

# The Sayings of Jesus from ΟΧΥΡΗΥΙCΗCΗC

## Hugh G. Evelyn White

### THE PROLOGUE

οὗτοι οἱ {οι} λόγοι οἱ [ζωοποιοὶ οὗς ἐλά-]  
 λησεν Ἰη(σοῦ)ς ὁ ζῶν κ[αὶ ὀφθεῖς τοῖς δέκα]  
 καὶ Θωμᾶ. καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτοῖς· πᾶς ὅστις]  
 ἂν τῶν λόγων τούτ[ων ἀκούσῃ, θανάτου]  
 οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται.

5

1. ΟΙΤΟΙΟΙΟΙ, *P*: οὗτοι οἱ {οι}, *Swete, Heinrici, Taylor*: {οι} τοῖοι οἱ, *GH, Wessely*: ζωοποιοί, *Bruston*: θαυμάσιοι, *GH*: θαυμαστοί, *Lock*: ἀληθῖνοι, *Swete, Taylor*: ἐσχατοί, *Hicks*: τελευταῖοι, *Wilamowitz*: ἐκλεκτοί, ἐκλεκτοὶ *Heinrici*: ἀληθεῖς, *Batiffol*. 2. καὶ ὀφθεῖς τοῖς δέκα, *Ed.*: κύριος οὐ καὶ ἀποθανών, *GH*: κύριος τοῖς τε ἄλλοις (οὐ τοῖς ἑ) μαθηταῖς, *Bartlet*: καὶ ὁ κύριος, *Heinrici*: ...Ἰουδα τῷ καὶ Θωμᾶ, *Lake*: καὶ ἀληθινός, *Lock*: καὶ μένων Φιλίππῳ, *Bruston*: κρυφίως Φιλίππῳ, *Batiffol*: καὶ δόξα αὐτοῖς καὶ θαῦμα, *Wessely*: κατενώπιον Ματθαῖ (2), *Wilamowitz*. 3. αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος· ὅστις, *Swete*: διδάσκων· ἐάν τις, *Lock*: αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω, *Taylor*. 1-5. τοῖοι οἱ λόγοι οὗς ἐλά|λησεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ ζῶν Κηφᾶ | καὶ Θωμᾶ. καὶ εἶπεν· μακάριος ὅς | ἂν τῶν λ. τούτων ἀκούσῃ, θανάτου | α. μ. γ.: *Hilgenfeld*.

These are the life-giving Sayings which Jesus spake who liveth and was seen of the Ten and of Thomas. And He said to them: Whosoever heareth these Sayings shall not taste of death.

1. οὗτοι οἱ [οι] λόγοι. The first syllable<sup>1</sup> is certainly οἱ (with an ι, and not with a damaged γ as Heinrici and Taylor supposed). GH consider the possibility of the correction οἱτοι, but prefer to omit the initial syllable and to read τοῖοι οἱ. The insertion of a superfluous initial syllable, however, seems very doubtful, whereas an additional οἱ may well have crept in after οἱτοι οἱ. The correction

of Swete and Heinrici is certainly more natural than τοῖοι=τοιόδε, supported though this is by late prose use, and is strengthened by the parallel οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὗς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς<sup>2</sup> quoted by the discoverers; and to this—remembering that the 'Prologue' is in reality no more than a diffuse title—we may add *Baruch* i 1 καὶ οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου οὗς ἐγραψε Βαρούχ.

<sup>1</sup> *Ox. Pap.* iv p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Luke* xxiv 44.

ζωοποιοί. Such restorations as those of Hicks and Wilamowitz are impossible since most if not all the Sayings are demonstrably pre-resurrectional. The Prologue—as a Prologue—has every appearance of aiming at the terse and forceful, and on this ground epithets like ‘wonderful,’ ‘true,’ and the rest, must be discarded. Swete, indeed, suggests ἀληθινοί, comparing *Apoc.* xii 6 οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί; but the epithet used attributively, as here, is weak. Something like ζωοποιοί seems to be required<sup>1</sup>. The phrases ὁ ζῶν and θανάτου οὐ μὴ γεύσεται make the idea of *life* very prominent in the Prologue, and the second of these especially seems to be intended to make good some claim made by the Editor for the Sayings. This claim must have been conveyed in the lost epithet of λόγοι, and ζωοποιοί seems most suitable. Parallels are plentiful: *John* vi 63 τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιούν... τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή; *Psalms* cxviii (cxix) τὸ λόγιόν σου ἐξησέν με; *Barnabas* vi οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ πίστει τῆς εὐαγγελίας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ζωοποιούμενοι ζήσομεν; lastly, the Fourth Gospel concludes (xx 31) with a claim exactly similar to the claim of the Prologue: ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύσητε... καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζῶν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ<sup>2</sup>.

2. The restoration of this line is of the greatest importance, since here and in l. 3 all editors find a declaration of the ultimate au-

thority for the Sayings, and consider that this, whether true or false, has an important bearing on the origin of the Collection.

The published conjectures<sup>3</sup> deal with two points which are, or seem to be, more or less distinct: (a) What followed ὁ ζῶν? (b) Who was coupled with Thomas? All editors take it as granted that Θωμᾶ depends on ἐλάλησεν.

(a) GH<sup>4</sup> suggested—but with equal reserve in both cases—κύριος or καὶ ἀποθανών, and Swete<sup>5</sup> prefers the latter of these, for which cf. *Apoc.* i 18. Heinrici<sup>6</sup> thinks ὁ ζῶν καὶ κύριος a likely solution, but finds the expression only in Gnostic writings. Lock<sup>7</sup> supports his ὁ ζῶν καὶ ἀληθινός by reference to the Litany of Sarapion:—ὁ θεὸς... ὁ τὸν χαρακτήρα τὸν ζῶντα καὶ ἀληθινὸν γεννήσας; but ἀληθινός was probably chosen in that passage as an appropriate epithet for χαρακτήρ rather than as ordinarily connected with ὁ ζῶν.

(b) Who was associated with Thomas? GH<sup>8</sup> suggested Philip or Matthias, as the *Pistis Sophia* represents these with Thomas as recipients of a special revelation; and Batiffol and Bruston have followed this suggestion. Professor Lake's brilliant conjecture<sup>9</sup> Ἰούδα τῷ | καὶ Θωμᾶ has the advantage of leaving Thomas' authority for the Sayings undivided, and is supported by the Ἰούδας ὁ καὶ Θωμᾶς of the *Acta Thomae*. All these proposals, however, are checked by an insuperable obstacle—the fact that the use of one (or two)

<sup>1</sup> When I proposed this (*J.T.S.* xiii 74) I was unaware that Bruston had already made the same suggestion (*Fragm. d'un anc. recueil de Paroles de Jésus* p. 13).

<sup>2</sup> Compare further *Apoc.* xii 18 seq.; ps.-Athan. Λόγος Σωτηρίας X. (*ad init.*) ὁ μακαρία ψυχὴ, ἣ ἀκούσασα τούτους τοὺς λόγους... καὶ ποιῶσα, μαρτύρομαι παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα καὶ ποιῶντι, ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ γραφήσεται ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς ζωῆς.

<sup>3</sup> The reading καὶ Θωμᾶ is almost universally admitted. Wessely alone (*P.O.* iv p. 161) reads κ[αὶ δόξα αὐτοῖς] καὶ θαῦμα; but the original does not bear out this suggestion, which in itself is unsatisfactory.

<sup>4</sup> *Ox. Pap.* iv p. 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken* 1905 p. 192.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 4.

<sup>7</sup> *Expos. Times* xv 490.

<sup>8</sup> *Ch. Quarterly Rev.* LVIII p. 426.

<sup>9</sup> *Hibbert Journ.* III p. 339.

names distinctly excludes the main body of the Apostles. We cannot assume that the Editor meant otherwise any more than that Barnabas<sup>1</sup> writing γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς δέκα λόγοις ἐν οἷς ἐλάλησεν... πρὸς Μωσῆν meant that others than Moses received the Ten Commandments. Yet if we judge of the Sayings—as we must—by their Synoptic parallels, we must conclude that neither were they the fruit of private revelation, nor have they any connection with Thomas: Saying v offers the most obvious proof of this point. The difficulty is so real that Swete<sup>2</sup> is driven to think that the Prologue is the opening of one of twelve groups of Sayings each of which was conventionally attributed to one of the Apostles, citing the title of the *Didache*, Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἐθνεσιν, and suggesting that the real title of the Oxyrhynchus Collection may have been Λόγοι Ἰησοῦ πρὸς τοὺς δώδεκα. Bruston<sup>3</sup> takes a desperate position maintaining that the Prologue is really the colophon to a preceding section of 'Words of Eternal Life' addressed to Philip and Thomas,—a theory which the arrangement of the papyrus alone puts out of court. Nor is the difficulty which we are discussing surmounted by Bartlet's τοῖς τε ἄλλοις or τοῖς ἑ μαθηταῖς | καὶ Θωμᾷ. This restoration singles out Thomas (presumably as the recorder of the Sayings) without excluding the rest of the Apostles: cf. *John* xx 26 ἦσαν ἔσω οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς μετ' αὐτῶν, *Mark* xvi 7 εἰπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ. But it is hard to see why Thomas should be claimed as the recorder of Sayings with which tradition has never connected him:

and if the Editor really claimed the authority of Thomas, he would surely have done so categorically.

We are therefore driven to doubt that the dependence of Θωμᾷ on ἐλάλησεν is inevitable. Two passages suggest another form of restoration. *Mark* xvi 11 καὶ ἐκεῖνοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῇ καὶ ἐθεάθη ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἠπιστάσαν, and *Acts* i 3 παρέστησεν ἐαυτὸν ζῶντα... ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς<sup>4</sup>. In each case the statement that Jesus lives is followed immediately by quotation of proof: he was seen by such and such persons. These passages together with *John* xx 26 (quoted above) suggest the restoration given in the text<sup>5</sup>, which makes the reference to Thomas natural and easy. The Editor, thinking, doubtless, of the appearance to Thomas as recorded by St John, says in effect: 'These are the words of One who lives now and once gave proof of his immortality by appearing not only to the Ten, but even to the Apostle who had most strongly declared his scepticism.' The sharply marked present and aorist participles (cp. *Mark* xvi 11, quoted above) contrast, of course, a continuous, permanent state and a past, momentary action respectively.

3. The restoration of the first half of the lacuna, though not of the greatest importance, is interesting. The discoverers proposed αὐτοῖς, and this is perhaps the most acceptable: it involves the assumption, indeed, that the Editor has made a mistake (since in *John* viii 48 sqq. the Saying is addressed to the Pharisees); but such an assumption is reasonable enough on general grounds and is supported by the verbal errors in the Saying itself. Doubtless he was quoting from memory. The αὐτῷ of Swete

<sup>1</sup> xv.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 494.

<sup>3</sup> *Fragm. d'un anc. recueil de Paroles de Jésus* p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> See further 1 *Cor.* xv 4-8; *Luke* xxiv 34.

<sup>5</sup> Alternatives are καὶ φανεῖς τοῖς δέκα and καὶ φανερωθεῖς τοῖς ἑ.

cannot be accepted. If right it would imply that the quotation is from a document, now lost, in which the Saying was actually addressed to Thomas; for the substitution of a definite person, Thomas, for the Pharisees as addressee could only be accounted for by the theory of defective memory.

Lock would supply διδάσκων, in imitation of the 'citation-formula' of St Paul and Clement of Rome. But, as I have tried to show in the Introduction, the Prologue is something very different from that formula, if indeed it can properly be called a formula.

While reading αὐτοῖς in the Text, I venture to suggest αὐτός, believing that emphasis may account for the peculiar position of the pronoun<sup>1</sup>. In this connection it will be well, at the risk of partial repetition, to consider the whole train of thought of the Prologue. I have already argued that *life* is the dominant note, and if the conjectured epithet of the Sayings, 'life-giving,' is right, it was natural for the Editor to develop, enforce, and justify the implied claim. If I am not mistaken, the following paraphrase will represent his idea: 'These are the life-giving words of Jesus—life-giving, because they were spoken by one who lives for ever, as he proved by appearing after his death and burial to his disciples, so that even the most sceptical was convinced. And Jesus himself and no other claimed precisely this virtue for his words.' In such a form the Prologue is at least rid of the dangerous and extremely difficult claims to the authority of Thomas, while the

thought seems reasonable and apposite. The Prologue, then, is, as I have said, no more than a diffuse title or head-line like *Mark* i 1 or *Baruch* i 1 (quoted above); but the Editor was carried away into a vindication of the claim he had made for special quality of his Collection.

One point of some interest remains to be examined. What relation does the citation (ll. 3-5) bear to its Johannine parallel? The passage in question (*John* viii 51-52) is as follows: ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν, λέγω ὑμῖν· ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. εἶπον αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι...καὶ σὺ λέγεις ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The Jewish perversion of the Saying is decidedly closer to the version in the Prologue than is the actual Saying. It is probable, as we have seen, that the Editor is actually quoting from the Fourth Gospel<sup>2</sup>; how, then, are we to explain the divergencies? GH<sup>3</sup> note that in the Synoptics (*Matth.* xvi 28, *Mark* ix 1, *Luke* ix 27) θανάτου γεύεσθαι denotes physical death; and Dr Taylor is certainly right in saying<sup>4</sup> that in the Johannine parallel the Jews perverted the Saying 'he shall not die spiritually' (θ. οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ) into 'he shall not die physically' (θ. οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται). The citation in the Prologue is therefore erroneous as it stands. But the error seems due simply to uncritical quotation from memory. The Editor failed to perceive the distinction between the two expressions, and perhaps the Synoptists had made the second phrase the more familiar to him. Similarly, inexact memory and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Mark* iv 27 ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός.

<sup>2</sup> The Prologue (the work of the Editor of the Collection) is of course later than the actual Sayings, and therefore stands on a different level in its relation to the Canonical Gospels.

<sup>3</sup> *Ox. Pap.* iv pp. 3-4.

<sup>4</sup> *Oxyrh. Sayings* p. 4.

confusion will adequately explain the use of ἀκούσῃ (which is, of course, certain) for St John's τηρήσῃ: cp. *John* v 24 ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων... ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. τούτων seems to

be an adaptation, made consciously or unconsciously to apply the Logion directly to the Sayings of the Collection.

## SAYING I

λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς·

μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζη[τῶν τοῦ ζητεῖν ἕως ἂν]  
εὕρῃ, καὶ ὅταν εὕρῃ [θαμβηθήσεται, καὶ θαμ-]  
βηθεὶς βασιλεύσει, κα[ὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπα-]  
ήσεται.

6. ζητῶν τὴν ζωὴν ἕως ἂν, *GH*: τοῦ ζητεῖν, *Heinrici*: ἐκζητεῖν *or* τὴν σοφίαν, *Taylor*: τὴν ἀληθειαν, *Lock*: τὸν πατέρα, *Swete*: τὸν κύριον, *Bruston*: με ..., *Batiffol*. 6-9. μὴ παυσ. ὁ ζ. ἕως ἂν | εὕρῃ· καὶ ὅταν εὕρῃ θαμ|βηθεὶς β. καὶ ἀναπα|ήσεται, *Hilgenfeld*. 7. θαμβείσθω, *Swete*. 8. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΗ, *P*.

Jesus saith :

Let not him who seeketh cease from seeking until he hath found ;  
And when he hath found, he shall be amazed ;  
And when he hath been amazed, he shall reign ;  
And when he hath reigned he shall have rest.

This Saying is quoted with very slight divergencies by Clement of Alexandria<sup>1</sup>, so that the restoration of the discoverers is, in all essentials, certain. As they observed, a word not quoted by Clement must have followed ζητῶν and must have been either an object or something dependent upon παυσάσθω<sup>2</sup>. They suggested tentatively τὴν ζωὴν, which is not unattractive. But the verb θαμβείσθαι gives the impression that something less abstract is required—something which will

produce amazement. Lock's τὴν ἀληθειαν<sup>3</sup> and Taylor's τὴν σοφίαν seem too frigid and trite. The former supports his conjecture by reference to the *Clementine Homilies* (III 52): διὸ καὶ ἐκβῶ λέγων· δεῦτε πρὸς ἐμὲ πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες· τουτέστιν οἱ τὴν ἀληθειαν ζητοῦντες καὶ μὴ εὕρισκοντες αὐτήν... καὶ ἄλλοτε· ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρισκετε, ὡς μὴ προδήλως κειμένης τῆς ἀληθείας. But in this passage it seems unlikely that the homilist is interpreting two familiar Sayings by

<sup>1</sup> *Strom.* II 9. 45 (quoted below, p. 7, g.v.).

<sup>3</sup> *Ch. Quarl. Rev.* LVIII 422.

<sup>2</sup> *Ox. Pap.* IV p. 5.

means of a third and less known utterance: the explanation has rather the air of being his own. And the supplement is too long for the lacuna. Swete's τὸν πατέρα and Bruston's τὸν κύριον (for which cp. *Isaiah* lv 6) chime ill with what follows: it is a little too obvious to say that to find the Father will cause amazement.

Moreover, these restorations, if accepted, would make it hard to understand why Clement should have omitted a positive object such as 'truth' or 'wisdom.' But Clement may well have dropped out some word or phrase which was slightly redundant and seemed to him to carry no particular weight: Heinrich's τοῦ ζητεῖν is exactly such a phrase and has therefore been adopted in our text.

It may be objected that this leaves the meaning of the clause too indefinite: what is the object or aim of search? The answer is, that no precise definition of the object sought was intended. The search is that vague aspiration of humanity after something above and beyond itself—the ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως of *Romans* viii 19. To a pious Jew of the Old Dispensation this aspiration might embody itself in the expectation of a Messiah (cp. *Luke* ii 25), though this specialized form of the idea is, of course, far narrower than the spirit of the present Saying. It is, in fact, the fulfilment of the vague, instinctive longing or aspiration of mankind—in Pauline phrase the revelation<sup>1</sup> of the glory which is to be—which provokes amazement, a condition of mind necessarily preceding ability to partake in the Kingdom itself.

Harnack understands θαμβηθήσεται in the sense of joyful surprise, comparing the Parable of the

Hidden Treasure (*Matth.* xiii 24). This parallel exactly illustrates the transition between εὐρεῖν and θαμβεῖσθαι, though θάμβος should rather mean *awed* amazement<sup>2</sup> as in *Luke* v 9: ἐξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ κτλ. θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτόν; *Mark* xvi 5 ἐξεθαμβήθησαν (of the women at the Sepulchre).

The Saying as a whole is new, but every part of it falls into line with the Synoptic record of the teaching of Jesus. The first clause is close enough to the familiar ζητεῖτε καὶ εὐρήσετε of *Matth.* vii 7 and *Luke* xi 9; and the discoverers also quote *Matth.* vi. 33 ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν [τοῦ θεοῦ]. For the second stage we have no such verbal parallel. Yet the sense is quite in harmony with the Synoptic account. Amazement, as Harnack remarks, follows finding in the Parable of the Hidden Treasure<sup>3</sup>; and the same Parable covers the third clause also, for in both amazement is followed by enjoyment of the thing found. The final clause echoes the promise of *Matth.* xi 28 δεῦτε πρὸς με... καὶ ἡ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς: to come to Christ is synonymous with attaining the Kingdom, and both the First Gospel and the Saying promise rest to those who do so.

In l. 7 Swete has proposed to read θαμβεῖσθω as shorter than the future (which the discoverers regard as somewhat long for the space to be filled), and because the imperative is used in the initial clause. This seems unnecessary: the future is apparently possible graphically—and an error such as θαμβήσεται is quite possible,—and the context surely requires it. Wonder follows upon finding as a natural consequence and not as a state to be induced.

<sup>1</sup> *Romans*, viii 18.

<sup>2</sup> See Swete *Exp. Times* xv 491.

<sup>3</sup> Joy is a concomitant of finding in the Parable because of the nature of the thing found.

II. 8-9. ἀναπαήσεται is a vulgar form of ἀναπαύσεται: it occurs in the parallel Clem. Alex. Strom. II 9 45, and Apoc. xiv 13<sup>1</sup>.

The popularity of the saying is proved by the number of parallels in patristic and apocryphal writings. The most important of these are two citations by Clement of Alexandria:

(1) Strom. II 9 45 ταύτης δὲ (sc. τῆς ἀληθείας) ἀρχὴ τὸ θαυμάσαι τὰ πράγματα, ὡς Πλάτων ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ λέγει (p. 155 D) καὶ Ματθίας ἐν τοῖς Παραδόσεσι παραιῶν· 'θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα· ἢ κὰν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγελίῳ· 'ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει'—γέγραπται—'καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται.'

(2) Strom. V 14 ἴσον γὰρ τοῦτοισι (Plato Tim. p. 90) ἐκεῖνα δύνатаι· 'οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν ἕως ἂν εὕρῃ· εὕρων δὲ θαμβηθήσεται· θαμβηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσει· βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαυθήσεται.'

Two questions now arise: (a) which of these two citations is the more faithful quotation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews? (b) Is the more exact citation independent of or identical with our Saying?

(a) It is probable that the former passage is a substantial and not a verbal quotation from the Gospel. Clement is putting the Platonic doctrine that wonder begets knowledge: assuming for the moment that the longer version is that which was actually found in the Gospel, may we not fairly argue that Clement would have reduced it to the short form found in Strom. II? For the first two clauses of the longer form would be omitted as irrelevant; and θαυμάσας would be substituted for θαμβηθεὶς, because the latter, while essential in the citation as such, was unsuitable in Clement's application of it—θάμ-

βος being an emotion which occupies the mind exclusively and therefore not conducive to receptivity. We may remark also that the longer version is far more Synoptic in style<sup>2</sup> than the shorter.

While, therefore, absolute certainty is impossible, it seems in the highest degree probable that Clement's shorter version is a modification—made by himself—of the longer form, and that the longer form is the true citation from the Hebrew gospel.

(b) In what relation, then, does the longer form stand to the present Saying? In Clement we have οὐ παύσεται—εὕρων—ἐπαναπαυθήσεται for the μὴ παυσάσθω—ἔταν εὕρη—ἀναπαήσεται of the Saying. Such variants as these which carry with them no difference of meaning are such as occur naturally wherever quotation is made from memory. They are common enough in early Christian literature to justify us in treating the instances under consideration as negligible, and consequently deciding that the Oxyrhynchus Saying is identical with a Saying recorded in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Further, in the Introduction, as also at various points in the Commentary, reason has been shown for regarding the Sayings as extracts. Coupling, then, the conclusion that the Sayings are extracts with the identity of Saying I and Clement's citation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, we reach the important conclusion—which, I believe, is universally admitted, that Saying I is quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

The other citations are less direct, and for the most part do little more than show how popular the Saying was. (1) Clement II 6

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Heinrici *op. cit.* p. 194.

<sup>2</sup> As we should expect a citation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. For the climax-form cp. *Matth.* v 25.

ἡ δὲ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγάλη καὶ θαυμαστή ἐστὶν καὶ ἀνάπαυσις τῆς μελλούσης βασιλείας καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου. Resch thinks this passage is dependent on Clement *Strom.* II 9; but in any case the passage unmistakably refers to the last clause of the Saying: Taylor<sup>1</sup> believes that θαυμαστή proves reference to the preceding clause also, a view which would oblige us to regard the passage as confirming Clement's shorter citation as the genuine form. But to say 'the promise is wonderful' is very different from saying 'the promise is attained through wonder,' as the Saying does. 'Clement' doubtless uses θαυμαστή without any reference to our Saying<sup>2</sup>. (2) *Acta Thomae* (ed. Tischendorf) οἱ ἀξίως μεταλαμβάνοντες τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀγαθῶν ἀναπαύονται καὶ ἀναπαύμενοι βασιλεύσουσιν. Though ἀνάπαυσις and βασιλεία are reversed, it is clear that here again the reference is to the final clause of the Saying. (3) *Evang. Thomae* (ed. Tischendorf) Α. v. ἀρκετόν σοί ἐστι ζητεῖν καὶ μὴ εὑρεῖν. This passage has not hitherto been connected with

the Saying. It seems to mean 'It is bad enough that, with all your search (expectation) as a pious Jew for the Messiah, you have failed to recognise him when he is before you. Do not make it worse by ill-treating me,' and so agrees exactly with the explanation of the initial clause in our Saying given above. (4) It seems at least possible that in *Pistis Sophia* (§ 251 ed. Petermann) there is an adapted version of Saying 1: Schwartz's translation of the Coptic is as follows: 'et dicite iis: ne remitte quaerere per diem et noctem, et ne ανακτητε (? = ἀνέχετε) vos usque dum inveneritis μυστήρια purgatores quae purgabunt vos ut redant vos εἰλικρινές lumen, ut euntes in altitudinem κληρονομήσητε lumen mei regni.' If we leave out the Gnostic dressing of this passage, the remainder *ne remitte quaerere... usque dum inveneritis... ut euntes in altitudinem κληρονομήσητε* (lumen) *mei regni*, is obviously very close to the Oxyrhynchus Saying; indeed the first clause of the Coptic is verbally almost identical with the first clause of the Greek.

## SAYING II

λέγει Ἰ[ούδας· τίνες ἄρα]

οἱ ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς, [καὶ πότε ἐλεύσεται] 10

ἡ βασιλεία (ἡ) ἐν οὐρα[νοῖς οὐσα; λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς·]

τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρ[ανοῦ, καὶ τῶν θηρίων ὅ-]

τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστ[ιν ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ]

οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλά[σσης, οὗτοι οἱ ἔλκον-]

τες ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἡ βασ[ιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν] 15

ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ]στι· [καὶ ὅστις ἂν ἐαυτὸν]

<sup>1</sup> *O.S.* p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Hippol. *Comm. in Dan.* IV 60 τοῦ οὐδὲν κυρίου διηγούμενου... περὶ τῆς μελλούσης τῶν ἀγίων βασιλείας ὡς εἶη ἐνδοξος καὶ θαυμαστή.



γνῶ ταύτην εὐρή[σει· καὶ εὐρόντες αὐτήν]  
 ἑαυτοὺς γνῶσεσθε [ὅτι υἱοὶ καὶ κληρονόμοι]  
 ἐστε ὑμεῖς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ π[αυτοκράτορος, καὶ]  
 γνῶσ(ε)σθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐν[θ(ε)ῶ ὄντας καὶ θ(εὸ)ν ἐν ὑμῖν.] 20  
 καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ πτῶ[λις θ(εο)ῦ].

9 ff. λέγει Ἰησοῦς· ἐρωτᾶτε τίνες οἱ εἰ. ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰ ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστιν;.....τὰ π. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν θηρίων ὅτι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ι. τῆς θαλάσσης, οὗτοι οἱ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστὶ καὶ ὅστις ἂν ἑαυτὸν γνῶ ταύτην εὐρήσει.....ἑαυτοὺς γνῶσεσθε καὶ εἰδήσετε ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε ὑμεῖς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ παντοκράτορος...γνῶσ(ε)σθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐν.....καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἡ πτῶ....., *GH*.

λ. Ἰησοῦς· μὴ φοβείτωσαν οἱ εἰ. ὁ. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ὑμῶν γὰρ ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἔσται τὰ π., *Bartlet*.

λ. Ἰησοῦς· ἐρωτᾶτε τίνες οἱ εἰ. ἡμᾶς ἄνω εἰς οὐρανὸν εἰ ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστιν; ἀμὴν λέγω, *Taylor*.

λ. Ἰησοῦς· τίνες εἰσιν οἱ εἰ. ὁ. πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν; ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ· οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ π. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶν κτίσμα ὅτι ὁ. τ. γ. ἐστὶν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ καὶ οἱ ι. τῆς θαλάσσης, οὗτοι οἱ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς, *Stwede*.

λ. Ἰησοῦς· πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ εἰ. ἡμᾶς εἰς τὰ κριτήρια ὅτι ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστιν; μήτι δύναται τὰ π. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιγιγνώσκειν τί ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστιν; καὶ τί ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οἱ ι. τῆς θαλάσσης; οὕτως οἱ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς. καὶ ἡ βασιλεία ὁμῶς μέντοι ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν, καὶ ὅς ἂν τὰ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν γνῶ, ταύτην εὐρήσει.....ἑαυτοὺς γνῶσεσθε ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ υἱοὶ ἐστε ὁ. τοῦ π. τοῦ τελείου ἐν οὐρανῷ. γνῶσεσθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ. ἐστε, ἡ πτοεῖσθε, *Deissmann*.

λ. Ἰησοῦς· μὴ λέγητε, διατὶ οἱ εἰ. ἡ. εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐπειδὴ ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ ὑπάρχει· μήποτε τὰ π. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσιν διατὶ ὁ. τ. γ. ἐστὶν ἔρπετὰ ἡ διατὶ οἱ ι. τῆς θαλάσσης; τοῖοι οἱ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰ. ὁ. ἐστὶ. ὅστις οὖν ἑαυτὸν γνῶ ταύτην εὐρήσει καὶ ὅταν ὑμεῖς εἰ. γνῶσεσθε, εἰδήσετε ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε ὁ. τ. π. τ. παντός, καὶ ὅταν γνῶσεσθε εἰ. ἐκ θεοῦ, τότε οὐράνιοι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ (?) πτεροφόροι, *Bruston*.

λέγει Ἰ.· τίνες οἱ ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς εἰσιν; ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ π. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. τί ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστιν; οἱ ι. τῆς θαλάσσης ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς. καὶ ἡ βασιλεία ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν. ὅς ἂν ἑαυτὸν γνῶ ταύτην εὐρήσει. ἑαυτοὺς γνῶσεσθε· ὑμεῖς ἐστε τοῦ π. τοῦ τελείου. γνῶσθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ πτῶ, *Hilgenfeld*.

λ. Ἰησοῦς· αἰτεῖτε, *Lock*; λ. Ἰησοῦς· μὴ εἰπητε, *Bartlet*.

9-11. λέγει Ἰησοῦς μὴ φοβείτωσαν οἱ εἰ. ὁ. εἰς κριτήρια· ὑμῶν γὰρ ἡ β. ἐν οὐρανῷ, *Wessely*.

17. εὐρήσει· ἐὰν γὰρ ἀληθῶς, *Swete*: εὐρήσει καὶ εὐρόντες αὐτήν, *Heinrici*. 18. Γνωσέσθαι, *P*, corr. *GH*: υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες, *Swete*. 19. ὑψίστον· καὶ ὑμεῖς ὅταν, *Bartlet*. 20. ἐν τῇ πόλει τοῦ θεοῦ, *Blass*: ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν, *Heinrici*: ἐντὸς τῆς πόλεως ὄντας, *Swete*: ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὄντας, *Taylor*. 21. ἡ πόλις, *Blass*, *GH*, *Swete*: ἡπτημένοι, *Heinrici*: ἡ πόλις θ(εο)ῦ, *Bethune Baker*.

Judas saith: 'Who, then, are they who draw us? And when shall come the Kingdom which is in Heaven?' Jesus saith: 'The birds of the air and, of the beasts, whatsoever is under the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea; these are they which draw you. And the Kingdom of Heaven is within you; and whosoever shall know himself shall find it. And when ye have found it, ye shall know that ye are sons and heirs of the almighty Father, and ye shall know that ye are in God and God in you. And ye are the city of God.'

Critics differ widely as to the meaning to be attached to the participle *ἔλκοντες* (l. 10), and this disagreement together with the mutilation of the Saying and the absence of any general parallel to the whole, has given rise to a large number of reconstructions.

The renderings of *ἔλκοντες* may be grouped as follows: (1) *GH*<sup>1</sup> and *Swete*<sup>2</sup> understand 'attract' or 'influence'; (2) *Taylor*<sup>3</sup> takes the word in its literal and physical sense, 'pull' or 'draw'; (3) *Bartlet*<sup>4</sup> would interpret it 'persecute'; (4) *Deissmann* renders 'drag' (*sc.* before the judgement-seat). These views can be considered only briefly. *Taylor's* rendering must be rejected on the ground of the extreme *naïveté* it assumes on the part of the author of this Saying. That the birds of the air might be said to draw us up to Heaven, is perhaps admissible as a poetic

figure and not without a classical echo; but to claim that the beasts 'on the earth and under the earth' also perform this service, borders on the ludicrous, while the admission of the fishes of the sea to the same privilege is surely intolerable<sup>5</sup>. *Bartlet's* reconstruction fails on the grounds given by *GH*, that authority over brute-creation hardly justifies the command 'fear not them who persecute you.' And it should be noticed that the parallel advanced by *Bartlet* from *Barnab.* vi 12 and 18 attributes this authority to mankind in general (following *Genesis* i 26). *Deissmann's* restoration<sup>6</sup> yields to none in ingenuity; but is it likely that unbelievers would be represented as making such a taunt? Surely the whole course of early Christian history shows that those who 'dragged Christians before the judgement-seats' failed to

<sup>1</sup> *Ox. Pap.* iv p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Expos. Times* xv 491.

<sup>3</sup> *Oxyrh. Sayings* pp. 9-10.

<sup>4</sup> In *Ox. Pap.* l.c.

<sup>5</sup> In *J.T.S.* vii p. 548, however, Dr *Taylor* compares *Philo de Praem. et Poen.* (M. ii 415, 421) to the effect that by contemplation of the world and its order men may rise up as on a sort of heavenly ladder to the thought of God.

<sup>6</sup> *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* (1904) S. 117.

understand this very point that 'the Kingdom was in Heaven.' Moreover, the reconstruction of ll. 11-14 has a strange sound and makes but a lefthanded reply to the supposed taunt of the persecutors.

Bruston<sup>1</sup> fails to see any connection between birds, beasts and fishes and the Kingdom, but finds a double opposition (1) between birds and fishes, (2) between the Kingdom and those who draw us to the earth. But Matthew (as we shall see) gives a key to the connection between birds and the Kingdom, and *Psalms* viii, with many other passages<sup>2</sup>, shows that birds, beasts and fishes are conventionally representative of the whole lower animate creation.

The sense in which GH and Swete understand ἔλκοντες is surely the right one, being supported, as the latter points out, by Clement (*Strom.* vii 2 § 9) who speaks of *menas τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι ἐκδόμενοι*<sup>3</sup>: the discoverers also compare the use of ἐλκύειν in *John* vi 44; xii 32. Taking ἔλκοντες in some such sense, GH base their restoration 'on the close parallelism which we have supposed to exist between l. 15 -τες ὑμᾶς καὶ ἡ βασιλεῖα τῶν οὐρανῶν and l. 10 οἱ ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς followed in l. 11 by ἡ βασιλεῖα ἐν οὐρανῷ.' Such a view, implying as it does that the Saying was in the form of question and answer, alone adequately explains the fragments of the text. The restoration ἔλκον]τες (ll. 14-15) is, of course, inevitable.

The restoration printed in our text rests upon two considerations to which perhaps too little impor-

tance has been attached. (1) In l. 10 the papyrus has ἡμᾶς and in l. 15 ὑμᾶς: the change may, as GH point out, be no more than an error which is very common in papyri; yet a restoration which can retain the MS. reading has at least a slight advantage. (2) In l. 15 [οἱ ἔλκον]τες ὑμᾶς is separated from ἡ βασιλεῖα by καὶ: does this not force us to conclude that the parallel οἱ ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς also was followed by καὶ, or, in other words, must not the question have been a double one<sup>4</sup>? If this be so, the restorations hitherto put forward must be profoundly modified; and it remains to give further grounds for the reconstruction here put forward. If the ἡμᾶς... ὑμᾶς of the papyrus is right, the question must have been put to Jesus by a second person (just as Saying v consists of a series of questions followed by an answer): it cannot well be a rhetorical or echoed question as GH regard it, and it is most unlikely that Jesus would have included himself among those who are 'drawn' by the birds, beasts and fishes. In l. 9 the surviving λέγει 'I [... naturally suggests the familiar λέγει 'Ἰησοῦς; but this is not inevitable, and I have conjectured λέγει 'Ιούδας introducing the question (cp. *John* xiv 22, quoted below), and have filled out the otherwise difficult lacuna in l. 11 with the formula λέγει 'Ἰησοῦς which introduces the answer: why Judas has been selected as the interrogator will become clear later. If, again, the answer is in two parts, connected by καὶ, it is highly probable that the question also was similarly

<sup>1</sup> *Fragm. d'un anc. recueil de Paroles de Jésus* p. 114.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Hesiod, *W. and D.* 277; *Job* xii 7, 8.

<sup>3</sup> Mr Badham cites further Clement *Strom.* vi 6 τοὺς μὲν γὰρ προτρέπει ὁ Κύριος τοῖς δὲ ἤδη ἐγχειρήσασιν καὶ χεῖρα δρέγει καὶ ἀνέλκει. *Id.* v 12 ἡ ἰσχύς τοῦ Λόγου... πάντα τὸν καταδοξάμενον καὶ ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἔλκει.

<sup>4</sup> Dr Taylor (*J.T.S.* vii p. 548) regards καὶ as 'editorial': in view of the apparent parallelism between question and answer, this explanation cannot, I think, be maintained.

divided. Leaving on one side, then, the first part of the question 'Who are they who draw us?' with its answer 'These are they who draw you,' we must ask what was the second question which is answered by 'The Kingdom of Heaven is within you.' Now this answer is familiar enough. *Luke* xvii 20 has: ἐπερωτήθεις δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως... ἰδοὺ γάρ, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν. Since Luke, then, gives the reply contained in our Saying as the answer to a definite question, and since we have reason to believe that our Saying contained a *double* question, is it not at least highly probable that the second part of the question which we are seeking to recover, was similar to the question answered in *Luke* by the remarkable saying 'The Kingdom of Heaven is within you'? I have therefore restored 'And when shall come (or cometh) the Kingdom which is in Heaven<sup>1</sup>?'.

I have supposed that Judas ('not Iscariot') is the interrogator. Luke, indeed, makes the Saying 'The Kingdom of Heaven is within you' part of the reply to the Pharisees; but this is not likely to be historically true, inasmuch as the Pharisees are normally represented to us as the last people of whom it could be said that the Kingdom was within them. Possibly Luke had before him some notice of a question of the Pharisees, 'When is this Kingdom to appear?' and the detached *logos* ἡ β. ἐντὸς ὑμῶν, and uncritically welded the two together.

Judas, however, appears in *John* xiv 22 with a closely parallel question: λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας... κύριε, τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῶν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ; where is latent the same contrast between a material and spiritual view of the Kingdom as in the present Saying. Hippolytus<sup>2</sup> also has preserved a notice of a question asked by Judas (Iscariot?) concerning the Kingdom: τοῦ οὖν κυρίου διηγουμένου περὶ τῆς μελλούσης τῶν ἀγίων βασιλείας... καταπλαγείς ὁ Ἰούδας... ἔφη· καὶ τίς ἄρα ὅψεται ταῦτα; We might almost suppose that the name of Judas became traditionally associated with a certain type of question, though possibly the two owners of that name were not always clearly distinguished.

We may now turn back to the remarkable reference to the birds, the beasts and the fishes. These, as we have seen, are representative of lower animate creation; but what is meant by saying that these 'draw' or 'influence' us? The answer is to be found, as Dr Taylor has shown<sup>3</sup>, in *Matth.* vi 26-30, where the fowls of the air and the lilies of the field<sup>4</sup> are represented as drawing us, if we will but heed the lesson they teach, by their example of faith in providence<sup>5</sup>. Dr Taylor further compares *Job* xii 7-8 ἀλλὰ δὴ ἐρώτησον τετράποδα ἐάν σοι εἴπωσι, πετεινὰ δὲ οὐρανοῦ ἐάν σοι ἀπαγγέλωσιν· ἐκδιήγησαι γῇ ἐάν σοι φράσῃ, καὶ ἐξηγήσονται σοι οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης, a passage which alike in its main thought and in its phraseology lies so closely parallel to our Saying as to make almost inevitable the conclusion that the com-

<sup>1</sup> For another setting of this question cf. 2 *Clem.* xii 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Comm. in Dan.* iv 60 (=Preuschen *Antileg.* p. 29 no. 23 b).

<sup>3</sup> *Oxyrh. Sayings* p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. also *Luke* xii 24 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. *Hymns Anc. and Mod.* 276, especially the last stanza.

piler of the Saying elaborated the essential idea of Matthew or Luke<sup>1</sup> on a model derived from the Old Testament.

In this connection it will be well to consider the relation between our Saying and Luke in regard to the *logos ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν ἐστιν*. GH, indeed, incline to see connection between the Saying and the Gospel of Thomas, quoting Hippolytus *Refut.* v 7 οὐ μόνον δ' αὐτῶν ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν φασὶ τῷ λόγῳ τὰ Ἀσσυρίων μυστήρια, ἀλλὰ καὶ Φρυγῶν περὶ τὴν τῶν γεγονότων καὶ γινόμενων καὶ ἐσομένων ἐτι μακαρίαν κρυβομένην ὁμοῦ καὶ φανερούμενην φύσιν ἥν περ φασὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ζητουμένην, περὶ ἧς διαρρήδην ἐν τῷ κατὰ Θωμᾶν ἐπιγραφόμενῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραδιδόασιν λέγοντες οὕτως· ἐμὲ δὲ ζήτων εὐρήσει ἐν παιδίῳ ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἑπτὰ· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ αἰῶνι κρυβόμενος φανεροῦμαι. But surely this passage does not state or imply that the *logos* was found also in the *Gospel of Thomas*: it seems clear that the Naassenes urged in defence of their doctrine, 'The Happy Nature, in which we believe, is the same as your canonical doctrine of the Kingdom of Heaven within a man, though its nature is more explicitly revealed in a *logos* in our own *Gospel of Thomas*.' The *logos*, then, is common to Luke and our Saying alone: are we to suppose that the evangelist and the logographer derived it from the same source or parallel sources, or that one is indebted to the other? Circumstantial evidence makes it probable, if not certain, that the Saying is indebted to the Gospel; for (1) we have already seen good reason to believe that the first part is composite and owes one of

its elements to the first Gospel; (2) if the second part of the Saying is genuine and not a later addition, its mystical and quasi-philosophical character demands a post-synoptic date; (3) the other Sayings generally betray dependence upon one or more of the Synoptics, and analogy therefore is in favour of a similar dependence here.

The second part of the Saying is less compact than the first, and restoration is consequently more hazardous. No detailed criticism of the suggestions hitherto published, therefore, is likely to serve any good purpose: it will be sufficient to remark on the new supplements given in the text as they occur. The restoration of GH in l. 16 is certainly right, and that of Heinrici in l. 17 almost equally so. In l. 18 I have substituted κληρονόμοι (for which compare *Luke* x 25 but especially *Romans* viii 14, 16-17 ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ θεοῦ... αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ... ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ· εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ) for θυγατέρες (Swete, Taylor). In l. 19 the discoverers' παντοκράτορος<sup>2</sup> may well be right, though the epithet is a matter of minor importance. Lines 20-21 are decidedly difficult: in the former only the suggestion of Heinrici ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν seems plausible. Following his suggestion, I had once thought of ἐν ἐμοὶ ὄντας καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν (cf. *John* vi 56; xiv 20; xv 5); but this is a little too long; and I therefore read ἐν θ(ε)ῷ ὄντας καὶ θ(ε)ὸν ἐν ὑμῖν, and compare 1 *John* iv 13 ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν. In the latter Blass' supplement ἡ πτόλις<sup>3</sup> alone seems pos-

<sup>1</sup> The common phrase τὰ περὶ τὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ makes it likely that Matthew rather than Luke, who has κόραες, was in the compiler's mind.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. 2 *Cor.* vi 18.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. *Matth.* v 14.

sible; and though the change of subject is abrupt, this is not necessarily an objection. I have adopted Prof. Bethune Baker's suggestion (privately communicated) that  $\theta(eo)\delta$  should be added.

The second part of the Saying in its abstract and philosophical character stands in strong contrast against the first. While the earlier portion is redolent of the countryside, the latter sounds like an echo from Alexandria<sup>1</sup> or some similar centre, and it seems at least possible that this part of the Saying is an addition to the less artificial first half.

Whether the second part is an amplification or no, there seems good ground for believing that the first part at least is an extract from a larger context. Whether the Saying began 'Ye ask who are they who draw us' (or the like), or '[Judas] saith: Who, then, are they who draw us?' it must have been preceded by some enigmatic statement which provoked the question (whether real or assumed), by some such statement as 'Ye shall be drawn unto the Kingdom.' If this be granted, the passage to which our Saying belonged was of the same type as the citation in 2 Clement v discussed in the Commentary on Saying iv, and this citation, as I have there tried to show, must come from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. In itself this attribution is obviously precarious; but the Saying seems to show certain tendencies which may in some

degree strengthen it: (1) there is a naïve unconventionality in the statement that birds, beasts and fishes 'draw' us which is generally similar to the spirit of the well-known fragment<sup>2</sup> from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, ἀρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα θαβώρ; both passages, moreover, seem to be adaptations from ancient Hebrew literature<sup>3</sup>. (2) The metaphysical and theological character of the second part of the Saying (apart from restorations) on the one hand is Johannine—and as we have seen in the Introduction the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* shows a distinct though minor Johannine element—and on the other lies parallel to Saying i, which is attributed by Clement of Alexandria to the same Gospel.

The argument of the Saying as a whole seems to be that men can be greatly influenced towards the Kingdom by the example of faith and trust shown by the lower creation; for the Kingdom is not a material one: it is latent in man and consists in his capacities for faith, trust, and the like. When a man becomes conscious of these and develops them (knows himself)—a process in which the example of the birds of the air and other creatures exercises a powerful influence—he has found the Kingdom, and realizes all that this implies, sonship with God and unity with God.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Clement of Alexandria *Paedag.* III 1 (quoted by Badham in *O.v. Pap.* IV 7) ἦν ἄρα, ὡς εἶκε, πάντων μέγιστον μαθημάτων τὸ γινῶναι αὐτόν· ἐαυτὸν γάρ τις ἐάν γινῶη, θεὸν εἴσεται.

<sup>2</sup> Orig. *Comm. in Ioh.* II 12 87.

<sup>3</sup> *Job* xii 7-8; *Ezech.* viii 3.

## SAYING III

λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς·

οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἄνθ[ρωπος τὴν ὁδὸν εὐ-]

ρῶν ἐπερωτῆσαι π[ά]ντα . . . . . διαι-]

ρῶν περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆ[ς καθέδρας; εὐρή-]

σετε ὅτι πολλοὶ ἔσονται π[ρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ] 25

οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι· καὶ [ζωὴν κληρονομήσου-]

σιν.

22-27. ἄνθρωπος κληθεὶς σώφρων ἐ. πάντως ἓνα τῶν κλητόρων π. τ. τ. τῆς δοχῆς ποῦ ἀνακληθήσεται β. π. ἔ. πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ οἱ ἔ. πρῶτοι καὶ δόξαν εὐρήσουσιν, *Deissmann*.

οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἄνθρωπος (ῶν) τῶν ἐντιμοτέρων ἐπερωτῆσαι παρὰ τοῦ δέλπου ἀπορῶν περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆς κλισίας ποῦ κληθήσεται· ὅτι π. ἔ. πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ οἱ ἔ. π. καὶ φανεροὶ ἀποβαλνουσιν, *Wessely*.

ἄνθρωπος περὶ τῶν καιρῶν ἐ. παρρησιαζόμενος ληρῶν περὶ τοῦ τ. τῆς δόξης· ὑμεῖς δὲ σιωπήσετε (κτλ.) καὶ ὀλίγοι εὐρήσουσιν, *Swete*.

ἄνθρωπος πλήρης ἡμερῶν ἐ. παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων περὶ τ. τ. τῆς μονῆς αὐτοῦ. ἀλλ' εὐρήσετε (κτλ.) καὶ ὀλίγοι κλητοὶ εἰσιν, *Taylor*.

22 ff. ἄνθρωπος νέος καὶ σώφρων ἐ. παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων π. τ. τ. τῆς ἀναπαύσεως· καὶ γνώσετε ὁ. π. ἔ. (κτλ.) καὶ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐκλάμψουσιν, *Bruston*.

22. περὶ τῶν πατέρων, *Bartlet*. 23. παρρησία καὶ ἱστορῶν, *Bartlet*.  
ἐπερωτήσε, *P* (corr. *GH*). 24. τῆς βασιλείας εἰδήσετε, *GH*.

25. ὅτι, *suprascript in P*. 26. ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔξουσιν, *GH*.

Jesus saith:

Shall a man who has found the way not fear to ask...determining all things concerning the place of his seat? Ye shall find that many first shall be last, and the last first, and they shall inherit eternal life.

The discoverers offer no restoration for the main part of this Saying, and those of Swete, Deissmann, Taylor and Bruston are, on general grounds, not satisfactory. Mr Badham has suggested comparison with *Apoc. Petr.* λέγει ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος·

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος τῶν ἀρχερωντῶν ὑμῶν τῶν δικαίων ἀνθρώπων; but no reconstruction on this basis seems possible.

I have ventured to follow what seems to be another possible line of restoration. Here, as elsewhere in

the Sayings, the Synoptics seem to give the safest clue, and the latter part of this Saying is obviously very close to the Synoptic Gospels. *Matth.* xix-xx has a series of incidents which are likely to help us. First (xix 27 ff.) we have τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα... τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμῖν; εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς... καθίσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους... πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι κτλ. Then follows the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (xx 1-16), ending like the preceding incident and the present Saying. Thirdly we have the episode of the 'mother of Zebedee's children' who asks precedence for her two sons (xx 20-24). Lastly Jesus himself utters a warning to those who seek the first place. These passages form a group which might be headed 'On seeking Precedence,' and the warning 'the first shall be last' surely links the whole with our Saying. It is highly probable, then, that the Saying also deals with the matter of seeking precedence in the Kingdom; and this probability is increased by the use of τόπος, a word which in *Luke* xiv 9-10 means 'place' (the 'room' of A.V.) with a definite connotation of precedence<sup>1</sup>.

In consequence, the restoration of τῆς καθέδρας in l. 24 seems almost inevitable—οὐκ ἀποκνήσει should then be treated as an indignant question; and we may assume that the lacuna after ἄνθρωπος was once occupied by words which gave reason why a man

should be ashamed to ask of such matters. I have therefore restored τὴν ὁδὸν εὐρών<sup>2</sup>. The general sense of the Saying would then be: 'a man who has found the one great and essential thing (the Way) ought to be ashamed to haggle about his precedence over others.'

There remains the lacuna in l. 23 which I cannot fill with any confidence. The missing words may possibly have been explanatory of ἐπερωτήσαι, and I have accordingly suggested πᾶντα... διαίρων<sup>3</sup>, 'determining (or trying to determine) all things concerning the place,' etc. The completion of l. 26 is a matter of only secondary importance. GH suggest ζῶν αἰῶνον ἔξουσιν<sup>4</sup>, which is adequate; but *Matth.* xix 29 may be thought to favour ζῶν κληρονομήσουσιν.

The Saying—however we restore it—is a remarkable instance of that salient characteristic of the Oxyrhynchus collection as a whole—the mixture of elements at once parallel to and divergent from the Synoptics. For while the first part of the Saying has nothing exactly similar in the Synoptics, it nevertheless seems related to a clearly marked group of episodes in the Gospels. On the other hand the second part of the Saying corresponds exactly with the Synoptic version, and as compared with *Mark* x 31 this correspondence is exact (Mark, indeed, inserts δέ after πολλοί, but this is due to his different context): *Matth.* xix 30 differs only in the omission of οἱ before the second ἔσχατοι<sup>5</sup>. The

<sup>1</sup> Note that almost immediately above (xiii 29-30) Luke says 'they shall come from the east and from the west... and shall sit down (ἀνακλιθήσονται) in the kingdom of God. And lo, there are last which shall be first,' etc. (This after speaking of the rejection of the self-righteous.)

<sup>2</sup> Cp. 1 *Clement* xxxvi αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς... ἐν ᾗ εὕρομεν τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν; *John* xiv 4 καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἰδατε τὴν ὁδόν.

<sup>3</sup> For this use of διαίρειν cp. Aristotle *Phys.* vi 9 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. *John* iii 16, 36; v 24.

<sup>5</sup> *Luke's* εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἱ ἔσονται πρῶτοι κτλ. (xiv 30) is obviously remote from the present question.



Synoptics and the Saying are indeed so close that it is incredible that the two are independent, and the evidence reviewed in the Introduction goes to show that it is the writer of the Saying who is the borrower. The points of difference between the versions of Matthew and Mark are, however, so slight that it is impossible to say with certainty whether the author of the Saying borrowed from the first or the second: only we may be sure that he borrowed from one of them.

The abrupt rebuke conveyed in the first part of the Saying reproving as it surely does the tendency to seek for precedence, can hardly be anything but an extract: it must have formed part, not of any general exhortation, but of a reply to some request. It is, indeed, only intelligible to one who can reconstruct the context. If conjecture is permissible, we might regard the Saying as coming from a lost version of the incident of the Sons of Zebedee.

## SAYING IV

λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς· [πάν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσ-]  
θεν τῆς ὄψεώς σου, καὶ [τὸ κεκαλυμμένον]  
ἀπὸ σου ἀποκαλυφ(θ)ήσεται[αἱ σοι· οὐ γάρ ἐσ-]  
τιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανε[ρὸν γενήσεται,] 30  
καὶ τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται].

28. τὸ κεκρυμμένον, *GH*. 29. ἀποκαλύφῃσεται, *P*, *Wessely*<sup>1</sup>  
(corr. *GH*). 30. φαίνῃ τοῖς...οὐρανίοις or ὃ οὐ φύσις φανερώσει ποτέ  
*Bruston*. 31. θεθαμμένον, *P* (corr. *GH*): οὐ γνωσθήσεται *GH*  
(alternative reading): οὐκ ἐξορύσσεται, *Bartlet*: οὐ φανερόν ἢ αὐτοῖς or οὐκ  
ἐξορύξει, *Bruston*.

Jesus saith:

Every thing that is not before thine eyes,  
And that which is hidden from thee, shall be revealed unto thee;  
For there is nothing hid that shall not become manifest,  
And buried that shall not be raised up.

The restoration of this Saying does not admit of much controversy: the second half of l. 30 and of l. 31 do indeed admit of different supplements; but these do not affect the general structure and

meaning of the whole. As far as I know, *Bruston* alone has disturbed this critical calm. In l. 30 he objects<sup>2</sup> to the discoverers' φανε[ρὸν] and thinks that φινῇ (= φάλιν) or φύσις<sup>3</sup> should be read.

<sup>1</sup> Comparing the analogous form of the aorist passive participle ἀποκαλυφείσης: see *Karanis et Sknopain Nesos* in *Mém. Acad. de Vienne* XLVII p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Fragm. d'un anc. recueil de Paroles de Jésus*, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 34.

The first half of this Saying is new, though *John* xiii 7 ὁ ἐγὼ ποιῶ σὺ οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι, γνώση δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα affords a parallel in the most general sense.

The latter half has parallels in all three Synoptics, Luke giving two versions of the Saying. These passages may be divided into two groups, as follows:

- I (a) *Mark* iv 22 οὐ γάρ ἐστι τι κρυπτόν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ, οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ' ἵνα εἰς φανερόν ἐλθῇ.
- (b) *Luke* viii 17 οὐ γάρ ἐστι κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἐλθῇ.
- II (a) *Matth.* x 26 οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.
- (b) *Luke* xii 2 οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.

In the first of these groups, where Luke is clearly dependent upon Mark, the Saying occurs in a series of disconnected logia and is therefore without context; but in the second we find it in the Charge to the Twelve (*Matth.* x 5 ff.), or to the Seventy (*Luke* x 1 ff.), though the third evangelist defers some of the most characteristic matter—including the parallel to the present Saying—to chapter xii. Our authorities for the Saying in its two-fold form are, then, Mark (for Group I) and Q (for Group II). Whether the latter owes its context to the ingenuity of an editor or no, is a matter which need not be discussed here: the question before us is the relationship of Saying IV to this double tradition. Grenfell and Hunt consider it to agree with Matthew and Luke (Group II)

in general arrangement, but with Mark in the language of the first clause of the second half. Elsewhere—in the *Logia* of 1897 as in the Sayings of 1903—the influence of Mark is very slight, if indeed it exists, while that of Matthew and Luke is strongly marked. Now the first clause of the second half of Saying IV coincides word for word with the Lucan parallel in Group I, and it therefore seems likely that Mark should be left out of the matter altogether. On the other hand the relationship between the Saying and Group II seems to extend beyond arrangement. ἀποκαλυφθήσεται is peculiar to the Q version—a fact which suggests that another Q word, κεκαλυμμένον, should be supplied instead of the discoverers' κεκρυμμένον. It may, then, be claimed that the Saying is dependent partly upon the Q tradition, and partly upon the Lucan version of Mark's tradition.

This, together with the novel first and fourth clauses, calls for explanation. The Saying would seem to have grown in the following way: the final clause either grew up naturally in post-apostolic days, or (as is more likely in view of the dependence of the third clause upon Luke viii) was deliberately substituted for the final clause in the version of Group I. Then, it appears, this revised Saying was contaminated with the Group II version, its first clause superseding the second clause of Group II, which it closely resembles. In consequence the first clause of Group II was left out of the parallelistic scheme, but was retained by prefixing a totally new first clause. It is significant that this clause contains the Johannine word ὅψις.

Is Saying IV an extract? If so, we must—in view of its relationship to Group II—assign it to a

version of the Charge to the Apostles (or to the Seventy), though the remarkable final clause indicates that the *particular* connection must have been other than Synoptic. The discoverers, indeed, held that the Prologue claimed S. Thomas as the authority for the Sayings, and that it is therefore inconceivable that the Collection is a series of excerpts from well-known Gospels. In the notes on the Prologue I have shown reason for believing that the mention of Thomas is there only casual, and that he was not claimed by the Editor as the source from which the Oxyrhynchus Sayings were derived. Consequently, there is no initial objection to the theory that the Sayings are extracts.

Does our Saying then show signs of extraction from a context? The use of the second person singular is remarkable: it gives the Saying a precision and directness which an isolated *logion* would hardly be likely to preserve. It is used, indeed, in discourses as an oratorical device to secure vividness<sup>1</sup>, but this explanation does not seem to meet the present case. Surely Saying IV is addressed to an individual, and the striking character of the final clause may be taken as lending support to this conclusion, since the departure from the Synoptic version may well be due to use in a more specialized context—a context in which such a version would be particularly appropriate.

This context may perhaps be recoverable. We have seen that the Saying in its Synoptic setting is part of the great missionary Charge, but we must here note that neither in the version of Matthew nor in that of Luke is

any *individual* specially prominent. Yet our Saying is, apparently, addressed to an individual. Now the author of the *Second Epistle of Clement*<sup>2</sup> has an interesting fragment of a version of the Charge which is related to the Synoptic versions, but diverges markedly from them. In this, the individual, St Peter, is introduced. The passage is as follows: λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος· ἑσέσθε ὡς ἄρνια ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· εἰάν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἄρνια; εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἄρνια τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτὰ καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυνατόν ποιεῖν· ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός. In this citation from an unnamed gospel the monologue is broken by an interlocutor—St Peter. May not our Saying well have been the reply to another question? I will venture to suggest what this question may have been. A very noteworthy deviation from the Synoptic version in the Clementine passage is the oxymoron 'those that kill you *and can do nothing to you*.' We shall see presently that the citation is highly rhetorical: for the present, is it not likely that the oxymoron is intended to evoke another question which might be restored as follows?—ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος λέγει· κύριε, πῶς λέγεις τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ἡμᾶς μηδὲν ἡμῖν δύνασθαι ποιεῖν; The reply to such a question might well be in the form of our Saying: 'you do not understand this now<sup>3</sup>, but later it will become clear; for that which is hidden shall be revealed, and that which has been buried shall

<sup>1</sup> *Matth.* vii 3, though the Saying may well be one which has lost its real context (in some incident) and been worked up here for convenience.

<sup>2</sup> § 5.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. *John* xiii 7.

be raised up.' The remarkable fourth clause of our Saying becomes very apt in such a context.

If, then, the Saying is a fragment from the gospel used by pseudo-Clement, can we discover which of the many rejected gospels this was? Lightfoot and Harnack have, indeed, consigned all pseudo-Clement's citations to the Egyptian Gospel, chiefly because one of them<sup>1</sup> appears to be a part of the dialogue with Salome cited by Clement of Alexandria from that Gospel. The citation in question may indeed be from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*; but we now know that that document was not the only record of the material contained in that dialogue<sup>2</sup>. And if it were certain that pseudo-Clement used this Gospel once, the fact would not prove that he used no other. Indeed, it would be hard to imagine a more complete contrast than that which exists between the remaining Clementine citations on the one hand, and the Salome dialogue as preserved by the Alexandrian Clement on the other: the former are Synoptic in character and of the type of the First and Third Gospels, while what little we actually know of the Egyptian Gospel<sup>3</sup> indicates that that document was of a very different character. Now the Clementine fragment of the missionary Charge shows a peculiar rhetorical structure. It commences with an abrupt statement 'Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves.' In its brevity and obvious incompleteness this is certainly designed to lead on to the question which follows—a ques-

tion, however, which is not particularly forcible. This put, the monologue continues by way of formal reply. The arrangement—which is not likely to have any historical foundation—seems intended to relieve the monologue by introducing a kind of dramatic variety. Possibly, then, this rhetorical structure will serve as a clue to the source of the Clementine citation, and so—if the connection between this and the Oxyrhynchus Saying be admitted—to that of our Saying. Happily a passage which shows exactly the same structure is extant. Jerome<sup>4</sup> cites the following passage from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*: "Si peccaverit," inquit, "frater tuus in verbo et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum." Dixit illi Simon discipulus eius: "Septies in die?" Respondit dominus et dixit ei: "Etiam ego dico tibi usque septuagies septies." Here as in the Clementine citation we have first an abrupt statement, then the mechanical question of the interlocutor, and lastly the remainder of the canonical Saying, here made into a response<sup>5</sup>.

Stylistic considerations at least do not oppose the ascription of the Oxyrhynchus Saying to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. At the outset of these notes we saw that the Saying depends upon Matthew and Luke, and later we recalled that pseudo-Clement's citations in general have the same tendency. The fragment of the missionary Charge is certainly Matthaean in the connected form it gives to that address, but the influence of the Third Gospel is perhaps to be

<sup>1</sup> Preuschen *Antilegomena* p. 2 f.

<sup>2</sup> The Saying about "trampling on the Garment of Shame" occurs in the Oxyrhynchus Gospel fragment (*Ox. Pap.* IV no. 655).

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Batiffol *Rév. Bibl.* 1897 pp. 513-15.

<sup>4</sup> *C. Pelag.* III 2 (Preuschen *Antilegomena* p. 6 no. 10 a).

<sup>5</sup> There is not the least doubt that such dramatic presentations of Sayings are later than their canonical versions, though Handmann (*das Hebr. Evang.* p. 87) thinks Jerome's citation is earlier than its parallel in Matthew and Luke.

seen in the use of *apvla*<sup>1</sup>. In Jerome's citation this double influence is more clearly marked, the words *in die* depending on *Luke* xvii 4, while *septuagies septies* is a phrase borrowed from Matthew (xviii 21-22)<sup>2</sup>. The whole question both of the derivation of the Oxyrhynchus Sayings from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and of the dependence of that Gospel upon Matthew and Luke has been considered in the Introduction.

It may be well to sum up by way of conclusion the various heads of the theory for which I have been arguing. (1) The Saying in its use of the second person singular is, so far, extra-Synoptic, and a parallel to this feature can be found only in the fragment of the missionary Charge preserved by pseudo-Clement. (2) This citation is remarkable in style, and in this regard is identical with a frag-

ment known to belong to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. (3) The Saying on the one part, and the apocryphal excerpts with which we are here concerned on the other, have an identical relation to the Synoptics.

Alternatively, this Saying might be thought to be an explanation substituted by the Hebrews Evangelist for the rebuke to St Peter in the episode recorded in *Matth.* xvi 21-23 (= *Mark* viii 30-33). Following out this conjecture we may suppose that the passage in St Matthew was combined with its doublet *Matth.* xvii 22-23, where the first evangelist leaves an opening for questions, whereas *Luke* ix 45, *Mark* ix 32 state that the disciples did not understand the saying (*καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν* : *Luke* ix 45) and feared to ask for an explanation.

## SAYING V

ἐξ]ετάζουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ  
λέ]γουσιν· πῶς νηστεύ[σομεν, καὶ πῶς προσ-  
ευξό]μεθα καὶ πῶς [ἐλεημοσύνην ποιή-  
σομεν, κ]αὶ τί παρατηρήσ[ομεν τῶν παραδο- 35  
θέντων]; λέγει Ἰησ(οῦ)ς· [οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ  
ὑποκρ]ιταί· μὴ ποιεῖτ[ε ταῦτα φανερώς,  
ἀλλὰ τ]ῆς ἀληθείας ἀν[τέχεσθε, καὶ ἡ δικαιο-  
σύνη ὑμῶ]ν ἀ[π]οκεκρ[υμμένη ἔστω· λέ-  
γω γάρ· μα]κάρι[ός] ἐστιν [ὁ ταῦτα ποιῶν ἐν 40  
κρυπτῷ, ὅτι ἐν φανερ]ῷ ἔστ[αι ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ  
παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὅς ἐστ]ιν [ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

<sup>1</sup> Matthew (x 16) uses *πρόβατα*, Luke (x 3) *ἀρνες*.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Adeney *Hibbert Journal* III 154. Jerome's fragment indeed uses the title dominus (*κύριος*), while Clement's fragment uses Ἰησοῦς. This however is no objection to my theory : Luke uses both Ἰησοῦς and κύριος (see x 1, 39-41 ; xi 39 ; xii 42 ; xiii 15 ; xvii 5).

33 ff. πῶς νηστεύσωμεν καὶ πῶς προσευξώμεθα καὶ πῶς ἐ. ποιήσωμεν καὶ τί παρατηρησώμεθα τῶν τοιούτων; λ. 'Ι. βλέπετε μὴ τὸν μισθὸν ἀπολείτε. μὴ ποιεῖτε μηδὲν εἰ μὴ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας· ἂν γὰρ ποιῇτε ταῦτα γνώσεσθε μυστήριον ἀποκεκρυμμένον· λέγω ὑμῖν· μακάριός ἐστιν ὁς ἂν..., *Stivels*.

33 ff. πῶς νηστεύσωμεν καὶ πῶς ἀπολυσώμεθα καὶ πῶς προσευξώμεθα τὸν κύριον καὶ τί παρατηρήσωμεν ἵνα ζώῃν κληρονομήσωμεν; λ. 'Ι. τοῖς μαθηταῖς· ὡς ὑποκριταὶ μὴ ποιεῖτε ὑμεῖς, ἀλλὰ ὡς οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναβλέπετε εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἀλλὰ οὐχ ἵνα ἀποκείσῃται ὑμῖν μισθός. ὁ τοῦτο ποίων μακάριός ἐστιν καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν αὐτῷ ἐστίν, *Briston*.

34 ff. καὶ πῶς ἐλεημοσύνην δώσωμεν καὶ τί παρατηρησώμεθα καὶ ποιήσωμεν; λ. 'Ι. οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ· μὴ ποιεῖτε ὑμεῖς ψεῦδος ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀντέχεσθε. ἔστω δὲ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν ἀποκεκρυμμένη ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου. μακάριός ἐστιν..., *Taylor*.

35. παρατηρήσωμεν ζητοῦντες τὴν βασιλείαν (οἱ τὴν ζωὴν), *Heinrici*.

35 ff. καὶ τί παρατηρήσωμεν ἵνα ζώῃν ἔχωμεν; λ. 'Ι. ὡς ποιοῦσιν οἱ ὑποκριταὶ μὴ ποιεῖτε ὑμεῖς; τῇ γὰρ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀνθίστανται, τὸν δὲ μισθὸν τὸν ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀθετοῦσιν· καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃ ὁ μισθὸς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστίν..., *Barnes*.

37. ὑποκρί[τα], *Taylor*: ]είται, *P*. 39. τὸ μάννα τὸ κεκρυμμένον, *Lock*.

His disciples examine him and say: How shall we fast, and how shall we pray, and how shall we do alms, and what shall we keep of the traditions? Jesus saith: Ye shall not be as the hypocrites. Do not these things openly, but cleave to the truth; and let your righteousness be concealed. For I say: Blessed is he that doeth these things in secret, for he shall be rewarded openly by the Father who is in Heaven.

The condition of the Saying is such as to discourage restoration, and the discoverers have confined themselves to the completion of l. 32 and the filling of some of the smaller lacunae. Here, as elsewhere in the Sayings, the only hope for a plausible restoration lies in following whatever clue the canonical Gospels may offer.

Let us first consider the restoration of the question to which the Saying proper is a reply. The discoverers' supplement for l. 32

is inevitable: as they remark, *Φαρισαῖοι* is not likely in view of what follows, nor, it may be added, would such a reading as οἱ μαθηταὶ *Ἰωάννου*, since John had already given definite teaching on both fasting and prayer<sup>1</sup>. We pass on then to the four questions put by the disciples. The first alone is adequately preserved, but the second may be confidently restored as 'How shall we pray?' both because the fragmentary reading of the papyrus seems to point

<sup>1</sup> *Luke xi 1.*

to this, and because fasting and prayer are continually linked together as two inseparable things. No word survives in the papyrus to indicate directly the subjects of the third and fourth questions, yet these also may be recovered if we can find and follow a Synoptic clue. Now in *Matth.* vi a series of subjects are discussed—(1) Almsgiving (*vv.* 2-4), (2) Prayer (*vv.* 5-15), (3) Fasting (*vv.* 16-18)—which furnish parallels to the first question. May we not then confidently conclude that the subject of the third question in our Saying was almsgiving<sup>1</sup>? If further parallel is needed to support the association of these three, reference may be made to the pseudo-Athanasian *Λόγος σωτηρίας πρὸς παρθένον* § xii p. 46 (von der Goltz): ὅλον τὸν χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς σου ἐν νηστεύειαι καὶ προσευχαῖς καὶ ἐλεημοσύναις διατέλει. The restoration of the fourth question is less obvious: the supplements of Swete and Taylor seem too vague to be acceptable; indeed, they do not amount to a really distinct question such as is needed. On the other hand, Bruston's suggestion 'what shall we observe, that we may inherit eternal life?' is altogether too wide, since the disciples are obviously inquiring on particular points. The discoverers<sup>2</sup>, however, threw out a suggestion which has been strangely neglected, 'How far, it was probably asked, are existing Jewish ordinances to be kept?' Now the verb παρατηρήσομεν<sup>3</sup> at once suggests comparison with *Mark* vii 9 καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ

ἵνα τὴν παραδόσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε, and παραδοθέντων may be restored in our Saying. This explains the form of the question ('what shall we observe'): fasting, prayer and almsgiving are fundamental things, and the disciples need only ask *how* these are to be performed; but they would naturally ask *what* was to be kept and what rejected of the less authorised mass of Jewish ritual and ceremonial tradition<sup>4</sup>. But if (as seems to be the case) the first three questions are parallel to, and perhaps derived from, a part of the Sermon on the Mount, how are we to account for the association with them of the fourth question as we have restored it? That section of the Sermon on the Mount which precedes the teaching on prayer, fasting and almsgiving, is a series of corrections and amplifications of the Old Law, introduced by the formula ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρήθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, and these sayings of 'men of old time' might fairly be summed up as παράδοσις or παραδοθέντα or perhaps νομιζόμενα.

We may now turn to the Saying proper, the answer to the four questions put by the disciples. None of the published restorations of the second half seems to be satisfactory. Dr Taylor seems to reconstruct the reply with little or no relevance to the questions of the disciples<sup>5</sup>, and Prof. Swete's conjectures make only a remote answer, which fails to give any direction as to the manner of doing alms, of praying and of fasting: and the introduction of μυστήριον<sup>6</sup> seems specially arbi-

<sup>1</sup> This view is taken by GH, Swete and Taylor and is, I believe, generally accepted.

<sup>2</sup> *Ox. Pap.* iv p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> For this compound cp. *Gal.* iv 10 ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιρούς.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. *Mark* vii 4 (quoted above).

<sup>5</sup> Dr Taylor (*J.T.S.* vii p. 349) sees in l. 39 a reference to *Col.* iii 3 ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ.

<sup>6</sup> For which cp. *Col.* i 26 τὸ μ. τὸ ἀποκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων.

trary. Here, as in the first half of the Saying, the Sermon on the Mount seems to be the best guide to restoration. The opening sections of *Matth.* vi on almsgiving, prayer and fasting are each accompanied by a warning, *μὴ σαλπίζης... ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ποιοῦσιν* (v. 2); *οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ* (v. 5); *μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ* (v. 16), and in view of these some such restoration of the first half of l. 37 as Dr Taylor's appears inevitable.

The main answer to the disciples' questions seems to lie in ll. 37-39, and if the questions themselves and the warning with which the reply opens appear to stand in intimate relation with the directions given in the Sermon on the Mount on Fasting, Prayer and Almsgiving, it is likely that the answer also should find a parallel in the same context. For the restoration given in the text, I would compare: (1) *Matth.* vi 3-4 σοὺ δὲ ποιῶντος ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ γνῶτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου τί ποιεῖ ἡ δεξιὰ σου· ὅπως ἢ σου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ (and the parallel passages, *vv.* 6 and 17), (2) *Matth.* vi 1 προσέχετε τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. In l. 38 ἀν[τέχεσθε] was suggested to me, before I had seen Dr Taylor's reconstruction, by *Matth.* vi 24 and especially by *Isaiah* lvi 1 (quoted below): it being granted that *ὑποκριταὶ* (l. 37) is right, some such antithesis is required. The introduction of *δικαιοσύνη* which covers religious and moral observances is justified alike by *Matth.* vi 1 (just quoted) and by *Matth.* v 20, where the word is apparently equivalent to the 'Law and the Prophets.'

Lastly, the Saying clearly ends with the promise of a blessing on

those who comply with the direction given above. The few letters extant in the papyrus are, of course, wholly inadequate of themselves to make any restoration probable; but if, as we have seen reason to believe, the whole preceding part of the Saying is parallel to a definite section of the Sermon on the Mount, our restoration, which relies upon the same passage, is at least plausible: cp. *Matth.* vi 1 προσέχετε... εἰ δὲ μήγε μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: *ib.* 4 ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἀποδώσει σοι ἐν τῷ φανερώ<sup>1</sup>. The form of the blessing is perhaps dependent upon *Isaiah* lvi 2 μακάριος ἄνθρωπος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀντεχόμενος αὐτῶν<sup>2</sup>. For the introductory λέγω γάρ cp. *Matth.* v 20, 2 *Clem.* VIII 5.

The general correspondence of our Saying to the section of the Sermon on the Mount, accompanied as it is by a marked freedom of treatment, raises the question of the relation between the logographer and Matthew. The Sermon on the Mount is, as a whole, a highly edited document, and of no part of it is this more true than of the section which lies parallel to the Saying: the recurrence of the set form 'When ye... be not as the hypocrites who...: verily they have their reward. But when ye..., do it secretly. And the Father who seeth in secret shall reward you' as each of the three great subjects is considered is an effective but essentially a literary device. The Saying, on the other hand, is quite informal and as we might think far more natural: 'How shall we do this and that?' are answered not separately after one set form, but altogether. And it should be noted here that the disciples are

<sup>1</sup> *Σ*, B, D, Z<sup>1</sup> with some versions and witnesses omit the final phrase.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. also *Matth.* xxiv 46.



presumably bidden to keep τὰ παραδοθέντα: cp. *Matth.* xxiii 3, v 17-19.

Is it, then, possible that the Saying is an earlier and more original version of a part of the Sermon on the Mount? A priori such a view is perhaps attractive, but it is hardly probable. The reply is cast in parallelistic form which is indeed a characteristic of many genuine Sayings, but in the Commentary on Saying IV we have already seen reason to suspect that parallelism may be the work of the author or editor upon whom the logographer drew; and the presence of the word ἀλήθεια,

which is distinctly Johannine rather than Synoptic, forces us to believe that here again the parallelism is not a primary trait. And ingenious as is the shape into which the whole Saying is cast<sup>1</sup>, such compression finds a parallel in [*Athanas.*] λόγος σωτηρίας ix ad init. (p. 43, ed. von der Goltz) μηδεὶς καταμανθανέτω τὴν ἀσκησίν σου... ἀλλ' εἴ τι ποιεῖς, ἐν κρυπτῷ ποιεῖ. καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ οὐράνιος ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἀποδώσει σοι. Moreover, the correspondences of the Saying with Matthew and the differences from that parallel are just such as we find in other Sayings (e.g. Saying II) which are manifestly post-Synoptic.

## SAYING VI

### [LOGION I]

- a [λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς· ἔκβα-]  
 b [λε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν]  
 c [ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,]  
 καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις  
 ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος  
 τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ  
 τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

a—c. *LS* (= *Luke* vi 42). ὀρύξεις | εἰς τὸ ἐνδότερόν σου τοῦ | ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἐκβα- | λεῖν τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ δοκὸν |, *Briston*. 1. διαβλέψεις, *Wessely*<sup>2</sup>.

Jesus saith:

Cast out first the beam out of thine own eye,

And then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.

<sup>1</sup> It was possibly suggested to him by *Luke* xi 1; and that incident might be thought a possible occasion for the present Saying.

<sup>2</sup> Wessely regards the *ca* (usually regarded as the page-number) as an alteration of διαβλέψεις.

The surviving fragment of this Saying stands first on the *verso* which the discoverers maintain to have come uppermost in the codex. The evidence on which their view is based<sup>1</sup> seems entirely satisfactory, and as it has already been reviewed in the Introduction, it need not be restated here. If Batiffol<sup>2</sup> were right in asserting the opposite view, the order of the Logia would be reversed, iv-viii becoming i-v: Bruston<sup>3</sup> actually accepts this inverted order and seeks to unite Logion I with Logion VIII, a change which carries with it a challenge of the discoverers' reading of the last two lines of the *recto*. This reconstruction cannot claim serious consideration unless examination of the papyrus should show Grenfell and Hunt's reading to be mistaken.

The Saying occurs in *Matth.* vii 3-5 and *Luke* vi 41-42; but there is nothing to show whether it appeared in our codex in the full form given by the Synoptics, or in the shorter form which LS<sup>4</sup> have suggested. The fragment as it stands agrees exactly with the *textus receptus* of *Luke* vi 42, and

that as Batiffol notes<sup>5</sup> in a minute point (τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ as against Matthew's ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ). Westcott and Hort, however, following Codex Vaticanus (B) and some other MSS., put ἐκβαλεῖν at the end of the clause in preference to the other uncials and the Coptic version. Taylor has therefore suggested<sup>6</sup> that the extant portion may be derived from *Matth.* vii 3-5, the phrase τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ being taken from *v.* 3, and the preceding part from *v.* 5. But such a hypothesis is as unlikely as it is artificial: surely it is both simple and natural to regard the fragment as identical with one of the two divergent lines of the Lucan text.

The Logion then must be derived from Luke or Luke's source (*i.e.* Q); but since on the one hand the Sayings and the Logia as a body are distinctly later than Luke, and on the other the phrase τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ is a literary refinement such as we might well attribute to Luke himself, every consideration goes to show that the Saying derives from the Third Gospel.

## SAYING VII

### [LOGION II]

λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς·

ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύση-	5
τε τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ	
εὔρητε τὴν βασιλεί-	
αν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν μὴ	
σαββατίσητε τὸ σάβ-	
βατον, οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸ(ν)	10
π(ατέ)ρα.	

<sup>1</sup> Λόγια Ἰησοῦ pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Paroles de Jésus* p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 503.

<sup>4</sup> *Rev. Bibl.* 1897 pp. 501-2, 508-9.

<sup>5</sup> *Two Lectures* p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Oxyrhynchus Logia* pp. 6-7.

5-6. ΜΗ ΝΗCΤΕΥΧΗΤΑΙ, *P.* μνηστεύσητε, *Kürb* (*ap. Zahn*), *Weiss*: μισήσητε, *von Gebhardt*: νηκήσητε (for νικήσητε), *Harnack* (?). τοῦ κόσμου, *LS*, *Gifford*: τῷ κόσμῳ, *Harnack*: ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, *Redpath*: ἕως τῶν δυσμῶν, *Anonymous in Academy*: τοῦ κοινού, *Quarry*: ἐλασμών, *Davidson*: τὴν νηστείαν, *Cersey*. 7. ΕΥΡΗΤΑΙ, *P.*

Jesus saith:

Except ye fast toward the world, ye shall not find the Kingdom of God;

And unless ye sanctify the whole week, ye shall not see the Father.

The reading of the papyrus is sufficiently clear throughout, but the unusual νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον has very generally been treated as a blunder. Yet none of the emendations proposed is satisfactory. The association of κόσμος with νηστεύειν or its equivalent ἀποτάξεσθαι is well enough attested to put out of court all attempts to change either verb or noun: thus Clement of Alexandria<sup>1</sup> has μακάριοι...οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες, and οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν κοσμικῶν νηστεύειν χρῆ: and in *Acta Pauli et Theclae*<sup>2</sup> we have μακάριοι οἱ ἀποταξάμενοι τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ, and again in *Pistis Sophia*<sup>3</sup> 'ἀποτάσσετε κόσμῳ omni et ὅλῃ omni.' Others have tried to alter the accusative, Harnack suggesting the dative, Lock and Gifford the genitive. This last would at least bring the phrase into line with Clement's use; but the laws of parallelism certainly require an accusative after νηστεύειν to balance σάββατον. Cersey<sup>4</sup> has sought another solution of the difficulty and one which is very attractive: the Aramaic words answering to κόσμος and νηστεία are so closely similar that a confusion of the two

would be the easiest matter possible. If, therefore, the Sayings, or the document from which they were derived, have been translated from the Aramaic, a translator working in the earlier part of the second century would the more easily fall into this error from his knowledge of the current expression 'to fast from the world.' The correction of κόσμον τὴν νηστείαν would have the advantage of perfecting the parallelism, νηστεύειν τὴν νηστείαν exactly balancing σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον. However attractive this view may be, other considerations seem to make it inadmissible; for the supposed translator would surely have written τοῦ κόσμου had he been thinking of the current ν. τοῦ κόσμου. And the proposed change radically alters the meaning of the Saying, attributing to Jesus a rigid formalism of which we have no other evidence and which is improbable in itself<sup>5</sup>. Even granted that the Logion is taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews<sup>6</sup>, it would be difficult to believe that the compiler of that book could have so far misrepresented the teaching of Jesus. If we are to accept Cersey's sugges-

<sup>1</sup> *Stram.* III 15. 99.

<sup>2</sup> § v.

<sup>3</sup> P. 157 (250) ed. Petermann.

<sup>4</sup> *Rev. Bibl.* 1898 pp. 415-16.

<sup>5</sup> But cp. *Matth.* 'one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law until all be fulfilled.'

<sup>6</sup> Since this Gospel satisfied Christian adherents to the old Law (*Euseb. H.E.* III 27 4).

tion at all, we must suppose that the Saying either belongs to an early period in the ministry before the characteristic antagonism to formalism had been developed—which is improbable in view of the references to the Father and to the Kingdom of God, signs which indicate a more mature period—or was intended to correct a tendency to carry customary religious observances too lightly. In favour of this last compare *Matth.* v 18, 19.

The construction *νηστεύειν τὸν κόσμον* is certainly unusual, but seems defensible<sup>1</sup>. Matthew (v 6) has *οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην* where the accusative is not the object of the participles, but expresses that in respect of which men hunger or thirst<sup>2</sup>; similarly *νηστεύειν τὸν κόσμον* surely means 'to be fasting in regard to (towards) the world<sup>3</sup>.' Further, Professor Bevan<sup>4</sup> has cited the Arabic: 'If thou desirest to escape the chastisement of God, then fast the world' (*صُمْ الدُّنْيَا*).

The shade of thought conveyed by the phrase in question deserves closer examination. When Clement of Alexandria uses *νηστεύειν τοῦ κόσμου*, his meaning is clearly 'to abstain from all that characterises the world as opposed to the heavenly kingdom': he uses *νηστεύειν* metaphorically. In the Logion, however, *νηστεύειν* retains its literal sense in part: fasting is merely symbolical and so, in itself, worth nothing; it must be in respect of the world, of evil things.

The emphasis, so to say, is on *κόσμον*, which introduces a new element, while the verb carries the old idea of fasting (abstinence from food) which is to be developed in the new direction.

The second half of the parallelism has caused some difficulty, though less than the first. Most editors are forced to use *σαββαρίζειν τὸ σάββατον* in a sense which has no parallel, 'to keep *true* sabbath,' or the like. Taylor<sup>5</sup> after collecting the LXX uses of *σαββαρίζειν* concludes that 'in no case does "to sabbathize a sabbath" mean to keep the Sabbath in the ordinary sense,' and that the Logion inculcates something altogether different from keeping the Jewish Sabbath in the ordinary way. Now, followed by *σάββατον, σάββατα*, the verb means either 'to keep the sabbatical year,' or 'to keep the Day of Atonement' (*Levit.* xxiii 32). The first of these senses is obviously out of the question here: the second would force us to accept Cersoy's correction in the first part of the Saying, since on the Day of Atonement the ideas of Fast and Sabbath were specially connected<sup>6</sup>. That the Saying<sup>7</sup> merely laid stress on keeping the Day of Atonement is, however, to narrow it beyond the limits we can admit, and if *σαββαρίζειν τὸ σ.* means only 'to keep the Day of Atonement,' it no longer balances *νηστεύειν τοῦ κόσμου*.

Early Christian writers develop the idea of a spiritual Sabbath as opposed to the formal Jewish institution, and of these the most

<sup>1</sup> Taylor (*J.T.S.* vii p. 549) points out that a similar accusative is used in *1 Cor.* vii 31 *οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι*.

<sup>2</sup> The A.V. rendering 'they who hunger and thirst *after* righteousness' is therefore incorrect: '*toward* righteousness' might be better.

<sup>3</sup> Wessely renders 'fast in that which concerns the world,' and regards the phrase as equivalent to *ἀποράσσειν τῷ κόσμῳ*; cp. *Luke* xiv 33. See also Empedocles ap. Plutarch *De Cohibenda Ira* (*ad fin.*) *νηστεύειν κακότητος*.

<sup>4</sup> Darembourg-Spiro, *Chrestomathie* (ed. 2) p. 34: see Taylor *J.T.S.* iii 549.

<sup>5</sup> *Ox. Log.* pp. 13-14.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* pp. 15 sqq.

<sup>7</sup> It may have been uttered on the Day of Atonement.

important in the present connection is Justin, who writes<sup>1</sup>: σαββαρίζειν ὑμᾶς ὁ καινὸς νόμος διὰ παντὸς ἐθέλει, καὶ ὑμεῖς μίαν ἀργούντες ἡμέραν εὐσεβεῖν δοκεῖτε, μὴ ποοῦντες διὰ τὴν ὑμῶν προσετάρχη. He then goes on to show that the true Sabbath consists in ceasing to sin and concludes: καὶ σεσαββάτικε τὰ τρυφερά καὶ ἀληθινὰ σάββατα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Here the words μίαν ἀργούντες ἡμέραν are particularly important, implying, as they do, censure of the Jewish practice of observing one day formally to the neglect of other days, whereas the new law bids men hold Sabbath διὰ παντός. Now, as in the first half of the Saying, so here the verb retains in a large measure its customary sense, and the object indicates the direction in which the old ordinance is to be developed. σάββατον, consequently, is not used in its ordinary sense here, but means 'week,' a use which is well attested: cp. *Luke* xviii 12 νηστεύω δις τοῦ σαββάτου; *John* xx 1, 19; *1 Cor.* xvi 2 κατὰ μίαν σαββάτον; *Didache* viii 1 νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρα σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτη. The word σάββατον was used in this sense commonly enough to have passed into Coptic; for in a collection of *Sayings of the Fathers*<sup>2</sup> we read 'they of Shiêt fasted the whole week' (παραῖματον τηρῶν) while the corresponding Greek version<sup>3</sup> has αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ Σκητιῶται ἐνήστευον τὴν ἐβδομάδα.

The general idea of this part of the Saying, therefore, will be: the observance of one day in the week as holy is symbolical; and if this fact is forgotten, Sabbath-keeping degenerates into fetichism—the cult of one day on which certain standards are in force which do not apply to other days. The new law requires men to sanctify, or

make a Sabbath of, each day of the week.

The Saying as a whole is independent, but is not without Synoptic relations. It may be conjectured that it was uttered on some such occasion as that to which the group of incidents recorded in *Luke* v 33–vi 11 belong: there the question of fasting is discussed, to be followed by two episodes directed against formalism in Sabbath-keeping. Yet it is important to observe that there is a distinct post-Synoptic shade in the teaching of the Logion, which urges a reapplication of the existing religious observances, while the protest of the Synoptic Jesus is against the exclusion of good or necessary work on the Sabbath, and against ostentation in fasting.

The general sense of the Logion, as also its form, is best paralleled by *Matth.* v 20 εἰ μὴ περισσεύσῃ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, where not only is the last clause strikingly close to the apodosis of the Logion, but the 'righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees' is to be taken to mean just such things as fasting and Sabbath-keeping. One is tempted to conjecture that the Saying was developed in the atmosphere of later thought from this passage with the aid of particulars borrowed from the Lucan passage noticed just above. At least such a method would be just what we might expect (cp. Saying iv, Logia vi and vii). The apparent Synoptic element in the protases—to which must be added the formula εἰ μὴ introducing conditions of salvation—is still more obvious in the apodosis. Harnack<sup>4</sup> has shown this most fully: ἡ βασιλεία

<sup>1</sup> *Dialog. c. Tryph.* 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Rev. de l'Orient Chrét.* xviii p. 178 (no. 171).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* xiv p. 363 (no. 242).

<sup>4</sup> *Die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu* p. 8.

τοῦ θεοῦ is of course Synoptic (*Matth.* xix 24); εὐρίσκειν is not actually used in connection with βασιλεία by the Synoptics, but we have the corresponding ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν (*Matth.* vi 33, *Luke* xii 31) and ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρησθε (*Matth.* vii 7). In the second apodosis, however, οὐκ ὤψεσθε τὸν πατέρα has a distinctly Johannine ring (*John* xiv 9 εἶώρακε τὸν πατέρα), though both the verb and the absolute use of ὁ πατήρ have Synoptic parallels (*Matth.* v 8 αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται, *id.* xi 27 οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ). The use of κόσμος deepens this impression of Johannine influence: cp. 1 *John* ii 15 μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. The Logion therefore has a peculiar technical, as apart from an intrinsic, value. It is indebted chiefly to the Synoptics: Johannine influence is apparent, but certainly not dominant; and we would conclude that the Logographer while post-Synoptic, wrote at a period when Johannine thought was only nascent, or, perhaps, in a locality to which only echoes of that movement had reached. The peculiar shade of thought which we have traced is probably characteristic of the period in which the Saying received its definite form: in its attitude towards fasting and Sabbath-keeping it lies somewhere between the Synoptics and Clement of Alexandria, nearer perhaps to the latter than the former.

Clement of Alexandria<sup>1</sup> develops from *Isaiah* lviii 6-14 the idea of a spiritual Sabbath in contradistinction to the Jewish institution<sup>2</sup> in a passage which has been thought to imply a knowledge of this Saying or of something intimately related to it. εὐνοῦχος τολύων...ὁ ἄγονος ἀληθείας. ἔϋλον οὗτος ξηρόν ἦν πρότερον· ὑπακούσας δὲ τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ

φυλάξας τὰ σάββατα κατ' ἀποχὴν ἀμαρτημάτων...ἐντιμότερος ἔσται τῶν ἀνευ πολιτείας ὀρθῆς λόγῳ μόνῳ παιδευομένων. διὰ τοῦτο 'οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται εὐνοῦχος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν θεοῦ,' ὁ ἄγονος καὶ ἄκαρπος καὶ πολιτεία καὶ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν εὐνοῦχισαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀμαρτίας διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· μακάριοι οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες. Robinson<sup>3</sup> holds that Clement is here making use of the second Logion (φυλάξας τὰ σάββατα...μακάριοι οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες) which he found in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, and that later on he adapts the fifth Logion from the same source. Both in the Introduction (pp. xl ff.) and in the Commentary on Logion v I have given reason for rejecting the attribution of the Logia to the Egyptian Gospel: in this place it will be sufficient to point out that, while there is nothing to show any connection between Clement's references to 'keeping Sabbath' and to 'they who fast from the world,' his source was certainly not our Logion in that the beatitude μακάριοι...εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες is certainly a direct quotation<sup>4</sup>, as is clear from *Strom.* III i 4 εἰ γὰρ ἴν' παρὰ θεοῦ...ἡ τοιαύτη διασκευή, οὐκ ἂν ἐμακάρισέν τοὺς εὐνοῦχους. And that apocryphal literature produced such beatitudes, it will be sufficient to quote *Acta Pauli et Theclae* § 5 μακάριοι οἱ ἀποταξάμενοι τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ. We conclude, then, that, while Dr Robinson may well be right in urging that in the passage quoted above, Clement has his eye fixed upon the Egyptian Gospel, our Logion was different from his source both in form and—if our interpretation of the Logion is on the right lines—in the shade of its meaning.

<sup>1</sup> *Strom.* III 15 § 99, quoted by Professor Mayor *ap.* Rendel Harris *Contemporary Review* 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. LS p. 9. <sup>3</sup> *Expositor* 1897 pp. 417 sqq. <sup>4</sup> In imitation of *Isaiah* lvi 1.

## SAYING VIII

## [LOGION III]

λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς· ἔ[σ]την  
 ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου,  
 καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὥφθην  
 αὐτοῖς· καὶ εὗρον πάν-  
 τας μεθύοντας, καὶ 15  
 οὐδένα εὗρον δειψῶ(ν)-  
 τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς· καὶ πο-  
 νεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ  
 τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀν(θρώπ)ων,  
 ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρ- 20  
 δία αὐτῶ(ν), καὶ [οὐ] βλέπ-  
 [ουσι τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτῶν].

13. *σαρκει, P* (corrected by the original hand): *ἔτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἦ, Bruston.* 21. *καὶ...βλεῖς, GH*: καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν οὐδὲ γινώσκουσιν τὴν ἑαυτῶν πτωχίαν, *Sweete* (combining with Logion IV): καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν, πτωχοὶ καὶ οὐκ οἶδασιν τὴν πτωχίαν, *Cross*: κ. ο. β. τὴν ταλαιπωρίαν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν πτωχίαν, *Taylor*: ἀμβλεῖς τῷ νοῦ, *Zahn*: ἀ. τῷ νῷ αὐτῶν, *Davidson*: ἀ. τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ οὐκ οἶδασιν αὐτῶν τὴν πτωχίαν, *Lock*: ἀμβλεῖς, μὴ γινώσκοντες ἑαυτῶν τὴν πτωχίαν, *Sanday*: καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ ἀκοῇ αὐτῶν· ἀλλὰ διώκετε τὴν πτωχίαν, *Heinrici*: καὶ οὐ βλέποντες, *Bruston*.

Jesus saith:

I stood in the midst of the world, And in flesh was I seen of them;

And I found all men drunken, And none found I athirst among them;

And my soul grieveth over the sons of men,

Because they are blind in their heart, And see not with their understanding.

The length of the lacuna after l. 21 has been a matter of dispute. Most editors and critics have not found strength to resist the temptation to join the remains of Logion IV to Logion III, and so argue that little more than a line or two has been lost at the foot of the *verso*<sup>1</sup>. Of the restorations based on this assumption, that of Mr Cross<sup>2</sup> is by far the best, as brilliantly continuing the parallelistic form. Taylor's reconstruction while resting on *Apoc.* iii 17 shows less clear-cut parallelism. On the other side, the discoverers claim that as many as five lines or even more may have been lost<sup>3</sup>; and in a codex of this date the page is likely to have resembled the column of the roll in its proportions. I have therefore not attempted to unite Logia III and IV, and, since l. 21 almost certainly concludes with *καὶ [οὐ] βλέπ[ουσι]*<sup>4</sup>, have ended the Saying with *τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτῶν*<sup>5</sup> which balances the *τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν* of ll. 20-1. For the parallelism *τυφλοὶ εἰσι...οὐ βλέπουσι* cp. *Acts* xiii 11 *τυφλὸς ἔσει...μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον*.

The two opening clauses of the Logion are closely parallel to *Baruch* iii 28 *μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράφη*, and literary dependence seems quite certain, in view of the fact remarked by GH<sup>6</sup> that some of the Fathers<sup>7</sup> applied this passage to the life of Jesus. The discoverers are inclined further to see a connection between the words *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου* and the *agraphon*<sup>8</sup> 'hic est medium mundi,' but the phrase in the Logion

certainly has no local or mystic meaning, and, as the parallelism shows, means no more than *αὐτοῖς*, 'among men.'

The aorists *ἔστην, ὤφθην, εὔρον* are thought by Harnack<sup>9</sup> to indicate a form of Logos doctrine implying pre-existence as in *John* xvi 28 *ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον*. Batiffol<sup>10</sup> on the contrary sees in them the doctrine of post-existence, and thinks that there is here Docetism such as that of the *Acta Johannis*. But surely the aorists indicate past actions and not past states, while the present, *πορεύ* (which leads Batiffol to split the Logion in two), indicates the speaker's consequent state of feeling at the moment of utterance. The meaning, then, will be: 'I took my place among men (*sc.* at the *beginning* of my ministry), and now, after experiencing the ways of men, my soul grieves.' Moreover, *πορεύ ἡ ψυχὴ μου* would be most inappropriate in a post-resurrectional Saying; and *ἐν σαρκί* while it implies pre-existence does not emphasise that doctrine, but dwells rather on the humanity of Jesus<sup>11</sup>, as a reason why men ought to have been able to understand and accept him: we might paraphrase 'as a man among men' (cp. the Saying quoted by Origen *διὰ τοὺς ἀσθενούντας ἡσθένουν, καὶ διὰ τοὺς πεινῶντας ἐπεινῶν, καὶ διὰ τοὺς διψῶντας ἐδίψων*<sup>12</sup>).

The words *μεθύοντας...διψῶντα* are regarded by Canon Sanday as marks of Encratite influence; *διψᾶν*, he argues, is used only once by

<sup>1</sup> LS p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> *Expositor* 1897 p. 259.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. Par.* 1 p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> For this expression cp. 2 *Clem.* 16 *πηροὶ ὄντες τῇ διανοίᾳ*.

<sup>6</sup> *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ* p. 12.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Irenaeus *Adv. Haeres.* iv xxxiv 4 (ed. Harvey).

<sup>8</sup> Resch *Agrapha* pp. 457 ff.

<sup>9</sup> *Die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu* p. 14.

<sup>10</sup> *Rev. Bibl.* 1897 pp. 507-8. Taylor (*J.T.S.* vii 550) seems to take the same view, that Jesus is represented as looking back after the Resurrection to the days of his flesh; he compares *Hebr.* v 7 *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*.

<sup>11</sup> As, perhaps, in *Barn.* v εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί, πῶς ἂν ἐσώθημεν ἄνθρωποι;

<sup>12</sup> Preuschen *Antilegomena* p. 28 12.



a Synoptic writer (*Matth.* v 6) in a spiritual sense, while in the fourth Gospel "the sense is always made clear by the context"; for the technical use of *μεθύειν* he can find no parallel. This view seems rather extreme. Any reader, especially one who had the slightest acquaintance with Johannine phraseology, could not fail to grasp the meaning of *διψῶντα*, which is as clear here as in *John* vii 37 *ἐὰν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω*<sup>1</sup>. But here again I think we have a literary debt to *Isaiah* lv 1 *οἱ διψῶντες πορεύσθε ἐφ' ὕδωρ*. If so, we may perhaps discern not developed but incipient Johannism at work, just as in the earlier clauses the Logos doctrine is rudimentary as compared with its presentment in the fourth Gospel. Similarly *μεθύοντας* need not be Encratite, but is again perfectly clear in the light of *Isaiah* xxviii 1 *οὐαὶ τῷ στεφάνῳ τῆς ὑβρείως, οἱ μισθωτοὶ Ἐφραὶμ...οἱ μεθύοντες ἀνεν οἴνου*. In the Logion, however, men are not represented as drunken with *ὑβρις*; and *Luke* xxi 34 *προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς μήποτε βαρηθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι ἐν κραιπάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς*, may have been in the compiler's mind<sup>2</sup>. Compare further *Matth.* xxiv 38 f. (= *Luke* xvii 26) *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις (sc. of Noah) τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες, γαμοῦντες καὶ ἐκγαμίζοντες...οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, and v 50 (cp. *Luke* xii 45) where eating and drinking *μετὰ τῶν μεθύοντων* are amongst the sins of the Wicked Servant. Probably, therefore, both Old Testament and Synoptic influences are blended in this part of the Saying.

Batiffol, as we have seen, pro-

poses to meet the change of tense from aorist (*ἔστην*) to present (*πορεύει*) by dividing the Logion into two Sayings of which the second begins with *πορεύει ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ* being editorial. He supports this view by the following considerations: (1) the change of tense indicates two different occasions; (2) the first four clauses form a complete parallelism which would be disturbed were the *πορεύει* clause truly a part of the same Saying; (3) the lack of antithesis between this and the preceding clauses. It has been shown already that the change of tense is accounted for by the sense, and surely it is perfectly natural to find the *πορεύει* clause following the four earlier clauses; for the first part of the Saying, a complaint against the attitude of men, would seem incomplete without a following statement of the result upon the feelings of Jesus. Thirdly, the *πορεύει* clause does indeed stand outside the parallelism, but the same thing occurs in *Matth.* vii 3-4, where the clause 'or how shalt thou say to thy brother' occupies an exactly similar position<sup>3</sup>; and the isolation of this clause gives it the special prominence which it deserves. Dr Abbott has aptly quoted the Sibylline Oracle<sup>4</sup>:

*καὶ τότε δ' Ἰσραὴλ μεμεθυσμένος οὐχὶ νοήσει,  
...ἀτὰρ ὄμμασιν οὐκ ἐσορῶντες τυφλότεροι σπαλάκων,*  
which possibly stands in some relation to this Logion and, if so, fortifies its unity by the association of the ideas of drunkenness and blindness. Similarly Reitzenstein<sup>5</sup> quotes pseudo-Hermes Trismegistus: *ποῖ φέρεσθε ὦ ἄνθρωποι, μεθύοντες, τὸν τῆς ἀγνώσεως ἄκρατον (λόγον) ἐκπίνοντες...; στῆτε νήψαντες,*

<sup>1</sup> Cp. also *Aphc.* xxi 6 *ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι δώσω ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς δωρεάν*, which again surely recalls *Isaiah* lv 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also *Luke* viii 14.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also *λέγω γάρ* in Saying v, if our restoration is right.

<sup>4</sup> *Potmantes* p. 204.

<sup>5</sup> 1360, 370.

ἀναβλέψατε τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς καρδίας. But it seems unnecessary to see here the influence of Egyptian syncretism.

The general character of the second part of the Logion is quite Synoptic: compare *Matth.* xxiii 37; *Luke* xiii 34, xix 41 (cited by Harnack). *John* i 10-11 and the *Apocrypha* 'qui mecum sunt non me intellexerunt,' πολλάκις ἐπεθύμησα ἀκοῦσαι ἓνα τῶν λόγων τούτων καὶ οὐκ ἔσχον τὸν ἐροῦντα<sup>1</sup>, are animated by the same feeling. The phrase *πονεί ἡ ψυχὴ μου* is certainly to be attributed to *Isaiah* liii 10 καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πονοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, and Harnack also quotes *Matth.* xxvi 38, *Mark* xiv 34, *John* xii 27 for trouble of soul in Jesus. The occasion of the Saying must have been similar to that of *Matth.* xiii 58, *Mark* vi 6 or *Matth.* xv.

In the two final clauses of the Logion the idea of spiritual sight or blindness finds an exact parallel in the *Gospel according to Thomas*<sup>2</sup>, νῦν καρποφορεῖτωσαν τὰ σά, καὶ βλέπετωσαν οἱ τυφλοὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ; but its virtual equivalent is common, as in *Psalms* lxviii (lxix) 24,

*Matth.* xv 14, xxiii 16, *John* ix 39 (quoted by Harnack)<sup>3</sup>. Compare also *Luke* iv 18 κηρύξαι... τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν (cited from *Isaiah*).

As a result of this examination we can trace three lines of influence in the Saying. Hebrew literature has left a deep mark, and to this must be added the Hebraisms *πονεί ἐπὶ* and *οἱ ἀνθρώπων*<sup>4</sup>, the repeated use of *καὶ* to introduce each clause, and the parallelistic form. The opening clauses of the Logion betray a tendency to Messianic interpretation later than that of the Synoptics. Secondly, the latter part of the Saying is Synoptic alike in the character of its thought, and in the simple directness and depth of its expression. Johannine characteristics, lastly, are perhaps not so prominent as they have been thought to be; yet the use of *μεθύειν* and *διψᾶν*, while not un-Synoptic and probably derived from the Old Testament itself, suggests that the Logion was formulated in an atmosphere not wholly free from Johannine metaphorical phraseology.

## SAYING IX

### [LOGION IV]

[λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς· ...]

\* \* \* \*

[....]εἰ[ν τ]ῇν πτωχείᾳ(ν).

22. ΠΤΩΧΪΔ, P. 22-3. καλὸν ἀν(θρώπ)ω τὴν πτ. | αἰρεῖσθαι οὗ ἔαν κ.τ.λ., and κελεύω σοι ἵνα τὴν πτ. προήρησαι ὅπου ἔαν κ.τ.λ., *Bruston*.

Jesus saith:

\* \* \* \* to...(their?) poverty.

<sup>1</sup> Preuschen *Antileg.* pp. 30-2.

<sup>2</sup> A viii (ed. Tischendorf).

<sup>3</sup> For its use in early Christian literature cf. 1 *Clement* xxxvi ἡνεώχθησαν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας, and 2 *Clem.* i 6 (quoted above).

<sup>4</sup> Harnack *op. cit.* p. 13.

The restorations which connect this fragment with the preceding Saying have been discussed already in the Commentary on Logion III. Bruston's attempts to unite this with the succeeding Logion rest on certain corrections<sup>1</sup> of the discoverers' readings made, apparently, without a re-examination of the original, and for that reason alone cannot be considered seriously. The obvious fact that ll. 23-30 form a single Saying for which we have parallels, and in which the idea of poverty has no place, puts his reconstructions completely out of court.

GH observe that *πτωχὰ* does not occur in any recorded Saying of Jesus, and that the Logion is, therefore, probably new. Yet the occasion may have been Synoptic, for *πτωχοί* occurs frequently, and we might perhaps think of the incident of the woman with the alabastron of myrrh (*Matth.* xxvi 11) as a possible occasion for the fragment: the Saying may have concluded: 'Ye have the poor with you always, and when ye will ye are able to relieve their poverty' [*κουφίσ[ε]ι[ν τ]ὴν πτωχέ[λ]αν*].

## SAYING X

### [LOGION V]

[λέγ]ει [Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς·  
 ὅπ]ου ἐὰν ὦσιν  
 [β', οὐκ] ἐ[ἴσι]ν ἄθεοι· καὶ  
 [ὅ]που ἐ[ἴς] ἐστιν μόνος, 25  
 [λέ]γω ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐ-  
 τ[οῦ]. ἔγει[ρ]ον τὸν λίθον),  
 καὶ κεῖ εὐρήσεις με,  
 σχίσον τὸ ξύλον, καὶ γὰρ  
 ἐκεῖ εἰμι. 30

23-26. [...]ει [...]ΟΥ ΕΔΝ ΩCΙΝ [...] Ε[...]Ν. ΘΕΟΙ ΚΑΙ [...]CQ·  
 Ε[...] ΕCΤΙΝ ΜΟΝΟC [...]ΤΩ ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ Κ.Τ.Λ., *P*: λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς·  
 ὅπου ἐὰν ὦσιν ....ε.....θεοὶ καὶ ..σθ· ε.. ἐστιν μόνος ..τῶ ἐγὼ εἰμι, *GH*:  
 ὅπου ἐὰν ὦσιν β, οὐκ εἰσιν ἄθεοι, καὶ ὅπου εἰς ἐστιν μόνος, λέγω ἐγὼ εἰμι,  
*Blass*: ὅπου ἐὰν ὦσιν οὐκ εἰσιν ἄθεοι καὶ ὥσπερ εἰς, *Harnack*: δ. ἐ. ὦ.  
 ἄνδρες καὶ ἄθεοι καὶ εἰ που εἰς, *Cross*: δ. ἐ. ὦ. πάντες μισόθεοι καὶ πιστοὶς  
 εἰς, *Swete*: δ. ἐ. ὦ. δύο, ἐκεῖ...οὖ καὶ ἐγὼ. οὐ εἰς, *Heinrici*: δ. ἐ. ὦ. οἱ  
 λεγόμενοι θεοὶ, *Redpath*: δ. ἐ. ὦ. ἐνιοὶ ἄθεοι καὶ ὁσίοις εἰς, *von Gebhardt*:  
 δ. ἐ. ὦ. Νάν ἰσχυροὶ οἱ ἄθεοι καὶ ἐν τῇ δοξῇ τίς ἐστιν μόνος ἐαυτῶ, and  
 δ. ἐ. ὦ. αὐτῶ ἐχθροὶ ἄθεοι καὶ ἀν(θρῶπ)οC δC ἐκεῖ ἐστιν μόνος οὕτω, *Bruston*

<sup>1</sup> *Paroles de Jésus* pp. 7, 15-16, 21.

(with Saying 1X prefixed in both cases): δ. ε. ω. β' ἢ γ', ἐκεῖ εἰσιν μετὰ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐλ ποὺ εἰς ἑστίν μόνος, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ, *Jülicher*.

26. [.]τω, *P*: λέγω, *Blass*<sup>1</sup>, *Redpath*, *Cross*: αὐτῷ, *Clemen*: αὐτῷ, *Zahn*, *Reitzenstein*, *Blass*<sup>2</sup>: ἰδοὺ, *Swete*: ἐκεῖ, *Heinrici*: οὕτω, *Harnack*: αὐτοῦ, *von Gebhardt*: ζήτω, *Badham*: κάτω, *Davidson*. 27. ἐξᾶρον, *Harnack*, *Bruston*: ἐγξισον (*for* ἐγξυσον) *Wessely*.

Jesus saith:

Wheresoever there be two, they are not without God,

And where there is one alone, I say, I am with him.

Lift up the stone, and there thou shalt find me;

Cleave the wood, and there I am.

For the actual reading of the papyrus reference must be made to the exhaustive note of the discoverers<sup>1</sup>. *Blass*' brilliant restoration is certainly final: its central point is, of course, the conjecture β' (δύο), and that 'Two' is here required is certain in view of the extant parallels to the first part of the Saying to be noticed presently. Objection has been raised<sup>2</sup> to the use of a cipher in a literary text and side by side with a number which is written out in full; but there are parallels which sufficiently cover this use. A papyrus fragment of St Matthew<sup>3</sup> has πᾶσαι οὖν γε[νε]αὶ ἀπὸ 'Αβραάμ ἕως Δαυὶδ γενεαὶ ἰδ. Mr *Redpath* has drawn attention to the fact that in a MS. like Codex B of the LXX ciphers are frequently found alongside the full word, as in *Num.* xxviii 19 μισχοὺς δύο, κριδὺν ἕνα, ἀμνοὺς ἐνιαυτοὺς ζ', and Dr *Sanday*<sup>4</sup> points to the variants in *Acts* xxvii 37 as evidence for the use of ciphers in a literary text. But a far more satisfactory parallel is forthcoming in the recently published fragment

of *Tobit*<sup>5</sup> where we find (ll. 2 ff.) ἐγὼ εἰμι 'Ραφαήλ εἰς ἐκ τῶν ζ' ἀγίων, and again (ll. 7 f.) ἐπαράχθησαν οἱ β' καὶ ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον. Since, therefore, *Blass*' restoration is so strongly supported and in itself is so entirely satisfactory, it is unnecessary to discuss the other and less adequate conjectures which have been put forward.

The Saying is in two parts, the second of which is wholly new, while the first seems to stand in some relation to the canonical scriptures, and has parallels more or less close in citations from non-canonical documents.

The most obvious parallel to the first part is *Matth.* xviii 20 οὗ γάρ εἰσι δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, and there can be no doubt that the relation is real<sup>6</sup>. Yet it is characteristic of the Logion that it sounds a distinct note: while Matthew by the addition of συνηγμένοι κ.τ.λ. makes the promised presence conditional on a formal gathering or congregation, the Saying has a diametrically opposite

<sup>1</sup> Δόγια 'Ιησοῦ p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Ox. Pap.* 1 no. 2 (recto, l. 9).

<sup>3</sup> *Two Lectures*, p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Taylor (*J. T. S.* vii p. 550) regards the first clause as dependent upon the Matthaean tradition, and the second clause concerning the 'one alone' as an 'appendix to an appendix'; *Wessely* considers that the development of the Matthaean original was due to Egyptian pantheistic influence: cp. *Reitzenstein Poimandres* p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> *Ox. Pap.* 1 p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* no. 1594 (pt xiii).

tendency<sup>1</sup>, and affirms that Jesus will be with his followers however lonely they may be, or in however informal circumstances. The spirit of the Logion-version, though not its form, is more nearly approached by *Matth.* xviii 20 *καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τῆς αἰῶνος*: and, though it contains no reference to solitude, the absence of the frigid ceremonial condition suffices to place this Saying on the same level as the Oxyrhynchus 'Logion.' Since the Saying cannot be assumed to be more true historically than the Matthaean parallel first quoted, it is probable that it is a conscious correction or amplification of that utterance, inspired, possibly, by the wider spirit of the second Matthaean parallel and (I would add) of *John* xvi 32 *καὶ οὐκ εἰμι μόνος ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστι*. It is also possible that the Logion rests on Jewish traditional teaching; and in support of this Taylor<sup>2</sup> cites from the *Pirque Aboth* a saying of Rabbi Chalafta: 'When ten sit and are occupied in the words of Torah, the Shechina is among them...And whence (is it proved) of even three?...And whence even two?...And whence even one? Because it is said: "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee and I will bless thee."' But such an utterance lies nearer or perhaps is the germ of Matthew's saying concerning the two or three.

But if the canonical books can show no more than the elements out of which the Saying probably grew, uncanonical writers exhibit it fully formed and even advanced a stage. Clement of Alexandria<sup>3</sup>

while defending marriage against the extreme ascetics has occasion to refer to the passage in *Matth.* xviii, interpreting the "Three" as husband, wife and child. A little later he writes: 'They (the ascetics) affirm that the Lord means that with the many (τῶν πλείονων) is the Demiourgos, the productive god; but with the one—that is the elect—is the Saviour.' Later still<sup>4</sup>, he tries another line of interpretation: 'perhaps with the One, the Jew, the Lord was in giving the Law; but in prophesying...he was gathering peoples...the Two; and a Third was being created out of the two unto a new man.' In the first of these passages we discern a Saying about One and οἱ πλείονες, and in the second about One, Two and Three; nor can we doubt that οἱ πλείονες of the first are equivalent to the Two and Three of the second passage. In a word, Clement's saying<sup>5</sup> went beyond the Logion in containing a clause about Three, and therefore cannot be identical with it. Such a three-clause Saying is actually preserved by Ephraem Syrus<sup>6</sup>: 'Ubi unus est, ibi et ego sum; et ubi duo sunt, ibi et ego ero; et quando tres sumus, quasi in ecclesia coimus.' It appears, therefore, that whereas the Logion in its revolt from the 'congregational condition' dropped the reference to the Three, the Saying which underlies Clement and that quoted by Ephraem (the two Sayings may or may not have been strictly identical), while starting with the Logion, went back to Matthew for this reference and so softened down the difference between the 'solitary' and the 'congregational' points of view.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Badham *Athenaeum* Aug. 7, 1897 (reading, however, ὅπου εἷς ἐστιν, μόνος ζήτω).

<sup>2</sup> *Ox. Log.* p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> *Strom.* III 10 § 63.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* § 70.

<sup>5</sup> Robinson (*Expos.* 1897 p. 417) thinks Clement may be dealing with a Saying advanced by Cassianus from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*: cf. *Introd.* p. xliii.

<sup>6</sup> Preuschen *Antilegomena* p. 31 no. 39.

On the other hand, the Logion is not to be taken as a recommendation of the solitary life, as Mr Badham<sup>1</sup> apparently regards it. If such were the meaning of the first part, it would surely have been developed in the second, which, in fact, refers to hard and common work. Moreover, this view does not assign its proper weight to the adverb<sup>2</sup>: the balancing of ὅπου...ὅπου in the first part against ἐκεῖ...ἐκεῖ in the second is surely not fortuitous, and the meaning must be not only 'When you are lonely, I am with you,' but 'Wherever you may be, and however lonely, I am there with you.' And lastly, if the Saying had been framed to console some 'ascetic of the Thebaid,' σχίσον τὸ ξύλον is very inappropriate: there is little wood in the retreats sought out by the solitaries of Upper Egypt.

In l. 24 the reading ἄθεοι, about which the discoverers<sup>3</sup> have some doubts, is established (as Harnack points out) by reference to *Ephes.* ii 12 μνημονεύετε...ὅτι ἦτε...χωρὶς Χριστοῦ...ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. This passage also exhibits the same Christology as the Logion, for in the one as in the other Χριστός is equated with θεός, a development which makes it impossible to regard the Saying as primary: the Synoptics do not positively record any claim of Christ to be identified with God.

The second part of the Saying presents little or no textual difficulty, but its interpretation has been much discussed. The chief lines of interpretation may be briefly summarised and discussed here.

(1) The raising of the stone

and the cleaving of the wood have been thought to carry a pantheistic meaning. Cersoy<sup>4</sup> thinks that divine immanence in matter (but not pantheism) is intended, and compares *Psalms* cxxxviii (cxxxix) 7 ff. Lock<sup>5</sup> believes likewise that the Logion asserts Christ's universal presence, but that it does not deny his personality by merging him in nature. In that case the articles are deictic and the first ἐκεῖ means 'in the wood'; but equally the second ἐκεῖ (after ἔγειρον τὸν λίθον) must mean 'under the stone'—a rendering which brings this line of interpretation to shipwreck<sup>6</sup>. Again, why 'raise the stone' but cleave the wood? Cersoy<sup>7</sup> again suggests that if the Saying can be assumed to be translated from Hebrew, 'raise' may be a mistake for 'hew,' since confusion between the two Hebrew words would be easy; but warrant would be needed for such an assumption. The discoverers aptly quoted the Saying from the *Gospel of Eve*: ἐγὼ σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγὼ· καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν ᾦς, ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ εἰμι, καὶ ἐν ᾧ πᾶσιν εἰμι ἐσπαρμένος, καὶ ὅθεν ἐὰν θέλῃς συλλέγεις με, ἐμὲ δὲ συλλέγων ἑαυτὸν συλλέγεις, and though it is likely (as remarked above) that this is derived from the Logion or its source, the distance between the two is obvious. One of the critics has rightly remarked that later ages might easily read into this Logion a pantheistic meaning which was never intended: this seems to have been done by the formulator of the Saying in the *Gospel of Eve*.

(2) Dr Barnes finds an allegorical reference to the stone which

<sup>1</sup> *Athen.* Aug. 7, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. the fragment of the *Gospel of Eve* (Epiphanius *Haer.* xxvi 3) καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν ᾦς, ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ εἰμι, which would seem to be a recasting of this Logion.

<sup>3</sup> *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ* p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Rev. Bibl.* 1893 p. 419.

<sup>5</sup> See Taylor *Ox. Log.* p. 40.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 420.

<sup>7</sup> *Two Lectures* pp. 24-5.

closed the Sepulchre and to the wood of the cross, and this suggestion is commended by Lock<sup>1</sup>, especially if the Logion can be supposed to be of comparatively late date. There seems, however, to be a double objection to this view: first, everything goes to show that the 'Logia' (and the Sayings) are not of a late date<sup>2</sup>; and secondly it is hard to see why we are to cleave (not pierce) the wood of the cross: the cross does not hide anything. Dr Lock mentions another allegorical interpretation by which the stone becomes the stones of an altar, the wood, the wood of sacrifice, but objects that this would introduce a ritual long obsolete. More cogent still is the fact that so allegorized, the second part of the Saying altogether loses sight of the idea of loneliness dominant in the first part.

Professor Swete, again, believes this part of the Logion to start from *Eccles.* x 9 (quoted below), and that it refers to the building of the Church: *Matth.* xvi 18 might seem to give colour to this solution. Yet to accept it is to distort the parallelism with the result that loneliness is primarily emphasised in the first, and building in the second part.

(3) The discoverers with Dr James would lay stress on the imperatives, which indicate that strenuous effort is needed to realise the promise of the first half of the Saying; but here again the parallelism is disturbed in so far as 'effort' does not balance 'loneliness.'

(4) Harnack<sup>3</sup>, like Swete, believes this half of the Saying to have started from *Eccles.* x 9

ἐξαιρῶν λίθους διαπορευθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς,  
σχίζων ξύλα κινδυνεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς,

and to be a conscious correction of its model: ἐγείρον should be read ἐξάρων<sup>4</sup>. Perhaps the correction is not needed; the compiler of the Saying need not be supposed to have turned to his text of *Ecclesiastes*, but probably relied on his memory and so wrote ἐγείρον instead of ἐξάρων. For the former word cf. *Matth.* xii 11. That ἐγείρον is the correct reading seems to be established by a citation, possibly from this very document or its source, in the *Etymolog. Gudianum*, ἐγείρε τὸν λίθον<sup>5</sup>: whether the Logion deliberately or unconsciously corrects the sentence of the Preacher must remain uncertain, but it is surely very difficult to resist Harnack's conclusion that the former is in some way dependent upon the latter. Possibly the connection is purely literary, and the compiler had no intent to correct his model. Harnack's presentation of the meaning of the Saying as a whole is admirable: 'The blessing' he writes<sup>6</sup> 'is not upon the work' [in itself]; yet the Saying is a protest against the idea that the presence of God is only to be obtained by fasting, prayer, and meditation...No, God is also present in the daily task, yet only if the disciple is really μόνος, i.e. separate from the world.' The

<sup>1</sup> *Two Lectures* p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Yet the discoverers retain their original reading, remarking that O is back-ligatured so that C rather than P would be expected, though bad writing may account for this (*Ox. Pap.* i p. 2). See also Wessely *Patr. Orient.* iv 155.

<sup>4</sup> See Reitzenstein *Ein Zitat aus den Λόγια Ἰησοῦ* (*Zeitschr. f. neutest. Wissenschaft u. Kunde* vi (1905) p. 203).

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 21.

<sup>6</sup> Though the Saying preserved in Codex Bezae (Luke vi 4) [Preuschen *Antilegomena* p. 27 no. 8] might be taken as evidence to the contrary.

<sup>7</sup> *Introduction* p. lxx.

only objection to be raised is to the quasi-technical sense of *μόνος*, which leaves the reference to the Two who are not without God unexplained. Should we not rather take the protest to be directed against the idea that a formal congregation, as well as ceremonial procedure, is necessary to secure God's presence, and that common work is essentially non-religious, and paraphrase the Saying: 'No matter where or how lonely you may be—whether you are only two or even one; no matter that you are at your daily task, hard, common work;—God is present with you there<sup>1</sup>? ἐκεῖ then (as its antithesis to ὅπου proves) means 'in the place where you are working.'

Lock finds difficulty alike in the singulars τὸν λίθον, τὸ ξύλον and in the aorists ἔγειρον (or ἐξᾶρον) and σχίσον, if such a line as Harnack has marked out is followed. But the language is surely semi-poetical, and the singular can be used legitimately just as we might say: 'Plough the field, turn the furrow'; and once the use of the singulars is admitted the aorists also are justified.

The second part of the Logion, or something like it, seems to have been known to the compiler of the extant recensions of the *Gospel according to Thomas*. Taylor has drawn attention to the passage εἶπε δὲ τῷ νεανίσκῳ· ἀνάστα νῦν, σχίξε τὰ ξύλα καὶ μνημόνευέ μου<sup>2</sup>. But if there is a real connection between the two it is obviously through one or more links which we can no longer recover. It may be worth while to remark on another passage<sup>3</sup> in the same Gospel where the injured builder is addressed: σοὶ λέγω ἄνθρωπε ἀνάστα ποιεῖ τὸ ἔργον σου. The importance attached to work makes it possible that there is a remote connection with the Logion: and to a builder the words 'raise the stone, cleave the wood' would most appropriately be addressed. In view of the close connection between the Sayings and the Logia and the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, "is it altogether fanciful to suggest that this Logion was addressed to that 'caementarius' with the withered hand of whom Jerome<sup>4</sup> has preserved notice?"

## SAYING XI

### [LOGION VI]

λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς· 30  
οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προ-  
φήτης ἐν τῇ π(ατ)ρίδι αὐ-  
τ[ο]ῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ  
θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς  
γεινώσκοντας αὐτό(ν). 35

<sup>1</sup> The condition "if you desire his presence" is of course understood: cf. *Apoc.* iii 20.

<sup>2</sup> A (ed. Tischendorf) x: cf. B ix.

<sup>3</sup> A xviii.

<sup>4</sup> *Comm. on Matth.* xii 13 [Preuschen *Antileg.* p. 5 no. 8].



Jesus saith :

A prophet is not acceptable in his own country,

Neither doth a physician do healing upon them who know him.

Each of the four Gospels has a parallel to the first part of this Logion. On the one hand we have *Mark* vi 4 οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, which is reproduced word for word (with the omission of καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ) in *Matth.* xiii 57, and is echoed more remotely in *John* iv 44 προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει. On the other, Luke (iv 23-24) reproduces this Saying with characteristic editorial touches combined with other matter which is obviously related to the second part : πάντως ἐπεὶ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· ἰατρί, θεράπενσον σεαυτὸν· ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καπερναοὺμ, ποιήσον καὶ ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου. εἶπε δὲ ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. On the purely verbal side, therefore, the Logion agrees with the Matthew-Mark version in reading οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης for the οὐδεὶς προφήτης of Luke. Yet this is so trifling and unimportant a point that it is quite impossible to claim it as indicating the influence either of Matthew or of Mark. The same cannot be said of the use of δεκτός, which is Lucan, in place of the ἄτιμος of Matthew and Mark. It is a literary improvement such as is characteristic of Luke, and was probably suggested to him by the citation from *Isaiah* lxi in v. 19 (κηρυῖσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ Κυρίου δεκτόν). The whole Lucan account of the visit to Nazareth is extremely interesting as throwing light on the evangelist's literary methods. Luke has made the visit to Nazareth the

first incident after the Temptation—an order which (if we are to accept the earlier Marcan arrangement) is artificial and unhistorical. Clearly Luke felt a literary and dramatic necessity to make Nazareth the scene of the first public appearance of Jesus, and has rearranged his material accordingly<sup>1</sup>. Luke, indeed, betrays himself by referring in iv 23 to mighty works done in Capernaum which he actually records under the ensuing visit to that town (iv 31 ff.). Not only is the position of the Nazareth incident unhistorical, but the discourse in the Synagogue in all probability is so also. Dr Swete<sup>2</sup> indeed thinks that 'Luke described the scene from the recollections of some eyewitness, perhaps the Mother of the Lord.' But since the manipulation of the incident to make it a dramatic opening of a prophet's career is purely unhistorical, the references to the prophets Elijah and Elishah (vv. 25 ff.) are equally so : their purpose is to emphasize the compiler's view of the episode. This being so, it is almost certain that all the non-Markan portion of the Lucan passage was evolved by the evangelist from his own feeling of what the situation (as arranged by him) required. Accordingly, he begins with the reading from *Isaiah* of the passage most appropriate to the opening of the ministry, followed by the direct claim to prophetic functions, 'To-day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.' Then, reverting to his source, he represents the people of Nazareth as scornful of Jesus because they know his origin, and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Holzmann *Life of Jesus* (E.T.) pp. 276-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel acc. to St Mark* p. 111.

finding in his source (*Mark* vi 5) the notice 'he could do there no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk and healed them,' saw his way to quote the proverb 'Physician, heal thyself' as part of the assumed jeers of the men of Nazareth. Next follows the Saying concerning the fate of a prophet in his own country, somewhat awkwardly inset by aid of the repeated *εἴπε δέ*. And lastly, the assumed challenge of the men of Nazareth to Jesus to do mighty works in his own country as he had done in Capernaum, is met by the declaration that as Elijah and Elishah were forced to limit their miraculous powers, so also the prophet, who had lately arisen amongst them, would do. This digression may be summed up in a sentence: the character of the discourse in the Synagogue is such as to prove it subsidiary to Luke's purpose in moving forward the visit to Nazareth and making it the significant opening episode of the prophetic ministry of Jesus, and the whole incident (excepting such parts as are guaranteed by Mark) is purely Lucan in origin.

*δεκτός* in the Logion, therefore, is directly borrowed from Luke, and the same must be true of the second part of the Logion since it is made up of purely Lucan materials. This part shows exactly the same method of composition as do Sayings III and IV, which consists in choosing a Saying from one of the Gospels already existing as a nucleus and expanding and developing this either for literary purposes or to include fresh phases of thought. In the present case the compiler seems to have aimed

partly at the formation of a parallelism, and partly at the contrivance of an apt retort to the proverb 'Physician, heal thyself'<sup>1</sup>—a retort which underlies the reference to the examples of Elijah and Elishah. The force of the Saying as a whole may perhaps be brought out by paraphrasing:—'You scorn me as a prophet because you know whence I am and challenge me to work miracles amongst my own people as I have done amongst strangers: I reply that as you reject the spiritual blessings I offer, you shall not share in the temporal blessings I would otherwise bestow.'

Swete remarks that the second part of the Logion is not, in its literal sense, true, and thinks that the physician must be a physician of the soul. But to accept this view would be to ignore the literal sense of the Lucan parallel; and in a retort such as this some latitude for inexactness must be allowed. I am not sure, also, that the two clauses are not intended as protasis and apodosis of a conditional sentence: 'If the prophet is not accepted by his own people, then the physician will not heal his own kin.'

The Saying shows traces which indicate either an Aramaic original or a compiler whose native tongue was Aramaic. In II. 33-34 the phrase *ποιεῖ θεράπείας* is considered by Cersoy to betray an Aramaic original; but, as Taylor notes, the phrase is also found in the *Protevangelium Jacobi* (xx). In I. 35 *γινώσκοντας αὐτόν* answers generally to *(τοῖς συγγενέσιν)* *καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ* of Mark and Matthew: Swete<sup>2</sup> compares *Psalms* lxxxvi (lxxxvii) 4 *τοῖς γινώσκουσίν με,*

<sup>1</sup> In the Introduction (p. xxxvi) I have shown reason for believing that the Sayings were extracts: in the present case the Saying of Jesus was no doubt preceded by the physician-proverb which was put directly (not indirectly as Luke has it) into the mouths of the people of Nazareth.

<sup>2</sup> *Expository Times* Sept. 1897 p. 548.

and suggests an Aramaic source. Cersoy suggests that there may be a mistranslation here where *els* τοὺς γνωστοὺς αὐτοῦ is required.

Such a slip might have occurred in translation from either an Aramaic or a Hebrew document.

## SAYING XII

### [LOGION VII]

λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς·

πόλις ὠκοδο-

μημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον

[δ]ρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐσ-

τηριγμένη οὔτε πε-

[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ-

[β]ῆναι.

40

36. ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗΜΕΝΗ, *P*, corr. by *GH*.  
by the original hand.

38. ΥΨΗΛΟΥ, *P*, corr.

Jesus saith:

A city built upon the top of a high mountain and established  
Can neither fall nor be hidden.

Batiffol<sup>1</sup> considers that the Saying has lost its true parallelistic form, for (as Harnack remarks) the fall of a whole city would be quite extraordinary whereas a single house might easily fall, and a part of the Logion is, in fact, dependent upon the Parable of the House upon the Sands. The original form would then be: 'A city built upon the top of a mountain cannot be hid, And a house established upon a high rock (or hill) cannot fall.' This has the advantage of restoring true parallelism and is probably correct. We may cite in support of this correction *Isaiah* ii 2 ὅτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ' ἄκρον τῶν ὀρέων<sup>2</sup>, a passage which probably

suggested to the compiler the idea of conflating the two New Testament Sayings (see below). Probably the confusion resulted on translation from an Aramaic original in which the word for 'house' had dropped out, causing a difficulty which the translator met by representing the city as unable either to fall or to be hid: he would seem to have manufactured a forced parallelism in which ὠκοδομημένη and ἐστηριγμένη are intended to balance οὔτε πέσσειν and οὔτε κρυβῆναι. In support of the opposite view that the Saying is in its original form, we may argue that the compiler was so bent on combining the two ideas of conspicuousness and stability that he overlooked the objection that a

<sup>1</sup> *Rev. Bibl.* 1897 p. 511.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. *Isaiah* iv 1.

city as a whole does not fall (thus in *Apoc.* xi 13 only a tenth part of the city falls as the result of 'a great earthquake'), and that the correction separates ὑψηλοῦ from ὄρους, while the actual reading has the support of *Isaiah* xxviii 4 καὶ ἔσται τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἐκπεσὸν τῆς ἐλπίδος τῆς δόξης ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ ὑψηλοῦ. On the whole, however, the arguments in favour of Batiffol's change seem to have more weight.

The first part of the Logion depends upon Matthew alone: οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη (v 14). The variant ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ ὄρους for Matthew's ἐπάνω is probably due to the influence of *Isaiah* ii 2, quoted above (or even of *Isaiah* xxviii 4; but the phrase is common in the Old Testament). ὑποδομημένη, as Lock points out<sup>1</sup>, is decidedly interesting as it is indicated as a variant for Matthew's κειμένη by the early Syriac versions, by Tatian, by one Latin version, and by a passage from the *Clementine Homilies* (III 67) quoted by Har-

nack: χρή οὖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὡς πόλιν ἐν ὕψει ὑποδομημένην φιλοθεον ἔχειν τάξιν καὶ διοίκησιν καλὴν.

This last passage together with *Isaiah* ii 2 is evidence enough to show that both 'house' and 'city' signify the Christian Church—an idea which is not unsynoptic: cf. *Matth.* v 14; xvi 18.

The second part of the Logion is parallel to the Parable of the Wise and Foolish Housebuilders (*Matth.* vii 24-25 = *Luke* vi 47-49), and the verbal resemblance of the Logion to *Matthew* is so close that to deny direct dependence is difficult indeed: the words ὑποδομημένη...ἐστηρικμένη...οὔτε πεσεῖν of the former being echoes of Matthew's ὑποδόμησε ... τεθεμελίωτο ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν (ἐστηρικμένη is a convenient abbreviation)...οὐκ ἔπεσεν. Luke, it must be noticed, shows no such verbal parallels.

In this Logion, therefore, we have a clear instance of conflation, a process which we have seen to be characteristic of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (Introduction p. lxii).

## SAYING XIII

### [LOGION VIII]

λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς·

ἀκούεις

[εἰς τὸ ἐ[ν ὧ]τίον σου, τὸ

[δὲ ἕτερον συνέκλεισας].

42. [.]IC TO E..TION COY TO, *P*: εἰς τὸ ἐνώπιον, *GH*: εἰς τὸ ἐνώτιον (εἰς τὸ ἐν ὧτίον, *Taylor*) σου, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον συνέκλεισας, *Swete*: ἀκούεις εἰς τὸ ἐν ὧτίον σου, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον ἔβυσας, *Lock*, *Sanday*: τῷ δὲ ἐτέρῳ παρακούεις, *Sanday*: (ἃ) ἀκούεις, εἰς τὸ ἐν ὧτίον σου τὸ δεξιόν, *Zahn*: ἀκουέῃς εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον σου στόμα<sup>2</sup>, *Bruston*: εἰς τὸ ταμεῖόν σου, *Badham*.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Lectures* pp. 13 and 26.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also *Paroles de Jésus* p. 10.

Jesus saith :

Thou hearest with one ear,  
But the other hast thou closed.

The restorations of Swete, Taylor, Lock and Sanday follow one general type and have the same general sense. Bruston, following Batiffol's hint<sup>1</sup>, would make this the commencement of the first Logion: this view has been discussed and rejected in the commentary on that Saying. Zahn's suggestion, 'What thou hearest, (hear) with thy right ear alone...' is ingenious and has the support of the passages collected by Dr Taylor<sup>2</sup> to show the importance attached by the Jews to the right ear. It is, however, too ingenious, and the English type of restoration is far more simple, natural and direct. I have preferred Swete's conjecture (with Taylor's division *ἐν ὠτίῳ*).

The discoverers, followed apparently by most editors, take the meaning to be 'Thou imperfectly understandest my message.' This does not seem quite adequate. Is there not an implication of wilful

deafness in *τὸ δὲ ἕτερον συνέκλεισας* which is more fully brought out by rendering 'You listen to me so far as outward hearing goes, but have closed the ears of your spiritual hearing against conviction<sup>3</sup>?' The Logion is, in fact, a masterly analysis of the attitude of those who instinctively close their hearts to unwelcome truth: compare generally *Matth.* xiii 13 *ἀκούοντες ἀκούουσι οὐδὲ συνιούσι*, which is proved by *vv.* 14-15 to refer to wilful hardness and not to natural weakness of comprehension; and *Luke* vi 46, 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say<sup>4</sup>?'.

The use of the second person singular makes it most likely that the Saying was addressed to an individual—as to the rich young ruler of *Matth.* xix 16-22, *Luke* xviii 23. It is noteworthy that this incident recurred in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Rev. Bibl.* 1897 p. 511 n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ox. Log.* pp. 63-5.

<sup>3</sup> Somewhat similar is Scott's Introduction to *Old Mortality*: 'Old Mortality was not one of those religious devotees, who, although one eye is seemingly turned towards heaven, keep the other steadfastly fixed on some sublunary object.'

<sup>4</sup> Compare further *Luke* viii 14 *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλοῦτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου...συνπνίγονται*.

<sup>5</sup> Preuschen *Antilegomena* p. 6 no. 11.

# INDEX

[NOTE. Only the more important names and topics discussed are included in this Index. References to the names of scholars and editors are given where the view expressed is of special importance.]

- Acta Pauli et Theclae* 27, 30  
*Acta Thomae* 2, 8  
*Acts, The* lvii  
 Adeney, W. F. lvii note 3, lxv (and *passim*)  
 Agrapha xxx, xliii  
 Alexandria 14  
 Almsgiving 23  
*Apocalypse of Peter, The* 15  
*Apophthegmata Patrum, The* xxv  
 Aramaic lxii, lxxiv, 27, 42  
 Atonement, Day of lxii, 28  
  
 Babylon lxv  
 Badham, F. P., on the source of the *Sayings* xlviii; on connection of the *Sayings* lxx, 38  
 Barnes, W. E. 38 f.  
 Bartlet, V., on twofold *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* xlix ff.; on connection of the *Sayings* lxx f.  
*Baruch*, literary use of in the *Sayings* lxiii, 1  
 Batiffol, P., on source of the *Sayings* xlix, 26, 33, 43 (and *passim*)  
*Bel and the Dragon*, quoted lxv  
 Bethune Baker, J. F. 14  
 Blass, F. 36  
 Bruston, C. 3, 26, 35  
  
 Capernaum 41  
 Cassianus, Julius xlvii, 37 note 5  
 Cersoy, P. lxii f., 27 f., 38, 42  
 Charge to The Twelve 18 f., 21  
 Christology 38  
 Ciphers in literary papyri 36  
*Clementine Homilies, The* 5, 44  
 Clement of Alexandria quotes *Gospel acc. to the Egyptians* xlv; and the Encratites xlvii; quotes *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* liv, 5, 27; on spiritual Sabbath 30, 37  
 Clement of Rome and supposed primitive collection of *Sayings*, xxx, xxxii  
 pseudo-Clement xlv f., 19  
 Collections of *Sayings* xxv ff.; supposed primitive xxix f.; its title and citation, formula xxx ff.; underlying *Mark* and *Q* xxxii ff.  
 Coronis, The use of xxiii, 1  
 Cross, J. A. 32  
  
 Demiourgos, The 37  
*Didache, The* lxix, lxxi, 3  
 Docetism lix, lxi, 32  
  
 Ebionites lvi  
 Egyptian influence on the *Sayings* xxv, 34 (see also under *Gospel*)  
 Encratites xlvi, 32  
 Ephraem Syrus xlvii, 37  
 Epiphanius quoted xxxi f.  
*Etymologicum Gudianum* 39  
 Eusebius xxvi f., lvi (and *passim*)  
 Extracts, The *Sayings* as xxxviii, xl, xlii, xlv, 18 f.  
 Ezekiel quoted lxv  
  
 Fasting 23, 28  
 Formalism 27, 29, 40  
 Formula introducing the *Sayings* xxii f., 1, lxxiii ff.  
  
 Gnostics, Gnosticism xlviii ff.  
 Gospels (Apocryphal) xl, xlii ff.  
 Gospels (Canonical) and the *Sayings* xxxiv ff., xl  
*Gospel acc. to the Egyptians* xlii, xlv, xlviii, 20, 30 (and *passim*)  
*Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* xlii, xlviii; supposed twofold version of xlix ff.; early Greek version of liii; Jerome's translations of *ib.*; relation to the

- Sayings* liv ff.; incidents in lvi ff.; Johannine traits in lix; influence of Hebrew literature lxiv; Temptation story in lxiv; use of LXX in lxv note 8; conflation of elements in lxvi, 7, 14, 20 f., 27, 40, 44 f. (and *passim*)
- Gospel acc. to S. John* xxxv, lxvii, 4 (and *passim*)
- Gospel acc. to S. Luke*, use of Q in xxix; relation to the *Sayings* xxxvii f.; influence on *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* lv f.; rejected by the Ebionites lvi, lxvi f., 20, 41 (and *passim*)
- Gospel acc. to S. Mark*, Papias on xxvi f.; historical present in xxxiii; relation to the *Sayings* xxxvi
- Gospel acc. to S. Matthew* xxvii, fivefold division of xxviii; relation to the *Sayings* xxxvi f., to *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* lv f., lxvi f., 20, 24, 44 (and *passim*)
- Gospel acc. to Thomas* xlii ff., 13, 34, 40
- Gospel acc. to the Twelve* lii f.
- Gospel of Eve* 38
- Gospel fragment from Oxyrhynchus xlv ff., xlix
- Grenfell, B. P. xix, xxii, lxvii (and *passim*)
- 'Happy Nature,' The 13
- Harnack, A. xxx, xxxv, xxxviii; on *Gospel acc. to the Egyptians* xlv ff.; on citations in pseudo-Clement xlv, xlv, lxiii, 6, 29, 39
- Harris, R. on primitive Collection of *Sayings* xxix f., xxxi
- Hebrews, Epistle to the* lxxv
- Hermes Trismegistus 33
- Hippolytus 12 f.
- Hunt, A. S. xix, xxii, lxvii (and *passim*)
- Ignatius lviii
- Immanence 38
- Isaiah, literary use of lxiii f., 33 f., 43 f.
- James, appearance to lvii
- James, M. R. on source of the *Sayings* xlii, 39
- Jerome, xlix, lii ff., lviii, 20 (and *passim*)
- Jewish literature lxiii f., 34 (and *passim*)
- Jewish ordinances 23, 27 ff.
- Job xxxvii, lxiii, 12
- Johannine influence xxxv f., xxxvii f., lv, lix ff., 25, 30, 33 f.
- John, St, death of xxvii; First Epistle of xxxv
- Judas 10 ff.
- Lake, Kirsopp, on connection between the *Sayings* and Q xxix; on supposed primitive Collection of *Sayings* *ib.* and f.
- Lazarus, parable of lxvi
- Logia* xix note 1, xxii; meaning of the term xxvi
- Logia Kyriaka* xxvi ff.; of *Matthew* *ib.*
- Logoi, logos*, meaning of xxix, xxxi ff., 1
- Logos doctrine 32 f.
- Lock, W., on the Title of the *Sayings* xxvi; on connection of the *Sayings* lxii note 1, lxxv, 38
- Matthias, *Traditions* of 7
- Messianic interpretation xxvii, li, lix, lxiii, lxiv f., 6, 34
- Naassenes, use of *Gospel of Thomas* by lxiii, 13
- Ophites, beliefs of lxv note 1
- Origen xlix, lii, lxiv (and *passim*)
- Oxyrhynchus, rubbish mounds at xix, xxi f.; collection of *Sayings* xxiii ff., xxv; title and relation to other Collections xxvi, 3; relation to the Fourth Gospel xxxv, to Mark xxxvi, to the Synoptics xxxvi ff.; its nature xxxviii ff.; a series of extracts xl ff.; conflation in xxxix, lxv, 16, 42; relation to *Gospel of Thomas* xliii f., to *Gospel acc. to the Egyptians* xlv ff., to

- Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* liv ff.; alleged Gnostic and ascetic character xlviii; parallelism in lxi; Semitic element in lxii; date and purpose of lxvii ff.; supposed connecting thought in lxix f.; alleged Pantheism 36 note 6.
- Pantheism 36 note 6, 38
- Papias on *Logia* of Matthew and Mark's Gospel xxvi ff.; his sources xxvii, xxix, lviii
- Paraphrasis xxiii, 1
- Parallelism xxiv, lxi, 18, 25, 27, 33
- Paul, St, and a primitive collection of *Sayings* xxx, xxxii, lvii
- Peter, St, lviii, lxvi; *Apocalypse of* 15
- Pharisees 12
- Philip 2 f.
- Pirke Aboth, The* xxv, xxxiii, lxiii, 37
- Pistis Sophia, The* xlviii f., 2, 8, 27
- Prayer 22 ff.
- Precedence 16
- Pre-existence, doctrine of xxxv, xxxix, lxi, 32
- Prologue to the *Sayings, The* xxii f., xxxv, xxxviii f., xlii, 1 f., 4
- Psalms*, literary use of the lix, lxiii, lxiv
- Ptah-hotep, *Precepts of* xxv
- Q*, its relation to the *Logia Kyriaka*, etc. xxviii; its nature xxix; recensions of *ib.*, 18, 26
- Reitzenstein, R. 33
- Rest of the Holy Spirit lix, lxi, lxiv
- Robinson, J. Armitage xlvii, lxiv note 1, 30
- Sabbath xlvii f., 28, 29, 30
- σαββατον*, meaning of 28 f.
- Salome xlv f., xlviii
- Sanday, W. xxix, 36 (and *passim*)
- Sarapion, Litany of 2
- Sayings (passim)*
- Sayings of the Fathers, The* xxv, 29
- Semitic element in the *Sayings* lxii, lxvii, 34
- Sermon on the Mount, *The* 23 ff.
- Shiêt (Scetis) 29
- Sibylline Oracles, The* 33
- Simon (Peter) 20
- Spirit, The Holy, Rest of lix, lxi, lxiv; as Mother of Christ lxiv; regarded as feminine by the Ophites lxv note 1
- Swete, H. B. lxxv, 3, 39, 42
- Syncretism 34
- Synoptics xxxii ff.; relation to the *Sayings* xxxvi ff., xxxix, lvii note 3; parallelism in lxi, lxvii; relation in date to the *Sayings* lxviii, 4, 16, 29 f., 34 (and *passim*)
- Tabor lxv
- Tatian 44
- Taylor, C. xliii, 45 (and *passim*)
- Temple, *The* lxv
- Temptation, *The*, in the *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* lxiv f.
- Thomas, St, xxxviii f., li, lix, lxxv, 1 ff. (see also under *Acta* and *Gospel*)
- Wessely, K. xx, 25 note 2, 28 note 3, 36 note 6, 39 note 4