

THE FOURTH OXYRHYNCHUS SAYING.

λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς·

[πὰν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσ]θεν τῆς ὄψεώς σου,
καὶ [τὸ κεκρυμμένον] ἀπὸ σου ἀποκαλυφ(θ)ήσεται[αί σου
οὐ γὰρ ἐσ]τιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανε[ρὸν γενήσεται,]
καὶ τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται].

The above text, as restored by the discoverers, is final in every essential. There are only two slight textual points to be noticed. In the final clause Grenfell and Hunt suggest ο[ὐ γνωσθήσεται] as an alternative to their own reading given above, but few will hesitate to prefer the stronger verb as the more satisfying. One might, perhaps, suggest that *κεκαλυμμένον* be read as an alternative to *κεκρυμμένον* in the second clause. Compare Matt. x 26, Luke xii 2.

The latter half of the Saying has parallels in all the Synoptics, and these passages may be divided into two groups :—

- I (a) οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ τι κρυπτὸν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῆ,
οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ' ἵνα εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ. (Mark iv 22.)
(b) οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται,
οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῆ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ.
(Luke viii 17.)
- II. (a) οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται,
καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. (Matt. x 26.)
(b) οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται,
καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. (Luke xii 2.)

In the first group, where Luke is clearly borrowing from Mark, the Saying occurs as one of a series of disconnected *logoi*, and is therefore without context. We find it in the second group as part of the Charge to the Twelve (Matt. x 5), or to the Seventy (Luke x 1), though the third evangelist defers some of the most characteristic matter—including the parallel to the present Saying—to ch. xii.

We may conclude that our authorities for the Saying in its twofold form are Mark (Group I) and Q (Group II).¹ Whether the latter owes its context to the ingenuity of an editor or no is a matter which must be passed over here. The question before us is the relationship of Saying iv to this double tradition.

Grenfell and Hunt considered it to agree with Matthew and Luke (Group II) in general arrangement, but with Mark in the language of the first clause of the second half. Elsewhere, in the *Logia* of 1897 as in the *Sayings* of 1903, the influence of Mark is very slight, if indeed it

¹ Cf. Hawkins *Hor. Synopt.* p. 82.

exists, while that of Matthew and Luke is strongly marked. Now the first clause of the second half of Saying iv coincides word for word with the Lucan parallel in Group I, and it therefore seems likely that Mark must be left out of the matter. On the other side, the relationship between the Saying and Group II seems to extend beyond arrangement. ἀποκαλυφθήσεται is peculiar to the Q version, and this suggests that another Q word, κεκαλυμμένον, should be read in place of κερυμμένον, as already noted. I think, therefore, that it may be claimed that the Saying is dependent partly upon the Q tradition, partly upon the Lucan version of Mark's tradition.

This, together with the novel first and fourth clauses, calls for explanation. What has happened to form the Saying seems to be as follows. The final clause either grew up naturally, or (as is more likely in view of the dependence of the third clause upon Luke viii) was deliberately substituted for that of the version of Group I. This Saying was contaminated with the form of Group II, and its first clause superseded the second clause of Group II, which it closely resembles. In consequence, the first clause of Group II was pushed out of the parallelism, but was retained by prefixing a totally new first clause. It is significant that this clause contains the Johannine word ὄψις.

Is Saying iv an extract? If so, in view of its relationship to Group II, we must assign it to a version of the Charge to the Apostles (or to the Seventy), though the final clause indicates that the immediate connexion must have been other than Synoptic. The *Introduction* to the Sayings has been put forward as fatal to theories of extraction, for with what face could an excerptor offer his pillage from known Gospels as a Collection based upon the authority of Thomas? This objection is insuperable if its premisses are sound, but there are reasons which lead one to believe that Thomas was not claimed as an authority for the Sayings by the author of the *Introduction*, but was only casually mentioned.¹ Relying on those reasons I venture to treat this matter as still open.

The use of the second person singular in this Saying is remarkable. In the first place it gives a precision and directness which an independent *logos* would hardly be likely to preserve. This in itself creates a presumption that what we have here is an extract. Secondly, no Synoptist represents the Saying as addressed to an individual. If we can find a version of the Charge in which an individual is addressed, it will be almost certain that the Saying is extracted from such a version, and we may possibly find out its place of origin. Now the author of the pseudo-Clementine epistle (§ 5) has a fragment of the Charge. (λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος.) *Ἔσεσθε ὡς ἄρνια ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. ἀποκριθεὶς

¹ See my note, *J.T.S.* xiii p. 75.

δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· Ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία ; εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά, καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φόβεισθε τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυνάμενος ποιεῖν· ἀλλὰ φοβείσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός. In this citation from an unnamed Gospel we have the monologue broken by an interlocutor—St Peter. May not our Saying have been in answer to another question? I will venture to suggest what this may have been.

A noteworthy deviation from the Synoptic version in the Clementine passage is the oxymoron, 'those that kill you, *and can do nothing to you*'. We shall see presently that the question put by St Peter is a rhetorical trick to give variety. And the oxymoron may be intended to lead up to another question, which would have been somewhat as follows: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος λέγει· Κύριε, πῶς λέγεις τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ἡμᾶς μηδὲν ἡμῖν δυνάσθαι ποιεῖν ; The reply to such a question might well be in the form of our Saying: 'You do not understand this now,¹ but later it will become clear, for that which is hidden shall be revealed, *and that which is buried shall be raised up.*' The striking fourth clause becomes very apt in such a context.

If, then, the Saying is a fragment from the Gospel used by pseudo-Clement, what was this Gospel? Lightfoot and Harnack have assigned all pseudo-Clement's citations to the Egyptian Gospel. The main ground for so doing is that one of them appears to belong to the Salome dialogue which is quoted by Clement of Alexandria from that Gospel. This may be so, though the Egyptian Gospel need not have been the sole record of the material contained in that dialogue.² But if pseudo-Clement used this Gospel once, the fact does not prove that he used no other; indeed, it would be hard to find a more complete contrast than that between the Salome dialogue on the one hand, and the remaining Clementine citations on the other. Let us recall that these last are Synoptic in character and of the type of the first and third Gospels. What little we actually know of the Egyptian Gospel does not accord with this.³

Now the pseudo-Clementine fragment of the Mission Charge shews a peculiar rhetorical structure. It commences with an abrupt statement: 'Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves.' In its brevity and obvious incompleteness this is surely designed to lead on to the question which follows—a question, however, which is not particularly intelligent. This put, the monologue precedes by way of formal reply. The

¹ Cf. John xiii 7.

² e. g. the Saying about 'trampling on the Garment of Shame' occurs in the Oxyrhynchus Gospel fragment (*Ox. Pap.* iv 655).

³ Batiffol *Revue Biblique*, 1897, pp. 513-515.

arrangement—there is not likely to be any historical foundation—seems intended to substitute a kind of dramatic variety for monologue. Surely this rhetorical structure will serve as a clue to the source of the passage if we can find a parallel. Happily such a parallel is extant. Jerome¹ cites the following from an apocryphal Gospel: ‘Si peccauerit, inquit, frater tuus in uerbo et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum. Dixit illi Simon discipulus eius: Septies in die? Respondit dominus et dixit ei: Etiam ego dico tibi usque septuagies septies.’ I think it will hardly be doubted that the correspondence in rhetorical form between this excerpt and that of pseudo-Clement points to a single source for both. Jerome refers the passage he quotes to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and I would therefore suggest this book as the authority for the Mission Charge fragment in pseudo-Clement.²

At the commencement of this note reason was shewn for seeing the influence of Matthew and Luke on the fourth Saying, and later we recalled that pseudo-Clement’s citations are Synoptic and have this same colouring. The Mission Charge fragment is certainly Matthean in the connected form it gives to that address: there is no unmistakable sign of Lucan influence, though ἀπρία suggests the Third rather than the First Gospel. But Jerome’s citation, like those of Clement, is Synoptic and shews the influence of Luke in the words *in die* (xvii 4), while *septuagies septies* is due to Matthew (xviii 21, 22).³ Indeed, the other fragments of the Hebrew Gospel mostly shew strong correspondence with both Matthew and Luke.

Our position is then as follows. (1) Saying iv, by its use of the second person singular, is so far extra-synoptic, and a parallel can be found only in pseudo-Clement’s Mission Charge. (2) This citation is remarkable in style, and in this regard finds a parallel in a known fragment from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. (3) The Saying on the one part, and the apocryphal excerpts with which we are here concerned—not to mention the greater number of the fragments of the Hebrews’ Gospel—on the other, have an identical relation to the Synoptists.

Since M. Batiffol in 1897 attributed the *Logia* fragment to the Gospel in question, we have gained the weighty evidence of Saying i, but this is not the place to discuss either that or any more general considerations on this side. I limit myself in this note to stating reasons which, if they will hold together, seem to lead back to the source of the fourth Saying.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

¹ *C. Pelag.* iii 2.

² In Jerome’s citation we have *dominus* (κύριος) while Clement’s fragment uses Ἰησοῦς. Yet this is not a serious obstacle: Luke uses Ἰησοῦς, but also uses Κύριος. See x 1, 39-41; xi 39; xii 42; xiii 15; xvii 5.

³ Cf. Adeney *Hibbert Journal* iii 154.