

THE “MOVEMENT AND REST” IN GOSPEL OF THOMAS 50

BENJAMIN LENSINK

Abstract. The fiftieth logion of the *Gospel of Thomas* is an enigmatic triad of questions and answers told by Jesus to his disciples. The answer to the third question “What is the sign of your (pl) Father which is in you (pl)?” reads “it is movement and rest.” This phrase has no known parallels in similar literature and its meaning is unclear. The current article evaluates different explanations offered in recent scholarship before assessing the words “movement” and “rest” in the *Gospel of Thomas* as a whole. It then gives an overview of four possible contexts: Genesis, Jewish Hermeticism, Platonism, and Aristotelianism. The article concludes with claiming that a Platonist view makes most sense: Just as the Demiurge in Plato’s *Timaeus* placed the rotating soul – which moves while staying at rest – into the head of humankind, so the sign of the Father in his elect disciples is movement and rest.

Keywords: Gospel of Thomas, Movement, Rest, Plato, Platonism, Genesis, Jewish Hermeticism, Aristotelianism.

1. Introduction

Because of the nature of the *Gospel of Thomas* (*GosThom*), where Jesus’ sayings are recorded often without context, it is a challenging task to interpret individual sayings.¹ Logion 50 is a good example. It is a triad of questions and answers told by Jesus to his disciples to prepare them for an interrogative confrontation with outsiders or heavenly powers, either during their earthly lives or *post mortem*.² The language used in this logion can be connected to language used

¹ I have written this paper during a one-semester stay at the University of Regensburg. I would like to thank Anna Oracz, PhD candidate at the faculty for Theology in Regensburg, for her many helpful comments and suggestions, and Professor Tobias Nicklas, Professor for the Exegesis and Hermeneutics of the New Testament in Regensburg, for his help with publishing. Any inaccuracies and mistakes are of course mine.

² There are three main lines of interpretation: (1) DeConick proposes a mystical ascent in the present: A. D. DECONICK, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*, (Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 33), Brill, Leiden, 1996, 43–99. (2) Gathercole argues for a post mortem ascent: S. GATHERCOLE, “*Quis et unde? Heavenly Obstacles in Gos. Thom. 50 and Related Literature*”, in M. BOCKMUEHL and G. G. STROUMSA (ed.), *Paradise in Antiquity. Jewish and Christian Views*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010, 82–99. (3) Several

in the Old and New Testament, early Jewish texts, early Christian texts, and Graeco-Roman philosophy. There are many intra-textual links with other logia in the collection, for example because of matching terminology (e.g., light, rest, image). At the same time, there is a link with the prologue of the *GosThom*; Logion 50 is an enigmatic logion, and “whoever finds the meaning of these words will not taste death.” It reads as follows:

50,1 Jesus said: “when they say to you (pl): ‘from where have you (pl) come?’ say to them: ‘We have come from the light, the place from which the light came into being on its own accord and stood alone and it revealed (itself?) in their image.’”³
 50,2 When they say to you (pl): ‘Are you (pl) it?’, say: ‘we are his children and we are the elect of the living Father.’ 50,3 When they ask you (pl): ‘What is the sign of your (pl) Father which is in you (pl)?’ (ΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΜΔΕΙΝ ΜΠΕΤΝΝΕΙΩΤ ΕΤΘΝ ΤΗΥΤΝ) say to them: ‘it is movement and rest’ (ΟΥΚΙΜ ΠΕ ΜΝ ΟΥΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ).”⁴

The last answer, in 50,3, “it is movement and rest,” has no known parallels in similar literature.⁵ In this article, I review the explanations already offered and propose several additional possible interpretations to answer the question “How can the phrase ‘it is movement and rest’ in *GosThom* 50,3 best be interpreted?” To

other scholars interpret the logion relating to social conflict: Valantatis interprets the saying as a preparation for conflict with outsiders: R. VALANTASIS, *The Gospel of Thomas*, Routledge, London, 1997, 127–129. Turner sees a gnostic missionary briefing in this logion: H. W. MONTEFIORE and H. E. W. TURNER, *Thomas and the Evangelists*, SCM Press, London, 1960, 86. Marjanen argues for an instruction given to the disciples for when they have to explain their identity to other people and groups: A. MARJANEN, *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 40), Brill, Leiden, 1996, 34, esp. n. 8.

- ³ This mention of “their image” without clear reference who the “they” might be has led to much speculation. The best solution in my opinion is offered by Tornau, who notes that the Greek third person reflexive pronomina ἑαυτοῦ, ἑαυτῶν etc. could also be used for the first and second person, especially in *koine* Greek. It is likely that the translator of the Coptic either was not aware of this, or that he/she misinterpreted the saying and thus translated ΤΟΥΘΙΚΩΝ, “their image,” instead of the more logical ΝΕΝΘΙΚΩΝ “our image.” C. TORNAU, „Die neuplatonische Kritik an den Gnostikern und das theologische Profil des Thomasevangeliums“, in J. FREY, E. E. POPKES, and J. SCHRÖTER (ed.), *Das Thomasevangelium. Entstehung – Rezeption – Theologie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 157) De Gruyter, Berlin, 2008, 327–359. For the translation of *GosThom* 50,1, see esp. the appendix on p. 358–359: *Zur Übersetzung von EvThom 50,1, NHC II,2, p. 42,1.*
- ⁴ I used the Coptic edition from Layton for my translation: B. LAYTON, *The Coptic Gnostic Library, Nag Hammadi Codex II,2–7* (Nag Hammadi Studies 20), Brill, Leiden, 1989, 72.
- ⁵ Cf. e.g., S. GATHERCOLE, *The Gospel of Thomas. Introduction and Commentary* (Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 11), Brill, Leiden, 2018, 409: “As far as I am aware, there is no parallel in heavenly ascents to this particular answer.”

do so, I first give an overview of previous interpretative proposals, then assess how both “movement” (ΚΙΜ) and “rest” (ἀναπαύσις) are used in the *GosThom*, to then discuss in more detail the different possible interpretations. I conclude the paper by giving my own reading.

I approach the text of the *GosThom* synchronically in this paper.⁶ That is to say, the starting point of my analysis is the second-century context of the Gospel in the way it is known to us from the Greek fragments and Coptic version.⁷

2. Previous Research

In general, there are four different approaches taken by scholars to interpret the last answer “it is movement and rest.” They focus on either (1) later uses of similar terminology in the Nag Hammadi-corpus and “Gnosticism,”⁸ (2) earlier Graeco-Roman uses of similar terminology, or (3) earlier Jewish hermetic uses of similar terminology as main context of the saying in *GosThom* 50. There are also some scholars that (4) combine elements from several traditions. Here, I give an overview of their argumentations. I engage with them in a later stage.

(1) Many scholars who place “movement and rest” in a gnostic context are among the earlier interpreters of the *GosThom*. Vielhauer focuses on ἀνάπαυσις in the *GosThom* and couples it with gnostic ἀνάπαυσις-speculation, the idea of eschatological rest as goal of Gnosticism.⁹ He follows Haenchen to explain its

⁶ Cf. e.g., GATHERCOLE, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 24–34; I. MIROSHNIKOV, *The Gospel of Thomas and Plato. A study of the Impact of Platonism on the “Fifth Gospel,”* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 93), Brill, Leiden, 2018, 33–37; A. GAGNÉ, *The Gospel According to Thomas. Translation, Introduction and Commentary* (Apocryphes, Collection de poche de L’AELAC 16), Brepols, Turnhout, 2019. For arguments in favor of a diachronic approach, cf. esp. R. McL. WILSON, “Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels”, in *Expository Times* 72 (1960) 36–39; A. D. DECONICK, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation. With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel* (Library of New Testament Studies 287), T&T Clark, New York, 2006, 3–10.

⁷ Cf., on a thorough comparison of the Greek fragments and Coptic version of the *GosThom*, GATHERCOLE, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 14–24, esp. 23: “There are occasionally different nuances of meaning between a Greek fragment and its corresponding Coptic text, but these are not sufficient to prevent treating the text as witnesses to the same work. Rather, the similarities where the Coptic and Greek do overlap are sufficient to imply that the Coptic text *in substance* goes back to a second-century Greek original resembling our Oxyrhynchus fragments” (italics original).

⁸ Since this has become a troublesome term in the last few decades, I write it between quotation markers here. For a good overview of the issue of “Gnosticism,” especially in the *GosThom*, cf. A. MARJANEN, “Is Thomas a Gnostic gospel?” in R. URO, (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroads. Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*, T&T Clark, New York, 1998, 107–139.

⁹ Cf. e.g., P. VIELHAUER, „ANΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ. Zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomasevangeliums“, in W. ELTESTER and F. H. KEBTLER (ed.), *Apophoreta. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 30), De Gruyter, Berlin, 1964, 281–299. On ἀνάπαυσις in other Nag Hammadi texts, see e.g., J. HELDERMAN, *Die*

coupling with “movement” in Logion 50; Haenchen interprets “‘Bewegung’ als stets erneuertes Suchen und Finden, ‘Ruhe’ aber in der (immer wieder gewonnenen) Gewißheit, daß der Gnostiker ein Sohn des lebendigen Vaters ist und damit im Grunde jetzt schon der Welt und ihrer Unrast entnommen in der himmlischen Heimat weilt.”¹⁰

Trevijano Etcheverria goes in the same direction. He notes that ἀνάπαυσις is an important term for Valentinian Gnosticism and he explains κίμ as the movement from the Gnostics back to the Father, in the same way the Logos moves from the heavens to earth and back in the *Tripartite Tractate* (NHC I,5), and the movement of Barbelos, the first thought of the Father in the *Trimorphic Protennoia* (NHC XIII,1).¹¹ He does not concern himself with explaining how the two terms stand in relationship with one another in *GosThom* 50.¹²

(2) The second group of scholars, which focuses on Graeco-Roman contexts, explains “movement and rest” mostly as coming from Plato and Platonism. According to Patterson – the first scholar who connected *GosThom* 50 with Platonism – the coupling of “movement” with “rest” belongs “uniquely to the Middle Platonists.”¹³ He notes the multiple occasions in which movement (κίνησις) and rest (στάσις) are coupled in Plato’s works. He also discusses Philo’s usage of words within the semantic fields of “movement” and “rest.”

Gathercole mentions Plato’s *Parmenides* in his commentary on the *GosThom*, in which the One is both moving and at rest.¹⁴ He also briefly refers to Aristotle’s Unmoved Mover and Plotinus’ view of the intellect (Cf. *Enn.* 2.2.3), which moves and is at rest at the same time. He thus argues that *GosThom* 50 points at a paradoxical simultaneity of motion and rest.¹⁵

Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung des valentinianisch-gnostischen Heilsgutes der Ruhe im Evangelium Veritatis und in anderen Schriften der Nag Hammadi Bibliothek (Nag Hammadi Studies 18), Brill, Leiden, 1984.

¹⁰ E. HAENCHEN, *Die Botschaft des Thomasevangeliums*, Alfred Topelmann, Berlin, 1961, 79.

¹¹ R. TREVIJANO ETCHEVERRÍA, «La Reconversión De La Escatología En Protología (Evtom Log. 18, 19, 24, 49 Y 50)», in *Salmanticensis* 40.2 (1993) 133–163, 154–161.

¹² To these authors, one may add e.g., R. M. GRANT and D. N. FREEDMAN, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, Doubleday, New York, 1960; R. KASSER, *L’Évangile selon Thomas: Présentation et Commentaire Théologique*, Delachaux et Niestlé Neuchâtel, 1961; J.-É. MENARD, *L’Évangile selon Thomas* (Nag Hammadi Studies 5), Brill, Leiden, 1975.

¹³ S. J. PATTERSON, “Jesus Meets Plato: The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas and Middle Platonism”, in J. FREY, E. E. POPKES, and J. SCHRÖTER (ed.), *Das Thomasevangelium. Entstehung – Rezeption – Theologie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 157) De Gruyter, Berlin, 2008, 181–205.

¹⁴ *Parmenides* 145E: καὶ κινεῖσθαι καὶ ἐστάναι. Cf. GATHERCOLE, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 409.

¹⁵ GATHERCOLE, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 409–410; cf. also GATHERCOLE, “*Quis et unde?*” 82–99.

Another interpretation that follows a similar line is offered by Miroshnikov. In the chapter on stability in the *GosThom* and Platonists in his book *The Gospel of Thomas and Plato*, he argues that *GosThom* 50,1 reflects Platonist language of transcendental “standing.”¹⁶ This allows him to interpret *GosThom* 50,3 in the same vein. He refers to Numenius and Philo who both claim that God moves and rests at the same time. This form of “motionless motion,” as he calls it, is important for Miroshnikov’s interpretation of *GosThom* 50,3 because he sees the Light in 50,1 fulfilling the same function; it “stood” and then produced – which Miroshnikov sees as movement – the disciples.¹⁷ He concludes: “Thus, it is possible to surmise that ‘movement and repose’ refer to the dialectic nature of ultimate reality: its stability goes hand in hand with its creativity.”¹⁸

(3) DeConick is convinced that the whole of Logion 50 is best understood if it is placed in the context of Jewish Hermeticism and sees the Logion reflecting “pre-mortem ascent lore from the Jewish mystical tradition and passages from texts influenced by this tradition.”¹⁹ She thus interprets “movement and rest” in like manner, and is as far as I know the only scholar to date to propose this context as the most plausible.

(4) Grosso explains the “movement and rest” as a combination between Aristotle’s Unmoved Mover and Jewish-Hellenistic exegesis. He points to the creation story in Genesis where the Spirit is moving over the water (Gen 1,2), and where God rests after creating the earth (Gen 2,2). The movement could be either personal growth or a shift to a new mentality; he interprets the rest as the eschatological rest in the kingdom (Cf. *GosThom* 60,6; 86,2; 90,2).²⁰

3. The terms $\kappa\iota\mu$ and $\alpha\lambda\eta\lambda\alpha\gamma\iota\varsigma$ in the *GosThom*

3.1. The term $\kappa\iota\mu$

This word appears three times in the *GosThom*, in logia 19, 50, and 78. It is impossible to compare them with their Greek equivalents, since there are no extant Greek fragments of these logia. In both logion 19 and 78, $\kappa\iota\mu$ is used as a verbal form and indicates general movement. In logion 19,3 the word is used to indicate that the five trees that are in paradise “do not move in summer and winter” ($\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\kappa\iota\mu$

¹⁶ MIROSHNIKOV, 151–155.

¹⁷ MIROSHNIKOV follows the translation offered by Tornau, who sees “their image” as a mistake from the Coptic translator, cf. note 3 above.

¹⁸ MIROSHNIKOV, 158.

¹⁹ DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*, 43.

²⁰ M. GROSSO, *Vangelo secondo Tommaso. Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento*, Carocci Editore, Rome, 2011, 183–184.

AN N̄YWM M̄P̄RW). The use of the word in logion 78,1 is also used in the context of moving plants: “Jesus said: Because of what are you going out to the countryside? To see a reed that moves about in the wind?” (ENAG EΓKAW EΓKIM E[BOL] ZITM̄ PTHY).

KIM is used as a noun in logion 50,3. Crum offers several possible Greek *Vorlagen* of KIM as noun in his Coptic dictionary: κίνησις, σάλος, σεισμός, νεῦμα, and παλμός.²¹ According to both Patterson and Miroschnikov, the most probable *Vorlage* in *GosThom* 50,3 is κίνησις.²² I agree with them, because rather than a specific movement, such as σάλος “tossing motion of an earthquake”²³ and σεισμός, “shaking, shock, (...) earthquake,”²⁴ κίνησις is used to describe movement in more general terms, which makes the most sense for KIM in *GosThom* 50,3.

3.2. The term ἀναπαύσις

ἀναπαύσις is a Greek loanword and occurs four times in the Coptic *GosThom*, in logia 50, 51, 60, and 90. None of these logia have survived in Greek, but since it is a loanword, it is safe to assume that its *Vorlage* is the Greek word ἀνάπαυσις. It is best translated as either “rest” or “repose.”

There is some scholarly discussion on ἀναπαύσις in *GosThom* 51,1, where the disciples ask Jesus about “the rest of the dead” (ETANAΠAYCIC N̄NETMOOYT). Instead of ETANAΠAYCIC, Pokorný reads ETANACTACIC and thus translates “the resurrection of the dead.” He comments: “The word *resurrection* (Gr. *anastasis*) in part 1 is almost illegible. It may be that the Coptic scribe originally wrote ‘repose’ (Gr. *anapausis*), which has the same syllables at the beginning and end.”²⁵ This is strange, especially since the Coptic manuscript reads ἀναπαύσις rather clearly.²⁶ DeConick argues that it is likely that an older version of this logion read ἀναστασις, but that it was corrected to ἀναπαύσις at a later point in the development of the text. Thus, she says, “it is quite possible in my mind that the earliest form of the question in the Gospel was, ‘When will the resurrection of the dead take place?’”²⁷

²¹ W. E. CRUM, *A Coptic Dictionary*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1939, 108.

²² PATTERSON, 200; MIROSHNIKOV, 155.

²³ *LSJ*, s.v. σάλος 1. Italics original.

²⁴ *LSJ*, s.v. σεισμός 1. Italics original.

²⁵ P. POKORNÝ, *Commentary on the Gospel of Thomas: From Interpretations to the Interpreted* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 5), T&T Clark, New York, 2009, 96.

²⁶ Cf. S. FARID, *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Codex II*, Brill, Leiden, 1974.

²⁷ DECONICK, *The Original Gospel of Thomas*, 183.

Since I read the Gospel synchronically, and not diachronically as DeConick does, I see no need to emend the text because the text as is known to us reads ἀναπαύσις. The term here refers to an actualized eschatological state, because Jesus answers the disciples that the rest for the dead “has already come,” (ζητῶν ἀει), but they do not realize yet (*GosThom* 51,2). At the same time, it bears soteriological notions within itself, because the rest of the kingdom is already on earth (Cf. *GosThom* 113).²⁸

The occurrence of ἀναπαύσις in *GosThom* 60 comes at the end of the logion, in which Jesus tells his disciples that they should not be like a lamb carried by a Samaritan. Such an animal can get slaughtered and eaten. To prevent becoming a corpse and being eaten, Jesus advises his disciples in 60,6: “He said to them: ‘You yourselves, seek a place for yourselves into rest (εἰς ἀναπαύσις), so that you will not become corpses and are eaten.’” Here the rest is soteriological, because finding a place into rest will save the disciples from death.²⁹

The last occurrence of ἀναπαύσις is found in *GosThom* 90. A longer version of this logion has survived in Matt 11,28-30. It is a brief logion: “Jesus said: ‘come to me, because my yoke is gentle and my lordship is mild, and you will find rest (ἀγαθὰ {γ}πα{γ}σις) for yourselves.’” Here, Jesus himself is where the rest is found (cf. *GosThom* 60), and again this rest includes soteriological notions: when following Jesus – the σωτήρ *par excellence* – one will find rest.

The closest words to ἀνάπαυσις in the Greek fragments of the *GosThom* can be found in logion 2, where we find a middle third person imperative from the verb παύω at the beginning: μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζητῶν], “let him who se[eks] not stop.” In the Coptic version, this is rendered as μῆτρεϣλο ἡῖ πετϣινε, “let the one who seeks not stop,” with the negative causative infinitive μῆτρεϣλο from the verb λο meaning “to cease, stop,”³⁰ as translation of παυσάσθω. Further on in the Greek version of *GosThom* 2, Attridge reconstructs the verb ἐπαναπαύω: κα[ὶ βασιλεύσας ἐπαναπαύ]ῆσεται, “an[d having reigned] he will [rest].”³¹ This reconstruction is based on Clement of Alexandria, who writes in *Strom* 5.14.96: οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν, ἕως ἂν εὖρη εὐρών δὲ θαμβηθήσεται, θαμβηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαύῆσεται “the searching one will not rest until he finds, and when he finds, he will be astonished. When he is astonished, he will reign. Having reigned,

²⁸ Cf. here GATHERCOLE, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 412–413.

²⁹ DECONICK, *The Original Gospel of Thomas*, 199.

³⁰ TLA lemma no. C1547 (λο), in *Coptic Dictionary Online* (Koptische/Coptic Electronic Language and Literature International Alliance), <https://coptic-dictionary.org/entry.cgi?tla=C1547> (accessed 2021–20–02).

³¹ H. W. ATTRIDGE, “Appendix. The Greek Fragments”, in B. LAYTON (ed.), *The Coptic Gnostic Library, Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7* (Nag Hammadi Studies 20), Brill, Leiden, 1989, 95–130.

he will rest.”³² Sadly, however, this specific sentence at the end of *GosThom* 2 is not found in the Coptic version.

4. Possible interpretations of “movement and rest”

The pairing of κίνησις and ἀνάπαυσις in *GosThom* 50 is unusual, since the expected antonyms of κίνησις are στάσις and ἡμερία.³³ In antiquity, this close pairing only occurs once more, in the completely different context of the sleep of dolphins.³⁴ I will thus mainly focus on κίνησις as it is paired with στάσις or ἡμερία.

4.1. Genesis

A first possible context of the phrase “it is movement and rest” can be found in Genesis. Several scholars have already pointed at the importance of Genesis for the *GosThom* as a whole,³⁵ and a few mention Logion 50 in the context of the creation story in Gen 1,1–2,3.³⁶ These readings compare the movement and rest in *GosThom* 50,3 with the movement of God’s Spirit (καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, “and the Spirit of God was being carried above the water” Gen 1,2 LXX) and his rest on the seventh day (καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, “and he rested on the seventh day from all his works”

³² Clement himself says that he quoted this from the letter to the Hebrews. The Greek text is cited from L. FRÜCHTEL and O. STÄHLIN, *Clemens Alexandrinus, Bd. 2, Stromata Buch I-VI*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1960.

³³ PATTERSON, 204.

³⁴ Plutarch, *de Sull. Anim.* 979D-E: οὕτω δ’ ἐξυπνισθεὶς ἀναρροῖζει καὶ πάλιν ἄνω γενόμενος ἐνδίδωσι, καὶ φέρεται κινήσει τινα μεμιγμένην ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτῷ μηχανώμενος “Thus roused, it [the dolphin] goes whizzing up, and when it reaches the surface, again goes slack, devising for itself a kind of rest combined with motion.” Translation from: PLUTARCH, *Moralia, Volume XII: Concerning the Face Which Appears in the Orb of the Moon. On the Principle of Cold. Whether Fire or Water Is More Useful. Whether Land or Sea Animals Are Cleverer. Beasts Are Rational. On the Eating of Flesh*, H. CHERNISS and W. C. HELMBOLD (trans.) (Loeb Classical Library 406), Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1957.

³⁵ Cf. e.g., S. DAVIES, “The Christology and Protology of the ‘Gospel of Thomas’”, in *JBL* 111.4 (1992) 663–682; E. H. PAGELS, “Exegesis of Genesis 1 in the Gospels of Thomas and John”, in *JBL* 118.3 (1999) 477–496; I. DUNDERBERG, “From Thomas to Valentinus: Genesis Exegesis in Fragment 4 of Valentinus and its Relationship to the Gospel of Thomas”, in J. M. ASGEIRSSON, A. D. DECONICK, and R. URO (ed.), *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity. The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 59), Brill, Leiden, 2006, 221–237; A. J. DROGE, “Sabbath Work/Sabbath Rest: Genesis, Thomas, John”, in *History of Religions* 47.2/3 (2007) 112–141; M. LELYVELD, *Les Logia de la Vie dans l’Évangile selon Thomas. A la Recherche d’une Tradition et une Rédaction* (Nag Hammadi Studies 34) Brill, Leiden, 1987, shows that several Jewish views on Adam can be found in the *GosThom* (p. 27–30, 38–43, 49–54).

³⁶ DAVIES, 669–671; GROSSO, 183–184.

Gen 2,2 LXX). The “sign of the Father” in this context could possibly be explained against the backdrop of God giving a sign to Cain (σημεῖον, LXX Gen 4,15) to protect him after he killed his brother Abel out of jealousy.³⁷ This sign was a visible mark, that showed all people that Cain was set apart and was under God’s protection.

4.2. Jewish Hermeticism

The context of early Jewish hermeticism is most strongly advocated by DeConick in her book *Seek to See Him. Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*.³⁸ She wants to challenge the interpretation of *GosThom* 50 as a post-mortem ascent that scholars before her saw in the logion.³⁹ She chooses a different approach, “especially since no one has noted yet that this Logion also has striking affinities with fragments of pre-mortem ascent lore from the Jewish mystical tradition and passages from texts influenced by this tradition.”⁴⁰ Furthermore, post-mortem ascension accounts that share similarities with *GosThom* 50 are texts of a later date, and we can therefore not conclude that *GosThom* 50 also necessarily speaks of a post-mortem ascension.⁴¹ Therefore, she argues: “we must consider the possibility that Logion 50 is associated with the Jewish mystical tradition, specifically the teaching that the mystic will be interrogated during his pre-mortem ascent through the heavenly realms.”⁴² She focuses especially on Jewish apocalyptic and Hekhalot literature.⁴³

This in turn means that she approaches the “it is movement and rest” in this same context of Jewish mystical tradition: “I would argue that this coupling of ‘movement’ with ‘rest’ is the result of a reinterpretation of the Hermetic concept of

³⁷ The Coptic word which is used for “sign” in *GosThom* 50,3, ΜΑΕΙΝ, is the standard Coptic translation of σημεῖον. All 77 occurrences of the word σημεῖον in the NA28 are translated as ΜΑΕΙΝ in the Sahidic Coptic NT (Curiously, only the Coptic translation of the Gospel of John translates the plural σημεῖα with the plural ΜΑΙΝ).

³⁸ DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*. In this section of my paper, I focus on chapters three and four, in which she gives an excellent overview of parallel literature of the logion as a whole and of its specific elements.

³⁹ See notes 9, 10, 11, and 12 above for an (incomplete) list of scholars who see *GosThom* 50 reflecting a “Gnostic” post-mortem ascension.

⁴⁰ DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*, 44.

⁴¹ DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*, 44.

⁴² DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*, 55.

⁴³ She mentions the *Apocalypse of Abraham*; the *Testament of Abraham*; the *Life of Adam and Eve* 25–28; the *Apocalypse of Moses* 37–9; 3 *Baruch*; 1 *Enoch*; 2 *Enoch*; 3 *Enoch*; the *Ascension of Isaiah*; the *Testament of Levi* 2.6–5.3; the *Testament of Isaac*; and the *Assumption of Moses*.

God the Immovable who has set the world in motion.”⁴⁴ She draws similarities with the *Corpus Hermeticum*, for example 5.5, where the ascending person sees “the immovable [the cosmic order] set in movement (τὸν ἀκίνητον διακινούμενον),” or 2.6, where the text explains that everything that moves (πᾶν δὲ τὸ κινούμενον) moves in something at rest (ἐν εστῶτι), and this something is God the Mover (τὸ κινούv).⁴⁵ Applied to *GosThom* 50, DeConick summarizes:

What characterizes the worthy person ascending, according to Logion 50, is that he is not only part of the cosmic order of movement but also participates in God’s immobility, the state of rest. The verifying “sign” that he belongs to God’s elect is that he knows that even though he belongs to the created order, he also belongs to God. He participates in the nature of the Unmoved Mover. He contains the motion of the macrocosmos within himself while at the same time partaking of God’s rest.⁴⁶

4.3. Plato and Platonism

Approaching the *GosThom* with a Platonic view has been done before,⁴⁷ also in the context of *GosThom* 50,3.⁴⁸ Several motifs in the *GosThom* can be explained quite well by employing Platonic thought as backdrop.⁴⁹ Because the opposition of motion and rest (κίνησις and στάσις) was already a point of discussion in the pre-Socratics, it is no surprise that we find Plato discussing it as well.⁵⁰

In Plato’s works, the terms movement and rest are not necessarily opposites. This can for example be seen in the *Timaeus*. After the Demiurge created the world in a perfect spherical shape, he assigned it with movement:

⁴⁴ DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*, 93.

⁴⁵ For a more in-depth explanation, cf. DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*, 93–95.

⁴⁶ DECONICK, *Seek to See Him*, 95.

⁴⁷ Cf. e.g., H. M. JACKSON, *The Lion Becomes Man: The Gnostic Leontomorphic Creator and the Platonic Tradition* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 81), Scholars Press, Atlanta, 1985; R. URO, *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context of the Gospel of Thomas*, T&T Clark, London, 2003; L. ROIG LANZILLOTTA, “Gospel of Thomas Logion 7 Unravelling. An Intertextual Approach to a Locus Vexatus”, in M. BAUKS, W. HOROWITZ, and A. LANGE (ed.), *Between Text and Text: The Hermeneutics of Intertextuality in Ancient Cultures and Their Afterlife in Medieval and Modern Times*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 2015, 116–132; PATTERSON; MIROSHNIKOV, who gives an overview of the state of the art on pages 38–44.

⁴⁸ Cf. GATHERCOLE, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 409; PATTERSON, 200–204; MIROSHNIKOV, 155–158.

⁴⁹ A recent example is Miroshnikov, who in my opinion successfully explains several motifs in the *GosThom* by utilizing Platonist philosophy. One example is his explanation of “becoming one” in the *GosThom* against the backdrop of Platonist metaphysics as discussed in chapter 4 of MIROSHNIKOV, 91–129.

⁵⁰ GATHERCOLE, “*Quis et unde?*” 98. Cf. here also B. M. SATTLER, *The Concept of Motion in Ancient Greek Thought. Foundations in Logic, Method, and Mathematics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020.

κίνησιν γὰρ ἀπένειμεν αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ σώματος οἰκείαν, τῶν ἑπτὰ τὴν περὶ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν μάλιστα οὔσαν. διὸ δὴ κατὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιαγαγὼν αὐτὸ ἐποίησε κύκλῳ κινεῖσθαι στρεφόμενον, τὰς δὲ ἕξ ἀπάσας κινήσεις ἀφεῖλε καὶ ἀπλανῆς ἀπειργάσατο ἐκείνων. ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν περίοδον αὐτὴν ἅτ’ οὐδὲν ποδῶν δέον ἀσκελῆς καὶ ἄπουν αὐτὸ ἐγέννησεν.

For movement He assigned unto it that which is proper to its body, namely, that one of the seven motions which specially belongs to reason and intelligence; *wherefore He spun it round uniformly in the same spot and within itself and made it move revolving in a circle*; and all the other six motions He took away and fashioned it free from their aberrations. And seeing that for this revolving motion it had no need of feet, He begat it legless and footless (34A).⁵¹

From the seven different types of movement at the disposal of the Demiurge – forwards, backwards, left, right, upwards, downwards, and revolving movement – he chose the revolving movement, the movement (κίνησις) that belongs to reason and intelligence (περὶ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν). Thus, the world moves only “in the same spot and within itself” (ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιαγαγὼν). We might even say that the world moves while it at the same time is at rest.

The other types of movement are creating disorder and can be irregular. Circular movement on the other hand is stable. Because this motion is the only rational movement, Patterson argues that “this also meant for [Plato] that everything said to partake of the divine, rational nature, must be of like form and movement.”⁵² Therefore, the spheres in the universe are rotating; both the planets – who also orbit around the earth in circular motion (38C-E) – and the stars (40A-B). At the same time, the rational human soul (ψυχή) is also spherical and spinning, filling the spherical form of the head (44D), as microcosm reflecting the rational part of the macrocosm. Thus, the spinning sphere, which moves while staying perfectly still, was “the physical basis for Plato’s rational universe.”⁵³

Plato thematizes motion and rest – κίνησις and στάσις – in other works as well, most notably in his *Sophist*, where the terms function to discuss opposition.⁵⁴ In the *Parmenides*, Plato describes the One as being “both moving and resting” (κινεῖσθαι τε καὶ ἐστάναι, 146A).

⁵¹ Translation taken from PLATO, *Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles*, R. G. BURY (trans.) (Loeb Classical Library 234), Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1929. Italics are mine.

⁵² PATTERSON, 201.

⁵³ PATTERSON, 202.

⁵⁴ Cf. on movement and rest in the *Sophist* SATTLER, 202–244; D. AMBUEL, “Difference in Kind: Observations on the Distinction of the Megista Gene”, in B. BOSSI and T. M. ROBINSON (ed.), *Plato’s ‘Sophist’ Revisited* (Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes 19), De Gruyter, Berlin, 2013, 247–267, esp. 252–257.

Later Platonist authors such as Plotinus, as well as authors who sympathized with Platonism such as Philo,⁵⁵ used similar language. Plotinus, in his fourteenth treatise called *On the Movement of Heaven* or *On the Circular Motion*, asks himself the question why the heaven moves in circular motion. In brief, he argues that “the life of the body is movement” (καὶ γὰρ σώματος ζωὴ κίνησις, *Enn.* 2.2.1).⁵⁶ In moving, the heaven rotates because “if it does not move in a circle, going on in a straight line will dissipate it; so it must move in a circle” (δεῖ ἄρα κύκλῳ, *Enn.* 2.2.1.). Circular movement needs no space other than the space that it occupies itself, and thus by moving in circles, the universe (τὸ πᾶν) can move while being at rest, in the same way as the intellect (νοῦς):

Ὁ δὲ νοῦς οὕτω κινεῖται· ἔστηκε γὰρ καὶ κινεῖται· περὶ αὐτὸν γάρ. Οὕτως οὖν καὶ τὸ πᾶν τῷ κύκλῳ κινεῖται ἅμα καὶ ἔστηκεν.

This is how intellect is moved; *it is both at rest and in motion*; for it moves around Him [the Good]. So, then, the universe, too, *both moves in its circle and is at rest*.

Philo also treats movement and rest, and in *On Abraham 27* even contrasts κίνησις with ἀνάπαυσις. In this part of his text he speaks of Noah, who can be called both “just” (δίκαιος) and “rest” (ἀνάπαυσις). Noah can be called “just” because this is the best virtue. The name “rest” is also applicable:

ἢ δ’ ἀνάπαυσις, ἐπεὶ καὶ τούναντίον τὴν παρὰ φύσιν κίνησιν ταραχῶν καὶ θορύβων στάσεών τε καὶ πολέμων αἰτίαν εἶναι συμβέβηκεν, ἦν μετῴσιν οἱ φαῦλοι, ἡρεμαῖον δὲ καὶ ἡσυχάζοντα καὶ σταθερὸν ἔτι δὲ καὶ εἰρηνικὸν βίον οἱ καλοκάγαθιαν τετιμηκότες

But “rest” is appropriate also, since its opposite, unnatural movement, proves to be the cause of turmoil and confusion and factions and wars. Such movement is sought by the worthless, while a life which is calm, serene, tranquil and peaceful to boot is the object of those who have valued nobility of conduct.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ I am aware that I discuss Philo’s works under the header “Plato and Platonism,” but that this categorization is not without discussion. For that reason, I speak of him here as author sympathizing with Platonism. For an argument to see Philo as “Platonizing exegete of scripture,” cf. D. T. RUNIA, “Was Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited”, in *Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993) 112–140. For a view of Philo as Middle Platonist, cf. MIROSHNIKOV, 14–16.

⁵⁶ All Greek quotes and English translations of Plotinus’ *Enneads* in this section are taken from PLOTINUS, *Ennead, Volume II*, A. H. ARMSTRONG (trans.) (Loeb Classical Library 441), Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1966.

⁵⁷ Taken from PHILO, *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses*, F. H. COLSON (trans.) (Loeb Classical Library 289), Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1935.

Philo here contrasts rest (ἀνάπαυσις) and its opposite (τὸναντίον) unnatural movement (τὴν παρὰ φύσιν κίνησιν). According to Miroshnikov, “Philo associates Repose [ἀνάπαυσις] with peacefulness and steadfastness; just like he contrasts repose with movement, so also he contrasts peacefulness with wars and steadfastness with riots.”⁵⁸

In another passage, in *On the Posterity and Exile of Cain* 28, Philo makes a similar point:

τό γε μὴν χρησθὲν τῷ πανσόφῳ Μωυσῆ λόγιον ἐναργέστατα δηλοῖ τὴν περὶ τὸν σπουδαῖον βεβαιοτάτην εὐστάθειαν, ἔστι δὲ τὸ λόγιον τοιόνδε· “σὺ δὲ αὐτοῦ στήθι μετ’ ἐμοῦ.” ἐξ οὐδύο παρίσταται, ἐν μὲν ὅτι τὸ ὄν τὸ τὰ ἄλλα κινεῖν καὶ τρέπον ἀκίνητόν τε καὶ ἄτρεπτον, ἕτερον δ’ ὅτι τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φύσεως, ἡρεμίας, τῷ σπουδαίῳ μεταδίδωσιν

But what shows in the clearest light the firm steadfastness of the man of worth is the oracle communicated to the all-wise Moses which runs thus: “But as for thee stand thou here by Me” (Deut 5,31). This oracle proves two things, one that the Existent Being who moves and turns all else is Himself exempt from movement and turning; and secondly that He makes the worthy man sharer of His own Nature, which is repose.⁵⁹

Here the creation is in motion (κίνησις), but God is stability (στάσις). He moves and turns everything but is himself free of movement. By quoting Deuteronomy, Philo shows that humankind can share in this stability, the repose (ἡρεμία) of God. But God is not always standing still necessarily, and there is room for God to maneuver. In *The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain* 68 God does move, but his movement is different than the movement of travelers:

οὐ γάρ φησιν “ᾧδε ἐγὼ στήσομαι καὶ ἐκεῖ,” ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν ὅτε πάρεμι ἔστηκα κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν | χρόνον κάκειθι, ἀλλ’ οὐ μεταβατικῶς κινούμενος, ὡς τὸν μὲν ἐπιλαμβάνειν τὸν δὲ ἀπολείπειν τόπον, ἀλλὰ τονικῆ χρώμενος τῇ κινήσει.

For He does not say “I will stand here and there,” but even now, when I am present here, I stand at the same time there also. My motion is not one of transference in space, where the traveller leaves one place when he occupies another, but it is a motion of self-extension and self-expansion.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ MIROSHNIKOV, 156.

⁵⁹ Taken from PHILO, *On the Cherubim. The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain. The Worse Attacks the Better. On the Posterity and Exile of Cain. On the Giants*, F. H. COLSON and G. H. WHITAKER (trans.) (Loeb Classical Library 227), Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1929.

⁶⁰ Taken from PHILO, *The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain*.

This movement is thus not like a journey, to leave from one place and arrive at another. This would not fit into Philo's view of God as omnipresent. Instead, this tonic movement (τονική κίνησις) "is a type of movement that is compatible with immovability."⁶¹

Concludingly, the rotation of the world and human intellect are central notions in Plato's *Timaeus*. The intellect, set in circular motion by the Demiurge, rests in one place. This paradoxical relationship between movement and rest is developed by Plotinus who explicitly acknowledges the paradox (κινεῖται ἅμα καὶ ἔστηκεν, *Enn.* 2.2.3.). The two terms are also important for Philo. It seems from *de Post.* 28 that God is incapable of movement and only functions as a kind of Unmoved Mover, of which I speak in the following part of this paper. However, he at the same time in *de Sacr.* 68 says that God is able to move, albeit not in the way we as humans do. Ultimately, true rest can only be found by God.

4.4. Aristotle

A few scholars see parallels between Aristotelian kinetic theory and *GosThom* 50,3. Grosso briefly comments on *GosThom* 50,3 and makes a connection between Aristotle's Unmoved Mover and Genesis with the Father as Unmoved Mover, whose attributes are movement and rest, as can be seen in Genesis.⁶² Pokorný refers to *Metaphysics* 12.7.1072b,⁶³ one of the passages where Aristotle describes the role of the Unmoved mover:

εἰ μὲν οὖν τι κινεῖται, ἐνδέχεται καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν· ὥστ' εἰ [ἡ] φορὰ πρώτη ἢ ἐνέργειά ἐστιν, ἢ κινεῖται ταύτη γ' ἐνδέχεται ἄλλως ἔχειν, κατὰ τόπον, καὶ εἰ μὴ κατ' οὐσίαν. ἐπει δ' ἔστι τι κινεῖται αὐτὸ ἀκίνητον ὄν, ἐνέργεια ὄν, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐνδέχεται ἄλλως ἔχειν οὐδαμῶς. φορὰ γὰρ ἢ πρώτη τῶν μεταβολῶν, ταύτης δὲ ἢ κύκλω· ταύτην δὲ τοῦτο κινεῖ. ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἄρα ἐστὶν ὄν· καὶ ἢ ἀνάγκη, καλῶς, καὶ οὕτως ἀρχή.

Now if a thing is moved, it can be otherwise than it is. Therefore if the actuality of "the heaven" is primary locomotion, then in so far as "the heaven" is moved, in this respect at least it is possible for it to be otherwise; i.e. in respect of place, even if not of substantiality. But since there is something—X—which moves while being itself

⁶¹ MIROSHNIKOV, 158, where he also shows that τονική κίνησις is a Stoic expression.

⁶² GROSSO, 184: "Il terzo segmento fornisce un'ulteriore caratterizzazione del Padre, indicandone quali attributi precipui il 'movimento' e il 'riposo.' Tale definizione discende dall'incrocio della tradizione di matrice aristotelica sul 'motore immobile' con l'esegesi guidaico-ellenistica del racconto della creazione, in riferimento al muoversi dello spirito di Dio sulle acque (Gen 1:2) e al riposo del settimo giorno (Gen 2:2-3)." On a connection between *GosThom* 50,3 and Aristotle's Unmoved Mover, cf. also GRANT and FREEMAN, 161; F. F. BRUCE, *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1984, 133 n. 38.

⁶³ POKORNÝ, 95.

unmoved, existing actually, X cannot be otherwise in any respect. For the primary kind of change is locomotion, and of locomotion circular locomotion; and this is the motion which X induces. Thus X is necessarily existent; and qua necessary it is good, and is in this sense a first principle.⁶⁴

The “something which moves while being itself unmoved” (τι κινουῦν αὐτὸ ἀκίνητον ὄν), is the Unmoved Mover, an element in Aristotle’s kinetic theory. He distinguishes between two types of movement: circular and rectilinear. All other movements are a mix between these two. Of these types, the circular movement is more important because it can be eternal, without beginning and end. A good example of such movement is the movement of planets and stars. This movement has no beginning:

motion and change in the universe can have no beginning, because the occurrence of change presupposes a previous process of change. With this argument Aristotle can establish an eternal chain of motions and refute the claim that there could have been a previously stationary state of the universe. But the eternal presence of motion in the universe, Aristotle argues, needs to rely on an eternal cause that guarantees its persistence.⁶⁵

This eternal cause is the reason a moved object moves, because “everything moved is moved by a mover which is in immediate contact with what is moved.”⁶⁶ All movement is dependent on this mover, that can be either an internal or external force. In living beings, the mover is internal, and in inanimate objects the mover is external. This mover, without itself being moved – if it would be moved, this mover would need an external force for it to be moved, *ad infinitum* – Aristotle calls the Unmoved Mover, or ‘that which moves without being moved’ (ὁ οὐ κινούμενον κινεῖ, *Meta.* 12.7.1072a).⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Taken from ARISTOTLE, *Metaphysics, Volume II: Books 10-14. Oeconomica. Magna Moralia*, H. TREDENNICK and G. C. ARMSTRONG (trans.) (Loeb Classical Library 287), Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1935.

⁶⁵ I. BODNÁR and P. PELLEGRIN, “Aristotle’s Physics and Cosmology”, in M. L. GILL and P. PELLEGRIN (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy* (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy), Blackwell, Oxford, 2006, 270–291, 282.

⁶⁶ BODNÁR and PELLEGRIN, 283.

⁶⁷ The descriptions in his works are not consistent: “[W]hat we hear in *Met.* Λ.6 is that the mover moves as an object of love and striving, which comes perilously close to abandoning the claims of *Physics* VIII about an unmoved mover which is an efficient cause of the motions of the cosmos,” BODNÁR and PELLEGRIN, 290. Cf. also on the Unmoved Mover L. JUDSON, “Heavenly motion and the unmoved mover”, in M. L. GILL and J. G. LENNOX (ed.), *Self-motion: From Aristotle to Newton*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994, 155–171; M. GABRIEL, “God’s Transcendental Activity: Ontotheology in *Metaphysics* 12”, in *The Review of Metaphysics* 63.2

In the context of *GosThom* 50,3, this would mean that the sign of the Father is the movement that he gives to humanity as Unmoved Mover and first principle (ἀρχή, *Meta.* 12.7.1072b) of the universe.

5. Conclusion

It might be possible that Genesis played a role in the statement “it is movement and rest,” but then it is hard to explain why it should be the sign of the Father. I am not completely convinced by my suggestion that it should be found in the sign given to Cain in Genesis 4 because this sign is given by God to protect Cain after he committed a sin; killing his brother.

The other three traditions that I chose to include, Jewish hermetic tradition, Platonism, and Aristotle, are closer to what we find in *GosThom* 50,3. Two aspects make it hard to choose between these three. (1) The scholarly tendency to categorize should be taken into account. It is compelling to choose one category I mentioned above, but it might very well be a mix of several elements and traditions that led to the creation of *GosThom* 50,3. (2) This is then exactly what happens with Jewish Hermeticism, because that tradition uses language that we find in both Plato and Aristotle; it speaks of an Unmoved Mover, *à la* Aristotle, and at the same time bears many elements within itself resembling Platonism, e.g., everything that moves, moves in something at rest.

On the basis of this, it might be possible that the Jewish hermetic tradition functioned as mediator between Plato and Aristotle on the one hand and the *GosThom* on the other. This is of course extremely hard to solidify or to falsify. Other elements are easier to explain.

First, a direct connection between the *GosThom* and Aristotle seems unlikely to me because Aristotle’s Unmoved Mover can explain movement because it causes to move, but I do not think that it also grants rest: “movement is not something that can continue to exist by itself, since its existence depends on the persistence of the action of the mover. Rest, and most particularly, natural rest, on the contrary, is, according to Aristotle, a *state*.”⁶⁸ So Aristotle’s Unmoved Mover only grants movement to that which it moves. Rest is not something that can be actively given by it. In the *GosThom*, on the other hand, the sign of the Father entails both movement *and* rest.

Second, Plato speaks extensively on movement in his *Timaeus*, one of his most-read and well-known works. The human soul (ψυχή) rotates while staying at

(2009) 385–414; I. BODNÁR, “Aristotle’s Natural Philosophy”, in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2018, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-natphil/> (Accessed 2021–02–28).

⁶⁸ BODNÁR and PELLEGRIN, 284. Italics original.

rest. It is the immortal part of the human composition.⁶⁹ When compared to *GosThom* 50,3 “When they ask you (pl): ‘What is the sign of your (pl) Father which is in you?’, say to them: ‘it is movement and rest,’” I suspect that it very well might be the case that the sign of the Father is this ψυχή. Just as the Demiurge placed the ψυχή into (εἰς) the human head (Plato, *Timaeus* 44D), which moves in circles while staying in one place, so the Father gives the elect disciples movement and rest in (ἐτᾶν) them as his sign. If this is the case, then I do not think that it is necessary to include Jewish hermetic tradition to explain *GosThom* 50,3.

Benjamin LENSINK
Faculty for Theology and Religious Studies
University of Groningen
The Netherlands

⁶⁹ S. BROADIE, *Nature and Divinity in Plato's Timaeus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011, 84–114.

Bibliography

- AMBUEL, David, "Difference in Kind: Observations on the Distinction of the *Megista Gene*." Pages 247–267 in *Plato's 'Sophist' Revisited*. Edited by Beatriz BOSSI and Thomas M. ROBINSON. Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes 19. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
- ARISTOTLE. *Metaphysics, Volume II: Books 10-14. Oeconomica. Magna Moralia*. Translated by Hugh TREDENNICK and G. Cyril ARMSTRONG. Loeb Classical Library 287. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- ATTRIDGE, Harold W, "Appendix. The Greek Fragments." Pages 95–130 in *The Coptic Gnostic Library, Nag Hammadi Codex II,2–7*. Edited by Bentley LAYTON. Nag Hammadi Studies XX. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- BODNÁR, István and Pierre PELLEGRIN, "Aristotle's Physics and Cosmology." Pages 270–291 in *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Edited by Mary Louise GILL and Pierre PELLEGRIN. Blackwell Companions to Philosophy. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- BODNÁR, István, "Aristotle's Natural Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2018. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-natphil/> (Accessed 2021–02–28).
- BROADIE, Sarah, *Nature and Divinity in Plato's Timaeus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- CRUM, W. E., *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
- DAVIES, Stevan, "The Christology and Protology of the 'Gospel of Thomas'." *JBL* 111.4 (1992): 663–682.
- DECONICK, April D., *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*, Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- DECONICK, April D., *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation. With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel*. Library of New Testament Studies 287. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- DROGE, A. J., "Sabbath Work/Sabbath Rest: Genesis, Thomas, John." *History of Religions* 47.2/3 (2007): 112–141.
- DUNDERBERG, Ismo, "From Thomas to Valentinus: Genesis Exegesis in Fragment 4 of Valentinus and its Relationship to the *Gospel of Thomas*." Pages 221–237 in *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity. The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas*. Edited by Jon Ma. ASGEIRSSON, April D. DECONICK, and Risto URO. Nag Hammadi and Manichaeic Studies 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- FARID, Shafik, *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Codex II*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- FRÜCHTEL, Ludwig and Otto STÄHLIN, *Clemens Alexandrinus, Bd. 2, Stromata Buch I-VI*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960.
- GABRIEL, Markus, "God's Transcendental Activity: Ontotheology in *Metaphysics* 12." *The Review of Metaphysics* 63.2 (2009): 385–414.
- GAGNÉ, André, *The Gospel According to Thomas. Translation, Introduction and Commentary*, Apocryphes, Collection de poche de L'AELAC 16. Turnhout: Brepolis, 2019.

- GATHERCOLE, Simon, “*Quis et unde? Heavenly Obstacles in Gos. Thom. 50 and Related Literature.*” Pages 82–99 in *Paradise in Antiquity. Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus BOCKMUEHL and Guy G. STROUMSA. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- GATHERCOLE, Simon, *The Gospel of Thomas. Introduction and Commentary*. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 11. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- GRANT, Robert M. and David N. FREEDMAN, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. New York: Doubleday, 1960.
- GROSSO, Matteo, *Vangelo secondo Tommaso. Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento*. Rome: Carocci editore, 2011.
- HAENCHEN, Ernst, *Die Botschaft des Thomasevangeliums*. Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1961.
- HELDERMAN, Jan, *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung des valentinianisch-gnostischen Heilsgutes der Ruhe im Evangelium Veritatis und in anderen Schriften der Nag Hammadi Bibliothek*. Nag Hammadi Studies 18. Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- JUDSON, Lindsay, “Heavenly motion and the unmoved mover.” Pages 155–171 in *Self-motion: From Aristotle to Newton*. Edited by Mary Louise GILL and James G. LENNOX. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- KASSER, Rudolphe, *L'Évangile selon Thomas: Présentation et Commentaire Théologique*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1961.
- LAYTON, Bentley, *The Coptic Gnostic Library, Nag Hammadi Codex II,2–7*. Nag Hammadi Studies XX Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- LELYVELD, Margaretha, *Les Logia de la Vie dans l'Évangile selon Thomas. A la Recherche d'une Tradition et une Rédaction*. Nag Hammadi Studies 34. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- MARJANEN, Antti, “Is Thomas a Gnostic gospel?” Pages 107–139 in *Thomas at the Crossroads. Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*. Edited by Risto URO. New York: T&T Clark, 1998.
- MARJANEN, Antti, *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 40. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- MÉNARD, Jacques-É., *L'Évangile selon Thomas*. Nag Hammadi Studies 5. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- MIROSHNIKOV, Ivan, *The Gospel of Thomas and Plato. A study of the Impact of Platonism on the “Fifth Gospel.”* Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 93. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- MONTEFIORE, Hugh W. and H. E. W. TURNER, *Thomas and the Evangelists*. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- PAGELS, Elaine H., “Exegesis of Genesis 1 in the Gospels of Thomas and John.” *JBL* 118.3 (1999): 477–496.
- PATTERSON, Stephen J., “Jesus Meets Plato: The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas and Middle Platonism.” Pages 181–205 in *Das Thomasevangelium. Entstehung –*

- Rezeption – Theologie*. Edited by Jörg FREY, Enno E. POPKES, and Jens SCHRÖTER. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 157. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.
- PHILO. *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses*. Translated by F. H. COLSON. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- PHILO. *On the Cherubim. The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain. The Worse Attacks the Better. On the Posterity and Exile of Cain. On the Giants*. Translated by F. H. COLSON and G. H. WHITAKER. Loeb Classical Library 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- PLATO. *Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles*. Translated by R.G. BURY. Loeb Classical Library 234. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- PLOTINUS. *Ennead, Volume II*. Translated by A. H. ARMSTRONG. Loeb Classical Library 441. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- POKORNÝ, Petr, *Commentary on the Gospel of Thomas: From Interpretations to the Interpreted*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 5. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- RUNIA, David T., “Was Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited.” *Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 112–140.
- SATTLER, Barbara M., *The Concept of Motion in Ancient Greek Thought. Foundations in Logic, Method, and Mathematics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- TORNAU, Christian, “Die neuplatonische Kritik an den Gnostikern und das theologische Profil des Thomasevangeliums.” Pages 327–359 in *Das Thomasevangelium. Entstehung – Rezeption – Theologie*. Edited by Jörg FREY, Enno E. POPKES, and Jens SCHRÖTER. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 157. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.
- TREVIJANO ETCHEVERRÍA, Ramón, “La Reconversión De La Escatología En Protología (Evtom Log. 18, 19, 24, 49 Y 50).” *Salmanticensis* 40, no. 2 (1993): 133–163.
- VALANTASIS, Richard, *The Gospel of Thomas*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- VIELHAUER, Philipp, “ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ. Zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomasevangeliums.” Pages 281–299 in *Apophoreta. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Walther ELTESTER and Franz H. KEBTTLER. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 30. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964.
- WILSON, R. McL, “Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels.” *Expository Times* 72 (1960): 36–39.