

THE
HARTFORD SEMINARY RECORD

VOL. VIII. No. I — NOVEMBER, 1897

[Entered at the Hartford Post Office as Second Class Matter]

Published quarterly on the 1st of November, February, May, and August. Subscription price, \$1.00 per year, in advance. Single copies, 30 cents. Remit to order of HARTFORD SEMINARY PRESS, Hosmer Hall, Hartford, Conn.

EDITORIAL BOARD: — Professor Arthur Lincoln Gillett, Professor Waldo Selden Pratt, Professor Alfred Tyler Perry. *Associate Editors*: — Rev. Thomas Manning Hodgdon, Mr. Edward Warren Capen.

With the opening of its eighth volume the RECORD begins the series of suggestions for special courses of study promised last August. It is believed these will constitute a valuable feature of the magazine for pastors who wish to follow some line of regular study but are somewhat at a loss how wisely to direct their efforts. Professor Walker's suggestions as to Congregationalism present lines of investigation and recommend material that ought to prove invaluable to the Congregational pastor interested in the history and development of his denomination. Mr. Rhoades' interesting comparison of two types of pessimism was excluded from our last issue from lack of space. We are glad to be able to give it at this time. The paper by Mr. Kelsey of the Fourth Church, Hartford, puts with force a question which every pastor must answer for himself as in earnestness of spirit he plans his work for the coming winter, and Professor Beardslee takes up a theme of especial interest in his studies on the Kingdom of God.

Seldom, we believe, have the same number of words had concentrated upon them the same quantity and intensity of scholarly and popular attention that has been bestowed upon the newly

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED "SAYINGS OF JESUS."

The remarkable papyri find made this last winter in the work of the Egypt Exploration Fund at Bêhnesa — an Arab village on the site of the ancient town of Oxyrhynchus¹ — obtained its chief interest in a single leaf from a papyrus codex which gave evidence of being part of a collection of sayings of Christ.

The first report was that this might possibly be from the much-discussed work of Papias, entitled "Expositions of Logia of the Lord" (*λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις*), or more likely from the even more struggled-over "Logia" of Matthew, witnessed to by Papias² and very largely necessitated by the exigencies of the Synoptic problem. There was consequently a very decided disappointment when it was found that neither origin could be given to the fragment.³ Indeed, there has been danger of a reaction from the first high estimate placed upon it to an undervaluing of its worth. It is by no means an unimportant fragment; on the contrary, if, in the over two hundred and fifty boxes of papyri which remain yet to be examined from the find, the text of the codex — or even any considerable part of it — should be discovered, we would have in our possession a document which would be exceedingly valuable for a criticism of the tradition of Jesus' words, if not for a criticism of the words themselves.

The codex of which our leaf is a part is of very early origin. The character of the papyri in whose company it was found give it the large likelihood of a place within the first three centuries. It may be difficult to determine just where inside this time limit it belongs. The characteristic Roman type of the handwriting

¹ Note the very interesting statements regarding the religious and monastic celebrity of Oxyrhynchus cited in Swete's article on the fragment — *Expos. Times*, Sept., '97, pp. 544 f.

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39.

³ The fact that Papias' own work was not simply a collection of Sayings of Christ, but expositions of them ruled out the first suggestion; while the second was disposed of by the fact that critical opinion has come quite fully to the decision that the Logia of Matthew must have included something of a narrative nexus between the individual sayings. This is apart from reasons derived from the text of our fragment, and also from the unsynoptic character of the thought of some of the individual Logia — as will appear later.

and the entire absence of all stops, breathings, and accents in the text would seem to make impossible anything later than 300 A.D.; while, on the other hand, the presence of word contractions usually found in biblical manuscripts, the interpolation of special characters to fill up space at the end of lines, a slight tendency towards a separation of words, and the fact that the fragment is part of a codex and not a roll, would make highly improbable anything earlier than 200 A.D. Perhaps within the first part of the third century would be the safest place to put it.⁴

At the same time it must be remembered that, while this is true of the writing, the contents of the codex and even the original gathering of them into this collection may be of a very much earlier date.⁵ Indeed, the great question which the fragment places before us is, "Have we here original sayings of Christ?"

The text of the fragment resolves itself into the following passages:

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

[" . . . and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye."]

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

["Jesus saith, Except ye fast in respect to the world,⁶ ye

⁴ The editors (Grenfell and Hunt) place it within the period 150-300 A.D. "*Sayings of Our Lord*," London, 1897; p. 6.

⁵ Harnack considers the writing as being not the autograph but the copy of it (*Über d. Jüngst Entdeckten Sprüche Jesu*, Freiburg, '97, p. 25), and the original collection may be even further back than one remove.

⁶ This acc. seems harsh, though there can be little doubt that, in view of the cognate acc. after σαββατίσητε, it is to be taken as an acc. of nearer definition and not as an acc. of time ("during the continuation of the κόσμος," as Swete renders it — p. 546). The meaning seems to be that they are to spiritually fast from the world, the accusative being used here, under the influence of the accompanying τὸ σάββατον, instead of the gen. — cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii., 16 (*Migne VIII*, p. 1200), where the passage in Isaiah (lvi. 3-5) is discussed, which represents God as promising special blessings to those eunuchs who keep his Sabbaths, and it is explained that they keep the Sabbath by refraining from sins, and that they are blessed in that they thus fast from the world (here the gen. is used — μακάριοι οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες), cf. also same author's *Elog.* (*Migne IX*, p. 704) where the gen. is again used οὗτος καὶ ἡμᾶς τῶν κοσμικῶν νηστεύειν χρή, ἵνα τῷ κόσμῳ ἀποθάνωμεν. Cf. also Rendel Harris, *Contemp. R. v.*, Sept., '97, p. 344. Should Redpath's suggestion (*Expos.* Oct., '97, p. 257) be right, that the scribe may have dropped out of the text an εἰς which originally stood between νηστεύσητε and τὸν κόσμον, so that our passage would assimilate in form to 1sa. lviii. : 4 (εἰ εἰς κρίσεις καὶ μάχας νηστεύετε), we would be confronted with the difficulty of understanding our Logion at all. It could not mean "Unless ye fast for the world (in the same sense as the people were being accused of fasting for strifes and contentions) ye shall not find the Kingdom." In fact it must mean directly the opposite of this.

shall in no wise find the Kingdom of God, and except ye keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.”]

III. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἔ[σ]την⁸ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὠφθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ εὔρον πάντας μεθύοντας καὶ οὐδένα εὔρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶ[ν] [τ]ῆν πτωχείαν.⁹

[“Jesus saith, I stood in the midst of the world, and in the 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 poverty.”]

IV. [Λέγει] Ἰησοῦς, ὅπ[ου] ἐὰν ᾧσιν ε εοι καὶ ε ἐστιν μόνος ὡ ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ’ αὐτ[οῦ]· ἔγει[ρον] τὸν λίθον κα’κεῖ εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον κα’γὼ ἐκεῖ εἰμί.¹⁰

[“Jesus saith, Wherever there are and there is one alone, I am with him. Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me, cleave the wood and there am I.”]

V. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[οῦ], οὐδὲ ἰατρός ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

[“Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him.”]

⁷ The editors state that *σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον* is the ordinary LXX. phrase and refer to Lev. xxiii. : 32; II. Chron. xxxvi. : 21, but Swete is justified in saying the normal phrase is *φυλάσσειν*, or *φυλάσσεισθαι* [in Jer. and Ezk. ἀγιάζειν] τὰ σάββατα; so that the sing. τὸ σάββατον is unique and points rather to the Ideal Sabbath which Christ requires (p. 547).

⁸ Letters within brackets are conjectural restorations; but no restorations are made in the text as here given except such as are most obviously justified.

⁹ The editors were at first disposed to consider τὴν πτωχείαν as part of a separate Logion, the remainder of which had been lost; but in his address before the Friends' Summer School at Scarborough, Eng., Mr. Grenfell seems to have been won over to the suggestion made by a reviewer in the *Guardian* of July 21, and agreed to by Swete that the text at the bottom of the page is to be connected with the words τὴν πτωχείαν at the top of the next page, as forming the concluding phrase of the Logion—reading ἀμβλεῖς τῇ διανοίᾳ οὐκ οἴδασιν αὐτῶν τὴν πτωχείαν. This would find a parallel, as the reviewer suggests, in Apoc. iii. : 17 (καὶ οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ταλαίπυρος καὶ ἐλεῖνός καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμνός.) Harnack comes independently to the same opinion as this, though he does not suggest exactly the same restoration of words (pp. 15 f).

¹⁰ The editors admit the extreme difficulty of satisfactorily filling the gap which exists in the first part of this Logion, but suggest the possibility of reading πάντες ἄθεοι after ᾧσιν and perhaps also πιστὸς εἰς before ἐστιν, though of πιστὸς they are doubtful. Swete, however, does not hesitate to read fully: Ὅπου ἐὰν ᾧσιν πάντες μισόθεοι, καὶ πιστὸς εἰς μόνος, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ’ αὐτοῦ (p. 547). Harnack suggests the following: Ὅπου ἐὰν ᾧσιν, οὐκ εἰσιν ἄθεοι, καὶ ὡς περ εἰς ἐστιν μόνος, οὕτω ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ’ αὐτοῦ, referring to Eph. ii. 12 for use of ἄθεοι; but ἄθεοι is generally used actively (“godless”), and, while used passively (“forsaken by God”) in Eph., it is there rather descriptive of an unchurched and uncovenanted condition than of a mere lack of the presence of God.

VI. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, πόλις ᾠκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον[ᾠ]ρους
 ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηριγμένη οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ[β]ῆναι.

[“Jesus saith, A city built upon the top of a high hill and
 established can neither fall nor be hid.”]

VII. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς ἀκούεις . . . σ . . . ο . . . ιον σου . . .
¹¹

[“Jesus saith, Thou hearest”]

It will be seen that of these Logia only II, V, and VI stand complete in the original text, and of these only II is without need of any restoration whatever. I is the closing part of a Logion coming over from the preceding page. III lacks most of its final sentence and is wanting a letter in two of its words. IV is quite fragmentary in its first part, while VII has hardly any of its contents preserved.

The all-important question regarding this leaf, however, has to do with its contents, and, briefly stated, is: “Are they or are they not original sayings of Christ?” It would be foolish to pretend that, in the present state of our knowledge concerning the origin of our fragment, this could be determined. This must be the outcome of years rather than months and weeks of work, even should the rest of the codex be discovered. All that can now be done is to give ourselves to a careful and patient study of the fragment as we have it, and to seek patristic literature as might throw light upon it, in hopes that other discoveries will be made that will help us to settled conclusions.

In such a study, with such a question before us, the first thing critically to be done is to compare these Logia with the utterances of Christ as we have them recorded in the Gospels.¹²

Of the seven Logia which we have it is clear that I, V, and VI remind us very decidedly of recorded sayings of Christ.

LOGION I.

LOGION.	MATT. vii. 5 (WH).	LUKE vi. 42 (WH).
.....καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.

¹¹ The editors fill up the gap between ἀκούεις and σου by the following conjecture, εἰς τὸ ἐνώπιόν σου; upon which Swete improves by suggesting εἰς τὸ ἐν ὠτίον σου, which is a New Testament phrase (Matt. x : 27) and not unlike the LXX. phrase ἀκούειν εἰς ἀκοήν ὠτίου (II. Kings, xxii. 45, Ps. xvii. [xviii.] 44). This would allow the Logion to be completed possibly somewhat as follows : τὸ δὲ ἕτερον συνέλειπας (cf. Swete, p. 549).

¹² Cf. Ropes' estimate of this method in his criticism of Resch in his work on the *Aggrapha Am. Journ. Theol.*, July, '97, p. 763.

It would seem, at first sight, that our Logion was a conflation of the Matthew and Luke texts.

Except for the fact that the position *ἐκβαλεῖν* in the Luke text as we give it has behind it, practically, only the authority of B. (though this is adopted by Tisch. as well as by WH), while for the position of *ἐκβαλεῖν* in the Luke text, as the Logion has it, stand SACD and several other uncials, with most of the versions. It is the reading of the Text. Recept. The Logion may, therefore, represent a text which followed Luke's rendering of these sayings, over against that of the other Gospels; or it may represent a text from which Luke derived his phraseology of these sayings, or, at least, which he followed more accurately than did the other Evangelists.¹³

What the first part of the Logion was, and, in case it corresponded to the first part of the Gospel passages, whether it followed the Luke text as closely as it does in the part we have before us, is, of course, impossible to say.

As to the contents of the Logion, therefore, as far as they are before us, we can say with great readiness that they represent what was an original saying of Christ,—either this one which we have in Matthew and Luke, or another similar one uttered at some other time in his ministry.

LOGION V.

LOGION.	MARK VI. 4 (WH).	MATT. XIII. 57 (WH).	LUKE IV. 24 (WH).	JOHN IV. 44 (WH).
οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτός προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[ο]ῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρός ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.	οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει.	προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι ἔχει.

Here, again, it would seem that the Logion had behind it the text of Luke—or a text which corresponded to it—rather than the text of, or corresponding to, any of the other Gospels—especially as Luke is the only one of the Evangelists who uses *δεκτός* and uses it only in this narrative (cf. v. 19).¹⁴ As to the closing part of the Logion (*οὐδὲ ἰατρός ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν*) it might possibly have been suggested by

¹³ D it. vg. cop. make the text of Luke correspond exactly with that of Matt.; so that our Logion cannot be said to follow the Western readings.

¹⁴ It seems to be a word common to Luke and Paul (cf. Acts x. 35 and II Cor. vi. 2; Philip. iv. 18).

the immediately preceding context in the Luke passage (cf. v. 23: Πάντως ἐρείτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην Ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτὸν· ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναοὺμ ποιήσον καὶ ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου.), where we have θεράπευσον and ποιήσον as the imperatives of the two sentences which form the passage, although ποιεῖ θεραπείας is an unusual phrase, as is also τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.¹⁵

Rendel Harris suggests, however, and his suggestion may be correct, that δεκτός is to be taken as evidence of an extra-canonical text which Luke alone had before him.¹⁶ It may, at the same time, be evidence only of a more careful following by Luke of an extra-canonical text common to all.

At all events we can say, without hesitation, that this Logion in its contents represents an original saying of Christ,—either this saying which we have in the Gospels, altered somewhat in its form, or another one uttered at some other time and not recorded in the Gospels. There would be nothing to prevent Christ, on some other occasion, when he was in the region of his early home, having put into this form which we have in the Logion some of the ideas which were present to him on this first visit of his ministry to the Synagogue of Nazareth.

LOGION VI.

LOGION.

πόλις ᾠκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον
[δ]ρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηριγμένη
οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε
κρυ[β]ῆναι.

ΜΑΤΤ. v. 14 (WH).

οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι
ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη.

Here the statement in Matthew would seem to be given a much extended form, ᾠκοδομημένη being substituted for κειμένη and ἐπ' ἄκρον ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ for ἐπάνω ὄρους. The added phrase ἐστηριγμένη οὔτε πεσεῖν [δύναται] may quite possibly have been suggested by the parabolic passage in Matt. vii. 24–27 where, in fact, ᾠκοδόμησεν is twice found as well as ἔπεσεν.¹⁷

¹⁵ At same time note the presence of the same verbs (θεράπευσεν and ποιῆσαι) in the following verse of Mark vi. 5). The Mark context, however, does not contain ἰατρός, though the 4th verse itself has συγγενεῖσιν which might be supposed to stand in some slight correspondence with γινώσκοντας.

¹⁶ Independent, July 29, 1897.

¹⁷ The objection made by the editors that the Logion cannot be considered a conflation of these two passages because it contains no reference to the "rock" which is the essential point of the parable loses sight of the fact to which Swete calls attention that the idea of the "rock" is implied in ἐστηριγμένη (p. 548). Harnack also accepts the possible influence of Matt. vii. : 24-27 upon the basal passage (p. 23).

At the same time the fact is to be noted to which the editors and also Rendel Harris call our attention, that all the Syriac versions as well as Tatian's Diatessaron (8:41) and Hilary's Com. on Matt.^{1*} read *ῥκοδομομένη* for *κειμένη* in Matt. v. 14. It may be, therefore, that the presence of *ῥκοδομημένη* in the Logion is not so much evidence of conflation as of a text of Christ's sayings, outside the Gospels, which the Logia and these Versions and Fathers have followed. The only objection to this would be that it would not account for the presence in the Logion of these other elements of Matt. vii. 24-27.

Be all this, however, as it may, we would have no hesitation in saying that this form given us in the Logion might represent an original saying of Christ, uttered at some other time in his ministry than that of Matt. v. 14. Christ himself might have combined these ideas as well as the scribe of the Logia.

Were these three Logia, therefore, the only ones contained in the fragment, we could say that the leaf might be part of a collection of sayings of Christ not contained in the Gospels,—or, at least, a collection of sayings recorded in the Gospels but given here in a somewhat different form. There would, in either case, be no question as to their coming from the original source of Christ himself. But when we come to the remaining Logia we are at once brought into confusion, and find the assertion of originality a very much more difficult one to make. These Logia are II, III, and IV. Logion VII is too fragmentary to discuss.

LOGION II.

Ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἔὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.

There is, of course, nothing among the recorded sayings of Christ which this parallels. In form, at least, it is entirely new. As far as the meaning of the statement is concerned, if it be taken spiritually in both members, there is nothing in it contrary to the known utterances of Christ, and it is quite possible that it might have been uttered after some such incident as is given in Mark ii. 18-iii. 6 (= Luke v. 33-vi. 11). Christ's strong statement against the Pharisaic ideas of fasting and keeping the Sabbath might have brought the disciples to query whether his teaching would not imply that they should neither fast nor keep

^{1*} The reference to Hilary comes from Swete.

the Sabbath at all. In reply to this he might have said what this Logion credits him with saying.¹⁹ The post-apostolic literature shows that some such idea as this regarding true fasting and true Sabbath-keeping was early current in the Church²⁰; though it seems too much to infer that its existence was necessarily due to a definite saying of Christ.²¹

LOGION III.

Ἐ[σ]την ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὠφθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ εὖρον πάντας μεθύοντας καὶ οὐδένα εὖρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶ[ν] [τ]ὴν πτωχείαν.

It is undoubtedly true that, if we take this Logion in its separate phrases, we can find something in the way of Gospel parallel to the expressions which they contain — particularly in John, which would have an added significance from the Apocryphal parallel (iii. 17) to the last phrase of the Logion,— if it were written originally as the suggested restoration makes it (*ἀμβλείς τῇ διανοίᾳ οὐκ οἶδασιν αὐτῶν τὴν πτωχείαν*).

e. g. (1) The phrase ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου might remind us, possibly, of the expression in the valedictory prayer, οὐκέτι εἶμι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (John xvii. 11), with such an ἐν μέσῳ phrase as ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἶμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν (Luke xxii. 27); or it could perhaps suggest to us the statement, Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων αὐτὸς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν (Luke xxiv. 36), providing we could mentally combine with it the statement by the Fourth Evangelist in the prologue of his Gospel, ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτῶν ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω (John i. 9 f).

(2) The longer phrase, ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὠφθην αὐτοῖς, could also possibly take us back to the

¹⁹ Cf. Swete's suggestion of this (p. 546). It might seem to some as though the rather metaphorical sense in which *νηστεύειν* appears here to be used (= ἀποτάσσεισθαι) and the un-New-Testament expression *σαββατίζεῖν τὸ σάββατον*, together with the presence of what are really Johannine phrases (τὸν κόσμον, ὄψεσθαι τὸν πατέρα) would not permit of such a synoptic event as the background of the Logion; and yet, after all, while the record of the event, as we have it, is confined to the synoptic narrative, the event itself is neither synoptic nor Johannine, but belongs to the life of Christ, and so may have produced some such a Logion as we have, though the form in which we have it is unusual. With a change in its expression it might have formed part of the synoptic narrative suggested.

²⁰ Cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 12, 15, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27. Ignatius, *Magn.*, 9. Especially the passage in Clem. Alex. *Strom.*, iii. 15 (*Migne VIII*, p. 1200), referred to under the translation of the Logia, where the form of the thought closely resembles that of our Logion (μακάριοι οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστευόντες). Also *Strom.*, vii. 12 (*Migne IX*, p. 504).

²¹ Swete would not apparently think so (p. 543), but see Ropes' exclusion of similar *Agaphai* from Resch's collection (*Am. Journ. Theol.*, July, '97, p. 761).

statement of the Fourth Evangelist in his prologue, *καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξην αὐτοῦ* (John i. 14).

(3) The phrase, *καὶ εὗρον πάντας μεθύοντας*, might possibly have some relation of idea to the statement in the parable of the wicked servant, *ἐσθίη δὲ καὶ πίνη μετὰ τῶν μεθύοντων* (Matt. xxiv. 49 = Luke xii. 45 [*μεθύσκεσθαι*]).

(4) The phrase, *καὶ οὐδένα εὗρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς* could remind us of the utterance of Christ *ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω* (John vii. 37) — the larger idea of *εὗρον* which controls both phrases, finding something of a parallel, perhaps, in Christ's question, *πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν ἄρα εἰρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς?* (Luke xviii. 8).

(5) *πονεῖ* is not a New Testament word, though Isaiah uses it apparently in an active sense, in connection with *ψυχὰς* (ix. 10, cf. also Isaiah liii. 10); yet somewhat corresponding ideas are found in Christ's statements *νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τετάρκται* (John xii. 27) and *περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου* (Matt xxvi. 38 = Mark xiv. 34), and in such incidents as Christ's weeping over Jerusalem (Luke xix. 41–44). The construction *πονεῖν ἐπὶ* reminds us of Mark iii. 5 (*συνλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ παρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν*).

(6) The expression *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* occurs in the Gospels only Mark iii. 28; though in the Epistles we have it Eph. iii. 5.

But this is about all that can be said in the direction of Gospel parallelism.²² As to the Logion in its entirety there is nothing in the Gospels to remind us of it. And when we come to ask ourselves whether we could understand Christ as so speaking at any time in his ministry, we might say that, as far as the problem of the tenses in the Logion is concerned, we could conceive of such a juxtaposition of Aorists and Presents in the sayings of Holy Week. John xvii. has very much of the same combinations — *ἐδόξασα, ἐφάνέρωσα, ἐτήρουν, ἐφύλαξα, ἀπέστειλα, ἐρωτῶ, ἔρχομαι, λαλῶ, ἀγιάζω, θέλω*.²³ Such a combination, however, might be supposed as possible also in the post-resurrection period, though we have no examples of it in the Gospels then.²⁴ So much for the form; but as far as the thought itself

²² The resemblance to I. Tim., iii. 16 is of course to be noted.

²³ Cf. Swete, p. 547.

²⁴ Cf. James, *Contemp. Rev.*, Aug., '97, pp. 158 f.

is concerned, we find it much more difficult to guide ourselves.²⁵ We confess to a feeling that there is a significant difference between such statements as ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν, or ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, or even αὐτὸς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν and this statement of the Logion, ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου. We can conceive of Christ standing ἐν μέσῳ μαθητῶν or of his being ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ; but the combination ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου carries with it for us an entirely different idea and one which we find it hard to associate with Christ's sayings. It sounds apocryphal, though it do so to nothing more than the subjective sense.

So we feel a difference between the prologue statement, καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν and the Logion phrase ἐν σαρκὶ ὄφθην αὐτοῖς. The one seems reasonable—if we may so express it—though so immeasurably profound; the other seems forced, and as having a purpose in it—though again this is largely a subjective impression.

When now we turn to the book of Baruch (iii. 38) and find there the following: μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὄφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναεστράφη these subjective suspicions find considerable confirming. It seems, in fact, extremely probable that there has been some connection between our Logion and this Baruch passage—especially when we remember that this verse belongs to the second part of this book, which is held to be a later addition—this verse being considered by some recent critics as a Christian interpolation—and further, when we recall the fact that this verse is quoted in connection with the Incarnation by patristic writers from the time of Irenæus,²⁶ and so might have been, like the thought of the preceding Logion, current in the early Church to such a degree as to give a natural cause for its presence here under the form of a saying of Christ.²⁷

LOGION IV.

[ὅπ]ου ἐὰν ᾶσιν ε [θ]εοὶ καὶ ε . . .
 ἐστὶν μόνος . . . [τ]ὼ ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτ[οῦ] · ἔγει[ρ]ον
 τὸν λίθον κα' κεῖ εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον κα' γ'ὼ ἐκεῖ εἰμί.

²⁵ On this basis Grenfell stoutly denies a post-resurrection possibility for the Logion because of the unlikelihood of such an expression as ποτε ἢ ψυχὴ μου from Christ at such a time (*Indep.*, Sept. 23, '97). Harnack holds the same view (p. 14). It is interesting at the same time to note the expressions of rebuke which Christ used to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 25), and to Thomas (John xx. 27).

²⁶ Cf. Irenæus *Adv. Her.*, iv. 20. § 4 (*Migne* VII, p. 1034). Cyprian, *Testim.*, ii. 6. (*Migne* IV, p. 729).

²⁷ Cf. Editors, p. 12. Swete, p. 517.

The first part of this Logion, as far as it is possible to read it, has every appearance of being a substantial reproduction of Matt. xviii. 20 (*ὅτι γὰρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἕμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*).²⁰ So that we might easily understand it, in this part at least, as being, either another form of this saying, or another saying given forth at some other period of his ministry and not recorded in the Gospels. Indeed, when we take the whole Logion, such an incident as that of the ambitious request of James and John, against which Christ inculcated a spirit of service and self-sacrifice, after his own example, might have given the necessary background for such a remark as it furnishes, and Mr. Grenfell may not be wrong in calling our attention to the peculiar fitness of such a saying on the lips of one who was known as "the carpenter's son."²⁰

If, however, we adopt the conjectural restoration of the lacunæ which Swete makes and which is admitted as possible by the editors,²⁰ we would read the first part of the Logion somewhat as follows: "*Wherever all are godless (unbelievers) and there is one faithful (believing), there am I with him.*" This might very well convey the idea of Christ's presence with the believer under conditions of peculiar difficulty and trial, and would decide the cast to be given to the second part of the Logion, which, as far as the text is concerned, is fortunately complete. This second part, then, would seem to be a further assurance of Christ's presence under the more concrete difficulties of the toil and labor of daily work. To be sure, there is nothing in the Gospel teachings of Christ which this reproduces; at the same time there is nothing with which it is contradictory. We would not find it altogether difficult to understand Christ as saying this, though the definite connection of His presence with the stone and the wood, or even with the act of raising and cleaving is confessedly strange. It goes beyond the idea of Matt. xviii. 20.²¹

When, consequently, we recall such a passage as Eccl. x. 9 — *Ἐξαίρων λίθους διαπονηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς · σχίζων ξύλα κιν-*

²⁰ See references to extended form of this verse found in Ephræm. Syr. *Evang. Concord. Έρρα.*, c. 14 (Editors, p. 13). It is not found, however, in the Greek version of Ephræm made from the MSS in the Bodleian Library, 1709.

²⁰ *Independent*, Sept. 23, 1897. Cf. also Harnack, p. 21.

²⁰ pp. 13 f.

²¹ Harnack contends as strongly as Mr. Grenfell against any pantheistic meaning in our Logion (p. 18), and yet he admits a possible mysticism in it (p. 19), and lays considerable stress on the likelihood of its influence in pantheistic-gnostic directions (pp. 21, 33 f., 36).

δυνεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς, and note the same idea of moving stones and cleaving wood as in our Logion, but presented in the form of danger rather than of labor and toil, we can see how the first part of our Logion, as restored by Swete, could be intended to convey the assurance of Christ's presence with his people, in the face of the danger arising from being the only faithful one among many unbelievers, and so, how the second part of the Logion could have been suggested by this Eccl. passage, and have been intended to carry with it the idea of danger which the Old Testament passage conveys—the assurance it gives being of Christ's presence, not only in the labor and toil, but in the risks and dangers of everyday toil and work.

At the same time, even this adjustment does not remove the strangeness which lies in the definite connection of Christ's presence with the stone and the wood or with the actions gathering around them. It is still an idea which passes beyond the limits of such a passage as that with which the first part of the Logion seems to be so closely connected.

With such results from our analytic work it is clearly difficult to make definite assertions as to the origin of our Logia. The most we seem justified in saying is something as follows:

I. There is a possibility that these Logia may represent original sayings of Christ." There is, at the same time, a possibility that in part, at least, they may represent other sources and be ascribed here to Christ. As far as the analytic work goes it would seem that the latter were more likely to be the case.

II. If the latter be the case and the sources from which the unoriginal part of the sayings comes be general and varied in character (*i. e.* partly Old Testament canonical writings [Log. V], partly Old Testament apocryphal writings [Log. III], partly the general sentiment of the Church [Log. II]), then it is hard to conjecture where the motive for such a collection would lie. Perhaps the most likely purpose would have been to serve the interest of some heretical sect; but what sect is, as yet, beyond our knowledge.

III. If, however, these sources be a definite extra-canonical Gospel, from which they were taken as excerpts, then we would have a single source for the whole collection, and there would

²² This is the position of Grenfell and Rendel Harris.

be less difficulty, perhaps, as to the motive for the collecting; since it might have been done for liturgical, or catechetical, or even private use.³³ But, again, when it comes to saying what Gospel this could have been, it is not an easy thing to be certain in statement.³⁴

IV. If they represent original sayings of Christ they must have come down to this third century in which our fragment was written, through an antiquarian spirit as well as a pious interest, since, by this time, — even in Egypt, where the development of Christianity was slow — the fuller Gospels of the canon would have rendered unlikely that such a collection would have been needed — as it might have been needed when first collected.³⁵

MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS.

³³ See suggestion of James (*Contemp. Rev.*, Aug., '97, p. 157). Also of writer in *Guardian* (July 21, '97); also of Badham (*Athenæum*, Aug. 7, '97).

³⁴ Harnack holds with persistent logic to an Egyptian Gospel source, considering this Gospel, however, as derived, not from our Canonical Gospels, but from the sources from which they themselves came, and as belonging, not to heretical literature, but to the early Gospel literature, in the strictest sense of the word (pp. 27-36). Badham holds to the same source, considering this Gospel, however, a heretical production (*Athenæum*, Aug. 7, '97). If this should prove to be the source and Harnack be right in the value he places upon the Egyptian Gospel, there would be almost as much interest attaching to our fragment as though it belonged to the same stage of Gospel development as the Matthew Logia itself.

³⁵ Cf. article by Prof. Bacon, *Independ.*, July 22, '97.