# 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:

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

# The Use of the Logia of Matthew in the Gospel of Mark.

PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, NEW YORK CITY.

THE Logia of the apostle Matthew, written in the Hebrew language, according to the testimony of Papias, in the citation of Eusebius,[1] was one of the most important sources of the Gospels. Certainly a considerable portion of the Sayings of Jesus given in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke came from this source. It is still in dispute, however, whether the Logia of Matthew was used by the Gospels of Mark and John. The latter question is beyond the scope of the present inquiry, — the former is the theme of this paper.

I have changed my mind several times on this question. My original position was that Mark used the Logia. When I wrote my *Messiah of the Gospels*, in 1894, I was inclined to the opinion that he did not. After the discovery and publication of the Oxyrhynchite logia,[2] in 1897, in view of the new light cast on the problem by these, I was convinced that the present Mark used the Logia of Matthew. A fresh study of the subject has brought me to an intermediate position : namely, that the original Mark did not use them, but that those found in Mark were additions from later hands. The Gospel of Mark, in my opinion, was originally written in the Hebrew language by St. Mark, the companion of St. Peter, for Jewish Christians. It was soon afterwards translated into Greek, and additions were made from other sources. It was subsequently edited by a third hand, which gave it its present form.[3]

In this paper I shall limit my attention to the Logia. I have shown in my articles on the Wisdom of Jesus,[4] that the Logia of St. Matthew contained only the sayings of Jesus in the form of Hebrew Wisdom, and not his parables, or his discussions in the form of Hal-

[1] McGiffert's *Eusebius*, pp. 152, 153, 173.

[2] Grenfell and Hunt, *Logia of Jesus*, 1897.

[3] *New Light on the Life of Jesus*, pp. 125 *seq.*

[4] *Expository Times*, 1897; also, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 89, 90.

acha ; and that these sayings were usually introduced by the words, "Jesus said," and had only occasional brief historical allusions. The Logia of St. Matthew contained no historical narrative whatsoever. It is just these Sayings of Jesus that we are to investigate in this paper. They are all of the type of Hebrew Wisdom ; that is, like those of the Book of Proverbs, the Wisdom of Ben Sira, and the Sayings of the Fathers in the Mishna. They are Hebrew gnomic poetry, having parallelism, measured lines, and, where sufficiently long, strophical organization. They were written in Hebrew, the religious language of the Jews of the first century of our era, and not in Aramaic, which was the language of common life in a great variety of dialects, but not the language of literature or of religion in the Apostolic age.

These logia, for the most part, appear in several versions in the Gospels. We have to use the principles of textual criticism to determine their original form, namely : (1) the reading which lies at the root of all the variations, and best explains them, is to be preferred. (2) The most difficult reading is more likely to be correct, from the natural tendency of the scribe to make his text as easy and intelligible as possible, and the natural process of simplification in transmission. (3) The reading most in accordance with the context, and, especially, with the style and usage of the author and his times, is to be preferred. This is on the principle of consistency and "intrinsic probability."

This last principle is developed in the study of gnomic poetry into these subordinate principles. Those readings are to be preferred — (a) which give the best parallelism, (b) which accord with the measure of the lines, (c) which make the strophes symmetrical, (d) which accord with the gnomic language and style. With this statement of principles we may take up the logia in detail.

In inductive study the results follow the induction. It is unwise to start with a theory which may predetermine the results.

This was the method of the investigation on which this paper is based. But it seems better in presenting the study to others to state at the outset what are these results, in order that they may be tested as we proceed ; it also saves time to give the original form of each logion, in order that it may be seen how the variations originated.

(1) They that are strong have no need of a physician, but they that are sick.
      I came not to call the righteous ; but on the contrary, sinners.

אינם צריכים לרופא החזקים ׀ כי־אם החולים
לא־באתי לקרוא הצדיקים ׀ כי־אם החטאים

This is an emblematic couplet, hexameters, with the cæsura after the fourth beat in both lines. It is given in Mk. $2^{17}$ Mt. $9^{12-13}$ Lk. $5^{31-32}$, in all at Levi's farewell feast, in response to the Pharisees who charged Jesus with impropriety of conduct in eating with Publicans and sinners. This is, in all three, introduced by a formula :

> Mk.: ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς.
> Lk.: ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς.
> Mt.: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν.

The original of these variations was אמר ישוע.

The Oxyrhynchite logia all begin with λέγει Ἰησοῦς, as Mark, not εἶπεν, as Matthew and Luke.

The variations of the couplet itself are :

(a) Mark and Matthew, οἱ ἰσχύοντες, *they that are strong,* which is an exact translation of the original. Luke, ὑγιαίνοντες, is a better medical term and better Greek, indicating, therefore, intentional change.

(b) Mark and Matthew have ἦλθον, Luke ἐλήλυθα ; both translations of Hebrew pf. באתי.

(c) Luke adds the explanatory εἰς μετάνοιαν, which makes the line too long for the measure, and cannot, therefore, be original.

(d) Matthew interjects between the two lines of the couplet a citation from Ho. $6^6$, which is apt, but destroys the beauty of the couplet. It certainly was not original, but came from the editor of the present Matthew ; who, indeed, gives the same citation again, Mt. $12^7$.

Was this couplet we are considering in the original Mark as a part of the narrative, and was it derived with the narrative from him by Matthew and Luke, or do the evangelists all cite from the Logia of Matthew? The evidence of the introductory formula is dubious, because it was necessary in its connection with the narrative, and, therefore, cannot prove citation from the Logia. Two of the changes of Luke are stylistic and interpretative ; the only one that looks like independence of Mark is the use of the perfect for the aorist. On the whole, it is probable that this logion was in the original Mark, and that it was not derived from the Logia ; and that the other Gospels depend on Mark for its use here ; although Luke may also have been influenced in his version by its use in the Logia.

> (2) No one putteth a new piece of cloth on an old garment,
> For the new teareth from the old and the rent is made worse.

No one putteth new wine into old skins,
For the wine bursteth the skins and the skins perish.

No one desireth new wine, who drinketh old,
For old wine is better than new wine.

This is an emblematic saying in three hexameter couplets.

אֵין אִישׁ יִתֵּן בַּד חָדָשׁ ׀ עַל־שִׂמְלָה בָּלָה
כִּי הֶחָדָשׁ יָבֵרִית מֵהַבְּלָה ׀ וְתֵרֹעַ הַקְּרִיעָה
אֵין אִישׁ יִתֵּן יַיִן חָדָשׁ ׀ בְּנֹאדוֹת בָּלִים
כִּי יִבְקַע הַיַּיִן הַנֹּאדוֹת ׀ וְהַנֹּאדוֹת יֹאבֵדוּ
אֵין אִישׁ יַחְפֹּץ בַּיַּיִן חָדָשׁ ׀ שָׁתָה יָשָׁן
כִּי יַיִן יָשָׁן ׀ טוֹב מִיַּיִן חָדָשׁ

This logion in Matthew and Mark is without introduction. But Luke has ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολήν. This does not stand for parable in the usual New Testament sense of a prose Haggada, but for the Hebrew מָשָׁל, an emblematic gnome, as not infrequently in the Gospels. It is probable that Luke found it in his original, the Logia of Matthew. It is evident that he does not depend on Mark, for he not only has quite a different version of two of the couplets from Mark and Matthew, but he alone gives the third couplet. Matthew also differs so much from Mark that it could not have derived the logion from Mark. All three depend on the same original, the Logia of Matthew. The variations appear sufficiently in the Revised English Version:

"No man seweth a piece of undressed cloth on an old garment; else that which should fill it up taketh from it, the new from the old, and a worse rent is made.

"And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins, else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins: but (they put) new wine into fresh wine-skins." (Mk. 2²¹⁻²².)

"No man putteth a piece of undressed cloth upon an old garment; for that which should fill it up taketh from the garment, and a worse rent is made.

"Neither do (men) put new wine into old wine-skins; else the skins burst, and the wine is spilled, and the skins perish: but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins, and both are preserved." (Mt. 9¹⁶⁻¹⁷.)

"No man rendeth a piece from a new garment and putteth it upon an old garment; else he will rend the new, and also the piece from the new will not agree with the old.

"And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins, else the new wine will burst the skins, and itself will be spilled, and the skins will perish. But new wine must be put into fresh wine-skins.

"And no man having drunk old (wine) desireth new; for he saith, The old is better." (Lk. 5³⁶⁻³⁹.)

The Gospels all mingle interpretation with the original; in fact, giving us paraphrase rather than translation of their original.   The Gospels are evidently independent in their use of their source in the Logia of Matthew; but they all give the logion the same place in their Gospels.   Does this imply that they found it here in Mark, and changed it intentionally by going back to the original in the Logia? That is improbable, because Mark is, in fact, nearer to the original, in the two strophes it uses, than either of the others.   There was no sufficient reason, therefore, to leave this version and resort to the original; certainly not for Matthew, for it is difficult to see why in this case Matthew would omit the third strophe, given by Luke only. In fact, this logion, while topically appropriate where the Gospels have given it, has no real propriety there.   Jesus had sufficiently answered the Pharisees in the previous context.   The application of this logion to the question of fasting is not evident in itself.   It was more appropriate to later conceptions than to the historical circumstances in which it is placed.   It seems probable that it was not in the original Mark, but was added here for topical reasons by the Greek translator.

(3) The Sabbath is for man,
　　Not man for the Sabbath.
　　The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.   (Mk. $2^{27-28}$ Mt. $12^8$ Lk. $6^5$.)

This is composed of a trimeter antithetical couplet, with its synthetic consequence in a third line.   The original was:

השבת בטבור האדם
לאראדם בטבור השבת
בןאדם אדן השבת

The first two lines were used by Mark only.   Matthew and Luke condensed the logion into the last line.   But no logion ever consisted of a single line.   Mark and Luke have the same introduction, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς; Matthew, as usual, omits it.   This logion has no other than a topical relation to its present place in Mark.   It is possible that the others condense from Mark, or that they all use the same source, the Logia of Matthew.   We cannot determine in this case.   In the former case, the logion came from St. Peter, the authority for the original Mark.

(4) Two logia are attached by Mark, $3^{23-29}$, to the story that his friends thought Jesus was beside himself, Mk. $3^{19b-21}$, which is unknown to Matthew and Luke.   Matthew attaches the same logia

(Mt. 12²⁵⁻³²) to the healing a dumb demoniac, Mt. 12²²⁻²³; which, in accordance with Luke, is a much later event, and adds still other logia to them, Mt. 12³³⁻⁴⁵. Luke attaches the first of these logia, Lk. 11¹⁷⁻²², to the same event as Matthew, Lk. 11¹⁴, and then adds other logia to those given in Matthew, Lk. 11²³⁻³⁶; but Luke gives the second logion in another group of logia, Lk. 12¹⁰. It is evident, therefore, that these evangelists use two independent logia in connections which seem to them most suitable topically.

It is improbable that either Matthew or Luke derived them from Mark, otherwise they would have given them in connection with the same incident as Mark. It is also improbable that they were in the original Mark, otherwise Matthew or Luke would have given the incident with them. It is probable, therefore, that they were added to Mark by the second hand; and that the three evangelists use the same source, the Logia of Matthew, and use it independently.

Mark introduces the logia by the words ἐν παραβολαῖς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς. This implies that they were enigmatic משלים; and, as we have seen, this term was doubtless in the original of Matthew's Logia. It is also probable that in this case the first logion had a brief historical introduction, which appears in the three evangelists, probably in the briefer form, resembling Mk. 3²² :

"The scribes which came down from Jerusalem said: He hath Beelzebub, and, By the prince of the demons casteth he out the demons."

The original was probably three tetrastichs :

If a kingdom is divided against itself, it is brought to desolation.
If a house is divided against itself, it cannot stand.
If Satan is risen up against himself, he is divided.
If Satan is divided, his kingdom cannot stand.

If I by Beelzebub cast out demons,
By whom do your sons cast them out ?
But if I by the finger of God cast out (demons),
Then is the kingdom of God come upon you.

When the strong man in armor guardeth his court,
Then his goods are in peace in his house.
But when a stronger than he cometh and overcometh him,
He taketh his armor and divideth his spoil.

אם־ממלכה תחלק על־עצמה תחרב
אם־הבית יחלק על־עצמו לא־יכן
אם שטן יתקמם על־נפשו יחלק
אם שטן נחלק לא־יכן ממלכתו

אם־אני בבעל־זבוב מגרש שדים
במי בניכם מגרשים אתם
אם־אני באצבע אלהים מגרש
הגיעה אליכם ממלכת האלהים

בשמר חצרו גבור בנשקו
או רכושו בשלום בביתו
אם־יבוא חזק ממנו ויתקפו
ישא נשקו וחלק שללו

Luke is, throughout, nearest to the original. Matthew condenses more than Luke, but gives the three strophes. Mark omits the second strophe altogether, and condenses in other respects. Therefore, from this point of view, it is improbable that Matthew and Luke used Mark. This logion, with its introduction, came first into the Greek Mark from the Logia of Matthew, and was not in the original Hebrew Mark.

The second logion of Mark, $3^{28-29}$, has certainly only a loose, topical connection. It is separated from the previous logion, in Mt. $12^{31-32}$, only by a logion couplet, not used in Mark, but given also in Lk. $11^{23}$. But the second logion of Mark is given in Lk. $12^{10}$ in an entirely different connection. The original was probably:

> Their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men,
> And all their blasphemies wherein they blaspheme;
> But whosoever shall blaspheme against the Spirit shall not be forgiven.
> Whosoever shall speak against the Son of man shall be forgiven;
> But whosoever shall speak against the Spirit shall not be forgiven,
> Neither in this age, nor in the age that is to come.

The original Hebrew was:

חטאתם יסלחו לבנו אדם
וכל גדופדים אשר ידפו
המגדף הרוח לא יסלח
המדבר בבן אדם יסלח
המדבר ברוח לא יסלח
בעילם הזה ובעולם הבא

Matthew is much nearer the original, giving both strophes. Mark gives only the first, Luke only the second. In the first strophe, Matthew uses the term "the Spirit." The measure of the second strophe requires "the Spirit" also. But Mark uses "Holy Spirit" in the first strophe, Matthew and Luke in the second; "Holy" in

both cases being an addition of the evangelists. It is most probable that this came from the second hand rather than from Mark. Both of these logia in Mark have only topical propriety.

(5) A trimeter tristich, Mk. $3^{34\text{-}35}$ Mt. $12^{49\text{-}50}$ Lk. $8^{21}$ :

> Behold my mother and my brethren !
> For whosoever doeth the will of God,
> The same is my brother and my mother.

> הנה אמי ואחי
> העשה רצון האלהים
> הוא אחי ואמי

The first line is the same in Mark and Matthew, except that in the Greek style of the one we have ἴδε, in the other ἰδού. But Luke omits the line altogether. Mark gives the second line. Matthew changes τοῦ θεοῦ into τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, characteristic of the present Gospel of Matthew, and not of its source, the Logia. Otherwise, there is only the stylistic difference of ὅστις for ὅς. In the third line, Mark inserts καὶ ἀδελφή; so Matthew. Luke combines both lines into a prose sentence and paraphrases, omitting "sister": "My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it." All attach this logion to the same incident; and it is most appropriate there. It seems to have been derived from Mark by the others, and to have been in the original Mark.

(6) Mk. $4^{21\text{-}25}$ gives five logia between the parable of the Sower and the parable of the Seed growing secretly. They certainly did not belong there in the teaching of Jesus. They have only topical propriety; for none of them are given by Matthew in this connection. Four of them are given by Lk. $8^{16\text{-}18}$, in the same connection as Mark, but three of them also elsewhere. The remaining one is given by Luke elsewhere.

(a) vs.$^{21}$ is given by Lk. $8^{16}$, in the same connection; and, then again, $11^{33}$, in connection with another set of logia. It is also given in Mt. $5^{15}$, in still another set of logia. The original form seems to be most nearly preserved in the latter passage, though the couplets are differently distributed. They were originally two independent tetrastichs. The original was probably :

> No one, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it under an ephah;
> But putteth it on a lampstand, that they which enter in may see light,
> For nothing is hid that shall not be made manifest,
> Nor anything secret that shall not come to light.

Ye are the light of the world.
A city set on a hill cannot be hid.
So let your light shine before the children of men,
That they may see your good works and glorify your Father.

Luke, in both passages, paraphrases rather than translates. It is evident that Luke, in neither passage, uses Mark; because in both he is much nearer the original than Mark. Mark gives this logion in its most condensed form, and puts it in the form of a question: "Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel, or under the bed, and not to be put on the stand?" It is introduced, however, by καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, the usual formula introducing a logion. It is evident that the three evangelists are independent in their use of this logion. They all alike derived it from the Logia of Matthew.

(b) vs.²² is also given by Luke here, 8¹⁷, but in Lk. 12² in an entirely different context. It is given by Mt. 10²⁶ in connection with the Commission of the Twelve. The connection of Lk. 12² is most appropriate, moreover, as it is there associated with another logion, given by Mt. 10²⁷⁻³², in connection with the Commission of the Twelve. The original was probably a tetrameter tetrastich:

There is nothing covered up, that shall not be revealed;
There is nothing hid, that shall not be made known:
That which one saith in darkness, in the light shall be heard:
That which one whispereth in the ear, on the housetop shall be proclaimed.

אין מכסה אשר־לא תלה
אין נעלם אשר־לא יודע
האמר בחשך באור ישמע
הלחש באזן על־הגג יקרא

In the first two lines, Matthew and Lk. 12² are practically the same; the only difference is stylistic, the former having κεκαλυμμένον, the latter συγκεκαλυμμένον. But in Lk. 8¹⁷ the translation is entirely different:

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται,
οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ.

This more nearly resembles Mk. 4²²:

οὐ γάρ ἐστίν τι κρυπτὸν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ
οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν.

But, in fact, the differences are more than the resemblances; and, therefore, there is no good evidence of the use of Mark by Luke here.

It is strange that Luke should have given, in this, as in the pre-vious logion, two different versions of the same original, from the Logia of Matthew ; but I see no escape from the conclusion that he did so here and elsewhere. Mark and Lk. $8^{17}$ both omit the last two lines of the logion given in Mt. $10^{27}$ and Lk. $12^3$. There is an interesting difference between them which shows a variant interpreta-tion of a common Hebrew original. The ptcs. אֹמֵר and לֹחֵשׁ of the original are interpreted by Luke as referring to the disciples, "what *ye* have said," "what *ye* have spoken"; but in Matthew, as first person, referring to Jesus, "what *I* tell you," in the first clause ; in the second, "what *ye* hear." In all probability, the original was designedly indefinite, referring to neither Jesus nor his disciples par-ticularly, but to any one whatever, as I have rendered it.

(*c*) vs.$^{23-24a}$ breaks up two lines of a couplet, assigning one to the conclusion of the previous logion, and the other as an introduction to Mark's fourth logion. The latter is given by Luke here as an introduction to the last logion given by Mark in this place. The original was doubtless :

> If any one hath ears, let him hear;
> But let him take heed how he hears.

> מי־לו אזנים ישמע
> יראה מה ישמע

Mark has it :

> If any one hath ears to hear, let him hear,
> And he said unto them, Take heed what ye hear.

The formula indicates derivation from the Logia of Matthew ; but the separation of the lines is that of an editor wishing to combine the two heterogeneous logia. It is improbable that it was so in the original Mark. It is improbable that if Luke found it there he would omit the logion to which it was attached. Moreover, the first line is given in a similar form in all three evangelists at the close of the parable itself : Mk. $4^9$, introduced by καὶ ἔλεγεν ; Lk. $8^8$, ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει ; Mt. $13^9$, without introduction. It is quite possible that it originally belonged just here.

(*d*) vs.$^{24b}$ is given by Lk. $6^{38}$ Mt. $7^2$, in the Sermon on the Mount, where it properly belongs. Luke alone gives the logion in its com-pleteness :

> Judge not, and ye shall not be judged :
> Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned :

Eventually acquit, and ye shall be eventually acquitted :
Give, and it shall be given unto you in good measure ;
Full and pressed down shall it be given unto your bosom :
With what measure ye measure, it shall be measured to you.

אל תשפטו ולא תשפטו
אל תחובו ולא תחיבו
נקה תנקה והגקו הגקה
תנו ותנן מרה מזבה
מלאה כלולה תנתן אל־חוק
במרה תמדו ימד לכם

Matthew omits two lines of the first strophe and two of the second,
giving only the first of the first strophe and the last of the second
strophe. Mark gives only the last line of the second strophe, and
adds another verb to make it more emphatic. It must be evident
that these three evangelists are all independent in the use of a
common source. It is altogether improbable that this line was in
Mark when Matthew and Luke used Mark. It came into the text
from the second hand.

(e) vs.[25] is given by Lk. 8[18b], and also Mt. 13[12]. Lk. 19[26] also gives
it in connection with the parable of the Pounds, and Mt. 25[29] in
connection with the parable of the Talents, these being different
versions of the same parable.

The original was probably :

The one that hath, to him shall be given ;
The one that hath not, what he hath shall be taken.

האיש יש־לו ינתן לו
האיש אין־לו יקח אשר־לו

Lk. 19[26] is nearer the original. Mt. 25[29] paraphrases ; so does Lk.
8[18]. The form of Mk. 4[25] is so different from any of them that there
can be no dependence of Luke upon Mark here. They all use inde-
pendently the same source, the Logia of Matthew.

It is evident, therefore, that all these logia were not in the original
Mark ; but came into Mark from the Logia of Matthew by a second
hand, probably the translator.

(7) Mk. 6[4] gives a saying of Jesus in connection with his rejection
at Nazareth, which appears in the same context in Mt. 13[57], Lk.
4[24] ; and, also, in Jn. 4[44], on Jesus' journey northward, through
Samaria to Galilee, probably with Nazareth as its destination. In all
these passages only a single line is given. The other line of the

couplet is missing.   Happily, the entire couplet is given in the Oxy-
rhynchite fragments.   Jesus saith :

> A prophet is not acceptable in his own country.
> A physician works no cures upon them that know him.

אין נביא רצוי בארצו
אין רפא ירפא ידעיו

This is introduced by λέγει Ἰησοῦς, and was evidently in the col-
lection of Logia as a separate logion.   Luke is nearer to it in the use
of δεκτὸς ἐν τῇ πατρίδι ἑαυτοῦ.   Mark and Matthew use ἄτιμος ; John,
τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει.

Mark emphasizes by adding " among his own kin, and in his own
house."   Matthew adds, " and in his own house."   Luke certainly
used the logia from the collection of Logia, even if he had Mark
before him.   Matthew is so close to Mark that it looks like depend-
ence upon him.   On the whole, it seems most probable that this
logion was in the original Mark, as it is so suited to its context.

(8) Mk. 6$^{8-11}$ gives a logion in connection with the Commission of
the Twelve.   This is given in Mt. 10$^{9-14}$ Lk. 9$^{3-5}$.   It is doubtless in
its original place in Mark, and Luke used it there.   It is in a con-
densed form in Mark, when compared with Matthew, which gives it
from the Logia of Matthew with many other similar logia.

(9) Mk. 8$^{34b}$–9$^1$ gives several logia in connection with Jesus' pre-
diction of his death and resurrection, in the closing weeks of his
ministry in Galilee.   (a) vs.$^{34b}$ Mt. 16$^{24}$ Lk. 9$^{23}$, a couplet of disciple-
ship.   The original :

> If any man would come after me,
> Let him deny himself and follow me.

אישׁיכי יחפץ לבוא אחרי
יכחשׁ בנפשׁו וילך אחרי

The versions of the three may all be explained as translations of
the Hebrew Mark, and the logion was doubtless in the original Mark.
They all add καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, to which Luke adds καθ'
ἡμέραν.   The reference to cross-bearing may not be original ; it
makes the last line of the logion just these two words too long if it
be a tetrameter couplet.   It probably was derived from the logia of
the final commission, given out of place in Mt. 10$^{38}$, in connection
with the original Commission of the Twelve, and in Lk. 14$^{27}$, in con-
nection with a series of logia grouped about the warning to count the
cost of discipleship.

(*b*) vs.[35] Mt. 16[25] Lk. 9[24] Jn. 12[25] is another logion supplementary to the previous one, and may indeed be a second couplet of it. The original was:

> Whoso findeth his life shall lose it,
> But whoso loseth his life shall find it.

This is a simple antithetic couplet of the tetrameter movement, complete and perfect in itself. This was cited, Mk. 8[35], as follows:

> Whosoever would save his life shall lose it,
> And whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it.

It is evident that Mark interprets in the use of "would save" and "shall save" for "find" in the two clauses; and that it inserts "for my sake and the gospel's" in order to show that this loss of life must have a Christian motive. Furthermore, this addition destroys the measure of the line, and transforms the couplet from poetry to prose.

Mt. 16[25] is nearer the original, having "shall find it" in the second clause, instead of Mark's "shall save it." Lk. 9[24] also inserts the demonstrative, "the same shall save it."

But Matthew and Luke, in other passages, cite the logion directly from the Logia, and not mediately through Mark. Thus, Mt. 10[39] cites it exactly from the Logia; and makes no change except by inserting "for my sake" in the second clause. Lk. 17[33], however, paraphrases here, so that the most of the language is new:

> Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it,
> But whosoever shall lose (his life) shall preserve it.

It is noteworthy, however, that no additions are made to it. But the greatest change is found in the Gospel of John, 12[25]:

> He that loveth his life loseth it,
> And he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal.

The first line is simply a paraphrase; but the second line makes a long insertion as well as a paraphrase, so that nothing of the original is left but the substance of the thought. Furthermore, the antitheses of love and hate, and of this world and the life eternal, are characteristic of the author of John's Gospel, and show clearly how his mind has colored and reconstructed the logion of Jesus (*Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 69–70).

Mk. 4[35] was doubtless, in its Hebrew form, the original of the three Versions in Greek, which, appearing in the same context, differ only by amplification. The logion here is in a prosaic form, which

might well have come from the original Mark.    But the form in
which it appears in the other passages was doubtless derived from
the Logia of Matthew direct.    In other words, they found it both in
the Hebrew Mark and the Hebrew Logia.

(*c*) vs.³⁶⁻³⁷ Mt. 16²⁶ Lk. 9²⁵ give us also logia in a prose form, so
nearly alike that they may be explained as translations of the same
Hebrew sentence in the Hebrew Mark.    We might find the original
logion as follows :

> What shall a man be profited
> If he gain the world and forfeit his life ?
> What shall a man give in exchange for his life ?

If we may thus restore this triplet, it is probable that the three
logia were all parts of one logion, given by the Hebrew Mark, in a
prose form, from the teaching of St. Peter.

(*d*) vs.³⁸ Mt. 16²⁷ Lk. 9²⁶.    This logion in Mark is in a prose form,
and Luke depends upon it.    Matthew, however, omits the first two
lines, and gives a fourth line, not in the others.

The original was probably :

> Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words,
> Of him will the Son of man also be ashamed,
> When he comes in the glory of his Father with the angels.
> Then will he reward each according to his work.

> אשר יבוש ממני ומדברי
> גם בן־אדם יבוש ממנו
> בבואו בכבוד אביו והמלאכים
> אז ישלם לאיש כמעשהו

(*e*) 9¹ Mt. 16²⁸ Lk. 9²⁷ give a logion introduced by Mark and
Matthew by ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, and by Luke λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς, doubt-
less all derived from the Logia.    It is attached to the previous ones
without historic connection, and refers to an entirely different situ-
ation.    Its present position has led to serious mistakes in its inter-
pretation.    The original connection has been lost.    The original was
probably :

> Some are standing here,
> Who will not taste of death,
> Till they see the kingdom of God.

> אנשים עומדים פה
> אשר־לא יטעמו מות
> עד־ראות מלכות האלהום

Luke, in the Bezan codex, gives the logion in its simple and complete form. He does not condense the Greek Mark, who substitutes for kingdom of God "the kingdom of God coming in power." Matthew substitutes "the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

It is possible that the original Mark had the simple Hebrew logion, and that the change in Mark is due to the Greek translator; but it is most probable that all derive from the same source, the Logia of Matthew. However, they have not any of them given this logion a very appropriate place.

(10) Mk. 9[35-37] attaches two logia to the rebuke of the disciples for reasoning among themselves who should be greatest. Jesus takes a little child in his arms to point the lesson. Mark separates the two logia by the statement of his taking the little child. Lk. 9[48] gives the first of them after the second. This may be stylistic. Mt. 18[5] only uses the second; and gives another logion before it, used by Mk. 10[15] and Lk. 18[17].

(a) The first of these is given also Mt. 20[26-27] Mk. 10[43-44] in connection with the reproof of James and John, where the logion is complete and doubtless in its original place.

It is also given Mt. 23[11], in another connection, evidently out of place. Lk. 22[26] gives it also at the Lord's Supper. It is probably an addition to Mark by the second or third hand. It is also tacked on in Lk. 9[48]. The narrative is more forcible without it. We shall consider it where it belongs, Mk. 10[43-44].

(b) The original of the second logion was:

> Whosoever receiveth one of the little ones, receiveth me.
> Whosoever receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me.

<div dir="rtl">

המקבל מהקמנים מקבל אותי
המקבל אותי מקבל שלחי

</div>

This was doubtless in the Hebrew Mark. The second line is given exactly by Luke, but enlarged by Mark. It is not given at all by Matthew. The first line is enlarged by all, by the addition of "in my name." The reference to little ones is indefinite in Mark and Matthew, but definite in Luke.

(11) Mk. 9[41-50] give a series of logia, not in Luke here, doubtless, therefore, an addition to the original Mark from the Logia of Matthew. Some of them are in the parallel of Mt. 18.

(a) vs.[41] is not in either Matthew or Luke here, but is given by Mt.

10⁴², in connection with the Commission of the Twelve.    The con-
nection is not very appropriate in either case.

The original was probably :

> Whosoever giveth a cup of water to drink,
> He shall not lose his reward.

> המשקה כוס מים
> לא יאבד שכרו

It is doubtless an addition to Mark by the second hand.

(*b*) vs.⁴² = Mt. 18⁶⁻⁷.   It is given by Lk. 17¹⁻² in a better connection.
The original was probably this :

> Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling !
> It must needs be that occasions of stumbling come ;
> But woe to him through whom they come.
> Whoso causeth one of the little ones to stumble,
> It were better for him if he had a millstone about his neck,
> And that he should be sunk into the depths of the sea.

> אוי לעולם ממבשולים
> צריך יבואו מכשלים
> אוילו על ידו יבאו
> המכשיל אחד מהקטנים
> טוב־לו רחים על צוארו
> וטבע במצולית הים

Matthew gives it completely, only that Gospel transposes the
strophes to connect them better with the logion as to little children.
Luke gives all but the first line.    Mark gives only the second
strophe, and that with some modifications.    It is impossible to sup-
pose that either Luke or Matthew found this logion in the original
Mark.   They derived it from the Logia of Matthew, as did Mark of
the second hand.

(*c*) vs.⁴³⁻⁴⁷ Mt. 18⁸⁻⁹.    This beautiful tristich is given by Mt. 5²⁹⁻³⁰,
in his version of the Sermon on the Mount, but evidently out of
place.[1]

The original was :

> If thy right hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off :
> It is better for thee maimed to enter into life,
> Than to have two hands and be cast into Gehenna.

[1] *Expository Times*, June, 1897, p. 397.

> And if thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off:
> It is better for thee halt to enter into life,
> Than to have two feet and be cast into Gehenna.

> And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, cast it out:
> It is better for thee with one eye to enter into life,
> Than to have two eyes and be cast into Gehenna.

These are tetrameters. Mark is much nearer the original than Matthew in either of his versions. He must have cited it from the Logia more accurately. It was not given by Luke at all. It is suited to the previous logion, which Luke gives in a more appropriate place. It is doubtless an addition to the original Mark. Furthermore, Mk. $9^{48}$ adds a term which is characteristic of Matthew elsewhere.

($d$) vs.$^{49-50}$:

> For every one shall be salted with fire.
> Salt is good:
> But if the salt have lost its saltness,
> Wherewith will ye season it?
> Have salt in yourselves,
> And be at peace one with another.

This logion is given in Mt. $5^{13}$, in the Sermon on the Mount:

> Ye are the salt of the earth:
> But if the salt have lost its savour,
> Wherewith shall it be salted?
> It is thenceforth good for nothing,
> But to be cast out and trodden under foot of men.

It is also given by Lk. $14^{34-35}$, attached to the logion on counting the cost:

> Salt therefore is good:
> But if even the salt have lost its savour,
> Wherewith shall it be seasoned?
> It is fit neither for the land, nor for the dunghill:
> Men cast it out.

The connection of Luke is certainly most appropriate. It belongs to the Perean ministry. The introductory sentence of Mark is doubtless a seam of explanation. It could hardly have been in the original Mark. The original was probably as follows:

> Salt is good for seasoning;
> But if the salt have lost its savour,
> Wherewith shall it be salted?

It is fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill,
But to be cast out and to be trodden under foot.
Have salt in yourselves.

(12) Mk. 10$^{11-12}$ Mt. 19$^9$.

This logion is attached to the question as to divorce most naturally; it is, however, given again by Mt. 5$^{32}$, in his version of the Sermon on the Mount, and also by Lk. 16$^{18}$, in a connection where it is evidently out of place.    Both the evangelists modify the original, but in different ways.    It is probable that Matthew here depends upon Mark.[5]

(13) Mk. 10$^{14-15}$ Lk. 18$^{16-17}$ Mt. 19$^{14}$.

This section was probably derived by all from the Logia of Matthew; and it is the same incident as Mk. 9$^{33-37}$ Lk. 9$^{46-48}$ Mt. 18$^{1-5}$, derived from the original Mark.    It is, therefore, an addition to the original Mark.    There are two logia here :

And he said unto them :

1) Suffer the little children to come unto me;
   Forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.

2) Verily I say unto you:
   Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in
   no wise enter therein.

This is identical in Mark and Luke.    Matthew (19$^{14}$) omits second strophe here, but gives it in the other place, 18$^{3-4}$: "Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.    Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven."    Matthew here has two couplets, and these are quite near their original gnomic form.    Mark condenses the second under a prose sentence, and omits the first altogether.

(14) Mk. 10$^{31}$ Mt. 19$^{30}$ attached to the discourse as to the call of the rich ruler :

But many that are first shall be last;
And the last first.

This is given by Matthew again, 20$^{16}$, at the close of the parable of the Hired Servants :

So the last shall be first, and the first last.

---

[5] I have discussed it fully in *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 86 *sq.*, and it is needless to repeat it here.

It is given by Lk. 13³⁰, in connection with the parable germ of the Foolish Virgins :

> And behold, there are last which shall be first,
> And there are first which shall be last.

The logion is most complete in the version of Luke, and most appropriate there. It is tacked on in Mark, and can hardly be original.

(15) Mk. 10⁴²⁻⁴⁵ Mt. 20²⁵⁻²⁸.

This is most suitable here. But it is given by Lk. 22²⁵⁻²⁶ at the Last Supper appropriately, and again by Mk. 9³⁵ in another connection, already considered as inappropriate :

> The rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them ;
> And their great ones exercise authority over them.
> Whosoever would be great among you shall be your minister ;
> And whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant.
> The Son of Man came (not to be ministered unto but) to minister,
> And to give his life a ransom for many.

(16) Mk. 11²⁵ :

> And whensoever ye stand praying,
> Forgive, if ye have aught against any one;
> That your Father also (which is in heaven) may forgive you your trespasses.

This is not in Matthew here, and is out of place in Mark. The phrase of Matthew, " Father which is in heaven," is an evidence that the logion is not original to Mark. It is similar to Mt. 6¹⁴⁻¹⁵, in the Sermon on the Mount, and is doubtless a reference to the section in the Lord's Prayer on forgiveness.

(17) 12³⁸⁻⁴⁰ Mt. 23¹ ff. Lk. 20⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷ is doubtless in place here, and quite near the original :

> Beware of the scribes,
> Which desire to walk in long robes,
> And love salutations in the market-place,
> And chief seats in the synagogues,
> And chief places at feasts ;
> They which devour widows' houses,
> And for a pretence make long prayers ;
> These shall receive greater condemnation.

Luke copies this closely. But Matthew gives a long discourse, in which these lines appear in a different order, some of them not at all. Lk. 11⁴³ gives also :

For ye love the chief seats in the synagogues,
And the salutations in the market-places.

We have examined carefully the logia used in the Gospel of Mark.
Several couplets are given in connection with historical incidents,
which evidently were with the stories in the original Mark. Several
logia are given in a condensed or prosaic form in connection with
certain incidents where they seem to be in their original place.
None of these give evidence of derivation from the Logia of
Matthew. But the greater portion of the logia used in Mark are in
places where they have no close connection with the context. They
seem to have been added for topical reasons, and to have been
derived from the Logia of Matthew. They were not in the original
Mark ; but were added to the original Mark by the second, and, in
some instances, by the third hand.