

# SWEET GOSPEL HARMONY. COME

## THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED SAYINGS OF JESUS. BY PROFESSOR ADOLF HARNACK, BERLIN.

(Authorised Translation.)

### I.

FOR the third time in the last twelve years we have received from Egypt new fragments of the oldest evangelic literature. In 1885 Bickell published a Papyrus-fragment of great antiquity, contained in the Archduke Rainer's collection of Papyri (*Innsbrucker Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 1885, iii. pp. 498-504; compare *Mittheil. aus der Sammlung der Pap. Ersh. Rainer 1 Jahrg.* Nos. 3 and 4, 1887, and A. Harnack in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, v. 4, 1889, pp. 481-497). The little fragment (3.5 × 4.3 centimetres) corresponds with Mark 14. 26-30, but presents a shorter and probably more original form. In 1892 we were surprised by the discovery of a considerable fragment of the Gospel of Peter, given to us by Bouriant (*Mémoires publiées par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire*, vol. ix., fasc. 1; cf. *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ix. 2, 1893). The narrative of the Passion and Resurrection is here presented in an independent, though secondary, form. Now Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt have discovered a Papyrus-leaf written on both sides (in the form of a codex, not a roll, 15 × 9 centimetres), which contains sayings of Jesus. It was found among a large number of Papyri which they discovered on the site where the capital of the Oxyrhynchite deme once stood. They date

the fragment, on palaeographic and other grounds, between 150 and 300 A.D., and are inclined to ascribe it more exactly to a date soon after 200. They have published it in a most satisfactory form (together with a *facsimile*), and done everything which can possibly be expected in an *editio princeps*. In preparing their edition they have consulted Messrs. Conybeare, Harris, James, and Turner, whose names are a guarantee that nothing has been omitted to give the best and soundest conception of the precious discovery. If I venture to write about the fragment, instead of merely drawing attention to their work, it is not in order to controvert the position of the editors or to improve upon their readings. They have said nothing that could be open to attack, and only in regard to one of the Sayings am I in a position to advance beyond their readings. But it is because I believe that one hypothesis which they have advanced amongst others regarding the character and source of the fragment can be much more definitely formulated than has been done by them, and because I am able to add certain observations which the editors have left for their successors to make.

#### FIRST SAYING.

. . . . καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

This agrees word for word with the text of Luke 6. 42; only the recent editors, following their preference for B, have put ἐκβαλεῖν at the end, whereas all other Uncials, and also the Coptic version, show the word where we find it in the Papyrus. In Matthew 7. 5 the reading is somewhat different: καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. No other variations are known in this comprehensive saying, only the closing phrase of which is extant in the Papyrus.

the fragment, on palæographic and other grounds, between 150 and 300 A.D., and are inclined to ascribe it more exactly to a date soon after 200. They have published it in a most satisfactory form (together with a *facsimile*), and done everything which can possibly be expected in an *editio princeps*. In preparing their edition they have consulted Messrs. Conybeare, Harris, James, and Turner, whose names are a guarantee that nothing has been omitted to give the best and soundest conception of the precious discovery. If I venture to write about the fragment, instead of merely drawing attention to their work, it is not in order to controvert the position of the editors or to improve upon their readings. They have said nothing that could be open to attack, and only in regard to one of the Sayings am I in a position to advance beyond their readings. But it is because I believe that one hypothesis which they have advanced amongst others regarding the character and source of the fragment can be much more definitely formulated than has been done by them, and because I am able to add certain observations which the editors have left for their successors to make.

#### FIRST SAYING.

. . . . καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

This agrees word for word with the text of Luke 6. 42; only the recent editors, following their preference for B, have put ἐκβαλεῖν at the end, whereas all other Uncials, and also the Coptic version, show the word where we find it in the Papyrus. In Matthew 7. 5 the reading is somewhat different: καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. No other variations are known in this comprehensive saying, only the closing phrase of which is extant in the Papyrus.

## SECOND SAYING.

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ εὑρήτε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον, οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.

The previous Saying presents no deviation from the Synoptic tradition, or at least from the Lucan form of it. This Saying, however, is quite new. And yet there is nothing unfamiliar either in its form or in some of its phrases; rather does it display relations with the Synoptic tradition, and possibly with the Fourth Gospel. Sentences commencing with *ἐὰν* and *ἐὰν μὴ*, introducing conditions of salvation, are found not very rarely in the Synoptics (cf. Matt. 18. 3; Mark 10. 15; Luke 18. 17; Matt. 16. 26; Mark 8. 36; Luke 17. 33). The central position which they ascribe to the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* does not require any citation in proof of it. And even the expression *εὑρεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, although it does not appear in the Synoptics, corresponds with the other phrase, *ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν* (Luke 12. 31 and Matt. 6. 33). The closing phrase, *οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα*, sounds Johannine. It is true Matthew reports Jesus as saying *αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται*, and the Synoptic character of the expression cannot be absolutely denied. But in *τὸν πατέρα* it reminds us rather of John, although it is hardly borrowed from him, and might stand just as well in either Matthew or Luke (cf. Matt. 11. 25-27).

But the point of this word of the Lord does not lie in the portions just referred to. It should be translated thus: "Unless ye fast in regard to the world, ye shall not find the Kingdom of God, and unless ye keep the Sabbath in the way answering to the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father." The irregular expression *νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον* is certainly not to be corrected (as e.g. *νηκήσητε* = *νικήσητε*). For *σαββατίσητε* covers *νηστεύσητε*, and *βασιλεία* covers

κόσμος. It follows at once, however, that it is not *ritual* fasting that can be meant, nor fasting at all in the proper sense of the word, as it was practised by the old Jewish and Gentile Christians (*vid.* Didaché, Hermas, Justin, Tertullian, etc.).<sup>1</sup> But the expression is to be understood allegorically. "Fasting in regard to the world" can only mean "separating oneself wholly from the world," and this significance is made perfectly clear by the following sentence, which contrasts the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ with κόσμος. If, however, νηστεύειν is not to be understood in a ritual sense, but as ἀποτάσσεσθαι, it follows from the parallelism that σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον also signifies something else than the precisian Jewish Sabbath-keeping (as in LXX.). What it does signify follows from its standing as a positive complement to νηστεύειν τὸν κόσμον, and from the vision of the Father being promised as its result. Hence it can only describe the complete sanctification of a man's life in God.

Neither the contents nor the form of the second sentence is unfamiliar to post-Apostolic literature; and the same may be said, as regards contents, in reference to the sharp contrast drawn between κόσμος and βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in the first sentence. *Hermas, Sim. I.*, is a paraphrase of the first half of this saying of the Lord, and puts this world and the Kingdom of God in the sharpest contrast (*cf.* moreover the second Epistle of Clement).<sup>2</sup> But the passage before us is not essentially more severe in its cast than Luke 14. 33: οὕτως οὖν πᾶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ὃς οὐκ ἀποτασσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής. Still there does lie a certain distinction in the general expression τὸν κόσμον. Like ὁψεσθε τὸν πατέρα, it sounds

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, *Barnabas* 3, *Hermas, Sim. V.*, and other passages, show how they wished to see even this fasting spiritualised and receiving an ethical turn in the service of man.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, c. 6, 3 ff.

Johannine. For only in the Fourth Gospel is *ὁ κόσμος* an expression for all that which is, and ought to remain, unfamiliar to the Christian.<sup>1</sup> The editors are right, however, in comparing also *Pistis Sophia* (p. 138, Schwartz's translation), where this is reported as a word of Christ: ("Dixi vobis olim): *ἀποτάσσετε κόσμῳ toti et ὕλη toti.*" For the use of *νηστεύειν* for *ἀποτάσσεσθαι* (? a variation in translation) I am not able to produce a parallel. At a very much later period "jejunare" is used in the Church for all acts of penance, but that cannot apply here. No more can it mean here what it means in Matthew 9. 15 (Luke 5. 33 ff.; Mark 2. 18 ff.), namely, "mourning." But the use of the word (though it cannot be paralleled) is neither incomprehensible nor far-fetched.

But, as regards the use of *σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον* in a metaphorical sense, reference may be made to Hebrews 4., Barnabas 15., and to many passages in the Dialogue of Justin with Trypho. From these passages it is clear that "Sabbath" was used in the early Christian Church in a double metaphorical sense. And yet both significations are mutually connected. In the first place, "Sabbath" is the symbol of the future time of rest and joy for the people of God. Thus it is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews (4. 9), *ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and Barnabas writes in his fifteenth chapter (on Gen. 2. 2), *καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ. τοῦτο λέγει· ὅταν ἐλθὼν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καταργήσῃ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνόμου καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀλλάξῃ τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας, τότε καλῶς καταπαύσεται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ.* But it is not with this signification that he begins his great discussion on the Christian comprehension of the Sabbath in c. 15. Rather does he set in the forefront the verse out of Exodus: *ἀγιάσατε τὸ σάββατον κυρίου χερσὶν καθααῖς καὶ καρδίᾳ καθαρά*, as well as the other in Jeremiah 17. 24 f.:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 John 2. 15, *μὴ ἀγαπάτε τὸν κόσμον μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.*

ἐὰν φυλάξωμεν οἱ υἱοὶ μὲν τὸ σάββατον, τότε ἐπιθήσω τὸ ἔλεός μου ἐπ' αὐτούς. He turns attention from the *day* to the *manner* of Sabbath-keeping, and regards the right manner of celebration as the essential point of the matter, which depends on no particular day. Then for the first time he introduces the Sabbath of the millennial kingdom, and connects the two references by this thought:—true Sabbath-keeping always consists in pure hearts and pure hands, but we shall not be able perfectly to keep the Sabbath until we do so in the future Kingdom of Christ (εἰ οὖν ἦν ὁ θεὸς ἡμέραν ἡγίασεν, νῦν τις δύναται ἡγιάσαι εἰ μὴ καθαρὸς ὢν τῇ καρδίᾳ, ἐν πᾶσιν πεπλανήμεθα. Ἴδε οὖν ἄρα τότε καλῶς καταπαυόμενοι ἡγιάσομεν αὐτήν, ὅτε δυνησόμεθα αὐτοὶ δικαιωθέντες καὶ ἀπολαβόντες τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, μηκέτι οὔσης τῆς ἀνομίας, καινῶν δὲ ἔργονότων πάντων ὑπὸ κυρίου· τότε δυνησόμεθα αὐτὴν ἡγιάσαι, αὐτοὶ ἡγιασθέντες πρῶτον. That Sabbath-keeping, in so far as it is possible in the present, consists in the purity of the heart, etc., is clearly asserted by Justin, who also uses the expression *σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον*. In *Dial.* 12 he says: *Σαββατίζειν ὑμᾶς ὁ καινὸς νόμος διὰ παντὸς ἐθέλει, καὶ ὑμεῖς μίαν ἀργοῦντες ἡμέραν εὐσεβεῖν δοκεῖτε, μὴ νοοῦντες διὰ τὴν ὑμῶν προσετάρχη . . . εἴ τις ἐν ὑμῖν ἐπίορκος ἢ κλέπτῃς παυσάσθω· εἴ τις μοιχὸς, μετανοησάτω, καὶ σεσαββάτικε τὰ τρυφερά καὶ ἀληθινὰ σάββατα τοῦ θεοῦ* (cf. c. 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27). Hence there can be no doubt concerning the sense of this passage. Here also *σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον* signifies to sanctify life in the service of God and according to His law.

It may therefore be maintained that the two main thoughts of this Saying are neither singular in early Christian literature, nor alien to the contents of the Gospels. It is another question whether its form is, strictly speaking, of the type found in the Synoptic Gospels, and we cannot answer this question in the affirmative. As the Synoptic tradition proves, Jesus stood so entirely in touch with His

people and with the Jewish worship, that it is hard for any one to be convinced that He ever used the technical terms *νηστεύειν* and *σαββατίζειν* simply in a metaphorical sense. It is true of course that He declared in what sense and with what disposition His disciples ought to fast and to keep the Sabbath; but He is always referring to *actual* fasting and the *actual* Sabbath. It is true He said that His disciples ought to leave their goods and their relations; but from a precept such as this it is a distinct step to an injunction "to fast in regard to the world."

Whether we may recognise in this commandment a rhetorical element which is not entirely absent from the antithesis of *νηστεύειν* and *σαββατίζειν*, or whether we find in it an element of essential principle, in either case it brings with it a note which we never or almost never hear in the Synoptic narratives. It is true this is a question of a mere shade of expression, and this Saying is far enough removed from the strong rhetoric which finds utterance in a sermon of Valentinus (in Clement, *Strom.*, IV. 13. 89): ὅταν γὰρ τὸν μὲν κόσμον λύητε, αὐτοὶ δὲ μὴ καταλύσθε, κυριεύετε τῆς κτίσεως καὶ τῆς φθορᾶς ἀπάσης. But even though we must admit that Jesus may perhaps have spoken on one occasion as this Saying reports, still the more probable conclusion is that the Saying has received some extraneous colouring characteristic of the post-Apostolic period.

### THIRD SAYING.

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἐ[σ]την ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐν σαρκί (corrected by first hand from *σαρκεί*) ὥφθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ εὔρον πάντας μεθύοντας καὶ οὐδένα εὔρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψύχη μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶ[ν] κ(αὶ) . . β . ε . .

This saying also is wholly new, and the Gospels acquaint us only with the complaint of Jesus concerning the blind-



ness of men (Matt. 15. 14 f. ; 23. 16-36 ; John 9. 39 ff.). Leaving aside for a moment the very remarkable introduction and the three Aorists, we have a simple and attractive saying, which readily ranges itself with the evangelic sayings of Jesus. Deep distress is lying upon His spirit. But no one will be surprised at such distress who recalls Luke 19. 41 (*καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτήν*), or Matthew 23. 37 (Luke 13. 34, *ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι κτλ.*), or the passages Matthew 26. 37, Mark 14. 34 (*περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου*), and John 12. 27 (*νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τετάρακται*). Notice *ἡ ψυχὴ μου*. Jesus spoke elsewhere also of His soul. Further, in two apocryphal sayings of Jesus this distress finds expression, although in another reference : *Act. Petr. Vercell.*, 10 : "Qui mecum sunt non me intellexerunt" ; and the Marcosians in Irenæus, I. 20. 2 : *πολλάκις ἐπεθύμησα ἀκοῦσαι ἓνα τῶν λόγων τούτων καὶ οὐκ ἔσχον τὸν ἐροῦντα*.<sup>1</sup> The expression *πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου* is probably derived from Isaiah 53. 10, *πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου*, and cannot strike us as strange from the lips of Jesus. With *πονεῖν ἐπὶ* (a Hebraising construction) compare Mark 3. 5, *συνλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν*, and other passages in the Synoptics (*σπλαγχνίζεσθαι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*). The expression *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* occurs, if I am not mistaken, only once in the Synoptics (Mark 3. 23),<sup>2</sup> and proves once more the Hebrew colouring of the fragment. To this also we may ascribe *εὕρισκιν*, which occurs twice in this Saying, and also in 2 and 4. Compare also the Apocryphal saying of the Lord, for which there is very early authority : *ἐφ' οἷς ἂν εὕρω ὑμᾶς, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ*.

The point of the Saying is a double one, the sad utterance concerning the unreceptivity of men, and the testi-

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless Westcott's conjecture of *ἐπεθύμησαν* here is well worthy of attention ; though indeed the Latin also reads "concupivi."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Eph. 3. 5.

mony of Himself to His painful labour of soul on their behalf. The picture under which the want of receptivity is presented is known to the Gospels, although not in the pregnant form "I found them all drunken."<sup>1</sup> The Sermon on the Mount speaks of "hungering and thirsting after righteousness"; but only John uses the absolute διψᾶν which we find here (John 14. 13-15; 6. 35; especially 7. 37, εἰάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω). This gives a further connection between these Sayings and the characteristic manner of the Fourth Gospel. It is not altogether without surprise that we read πάντας, and recall the sharp expression of the second Saying: νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον. Moreover it is not Johannine (cf. c. 1. 12, ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, and yet c. 1. 10, ὁ κόσμος οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτόν), but still it can be understood *cum grano salis*, as in Matthew 23. 27, the general statement καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησατε; indeed it probably must be so understood, for otherwise the second half of the sentence would be incomprehensible. In the latter there is nothing which does not correspond with the Synoptic speeches of Jesus. We may gratefully accept the beautiful expression of Jesus' labour of soul (pain) continuing in spite of the want of receptivity in His hearers.

But the Logion has an introduction besides. In this there is as much to surprise as there is little in the Saying proper. "I placed myself (stepped, stood) in the midst of the world, and in the flesh I appeared to them, and I found them," etc. At the first glance one is inclined to think (as the editors recognise) of some speech of Jesus which He delivered to His disciples after His Resurrection. Of so-called Gospels in which Jesus speaks when returned to life, we know quite enough. But on closer examination we are compelled to abandon this suggestion. The transition to the present tense πονεῖ, in other words the declara-

<sup>1</sup> We may compare μεθύοντες in Matthew 24. 49, and passages in the Old Testament, but not the drunkards in the Apocalypse.

tion that His soul (now, still) labours (suffers) for mankind, is incomprehensible if it is to be the risen Jesus who is speaking. It shows that in these words we must recognise a backward glance upon His work on the part of the still living not the risen Christ. The thought with which it is introduced answers to the belief of Paul, of John, and of 1 Timothy 3. 16. Every one will be reminded of this passage: *ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ*, and of John 1. 10, 11, 14. But that this confession of faith should be put in the mouth of Jesus, and at the same time in a strongly rhetorical form (*ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου*), goes considerably beyond the old Gospels. John at any rate did not venture to put in the mouth of Jesus, so definitely as this, that which he prefixed to his Gospel in the Prologue. In the Gospel Jesus speaks of His pre-existence in allusions. Here, however, Jesus speaks as a Divine Being. The Gospel out of which this Saying is taken must really have been a Logos-Gospel, whether the word Logos appeared in it or not. That is to say, it must have been a Gospel to which the characteristic type of John's Gospel must have been related as the immediately preceding stage. Hitherto we have possessed not a single fragment of a Gospel in which a strong and comparatively pure Synoptic tradition is seen combined with Pauline-Johannine theology in the form of *evangelic* utterances. We could at the very most surmise the existence of such Gospels. What we possessed consisted (besides our four Gospels, the Gospel of the Hebrews, and the Gospel of Peter) of Gnostic-theological Gospels or late apocryphal ones, which could have no bearing on the original evangelic tradition. Now we learn (I pass over the remains of the Gospel of the Egyptians, for I shall deal with it below)—we learn by a *single saying* the existence of a Gospel<sup>1</sup> which

<sup>1</sup> That this Saying can be no isolated saying, but must belong to a whole, appears to me obvious.

teaches us that the line, which leads from the Synoptics to John, was carried still further. But the relation so conceived and defined would not be sufficient. The Sayings, which we have already examined, and those which we have yet to examine, show that they proceed from a source which in form and contents stands much closer to the Synoptics than the fourth Gospel does. Thus we have not to assume a direct succession—Synoptics, John, our Gospel—but a dual development. The Johannine Gospel has emancipated itself from the old tradition far more than the Gospel from which our Sayings are derived. But inasmuch as it does not present Christ describing Himself directly as a Divine Being, who has appeared in the flesh, it remains historically more accurate in regard to the decisive and chief question. And also that ominous expression, “I stood in the midst of the world,” which reminds us of the Egyptian Gnostic Gospels, and may well be regarded as a root of subsequent extravagances—one looks for it in vain in the Fourth Gospel.

How much of the history of theology, how much whose issues are still far from cleared up, lies in this single Logion! In the same breath Jesus all but describes Himself as the supra-mundane Being manifested in the flesh, and yet speaks as He does in the Synoptics of the *πνεῦμα*, the weary labour, of His soul.

Unfortunately, the conclusion of the Logion is illegible. The editors think that it came to an end after a few more letters, that a new Logion (the fourth) began on the next line (which is, however, quite destroyed), and extended to the first line of the second page, where [τ]ὴν πρωχέλαν can still be read. Since the latter word is not found in our Gospels, they assume that it was a hitherto unknown Saying. But all these assumptions are very insecure. (1) It is quite uncertain whether a line is missing. (2) The third Saying is certainly not terminated. It is most natural to



complete line 21, καὶ οὐ βλέπο: then υσιν (=βλέπουσιν) would fall on the first line of the next page, and it would be suitably completed if we were to insert εἰς before τὴν πτωχείαν.<sup>1</sup> Here we may recall Revelation 3. 17: σὺ εἶ ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ ἐλεινὸς καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλός. But however this may be,<sup>2</sup> the space seems to me to be too small for us to assume a new Saying; and if the Papyrus actually contained one, we must now resign ourselves to its disappearance.

#### FOURTH SAYING.<sup>3</sup>

[Δεγ]ει [Ἰησοῦς ὅπ]ου ἔαν ὧσιν [. . .] ε [. . .] . . .  
(θ)εοὶ καὶ [. .] (σο) [.]ε [. .] ἐστιν μόνος [. .] (τ)ω ἐγὼ  
εἰμί μετ' αὐτ[ου]. ἔγει[ρ]ου τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκεί ἐνρήσεις με,  
σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμί.

In regard to the condition of these lines on the Papyrus and their meaning, the editors remark as follows:—

“In line 23, immediately before ΟΥ, there is part of a stroke which may very well be the end of the cross-bar of Π.”

“In line 24 the remains of the letter before ΕΟΙ are consistent with Θ only, and those of the letter preceding suit A better than X or Λ, which seem to be the only alternatives. Before this there is the bottom of a perpendicular stroke, which would be consistent with Η, Ι, Ν, Π, and perhaps Γ and Ψ.”

“At the beginning of line 25, what we have read as C may equally well be the second half of Π, and O might possibly be one letter, Ω, though this does not correspond with the vestiges so well.”

<sup>1</sup> The editors say expressly that in spaces 5 and 6 the letters εἰ are possible; remains of letters can be detected here; in spaces 1-4 and 7 nothing can now be read.

<sup>2</sup> One misses very unwillingly αὐτῶν after τὴν πτωχείαν. βλέπειν εἰς is a Hebraising construction: cf. the Synoptics.

<sup>3</sup> The fifth in the *editio princeps*.

"In line 26 the first letter of which any part is preserved may be **Τ**, **Π**, or **Γ**; but **[Ε]ΓΩ** would not fill the lacuna."

"In line 27 there is not room for **ΑΥΤ[ΩΝ]**, and moreover the tip of a letter is visible, which suits **Υ**."

"It seems fairly certain that the Logion offers a general parallel to Matthew 18. 20, though with considerable divergences. An extension of that verse which comes nearer to our passage is found in Ephraem Syr., *Evang. Concord. Expos.*, c. 14 (Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 295), where the important addition "ubi unus est" corresponds to "**μόνος**" here, and suggests that **ΕΙC** should be read either at the beginning of line 25 or before **ΕCΤΙΝ**. The meaning may then be that wherever there are several believers, or even only one, Jesus is always present. No explanation can, however, be considered satisfactory unless it enables the lacunæ in lines 25 and 26 to be plausibly filled up, and provides an adequate conjecture for the word ending in **ΕΟΙ**, which is the real key to the whole passage."

"If **ΑΘΕΟΙ** is the right reading there, a contrast seems to be intended between the many ungodly and the one true believer: 'Where all men else are unbelievers, if one alone is (faithful), I am with him.' But *ἄθεοι* is hardly a natural word in this connexion; and some such adjective as *πιστός* would be required in line 25, and it is difficult to see how this can be obtained. Further, unless *εἰ* is lost at the beginning of line 25, both the explanations suggested require either *ἐστιν* to be a mistake for *ἦ*, or *καί* to be a mistake for *κεῖ*."

"The whole passage should be compared with an extract from the Gnostic 'Gospel of Elve,' quoted by Epiphanius, *Haer.* 26, 3: *ἐγὼ σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγώ· καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν ᾗς ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ εἰμι, καὶ ἐν ᾧπασίν εἰμι ἐσπαρμένος, καὶ ὅθεν ἐὰν θέλῃς συλλέγεις με, ἐμὲ δὲ συλλέγων ἐαυτὸν συλλέγεις.* But the idea here, that Christ is in His believers (cf. John 14. 20), is rather different from that of our passage and Matthew 18. 20,

where it is only promised that He will be with them. It is, however, somewhat tempting to connect the quotation with the remarkable but difficult sentence, 'Raise the stone,' etc., as implying the presence of Christ in all things (cf. Eph. 4. 6). Another possible explanation of these words would be to regard them as a parallel to Matthew 7. 7: 'Ask, and it shall be given you,' and as intended to teach the effort required in order to find Christ."

The editors have, in my opinion, already pointed out the right direction in their completion of the passage, but they have not followed it up to the end, and on that account have failed to reach a satisfactory explanation of it. There can be no doubt of the following:—

(1) The second, wholly legible, half of the Saying evidently contains the concrete *application* of the general announcement in the first half, and that in two examples.

(2) Hence it follows that the obscure *καὶ κεῖ εὐρήσεις με*, and *καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ* must be explained in accordance with the plain sentence *ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ*. Any pantheistic significance is thereby excluded. Such a significance may very well have been subsequently attached to the Saying, but is not actually contained in it. For the general sentence, in which that thought must have been strongly expressed, presents rather the entirely different one, "I am *with him*." It is not the union of Christ with wood or stone that is expressed, but the union of Christ with the *believer*, even though in separation from the world he is working on wood or stone, that is, is engaged upon his earthly toil. (For the form of the expression see below.)

(3) If it is certain (and it is so) that the second half of the general sentence contains the thought, "I am with him, wherever one is alone," and that the subsequent application expresses the fact that this holds good for the *situa-*



tions in which this single man finds himself, then one expects the general sentence to run: *καὶ ὥσπερ εἰς ἔστιν μόνος, οὕτω ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ*.<sup>1</sup> This reading corresponds accurately with the number of letters and with the remains of letters which are still visible.<sup>2</sup> It has this advantage, that we do not require to insert either an *εἰ* or a *πιστός*, or to change an Indicative into a Conjunctive; and further, it brings into connexion with the very probable *οὕτω* a corresponding *ὥσπερ*. The general announcement therefore ran thus: "Just in the way in which a man is alone am I with him." Now we can understand the paradox of the expression: "raise the stone, and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood, and I am there." There is here, indeed, something mystical, but nothing pantheistic. The sense is: "If only a man is truly alone, that is, separated from the world, then Christ is as surely with him as those objects are to which his daily toil is applied." Not in stone and wood is he to find and have Christ. (It is certainly misleading, but only misleading, that *ἐγχείρον* may also be understood in a ritual sense. But no one can think of the splitting of wood for a sacrifice; we should in that case, moreover, be dealing with acts of heathen worship.) It is just in his earthly drudgery that a man will find Christ as certainly as he has stone and wood before him. A man entirely set free from the world—that is the declaration—is always with

<sup>1</sup> For *ὥσπερ* . . . *οὕτως* compare Matthew 12. 40; 13. 40; 24. 27 (Luke 17. 24); 24. 37. In Paul, as is well known, *ὥσπερ* . . . *οὕτως* (*καὶ*) is especially common, cf. Romans 5. 12, 19, 21; 6. 4, 19; 11. 30; 1 Cor. 11. 12; 15. 22; 16. 1; Gal. 4. 29; cf. also James 2. 26.

<sup>2</sup> After *καὶ* there are two letters completely illegible; these I have restored as *ὥς*: of the three following letters the third has entirely disappeared; I insert *π*; the first of the three shows, according to the editors, the remains of a *π* or *ε*; I insert *π*: for the second they surmise an *ο* or (in combination with the third) *Ω*; in such uncertainty it may be permitted to write *ε*. Of the three next letters only the first is legible, *ε*; we fill in *ε*s. Then follow the clearly deciphered words *ἔστιν μόνος*, and of the next four letters the fourth is certainly *Ω*, the third probably *τ*, so that *οὕτω* is clearly indicated.

Christ, or rather, Christ is always with him, and that just in the way in which his particular situation demands. He is in the full sense of the word his *Comrade*. At the right moment Dr. H. Lisco has drawn my attention to the words in Ecclesiastes 10. 9: *ἐξάιρων λίθους διαπονηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, σχίζων ξύλα κινδυνεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς* (כִּסְיֵעַ אֲבָנִים יַעֲצֹב בְּחִצּוֹן עֲצִים יִשְׁכֹּן בָּם בְּהֶם בּוֹקֵעַ בְּהֶם = "if he breaks stones, he shall be wounded of them; if he splits logs, he shall be in danger of them.") Our text cannot be without some connexion with this passage, and clearly it is an intentional antithesis to it. The pessimistic preacher says that a man will find pain and danger in his labour. Christ says that he shall find in them Himself. It does not follow from this that the author of this Saying (it may be Jesus) must have rejected the Old Testament because he framed the antithesis. While it is, however, in itself worthy of attention that in a Gospel—in a Saying ascribed to Christ—the Preacher is referred to, it is still more remarkable that the Saying does not follow the LXX. (which gives *ἐξάιρων* rightly), but another translation of the original text. But ought we not to read *ἐξαρον* in line 27? According to the facsimile that appears to me quite possible.

If, however, the main point of the Saying lies in the word *μόνος*, signifying withdrawal from the world, then we may venture to complete the sentence. And here the editors appear to me to have approached near to the right solution, but not to have actually found it. Seeing that the reading *ὅπου ἐὰν ᾖσιν . . . . ε . . . . (α)θεοὶ* is well established, there can be no reason to resist the reading *ἄθεοι* (cf. Ephesians ii. 12: *ἥτε τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς χριστοῦ . . . καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*). "Wherever the crowd is, there are the godless ones"; that we might well expect. But since the following *καὶ* makes it more probable that here also we have a positive, an encouraging, assurance, and seeing further that in the narrow space there is hardly room for

this thought, the simple reading will be : ὅπου ἐὰν ᾤσιν, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄθεοι, καὶ ὥσπερ εἰς ἕστιν μόνος, οὕτω ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ. This reading answers all the conditions with the single exception that the editors require four letters before the ε in εἰσιν, whereas οὐκ has only three. But κ always takes up a good deal of space in the MS. And we might also read οὐχί. This reading, the *thought* of which I take to be certain, while its verbal form is very probable, is further recommended by the consideration that it affords a fine climax. "Wherever they are (the disciples, of course) they shall not be without God, and in whatever way a single one works in solitude, removed from the world, I shall be with him as certainly as the object of his labour is beside him."

It is a profound sentence and a valuable parallel, though differently applied, to the evangelic promises of Christ's presence : "I am with you always," "I will not leave you orphans." Cf. also Matthew 10. 29.<sup>1</sup> The editors have already remarked that the Saying, "Ubi unus est, ibi et ego sum," is attested by Ephraem, *i.e.* by Tatian (Zahn, *Diatessaron*, p. 169 ; cf. also Resch, *Paralleltexte zu Matthäus*, p. 233 f.). It is particularly to be noticed, moreover, that in this Logion ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ is a complete parallel to οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄθεοι.<sup>2</sup> This points to the conclusion that in the Gospel from which this saying is derived, God and Christ had been brought specially close to one another, somewhat in the Johannine manner ; and that this unity was repre-

Ἀπεν τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν (ἄθεοι). Of course the Saying before us is taken from a larger context. The discourse must have been about the disciples. It is as if, for example, the saying in 17. 16 were excerpted and isolated from the fourth Gospel ; ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσὶν καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. But the Saying which corresponds most closely in contents to this (and also in respect of the union between the Father and the Son) is John 14. 23. For μόνος cf. John 8. 29 ; 16. 32.

<sup>2</sup> The word is not found in the Gospels ; but it is used by Paul (*vid. supra*), and that alongside of χωρὶς Χριστοῦ : and it is only the word that is lacking.

sented not alone as one of disposition and of will, follows from the introduction to the third Saying (see above).

The explanation here given involves the laying aside of the hypothesis which would relate this Saying to the romantic sayings in the Gospel of Eve, or to those in the *Pistis Sophia* (cf. e.g. p. 145, "Ego sum isti et isti sunt ego"). It excludes also any pantheistic interpretation,<sup>1</sup> as well as every interpretation which regards the stone-lifting and the wood-hewing as anything else than the rough and solitary labour of the day. Was not the Speaker Himself a carpenter, and the son of a carpenter? Is He not here speaking out of His own experience of God's nearness, which He had discerned as a living presence during His own work as carpenter, as real as the objects of His toil? Of course we are not to understand Him "in a Lutheran sense." The blessing does not lie in the work itself; and yet the saying is a protest against the idea that the nearness of God is a fact for, and to be discerned by, those only who are engaged in fasting, prayer, and meditation. No; God is also present at the daily task, but only then when the disciple is actually *μόνος*—that is, separated from the world.

However, the effect of a spoken word is not confined to the direct line of its original purpose. In an enthusiastic circle, in which religious reflection and speculation were strained to the uttermost, and where also a knowledge of Stoicism was not wanting, a Saying like this (*ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ · ἐξἄρον τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκεί εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμί*) was bound to act as a finger-post pointing in the direction of pantheism. That such a result took place is shown by the remains of the Egyptian-Gnostic Gospels.

<sup>1</sup> I cannot understand the editors' reference to Matt. 7. 7 as another possible parallel.

FIFTH SAYING.<sup>1</sup>

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[ο]ῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

The first half of this Saying corresponds, word for word, with the Synoptics, and, indeed, apart from the fact that Luke gives οὐδεὶς (Matt. 13. 57 and Mark 6. 4 οὐκ ἔστιν), it corresponds word for word with Luke.<sup>2</sup>

The second half is new, and yet finds a remarkable parallel in the texts of Matthew and Mark. Thus the latter goes on thus (6. 5) : καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν· καὶ ἐθαύμασεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.<sup>3</sup> That the physician in this Logion is combined with the prophet is accordingly nothing new.

The passage is thus related both to the type presented by Matthew and to that in Luke. Moreover, the word *θεραπεία* is found only in Luke (Matt. 24. 45). The case here, therefore, is the same as in the first Logion. We look in vain in the Gospels for the expression οἱ γινώσκοντες αὐτόν. This Saying also, like the third, is a sorrowful one. No one will seek to deny that it may have been spoken by Jesus.

SIXTH SAYING.<sup>4</sup>

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, πόλις ὠκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηριγμένη οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ[β]ῆναι.

<sup>1</sup> The sixth in the *editio princeps*.

<sup>2</sup> In Luke ND give *ἐαυτοῦ*, the other Uncials *αὐτοῦ*. Matthew 13. 57 and Mark 6. 4 have *ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ* for *δεκτός*, and Matthew writes *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ*, while Mark further inserts *καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ* between the two phrases. Finally, John writes (4. 44), *αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει*.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew 13. 58 has the same thought, but in a shorter form: *καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν*.

<sup>4</sup> The seventh in the *editio princeps*.

In Matthew, who alone reports this Saying (5. 14), it runs: οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη. But Tatian (Arab. ed. Ciasca, p. 15a) read, as did also the Peshitta: "Non potest civitas abscondi supra montem *edificata*." If this suffices to cover one divergence, we may perhaps compare *Clementine Homilies*, iii. 67 (Resch, *Paralleltexte zu Matthäus*, p. 68 f.: χρῆ οὖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὡς πόλιν ἐν ὕψει ὠκοδομημένην φιλόθεον ἔχειν τάξιν καὶ διοίκησιν καλήν). This would provide a parallel also for the second divergence.<sup>1</sup> But these variations (? due to translation) are unimportant. The additions, however, καὶ ἐστηριγμένη and οὔτε πεσεῖν, are noteworthy. They complicate a Logion which has a clear and single meaning. This can hardly be the original form. A "city" which cannot "fall" is a strange idea. Rather does it appear as if the parable of the house on the rock (Matthew 7. 24-27) were making its influence felt. There we have οὐκ ἔπεσεν, and, though the house is not ἐστηριγμένη, it is ὠκοδομημένη ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. It is of importance that we have here a Saying contained in Matthew, but not found at all in Luke.

#### SEVENTH SAYING.<sup>2</sup>

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἀκούεις. (ι)σ(τ)ο(ε) . . . (τ)ιον σου (το).

The Editors remark that the reading after ἀκούεις, where line 42 begins, is wholly uncertain. They say that εἰς τὸ ἐνώπιόν σου would be possible; and the last two letters may be ΚΕ or ΓΕ. It cannot, therefore, be decided whether we should read ἄκουε ἰσ- or ἀκούεις at the end of line 41. ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ appears to be excluded. In any case, the Saying is an unknown one; for no Saying in our Gospels begins with ἀκούεις or ἄκουε ἰσ.

<sup>1</sup> ἄκρον is found in the Synoptics; Matt. 24. 31; Mark 13. 27; Luke 16. 24.

<sup>2</sup> The eighth in the *editio princeps*.