



BRILL

Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas

Author(s): April D. De Conick and Jarl Fossum

Source: *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Jun., 1991), pp. 123-150

Published by: [BRILL](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1584420>

Accessed: 08/10/2013 15:07

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



BRILL is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Vigiliae Christianae*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

**STRIPPED BEFORE GOD:
A NEW INTERPRETATION OF LOGION 37
IN THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS**

BY

APRIL D. DE CONICK and JARL FOSSUM

Dedicated to Professor Gilles Quispel
on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday

With the publication of the article, “The Garments of Shame”, by J. Z. Smith in 1966, logion 37 of the *Gospel of Thomas* was nudged into a baptismal *Sitz im Leben*. Smith suggested that the logion was an “interpretation” of an “archaic Christian baptismal rite”. He defined four principal motifs within this logion: 1) the undressing of the disciples; 2) being naked and without shame; 3) their treading upon the garments; and 4) their being as little children. He concluded that these four elements were only found joined together in “baptismal rituals and homilies”.¹

As far as we have been able to determine, Smith’s conclusions have never been challenged. Rather, they are regarded as a foundation upon which to build further theories.² The present essay is an attempt to challenge these conclusions and to propose a new interpretation of logion 37. The saying, as it is found in the Coptic text from Nag Ham-madi, reads:

His disciples said, “When will you become revealed to us and when shall we see you?” Jesus said, “When you disrobe without being ashamed and take up your garments and place them under your feet like little children and tread on them, then [you will see] the Son of the Living One, and you will not be afraid.”³

In contrast to Smith’s proposal, we suggest that the logion structurally consists of three principal motifs: 1) stripping off the garments without shame; 2) treading upon them like children; and 3) gaining the capacity to see the Son of God without fear.⁴ This logion, far from speaking about baptism, utilizes common encratite teaching in order to describe

the necessary preparations for salvation and ascension to heaven.⁵ Moreover, if any ritual is being reflected here, it is a primitive unction ritual separate from baptism.

1) *Stripping off the garments without shame.*

a) *Stripping off the garments: Prehistory of the metaphor.* Stripping off of garments is a common metaphor in Jewish and Christian literature for the removal of the material body.⁶ The Jewish and Christian notions surrounding this metaphor are rooted in speculation concerning Gen. 3,21. According to this passage, as a consequence of Adam and Eve's sin, God made them "garments of skins, and clothed them". Prior to the Fall, Adam and Eve were understood to be luminous beings, their light even surpassing the light of the sun.⁷ This light could be seen as their garment, which they lost as a consequence of the Fall.⁸ As compensation, God clothed them with "garments of skin". As will be seen below, these garments, according to both Jewish and Christian authors, were identified with the human or fleshly body and needed to be cast off.⁹

b) *Stripping off the garments: Use of the metaphor in a sacramental setting.* An actual symbolic-ritual removal of clothes in baptismal liturgy can not be ascertained before the fourth century.¹⁰ The first positive instance is Jerome's *Epistle to Fabiola*. Here the candidate is said to remove the "tunics of skin" and, upon "rising from baptism," don the "garment of Christ" which is described as a white linen robe.¹¹ The clothes which are removed apparently are seen as the skin, even the body, with which God clothed Adam and Eve.¹²

E. Segelberg has argued that a symbolic *depositio* in baptism is implied in the *Gospel of Philip*,¹³ which is of uncertain date but probably somewhat earlier than Jerome.¹⁴ As for the first text to which Segelberg refers, it can not be said to bear out his argument:

While we are in this world it is fitting for us to acquire the resurrection, so that when we strip off the flesh we may be found in rest and not walk in the middle.¹⁵

The stripping off of the flesh occurs when people are leaving "this world"; it does not refer to a symbolic removal of clothes in baptism, which is not even mentioned.¹⁶

The other text adduced by Segelberg does mention baptism. It says that "the living water is a body (σῶμα)" and that "it is necessary to put

on the Living Man.” In order for man to do so, “when he goes down into the water, he unclothes himself.”¹⁷ The emphasis here is entirely upon the donning of “the body” of “the Living Man” in baptism;¹⁸ the removal of the clothes is not said to be a symbolic stripping off of the body of Adam. Admittedly, the idea may be *implied*, but we would need far more evidence for giving a baptismal interpretation to logion 37 in the *Gospel of Thomas*, which was written much earlier than *Philip*, namely around 140 C.E.¹⁹

The *Odes of Solomon*, which—like the *Gospel of Thomas* and probably even the *Gospel of Philip*—appear to have a Syrian provenance,²⁰ can not provide such evidence. H. J. Drijvers has demonstrated that the *Odes* originated at the beginning of the third century,²¹ so the *Gospel of Thomas* is about sixty years older. The *Odes* may of course contain primitive traditions, but it does not seem that we can find a baptismal *depositio* of garments as a symbol for putting off the body.

D. MacDonald argues for a baptismal setting for the following texts:²²

And I abandoned the folly cast upon the earth,
And I stripped it off and cast it from me.

And the Lord renewed me with his garment,
And possessed me by his light.

And from above he gave me immortal rest,
And I became like the land that blossoms and rejoices in its fruits.²³

And I stripped off darkness,
And put on light.

And even I myself acquired members.
In them there was no sickness or affliction or suffering.²⁴

And I was covered with the covering of your spirit,
And I removed from me my garments of skin.

Because your right hand raised me,
And caused sickness to pass from me.²⁵

These texts do speak of a symbolic-ritual removal of garments of skin or the body, but there is no reference to baptism in these passages or even in their context.²⁶ MacDonald obviously has been misled by J. H. Bernard, the great champion of the baptismal setting of the *Odes*, who argued for an allusion to the investiture with baptismal garments in those passages where the Odist speaks about “putting on” a divine entity.²⁷ Admittedly, although “the *Odes*, taken *en bloc*, are not bap-

tismal hymns,”²⁸ Bernard’s hypothesis may still hold true for *some* of them. However, when we examine those Odes in which there does seem to be an allusion to baptism, the phrase “put on” would *not* appear to refer to the donning of the baptismal garment. *Ode* 4 says: “For who shall put on your grace and be rejected?”²⁹ And, three verses later, it is prayed: “Sprinkle upon us your sprinklings, and open your bountiful springs which abundantly supply us with milk and honey.” The latter verse may be an allusion to baptism and the following eucharist.³⁰ Whatever was “put on” thus would appear to have been put on *before* baptism.

This conclusion is borne out by *Ode* 39, where we read: “Therefore, put on the name of the Most High and know him, and you shall cross without danger; because the rivers shall be obedient to you.”³¹ This text may allude to the idea of baptism as a dangerous sea journey.³² In order to make the journey safely, the baptizand had to “put on” the Name of God.

What is meant by the phrase, putting on a divine entity? In the verse immediately preceding the last verse, we read: “Because the sign on them is the Lord, and the sign is the Way for those who cross in the name of the Lord.” This “sign” (*ʔt*) which is “the Lord” is probably identical with “the Name of the Most High” in the next verse. In *Ode* 8, 15, we read that God has set a “seal” (*tbʿt*) upon the face of the elect even before they existed; this seal appears to be identical with “the Name” of the savior which later is said to be with them and protect them forever.³³ This seal of the Name apparently is identical with the sign of the Name in *Ode* 39. In Revelation, the “seal” of God put on the forehead of the elect (7,2-3; 9,4) is explicitly said to be the Name of God.³⁴

Returning to *Ode* 4, we may quote the verses between the two excerpts given above: “Because your seal is known; and your creatures are known to it. And your hosts possess it, and the elect archangels are clothed with it.” This “sign” or “seal” (*h̄tm*) which is put on by the archangels probably is identical with the “grace” which, when “put on,” makes one acceptable before God.

The putting on of the sign or seal of the Divine Name before baptism probably refers to the anointing, which in Syrian Christianity was done before the immersion.³⁵ The *Acts of Thomas*, a work from the same time and provenance as the *Odes*, provide substantial evidence to the effect that the pre-baptismal unction conveyed the “seal” of the Name.

The unction is a “sealing” which communicates the “seal”.³⁶ Since Thomas invokes the Name while anointing, it is clear that the seal is the seal of the Name. Being invoked, the “Power” or the “Name” comes to inhabit the oil “which men may put on”: “[...] Jesus, let [your] victorious Power come, and let it settle in this oil [...] and let it dwell in this oil, over which we name your holy Name.”³⁷ The “Power” is identical with the “Name.” In the epiclesis at the unction in ch. 27, the Spirit is called both “Name of the Messiah” and “Power”.³⁸ At the unction in ch. 132, the oil (or the Spirit which it conveys) is called “Name of the Messiah” and “Hidden Power”.³⁹

In the fifth century, the Church Father Narsai in his liturgical homilies summarized the Syrian tradition about the seal of the Name communicated through the unction. Holding the oil in his hand, the priest “shows to the eyes of the bodily senses the Hidden Power...” In anointing the believers, the priest “signs the flock with the sign of the Lord, and seals upon it His Hidden Name [...]”⁴⁰

It is logical that the *Odes* refer to the anointing as an investiture, for, after the “sealing” of the forehead, the *entire body* was anointed. In the *Acts of Thomas* ch. 157, the apostle, after having invoked the “Power” or “Name,” pours oil on the heads of the naked baptizands and then anoints the man, while his female companion anoints the women.⁴¹

Returning to the *Odes*, we note that where unction is spoken of as a “putting on” of a divine entity before baptism, we find neither a removal of clothes before unction nor a reclothing after baptism. In the texts cited by MacDonald, however, we do find both a removal of clothes and a putting on of a garment, but no baptism. Moreover, the clothes which are removed before the donning of a new garment are obviously seen as the body which Adam acquired as a consequence of the Fall, as is evidenced by the phrase “garments of skin”. Finally, the putting on of a new garment would again seem to be the oil of the unction ritual, as is evidenced by the phrase “covering of Your Spirit”, for the anointment ritual conveyed the Spirit of God.⁴²

Thus, the evidence of the *Odes* allows us to conclude that two rituals are described. The one sets forth unction and baptism, the other unction only. Only in descriptions of the latter is there made mention of removal of the clothes which symbolize the material body.

c) *Stripping off the garments: Use of the metaphor in relationship to ascension.* It is not justifiable to *assume* that baptism follows upon unc-

tion in the latter ritual, because the texts describing this ritual proceed directly from unction to ascension to heaven. It is true that some later texts speak of baptism as taking place in heaven,⁴³ but this is not the case in the *Odes of Solomon*. In *Ode 11*, the Odist, after having related that the Lord “renewed” him “with his garment” and “possessed” him “with His light,”⁴⁴ describes his lofty state and then says, “And He took me to His Paradise [...]”⁴⁵ There is no indication of a baptism being administered in the heavenly Paradise.

In *Ode 21*, after having related that he had “stripped off darkness,” “put on light,” and acquired a new body (“members”) without affliction, the Odist says, “And I was lifted up in the light, and I passed before His face. And I was constantly near Him, while praising and confessing Him.”⁴⁶ The one having stripped off the body and been anointed, thereby acquiring a glorious body, is elevated to heaven and transformed into an angel of the Countenance, *i.e.*, one of the angels performing cultic service before God and therefore being allowed to see his face.⁴⁷ He is not baptized.

Even *Ode 25* may speak of an ascension, for after having stated that he removed his “garments of skin”, the Odist says: “For Your right hand lifted me up.” In any case, baptism is not mentioned.

It would seem that the *Odes of Solomon* have added a cultic expedient to the kind of encratite soteriology which was espoused by the group behind the *Gospel of Thomas*. Originally, leaving the body and ascending to heaven and gazing on God or the divine hypostasis did not require unction or any other sacramental act.

There is much evidence to this effect. To Philo, “the tunics (χιτῶνας) of skin [Gen. 3,21]” is “symbolically the natural skin of the body (τὸ τοῦ σώματος φυσικὸν δέρμα).”⁴⁸ It must be stripped off upon ascension to heaven: “the soul that loves God” has “disrobed itself of the body (ἐκδύσα τὸ σῶμα)” and has “fled far away (φυγοῦσα).”⁴⁹ Interestingly, Philo describes this as one of the “three ways in which the soul is made naked.”⁵⁰ Moreover, Philo explains that “those who have made a compact and a truce with the body (σῶμα) are unable to cast off (ἀπαμφιάσασθαι) from them the garment of flesh (τὸ σαρκῶν περιβλήμα).”⁵¹

When describing the nature of the “intellect” in comparison to that of “sense-perception”, Philo says that “our soul moves often by itself, stripping itself of the entire encumbrance of the body (ἅλῳ τὸν σωματικὸν ὄγκον ἐκδύσα).”⁵² This last passage uses language found in descriptions

of the ascent of the wise: once one has stripped oneself of the body and has “escaped from the noisy pack of the senses,” one apprehends with the “intellect only” (τὰ νοήσει μόνη) and exists in an “unclad movement” (τὴν γυμνὴν κίνησιν). The one who is clad (ἐπαμπισχομένη) in the body, however, apprehends with the objects of sense perception: that is, he has been “swept down” (κατασύρεται) to the world of sense perception.⁵³

In *De posteritate Caini*, Philo discusses the ascent of the wise, when the wise person goes up “to the heights” like Rebecca who, after going down to the spring to fill her pitcher, “came up again.” Rebecca is a type of the wise who “is enamoured of spiritual objects” and so “has learned by use of reason to rid herself completely of the body which the waterskin represents (ἔμαθε γὰρ ἡ ἀσωμάτων ἐρώσα ὅλον ἀποδύεσθαι λογισμῶ τὸν ἀσκόν, τὸ σῶμα).” Hagar is a type of the foolish who brought “a skin (ἀσκόν) to the place of drawing water.” Rebecca, however, brought a “pitcher” and had “no need of any bulky leathern vessel” (δερματίνου ὄγκου <τὸ> παράπαν οὐδενός) which, as we just saw, is equated with the waterskin or body (ἀσκός or σῶμα).⁵⁴ Notice the similarity in language with the above-mentioned passage from *De somniis* in which Philo speaks of the soul stripping itself of the encumbrance of the body (ὅλον τὸν σωματικὸν ὄγκον ἐκδύσα). The same image is used here for Rebecca who, because she is “enamoured of spiritual objects,” has no need for the vessel of the body. There is a strict dichotomy between the spiritually-oriented wise person who sees God and the foolish person who is weighted down by the bulky vessel of skin and sees only through the physical eyes.

Frequently, Moses is described by Philo as a type of the wise who ascends to God. God’s command in Exod. 29,24, “Go, get thee down, and come up,” is compared to Rebecca’s descent to the spring and her ascent immediately following.⁵⁵ When Philo interprets Exod. 24,18, where it is described that Moses went up to God on Mt. Sinai, he explains that “to such strains [melodies of heaven] it is said that Moses was listening, when having laid aside his body (ἀσώματον γενόμενον); for forty days and as many nights he touched neither bread nor water at all.” Philo concludes from this that partaking in the heavenly world quite literally requires that one put aside the mortal body and its needs by becoming an ascetic. The rationale for this is described by Philo in the following manner:

If the sound of it [the perfect harmony of the heavens] ever reached our ears, there would be produced irrepressible yearnings, frantic longings,

wild ceaseless passionate desires, compelling to abstain even from necessary food, for no longer should we take in nourishment from meat and drink through the throat after the fashion of mortals, but, as beings awaiting immortality, from inspired strains of perfect melody coming to us through our ears.⁵⁶

In another of his writings, Philo states that according to Exod. 33,7 when Moses went outside the camp and pitched the “tent of testimony,” Moses was leaving his body and apprehending the “wisdom testified to by God.” Furthermore, everyone who sought God “went out to it.” Philo concludes that if one is to seek God, one must *not* remain in the “heavy encumbrances of the body” (σωματικοῦς ὄγκοις) but “go out from yourself” (ἐξελθοῦσα ἀπὸ σαυτῆς).⁵⁷ Moses who “pitched his own tent outside the camp (Exod. 33,7) and the whole array of bodily things (τοῦ σωματικοῦ παντός)” are likened to the sort of wise men, according to Philo, who have “disrobed themselves of all created things (πάντα ἀπαμφιασάμενον τὰ ἐν γενέσει) and “naked will come to God” (γυμνῆ πρὸς θεὸν ἀφίξεται). It is only in such a state of “nakedness” that Moses begins “to worship God” as he ascends to heaven and, “entering the darkness, the invisible region, abides there while he learns the secrets of the most holy mysteries.”⁵⁸

Some Christians described the body in similar terms and incorporated these notions into their soteriological schemes. These Christians concluded that when one returned to the heavenly world or to the primordial condition of Paradise, one would be required to remove the material body or garment of skin.⁵⁹ The notion that the material body must be stripped off during the resurrection is at least contemporary with Paul. In his discussion about the spiritual body in 2 Cor. 5,1-10, Paul is seen to be in dialogue over this very issue. He presents the view that in the resurrection believers will be “putting on” (ἐπενδύσασθαι) the “heavenly dwelling” (5,2) so that “what is mortal may be swallowed up by life” (5,4). He goes out of his way to make clear to his audience that believers will not be “unclothed” (ἐκδύσασθαι) of their mortal bodies but will be “further clothed” (ἐπενδύσασθαι) with spiritual bodies (5,4). Additionally, Paul states that the reason that the spiritual body is “put on” (ἐνδυσάμενοι) is so that, when the mortal body is removed at the time of the resurrection, the person will not be naked before God (5,3).⁶⁰ Thus, nakedness to Paul is the condition of having removed the mortal garment of flesh.

Apparently, Paul is in a heated debate with a view that during the

final resurrection, when the believers ascend to heaven, they will strip off their mortal bodies in order to lay bare their spiritual selves before God. Paul instead, contends that the believer will not stand naked before God, but that the mortality will be destroyed by being “swallowed up” by the heavenly body given by God (5,4).⁶¹

A noteworthy parallel to Paul’s own debate is the discussion put forward in the Jewish portion of the *History of the Rechabites*⁶² in which the Blessed Ones on the Paradise-like island are all *naked*. The human visiting the island asks them, “Why are you naked?” He is told, “You are the one who is naked, and you do not discern that your garment is corrupted, but my own garment is not corrupted,”⁶³ because “we are naked not as you suppose, for we are covered with a covering of glory....”⁶⁴

Furthermore, the *History of the Rechabites* provides a link between naked people having ascended to Paradise and Adam and Eve. They are described as “mortals” who are “purified and spotless,”⁶⁵ beings who are “Earthly Angels”.⁶⁶ The text states that “...these blessed ones are like Adam and Eve before they sinned,”⁶⁷ and who “are covered with a *stolē* of glory like that which clothed Adam and Eve before they sinned.”⁶⁸ Thus, these purified mortals had attained the pre-Fall state of blessedness, a state when Adam and Eve were “naked” glorious light-beings in the Garden.

It is also important to note that the *History of the Rechabites* contains a passage which records that the Blessed Ones take on lives of “virginity” on this Paradise-like island.⁶⁹ As we shall see in the next section, the imagery of asexuality is often found to be connected with the motifs of shedding the body and ascending to heaven, most probably because the state of Adam before the Fall was thought to be a state of asexuality. Thus, to become like the pre-Fall Adam, the Blessed Ones have removed their earthly bodies, ascended to a heavenly realm, are covered with glory, and now participate in lives of celibacy.

We conclude that the removal of the garment describes the removal of the material body during ascension to a heavenly realm. Additionally, with the exception of the *Odes*, this imagery is *not* employed in primitive sacramental settings. Moreover, the *Odes*, when employing this imagery, speak of unction, not baptism.

d) *Shamelessness*. The stripping off of the garments in logion 37 is qualified by one additional expression: the garment must be stripped off without being ashamed. Again, this expression finds its origins in the

Genesis story. According to Gen. 2,25, the primordial state of Adam was a state when man and woman were naked and not ashamed. After the Fall, Gen. 3,7 says, Adam and Eve's "eyes were opened, and they knew that they were naked." Genesis does not explicitly state that Adam and Eve *became ashamed*, but this was elaborated on in some pseudepigraphic works. Eve, in *Jubilees*, "covered her shame with a fig leaf" and *then* gave Adam the fruit to eat. Now Adam's "eyes were opened and he saw that he was naked. And he took a fig leaf and sewed it and made an apron for himself. And he covered his shame."⁷⁰

The creative author of the *Apocalypse of Moses* expressed the dilemma of "shame" in another manner. After she is tricked by the serpent, Eve cries, "I looked for leaves in my region so that I might cover my shame, but I did not find any from the trees of Paradise, since while I ate, the leaves of all the trees of my portion fell, except those of the fig tree only." Eve sews a skirt for herself from the fig leaves and then seduces Adam into eating the forbidden fruit.⁷¹

Once more, the *Gospel of Thomas* is interpreting the Genesis account: when one strips off the mortal body and returns to Adam's pre-Fall state, one also is returning to the primordial experience of "not being ashamed" before Adam and Eve's "eyes were opened."⁷²

2) *Treading on them like little Children.*

a) *Treading on them.* Smith has suggested that the image of treading on the garments witnesses to a baptismal context. This motif was identified by Smith as belonging to the ceremony of exorcism which occurred while the initiate stood upon sackcloth.

This, however, was a *pre-baptismal* ceremony⁷³ and was *not* "typical" of the Syrian baptismal praxis as Smith seems to believe.⁷⁴ Rather, as A. F. J. Klijn has noted, this custom is only found in very late texts from Narsai and Theodore of Mopsuestia and is not present in other Syrian baptismal liturgies.⁷⁵ In fact, Klijn states that, "in ancient Syrian baptism liturgy neither the exorcism of the candidates for baptism nor of the baptismal water is known."⁷⁶ Clearly, Smith's understanding of the motif of trampling on one's garment is unsatisfactory.

Far from referring to the pre-baptismal rite of exorcism, this image simply refers to an act of renunciation, specifically an act of renouncing that which is being trampled upon. A demonstration of this idea is seen

in Josephus' account of the child Moses renouncing the Egyptian rule by trampling on the king's diadem:

[Thermuthis] put the infant into her father's hands: so he took him, and hugged him close to his breast; and on his daughter's account, in a pleasant way, put his diadem upon his head; but Moses threw it down to the ground, and in a puerile mood, he wreathed it round, and trod upon it with his feet...[then the scribe said to the king] "he himself affords an attestation to the prediction of the same thing, by his trampling upon your government, and treading upon your diadem."⁷⁷

Here the child Moses, as a symbolic foreshadowing of his adult career, tramples on the king's diadem, thus renouncing the Egyptian government and rule.

In several gnostic texts, the image of "trampling" is used to describe the act of renunciation. A Coptic Manichaean psalm speaks of Jesus, apparently during his resurrection, putting off the "vain garment of the flesh" and causing "the clean feet of my soul to trample confidently upon it."⁷⁸

A striking passage from the Nag Hammadi Valentinian fragment entitled *On the Anointing* (NHC 11,2a) associates the action of trampling on various aspects of the physical cosmos such as snakes, scorpions, and the power of the Devil, with unction. In fact, it is the unction that enables the candidate to renounce this world and its powers.⁷⁹

This view of unction is also preserved in another gnostic text, the *Hypostasis of the Archons*. After the candidate is anointed with the "unction of Life eternal", he is said to be able to overcome death by trampling it underfoot.⁸⁰ Significantly, the motif of ascension is also present: after the candidate is anointed and thus has trampled on death, he "will ascend into the limitless light."⁸¹

Clearly, the *Gospel of Thomas* is sharing in this type of imagery. In logion 37, trampling on the garments refers to the act of renouncing these garments, that is, the mortal body.

Unlike the two Nag Hammadi texts just quoted, *Thomas* does not associate the act of trampling on the "garments" with unction or any other sacrament. In this it is similar to a saying in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*:

When Salome asked when what she had inquired about would be known, the Lord said, "When you have trampled on the garment of shame and when the two become one and the male with the female (is) neither male nor female."⁸²

This saying is found in a discussion by Clement of Alexandria which focuses on the encratite understanding of “error”, that is, sexual intercourse. Clement states that the encratite leader Julius Cassianus used this logion in order to substantiate his teaching that sexual tendencies must be renounced, thereby creating an asexual person. The “garment of shame” obviously refers to the body which is controlled by sexual impulses. This passage connects trampling on the “garment of shame” with the making of the male and female into something neither male nor female, that is, an asexual being.

Thomas can be seen to employ the garment metaphor in much the same manner as the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and Cassianus. The garment which was given to man as a consequence of the Fall, or intercourse, must be removed in order to ascend to the heavenly realm and return to the Pre-Fall state of shamelessness.⁸³

It is important to note that the motif of becoming asexual in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* does not seem to occur in a baptismal context but rather in an *eschatological* setting, for Salome questions Jesus about the fulfillment of things that would happen in the future.⁸⁴ This eschatological setting is seen clearly in the version of the saying given by 2 *Clement*:

For the Lord himself, on being asked by someone when the Kingdom would come, said, “When the two shall be one and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female.”⁸⁵

Note that the setting of the saying as furnished by 2 *Clement* is that of an eschatological question followed by an answer which teaches about asexuality.

Logion 37 is similar to the saying occurring in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and 2 *Clement*, but it would not be right to interpret it futuristically. In *Thomas*, a futuristic eschatology is lacking. The eschatology in *Thomas* is realized and spiritualized.⁸⁶ Thus, rather than pointing to the future for the return to asexuality, logion 37 understands the return of asexuality to be a present possibility. An appropriate mythological expression of this realized eschatology is the notion of an ascension to heaven.

b) *Like little children*. In our logion, the idea of asexuality, rather than being dependent on gender terminology as found in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, is expressed by the image of little children. The act of renouncing the body is said to be like an act of little children. Also in

logia 21 and 22, the encratites are said to be like children.⁸⁷ E. Peterson has collocated these two logia with Christian texts where Adam in Paradise is described as a παιδίον, “child” or “infant”, or a νήπιος, “infant” or “innocent one”.⁸⁸ Citing Gen. 2,25, they “were both naked and were not ashamed,” Irenaeus says that Adam was a “virgin” and “had no understanding of the procreation of children, for it was necessary that they [*i.e.*, Adam and Eve] first should come to adult age...”⁸⁹ “Adam and Eve were naked and were not ashamed, for their thoughts were innocent and childlike, and they had no conception or imagination of the sort that is engendered in the soul by evil, through concupiscence, and by lust...”⁹⁰

At about the same time as Irenaeus wrote, Theophilus of Antioch, in a discussion on the Tree of Knowledge, said: “In his actual age, Adam was as old as an infant (τῆ δὲ οὔσῃ ἡλικίᾳ ὅδε Ἀδάμ ἔτη νήπιος ἦν).”⁹¹ According to Theophilus, God wanted Adam to “remain single and pure (ἀπλοῦν καὶ ἀκέραιον) for a longer time, remaining in infancy.”

Clement of Alexandria, slightly later than Irenaeus and Theophilus, also understands the pre-Fall Adam to have been a child in Paradise. When in Paradise, Adam “played like a child without constraint (ἐπαίξει λελυμένος).” It was only when he “fell into lust” (ὕποπίπτων ἡδονῆ), that “the child became a man (ὁ παῖς ἀνδριζόμενος).”⁹²

This imagery throws light on logion 37 as well as logia 21 and 22. The encratite who renounces the body (“tramples on the clothes”) is compared to a little child, because he has returned to the pre-Fall state of Adam, when the first human was an innocent child without concupiscence.⁹³

3) *Having the capacity to see God without fear.*

a) *Seeing God.* Perhaps the most important part of logion 37 is the recognition that once one has removed the body and renounced it, one is able to “see” God. The whole logion is framed with the question of being able to “see” God: the disciples introduce the logion by asking when Jesus will be revealed to them and when they will be able to see him. The logion concludes with the striking statement: “then you will see the Son of the Living One, and you will not be afraid.”^{93a}

To gaze at God or the divine hypostasis was the aim of apocalypticists and mystics ascending to heaven.⁹⁴ This is apparent throughout the mystical texts starting with 1 *Enoch* 14,67.⁹⁵ Moreover, Philo often

describes the ascension of Moses as the experience of “seeing” God. In the *De posteritate Caini*, Philo states that Moses yearns to “see (ὄρᾶν) God and to be seen (ὀρασθαι) by Him.” Moses even asks God to reveal His Presence to him. Philo then tells us that Moses ascended to God by entering into “the thick darkness where God was (Exod. 20,21), that is into conceptions regarding the Existent Being that belong to the unapproachable region where there are no material forms.”⁹⁶ Philo frequently takes great deliberation in describing Moses’ attempts to “see” God after he has ascended to heaven as related in Exod. 33. Two passages from Philo illustrate this point. The first text is from *De mutatione nominum* where Moses “entered into the darkness” or, as Philo interprets, into “existence invisible and incorporeal.” In this heavenly realm, Moses “searched everywhere and into everything in his desire to see (ἰδεῖν) clearly and plainly Him, the object of our much yearning, Who alone is good.”⁹⁷ But Philo insists that God alone “by His very nature cannot be seen (ὀρασθαι),”⁹⁸ because, as the second text, from *De fuga et inventione*, explains, “the man that wishes to set his gaze upon the Supreme Essence, before he sees (ἰδεῖν) Him will be blinded by the rays that beam forth all around Him.”⁹⁹ Thus, Philo states that God said to Moses, “What is behind Me thou shalt see, but My face thou shalt by no means see” (Exod. 33,23).¹⁰⁰

Furthermore, Philo describes the condition of mortality, as a state in which man is incapable of seeing God. Apparently, this incapacity resulted from the Fall when man preferred “misery the soul’s death to happiness the real life,” and when he “gorged” himself with “ignorance and corruption.”¹⁰¹ Thus, Philo states that when God asked Adam, “Where art thou?” (Gen. 3,9),¹⁰² Adam answered appropriately, “Here where I am; where those are who are incapable of seeing (ἰδεῖν ἀδυνατοῦντες) God; where those are who do not listen to God; where those are who hide themselves from the Author of all things...”¹⁰³ As a matter of fact, Philo explains that it is not possible for a person “whose abode is in the body and the mortal race (κατοικοῦντα ἐν σώματι καὶ τῷ θνητῷ γένει)” to be “with God” (συγγενέσθαι θεῷ).¹⁰⁴ This is only possible for the person whom God “rescues out of the prison” (ἐκ τοῦ δεσμοτηρίου διαρρέεται), which presumably here is the body and the mortal race.¹⁰⁵ With this exegesis of the Genesis story, it is understandable why Philo insists that, in order to ascend to a heavenly realm and attempt to “see” God, one must put aside the material body.

A remarkable parallel to the motifs presented in logion 37 is the ascension and vision of Enoch as related in *2 Enoch* ch. 22.¹⁰⁶ In this ascension narrative, Enoch *sees* God and falls to the ground. Then he is made to stand up, and God says, “Do not be afraid.”¹⁰⁷ Enoch now is *stripped* of his “earthly garments.” Next, Enoch is anointed and made like the angels. Here, even though the removal of the “earthly garments” is found after the ascension and first gazing at God, we do witness a common nexus of ideas: stripping and seeing God without fear.

Interestingly, this common nexus of ideas is connected with the ritual of anointing. In fact, this ritual brings about Enoch’s change: Enoch is said to have been transformed into one of the angels of the Countenance, that is, the angels who may *see* the divine Countenance. Enoch becomes “like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference” so that he can “stand in front of my [God’s] face forever.”¹⁰⁸

When Isaiah, in the *Ascension of Isaiah*,¹⁰⁹ is taken up to heaven in order to “see” God and the Son, he has to leave his “body” behind.¹¹⁰ As a matter of fact, the angel who is sent to Isaiah informs him that he will not gain knowledge of the angel’s name because Isaiah will have to “return into this body” after his vision.¹¹¹ The angel explains that his purpose in coming to Isaiah is to “take you up” so that “you will see.”¹¹² Once in the seventh heaven, Isaiah has a “garment” waiting for him.¹¹³ Having ascended, he first “sees” in the seventh heaven “Enoch [who also had ascended] and all who were with him, *stripped of their garments of the flesh*.” They were clad “in their higher garments” and were “like the angels who stand there in great glory.”¹¹⁴ After a while, Isaiah “sees” God whom he describes as the “Great Glory”.¹¹⁵ At the end of the book, he is bid to return into his “garment” on earth.¹¹⁶ Again we have a common nexus of motifs: one must strip away the mortal body or garment when ascending to heaven; once in heaven, one “sees” God.

The *Hymn of the Pearl*, found in the *Acts of Thomas*,¹¹⁷ also testifies to this common nexus of ascension themes. This extended allegory speaks about a prince (the soul) who is sent into Egypt (the world) in order to recover a pearl (the purity of the soul). Upon leaving his father’s kingdom (descending to earth), he strips off his glorious robe (his heavenly body) and dons Egyptian garments (his physical body) as a disguise. But soon he forgets his mission. The prince’s parents, how-

ever, send him a letter which reminds him of his task. So he recovers the pearl and “having stripped off the filthy garment,” he leaves Egypt and travels back to his father’s kingdom (ascends to heaven). Once he has arrived, he “sees” his glorious robe and states that “the image of the King of kings was entirely upon it [the robe].” He is then clothed in it.¹¹⁸ Even though the prince does not directly see God, the idea of “seeing” interestingly is not totally absent. The prince “sees” the glorious robe as well as the image of God upon it. Moreover, the hymn ends by telling that the prince made his appearance before his father (God).

b) *Without Fear*. As with so many of the motifs already discussed, this motif also refers to the Genesis account of the Fall. After the Fall, Adam and Eve hid themselves from the sight of God because, according to Adam, “I was afraid, because I was naked” (3,10). Thus, we can infer that *before* the Fall, Adam was *naked* (that is, not clothed with the garment of skin) but not *ashamed*, and *saw* God and was *not afraid*.

Because of the Fall and its consequences (one of them being that Adam was afraid to see God), it is natural that feelings of fear are often described in ascension narratives when the person ascending returns to Paradise and faces God. For instance, in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, when Isaiah finally reaches the seventh heaven, the sound of a heavenly voice causes him to tremble and be afraid.¹¹⁹

The *Life of Adam and Eve* recounts the story of Adam’s ascension to the “Paradise of the righteous” where he “saw the Lord sitting and his appearance was unbearable flaming fire.”¹²⁰ At this sight, Adam exclaims that “I was disturbed when I saw this; fear laid hold of me.”¹²¹

Finally, we should note the ascension of the patriarch Enoch to the throne of the Great Glory in 1 *Enoch* 14. As Enoch ascended into heaven, he approached a “great house”. He states, “Fear covered me and trembling seized me.” Thus he fell upon his face.¹²² At this point in the narrative, Enoch has another vision. He saw a “second house” and he “saw inside it a lofty throne” and the “Great Glory was sitting upon it.”¹²³ Enoch explains that he was still prostrate and “trembling” with his face covered.¹²⁴

Moreover, it is noteworthy that when the person who has ascended to the Pre-Fall state by removing his earthly garments, he is no longer afraid to stand before God. This is clearly the case in 2 *Enoch*: when Enoch strips off his “earthly garment,” is anointed, and becomes like an angel, he is no longer afraid, but freely converses with God:

And the Lord, with his own mouth, called to me, “Be brave, Enoch! Don’t be frightened! Stand up, and stand in front of my face forever”...The Lord said to Michael, “Take Enoch, and extract (him) from the earthly clothing. And anoint him with the delightful oil, and put (him) into the clothes of glory.” And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil...And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference...And the Lord spoke to me: “Whatever you see, Enoch, things standing still and moving about and which were brought to perfection by me, I myself will explain it to you.”¹²⁵

Apparently, Enoch has returned to the primordial condition of Adam, that is, when Adam did not have a garment of skin but was naked and unafraid to see God and converse with Him.

Significantly, the imagery in this passage parallels that which we found earlier in the *Odes of Solomon*, especially *Odes 21* and *36*.¹²⁶ In the *Odes*, ascension into God’s presence was shown to be linked to the stripping and anointing of the chosen individual. The result of these actions was the transformation of the individual into an angelic-like being, a being who lived in God’s presence and passed before his face. Just as in *2 Enoch 22*, there was no mention of baptism.

Conclusion

The three principal motifs which comprise logion 37 are deeply rooted in Adamic topology and demonstrate a Jewish-Christian exegesis of the Genesis story most analogous to the encratite exegesis taught by Julius Cassianus. The “garment” is a metaphor for the physical body which was given to Adam as a consequence of the Fall. In the soteriological scheme, this garment must be removed and renounced. This is accomplished by becoming asexual and modeling one’s lifestyle after that of Adam when he was still an innocent child. When the body of shame and sexual intercourse have been “trampled upon”, the believer achieves a new state, a Paradise-like state in which he can ascend to a heavenly realm and, walking before God, gaze at Him unencumbered by the shame of Adam’s Fall.

Further, logion 37 is *not* baptismal. *2 Enoch* and the *Odes of Solomon*, the earliest sacramental texts on the removal of clothing, speak of an unction ceremony that is not even part of a baptismal ritual. Moreover, a couple of gnostic texts seem to connect the symbolic act of treading on physical aspects of the cosmos with unction. But because

this nexus of ideas found in logion 37 occurs also in non-sacramental settings, it can not be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that saying 37 is a witness to unction.

Regardless of whether or not logion 37 testifies to the sacrament of unction, it is clear that encratism, according to this logion, was a requirement for salvation and the return to the pre-Fall condition of Paradise where one stripped off the body, ascended to heaven, gazed at God, and became like one of the angels.

NOTES

¹ See J. Z. Smith, *The Garments of Shame*, *History of Religions* 5 (1966) 217-238. For the above quotations, refer to p. 235, 218, and 237 respectively.

² S. L. Davies, when discussing logion 37, uncritically restates Smith's arguments and conclusions, and then moves on to argue for an actual baptismal *Sitz im Leben* for the *Gospel of Thomas* itself. He goes as far as stating that the *Gospel of Thomas* was "part of the post-baptismal instruction of new Christians"; see *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom* (New York 1983) 117-137. K. King concludes that entering the kingdom in the *Gospel of Thomas* is "virtually synonymous with belonging to the Thomas group/community", and that entry into this kingdom or community occurs through baptism; see *Kingdom in the Gospel of Thomas*, *Forum* 3 (1987) 53 and 67-69. D. MacDonald also relies upon Smith's conclusions and argues that even the *Sitz im Leben* of the primitive "Dominical Saying" upon which logion 37 possibly is based is that of baptism; see *There is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*, *Harvard Dissertations in Religion* 20 (Philadelphia 1987) 50-63.

³ B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7*, *Nag Hammadi Studies* XX, *The Coptic Gnostic Library* (Leiden 1989) 68. T. Lambdin provides the English translation in the same volume, p. 69.

⁴ In Rev. 1,18, the "Living One" is Christ. This is probably an exegetical expansion of the preceding "the First and the Last." The latter is essentially the same as the name "Alpha and Omega" used of God in 1,8. The "Living One," too, is a divine name. For occurrences in the Greek versions of the Old Testament and Pseudepigrapha, see W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* 21 (3rd edition by H. Gressmann; Tübingen 1926) 311 n. 4.

⁵ G. Blond, *Encratisme*, in M. Viller, F. Cavallera, and J. DeGuibert (eds.), *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* IV (Paris 1960) 628-642, defines encratism, "self-control", as both a tendency and a sect. The renunciation of this world, expressed through abstinence from meat, wine, marriage, and property, was a tendency which can be seen even in the Catholic Church. Encratism also was a widespread sectarian phenomenon in the Orient, as is evidenced by the doctrines of Tatian, Julius Cassianus, and others commented on in the third book of Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata*. See also G. Quispel, *The Study of Encratism: A Historical Survey*, in U. Bianchi (ed.), *La Tradizione dell'Enkrateia*, *Atti del Colloquio Internazionale—Milano 20-23 Aprile 1982* (Rome 1985) 35-81.

We defend the position that the *Gospel of Thomas* is not gnostic but encratite in nature, as are several other Nag Hammadi manuscripts (e.g., the *Exegesis on the Soul*, the *Book*

of *Thomas the Contender*, and the *Sentences of Sextus*). The encratite character of the *Gospel of Thomas* has been attributed by G. Quispel to one of the sources which the author of the *Gospel of Thomas* espoused when composing this text. Quispel argues persuasively that the author also used a Jewish Christian gospel and a Hermetic source; see now his article, *The Gospel of Thomas Revisited*, in B. Barc (ed.), *Colloque international sur les Textes de Nag Hammadi*, Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, "Études" 1 (Québec and Louvain 1981) 218-266. M. Lelyveld, *Les Logia de la Vie dans L'Évangile selon Thomas*, Nag Hammadi Studies XXXIV (Leiden 1987), also is an advocate of the encratite character of this gospel.

⁶ MacDonald, 23-25, wants to derive this notion from Greek tradition, especially that of the Orphic/Platonic school. However, the comparison of the body to a garment is also found in Indian-Iranian tradition; see S. L. Wikander, *Vayu* (Lund 1941) 42-47; G. Widengren, *The Great Vohu Manah and the Apostle of God*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1945:5 (Uppsala & Leipzig 1945) 18, 36-37, 39 *et passim*.

In Iranian tradition, there is also mention of shedding the bodily garment. This occurs upon ascension to heaven. For instance, in the story of Zarathustra's call (*Denkart* VII, 2, 60-61), Zarathustra puts off his bodily garment and ascends to heaven in ecstasy; see C. Salemann, *Manichäische Studien* (Petersburg 1908) 130-131; Widengren, 60-61. Another work (*Datastan i Denik* 37,33) describes "the flesh" as "the garment of the visible world"; see Widengren, 51.

⁷ See L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* V (Philadelphia 1925) 97 n. 69; B. Murmelstein, Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255 n. 3; W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart and Berlin 1938) 11.

⁸ For the primordial man being clothed with a glorious garment, see already Ezek. 28,13. Some Rabbinic texts take this to be a description of Adam; see, e.g., *Pesikta* 36b. For further references to the luminous garment of Adam and Eve, see Ginzberg, *loc. cit.*; Murmelstein, *loc. cit.*; Staerk, 11-12. For additional evidence from Christianity, especially in the East, see G. Quispel, *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum XV (Leiden 1967) 30-1, 57-60; S. Brock, Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition, *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter*, Eichstätter Beiträge 4 (Regensburg 1982) 14, 23. In a transferred sense, the first covering of Adam and Eve was said to be one of righteousness or good deeds; see *Apoc. Mos.* 20,1-3; *Shabb.* 14a; *Meg.* 32a; *Gen. R.* 19,6. *Iren. Adv. haer.* 3,23,5 speaks of a "robe of sanctity." Cf. Tert. *De pud.* 9.

⁹ There was also a tradition to the effect that the verbs in Gen. 3,21 should be taken as pluperfects, referring to the status of Adam and Eve *before* the Fall, and that the verse spoke of their robe of glory. Thus *Gen. R.* 20,12 says that the scroll of R. Meir (*a tanna* of the third generation) read ʾwr, "light", instead of ʿwr, "skin". This wording is presupposed by both Targums, which read "garments of glory (yqʾr)". Brock, 29 n. 13, also refers to the Peshitta version of Ps. 8,6 which reads that God *clothed* man with "honor and glory", whereas all other versions have "crowned."

¹⁰ A few New Testament texts speak about putting off "the body of flesh" (Col. 2,11) or "the old nature" (Col. 3,9; Eph. 4,22) in baptism, but this phraseology has solely a moral significance; see P. W. van der Horst, Observations on a Pauline Expression, *New Testament Studies* 19 (1973) 181-187. Moreover, there is no indication that the metaphor was symbolized by the removal of the clothes.

¹¹ 64,19 (CSEL 54, 610). See J. Quasten, A Pythagorean Idea in St. Jerome, *American Journal of Philology* 63 (1942) 207, for a translation and interpretation of this passage.

¹² For Church Fathers subsequent to Jerome, refer to Smith, 222-233.

¹³ See The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and Its Sacramental System, *Numen* 7 (1960) 192-193. Smith, 220, cites this work.

¹⁴ H. G. Gaffron, *Studien zum koptischen Philippusevangelium unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sakramente* (Diss., Bonn 1969) 69-70, suggested the second half of the second century. W. Isenberg, in the introduction to the translation in J. M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (revised edition; San Francisco 1988) 141, now speaks of the second half of the third century. G. Quispel, Genius and Spirit, in M. Krause (ed.), *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts In Honour of Pahor Labib*, Nag Hammadi Studies VI (Leiden 1975), has suggested that the *Gospel of Philip* "may have been composed about the time during which Tertullian wrote" against the Valentinians (166). In *Adv. Valent.* 4, it is said that Axionicus of Antioch remained faithful to the original doctrine of Valentinus. Since *Philip* does seem to reproduce the teachings of Valentinus, Quispel concludes that *Philip* was written in the *first* part of the third century. An Antiochene background for *Philip* has been argued by E. Segelberg, The Antiochene Background of the Gospel of Philip, *Bulletin de Société d'Archéologie Copte* 18 (1966) 205-23. Cf. Isenberg, 141.

¹⁵ 66, 16-20 (Layton [ed.], *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2-7 172).

¹⁶ Cf. 73,3-5: "If they do not first receive the resurrection while they live, when they die they will receive nothing" (Layton, 188). The text goes on to say that it is not baptism but the unction which conveys the resurrection. Thus, it may be that the removal of the clothes *before the anointing* could be seen as a prefiguration of the stripping off of the flesh, since this was the sacrament which conferred the resurrection.

¹⁷ 75,21-25 (Layton, 192).

¹⁸ For Christian evidence that baptism is a "garment" (ἔνδυμα), refer to J. Daniélou, Catéchèse Pascale et retour au Paradis, *Maison-Dieu* 45 (1956) 115. See now also the *Tripartite Tractate* (NHC I, 5) 128,20-25; 129,3-5. The Mandaeans believe that the water of baptism is an investiture with light garments; see K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* II, *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 75 (Göttingen 1961) 181-86.

¹⁹ This was suggested already by G. Quispel, The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament, *Vigiliae Christianae* 11 (1957) 13. Since *Thomas* is made up of different sources, the individual logia are of course older. Some of them may contain words of Jesus. H. Koester, One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels, in J. Robinson and H. Koester (eds.), *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia 1971) 158-204, proposes that the basis of *Thomas* is a very primitive sayings collection which predates Q and was later incorporated into Q.

²⁰ An Edessene origin of the *Gospel of Thomas* was suggested by H.-Ch. Puech, Une collection des paroles de Jésus récemment retrouvée: L'Évangile selon Thomas, *Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1957, 155. See now the introduction to the Gospel of Thomas by B. Blatz in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* I (Tübingen 1987) 95, citing some of the supportive literature in n. 23.

²¹ See Die Oden Salomos und die Polemik mit den Markioniten im syrischen Christentum, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 205 (Symposium Syriacum 1976, 1978) 39-55. Drijvers' work appears to be unknown to J. M. Charlesworth, who does not cite it in his

introduction to the *Odes* in his edition, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha 2* (Garden City, New York 1985) 725-734.

²² See *op. cit.* 57, citing Segelberg, "In the *Odes* there are a good many references to baptismal ritual which enable us to reconstruct a good deal of the baptismal ritual of the *Odes*" (The Baptismal Rite according to some of the Coptic-Gnostic Texts of Nag-Hammadi, in F. L. Cross [ed.], *International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Texte und Untersuchungen 80, Studia Patristica 5 [Berlin 1962] 118).

²³ 11,10-12 (M. Lattke [ed. and trans.], *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis I*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 25/1 [Fribourg and Göttingen 1979] 108 [text] and 109 [translation]).

²⁴ 21,3-4 (Lattke, 131 [text] and 132 [translation]).

²⁵ 25,8-9 (Lattke, 150, 152 [text] and 151, 153 [translation]).

²⁶ 11,6-7 speaks about drinking living water, a phrase which could be applied to baptism by both the Church Fathers and the Gnostics; see G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London 1951) 111 n. 2; Rudolph, 125-27, 384-5, 386, 389-90. However, if this is an allusion to baptism, then verses 10-11 can not speak about a symbolic removal of clothes before baptism!

²⁷ See *The Odes of Solomon*, Texts and Studies 8/3 (Cambridge 1912) 72, 78, 90, 167. The *Odes* declare that the elect "put on" (*lbš*) God's "love" (3,1b; 23,3), his "grace" (4,6; 20,7), the savior himself (7,4; cf. Gal. 3,7), "holiness" (13,3), "incorruptibility through His Name" (15,8), "light" (21,3), "joy" (23,1), the "Perfect Virgin" (33,12), and "the Name" (39,8).

²⁸ J. Rendel Harris and A. Mingana (eds. and trans.), *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon 2* (Manchester 1920) 197.

²⁹ V. 6 (Lattke, 82 [text] and 83 [translation]).

³⁰ For milk and honey as a description of the eucharist victuals, see J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (trans. and ed. by J. A. Baker; London 1964) 332-334.

³¹ V. 8 (Lattke, 176 [text] and 177 [translation]).

³² For this conception, see P. Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne église*, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 10 (Uppsala 1942) 73ff.

³³ See vv. 19 and 22 (Lattke, 100, 102 [text] and 101, 103 [translation]).

³⁴ Compare 7,2-3 and 9,4 with 14,1 and 22,4.

³⁵ For descriptions of the order of initiatory rites in Syrian Christianity, refer to T. W. Masion, *Miscellanea Apocalyptica III*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947) 59; *idem*, *Entry into Membership of the Early Church*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947) 25-33; R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition* (Cambridge 1975) 21. The evidence is stated in full by D. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Texts and Studies VIII/1 (Cambridge 1916) xlii-xlix.

³⁶ See, e.g., chs. 26-27. For the "seal" in the Acts, see F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis*, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 5 (Paderborn 1911) 95-98.

³⁷ Ch. 157 (W. Wright [ed.], *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles I* [London and Edinburgh 1871] 374, and *idem* [trans.], *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles II* [London and Edinburgh 1871] 289; M. Bonnet [ed.], *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha II/2* [Leipzig 1903] 267).

³⁸ Wright, I 193, and II 166; Bonnet, 142.

³⁹ Wright, I 302, and II 267; Bonnet, 240.

⁴⁰ Connolly, 40. For the seal of the Name in Syrian Christianity, see further J. E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 36 (Tübingen 1985) 98-103.

⁴¹ See also *Did. Apost.* ch. 16; *Apost. Const.* 33,16,2-3.

⁴² See 1 Sam. 16,13; Isa. 61,1; Luk 4,18; Acts 10,38. In *Ode* 33,12 the “Perfect Virgin” admonishes people to don her. Bernard took the Virgin to be the Church, since the Church is described as a “Virgin” in the *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Vis.* 4). But note that Hermas identifies the Church and the Spirit (*Sim.* 9,1,1). In *Similitude* 9,13,2, the believers are said to clothe themselves with the clothing of the “virgins”, who are identified as the “holy Spirits” (cf. 9,17,4). In *Similitude* 9,24,2, the white robe given to the one entering the Church is identified as the Spirit. The *Pseudo-Clementines* teach that the believers are vested with the “divine spirit” (*Hom.* 8,22).

⁴³ For material in the heresiological literature, see Rudolph, 384-387; G. Widengren, Baptism and Enthronement in some Jewish-Christian Gnostic Documents, in S. G. F. Brandon (ed.), *The Saviour God*, Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation Presented to Edwin Oliver James (Manchester 1963) 205-217. References to heavenly baptism in the Nag Hammadi collection remain to be described systematically. The author of *Zostrianos* (NHC VIII,1) 4,21-28 describes a heavenly baptism which he received after having cast his body upon the earth. Cf. *Trimorphic Protennoia* (NHC XIII,1) 48,6-20. E. Peterson, Die “Taufe” im Acherusischen See, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome, Freiburg and Vienna 1959) 310-32, discusses the idea of heavenly baptism after death.

⁴⁴ V. 11.

⁴⁵ V. 16a (Lattke, 110 [text] and 111 [translation]). The rest of the *Ode* describes Paradise. In *Ode* 20,7, the Odist admonishes people to “put on the grace of the Lord generously, and come into His Paradise” (Lattke, 130 [text] and 131 [translation]). As has been seen above, pp. 125-6, “grace” is a term for unction in *Ode* 4,6.

In *Ode* 11, 12, the Odist says that he was given “rest” after having stripped off the body and been given a new “garment”. In the Adamic literature, Adam requests to be anointed so that he may attain “rest”; see *Life of Adam and Eve* ch. 36; *Apocalypse of Moses* 9,3. In the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, the “true prophet” is anointed with “grace” and thereby attains “rest” (3,20). For Paradise as a resting-place, see O. Hofius, *Katapausis. Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 11 (Tübingen 1970) 59-74.

⁴⁶ Vv. 6-7 (Lattke, 132 [text] and 133 [translation]).

⁴⁷ In *Ode* 36, the Odist begins by relating that the Spirit, which was the divine power conveyed by unction, raised him to heaven and caused him to be standing before the face of God. Here he praised the Lord, having been made the greatest of the sons of God, *i.e.*, the angels (vv. 1-4). The Odist also says, “He anointed me with perfection, and I became one of those who are near him” (v. 6 [Lattke, 170 (text) and 171 (translation)]). Thus it appears that anointing was associated with the ascent to heaven and transformation into an angelic figure.

⁴⁸ *Quaest. in Gen.* 1,53 (R. Marcus [ed. and trans.], *Philo*, Supplement I, The Loeb Classical Library [London and Cambridge, Mass., 1929] 30-31).

⁴⁹ *Leg. all.* 2,55; 56 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* I, The Loeb Classical Library [London and Cambridge, Mass., 1929 and reprints] 258-259). Cf. MacDonald, 28, who uses this passage as well as *De somn.* 1,43 and *Quod Deus sit imm.* 56 (see below) to demonstrate that “Philo’s favorite image for the body is the garment”; he does not acknowledge, however, the connections between stripping the body and ascending to heaven in these passages. In pp. 28-29, however, he does discuss several other texts

which speak of the separation of the soul from the body and the soul's subsequent *ascent* to a higher realm.

⁵⁰ *Leg. all.* 2,54 (*ibid.*, 258-259).

⁵¹ *Quod Deus sit imm.* 56 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* III, The Loeb Classical Library [London and New York 1929 and reprints] 38-39). Cf. MacDonald, 28.

⁵² *De somn.* 1,43 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* V, The Loeb Classical Library [London and New York 1929 and reprints] 316-19). MacDonald, 28 n. 40, cites additional texts from Philo which speak of the soul "stripping" itself of the body (note that his reference to *Leg. all.* 57-58 should read 2,57-58).

⁵³ *De somn.* 1,43-44 (*ibid.*, 316-19). There are several other discussions about the wise ascending to heaven in which Philo describes the body in analogous language. Often these descriptions of ascensions accompany references to "seeing" God. For the most part, these references to "seeing" God will be reserved for discussion later in this paper; see section 3a.

⁵⁴ 136-137 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* II, The Loeb Classical Library [London and New York 1929 and reprints] 406-409). Note that in *Leg. all.* 3,69, Philo equates the following expressions: the body (σῶμα), leathern bulk (δερμάτινον ὄγκον), corpses (νεκρόν), and a dead thing (τεθνηκός αἰεί).

⁵⁵ *De post. Caini* 136 (*ibid.*, 406-407).

⁵⁶ *De somn.* 1,36 (*Philo* V, 312-315).

⁵⁷ *Leg. all.* 3,46-47 (*Philo* I, 330-333).

⁵⁸ *De gig.* 54 (*Philo* II, 470-473).

⁵⁹ Cf. *Gospel of Truth* (NHC I,3) 20,29-34 where this was first accomplished by Jesus at his resurrection. Jesus' resurrection is described in terms which define his material existence as a time during which he was clothed in mortality; his resurrection and subsequent ascension to God are described as the process of stripping off the mortal body and donning immortality. This type of exegesis of Gen. 3,21 reflects a new understanding of the Adam story: through the resurrection, Jesus becomes the first to return to the pre-Fall state of Adam when he was clothed in glory.

Some texts teach that at death, the individual would remove his "garment" and ascend to heaven; see, e.g., *Acts of Thomas* ch. 147; *Coptic Manichean Psalm-Book* 81,8-9. Logion 21 of the *Gospel of Thomas* has also been interpreted along these lines; the logion reads: "Mary said to Jesus, 'Whom are Your disciples like?' He said, 'They are like children who have settled in a field which is not theirs. When the owners of the field come, they will say, 'Let us have back our field.' They (will) undress in their presence in order to let them have back their field and to give it back to them.' " H.-M. Schenke in J. Leipoldt and H.-M. Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hammadi* (Hamburg-Bergstedt 1960) 14 n. 2, has interpreted the field as the cosmos and the owners of the field as the *archontai*, and, furthermore, equated the stripping of the garments with death. R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (London 1960) 134, agree that the garments are the body. G. Quispel, *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum XV (Leiden 1967) 54, compares log. 21 to a passage in the *Shepherd of Hermas* where the Christians are described as strangers in the world: the "Lord of the land" is the devil; Christians have to leave the "land" owned by him (*Sim.* 1,4). Since death is not mentioned in log. 21, it is probable that the text simply states that if the believer wishes to

ascend to heaven, it is necessary to leave behind the world (field) and the physical body (clothes). Cf. below, p. 134.

⁶⁰ M. E. Thrall, "Putting on" or "Stripping off" in 2 Corinthians 5:3, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticisms: Its Significance for Exegesis, Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford 1981) 221-237, has convincingly argued that the evidence favors the reading ἐνδυσάμενοι in 2 Cor. 5,3 rather than ἐκδυσάμενοι as the third edition of the *Greek New Testament* (United Bible Societies) has printed.

⁶¹ The *Gospel of Philip* 56,26-57,22 is also involved in the debate over the body and the resurrection, and most likely bases its interpretation of the resurrection on 1 Cor. 15,35ff. This gnostic "gospel" states that there was a group of Christians who contended that they would rise in the flesh because they were afraid to be naked. Those who would rise in the body, the *Gospel of Philip* responds, are those who actually would be naked. It is those who uncliothe themselves who are not naked. The *Gospel of Philip* concurs with Paul in that the believer will be clothed in spiritual bodies, maintaining that the believer who partakes in the eucharist, will have received "Jesus' flesh" as a clothing in which to arise.

⁶² J. H. Charlesworth, in the introduction to this text in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2 (New York 1985) 444-445, dates this portion of the text to the second century C.E. or earlier.

⁶³ 5,3 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456]). See also the Greek text in J. H. Charlesworth (ed. and trans.), *The History of the Rechabites* I (The Greek Recension), Texts and Translations 17 (Chico 1982) 32 (text) and 33 (trans), which reads: "For you are wearing the skins of the sheep of the earth, and these perish with your body..." This blessed one speaking then appears as a gigantic being. Cf. the transfiguration of Jesus in the *Acts of John* ch. 90, where Jesus is both *naked* and of enormous stature. Note that the ascension of the mountain is an ascension to *heaven*. Refer to J. Fossum's forthcoming article, *Jesus nudus: The Transfiguration of Jesus in the Acts of John*.

⁶⁴ 12,3 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456-457]). See also Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 68 (text) and 69 (translation) for the Greek recension, which reads: "And we are not naked of body, as indeed you foolishly suppose, for we have the garment of immortality, and we are not ashamed before each other." Compare this text to the *Gospel of Philip* 56,26ff.; see above, n. 61.

⁶⁵ 11,2 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456]). See also the Greek text in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 64 (text) and 65 (translation) which reads: "For also we are pious, but not immortal."

⁶⁶ 7,11 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 453]). See also the Greek text in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 46 (text) and 47 (translation), where Zosimos addresses the Blessed Ones as "my lords" (κύριοί μου) rather than "Earthly Angels". The Greek recension, however, understands the Blessed Ones to be like angels; see 5,4 where a Blessed One is described as "a son of God" whose "face (was) like the face of an angel".

⁶⁷ 7,2 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 452]). The Greek recension is silent regarding this reference to the Blessed Ones being like Adam and Eve before they sinned; see Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 38 (text) and 39 (translation). But see next note.

⁶⁸ 12,3 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 457]). The Greek recension in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 68 (text) and

69 (translation) reads: ‘for we have the garment of immortality, and we are not ashamed before each other.’ The shamelessness of the Blessed One alludes to the pre-Fall situation of Adam and Eve; cf. below, sections 1d and 2b.

⁶⁹ 11,6-8 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456]). See also the Greek text in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* 1, 66 (text) and 67 (translation). In the (*Second*) *Apocalypse of James* (NHC V, 4), it is said that Jesus “was the virgin” and “was naked, and there was no garment clothing him” (58,18 and 21-23 [A. Veilleux (ed.), *Des Deux Apocalypses de Jacques*, Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, “Textes” 17 (Québec 1986) 147]).

⁷⁰ 3,21-22.

⁷¹ Ch. 20.

⁷² Smith, 223, does note the allusion to Genesis, but links log. 37 with the Adam imagery in the baptismal homilies of Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. fourth century) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. fifth century). Earlier texts where the Genesis reference is found, however, are not baptismal. We will return to the notion of “shamelessness” below; see section 2b.

⁷³ See J. Quasten, Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium, *Harvard Theological Review* 35 (1942) 209-219. Quasten, 211-212, notes that Augustine is also a witness to this pre-baptismal ceremony, but because *Thomas* is much earlier and has a Syrian provenance, these Augustinian texts are not important to our discussion.

⁷⁴ Smith, 224.

⁷⁵ See An Ancient Syriac Baptismal Liturgy in the Syriac Acts of John, *Novum Testamentum* 6 (1963) 222, and nn. 5 and 6.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 222.

⁷⁷ *Jew. Ant.* 2,9,7. Cited by Lelyveld, 85-86. Cf. Hermas, *Sim.* 9,32 where the believers are admonished not to trample the Lord’s mercy underfoot.

⁷⁸ No. CCLXXVIII (C. R. C. Allberry [ed. and trans.], *A Manichaean Psalm-Book*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection II/2 [Stuttgart 1938] 99, lines 26-27). It is not improbable that this passage from the *Manichaean Psalm-book* is actually an explication of logion 37 itself, since Mani and his disciples would seem to have drawn upon the *Gospel of Thomas*; see H.-Ch. Puech, in E. Hennecke (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha* I, new edition by W. Schneemelcher, English Translation ed. by R. McL. Wilson (London 1963 and 1973) 283-284. That Mani used the *Gospel of Thomas* is entirely comprehensible, since, as we now know, he grew up in a Jewish Christian sect. This was already stated by Ibn al-Nadim (*Fihrist* 9,1) and is now borne out by the *Cologne Mani Codex*. For this discussion, see G. Quispel, Mani, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris 1972) 667-672; Jewish Gnosis and Mandaean Gnosticism, in J.-E. Menard (ed.), *Les textes de Nag Hammadi*, Nag Hammadi Studies VII (Leiden 1975) 108-112; F. Decret, *Mani* (Paris 1974) 48-55; K. Rudolph, Die Bedeutung des Kölner Mani-Codex für die Manichäismuskforschung, *Mélanges d’histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris 1974) 471-486; Antike Baptisten, *Sitzungsberichte Leipzig*, phil.-hist. Kl. 1214 (Berlin 1981) 13-17; L. Cirillo, *Elchasai e gli Elchasaiti* (Cosenza 1984).

⁷⁹ 40,11-17 (J. Ménard, *L’Exposé Valentinien. Les Fragments sur le Baptême et sur l’Eucharistie*, Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, “Textes” 14 [Québec 1985] 56 [text] and 57 [translation]). In general, unction seems to have been more important than baptism in gnosticism; refer to Rudolph, *Gnosis* 228-29. The Nag Hammadi fragment above seems

to presuppose that unction precedes baptism since this very fragment is followed by two fragments on baptism.

⁸⁰ MacDonald, 61-62, notes this passage and the preceding passage in reference to “trampling on the powers of darkness.” However, he incorrectly uses it as evidence for the pre-baptismal ceremony of exorcism. Baptism is not mentioned at all.

⁸¹ 97,2-10 (R. Bullard, *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, Patristische Texte und Studien 10 [Berlin 1970] 40-41). We are reminded here of the *Odes of Solomon*, where unction gives the power to ascend; see above, p. 128.

⁸² *Strom.* 3, 13, 92 (O. Stählin [ed.], *Clemens Alexandrinus, Werke* II, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 15, new edition by L. Früchtel [Berlin 1962] 238). MacDonald, 30-39, argues that this passage is reminiscent of Gen. 1-3: the garment of shame refers to the “coats of skins” in Gen. 3,21, behind the notion of two becoming one is Gen. 2,24, and Gen. 1,27 is in the background of “neither male and female”. Thus MacDonald concludes that the garment of shame is the body, and the two becoming one and “neither male and female” means a return to the primordial sexless androgyne. He, however, incorrectly understands the “performative setting” of this “Dominical Saying” to be baptism; see especially 50-63.

⁸³ For a similar view of the shameful of intercourse, see *Acts of Thomas* ch. 14, which tells of a bride who is unashamed, because she has taken to herself the “incorruptible Bridegroom”; she cries out, “the veil of corruption is taken away from me; and that I am not ashamed, (is) because the deed of shame has been removed far from me...and that this deed of corruption is despised by me, and the spoils of this wedding-feast that passes away, (is) because I am invited to the true wedding-feast; and that I have not had intercourse with a husband, the end whereof is bitter repentance, (is) because I am betrothed to the true Husband” (Wright, I, 182-183, and II, 157; Bonnet, 120). The notion that sexual intercourse was to be associated with the Fall was not uncommon in Christian circles; see Tert. *De monog.* 5; Iren. *Adv. haer.* 3,23,5; *Acts of Thomas* chs. 43-44; Ephrem, *In Gen. et in Exod.* ch. 30; John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 4,2; *Liber Graduum* 20,6.

⁸⁴ In fact, T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* II/2 (1892) 634, suggests that this passage should be translated: “when...would come to pass.”

⁸⁵ 12,1-2 (K. Lake [ed. and trans.], *The Apostolic Fathers* I, The Loeb Classical Library [London and Cambridge, Mass., 1912 and reprints] 146-147). A quite similar saying is found in the *Gospel of Thomas* log. 22. Cf. also *Acts of Peter* ch. 38; *Acts of Philip* ch. 140. W. Meeks, *The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity*, *History of Religions* 13 (1974) 207, may be right that Gal. 3,27-28 shows that the difference of gender was dissolved in baptism, but Davies, 132, is not justified in his opinion that this holds true also for *Thomas* log. 22. Whatever the relation between Gal. 3,28 and *Thomas*, logia 22 and 37 are closer to the passages in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and *2 Clement*, where the setting is eschatological and not baptismal.

⁸⁶ See now Blatz, 97.

⁸⁷ Quispel, *Thomas Revisited* 265, attributes both these logia to the *Gospel of the Egyptians* “or another Encratite source”. In logion 4, which Quispel also wants to assign to the encratite source, it is said that an old man may ask “a small child seven days old about the place of life” in order to live.

⁸⁸ See *Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrus-Fragment der Acta Pauli*, *Frühkirche* 195.

⁸⁹ *Adv. haer.* 3,22,4 (A. Stieren [ed.], *Irenaeus, Adversus haereses* 2 [Leipzig 1853] 545).

⁹⁰ *Demonstratio* ch. 12 (J. Smith [ed. and trans.], *St. Irenaeus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, Ancient Christian Writers 16 [London 1952] 56).

⁹¹ *Ad Autolyicum* 2,25 (R. M. Grant [ed. and trans.], *Theophilus of Antioch ad Autolyicum*, Oxford Early Christian Texts [Oxford 1970] 66 [text] and 67 [translation]).

⁹² *Prot.* 11,111,1 (C. Mondésert [ed. and trans.], *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Protreptique*. Sources Chrétiennes [Paris 1949] 179 [text] and 178 [translation]).

⁹³ H. Kee, "Becoming a Child" in the Gospel of Thomas, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963) 307-314, does not know the tradition that Adam was an innocent child before the Fall, but takes a clue from the association in log. 22 of the idea of little children with that of the single one, which A. F. J. Klijn, The "Single One" in the Gospel of Thomas, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962) 271-278, derives from Jewish speculation about Adam before the Fall. This "singleness" of Adam included asexuality. Thus Kee is able to interpret the image of little children as referring to "what Adam was in the beginning, a being of childlike asexual innocence" (311; italics ours).

^{93a} Smith, 234, notes the eschatological connotation, but does not explore the connection between the *question* and the *conditions of the answer*.

⁹⁴ It is surprising that Smith and his followers have not noted that there are a few texts which teach that the newly baptized were granted a vision of Christ; see *Acts of Peter* ch. 5; *Acts of Thomas* ch. 27 (Syriac text only). See further Peterson, Bemerkungen 193-196; A. F. J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum V (Leiden 1962) 211-212. There can be no doubt, however, that this is an adaptation of the *visio dei* motif.

⁹⁵ See C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven* (London 1982).

⁹⁶ 13-14 (*Philo* II, 334-335).

⁹⁷ 7 (*Philo* V, 144-45).

⁹⁸ 9 (*ibid.*, 146-47).

⁹⁹ *De fuga*. 165 (*ibid.*, 100-101).

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* Cf. *De post. Caini* 169 (*Philo* II, 428-429).

¹⁰¹ *Leg. all.* 3,52 (*Philo* I, 334-337).

¹⁰² *Leg. all.* 3,49 (*ibid.*, 332-333).

¹⁰³ *Leg. all.* 3,54 (*ibid.*, 336-337).

¹⁰⁴ *Leg. all.* 3,42 (*ibid.*, 328-329).

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ F. I. Anderson in the introduction to 2 *Enoch* in Charlesworth (ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 1 91, 94-97, suggests the late first century C.E. as a date for this text. We even venture to suggest a pre-70 date because 51,4 admonishes people to pray in the Temple three times daily. For this Jewish custom, see Dan. 6,11 and Acts 3,1.

¹⁰⁷ We will discuss the theme of being unafraid in the next section (3b).

¹⁰⁸ 2 *Enoch* 22,7-10.

¹⁰⁹ A second century C.E. date is given to the vision by M. A. Knibb, in the introduction to the work in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha* 2 150.

¹¹⁰ 7,5-8; 6,10-13; 8,11-14.

¹¹¹ 7,4-5.

¹¹² 7,5-6.

¹¹³ 9,2.

¹¹⁴ 9,9.

¹¹⁵ 9,37.

¹¹⁶ 11,35.

¹¹⁷ 108-113 (Wright, I 274-279, and II 238-245; Bonnet 219-224).

¹¹⁸ See Quispel, *Makarius* 57-60, who suggests that the concept of the robe derives from 2 Cor. 5,3. Cf. above, p. 130. MacDonald, 56, gives a similar interpretation of this hymn, but without citing Quispel.

¹¹⁹ 9,1-2.

¹²⁰ 25,3.

¹²¹ 26,1.

¹²² 14,14-15.

¹²³ 14,15-21.

¹²⁴ 14,24.

¹²⁵ Chs. 22-24. Note that the anointing in this text takes place in heaven; the same is seen in *Ode* 36; see n. 47. What is important, however, is the common nexus of motifs: stripping, anointing, ascension, elimination of fear, and seeing God.

¹²⁶ See above, p. 128 with n. 47.

Department of Near Eastern Studies
The University of Michigan
3074 Frieze Building
Ann Arbor
Michigan 48109-1285
U.S.A.