

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

Paul that made Christ, but Christ that made Paul what he was. We conclude, therefore, that Christianity, instead of becoming extinct if Paul had not appeared upon the scene, would have been very much the same in substance as it is, and would have had very much the same triumphant career.

We need scarcely remark in closing that our contention in no way lessens the value of the apologetic argument derived from the conversion, life, and writings of the Apostle. The argument, indeed, remains exactly as it was before. Our line of thought only gives increased force and prominence to the evidence for Christianity that existed *before* Paul. It emphasises the fact that *before* and *aback* of Paul, and quite independent of him, there was evidence existing for Christianity so powerful as to conquer the bigoted Pharisee and persecutor, who had the means of attaining to full and first-hand knowledge of all the details. This evidence is nothing less than *Christ Himself*, who is at once the supreme evidence as well as the substance of Christianity. Our argument really removes Paul from standing in front of Christ and so far obscuring Him, and tends to bring Christ Himself directly and supremely into view, as the One who virtually speaks to us in Paul.

ALEXANDER MAIR.

THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.

To those who are interested in the early history of Christianity there probably has never been published a better sixpenny-worth than the little tract in which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt introduce us to the newly-discovered leaf of *The Sayings of Jesus*. The reproduction of the original papyrus, the introduction, the text, the translation and notes, and the general remarks are all excellent. We

may express the hope that this publication will attract subscribers to the Egyptian Exploration Fund and the Græco-Roman branch of it. A subscription of one guinea per annum to the latter will entitle the subscriber to the annual volume, which is intended to be of about 300 quarto pages, with facsimile plates of the more important papyri, under the editorship of the same two gentlemen who have produced this edition of the *Logia*.

There will no doubt be guesses in plenty as to the way in which the *lacunæ* in the papyrus ought to be filled up. Even the best guesses will be worth little, unless they are supported by some sort of confirmatory evidence. Nevertheless guessing is attractive, and even a foolish guess may suggest a clue to those who are wiser. I, therefore, venture to offer the following conjectures.

The third saying (lines 11-21 in the papyrus) runs as follows:—

- (11) ΛΕΓΕΙ Τ̄C Ε[C]ΤΗΝ
 (12) ΕΝ ΜΕCΩ ΤΟΥ ΚΟCΜΟΥ
 (13) ΚΑΙ ΕΝ CΑΡΚΕΙ ΩΦΘΗΝ
 (14) ΑΥΤΟΙC ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΟΝ ΠΑΝ
 (15) ΤΑC ΜΕΘΥΟΝΤΑC ΚΑΙ
 (16) ΟΥΔΕΝΑ ΕΥΡΟΝ ΔΕΙΨΩ̄
 (17) ΤΑ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙC ΚΑΙ ΠΟ
 (18) ΝΕΙ Η ΨΥΧΗ ΜΟΥ ΕΠΙ
 (19) ΤΟΙC ΥΙΟΙC ΤΩΝ ΑΝΩ̄Ν
 (20) ΟΤΙ ΤΥΦΛΟΙ ΕΙCΙΝ ΤΗ ΚΑΡ
 (21) ΔΙΑ ΑΥΤΩ[N] ΚΑΙ(?) . . ΒΛΕΙC(?)

“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”

After the above there is at least one line missing, possibly more than one, where the bottom of the page has been frayed away, and then there follows, at the top of the next page, the defective line—

(22) [. . .] . . [Τ]ΗΝ ΠΤΩΧΕΙΑ̅

after which another Saying begins.

Upon these two fragments the editors remark "As it is uncertain how much has been lost after line 21, line 22 may contain the end of the preceding Saying; but more probably it forms part of a distinct one."

No doubt they have reasons, which they do not give, for preferring the opinion that the two fragments belong to different Sayings. We may, however, observe that the words τυφλός and πτωχεία occurring in proximity to each other remind us of Revelation iii. 17, "and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked," and suggests that πτωχείαν may be part of the same Saying in which τυφλοί occurs. If there be only one line missing, it is possible that the connexion may have been something like the following:—

ὅτι τυφλοί εἰσιν τῇ καρ
 διά αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐ βλέπ
 ουσιν, πτωχοὶ καὶ οὐκ
 οἶδασιν τὴν πτωχείαν.

"Because they are blind in their heart, and do not see, poor, and do not know their poverty."

Even if there be two or three lines missing, it is still possible that the third Saying may have been long enough to end with πτωχείαν. To complete the third Saying and commence another would be likely to take more than two or three lines. The average length of the complete Sayings in the fragment is about seven lines.

The fifth Saying (lines 23-30 in the papyrus) runs as follows:—

- (23) [ΛΕΓ]ΕΙ [Τ̄ ΟΠ]ΟΥ ΕΑΝ ΩCIN
 (24) [. . . .]Ε[. . .] . . Θ(?)ΕΟΙ ΚΑΙ
 (25) [. .]C(?)Ο(?) . Ε[. .] ΕCΤΙΝ ΜΟΝΟC
 (26) [. .]Τ(?)Ω ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΜΕΤ ΑΥ
 (27) Τ[ΟΥ] ΕΓΕΙΡΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΛΙΘ̄
 (28) ΚΑΚΕΙ ΕΥΡΗCΕΙC ΜΕ
 (29) CΧΙCΟΝ ΤΟ ΞΥΛΟΝ ΚΑΓΩ
 (30) ΕΚΕΙ ΕΙΜΙ

“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.”

“It seems fairly certain,” Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt remark, that this saying “offers a general parallel to Matthew xviii. 20—‘For where two or three are gathered together,’ etc., though with considerable divergences. An extension of that verse which comes nearer to our passage is found in Ephraem Syr., *Evang. Concord. Expos.*, c. 14 (*v. Resch, Agrapha*, p. 295), where the important addition *ubi unus est* corresponds to *μόνος* here, and suggests that ΕΙC should be read either at the beginning of line 25 or before ΕCΤΙΝ. The meaning may then be that wherever there are several believers, or even only one, Jesus is always present.”

But it appears that the word *ἄθεοι* occurs in line 24. “The remains of the letter before ΕΟΙ are consistent with Θ only, and those of the letter preceding suit Α better than Χ or Λ, which seem to be the only alternatives.” We are therefore apparently compelled to read *ἄθεοι*. Therefore an alternative suggestion is made that “a contrast seems to be intended between the many ungodly and the one true believer: ‘Where all men else are unbelievers, if only one is (faithful), I am with him.’”

If we are to take *ἄθεος* in this sense, I venture to suggest that the passage, as it stands, without the addition of any

new thought, affords a meaning which, though perhaps somewhat unexpected, is at least quite clear, and consistent with the rest of the Saying. Is it not possible that the whole passage may have run somewhat as follows?

- (21) ΛΕΓΕΙ ΙC, ΟΠΟΥ ΕΑΝ ΩCΙΝ
 (22) [ΑΝΔΡΕC ΚΑΙ] ΑΘΕΟΙ, ΚΑΙ
 (23) [ΕΙ ΠΟΥ ΕΙC] ΕCΤΙΝ ΜΟΝΟC,
 (24) [ΛΕΓΩ] ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΜΕΤ ΑΥ
 (25) ΤΟΥ. ΕΓΕΙΡΟΝ ΤΟΝ κ.τ.λ.

This would give to the whole Saying a clear and consistent meaning, that the presence of Him, "by whom all things were made," and who "upholdeth all things by the word of His power," who "for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven," and "stood in the midst of the world," while his soul "grieved over the sons of men," is present even with the sinner and the ungodly, as He is in all creation :—

"Jesus says : Wherever there be men, even ungodly men, and even if anywhere there is one alone, I say, I am with that one. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find Me. Cleave the wood, and I am there."

But a better solution, if it be a possible one, would be to suppose *ἄθεοι* to be a predicate, and the end of a first apodosis, to insert before it the words *οὐκ εἶσιν*, which would agree with the vestiges of uncertain letters, and to suppose before these words some such word as *πιστοί, μαθηταί, προσευχόμενοι*, or such like.¹ The whole would then run : "Wherever there may be disciples (or, faithful, etc.), they are not without God, and even if there is one alone, I am with him," etc. The objection to this solution would be the difficulty of finding room for all the letters in

¹ This would agree best with the duplicate structure of the other Sayings. See below.

μαθηταί (*πιστοί*, etc.). Possibly, however, this difficulty might disappear, if any of the requisite words could be represented by an abbreviation for which there would be space in the MS. It is not easy to say from the reproduction how much space there would be. But it is said that the MS. itself is much clearer. If this solution could be adopted, it would bring us back to the first conjecture of Messrs. Hunt and Grenfell. The sense which it gives to the word *ἄθελαι* is perhaps better than that given in the last solution, or in that proposed by the editors.

We are assuming that the letters *αθελαι* in line 22 represent the word *ἄθελαι*. But perhaps this may not be so. Possibly the five letters may be the end of a longer word. If so, what can the longer word be? One thinks of the Homeric words *ζῆθελαι* and *ἡγάθελαι*, both of which were used by Christian poets or epigrammatists, though not in exactly the sense required here. Still it is hard to limit the meaning of words that had so long a life, and *καὶ δέκα ἡγάθελαι*, "even ten righteous," would make good sense in line 24 (compare Genesis xviii. 24, 26, 32). Other words that might fit in at the beginning of the line are *πέντε*, or *καὶ πέντε*, or *σύλλεκτοι*, or *προσευχή*, *προσευχόμενοι*, etc.

Desiring to escape from the "pantheistic" interpretation of the latter part of this Saying, the editors propose another possible explanation of the words, namely, "to regard them as a parallel to Matthew vii. 7, 'Ask, and it shall be given you,' and as intended to teach the effort required in order to find Christ."

With the same object in view, Mr. Grenfell is reported to have suggested, in a lecture recently delivered at Scarborough, "that the saying really involved a promise to be with the true believer, not merely in the act of worship, 'where two or three are gathered together,' but in the every-day labour of the world. It was addressed to the pessimistic mind, which regarded toil and labour as

drudgery and sorrow, and what it said was, 'Labour is not sorrow. In labour you will find Me. I am with you just as much in toil and work as in fasting and meditation and prayer. My presence may be just as real to you when you raise the stone or cleave the wood, as when you are actually engaged in worship,' and did they not think there was a peculiar dramatic fitness in the symbols used by the carpenter's son?"¹

It is hard to resist an interpretation that is put so attractively. But it can hardly be denied that it is not the interpretation which naturally occurs to us when we read the words themselves without any preconceived theory as to their origin. In the case of a document about which we know so little, our safest plan will be to take everything that it says in the simplest and most natural sense, and then to construct our theories about the authorship or origin of the document.

It is not intended by this to imply that the words in question must of necessity be taken in a pantheistic sense. They may mean no more than the words of the Psalm, which we have been accustomed to sing Sunday after Sunday without any suspicion of unorthodoxy:—

"If I climb up unto heaven, Thou art there: if I go down to hell, Thou art there also.

"If I take the wings of the morning: and remain in the uttermost parts of the sea;

"Even there also shall Thy hand lead me: and Thy right hand shall hold me."²

With regard to the relation between the fragment and the other remains of early Christian literature, the editors express the opinion that it is quite possible that the sayings "embody a tradition independent of those which have taken shape in our canonical Gospels" (p. 18). This is better

¹ *Scarborough Post*, Thursday, August 12th, 1897.

² Psalm cxxxix. (Prayer-Book Version).

than assuming that the work must have been founded on the Gospels, and then exerting our ingenuity to explain its variations from them. We have been too much in the habit of explaining everything by the historical and literary remains that have come down to us, and too ready to forget the obvious conclusions to be drawn from the preface to St. Luke's Gospel. There was much in the early days of the Church of which little or no record has reached us, as there may have been many men, teachers, thinkers, or administrators, whose names have been forgotten. One fact alone will illustrate the fragmentary nature of our knowledge of those times, that of nine or ten out of the twelve apostles whom the Master is recorded to have appointed to carry on his work and preach the Gospel to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, and to whom the traditions of later times ascribe the founding of a widely extended Church, there is not, outside of the Gospels, if we except a few words in the Acts of the Apostles, a single trace of any kind of certain historical record; and all that we know of the other two or three might be written down on two sides of a slate. This papyrus leaf from the rubbish-heap of Oxyrhynchus is like a broken branch floating up from a submerged country. A comparison of it with the canonical Gospels tends to the same conclusion that was at once suggested by the fragment of the Gospel of Peter. It is impossible to be satisfied with the supposition that either could have been concocted from one or more of the four canonical Gospels. The Gospels may have been in existence at the time when the Sayings were written out, and they may have been known to the writer of the Sayings. And if so, we have a simple explanation of the remarkable coincidence of the language of two of the Logia with the language of St. Luke's Gospel, and of other resemblances to the language of the Gospels. But the writer must have used other sources in addition to the Gospels. He cannot have been dependent upon them alone. But the other view

is simpler, that the sayings were written independently of the Gospels, and that the coincidences are due to the resemblance between two separate streams of tradition descending from the same source.

Whichever view we adopt, whether we suppose the writer of the Sayings to have had the Gospels before him or not, it would seem that the Sayings were collected before the canonical Gospels had acquired their present unique authority. Either hypothesis, therefore, suggests a comparatively early date. This, however, does not mean that we are prepared to go along with Professor Rendel Harris, who claims (*Contemporary Review*, September, 1897) that the contents of the fragment belong to the earliest age, that the sayings are, in fact, the first written record of the words that fell from the lips of Jesus, and that they represent the original source from which the canonical Gospels sprang. The arguments by which he supports this opinion do not appear to us to be convincing.¹ Nor do the Sayings themselves appear to agree with it. They are too elaborate. Such double Sayings, for example, as Nos. 6 and 7, "A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him," and, "A city built upon the top of a high hill can neither fall nor be hid," do not look like the originals from which the simpler Sayings which we find in the Gospels were derived, but seem rather to have been themselves made up by putting single Sayings together. The same duplicate structure appears also in the second Saying, "Except ye fast to the

¹ Mr. Rendel Harris makes a valuable contribution to the discussion of the subject when he shows that both parts of the saying about fasting and keeping the Sabbath may be understood spiritually, and that such an understanding of them would be consistent with a stream of Christian teaching. But when he asserts that the logion was the source from which this stream of teaching was derived, he seems to go beyond the evidence. As he himself reminds us, the roots of this spiritual view of ordinances may be traced back to the Book of Isaiah, and there is nothing to show whether the logion was an early or a late fruit of it.

world ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye keep the sabbath ye shall not see the Father"; and, if the *lacunæ* in Nos. 3 and 5 were filled up, we should probably find the duplication there also in a more complicated form. This does not look like the earliest presentation of the words of the Galilean Preacher. The condensation, the finished completeness, seem to stamp the sayings as coming from the study or the lecture hall rather than from the popular discourse in the village street or by the lake or mountain side. Of course it is possible to suppose that Jesus spoke in the style of the prophetic books. But if He did, this fragment is the first intimation that we have received of the fact, and the Sermon on the Mount is as unlike His original manner as the Johannine discourses. If the Logia be anything more than a manual composed for himself by some individual Christian with a taste for Hebrew poetry, we have now three styles of teaching attributed to Jesus—the Synoptic, the Johannine, and the style of these sayings.

The judgment of the editors is that the Sayings "were put together not later than the end of the first or the beginning of the second century" (p. 18). In reality our data seem as yet insufficient to determine either the exact date or the doctrinal character of the document.

We have followed the editors in calling the Sayings Logia. We must, however, on second thoughts, express regret that this title has been applied to them in the way that it has. To use this term as a name for the papyrus is to prejudice a controversy which has not yet been decided, though the discovery of the fragment may be an important contribution towards its settlement. The fragment is, no doubt, an answer to those who reject the notion of a collection of mere Sayings of our Lord as in itself incredible, but it does not prove that these Sayings were called *λόγια*.¹

¹ "Not to speak of the absurdity of supposing a collection of our Lord's

The editors assume off-hand that they were so called. On the first page of the Introduction they say that "the document in question is a leaf from a papyrus book containing a collection of Logia or Sayings of our Lord." It is certainly possible, or even probable, that these Sayings may have been called Logia. But there is no evidence yet that they were. When the editors say (p. 18) that "it is difficult to imagine a title better suited to a series of sayings, each introduced by the phrase λέγει Ἰησοῦς, than Logia; and the discovery strongly supports the view that in speaking of λόγια Papias and Eusebius intended some similar collection," they lay themselves open to the old reply from those who hold a different opinion about the Logia mentioned by Papias, that λόγοι would be just as suitable a title as λόγια, if not more suitable, and that, for all we know to the contrary, the Sayings may have been called λόγοι by the writer. If there be any truth in the interesting supposition of Mr. Rendel Harris, that the recurring formula, "Remember the words (τῶν λόγων) of the Lord Jesus, how He Himself said" (Acts xx. 35, etc.), refers to some such collection of Sayings as that to which the discovered leaf belonged (*Contemporary Review*, Sept., 1897), it would afford an argument to those who think that λόγοι would be the more likely title.

JOHN A. CROSS.

Sayings to have been made without any history of the occasions on which they were spoken, λόγια is one word, λόγοι is another. . . . Philo quotes as a λόγιον . . . the narrative in Genesis iv. 15."—Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament* (Fourth Edition), pp. 98, 99.