006: 395) state, "the text contains sayings of Jesus and a dialogue between Jesus and Thomas, along with a sermon by Jesus on sinners who face judgment."

[31] Turner (1992: 6: 529) states, "By 'knowing himself' Thomas would also know the 'depth of the all,' whence the Savior came and whither he was about to return, and thus become a missionary possessing the true teaching of Jesus." Layton (1987: 401) states, "The savior's revelation in this dialogue takes the form of a philosophical *treatise* broken up into a series of lengthy replies given by the savior. These include an explicit discussion of the mystical theology implied by the model of divine twinship; and apocalyptic description of the fate of souls and bodies and of the character of the wise and the fool."

[32] See Van Oort, 2008: 219.

about in his heart (138:4-6).[33] Turner (2000: 2: 174) comments, "As the savior's twin, Thomas had a claim to direct insight into the nature of the savior and his teaching. Hence by 'knowing himself,' Thomas would also know the 'depth of the all' whence the savior came and whither he was going to return, and could therefore become a missionary possessed of the true (here, ascetic) teaching of Jesus." This personal acquaintance that Thomas shared with Jesus enabled him to "see what is obscure to humankind."[34]

At the outset of the *BTh*, the dialogue develops around the theme of obscure things.[35] Thomas consistently requests that the Savior impart the secret knowledge. He is introduced as one who has "personally seen what is obscure to humankind and what people are impeded by when they lack acquaintance" (138:19-20). In 138:21-37, Thomas asks the Savior yet again to receive the knowledge of obscure things. He says to Jesus: "I have heard from you about the obscure things" (138:24-25). This statement can mean that Thomas heard obscure things *once*, and now he requests the master to explain them in detail. Lapham (2003: 128) states, "It is Thomas' task to propagate abroad the 'secret words' entrusted to him through his dialogue with the savior. He is to proclaim the imperative nature of the ecstatic way of life in the struggle for perfection."[36] The Savior's response to Thomas bifurcates between the visible and the invisible things.[37] His response to Thomas reveals two significant aspects: first, even the deeds of truth that are visible in the world are obscure for human beings (138:27-34); and second, if that is the case, how can the exalted majesty and fullness be visible to them? Thomas responded: "Tell us about the things you

[33] The Savior continues, "those who have only known themselves have also received acquaintance with the depth of the entirety" (138:17-19). Also see Horman, 2011: 213.

[34] Barnstone and Meyer (2006: 395–96) comment, "Within the Book of Thomas the utterances of Jesus sometimes recall sayings and themes in the Gospel of Thomas. Here Jesus comments on Judas the twin, on knowledge of self, on what is hidden and what is visible, on the desires of flesh, and on wisdom and foolishness."

[35] Lapham (2003: 127) states, "A radical alteration in style begins within p. 142 of the Codex, the dialogue suddenly becoming a monologue in which the Savior pronounces a series of woes and blessings, after the manner of Synoptic Beatitudes. The customary explanation of this change is that the *Book of Thomas* is in fact a composite work comprising two quite different texts, joined because of their common ascetic theme." Cf. Turner, 2007: 237.

[36] Lapham (2003: 128) continues, "Like the Prophets before him, however, Thomas is concerned that his preaching might fall on deaf ears; and he tells the Savior of his fear that all who preach such a message will become 'laughing-stocks to the world.'"

[37] Jesus asks: "If things that are visible unto you (pl.) are obscure to you, how can you hear about those that are not visible? If the deeds of truth that are visible in the world are difficult for you (pl.) to do, how then will you do those of exalted majesty and of the fullness, which are not visible?" (138:27-34).

are saying, for they are not obvious to us, [but, rather], obscure" (138:36-38). In the *BTh*, Thomas's intimacy with the Savior, his curiosity to know the secret wisdom, and his representative role as one who engages in dialogue are brought to the attention of the reader. In 139:20, Thomas acknowledges the Savior as one who gives enlightenment. In response, Jesus tells him that what he teaches is "the teaching of those who are perfect" (140:8-14). Then he offers Thomas the choice to either be perfect or to be ignorant (140:11-14). As Thomas was taught the perfect knowledge of the Savior, he was considered "perfect in every (kind of) wisdom."[38] Still, he must strive hard to achieve the majesty of perfection.[39] Thomas said: "It is obvious—indeed, it has been said—that [many . . .] those who are not acquainted . . . soul(s)." The Savior's response in 140:40-41 is: "[Blessed (?) is] the wise person who has [sought truth]; once having found it, has relied upon it forever; and has not feared those who wish to cause a disturbance."[40] Here, the people are characterized into three groups: first, those who are ignorant; second, those who are perfect in the world; and third, those who strive hard to attain the majesty of perfection. Jesus counted Thomas in the second category and encourages him to make progress toward the third.

Thomas was willing to surrender, work hard and remain attentive, and he was eager to learn. His attitude of surrender is reflected through his statement: "It is you, Lord, who should speak and I, who should listen to you" (142:7-8). His last words in the *BTh* mark a distinction between himself (and his community) and the world outside: "Truly, you have persuaded us, Lord; we have thought with our hearts, and it is obviously thus. And your utterance is free of envy" (142:18-25). As the spiritual sibling of Jesus, Thomas was well acquainted with the Savior. The Savior uttered to him the secret wisdom so that the community he represents might be guided by the mysterious truths. As Thomas represents his community, he wishes his community to be wise in every way. This is marked by the plural form of address used by the Savior. Jesus expects the community of Thomas to be "laborers" and at the same time "learners" (138:34-35). He says that the majesty of perfection can be attainable

[38] Lapham (2003: 126–27) comments, "Thomas is given to understand that, while he is yet far from achieving perfection, he alone, among the Twelve, because he is the Savior's 'twin and sole true friend,' has begun to comprehend the truth which remains hidden to others."

[39] On one occasion, Jesus said to Thomas: "You (pl.) are children until you become mature" (139:11).

[40] Also see Barnstone and Meyer, 2006: 396; Klauck, 2003: 181.

to them only through "labor" and "learning" (138:34-35). Thomas's consistent request to the Savior to know the obscure things (of God) rather than worldly things makes him a unique character in every respect (138:36-37). The Savior urges Thomas to move away from the world of the visible to the invisible (138:27-38), from the body to the soul (138:39-139:11; 141:5-17), from ignorance to intelligence (140:8-14), from foolishness to wisdom, and from falsehood to truth (140:15-37). Jesus acknowledges that Thomas is a learner but at the same time he has not yet received the majesty of perfection. As a person surrenders himself before the Savior, and labors and learns, he develops from the status of perfection to the majesty of perfection. Thomas's response to Jesus suggests that it is Jesus who should speak and he should listen (142:7). Thomas's final utterance in 142:18-24 affirms the following things: first, Jesus persuades Thomas and the rest of the disciples; second, Thomas and his companions understood Jesus's utterance clearly; third, Jesus's utterance is free of envy; fourth, though the utterances of Jesus are laudable for those who follow him, they are laughable and ridiculous for most who are of this world; and fifth, the disciples find it difficult to proclaim the words of Jesus because they are not esteemed [in] the world. Thomas as a responsible person has the following goals to fulfill: first, to lead the people of the world from ignorance to perfection; second, to maintain the status of the perfect in the world; and third, to lead his community from their perfect nature to the majesty of perfection.

As in the case of the Gospel of John, the *BTh* also develops within a dualistic framework. The dualism of body and soul plays a significant role within the ideology of the text.[41] The *BTh* 138:39–139:9 foregrounds this thematic contrast with the following emphasis:

> [All] bodies [of men and] beasts are begotten [irrational . . .] since the body is bestial. So just as the body of the beasts perishes, so also will these formations (i.e., the human body) perish. Do they not derive from intercourse like that of the beasts?

According to Klauck (2003: 179), the *BTh* 138:39–139:9 comprises the principal theme of the text. He (2003: 179) states: "This brings us to the true subject of the dialogue, viz. sexuality and procreation, which are seen as a prominent

[41] Riley (1995: 163–64) says, "The argument of the *Book of Thomas* is that the body is temporary and perishable, and an unworthy object of hope."

symptom of the imperfection, fragility and mortality of existence. The valuable part of the human person, his soul, must free itself from this dimension if it is to reach its own true home, which lies 'above.'" To reach the majesty of perfection, Thomas is instructed to abstain from bodily desires and to free his soul from all worldly pleasures. Klauck (2003: 180) considers 139:24-31 to be another significant passage:

> The Savior said, "O blessed Thomas, of course this visible light shone on your behalf—not in order [that] you remain here, but rather that you come forth—and whenever all the elect abandon bestiality, then this light will withdraw up to its essence, and its essence will welcome it since it is a good servant."[42]

Thomas is advised to follow the visible light so that it can guide him to the invisible light. Later, the metaphor changes from light to fire, which symbolizes the "fiery" form of the passions (139:33-42). The Savior says:

> O bitterness of the fire that burns in the bodies of men and in their marrow, burning in them night and day, burning in the limbs of men and [making] their minds drunk and their souls deranged [and moving] them within males and females [by day and] night and moving them [with] a [movement that moves] secretly and visibly. For the males [moves; they move upon the females] and the females upon [the males].[43]

Here, Thomas is advised to escape from the fiery passions of the world. These visible and fiery passions are a hindrance to him in freeing his soul and experiencing the invisible things above. Klauck (2003: 180) states, "The Book of Thomas now attempts to demonstrate by means of a new parable how one can escape from eros; one must take 'refuge' with the genuine wisdom, rather than with the false wisdom (cf. Prov 9:1-18). This lends wings to the soul, with which it can fly away and escape from lust."[44] Thus, the *BTh* frames its ideology within a dualistic framework as follows: first, the visible things are significant only as they instruct us to understand the invisible; and second,

[42] Klauck (2003: 180) comments, "The 'visible light' is the earthly sun, which carries out its task as a 'good servant' of the highest God. This entails activity 'here' (i.e., shining on this earth), but the true home of the sun is in heaven which lies still higher up."

[43] Cf. Klauck, 2003: 180; Hopkins, 2007: 76.

[44] Klauck (2003: 180) sees it as an image older than Plato's *Phaedrus*, and certainly not confined to Platonism.

the visible world comprises bodily things, but human beings should free their souls from bodily aspects.[45] Here, the Savior attunes the ethos of Thomas (and his community) in rhythm with the ethos of God.

Thomasine traditions including the *GTh* and the *BTh* reflect tenets of asceticism.[46] In the *BTh*, the bodies are those that arise from sexuality, feed on other bodies, engage in further sexuality, and perish in an unbroken cycle. This further delineates how lust causes humans to act as though mere beasts, engaging in sex only to make more bodies, all of which will perish. In the words of Riley (1995: 159; cf. 139:1-4), "sexuality is a sign of impermanence, mutability, and mortality."[47] The text in 139:6-11 states as follows:

> Indeed, just as the bodies of domestic animals perish, so too these modeled forms will perish. Does it (the body) not result from sexual intercourse like that of the domestic animals? If it, too, is from that (intercourse), how can it produce anything different than they do? For this reason, then, you (pl.) are children until you become mature.

Here, the narrator reinforces this notion through rhetorical questions and it is further stated in the monologue section (144:8-12) the following way:

> Woe unto you (pl.) who love the sexual intercourse that belongs to femininity and its foul cohabitation. And woe unto you (pl.) who are gripped by the authorities of your bodies; for they will afflict you. Woe unto you (pl.) who are gripped by the agencies of wicked demons.

These passages of the *BTh* explicitly state the necessity of abstaining from bodily interactions and sexual intercourse. Thus, there is a strong emphasis on the aspect of asceticism in the text. The ascetic mode of lifestyle emphasized in the *BTh* would have influenced the readers of the text. The Thomasine community's ascetic mode of lifestyle is well described within the framework

[45] Riley (1995: 167) states, "The visible and material world is destined to end, and along with it all flesh. The soul, which alone endures, must remain weightless and pure that it may 'come forth out of the visible realm' into the 'exalted height and the pleroma' (138:26, 33)."

[46] Turner (1992: 6: 529) comments, "This true teaching of Jesus turns out to be consistently ascetic. Its basic theme and catchword is 'fire,' the fire of bodily passions that torment the soul, and its counterpart in the flames of hell: one shall be punished by that by which one sins. Around this principal theme are gathered a number of conceptual oppositions." Cf. Scholer, 1997: 410.

[47] Riley (1995: 157) states about the *BTh* as follows: "It purports to be a revelation dialogue of Jesus and his twin brother Thomas which takes place between Easter and the ascension, during which Thomas asks Jesus about the secrets of spiritual truth."

of a post-resurrection conversation between Jesus and Thomas. Thomas's first utterance in 138:21-26 begins with his request to the Savior as follows: "So I beg you, then, before your ascension to tell me [about the] things I am asking you about." The events of the *BTh* are to be understood as post-resurrection deliberations between the Savior and Thomas. Both in the case of John's Gospel and the *BTh*, Thomas is well connected to the post-resurrection narratives (cf. Jn 20:24-28).[48] In all these traditions, Thomas is portrayed as a person who shares mysterious wisdom with Jesus and as a figure who manifests a superior status and role among the disciples.

The text shows the bond between Jesus and Thomas through the usage of titles. While the narrator introduces Thomas as "Judas Thomas" (138:1-4) and as "Judas, called Thomas" (142:1-26), Jesus addresses him in the following ways: "Brother Thomas" (twice), "My Twin," "True Friend," "My Brother," (138:4-21), and "Blessed Thomas" (138:21-139:31).[49] In the text, Jesus is introduced as the "Savior" (138:1-4, 4-21), "I am," and "the Knowledge of Truth" (138:4-21).[50] Hennecke (1959/1963: 308) describes, "From the first the Savior turns to his 'brother' Thomas, who is called his 'twin brother' and 'companion.' He promises him certain revelations, and the apostle requests him to impart them to him before his ascension."[51] As stated, Thomas is one who walks and converses with Jesus (138:4-21).[52] Their spiritual twin relationship is reflected through the usage of these titles. While Jesus appears as the sharer of knowledge, Thomas appears as one who follows what the Savior says. While Jesus accepts Thomas as a knowledgeable person, he considers the rest of the world as submerged in ignorance. Thomas's question to Jesus, "How can we go and preach them when we are [not] respected in the world?" makes much more sense in the larger

[48] Riley (1995: 157–58) states, "Like the Gospel of John and several later works of developing orthodoxy, it is also concerned among other things with resurrection and the fate of the body after death." Also see Ehrman, 2013: 412; Butcher, 2000: 149.

[49] Klauck (2003: 179) comments about the twin-brother tradition with the following words: "This was adopted by the Socratic-Platonic tradition and became a commonplace, not only in the general culture of educated persons in classical antiquity, but also in the Hellenistic Jewish sapiential tradition within which the author of the Book of Thomas stands."

[50] Charlesworth (1995: 377–78) comments, "As in the Gospel of John, so in the *BTh*, the premier disciple is Thomas. Its author has Jesus say to Thomas, 'you are my twin and true companion.'" Also see Papandrea, 2016: 53; Klauck, 2003: 178; Ehrman, 2013: 412.

[51] According to Charlesworth (1995: 378), "In the *Book of Thomas the Contender* Jesus tells Thomas, 'you are going to be called my sibling' (138:10). That verse begins with 'inasmuch as,' which apparently derives from an exegesis of John 19:27, and so identifies the Beloved Disciple under the cross as Thomas."

[52] Cf. 1995: 378.

context of the text (142:18-24). His question notes an ironic situation within the text: the knowledgeable are not respected in the world, and the ignorant rule it. The monologue of the *BTh* begins as a response to Thomas at that particular point (142:26–145:15). In the text, the vertical contrast (i.e., the one between the world "from above" and the world "from below") is highlighted (138:21–139:31) over against the horizontal contrast (i.e., the Synoptic tenet of the contrast between "this age" and the "age to come").[53] As Thomas and his community are counted in the category of perfect (and at the point of striving hard to achieve the majesty of perfection), they are recognized in the world "from above." Thus, the similarities between the *BTh* and the eschatological tenets of John's Gospel are striking and conspicuous.

While Thomas's utterances are shorter in length in comparison to Jesus's longer responses, his utterances function as persuasive questions that lead Jesus to engage with him. Moreover, the narrator pays more attention to Jesus's longer and revelatory utterances.[54] Themes such as "knowledge" (138:4-21), "truth," "light" (vs. "darkness," 138:21–139:31; 143:8-145:1), "wisdom" (139:31–141:2), "belief," "world" (141:2–142:26), and "judge"/"judgment" (142:26–143:7) are reminiscent of the themes of John's Gospel. Literary devices, such as rhetorical questions (138:21–139:31), enigmatic sayings (138:4-21), similitude (i.e., about "arrows at a target during the night," 138:21–139:31; "a tree growing by the stream of water," 139:31–141:2),[55] proverbial sayings (i.e., "the intelligent person is perfect in all wisdom," and "the wise person is nourished by truth," 139:31–141:2) and the like, are stylistically employed to interlock the reader with the text.[56] Thomas displays the intelligence needed to engage with the enigmatic sayings of Jesus, and thus his questions persuade Jesus to carry on his conversation with the interlocutor. Thus, the narrator of the story foregrounds the following: first, the interaction of Jesus and

[53] See Allison, 1992: 206–09; Caragounis, 1992: 417–30.

[54] The revelatory type of dialogues are also found in many pagan Hermetic and Gnostic Christian texts, including many from Nag Hammadi: *The Apocryphon of John* (NHC 2,1), *The Sophia of Jesus Christ* (NHC 3,4), *The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth* (NHC 6,6), *The Dialogue of the Savior* (NHC 3,5), and *The Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC 8,2). Turner (1992: 6: 529) says, "These dialogues are set at a time between the resurrection and ascension, when the Savior appeared on earth in his true divine form."

[55] See Klauck, 2003: 179.

[56] Turner (2000: 2: 174) states, "The material of section A consists of similes (139:13-20; 142:11-18), proverbial sayings (138:16-18; 138:28-30; 139:21; 140:1-4; 140:13-18; 140:38-40; 140:41-141:1), and a quotation of Psalm 1:3 (140:17-18)."

Thomas in a persuasive manner; second, Thomas's character as an ideal figure who inspires the reader to develop from ignorance to perfection and further from perfection to the majesty of perfection; third, the literary and narrative character of the *BTh* that demonstrates the performative function of the story of Thomas in relation to Jesus; and fourth, the mystical union of Thomas with Jesus and the resultant instructions he receives for spiritual maturity.

Concluding remarks

In recapitulation, the following aspects are significant regarding the characterization of Thomas. First, the *BTh* enables the reader to understand the engagement of the Thomasine community with that of the ideological and philosophical world of early Christian centuries. Second, the *BTh* provides further knowledge concerning Jesus's closer relationship with Thomas as a sharer of secret truth and revealer of hidden sayings. Third, the literary features and thematic aspects of the *BTh* are in several ways reminiscent of the Synoptics, *GTh*, and *ATh* (except in a few cases). Fourth, as in the case of the other East Syrian documents (i.e., *GTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh*), the *BTh* delineates Thomas as the "Twin Brother" of Jesus. Fifth, while the rest of the world is in ignorance, Thomas and his community have an attachment to Jesus and an ability to comprehend his sayings. Sixth, the development from ignorance by Thomas and his community and their endeavor to progress from perfection to the majesty of perfection is exemplified before the reader as a paradigm. And seventh, the thematic, character-based, and perspectival similarities of the Gospel of John with that of the Thomas literature (i.e., *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh*) highlight the personality of Thomas and his existence as a person of worth and integrity in the first-century Christian context. Thus, after the *GTh*, the *BTh* further establishes the character of Thomas (and his community) for wider efficacy.

7

The Acts of Thomas

Introduction

The apocryphal book that delineates the twelve great acts of Apostle Thomas (cc. 1–107, 114–158), the *Hymn of the Pearl* (cc. 108–113), and his martyrdom (cc. 159–170) is commonly entitled *The Acts of Thomas* (*ATh*) (i.e., *Periodei Thoma*).[1] This noncanonical work is usually considered to be an early third-century (i.e., 200–250 CE) literary composition.[2] Reference to the *ATh* by Epiphanius Salamis shows that it was in circulation in the fourth century.[3] According to Charlesworth (1995: 378–9), "The *Acts of Thomas* is so late that we should expect that it reflects knowledge of all the intra-canonical gospels; perhaps a *Diatessaron* was quoted . . . *The Acts of Thomas* must antedate Epiphanius (315–403) who refers to it."[4] The complete versions of the *ATh* in Syriac[5] and in Greek are available.[6] In addition, other full and partial versions

[1] For more details about *The Hymn of the Pearl*, refer to Layton, 1987: 366–75; Ferreira, 2002: 1–32. Layton (1987: 370) says, "In its known form, HPrl is part of a much larger work, *The Acts of Thomas*, which recounts the wanderings and adventures of an ascetic preacher Didymus Judas Thomas and the miracles he performed with the aid of his twin brother Jesus."

[2] Some scholars connected the *ATh* or the *Hymn of the Pearl* (chs. 108–13) with Bardaisan, the Syrian theologian of the second century. See Attridge, 1992: 6: 531.

[3] Attridge (1992: 6: 531) states, "The major Syriac witness (B.M. add. 14.645) dates to 936 CE. The earliest Syriac witness to the text, a fragmentary palimpsest (Sinai 30), dates from the 5th or 6th century. The major Greek witnesses (Paris. gr. 1510 and Vallicel. B 35) date to the 11th century, although there are partial Greek witnesses dating from the 10th. Some form of the work was clearly in circulation by the end of the 4th century when testimonies begin."

[4] Also refer to Quispel, 1975.

[5] Klijn (1962: 1) mentions, "The Syriac text of the *Acts of Thomas* is available in the following MSS: (1) Sinai 30, 5/6 CE cent. Edited by A. Smith Lewis; (2) B.M. add. 14. 645, 936 CE. Edited by W. Wright; (3) Mosul No. 86. Property of the Chaldean Patriarchate, 1711/12 CE; (4) Sachau No. 222, Berlin, 1881 CE. Edited by P. Bedjan; and (5) Cambridge, Add. 2822, 1883 CE." He further says, "The MSS Mosul No. 86 and Cambridge Add. 2822 are identical to Sachau No. 222. The MS Sachau is secondary to B.M." Also refer to Wright, 1871.

[6] Klijn (1962: 13–14) states, "Originally the *Acts of Thomas* were written in Syriac. The contents of the Acts show that the Greek version goes back to a stage of the Syriac version earlier than known from

of the text in Latin, Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic languages are also available.[7] But these versions are not as popular as the Syriac and Greek forms.[8] Attridge (1992: 6: 531) states, "Like other apocryphal acts combining popular legend and religious propaganda, the work (i.e., *ATh*) attempts to entertain and instruct. In addition to narratives of Thomas' adventures, its poetic and liturgical elements provide important evidence for early Syrian Christian traditions."[9] From the above statements of Charlesworth and Attridge, we can infer that the author(s) of the *ATh* would have incorporated the readily available gospel traditions into the text as well as the "popular legends and religious propaganda" around the historical personality of Apostle Thomas.

Like the other apocryphal Acts, the *ATh* contains the following: first, the propagation of the Gospel; second, the deeds and words of the Apostle; and third, the martyrdom of the Apostle.[10] While the canonical *Acts of the Apostles* received its written format in the first century itself, the traditions related to Thomas were circulated in their oral form at least until the beginning of the third century.[11] While the early church was too obsessed with Peter, John, James, and more extensively with Paul, and the traditions related to all of them, the inquisitive personality of Thomas received only minor or even scant attention. While the *Acts of Peter* (*APet*), *Acts of Paul* (*APaul*), and *Acts of John* (*AJohn*) were composed as complimentary works after the well-acclaimed Petrine, Pauline, and Johannine corpuses of early Christianity, there is no evidence to prove the existence of a widely acknowledged "Thomas corpus" after which the *ATh* would have emerged (with the exception of the *Gospel*

the Syriac version in the available MSS." See Lalleman, 2000: 68; cf. Bauckham, 1997: 72; Van den Bosch, 2001: 126.

7 For more details about all these versions, see Klijn, 1962: 8–13; Attridge, 1992: 6: 531.

8 Lapham (2003: 122) says, "Strong arguments have been adduced for a Greek original, but there is a growing consensus towards the primacy of the Syriac text, largely because of the many Syriasms found in the Greek versions." He (2003: 122) also says, "What is not given sufficient attention, however, is the possibility that the extant *Acts of Thomas* is a composite work which might be traced back to two distinct sources, one Syriac and one Greek, and that subsequent conflation has produced the present versions."

9 Attridge (1992: 6: 531) further states, "The work is clearly associated with Syria, and particularly with the city of Edessa, where Thomas was traditionally venerated. The apostle's martyrdom (chaps. 159–70) records the translation of his relics from India back to the West, presumably to Edessa." Also see Lalleman, 2000: 68.

10 See Klijn, 1962: 18.

11 Klijn (1962: 18) says, "Originally the propagation of the Gospel was the main subject for writing these Acts. This appears from the canonical Acts (Acts 1:8). As the Gospel was known to more people in the ancient world this topic fell into the back-ground."

of Thomas [*GTh*]).[12] In that sense, while *APet*, *APaul*, and *AJohn* emerged as works concerning the "key figures" of the early church, Thomas and the *ATh* would not have received such popular attention.[13] The following sections provide a closer analysis of the *ATh*.

Thomas within the narrative framework of the *Acts of Thomas*

In the *ATh*, the Apostle Thomas is described as the Apostle to the East, and more specifically as the Apostle of India.[14] The fourteen Acts of the book (including the *Martyrdom* section; cc. 159–170) are filled with dialogic interactions and dramatic movements (cc. 2, 3, 17, 18).[15] The plot development of the story is progressive (except the narrative breaks at several intervals) as it persuades the reader to move forward with greater anticipation.[16] The text comprises several micro-literary genres such as narratives, dialogues (cc. 2, 3, 17, 18), homilies (c. 28), prayers (cc. 10, 34), Christological utterances,[17] hymns,[18] and apocalyptic descriptions (cc. 22–24). It is arranged just like a literary composition that emerged out of the Judaeo-Christian thought-world.[19] In the process of reading the *ATh*, a reader might find numerous allusions to utterances and passages of the NT.[20] We may even suppose that the author knew all the books of the NT and the *GTh*.[21] The explicit and implicit

[12] The *ATh* shows considerable parallelism with the *APet* and the *APaul*; but it shows very little parallelism with the *AJohn*. Cf. Attridge, 1992: 6: 531; Klijn, 1962: 23–6; Bauckham, 1997: 70–72.

[13] There were five major noncanonical Acts such as *The Acts of John* (*AJohn*), *The Acts of Peter* (*APet*), *The Acts of Andrew* (*AAndr*), *The Acts of Thomas* (*ATh*), and *The Acts of Paul* (*APaul*). Cf. Lapham, 2003: 121. For more on the relationship between the *ATh* and other apocryphal Acts, see Klijn, 1962: 20–26; Attridge, 1992: 6: 531.

[14] Cc. 1, 2, 16, 17, 39, 42, 62, 98, 101, 108, 116, 117, 123, and 170. Cf. Klijn, 1962: 27–29. But Van den Bosch (2001: 136) has a different view: "the data in the *ATh* which might provide us with some historical and geographical information about Thomas' journey are so elusive that there is insufficient evidence to corroborate the hypothesis that the apostle actually went to India."

[15] See Attridge, 1992: 6: 531; Klijn, 1962: 65–66, 73–74, 166–69.

[16] See the narratorial breaks at cc. 1–16, 17–29, 30–61, 62–158, 159–170.

[17] Cc. 10, 25, 34, 39, 47, 48, 53.

[18] Cc. 6–7, 26, 108–113. See more details about the hymns of *ATh* in Attridge, 1992: 6: 533; Lapham, 2003: 123.

[19] Cf. Lalleman, 2000: 68.

[20] There are both explicit and implicit references to the passages of the canonical Old Testament and New Testament documents in the *ATh*. See Charlesworth, 1995: 378.

[21] See Charlesworth, 1995: 378; cf. Klijn, 1962: 49–51.

narrative echo effects of the canonical gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline corpus, the Book of Revelation, and even the Old Testament (esp. in Act 7) persuade the reader to believe that the *ATh* emerged out of the biblical story world.[22] In addition to its allegiance to the Judaeo-Christian thought-world, it compliments themes and ideologies from an extended Indian/Eastern world.[23]

The hymn in Act 1 (cc. 6–7) delineates the relationship between the bridal church and the bridegroom king. It maintains all the ingredients of the passages that narrate the relationship between the bridegroom (Jesus) and the bride (church) in the NT (cc. 14, 124, 135).[24] The hymn ends in a stylistically flavored *Trinitarian formula* (lines 50–55) that leads us back to the NT texts (2 Cor. 13:14). The appearance of speaking beings such as a black snake (Act 3; cf. Gen. 3:1-6), a colt (Act 4), a devil-like figure (Act 5; cf. Mt. 4:1-11; Lk. 4:1-13), and asses (Act 8; cf. Num. 22:30) is not a strange phenomenon for readers of the biblical narratives.[25] Thomas's involvement as an exorcist and the related demonic confessions (cc. 75, 77) are reminiscent of what Jesus had done in the canonical gospels.[26] The *ATh* contains developed Christological utterances/titles and praises,[27] Christophanies (cc. 3, 11, 30), Trinitarian formulae (cc. 7, 27), developed sacramentalism,[28] and Messianic inferences (cc. 27, 37, 59, 65). A noticeable difference between the *ATh* and the *GTh* is the former's continued emphasis on the resurrection of Jesus (c. 80). In the *ATh*, God and Jesus are placed behind all the events and are self-evidently part of the worldview of the text.

The *ATh* emphasizes an ethically oriented Christian way of life, charity, and the mission of liberation (c. 19). Again, these concerns are not alien to the readers of biblical narratives. The text also forbids fornication and adultery (cf. 1 Cor. 5:1–6:20). As in the case of the Pauline Epistles, the *ATh* gives high regard to the concept of leaving the "old life" to enter the mystical

[22] Attridge (1992: 6: 533) comments, "While poems and liturgies have exotic elements, Thomas' explicit teaching is generally familiar early Christian material."
[23] See Waldmann, 1996: 10, 35–42; *contra* Van den Bosch, 2001: 126–27.
[24] Read more about "bride" and "bridegroom" in Reddish, 1992: 1: 782; Plummer, 1988: 1: 326–27.
[25] See Attridge, 1992: 6: 531–52.
[26] See Mk 1:21-26; 3:10-11; 5:5-7. While discussing cc. 42–50, Attridge (1992: 6: 532) says, "Thomas exorcizes the demon, who complains at length before being expelled."
[27] Cc. 10, 25, 34, 39, 47–48, 53. See Klijn, 1962: 46.
[28] Cc. 25–27, 29, 49, 50–51, 121, 132–133, 157–158, 169. See Klijn, 1962: 54–61; Attridge, 1992: 6: 531.

experience of the "new life."[29] The text gives the impression that the Thomas community was emphasizing aspects of the ascetic lifestyle (c. 144).[30] Firth (2001: 9) states, "a large part of St. Thomas' teaching and effort is designed to establish the doctrine that marriage is sinful and that Christians ought to abstain from it." In this case, the book informs the reader that Thomas was more emphatic than Paul with regard to marriage and celibacy. While Paul gave enough choice for his readers to choose between "marriage" and "celibacy" (1 Cor. 7:1-40), Thomas takes a step to teach a kind of radical asceticism.[31] Lalleman (2000: 68) states, "It [*ATh*] has Thomas travel to India and preach the cessation of marriage and procreation." Even when there are considerable differences in their emphases, it is interesting to note that (as their master Jesus) both Paul and Thomas preferred a celibate mode of lifestyle.[32]

In the *ATh*, Apostle Thomas's identity is magnified through some of the utterances of his interlocutors. On a few occasions, Jesus introduces himself as "the brother of Judas" (cc. 11, 12). While the flute-playing girl witnesses Judas with the words "this man is either God or the Apostle of God" (c. 9), a large serpent (c. 31) and later a colt (c. 39) herald him as "the Twin of Jesus."[33] Karish describes Thomas's miraculous activities to Mygdonia as follows:

> From the day that the world came into being, it had never been heard that a man brought the dead to life; but this man, as I hear, makes as if he brought the dead to life. (c. 96)

[29] Cf. Rom. 6:4; 1 Cor. 5:7; 2 Cor. 3:6; 5:17; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10. Attridge (1992: 2: 533) states, "The major focus is the Savior, Jesus Christ, who combines divinity with humanity (cc. 48, 80), and who reduced himself to smallness (cc. 15, 123) to enable humans to participate in the majesty of a new humanity (cc. 48)."

[30] Also refer to Mt. 19:12.

[31] Attridge (1992: 6: 533–34) comments, "Conversion entails a life of rigorous asceticism, particularly in sexual matters. While the transitory world and all its allurements are to be rejected in favor of the world above (cc. 36–37), the source of all other ills is clearly sex and its use is to be rejected, even in marriage (cc. 12, 28, 84, 126, 144)." Cf. Bauckham, 1997: 72.

[32] Klijn (1962: 49–50) states, "Tatian must have influenced the church in Syria in a thorough way. This is proved by Tatian's Diatessaron which was wholeheartedly accepted by Syria in spite of its encratitic trends. It is possible that in Syria ascetic tendencies were available, but we may be sure that Tatian systematized these ideas." We also see remarkable ascetic similarities between the *ATh* and *Oratio ad Graecos* of Tatian. See Attridge, 1992: 6: 532; Lapham, 2003: 123, 125. Read about "marriage" and "celibacy" in Collins, 1992a,b: 4: 569–73; Peterson, 1988: 3: 262–77.

[33] Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 380.

Judas proclaims (to Karish) about the greatness of his God:

> My Lord Jesus the Messiah, with whom I take *refuge* is greater than you and your king and all your forces. (c. 106)[34]

Karish's testimonial informs us that the mission of Judas included miracles and resurrections of the dead (cf. Jn 11:1-53).[35] Thomas's exercise of divine power, that is, even his power to raise the dead, elevates him above some of the other apostles of early Christianity. As a continuation to the Gospel of John (20:28), the utterance "My Lord and My God" is repeatedly used in the *ATh*.[36] While Thomas continually exalts the name of Jesus, his interlocutors see him as a "slave of Jesus" (c. 1), an "Apostle of God," the "Twin of Jesus," and a man that "brought the dead to life."[37] The East Syrian traditions strongly uphold the view that Judas Thomas was the "Twin Brother" of Jesus and canonize him as one of the greatest apostles of Jesus Christ.[38] In this way, the identity of Thomas is brought to the foreground through the words of Jesus, Thomas himself, and also his other interlocutors.

This aspect of teaching (along with healing) was highly regarded in the missionary activities of Thomas (c. 20).[39] The *ATh* includes the Synoptic type of banquet stories (Act 1; cf. Mt. 5:3-11; Lk. 6:20-22) and discourses in the form of the Sermon on the Mount (Act 2 [cc. 28–29]; cf. Mt. 5–7; Lk. 6:17-49). In his eloquent homilies and persuasive teachings, Thomas conveys all the qualities of a moral teacher. While Baptism and the Eucharist are mostly implicit (except for a few explicit references) in the canonical gospels, in the *ATh* they are mostly explicit.[40] The journey of Thomas on the colt (c. 40) is reminiscent of Jesus's triumphal entry in the gospel narratives.[41] In the text, Thomas is introduced as a persecuted and reviled missionary (c. 107) and an imprisoned preacher who

[34] Thomas continues by saying that "our Lord Jesus the Messiah is stronger than all powers and kings and rulers" (c. 119). See Lapham, 2003: 124.

[35] Attridge (1992: 6: 531) comments, "The first six (Acts) are loosely connected episodes highlighting Thomas' miraculous powers."

[36] Cc. 81, 97, 167. Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 379–80.

[37] Lapham (2003: 121–22) points out: "as Thomas journeys through India, we are given abundant illustrations of the Apostle's power (as the spiritual twin of Jesus), as he preaches chastity, casts out demons, admonishes the wicked, performs wondrous deeds, heals and baptizes, and raises the dead—after the manner of Jesus himself."

[38] See Bauckham, 1997: 72; Klijn, 1962: 38–53.

[39] See Lapham, 2003: 121–26.

[40] See cc. 26–27, 29, 51, 132; Act 5; Act 10. See Klijn, 1962: 54–61.

[41] See Mt. 21:1-9; Mk 11:1-11; Lk. 19:28-38; Jn 12:12-18.

sings melodious hymns in a prison cell and is rescued by God (cc. 108–113, 148).[42] On several occasions, the characterization of Apostle Thomas is similar to that of Peter and Paul in the Acts of the Apostles and in other apocryphal Acts.[43] On a few occasions, Judas is imprisoned, beaten up, and dragged like Jesus in the passion narratives (Act 11) and other apostles in the rest of the NT.[44] Thus, the character of Thomas reminds us of the characterization of Jesus and other apostles in the NT canon.

On one occasion, Thomas is accompanied by a multitude of people (Act 5), and on another, he is portrayed as a preacher in a prison context where he is heard by several captives (Act 12; c. 148). This is reminiscent of some of the portrayals of Jesus, Peter, Paul, and other figures of Christianity.[45] On one occasion, Thomas had to undergo severe persecution under King Mazdai. King Mazdai ordered two heated plates of iron upon which Thomas was to stand barefoot (c. 140). The soldiers grabbed him to make him step on the plates that were (glowing) like fire. The narrator of the *ATh* portrays how Thomas was rescued by God from that torment.[46] Thomas's miraculous escape from that punishment is in several ways similar to the escape traditions of Jesus and the other apostles (c. 140).[47] Toward the end of Act 13, a long list of followers such as Sifur, his wife and daughter, Mygdonia, Tertia, Narkia the nurse, and Vizan and his wife Manashar are mentioned as believers and all of them share a Eucharistic meal sanctified by Thomas (cc. 55–58).[48] This shows that many influential figures of society were persuaded by Thomas's life and ministry, and a large number of them were converted to the newly introduced faith. The appointment of deacons such as Xanthippus (cc. 65, 66) and Vizan (c. 169) and priests such as Sifur (cc. 169–170) by Thomas and the presence of flocks under them (cc. 67, 169–170) show the growth of the Christian mission in the eastern part of the globe at the incipient stages of the church.

[42] See a similar passage in Acts 16:16–40.
[43] Cc. 12:1-19; 16:25-28. Also see *APet* and *APaul*.
[44] See Mt. 26–27; Mk 14–15; Lk. 22–23; Jn 18–19; 1 Cor. 15:32; 2 Cor. 11: 23-25.
[45] This is one of the typical portrayals in the gospel narratives; Jesus is introduced as one interacts with the multitudes, and later on he is viewed as a suffering servant.
[46] Lapham (2003: 122) states, "His conversions, particularly among the families of the rich and powerful, bring him into inevitable conflict and persecution." In the Book of Acts, the leading figures of the text, Peter and Paul, undergo both the above stated experiences.
[47] Jn 8:59; 10:31-32, 39-40; 11:8.
[48] See Lapham, 2003: 122; Puliurumpil, 2012: 22–23.

The portrayal of Thomas in the *ATh* reveals some significant factors regarding his identity as a missionary preacher. In the text, he is often addressed as a "stranger" (c. 4) and his God (Jesus) as a "New God" (c. 42). It records his abstinence from food and drink, his usual practice of wearing only one garment, his habit of not taking pay from anyone (c. 96), and his lifestyle as a recluse, an ascetic, a pauper, and a wandering mendicant. In his missionary endeavors, Thomas emphasized three doctrines, namely purity, humility, and temperance, as the significant aspects of Christian living. As in the case of the commandment of Jesus in Mk 16:15, Thomas gave prominence to the duty of preaching. The Apostle is constantly portrayed as a praying Christian (c. 104) and as a person who did not go near women (c. 144). Throughout the book, Thomas is portrayed as a sharer in the hidden word of the life-giver and receiver of the secret mysteries of the Son of God (c. 97). This is reminiscent of the portrayal of Thomas in the Gospel of John and the *GTh*. Moreover, Thomas is portrayed in the text as an itinerant missionary and one who never ceased to preach to the multitudes. All of these evidences show that Thomas was a missionary par excellence.

In sum, the *ATh* delineates a developed and sophisticated theology that aligns mostly with the patterns of the biblical thought-world. The theological emphases of the *ATh* include sanctity, simplicity, kerygmatic concerns of the resurrected Jesus, the cross and salvation, sacrificial lifestyle and suffering for Jesus, charity and concerns for the poor,[49] the transfer from "old life" to "new life," religious conversion, physical and psychological healing (cc. 10, 49, 95), and sacramentalism.[50] These aspects foreground the doctrinal foundation of the Thomas community.[51] A dualistic contrast is at the root of the theological framework of the *ATh*.[52] Klijn (1962: 34) states, "The doctrine of these Acts

[49] Van den Bosch (2001: 128) comments, "the concrete information about India in the ATh is extremely poor."

[50] Attridge (1992: 6: 531) comments, "With the king's [Gundaphor's] abundant supplies Thomas initiates a program of poor relief while preaching the gospel." Klijn (1962: 49) states, "This means that we can speak of a christology which remained the same both in the *Odes of Solomon* and the *Acts of Thomas*, but that at a later date Syriac theology was influenced by ideas not existing in the beginning."

[51] See Klijn, 1962: 54–61.

[52] Lapham (2003: 125) observes, "The *ATh* is wholly dualistic in outlook. Matter stands in opposition to the spirit, and the present state of humanity is seen as a perversion of their original God-created nature."

is dominated by the contrast between corruptible and incorruptible."[53] This contrast stabilizes the mission-theological concerns of Apostle Thomas. According to the *ATh*, Apostle Thomas was a missionary who lived out the theology of the early church in order to transform an alien socio-religious order in the Eastern Hemisphere of the world. As a "missionary theologian to the East," he accomplished a fulfilling mission and laid down a strong theological foundation during the early stages of Christianity.

The Indo-Parthian and South Indian theories

The *ATh* is explicit in stating that Apostle Thomas visited India.[54] The resurrected Jesus sells his slave Judas to Habban for a price of twenty (pieces of) silver.[55] Habban was a merchant of King Gundaphoros who searched for a skilled carpenter (c. 2). Thomas, as an artificer, follows Habban to the kingdom of Gundaphoros.[56] Charlesworth (1995: 380) recapitulates the East Syrian tradition with regard to Thomas as follows: "The *Acts of Thomas* takes us into the East where the Apostle Thomas was considered Judas Thomas and Jesus' twin brother." Moreover, Bauckham (1997: 72) invites our attention straight into the Indian scenario as he states: "The *Acts of Thomas* recounts Thomas' missionary activity in India."[57] The usage of the name "India" (15 times) indicates that the traditions narrated within the *ATh* connect well with the nation.[58] Within the overall framework of the story, Thomas is placed as a missionary to India and not as one destined to Parthia. The name Parthia appears only once in the *ATh* (c. 110), and is mentioned in the *Hymn of the Pearl* (cc. 108–113).[59] Though we are unable to decide between India and Parthia on account of the church fathers' traditions and scholarly views, the Indo-Parthian connection of the first-century context has to be considered.[60]

[53] For more details about the dualistic understanding of *ATh*, see Klijn, 1962: 34–37.
[54] *Contra* Van den Bosch, 2001: 136.
[55] Van den Bosch, 2001: 127; Klijn, 1962: 157–58; Bovon, 1981: 233–48.
[56] Van den Bosch, 2001: 127; Attridge, 1992: 6: 531; Lapham, 2003: 121.
[57] Also see Attridge, 1992: 6: 531; Helyer, 2012: 2: 689.
[58] Cc. 1 (2 times), 16, 17, 42 (2 times), 62 (2 times), 98, 101, 116 (2 times), 117 and 170, and 'Indian(s)' (5 times; cc. 1, 2, 39, 108, 123).
[59] For more details about *The Hymn of the Pearl*, refer to Ferreira, 2002: 1–32.
[60] See Firth, 2001: 5–9.

While Eusebius and Origen connect Thomas with Parthia, a considerable number of church fathers connect him with India.[61] As history informs us, the northwestern part of India was attached to the then Parthian kingdom.[62] Expressions such as "And while Judas was preaching throughout all India" (c. 62; Act 7) inform the reader that Thomas had visited several parts of the nation and even traveled beyond the country. Even Sifur himself claims that he was a great man throughout India (c. 62).[63] Thomas would definitely have used his connections with Sifur and other influential figures as a means to travel widely in different parts of the nation.

The actual story of Gundaphoros and his kingdom begins in c. 17 (Act 2). Act 2 begins as follows: "And when Judas had entered *into the realm of India* with the merchant Habban … ." A reader of the text may think that Sandaruk (Act 1) is a non-Indian region, but Gundaphoros was considered to be a king of the northwestern part of India.[64] Firth (2001: 11) states, "Since 1834 numerous coins have been found in the Punjab and in Afghanistan bearing his name in Greek on one side and in Pali on the other; they are dated on palaeographical grounds in the first half of the first century CE, and their number suggests that his reign was a fairly long one." Later on, a stone inscription (the *Takht-i-Bahi Stone*) containing Gundaphoros's name (dated 46 CE) was also identified.[65] Some of the coins have the name of Gad, who was Gundaphoros's brother.[66] But, when the events unfold in Act 1, the readers are informed that they are reaching a different setting. Act 1 (cc. 1–16) outlines the following events: first, Thomas's journey from Jerusalem with Habban; second, their arrival in Sandaruk;[67] third, the wedding banquet and the miracle; and fourth, the

[61] See Eusebius, *HE* 3.1.1. Also, Hippolytus and others connect him with Calamina. Cf. Van den Bosch, 2001: 137. See more details about Origen and his understanding in pp. 163–64.

[62] Van den Bosch (2001: 137) says, "This tradition may have been based on the close bonds of the apostle with Edessa which formed a part of the Parthian empire during the first two centuries CE and was sometimes described as 'the daughter of Parthia.'" Also see Klijn, 1962: 30–33; Attridge, 1992: 6: 531.

[63] See Klijn, 1962: 97–98.

[64] See Attridge, 1992: 6: 531.

[65] Van den Bosch (2001: 132; cf. Sircar, 1965: 245) notes, "It is equated with the name Gondophoros which occurs on ancient Indian coins and on the inscriptions from Takht-Bah in the district of Peshwar (Pakistan), which are nowadays stored in the museum of Lahore."

[66] Van den Bosch (2001: 134) states, "Gad is closely associated with Gondophoros by the Gudana-Orthagna coins and it is even suggested that he might have reigned after the death of Gondophoros. Their common title Orthagna, 'remover of resistance,' might then be interpreted as an indication of their close relationship."

[67] Van den Bosch (2001: 127) describes, "The two embark in an unspecified port and sail to a town called Andrapolis in Greek, and Sandaruk in the Syrian text."

conversion of the king's daughter and son-in-law. This suggests that the events in Sandaruk happened on their way to the kingdom of Gundaphoros.[68] There are varied views regarding the identification of Sandaruk. Some identify Sandaruk as Socotra, an island in the Arabian Sea off the northeast coast of Africa.[69] However, there is no solid historical evidence to prove this argument. If Sandaruk (Greek form of "Andrapolis") is identified as "Andhra," as Plinius (*Nat. Hist.* 6.19, 22, 67) and *Cambridge History of India* (1:598-601) indicate, then we have evidence for Thomas's connections with South India.[70] The name "Sandaruk" may be a derivation of sandalwood (or where the sandal trees grow), and Kerala was known for that tree since the ancient past. From a geographical point of view, *Keralam* in particular and *Tamilakam* in general kept a unique cultural identity from that of Greater India.[71] If Thomas came to a coastal land that was connected to a Jewish kingdom, to a place where sandal trees grew and Jewish people lived (i.e., like the flutist girl; c. 5), a place in which the breeze was steady (c. 3), and a place where Christianity rapidly grew later on (i.e., St. Thomas Christians), then Sandaruk can be considered one of the places on the Malabar Coast in Old Kerala (probably Maliankara). There is also historical evidence that in the tenth century BCE on an annual basis around 120 ships of King Solomon reached the shore of the Maliankara (Periyar) river.[72] This shows that a trade relationship existed between King Solomon's kingdom (992–952 BCE) and the Malabar Coast. In 47 BCE, the

[68] Eusebius relates that Thomas was divinely moved to send Thaddeus as an herald and evangelist of the teachings about Christ to Edessa (Eusebius, *HE*, 1.13.4), and the Syrian *Doctrina Addai* reports a similar tradition that Thomas sent the apostle Addai to Edessa (see Schermann, 1907: 274). Van der Bosch (2001: 138; cf. Drijvers, 1989: 292) states, "These two statements seem to suggest that Thomas did not visit Edessa, but limited himself to the organization of the mission of Parthia, which had been assigned to him by lot."

[69] See the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, an early shipping manual, and also the writings of Marco Polo, 1254–1324. However, Socotra was called 'Dioskouridou' in the first century.

[70] Herzfeld (1935: 62) has suggested "the Syrian expression Sandaruk as an imitation of the Persian name Sind(a)rud, i.e., Indus river." Van den Bosch (2001: 129) states, "The addition of the term *polis* to the incomplete Greek form Andra may have led to a further corruption of the Syrian name." Moffett (1998/2006: 1: 27) indicates here "the Andhra territory on the Indian coast." Cf. Attridge, 1992: 6: 531; Dihle, 1963/1984: 66; Van den Bosch, 2001: 129.

[71] Bhaskaran (2015: 55) states, "Though the region is known as Malabar among the Arabs during the middle age, the people of the land called 'Malayalam' for the *Malayam* or *Malanadu* to refer to the land of Kerala." In that sense, the southern regions of India were not counted in the Greater Indian (northern) province.

[72] Menon (1967: 57) mentions, "Kerala had contacts with the countries of the outside world even from time immemorial. The Arabs, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Phoenicians, the Israelites, the Greeks, the Romans and the Chinese were among the foreign peoples who had contacts with the Kerala coast in the ancient period." Menon (1967: 58–59) further says, "About 1000 BCE King Solomon of Israel equipped a fleet of ships manned by the Phoenicians which sailed to the East and

wind that facilitated the trade relationship between the Western world and South India was discovered. This wind was named "Hippalus Monsoon."[73] These contextual realities (along with the "oral traditions" of the church) can be considered as evidence for the arrival of Thomas to the Malabar Coast. Philip (1950: chapter 4) argues that "Andrapolis is really Cranganore and Gundaphoros is really Kandapparaja, a Tamil king in the region of Mylapore."[74] While Sandaruk can be considered Cranganore as stated previously, we are unable to settle on Gundaphoros as a South Indian king.[75]

A closer observation of the *ATh* enables the reader to identify a sequence of locations in the following order: *South India* (cc. 1–16; i.e., Malabar Coast), *North India* (cc. 17–61), and *South India* (cc. 62–170; i.e., Coromandel Coast).[76] In this case, Thomas ministered in at least three major regions in the larger Indian context. If we consider what the author of the *ATh* states in c. 62 (i.e., "And while Judas was preaching throughout all India") as a genuine statement, then we find that Thomas preached in different geopolitical regions of the Indian subcontinent, including both North India and South India. Firth (2001: 9–10) distinguishes kingdoms such as Andrapolis, the political boundary of Gundaphoros, and the nation of Mazdai as three entirely different regions. The details available in the *ATh* should not be regarded as "entirely legendary" (as Bauckham), "novelistic fiction" (as McGrath), and "legendary"/"fiction" (as Firth), but as the penultimate document pertinent to a "disregarded" and "forgotten" personality and his involvement as an influential missionary

came to Ophir and fetched from thence gold. . . . In addition to gold such items as ivory, apes and peacocks were also carried by Solomon's ships and all these were indigenous to Kerala."

[73] But Van den Bosch (2001: 140) attempts to connect the *Hippalus Monsoon* with North India. For more details about *Hippalus Monsoon*, refer to *Maritime Heritage of India*, 2016.

[74] See Firth, 2001: 16.

[75] This is mainly because of the following reasons: first, in the *ATh*, Sandaruk and Gundaphoros's kingdom are clearly distinguished; second, there is historical evidence that Gundaphoros was a North Indian king whereas Kandapparaja was a South Indian king; third, there is a clear transition in the story from Sandaruk to Gundaphoros's kingdom; and fourth, there are contextual descriptions in the text about Sandaruk having a closer affinity with the South Indian (especially Kerala) environment. Van den Bosch (2001: 131) mentions, "When the rather cryptic name Sandaruk as designation for the Indus river was no longer understandable, it was replaced in the Greek text by the more conceivable name Andrapolis, 'city of people.' The later added gloss, 'royal city,' explains the town as a royal residence as is evident from the story."

[76] Klijn (1962: 28) says the following about the structure of the *ATh*: "the first part deals with some very loosely connected Acts, the second part consists of one long story. . . . The first part may go back to very old traditions according to which Thomas went to North India, in the traditions of the Ancient Church hinted at as Parthia. The second part may have been added to show Thomas' work in South India." Also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 23.

theologian.[77] But the narrator does use legendary and fictional elements to create his story world. During his mission in the northwestern part of India, Thomas would have likely traveled to parts of current Pakistan and Afghanistan. Traditionally, it is believed that his preaching in Mylapore aroused the hostility of the local people and he was martyred there.[78] Third-century evidence attributed to Hippolytus, Dorotheus, and *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Teaching of the Apostles) supports the view that Thomas's sphere of work was India. The church fathers' evidence from the end of the fourth century, that is, the work of St. Ambrose, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Ephraem the Syrian, and St. Jerome, also accepts the view that St. Thomas's sphere of mission was India.[79]

The impact of Thomas's mission in India is clearly depicted in the *ATh*. Helyer (2012: 2: 689) states, "The narrative emphasizes Thomas' wondrous deeds, accounts of conversions, and his sufferings and ultimate martyrdom." The text mentions that Thomas appointed deacons such as Xanthippus (cc. 65–67) and Vizan, and priests such as Sifur (c. 169). In Sandaruk, the king's daughter and her bridegroom became Jesus's followers (Act 1).[80] In Act 2, the conversion of King Gundaphoros and his brother Gad is mentioned as a significant event. In Mazdai's kingdom, the woman who was rescued from the black snake (Act 3), the young man who was healed (Act 4), the woman who was brought back to life (Act 4), Sifur the general (Act 7), his wife and daughter (Act 10), Mygdonia the wife of Karish (Act 10), Tertia the wife of King Mazdai (Act 11), Vizan the son of King Mazdai (Act 12), Narkia the nurse, and Manashar the wife of Vizan became followers of the newly proclaimed faith.[81] The following are the most significant miracles recorded in the *ATh*: the miracle in Sandaruk (c. 8), the rescuing of a youth from the smiting of a black snake (c. 37), the rescuing of a woman from the hand of the devil who took up his abode in her (Act 5), the healing of a young man's withered hand (Act 6), the resurrection of a murdered adulterous woman

[77] Firth (2001: 2–3) says, "It was one of the early eastward movements that first brought Christianity to India. According to tradition it was brought in the first century by one of the twelve apostles, St. Thomas. This has been the constant tradition of the Syrian Christians of Malabar, and it has been widely believed in the West also that this apostle's sphere of work was India." Also see Bauckham, 1997: 68–73; McGrath, 2008: 297–311.

[78] See Firth, 2001: 3–4.

[79] Cf. Firth, 2001: 5. See more details about *Didascalia Apostolorum* in pp. 165–66.

[80] See Attridge, 1992: 6: 531.

[81] Cf. Attridge, 1992: 6: 531–34.

(Act 6), the healing of Sifur's wife and daughter (Act 8), and Thomas's own miraculous escape from prison (Act 10).[82] These conversions and healings demonstrate Thomas's significance as a follower and minister of Jesus.[83] From all these events, a reader of the story comprehends Thomas's boundless influence among the communities and his engagements in witnessing Jesus in wider Indian contexts.

With the identification of Sandaruk as a South Indian coast, the *ATh* can be considered as a mission mandate that details the works of Thomas in three major Indian kingdoms, that is, Sandaruk (Malabar Coast), the northwestern Indian kingdom (the Indo-Parthian area), and the Mazdai kingdom (Coromandel Coast). If the *ATh* maintains an accurate chronological sequence, then we have evidence against the arguments of Medlycott and Farquhar who argue that Thomas first went to the northwestern parts of India.[84] The order of the book suggests that Thomas first went to Andrapolis (Malabar Coast), then to Gundaphoros's kingdom (northwestern India), and consequently to Mazdai's kingdom (Mylapore area). In that case, Thomas's extended mission was in Mazdai's kingdom (i.e., on the Coromandel Coast). Further, this may go against Farquhar's argument that Thomas's extended mission was in the northwestern part of the country. The discussion thus far provides us with some clues with regard to the identity of Thomas: first, Thomas's story was created out of details surrounding the historical figure and his witness among the socially ostracized; second, in a broader sense, Thomas's coming to the eastern part of the world is a commonly accepted view; third, there are more possibilities for the coming of Thomas to India; fourth, during his time in India, Thomas extended his involvements as a witness in the country; fifth, Thomas's influence was remarkable as he was an ascetic leader and a performer of miraculous activities; sixth, through Thomas's witnessing of Christ, many local citizens were converted to the newly introduced faith; and seventh, Thomas's movement was integrative and contextual in nature.

[82] Cf. Attridge, 1992: 6: 531–34.

[83] Attridge (1992: 6: 533) states, "Acceptance of Christ and his apostle brings salvation from inimical powers graphically portrayed in the exorcisms (c. 32) and from the punishments of hell (cc. 56–58). It also liberates the believer from ignorance and error (c. 98) while providing knowledge of the origin and destiny of the self (c. 15)."

[84] See Medlycott, 1905; Farquhar, 1927: 20–50.

The martyrdom of Thomas

The Greek version of the *ATh* consists of thirteen Acts and the concluding section (as the fourteenth Act) that describes the martyrdom of Apostle Thomas.[85] The fourteen Acts of the text together discuss the arrival, mission engagements, and martyrdom of Thomas. In the text, the martyrdom of Thomas takes place in Mazdai's kingdom (cc. 159–170).[86] At the point of his death, Judas proclaims: "I rejoice that the time is fulfilled and the day comes that I may go and receive my reward from my Lord" (c. 159). His words are courageous and are in greater conformity with the NT narrative world. The joy of his accomplishment is expressed through the following words: "And be not weary . . . in persecution . . . you see me treated ignominiously, and imprisoned too, and dying, because I am fulfilling the will of my Lord" (c. 160).[87] Thomas considers death as a "release from the world" (c. 160). Judas said: "I have toiled in His service, and I have completed (my task) because of His grace" (c. 160). This is reminiscent of Paul's statements in 2 Tim. 4:7. Lapham (2003: 123) states, "We should note that Thomas' subsequent trial before Mazdai is redolent of the trial of Jesus before Pilate."[88] From all these details, we understand that Apostle Thomas was prepared to face death. In c. 168, King Mazdai ordered his soldiers to stab Thomas; they all struck him and he fell down and died.[89] The people wept and they brought good garments, many linen clothes, and buried Judas in the sepulcher in which the ancient kings were buried (c. 168).[90] Again, this is reminiscent of Jesus's death and burial in the canonical gospels (John 19).[91] After the death of Thomas, King Mazdai was converted and Sifur the priest and his brothers prayed for him (c. 170). The author of the *ATh*

[85] Cf. Attridge, 1992: 6: 531. Enslin (1962: 632) states that "the martyrdom account was circulated separately."
[86] See Attridge, 1992: 6: 532–33.
[87] See Klijn, 1962: 150–01, 301–32.
[88] Attridge (1992: 6: 532) comments, "After the guard reports to Mazdai the strange comings and goings of the night, there follows another dramatic encounter between Mazdai and Thomas, reminiscent of that between Pilate and Jesus."
[89] Firth (2001: 11; cf. cc. 167–69) states, "He [Thomas] is taken outside the city by four soldiers, who kill him with their spears, but not before he has ordained a presbyter and a deacon from among his noble converts."
[90] See Lapham, 2003: 123; Klijn, 1962: 153, 303; Van den Bosch, 2001: 128.
[91] Attridge (1992: 6: 533; c. 170) comments, "Mazdai searches for Thomas' bones, with which to heal an ailing son. They have been taken West, but the king uses dust from the tomb area to good effect. After Thomas appears to him he is brought to Sifur, now a presbyter, and requests prayers."

wraps up the entire story as follows: "Here end the Acts of Judas Thomas, the Apostle of our Lord Jesus the Messiah, who suffered martyrdom in the land of India by the hands of king Mazdai." Thus, the text affirms the martyrdom of Thomas in the land of India.

Several of the early traditions support Thomas's apostolic mission and his subsequent martyrdom in India. Medlycott (1905: chapter 2) quotes a hymn written by Ephrem the Syrian (died 373) in which the Devil cries:

> Into what land shall I fly from the just? I stirred up Death the apostles to slay, that by their death I might escape their blows. But harder still am I now stricken: the Apostle I slew in India has overtaken me in Edessa; here and there he is all himself. There went I, and there was he: here and there to my grief I find him.[92]

Ephrem's hymn reflects the East Syrian belief concerning the martyrdom of Thomas and the connection between Edessa and India. St. Jerome's martyrology mentioned that Thomas died on July 3.[93] St. Ephrem wrote in his *Carmina Nisibene 42* and *Hymni disperse 5–7* that the apostle was put to death in India, and that his remains were subsequently buried in Edessa, brought there by an unnamed merchant.[94] A Syrian ecclesiastical calendar confirms it by identifying the merchant as Khabin.[95] Meyer (2007: 779–80) mentions, "in her travel journal a Christian pilgrim Egeria recounts how she visited Edessa in 384 and viewed the bones of St. Thomas."[96] In the writings of St. Ephrem and in the witnesses of the Roman, Greek, and Ethiopian churches, especially in several of the hymns, liturgies, calendars, sacramentaries, and martyrologies, the mission and martyrdom of Thomas are mentioned.[97] It is believed that while the majority of the relics were transferred to Edessa from India, a few remains are still kept in Mylapore.[98]

[92] Klijn (1962: 20–21) states, "For the *Acts of Thomas* we may refer to Ephrem Syrus. From his writings it appears that he knew about Thomas having gone to India. This is also found in the *Manichaean Psalms*. Whether we are justified in saying that Ephrem knew the *Acts of Thomas* cannot be determined." See more details in pp. 164–65.

[93] Cf. Calendarium, 1969: 96.

[94] Church fathers such as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Rufinus, and Socrates connect Thomas with Parthia. Cf. Medlycott, 1905; Klijn, 1962: 20, 27; Meyer, 2007: 779–80.

[95] See Medlycott, 1905.

[96] Cf. Drijvers, 2: 322–39.

[97] Cf. Segal, 2005: 174–76, 250.

[98] The church father Clement of Alexandria reports an entirely different view. "In the first place," Klijn (1962: 27) says, "we may refer to Clement of Alexandria, *Strom*. 4.71.3, who writes that according to

There are diverse patristic records regarding the destination of Thomas's missionary activities in the Eastern Hemisphere. The majority of the church fathers are unanimous in their opinion about his travel to the Eastern Hemisphere. Their disagreements mostly concern Thomas's destination in the East.[99] Connecting Thomas with the Parthian kingdom would not dissolve the possibility of his coming to India as the traditions relating to Thomas's coming to India can be supported with the local Malabar and Mylapore traditions.[100]

At this point, it is also important to consider recent scholarship on the subject. Attridge (1992: 6: 531) commented: "The work [*ATh*] is clearly associated with Syria, and particularly with the city of Edessa, where Thomas was traditionally venerated. The Apostle's martyrdom (cc. 159–170) records the transferal of his relics from India back to the West, presumably to Edessa."[101] Attridge's observation is helpful in figuring out the significance of Thomas's martyrdom tradition in the East Syrian context. Charlesworth (1995: 380) also considers *ATh* as a document attuned with the thought-world of John's Gospel as well as with East Syrian Christianity.[102] But Bornkamm weighs down the historical value of the *ATh* and recounts it as a legendary tradition. He (1964: 427) says, "The Acts are . . . the oldest witness for the legend of Thomas' martyr death and the transference of his bones to Edessa." His (1964: 427) attribution of Thomas's connections with Parthia seemingly overlooks the first-century Indo-Parthian relations.[103] In that sense, Bornkamm analyzes the *ATh* from two different standpoints: first, as a legendary or ahistorical document; and second, by detaching Thomas from the Indian traditions. While Attridge and Charlesworth attempt to connect Thomas with the East Syrian traditions in general and Indian traditions in particular, Bornkamm takes an altogether different stance. This reflects how there is no consensus among scholars

Heracleon, Thomas died a natural death." Cf. Bussagli, 255.

[99] See Ephrem, 693–708. Also see *Manich. Psalm* 194:13 and 192:15-16.

[100] See Firth, 2001: 14.

[101] *Contra* Van den Bosch, 2001: 135–36.

[102] In my personal interactions with Charlesworth, I gathered his views in favor of Thomas's connections with India.

[103] On its historical value, see Bauer, 1934: 6–8. At the same time, Bornkamm (1964: 427) states, "The Catholic Abgar-legend traces back to Thomas the evangelizing of Edessa, where his bones have been preserved since the fourth century." Also see Van den Bosch, 2001: 135–36.

about this matter. However, a considerable majority view in favor of Thomas's martyrdom in the Indian context. Thomas's coming to India is also supported by the tradition of the church/es in Kerala and its/their continuing relationship with the Syrian and Persian ecclesiastical bodies, the historical records of Indo-Parthian relations and archaeological relics, the Coromandel traditions about Thomas's martyrdom in Mylapore, and the traditional and historical remains and beliefs of the Syrian church/es of Edessa.[104]

Concluding remarks

The narrative and semantic details of the *ATh* add further strength to the information we gathered about Thomas from the *GTh* and the *BTh*. One of the most significant details we find in the *ATh* is his travel beyond the Greco–Roman world. The narrative details concerning Thomas's journey to the Eastern Hemisphere, especially to the Indo-Parthian and South Indian contexts, help the reader to understand him from an entirely different angle. A reader can perceive the way historical kernels and novelistic elements are interwoven in the *ATh* to foreground the character and his identity. McGrath (2008: 297–311) states, "while the Acts of Thomas is almost certainly a work of a novelistic fiction, this should not lead us to ignore the instances of confirmable historical information embedded therein, as in many other works of historical fiction."[105] Though McGrath finds fictitious and legendary elements in the *ATh*, he does not fail to acknowledge the incorporation of historical facts within it. The prolonged delay of the text's composition would have resulted in its fictitious/legendary character. In the text, Thomas's character and identity are perceived as significant in the following ways: first, Thomas appears as a disciple with a close-knit relationship with and commitment to Jesus and at the same time as one who witnesses his master's message; second, he accepts a challenge as he travels beyond the usual geographical limits; third, he visits the extended

[104] Meyer (2007: 779) says, "In a variety of ways Thomas is linked to Edessa, and he becomes a patron saint of Syrian Christianity and an apostolic missionary to Parthia and, eventually, India, where, legend would have it, he was martyred."

[105] Similarly, Firth (2001: 9) comments: "Much, indeed most, of the material they contain is legendary, though here and there they may be founded on fact."

Indian scenario and engages himself with people from varied walks of life; fourth, his character and ideologies fit within the framework of the extended Thomasine literature (including the Gospel of John); and fifth, as in the Fourth Gospel, he appears as Jesus's spiritual twin and proclaims him as "My Lord and my God" (cc. 81, 97, 167). Thus, Thomas's characterization in the *ATh* qualifies him to be called an "Apostle to the Eastern world." With this information in hand, let us now move to the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*.

8

The Infancy Gospel of Thomas

Introduction

The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* is another apocryphal document that is commonly considered to be a second-century composition.[1] It includes representative stories of miracles performed by the child Jesus up to his twelfth year.[2] Mirecki (1992: 540) observes, "*IGTh* represents the textualization of a cycle of orally transmitted folklore which was continually expanded by the still circulating oral tradition."[3] From Mirecki's statement, one can infer that the traditions inscribed in the *IGTh* were not merely imaginative stories intended to fill in the gaps of Jesus's life history, but were traditions developed around the earthly Jesus. Hippolytus and Origen refer to a *GTh*, but it is unclear whether they were familiar with the *IGTh* or the *GTh*.[4] There is an earlier reference from Irenaeus that draws the reader's attention back to the second century.[5] Cameron (1982: 122–30) notes as follows:

> In his citation Irenaeus first quotes a non-canonical story that circulated about the childhood of Jesus and then goes directly on to quote a passage from the infancy narratives of the Gospel of Luke (Luke 2:49). Since the

[1] See the text translated by James, 1924/1953: 49–70. Hennecke (1959/1963: 1: 390) comments, "The mss. give 'Infancy of the Lord Jesus' (Syriac version), or are entitled 'Account of the Infancy of the Lord by Thomas, the philosopher of Israel' (Greek ms. A), or again 'Book of the holy apostle Thomas concerning the life of the Lord in his infancy' (Greek ms. B)." Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 377; Bauckham, 1992: 290.

[2] For more details about the similarities and differences between Pseudo-Matthew and the *IGTh*, see Elliott, ed., 2005. Cf. Klauck, 2003: 73; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 390.

[3] Aasgaard (2009/2010: 14–34) considers an oral/written tradition approach in order to understand the history of transmission of the *IGTh*. Also see Gero, 1971: 46–80.

[4] See Cameron, 1982: 122–30.

[5] Lapham (2003: 131) states, "The many allusions to the text of the New Testament, particularly to the Gospel of Luke, place the composition of this work at the earliest during the second century."

> *IGTh* records both of these stories, in relative close proximity to one another, it is possible that the apocryphal writing cited by Irenaeus is, in fact, what is now known as the *IGTh*.

The usage of the text in Irenaeus's writing makes it evident that stories related to Jesus's childhood/boyhood were available in oral (or written) form for the early church fathers and they even quoted those traditions for apologetical purposes.[6] A reader of the text should understand the following things: first, the individual stories themselves may derive from the end of the first century; second, some stories enjoyed wide circulation during the second century; and third, in the succeeding centuries, the oral and written traditions achieved extensive usage and popularity among diverse linguistic and national communities.[7] The text of the *IGTh* is available in Syriac, Greek, Latin, Slavonic, Irish, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Georgian versions.[8] Gero (1971: 51, 55) considers the *IGTh* in its Estrangela script of Syriac (= BM Syr) as the earliest known form.[9] Mirecki (1992: 542) states, "Although nothing definite can be said about the place of composition, the high value ascribed to the early Syriac manuscripts, the traditional association with the Syrian Thomas tradition, and the possibility of shared traditions with the *GTh* (cf. *IGTh* 10:2 and *GTh* log. 77) all suggest Syria as the place of composition."[10] If the Syriac version is accepted as the earliest, then we can attribute its origin to the Edessan school.

These details help us to outline the following facts. The literature of the gospels, or at least large portions of it, came gradually into existence through a process by which oral or written materials were passed down from one

[6] Also refer to Mirecki, 1992: 6: 542.

[7] See Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer*. 1.20.1. The passage quoted was the exchange between the child Jesus and his teacher, Zacchaeus (*IGTh* 6). Klauck (2003: 74) states, "Dates from the second to the fifth century have been suggested for the composition of IGTh; however, the parallel to Irenaeus certainly justifies dating the basic material of the text to the late second century." See Lapham, 2003: 129; Cameron, 1982: 122; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 391; Aasgaard, 2009/2010: 14–34.

[8] For more details about the versions, see Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 388–90. Also see Klauck, 2003: 73.

[9] Lapham (2003: 130) states, "In view of the association with the person of Thomas, and of the special prominence of the Syriac versions of the text, we might speculate that the author, perhaps of Jewish Diaspora extraction, was a Christian living in or around Edessa, where Thomasine tradition was persistently robust." Read more details in Mirecki, 1992: 6: 540–01; Wright, 1865; *contra* Elliott, 2016: 5.

[10] Mirecki (1992: 6: 541) states, "In the modern period, *IGTh* is best known in the so-called longer recension (*GrA*; = Gero's A-type text), based on two Greek mss. One is dated to the 15th century and is currently in Bologna (= *Bonon*) and the other is dated to the 16th century, may be dependent on *Bonon*, and is in Dresden (= *Dresd*)." Cf. Cameron, 1982: 122–30; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 388, 391.

generation to another.[11] The writings of Dibelius and Bultmann make this point particularly compelling.[12] Though many of the oral traditions emerged in their written form at an early stage, many others continued to remain in the oral format.[13] The demands of early Christian communities compelled the authors to translate the oral traditions to their written shape. The early theology of the church was mainly developed around Jesus's virgin birth, his public ministry, the passion, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension. This resulted in the categorical neglect of Jesus's boyhood history that existed in an oral (and also written) form.[14] Luke's inclusion of a boyhood story of Jesus (which is not in Matthew, Mark, or John) can be understood as an indication toward the existence of boyhood stories in the first century (Lk. 2:41-52).[15] This is also supported by what Luke states at the beginning of his gospel: "Since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (1:1–2).[16] Thus, it is necessary to question whether someone can emerge in life without having a boyhood history. By addressing this question inadequately, many scholars have shown a negative attitude toward the *IGTh*.[17] A reader who is inquisitive about the role of Thomas in early Christianity and about the significance of the oral traditions in the first-century Ancient Near Eastern context cannot abnegate the significance of the *IGTh*.

[11] Also see Knight, 1992: 633–38; Robbins, 1992: 841; Henshaw, 1952: 49; Redlich, 1939: 11.

[12] See Dibelius, 1971/1982; Bultmann, 1976.

[13] Lapham (2003: 129) mentions, "As a document it has no reliable early attestation. Some believe that this collection of stories was put together no earlier than the fourth or fifth century."

[14] See Aasgaard, 2009/2010: 4–34.

[15] Mirecki (1992: 6: 543) states, "The complete absence from early Christian literature of any stories about these 'hidden years' of Jesus' life after the age of twelve is unusually striking and yet has received no comment from researchers. The 'absence' of such stories can be explained by the thesis that they did in fact exist and survived only after they were gathered together at the textual level and subsumed under the secondary framework of infancy narratives." Also see Lapham, 2003: 129; Bovon, 2003: 296.

[16] Lapham (2003: 129) says, "The traditional Gospels provide sparse information about the infant years of Jesus. Apart from the birth stories in Matthew and Luke, and the Lukan story of the twelve-year-old Jesus in the Temple, these early 'hidden years' remain precisely that." Also see Cameron, 1982: 123.

[17] While Witherington (1992: 73) belittles the *IGTh* as a document of "little or no historical worth," Barton (1992: 101) weighs it down as a production "for the purpose of satisfying curiosity and defending Christological dogma." Blomberg (1992: 293) considers the *IGTh* (along with other Apocryphal Gospels) as "clearly legendary attempts to fill in the 'gaps' in the Gospel record." Bruce (1992: 98), similarly, does not see in it anything more than "portraying him [Jesus] as a juvenile prodigy."

The Character of Thomas in the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*

The character of Thomas appears explicitly in the title and in the preamble (ch. 1) of the *IGTh*. Otherwise, his character almost always appears as an implicit observer and narrator of the events around boy Jesus. The text is introduced with the following title: "The account of Thomas the Israelite philosopher concerning the childhood of the Lord."[18] From this title, a reader understands that Thomas was perceived as a philosopher in the earlier stages of Christianity. Thomas knew Jesus even from his childhood and hence he was considered as his spiritual twin. In the preamble (ch. 1), the narrator introduces the text as follows:

> I, Thomas the Israelite, tell and make known to you all, brothers and sisters from among the Gentiles, all the works of the childhood of our Lord Jesus Christ and his mighty deeds, which he did when he was born in our land.[19]

From the preamble, four things are made obvious: first, the narrative develops through the perspective of "Thomas the Israelite";[20] second, the receivers of the document are "all my [i.e., Thomas's] non-Jewish brothers and sisters"; third, the message of the text is "the extraordinary childhood deeds of Lord Jesus Christ"; and fourth, Jesus was born in Thomas's own region.[21] Hennecke (1959/1963: 1: 390–91) states, "The choice of Thomas, who is sometimes called an apostle and sometimes an 'Israelite philosopher,' as the author, may be connected with the tradition of his apostolic labors in India. Perhaps it is not accidental that it is precisely the material in this book for which parallels exist in Indian legends."[22] In the work, Jesus's story unfolds one event after another as Thomas remains as the observer and reporter of what takes place.

[18] Cameron (1982: 122) states, "Attribution of authorship to Thomas seems to be a secondary, late development. Identifying the provenance of the work is difficult, although a location in eastern Syria, where Thomas traditions had their origin, is most likely."

[19] See Lapham, 2003: 129.

[20] Lapham (2003: 129) states, "The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* claims to be a comprehensive account of the childhood work of Jesus, compiled by 'Thomas the Israelite.'" Also see Aasgaard, 2009/2010: 40.

[21] Charlesworth (1995: 377) states, "In this work the apostle Thomas is the one who speaks in the very first line . . . Thomas is thus the one who reveals knowledge to all regarding Jesus' childhood." Klauck (2003: 73) mentions, "The title's attribution to Thomas, one of the twelve, which is repeated in chap. 1, is a later addition; indeed, the preamble as a whole (chap. 1) is a secondary interpolation."

[22] For more details about Indian legends, refer to Van Eysinga, 1909.

In the *IGTh*, the involvement of Thomas within the story line can be perceived mostly through implicit narrative connotations. Within the narrative framework, Jesus's story develops through the ages of five, six, eight, and twelve years.[23] The events develop through the perspective of Thomas the Israelite.[24] At the outset of the story, it is affirmed that Jesus and Thomas were from the same region (ch. 1). This makes the reader aware that Thomas could hear Jesus's voice, see his deeds (2:1-7), and recognize him as a Sabbath breaker even from childhood (2:4-7). As a witness, Thomas reports the activities of boy Jesus as follows: "collecting the flowing water into ponds and made the water instantly pure" (2:2), "made soft clay and shaped it into twelve sparrows . . . on the Sabbath day" (2:3), and "the sparrows that are made of soft clay flew off" (2:6).[25] Every word Jesus uttered and every deed he performed were known to Thomas. The *IGTh* testifies that Thomas knew Joseph the father of Jesus (2:4-6; 3:4; 4:4; 5:1-6; 6:1-22; 12:1–13:4), his mother (11:1-4), his brother James (16:1-2), and the way Jesus helped his parents in farming and carpentry (12:1–13:4). Jesus's behavior within the family setup and Joseph's reaction to him are made obvious (6:1-22). The text narrates the mannerisms of boy Jesus in the playground and in the work place. On some occasions, people approached Joseph the father with complaints about him (3:4; 4:4). The top secrets of Jesus's family are also delineated (i.e., what Joseph and his mother discussed about Jesus [14:5] as concerned parents). Thomas knew the number and identity (by name, 6:1–8:4) of Jesus's teachers, the way Jesus behaved in class, and even the minute details of the conversations during the hours of teaching (6:1–8:4; 14:1-5; 15:1-7).[26] Jesus said to Zacchaeus, the first teacher: "I existed when you were born" (6:6) and "when the world was created, I existed along with the one who sent me to you" (6:10).[27] The *IGTh* mentions that Thomas even knew the identity of Jesus's playmates (3:1; 9:4). His boyhood mannerisms and his power to heal people are drawn to the attention of the reader.[28] Thomas views gradual development in Jesus's behavior as the story

[23] See the story line descriptions by Mirecki, 1992: 6: 542.
[24] In the prologue, Thomas speaks in the first person.
[25] See Mirecki, 1992: 6: 542; Fein and Johnston, 2014: 209–10.
[26] Keith (2011: 161) states, "the *IGTh* portrays a five- to twelve-year-old Jesus who transcends literate education."
[27] See Klauck, 2003: 74–75.
[28] Cf. Blomberg, 1992: 304–05.

line progresses and reaches its climax. As Mirecki (1992: 6: 542) considers, the primary focus of the *IGTh* must be understood as the revelation of Jesus's "gradual maturation." These details support the understanding that Jesus and Thomas knew each other intimately from their childhood.

The canonical gospels provide indications concerning Thomas's connections with Jesus from childhood. The call narratives of the four gospels must be briefly analyzed here for clarity.[29] In Matthew, there are five specific calls mentioned (i.e., of Simon Peter, Andrew, James, John, and Matthew; see 4:18-22; 9:9).[30] Similarly, in Mark, five people receive specific calls from Jesus (i.e., Simon, Andrew, James, John, and Levi son of Alphaeus; see 1:16-20; 2:13-14).[31] In Luke, four people receive specific calls from the teacher (i.e., Simon, James, John, and Levi the tax collector; see 5:1-11, 27-30).[32] Moreover, in all the Synoptics, the names of the Twelve are mentioned (see Mt. 10:2-4; Mk 3:13-19; Lk. 6:12-16). In John, while three people are added (i.e., an unnamed disciple, Philip, and Nathanael), two are sustained from the Synoptic list (Andrew and Simon Peter; see 1:35-51). In John, the most difficult task is suggesting the names of the unnamed disciples in ch. 1 (vv. 37, 39, 40) and 21 (v. 2).[33] As stated previously, only eight people had received specific calls from Jesus (i.e., Simon Peter, Andrew, James, John, Matthew [Levi], Philip, Nathanael [if he is Bartholomew], and an unnamed disciple). This further means that there is no record of the call of Thomas, James son of Alphaeus, Thaddaeus (Judas son of James), Simon the Zealot, or Judas Iscariot.[34] Out of the five people listed here, Thomas is linked to Jesus from his boyhood days in the *IGTh*. The analysis here provides convincing details to prove that Thomas was not added to the circle of Jesus when he started his public ministry. They were together from childhood and knew each other

[29] Cf. Weder, 1992: 2: 207–10.

[30] Talbert (2010: 74) comments, "Some circles understood the gathering of disciples in terms of a summons and a response. Diogenes Laertius, for example, tells of Socrates' call of Xenophon (*Vit. Phil*. 2.48)." Talbert (2010: 74) further comments, "The readers of the canonical Gospels will recognize this type of call story in Mark 1:16–20 (Matthew 4:18-22); 2:14; Luke 5:1-11; 19:5; John 1:43. In Matthew 4:18-22, therefore, the ancient auditor would have recognized as a conventional type of the story of Jesus' summons of Peter, Andrew, James, and John and their following him." Also see Keener, 1997: 97–100.

[31] See Moloney, 2002: 50–02; Schweizer, 1970: 47–49.

[32] Zacchaeus also appears as a called one (Lk. 19:5). See Geldenhuys, 1979: 180–03, 192–94; Ryken, 2009: 202–14, 227–39.

[33] See Thomaskutty, 2015: 48–78.

[34] Cf. Wilkins, 1992: 179–81.

intimately. If Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul were added to the circle of Jesus after he started his public ministry, then who knew earthly Jesus better? This information draws the attention of the reader toward the twin-brother motif of the Syrian traditions. The expression in the prologue of the *IGTh* (i.e., "he [Jesus] was born in our land," ch. 1) strengthens this argument.

The Gospel of John can be considered a mining field for understanding new insights concerning Thomas. An interlocked reading of John with the *IGTh* provides significant information regarding Thomas's connection with Jesus. Though Thomas was a key figure in the story of John, even in the climax (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-29; 21:2), there is no mention of his call throughout the whole gospel tradition. A combined reading of the canonical gospels and the *IGTh* suggests the following: first, the absence of Thomas's call in the Synoptics and the prevalent Thomasine traditions in John make it explicit that the character was already there with Jesus—this can be better interpreted through their connection from childhood as narrated in the *IGTh*; second, the Johannine traditions and the Syrian traditions believed in the spiritual twinship of Thomas with Jesus—this can be substantiated by their continued attachment from childhood as in the *IGTh*;[35] third, the repetition of Lk. 2:41-51 in *IGTh* 19 reveals that traditions related to the childhood of Jesus existed in the first century CE, in which case they were circulated in relation to Thomas who was Jesus's childhood friend;[36] and fourth, the narrative connection between *IGTh* 10:2 and *GTh* 77 further strengthens the view that childhood traditions were widely circulated around the apostolic figure Thomas.[37]

The traditions related to the childhood of Jesus are predominantly attached to James (*ProtJam*) and Thomas (*IGTh*).[38] Thomas's familiarity with James

[35] See Layton, 1987: 359–60.

[36] The entire tradition of the *IGTh* is placed to fill the gap between Lk. 2:40 and 2:41-51 (see Mirecki, 1992: 5: 543). Klauck (2003: 73) comments, "The only direct loan from the New Testament is the pericope about the twelve-year-old Jesus in the temple (Luke 2:41-52, in *IGTh* 19)—with good reason, since this is the obvious nucleus from which the whole work has grown." See Cullmann, 1990/2003: 1: 441; Lapham, 2003: 130; Mirecki, 1992: 6: 543; Bovon, 2003: 296.

[37] The parallel between the *GTh* and *IGTh* is noticeable (see *IGTh* 10:2; cf. *GTh* 77; cf. Lapham, 2003: 131; Valantasis, 1997: 155–6):And when a clamour arose and a concourse of people took place, the child Jesus also ran there, and forced his way through the crowd, and took the injured foot, and it was healed immediately. And he said to the young man: "Arise now, cleave the wood and remember me." And when the crowd saw what happened, they worshipped the child, saying: "Truly the spirit of God dwells in this child."

[38] For more details about *The Protevangelium of James*, refer to Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 370–88; Lapham, 2003: 64; James, 1924: 38; Cameron, 1982: 107–09; Klauck, 2003: 64–72. We have *The ProtJam* in the original Greek and in several oriental versions, the oldest of which is the Syriac. For

from the earlier stages is mentioned in *IGTh* 16:1-2 through a miraculous story: first, Joseph sends his son James to bind wood and take it to his house, and the child Jesus follows him; second, while James is gathering the sticks, a viper bites his hand; and third, as he is about to die, Jesus breathes upon the bite and at once James becomes well.[39] In the story, James appears as Jesus's brother and hence his own family member. But Thomas appears as a friend of Jesus and one who observes the event. This attachment of Jesus, James, and Thomas is also seen in *GTh* 12–13. In the *IGTh*, whereas James is introduced as a brother of Jesus and family member, Thomas is mentioned as Jesus's friend from childhood. In the *GTh*, this relationship is further explained in the context of Jesus's public ministry. While in *GTh* 12 Jesus affirms that "no matter where you come it is James the Just you shall go," in *GTh* 13, Thomas's role appears to be above that of James as the sharer of esoteric wisdom with Jesus. This relationship between Jesus, James, and Thomas reveals the following things: first, James and Thomas were attached to Jesus from childhood and this relationship continued even during the public ministry; second, though James was respected, Thomas had a unique leadership role in the early church;[40] and third, while James (as brother) was well aware of Jesus's earthly family connections, birth, and infancy as mentioned in *ProtJam*, Thomas (as a childhood friend) was aware of the childhood details of Jesus as narrated in the *IGTh*.[41]

The *IGTh* has its own Christological affirmations through the usage of Christological titles and confessions. The aspects such as the preexistence of Jesus (7:2), his role as a heavenly redeemer (8:1), and his function as a teacher of the law (15:1-4) exemplify his unique role as the protagonist of the story.[42] Zacchaeus, the first teacher, spoke about boy Jesus in the following way: "this child is not earth-born" and was "begotten even before the creation

another material that refers to the infancy of Jesus, *The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, see Klauck, 2003: 78–81; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 410–13.

[39] See Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 398.

[40] See Valantasis, 1997: 78.

[41] Lapham (2003: 62) comments, "The *ProtJam* is one of the earliest of these [i.e., Infancy Gospels]. Like other such Gospels, this work owes much to the canonical texts; but it expands and embellishes these, and adds material which is to be found nowhere else, concerning the miraculous birth, and the early years, of Mary herself." See Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 363–401; James, 1924: 38; Cameron, 1982: 107–09; Klauck, 2003: 64–72.

[42] See Hennecke, 1959/1963: 1: 391–92.

of the world" (7:2).[43] Klauck (2003: 77) rightly states, "A christology of pre-existence, which is not yet found in Matthew 1-2 and Luke 1-2, is introduced into the infancy narratives of *IGTh*." The first teacher speaks to the people and praises Jesus's power as follows: "He [Jesus] is something great, a god or an angel" (7:4).[44] Similarly, the raised Zenon utters: "Lord, you did not throw me down, but raised me up" (9:3). Toward the end of ch. 9, the narrator reports: "the parents of the child glorified God for the miracle that had happened and worshipped Jesus" (9:3b).[45] On several occasions, the crowd that gathered around Jesus marveled at him and subsequently worshipped him, saying: "Truly the spirit of God dwells in this child" (10:2b), "Truly, this child is either a god or an angel of God, for every word of his is an accomplished deed" (17:2), and "This child is from heaven, for he has saved many souls from death, and is able to save them all his lifelong" (18:2).[46] Within the narrative framework of the *IGTh*, Jesus heals the diseased (8:2; 10:1-2; 15:4; 16:1), raises people from death (9:1-3; 18:1), and performs nature miracles (11:1-2; 12:1-2; 13:1-2).[47] Klauck (2003: 75) further states, "Jesus confirms (in Johannine diction) that he has 'come from above' in order to 'call to the things above' those destined to receive them."[48] This narrative development informs the reader the Christological perspective of the text.[49] As the spiritual twin and the childhood friend of Jesus, Thomas perceived Jesus with a wealth of experience and knowledge. When a reader understands the relationship between Thomas and Jesus and Thomas's Christological perception in the *IGTh*, this adds further context to his utterance in John 20:28 (i.e., "My Lord and my God").[50]

[43] Lapham (2003: 131; cf. 167–72) observes, "The episode of Jesus and his schoolteacher, for instance, told three times in this Infancy Gospel, and undoubtedly a legend of considerable popularity, appears also in the *Epistula Apostolorum*."

[44] See Klauck, 2003: 75.

[45] Lapham (2003: 130) states, "the miraculous stories are told to demonstrate the divine nature of Christ; and here, in this Infancy Gospel, the reaction of the onlookers after each marvel is proof of Jesus' heavenly origin."

[46] See Mirecki, 1992: 6: 543; Lapham, 2003: 129–31.

[47] See Mirecki, 1992: 6: 543; Klauck, 2003: 75–6.

[48] Cameron (1982: 123) says, "the *IGTh* lays stress upon what it understood to be Jesus' self-awareness, wisdom, divine identity, and destiny."

[49] Cf. Mirecki, 1992: 6: 543; Cameron, 1982: 122–24.

[50] The *IGTh* is concluded with a makarism: "Blessed are you among women, because the Lord has blessed the fruit of your womb. For such glory and such excellence and wisdom we have never seen or heard" (19:5). This clear conclusion of the text is confirmed by a brief doxology: "To him be glory forever and ever, Amen." See Lapham, 2003: 129–31; Klauck, 2003: 76.

Concluding remarks

The analysis of the *IGTh* in this chapter enables us to understand the character of Thomas in relation to Jesus's childhood. When the text introduces Thomas as the narrative voice of the story, a reader infers the underlying logic of the plot development. When we integrate the story of the *IGTh* with other traditions, we can understand Thomas's attachment with Jesus from childhood—as his name does not appear in the call narratives of the canonical gospels, as per the childhood details narrated in the *IGTh*, and as we infer it through the twin-brother motif of the Syrian traditions. The traditions included in the *IGTh* cannot be simply perceived as loosely connected stories. The narrative develops in a coherent and interconnected fashion through Jesus's childhood at the ages of five, six, eight, and twelve years. Aasgaard (2009/2010: 45) states after a careful analysis of the *IGTh*, "The analysis, then, shows that *IGTh* has an ordered structure and a coherent storyline, with narrative climaxes and some instances of interconnecting flashbacks and anticipations." When Thomas emerges as the narrator and observer of the events, the reader perceives the following things: first, that Thomas was the childhood friend and twin brother of Jesus, and hence there are more chances for a Thomasine origin of the traditions in the *IGTh*; second, in an integrated approach, Thomas develops from a "childhood friend" to an "earlier disciple" (i.e., *IGTh*), and later on to a "mature believer" (Gospel of John); third, Thomas's discipleship develops alongside James's discipleship, in which case they would have been the first disciples of Jesus; fourth, Thomas would have been one of the earliest witnesses of Jesus's miraculous deeds, Sabbath-breaking incidents, raising of the dead, and profound utterances, and people's usage of Christological titles and confessions; fifth, Thomas as an Israelite and friend of Jesus would have been later on recognized as a philosopher; sixth, as a childhood friend, Thomas would have recognized the preexistent nature of Jesus—John, in that sense, borrowed those traditions during the composition of his gospel (Jn 1:1-18); and seventh, the previous categories alongside his missionary endeavors in the Eastern world would have qualified Thomas to be a significant figure in the annals of early Christianity. While Thomas is silent in the first half of the Gospel of John and emerges as a developing character toward the dénouement of the story—that is, without being introduced by a

call narrative—a reader infers his presence with Jesus from the earlier stages of life. In that way, the traditions of the *IGTh* interlock with other canonical and extracanonical traditions.

As in the case of the Gospel of John, the apocryphal documents also highlight the personality and significance of Didymus Judas Thomas from an early Christian point of view. All these writings portray Thomas as a dignified and exemplary figure whose traditions sustained for a long period of time. The availability of the apocryphal Thomas literature alongside of the Fourth Gospel (FG) indicates that there were multiple traditions developed around his personality and ideology. Documents such as the *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh* provide the reader with extended knowledge concerning Thomas and his continued influence among the early Christian communities. The *GTh* foregrounds him as a figure of esoteric wisdom and as a character who shares secret knowledge with Jesus. Within the framework of the *GTh*, Thomas's character develops from incomprehension to comprehension and he holds a significant leadership role as he partakes in the Jesus movement. While Peter and Matthew attempt to understand Jesus from their fixed categories of knowledge, Thomas comprehends his ineffable nature. This is in many ways similar to the characterization of Thomas in the FG. The *BTh* reflects the engagement of the Thomasine community with the ideological and philosophical thought-world of early Christianity. The *BTh*, as in the case of the *GTh*, portrays Thomas as the twin brother of Jesus and also as a sharer of secret truth and revealer of hidden sayings. A reader can recognize his character as one who develops from ignorance to perfection. The *BTh* also brings to the fore his worthiness and integrity as a character. In the case of the *ATh*, the reader's attention is invited beyond the Greco–Roman world. In the *ATh*, Thomas is introduced as a traveler to the Eastern Hemisphere, that is, to the Indo-Parthian and South Indian provinces. A reader can also notice the way historical facts and fictitious elements are coalesced within the text. Within the narrative framework, Thomas is pictured as a witness of Jesus and as a figure who engages himself with people from varied walks of life. On the basis of the *ATh*, a reader can understand him as an "Apostle to the Eastern world." The content of the *IGTh* shows several resemblances with the other apocryphal writings. In the text, Thomas is addressed as a philosopher and, at the same time, as one who was attached to Jesus from childhood. The *IGTh*

describes Thomas's development as Jesus's disciple even from childhood and as an earliest witness of Jesus. Thus, the apocryphal traditions portray Thomas as a significant figure of early Christianity. Having analyzed the canonical and extracanonical details pertinent to the character, in the next section we will explore the historical traditions related to Thomas.

Part Three

Thomas in the Historical Traditions

In the previous eight chapters, we explored the development of Didymus Judas Thomas in the Johannine and the so-called apocryphal traditions. For an extended understanding of the person and work of Thomas, we also need to analyze the historical traditions pertinent to him. In the process, the following questions must be addressed: How were the identity and work of Thomas perceived in the history of Christianity? And how can we reconstruct a history of Thomas with the help of the available traditio-historical materials? In Chapter 9, we will attempt to understand the way the nation of India was perceived in antiquity and the possibilities of Thomas's coming to the Greater Indian provinces. Some of the significant questions to be explored are: How were the church fathers, historians, and travelers divided in their perceptions of Parthia and India? And how were the Persian and Indian territories connected? In Chapter 10, we will further explore the explicit and implicit evidences to reconstruct a history of Thomas. In this section, the conceptualization of the character will be expounded from the points of view of the Synoptic Gospels, the Fourth Gospel, the Book of Acts, and the apocryphal and patristic evidences. Meanwhile, we will also investigate the way the Thomas community was perceived in history. Using this evidence, we will attempt to reach a wider understanding of the person and work of Thomas. A reconstruction of the history of Thomas with available evidence may then help us to perceive the identity of the character with greater clarity.

An understanding of the person and work of Thomas in geographically wider areas and over a chronologically extended period will enable us to assess the popularity of the traditions related to him. We will also analyze how the Thomas community functioned beyond the existing perceptions. All this together will help us to place Thomas with more clarity in the historical annals.

9

Patristic References about Thomas

Introduction

Having discussed the character of Didymus Judas Thomas both in the Gospel of John and the apocryphal traditions, it is vital to investigate evidence about him in the historical traditions. However, any exercise in understanding the identity of Thomas based on historical traditions is not an easy task. The purpose of the current chapter is fourfold: first, to take a look at pre-Christian history to understand the connection between India and the rest of the world; second, to explore how the traditions about Thomas spread in wider geographical areas; third, to investigate the development of the Thomas tradition on a chronological basis; and fourth, to understand the consistency of the tradition on the basis of geographical and chronological details. In order to achieve these goals, the current chapter attempts to answer the following questions: Was India a known geopolitical region to the Jews, Babylonians, Greeks, Romans, and Persians of ancient times? How did the discovery of new sea routes facilitate connections between Greater India and other parts of the world? Do the classical writings of the pre-Christian and subsequent periods discuss Greater India's connections with the rest of the world? How did the early church fathers discuss the coming of Thomas to the Eastern part of the world? What information do we gather about St. Thomas from the early church fathers, copper plates, ballads, travelers' records, traders' manuals, and visitors' writings? How is the martyrdom of Thomas recorded in traditio-historical documents? Is there other convincing evidence that contradicts the Indian or Parthian apostolate of Thomas? How can the Parthian and the Indian connections of Thomas be understood? These questions are crucial for understanding the Thomas traditions and also relating him with the Eastern part of the world. In the following sections, we

will analyze the traditio-historical documents under two sections: first, India in the classical writings; and second, Thomas in the traditio-historical and patristic writings.

India in the classical writings

Ancient evidence, at least from 1000 BCE, suggests the possibility of commercial connections between India and Israel.[1] Other than connections with Israel, Kerala also had contacts with the Arabs, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Greeks, the Romans and the Chinese. During the days of King Solomon, ships used to navigate this region to trade in ivory, teakwood, rosewood, sandalwood, apes, and peacocks.[2] It is even believed that the teak from the forests of Kerala was used to build Solomon's Temple.[3] According to ancient belief, Biblical Ophir, visited by King Solomon's ships, was the coastal village of Poovar, south of Trivandrum, the present-day capital of Kerala.[4] Katz (2000: 27) mentions that "the Hebrew Bible, which contains Sanskrit and Tamil words, suggests and describes trade between Solomon's kingdom and India. The First Book of Kings 10:22 describes the opulence of the court of King Solomon, an opulence that the Bible suggests derived from the India trade."[5] Some of the stories in Buddhist traditions have striking similarities with the stories related to King Solomon (1 Kings 3:16-28; cf. *Mahoshadha Jâtaka*).[6] The Book of Esther that may have been written around 500 BCE states that King Ahasuerus's kingdom stretched from Hoddu (i.e.,

[1] See Weil, 2009: 1: 1204. Prior to 1000 BCE, there are indications of the coming of the Aryans to India around 2000/1500 BCE. See Mundadan, 2001: 1: 9.

[2] Katz (2000: 27) comments, "The biblical book of Kings mentions that King Solomon's ships carry kofim (apes), tukim (peacocks), and almag (sandalwood = valgum) of Indian origin." Rawlinson (1916/2002: 10) reports, "The 'navy of Tarshish' made a triennial voyage to the East, bringing back with them a vast quantity of gold and silver, ivory, apes, peacocks, and 'a great plenty of almug trees and precious stones." See George, 1972: 1; Pinto, 2015.

[3] See Blady, 2000: 231; Philip, 1908/2002: 24.

[4] See Bhatt and Bhargava, 2006: 29; Nair, 2012: 17; Avari, 2016; Kusuman, 1987: 2; Ramachandran, 2007/2008.

[5] Philip (1908/2002: 24) comments, "It is almost a generally admitted fact that commercial communications existed between the coasts of India and Palestine from a very early age." Ptolemy conversed with Indians in Alexandria, and Indian residents were found in Egypt in Pliny's time (1st century CE)."

[6] Rawlinson (1916/2002: 11) records, "There is the curious resemblance between the *Mahoshadha Jâtaka* and the story of the Judgment of Solomon. In the former story, the Buddha, incarnate in the former birth as *vazir* of the Raja of Benares, has to adjudicate between two women, each of whom claims a certain infant." Also see Skolnik and Berenbaum, 2007: 9: 772.

India) to Kush (i.e., Ethiopia; Esther 1:1; 8:9) with 127 provinces.[7] The Buddhist *Bâveru Jâtaka* also refers to the ancient trade between India and Babylon (i.e., *Bâveru* in Sanskrit). The text refers to "Indian merchants who took periodic voyages to the land of *Bâveru*."[8] This evidence suggests that ancient India had trade connections with Jewish, Persian, and Babylonian kingdoms.

Obviously, such trade from Palestine to India did not stop during the Greek and Roman periods; it clearly continued according to all known records, and Thomas could have made it to India via a caravan along the routes of synagogues, or over the sea as in the *Periplus*.[9] The Greek and Roman writers of the pre-Christian era provide us with a lot of materials concerning India in which Didymus Judas Thomas later on preached the gospel. The Western accounts describe that "there was a time when India too was a classical land on a par with Greece and Rome."[10] From the sixth century BCE, the Persians, Greeks, and Romans started showing interest in the Indian subcontinent.[11] For them, India was the vast land east of the river Indus or the whole Orient.[12] Among the Greeks, according to written sources, Scylax of Karyanda in the sixth century BCE was the first to visit India and wrote an account of it.[13] He was a pioneer in geography, an explorer, and the first Western observer to give an account of India.[14] Hecataeus of Miletus (560–490 BCE), another significant figure, also wrote about India.[15] He also drew the earliest Greek map of India that includes the River Indus.[16] Around 430 BCE, Herodotus wrote a book

[7] India in Hebrew is *Hoddu*, from the Old Persian *hidauw* and *hinduish*; in Sanskrit, India is *Sindhu*, meaning "stream" or "river," referring to the River Indus. See Bhaskaran, 2015: 40; Manning, Speir, and Scharf, 1856: 157–59; Katz, 2000: 27.

[8] See Katz, 2000: 27.

[9] Some of these conclusions are derived from my one-on-one conversations with James H. Charlesworth.

[10] See Puliurumpil, 2016: 14.

[11] Mundadan (2001: 1: 12–13) states, "From 516 BC to AD 220, India was continually in rather close contact with the great empires of the West. This contact definitely influenced not only the course of events in India's history but also her culture and life pattern."

[12] See Puliurumpil, 2016: 13.

[13] Sagar (1992: 40) comments, "Greek mercenary Scylax of Karyanda who explored the Indus delta must have increased the knowledge of the Indians about the areas covered by him during his explorations." He further records, "It is said that when the Indian soldiers fought in Greece for Darius, they came in contact with the Greeks for the first time and perhaps due to this contact, an Indian philosopher visited Socrates sometime before 400 BCE." Also see Jacobs, 2015: 28; Mouton, Rutherford, and Yakubovich, 2013: 450; Puliurumpil, 2016: 53–63.

[14] See Tripathi, 1942/1992: 116; Puliurumpil, 2016: 23.

[15] Puliurumpil (2016: 65) mentions that "Hecataeus of Miletus (560–490 BCE) is a historian and a geographer. He is the first known Greek historian and was one of the first classical writers to mention the different peoples and countries of the world."

[16] See Kuzminski, 2008: 36.

about India, which describes it as "the farthest part of the inhabited world towards the east."[17] Herodotus mentions the existence of "many nations of the Indians."[18] This detail from Herodotus is a strong indication that pre-Christian India was as diverse as modern India.[19]

India was known to the Westerners not only through the writings of Scylax, Hecataeus, and Herodotus, but also through other later writers. Around 400 BCE, Ctesias of Cnidus wrote his *Indika* that contains extensive knowledge concerning the land of India.[20] Ctesias alludes to cinnamon, a common product of Malabar, as *carpion*, a name that seems to have been derived from the Tamil or Malayalam word *karuppu*.[21] This proves the argument that India was traditionally considered as a land of spices.[22] While Megasthenes defined the boundaries of ancient India, Erastothenes distinguished its boundaries from Persia.[23] Thus, the boundaries of India were clearly distinguished from other countries even during the pre-Christian period. Puliurumpil (2016: 175) states as follows:

> In the sixth century with Scylax begins the Western references to India; the term "India," of course, referring to the River Indus and the surrounding regions. But in the fourth century with Megasthenes, the term "India"

[17] Herodotus 3.106, as quoted in McCrindle, 1901: 4. The Greek writer Herodotus is known as the "father of history." His famous book *History of the Wars*, written in 430 BCE, is a description of the wars between the Persian Empire and the Greek city states. In Chapter 3, paragraphs 98 to 106 speak about India as the farthest land on earth, and about the Indian people, their lifestyle, and the gold available there. Other references to India in the same book are found in 4.40, 44; 7.65, 70, 86, 187, and 8.113. Also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 27; Puliurumpil, 2016: 24.

[18] Prasad (1980: xxi) comments, "This, together with the allusion to India's being more populous than the rest of the world and yielding a larger revenue than Babylon, Assyria or any other kingdom subject to Persia, leaves the impression that India was then exactly the same country it has been ever since."

[19] Parker (2008: 33) states that "India's very marginality gave it a privileged position in the early history of Greek map-making, as a marker of the edges of the world, in the cosmologies of Hecataeus and Herodotus. When Alexander III of Macedon succeeded his father Philip II in 336 BCE there was thus already a vivid Greek notion of India." Also see Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella, 2007: 497; Rapson, 1935: 397.

[20] Ctesias (Ktesias) is a Greek physician and a historian from Cnidus, who lived in the fifth century BCE. He had an account of India titled *Indika* which is a record of the beliefs of the Persians about India. This book speaks about the peoples, philosophers, artisans, gold and other riches and wonders in India. This book remains only in fragments in the original form. Also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 27–28; 2016: 24–25.

[21] Chattopadhyaya (1999: 2) states, "Before Alexander's march to India, Persia was a mediator between Greece and India. Scylax of Karyanda and Ctesias of Knidos, were the authors of descriptions about India, stationed in India. Their accounts associated India with the miraculous and the fabulous." Also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 28.

[22] See Nichols, 2011: 43–44.

[23] See McCrindle, 1887: 30; Kalota, 1976: 22–23.

> becomes clearer and rather accurate. He who lived in India, in the court of Chandragupta as ambassador of Seleucus, could also write a book on India which made him famous and India more known to the Western world.

Before the Indian invasion of Alexander the king of Macedonia, the Greeks considered India as a mere land of fables.[24] In 326 BCE, Alexander with his army crossed the Indus, the eastern boundary of the Persian Empire, and entered India.[25] In 327 BCE, Alexander invaded India, apparently believing that possessions of that country would give him all of Asia and thus allow him to become the master of the whole Orient.[26] Though Alexander was not successful in conquering Indian territories, he did bring India into close contact with the Greeks.[27] One of the strangest among all the exotic phenomena that Alexander's army encountered in India was the religious and ascetic lifestyle.[28] He had broken the great barrier for many in the West, the Persian Empire, which separated and prevented the Greeks from having direct communications with India and her people.[29]

The three *Indika*s of Ctesias, Megasthenes, and Arrian really do uphold the fame of India in ancient times.[30] Among them, Arrian, quoting both Megasthenes and Eratosthenes, wrote about India and mentioned the east and northwest winds.[31] In the fifteenth chapter of Strabo's (64 BCE–24 CE) work

[24] Puliurumpil (2016: 13) further states, "While appreciating the immense wealth, the marvellous wisdom and the high asceticism of the Indians they [the ancient western writers] also describe a lot of fanciful creatures, legends and certain strange customs of the people."

[25] See Puliurumpil, 2012: 29.

[26] For more details about Alexander the Great and his connections with India, refer to Gunther, 1953/2007; Puliurumpil, 2016: 33.

[27] See Dueck, 2016: 341.

[28] See Puliurumpil, 2016: 44.

[29] Puliurumpil (2016: 436) further says, "Herodotus' account is a noteworthy one as he is the first western writer to show the quasi exact geographical location of India. For him India is the 'farthest,' 'biggest' and the 'wealthiest' land." He (2016: 436–37) further states, "He [Herodotus] was so accurate to write that India was the twentieth satrapy (east of the river Indus) of the great Persian Empire, whose satrap presented the emperor the highest quantity of gold (*The Histories*, Book 3, chap. 94). The world map drawn by Herodotus, where India is well-depicted, is to be mentioned specially." Also see Perumalil, 1971: 6–7.

[30] Puliurumpil (2016: 436) states, "It is to the information collected by the officers of Alexander, Seleucus and Ptolemies, condensed, extracted and reduced to a consistent shape by Diodorus, Strabo, Pliny and Arrian during the first century before and the first century after Christ that we owe most of our knowledge of ancient India. Besides the accounts of these Greek writers there are the earlier accounts of Herodotus and Ctesias." Also see Singh, 2008: 324; Parker, 2008: 53.

[31] Kurien (2002: 43) writes, "In the last few centuries BCE, Greeks and Romans carried on an extensive trade with Kerala. Spices such as cardamom, cinnamon, ginger, turmeric, and pepper seem to have been in particular demand." See Arrian, *Anabasis*, 6.5, in McCrindle, 1901: 88. Also see Roller, 2010: 1; Puliurumpil, 2012: 38.

entitled *Geographia* (*Geography*), he considers India as the first and largest country in the East.[32] Arrian, Strabo, and many others comment about the physical conditions of India.[33] Pliny (23–79 CE) in his *Historica Naturalis* (Natural History) writes about the Egyptian Ptolemy Philadelphus sending an ambassador called Dionysius to Pataliputra "to put the truth to test by personal inspection."[34] Pliny gives a very accurate description of the route to India, the country of Malabar, and its items of trade. According to him, the Greek ships anchored at either Muziris or Kollam. The word he uses for Muziris is *primum emporium Indiae* and for Kollam "Nelkanda." The important articles were spices, pearls, diamonds, and silks; while the first three were found in South India, the last was brought down in country ships from China.[35] Puliurumpil (2016: 369–70) comments that "Pliny's detailed description of the voyage from Alexandria to South India on the Nile up to Coptos, through the desert to Berenice at the Red Sea and then across the Indian Ocean to Muziris (Kerala), was based on earlier and contemporary reports and contains interesting facts."[36] Another important writer of this time is Ptolemy, whose famous work is entitled *Geography*. He describes the exact locations of many of the geographical regions of ancient India.[37] In 139 CE, Ptolemy mentions different places in Kerala or Thamizhakam. According to him, the title of the Chera king was *Kerabotras* and the capital of the kingdom was Karour on the banks of the river Kaveri.[38] Other places he mentions are Tundis (Kadalundi

[32] See Puliurumpil, 2016: 289–95.

[33] Arrian, *Anabasis* 6.5, in McCrindle, 1901: 89; Strabo 15.1.13. Ptolemy writing in 150 CE assigns five mouths to the Ganges and seven mouths to the Indus. See Puliurumpil, 2012: 40–41.

[34] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 6.17. See more details in Rawlinson, 1926: 93; Puliurumpil, 2012: 40.

[35] See Jones, 1969: 101. Also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 70.

[36] Also see Bostock and Riley, 1855: 62–65; Philip, 1908/2002: 26. Puliurumpil (2016: 439) further comments, "The first two centuries of the Christian era indicate an increase in trade between India and Rome. This expansion of trade was due to the comparative peace established by the Roman Empire during the time of Augustus (63 BCE–14 CE), which allowed for new explorations. Thus a significant commercial relationship existed between Indian and the Roman Empire."

[37] Periplus 57. Also see Schoff, 1912: 45; Pliny, *Nat. Hist*. book 6 is on the people, book 8 on the animals, book 12 on the plants, and book 31 on the minerals of India. The religious mind-set of Indians is reflected through the story of Socrates's conversation with an Indian in Athens, who asked what sort of philosopher he was. When Socrates replied that he "investigated human life," the Indian laughed, saying that "no one was able to observe human affairs if he was ignorant of divine affairs." This incident is reported by the Christian historian Eusebius of Caesarea (260–340 CE), who cites it from Aristocles, who in turn is quoting Aristoxenos (320–300 BCE). Also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 49; 2016: 27–28.

[38] Mundadan (2001: 1: 15) states, "The 'Colobotras' of Pliny, the 'Keprobotras' of *The Periplus*, the 'Kerobotras' of Ptolomy were Greek equivalents of the Keralaputra of the Asokan edict of 257 BC."

near Bepur) and Nirkanda (Neendakara near Quilon).[39] From these writings, we learn that Greater India was a well-known geographical area to the Westerners.

The relationships between India and the ancient kingdoms were further facilitated after the discovery of new travel routes to India. The discovery of monsoon wind in 47 CE by Hippalus was a great event in history that resulted in the use of a new sea route to the Indian subcontinent.[40] From the time of the discovery of the wind, Roman ships began to sail straight across the sea to India. Pliny writes: "In later times it has been considered a well ascertained fact that the voyage from Syagrus, the Promontory of Arabia, reckoned at thirteen hundred and thirty five miles, can be performed most advantageously with aid of a westerly wind, which is there known by the name of Hippalus."[41] With the help of Hippalus, Muziris, the nearest port of India, was reachable in forty days.[42] An authentic piece of information about the Malabar Coast is found in the writings of a Byzantine monk called Cosmas Indicopleustes who lived in the first part of the sixth century CE. He writes about Malabar to show the significant role played by the Christians in the commercial activities on the island of Ceylon.[43] He wrote: "In the Island of Taprobane (Ceylon) there is a Church of Christians, clerics and faithful. Likewise at Male where the pepper grows and in the town of Kalliana there is also a bishop consecrated in Persia."[44] While speaking about the port cities of Kerala, Cosmas makes mention of the Christian communities of Malabar and Kalyan. The active involvement of these Christians in trade resulted in the formation of many trading colonies in Kerala.[45] Furthermore, Periplus records that Muziris and Barace (Purakad) were the chief ports of the time from which a great quantity of pepper, the chief product of Malabar, was sent to Europe.[46] These details

[39] See Logan, 1989: 250.
[40] See Philip, 1908/2002: 26; Puliurumpil, 2012: 63.
[41] Pliny, *Nat. Hist*. 6.23. Also see Allaby, 2010: 73; Puliurumpil, 2012: 64–65.
[42] Thapar (2015: np) states, "The use of the winds for navigation may have made it necessary for seamen and traders from Egypt to stay a short while on the Indian coast before returning to their Red Sea ports, increasing contact between local Indians and the visiting Yavanas." See Neill, 1984: 31; Greswell, 1852: 4: 487–89; Puliurumpil, 2016: 372.
[43] See Charles, 2013: 460; Hunter, 1886/2000.
[44] Cosmas, *CT 11*, 88.445–8. Also see Aiya, 1906: 241; Puliurumpil, 2012: 74–75.
[45] See Chandra, 1977: 117–18.
[46] Puliurumpil (2016: 440) says that "The vehement Indo-Roman trade and the wide use of Alexandria-Muziris commercial route helped the arrival of Jews in the South-Indian cities and which paved

prove that India was not an unknown land (*terra incognita*), but a land that was known to Western writers, historians, and geographers and thereby to traders, sailors, and travelers.

The Indian subcontinent was well connected to the ancient Jewish, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman kingdoms/empires, and hence it could have been known even to Jesus and his disciples. Thomas with his challenging character as described in the Gospel of John and in the apocryphal documents may well have chosen the farthest, greatest, and wealthiest land, as Herodotus qualifies India, to witness the gospel of Jesus Christ.[47] This discussion enables us to see how Thomas would have emerged as a figure who embraced the nation of India and its missions. The following aspects are significant: first, India was a known geopolitical region to the Jews, Babylonians, Greeks, Romans, and Persians—Thomas would have learned extensively about the nation from travelers and writers and thus would have developed an interest in India; second, as India was considered the farthest nation, Thomas would have chosen that geopolitical area to fulfill the Acts 1:8 mission mandate that extends even to "the ends of the earth"; third, as India was considered as one of the religious (for example, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism) and philosophical centers of the world, Thomas would have taken steps to go and accomplish Jesus's imperative, "making disciples of all nations" (see Mt. 28:19a); fourth, as the discovery of new sea routes facilitated connections between Indian coastal areas (i.e., both northwestern and southern India) and the Jewish as well as Greco–Roman world, Thomas would have had more opportunities to visit the nation; and fifth, as there is evidence to prove the existence of Jewish settlements in India during the pre-Christian periods, Thomas would have used such opportunities to visit them. These points can be further substantiated by the historical and patristic references about Thomas. In the following section, we will investigate how historians, travelers, and church fathers refer to the visit of Thomas to India.

the way for Apostle Thomas to reach India to preach Jesus the Lord." The development of the academic field known as *Indology*, a branch of study of the past glorious state of India including its philosophies, cultures, religions, and literature, is an attempt to explore the classical and glorious past of the Indian subcontinent.

[47] See Puliurumpil, 2016: 440.

Thomas in the traditio-historical and patristic writings

The previous discussion gives us a clear view concerning the connection between India and the West. This connection during the pre-Christian period makes Thomas's missionary journeys to the Eastern part of the world possible.[48] On that basis, Indians claim the evidence for St. Thomas in India is as strong as that of St. Peter in Rome.[49] In the following pages, we will analyze the reports of early church fathers, travelers, traders, and visitors in order to understand the traditio-historical aspects of St. Thomas and the Indian Church.

Church fathers such as Eusebius and Jerome report on the visit of a Christian philosopher called Pantaenus to Indian Christianity in 189 or 190 CE.[50] Jerome mentions that he was sent by Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria, at the request of the native Indian Christians.[51] According to Eusebius, Pantaenus is supposed to have discovered Christians in India who had in their possession a Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew, brought to them by St. Bartholomew.[52] Moffett (2006: 1: 38) states that "Pantaenus' pupils and successors, Clement and Origen, for example, write about India as if they knew more of that land than passing myths and in no way confused it with Arabia and Persia." There should be nothing surprising about Pantaenus finding Christians in India if

[48] Job (1952) divides his mission journeys into the following categories: the First Missionary Journey (ca. 33–50 CE); the Second Missionary Journey (ca. 50–59 CE); and the Last Mission and the Martyrdom (ca. 59–68 CE).

[49] See Daughrity and Athyal, 2016: 3; Frykenberg, 2008: viii; Visvanathan, 1999: 2–3. Jayakumar (2013: 5–6) argues, "It is said that Christianity is as old as Christianity itself. Christianity reached India, even before St. Peter reached Rome in 68 AD."

[50] Puliurumpil (2012: 193) also considers Pantaenus's visit as the second Indian mission, after the first Indian mission of St. Thomas. Among his disciples were Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Clement of Alexandria called him 'the Sicilian bee' in recognition of his diligent study habits, and Origen described him as the first Christian who has fully availed himself of the stores of true learning and philosophy. See Moffett, 1998: 36; Gordon, 1921: 115.

[51] Jerome, *De Viris*, 683. Jerome mentions twice the mission of Pantaenus to India, first in a letter he wrote to a Roman friend, and again in his book *About the Most Famous Men*. See Puliurumpil, 2012: 196. A large number of scholars, including Medlycott (1905), Mingana (1926: 435–95), and Bhaskaran (2015: 76), do not support the argument that Pantaenus visited South India. See Philip, 1908/2002: 52; Daughrity and Athyal, 2016: 7.

[52] Eusebius, *HE* 5.10.3; Jerome, *De Viris*, 683; see Puliurumpil, 2012: 196; Moffett, 2006: 1: 36–39; Guthrie, 1990: 47. Philip (1908/2002: 52) says that "Pantaenus was the head of the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria, and during the period of his voyage to India his chair was occupied by Clement. From information received by Pantaenus, Clement and Jerome describe the India of Pantaenus as a place inhabited by *Brahmins* and *Philosophers*, and of the last-mentioned sect, Clement says that 'they know not marriage nor begetting of children.'" Nedungatt (2008: 182) rightly comments, "Certain writers ignore or mislead this historical fact so that they can postpone Christian origins in India to the fourth century, or to the fifth century, if not later." Mundadan (2001: 1: 118–20) also records the visit of a certain Theophilus (fourth century) among others.

Thomas, and possibly Bartholomew, had already preached there.[53] From these details, we understand that Indian Christianity was known widely toward the end of the second century. Moreover, the well-known Syrian copper plates, which date back to 230 CE, show the influential position of early Indian Christianity.[54] Philip (1908/2002: 61) argues, "The antiquity and the Apostolic foundation of the Church of Malabar cannot have a better confirmation than in the copper plates and the mission of Pantaenus almost within the sub-apostolic age." On the basis of the reported visit of Pantaenus and these copper plates, one can argue that Christianity was existent in Malabar at least by the end of the second century and during the early part of the third century.[55]

There are details available regarding the existence of Christian communities in the northwestern part of India before the Council of Nicaea. The oldest tradition of Christianity in this part of the world is a notice according to which Dudi (or David), Bishop of Basra, went to India to preach the gospel in 295–300 CE.[56] The presence of a certain Bishop John, a Persian, during the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE as a representative of the churches and a "bishop of whole of Persia and Greater India" also needs to be understood as significant.[57] In 345 CE, twenty years after the Nicene Council, a Syrian fleet of 400 people representing 72 families, including clergy, men and women,

[53] Neill (1984: 40) argues, "It must be taken as probable that South India is the India of Pantaenus." Also see McDowell, 2015: 163; Mundadan, 2001: 1: 116–17; Irvin and Sunquist, 2001: 1: 94–95.

[54] According to Philip (1908/2002: 58), "These are two *sasanams* issued by two princes on different occasions, one being in favor of the Christians of Cranganore, and the other of those of Quilon." Philip (1908/2002: 58) continues, "The first comprises a single instrument written in old Tamil characters mixed with a good many *grantha* letters purely Dravidian. It was issued by King *Sri Veera Raghava Chakravarthi* to *Iravi Corttan* of *Mahadevarpatnam* (that is, the Christian quarter in Cranganore), creating him Grand Merchant of the Cheraman world, and granting him the lordship of *Manigramam* with remission of taxes and certain social privileges including supremacy over particular classes of artisans." Philip (1908/2002: 58) further says, "The second *sasanam* consists of four plates containing seven pages in all, and was granted under command of King *Sthanu Revi Gupta* by *Ayyan Adigal* to the *Tharisa Church* established by *Isodata Viran* of *Kurakkeni Kollam* (Quilon), transferring several heathen families and a strip of land to the church and congregation, with certain privileges and remission of tax." Also see Menon, 1878: 45–48.

[55] Philip (1908/2002: 61) comments, "A Christian community that thrived in a Hindu country in 230 CE, in such an influential condition as to be favored by a conservative Hindu Ruler, must certainly have had its foundation long previous to that age." Also see Prasad, 2009: 12.2: 484; Parker, 7: 343; Macbride, 1856: 28.

[56] Cf. Mingana, 1926: 450; Klijn, 1962: 27–28; Kuriakose, 1982: 3; Mundadan, 2001: 1: 78; Stephen, 2001: 4.

[57] Philip (1908/2002: 64–65) states, "We may, therefore, presume that John signed the decrees of the Council of Nicaea on behalf of the Indian Church because he was authorized, probably in the Synod itself, to exercise the functions of an Archbishop over it." Also see Placid, 1956: 375–424, 383; Klijn, 1962: 28; Mundadan, 2001: 1: 79; Bhaskaran, 2015: 47; Espín and Nickoloff, 2007: 90.

and children, came and settled in Kerala under the leadership of Thomas of Cana (or "Cnai Thoman").[58] They landed in Cranganore and were cordially welcomed by *Cheraman Perumal*, the then Ruler of Malabar, in the hope that they would add a further impetus to the cause of trade.[59] In the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes (*Universal Christian Topography*, 522 CE), we find further reports about the presence of Christianity in India.[60] He wrote two very informative texts about India's Christians. First, he places them in Male, or the Malabar Coast (Kerala), and in Ceylon (Sri Lanka). Then, he refers to them as Persian Christians, and specifically mentions that their bishop had been appointed and consecrated in Persia.[61] All these evidences increase our understanding concerning the presence of Christianity mostly in the southern and northwestern parts of India. According to these traditions, the majority of travelers from the Greco–Roman worlds entered India either through the southern coast or through the northwestern region. In short, we can easily relate Indian Christianity with the Persian ecclesiastical authorities right from its beginnings on the basis of the following information: first, John's appointment as a "bishop of whole of Persia and Greater India"; and second, Cosmas's record about the leadership of the Malabar church appointed from Persia. This information may further help us to understand Thomas's possible connections with both the Indo-Parthian and South Indian regions.

Even the early church fathers hover between Persia and India when they discuss the destination of Thomas's mission and martyrdom. Origen (185–254 CE), in his *Commentary on Genesis*, associates St. Thomas with Parthia.[62] Since his commentary is dated 224 CE, we can assume that he wrote it before leaving Alexandria for Caesarea in 231 or 233.[63] Origen mentions the names of Thomas, Andrew, John, Peter, and Paul in relation to their mission destinations. According to him, Thomas obtained Parthia by lot, while Andrew Scythia,

[58] See Mundadan, 2001: 1: 90–95; Daughrity and Athyal, 2016: 11; Hillerbrand, 2004: 2: 810; Smith, 1966: 184; Neill, 1984: 42–43; Philip, 1908/2002: 67.

[59] See Philip, 1908/2002: 67; Varghese and Varghese, 2011: 73; Neill, 1984: 42–43; Daniel, 1972/1986: 37.

[60] See McCrindle, *Christian Topography*, 118–19; Howard, 2012: 145.

[61] See Daughrity and Athyal, 2016: 10.

[62] Though Origen's original work has been lost, Eusebius preserved his statement related to the destination of the apostles including Thomas. His *Commentary on Genesis* is not extant in the Greek original, but is available in fragments of Greek citations in an early Latin translation. See Eusebius, *HE* 3.1; also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 248; Hough, 1893: 1: 39–41; Sharan, 2010: 20.

[63] See Puliurumpil, 2012: 249.

John Asia (who died in Ephesus), and Peter and Paul were martyred in Rome under Nero.[64] The association of Thomas with Parthia, suggested by Origen, can be better understood on the basis of the geopolitical realities of that time. Nedungatt (2008: 185) states, "At the time of the Apostles Parthia extended from the Indus River in the East to the Tigris in the West, from the Caspian Sea in the North to the Persian Gulf in the South. But the breakaway kingdom of Gudnaphar, too, was called Parthia, or alternatively India as the equivalent of 'Indo-Parthia,' corresponding to north-West India of the Mauryan Empire."[65] Nedungatt's statement enhances our understanding of the geopolitical map of India. It further helps us to relate Thomas with the wider Indo-Parthian area. In that sense, Origen's Parthia can be understood as Indo-Parthia in the *Acts of Thomas* (*ATh*). A reader who relates the argument of Origen with the early Indo-Parthian geopolitical connections can easily perceive the ecclesiastical relations of first-century Christendom.[66]

St. Ephrem (306–373 CE), in many of his hymns, refers to the Indian mission of St. Thomas. In all of these writings, he praises the Apostle Thomas.[67] Through these, he attests to the fact that India was the field of Thomas's evangelization, death, and burial.[68] In particular, he discusses the contemporary living tradition of Edessa concerning the mission of Thomas in India and his relics.[69] In the *Carmina Nisibene* 42, Ephrem sings of the transfer of the relics of Thomas from India to Edessa.[70] The first stanza of the hymn develops as follows:

> The evil one wailed: where now, is there a place for me to flee from the righteous?
> I stirred up Death to slay the Apostles, that I might be safe from their blows.

[64] See Eusebius, *HE* 3.1. Also see Aerthayil, 1982: 13–14.

[65] Also see the *Clementine Recognitions* (a third-century document), which was fathered on Clement of Rome, and probably composed between 222 and 325.

[66] At the same time, Varghese (2008: 1: 295) states that "St. Thomas came to India by the land route via. Thakshashila (Taxila), an ancient seat of learning in India, confined his mission in North-Western India, mainly in the kingdom of King Gundaphoros and never came to South India."

[67] Mundadan (2001: 1: 27) comments that "St. Ephrem composed hymns in honor of St. Thomas whose relics were being venerated in a shrine at Edessa where this great Syrian poet was living." Also see Kuriakose, 1982: 4–5.

[68] St. Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus (220 CE), refers to Calamina, a city in India, as the place of St. Thomas's martyrdom. As Thomas (2011: 2: 376) states, "the tomb of St. Thomas in India is as much venerated, in his day, as that of St. Peter in Rome." See Moffett, 1998/2006: 1: 33; Kuriakose, 1982: 4–5; Philip, 1908/2002: 48. *Contra* Gillman and Klimkeit, 1994: 162–64.

[69] See Yousif, 1987: 79; also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 218; Kanjamala, 2014/2018: 264.

[70] See Bickell, 1866: 33; Bhaskaran, 2012: 19–20; Puliurumpil, 2012: 219.

> By their deaths now more exceedingly am I cruelly beaten.
> The apostle whom I slew in India is before me in Edessa: He is here wholly and also there.
> I went there, there was he: here and there I have found him and been grieved.
> Blessed is the might that dwells in the hallowed bones![71]

In three other hymns (*Madrasha* 1, 2, and 3), we find Ephrem praising St. Thomas and India. In *Madrasha* 1.11, Thomas is hailed as a renowned person among the apostles and due to his deeds, he is referred to as "Blessed."[72] In 1.12, he is described as one who brought the people of India from darkness to light. In 2.1, he attains great honor due to the transferal of his bones from India to Edessa. In 3.3, he is praised and appreciated by his followers.[73] Moreover, Ephrem also writes positively about Thomas in his *Hymni Dispersi* and *Memre for New Sunday*.[74] Nedungatt (2008: 191) states, "According to the witness of Ephrem, while Edessan Christianity was not of apostolic foundation, Indian Christianity was. Moreover, if the transfer of the relics of the Apostle Thomas to Edessa from India is historical, logically it presupposes that he went there and died there." As most of Ephrem's hymns were incorporated in the liturgy of the Syrian church and were sung frequently therein, they are considered to be supporting documents of the mission of Thomas in India.[75] In Ephrem's writings, a particular emphasis is placed on Thomas's South Indian mission.

The *Didaskalia Apostolorum*, a Syrian document of the early third century (200–250 CE), speaks of how the early churches collected the testimony of the apostles who had gone out to testify the gospel to the world: James in Jerusalem, Mark in Egypt, Peter in Syria and Rome, and Thomas in India.[76] The *Didaskalia* clearly states that "India and all its own countries, and those bordering on it, even to the farther sea, received the Apostles' Hand of the Priesthood from Judas Thomas, who was Guide and Ruler in the church which

[71] See Yousif, 1987: 79; Schaff and Wallace, 2007: 13: 205; Jayakumar, 2013: 9; Mathew and Thomas, 2005: 12.

[72] Ephrem is well known for his *madrashe*, of which over 400 have been preserved. The word *madrash* is derived from the Syriac root *d.r.sh.*, which means "to expound, preach, or search out." See Jensen and Watkins, 2005: 8; also see Moffett, 1998/2006: 1: 30; Puliurumpil, 2012: 227.

[73] See Lamy, 1902: 4: 694; Puliurumpil, 2012: 231–37.

[74] See Lamy 1882: 1: 540–62, 693–708.

[75] See Puliurumpil, 2012: 246.

[76] See Moffett, 1998/2006: 1: 33; Mingana, 1926: 16; Cureton, 1864: 32–33; Nedungatt, 2008: 188; Jayakumar, 2013: 9; Puliurumpil, 2012: 252. For more details about the text, see Connolly, 2009.

he built and ministered there."[77] The text says that the field of St. Thomas was "India and all its own countries" and extended "even to the farther sea."[78] This can be considered as a reference to Indo-Parthian provinces, the Malabar Coast, and the Coromandel Coast where Thomas lived and ministered. The *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta*, written by a pilgrim lady named Egeria who visited the Shrine of Thomas in Edessa in the last quarter of the fourth century (i.e., between 384 and 388), reports on the transfer of relics of St. Thomas to Edessa from India.[79] Together, these documents further support the argument that Thomas was sent as an apostle both to the Indo-Parthian and the South Indian provinces.

St. Gregory of Nazianzen (329–390 CE), in one of his sermons, preached against the Arians in Constantinople (c. 380 CE), and praised the apostles who evangelized foreign countries.[80] In this context, he mentions the ministry of Thomas in India, as well as the involvements of other apostles in different parts of the world.[81] He mentions Judea as the field of Peter's mission and also refers to the other apostles including Thomas in India.[82] Gregory Nazianzen comments that:

> Were not the Apostles aliens among the many nations and countries committed to them? . . . Let alone Judea, the country of Peter. What had Paul in common with the gentiles, Luke with Achaea, Andrew with Epirus, John with Ephesus, Thomas with India, Mark with Italy? What had all the others, not to mention each of them by name, with the people to whom they are sent?[83]

Gregory Nazianzen plainly states that the apostles were aliens in the nations they visited.[84] St. Ambrose of Milan (340–397) identifies Thomas with Muziris and India.[85] In his famous book entitled *De Moribus Brahmanorum*, Ambrose

[77] See Moffett, 1998/2006: 1: 33; Medlycott, 1905: 35; Mundadan, 2001: 1: 28; Sharan, 2010: 19.
[78] Mathew and Thomas (2005: 14) say, "This clearly fits in with the West Coast and East Coast of South India, and not to any interior place in North India."
[79] The voyage of Egeria can be considered as one of the most important pieces of evidence used to discuss early medieval pilgrimage. For more details about Egeria's travel narrative, see Gingras, 1970; Maraval, 1982. Also see Gamurrini, 1888: 33–34; Dietz, 2005: 44; Puliurumpil, 2012: 256–57.
[80] See Kuriakose, 1982: 5.
[81] Gregory Nazianzen, *Contra Arianos* 11.28; Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration* 33.11. Also see Nedungatt, 2008: 191; Gillman and Klimkeit, 1994: 162; Thomas, 2009: 189.
[82] See Nazianzen, 1862; Nedungatt, 2008: 191.
[83] Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio* 33, quoted in Nedungatt, 2008: 191.
[84] See Puliurumpil, 2012: 263.
[85] See Medlycott, 1905: 43; Kuriakose, 1982: 6.

speaks about the nation of India, its people including the Brahmins, the city of Muziris, and about Thomas. While he associates Thomas with the nation of India, he finds that Matthew has connections with Persia.[86] St. Jerome (345–420), in his *Epistola ad Marcellam*, comments that: "He [Jesus] dwelt in all places: with Thomas in India, with Peter in Rome, with Paul in Illyricum, with Titus in Crete, with Andrew in Achaia (Greece), with each apostolic man in each and all countries."[87] In his *De Viris Illustribus*, Jerome states that Thomas preached to many peoples, beginning with the Parthians and ending with the Indians.[88] While Gregory and Ambrose connect Thomas exclusively with India, Jerome speaks about his mission "beginning with the Parthians and ending with the Indians." This indication of Jerome points toward a wider involvement of Thomas both in the Parthian and the Indian provinces. In a practical sense, the references to the "Parthians" and the "Indians" can be understood as indications of Thomas's Indo-Parthian and South Indian missions.

Moreover, John Chrysostom (347–407 CE) states that the Indians were evangelized by an apostle with the "gift of tongues." A reader will understand that Chrysostom is speaking about the Apostle Thomas. During Chrysostom's time, it was a well-known fact that Thomas had preached in India.[89] He asserts that the Apostles "erected altars everywhere, in the territory of the Romans, of the Persians, of the Scythians, of the Moors, and of the Indians."[90]

[86] *PL* 14, 1143. Nedungatt (2008: 192) comments, "It is also significant that Ambrose speaks of India as a country lying beyond 'rugged mountains,' perhaps a veiled allusion to Thomas first evangelizing the mountainous Parthia before venturing into India proper." Also see Puliurumpil, 2012: 264–68.

[87] See Jerome, *Epistola ad Marcellam*, PL 22: 588–89. Also see Moffett, 2006: 1: 39; Nedungatt, 2008: 196–97. Philip (1908/2002: 48) comments that "Jerome, who flourished in the 4th century and who was the ornament of the literary world of his age, speaks of St. Thomas' mission to India as a fact universally known and believed in his time."

[88] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, PL 23: 721. Asterius of Amasea (330/335–420/425), Paulinus of Nola (353–431), Socrates Scholasticus (380–440), Jacob of Sarug (451–521) and others also connect Thomas with India. Nedungatt (2008: 196) says, "It is not without significance that Jerome, like Origen and Ambrose, mentions 'Thomas in India' in the first place, even ahead of Peter in Rome and of Paul in Illyria." See Puliurumpil, 2012: 268–75.

[89] Although John Chrysostom considers Thomas's incredulity as one of the many examples of disbelief in Jesus's Resurrection, he records his missionary journey to the alien Indian provinces. See Chrysostom, *Homily* 26, PL 63.179; Chrysostom, 1959: 458. Also see Aerthayil, 1982: 16; Dijkstra, 2016: 333–34; Hiller, 2014: 90; Puliurumpil, 2012: 276–77; Mathew and Thomas, 2005: 12.

[90] Chrysostom, *Quod Christus*, 6; Chrysostom, *Homily* 4.29. Nedungatt (2008: 193) states, "This means that, according to Chrysostom, the gospel was preached in India and the Christian worship was inaugurated there by one of the Apostles." Similarly, Gaudentius of Brescia (ca. 410) connects Thomas with India. One sermon attributed to John Chrysostom even concludes by reporting how his listeners throw themselves down in front of the saint's grave and embrace his body (see *Sermon on St. Thomas Apostle*, PG 59.500). Also see Most, 2005: 218–19.

The aforementioned traditions from the church fathers strongly emphasize Thomas's coming to the extended Indian (i.e., both Indo-Parthian and South Indian) provinces. After analyzing all of these traditions, Mundadan (2001: 1: 27) states:

> Before Nicaea we have the testimonies of Origen (referred to by Eusebius), Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius who link the apostolate of St. Thomas with Parthia. Those who write after the council, like Socrates, Gregory of Nazianzus, Paulinus of Nola, Rufinus, and a few others speak of India as the field of his activity. Jerome, John Chrysostom, Isidore of Seville and others apparently combine the two traditions. This is the basis for suggesting a double tradition existing in the third century; the Alexandrian tradition giving one aspect of the original tradition and putting the emphasis on Parthia, and the other, the Edessan tradition, parallel to and perhaps depending on the *Acts of Thomas*, laying stress on India.[91]

From these church fathers' traditions, we can infer the following: first, as the Indian church functioned under the Persian authorities, the association of Thomas with Parthia can be ascertained from the ecclesiastical outlook;[92] second, as the northwestern part of India was vaguely understood as a Parthian province, the church fathers discussed the Indo-Parthian mission of Thomas as Parthian; third, as the South Indian church functioned under the Persian ecclesiastical authority, the two distant provinces (Indo-Parthian and South Indian) were considered as two different kingdoms; fourth, as the Indo-Parthian and South Indian provinces were ruled by two distinct political authorities, they were considered as two entirely different kingdoms or empires; fifth, while a group of church fathers emphasized the Indo-Parthian mission of Apostle Thomas, others considered South India as the field of his mission; sixth, as a third group emphasized both the Parthian and the Indian connections of Thomas, they attempted to understand his connection with

[91] Those who argued for Parthia as the destination of Thomas's ministry are: Origen (185–254 CE; referred to by Eusebius), Clement of Alexandria (150–215 CE), and Eusebius (260–340 CE). Those who argued for the Indian apostolate are: Socrates (380–440 CE), Gregory of Nazianzen (329–390 CE), Paulinus of Nola (353–431 CE), and Rufinus (345–411 CE). But, those who argue for both are: Jerome (345–420 CE), John Chrysostom (347–407 CE), and Isidore of Seville (560–636 CE). While Mundadan (2001: 1: 27) lists Rufinus in the second category, Nedungatt (2008: 214) adds him in the first category. For more details, see Kuriakose, 1982: 3–8.

[92] Aerthayil (1982: 13) asks, "What was the relation between Parthia and India? In those days a large portion of North-West-India was included in the Parthian Kingdom and therefore we could say that Parthia included India also."

both the Indo-Parthian and South Indian provinces; and seventh, while the pre-Nicene traditions emphasized the Indo-Parthian mission of Thomas, the post-Nicene period laid emphasis on the South Indian mission. All these observations make it clear that Thomas's apostleship was extended to the wider Indian community.

Thomas's Indian apostleship can be further established with the help of later traditions. Some of the later writings refer to Calamina or Mylapore as the place of Thomas's death and burial.[93] St. Gregory of Tours (538–594 CE), in his *Gloria Martyrum*, cites a certain history of the martyrdom of Apostle Thomas.[94] He writes: "Thomas, the apostle, according to the narrative of his martyrdom, is stated to have suffered in India. His holy remains (corpus), after a long interval of time, were transferred to the city of Edessa by the Syrians and were interred there."[95] St. Gregory the Great (590–604) refers to Thomas twice, both times in liturgical contexts. One reference echoes *ATh* 1: "The Lord appeared to Thomas at night in a vision and told him, Do not fear to go to India,"[96] and the other refers to when the apostles of Jesus Christ, including Thomas, present themselves with their trophies.[97] Other two works referring to Thomas were *De Miraculis Beati Thomae* and *Passio Thomae*. *De Miraculis Beati Thomae* connects Thomas's mission and martyrdom with India.[98] The Latin *Passio Thomae* also provides a detailed description about Thomas's suffering and death in India.[99] Moreover, other witness accounts of the Indian apostleship of Thomas can be found in the writings of Isidore of Seville (560–636 CE), Dorotheus of Tyre, Bede the Venerable (673–735 CE), Oderic Vitalis (1075–1142 CE), Michael the Syrian (1126–1199 CE),

[93] For more details, see Cunningham, 1871: 2: 60; Huc, 1857: 1: 19–21.
[94] See Nedungatt, 2008: 200–01.
[95] Tours, *Miraculum Liber*, 733. Also see Gillman and Klimkeit, 1994: 162; Jayakumar, 2013: 9; Mathew and Thomas, 2005: 11; Philip, 1908/2002: 49.
[96] See Klijn, 1962: 65.
[97] See Gregory the Great, *Liber Responsorialis*. See the following authors and their writings: Isidore of Seville (560–636), Pseudo-Dorotheus (after 600), the Codex of Fulda (early eighth century), Odericus Vitalis (1075–after 1143), Dionysius Bar Salibi (d. 1171), Michael the Syrian (1166–1199), Mar Solomon of Basora (1222), and Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (ca.1256–1335). These authors, among others, also connect Thomas with India. See Nedungatt, 2008: 202–11; Puliurumpil, 2012: 308.
[98] See Wright, 1968: 293; Ford, 2016: 118.
[99] Sharan (2010: 37) observes, "The *Passio Thomae* had St. Thomas killed by a pagan priest with a sword, and *De Miraculis Thomae* had him killed by a Pagan priest with a lance. These stories were at odds with the one found in the *Acts of Thomas*, which had the apostle executed on the orders of a Persian king, by four royal soldiers with spears." See Puliurumpil, 2012: 304–05.

Mar Solomon of Basrah and Bar Hebraeus of Antioch (thirteenth century), Nikephores Kallistos (1256–1335 CE), and others.[100] These references further prove that Thomas's apostleship to India received continuous attention in the succeeding centuries.

There are also other historical references and traditional practices that explain the connection of Thomas with India. Around 883 CE, two Catholic clerics from England, named Sigehelm and Aethelstan, were sent by the Anglo-Saxon King Alfred the Great (ruled 871–899 CE) to India.[101] They brought with them alms and visited the tomb of St. Thomas in Mylapore.[102] Marco Polo, the famous Italian explorer, gives an account of his first visit to Thomas's tomb in India (1292 CE), which is recorded as a place of pilgrimage for both the Christians and the Muslims.[103] In 1293 CE, John of Monte Corvino, a Franciscan appointed as the ambassador to China, on his way to the final destination spent thirteen months in South India.[104] He baptized around 100 people before moving to China, where he became the first Roman Catholic Archbishop in 1307 CE.[105] Around 1440 CE, Nicolo de Conti, another traveler who visited India, refers to a church of St. Thomas and locates it at Malpuria, a maritime city situated in the second gulf beyond India (i.e., the Bay of Bengal).[106] Details of the Malabar tradition are also found in ballads or folksongs, such as *Ramban* (*Rabban*) *Thoma Pattu*, *Margan Kali Pattu*, and *Veeradian Pattu*.[107] These ballads were composed and have been sung for centuries. All of the aforementioned references provide us with evidence to argue for Thomas's Indian apostleship.

[100] See Kuriakose, 1982: 6–26; Nedungatt, 2008: 181–218; Puliurumpil, 2012: 305–15.
[101] See White, 1978: 214.
[102] See Daughrity and Athyal, 2016: 15.
[103] See Polo, Benedetto, and Ricci, 1931: 309–10; Olschki, 1960: 230–31; Jayakumar, 2013: 9; Mathew and Thomas, 2005: 9; Kuriakose, 1982: 15.
[104] See Zacour and Hazard, 1985: 511.
[105] See Mathew and Thomas, 2005: 10; Zacour and Hazard, 1985: 511; Anthonysamy, 2009: 65–71. Also see an Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (883 CE), Blessed Odoric of Pordenone (1324), Bishops from Bagdad (1504), Duarte Barbosa (1515), Diogo Fernandes (1517), St. Francis Xavier (1545), and the Roman Martyrology (1584).
[106] There are also records of the travels of Jordanus Cataline (1321), Odoric (1325), and John de Marignolli (1349). For more details, see Rogers, 1962: 36; Daughrity and Athyal, 2016: 15–16.
[107] Moffett (2006: 1: 34) states that "*Thomas Rabban Pattu*" ("Song of Thomas"), which dates the apostle's arrival to 50 CE, "has been traced in writing, it is said, back to 1601 (or 1101) and beyond that date to an oral narrative handed down in one family line for forty-eight generations." Moffett (2006: 1: 34) further says, "Another song, the better known '*Margam Kali Pattu*,' was put into writing in 1732. This locates the apostle's building of a king's palace in the Chola kingdom of South India." Also see Nedungatt, 2008: 355–59; Daniel, 1972/1986: 13; Katz, 2000: 19.

Concluding remarks

In recapitulation, as noted, there was a trade relationship between India and Israel and the Jewish kingdom at least from the time of King Solomon's reign. Historians of pre-Christian times, such as Scylax, Hecataeus, Herodotus, and many others, recorded the connection of India with the rest of the world. The discovery of new sea routes and the establishment of further trade relationships facilitated the connection between India and other parts of the world. A common consensus among scholars is that Christianity existed in India at least from the time of Pantaenus. In that case, tracing the history further back to St. Thomas is an easy task. Beginning from the third and fourth centuries, a large number of Christian writers witnessed the Indian apostolate of Thomas.[108] The patristic evidence can be broadly divided into three categories: first, those who link Thomas only with Parthia; second, those who link his apostleship and martyrdom with India; and third, those who mention Parthia and India and other nations.[109] This categorization shows that most of the early church fathers associated Thomas either with Parthia or with India. As Parthia was a broader geographical region with an ecclesiastical authority that covered even the Indian provinces, we can better understand the destination as the Indo-Parthian provinces. Moreover, the references to India can be interpreted as referring to the South Indian provinces. Details concerning the appointment of bishops for "the whole of Persia and Greater India," the leadership of the South Indian church from Persia, and the narrative descriptions about the Indo-Parthian and South Indian mission of Thomas in the *ATh* explain the relative status of the Indian church in closer connection with the Parthian ecclesiastical authorities. The analysis in this chapter helps us to reach the following conclusions: first, through trade relationships, India became well connected to the rest of the world, especially the Jewish, Babylonian, Greek, Roman, and Persian kingdoms and empires; second, the traditions related to Thomas's apostleship to India were unanimous, consistent, and reasonably early, and they circulated among the church fathers, travelers,

[108] Jerome, Isidore, Oderic and others even cite Calamina in India (present-day Mylapore near Chennai) as the place of the martyrdom of Thomas. See Puliurumpil, 2012: 291.
[109] See Nedungatt, 2008: 213.

traders, geographers, and historians from a wider geographical area;[110] third, chronologically, the Indian apostolate of Thomas was acknowledged and accepted over a longer period of time; and fourth, we do not have convincing contradictory evidence stating that Thomas did not go to India or Parthia, or that he went elsewhere. This means that the apostleship of Thomas was widely accepted both in the Eastern and Western hemispheres. On the basis of all this evidence, we can conclude that Thomas's apostleship to India received continuous and widespread attention in the region.

[110] See McDowell, 2015: 163.

10

Reconstructing a History of Apostle Thomas

Introduction

With an understanding of the portrayal of Thomas in the writings of the church fathers, travelers, traders, geographers, and historians from an extended period of time and from a wider geographical area, here we will attempt to reconstruct a history of Apostle Thomas taking into consideration an array of details from the NT, apocryphal documents, and historical traditions. In this process, both the explicit and implicit details are used to reconstruct the story of Thomas. The review of evidence in this chapter will help us to sketch the person and work of Thomas with some precision. The following questions are given prominence in the process: How do the Synoptic Gospels perceive Thomas as part of the Twelve disciples? How does the Johannine narrator expand the ideas about Thomas and place him at the significant narrative intervals of his Gospel? How do the details of the Book of Acts help us to locate Thomas in the annals of early church history? What role does the apocryphal and patristic evidence play in recreating the story of Thomas? Were the Thomas community analyses initiated by scholars with a broader outlook or with a limited perspective? And how do all these details help us to place Thomas in relation to Indian Christianity? Thus, the current chapter is an attempt to bring together ideas from biblical, apocryphal, and historical details taking into consideration both geographical and chronological references.

Jesus's disciples in the Synoptic accounts

In the Synoptic Gospels, the disciples of Jesus, or the Twelve, appear as immediate observers of the events and their presence is observable behind

the narrative annals.[1] The evangelists record the call of Simon, Andrew, James, John, and Levi son of Alphaeus and their acceptance to follow Jesus; but, lamentably, there is no mention of the call of Thomas.[2] Jesus appointed the Twelve, whom he also named apostles, first, to be with him; second, to be sent out to proclaim his message; third, to have the authority to cast out demons; and fourth, to heal every disease and sickness.[3] In the introduction to the list of the Twelve, Luke makes it explicit that Jesus "called his disciples to him, and chose twelve of them, whom he also named apostles" (Lk. 6:13).[4] While discussing the role of the Twelve, Wilkins (1992: 178) says that "not only are they Jesus' disciples (committed followers), but they are also in training to be his apostles (commissioned representatives)."[5] As the Twelve follow him, Jesus describes for them the mysteries of the parables.[6] They interact with him in dialogues and actively get involved in his mission.[7] Matthew 19:10-12 mentions that Jesus even teaches them about marriage and celibacy. He calls the Twelve and sends them out with several instructions and authority over the unclean spirits (Mk 6:7-13; 11:1; Mt. 10:5-42; 21:1-3; Lk. 9:1-6).[8] As one among the Twelve (Mk 3:16-19), Thomas would have had

[1] "The Twelve" becomes a common designation in Mark (3:16; 4:10; 6:7; 9:35; 10:32; 11:11; 14:10, 17, 20, 43). Also see Guelich, 1989: 34A: 158; Lane, 1974: 132–33; Bock, 1994: 540–41; Trebilco, 2012: 218–19.

[2] While Mark and Matthew record the call of Peter and Andrew, Luke records the call of Peter (Mk 1:16; Mt. 4:18; cf. Lk. 5:1-11). The call of James and John is recorded in all three Gospels (Mk 1:19; Mt. 4:21; Lk. 5:10). The call of Levi is also seen in Mk 2:14; Mt. 9:9; and Lk. 5:27-32. See Wilkins, 1992: 178; Johnson, 1991: 3: 97; Lane, 1974: 100–02; Fitzmyer, 1970: 28: 589–92; Trebilco, 2012: 218.

[3] See Mk 3:14-15; Mt. 10:2-4; Lk. 6:13-16. Wilkins (1992: 177) states that "in the midst of the ebb and flow of the popularity of the Jesus movement, a core of twelve disciples were called by Jesus . . . Matthew and Mark (at least from Mk 3:13 par. Mt. 10:1) generally identify the terms *disciple* and *the Twelve* with one another, though not to the extent of implying that the term 'disciple' should be limited to the Twelve." Guelich (1989: 34A: 157) comments, "Taking the verb with the force of 'he made' or 'created' accents the Twelve and implies the coming into being of something new. It follows that the 'making' of the Twelve is viewed accordingly as the creation of the new people of God." Also see Lane, 1974: 132–33; Bock, 1994: 540–47; Turner, 2008: 264–65.

[4] Johnson (1991: 3: 102–03) comments that, "in Luke-Acts, the Twelve play a particularly important symbolic role as the basis and leadership of the restored Israel called by the prophet." Weder (1992: 2: 210) observes that "Luke identifies the Twelve with the apostles and is especially interested in the continuity of the disciples with the period of Jesus' life." Also see Lk. 8:1; 9:1, 12, 17; 18:31; 22:3, 30, 47; Acts 6:2 (esp. Acts 1:15-26). See Bock, 1994: 540–41; Green, 1997: 258–59; Fitzmyer, 1970: 28: 616–17.

[5] On certain occasions, Jesus even took a smaller circle of disciples to follow him. See Mk 1:29-31; 5:37; 9:2; 13:3; 14:33; Mt. 17:1; Lk. 9:28. See Guelich, 1989: 34A: 62; Lane, 1974: 134.

[6] See Mk 4:10, 34; 7:17; 9:28-29; 10:10; 13:3; Mt. 13:10-12, 36-39; 15:15-20; Lk. 8:9-10. Also see Mk 6:1; 8:27; 10:23-27; 11:11, 19; 12:43–13:2; Mt. 16:5-12; 19:23-24.

[7] See Mk 6:30-52; 8:1-10; Mt. 15:32-39; 16:13-16; 18:21-25; 19:27-30; Lk. 6:20-49.

[8] See Green, 1997: 356–60; Harrington, 1991/2007: 1: 139–44; Fitzmyer, 1970: 28: 751–55.

the privilege of being with and interacting with Jesus, sharing the mysteries of the parables, proclaiming his message, casting out demons, and healing the diseased.[9] As Charlesworth proves, the existence of the Twelve is a historical fact because Judas Iscariot is always signaled out as "one of the Twelve."[10]

Jesus warns his disciples that his Messianic identity must be kept secret (Mt. 16:20).[11] He teaches them the lessons of servanthood and the cost of discipleship.[12] On several occasions, Jesus discloses to the Twelve his upcoming death.[13] Pointing to his disciples, Jesus says, "Here are my mother and my brothers" (Mt. 12:49).[14] This statement of Jesus marks his intimacy with the closer circle of disciples. During the post-resurrection context, he commissions the Twelve for the universal mission.[15] Wilkins (1992: 178) states, "As 'disciples' the Twelve are set aside as the examples of what Jesus accomplishes in his followers; as apostles the Twelve are set aside as the leaders within the new movement to come, the church." The development of the Twelve from the status of disciples in the Jesus movement to the status of apostles in the early Christian communities is made clear through these Gospel narratives.[16] With this information in hand, a reader can understand the role of Thomas as one who was involved in the Jesus movement not only as an observer of the events, but also as an active participant in the mission initiatives of his master. This further explains how the early Christian communities perceived the Twelve of which Thomas was a member. Having an understanding of the character of Thomas as part of the Twelve, let us now see how he is perceived in the FG.

[9] Mark gives evidence of disciples outside the circle of the Twelve, and Matthew specifically speaks of them (8:19, 21) and alludes to a wider circle of disciples (10:24-25, 42). Luke seems to indicate that Jesus chose the Twelve from among a much larger number of disciples (cf. 6:13, 17). Also see Wilkins, 1992: 177–78; Bock, 1994: 540–41.

[10] Charlesworth (1989: 137–38) comments, "If the Church created the institution of the twelve, then why was Judas placed within that institution? . . . I [Charlesworth] think, therefore, that it is quite probable that *Jesus appointed twelve disciples*."

[11] See Harrington, 1991/2007: 1: 248; Turner, 2008: 406.

[12] See Mk 9:35; Mt. 16:24-28; 18:1-6; Lk. 9:46-48. Cf. Johnson, 1991: 2: 228-33; Green, 1997: 564–67.

[13] See Mk 10:32-34; 14:17-21; Mt. 16:21-23; 17:22-23; 20:17-19; 26:1-2; Lk. 9:21-27, 43b-45.

[14] Harrington (1991/2007: 1: 191) states, "By his words and actions Jesus redefines membership in his family. He also defines discipleship as doing the will of his heavenly Father."

[15] See Mk 16:15-18; Mt. 28:16-20. Also see Turner, 2008: 688–91.

[16] See Trebilco, 2012: 218–20.

Jesus's disciples in the Johannine community context

In the post-resurrection context, the Johannine community developed its polemic against its antagonists first in the form of oral traditions and then in later stages through their writings. In the FG, the narrator describes the divisive nature of society by placing Jesus as the hero of justice against the injustices of his counterparts.[17] The presentation of Jesus as the Word, the Messiah, the Savior of the world, the Lamb of God, and the eschatological judge through the means of dialogical duels and rhetorical methods certainly helps the narrator to incorporate the feelings of the community.[18] The theme of eternal life is introduced in a context in which the community's life is at risk.[19] At the outset of the Gospel, the narrator introduces Jesus [the Word] as "God" himself (1:1).[20] Jesus's preexistent nature and divinity are presented through the narratorial statements in 1:1-3 and 14.[21] O'Grady (1999: 9) comments, "The Prologue itself clearly emphasizes the divinity of Jesus."[22] The Gospel emerges as a flashback narrative as the divinity of Jesus receives further affirmation toward the climax of the story (20:28).[23] As one of the most profound Christological utterances, Thomas's statement in 20:28 can be assuredly linked to the narrator's statement in 1:1. The narrator uses Thomas as an instrumental figure to establish the divinity of Jesus (20:28).[24]

[17] See Thomaskutty, 2015: 469; Conway, 2002: 479–95; Meeks, 1972: 44–72.

[18] For more details about the dialogue and the Johannine community, see Thomaskutty, 2015: 469.

[19] Lindars (2000: 81) says, "The chief clue to the distinctive character of John's concept of salvation is the use of 'life' or 'eternal life' instead of 'kingdom of God' or 'kingdom of heaven.'" Also see Ihenacho, 2001: 3–355; Wenham, 2006: 8–10.

[20] Culpeper (1983: 112) states that "John insists on the recognition of Jesus' divinity and his origin from above."

[21] For more details about the preexistent nature of the Word, see Moloney, 1989/1998: 34–35, 536–38; Blomberg, 2001: 71–73, 268–70; Thomaskutty, 2013–2015: 1–17; Beasley-Murray, 1999: 10–11; Hengel, 2008: 265–94.

[22] O'Grady (1999: 19) says, "The Fourth Gospel has long been recognized as emphasizing the divinity of Jesus. It also preserves his humanity . . . With careful progression the author led from humanity to divinity without losing anything in the process. The divine Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is the very human Jesus of Nazareth." Also see Calvin, 1994: 15; Blomberg, 2001: 71–73, 268–70; *contra* Skinner, 2012/2013: 111–27.

[23] Wilkins (1992: 180) states, "his [Thomas's] spiritual insight is demonstrated in his confession of Jesus as Lord and God (John 20:28), one of the most profound declarations of Jesus' deity in the NT." Köstenberger (1998: 49–50) comments, "The importance given by the fourth evangelist to the divine nature and origin of Jesus is also seen in his strategic placement of references. Jesus' divine nature and origin are highlighted in the introductions to both parts of his Gospel (1:1-4 and 13:1-3), as well as near its conclusion (20:28)."

[24] Van der Watt (2007: 46) comments, "Jesus is explicitly called 'God' (Gk. = *theos*) at the beginning and end of the Gospel. The Gospel starts by explicitly saying: 'The Word was God' (1:1; see 1:18; 1

As Thomas functions in a dynamic way to fulfill the narrative masterplan of the Gospel, we cannot simply reduce him to a negative, uncomprehending, an unbelieving character.[25] The "we" sections (1:14, 16; cf. 1:41) of the prologue provide us with clues concerning John's representative role as a narrator within the text.[26] As John prefigures the story right from the beginning and aims toward a certain conclusion, Thomas's character can be construed as one of those who have *seen* his [Jesus's] glory (1:14).[27] Moreover, as Thomas proved his belief through various stages of life, we can consider him as one among the "children of God" (1:12). In the prologue, the following clues can be gathered: first, the narrator uses the mode of Thomas's confession in his/her introductory statement (i.e., "the Word was God," see 1:1; cf. 20:28);[28] second, Thomas witnesses the Word as the *Licht Liebe Leben* (i.e., *Light-Love-Life*) right from the beginning as he was part of the closer circle of Jesus and was also known within the Johannine circle;[29] third, he was one among the "we" category, those who saw the glory of Jesus; fourth, as the FG is a post-resurrection narrative, it uses a "flashback" method in presenting the story,[30] and Thomas as a key figure had all the privileges of seeing the glory of Jesus; and fifth, he was one among the believing, that is, the children of God. The narrator intentionally foresees Thomas as a figure who can unravel the thesis statement placed right at the outset of the Gospel.[31]

John 5:20). It concludes with Thomas confessing the risen Jesus as 'My Lord and my God' (20:28)." Also see Köstenberger, 1998: 47.

[25] For more details on Jn 1:1-18, see Borgen, 1987: 75–115; also see Mopsuestia, 2010: 11–12; Clark, 1972/1989: 23–25; Evans, 1993: 13–76. *Contra* Skinner, 2009; Riley, 1995; DeConick, 2001; Pagels, 1999.

[26] Barrett (1955/1956: 138; also see 140) says, "This first person plural does not necessarily imply that the gospel was written by an eye-witness. It is the apostolic Church that speaks." Also see Von Speyr, 1949/1994: 117–24.

[27] Thomas is the one who emphasized the connection between *seeing* and believing (20:25).

[28] Theodore of Mopsuestia (2010: 11) says, "And when he said *was with God*, he added, *and the Word was God*, without saying *was God* before assuring us that he *was with God*. But after he had said, *was with God*, he then added, *and was God*, as if saying that he was nothing else but what the one whom he was with also was." Also see Evans, 1993: 13–76. Also see Köstenberger, 1998: 46–47.

[29] See Theodore of Mopsuestia, 2010: 13–15; Voigt, 1991; Von Speyr, 1949/1994: 17–48; Thomaskutty, 2013–15: 4-5, 16; Johnson, 1992: 481–84.

[30] Williams (2013: 104) states, "After his resurrection, it is claimed, the disciples 'remembered' Jesus' veiled statements and actions as well as scriptural words about him (2:22; 12:16). This 'remembering' does not simply consist of the collection of past events; it acts as a bridge to a new perception that is inseparable from the disciples' post-resurrection perspective which is necessary for belief and deeper insight." Smith (1995: 102) comments that "the entire Gospel is written, and could only have been written, from the standpoint of a distinctly Christian and *postresurrection* perspective." Also see Lincoln, 1998: 122; Thatcher, 2008: 13–14; Kok, 2016: 273.

[31] Bruce (1983: 31) comments that "the Word shares the very nature of God, for 'the Word was *God*.'"

As the FG develops as a *two-level drama* composed from a post-resurrection perspective, Jesus's disciples appear in the Gospel as paradigms for the Johannine community.[32] Martyn (1968/1979: 24–151) maintains that the Gospel of John is made up of two stories, namely the story of Jesus and the story of the Johannine congregation who selected events from the life of Jesus to apply to their own situation, thus interweaving their own situation with the story of Jesus.[33] An investigation concerning the presentation of the disciples in John has to be perceived from this premise. John does not include a list of the disciples as in the Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts.[34] The narrator's awareness about the familiarity of the disciples among the Christian circles would have resulted in such an exclusion. At the same time, John presents a list of call narratives where he introduces a few disciples, such as Andrew and Peter (1:35-42), and Philip and Nathanael (1:43-51).[35] When Jesus's public ministry accelerates from ch. 2, the narrator introduces the disciples on several occasions, as they appear themselves with Jesus,[36] get involved in various activities,[37] conduct themselves and react in relation to faith concerns (2:11, 22), remember events during the post-resurrection period,[38] show their astonishment and misunderstanding,[39] and engage in dialogues.[40] On many other occasions, the disciples are introduced by other dialogue partners.[41] In Jesus's prayer in ch. 17, his concern and prayer for the disciples is obvious (17:6–19). Moreover, some of the disciples are mentioned by their personal names:

[32] Also see Lincoln, 2000: 17–21; Wright, 2009: 1–98; Tovey, 2007: 148.

[33] Van der Watt (2007: 114) states that the "integration of the Jesus story with the concrete experiences of the Johannine Christians developed over decades—the Jesus-events took place in more or less 30 CE and the Gospel was only finalized in its present form more or less during the last decade of the first century—a period of sixty years." For more details about the disciples, see Wilkins, 1992: 176–82; Weder, 1992: 2: 207–10.

[34] See Mt. 10:2-4; Mk 3:16-19; Lk. 6:13-16; Acts 1:13. For more details about the background of the word *mathētēs*, see Wilkins, 1992: 176.

[35] Bennema (2009: 117–18; also see 64–68) states that, "if three of the four named disciples in 1:35–51 belong to the Twelve (Andrew, Peter, Philip), then perhaps Nathanael does too (1:45), but this is more tentative. This idea may be supported by the parallelism of 1:35-42 and 1:43-51, in which Andrew finds Peter, and Philip finds Nathanael." Also see Bruce, 1983: 55–63; Thomaskutty, 2016: 7–9, 17–19; Wilkins, 1992: 177.

[36] See 2:2, 12; 3:22; 6:3; 11:54; 13:23; 18:1, 15-16; 20:30; 21:1; and 4-14.

[37] See 4:2, 8; 6:13, 16, 22-23; 20:2-10; and 21:8.

[38] See 2:17, 22; and 12:16.

[39] See 4:27; 12:16; 13:22; and 16:17-18.

[40] See 4:31-38; 6:12, 19-21, 60-70; 9:1-5; 11:7-16; 12:4-7; 13:5-20; 16:29-33; and 20:19-29. Also see Bennema, 2009: 119–26; Thomaskutty, 2016: 5–21.

[41] See 7:3; 18:19; and 20:18. Mlakuzhyil (2008: 153) states, "It is noteworthy that 74 out of the 78 times the term 'disciple' (*mathētēs*) occurs in John's Gospel it refers to the *disciples of Jesus*." Also see Weder, 1992: 2: 207–10.

Philip,[42] Andrew,[43] Peter,[44] Judas Iscariot,[45] Thomas,[46] Judas (not Iscariot, 14:22), the Beloved Disciple,[47] and the sons of Zebedee (21:2).[48] According to Wilkins (1992: 186), there are some fundamental aspects of discipleship within the Johannine community: first, the belief or acceptance of Jesus's claims vis-à-vis the Father; second, belief is a process of gradual understanding and perception; and third, a sustained and deliberate contrast is drawn between believers and unbelievers.[49] To explain these fundamental aspects, the narrator describes the involvement of the disciples based on the events from the *Sitz im Leben Jesu*. This further means that the Fourth Evangelist elaborates on the faith reactions of his community with the examples drawn from Jesus's own life situation.[50] With that intent in mind, the narrator orchestrates his story by placing the Twelve throughout the narrative masterplan.[51] Mlakuzhyil (2008: 154) states, "The importance of the 'disciple' is seen also from their explicit mention both in the introduction (1:1-2:12; cf. 1:35, 37; 2:2, 11, 12) and in the conclusion (20:30-31; cf. 'in the presence of the disciples,' 20:30) of the Gospel of John." During the first sign performance, the narrator states: "Jesus and his disciples had also been invited to the wedding" (2:2); "his disciples believed in him" (2:11); and "he went down to Capernaum with his mother, his brothers, and his disciples; and they remained there a few days" (2:12).[52] This attestation of

[42] See 6:5, 7; 12:20-22; and 14:8-9.
[43] See 6:8 and 12:20-22.
[44] See 6:68; 13:6-9, 24, 36-37; 18:10-11, 15-18, 25-27; 20:2-6; 21:2-3, 7, 11; and 15-21.
[45] See 6:71; 12:4-6; 13:2, 26, 29-30; and 18:2-5.
[46] See 11:16; 14:5; 20:24-29; and 21:2.
[47] See 19:26-27; 20:2-8; 21:7; and 20-24. Charlesworth (1995) considers Thomas as the Beloved Disciple on the basis of several facts: first, as John is a drama, Thomas appears at the climax of the story; second, John intends to demonstrate the great confession of Thomas (20:28) as a climactic statement; and third, John alludes that Thomas knew that Jesus had a wound in his side.
[48] Mlakuzhyil (2008: 154) further says that "the 'disciples' are mentioned in every section of John's Gospel (2-4; 5-10; 11-12; 13-17; 18-20; 21) and Jesus is alone with his 'disciples' in chap. 13–17 and in chap. 21." Bruce (1983: 143) comments that, "There are several places in the Gospel of John where individual disciples are named, as against the general reference to 'his disciples' in parallel accounts in the other Gospels." Also see Mlakuzhyil, 1987: 281; Wilkins, 1992: 176–82.
[49] For more details about the dynamics of discipleship in John, see Wilkins, 1992: 186.
[50] The term "the Twelve" occurs four times in John's Gospel (6:67, 70, 71; 20:24; see Wilkins, 1992: 178–81). Bennema (2009: 117) states that "We must keep in mind that John uses the term 'disciple' for others who follow Jesus apart from the Twelve (4:1; 6:60-66; 7:3; 8:31; 9:28; 19:38)—though many of them are unable to sustain their discipleship."
[51] See Mlakuzhyil, 2008: 154.
[52] Bruce (1983: 73) comments about the mention of "disciples" in 2:12 as follows: "The disciples will be (in the first instance) those whose call is recorded in chapter 1." But, in the overall framework of the Gospel, often disciples appear without any introduction. This aspect calls the attention of the reader toward the reinterpretative tendency of the Gospel.

their presence with Jesus during a social gathering, their faith reactions, and their staying with him for a longer period foregrounds their role and status in the Jesus movement.[53]

At the macro-level narrative of John, the character of Thomas emerges as follows: first, in the prologue (1:1), the narrator prefigures the forthcoming appearance of Thomas and foresees his utterance concerning the divinity of Jesus (1:1; cf. 20:28);[54] second, in the Book of Signs (11:16), he appears in the narrative that delineates Jesus's raising of Lazarus, and thus foreshadows the death and resurrection of Jesus in a dynamic way; third, in the Farewell Discourse (14:5), Thomas's statement appears as instrumental in revealing Jesus's identity as "the way, the truth, and the life," and thus directs the attention of the reader toward Jesus's ascension to the Father and the descent of another comforter; fourth, in the passion narrative (chs. 18–19), though there is no indication about nailing Jesus's hands, the utterance of Thomas in 20:25 makes it explicit that his hands were nailed; fifth, in the Resurrection Narrative (20:24-29), he appears in a most profound fashion during Jesus's resurrection scenes; sixth, in the epilogue (21:2), his presence among the seven disciples proves his faithfulness and commitment; and seventh, throughout the narrative framework of John, Thomas's presence is obvious as a member of the Twelve. This means that Thomas's presence is both explicit and implicit in some of the significant transitions of John's narrative.[55] The character of Thomas submerges into the narrative world of John right from its beginning, and from 11:16 onward he emerges convincingly as an important speaker. The theological apex of John's story happens through the phenomenal utterance of Thomas in 20:28.[56] The narrator reaches the thesis statement (i.e., "the Word was God," 1:1) through the theological climax of the Gospel (20:28).[57]

[53] Weder (1992: 2: 210) states that, "Everything depends on remaining in the word of Jesus—on the living relationship to Jesus—whose service in love makes the disciples into friends (John 13:15)."

[54] Even his role as an implicit character can be inferred from the "we" sections (1:14, 16; cf. 1:41) and among the "children of God" (1:12). See Barrett, 1955/1956: 130.

[55] See Moloney, 1989/1998: 327, 394–95, 536–40, 549–49; Bruce, 1983: 242, 298–99, 393–94, 398–99; Bennema, 2009: 164–70; *contra* Skinner, 2009.

[56] In his book (2009; also see Wiarda, 2010: 651–53), Skinner concludes that Thomas is indeed presented as a negative, uncomprehending, and unbelieving figure. He also counts Thomas as one among a much larger company of Johannine characters.

[57] Wilkins (1992: 180) comments, "His [Thomas's] faithfulness is revealed when he gathers with some of the other disciples in Galilee after the resurrection (John 21:2)." See Bennema, 2009: 164–70; *contra* Skinner, 2009.

His four explicit appearances in John introduce the following network within the narrative:

11:16	Thomas arises from the background into the foreground. The narrator introduces him as he bridges the crucial narrative in 11:1-53 with the death and the resurrection of Jesus. A shift of emphasis takes place from the death and the raising of Lazarus to the death and the resurrection of Jesus. The brief story of Lazarus is used as a catalyst to attune the attention of the reader toward the major story of the Gospel, that is, the story of Jesus.
14:5	After engaging in a dialogue with Jesus and the rest of the disciples toward the end of the Book of Signs (11:16), in 14:5 Thomas appears for a second time. The statement of Thomas in 14:5 and the response of Jesus to it in 14:6 direct the attention of the reader toward the death, the resurrection, and the ascension of Jesus. It also directs our attention toward the future mission of the Holy Spirit.
20:24–29	Thomas develops from his earlier position (that is, *I will not believe*, 20:25) to the conviction that Jesus is *My Lord and my God* (20:28). It attunes the attention of the reader toward Jesus's identity as both 'Lord' and 'God' (20:28). Moreover, he appears as one who fulfills the narratorial purpose of the Gospel (that is, 1:1).
21:2	Thomas is counted among those who have seen the glory of God/Jesus (also see 1:14). He appears as a faithful and loyal member of the community of God in a post-resurrection context.[58]

The utterances and narrative references concerning Thomas discussed earlier reflect the post-resurrection perspective of the Johannine community. A relevant understanding of the FG is possible with a consideration of Thomas at the crossroads of the Johannine framework. The explicit and implicit references about the character, his placement at the significant transitions, and the *grand inclusio* created between the statement of the narrator at the outset (1:1) and the theological climax through Thomas's utterance (20:28) foreground his character before the readers.[59] The narrator of the story

[58] For more details about the utterances of Thomas, see Bennema, 2009: 164–70.

[59] Theodore of Mopsuestia (2010: 3) states, "John set about to write his Gospel. And so he immediately started from the beginning with the doctrine about the divinity [of Christ], because he thought that the teaching of the gospel necessarily had to start from there." Cyril of Alexandria (2013: 13)

facilitates several features of characterization in the portrayal of Thomas. The narrative framework of John delineates the role and status of his character in the early Christian communities with particular emphasis on the Johannine community. In the next section, our analysis of the disciples/the Twelve with a special focus on the character of Thomas in John will be further explored in relation to the Book of Acts.

Jesus's disciples within the framework of the Book of Acts

Having analyzed the role and status of Thomas and the other disciples within the Johannine community context, a broader view of the disciples and their activities can be drawn from the Book of Acts. While John perceives the activities of the disciples as he interweaves the story of Jesus with the story of the Johannine community, Acts deals with the subject matter mostly from the perspective of the early church.[60] At the outset of the book, Acts describes the period of the foundation and expansion of the Jesus groups and Jesus's final appearance among the core group of disciples.[61] After introducing a list of the disciples from the perspective of Jesus's public ministry in the Gospel (i.e., Lk. 6:13-16; cf. Mt. 10:2-4; Mk 3:16-19), the evangelist once again lists them in the context of the ascension of Jesus in Acts (1:13).[62] The two lists of the disciples within the broader Lukan framework confirm the continuous

comments, "Not only was the Word 'with God,' but also he 'was God.' Because he was 'with God,' we recognize him as another besides the Father, and we believe that the Son exists on his own. But because he 'was God,' we understand him to be of the same substance and to be from him by nature because he is both God and comes forth from God." See Barrett, 1955/1956: 130; Von Speyr, 1994: 20–21; Evans, 1993: 13–76; Carson, 1991: 117–19.

[60] Marshall (1993: 1: 182) states, "They [the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts] form two parts of one work, conceived in its final form as a unity, whether or not the original composition of the Gospel took place independently of the plan to produce the two-part work." For more details concerning the relationship between Luke and Acts, see Marshall, 1993: 163–82. For details about "Luke as a Historian," see Bruce, 1990: 27–34; Parsons, 2008: 7–8; Barrett, 2002: xxxv–xl.

[61] Barrett (2002: lviii) further stated, "Continuity between the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth and the church after the time of the resurrection is provided by twelve men." Also see Malina and Pilch, 2008: 6; Witherington, 1998: 126.

[62] While Thomas appears as the eighth person in the list of the Gospel (6:15), he appears as the sixth person in the Book of Acts (1:13). Matera (2007: 54) says that "The ending of the Gospel leads into the beginning of Acts, and the beginning of Acts recalls the ending of the Gospel inasmuch as both deal with similar material: proof of the Lord's resurrection (Luke 24:36-43; Acts 1:3); the commissioning of the Apostles to be his witnesses of the resurrection (Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8); instructions to wait in Jerusalem for the gift of the Spirit (Luke 24:48; Acts 1:4-5); and accounts of the Lord's ascension (Luke 24:50-53; Acts 1:9)." Also see Witherington, 1998: 113; Parsons, 2008: 30.

presence of Thomas during Jesus's pre-Easter, Easter, and post-Easter periods.[63] The Book of Acts begins with a statement concerning the content of the Gospel of Luke: "I wrote about all that Jesus did and taught from the beginning until the day when he was taken up to heaven" (Acts 1:1-2).[64] The narrator further states that after the events of the passion, Jesus presented himself as alive to the disciples with convincing proof and over a course of forty days he spoke unto them about the Kingdom of God (1:3).[65] In the narrative, Jesus instructs the disciples not to leave Jerusalem until they receive the promise of the Father (1:4a).[66] One of the key statements of Jesus to the disciples appears in 1:8: "But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth."[67] Afterwards, Jesus was lifted up while the disciples were gazing (1:9). According to the primitive understanding, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus represent one continuous movement and together they constitute his exaltation.[68] Thomas, along with the other disciples, was a witness of this continuous movement.[69] As witnesses to the ascension of Jesus, the disciples returned back to the upstair-room in Jerusalem and started praying (1:12-13).[70] As a whole, Acts emphasizes the prominence of the apostolic ministry and as a result replaces Matthias with Judas Iscariot (1:17-26).[71] The emphasis laid on the title and role of an apostle in 1:25-26 has to be understood in that context.[72]

[63] Malina and Pilch (2008: 24) do not look at the order in which the disciples are introduced when they say "the list of the apostles here is the same as in Luke 6:14-16, minus Judas." Also see Bruce, 1990: 105–06.

[64] Matera (2007: 54) further says that, "whereas the beginning of Acts recalls the major themes of Jesus' preaching (the kingdom of God; Acts 1:3), the ending of the Gospel foreshadows the major theme of the apostles' preaching, repentance for the forgiveness of sins (Luke 24:47). This interlocking pattern reminds readers that even though Acts begins a new phase of the story, the story it tells is the resumption of a story already begun." Also see Bruce, 1990: 97–100.

[65] See Malina and Pilch, 2008: 20.

[66] See Wagner, 2008: 47–49; Bruce, 1990: 101.

[67] Malina and Pilch (2008: 9) state that "The story of Acts unfolds while underscoring the expansion of Jesus groups."

[68] See Bruce, 1990: 103.

[69] While Luke chronicled the growth of the church from Jerusalem to Rome, the Twelve, including Peter, seem to have played little or no role in that process. See Witherington, 1998: 127.

[70] See Bruce, 1990: 105–07; Barrett, 2002: 7–8; Parsons, 2008: 29–30.

[71] But Witherington (1998: 126) argues that "Nothing is said here about the Twelve being the foundation of the church, nor is the idea of apostolic succession either broached or made plausible since apostles had to be eyewitnesses of the risen Lord, nor is the idea that they are the true Israel made clear, though the latter idea may be intimated." Also see Barrett, 2002: lviii; Parsons, 2008: 31.

[72] Barrett (2002: lviii–lix) states that "It is sometimes but not always suggested fairly definitely that the Apostles are identified with the Twelve, and there are only two verses (14:4, 14) where persons

On the day of Pentecost, among those who gathered in Jerusalem, there were even people from the province of Parthia (2:1).[73] Bock (2007: 103) comments that "The table moves from East to West, except that the Parthians and Romans start the first and last pairs respectively as the key powers of East and West."[74] As India was well connected to Parthia and the Indian church was under the Persian ecclesiastical authorities, a reader is informed about the representation from the Eastern world (2:9).[75] While Peter was standing with the other disciples and addressing the entire community gathered (2:14), he was representing the whole group of the apostles (2:14, 37). The high regard for the apostles among the new converts can be understood through the passages in 2:42-43; 5:12, 18, 39-42; and 6:4.[76] The twelve apostles and their ministries develop as they call the community of the disciples together (6:2), select seven men to serve at the table (6:3), and pray and lay hands on them (6:6).[77] The accusations against Stephen (6:11) and the subsequent stoning and martyrdom could have drastically changed the mission activities of the apostles (7:54-60).[78] Moreover, there is a record of a severe persecution against the church in Jerusalem and the resultant scattering of all followers except the apostles throughout the countryside of Judea and Samaria (8:1).[79] The activities

not belonging to the Twelve are called apostles. Only in these verses is Paul (and Barnabas with him) called an apostle, and it is clear that Paul (and presumably Barnabas also) did not fulfill the conditions laid down in 1:21 and 22 for appointment."

[73] For more details about the day of Pentecost, see Bock, 2007: 92–93. Trebilco (1994: 2: 300–01) states that "Asia can designate a continent which is distinct from Europe. For example, Strabo regards continental Asia as bounded by the Nile and Europe (which begins at the Cimmerian Bosporus) in the west and extending to India in the east. The usage of the term with this sense is mainly limited to the geographers and then only when they are talking about continents, in contrast to ordinary usage. Luke does not seem to use the term with this sense." See Barrett, 2002: 17.

[74] Also see Josephus, *War* 2.16.4 § 379.

[75] Barrett (2002: 19) comments that "Judea (v. 9) has often been suspected of corruption, and there are ill-attested variants: Jews, Armenia, Syria, India." Also see Bock, 2007: 102–04.

[76] Bruce (1990: 183) comments, "Leading the church's prayer and preaching the gospel publicly took up all the apostles' time, so that they had none to spare for 'serving tables' and making sure that the daily allocation from the common fund was distributed fairly." Talbert (1997: 12) states, "The succession of apostolic rule is reflected in the centrality of Jerusalem and the Twelve in the missionary enterprise in Acts. This succession is limited to and ends with the Twelve. No succession vocabulary links the Twelve to anyone after them in Acts." See 6:1-7; 8:14-24; 11:22-26; 14:21-23; 15:22-27, 31-32, 36; 19:21-22; 20:2, 17, 28; also see Talbert, 1997: 40–50; Barrett, 2002: 73–83; Johnson, 1992: 5: 15.

[77] Barrett (2002: lviii) says that "They [the Twelve] are . . . responsible for the initial proclamation of the Christian message and are still regarded in ch. 6 as responsible for it."

[78] Malina and Pilch (2008: 60) comment, "Stephen's opponents realize that they lost the challenge-riposte interaction by resorting to violence. They presumably are so dishonored that they are enraged and feel obliged to get satisfaction by killing Stephen." See Witherington, 1998: 275–76.

[79] See Munck, 1967: 31: 67–73.

of Saul, through ravaging the church, dragging off both men and women, and committing them to prison (8:3), further threatened the very existence of the early church.[80] At the same time, those who were scattered went from place to place and proclaimed the gospel (8:4). After Philip proclaimed the message (8:5-13), Peter and John went to Samaria and strengthened the ministry there (8:14-25; also see vv. 26–40).[81] Thus, though the role and status of the apostles were regarded with significance, the narrator focuses mostly on the ministries of Peter, John, Stephen, and Philip. The narrator notes the presence of all other apostles (including Thomas) in Jerusalem; but most of them are not in the limelight.

In Jerusalem, Saul's persecution of the Christians further hindered the mission activities (9:1-2, 13-14, 21).[82] But after Saul's conversion, Barnabas takes keen interest in bringing him to the apostles (9:27).[83] The mission initiatives were developed under Peter and Paul as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch (cf. 9:31–10:48; 11:1-19),[84] and the believers were first called "Christians" in Antioch (11:26).[85] Incidents such as the martyrdom of James, the imprisonment of Peter, and the hatred of Jews led the Christians toward great turmoil (12:1-5, 11; 14:19). After the commissioning of Paul and Barnabas in Antioch (13:1-51), the Gentile mission began to progress further (14:24-28).[86] Meanwhile, Paul, Barnabas, and some others were appointed to discuss the concerns of the Gentile churches with the apostles and the elders in Jerusalem (15:1-35; cf. Gal. 2).[87] Peter, Paul, and Barnabas argued for the cause of the Gentile believers (15:6-14).[88] The apostolic council in Jerusalem was instrumental in the advancement of the Gentile

[80] See Malina and Pilch, 2008: 60–62.
[81] See Johnson, 1992: 5: 150–54; Witherington, 1998: 279–301.
[82] See Malina and Pilch, 2008: 67.
[83] See Barrett, 2002: 130–01; Talbert, 1997: 93–103.
[84] Wilkins (1992: 179) states that "The Twelve are normally mentioned as a group, with only occasional focus on individuals. Peter is the most familiar of the apostles to NT readers, with his name mentioned 210 times in the NT. The name of Paul is mentioned 162 times. The combined appearances of the names of all the other apostles totals only 142 times. Not much is known about the individual lives of the Twelve except what can be gathered from the scant biblical data and from some statements of the early church fathers."
[85] Wilkins (1992: 181) states, "As Acts records, by the time of the early church the term *disciple* had become synonymous with the true believer—all those who confessed Jesus as Messiah—or, as they were first called at Antioch, 'Christians' (*Christianoi*, Acts 11:26)."
[86] See Malina and Pilch, 2008: 88–98.
[87] See Witherington, 1998: 450–51; Peterson, 2009: 417–42.
[88] See Mounce, 1979: 1: 198–203; Witherington, 1998: 439–64; Parsons, 2008: 207–25; Talbert, 1997: 136–44; Barrett, 2002: 221–40; Malina and Pilch, 2008: 105–07.

mission. Thus, Acts outlines the development of the mission from Jerusalem to Rome under Paul, Peter, and Barnabas.[89] In this process, the initiatives of Thomas and the other apostles do not receive due attention. As Bruce (1990: 335) states, "How many of the apostles were still resident in Jerusalem is uncertain; probably those who were accessible were brought together for this consultation." The narrative details make us think that the majority of the apostles (including Thomas) would have remained in Jerusalem at least until the apostolic council.

The emergence of the apostles and their engagement in missions can be inferred in a dynamic way within the narrative framework of the Book of Acts. The final statements of Jesus concerning the burgeoning mission of the disciples (1:4a, 8), his ascension (1:9), and the events related to the early Christian community mark a transition in the life and ministry of the apostles. The various events indicated in Acts direct our attention toward the prospects and problems in the apostolic ministry. The table in page 187 foregrounds the major events in the life of the early church.

These details foreground the situational aspects of the apostles and the early Christian community. The narrative details of the Book of Acts suggest that Thomas and the other disciples would have remained in Jerusalem at least until the formation of the apostolic council. In that case, there are possible underpinnings to support his visit to India around 52 CE.[90] Traditions related to Thomas suggest that his missionary period in India extended from around 52 CE until 72 CE.[91] The Acts of the Apostles suggest the following possibilities with regard to the missional engagement of Thomas: first, the message of Jesus during the post-Easter period (1:4a, 8) would have equipped him to travel a different route; second, the persecution of the Jews and the martyrdom of Stephen and James would have prepared him to go beyond the Jewish geographical boundaries; third, the upper room experiences, the events on the day of Pentecost, the accessibility of foreign gatherings in Jerusalem, even those from Persia, and the flourishing of the mission in

[89] See Bruce, 1990: 336–42.

[90] Gibson (2013: 218) argues that "while no precise time interval can be determined between the Jerusalem council and Paul's trial before Gallio, it was likely around 2–4 years. This would place the Jerusalem council between 47–49 CE (and possibly slightly earlier or later)." Also see Witherington, 1998: 440.

[91] See Löwner, 2014: 458.

Texts	Events
1:4a, 8	Jesus's final statement concerning the apostolic mission
1:9	Ascension of Jesus
1:12-13	The upper room gathering
1:13	List of the disciples (Thomas appears as the sixth person)
1:17-26	Prominence of the apostolic ministry
2:1-47	Events on the day of Pentecost
6:3–6	Selection of seven men to serve at the table
6:11-15; 7:54-60	Accusation against Stephen, the stoning event
8:1-3	Persecution against Christians and the scattering of the believers
8:4-40	Mission flourishes in Samaria
9:1-21	Saul's persecution of the church
11:26	Believers first called "Christians" in Antioch
12:1-5, 11; 14:19	Martyrdom of James, arrest of Peter, stoning and dragging of Paul
13:1-51	Commissioning of Paul and Barnabas for the Gentile mission
15:1-29	First apostolic council in Jerusalem

Samaria and Antioch would have helped him to envision a broader missional engagement; fourth, the focus of the early church on Peter and James in the Judean context and Paul and Barnabas in the Gentile context would have directed him beyond the familiar geographical provinces; and fifth, after the putative Jerusalem council in 49 CE, the mother church even extended its missional propaganda toward the heathen world. These possibilities would have resulted in the eastward movement of Thomas. The apocryphal and patristic traditions will provide us with more information concerning the person and work of Thomas.

Apocryphal and patristic traditions

As we already discussed in the earlier chapters, the apocryphal documents such as *GTh*, *BTh*, *ATh*, and *IGTh*, and the patristic and other traditio-historical witnesses provide us further details regarding the person and work of Thomas. These documents exemplify how traditions related to Thomas existed among the faith communities for a prolonged period of time and how they were widely circulated during the early and subsequent centuries of Christianity. Among them, the *GTh* is considered to be the earliest document that was geographically widespread, attested by historians and church fathers,

and mostly understood as an independent document.[92] The prologue of the *GTh* connects Thomas with the sayings of Jesus in the Gospel. The Gospel holds the view that Thomas shared "secret" revelations with Jesus. The narrator of the text describes Thomas as an authoritative interpreter of the sayings of Jesus, spiritual twin brother of his master, and as one who never tastes death.[93] Log 13 describes how Thomas grasped the incomprehensible character of Jesus, functioned as a superior personality even above Peter and Matthew, and perceived the ineffable nature of Jesus.[94] He appears as a character who is drunk in the wisdom of Jesus and God and as one who received a special revelation that cannot be shared.[95] Thomas's superior knowledge about the person of Jesus, his access to the life situation of his master, and his influential position in the early Christian context are also in view. Through his constant interactions and dialogues with Jesus, Thomas develops as a mature, knowledgeable, and believing character.[96] In the *BTh*, Thomas is presented as a "laborer" and "learner" of the secret wisdom of God (138:34-35). As a result of his continued interactions with Jesus, Thomas's character is able to inspire the reader to develop from ignorance to perfection and from perfection to the majesty of perfection.[97] The *BTh* also narrates his mystical union and twin brother relationship with Jesus.[98] While the *GTh* develops in the form of a collection of sayings attributed to Jesus, the *BTh* develops in the form of a dialogue leading to a discourse where Jesus and Thomas are the main interlocutors.[99]

In the *ATh*, Thomas is portrayed as a witness of Jesus among the socially ostracized people. The framework of the document describes his coming to the Eastern part of the world, especially the possibility of him traveling to the Indian provinces. Thomas witnesses Jesus in the region of India as an ascetic leader and performer of miraculous activities (cc. 10, 49, 95).[100] As his movement was integrative and contextual in nature, many people

[92] See Meyer, 2007: 133; Hennecke, 1959/1963: 283; Koester, 1977: 117; Koester, 1989: 40; Goodacre, 2014: 282–93; Cameron, 1992: 6: 535–38; Uro, 2003: 27; Layton, 1987: 361, 364.
[93] See Charlesworth, 1995: 374; Ehrman and Pleše, 2011: 305; Pokorný, 2009: 36–38.
[94] See Valantasis, 1997: 75–76; Klauck, 2003: 114.
[95] See Valantasis, 1997: 75; also see Pokorný, 2009: 54–55.
[96] See Skinner, 2009: xxi–xxii.
[97] See Lapham, 2003: 126–27.
[98] See Van Oort, 2008: 219; Turner, 2000: 2: 174.
[99] See Turner, 2007: 236.
[100] See Lapham, 2003: 121–26.

committed themselves to the newly introduced faith.[101] Within the narrative framework of the *ATh*, Thomas maintains a closer relationship with Jesus and shows willingness to witness him and even to die for him. As in John's Gospel (and also in *GTh* and *BTh*), he appears in the *ATh* as the spiritual twin of Jesus and proclaims his master as "My Lord and my God."[102] As he stepped out of the Jewish and the Gentile geographical borders, his work in the Eastern world seems to have received lesser or no attention from the mother church and this further resulted in the delayed composition of the traditions attached to him.[103] The *IGTh* presents Thomas as a childhood friend and twin brother of Jesus.[104] His development from a "childhood friend" to an "earlier disciple" (as in *IGTh*), and later on to a "mature believer" (as in the Gospel of John), gives us a broader understanding of his person and work. In the *IGTh*, the discipleship of Thomas develops alongside of the discipleship of James, the brother of Jesus (16:1-2).[105] Thomas emerges as one of the earliest witnesses of the words, deeds, and preexistent nature of Jesus.[106] Thus, the apocryphal documents provide us with a profound understanding of the character of Thomas.

Historians from the pre-Christian periods such as Scylax, Hecataeus, Herodotus, and others reported the existing connections between the Indian subcontinent and the rest of the world.[107] The available historical and geographical details make us aware that India was a known territory to the land of the Jews and hence to Jesus and his disciples. Thomas seems to have traveled to India to share his master's message as it was the farthest, greatest, and wealthiest land.[108] As a witness of the final utterances and ascension of Jesus (Acts 1:6-14), the interest of Thomas to fulfill the mission mandate in India is understandable.[109] Another reason for his travel to India may have been his challenge to fulfill the missional imperative of Jesus (see Mk 16:15; Mt. 28:19a). The founding of new sea routes

[101] Cc. 65–7, 169–70.
[102] Cc. 81, 97, 167. Cf. Charlesworth, 1995: 379–80.
[103] See Bauckham, 1997: 68–73; McGrath, 2008: 297–311.
[104] See Layton, 1987: 359–60.
[105] See Valantasis, 1997: 78.
[106] See Klauck, 2003: 77.
[107] The rest of the world is inclusive of the Jewish, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman kingdoms/empires. See Jacobs, 2015: 28; Mouton, Rutherford, and Yakubovich, 2013: 450; Puliurumpil, 2012: 27–28; Puliurumpil, 2016: 24–25, 53–63. Also see Kuzminski, 2008: 36.
[108] See Puliurumpil, 2016: 440.
[109] See Keener, 2012: 1: 705–07.

and the existence of Jewish settlements in India would have helped him to facilitate his journey. This argument can be further substantiated by documents from Christian historians, travelers, and church fathers.[110] On the basis of the scholarly consensus concerning the visit of Pantaenus, one can trace the history of Christianity in India at least as far back as the close of the second century.[111] As Thomas's apostolicity in India is acknowledged, we can trace the history of Christianity in the nation right from the first century. As Parthia was a broader geographical region and at the same time the ecclesiastical authority over the Eastern part of the globe, India's position within the Persian region would have been considered in relational terms.[112] As the Parthian ecclesiastical authority was ruling over the entire region including India, appointments of bishops were made for the whole of Persia and Greater India. Moreover, as the *ATh* explains, the Indo-Parthian and the South Indian missions of Thomas would have been widely known among the church fathers and the historians. All these aspects together emphasize the relative significance of India in the discussion of church history.[113] In the church fathers' traditions, Thomas is constantly connected either with Persia or with India or with both Persia and India. From the third century CE onward, church fathers, historians, and travelers connected the traditions related to Thomas mostly with India.[114] While many attempted to understand Thomas in relation to the South Indian and Indo-Parthian provinces, they captured Thomas and his destination from the geographical and ecclesiastical details available to them. This argument holds strong as there is no other convincing traditions that connect Thomas with any other parts of the world.

Identity of the Thomas community

The Thomasine community's identity cannot be easily ascertained without having a wider outlook of the traditions related to him.[115] The traditions in the

[110] For more details about the connections between India and the rest of the world, see Chapter 9.
[111] See Moffett, 1998: 36; Gordon, 1921: 115; Philip, 1908/2002: 52; Daughrity and Athyal, 2016: 7.
[112] See Placid, 1956: 375–424, 383; Klijn, 1962: 28; Mundadan, 2001: 1: 79; Bhaskaran, 2015: 47; Espín and Nickoloff, 2007: 90.
[113] See McCrindle, *Christian Topography*: 118–19; Howard, 2012: 145; Varghese, 2008: 1: 295.
[114] For more details regarding the church fathers' traditions, see Chapter 9.
[115] Also see the "Thomasine School" hypotheses in Layton, 1987: 357–409; Charlesworth, 1995: 360–89.

Jewish, Syrian, Persian, Indian, and other contexts help us to understand how he was perceived in varied geographical contexts. The Book of Acts provides us with evidence concerning the initial stages of Christianity in Syria. According to Acts, Christianity spread to the Gentile world en route to Antioch. McRay (1993: 23) says, "Antioch of Syria, one of the principal cities of the Roman Empire, was the focal point of Christianity as it spread beyond the borders of Palestine to the Diaspora."[116] The initiatives of Saul/Paul, Barnabas, and Peter are described in several passages in the NT.[117] The Gentile mission around the areas of Antioch happened after the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 6:11-15; 7:54-60) and James (Acts 12:1-5) and the imprisonment of Peter (Acts 12:11). The Book of Acts states that "it was in Antioch that the disciples were first called 'Christians'" (11:26).[118] Damascus, another major Syrian city, was also considered significant in several missional discourses (9:1-22).[119] While Edessa in East Syria developed as the center of Syriac-speaking Christendom, Antioch was the center of the more Hellenized churches of West Syria.[120] Edessa was home for significant figures such as Tatian and Ephrem the Syrian.[121] Balla (1997: 51) states that "it remains possible that Tatian prepared the *Diatessaron*

[116] Barrett (2002: 173) states that "Antioch, though founded as late as 300 BCE by Seleucus I, was one of the greatest cities of antiquity. There were many Jews in Antioch, and they received many privileges from its founder." Jaffers (1999: 289) states that "Antioch continued to be a major center of Christianity for centuries. It produced a number of church leaders in later years, notably the apologist Theophilus and the preacher John Chrysostom."

[117] See Acts 11:20, 25-26; 13:1-3; 14:21-23; 15:30; 18:18-23; and Gal 2:11-14. Antioch was the third among the cities of the Roman world at this time; see Josephus, *War* 3.2.4 § 29. Talbert (1997: 114) observes that "Although it [Antioch] contained a large Jewish population (Josephus, *War* 7.3.2-4 §§ 41-62; *Apion* 2.4 § 39), it was a Gentile city. Any church that would be there would contain a mixture of converted Jews and Gentiles (cf. Gal. 2:11-14)." See Parsons, 2008: 165; Talbert, 1997: 114–15; Bruce, 1990: 266–78, 350; Immanuel, 2016: 140–41, 156, 169, 204–06; Witherington, 1998: 473; McRay, 1993: 24.

[118] Christians, the name for the disciples, occurs only three times in the New Testament; Acts 11:26; 26:28; and 1 Peter 4:16. See Barrett, 2002: 175; Parsons, 2008: 168.

[119] Jaffers (1999: 287) observes, "Syria's large cities were centers of Hellenistic culture in the Near East. Besides Antioch and Damascus, Syria's important cities included Berea, Laodicea, Epiphania, Heliopolis, with its magnificent temples, Palmyra and Apamea." See Barrett, 2002: 129–49; Talbert, 1997: 93–103; Parsons, 2008: 125–35.

[120] Urhâi or Edessa, a very old city, is situated in the East of the Euphrates in the North of Mesopotamia. Adrian (1913: 28–29; also see 22, 36) explains, "The city of Edessa, capital of the kingdom of Osroene, is the center from which Christianity spread through East Syria and into Persia." Also see Lapidge, 1996: 99; Hinson, 1995: 80.

[121] Drijvers (1992: chapter 6) states, "We can assume that the new belief spread eastwards from Antioch along the main trade routes to northern Mesopotamia. So it came to Edessa, capital of the small kingdom of Osrhoene in Northern Mesopotamia." Also see Lapidge, 1996: 99; Mundadan, 2001: 1: 27; Kuriakose, 1982: 4–5.

for orthodox Christians and that orthodox Christians received it in Edessa."[122] Lapham (2003: 88) makes the following observation:

> It would be a mistake to assume that Christianity first came to the province of Syria solely by way of its chief city, Antioch. Certainly the New Testament testifies to the paramount importance of this Roman city for the early movement of the faith into Asia Minor and Greece; and while no eastern missionary thrust towards Edessa is mentioned in the Acts, clearly we cannot rule out some early apostolic evangelism within this region from Antioch.

The tradition of the East Syrian church narrated in the *Doctrina Addai* (i.e., *Teaching of Addai*) plays a significant role in understanding the identity of Thomas. In the Syriac story of Abgar, king of Edessa, Addai (*Thaddaeus* in Greek) performs miracles and preaches powerfully in the city.[123] As per the tradition, Addai was one of the seventy followers of Jesus (cf. Lk. 10:1).[124] He was sent to Edessa by Judas Thomas because Jesus, in a letter to Abgar, had promised to send one of his disciples.[125] This tradition that links Edessan Syriac Christianity directly with Jesus makes a claim for apostolic origins and historical authenticity.[126] Moreover, as Saint-Laurent (2015: 40) comments, "With the *Teaching of Addai*, we see the efforts of the Christian leaders of the city [Edessa] to unify a dual apostolic lineage: Thomas and Addai, whom Thomas ordains and sends to Edessa. Both travel to Edessa: Thomas through the translation of his relics, Addai through his missionary efforts."[127] From these writings that are myths with historical elements, the following details can be gathered: first, Syriac Christianity in Edessa has a distinct identity as it identifies more with the Palestinian Jesus movement than with the Gentile Christian movement; second, the twinship of Thomas was well accepted in Edessa

[122] The first version of the New Testament to be widely used among Syriac-speaking Christians was the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. See Menzies, 2007: 9: 35–41; Ross, 2001; Hilar, 2012: 141.

[123] For more details about *Doctrina Addai*, see Klijn, 1962: 30–31; Ramelli, 2009; Johnson, 2012: 175–78; Younan, 2009: 65–67.

[124] Eusebius identifies five of the seventy, namely Barnabas, Sosthenes, Cephas, Matthias, and Thaddaeus. See Metzger, 1980: 10: 23.

[125] See Norris, 1997/1999: 19.

[126] See Taylor, 2013: 69.

[127] Pappas (1991: 101) says that "The Nestorians or Eastern Syrian Christians mention in their calendar that the body of St. Thomas was brought from India to Urfa (Edessa) by the merchant Khabin. Evidently, in 163, the bones of St. Thomas were brought from Madras, India, to Edessa. The transfer of the Apostles' bones to Edessa is celebrated by the Syrian church on July 3." Shahid (1984/2006: 225) mentions that the year of transfer was 394 CE. Also see Ellis, 2012: 155.

through the understanding of his role as a mediator between Jesus and the Christians in East Syria; third, as Thomas was part of the apostolic guild at least until the apostolic council, there are possibilities for his visit to Edessa either from Jerusalem or from Antioch; fourth, the transfer of Thomas's mortal remains from Mylapore, India, to Edessa has to be viewed in closer relationship with other traditions;[128] and fifth, the identity of the Thomas community cannot be properly understood without having knowledge of his relationship with Edessan Christianity.

There is literary and historical evidence that supports the view that communities of Christians existed in different parts of the Parthian Empire from the first century CE onward.[129] The Book of Acts cites that "Parthians, Medes, and Elamites," three Persian tribal groups, were present on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:9).[130] There were more than twenty bishoprics in the Tigris–Euphrates Valley by 225 CE or at the beginning of the Sassanian rule.[131] In 325 CE, John of Persia attended the Council of Nicaea and other Persian bishops attended church councils and traveled within the Empire.[132] East Syriac Christianity was later on established based on two cities, Edessa in the Syrian province and Nisibis in the Persian province.[133] Christians in Persia believe that the Apostle Thomas visited Persian provinces en route to India.[134] Moreover, the Christians in Persia consider Edessa as their spiritual home.[135] As Thomas was acknowledged as the patron apostle of Syrian Christianity in Edessa, he was also highly regarded by its advocates in Persia.[136] The traditions developed among the Syrian church fathers and documents such as *Didaskalia*

[128] Skemer (2006: 97) records how "Near the end of her pilgrimage to the Christian holy places, which has been dated to the years 381–84 or some time between 394 and 404, Egeria journeyed to Edessa, the seat of Abgar's realm, to visit the tomb of the Apostle Thomas."

[129] See Gorder, 2010: 24.

[130] See Montgomery, 2002: 19–20; Gorder, 2010: 24.

[131] Sassanian rule extended from 224 to 651 CE. See Latourette, 1937: 103; cf. Montgomery, 2002: 40. Also see Waterfield, 1973: 24: 39–41.

[132] See Elton, 1996: 100; Kanjamala, 2014/2018.

[133] See Roldanus, 2006: 153–54. Later on, Nestorian Christianity also developed and spread throughout the Syrian and Parthian provinces. For more details about Nestorian Christianity, see Stewart, 1928.

[134] See Gorder, 2010: 25.

[135] Torrey (1881: 2: 141) states, "The Persian Church seems, therefore, to have been active in promoting the spread of Christianity. Their commercial relations, and also the persecutions to which they were subjected, and which induced Christians to emigrate, gave them opportunities for this work." Roldanus (2006: 153) states, "For centuries, the Persian Kingdom was the only strong nation with which the Roman Empire found itself confronted." Also see Buck, 1999: 63; Gorder, 2010: 25.

[136] Klijn (1962: 27) states that "It is, however, not quite clear what is meant by 'India.' Probably the North-Western part of India is meant. It is quite possible that this region received Christianity from Parthia."

Apostolorum, the *ATh*, and others exemplify how Thomas was understood and how his community was perceived beyond time and space.[137] The church fathers can mostly be divided between three viewpoints: first, some understood Thomas as an apostle to Persia; second, some linked his apostleship with India; and third, some connected him with both Persia and India, and other nations.[138] In that sense, the Indo-Parthian and South Indian theories based on the *ATh* help us to see the larger picture.[139] Besides the frequently traversed sea routes to India, there were land routes through Mesopotamia, Persia, and Afghanistan to the ancient town of Purushapura (Peshawar).[140] There was a dynasty of Christian kings in the Indus delta of the Parthians and King Gundaphoros was famous among them.[141] Farquhar argues that Thomas's first and most extended mission was in the North (Punjab area), but he had to leave the region because of the Kushan invasion, which eventually wiped out the Christians of that region so that no trace remained.[142] From all these writings, we understand that the reach of Thomas and his community was far beyond the Jewish and Syrian territories.

As the visit of Thomas to Parthia and the northwestern part of India is supported by tradition, his coming to the South Indian region is also widely accepted. According to the South Indian tradition, Apostle Thomas landed in Muziris (Kodungalloor) in 52 CE.[143] Indian Christians, particularly the Syrian Christians of Kerala, trace their origins to Thomas. The traditions of Syrian Christians are rich as they describe the advent of the apostle, his work, his conversion of Brahmins, and his martyrdom in Mylapore. As the living tradition continues, the Christians of Kerala identify themselves as Thomas Christians.[144] As Thomas was instrumental in founding churches where Xanthippus, Vizan, and Sifur ministered as per the *ATh* (cc. 65, 66, 169–70),

[137] See Padinjarekutt, 2005: 25.
[138] For more details, see Chapter 9. Also see Nedungatt, 2008: 213.
[139] See Prasad, 2009: 12/2: 479.
[140] For more details concerning the St. Thomas tradition and the church of Pakistan, see Athyal, 1996: 470; Prasad, 2009: 12/2: 479.
[141] For more details, see Chapter 7 on the *ATh*.
[142] See Farquhar, 1926/1927: 10.1/11.1; Firth, 2001: 17; Sen, 1988/1999: 593. While only scarce materials are available to prove Thomas's extended mission in the Eastern part of the world, there are attempts to connect him with different geographical areas. It is argued that he could have possibly had mission involvements in Jerusalem, Edessa, Socotra, Indo-Parthia (maybe both in Parthia and northwestern India), Kalyan, South India, Malacca, China, Burma, and other places.
[143] See Neill, 1984: 30; Suhas, 2004: 67.
[144] See Prasad, 2009: 12/2: 479; Neill, 1984: 30.

tradition upholds that he founded churches in Kerala, that is, in Muziris (Maliankara), Palayur, Parur (Kottakkavu), Gokamangalam, Niranam, Chayal (Nilakkal), and Quilon (Kollam).[145] Even today, churches and communities of Thomas Christians exist in these provinces of influence.[146] Both in the *ATh* and in popular traditions, Thomas is understood as an apostle who was instrumental in founding churches and appointing ministers. In that sense, Thomas was perceived by his community as a significant influence, especially in the Eastern part of the world. On the basis of this discussion, we come to the following observations: first, there are various traditions that connect Thomas with Jerusalem, Galilee, Syria, Persia, northwestern India, and South India; second, in the first century CE, these geopolitical regions were well connected through both sea routes and land routes; third, the apostleship of Thomas was widely acknowledged over a long period of time; fourth, the community of Thomas existed over a long span of time and the Thomas Christians of Kerala continue to exist as a living community; and fifth, the connection of the Church in Kerala with the Syrian and Persian ecclesiastical bodies explains the continuity in a more concrete sense.

Thomasine writings demonstrate the mystical version of Christianity, that is, as elitist, ascetic, self-denying, and focused upon a higher realm of existence.[147] It is also observed that esoteric knowledge and commitment to the secret interpretations of the community are central to its understanding and are the basis of its allegiance to the teachings of Jesus.[148] In that sense, the Thomasine community understands Jesus as a mystical example of wholeness.[149] This peculiar aspect of the community is mostly evident irrespective of geographical distinctions. This means that the East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian versions of Thomas Christianity commonly share many characteristic features.[150] Layton considers the *GTh*, *BTh*, and the *Hymn of the Pearl* (i.e., part of the *ATh*) as writings that emerged

[145] See Firth, 2001: 3.
[146] See Neill, 1984: 30.
[147] See Foster, 2009: 40–41.
[148] Kim (2007: 393–414) argues that, just like any other early Christian community, the Thomas community maintained its own tradition (oral, written, or both) of Jesus for the continuity and prosperity of the movement.
[149] See Foster, 2009: 40.
[150] Layton (1987: 359) comments, "According to ancient tradition Thomas deserves credit for the conversion of northern Mesopotamia and India to Christianity."

from the "School of St. Thomas."[151] Even many of those who do not endorse Layton's school hypothesis nevertheless share his conviction that these texts emerged from an East Syrian context.[152] At the same time, a reader needs to understand that these texts reflect the ideological and communitarian aspects of not only the East Syrian community but also the Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian communities. This further means that there were Thomasine communities established in the Eastern part of the world and that they shared ideas in common.[153] While Riley, DeConick, and Pagels agree on the view that the Johannine community developed an anti-Thomas polemic, their basic assumption was based on the community-conflict position.[154] They attempt to understand the character of Thomas and his community exclusively from the East Syrian perspective.[155] As Thomas's influence was mainly in the Eastern part of the world, that is, in East Syria, Persia, Indo-Parthia, and South India, his community would have adopted an integrative approach that befits the Eastern context.[156] These details help us to arrive at the following conclusions concerning the Thomasine community: first, the community of Thomas, as an Eastern community, kept a separate identity from the rest of the early Christian communities; second, although Syrian Christianity emerged from the roots of the Palestinian Jesus movement, it kept its identity distinct from both the Jewish and the Greco–Roman movements; third, the East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian connectivity of the community helped its advancement as an Eastern Christian movement; and fourth, the mystical, ascetic, and esoteric nature of Thomas Christianity marks a sharp distinction from the Jewish and Gentile groups of Christians. These aspects help us to understand the widespread movement of the community over a long period of time.

[151] See Layton, 1987: 359–409.
[152] See Stang, 2016.
[153] Saint-Laurent (2015: 33) states, "The narrative of the *Acts of Thomas* takes Thomas from Jerusalem, the city of Jesus' death and resurrection, to India, the place of Thomas' martyrdom. Between these sacred locations are places like Edessa that honor Thomas' memory."
[154] See Riley, 1995: 74–82, 148–49, 177; DeConick, 2001: 303–12; Pagels, 1999: 477–96. For more details about the community-conflict hypothesis, see Skinner, 2009: 16–18.
[155] While Skinner (2009: 231–33) considers Thomas as a relatively insignificant character within the Gospel of John, he underscores the broader outlook of the character of Thomas within John's narrative masterplan.
[156] As Kim (2007: 393–414) argues, it is far more important to understand the Thomas community as a creative and independent movement.

Thomas Christianity in India

The character of Thomas is engraved in the cultural artifacts and spiritual aspirations of the Indian Christians. While he is closely associated with Jesus and listed as one among the Twelve disciples in the Synoptic Gospels (Mk 3:14-15; Mt. 10:2-4; Lk. 6:13-16), he is portrayed as one of the leading characters and as a brave speaker in the FG (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-29; 21:2). While Thomas is found in the company of the apostles in the Book of Acts (1:13), he is elevated as a key figure in the apocryphal documents and in the works of the church fathers and historians. The tradition of Thomas and his community in India is strongly attached to the Jewish, East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian backgrounds. Through all these backgrounds, he continues to appear more and more like the apostolic figure whom the Indian Christians acknowledged for several centuries.[157] In that sense, Thomas Christianity in India can be considered as a recapitulation of all other Thomas traditions. At the same time, Thomas Christianity in India has its own peculiar features when it is compared with the Jewish and the Gentile Christian communities. As an apostle schooled under Jesus, Thomas continues to appear as a figure who shapes the lives of the Indian Christians through their mystical bond with Jesus. The attachment of the Indian church with that of the East Syrian and Persian churches, and the linkage of all these churches with the Thomasine tradition, attune our attention toward the early annals of Christian history. Thomas Christians were known for their ascetic lifestyle, their exercise of esoteric knowledge, and their mystical character in spirituality.[158] These characteristics are sustained even today at the ecclesiastical levels as the community believes that they inherit all these characteristics from the heritage of Thomas. Thomas Christianity influenced the history of India, and at the same time, it has been molded by its Indian context.[159] As a community formed around the person and work of Thomas, the community members consider themselves as the "children of Thomas" and hence the "children of Jesus." The fatherhood of Thomas over

[157] Pierson (2009: 52) states, "We also know that the Church in South India used Syriac, the language of Edessa and much of the Middle East." Also see Firth, 2001: 18–33.
[158] George (2016) sees St. Thomas Christianity as a unique form of Christianity.
[159] See Hrangkhuma, 1996: 393.

the church is considered to be a generally accepted norm among the Indian Christians.

Thomas's attachment to the Greater Indian provinces is described in detail in the *ATh*.[160] Moffett (2006: 1: 25) comments that "it [*ATh*] survives as the oldest narrative account of a church in Asia beyond the borders of the Roman Empire."[161] Thomas is traditionally considered as the Apostle of India and the *ATh* is recognized as one of the oldest accounts that record the existence of the church beyond the Roman Empire. Frykenberg (2008: 115) states that, "in light of facts known and not known, millions of Thomas Christians remain certain that their founder was none other than the Apostle himself. For them, this is an established article of faith—a part of their own canon from which there can be no deviation." Thus, Thomas is widely accepted as the founder of the Eastern Church. Other than the ministerial engagements of Thomas, his martyrdom is acknowledged as one of the significant annals in the history of Christianity. In the Portuguese reports, the coming of Thomas to the South Indian provinces, his ministry in different parts of the nation, and his martyrdom in Mylapore are recorded with greater significance.[162] According to the Portuguese records, an amalgam of triple traditions, namely those of Malabar, East Syria, and Mylapore, make the Thomas tradition more prominent.[163] Mundadan also considers the Mylapore tradition with greater significance alongside the traditions related to Malabar and East Syria.[164] Nedungatt (2008: 399) further emphasizes this as follows:

> A comparative study of the five principal NT apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, namely, of Peter, Paul, John, Andrew, and Thomas, shows that the places mentioned as those where the first four of these leading Apostles died are what is known otherwise from history: Rome in the case of Peter and Paul,

[160] See Chapter 7.

[161] Mundadan (2001: 1: 60) states, "This romantic account [*ATh*] is probably based on a historical nucleus, representing the first and second century oral tradition. From the fourth century on there is unanimity among Churches about the tradition." Also see Nedungatt, 2008: 398.

[162] Mundadan (2001: 1: 49) comments, "'the holy man,' who for the East-Syrians, the St. Thomas Christians, and the Portuguese was undoubtedly St. Thomas the Apostle, died near the town of Mylapore and his body was buried in the right-hand chapel of the house and this the Portuguese visited in 1517."

[163] For Mundadan (2001: 1: 38), the Malabar tradition means "what the people of Kerala told the Portuguese," the East Syrian tradition means "information from East-Syrian people or books," and the Mylapore tradition means "what the people of Mylapore told the Portuguese."

[164] See Mundadan, 2001: 1: 38.

> Ephesus of John, and Patras of Andrew. If so, one may reasonably conclude that in the fifth case also this is so: that is, the *ATh* account that Thomas died as a martyr in India is historically reliable.

Thomas Christians believe that he was martyred in Mylapore and that his mortal remains were transferred to Edessa.[165] The Thomas community in the South Indian province is considered as the most ancient Christian community of the Far East. Their community life is mostly based on the "Law of Thomas."[166] In this regard, Aerthayil (1982: 29) states that:

> The external manifestation or expression of this faith [of the Thomas Christians in India] through the Oriental mode of worship is certainly a special characteristic of this Christian community, of the Far-East. They called this Oriental mode of worship, together with the disciplinary and social dimensions connected with it, the "Law of Thomas." This is an important part of the spiritual heritage of the Malabar Church, because it is precisely this Law of Thomas that makes the Malabar church a distinct Oriental church.

The Thomas community of India consider themselves as part of the body of Christ, but they have their own sacred liturgy, rites, and hierarchical orders.[167] The community practices ecclesiastical discipline and a spirituality that focuses on the glorious trinity.[168] The iconographic and symbolic aspects of the Thomas Christians set them apart as a distinct community. They believe that their Christian morality is apostolic in origin and hence that it is an "Apostolic Gift."[169] The spiritual formation of the community is rooted in their ascetic as well as mystical experiences, their liturgical theology, and their genuine and spontaneous spirituality.[170] Christianity in Kerala must be understood as a unique configuration arising out of the local Indian ethos and the ethical values derived out of the Jerusalemite, Syrian, and Persian experiences of Christianity.[171] The Thomas Christians

[165] See Gingras, 1970; Maraval, 1982. Also see Gamurrini, 1888: 33–34; Dietz, 2005: 44; Puliurumpil, 2012: 256–57.
[166] See Aerthayil, 1982: 9.
[167] See Aerthayil, 1982: 29–30.
[168] See Aerthayil, 1982: 92–100.
[169] See Aerthayil, 1982: 217.
[170] See Aerthayil, 1982: 217–28.
[171] Vishvanathan (1999: 1) says that "The features of their social life make Syrian Christians recognizable as a unique cultural group in the comparative analyses of Christian communities in the world."

believe that their origins, doctrinal basis, and ecclesiastical authority are rooted in the apostolic tradition established in the person and work of St. Thomas.[172]

At the St. Thomas Day celebration in New Delhi on December 18, 1955, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the then President of India, made the following observation in his speech: "Remember, St. Thomas came to India when many of the countries of Europe had not yet become Christian, and so those Indians who trace their Christianity to him have a longer history and a higher ancestry than that of Christians of many of the European countries."[173] This is an acknowledged popular tradition not only among the Christians but also among the non-Christian communities of the country. Mundadan (2001: 1: 21) points out that

> There are two views among scholars about the origin of Christianity in India. According to one, the foundations of Christianity in India were laid by St. Thomas, the Apostle, or even by two Apostles, St. Thomas and St. Bartholomew. The other view would ascribe the arrival of Christianity in India to the enterprise of merchants and missionaries of the East-Syrian or Persian Church. Those who propound the apostolic origin do not deny the role of the East-Syrian Church in reinforcing Indian Christianity.

The "living tradition" among the Thomas Christian communities of Kerala is stronger than any other tradition.[174] Mundadan (2001: 1: 61) further states, "The South Indian claim to the apostolate of St. Thomas is supported by two monuments: the community of St. Thomas Christians with their living tradition, and the tomb of Mylapore which is definitely identified as the burial place of St. Thomas." There is a common consensus among scholars about the apostolic kerygma in Kerala.[175] As the apostolic claim is exclusively part of the Thomas Christians of India, it has more authenticity than any other tradition. In sum, Thomas Christianity in India cannot be easily detached from the person and work of Thomas. The traditio-historical

[172] See Frykenberg, 2008: 115.
[173] Nedungatt (2008: 410) states, "When taken together with the massive patristic witness and the Indian tradition spread over four foci, the response can be 'historically certain.'" Also see Mundadan, 2001: 1: 9.
[174] See Mundadan, 2001: 1: 61.
[175] See Mundadan, 2001: 1: 61.

evidence and the "living tradition" of the believing community closely attach Thomas with Indian Christianity. This exclusive claim of the Thomas Christians cannot be challenged unless historians come up with convincing alternative views.

Concluding remarks

The details in this chapter enable us to reconstruct a historical perception of the person and work of Thomas. The Synoptic Gospels introduce him as one of the Twelve during Jesus's public ministry. In these texts, Thomas's character develops not merely as a passive observer of the events around Jesus, but also as an active partner in the mission of God. In the FG, the narrative framework looks mostly Thomasine. The *grand inclusio* of the Gospel (between 1:1 and 20:28) can be properly understood with Thomas at the narrative intervals. Thomas appears, first of all, as a backgrounded figure, and then he is brought to the foreground from ch. 11 onward. The Johannine narrator draws a picture of Thomas with precision through his four explicit appearances (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-29; 21:2). In the Book of Acts, we see his active presence in the early church context. Thomas develops in Acts from his role and status as a disciple in Jesus's own life situation to his position as an apostle in the early church's life situation. The spiritual experiences on the day of Pentecost and in the upper room, the emerging situation of persecution in the Jerusalemite context, and the post-council (i.e., 49 CE) attitude of the mother church toward missions would have challenged Thomas to pursue the task of going beyond the Jewish and Greco–Roman boundaries. The apocryphal documents substantiate the relationship of Thomas with Jesus as he is the "twin-brother," sharer of "secret" revelations, "childhood friend," and "earlier disciple." Among them, the *ATh* emphasizes Thomas's commitment to preaching the gospel in the Far-Eastern world. Furthermore, the records of church fathers, historians, travelers, and geographers connect Thomas mostly with the Greater Indian provinces. From a communitarian point of view, Thomas Christianity, though rooted in the Palestinian Jesus movement and connected to Gentile Christianity, kept its own identity as a mystical, ascetic, and esoteric group spread throughout the East Syrian, Persian, Indo-

Parthian, and South Indian provinces. The "living tradition" of the Thomas Christians of Kerala and the tomb of Mylapore remain unchallenged even today as no alternative evidence has been found. Thus, the character of Thomas continues to marvel as a figure in the annals of the pre-Easter, Easter, and post-Easter narratives and traditions.

The last two chapters have provided us with an overview of the Thomas documents from geographically vast areas over a chronologically extended period of time. The details regarding Thomas outlined in the Johannine and the apocryphal documents are further substantiated by the traditions from the church fathers, historians, travelers, and geographers. As concluded in Chapter 9, India had a well-established trade relationship with the rest of the world, even before the beginning of Christianity. Hence, India was not a *terra incognita* for outsiders during the post-resurrection period. Furthermore, we can now expound how Thomas's apostleship to India was unanimously accepted, consistent, and reasonably early. As Thomas's Indian apostolate was acknowledged over a longer period of time and there were no convincing contradictory views, it continues to remain as an accepted view in historical documents of the church. Chapter 10 further demonstrates how we can reconstruct a history of Thomas based on NT, apocryphal, and historical traditions. Having analyzed the canonical, extracanonical, and traditio-historical details related to Thomas's character, in the next section we will derive the overarching conclusions of the study.

General Conclusion

The analysis of the Thomas Literature and traditions using an interdisciplinary approach has enabled us to develop a clearer understanding of the literary and historical image of Didymus Judas Thomas.[1] A reader of the TL can observe the progress of his character in a consistent and persuasive manner while learning how Thomas and his community contributed to the advancement of early Christian theological underpinnings. The study has yielded significant results as it takes into consideration different layers of documents,[2] multiple methods,[3] various geographical locations,[4] assorted chronological spans,[5] and several people involved.[6] Through all these, it has been possible to attain certain levels of knowledge concerning the continual impact of the Thomas tradition through many generations of people. The interdisciplinary approach helped first to integrate the literary, historical, and theological aspects related to Thomas (i.e., with the help of both synchronic and diachronic methods). Second, it helped to derive knowledge from the scattered traditions. Third, it helped to build a coherent and interconnected perspective about Thomas. Fourth, it reconstructed a history of the character with the help of the available materials. And finally, it bridged the Eastern and Western scholarly perspectives to construe a universally accepted understanding of the person and work of Thomas.

In John's Gospel, Thomas enters the center stage at some of the crucial narrative intervals as a person of braveness (11:16), inquisitiveness (14:5), revelatory confession (20:24-28), and faithfulness (21:2).[7] In 11:16, the narrator foregrounds the role and status of his character. Some of the

[1] See the "Research Methodology" section in the introductory chapter.
[2] These layers of documents include the NT, apocrypha, and historical traditions.
[3] This refers to narrative, rhetorical, theological, and historical-critical methods.
[4] These locations are Jerusalem, East Syria, Persia, Indo-Parthia, and South India.
[5] This covers the apostolic period until the time of the living traditions of Malabar.
[6] These include apostles, church fathers, historians, geographers, travelers, and archaeologists.
[7] See Bennema, 2014: 287–97.

significant kernels in this story include Thomas's braveness to go and die with Jesus, his leadership role among the disciples, and his strategic position to direct the attention of the reader away from the death and raising of Lazarus to the upcoming death and resurrection of Jesus.[8] In 14:5, the question asked by Thomas initiates a paradigm shift from a horizontal journey (to Jerusalem, 11:16) to a vertical Way (Jesus himself, the Way to the Father, 14:5-6). At the same time, his question enables Jesus to reveal some of the mysterious truths pertinent to Himself and the heavenly realities (14:6). The role of Thomas, as a seeker of truth, a believer based on seen things, and an action-oriented and progressive character, is introduced as a paradigm for Christian spirituality. The character's frankness in speech and vibrant nature exemplify his special role in the Jesus movement.[9] His engagement with Jesus and the other disciples reaches its apex through his most profound utterance in 20:28: "My Lord and my God." Thomas moves away from his earlier conviction ("I will not believe," 20:25b) to state that Jesus is "My Lord and my God." The analeptic and proleptic connection between the narrative introduction ("the Word was God," 1:1) and Thomas's Christological utterance ("My Lord and my God," 20:28) forms a *grand inclusio* within the narrative framework of the Gospel.[10] In that sense, we can construe how John's narrative framework advances in a Thomasine fashion.[11] The plot structure of the Gospel, with a proper beginning (1:1: "Jesus was God"), a middle (the entire body of the Gospel: "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us"), and an ending (20:28: Thomas's utterance "My Lord and my God"), includes all the elements of a literary rhetoric. Chapter 21, with Thomas's presence among the seven disciples (21:2), can be considered as a narrative expansion of 20:24-31. Thomas continues to be the most profound proclaimer of the Gospel as the lagging natures of Peter and John are clearly revealed in ch. 21.[12] Through a constellation of themes, such as *going*, *dying*, *believing*, *loving*, *glorification*, and *Christological titles*, Thomas's character advances in the text with heroic qualities.[13]

[8] See Chapter 1.
[9] See Chapter 2.
[10] See Chapter 3.
[11] See Charlesworth, 1995.
[12] See Chapter 4.
[13] See Part 1 for details concerning theological development.

In harmony with the details of the Fourth Gospel (FG), the apocryphal documents provide further information about the character of Thomas. In the *GTh*, the narrator demonstrates his mystical union and sharing of esoteric wisdom with Jesus. Some of his noteworthy characteristics include his maturity as a believer, progress in knowledge, and non-hypocritical attitude. While Peter and James are leading figures in the NT, the *GTh* foregrounds Thomas as a key personality.[14] The *BTh* further strengthens the ideologies of the *GTh*. In the *BTh*, the Thomasine community's engagement with the Greco–Roman ideologies is made conspicuous. The development of Thomas from ignorance to perfection and then to majesty of perfection is presented as a paradigm.[15] In the *ATh*, the merging together of historical kernels and novelistic fiction informs the reader of Thomas's travel beyond the Greco–Roman context. The narrator brings into focus his cross-cultural mission involvements in the Indo-Parthian and South Indian geographical areas. The text also emphasizes his intimate relationship with Jesus, challenging personality, and cross-cultural mission involvements.[16] In the *IGTh*, Thomas is introduced as an early friend of Jesus. In the text, Thomas functions as a childhood friend, an earlier disciple, and a mature believer. As the discipleship of James and Thomas develops almost at the same time, Thomas should be considered as one of the earliest witnesses of Jesus's preexistent nature and miraculous power.[17] These apocryphal documents alongside the FG introduce him as the spiritual twin of Jesus. Thomas is engaged in constant discourse with Jesus and is drunk in the wisdom of God.[18] In this way, the extracanonical documents disclose the Johannine character with more precision.

The traditio-historical materials, though widely scattered, further establish the NT and the apocryphal understanding of Thomas. There are historical accounts from the pre-Christian periods to confirm the trade relationship between the Greater Indian provinces and the Western world. The presence of people from the East in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 1:9) and evidence of existent land and sea routes between the Jewish

[14] See Chapter 5.
[15] See Chapter 6.
[16] See Chapter 7.
[17] See Chapter 8.
[18] See Chapter 5.

kingdom and the Greater Indian provinces confirm the possibilities of such connections.[19] In the patristic traditions, Thomas is mostly linked to either Parthia or India, or both. The affiliation of the Indian church with the Persian ecclesiastical authorities from earlier times and the unanimous, consistent, and reasonably early traditions concerning Thomas's apostolate make this connection more compelling. The apostolate of Thomas to the Eastern world was widely acknowledged over a prolonged period of time, and the lack of convincing views that challenge the Indian apostolate of Thomas is obvious. Both Eastern and Western scholars have paid continuous and broad attention to the Thomas tradition relating him to Greater India.[20] The majority of church fathers, historians, travelers, geographers, and archaeologists connect Thomas with Greater India.[21] Chapter 10 attempted to reconstruct a history of Thomas combining the materials from the Synoptics, FG, Book of Acts, apocryphal documents, patristic and historical traditions, and various other traditions from Jerusalemite, East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian provinces.[22] The chronologically and geographically widespread traditions direct our attention toward the Eastern hemisphere with a particular emphasis on the Greater Indian provinces. All these traditions together give us a consistent and coherent understanding of Thomas's apostleship. The living tradition of Malabar, the tomb of Mylapore, archaeological evidence relating to the kingdom of Gundaphoros, the local traditions of Malabar including the *Ramban Thoma Pattu*, *Margan Kali Pattu*, *Veeradian Pattu*, and other traditions, lead our exclusive focus on the Eastern regions.[23] The social memory related to the person and work of Thomas continues to take shape in various forms and among different communities.[24]

In our analysis, we can see that Thomas is one of the oldest and strongest traditions in church history. The uninterrupted development of the tradition has a unique progression. It begins with the FG as a product of the Johannine community and is followed by the production of the *GTh* between 130 and

[19] See Chapter 9.
[20] See Chapter 9. However, challenging views arise in both Western and the Eastern contexts.
[21] See Chapter 9.
[22] See Chapter 10.
[23] See Chapter 9.
[24] See Keith, 2015: 354–76.

250 CE, the *BTh* before 300 CE, and the *ATh* between 200 and 250 CE.[25] While the *IGTh* developed out of stories from the second half of the first century and continued to hold prominence for a long period of time, the church fathers' traditions dominated from the second and third centuries onward. However, the oral traditions have held their importance right from the beginning as have the discussions of the church historians from both the Eastern and Western contexts, the living traditions of Malabar, and the tomb in Mylapore.[26] This points to the fact that the TL and traditions were developed and reinterpreted in an unbroken manner, and they were widely spread among the communities of faith. Several of these traditions found in the NT, apocrypha, and historical traditions can be coalesced as they emphasize certain aspects: first, Thomas is constantly introduced as the spiritual twin of Jesus and thus the mystical and esoteric traditions related to him continue to develop;[27] second, Thomas's character is attached to miracle stories in the FG (raising of Lazarus [11:16], resurrection of Jesus [20:24-28], the miraculous catch of fish [21:2]), in the *ATh* (cc. 8, 37, 96, 106), in the *IGTh* (8:2; 9:1-3; 10:1-2; 11:1-2; 12:1-2; 13:1-2; 15:4; 16:1; 18:1), and in the local traditions of Malabar where Thomas is connected to several miraculous events;[28] third, Thomas is the subject of martyrdom and death traditions (his willingness to die with Jesus [Jn 11:16], Jesus as martyr in the FG [Jn 18–19], and Thomas as a martyr in the *ATh* [cc. 159–170]); fourth, Thomas's utterance, "My Lord and my God," has a continuous impact (Jn 20:28; *ATh* cc. 81, 97, 167);[29] and fifth, Thomas is connected with Jesus as a dialogue partner and hence is regarded as a sharer of divine revelation (Jn 11:16; 14:5; 20:24-28; *BTh* 138:4–142:21; *ATh* cc. 1–2). These traditions further appear in oral and written forms in patristic records and the existing traditions of the Thomas Christians. Thus, the development of the TL and traditions stretches throughout the history of Christianity. It begins with the Bethany-centric and Galilean appearances of Thomas in the FG, of Jesus and the disciples

[25] Bultmann (1971: 12) considers the redactional edition of the Gospel to have been composed between 80 and 120 CE. The mention of Thomas in the Synoptic traditions and in the Book of Acts provides us further understanding of the development of the tradition in the first century itself.

[26] See Mundadan, 2001: 1: 61.

[27] See Jn 11:16; 20:24; 21:2; *GTh* 1, 13; *BTh* 138:1-3, 4-21; *ATh* cc. 31, 39; his appearance as Jesus's childhood friend in the *IGTh*, and the belief that Thomas is the "twin" of Jesus among the Thomas Community. In the historical traditions, Thomas is continually described as the "twin" of Jesus.

[28] In the local Malabar tradition, there are various miracles in oral form attached to Thomas.

[29] The Thomas community in India continually attribute this utterance to Thomas.

in Jerusalem in the *ATh*, and the introduction of Thomas the Israelite in the *IGTh*. In the middle stage of development, there are various traditions such as those from East Syria, Persia, Indo-Parthia, and South India. Finally, the Thomas tradition continues to exist through the living traditions and the tomb of Mylapore.[30] This development shows the uninterrupted distribution of the Thomas tradition from its starting point in Israel to its present existence in the form of Thomas Christianity.

The authenticity of the words and deeds of an NT character can be understood on the basis of a combination of multiple criteria.[31] In Thomas's case, several areas related to him throughout the TL and traditions must be evaluated in a succinct fashion. First, there are *multiple attestations*, meaning there is more than one independent source that reproduced various aspects[32] and sayings[33] connected to Thomas. As we have seen, Thomas's character is widely attested in the canonical, extracanonical, and traditio-historical documents over a prolonged period of time.[34] Second, there are *multiple forms*, meaning that the tradition pertinent to him appears in various forms of literature such as discourses/dialogues/monologues (Jn 11:16; 14:5; 20:24-28; *BTh*), miracle stories (Jn 11:16; 20:24-28; 21:2), saying materials (*GTh*), romance genres (*ATh*), infancy stories (*IGTh*), hymns (Ephrem), travel narratives (Egeria), martyrdom narratives (Gregory of Tours), and ballads and folksongs (Malabar tradition).[35] Third, the *linguistic phenomena* must be considered as the Thomasine tradition mostly developed in Syriac, a language that is closer to Aramaic. This linguistic tradition continues to exist through the faith and practices of the Syrian Christians of Kerala. Fourth, the *tendencies of developing tradition* must be explored as the traditions of Thomas developed at multiple levels such as oral forms (continues through the "living tradition" of Kerala), collections of utterances (*GTh*), discourses and dialogues (FG), dialogues turned to monologues (*BTh*), romance literature (*ATh*), and infancy

[30] The "living tradition" of Malabar and the tomb of Mylapore remain as significant historical monuments.
[31] See Meier, 1991/2001: 1: 168–84; Stein, 1980: 1: 225–63; also see Guthrie, 1961/1990: 243.
[32] This includes aspects such as the "twin"-brother motif, Thomas's companionship with Jesus, mystical and esoteric developments, and his travel to the Eastern hemisphere in general and the Greater Indian provinces in particular.
[33] For example, "My Lord and my God."
[34] See Gregg, 2006: 28–29; Guthrie, 1961/1990: 243–44; Stein, 1980: 1: 225–63.
[35] All these forms are discussed in detail in the previous ten chapters.

traditions (*IGTh*).[36] From this list of traditions, we can understand that the Thomasine tradition developed according to the needs and demands of the faith communities. Fifth, *dissimilarity* must be taken into account as although Thomas Christianity was rooted in the Jesus movement, its development in the East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian contexts made it a unique form of Christianity.[37] Its distinctiveness is more vivid when we compare it with the Western manifestations including Pauline Christianity. Sixth, the *coherence* of traditions must be examined; at the same time within the TL and traditions, Thomas Christianity's advancement is portrayed in a coherent fashion.[38] Finally, the possibility of *embarrassment* must be considered as the geographical location (Eastern part of the world) and theological distinction (mystical, esoteric, and ascetic) of the Thomasine traditions would have remained an embarrassment to Western Christianity.[39] This would have been one of the reasons behind the neglect of Thomas Christianity in Jerusalem and in the West. A convergence of different lines of evidence shows the distinctive features of Thomas Christianity and the authenticity of such a movement in the annals of history.

In the study, Thomas's literary character, historical persona, and theological traits are integrated for a comprehensive understanding of his person and work. These three areas are interlocked for an overall perspective of his words and deeds. As a literary character, Thomas exercises courage, loyalty, and discipleship. As an ideal person, he lives a realist, down-to-earth, and pragmatic lifestyle (Jn 11:16; 14:5; 20:24-28; 21:2).[40] John foregrounds his character with the help of rhetorical devices,[41] places him at narrative transitions, demonstrates his development from ignorance to knowledge and from unbelief to belief, and designs the master plot based on the prologue

[36] See Guthrie, 1961/1990: 245.

[37] In relation to Jesus, this criterion is used in a different way. As Gregg (2006: 29) says, "Typically the criterion of dissimilarity is used by historical Jesus research scholars as shorthand for the criterion of double dissimilarity, meaning that a saying of Jesus which is dissimilar from both the Judaism of his time and the early church which followed him is likely authentic."

[38] In historical Jesus research, this criterion is labelled as a *criterion of consistency* and considers other sayings and actions of Jesus that fit in well with the preliminary data." See Lee, 2005: 119.

[39] In historical Jesus research, the *criterion of embarrassment* is used as a heightened form of the *criterion of dissimilarity*. See Gregg, 2006: 30; Lee, 2005: 118.

[40] Culpepper (1983: 124) considers Thomas as a "clear-eyed realist." Also see Bennema, 2014: 295; Bennema, 2009: 169.

[41] This includes rhetorical devices such as misunderstanding, among others.

and Thomas's final utterance (1:1 and 20:28).[42] In the apocryphal traditions, his character develops as Jesus's twin and spiritual companion; as a fellow initiate into the hidden words of Christ; and as a model of ascetic, mystical, and esoteric spirituality.[43] The traditio-historical documents portray him with all the qualities of a heroic, challenging personality and a martyr for Christ.[44] These character traits are rooted in the reality of his identity as a historical person.

A demand has arisen for the quest of a historical Thomas.[45] As already discussed, recent archaeological evidence related to Gundaphoros and his kingdom, his brother Gad,[46] the living tradition of Malabar, the tomb of Mylapore, and the geographical and chronological details pertinent to both the Indo-Parthian and South Indian mission of Thomas draw our attention toward his identity as a historical figure.[47] Thomas as a person emerged out of the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* and the *Sitz im Leben Kirche* in John's Gospel,[48] and in the East Syrian, Persian, Indo-Parthian, and South Indian literature (apocryphal and traditio-historical documents) he is regarded as a historical figure. Thomas is also a catalyst of unique theological aspects. In the FG, his character advances alongside some of the theological themes such as belief, love, and the glory of God, and also some of the Christological titles.[49] The utterance of Thomas in 20:28 is considered to be one of the most profound Christological utterances.[50] The ascetic tendencies, mystical experiences, and esoteric impartation of wisdom are integral parts of Thomasine Christianity. The literary, historical, and theological aspects of the TL and traditions exemplify the unique development of the Thomas movement right from the beginning.

Thomas Christianity developed as a steady movement in Jerusalem, East Syria, Persia, Indo-Parthia, and South India over a prolonged period of time,

[42] See Chapter 4. Also see Resseguie, 2013: 17; Culpepper, 2013: 18–35.
[43] See Chapters 5–8.
[44] See Chapters 9–10.
[45] See "Quest for the Historical Thomas, Apostle of India" (Nedungatt, 2008).
[46] See Chapter 7.
[47] See Chapter 9.
[48] As the FG is considered as a *two-level drama*, it discusses the role and status of Thomas in both the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* and *Sitz im Leben Kirche* contexts. See Martyn, 1968/1979; Thomaskutty, 2015: 464–81.
[49] See Part 1, Chapters 1–4.
[50] See Chapter 4.

beginning in the first-century Jerusalemite context and expanding into the living traditions of Thomas Christianity.[51] As a unique, concrete, and consistent movement in history, its most expressive form is encapsulated in the living traditions of Malabar. Since Thomas is introduced as one who never tastes death ("living Thomas") and as a representative of the "living Jesus" (prologue of the *ATh*), the living traditions of Malabar encompass the ideological and phenomenological understanding of Thomasology. The spirituality expressed in the TL emerges in its most realistic form through the spiritual exercises of the Thomas Christians. This link can be easily interpreted by placing Thomas at the center of the discussion.[52] In a sense, the FG connects its ideology smoothly with the Indian scenario through the on-stage appearance of Thomas. Kanagaraj (2005: 20) states that a "fascinating element in John for an Indian is the importance given to the Apostle Thomas (11:16; 14:5; 20:24-29), who, according to reliable traditions, came to India in the first century with the message of salvation that is in Jesus."[53] The link between the Johannine and the Indian ideologies can be explained through an emphasis on the following aspects: the mystical union with God,[54] spirituality as devotion, symbolical and logical argumentation,[55] the dual nature of individual transformation and community life, and the light connected with the brilliant light.[56] The Thomas movement emphasized these aspects as part of its ethos. Moreover, the mystical, ascetic, and esoteric aspects of the TL and traditions emerge in their most demonstrative form in the living traditions of the Thomas Christians. In sum, the Thomas of the FG, the apocryphal traditions, and the traditio-historical materials can be easily aligned with the living traditions of Malabar. This can be further supported by the evidence of the tomb of Mylapore.

Finally, we will discuss how a Thomasine School hypothesis can be derived out of the TL and traditions. Layton (1987: 357–409) posits the existence of a Thomasine School in the city of Edessa with the suggestion of three texts that

[51] See Chapter 9.

[52] Kanagaraj (2005: 19) says, "No New Testament book has had more of an impact on Indian thinkers and philosophers than the Gospel of John." Bishop Westcott (1825–1901), who was the Bishop of Durham, England in 1890–1901, said that the most profound commentary on John's Gospel would not be written until an Indian theologian undertook the task. Also see Hargreaves, 2001: 333–35.

[53] Also see Klijn, 1962: 27–29.

[54] For more details about Johannine mysticism, see Kanagaraj, 1998.

[55] Sen (2005/2006), in his *The Argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian History, Culture and Identity*, discusses in detail the argumentative nature of Indian minds. Also see Nissen, 2013: 17–50.

[56] See Kanagaraj, 2005: 7–8.

formed part of the School: the *GTh*, *BTh*, and "Hymn of the Pearl," which is part of the *ATh*.[57] Charlesworth considers Edessa as the center of the school; but, he does not limit it to the city.[58] Charlesworth (1995: 362) says, "The School of Thomas was one of the most influential of the early Christian Schools."[59] In our study, we see the Thomasine School as an ideological movement that stretches from the first century CE and continues to exist through the living traditions of Malabar. The Thomas School here designates the way that TL and traditions consistently sustain the heritage of the movement as a coherent ideological and philosophical worldview.[60] As Culpepper observes, there are significant aspects of ancient schools that must be considered.[61] First, Thomasine ideologies were continually and consistently expressed in different geographical areas over a prolonged period of time. Second, the Thomas School traced its origins to Thomas as the founder whom its members regarded as an exemplary figure. The person and work of Thomas expressed in the TL and traditions persuaded the members to continue as his loyal disciples. Third, the Thomas School valued the teachings of Thomas and the traditions relating to him. The continuous emphasis on Thomas's Christological vision (i.e., Jesus as Lord and God) and his ascetic, mystical, and esoteric exercises make it a unique way of life. Fourth, members of the school were considered as disciples or students of Thomas. Church fathers such as St. Ephrem, St. Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, and many others, honored Thomas in their writings.[62] Even today, the Thomas Christians of Malabar continue to respect him as their teacher. Fifth, teaching, learning, studying, and writing were common activities of the school. These aspects were/are continually followed and emphasized in Eastern Christianity by considering Thomas as a paradigm of Christian spirituality. Sixth, the School of Thomas maintained its own identity and ideological framework. The Eastward development of the Thomas movement in the form of Syriac Christianity demonstrates its distinctive

[57] Also see Stang, 2016.
[58] See Charlesworth, 1995: 361; also see Klijn, 1962: 30–33.
[59] Charlesworth (1995: 364) further states, "The School of Thomas is related in some way with the putative Johannine School and both of them show some influences from Qumran and Persia."
[60] Lewis (2013) and Uro (2003) argue against a school hypothesis. Also see DeConick, 2001a: 28; Stang, 2016.
[61] Culpepper (1975: 258–59) identifies nine characteristics of an ancient school. Here, seven out of the nine can be considered for an understanding of the School of Thomas.
[62] See Chapter 9.

identity. And finally, the Thomas School developed organizational means to insure its perpetuity.[63] This was implemented from time to time according to the contextual demands of the school. In short, the twin motif of the TL highlights the unique personality of living Thomas in closer relationship with the "living Jesus."[64] This study of Thomas with the help of an interdisciplinary approach informs us of a wider spectrum of his person and work. Such an eclectic reading proves how Thomas stands tall as a unique figure in the history of Christianity.

[63] See Culpepper, 1975: 258–59.
[64] See Stang, 2016.

Bibliography

Aasgaard, R., 2009/2010. *The Childhood of Jesus: Decoding the Apocryphal Infancy Gospel of Thomas*. Cambridge: James Clarke and Company.

Adrian, F., 1913. *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic Truth Society.

Aerthayil, J., 1982. *The Spiritual Heritage of the St. Thomas Christians*. Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications.

Aiya, V. N., 1906. *The Travancore State Manual*. Vol. 1. Trivandrum : Government Press.

Alexandria, C., 2013/2015. *Commentary on John*. Ancient Christian Texts. Vols. 1-2. Tran./Intro. Maxwell, D. R. Ed. Elowsky, J. C. Downers Grove: IVP.

Allaby, M., 2010. *Exploration: New Lands, New Worlds*. New York: Facts on File.

Allen, R. J., 2012. *Reading the New Testament for the First Time*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Allison, D. C., 1992. "Eschatology." *DJG*. Downers Grove: IVP, 206–09.

Anderson, B. W., 1962. "Lord." *IDB*. Vol. 3. Nashville: Abingdon, 150–51.

Anderson, P. N., 2017. "On Thomas and Evidence—No Doubt!" http://bibleinterp.com/articles/2017/04/and418010.shtml, dated April 2017.

Anderson, P. N., 2011. *The Riddles of the Fourth Gospel: An Introduction to John*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Anderson, P. N., 2008. "From One Dialogue to Another: Johannine Polyvalence from Origins to Receptions." In *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present and Future of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 93–120.

Anthonysamy, S. J., 2009. *A Saga of Faith: St. Thomas the Apostle of India*. Chennai: National Shrine of St. Thomas Basilica.

Arampulickal, J., 1994. *The Pastoral Care of the Syro-Malabar Catholic Migrants*. Vadavathoor, Kottayam: OIRS India Publications.

Asheri, D., Lloyd, A. and Corcella, A., 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus, Books I-IV*. Oxford: University Press.

Athyal, S., ed., 1996. *Church in Asia Today: Opportunities and Challenges*. Singapore: ALCWE.

Attridge, H. W., 1992. "Thomas, Acts of." *ABD*. Vol. 6. New York: Doubleday, 531-4.

Attridge, H. W., 1989. "The Greek Fragments." In *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7*. Ed. Layton, B. The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Vol. 2. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Avari, B., 2016. *India, the Ancient Past: A History of the Indian Subcontinent from c. 7000 BCE to CE 1200*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.

Ball, D. M., 1996. *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. JSNTSS. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Balla, P., 1997. *Challenges to New Testament Theology: An Attempt to Justify the Enterprise*. WUNT 95. Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck.

Barnhart, B., 1989. *The Good Wine: Reading John from the Center*. New York: Paulist Press.

Barnstone, W. and Meyer, M., eds., 2006. *The Gnostic Bible*. Boston and London: New Seeds.

Barnstone, W. and Meyer, M., 1955/1956/1962. *The Gospel according to St. John*. New York: MacMillan Company.

Barrett, C. K., 2002. *Acts: A Shorter Commentary*. London: T&T Clark.

Barrett, C. K., 1955/1956/1960/1962. *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: SPCK.

Barton, S. C., 1992. "Child, Children." *DJG*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 100–04.

Bauckham, R. J., 2015. *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*. Bloomsbury Academic Collections: Biblical Studies, Early Christianity. London: Bloomsbury.

Bauckham, R. J., 1997. "Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings." *DLNTD*. Eds. Martin, R. P. and Davids, P. H. Downers Grove: IVP, 68–73.

Bauckham, R. J., 1992. "Gospels (Apocryphal)." *DJG*. Downers Grove: IVP, 286–91.

Bauman, E. W., 1971. *John's Gospel in the Modern World*. A Study Guide for the Film and TV Course. Washington, DC: Bauman Bible Telecasts.

Beasley-Murray, G. R., 1999. *John*. Second Edition. WBC. Nashville and Dallas: Thomas Nelson.

Beasley-Murray, G. R., 1989. *John*. Word Biblical Themes. Dallas: Word Publishing.

Bennema, C., 2014. *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*. Second Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Bennema, C., 2009. *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*. Bangalore: Primalogue.

Bernard, J. H., 1928/1963. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. Vol. 2. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bhaskaran, A., 2015. *The Apostolate of St. Thomas: An Evaluation of Existing Traditions*. PhD Dissertation. Bangalore: SAIACS.

Bhaskaran, V. P., 2012. *The Legacy of St. Thomas, Apostle of India*. Mumbai: St. Paul's.

Bhatt, S. C. and Bhargava, G. K., eds., 2006. *Land and People of Indian States and Union Territoriers, Kerala*. Vol. 14. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.

Bickell, G., 1866. *S. Ephraemi Syri, Carmina Nisibena: additis prolegomenis et supplement lexicorum syriacorum*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Black, M., 1946/1954. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Blady, K., 2000. *Jewish Communities in Exotic Places*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Blair, E. P., 1962. "Thomas." *IDB*. Vol 4. Nashville: Abingdon, 632.

Blomberg, C. L., 2001. *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel*. England: IVP.

Blomberg, C. L., 1992a. "Gospels (Historical Reliability)." *DJG*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 291–97.

Blomberg, C. L., 1992b. "Healing." *DJG*. Downers Grove: IVP, 299–307.

Blomberg, C. L., 1988. "Thomas." *ISBE*. Ed. Bromiley, G. W. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 841–42.

Bock, D. L., 2007. *Acts*. BECNT. Eds. Yarbrough, R. W. and Stein, R. H. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Bock, D. L., 1994. *Luke 1:1-9:50*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Bock, D. L., 1991. "Form Criticism." *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*. Eds. Black, D. A. and Dockery, D. S. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Boice, J. M., 1985. *The Gospel of John: An Expositional Commentary*. Five Volumes in One. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Boice, J. M., 1970. *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John. Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Bonney, W., 2002. *Caused to Believe: The Doubting Thomas Story at the Climax of John's Christological Narrative*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Borchert, G. L., 2002. *John 12-21*. The New American Commentary. Vol. 25B. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman Publishers.

Borgen, P., 1987. *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*. Brown Judaic Studies 131. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Bornkamm, G., 1964. "The Acts of Thomas." *NT Apocrypha*. Tran. Wilson, R. M. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Borse, U., 1990. "ἄγω." *EDNT*. Eds. Balz, H. and Schneider, G. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 24–25.

Bouyer, L., 1964. *The Fourth Gospel*. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press.

Bovon, F., 2003. *Studies in Early Christianity*. WUNT 161. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bowman, J., 1975. *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews: A Study in R. Akiba, Esther and the Gospel of John*. Pittsburgh, PA: The Pickwick Press.

Brant, J. A., 2011. *John*. PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Brant, J. A., 2004. *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Brochure, 2012. *AD 52-il Vishuddha Thomasleeha Sthapicha Malliankarappally*. Maliankara: Mar Thomas Church Historical Museum.

Brouwer, W., 2000. *The Literary Development of John 13:17: A Chiastic Reading*. SBLDS 182. Altanta: SBL.

Brown, R. E., 1966–70. *The Gospel according to John*. Garden City and New York: Doubleday.

Browning, W. R. F., 1996/2004. *Oxford Dictionary of the Bible*. Oxford: University Press.

Bruce, F. F., 1992. "Canon." *DJG*. Downers Grove: IVP, 93–100.

Bruce, F. F., 1990. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Third Revision. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bruce, F. F., 1983/1994. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bruner, F. D., 2012. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Buck, C., 1999. *Paradise and Paradigm: Key Symbols in Persian Christianity and the Bahā'ī Faith*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bultmann, R., 1971. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Tran. Beasley-Murray, G. R. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Bultmann, R., 1963/1976. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. New York: Harper and Row.

Burke, A. J., 2003. *The Rising of Lazarus and the Passion of Jesus in John 11 and 12*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 59. Lewiston and Queenston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Butcher, J. B., 2000. *Telling the Untold Stories: Encounters with the Resurrected Jesus*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Byrne, B., 1991. *Lazarus: A Contemporary Reading of John 11:1-46*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.

Cadman, W. H., 1969. *The Open Heaven: The Revelation of God in the Johannine Sayings of Jesus*. Ed. Caird, G. B. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Calvin, J., 1994. *John*. The Crossway Classic Commentaries. Eds. McGrath, A. and Packer, J. I. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.

Cameron, R., 1992. "Thomas, Gospel of." *ABD*. Vol. 6. New York: Doubleday, 535–40.

Cameron, R., ed., 1982. *The Other Gospels: Non-canonical Gospel Texts*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Caragounis, C. C., 1992. "Kingdom of God/Heaven." *DJG*. Downers Grove: IVP, 417–30.

Carroll, J. T., 2012. *Luke: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

Carson, D. A., 1991. *The Gospel according to John*. Leicester: IVP/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Carter, W., 2006. *John: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Casey, M., 1996. *Is John's Gospel True?* London and New York: Routledge.

Catchpole, D., 1993. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Chakkuvarackal, T. J., 2007. "'Seeing and Believing': Jesus and Thomas in 20:24-29." *FTR*. Vol. 10/2, 35–53.

Chandra, M., 1977. *Trade and Trade Routes in Ancient India*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.

Charles, D. J., 2013. *Antioxidant Properties of Spices, Herbs and Other Sources*. New York: Springer.

Charlesworth, J. H., 2017. "Canon: The Measuring Rule for Discerning God's Word." *The Formation of the Biblical Canon*. Ed. McDonald, L. M. 2 Vols. London and New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, xiii-xx.

Charlesworth, J. H., 2001. "The Gospel of John: Exclusivism Caused by a Social Setting Different from That of Jesus (John 11:54 and 14:6)." *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium 2000*. Eds. Bieringer, R., Pollefeyt, D., and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, F. Assen, Netherlands: Royal Van Goecum, 479–513.

Charlesworth, J. H., 1995. *The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Charlesworth, J. H., 1989. *Jesus Within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. London: SPCK.

Charlesworth, J. H and Mueller, J. R., 1987. *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications*. ATLABS 17. Metuchen and London: ATLA and Scarecrow Press.

Chatman, S., 1978. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University.

Chattopadhyaya, R., 1999. *Swami Vivekananda in India: A Corrective Biography*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Chennattu, R. M., 2006. *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Chilton, B., 1995. "Traditio-Historical Criticism and Study of Jesus." *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Ed. Green, J. B. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Chrysostom, J., 2012. *Homilies of St. Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. North Charleston, South Carolina: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform// Homily 26 on the Epistle to the Hebrews. PL 63.

Chrysostom, J., 1959. *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist, Homilies 48-88*. The Fathers of the Church. Tran. Goggin, S.T.A. California: The Catholic University of America Press.

Chrysostom, J., 1889. *Homily 4 on the Acts of the Apostles*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 11. Buffalo and New York: Christian Literature Publishing Company.

Chrysostom, J., 1735. *Quod Christus sit Deus* § 6. Vol. 1. Paris: Montfacon.

Clark, G. H., 1972/1989. *The Johannine Logos*. Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation.

Collins, R. F., 1992a. "Marriage (NT)." *ABD*. Vol. 4, 569–73.

Collins, R. F., 1992b. "Thomas." *ABD*. Vol. 6, 528–29.

Collins, R. F., 1990/1991. *These Things Have Been Written: Studies on the Fourth Gospel*. Louvain: Peeters/Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Connolly, R. H., 2009. *Didaskalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments*. ATT. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Conway, C. M., 2002. "The Production of the Johannine Community: A New Historicist Perspective." *JBL* 121/3, 479–95.

Counet, P. C., 2000. *John, A Postmodern Gospel: Introduction to Deconstructive Exegesis Applied to the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Countryman, L. W., 1987. *The Mystical Way in the Fourth Gospel: Crossing Over into God*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Crindle, J. W. M., ed., 1897. *Christian Topography of Cosmos Indicopleustes*. Reissued by Cambridge University Press in 2010, 118–19.

Cullmann, O., 1990/2003. "Infancy Gospels." *New Testament Apocrypha*. Vol. 1. Ed. Schneemelcher, W. Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 439–51.

Cullmann, O., 1975. *The Johannine Circle*. Tran. Bowden, J. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Culpepper, R. A., 2013. "The Wave of the Tapestry: Character and Theme in John." *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. Ed. Skinner, C. W. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 18–35.

Culpepper, R. A., 1998. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Culpepper, R. A., 1983. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Culpepper, R. A., 1975. *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools*. SBLDS 26. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

Cunningham, A., 1871. *Four Reports Made During the Years 1862-63-64-65*. ASI. Vol. 2. Simla: The Government Central Press.

Cureton, W., ed., 1864. *Ancient Syriac Documents*. London: Williams and Norgate.

Daniel, D., 1972/1986. *The Orthodox Church of India: History*. New Delhi: Miss Rachel David.

Daniel, K. N., 1951. *The South Indian Apostolate of St. Thomas*. CHAI. Serampore: Serampore College.

Daughrity, D. B. and Athyal, J. M., 2016. *Understanding World Christianity: India*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Davies, M., 1992. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSS 69. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Davies, S., 2009. *The Infancy Gospels of Jesus: Apocryphal Tales from the Childhood of Mary and Jesus—Annotated and Explained*. Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths Publishing.

Davies, S., 2002. *The Gospel of Thomas: Annotated and Explained*. Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths Publishing.

Davies, W. D. and Allison, D. C., 2004. *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary*. London: T&T Clark.

De Boer, M. C., 1992. "Narrative Criticism, Historical Criticism, and the Gospel of John." *JSNT* 47, 35–48.

DeConick, A. D., 2006. *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel*. New York: T&T Clark.

DeConick, A. D., 2005. *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and Its Growth*. London: T&T Clark.

DeConick, A. D., 2001. "John Rivals Thomas: From Community Conflict to Gospel Narrative." *Jesus in the Johannine Tradition*. Eds. Fortna, R. T. and Thatcher, T. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 303–12.

DeConick, A. D., 2001a. *Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature*. JSNTSS 157. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

De Jonge, M., 1977. *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God, Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

Dennis, J. A., 2013. "Glory." *DJG*. Second Edition. Ed. Green, J. B. Downers Grove: IVP, 313–15.

Derrett, J. D. M., 1993. *The Victim: The Johannine Passion Narrative Reexamined*. England: Peter I. Dwinkwater.

Dibelius, M., 1971/1982. *From Tradition to History*. Tran. Woolf, B. L. Cambridge: James Clarke and Company.

Dibelius, M., 1934. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Cambridge: James Clarke and Company.

Dietz, M., 2005. *Wandering Monks, Virgins, and Pilgrims: Ascetic Travel in the Mediterranean World, AD 300—800*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Dihle, A., 1963/1984. "Neues zur Thomas-Tradition." *Antike und Orient*. Heidelberg.

Dijkstra, R., ed., 2016. *The Apostles in Early Christian Art and Poetry*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Dodd, C. H., 1953/1960. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press.

Drijvers, H. J. W., 1992. "Syriac Christianity and Judaism." *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. Eds. Lieu, J., North, J. and Rajak, T. London: Routledge.

Drijvers, H. J. W., 1989. "The Acts of Thomas." *New Testament Apocrypha 2*. Ed. Schneemelcher, W. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Dueck, D., 2016. "Modeling Ethnicity: Patterns of Ethnic Evaluation in the Indian Records of Alexander's Companions and Megasthenes." *The Routledge Handbook of Identity and the Environment in the Classical and Medieval Worlds*. Eds. Kennedy, R. F. and Jones-Lewis, M. London and New York: Routledge.

Duke, P. D., 1985. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Dunderberg, I., 2006. *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict: Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas*. Oxford: University Press.

Dunn, J. D. G., 2013. *The Oral Gospel Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Edwards, J. R., 2015. *The Gospel according to Luke*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/ Nottingham: Apollos.

Edwards, M., 2004. *John*. BBC. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Ehrman, B. D., 2013. *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*. Oxford: University Press.

Ehrman, B. D. and Pleše, Z., 2011. *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations*. Oxford: University Press.

Eller, V., 1987. *The Beloved Disciple: His Name, His Story, His Thought*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Elliott, J. K., 2016. *A Synopsis of the Apocryphal Nativity and Infancy Narratives*. Second Edition, Revised and Expanded. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Elliott, J. K., ed., 2005. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation Based on M. R. James*. Oxford: University Press.

Ellis, R., 2012. *Jesus, King of Edessa*. Cheshire, UK: Edfu Books.

Elson, T.O., 2001. *Disciples and Christology in the Gospel of John: The Contrasting Function of Disciples in Greco-Roman Biography and the Fourth Gospel*. SOTDD to Fuller Theological Seminary. Pasadena: Fuller Theological Seminary.

Elton, H., 1996. *Frontiers of the Roman Empire*. London: B. T. Batzford.

Enslin, M. S., 1962. "Thomas, Acts of." *IDB*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 632–34.

Ephrem., c. 693-708. *De Thoma Apostolo*. Lamy 4.

Esler, P. F. and Piper, R., 2006. *Lazarus, Mary and Martha: Social-Scientific Approaches to the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Espín, O. O. and Nickoloff, J. B., eds., 2007. *IDTRS*. Collegeville, MT: Liturgical Press.

Evans, C. A., 1993. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*. JSNTSS. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Evans, C. A., 1992. *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Farquhar, J. N., 1926/1927. *The Apostle Thomas in North India*. BJRL. 10: 80-111/*The Apostle Thomas in South India*. BJRL. 11, 20–50.

Fein, S. and Johnston, M., eds., 2014. *Robert Thornton and His Books: Essays on the Lincoln and London Thornton Manuscripts*. New York: The University of New York.

Ferreira, J., 2002. *The Hymn of the Pearl: The Syriac and Greek Texts with Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Early Christian Studies 3. Sydney: St. Pauls Publications.

Firth, C .B., 2001. *An Introduction to Indian Church History*. ITL. Delhi: ISPCK.

Fitzmyer, J. A., 1981/1991. "κύριος." *EDNT*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 328–31.

Fitzmyer, J. A., 1970. *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX*. AB. Vol. 28. New York and London: Doubleday.

Foerster., 1965. "κύριος." *TDNT*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1039–98.

Ford, A. J., 2016. *Marvel and Artefact: The 'Wonders of the East' in its Manuscript Contexts*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Fortna, R. T., 1988. *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Fortna, R. T., 1970. *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press.

Foster, P., 2009. *The Apocryphal Gospels: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: University Press.

Frykenberg, R., 2008. *Christianity in India: From Beginnings to the Present*. Oxford: University Press.

Funk, R. W., 1988. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press.

Gamurrini, 1888. *S. Silviae Aquitanae Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta*. Rome.

Gathercole, S., 2014. "Thomas Revisited: A Rejoinder to Denzey Lewis, Kloppenborg and Patterson." *JSNT* 36/3, 262–81.

Gathercole, S., 2014a. *The Gospel of Thomas*. TENTS. Vol. 11. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Gathercole, S., 2012. *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: Original Language and Influences*. SNTSMS 151. Cambridge: University Press.

Geldenhuys, N., 1979. *The Gospel of Luke: The New International Commentary on the NT*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gench, F. T., 2007. *Encounters with Jesus: Studies in the Gospel of John*. Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Genette, G., 1972/1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Tran. Lewin, J. E. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University.

George, A., 2016. *The Christ of India: The Story of Saint Thomas Christianity*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

George, K. M., 1972. *Western Influence on Malayalam Language and Literature*. Trivandrum: Sahitya Akademy.

Germond, P., 1996. "A Rhetoric of Gender in Early Christianity: Sex and Salvation in the *Acts of Thomas*." *Rhetoric, Scripture, and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*. Eds. Porter, S. E. and Olbricht, T. H. JSNTSS 131. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Gero, S., 1971. *The Infancy Gospel of Thomas: A Study of the Textual and Literary Problems*. NovT 13, 46–80.

Gibson, J. J., 2013. *Peter between Jerusalem and Antioch: Peter, James and the Gentiles*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Gill, J., 2003. *An Exposition of the Gospel according to John*. NCS. Springfield, MO: Particular Baptist Press.

Gillman, I. and Klimkeit, H.-J., 1994. *Christians in Asia before 1500*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gingras, G. E., tran., 1970. *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage*. ACW. New York: The Newman Press.

Godley, A. D., tran., 1921. *Herodotus*. Vol. 2. London.

Goodacre, M., 2014. "Did Thomas Know the Synoptic Gospels? A Response to Denzey Lewis, Kloppenborg and Patterson." *JSNT* 36/3, 282–93.

Goodacre, M., 2012. *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas' Familiarity with the Synoptics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gorder, A. C. V., 2010. *Christianity in Persia and the Status of Non-Muslims in Iran*. Lanham and New York: Lexington Books.

Gordon, E. A., 1921. *Asian Christology and Mahayana: A Reprint of the Century-old 'Indian Christian Church' by Thomas Yeats, and the Further Investigation of the Religion of the Orient as Influenced by the Apostle of the Hindus and the Chinese*. Tokyo.

Grant, R. M., 1968. "Thomas, Saint." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Vol. 21. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Green, J. B., 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Gregg, B. H., 2006. *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q*. WUNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Gregory, Great. *Liber Responsorialis*. De Sancto Thoma in matutinis Laudibus. PL 78, 819 C.

Greimas, A. J. and Courtés, J., 1979/1982. *Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Greswell, E., 1852. *Fasti Temporis Catholici and Origines Kalendariae*. Vol. 4. Oxford: University Press.

Guelich, R. A., 1989. *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 34A. Dallas: Word Books.

Guilding, A., 1960. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Guillaumont, A., Peuch, H-C., Quispel, G., et. al., 1959. *The Gospel according to Thomas: Coptic Text Established and Translated*. Leiden: Brill/New York: Harper and Brothers.

Gunther, J., 1953/2007. *Alexander the Great*. New York: Sterling Publishing Company.

Guthrie, D., 1990. *New Testament Introduction*. Fourth Edition. Leicester: Apollos/ Downers Grove: IVP.

Haenchen, E., 1984. *A Commentary on the Gospel of John chapters 7-21*. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Hamid-Khani, S., 2000. *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Hargreaves, C., 2001. "Westcott, India, and 'John.'" *ExpTim*. Vol. 112, 333–35.

Harrington, D. J., 1991/2007. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina 1. Collegeville, MT: Liturgical Press.

Harrison, E. F., 1962. *John: The Gospel of Faith*. Chicago: Moody Press.

Helyer, L. R., 2012. "Thomas, Gospel of/Acts of." *OESAC*. Vol. 2. Oxford: University Press, 689.

Hendriksen, W., 1953/1954/1972. *Exposition of the Gospel according to John*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Hengel, M., 2008. "The Prologue of the Gospel of John as the Gateway to Christological Truth." *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Eds. Bauckham, R. and Mosser, C. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 265–94.

Hennecke, E., 1959/1963. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Gospels and Related Writings. Ed. Schneemelcher, W. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Henshaw, T., 1939/1952. *New Testament Literature: In the Light of Modern Scholarship*. London: George Allen and Unwin Limited.

Hervieux, J., 1960. *The New Testament Apocrypha*. New York: Hawthorn Books.

Herzfeld, E., 1935. *Archaeological History of Iran*. London.

Herzog, F., 1972. *Liberation Theology: Liberation in the Light of the Fourth Gospel*. New York: The Seabury Press.

Hillar, M., 2012. *From Logos to Trinity: The Evolution of Religious Beliefs from Pythagoras to Tertullian*. Cambridge: University Press.

Hiller, D., 2014. *Gendered Perceptions of Florentine Last Supper Frescoes, c. 1350-1490*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Hillerbrand, H. J., ed., 2004. *The Encyclopedia of Protestantism*. Vols. 1–4. London and New York: Routledge.

Hinson, E. G., 1995. *The Church Triumphant: A History of Christianity up to 1300*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.

Hopkins, D., 2007. *Father and Son: East is West*. Daniel Hopkins.

Horman, J., 2011. *A Common Written Greek Source for Mark and Thomas*. SJC. Vol. 20. Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Hoskyns, E. C., 1940. *The Fourth Gospel*. Ed. Davey, F. N. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

Hough, J., 1893. *The History of Christianity in India: From the Commencement of the Christian Era*. Vol. 1. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside.

Howard, M. C., 2012. *Transnationalism in Ancient and Medieval Societies: The Role of Cross-Border Trade and Travel*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company.

Howard-Brook, W., 1997. *John's Gospel and the Renewal of the Church*. Maryknoll: Orbis.

Howard-Brook, W., 1994. *Becoming Children of God: John's Gospel and Radical Discipleship*. Maryknoll: Orbis.

Hrangkhuma, F., 1996. "The Church in India." *Church in Asia Today: Opportunities and Challenges*. Ed. Athyal, S. Singapore: ALCWE, 392–434.

Huc, M. C., 1857. *Christianity in China, Tartary, and Thibet*. Vol. 1. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts.

Hunter, A. M., 1968. *According to John*. London: SCM Press.

Hunter, W. W., 1886/2000. *The Indian Empire: Its People, History, and Products*. Second Edition. London: Trübner and Company, Ludgate Hill.

Ihenacho, D. A., 2001. *The Community of Eternal Life: The Study of the Meaning of Life for the Johannine Community*. Lanham, New York and Oxford: University Press of America.

Immanuel, B., 2016. *Acts of the Apostles: An Exegetical and Contextual Commentary*. ICNT. Bangalore: Primalogue.

Irvin, D. T. and Sunquist, S. W., 2001. *History of the World Christian Movement*. Earliest Christianity to 1453. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Israel, B. J., 1982. *The Jews of India*. New Delhi: Mosaic Books.

Jacobs, S., 2015. *The Art of Living Foundation: Spirituality and Wellbeing in the Global Context*. London and New York: Routledge.

James, M. R., 1924/1953. *The Apocryphal New Testament being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jayakumar, A., 2002. *History of Christianity in India: Major Themes*. Kolkata: SCEPTRE.

Jeffers, J. S., 1999. *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of the Early Christianity*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP.

Jenkins, P., 2001. *Hidden Gospels: How the Search for Jesus Lost Its Way*. Oxford: University Press.

Jensen, J. R. and Watkins, P. H., 2005. *She Who Prays: A Woman's Interfaith Prayer Book*. New York: Morehouse Publishing.

Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 26. PL 23.

Jerome, *Epistola ad Marcellam*. PL 22.

Job, K. E., 1952. *St. Thomas the Apostle*. Trichinopoly: Catholic Truth Society of India.

Johnson, D. H., 1992. "Logos." *DJG*. Downers Grove: IVP, 481–84.

Johnson, L. T., 1992. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Ed. Harrington, D. J. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Johnson, L. T., 1991. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Ed. Harrington, D. J. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Johnson, S. E., 1962. "Lord (Christ)." *IDB*. Vol. 3. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 151.

Johnson, S. F., ed., 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*. Oxford: University Press.

Kalota, N. S., 1976. *India as Described by Megasthenes*. Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Kanagaraj, J. J., 2005. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Secunderabad: OM Books.

Kanagaraj, J. J., 1998. *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into Its Background*. JSNTSS 158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academy Press.

Kanjamala, A., 2014/2018. *The Future of Christian Mission in India: Toward a New Paradigm for the Third Millennium*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Katz, N., 2000. *Who are the Jews of India?* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Keener, C. S., 2012. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Keener, C. S., 2003. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Vol. 2. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Keener, C. S., 1997. *Matthew*. The IVP NT Commentary Series. Downers Grove: IVP.

Keith, C., 2015. "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One)." *Early Christianity* 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 354–76.

Keith, C., 2011. *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*. London: T&T Clark.

Keizer, L., 2009. *The Kabbalistic Words of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas: Recovering the Inner-Circle Teachings of Yeshua*. Lewis Keizer.

Kennedy, G. A., 1984. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press.

Kim, D. W., 2007. "What Shall We Do? The Community Rules of Thomas in the 'Fifth Gospel.'" *Biblica*. Vol. 88/3, 393–414.

Klauck, H.-J., 2003. *Apocryphal Gospels: An Introduction*. Tran. McNeil, B. London: T&T Clark.

Klijn, A. F. J., 1962. *The Acts of Thomas: Introduction, Text, Commentary*. SNT. Ed. Van Unnik, W. C. Leiden: Brill.

Kloppenborg, J. S., 2014. "A New Synoptic Problem: Mark Goodacre and Simon Gathercole on *Thomas*. " *JSNT* 36/3, 199–239.

Knight, D. A., 1992. "Tradition History." *ABD*. Vol. 6. New York: Doubleday, 633–38.

Koder, S. S. *Kerala and Her Jews*. Cochin: Cochin Synagogue.

Koester, H., 2007. *From Jesus to the Gospels: Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Koester, H., 1989. "Introduction." *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*. Ed. Layton, B. The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Vol. 2. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Koester, H., and Lambdin, T. O., 1977. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Trans. Robinson, J. M. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.

Koester, H., 1971. "GNOMAI DIAPHOROI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," ""One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels," "The Structure and Criteria of Early Christian Belief." *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*. Eds. Robinson, J. M. and Koester, H. Philadelphia: Fortress Press/ Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Kok, J., 2016. *New Perspectives on Healing, Restoration and Reconciliation in John's Gospel*. BINS 149. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Köstenberger, A. J., 2009. *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Köstenberger, A. J., 2004. *John*. ECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Köstenberger, A. J., 1998. *The Mission of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kruse, C. G., 2003. *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Kuriakose, M. K., 1982. *History of Christianity in India: Source Materials*. Madras: CLS.

Kurien, P. A., 2002. *Kaleidoscopic Ethnicity: International Migration and the Reconstruction of Community Identities in India*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kusuman, K. K., 1987. *A History of Trade and Commerce in Travancore (1600-1805)*. Delhi: Mittal Publications.

Kuzminski, A., 2008. *Pyrrhonism: How the Ancient Greeks Reinvented Buddhism*. New York: Lexington Books.

Kysar, R., 1976. *John the Maverick Gospel*. Revised Edition. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Lalleman, P. J., 2000. "Apocryphal Acts and Epistles." *DNTB*. Eds. Evans, C. A. and Porter, S. E. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 66–69.

Lamy, J., 1902. *S. Ephraemi Syri Hymni Sermones*. Vol. 4. Louvain: Louvain University.

Lamy, J., 1882. *Sancti Ephremi Syri Hymn et Sermons*. Vol. 1. Mechlin.

Lane, W. L., 1974. *The Gospel of Mark*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Lapham, F., 2003. *An Introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha*. London: T&T Clark.

Lapidge, M., 1996. *Anglo-Latin Literature 600-899*. London and Rio Grande: The Hambledon.

Larsson, T., 2001. *God in the Fourth Gospel: A Hermeneutical Study of the History of Interpretations*. Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series 35. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist and Wiksell International.

Lategan, B., 2009. "Reception Theory." *Focusing on the Message: New Testament Hermeneutics, Exegesis and Methods*. Pretoria: Protea, 457–84.

Layton, B., 1989. "Preface" and "Introduction." *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*. The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Vol 2. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Layton, B., 1987. *The Gnostic Scriptures: Ancient Wisdom for the New Age*. New York: Doubleday.

Lee, A. H. I., 2005. *From Messiah to Preexistent Son: Jesus' Self-Consciousness and Early Christian Exegesis of Messianic Psalms*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Lee, D. A., 1995. "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20." *JSNT* 58/01, 37–43.

Lewis, N. D., 2013. *Introduction to "Gnosticism": Ancient Voices, Christian Worlds*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Liebenberg, J., 2001. *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Lincoln, A. T., 2005. *The Gospel according to Saint John*. BNTC. London: Continuum.

Lincoln, A. T., 2000. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Lincoln, A. T., 1998. "'I am the Resurrection and the Life': The Resurrection Message of the Fourth Gospel." *Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message of the New Testament*. Ed. Longenecker, R. N. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lindars, B., Edward, R. B., and Court, J. M., 2000. *The Johannine Literature*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Logan, W., 1989. *Malabar*. Vol. 1. Madras.

Löwner, G., 2014. "Christian Art and Architecture in Asia." *OHCA*. Ed. Wilfred, F. Oxford: University Press.

Macbride, J. D., 1856. *A Lecture Read on Monday Evening, March 3, 1856, at a Meeting of the Junior Missionary Association for Members of the University, by the Principal of Magdalen Hall, and Printed at Their Request*. Oxford: W. Baxter.

Malina, B. J. and Pilch, J. J., 2008. *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Manning, C. S., Speir, M. C. and Scharf, G., 1856. *Life in Ancient India*. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

Maraval, P., ed., 1982. *Égérie: Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire)*. Paris.

*Maritime Heritage of India: A Photo Essay Book by the Indian Navy (*2016*)*. Indian Naval Academy.

Marjanen, A., 1998. "Thomas and the Beloved Disciple." *Thomas at the Crossroads: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*. Ed. Uro, R. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Marshall, I. H., 1993. "Acts and the 'Former Treatise.'" *Ancient Literary Setting: The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Eds. Winter, B. W. and Clarke, A.D. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Martin, F. and Wright, W. M., 2015. *The Gospel of John*. CCSS. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Martin, R. P., 1975. *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students*. The Four Gospels. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Martyn, J. L., 1968/1979. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Matera, F. J., 2007. *New Testament Theology: Exploring Diversity and Unity*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Mathew, C. P. and Thomas, M. M., 2005. *The Indian Churches of St. Thomas*. Faridabad/Delhi: DJVP/ISPCK.

May, D. M., 1990/1991. "Thomas the Contender, Book of." *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible*. Ed. Mills, W. E. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.

McCrindle, J. W., 1901. *Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature*. Westminster.

McCrindle, J. W., 1887. *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian*. Calcutta.

McDonald, L. M., 2017. *The Formation of the Biblical Canon*. 2 Vols. London and New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

McDowell, S., 2015. *The Fate of the Apostles: Examining the Martyrdom Accounts of the Closest Followers of Jesus*. London and New York: Routledge.

McGrath, J. F., 2008. "History and Fiction in the Acts of Thomas: The State of the Question." *JSP*, 17/4. Sage Publications, 297–311.

McRay, J., 1993. "Antioch on the Orontes." *DPL*. Eds. Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P. and Reid, D. G. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 23–25.

Medlycott, A. E., 1905. *India and the Apostle St. Thomas: An Inquiry, with a Critical Analysis of the Acta Thomae*. London.

Meeks, W. A., 1972. "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *JBL* 91, 44–72.

Meier, J. P., 1991–2001. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Vol. 1. New York: Doubleday.

Menon, A. S., 1967. *A Survey of Kerala History*. Trivandrum and Kottayam: D. C. Books.

Menon, P. S., 1878. *History of Travancore*. Travancore: Government Press.

Menzies, A., ed., 2007. *The Anti-Nicene Fathers: Recently Discovered Additions to Early Christian Literature*. Vol. 9. New York: Cosimo Classics.

Metzger, B. M., 1980. *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic*. Vol. 10. Leiden: Brill.

Metzger, P. L., 2010. *The Gospel of John: When Love Comes to Town*. Downers Grove: IVP.

Meyer, F. B., 1987. *The Life of Love*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company.

Meyer, M., 2012. *The Gospels of the Marginalized: The Redemption of Doubting Thomas, Mary Magdalene, and Judas Iscariot in Early Christian Literature*. Eugene, OR: Cascade.

Meyer, M., 2010. "Who Did Jesus Love Most? Beloved Disciple in John and Other Gospels." *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Meyer, M., ed., 2007. *The Nag Hammadi Scriptures*. The International Edition. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Meyer, M., 2003. *Secret Gospels: Essays on Thomas and the Secret Gospel of Mark*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

Meyer, M. and Bloom, H., 1992. *The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Michaels, J. R., 2010. *The Gospel of John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Miller, R., 2004. *The Gospel of Thomas: A Guidebook for Spiritual Practice*. Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths Publishing.

Mingana, A., 1926. *The Early Spread of Christianity in India*. Reprint from BJRL 10, 435-514, 443–47.

Mirecki, P. A., 1992. "Thomas, The Infancy Gospel of." *ABD*. Vol. 6. New York: Doubleday, 540–44.

Mlakuzhyil, G., 2008. *Initiation to the Gospel of Life: A Guide to John's Gospel*. Mumbai: St. Pauls.

Mlakuzhyil, G., 1987. *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico.

Moffett, S. H., 1998/2006. *A History of Christianity in Asia: Beginnings to 1500*. Vol. 1. New York: Orbis Press.

Moloney, F. J., 2005. *The Gospel of John: Text and Context*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Moloney, F. J., 2002. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Moloney, F. J., 1998. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina 4. Ed. Harrington, D. J. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Moloney, F. J., 1998a. *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Moloney, F. J., 1996. *Signs and Shadows: Reading John 5-12*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Moloney, F. J., 1989. "Johannine Theology." *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Brown, R. E., Fitzmyer, J. A., and Murphy, R. E. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1417–26.

Montefiore, H. and Turner, H. E. W., 1962. *Thomas and the Evangelists*. Studies in Biblical Theology 35. London: SCM Press.

Montgomery, R. L., 2002. *The Lopsided Spread of Christianity: Toward an Understanding of the Diffusion of Religions*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Mopsuestia, T., 2010. *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Tran./intro. Conti, M. Ed. Elowsky, J. C. ACT. Downers Grove: IVP.

Morris, L., 1995. *The Gospel according to John*. NICNT. Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Morris, L., 1989. *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Leicester: IVP.

Morris, L., 1988. *Reflections on the Gospel of John*. John 11-16. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Most, G. W., 2005. *Doubting Thomas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mounce, R. H., 1979. "Apostolic Council." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 198–203.

Mouton, A., Rutherford, I., and Yakubovich, I., eds., 2013. *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Munck, J., 1967. *The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction, Translation and Notes.* AB. Vol. 31. New York and London: Doubleday.

Mundadan, A. M., 2001. *History of Christianity in India: From the Beginning up to the Middle of the Sixteenth Century*. Vol. 1. Bangalore: CHAI.

Murray, H., 1820. *Discoveries and Travels in Asia*. Edinburgh.

Nair, K. K., 2012. *By Sweat and Sword: Trade, Diplomacy and War in Kerala through the Ages*. New Delhi: Manohar.

Nazianzen, G., 1862. "Contra Arianos et de seipso." *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*. Series Graeca 36. Ed. Migne, J-P. Paris: Imprimerie catholique.

Nazianzen, G. *Oratio* 33. *Contro Arianos* 11 (PG 26, 228).

Nedungatt, G., 2008. *Quest for the Historical Thomas, Apostle of India: A Re-reading of the Evidence*. Bangalore: TPI.

Neill, S., 1984. *A History of Christianity in India: The Beginnings to AD 1707*. Cambridge: University Press.

Newman, B. M. and Nida, E.A., 1980/1993. *A Handbook on the Gospel of John*. New York: United Bible Societies.

Neyrey, J. H., 2007. *The Gospel of John*. NCBC. Cambridge: University Press.

Nichols, A. G., 2011. *Ctesias on India: Translation and Commentary*. London and New Delhi: Bloomsbury.

Nicholson, G. C., 1983. *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*. SBLDS 63. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Nissen, J., 2013. *The Gospel of John and the Religious Quest: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Nixon, R. E., 2000. "Thomas." *NBD*. Third Edition. Secunderabad: OM—Authentic Books, 1182–83.

Norris, F. W., 1997/1999. "Addai (first century)." *EEC*. Ed. Ferguson, E. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.

O'Brien, K. S., 2005. "Written That You May Believe: John 20 and Narrative Rhetoric." *CBQ* 67/2, 284–302.

O'Day, G. R., 1986. *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Odeberg, H., 1968. *The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner Publisher.

O'Grady, J. F., 1999. *According to John: The Witness of the Beloved Disciple*. New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press.

Olschki, L., 1960. *Marco Polo's Asia: An Introduction to his 'Description of the World' called 'Il Milione.'* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Orchard, H. C., 1998. *Courting Betrayal: Jesus as Victim in the Gospel of John*. JSNTSS 161. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Padinjarekkutt, I., 2005. *Christianity through the Centuries*. Mumbai: St. Paul.

Pagels, E. H., 2003. *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.

Pagels, E. H., 1999. "Exegesis of Genesis 1 in the Gospels of Thomas and John." *JBL* 118, 477–96.

Pagels, E. H., 1979. *The Gnostic Gospels*. New York: Random House.

Painter, J., 1993. *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Painter, R. J., 2011. *The Gospel of John: A Thematic Approach*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Palmer, E. F., 1978. *The Intimate Gospel*. Studies in John. Waco, Texas: WBP.

Panikkar, K. M., 1945. *India and the Indian Ocean*. London.

Papandrea, J. L., 2016. *The Earliest Christologies: Five Images of Christ in the Postapostolic Age*. Minneapolis: IVP.

Pappas, P. C., 1991. *Jesus' Tomb in India: Debate on His Death and Resurrection*. USA: Asian Humanities Press.

Parker, G., 2008. *The Making of Roman India*. Cambridge: University Press.

Parker, J. W. "Grant to the Early Christian Church of India." *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. Vol. 7. London: John W. Parker, West Strand.

Parsons, M. C., 2015. *Luke*. PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Parsons, M. C., 2008. *Acts*. PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Patterson, S. J., 2014. "Twice More—*Thomas* and the Synoptics: A Reply to Simon Gathercole, *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas*, and Mark Goodacre, *Thomas and the Gospels*." *JSNT* 36/3, 251–61.

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

Patterson, S. J., 1992. "Gospels, Apocryphal." *ABD*. Vol. 2, 1079–81.

Patterson, W. P., 1988. "Marriage." *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 3. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 262–77.

Pelkmans, M., 2013. *Ethnographies of Doubt: Faith and Uncertainty in Contemporary Societies*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris.

Perrin, N., 2007. *Thomas, The Other Gospel*. London: SPCK.

Perrin, N., 2002. *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Perumalil, M. C., 1971. *Apostles in India*. Patna.

Petersen, N. R., 1993. *The Gospel of John and the Sociology of Light: Language and Characterization in the Fourth Gospel*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

Peterson, D. G., 2009. *The Acts of the Apostles*. PNTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Philip, E. M., 1908/2002. *The Indian Church of St. Thomas*. Changanacherry: Mor Adai Study Centre.

Pierson, P. E., 2009. *The Dynamics of Christian Mission: History through a Missiological Perspective*. Pasadena, CA: WCIU Press.

Pinto, L., 2015. *Being a Christian in Sri Lanka: Historical, Political, Social, and Religious Considerations*. Bloomington: Balboa Press.

Placid, R. P., 1956. *Les Syriens du Malabar*. L'Orient Syr, 375–424.

Pliny, G., 1969. *Natural History*. Tran./Ed. Jones, W. H. S. London.

Pliny, G., 1855. *Natural History*. Trans. Bostock, J. and Riley, H. T. Vol. 2. London.

Plummer, A., 1988. "Bride" and "Bridegroom." *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 326–27.

Pokorný, P., 2009. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Thomas: From Interpretations to the Interpreted*. London: T&T Clark.

Polo, M., Benedetto, L. F. and Ricci, A., 1931. *The Travels of Marco Polo*. London and New York: Routledge Curzon.

Popkes, E. E., 2013. "Love, Love Command." *DJG*. Second Edition. Ed. Green, J. B. Downers Grove: IVP, 535–40.

Popp, T., 2013. "Thomas: Question Marks and Exclamation Marks." *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*. Eds. Hunt, S. A., Tolmie, D. F. and Zimmermann, R. WUNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 504–29.

Powell, I., 1962. *John's Wonderful Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Prasad, R., ed., 2009. *History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilization*. HDSCIPM. Vol. 12/2. Kolkata and Delhi: Center for Studies in Civilization.

Prasad, R. C., 1980. *Early English Travelers in India: A Study in the Travel Literature of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Periods with Particular Reference to India*. Delhi, Varanasi, and Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

Price, R. M., 2011. *Secret Scrolls: Revelations from the Lost Gospel Novels*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Probst, H., 1993. "ὑπάγω." *EDNT*. Eds. Balz, H. and Schneider, G. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 393–94.

Puliurumpil, J., 2016. *Classic India: Western Accounts Before Christ*. Vadavathoor and Kottayam: OIRS, India.

Puliurumpil, J., 2013. *History of the Syro Malabar Church*. Vadavathoor and Kottayam: OIRS, India.

Puliurumpil, J., 2012. *St. Thomas in India: Patristic Evidences*. Vadavathoor and Kottayam: OIRS, India.

Puthur, B., ed., 2006. *St. Thomas Christians and Nambudiris, Jews and Sangam Literature: A Historical Appraisal*. Kochi, South India: LRC Publications.

Quast, K., 1991. *Reading the Gospel of John: An Introduction*. New York, NJ:Paulist Press.

Quispel, G., 1975. *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas: Studies in the History of the Western Diatessaron*. Leiden: Brill.

Ramachandran, A., 2007/2008. *Grains, Greens, and Grated Coconuts: Recipes and Remembrances of a Vegetarian Legacy*. Bloomington: iUniverse.

Ramelli, I., 2009. *Possible Historical Traces in the Doctrina Addai*. New York: Gorgias Press.

Rapson, E. J., ed., 1935. *Ancient India*. CHI. Vol. 1. Cambridge: University Press.

Rawlinson, H. G., 1926/2002. *Intercourse between India and the Western World from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Rome*. Cambridge and New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

Rawlinson, H. G., 1916. *India and the Western World*. Cambridge: University Press.

Reddish, M. G., 1992. "Bride of Christ." *ABD*. Vol. 1, 782.

Redlich, E. B., 1939. *Form Criticism: Its Value and Limitations*. London: Duckworth.

Reinhartz, A., 1992. *The Word in the World: The Cosmological Tale in the Fourth Gospel*. SBLMS. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Rensberger, D., 1988. *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Resseguie, J. L., 2013. "A Narrative-Critical Approach to the Fourth Gospel." *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. Ed. Skinner, C. W. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 1–17.

Ridderbos, H., 1987/1997. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Riley, G. J., 1995. *Resurrection Reconsidered: John and Thomas in Controversy*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Ringe, S. H., 1999. *Wisdom's Friends: Community and Christology in the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Robbins, V. K., 1992. "Form Criticism (New Testament)." *ABD*. New York: Doubleday, 841–44.

Robinson, J. M., 1989. "Foreword." *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*. Ed. Layton, B. The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Vol. 2. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Rogers, F. M., 1962. *The Quest for Eastern Christians: Travels and Rumor in the Age of Discovery*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Roldanus, J., 2006. *The Church in the Age of Constantine: The Theological Challenges*. London and New York: Routledge.

Roller, D. W., 2010. *Eratosthenes' Geography*. Princeton: University Press.

Ross, S. K., 2001. *Roman Edessa: Politics and Culture on the Eastern Fringes of the Roman Empire, 114-242 CE*. London and New York: Routledge.

Roukema, R., 2010. *Jesus, Gnosis and Dogma*. New York: T&T Clark.

Ruckstuhl, E., 1991. "Thomas." *EDNT*. Vol. 2. Eds. Balz, H. and Schneider, G. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 164–65.

Ryken, P. G., 2009. *Luke: Reformed Expository Commentary, Chapters 1-12*. Vol. 1. New York: P and R Publishing.

Sagar, K. C., 1992. *Foreign Influence on Ancient India*. New Delhi: Northern Book Center.

Saint-Laurent, J. M., 2015. *Missionary Stories and the Formation of the Syriac Churches*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Sanders, J. N. and Mastin, B. A., 1968. *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row.

Schaff, P. and Wallace, H., 2007. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series*. Gregory the Great, Ephraim Syrus, Aphrahat. Vol. 13. New York: Cosimo Classics.

Schenke, H-M., 1991. "The Book of Thomas." *New Testament Apocrypha*. Ed. Schneemelcher, W. Vol. 1. Cambridge: James Clarke/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 179–208.

Schermann, T., 1907. *Propheten und apostellegenden*. Texte und Untersuchungen 31/3. Leipzig.

Schnackenburg, R., 1965/1968/1982. *The Gospel according to St. John*. Vols. 1-3. Tran. Smyth, K. New York: Herder and Herder.

Schneiders, S. M., 2008. "Touching the Risen Jesus: Mary Magdalene and Thomas the Twin in John 20." *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Eds. Koester, C. R. and Bieringer, R. WUNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 153–76.

Schoff, H. W., 1912. *The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*. Longman.

Scholer, D. M., 1997. "Gnosis, Gnosticism." *DLNTD*. Eds. Martin, R. P. and Davids, P. H. Downers Grove: IVP, 400–12.

Schweizer, E., 1970. *The Good News according to Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel*. London: SPCK.

Scott, M., 1992. *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus*. JSNTSS 71. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Segal, J. B., 2005. *Edessa 'the Blessed City.'* Gorgias Press LLC.

Sen, A., 2005/2006. *The Argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian Culture, History and Identity*. London and New York: Penguin Books.

Sen, S. N., 1988/1999. *Ancient Indian History and Civilization*. Second Edition. New Delhi and Bangalore: New Age International Publishers.

Shahid, I., 1984/2006. *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fourth Century*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

Sharan, I., 2010. *The Myth of Saint Thomas and the Mylapore Shiva Temple*. Third Revised Edition. New Delhi: Voice of India.

Siebald, M., 1997. "Lazarus of Bethany." *The Gospel of John: The Story of the Son of God*. CBS. Ed. Read, P. P. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Singh, U., 2008. *A History of Ancient and Early Medieval India: From the Stone Age to the 12*th *Century*. Delhi and Chennai: Pearson Longman.

Sircar, D. C., 1965. *Indian Epigraphy*. New Delhi.

Skemer, D. C., 2006. *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages*. State College, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

Skinner, C. W., 2012/2013. "Misunderstanding, Christology, and Johannine Characterization: Reading John's Characters through the Lens of the Prologue." *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. LNTS 461. London: Bloomsbury, 111–27.

Skinner, C. W., 2012. *The Gospel of Thomas: What Are They Saying About?* Mahwah: Paulist Press.

Skinner, C. W., 2009. *John and Thomas—Gospels in Conflict? Johannine Characterization and the Thomas Question*. PTMS. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Skolnik, F. and Berenbaum, M., 2007. *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Vol. 9. USA: MacMillan References.

Sloyan, G. S., 1988. *John*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Smith, D. E., 1966. *South Asian Politics and Religion*. Princeton: University Press.

Smith, D. E., 1999. *John*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Smith, D. M., 1995. *The Theology of the Gospel of John*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: University Press.

Staley, J. L., 1995. *Reading with a Passion: Rhetoric, Autobiography, and the American West in the Gospel of John*. New York: Continuum.

Stang, C. M., 2016. *Our Divine Double*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stang, C. M., 2013. "Doubting Thomas, Restaged: Between Athens and Berlin." *HDB*, 41–50.

Stanley, D. M., 1986. *"I Encountered God!" The Spiritual Exercises with the Gospel of Saint John*. St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources.

Stein, R. H., 2008. *Mark*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Stein, R. H., 1987/2001. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Stein, R. H., 1980. "The 'Criteria' for Authenticity." *Gospel Perspectives*. Eds. France, R. T. and Wenham, D. Vol. 1, 225–63.

Stephen, M., 2001. *A Christian Theology in the Indian Context*. Delhi: ISPCK.

Stewart, J., 1928. *Nestorian Missionary Enterprise: The Story of a Church on Fire*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Stibbe, M. W. G., 1994. *John's Gospel*. London and New York: Routledge.

Stibbe, M. W. G., 1993. *John*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Story, C. I. K., 1997. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose, Pattern, and Power*. Shippensburg, PA: Ragged Edge Publication.

Suhas, H. K., 2004. *Consolation of Mind*. New York and London: iUniverse, Inc.

Swartley, W. M., 2013. *John*. BCBC. Harrisonburg and Waterloo: Herald Press.

Sylva, D., 2013. *Thomas—Love as Strong as Death: Faith and Commitment in the Fourth Gospel*. LNTS 434. London: Bloomsbury.

Talbert, C. H., 2010. *Matthew*. PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Talbert, C. H., 1997. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Talbert, C. H., 1992/2005. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*. Revised Edition. Macon, Georgia: Smyth and Helwys.

Talbert, C. H., 1989. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. New York: Crossroad.

Tan, P. K. W., 1993. *A Stylistics of Drama: With Special Focus on Stoppard's Travesties*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Tarazi, P. N., 2004. *Johannine Writings*. The New Testament: Introduction. Vol. 3. Crestwood and New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Taylor, V., 1933. *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*. London: McMillan Publishers.

Taylor, W., 2013. *Narratives of Identity: The Syrian Orthodox Church and the Church of England, 1895-1914*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Temple, S., 1975. *The Core of the Fourth Gospel*. London and Oxford: Mowbrays.

Tennent, T., 2016. *How God Saves the World: A Short History of Global Christianity*. Franklin, TE: Seedbed Publishing.

Tennent, T., 2016a. "Saint Thomas, Not 'Doubting Thomas,' Preaches the Gospel in India." http://www.seedbed.com/saint-thomas-preaches-the-gospel-in-india/?utm_source=feedly&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=saint-thomas-preaches-the-gospel-in-india, dated April 2017.

Tenney, M. C., 1981. *The Gospel of John*. EBC. Vol. 9. Ed. Gaebelein, F. E. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Thapar, R., 2015. *The Penguin History of Early India: From the Origins to AD 1300*. Delhi: Penguin Books.

Thatcher, T., 2008. "Anatomies of the Fourth Gospel: Past, Present, and Future Problems." *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Eds. Thatcher, T. and Moore, S. D. Atlanta: SBL, 1–35.

Thatcher, T., 2000. *The Riddles of Jesus in John: A Study in Tradition and Folklore*. SBLMS. Atlanta, Georgia: SBL.

Therath, A., 1997. *Jerusalem in the Gospel of John: An Exegetical and Theological Inquiry into Johannine Geography*. New Delhi: Intercultural Publications.

Thomas, A., 2009. "Apologetics and Race." *Apologetics for a New Generation*. Ed. McDowell, S. Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers.

Thomas, T., 2011. "Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church." *EEOC*. Ed. McGuckin, J. A. Vol. 2. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Thomaskutty, J., 2016. "Reading John's Gospel in the Nepali Context." *JAET*. Vol. 20/1, 5–21.

Thomaskutty, J., 2015. *Dialogue in the Book of Signs: A Polyvalent Analysis of John 1:19-12:50*. BINS 136. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Thomaskutty, J., 2013-2015. "Dialogical Nature of John's Prologue." *UBSJ*. Vol. 8/2-9/1, 1–17.

Thompson, M. M., 2015. *John: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Thompson, M. M., 2013. "Lazarus: 'Behold a Man Raised Up by Christ!'" *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*. Eds. Hunt, S. A., Tolmie, D. F., and Zimmermann, R. Tübingen: Mohr and Siebeck, 460–72.

Thompson, M. M., 2001. *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Tolmie, D. F., 1995. *Jesus' Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1-17:26 in Narratological Perspective*. BINS 12. Leiden and New York: Brill.

Torrey, J., 1881. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church: From the German of Dr. Augustus Neander*. Vol. 2. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.

Tours, G. *Miraculum Liber* 1/32. PL 71, 733.

Tovey, D., 2007. *Jesus: Story of God, John's Story of Jesus*. Adelaide: ATF Press.

Trakatellis, M. D., 1998. "Seeing and Believing: The Thomas Incident (John 20:24-29)." *Agape and Diakonia*. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

Trebilco, P., 2012. *Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*. Cambridge: University Press.

Trebilco, P., 1994. "Asia." *Graeco-Roman Setting: The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 2. Eds. Gill, D. W. J. and Gempf, C. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Tripathi, R., 1942/1992. *History of Ancient India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Trumbower, J. A., 1992. *Born from Above*. HUT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Tuckett, C. M., 1996. *Q and the History of Early Christianity*. Studies on Q. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Turner, D. L., 2008. *Matthew*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Turner, G. A. and Mantey, J. R., 1964. *The Evangelical Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Turner, J. D. and Meyer, M., 2007. "The Book of Thomas." *The Nag Hammadi Scriptures*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 235–45.

Turner, J. D. and Meyer, M., 2007a. "The Book of Thomas and the Platonic Jesus." *L'évangile selon Thomas et les textes de Nag Hammadi*. Eds. Painchaud, L. and Poirier, P-H. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval/Louvain: Peeters.

Turner, J. D. and Meyer, M., 2000. "Introduction." *Tractate 7: The Book of Thomas the Contender Writing to the Perfect*. The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Vol. 2. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Turner, J. D. and Meyer, M., 1992. "Thomas the Contender, Book of." *ABD*. Vol. 6. New York: Doubleday, 529–30.

Uro, R., 2003. *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context of the Gospel of Thomas*. London: T&T Clark.

Uro, R., ed., 1998. *Thomas at the Crossroads: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Valantasis, R., 1997. *The Gospel of Thomas*. NTR. London and New York: Routledge.

Van Aarde, A. G., 2009. "Narrative Criticism." *Focusing on the Message: New Testament Hermeneutics, Exegesis, and Methods*. Pretoria: Protea, 381–418.

Van den Bosch, L. P., 2001. "India and the Apostolate of St. Thomas." *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*. Ed. Bremmer, J. N. Leuven: Peeters.

Van der Watt, J. G., 2007. *An Introduction to the Johannine Gospel and Letters*. New York: T&T Clark.

Van Eysinga, G. A., 1909. *Indische Einflüsse auf evangelische Erzählungen*.

Van Oort, J., ed., 2008. *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica: Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Varghese, A. P., 2008. *India: History, Religion, Vision and Contribution to the World*. Vol. 1. Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributers.

Varghese, R. A. and Varghese, M. A., 2011. *Thomas: From Tales and Traditions to a Time for Truth*. Mumbai: St. Paul's.

Vellian, J., ed., 1972. *The Syrian Churches Series*. The Apostle Thomas in India according to the Acts of Thomas. Kottayam, Kerala.

Visvanathan, S., 1999. *The Christians of Kerala: History, Belief and Ritual among the Yakoba*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Voigt, G., 1991. *Licht-Liebe-Leben: Das Evangelicum nach Johannes*. Gottingen: Vandenhoech and Ruprecht.

Von Speyr, A., 1949/1994. *The Word Becomes Flesh: Meditations on John 1-5*. Trans. Wiedenhöver, L. and Dru, A. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

Von Wahlde, U. C., 2010. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Vol. 2. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Voorwinde, S., 2005. *Jesus' Emotions in the Fourth Gospel: Human or Divine?* LNTS 284. London: T&T Clark.

Waetjen, H. C., 2005. *The Gospel of the Beloved Disciple: A Work in Two Editions*. London: T&T Clark.

Wagner, C. P., 2008. *The Book of Acts: A Commentary*. Ventura, CA: From Gospel Light.

Waldmann, H., 1996. *Das Christentum in Indien und der Königsweg der Apostel in Edessa, Indien and Rom*. Tübingen.

Waterfield, R. E., 1973. *Christians in Persia: Assyrians, Armenians, Roman Catholics and Protestants*. Vol. 24. London and New York: Routledge.

Weder, H., 1992. "Disciple, Discipleship." *ABD*. Ed. Freedman, D. N. Vol. 2. New York and London: Doubleday, 207–10.

Weil, S., 2009. *Themes and Phenomena of the Jewish Diaspora*. Encyclopedia of the Jewish Diaspora: Origins, Experiences and Culture. Vol. 1. Ed. Ehrlich, M. A. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Wenham, D., 2006. "Paradigms and Possibilities in the Study of John's Gospel." *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Whitacre, R. A., 1999. *John*. IVPNTCS. Downers Grove, IL: IVP.

White, L., 1978. *Medieval Religion and Technology: Collected Essays*. Los Angeles: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, University of California.

Wiarda, T., 2010. *Book Review: John and Thomas—Gospels in Conflict? Johannine Characterization and the Thomas Question*. Authored by Skinner, C. W. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock. In *JETS* 53/3, 651-3.

Wilkins, M. J., 1992. "Disciples." *DJG*. Eds. Green, J. B., McKnight, S. and Marshall, I. H. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 176–82.

Williams, C. H., 2013. "Unveiling Revelation: The Spirit-Paraclete and Apocalyptic Disclosure in the Gospel of John." *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*. Eds. Williams, C. H. and Rowland, C. London and New York: T&T Clark Bloomsbury.

Witherington, B., 2004. *The Gospel Code: Novel Claims about Jesus, Mary Magdalene and Da Vinci*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP.

Witherington, B., 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Witherington, B., 1995. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Witherington, B., 1992. "Birth of Jesus." *DJG*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 60–74.

Witherington, B., 1992b. "Lord." *DJG*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 484–92.

Wolfe, R., 2010. *The Gospel of Thomas: The Enlightenment Teachings of Jesus*. Ojai, CA: Karina Library Press.

Woodberry, J. D., 1996. "The Church in West and Central Asia." *Church in Asia Today: Opportunities and Challenges*. Ed. Athyal, S. Singapore: ALCWE.

Wright, W., 1871. *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. Vols. 1-2. London and Edinburgh.

Wright, W., 1865. *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament*. London.

Wright, W. A., 1968. *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. Amsterdam.

Wright, W. M., 2009. *Rhetoric and Theology: Figural Reading of John 9*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Yeung, M. W., 2013. "Faith." *DJG*. Second Edition. Ed. Green, J. B. Downers Grove: IVP, 259–62.

Younan, A., 2009. *The Mesopotamian School and Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Berkeley, CA: Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology.

Yousif, P., 1987. "The Apostle Thomas in the Witness of St. Ephrem of Nisibis." *Homage to Mar Cariattil, Pioneer Malabar Ecumenist*. Ed. Payngot, C. Rome.

Zacour, N. P. and Hazard, H. W., eds., 1985. *The Impact of the Crusades on the Near East*. Vol. 5. A History of the Crusades. Ed. Setton, K. M. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin.

Zinner, S., 2011. *The Gospel of Thomas: In the Light of Early Jewish, Christian and Islamic Esoteric Trajectories*. London: The Matheson Trust.

Index of Ancient Sources

Index of Authors