

*THE SO-CALLED LOGIA AND THEIR RELATION  
TO THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES.*

THERE will be, no doubt, many learned papers written on the extraordinary discovery of what, at any rate, purport to be the very words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. My primary object in writing this short article is to gather together a few thoughts that have occurred to me as to their connection with the Canonical Scriptures, adding, perhaps, just one or two remarks on other subjects.

Let me remark by way of beginning that, although the editors divide the contents of their papyrus into eight Logia, it is just possible there may be only four and a half made up as follows : I., II., III.-V., VI., VII.-VIII. This is a mere matter of detail, the authority for reading λέγει Ἰησοῦς at the commencement of V., being only the two letters ει in the middle of a lacuna. As for the expression λέγει Ἰησοῦς, it is noticeable that it occurs absolutely only in the fourth Gospel (λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 11. 39, a few MSS. omitting ὁ; λέγει Ἰ., 13. 31, where some MSS. insert ὁ; Ἰησοῦς...λέγει, 19. 28). On the first of these passages we shall have something more to say later on. The expression λέγει αὐτοῖς (or, αὐτῶ, αὐτῇ) Ἰ. also seems to be much more common in the fourth Gospel than in any of the others.

We will now proceed to the examination of each λόγιον separately, adopting the enumeration of the editors.

I. It does not seem to me quite clear after all that these words can be referred with absolute certainty to Luke 6. 42. The position of ἐκβαλεῖν corresponds to its position in Matthew 7. 5; in Luke 6. 42 that position is doubtful. At the same time the last words certainly follow Luke 6., where in some MSS. the reading has been assimilated to

Matthew.<sup>1</sup> I was inclined to think at first that there was intended to be a break after ἀδελφοῦ, and that σου was not read in the MS., but what looks like a stop seems to be only a flaw in the papyrus.

II. We may call this, I think, the greatest crux of the whole document. But the key to the passage may perhaps be found in Isaiah 58., where the fast and the sabbath and their observance are both treated spiritually. It also gives us a clue towards the true reading of the text. If we can imagine that the scribe has accidentally omitted εἰς after νηστεύσητε (in cod. -αι), as he very well might, then ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε εἰς τὸν κόσμον has its parallel in construction, and its opposite in meaning in Isaiah 58. 4 (LXX.), εἰ εἰς κρίσεις καὶ μάχας νηστεύετε. The fast of Isaiah 58. 4 involved a seeking for God and His ways (58. 2), but no finding: the fast of the Logion secures a finding of the kingdom. The seeking to find is taught in Matthew 6. 33, the finding after seeking is promised Matthew 7. 7. This is also the Johannine teaching (1 S. John 2. 15-17, μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον...).

Origen, commenting upon this last passage (I. 300), speaks of those who overcome the world as living "by the heavenly altar" (παρὰ τῷ ἐν οὐρανοῖς θυσιαστηρίῳ).

If we accept the connection of this Logion with Isaiah 58., then the second half of the saying seems to be not so difficult by any means as the first. Our Lord never condemned a right keeping of the Sabbath throughout His life, so far as we know. He kept the Jewish fasts and festivals. What He did condemn was the unspiritualized keeping of them, which is what Isaiah 58. also condemns (see *vv.* 13, 14). The seeing the Father, then, corresponds to the words of the prophet: "Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." That "to see the Father" was something

<sup>1</sup> I have not quoted the authorities on either side, as they are easily to be seen in Tischendorf, and are not necessary for my immediate purpose.

which the earliest Christians desired, is shown by the words (John 14. 8), "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. . . . He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father."

III. This Logion I think looks back to John 7. 37, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink." If we want to find a connection between it and the preceding Logion, we may perhaps find it in John 7. 28, 29. The expression *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου*, when we remember that the saying of John 7. 37 was uttered in the Temple, may refer to the Jewish belief that Jerusalem and especially its temple was the "umbilicus" of the world (cf. Ezek. 5. 5). Hippolytus (*c. Hær. Noët.*, c. 17) makes a statement practically identical with that of the Logion:—*οὗτος προσελθὼν εἰς κόσμον Θεὸς ἐν σώματι ἐφανερώθη.*

What does the rest of the Logion mean? We may refer back again partly for our elucidation to Isaiah 55. so close to Isaiah 58. already quoted:—"Ho every one that thirsteth . . .," and partly to the fourth beatitude:—"Blessed are they that . . . thirst after righteousness." *μεθύοντας* admits of two renderings: (1) drunk, and then it would refer to the overwhelming pride of the Pharisees, or (2) drinking freely, *i.e.*, of the knowledge that was ready to their hand. The thirsting should have been for something else (cf. Jer. 31. LXX. 38. 25, *ὅτι ἐμέθυσα πᾶσαν ψυχὴν διψῶσαν*). The trouble of the soul of Jesus though the word *πονεῖ* does not occur is again Johannine, see 12. 27, 13. 21. I cannot find that the expression "the sons of men" ever occurs in the New Testament. It may be to let "the Son of man" stand out alone with none other having any title like Him. As for the "blind in heart" I should say that we must once more look to the fourth Gospel, John 9. 41, "Ye say, we see; therefore your sin remaineth." Is it just possible that after *αὐτῶν* the fragment went on *καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία αὐτῶν μένει*? I am afraid not.

The colotype gives no help for this, and I have not seen the papyrus.

IV. There is nothing to go upon here. One is tempted to wish that the word *πτωχείαν* might connect itself with Lam. 3. 1 (LXX.), *ἐγὼ ἀνὴρ ὁ βλέπων πτωχείαν*.

V. Prof. Harnack<sup>1</sup> seems to have correctly identified the source of the latter part of this Logion with Ecclesiastes 10. 9 (LXX.), *ἐξαίρων λίθους δαπανηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, σχίζων ξύλα κινδυνεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς*. This would imply that the power of Christ is present to those who labour in their daily toil even if it be dangerous. Before Harnack's pamphlet appeared I had been inclined to think that the words referred to the resurrection and crucifixion, including also in them a secondary reference to the raising of Lazarus (John 11. 39, *λέγει [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς Ἄρατε τὸν λίθον*), and the offering of Isaac (Gen. 22. 3, *σχίσας ξύλα*), in both of which narratives there is a Theophany recorded; but I do not feel at all sure about it now. I would compare, however, the quotation from 2 Esdras 5. 5, and its interpretation as referring to the cross in *Ep. Barn.* 12, *ὅταν ξύλον κλιθῆ καὶ ἀναστῆ καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα στάξῃ*. As to the first half of the passage I would venture to suggest that it stood: *λέγει Ἰησοῦς ὅπου ἐὰν ὦσιν οἱ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ καὶ ὅπου εἰς ἐστὶν μόνος, λέγω, Ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ*.<sup>2</sup> For the *οἱ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ* I would refer to 1 Corinthians 8. 5, and for the general run of the sentence we must again resort to the fourth Gospel, John 10. 34, 35. It is noticeable that in commenting upon 1 Corinthians 8. 5, Origen (I. 746) says: *οἶδε δὲ ὁ Λόγος θεοῦ τοὺς μὲν τινὰς λεγομένους*.

VI. The first half of this Logion, by its use of the word *δεκτός*, goes back to Luke 4. 24, rather than to Matthew 13.

<sup>1</sup> Nearly the whole of this article was written before Prof. Harnack's *Über die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu* reached England.

<sup>2</sup> There is a nice distinction drawn here by the two constructions following the word *ὅπου*.

57; Mark 6. 4; John 4. 44. The second half also refers to Luke 4. 23. The "knowing" of Christ by others is a Johannine expression (7. 28, 8. 19; though the word is *oïda*).

VII. This is a combination of Matthew 5. 14 with a recollection of the phrasing of Matthew 7. 24, 25.

What are the results to be gathered from this investigation? Two results might at first sight seem probable.

(1) The Johannine phraseology would account perhaps for the appearance of the Logia in Egypt if we consider that that Gospel is a Christianizing of the philosophy of Philo.

(2) The Logia might be imagined to have a genuine original behind them, and to have come to us with Gnostic accretions and alterations.

But I am bold enough to think that we must look elsewhere for their origin, and that we can discover a source for them which will account for most of the difficulties which surround them. I believe we have in them a fragment of perhaps some apocryphal gospel<sup>1</sup> claiming to give a sort of *procès verbal* of the indictment or evidence used at the trial of Christ before the Jewish authorities, in much the same way as the trials of the early Christians before the heathen tribunals were officially recorded. The Jewish authorities would want some justification, which might be recorded, for handing over our Lord for judgment to the representative of Cæsar. We know that the evidence was got up. "They watched Him, and sent forth spies, which feigned themselves to be righteous, that they might take hold of His speech, so as to deliver Him to the rule and to the authority of the governor" (Luke 20. 20). We know

<sup>1</sup> What apocryphal Gospel I will not venture to decide. The Gospel of Peter at any rate was known not so many miles away from the place where this fragment was discovered.

that the evidence given was not of one, but of many (Matt. 26. 59, 60; Mark 14. 55-59), and that it had reference to words, not to acts. We know that the last witnesses called at the trial misrepresented what our Lord had said, but did not actually invent charges against Him.<sup>1</sup> This fragment might then be taken to represent some of the previous evidence. We have seen how in every case there seems to be some reason for considering that it has reference to some utterances in the four canonical Gospels. It only remains to ask, Were these so-called Logia suited for this purpose? Very much so, I think. Logion 1, if the former part was quoted as accurately as the latter—it may have been misquoted—in its entirety must have irritated any self-righteous Pharisee when it came to his ears. Logion 2 was, it seems to me, introduced because of its use of the expression “the Father.” I know of no passage in the Old Testament where it is used of God the Father in the way in which our Lord used it. Isaiah 9. 6 is the only one that approaches to it. We know how our Lord’s use of the term “My Father” irritated the Jews (*i.e.*, the Jewish authorities), so that they sought the more to kill Him. I am bound, however, to confess that this is the weakest link in my chain of argument from the passages. Or, it may be that it is the spiritualising of the Sabbath that was attacked in this passage, for of course the Jews would object to that. We must then translate: If you do not make a true Sabbath of the Sabbath. The noun *σαββατισμός* is used of a spiritual Sabbath (Heb. 4. 9). If Logion 3 misrepresents John 7. 37, then we are told that after He had said the words there recorded “some of them would have taken Him.” And if its last

<sup>1</sup> The use of the present tense in the formula Ἰησοῦς λέγει might perhaps be said to weigh against this view, as if ἔλεγεν was the only possible form in such a case; but whatever view be taken of these fragments, Ἰ. λέγει must be taken as equivalent to “This is a saying of Jesus,” and in my view these were taken and testified to as specimen sayings of Jesus.

words refer to John 9. 41, then they were an answer to an objecting question of the Pharisees. Of Logion 4. we can say nothing. If I am right in my restoration of the first half of Logion 5, our Lord's words were an answer to a violent attack upon Him for blasphemy; and if Harnack is right about the second half, the scribes would be ready to attack Him for having misquoted their canonical Scriptures to suit His own purposes. The words about the prophet and the physician in Logion 6 go back to the discourse in the synagogue at Nazareth, at the end of which very violent measures were taken against our Lord. And, in conclusion, what would be likely to irritate the Pharisaic pride more than to be told that our Lord had compared His disciples—*filiī glebæ* as they most of them were, and one a publican, and all, or nearly all, of them despised Galilæans—to a city so built on a high mountain, and so firmly settled, that it could not fall or be hid? If the question is asked why they were not recorded in any of the canonical Gospels, I answer, Because they were fruitless in result, and would serve no object by being inserted; no two witnesses could agree as to what had been really said.

HENRY A. REDPATH.