

THE
SAYINGS OF JESUS

FROM OXYRHYNCHUS

For the 8th Edition
See "Greek" and the
EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION, CRITICAL
APPARATUS AND COMMENTARY

BY

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE, M.A.

MEMBER OF THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN MUSEUM
EXPEDITION IN EGYPT AND FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF
WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1920

PREFACE

THE addition of one more item to the literature which has gathered round the famous Oxyrhynchus *Sayings* does not, in itself, need any apology; for large as that literature is, it has not solved all the problems which the papyrus fragments present, nor has it exhausted all the possibilities of text-reconstruction and interpretation. But inasmuch as I have no passport admitting me to the realms of theology, my intrusion into what appears to be a theological province demands explanation. From one point of view, indeed, the *Sayings* seem to fall well within the demesne of theology, but from another to lie on the vague borderland which parts theological from ancient literature in its broadest sense. I need hardly say that I prefer the latter. In this little study, therefore, I have regarded the fragments as remains of early Christian literature rather than as a theological document: the distinction, if fine, is real, and may serve to deliver me from the charge of exercising myself in great matters which are too high for me.

To multiply restorations of fragmentary texts is a process of doubtful benefit. Owing to accident my reconstructed text was drawn up before I had seen and weighed the restorations suggested by others; and though later study has led me considerably to modify my first draft, it has not prevented me from retaining certain supplements which take a new direction. That I have done so is due, I hope, neither to parental fondness for my own offspring nor to perverse

PREFACE

love of novelty, but (if I may say so) to a feeling that the right track had not yet been found.

In the Introduction and Commentary I have tried not only to bring forward fresh considerations bearing upon the problems involved, but also to represent and consider the judgments of previous editors. This part of my work was begun in 1912 and continued during intervals of leisure in the following eighteen months. As a result I am conscious of a certain unevenness of treatment which recent revision has not, I fear, wholly eliminated.

For an editor to express obligations is often to accuse the guiltless of complicity. While, therefore, I cannot leave unspoken my very deep indebtedness to Professor J. F. Bethune Baker for much help and encouragement, I must add that I alone am responsible for my extravagances and my faults. With the late M. Jean Maspero I had the privilege of discussing many points relating to the *Sayings*, and it is to his memory therefore that I dedicate this little book.

I have to thank the Council of the Egypt Exploration Fund for permitting me to re-edit the fragments found by Professors Grenfell and Hunt under the auspices of that Society. I should also like to express my sincere gratitude to the Reader of the Cambridge University Press for the very great pains with which he has read my proofs, thereby saving me from a very formidable list of errors and imperfect references.

H. G. E. W.

CAMBRIDGE,

July 5, 1920.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
BIBLIOGRAPHY	xi
THE TEXT OF THE PAPYRI	xiv
THE RESTORED TEXT	xvi
INTRODUCTION	xix
TEXT WITH CRITICAL APPARATUS, TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY	I
INDEX	46

BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

FRAGMENT I.

(Oxyrhynchus Papyri, no. 654.)

- Bartlet, V. *The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus* (*Contemporary Review*, LXXXVII, 1905, pp. 116 ff. ; *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, I, pp. 11 ff.).
- Batiffol, P. *Nouveaux Fragm. Évang. de Behnesa* (*Revue Biblique*, N.S. I, 1904, pp. 481 ff.).
- Bruston, C. *Fragments d'un ancien Recueil de Paroles de Jésus*, Paris, 1905.
- Deissmann, A. *Zur Text-Rekonstruktion der neusten Jesusworte aus Oxyrhynchos* (*Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*, July 18th, 1904, pp. 116 ff.).
- Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. *New Sayings of Jesus* (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Pt IV, pp. 1 ff., no. 654)².
- *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragments of a Lost Gospel*, Oxford, 1904.
- Harnack, A. *Über einige Worte Jesu die nicht in den kanonischen Evangelien stehen* (*Sitz. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, 1904, pp. 170 ff.).
- Heinrici, G. *Die neuen Herrensprüchen* (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, pp. 188 ff.).
- *Die neuen Herrensprüchen* (*Theol. Literaturzeit.* XXIX, 1904, 428 ff.).
- Hilgenfeld, A. *Neue Logia Jesu* (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* N.S. XII, 1904, pp. 414 ff.).
- Lake, K. *The New Sayings of Jesus and the Synoptic Problem* (*Hibbert Journal*, III, pp. 332 ff.).

¹ No attempt has been made to make this Bibliography exhaustive: it is select in the sense that it contains all the editions and studies which directly or indirectly have influenced the following pages.

² *Editio princeps*.

- Lock, W. *The New Sayings of Jesus* (*Church Quarterly Rev.* LVIII, pp. 422 ff.).
- *The Value of the "New Sayings of Jesus"* (*Interpreter*, I, pp. 30 ff.).
- Swete, H. B. *The New Oxyrhynchus Sayings* (*Expository Times*, XV, pp. 488 ff.).
- Taylor, C. *The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus*, Oxford, 1905.
- *The Oxyrhynchus and other Agrapha* (*Journal of Theological Studies*, VII, 546 ff.).
- Wessely, C. *Collections de prétendues Sentences de Jésus* (*Patrologia Orientalis*, IV, pp. 151 ff.).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. "Oxyrhynchos Papyri IV" (*Gött. Gel. Anzeiger*, 1904, pp. 659 ff.).

FRAGMENT II¹.

(Oxyrhynchus Papyri, no. 1.)

- Badham, F. P. *The New Logia* (*Athenaeum*, Aug. 7th, 1897).
- Bartlet, V. *The New Logia* (*Athenaeum*, July 24th, 1897).
- Batiffol, P. *Les Logia du Papyrus de Behnesa* (*Revue Biblique*, VI, 1897, pp. 501 ff.).
- Blass, F. (*Evang. Kircheng.* 1897, pp. 498 ff.).
- Bruston, C. *Les Paroles de Jésus*, Paris, 1898.
- Cer soy, P. *Quelques Remarques sur les Logia de Behnesa* (*Revue Biblique*, VII, 1898, 415 ff.).
- Clemen, C. *Neugefundene Jesusworte* (*Die Christliche Welt*, July 29th, 1897).
- Davidson, T. (Review.) *International Journal of Ethics*, VIII, 106 ff.
- Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗCOY, *Sayings of Our Lord from an early Greek Papyrus*², Oxford, 1897.
- ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗCOY (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Pt 1, pp. 1 ff., no. 1).
- Harnack, A. *Die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu*, Freiburg, 1897.
- *The recently discovered Sayings of Jesus* (*Expositor*, 5th Series, VI, pp. 321 ff., 401 ff.)³.

¹ For fuller bibliographies on this fragment, see Lock and Sanday, *Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 5 f.; Holtzmann in *Theol. Jahresh.* XVII, 115 ff., XVIII, 148 ff.

² *Editio princeps.*

³ Translation of the foregoing.

- Harris, J. R. *The Logia and the Gospels* (*Contemporary Review*, LXXII, pp. 341 ff.).
- Heinrici, G. (Review.) (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, XXII, 445 ff.).
- Holtzmann, H. *Neue Sprüche Jesu* (*Prot. Monatsheft*, I, 385 ff.).
- James, M. R. *The New Sayings of Christ* (*Contemporary Review*, LXXII, pp. 153 ff.).
- Jülicher, A. Λόγια Ἰησοῦ (*Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1897, pp. 921 ff.).
- Lock, W. and Sanday, W. *Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus*, Oxford, 1897.
- Redpath, H. A. *The so-called Logia and their Relation to the Canonical Scriptures* (*Expositor*, 5th Series, VI, 224 ff.).
- Reitzenstein, R. *Ein Zitat aus den Λόγια Ἰησοῦ* (*Zeitschr. f. neutest. Wissenschaft u. Kunde*, VI, p. 203).
- *Poimandres*, 239 ff., Leipzig, 1904.
- Scholz, A. von. *Zu den Logia Jesu* (*Theol. Quartalschr.* 1900, pp. 1 ff.).
- Swete, H. B. *The Oxyrhynchus Fragment* (*Expository Times*, Sept. 1897).
- Taylor, C. *The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels*, Oxford, 1899.
- Weiss, J. *Neue Logia* (*Theol. Rundschau*, I, 1898, pp. 227 ff.).
- Wessely, C. (See Bibliography for Fragment I.)
- Zahn, T. *Die jüngst gefundenen "Aussprüche Jesu"* (*Theol. Literaturblatt*, XVIII, 1897, pp. 417 ff., 425 ff.).

THE TEXT OF THE PAPYRI

(*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 654)

οἱ τοιοὶ οἱ λόγοι οἱ [
 ἤσεν ἰησ̄ οὗ ζών κ[
 καὶ θώμα καὶ εἶπεν [
 ἀν τῶν λόγων τοῦτ[
 5 οὐ μὴ γεύσεται· [
 μὴ παύσασθω ὁ ζή[
 εὔρη καὶ ὅταν εὗρ[
 βῇ θείῃ βασιλεύει κ[
 ἡσεται· λέγει ἰ[
 10 οἱ ἐλκόντες ἡμᾶς [
 ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρανῷ [
 τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρα[
 νῷ ὑπο τὴν γῆν ἐστ[
 οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλά[
 15 τος ὑμᾶς καὶ ἡ βασ[
 ἰς ἐν τῷ ὕμῳ [·] ὅτι [
 γινώσκω ταύτην εὔρη[
 εἰς αὐτοὺς γινώσκεισθαι [
 ὑμεῖς
 ἐστε τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ τ[
 20 γινώσκει αὐτοὺς ἐν[
 καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ πτῶ[
 οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἀνθ[

ρῶν ἐπερωτήσε πα[
 ρῶν περὶ τοῦ τοποῦ τῆ[
 ὅτι
 25 σέτε πολλοὶ ἐσονται π[
 οἱ ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι καὶ [
 σὺ λέγει ἰησ̄· [
 θέν τῆς ὁψέως σοῦ καὶ [
 ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀποκαλύψεται [
 30 τὴν κρυπτόν· ὁ οὐ φάνε[
 καὶ θεθαμμένον ὁ ο[
 [·] ἐτάξουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ [
 [·] γούσιν πῶς νῆστευ[
 [·] μεθὰ καὶ πῶς [
 35 [·] αἱ τὶ παρατηρήσ[
 [·] ν· λέγει ἰησ̄ [
 [·] εἴται μὴ ποιεῖτ[
 [·] ἡς ἀληθείας ἀν[
 [·] ν δ[] οὐ κεκρ[
 40 [·] καρὶ [·] ἐστὶν [
 [·] ὧ ἐστ[
 [·] ἰν[
 * * *

(Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1)

Verso

1A

και τότε διαβλεψείς
 εκβαλεῖν το καρφος
 το εν τῷ οφθαλμῷ
 του αδελφου σου λεγει
 5 ἰς εαν μη νηστεύσῃ
 ται τον κοσμον οὐ μη
 εὔρηται την βασιλει
 αν του θῡ και εαν μη
 σαββατισχτε το σαβ̄
 10 βατον οὐκ οψεσθε το
 π̄ρα λεγει ἰς ε[.]την
 εν μεσω του κοσμου
 και εν σαρκει ωφθην
 αυτοις και ευρον παν
 15 τας μεθύοντας και
 ουδενα ευρον δειψῶ
 τα εν αυτοις και πο̄
 νει η ψυχη μου επι
 τοις υἱοις των ανων
 20 οτι τυφλοι εισιν τη καρ
 δια αυτω[.] και . . . βλεπ

* * * *

Recto

ε

[...].ει[.]ην πτωχῶ
 [...].ει[.]ου εαν ωσιν
 [...].ε[.]...θεοι και
 [.]πο̄ .ε[.] εστιν μονος
 5 [.]γω εγω ειμι μετ αυ
 τ[.] ερει [.]ον τον λιθ̄
 κακει ευρησεις με
 σχικον το ξυλον καρω
 εκει ειμι λεγει ἰς ου
 10 κ εστιν δεκτος προ
 φητης εν τη π̄ριαι αυ
 τ[.] ουδε ιατρος ποιει
 θεραπειας εις τους
 γεινωσκοντας αυτ̄
 15 λεγει ἰς πολις οικοδο
 μημενη επ ακρον
 [.]ρους υψηλους και ες
 τηριγμενη ουτε πε
 [.]ειν δυναται ουτε κρυ
 20 [.]ηναι λεγει ἰς ακουεις
 [.]ις το ε . . . τιον σου το

* * * *

THE RESTORED TEXT¹

οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ ζωοποιοὶ οὓς ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ ζῶν
καὶ ὁφθεὶς τοῖς δέκα καὶ Θωμᾶ. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶς
ὅστις ἂν τῶν λόγων τούτων ἀκούσῃ, θανάτου οὐ μὴ
γεύσεται.

α'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζητῶν τοῦ ζητεῖν ἕως ἂν εὕρῃ, καὶ
ὅταν εὕρῃ θαμβηθήσεται·

καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει, καὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαή-
σεται.

β'. λέγει Ἰούδας· τίνες ἄρα οἱ ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς,

καὶ πότε ἐλεύσεται ἡ βασιλεία ἢ ἐν οὐρανοῖς οὐσα;

λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ τῶν θηρίων ὅτι ὑπὸ τὴν
γῆν ἐστὶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης—
οὗτοι οἱ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς.

καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστὶ. καὶ
ὅστις ἂν ἑαυτὸν γινῶ ταύτην εὐρήσει· καὶ εὐρόντες αὐτὴν
ἑαυτοὺς γνώσεσθε ὅτι υἱοὶ καὶ κληρονόμοι ἐστέ ὑμεῖς
τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ παντοκράτορος· καὶ γνώσεσθε ἑαυτοὺς
ἐν θεῷ ὄντας καὶ θεὸν ἐν ὑμῖν. καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἡ πτόλις
θεοῦ.

γ'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ὁδὸν εὐρῶν ἐπερωτῆσαι
πάντα...διαιρῶν περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆς καθέδρας; εὐρήσετε

¹ The restorations are not here distinguished. The parallel clauses are as far as possible indicated by the arrangement.

ὅτι πολλοὶ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι
πρῶτοι· καὶ ζωὴν κληρονομήσουσιν.

δ'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

πάν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ὄψεώς σου,
καὶ τὸ κεκαλυμμένον ἀπὸ σου ἀποκαλυφθήσεται σοι·
οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται,
καὶ τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται.

ε'. ἐξετάζουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγουσιν·
πῶς νηστεύομεν, καὶ πῶς προσευξόμεθα, καὶ πῶς ἐλεη-
μοσύνην ποιήσομεν, καὶ τί παρατηρήσομεν τῶν παρα-
δοθέντων;

λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί· μὴ ποιεῖτε ταῦτα φανε-
ρῶς·

ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀντέχεσθε, καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν
ἀποκεκρυμμένη ἔστω.

λέγω γάρ·

μακάριός ἐστιν ὁ ταῦτα ποιῶν ἐν κρυπτῷ,
ὅτι ἐν φανερῷ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ
ὃς ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

* * *

ς'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

ἐκβαλλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,
καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ
ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

ζ'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν
βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ·

καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον, οὐκ ὄψεσθε
τὸν πατέρα.

η'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθην αὐτοῖς·
καὶ εὗρον πάντας μεθύοντας, καὶ οὐδένα εὗρον διψῶντα
ἐν αὐτοῖς·

καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν,
καὶ οὐ βλέπουσι τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτῶν.

θ'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

... εἰς τὴν πτωχείαν ...

ι'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

ὅπου ἐὰν ᾧσιν β', οὐκ εἰσιν ἄθεοι·
καὶ ὅπου εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ μόνος, λέγω ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ.
ἔγειρον τὸν λίθον, καὶ ἐκεῖ εὐρήσεις με,
σχίσον τὸ ξύλον, καὶ ἐκεῖ εἰμι.

ια'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

οὐκ ἐστὶν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ,
οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας
αὐτόν.

ιβ'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

πόλις ὠκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ
ἐστηριγμένη
οὔτε πεσεῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυβῆναι.

ιγ'. λέγει Ἰησοῦς·

ἀκούεις εἰς τὸ ἐν ὠτίῳ σου,
τὸ δὲ ἕτερον συνέκλεισας.

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. THE PAPYRI.

In 1897 Messrs B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, while excavating on behalf of the Graeco-Roman Branch of the Egypt Exploration Fund, recovered from one of the rubbish-mounds of the city of Oxyrhynchus a leaf of a papyrus book containing eight (or, as some think, seven) Sayings of Jesus¹. This fragment, which measures 15 cm. by 9 cm. in its actual state, is a leaf from a codex and is inscribed on both sides. The lower edge of the leaf is broken leaving no indication to show how much has been lost. While the discoverers think that as many as five or even ten lines may have been lost, on the ground that the page of an early codex such as this would resemble the high, narrow column of a papyrus roll², later editors fascinated by the temptation of combining Sayings VIII and IX [Logia III and IV], claim that what has been lost is not great in amount, and that the lacuna between the texts of the *recto* and *verso* can be bridged by restoration: I have preferred to follow the expert authority of Grenfell and Hunt. The upper edge of the leaf has not suffered severely, and the right-hand side is also intact, but the left side is very ragged, though fragments of the original edge seem to be preserved here and there³. There is an ample

¹ Published by the discoverers under the title *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ*, Sayings of our Lord (Frowde, 1897), and in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 1, No. 1. Since the discovery of *Ox. Pap.* 654 the term Logia as applied to these Sayings has been proved to be mistaken; it is abandoned in this edition. The original is now in the Semitic Library, Harvard.

² *Ox. Pap.* 1, p. 1.

³ So far as I can judge from the facsimile in the *editio princeps*.

upper margin, while the left and right margins are decidedly narrower: a strip of papyrus has been gummed along the left edge of the *recto*. A few holes in the area of the text do not in themselves constitute formidable lacunae; but while the *verso* is tolerably legible throughout, the writing on the left side of the *recto* is rubbed or faded and far less distinct.

The discoverers concluded that the *verso* (which bears the numeral¹ ια, written by a later hand, at the top right-hand corner of the text) came uppermost in the book, "since it was usual to foliate the right-hand pages of a book." A page from a codex of Sophocles² also shows the *verso* uppermost: the *verso* indeed must necessarily come uppermost as often as the *recto* where a codex consists in gatherings of sheets once folded. Grenfell and Hunt advance another reason for their conclusion which is surely decisive. The scribe has filled out the ends of his short lines on the *verso* with the character 7: this device is intended to make the outer edge of the text even throughout, just as mediaeval cutters of inscriptions, scribes, and printers fill out short lines with pieces of conventional ornament. On the *recto* no such device is used, surely because this side was undermost and the ends of the lines being next the inner edge (and so less conspicuous) did not need such filling out.

This conclusion has been disputed by Batiffol³, who argues that it was usual to number the last page of each quire in a codex and that the papyrus is, therefore, the last leaf of the eleventh quire of a codex, the *recto* lying uppermost. He thinks that the ragged left edge of the *verso* has reached its present shredded state because it was the outer edge and so exposed to wear, and that the slip of papyrus gummed along the left border of the *recto* (which the discoverers explain as

¹ Wessely (*P. O.* iv, p. 153) treats the ια not as a numeral, but as a correction.

² *Ox. Pap.* i, no. 22 (pp. 47 sqq.).

³ *Revue Biblique*, 1897, p. 502.

intended to strengthen the outer margin) is simply a trace of the juxtaposition of another leaf. This last point can only be decided by experts after examination of the original; but it may be remarked here that the ragged state of the left edge of the *verso* is very likely due to the tearing out of the leaf, and that Batiffol overlooks the fact that in any quire there would be as many *verses* uppermost as *rectos*. There is, then, no good reason for doubting the discoverers' conclusion.

In general the papyri found in the rubbish-mounds of Oxyrhynchus date from the first to the eighth century, but the mound which yielded the fragment under consideration contained a great number of papyri of the first three centuries of the Christian era¹, and the Sayings were found in immediate association with documents of the second and third centuries. The hand is typical of the Roman period and indicates 300 A.D. as the latest date to which the MS. can be assigned, while the Biblical contractions, $\overline{\iota\epsilon}$, $\overline{\theta\epsilon}$, $\overline{\pi\rho}$, $\overline{\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma}$ together with the codex-form as opposed to the roll-form make an earlier date than 100 A.D. impossible and 150 A.D. unlikely as a *terminus ante quem*. The discoverers, considering that the type of uncial here used is decidedly earlier than that in use immediately before 300 A.D., conclude that the probable date of their papyrus is not much later than 200 A.D.²

In addition to the contractions already mentioned, final ω is sometimes represented by a stroke over the preceding vowel, and in the fifth so-called Logion (Saying X) the word $\delta\acute{\omega}$ was written in numeral form β' . Marks of punctuation are wholly absent, but a sign 7—as we have already seen—is used for filling in blank spaces at the end of lines. Some eccentricities in orthography, such as are common in Egyptian Greek, occur: e.g. $\alpha\iota$ for ϵ and $\epsilon\iota$ for ι : in ll. 36 and

¹ *Eg. Expl. Fund. Arch. Rep.* 1896-7, p. 6: $\Lambda\delta\gamma\mu\alpha\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$, p. 5.

² See $\Lambda\delta\gamma\mu\alpha\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$, p. 6.

38 mistakes are found, but the second of these has been corrected.

Each Saying is introduced by the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς¹, and the regular use of this together with the codex form, the use of practically no abbreviations other than Biblical, prove the papyrus to be a fragment of a literary work and not a series of notes or jottings for temporary use.

In 1903 the same two scholars resumed work at Oxyrhynchus and found a second papyrus containing five further Sayings of Jesus preceded by a Prologue². The new fragment is part of a roll, 244 m. high by 1078 m. wide, and, as it stands, is easily legible throughout. The entire right-hand side of the column has been lost, so that only one half of each of the 42 lines it contains has been preserved. Moreover, after l. 31 the beginnings of the lines also have been destroyed, the lacunae increasing as we descend until in l. 42 only two characters remain. These Sayings are written upon the *verso* of the roll, the *recto* being occupied by a land-survey list in a cursive hand which belongs to the end of the second or early part of the third century A.D. The hand of the *verso* is "an upright, informal uncial of medium size," not so fine as that of the fragment found in 1897, but clear and well-formed, which the discoverers assign to the middle or end of the third century. A date later than 300 A.D. is regarded as most unlikely by them³. The new papyrus (hereafter referred to as 654) is therefore nearly contemporary with the "Logia-fragment," which is assigned to an earlier decade in the third century.

¹ For a discussion of this formula see below, § 9.

² Published by the discoverers in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. IV, as no. 654, and, with less detail, in the Egypt Exploration Fund's *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a lost Gospel* (Frowde, London and New York, 1904). I have borrowed the term Prologue in preference to Introduction from Dr Sweete, as the latter seems to misrepresent the character of the opening five lines.

³ For this section see *Ox. Pap.* IV, pp. 1 ff.

The only abbreviation which occurs is the normal $\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{c}}^1$. The scribe places diaeresis over initial i and $\text{\ddot{y}}$, but has employed no punctuation marks. Though the words are sometimes separated, this is by no means generally or systematically done. In ll. 20, 25, words have been omitted but subsequently supplied above the line. In l. 1 there is obviously an uncorrected mistake, as also in l. 20; and in ll. 18, 23 and 31 are eccentricities, Δi for ϵ , ϵ for Δi , such as are common in Egyptian papyri and ostraka. The end of each Saying² is marked by the *coronis* \times , and is marked off from the following Saying by a *paragraphus*, a horizontal stroke drawn from the margin between the two Sayings.

The use of these signs together with the uncial script, the general absence of abbreviations, the systematic use of the formula $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}$ $\text{\textit{I}}\eta\sigma\omega\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ before each Saying, and above all the presence of a *Prologue*, prove that 654, like **I**, is a fragment of a literary work³.

§ 2. THE OXYRHYNCHUS COLLECTION.

The results of the preceding section may be summed up as follows: (1) both **I** and 654 are fragments from literary works, (2) both were written during the third century and probably in its earlier half, though **I** is considered by the discoverers to be the earlier by a few decades.

Did these two fragments belong to one Collection? Of course they do not come from the same MS., since **I** is from a codex and 654 from a roll; but they may represent two

¹ But others may well have occurred in the missing portion of the papyrus.

² In l. 27 the *coronis* is placed after the formula $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}$ $\text{\textit{I}}\eta\sigma\omega\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ obviously by accident, and in l. 36 at the end of the series of questions put by the disciples.

³ The discoverers (*Ox. Pap.* iv, p. 1) point out that there is nothing at all uncommon in the use of the back of an ephemeral document for a literary text.

copies of the same document. Now **1** is numbered 11 and is therefore the eleventh leaf of a codex: it contains eight Sayings. If we allow for the occasional occurrence of longer Sayings, such as the second and fifth in **654**, we may conclude that on an average each leaf of the codex to which **1** belonged contained five Sayings: more than fifty Sayings must therefore have preceded **1**, which, moreover, need not have been the last page in the codex, and the Collection which it represents must have been a large one. The same may be said of the Collection of which **654** is a fragment, for the papyrus begins with a formal Prologue which would be unsuitable to anything but a work of some length; and the text is written on the back of a document which is likely to have been a long one¹. When we recall further that both fragments are of one provenance and are approximately of one date, we have a good *prima facie* case for treating them as parts of one and the same Collection. Internal evidence bears this out. (1) The use of λέγει Ἰησοῦς absolutely, as a formula to introduce Sayings is unique—though this argument is not very forcible since the Oxyrhynchus fragments are the only extant remains of any formal collection of Sayings of Jesus. (2) The peculiar relation of both to the canonical Gospels is the same in the character of their divergencies and resemblances alike². (3) Both show distinct traces of the influence of Hebrew literature³. (4) The general level of thought, the doctrinal development, and the colouring is equal in both fragments. And in pure style there is the same similarity: if the parallelistic form of the Sayings in **1** is not as uniformly present in **654**, this means no more than that at some points in his source the compiler of the Collection found much, and at others little parallelistic matter; and as a matter of fact at least one, if not two, Sayings in **654** are

¹ See *Ox. Pap.* IV, pp. 2, 10.

² See § 4 (pp. xxxiv ff.), where this subject is discussed in detail.

³ Pp. lxiii ff.

cast in this shape (Sayings IV and V). Similarly the presence of a context in Saying V (and probably in Saying II), and the greater length of two of the Sayings in 654 are due to purely accidental causes. Here the compiler of the Collection might find short epigrammatic utterances, here longer Sayings which needed something of a context to bring out their meaning,—and would wish to include both alike in his “Treasury.”

All our evidence then, so far as it goes, distinctly favours the supposition that 654 is the first part of a literary Collection of Sayings, to which I also belonged.

§ 3. COLLECTIONS OF SAYINGS IN GENERAL.

Is the Oxyrhynchus Collection unique in Christian literature, or is it but one example of a numerous class? The answer to this question must obviously determine the standpoint from which we regard this document. And first we must remember that Collections of noteworthy Sayings are by no means unknown in literature generally. The Jews preserved the Sayings of their famous doctors in the Talmud and later in the Collection known as *Pirke Aboth*; and since Jewish colonies were to be found in many parts of Egypt, and Jewish influence was necessarily strong in the early Christian period, it is not impossible that the Oxyrhynchus Collection was formed, directly or indirectly, after a Hebraic model¹. But it is not necessary to assume this. The Egyptian also was naturally inclined to form Collections of Sayings, recording in aphoristic form the virtues and teaching of famous men; and the *Apophthegmata Patrum*² has come down to us as a remarkable fruit of this tendency, while the *Precepts of Ptah-hotep*³ is partly preserved to us as a somewhat similar

¹ Lock and Sanday, *Two Lectures*, p. 48.

² For a Greek text of the alphabetic recension see Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, LXV, cols. 71 ff. On the origin and date of this and other recensions see Butler, *Laus. Hist. of Palladius*, I, pp. 208 ff.

³ See Budge, *Literature of the Egyptians*, pp. 224 ff. To the same general class belong the *Maxims of Ani* (see *op. cit.* pp. 228 ff.).

monument from the Dynastic Period. We need not therefore go outside Egypt to find the origin of such literature.

The discoverers have suggested that the Oxyrhynchus Collection may well have been but one of many such works and cite the *Logia* of Matthew and the *Logia Kyriaka* on which Papias commented as other examples of Collections of Sayings, though they regard the possibility of a connection between either of these and the document found by them as entirely remote. What, then, was the nature of the two works referred to, and were they in their general structure and scope similar to the Oxyrhynchus Collection? In this connection Dr Lock¹ has remarked that in the first and second centuries the term *λόγια* or *τὰ λόγια* with *Θεοῦ*, or *τοῦ Κυρίου*, or *Κυριακά* added, generally seems to mean either the Old Testament or the whole Gospel message, while the combination *λόγια Ἰησοῦ* is never found: accordingly he suggested (in 1897) that the true title of the Oxyrhynchus Collection was *λόγοι Ἰησοῦ*²—a brilliant conjecture which was confirmed by the discovery of 654. But Papias³ in his notice of Mark's Gospel and Matthew's *Logia* seems to equate *λόγοι* and *λόγια*, though the latter term, no doubt, has the fuller meaning "*inspired Sayings*." I therefore take *λόγια* and *λόγοι* alike to mean "*Sayings*." The passage is very important for an investigation of the nature of the *Logia* of Matthew and the *Logia Kyriaka*: it may here be quoted in full. καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγεν· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσεν τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ· ὅς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων. ὥστε οὐδὲν ἡμαρτεν Μάρκος, οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποιή-

¹ *Two Lectures*, p. 16.

² For *λόγος* = 'Saying' (in our sense) cp. *Matth.* xv 12.

³ *op.* Eusebius *H. E.* III, 39. 15, 16.

στατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσεν παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστορεῖται τῷ Παπία περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται. Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος.

I am reminded that the view that Papias' work dealt not with Sayings of our Lord, but with Messianic prophecies—which, of course, occupy a larger place in *Matthew* than in any other Gospel—is now gaining considerable ground. It is impossible to enter here upon a discussion of the nature of Papias' work; nor am I qualified to do so. But surely the evidence before us goes to show that unrecorded Sayings, parables and acts of our Lord were the materials Papias collected and dealt with. Cp. the words of Eusebius where after recording the miraculous deliverance of Justus Barsabas he adds: (§ 11) καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὡσὰν ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου εἰς αὐτὸν ἤκοντα παρατίθεται, ξείας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τινὰ ἄλλα μυθικώτερα. It is difficult to see how such material and traditions, such as the death of St John the Divine, the incident of the woman "accused of many sins before the Lord" would be fitted into a disquisition on Messianic prophecies. Again, Papias as reported by Eusebius (III, 39. 4) tells us that: τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν. It is doubtful if he would in this way obtain much to enrich a work on Messianic prophecies; but he would be likely to hear of many unrecorded Sayings, Discourses and the like. On the one hand Papias seems to disparage a side of Mark's work: it was composed for special needs, and the Sayings or discourses of the Lord were somewhat loosely and disjointedly set down (οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων); on the other, he appears to find Matthew's work superior in this respect, though some difficulty in the rendering or interpretation of

it arose from the use of the "Hebrew dialect" (Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο [v.l. συνεγράψατο], ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος). When we recall that Papias is commenting on *Sayings* of the Lord we can hardly doubt the reason for this comparison between the two works as συντάξεις λόγων: he is choosing the *Logia* of Matthew as the subject of his Commentary¹ and explaining why he preferred this work to Mark's Gospel. The remark ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος is accounted for by the fact that Papias proposes to give ἐρμηνεῖαι of his own: he implies, of course, that this interpretation had hitherto been ill done and that his own would be authoritative. The *Logia* of Matthew and the λόγια Κυριακά on which Papias commented are therefore, on this view, one and the same.

This identification is also made by Kirsopp Lake on different grounds². It is known that the Commentary of Papias was in five books, and Sir John Hawkins has pointed out³ that the First Gospel shows signs of an underlying document divided into five "perēks" or chapters, the ends of which appear in *Matth.* vii 28, xi 1, xiii 53, xix 1, xxvi 1—roughly in the form καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους.... Presumably the underlying document is the *Logia* of Matthew, a fact which would account for the otherwise difficult ascription of the First Gospel to Matthew.

The *Logia* of Matthew and the *Logia Kyriaka* resolve themselves on this argument into Q, the non-Markan source of the First and Third Gospels. Now though there may be some disagreement as to the exact shape and

¹ Papias clearly worked on the basis of an accepted document and grouped his real material round those passages which it seemed to supplement and explain. Compare Papias' own words συγκατατάξαι ταῖς ἐρμηνείαις, and the account of Eusebius (*H. E.* III, 39, 11) καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὡσὰν ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου... παρατίθεται, ξένας τὲ τινὰς παραβολὰς τοῦ σωτῆρος κ.τ.λ.

² *Hibbert Journal*, III, pp. 337-8.

³ *Horae Synopticae*, 131-5.

details of Q, its general form and nature is clear: it consisted in discourses and parables, with some short Sayings and, apparently, brief narrative connections. This is a document totally different from the Oxyrhynchus Collection which is a series of short, independent Sayings without any connections either of narrative or (apparently) of subject. Professor Lake¹ has indeed suggested a connection between the Oxyrhynchus Sayings and Q by an analysis of *Luke* i 1-4. He points out that in the clause ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν, the word κατηχήθης has a technical sound, and asks: can these λόγοι be a series of Sayings used for the instruction of converts which Luke is providing with a historical framework? If so, οἱ λόγοι is equivalent to Q and was used by Luke directly, while the First Gospel is based upon a recension known as *λόγια*—the Matthaean *Logia* of Papias. But there is no need to suppose Luke means more by λόγοι here than “matters,” “subjects”—even if κατηχήθης be given its full technical sense; and in any case the Q of Luke like the Q of Matthew (supposing them to have used different recensions) must still have been totally unlike the Oxyrhynchus Collection.

The *Logia* of Matthew, then, together with its equivalents and semi-equivalents cannot—so far as our evidence enables us to judge—have been in any sense analogous to the Oxyrhynchus Sayings.

Is it possible to discern behind the Synoptic Gospels and behind, or independent of, Q a primitive Collection of Sayings which is comparable to that of Oxyrhynchus? The theory that in the earliest days of Christianity there existed a Collection of Sayings was enthusiastically championed by Dr Rendel Harris² after the publication of **I**, was accepted and advanced a stage by Professor Lake³ after the appear-

¹ *Hibbert Journal*, III, p. 337.

² *Contemp. Rev.* 1897, p. 346.

³ *Hibbert Journal*, III, pp. 332 ff.

ance of 654, and has even found a follower in Dr Harnack¹ (who identifies this document with Q). Harris pointed out that *agrapha* are quoted by St Paul², Clement of Rome, and Polycarp with an introductory formula which varies but little, wherever used, and considered that the constancy with which this distinctive formula is used indicates that it is borrowed from a Collection of Sayings. The passages in question are as follows:

(1) *Acts* xx 35 δει...μνημονεύειν τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· κ.τ.λ.

(2) i *Clem. Rom.* xiii μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν· οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν κ.τ.λ.

(3) *Id.* XLVI μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· εἶπε γάρ· κ.τ.λ.

(4) Polycarp, *ad Philipp.* ii μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων, κ.τ.λ.

Since, however, Polycarp appears to have borrowed both formula and *agraphon* from Clement, St Paul and Clement of Rome stand alone as authorities for this formula. Professor Lake³ claims that in the Prologue of 654 we have another example of this citation-formula and one which by its position at the head of a series of Sayings vindicates Harris' theory in the most striking way. And indeed at first sight the words οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι...οὓς ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς...καὶ εἶπεν seem to lie very near to the introduction used by St Paul and Clement. Closer examination does not confirm this. In St Paul and in Clement ὅτι εἶπεν (or its equivalent) is always exegetical of οἱ λόγοι, whereas the author of the Prologue makes οἱ λόγοι cover the whole Collection, and uses καὶ εἶπεν to introduce a casual citation

¹ *The Sayings of Jesus* (E.T.), pp. 188-9.

² St Paul has another logion (but without formula) in 1 Cor. xiii 2 καὶ ἐχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ἄνθρωπον μεθιστάνειν (cf. *Matth.* xxi 21).

³ *Hibbert Journal*, III, 334.

intended to clinch a point which he is driving home. The Prologue of 654 cannot therefore be held to support Dr Harris' theory.

The main position moreover is open to attack from more than one side. Clement's earlier citation does not seem to be a *Logos* at all (in the technical sense) for the writer clearly indicates that it is taken from a discourse on ἐπιείκεια and μακροθυμία: and there is nothing to show that the same may not be true of the remaining examples. Again, the "formula" is by no means necessarily borrowed from a Collection: in itself it is a natural hieratic form such as would, when once established, come in very general use¹. But above all we find the "formula" or very close approximations to it in the Gospels and elsewhere in contexts which do not allow us to regard it as a loan from a Collection of our Lord's Sayings.

(1) *Luke* xii 61 καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι....

(2) *Id.* xxiv 6 μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν...λέγων....

(3) *Ib.* 44 οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὅτι....

(4) *Acts* xi 16 ὑπεμνήσθη δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος κυρίου ὡς ἔλεγε Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι....

(5) *John* xv 20 μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν.

(6) *Id.* xvi 4 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λελάληκα ἵνα...μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν.

(7) *Jude* 17 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων...ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν....

(8) *Clem. Rom.* xix 20 μεμνήμεθα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλου ὡς ἐντελλόμενος εἶπεν ἡμῖν....

(9) Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxiv 5 μνημονεύετε τῶν λόγων κυρίου ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν....

¹ Just as "You will remember how our Lord says" is a stock pulpit-phrase at the present day.

Of these passages (8) alone introduces an *agraphon* (previously overlooked in this connection), and if we are to maintain that the "formula" is still derived from a Collection, we must be equally prepared to maintain the probability that our Lord (as in 3, 5 and 6) and the angels at the Sepulchre (as in 2) would be represented as quoting a citation-formula from a Collection; we must explain why Luke uses it in (1) as part of his ordinary narrative, and why Peter in (4) uses it to preface a Saying which he remembers to have heard himself from Jesus. Are we, lastly, to infer from (7) that there was also a Collection of Sayings of the Apostles introduced by the same formula? The example quoted from Epiphanius gives the key to the whole matter. Formula and citation are there borrowed from *Acts* xx 35, and we have already seen that Polycarp borrows the formula (with an *agraphon*) from Clement of Rome. The form of citation is solemn and impressive and, as we have said, once it had taken root, it would spread widely. It is by no means unlikely that Luke—who has no less than five examples—was the first to make it current coin; but in its origin it seems to be merely a natural homiletic expression. May it not be that Luke learnt it from St Paul himself, not at Ephesus alone, but in the general course of his preaching, absorbed it into his own literary stock, and so passed it on to other writers? We conclude, then, that the citation-formula of Paul and Clement cannot be held to be evidence for the existence of a Collection of Sayings—much less of a Collection analogous in type to the Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus.

Lastly, can we discern such a primitive Collection in the two sources of the Synoptic Gospels, Mark and Q? The second of these contained a number of Sayings which are short, epigrammatic, and often parallelistic in form: *Luke* vi 27 ff. and *Matth.* v 13 ff. may be mentioned as special repositories of such Sayings. These *logoi* are exactly what

we should expect to find in a primitive Collection. In many cases they are quite arbitrarily introduced without context, and in others owe their grouping to an editor's striving after *σύνταξις*. The probability that these isolated *logoi* are derived from a Collection is greatly strengthened when we turn to the second Gospel. Mark shows a decided partiality to the historic present; yet in ch. iv we find a series of Sayings—of which the first two (*vv.* 21-23 and 24-25) have only a verbal connection, and the second pair (*vv.* 26-29 and 30-32) though linked by their common subject (the kingdom of Heaven), cannot well have been uttered on a single occasion—preceded in each case by the formula *καὶ ἔλεγεν*¹. Now this formula "he used to say" or "he was saying" is precisely that used to introduce supplementary Sayings of Jewish Rabbis in such a work as the *Pirke Aboth* from which Dr Burney² quotes as an example "Hillel said...He used to say...." In the corresponding Lucan passage (*Luke viii* 16-18) these remarkable introductions have been improved away. While, therefore, we are far from possessing complete proof, the character of the isolated Sayings and the Marcan use of the formula *καὶ ἔλεγεν* make it probable that here at last we have traces of a primitive Collection which was used by Mark and by the compiler of Q or, as we may say, by Matthew in compiling his *Logia*.

Assuming for purposes of argument that this primitive Collection is now proved to have existed, what are we to say of its relation to the Oxyrhynchus Collection? First, the Egyptian example is not derived from the primitive document: it is based—as we shall see—on the Gospels and, indeed, contains elements which are obviously later than anything in either Matthew or Luke, nor could we well

¹ Should *vv.* 2 ff., 9 and 11 be included in this series?

² *Ap. Lock and Sanday, Two Lectures*, p. 47. See also Taylor, *Oxyrhynchus Logia*, pp. 25-6.

imagine the Oxyrhynchus Collection to be a recension in the light of later thought and more developed theology of such a primitive Collection. Can we then regard these Collections as two links in a chain, and suppose that the intervening links—a greater or less number of other Collections—have been lost to us? In that case the Oxyrhynchus Sayings would be, at least indirectly, modelled after the primitive Collection, and the new matter in them, where not demonstrably of later date, would acquire a very weighty claim to historicity. But this is improbable: a number of Collections covering the period from the earliest days of Christianity could hardly have perished without leaving other traces and without the slightest literary notice¹. It is far more likely that the Oxyrhynchus Collection was made at a time when the primitive Collection had been absorbed into the Synoptic Gospels and utterly forgotten, by some person familiar with the Jewish and Egyptian practice of treasuring up the pregnant Sayings of famous teachers. So regarded, it would be but an unconscious revival of the primitive Christian Collection, and its true model would be Jewish or Egyptian.

§ 4. RELATION TO THE CANONICAL GOSPELS.

The most hasty glance at the text of the two Oxyrhynchus fragments is sufficient to show that the Collection stood in intimate, but somewhat peculiar, relation to the Canonical Gospels. If the nature of this relation can be determined, we shall have achieved a distinct step towards ascertaining the position of the Sayings in Christian literature and their date, and, it may be, we shall find in our hands a clue to their origin.

In the first place we can say positively that the Sayings are not extracts from the Canonical Gospels. Some of the

¹ Unless indeed *λόγοι* in *Luke* i 4 be a reference; though Luke seems to derive all his *logoi* from Mark or from Q.

Sayings are completely new: others, indeed, approach one or other of the Gospels very nearly at certain points, but with such differences as preclude not only the theory of direct extraction but even of loose citation.

What connection, then, if any, exists between the Oxyrhynchus Collection and the Fourth Gospel? In their general character the Sayings are clearly Synoptic rather than Johannine. In the *Prologue*, indeed, we have what appears to be a direct citation from John; but this owes its position to the compiler of the Collection, and therefore stands quite apart from the Sayings themselves. In fact the two fragments do not contain a single passage which can be regarded as derived either from the Fourth Gospel or from any other Johannine work. And though in 654 (l. 20) I have ventured on a conjecture which lies very near to a passage in the First Epistle of St John, I do not suppose that the restoration—should it ever be vindicated—was derived either directly or indirectly from that work: so impressive a dictum as “we abide in Him and He in us” cannot have appeared for the first time in St John’s Gospel, but (historicity apart) must have its roots in very early times; and I do not see why the Oxyrhynchus Collection may not have been indebted to the same source (whether traditional or documentary) as St John, or to some nearly related source. At the same time Johannine influence is distinctly traceable in the Sayings. The most important mark of this influence is to be found in Saying VIII (Logion III) where the expression ἐν σαρκὶ ὡφθην αὐτοῖς distinctly implies, though it need not there consciously insist upon, the doctrine of Pre-existence, a doctrine which is quite foreign to the Synoptics: perhaps, too, the mystical philosophy of the latter part of Saying II (so far as it is extant) is also to be accounted Johannine. More numerous are expressions and phrases which are characteristic of the Johannine period. Harnack has remarked that in

Saying VII (Logion II) ὁ κόσμος is used in its Johannine sense of all that is foreign and must remain foreign to the Christian, and if in the same Saying ὁψεσθαι τὸν πατέρα can be paralleled in St Matthew, the Synoptic use of the phrase is altogether exceptional while in St John it is normal. In Saying VIII (Logion III) ἐν σαρκὶ ὠφθῆναι not only indicates a Johannine doctrine, but verbally also is characteristic of the same movement. (Dr Sanday compares 1 *Tim.* iii 16; 1 *John* iv 2; 2 *John* 7.) The use of διψᾶν similarly betrays Johannine influence; but if the view expressed in the Commentary is right, and there is some sort of a literary debt to Isaiah, it marks incipient rather than fully developed Johannism. Finally, Saying X (Logion V), though apparently connected with Matthew so far as form is concerned, is Johannine in spirit (cf. *John* xiv 18; xvi 32).

A fairly definite conclusion may be drawn from these facts: Johannine influence is distinctly present, though definite dependence on any of the Johannine works or literary use of any of them is not likely. Nor is this tendency a vital element in the Sayings, but belongs to their colouring rather than to their substance. On a general view we might say that the Sayings were formed at a period when Johannism was already in the air but still nascent and undeveloped, or if we hold that Johannine thought is essentially the product of one master mind, that they were shaped in a locality which lay back from the stream and was only reached by ripples of Johannine thought.

The relation of the Sayings is therefore with the Synoptics¹. Of these, Mark may be dismissed at once. There is no Saying which finds a parallel in Mark alone, none whose phraseology is distinctively that of the second Gospel. But with Matthew and with Luke the Sayings are very intimately connected. The first clause of Saying I recalls ζητεῖτε καὶ

¹ The relations of the Sayings to the Synoptics are discussed in detail in the Commentary on each Saying.

εὐρήσετε which is common to both Matthew and Luke, and, though it need not be dependent upon either, the probability that it is an amplification of the canonical version is strong. The earlier part of Saying II, though apparently in literary dependence on *Job*, is likely to have been suggested by *Matth.* vi 25 ff., but has a definite point of contact with *Luke* in the phrase *ἡ βασιλεία ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστί*. On the other hand the ending of Saying III definitely follows *Matth.* xix 30, as against *Luke* xiv 30, while Saying IV is compounded of elements derived from both *Matthew* and *Luke* (Commentary, p. 18). Saying V again seems to be closely parallel to *Matthew* in its substance, and probably in its wording also, though the extreme mutilation of the papyrus forbids a confident conclusion. Saying VI (Logion I) agrees exactly with *Luke* so far as it is preserved. In Sayings VII–IX (Logia II–IV) there is nothing to indicate a direct debt to either *Matthew* or *Luke*, though Saying VII (Logion II), as Harnack has pointed out, contains phrases which are characteristic of the Synoptics. Saying X (Logion V) is certainly connected with Matthew's "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst," but diverges from it so markedly that the relation may not be immediate. With Sayings XI and XII (Logia VI and VII) we are on firmer ground: the former is undoubtedly connected with *Luke* alone, as is proved by (1) the use of *δεκτός*, and (2) the manipulation of the physician-proverb; the latter is a contamination of a Saying peculiar to *Matthew*, with elements drawn from the Matthaean version of the parable of the Wise and Foolish Housebuilders.

Such in brief review is the relation between the Sayings and the Gospels. Three conclusions stand out clearly: (1) there are instances of literary dependence on the part of the Sayings upon *Matthew* and *Luke*; (2) there is no clear trace of Marcan influence; and (3) Johannine influence has occasionally coloured the Sayings, but is superficial; and

the Sayings are nowhere in literary dependence on the Johannine books.

§ 5. THE NATURE OF THE COLLECTION.

Three main views have been formulated as to the nature and origin of the Oxyrhynchus Sayings. First, they have been thought to constitute a genuine and independent Collection; that is, a Collection of Sayings hitherto current orally and by tradition independently of written documents. On another explanation the Sayings, while containing a large element of accretion due to the mind of their editor (or, perhaps, gathered in the course of tradition), spring ultimately from the Canon. Others regard the Collection as a thesaurus derived from one or more of the uncanonical Gospels.

The first view is based by the discoverers upon two main arguments. (1) "The primitive cast and setting of the Sayings, the absence of any consistent tendency in favour of any particular sect, the wide divergence in the familiar Sayings from the text of the Gospels, the striking character of those which are new, combine to separate the fragment [I] from the Apocryphal literature of the middle and latter half of the second century and to refer it back to a period when the Canonical Gospels had not yet reached their pre-eminent position¹." (2) The reference to St Thomas in the Prologue of 654 as the authority for the Sayings makes it impossible to believe that the Collection could have been derived from an apocryphal Gospel: such a fraud would have been detected at once².

That the Sayings are in some sense primitive is, of course, true; but the epithet is relative, and though the Sayings are undoubtedly primitive as compared with apocryphal literature generally, they are as certainly not primitive when

¹ *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ*, p. 16.

² *Ox. Pap.* IV, p. 16.

compared with the Synoptic Gospels—unless indeed the evidence summed up in the preceding section can be proved to be misleading. The very divergencies of the Sayings from their Synoptic parallels point the same way in as much as they are traceable to the context of the authentic Saying, or are the result of conflation with another Synoptic Saying (see especially Sayings IV, XI and XII). Moreover, there are in the Sayings clear signs of a somewhat later plane of thought than that of the Synoptic Gospels, signs such as the sense in which *ὁ κόσμος* is used in Saying VII (Logion II) or as the doctrine of Pre-existence implied in Saying VIII (Logion III). It would indeed be difficult to regard the Sayings as derived from any documentary source if we could accept the discoverers' view that according to the *Prologue* the Sayings were addressed to Thomas, or to Thomas and one or more other of the disciples. But the Sayings themselves are addressed sometimes in the 2nd person singular, sometimes in the plural, and are sometimes quite neutral; and one at least is in answer to a question put by the disciples as a body (Saying V). They can hardly be said to be addressed exclusively to one (or two) persons. Moreover, in the Commentary on the *Prologue* I have shown reason for believing that the Prologue made no such claim to the authority of Thomas, but merely mentions the apostle incidentally. We cannot, then—at least for the reasons stated by the first editors—accept the Collection as genuine and independent.

In view of their common quality, Dr Sanday regards the Sayings as the work of a single mind, starting as a rule from a genuine Saying but working it up in a sense of its own: the individual stamp which they show belongs to a later generation and to a more developed stage of reflection than do the authentic Sayings¹. But while Dr Sanday believes them to have originated under conditions of thought which

¹ *Two Lectures*, pp. 34-35.

the Gospels had created, he considers that direct literary use of the Canonical books is not probable¹.

This view can be accepted as it stands except in so far as it denies the direct literary dependence of the Sayings upon the Gospels. The question has already been considered generally in the section on the Relation to the Canonical Gospels, and the particular instances of dependence are examined in detail in the Commentary: we need only repeat here that literary dependence seems to be the only explanation which will meet the double fact that the correspondences, when they occur, are very close and often extend even to minute points, as in Saying VI (Logion I), and that the divergencies are clearly intentional and calculated either to give a new direction to the Sayings, or (apparently) to adapt it to a new context.

We are now reduced to a choice between two alternatives. Either the Collection is entirely spurious and is a literary invention by a writer of the early second century who set himself to invent Sayings and made some use of Synoptic materials in order to make his work seem genuine; or the Collection is a Treasury of Sayings culled from one or more of the Apocryphal Gospels. The evidence which supports the second alternative excludes the former. Now in an independent Collection (whether spurious or genuine) each Saying must be complete in itself and will reveal no traces of a context: in a Collection of extracts, however, some Sayings may be quite self-contained, but others may be expected to show signs of the context from which they have been torn. The Oxyrhynchus Sayings seem to show such signs of extraction. Saying I is, of course, complete in itself, though we know from Clement of Alexandria that it was actually an extract (see Commentary). The second is too mutilated to admit of absolute certainty, but the question "Who are they who draw us?" postulates a

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 41.

preceding Saying or discourse in which a reference made to οἱ ἔλκοιτες provoked the question. The third Saying (see Commentary) has all the air of being derived from a narrative passage parallel to one or other of the Synoptic incidents dealing with the seeking for precedence. Saying IV is certainly addressed to an individual—a mark of precision which is not in the least likely to have survived in a purely independent Saying—and is therefore to be accounted an extract: I may perhaps be allowed to draw attention to my attempt to restore this Saying to its original context. The discoverers have rightly remarked that the context of Saying V, which the compiler was obliged to retain in order to make his Saying intelligible, may be made to furnish an argument either for or against the theory of extraction¹. None the less, this Saying is probably an extract: it begins with a very forcible verb, ἐξετάζουσιν, for which the discoverers compare *John* xxi 12 οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν. The meaning in both cases is more than “to ask him”: it is rather “to examine him strictly,” with a view to clearing up uncertainty or difficulty or mystery. This being so, we are forced to conclude that the Saying once had a context representing something to have been said or done by Jesus which caused the disciples to inquire what was his precise teaching on prayer, fasting and the like. Saying VI is addressed in the second person singular; but the use here may be purely rhetorical, unless the missing first half gave the extant fragment a new and more particular direction. But this will not apply to Saying XIII (Logion VIII): here, as in Saying IV, it seems clear that an individual is addressed, and we feel a curious sense of incompleteness in the absence of the circumstances in which the Saying was uttered and have to paraphrase it in order to understand its meaning. We should understand better what is signified by ‘hearing with one ear’ if we knew for certain what called forth the

¹ *Ox. Pap.* iv, p. 15.

rebuke. The remainder of the Sayings are quite neutral; but the instances in which the loss of a context is more or less clearly indicated are sufficient to create a very strong presumption that the Oxyrhynchus Sayings are in fact extracts.

§ 6. RELATION TO THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

In the preceding section I have shown reason for believing that the Sayings are extracts; and as they cannot have been derived from the Canonical Gospels, their only possible source is one or more of the Apocryphal Gospels. In this connection Dr M. R. James has suggested that we probably have to do with more than a single source and that several Gospels may have been laid under contribution¹; but the definite homogeneity of the Sayings alike in style, in method of composition, and in level of thought is fatal to this view which can, indeed, rank as little more than a guess without further precision as to what the plural Gospels were.

It would, perhaps, be generally conceded by those critics who regard the Sayings as extracts that only three of the various sources which have been suggested any longer have a serious claim to consideration—the *Gospel of Thomas*, and the *Gospels according to the Egyptians* and the *Hebrews*².

A connection between the Sayings and the *Gospel of Thomas* is somewhat favourably regarded by the discoverers³ for the twofold reason that in the Prologue the Sayings are attributed to Thomas, and that the Saying "the Kingdom of Heaven is within you" is thought to have occurred in

¹ *Contemp. Review*, 1897, p. 157.

² Zahn's view that the Ebionite Gospel was the source of the Sayings would be very plausible (compare Saying VII with the *agraphon* quoted by Epiphanius in *Haer.* xxx, 16) were it not that the Christology of that Gospel is irreconcilable with that of Saying X.

³ *Ox. Pap.* iv, pp. 18–19.

some form in the *Gospel of Thomas* as well as in the Sayings. The former of these, however, is pure conjecture: the attribution of the Sayings to Thomas depends on a restoration of the text of the Prologue which, as I think, can no longer be maintained; and as I have shown in the Commentary a more natural and less dangerous supplement is possible. The second piece of evidence advanced by the discoverers must also be rejected; first, because Hippolytus¹ gives no ground for believing that ἡ ἐν τὸς ἀνθρώπου βασιλεία is other than a reference to the well-known Saying in *Luke* (see Commentary on Saying II); and secondly because the extant recensions of the *Gospel of Thomas* are confined to a narrative of the childhood of Jesus and no evidence exists to show that in its original form the Gospel had any wider scope, while the Saying about the Kingdom of Heaven cannot have occurred in a narrative of the childhood. And further, the *agraphon* actually quoted by Hippolytus from the *Gospel of Thomas* ἐμὲ ὁ ζητῶν εὐρήσει ἐν παιδίοις ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἑπτὰ would seem to indicate that in its original form as used by the Naasenes this document was no more than a Childhood-Gospel.

On the other hand Dr Taylor² has shown that there are some points of contact between the Sayings and the extant versions of the *Gospel of Thomas*. Is it then possible to maintain with any show of plausibility that the Sayings³ which show connection with the Gospel may have actually been derived from that Gospel in its primitive form? This must be answered in the negative. Not only is it almost or quite certain that the original *Gospel of Thomas* was a Gospel of the Childhood in which most, if not all, of the Oxyrhynchus Sayings could never have occurred, but the relevant passages in the extant versions of the Gospel are so few and so slight, and their contexts are so obviously

¹ *Refut.* v, 7.

² *Oxyrh. Logia*, pp. 90-93.

³ See Commentary on Sayings I, VIII and X.

irreconcilable with those of the Sayings which they recall, that they can be regarded as no more than reminiscences due directly or indirectly to the Sayings or to their source: no exercise of ingenuity can make it seem even possible that Saying VIII (Logion III), for example, took the place in the original Gospel of the Saying¹ *νῦν καρποφορεῖτωσαν τὰ σά, καὶ βλέπέτωσαν οἱ τυφλοὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ.*

The claim of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* to be considered the source of the Sayings has been maintained by Harnack², Badham, Taylor and others. Harnack is satisfied that the Sayings are extracts, and that their source was a Gospel of Synoptic type. He goes on to indicate that the citations³ in the ps.-Clementine *Second Epistle to the Corinthians* bear the same relation to the Synoptic Gospels as do the Sayings in their well-defined dependence upon Matthew and Luke. All this coincides with the view which I had formed independently, save only in one particular. Not only do ps.-Clement's citations resemble the Sayings in their relation to Matthew and Luke, but also in the peculiar character of their divergencies from the Synoptic writers⁴. Perhaps the most notable of these citations is the following (xii 2): *ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπὸ τινος πότε ἤξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν· ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἓν, καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω, καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ.*

This Saying closely resembles the concluding part of a fragment from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* III, 9, 64) *Σαλώμη φησί· Μέχρι τίνος οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀποθανοῦνται;...ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ κύριος· Μέχρις ἃν τίκτωσιν αἱ γυναῖκες· (id. III, 9, 63) ἦλθον [γὰρ] καταλῦσαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας. (id. III, 9, 66) Καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα;...ἀμείβεται λέγων ὁ κύριος· Πᾶσαν φάγε*

¹ *Evang. Thom.* A, VIII (ed. Tischendorf).

² *Op. cit.* pp. 26 ff.

³ Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, pp. 32-3.

⁴ See esp. Preuschen, p. 32, no. 10.

βοτάνην, τὴν δὲ πικρίαν ἔχουσιν μὴ φάγῃς. (*id.* III, 13, 92)
 πυνθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης πότε γνωσθήσεται (γενήσεται: Zahn)
 τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο, ἔφη ὁ κύριος· "Ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνῃς ἔνδυμα
 πατήσῃτε καὶ ὅταν γένῃται τὰ δύο ἓν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς
 θηλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ. But can it be held that ps.-
 Clement's citation is identical with this fragment? The
 divergencies between the two are such as can scarcely be
 reconciled by the theory of quotation from memory.

(i) ps.-Clement's context is purely Lucan: in xii 13 and
 xviii 18 Luke records inquiries addressed to our Lord by "a
 certain man"; and in xviii 20 precisely the same question as
 that recorded by ps.-Clement is asked; though Luke ascribes
 it to the Pharisees¹. Contrast this with the fragment from the
 Egyptian Gospel. Salome inquires: When the things about
 which she asked shall be known (*or* shall come to pass)?
 Her question was: "How long shall men die?" This may
 be ultimately equivalent to "When shall the kingdom of
 God come?", but formally the two are so remote that it is
 extremely doubtful if ps.-Clement would have treated them
 as synonymous. And would he have been likely to have
 forgotten who put this question? It is vastly more probable
 that the author of the Egyptian Gospel substituted Salome
 for the indefinite interlocutor of ps.-Clement's source².

(ii) Further, ps.-Clement has nothing to correspond to the
 remarkable clause concerning trampling upon the garment
 of shame. It is not likely to have escaped his memory if it
 stood in his original, and why should he suppress it? So far
 indeed is the Clementine citation from being identical with
 the passage from the Egyptian Gospel, that the former
 appears to stand to the latter rather in the relation of grand-
 father; for the Gospel-fragment discovered by Grenfell and
 Hunt (*Ox. Pap.* iv, no. 655, ll. 17 ff.) has a passage which
 seems to stand between the two under consideration. On
 the one hand the context λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·

¹ See Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 196.

² Resch, *op. cit.* 203.

πότε ἡμῖν ἐμφανῆς ἔσει καὶ πότε σε ὀψόμεθα; seems closely related to the Clementine version¹; but on the other, the actual Saying λέγει ὅταν ἐκδύσησθε καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθῆτε... betrays kinship with the Egyptian Gospel.

(iii) Again, ps.-Clement has the clause: "and that which is without as that which is within"—a clause which the Egyptian Gospel omits. This omission can only be explained (as I believe) on Resch's theory² as deliberate in order to give a purely Encratite meaning to a Saying whose original significance³ was that the kingdom of God will come when all differences and barriers are broken down.

In view of these divergencies the conclusion that the Clementine version is not only not to be identified with that of the Egyptian Gospel but stands at least two stages above it, seems inevitable. Harnack's argument that the ps.-Clementine citations were derived from the Egyptian Gospel⁴ rested solely upon the assumed identity of the Clementine with the Egyptian version: if this may now be taken as disproved, his attribution of the Sayings to the Egyptian Gospel on the grounds already stated must fall to the ground.

We may add the following considerations: (i) if the passage in ii Clem. xii 2 were proved to be a loose citation of the Egyptian Gospel, this would not necessarily imply that all the citations were from that source; for apart from its context the Saying is rather Pauline than Synoptic. (ii) Though in view of their common quality the Sayings certainly conform to one *type*, this need not imply that they necessarily came from one and the same document. The citation in ii Clem. v 2 may be referred on structural grounds to the *Gospel*

¹ Immediately before the citation ps.-Clem. says: ἐπειδὴ οὐκ οἶδαμεν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

² Resch, *op. cit.* p. 202.

³ For the elements in and interpretation of this Saying, cp. Resch, *op. cit.* 197 ff.

⁴ And, we may add, his theory of the Synoptic character of that Gospel.

according to the *Hebrews* as I have pointed out elsewhere¹—a view which is perhaps strengthened by the fact that it is immediately followed (in v 5) by an oblique citation of a passage known to come from that Gospel².

Before we leave this matter, however, we must consider the view of Dr Armitage Robinson³ who, without committing himself to Harnack's theory as to the source of the Sayings as a whole, considers that Sayings VII and X (Logia II and V) at least may be from the Egyptian Gospel. Clement of Alexandria⁴ in his discussion of the subject of marriage seems to meet an objection based upon a saying similar to the first half of Saying X (Logion V), and further on in the same argument mentions Julius Cassianus as quoting the Salome dialogue from the Egyptian Gospel. Clement then quotes the passage from Isaiah dealing with the eunuchs and their Sabbath-keeping and winds up with an allegorical interpretation of the eunuchs as keeping Sabbath by refraining from sin: "Blessed are they," he concludes, "who fast from the world." Dr Armitage Robinson argues that, while certainty is impossible, Clement is probably dealing with not one but three citations from the Egyptian Gospel. This probability may be admitted; but the admission does not involve the attribution of Sayings VII and X to the Egyptian Gospel. As I have tried to show in the Commentary on the latter of these Sayings, the Saying with which Clement had to deal had a reference not only to One and Two, but also to Three which is lacking in the Oxyrhynchus Saying though it is found in a version quoted by Ephraem Syrus. If therefore the Saying with which Clement deals actually occurred in the Egyptian Gospel,

¹ *J. T. S.* xiv, 401-2.

² ii *Clem.* v 2 ἡ δὲ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγάλη καὶ θαυμαστή ἐστὶν καὶ ἀνάπαυσις τῆς μελλούσης βασιλείας καὶ ζωῆς αἰώνιου.

³ *Expositor*, 1897, pp. 417 ff.

⁴ *Strom.* iii, *passim*.

we may be sure that the Sayings are not derived from that document, since it is there found in an extended and more developed form. Neither does it seem likely that Clement's blessing on "those who fast from the world" is directly derived from our Saying. If I am not mistaken in my interpretation of Saying VII, Clement's allegorical explanation of the terms "Sabbath" and the "fast from the world" is altogether later than the sense in which they are used in the Saying: and, as I have argued in the Commentary, the positive beatitude "Blessed are they who fast from the world" is probably a direct quotation (whether from the Egyptian Gospel or no), and is therefore not to be identified with the converse form "Unless ye fast the world, ye shall not find the kingdom of God" of the Oxyrhynchus Saying.

Lastly, Mr Badham¹ finds that in "their seeming Gnosticism, their asceticism, the country where this papyrus was discovered, and, above all, some remarkable points of contact with the *Pistis Sophia* and allied works, no other source than the Egyptian Gospel seems possible" for the Sayings. First of all we may dismiss the argument from the place of origin: hitherto many Gospel fragments have been found in Egypt but not one which can pretend to come from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, a work which seems, indeed, never to have been so very popular in Egypt and to have been the treasure of a sect rather than of a Church. As to the alleged asceticism of the Sayings, it is non-existent. The fast towards the world of Saying VII means no more than abstention from sin as the thing symbolised in the rite of fasting, and in Saying V fasting is regarded only as one of the normal religious observances to be performed sincerely and without ostentation. Finally, there is the Gnosticism which Mr Badham sees in Saying VIII (Logion III): "Christ refers back to the days of His flesh in a way which distinctly implies some occasion between the Resurrection

¹ *Athenaeum*, Aug. 7, 1897.

and Ascension" and "from the '*Pistis Sophia*' and Irenaeus we know what an attraction the Gnostics found in this interval." How unfounded this view is will become clear (I think) to anyone who will weigh the considerations put forward in the Commentary on Saying VIII. I need only repeat here how inappropriate the expression "My soul grieveth over the sons of men" would be in the mouth of the risen Christ.

To sum up. We have now examined the arguments by which Harnack, Robinson and Badham have sought to refer the Sayings to the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, and as a result we find (*a*) that the passages in the Sayings which have been thought to correspond with citations from the Egyptian Gospel certainly cannot be identified with these citations; (*b*) that while the Egyptian Gospel approached such works as the *Pistis Sophia* in character, the Sayings are strictly of Synoptic type and unmarked by any Gnostic or Enekratite traits. In a word, the Egyptian Gospel was certainly not the source of our Sayings.

We turn, then, to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* which was claimed as the source of the Sayings by Batiffol immediately after the discovery of I. But before we review the evidence which points to this Gospel as the source of our Sayings, we must clear the ground by ascertaining what we mean by the Hebrew Gospel. For Bartlett¹, accepting Dr Sanday's view as to the formation of the Sayings, has taken up a much more advanced position and claims that *Ox. Pap. I, 654* and *655* are fragments of a Gospel (as opposed to a Collection of Sayings) which is an Alexandrine *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and to be distinguished from the Palestinian Gospel known to Origen and to Jerome.

Now the character of *Ox. Pap. 655* is quite unmistakable: it is that of a Gospel in the ordinary sense of the term. Though its matter is wholly discourse, it is continuous.

¹ *Contemp. Rev.* 1905, pp. 116 ff.; *Rev. of Theol. and Philos.* 1, p. 16.

The change of subject in l. 17 is no more significant than is a new paragraph in the Canonical Gospels; and though it may be argued that the general form of ll. 17–20 corresponds so exactly to that of Saying V as to suggest that that passage is merely one of a string of Sayings, this correspondence proves nothing: it is more likely that Saying V was extracted with its context because of its compact form and because the context was necessary, than that 655 is to be regarded as a string of Sayings merely because one of the Sayings it includes forms with its context an independent paragraph cast in the same shape as the fifth Oxyrhynchus Saying.

The fatal objection to Bartlet's theory, however, lies in another direction. In 654 we have the beginning of a document stated in the Prologue to contain Sayings and not a Gospel (λόγοι: contrast *Mark* i 1), and consisting in a series of Sayings which exhibit only the loosest connection, if any, with one another. Moreover, these Sayings are carefully marked off from one another not only by the introductory formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς, but also by the orthographic coronis and paragraphus. In 1, a fragment from a point considerably further on in the same document, the critical marks are indeed not found—since 1 belongs to another copy—but the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς still introduces each saying with that “monotonous regularity” which Dr Bartlet¹ considers so improbable. The natural inference is that since the introductory formula occurs regularly in these two widely separated fragments, it occurred throughout the whole work. Contrast this with the use of 655. At the end of the discourse (l. 17) a saying is introduced by λέγει alone, while in l. 41—the context is lost—the reproof of the Pharisees is introduced by ἔλεγε. Such a use is quite normal in a Gospel: equally certainly the regularly repeated λέγει Ἰησοῦς of 654 and 1 introducing disconnected apophthegms is

¹ *Rev. of Theol. and Philos.* 1, p. 16.

foreign to a Gospel unless we are prepared to use that term in a new sense.

Dr Bartlet has also stated what he thinks to be the occasion of his "Gospel"¹. Holding the Sayings to be post-resurrectional², he considers that they were uttered on the occasion mentioned in *John* xx 26 and *Luke* xxiv 44, and that they conveyed the inner meaning of the Sayings uttered during the Ministry. This view seems to be quite arbitrary. (1) The Prologue of 654 does not say—as it might surely be expected to do—that the Sayings were uttered on any such occasion as Dr Bartlet suggests, nor does it affirm that they were addressed to Thomas or to Thomas and others. (2) On the occasion mentioned by Luke it was not the inner meaning of the words of the Ministry that was expounded, but (as is expressly stated in *vv.* 44–6) the Messianic passages of the Old Testament. (3) Dr Bartlet's theory as to the exposition of the "inner meaning" depends wholly upon the connection he sees between the Sayings. Yet there are few critics who can see any such connection, and fewer still who can agree as to its exact nature. Surely if the compiler intended the Sayings to carry an inner meaning, he would not have buried it in such obscurity as to be extracted only by the ingenuity of a modern scholar; more especially as his readers were probably comparatively simple folk. (4) The Sayings themselves do not support the post-resurrection theory. Saying VIII (see Commentary) is not an utterance of the risen Christ, nor does the Prologue indicate such an occasion. All the Sayings are appropriate to the period of the Ministry and to that alone; for who would represent the disciples as asking for instruction as to prayer, fasting and the like in the period which intervened between the Resurrection and Ascension? I conclude, therefore,

¹ *Contemp. Rev.* 1903, pp. 118–9.

² Taylor holds the same view as to the occasion of the Sayings, comparing further *Acts* i 3 (*J.T.S.* vii, p. 546).

that 655 is not to be associated with 654 and 1, and that these latter are certainly not fragments of a Gospel.

We now come to Dr Bartlet's theory of a twofold *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the Alexandrine Gospel known to Clement of Alexandria, and the Palestinian Gospel of Origen and Jerome. This theory is built mainly upon the fact that, although Clement of Alexandria knew no Aramaic, he uses the Hebrew Gospel familiarly and as a document well known to his readers¹. It is therefore presumed that when Clement describes a Gospel as καθ' Ἑβραίων, the term is purely descriptive and means "the Gospel in use amongst the Hebrews" as distinguished from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, that this was no other than that *Gospel according to the Twelve* which Origen² pairs off with the Egyptian Gospel, and cannot be the Gospel known to Jerome, since Jerome never shows knowledge of Saying I and would not have translated the Aramaic Gospel in Greek had a translation already existed.

This argument cannot, I think, possibly be maintained. The qualifications καθ' Ἑβραίων and καθ' Αἰγυπτίων are obviously correlative and can have arisen nowhere else than in Alexandria, so that we can surely infer that the Hebrew Gospel was current, at least in Aramaic, in the city of Clement. Bartlet seems to attach a territorial sense³ to these qualifications: it seems much more likely that they have a sectarian significance, that Αἰγυπτίοι are not really Egyptians but Jews of Alexandria who had dropped their own tongue and adopted the language and something of the philosophic culture of their adopted home⁴, and that Ἑβραῖοι are the more scrupulous Jews of Alexandria who refused to be absorbed by local influences. The position

¹ In *Strom.* v, 14, 96 Clement quotes Saying I, referring to it as ἐκεῖνα.

² *Hom. in Luc.* 1 (Preuschen, p. 1).

³ As does Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* II, 1, p. 639.

⁴ These would correspond exactly to the Ἰουδαῖοι...οἱ κατοικοῦντες Αἴγυπτον of *Acts* ii 5-11.

would be exactly paralleled if we compare the Jews of the Ghetto in any of our modern cities with the Jews of the higher financial and commercial classes: the one class excludes the alien culture, faith and manners by which it is surrounded, while the other wholly or partly is eager to assume them. Such a distinction agrees exactly with the different characters of the two Gospels: the one party would evolve the Egyptian Gospel, Gnostic, mystic, and sophistic, and the other, clinging to old customs and rites, would produce the Hebrew Gospel in their own tongue.

That the Gospel καθ' Ἑβραίων is identical with the *Gospel according to the Twelve* mentioned by Origen is in all probability true, but the fact does not indicate two Hebrew Gospels, for Jerome¹ actually mentions "secundum Apostolos" as one of the titles of his so-called Palestinian Gospel.

Again, Bartlet assumes an extraordinary as well as a most unfortunate coincidence when he postulates that Clement chose purely for purposes of distinction a title which all other writers reserve as the special designation of a particular and most important Gospel.

Finally, there remains the difficulty as to Clement's use of an Aramaic Gospel. This difficulty vanishes at once when we recall that an early translation into Greek is *a priori* most probable, and that there is actual evidence in favour of this in the use of the Gospel by Hegesippus, Eusebius, Clement and Origen². That Jerome translated the Gospel from the Aramaic into Greek and Latin indicates no more than that he knew of no other translation: and by his time the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* may well have sunk before the increasing authority of the Canonical Gospels into a position

¹ *Contra Pelag.* III, 2.

² Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* II, i, 635-641; *Sitzungsber. d. k. Preuss. Akad.* 1904, p. 176. Handmann, *Das Hebräer-Evangelium*, pp. 33, 116-117.

of merely provincial validity—a supposition which would carry with it the gradual disappearance of the early Greek rendering. Nor can I see force in the argument that since Jerome does not quote Saying I, it cannot have occurred in the Gospel which he translated. It was obviously impossible to quote everything that was remarkable in that book, and Jerome never attempted to do so: for neither, it may be observed, does he quote the remarkable Saying concerning the Division of Souls¹. As a result of these various considerations we are now able to claim that when Clement of Alexandria and Jerome mention the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, they are speaking of one and the same document. We have now to inquire what is the evidence which connects the Sayings with this Gospel.

Our external evidence is limited to the fact that Clement of Alexandria twice quotes parallels to Saying I, once in an abbreviated form which he expressly attributes to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and again in a shape which is identical in all but minute points with the Oxyrhynchus version, but this time without naming his source. The question whether Clement's longer or shorter form is the more exact quotation from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is therefore of great importance: it is discussed in its proper place in the Commentary on Saying I; but for purposes of the present argument it will be sufficient to state the conclusion there arrived at, that Clement's longer form is the more exact: and this conclusion is, so far as I know, admitted by all critics.

One of the Sayings, then, is certainly derived from the Hebrews' Gospel. Does internal evidence go to show that the remaining Sayings are also taken from this source²?

In Saying IV the use of the second person singular distinguishes that fragment of the Mission Charge from the

¹ Preuschen, p. 8, no. 22.

² Schmidtke's *Neue Frag. u. Untersuch. z. d. Judenchrstl. Evang.* has come into my hands too late to be of use in the following pages.

Synoptic versions and connects it with the only other known version, the non-canonical fragment quoted by pseudo-Clement¹. Now this apocryphal fragment exhibits a rhetorical structure which is peculiarly striking and which we find repeated in a fragment, quoted by Jerome from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and nowhere else. We may therefore conclude with some degree of confidence that Saying IV also comes from the Hebrews' Gospel².

Secondly, the relation of the Sayings on the one hand and of the extant fragments of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* on the other to the Synoptic Gospels seems to be the same. In the Sayings we found (§ 4) a very strong Lucan influence combined with an almost equally marked dependence upon Matthew: Johannine influence was seen to be not essential, being strictly occasional and more a matter of colouring than of form. No clear sign of dependence upon Mark could be detected; but there is an important amount of new matter³, and some striking results seem due to the author's combination of his sources. How do these features agree with the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*?

The *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as its alternative title "according to Matthew" shows, must have been very closely allied to our First Gospel. At first sight this predominating Matthaean influence may seem incompatible with the characteristic Lucan predominance in the Sayings, but it is not really so. Judging by the extant fragments, we are led to believe that the framework and narrative of this Gospel closely followed that of the canonical Matthew, and to this its subtitle is due. But (to anticipate some of the results of our examination) the apocryphal evangelist made great use of Luke in elaborating or recasting minor incidents, matters

¹ *Ad Corinth.* v, 2-4.

² See Commentary on Saying IV and my note in *Journ. Theol. Stud.* xiv, 400 ff.

³ Some part at least of this may be due to local and oral tradition (as is likely) the Hebrews' Gospel originated in Palestine.

of detail, and Sayings. Eusebius¹ tells us that the Ebionite readers of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* "made little account of the rest": may this not have been because the evangelist had worked into his main "Matthaeian" fabric practically all in Luke that was at once striking and acceptable to Jewish converts who would not break wholly with their old faith—and so had robbed Luke of importance? If such were the case it is only to be expected that fragments from the Hebrews' Gospel like the Sayings should show a predominant Lucan influence. Had we their contexts, it is likely that we should find that they occurred mainly in Matthaeian settings.

First of all, the extant fragments of the Hebrews' Gospel shows a number of very striking passages in which Lucan influence is incontestable.

(1) The remarkable reproof of the Rich Man quoted by Origen² follows Matthew generally in the first half, but later we have: "et ecce multi fratres tui, filii Abrahae, amicti sunt stercore, morientes prae fame et domus tua plena est bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ea ad eos." Comparing this with *Luke* xvi 19 ff. we get the following parallels which cannot be accidental: *alter diuitum* (in the first part) at once recalls Luke's "there was a certain rich man"; *filii Abrahae* and *amicti sunt stercore* are the converse of "father Abraham" (v. 24) and of "who was clothed in purple and fine linen"; *domus tua plena est bonis* corresponds to "fared sumptuously every day"; *egreditur* is reminiscent of "was laid at his gate" and *morientes prae fame* of "desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table." There can be no doubt whatever that the evangelist of the Hebrews' Gospel is here elaborating his main source, Matthew, with reminiscences of the Lucan parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.

(2) Eusebius³ has preserved in abstract the parable of the

¹ *H.E.* III, 27. 4.

² *Comm. in Matth.* xv, 14 (Preuschen, p. 6, no. 11).

³ *Theophania* (?) (Preuschen, p. 7, no. 14).

Three Servants. One of the servants by a bold departure from the Canonical version is there described as ὁ ἀσώτως ἐξηκώς...ὁ καταφαγὼν τὴν ὑπαρξίν τοῦ δεσπότου μετὰ πορνῶν καὶ ἀνλητρίδων. Now the original of the Parable in the Hebrews' Gospel is certainly *Matth.* xxv 14-30; but with this has been fused the story of the Wicked Servant of *Matth.* xxiv 48-51 who is remodelled on the lines of the Lucan Prodigal Son. This is clear if we compare the description just quoted from Eusebius with *Luke* xv 13, 30: διεσκόρπισε τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ ζῶν ἀσώτως...ὁ καταφαγὼν σὸν τὸν βίον μετὰ τῶν πορνῶν.

(3) The fragment describing the appearance after the Resurrection to James¹ has no parallel in Matthew: nor does that Gospel contain anything upon which it can be thought to have been built. The appearance to James is otherwise recorded by St Paul alone², and the attestation of this might be thought to be quite the most valuable piece of information preserved to us by the Hebrews' Gospel were it not more than probable that the whole incident is composite. It would appear that the evangelist started from the fact recorded by St Paul and possibly otherwise known; that James's vow "se non comesurum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem domini donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus," which can scarcely be historical³, was suggested by the vow of the fanatics who sought to kill St Paul (*Acts* xxi 12), and that the remainder of the incident is fashioned after *Luke* xxiv 30, 42: compare especially Luke's λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησε, καὶ κλάσας ἐπέδιδον αὐτοῖς with "tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et dedit Iacobo iusto." In this case the Lucan influence seems to have radiated from *Acts* as well as from the Gospel.

¹ Jerome, *de Viris ill.* 2 (Preuschen, pp. 7-8, no. 18).

² *1 Cor.* xv 7.

³ If indeed the Synoptics are right in limiting the Last Supper to the Twelve alone. Adeney (*Hibbert Journ.* III, 157) is probably right in seeing here confusion between James the Apostle and James ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου.

Sayings and approximately equal in extent. We must now ask whether the Johannine element which is to be distinguished in the Sayings has a parallel in the Gospel.

(1) Jerome¹ has preserved an account of the Baptism of Jesus which is remarkable both in other respects and especially in its insistence on the rest of the Holy Spirit: "descendit... requievit super eum... Expectabam te ut venires et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea." In the first place it is evident that the writer is thinking of the dove and the ark (*Genesis* viii 9); that is, that the passage is a product of the age of reflection². And secondly it is to be noted that the Synoptics have nothing like the "requievit... requies" of the Hebrews' Gospel: Matthew has ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν; Mark, καταβαῖνον ἐπ' αὐτόν; Luke, καταβῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν. John's account alone is parallel: τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον... καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν³. Again in the same passage, where all the Synoptics have ἀγαπητός, the apocryphal Gospel has "filius primogenitus," which in its developed theology is nearer to St John's⁴ ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, though for an exact parallel we must go to *Hebrews* i 6; and it must be remembered that the writer is applying *Psalms* lxxxix 27 in a Messianic sense.

(2) The appearance to Peter and those with him quoted above to illustrate the Lucan element in the Hebrews' Gospel shows in one respect a strong development beyond Luke in the direction of Johannism. Luke does not record that the disciples touched Jesus, whereas our Gospel not only states that they touched him, but emphasises the effect which this had upon them⁵. St John's account of the appearance to Thomas, however, is essentially parallel. Is not our evangelist, like St John, combating a form of Docetism?

¹ *Comm. in Is.* IV, p. 156 (Preuschen, p. 4, no. 4).

² As Adeney remarks on other grounds (*Hibbert Journ.* III, p. 150).

³ i 32.

⁴ i 18; the epithet (πρωτότοκος) is certainly due to *Psalms* lxxxix 7.

⁵ Cf. *John* xx 22.

(3) Still more definitely Johannine (though an alien element is also to be felt) is the *logos* cited by Eusebius¹: "I choose even the good ones [souls] whom my Father in Heaven has given me." It would almost seem as if the compiler of the Hebrews' Gospel were here borrowing directly² from St John when we compare *John* xiii 18 ἐγὼ οἶδα οὓς ἐξελεξάμην, and xvii 6 ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς ἔδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου· σοὶ ἦσαν καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοὺς ἔδωκας. Yet the context of this Saying was Synoptic: "He taught the cause of the division of the souls which would happen in the houses"—a context which is obviously parallel to *Matth.* x 35-37 ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.

(4) Johannine, too, in tone and feeling are such Sayings as that quoted by Jerome³: "et nunquam (inquit) laeti sitis nisi cum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate"; and that reported by the same Father⁴: "ut in evangelio quod iuxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consueverunt, inter maxima ponitur crimina qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit"—even though the second of these may seem to be related to *Matth.* v 22-23.

In the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, then, there is a distinct Johannine element, but it is by no means deep-seated. There is only a single passage which can possibly be dependent upon St John's Gospel, and in view of our ignorance of St John's sources, it is as likely that in this case both evangelists are reproducing something out of a common stock, as that one is dependent upon the other. So far, at least, the Hebrews' Gospel is parallel to the Sayings. In matters of dogma, it contains the Johannine doctrine of the

¹ *Theophan.* IV, 12 (tr. Greissmann) = Preuschen, p. 9, no. 22.

² At any rate so close a correspondence will perhaps justify the seeming boldness of my restoration of Saying II, l. 20.

³ *Comm. in Ephes.* v, 4 (Preuschen, p. 9, no. 21).

⁴ *Comm. in Ez.* XVIII, 7 (Preuschen, p. 8, no. 20).

Rest of the Holy Spirit and is anti-Docetic, while Saying VIII in its consciousness of the doctrine of Pre-existence similarly betrays Johannine influence. Yet in none of these matters is dependence on the part of the Hebrews' Gospel or of the Sayings upon John in the least likely. These with the remaining and slighter Johannine touches (such as the use of $\delta \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ in Saying VII) observable in the Sayings indicate rather that the fragments of the Hebrews' Gospel together with the Sayings are not widely separated in date from John, than that one is dependent upon the other. In a word, then, the Johannism of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is both in its character and its limitations fairly concordant with the Johannine features of the Sayings.

A variety of other considerations contribute to support the case—already a strong one—that the Sayings are taken from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.

(1) Unfortunately those writers who have quoted from the Hebrews' Gospel found little or no occasion to cite apophthegms of the type of our Sayings. We cannot therefore be sure how far the new matter in our Sayings was comparable with the new matter in similar Sayings occurring in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Probably, however, it was very much the same: Saying I, on other grounds the strongest link between the Sayings and the Gospel is wholly new, and the fragments of narrative and discourse from the latter which are extant show new matter or new combinations to an extent which makes legitimate the inference that the apophthegms also must have exhibited a similar quality. The loss of these short Sayings is regrettable also because we are unable to say how largely the Hebrews' Gospel employed parallelism. In the Sayings we find this literary feature most prominent: more than half of the thirteen Sayings are parallelistic. Now parallelism is quite a common feature in the Synoptic Gospels, no doubt because it was the form in which short maxims were couched in their sources; but in the Oxyrhynchus

Sayings we find apophthegms cast in this form although they are composite: that is, the form has been deliberately adopted. It can hardly be supposed that anyone but a Semite writing for Semites would have done this.

(2) Other characteristics in the Sayings point to a source of essentially Jewish character. The questions asked by the disciples in Saying V—especially if my restoration of the fourth be fairly accurate—would be of interest mainly, if not only, to Jewish converts; and Saying VII (Logion II) deals with purely Jewish institutions. Could we only accept Professor Cersoy's conjecture that τὸν κόσμον in that Saying is a blunder of translation for τὴν νηστείαν this view would be greatly strengthened, as the reference would then be the Day of Atonement, and we should be able to recognise one of the chief traits of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*—its attachment to the Old Law¹. With the matter of institutions we may couple that of language. It has been thought that traces of an Aramaic original can be found in the Sayings, and if the truth of this could be shown, it would go far to prove that they were derived from the Hebrews' Gospel which was in Aramaic². Yet such traces may originate a stage further back, in the period of oral rather than of documentary currency; and in some cases they may be no more than Semiticisms in the Alexandrine or Palestinian κοινή. Unfortunately the instances in which such peculiarities have been thought to occur are never definite. In Saying VII (Logion II), as we have just seen, Cersoy shows that our actual reading τὸν κόσμον may be a translator's error for τὴν νηστείαν (the original being either Hebrew or Aramaic). The same scholar points out that in

¹ Eusebius, *H.E.* III, 27. 4.

² I am inclined, however, to suspect that this Gospel was composed in Greek—the version used by Clement of Alexandria—but was almost at once rendered in Aramaic, perhaps in deference to national prejudice; and that this *original* Greek version was then lost. But I have not tried to mature or to test this view.

Saying X (Logion V) the injunction "raise the stone," which has caused some difficulty, may be again a mistranslation for "hew the stone"; but such an emendation postulates a Hebrew original. Again in Saying XI (Logion VI) Cersoy notes that ποιῇ θεραπείας suggests an Aramaic original—though the recurrence of the idiom in the *Protevangelium* (xx) makes it more like a mere Semiticism current in the *κουρή*—and that γνώσκοντας αὐτόν is again the blunder of a translator from the Aramaic for εἰς τοὺς γνωστοὺς αὐτοῦ. Harnack has further pointed out that the use of καί...καί is a Semitic feature. No one of these instances¹, however, forces us irresistibly to the conclusion that the Sayings were translated from Aramaic, and the matter must be left as an open question.

(3) In the Commentary on the Sayings we have noted frequent instances of the use of Jewish literature. In Saying II the mention of birds, beasts and fishes as symbolical of creation and as a link between Man and Heaven is almost certainly to be connected with *Job* xii 7-8, or perhaps with *Psalms* viii. Saying VIII (Logion III) opens with an adaptation in a Messianic sense of *Baruch* iii 28; its use of δαψᾶν and μεθεῖν in a spiritual sense is likely to be due to *Isaiah* lv 1 and xxiii 1, while the phrase ποιεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ derives from *Isaiah* liii 10. The ninth Saying (Logion IV) seems to make use of a traditional Jewish Saying to be found in the *Pirke Aboth*: and the second part of the same Saying undoubtedly is related to *Eccles.* x 9. The conflation of two New Testament elements in Saying XII (Logion VII) is due to *Isaiah* ii 2, and the "high hill" of that Saying seems to be inspired by *Isaiah* xxviii 4. Such a use of Jewish literature is what might be expected

¹ To these should be added the idioms ποιεῖ ἐπὶ and οἱ τοὶ ἀνθρώπων in Saying VIII (Logion III); the repeated use of καὶ throughout the Sayings to introduce new clauses might be an Egyptian feature; for in Coptic narratives clauses are commonly introduced by οὐνο, 'and.'

in fragments which (as we are urging) came from a Gospel designed for Jewish readers. How far, then, do the known fragments of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* show a corresponding use of Hebrew literature?

1. The Baptism fragment which we have already noticed as containing a Johannine element certainly looks back to *Genesis* viii 9, the dove and the ark being regarded as symbolical of the Holy Spirit and Our Lord. It is important to notice that this Messianic interpretation corresponds exactly to the application of *Baruch* iii 28 in Saying VIII. But the literary affinities of this passage extend further¹. The idea of the *rest* of the Holy Spirit is derived primarily from *Isaiah* xi 1 "the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him"; while the words "tu es enim requies mea" not uncertainly echo *Psalms* cxxxii 14 "This is my rest for ever: here will I dwell, for I have desired it"; and lastly "tu es filius meus primogenitus" are inseparably connected with *Psalms* ii 7 "Thou art my son," and *Psalms* lxxxix 27 "And I will make him my first-born."

2. Origen² quotes a remarkable fragment from the Story of the Temptation found in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Matthew, it will be remembered, narrates the beginning of the Temptation in the simplest way: "Then was Jesus carried up by the Spirit into the wilderness³." But the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* with characteristic boldness and love of novelty represents Our Lord himself as telling the story of his Temptation, and puts into his mouth these startling words: ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ. The expression "my mother the Holy

¹ The important parallels which follow were pointed out by Dr Armitage Robinson (*Expositor* v, p. 194).

² *Comm. in Joh.* II, 12. 87 (Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 5, no. 5).

³ IV, 1.

Spirit" does not immediately concern us¹; but the remainder is beyond doubt a literary loan. Thus in Ezekiel² we have ἀνέλαβέ με τῆς κορυφῆς μου καὶ ἀνέλαβέ με πνεῦμα ἀναμέσον τῆς γῆς καὶ ἀναμέσον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and in *Bel and the Dragon*³ καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτοῦ ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου τοῦ Ἀρβακούμ τῆς κόμης αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπάνω τοῦ λάκκου τοῦ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι. One, probably both, of these passages was imitated by the author of the Apocryphal Gospel. Even the reference to Tabor is not without significance. Dr Adeney⁴ points out, indeed, that it was occupied in the time of Our Lord by a Roman fortress and so was unsuitable⁵ as a site for the Temptation, but considers that *Psalms* lxxxix 12 and *Jeremiah* xlii 18 suggested the reference.

3. The Evangelist elaborates in characteristic fashion the account of one of the signs which followed the Crucifixion. Matthew⁶ says simply that at the last cry of Jesus the Veil of the Temple was rent in twain; but the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (as rendered by Jerome⁷) gives "superliminare templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum." Once again the change seems to be due to literary imitation dictated by a desire to find fulfilments of as many Messianic passages as possible; for the original is *Isaiah* vi 4, where the LXX⁸ has ἐπήρθη τὸ ὑπέρθυρον ἀπὸ τῆς

¹ The Ophites (see Irenaeus i, 28. 1) held that the Spirit was feminine (grammatically the *word* is feminine in Semitic languages) and was beloved by the First Man to whom she bare a Son. See Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 382.

² viii 3.

³ v 36.

⁴ *Hibbert Journal* III, p. 162.

⁵ But may not the Roman fortress have been regarded as roughly reproducing "Babylon" and the "den"? In such a neighbourhood, too, something might be seen of the "kingdoms of the world and the glory of them."

⁶ iv 1.

⁷ *Comm. in Matth.* xxvii, 51 (Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 7, no. 17).

⁸ The Hebrew of *Isaiah* does not give the same parallel; the A.V. renders "the posts of the door," the R.V. "the foundations of the threshold." From this it appears that the author of the *Gospel according*

φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραγον (doubtless the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* had something parallel to the κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ of *Matth.* xxvii 50).

In their use of Jewish literature, then, the Sayings and the fragments of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* are parallel; and in this we have one of the strongest supports for our attribution of the Sayings to this Gospel.

4. The conflation of elements or expressions from different Gospels or from different parts of the same Gospel is one of the most salient features in our fragments of the Oxyrhynchus Collection (see Commentary on Sayings I, II, III, IV, X, XI and XII), and in this again it corresponds exactly with the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Thus in the earlier¹ of the two fragments of the Baptism-narrative the opening words "ecce mater domini et fratres eius" at once recall *Matth.* xii 46 ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί, and are grafted on to the general narrative of the Baptism. Again, in the dialogue on forgiveness between the Lord and Peter², the words "in die" are derived from Luke, while the "septuagies septies" belongs to Matthew. But the most striking example of this method of composition is the incident of the Rich Man³. Here the main Matthaean framework has been filled in with material taken, as we have already seen in detail, from the Lucan parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. And similarly in the story of the Three Servants⁴, one of the Matthaean characters is remodelled on the lines of the Lucan Prodigal Son. As in

to the *Hebrews* used the LXX (see Dr Armitage Robinson in *Expositor* v, 198 ff.); but Jerome (*de Vir. ill.* ch. 3) says that the "Hebrew Matthew" followed the Hebrew of the O.T. and not the LXX. Nestle (*Evangel. Kirchenbl. f. Würt.* 1895, no. 16), however, gives reason for thinking that the Hebrew for "lintel" is more original than that for "veil" (the latter being a variant). If so, the Evangelist need not be supposed to have used the LXX.

¹ Preuschen, p. 4, no. 3.

² *Ib.* p. 6, no. 10.

³ *Ib.* p. 6, no. 11.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 7, no. 14.

its use of the Old Testament, then, so also in its method of composition and in its use of existing Gospels, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* shows the same features as do our Sayings.

We may now sum up the results of this somewhat lengthy review of the evidence connecting the Sayings with the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. The only Saying which can be positively identified as a quotation is from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. The peculiar relation of the Sayings and of the Gospel to the Synoptics and to the Fourth Gospel are identical. Moreover in their parallelism, in their interest in matters such as would only concern Jewish converts, in their use of Semitic idioms and syntax, and perhaps even in traces of an Aramaic original, the Sayings postulate a source of Semitic character. Both documents, finally, are exactly parallel in the method and extent of their use of Hebrew literature, and in the peculiar method of their composition from conflated elements. Positive proof we cannot have, unless some new discovery should hereafter add to our evidence; but this at least we may claim, that circumstantial evidence in abundance and from every side points to the conclusion that the Oxyrhynchus Sayings are excerpts from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.

§ 7. THE DATE OF THE COLLECTION.

The discoverers date I "not much later than the beginning of the third century," and 654 to the middle or end of the same century: they consider, therefore, that the Collection as such must go back at least to the end of the second century, but, in view of internal evidence, consider that it is likely to have been formed before A.D. 140. Since the papyri belong to the third century and one, at least, of them to the earlier half of it, we may accept the first part of Grenfell and Hunt's conclusion, that the Collection must have been

formed not later than the end of the second century. But can we carry the date further back? The Sayings themselves seem to carry tolerably distinct marks of their relative, though perhaps not of their numerical date : they are later than both Matthew and Luke in that they draw upon both these Gospels, and since these Gospels must have taken some years to become generally current, they must be decidedly later. At the same time they are obviously products of the true, if later, Synoptic age. On the other hand, if the view expressed above as to the Johannine element in the Sayings is true, the Sayings are somewhat earlier than the Fourth Gospel. While we find in the Sayings something of Johannine phraseology and dogma, these are both limited in extent and rudimentary in development. The natural inference then is that the Sayings belong to a period when the Synoptic tendency had not yet failed, but when Johannine influence—of which the Fourth Gospel marks the acme—was still only nascent. Now Messrs Grenfell and Hunt take the step back from 200 A.D. to 140 A.D. or earlier relying on their theory that the Collection is essentially independent, a theory which permits them to date the Collection by the internal evidence of the Sayings. In our view, however, the Sayings are extracts ; and if this is correct, the date of the formation of the Collection cannot be fixed from the character of the Sayings themselves. The Prologue, which dates from the formation of the Collection, furnishes us with one clue in the use of a citation from St John, allowing us to infer that the Collection was made at a period when the Fourth Gospel was already accepted as of universal authority. This, however, is but vague and would admit the possibility that the Collection was formed at quite a late date. Fortunately the *Prologue* gives another indication which is of the highest value. The compiler describes his work as containing οἱ λόγοι οὓς ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς and he prefaces each Saying with λέγει Ἰησοῦς. Now even

in Luke the substitution of ὁ κύριος for the name Ἰησοῦς is growing marked and towards the end of the second century becomes the normal method of reference to Our Lord. The heading of the *Didache*, which is perhaps the nearest parallel we have to the Prologue of the Sayings, begins not Διδαχὴ Ἰησοῦ but Διδαχὴ τοῦ κυρίου. The use of the name Ἰησοῦς, then, both in the Prologue and in the introductory formula may be taken as a sign of distinctly early date, and we may conclude, though on different grounds, that Grenfell and Hunt's date, A.D. 140, is the latest that is likely for the formation of the Collection.

§ 8. THE PURPOSE OF THE COLLECTION.

The problem of the purpose of the Collection is not altogether distinct from the question of its origin. If, for example, it could be proved that the Sayings are totally disconnected and possessed of no common quality, it would be extremely probable that the Collection was a mere record intended to preserve Sayings which were in danger of being lost, simply because they were Sayings of Jesus. Two main views—apart from the discoverers' view that it is a genuine collection—have been taken as to the purpose of the Collection: some critics consider that they had a didactic purpose, and therefore were connected by a continuous thread of subject or idea: others fail to see any connection, or any continuous connection, between the Sayings, and regard them simply as a record. This second point of view is adopted by the discoverers who consider that, prior to the formation of the Collection, the Sayings were current in tradition and were gleaned up here and there. They admit, of course, that in 654 the first four (? three) Sayings are linked by the idea of the Kingdom which recurs in each, but point out that with Saying V the interconnection ceases altogether, and that it is in any case unlikely that such a link could have been maintained throughout a long series

of Sayings. In **I** the discoverers confess themselves totally unable to trace any thread of connection.

This is indeed the only logical conclusion which can be reached, if indeed the Sayings are to be taken at their face-value. Other critics, however, have preferred not to do this and consider that the Sayings are mere texts covering an inner and connected meaning and are not to be interpreted literally.

(1) Mr Badham¹ traces the connection as follows: "[Wouldst thou see Christ? ...] Purify thine eye by self-examination (Saying VI). Purify thine eye by abstinence from the world and by observing times of tranquil meditation (Saying VII). Remember how satiety blinded the world when I came (Saying VIII). If thy home be godless, go forth and find me in the stocks and stones of the desert (Saying X). Forsake thine uncongenial Nazareth (Saying XI). Look up to where the lights of thy true home are burning (Saying XII)." He therefore takes the fragment to be "a page from some middle-Christian 'Garden of the Soul'." The main objection to this allegorical interpretation is that there is nothing to warn us that such is intended, although we now possess the Prologue to the Collection as a whole. The Sayings are there stated to be merely "lifegiving words of Jesus," and the plain man would naturally take them at their face-value as such and no more. Mr Badham's result, in fact, is only attained by putting into the Sayings much more than is actually to be found in them: take, for instance, his interpretation of Saying X. It urges, in effect, "Seek loneliness: it is the best way to find Christ"; whereas the real meaning of the Saying is "In spite of loneliness, Christ is ever present." Nor can I think that this "inner meaning" adds to the value which the Sayings already possess as independent units.

(2) Dr Bartlet² also finds an inner meaning in the Sayings, which he considers to be a collection of texts forming the

¹ Writing on **I** (*Athenaeum*, Aug. 7, 1897).

² *Athenaeum*, July 24, 1897; *Rev. of Theol. and Philos.* 1, pp. 13-14.

basis of a manual of instruction designed, perhaps, like the *Two Ways* of the *Didache* for catechumens prior to Baptism. It is held to come from the close of the series of Sayings to which it belonged: "The earlier pages have presumably set forth the nature of the Kingdom of God... Then come the conditions of true receptivity; and the thought proceeds thus:—To judge aright one must purge one's own eye. Only he who cultivates an unworldly spirit can find God's kingdom: to see the Father, one must not neglect to observe the Sabbath in spirit and in truth. Incarnate wisdom testifies sadly to the unreceptiveness of the mass; but speaks cheer to the solitary soul amid the faithless many—ever near though hidden from the careless, superficial eye. That his own in Judaea have not believed should be no stumbling block: it is according to rule. Yet in spite of present fewness believers are bound to hold out and make themselves felt at last, because firm-built on the very Mount of God." Here, as in Mr Badham's paraphrase, connection is attained—if indeed it is attained—only by reading into the Sayings what is not there and what is not even hinted at. But is unity of thought really attained? On Dr Bartlett's interpretation Saying VI inculcates right judgment; Saying VII, unworldliness and Sabbath keeping; and Saying VIII complains of the unreceptiveness of men. The Sayings surely break up into separate units as they were before. And certainly it would be difficult to establish connection between two such Sayings as the eighth and tenth, where the words "I found *all* men drunken and *none* found I athirst" are followed by "where there is one alone, I say I am with him."

The attempt, then, to trace a thread of connecting thought, which constitutes the didactic purposes of the Collection, must be abandoned. The first three Sayings do indeed deal with the kingdom, but can these be thought to provide a sufficient basis for an adequate treatment of the subject of the kingdom, more especially as Saying I asserts that the

kingdom is reached through seeking, finding and amazement, while Saying II declares that the kingdom is within us and is to be attained by self-knowledge¹? When the compiler therefore grouped the first three Sayings together, he did so because they were concerned with the same subject, and not in order to provide a compendium of scriptural teaching on the Kingdom of Heaven: had that been his aim, he would doubtless have devoted many more Sayings to the subject. I believe, then, that the order of the Sayings is almost fortuitous: here and there a catch-word may have led the compiler to group together Sayings which happened to deal with one subject²; but there is no connecting thread of thought running through the whole. At the same time, if the Sayings are—as we hold—extracts, the compiler must have selected them because of some quality which they possessed. This quality, I believe, was made clear in the Prologue and I would refer to the Commentary for my reasons for this conviction. But apart from my restoration of “life-giving” as the epithet applied by the compiler to the “words of Jesus” which he collected, the Sayings one and all are of the type known in modern devotional works as “helpful.” It is hard to see any connection between the Sayings, but their individual value is clear. If, then, we regard the Sayings as having been selected for their independent worth and not as units illustrating any developing principle, as a thesaurus designed to give in a small compass³ so much of a Gospel as was

¹ Dr Lock (*Ch. Quarterly Review*, LVIII, 425) thinks *truth* is the idea which links the first five Sayings. In I, however, the idea depends upon a restoration; in II and IV, it is not obvious, but (at most) latent; it is hard to see how it can enter into III at all, and only in V is it explicit.

² It should be noted that while Sayings I–III deal with the kingdom, the same subject is brought up again in Saying VII many pages further on: this does not seem to indicate an orderly arrangement such as is required by the theory of arrangement on a definite principle.

³ A small book of Sayings, we should remember, could be searched

judged most likely to be of help and comfort in daily life, does not this view agree best with the data on which we have to work?

§ 9. THE FORMULA λέγει Ἰησοῦς.

Each Saying in the Collection is preceded by the words λέγει Ἰησοῦς, a form which has given rise to much discussion. Consequently it will be well to begin by clearing the ground. And first, these words are not part of the excerpt (if we hold the Sayings to be excerpts), since it is inconceivable that such a series of selected passages should all happen to begin with an historic present and not occasionally with εἶπε or ἔλεγε. For the same reason it is impossible to regard these words as narrative connections in what is really part of a Gospel (as opposed to a series of distinct Sayings). The phrase, then, is a formula introducing each Saying. This formula, however, is decidedly remarkable, and no parallel is readily forthcoming. We are familiar with such a prefatory phrase as λέγει αὐτῷ (or αὐτοῖς) ὁ Ἰησοῦς in the Fourth Gospel and, less frequently, in the Synoptics; but the absolute use without a dative is certainly most unusual. Probably the Synoptics have no parallel; and in St John's Gospel only xi 39 and xiii 31 (to which may be added the absolute εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς of vi 9) readily present themselves. How is this general suppression of the dative to be explained? The first, perhaps, and most important consideration in the compiler's mind was the need to keep his formula from passing into a vague context: had he added αὐτῷ or αὐτοῖς or a personal name like τῷ Πέτρῳ to the simple λέγει Ἰησοῦς, he would no longer have the advantage of a formula, and would feel more and more the necessity for enlarging his

through in a very short time, whereas it would take long for the devotee in search of consolation to find in his copy of a Gospel—whether roll or codex—the particular Saying which should satisfy his need.

rudimentary context by adding when or in what circumstances the Saying was spoken to such and such persons.

What, then, was the compiler's object in repeating this formula with such regularity? Partly, no doubt, it is due to the influence of the Jewish Collections of Sayings where two or more Sayings of one teacher are introduced thus: "A. said.... He used to say...." But this fails to explain the regularity with which the personal name and the present tense is repeated. We may to some degree account for this regularity on the grounds of literary propriety: just as the Sayings could not be strung together one after another without any formula at all, so it was in a literary sense impossible to preface each Saying with a mere ἔλεγε or καὶ ἔλεγε: only in a short series would such a form of introduction be tolerable. The formula chosen, λέγει Ἰησοῦς, however, most successfully avoids this danger. With each new Saying it demands and rouses our attention afresh, and its effectiveness can best be understood if by way of experiment we substitute ἔλεγε...καὶ ἔλεγε...καὶ ἔλεγε. But beside the literary motive there was also, no doubt, a feeling that the incisive repetition of the formula added to the solemnity with which the Sayings sound.

Lastly, what is the significance of the present tense λέγει, since its unvarying use shows that it cannot be regarded as an ordinary historic present? Dr Burney¹ has suggested that the present tense may have been adopted by a translator from neo-Hebrew or Aramaic who found a participle alone in his original, and that a participle might be expected if the formula represents the formula of citation used in the Talmud. This explanation may account for the repeated present tense, but I am by no means clear that it accounts for the repeated personal name, and am still more doubtful that the Collection *as such* ever existed in any other language than Greek².

¹ *ap.* Lock and Sanday, *Two Lectures*, pp. 47-8.

² The Prologue seems to reproduce the exact wording of St John except where the writer found it necessary to adapt the citation to his period.

Dr Lock¹ somewhat favours the suggestion that the present tense is used because Jesus was still living when the Collection was made by some disciple; but apart from the difficulty noticed by Dr Lock in applying this to Saying VIII, there are so many points in which the Sayings are obviously later than the Synoptic Gospels that this explanation is quite inadmissible. Dr Lock considers Swete's suggestion that the formula is parallel to the common λέγει ἡ γραφή where a sacred book is cited as a present witness to the truth, but rejects it "as inappropriate in a disconnected series of Sayings which are not apparently illustrative of any one truth." The best and, as I believe, the true solution of the difficulty is to explain the present as having a mystical force². Dr Lock very happily cites in illustration the verse from Cowper's hymn: "Jesus speaks and speaks to thee," and an incident from Dr Pusey's *Life*; and this is confirmed by the Prologue to the Collection with its marked insistence on the fact that Jesus lives. If the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* could write of Abel (xī 4) καὶ δι' αὐτῆς (sc. πίστεως) ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ, we can surely conclude that when he wrote λέγει Ἰησοῦς the compiler of the Collection meant that the Sayings were not to be regarded as words uttered in the past and only historically interesting, but as being ever repeated³ by that Jesus "who lives and appeared to the Ten and to Thomas."

The formula uses Ἰησοῦς not ὁ Ἰησοῦς. In this, I think, we have another mark of Johannine influence in the compiler of the Collection. In the Fourth Gospel ὁ Ἰησοῦς is

¹ *Two Lectures*, p. 18.

² At the same time the historic use of the present in Gospel narrative (such as *John* xī 39 λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς...λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφή...(40) λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς...(44) λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς) is likely to have contributory influence.

³ The sentiment is somewhat that of *Hymns Anc. and Mod.* 207, "And His that gentle voice we *hear*, | Soft as the breath of even, | That *checks* each fault, that *calms* each fear, | And *speaks* of heaven."

the normal mode of reference, but Ἰησοῦς (without the article) is by no means uncommon (see *John* iv 47, 50; viii 1, 49, 54, 59; xii 44, 54; xviii 34; xix 26). In the Synoptics, on the other hand, Ἰησοῦς is very rare. Personages referring to Jesus may indeed say Ἰησοῦς (see *Matth.* xxvii 17, 22; *Mark* v 7; as also in *John* i 46, ix 11); but otherwise ὁ Ἰησοῦς seems to be always used in the narrative after Jesus had entered on his ministry: *Mark* i 9 and *Luke* iii 21; iv 1, [4] significantly fall within the narrative of the Baptism and Temptation¹.

¹ But *Luke* iv 8, 13 (Temptation) uses ὁ Ἰησοῦς.