

THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED SAYINGS OF
JESUS. BY PROFESSOR ADOLF HARNACK,
BERLIN.

(Authorised Translation.)

II.

THE LOGIA AND THE GOSPEL OF THE EGYPTIANS.

WE may now give a translation of the Sayings :—

1. . . . *And then see clearly to draw out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.*

2. *Jesus saith : Except ye fast in regard to the world, ye shall not find the kingdom of God ; and except ye keep the Sabbath rightly, ye shall not behold the Father.*

3. *Jesus saith : I stepped into the midst of the world, and in the flesh appeared I unto them, and I found them all drunken, and I found no one among them thirsting, and My soul is sore troubled ("suffereth") for the children of men, because they are blind in their hearts (and see not) . . . the poverty.*

4. *Jesus saith : Wheresoever they may be, there are they not without God, and according as one is alone, in the same way am I with him ; raise (lift) up the stone, and there shalt thou find Me ; split the wood, and I am there.*

5. *Jesus saith : A prophet is not welcome in his own city, neither doth a physician work cures on them that know him.*

6. *Jesus saith : A city which is built and firmly founded on the top of a high hill can neither fall nor be hid.*

7. *Jesus saith : Thou hearest (or, hear).*

In the first place, we can say definitely what this fragment is not.

1. It is no survival of that original Gospel, consisting chiefly of words of the Lord, which has been justly assumed as a main source of Matthew and Luke. The third Saying, for example, with its introduction, *ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄφθην αὐτοῖς*, forbids such a supposition. For our Matthew and Luke could not have retained the type they display if their main source had introduced Jesus speaking as He does here.

2. Our fragment is, further, no part of the Papiian collection of the Lord's sayings. For such a collection Papias never formed. Rather did he take the Gospels as the foundation of his exegetical work, and it was only for the *illustration* of evangelic sayings that he used in the proper place traditions or sayings of the Lord which were current either orally or in writing.

3. Neither is our fragment a portion of, or an extract from, a Gnostic Gospel. For it contains nothing of a Gnostic character, in the sense of Dualism, Docetism, or Pantheism, neither does it point in this direction. It is true we do not know a case in early Christian, but non-Gnostic Gospels, in which Christ is made to assert His own Divine nature in this particular way. But a Gospel cannot be called Gnostic simply because of this feature.

4. Our fragment, as it stands, is not, (or, at any rate, most probably is not), a leaf torn out of any Gospel. But it is an excerpt from a writing of that kind made with intention, that is to say, with a well-defined purpose. Against the supposition that it is a leaf torn out of a Gospel we have the following considerations: (*a*) the complete want of connection between the Sayings; it is simply impossible to discover any inward principle in their combination; the Sayings are neither very difficult, and therefore

requiring interpretation, nor can their "picturesque force" be regarded as a bond of connection. If, however, we recall the fact that in Luke (and even in Matthew) several verse-groups may be found which are likewise without any interdependence, then we have to remark (b) that in the fragment before us *each* Saying is introduced by the impressive *Λέγει Ἰησοῦς*. But such an introduction would be more than surprising if we had before us a fragment of a Gospel. Finally (c), the fourth Saying shows clearly that it is taken from a larger context; for we have to supply the fact that the Lord is here speaking of His disciples.¹

If it be shown from these considerations that the fragment is a collection of extracts (and, accordingly, not an unaltered fragment of a particular collection of apophthegms), on the other hand, there is no proof for the assumption that it was penned for merely private or scholarly purposes. The solemn repetition of *Λέγει Ἰησοῦς* before (or, ? after) each Saying is not usually employed in Greek collections of apophthegms, or *catenæ*; in these it would run (τοῦ) Ἰησοῦ or τοῦ αὐτοῦ: λέγει Ἰησοῦς, on the other hand, points to the Semitic manner. The phrase, therefore, cannot well be explained otherwise than by supposing that the collection was intended for public use. Further, our MS. has the appearance of a copy, rather than of an autograph, of such a collection.²

5. If our fragment is a collection of extracts, it is further certain that they have not been extracted out of the canonical Gospels. Such a supposition would be possible only in the case of the first Saying; all the others forbid it. Now it is certainly possible that the Sayings were brought to-

¹ In the other cases also there is no indication of the occasion; this cannot be primary; the compiler was concerned only with the Saying, and he left out the occasion.

² The simple Ἰησοῦς is moreover a sign of great antiquity; in quotations of the second century ὁ κύριος is commonly used.

gether from different sources, but the idea is not probable. For Sayings 2-4 have nothing whatever to do with the canonical Gospels in their general scope, though in a free way they recall certain of their phrases. The fifth and sixth Sayings come very close to the Gospels, and yet cannot have been directly drawn from them, while the first Saying, in so far as it is preserved, is identical with Luke 6. 42. This being the situation, we must bear in mind that the three new Sayings are not indeed without any internal connection (thus each of the three contains points of relation with the fourth Gospel¹); further, that while the sixth recalls Matthew with a reminiscence of Luke, the fifth recalls Luke with a reminiscence of Matthew, and the seventh is wholly Lucan; and lastly that in the third we actually find an expression which appears only in Mark. Bearing all this in mind, it appears most probable that the fragment is a collection of extracts out of a single Gospel, which belongs, at least in regard to its ground-work, to the Synoptic tradition, whether it were an independent stem or a dependent branch.

If this hypothesis, (namely, that we have here to do with extracts out of a single Gospel, not Gnostic, but related to our canonical Gospels,) must be held to be well founded and the most probable one, then we have no great choice before us. If, that is to say, we remember that this Papyrus comes from Egypt, that it belongs to the third century (according to the editors, to the very beginning of that century), and to all appearance is not the autograph, so that its original may be considerably older than itself, then every one who knows will grant that only the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Gospel of Peter can be thought of.²

¹ In the first, *κόσμος* and *ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα*; in the second, *ἐν σαρκὶ ὄφθη* and *διψῶντα*; in the third, the parallelism of *οὐκ ἄθεοι* and *ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ*.

² The Gospel of the Hebrews is excluded by Saying 2 (allegorical application of the Sabbath-commandment) and by Saying 3 (spiritualising Christology).

The only reason why the latter need even be thought of is because we have recently recovered a fragment of it from Egypt, and because it is known to Origen. But we do not know where Origen made acquaintance with it, and the fragment in question belongs to the eighth century at the earliest. How much literary interchange took place before that time! On the other hand, the Gospel of the Egyptians is variously attested for Egypt for the period from A.D. 160 downwards.

The editors were, therefore, quite right in thinking first of all of this Gospel; indeed they laid hold of this hypothesis with a certain confidence, from which one might have expected that they would adhere to it.¹ But, whether they have not weighed with sufficient care what is known about the Gospel of the Egyptians, or whether they did not wish to anticipate and exclude other more attractive hypotheses, they have allowed the Gospel of the Egyptians to drop, or at least to sink to the position of one possibility amongst many.

If, however, we carefully combine all that we know of the Gospel of the Egyptians, the supposition that this fragment has been extracted from it can be raised to a very considerable degree of probability. Why and for what purpose the extracts were made, cannot be quite clearly made out. But if we bear in mind that the Sayings here extracted are different from the canonical ones² or else entirely new, and if we consider further that the Gospel of the Egyptians must have corresponded in great parts of it with our Canonical Gospels (see below), then it is natural

¹ P. 16: "Taking 140 A.D. as the *terminus ad quem*, and postponing for the present the question of the *terminus a quo*, we proceed to consider the possibility, which the provenance of the papyrus naturally suggests, that our fragment may come from the 'Gospel according to the Egyptians.'"

² There is nothing to prevent the supposition that the first Saying, of which only the conclusion identical with Luke is preserved, did *not* correspond with the Synoptics in the beginning or in the middle.

to suppose that here we have extracted from that Gospel such Sayings as are not found in the canonical ones, but seemed to the compiler both trustworthy and valuable.

The Gospel of the Egyptians has been discussed by me at length in the *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, vol. i., pp. 612-622; I collect here the results of these investigations.

(1) The name *Εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Αἰγυπτίους* is used by the Naassenes in Hippolytus, by Clement, Origen and Epiphanius (or by his sources). It is the title of a book, and arose in Egypt itself. This Gospel never had an author's name prefixed to it.

(2) The title cannot be without some relation to the book, *Εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*, which also was read in Egypt at a very early period, probably received this title there, and also bore no author's name.

(3) If the Christians in Egypt (not heretics) at one time possessed two Gospels, one of which they called *καθ' Ἑβραίους* and the other *κατ' Αἰγυπτίους*, that shows that they possessed them *before* the canonical Gospels which were furnished with the names of Apostolic authors. For such Gospels would not have been able either to force their way into circulation or to establish themselves alongside of Gospels bearing the names of Apostles. On the contrary the former would of necessity give way gradually before the canonical Gospels, as is proved to this day by the historical evidence.

(4) The Gospel of the Egyptians was used (a) by Theodotus, the Egyptian pupil of Valentinus (apparently alongside of the Canonical Gospels); (b) by the Egyptian "Encratites," whose leader and literary representative, Cassian, appeals of preference to a passage in this Gospel (the Encratites, however, were not originally a sect, but a School within the Church which became a sect by a gradual

process of exclusion on the part of the Church); (c) by the Roman Bishop Soter, the author of the so-called Second Epistle of Clement, who made copious use of this Gospel (probably along with the Synoptics) about A.D. 170. This shows that the Gospel was neither heretical nor Gnostic. For otherwise its character would certainly have been detected at Rome in 170. It further shows that the Gospels must have enjoyed great respect and no inconsiderable circulation, since it had come as far as Rome and was there reckoned among the evangelic writings used in public worship.¹ This position, it is true, it had to surrender after a few years in favour of the *τετράμορφον*, which no longer permitted the existence of anything of an evangelic character alongside of itself. It was further used (d) by the Naassenes (where? perhaps in Egypt); (e) by the Sabellians in the Pentapolis, who favoured it because of its modalism (the Sabellians were originally not a heretical sect, but representatives of a particular Christological doctrine within the Church); (f) by Clement of Alexandria, who indeed expressly remarks that this Gospel does not stand in line with "the four Gospels handed down to us by tradition," but at the same time held it to be trustworthy, upheld it even in regard to a particularly curious Pericope, and defended it against the charge of essential Encratism; (g) by Origen, who reckoned it among the false Gospels, the list of which he heads with this one. The history of the book, which at this point disappears without a trace from the ecclesiastical field of view, lies so

¹ The comparative modalism of the Gospel (see below) would be found objectionable least of all in Rome, and a community which read Hermas, *Simil. I.*, as a prophetic announcement could not yet, even in 170, take umbrage at the Encratism of the book (see below). That the book was read at Rome under the title of the Gospel of the Egyptians is *a priori* improbable. This name must have been given to it in Egypt, because it was used there, not by the Jewish Christians, who read the Gospel of the Hebrews, but by the Coptic Gentile-Christians as their Gospel.

clearly before us in the above chain of witnesses, that there is no necessity to display it. That the Gospel was used by heretics amongst others, is naturally no proof of its heretical character. For the Canonical Gospels also were diligently used, and regarded as sacred, by Gnostics.

(5) It follows from its history that the Gospel of the Egyptians cannot have come into existence later than the first third of the second century. The *terminus a quo*, however, remains uncertain.

(6) Concerning the contents of the Gospel we have the following information :—

(i.) The Sayings to be immediately adduced, which have come down to us as part of its contents, show that it was in general of a Synoptic character, and bore the Synoptic stamp in both form and contents, and, indeed, that *it corresponded more closely now with Matthew and now with Luke*. It is impossible to say that it stood nearer to the one than to the other.

(ii.) In its Christology, however, it not only followed the higher spiritualising form (in distinction to the Synoptists but in harmony with John); but there must also have been passages in it which could be understood in a distinctly modalist sense; for the Sabellians appealed to this Gospel in support of their doctrine that Father, Son, and Spirit were the same.¹

(iii.) Epiphanius (or his authority), who relates this, relates also that in this Gospel *πολλὰ τοιαῦτα* (*i.e.* such as modalism) *ὡς ἐν παραβύστω* (*i.e.* not belonging to the main character of the book, which was Synoptic; see above) *μυστηριωδῶς* (*i.e.* not in mere dry statements) *ἐκ τοῦ*

¹ From Epiph., *Hær.* 62. 2, it may be inferred with probability that the Saying *οἱ δύο ἐν ἑσμεν* was found in the Gospel of the Egyptians. This Saying has escaped even the wide scope of Resch's search. It is moreover curious that among the fragments of the Gospel of the Egyptians which have come down to us, we actually find *ἔσται* (*γενήσεται*) *τὰ δύο ἐν* as a Saying of the Lord, though in a quite different connection, and with a future tense, which is to be noted.

προσώπου τοῦ σωτήρος (*i.e.* in the form of a word of the Lord, not as a reflection of the writer) ἀναφέρεται: and particularly that modalism was contained in it in the form of Sayings of the Lord (? a Saying of the Lord), in fact, αὐτοῦ δηλοῦντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

(iv.) Hippolytus relates that the Naassenes based their speculations about the soul on the Gospel of the Egyptians, though he does not say in what way they did so. We know well enough, however, *e.g.* from Irenæus, how much the Gnostics discovered in Sayings of the Lord.

(v.) The old and once influential party of the Encratites continued to use this Gospel in Egypt after the Church had dropped it. It follows that it was of a character to give support to Encratism. This is further confirmed by a remarkable passage in the book which has been preserved. But the fact that Cassian and Theodotus emphasized this passage only, further, that Soter also made use of it (certainly of that half of it which is less open to suspicion), and yet again that Clement, who had no Encratite leanings whatever, defended both this passage and the whole book against the charge of extreme Encratism,—these facts show that the Gospel cannot have been written with the purpose of propagating such Encratism, but that the preaching of abstinence, even of the most extreme kind, must have been but one of its elements, though it may have been a very important one. But this is also *one* of the elements, and, in my judgment, a very important one, in the Sayings of the Lord in Luke, however true it may be that the emphasis laid on abstinence in *one* passage in the Gospel of the Egyptians is peculiar, and goes beyond the limit of Luke. But how many single points are there to be found in the Synoptic Gospels which are peculiar, and would, if they turned up on a sheet of papyrus to-day, be unhesitatingly rejected by thorough-going disciples of Matthew and Luke!

The following Sayings from the Gospel of the Egyptians have been preserved : ¹—

(1) *Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος· Ἐὰν ἦτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου καὶ μὴ ποιῆτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ, ἐργάται ἀνομίας* (II. Clem. 4. 5). The introduction is quite new; the second half is more closely related to Luke 13. 27 than to Matt. 7. 23.

(2) *Λέγει ὁ κύριος· Ἔσσεσθε ὡς ἄρνια ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· Ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἄρνια; Εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· Μὴ φοβεῖσθωσαν τὰ ἄρνια τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά. καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτένοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός* (II. Clem. 5. 2 f.). A Saying of the Lord not otherwise known. It is in part related to Matt. 10. 28 (Luke 12. 4, 5), and corresponds at the beginning with Luke 10. 3.

(3) *Λέγει ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· Εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτε ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς ἐστίν* (II. Clem. 8. 5). A Saying that is not found in the Gospels, but corresponds partly with Luke 16. 10 and Matt. 25. 21–23.

(4) *Τῇ Σαλώμῃ πυνθανομένη, μέχρι ποτε θάνατος ἰσχύσει, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος· Μέχρις ἂν ὑμεῖς αἱ γυναῖκες τίκετε· ἦλθον γὰρ καταλύσαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας. Καὶ ἡ Σαλώμη ἔφη αὐτῷ· Καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα; Ὁ δὲ κύριος ἡμείψατο λέγων· Πᾶσαν φάγε βοτάνην, τὴν δὲ πικρίαν ἔχουσαν μὴ φάγῃς. Πυνθανομένης δὲ τῆς Σαλώμης ποτε γνωσθήσεται τὰ*

¹ Of the eleven evangelic quotations in the Second Epistle of Clement there are three which I do not claim for our Gospel (c. 2. 4; 6. 1; 6. 2), seeing that they correspond word for word with Matt. 9. 13 (Mark 2. 17), Luke 16. 13, and Matt. 16. 26 (Mark 8. 36). And yet there must remain at least the possibility that they belong to the Gospel of the Egyptians. But I take in the four quotations in c. 3. 2; 4. 2; 9. 11; 13. 4 because of the distinct balance of probability that they are cited from this Gospel.

περὶ ὧν ἤρετο (*i.e.*, when the Kingdom of God shall come), ἔφη ὁ κύριος· "Ὅταν οὖν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε, καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἔν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ (Cassian in Clement, Theodotus in Clement, Clement himself, Soter). The conversation cannot be restored with entire certainty; ¹ it is wholly new.

(5) Λέγει καὶ αὐτός· Τὸν ὁμολογήσαντά με, ὁμολογήσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου (II. Clem. 3. 2). This Saying is closely related to Matt. 10. 32 (Luke 12. 8).

(6) Λέγει· Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, κύριε, κύριε, σωθήσεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην (II. Clem. 4. 2). This Saying is related to Matt. 7. 21 (Luke 6. 46).

(7) Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος· Ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου (II. Clem. 9. 11). This Saying is related to Matt. 12. 49 (Mark 3. 35) and Luke 8. 21).

(8) Λέγει ὁ θεός·² Οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς (II. Clem. 13. 4). This Saying has an echo of Luke 6. 32, 35.

Such is the amount of our knowledge of the Gospel of the Egyptians up to the present. Let us now compare with these results the Sayings before us:—

(1) It has been already remarked above that, on external grounds, their origin is first of all to be sought for in the Gospel of the Egyptians.

(2) Like the Gospel of the Egyptians, these Sayings bear in general the Synoptic stamp (see the Commentary).

(3) Although only six Sayings have been preserved, we may say that their relation to Luke and Matthew is precisely the same as that of the extant Sayings from the

¹ Soter (II. Clem. 12. 2) gives the following from this conversation: 'Ἐπερωτηθεὶς αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπὸ τίνος· Πότε ἔξει (αὐτοῦ) ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν· "Ὅταν ἴσται τὰ δύο ἔν, καὶ τὸ ἕξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ . . . : ταῦτα ὑμῶν ποιοῦντων ἐλεύσεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ πατρός μου.

² This striking formula of quotation is very readily explained by the character of the Gospel of the Egyptians leaning towards modalism.

Gospel of the Egyptians. They stand in closer relation now to the one Gospel and now to the other.

(4) The Gospel of the Egyptians was a special favourite of the Encratites in Egypt, and they held fast to it even after the Church had excluded it from the sacred writings. These Sayings contain one distinctly Encratite passage (*ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον*), and one which is rigorously severe in its judgment on mankind (*ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου . . . καὶ εὗρον πάντα μεθύοντας*).

(5) The Gospel of the Egyptians contained a Christology of a higher spiritualising kind, which indeed came near to Modalism, and that not in the form of reflections by the author, but of Sayings of the Lord (*αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δηλοῦντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα, κτλ.* In our Sayings Jesus Himself says to the disciples: *ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄφθην αὐτοῖς*, and thereby indirectly describes Himself as a Divine Being. But still further, the fourth Saying expresses a complete parallel between "to be with God" and "to be with Him, Christ." There we have a passage which can be very readily expounded in a modalist sense. But seeing that, according to the testimony of Epiphanius, the Lord expressed His own witness to Himself in the Gospel of the Egyptians in such a way as to emphasise the closest unity with the Father, we must be prepared to find that the Gospel stands related on one side to the Gospel of John, although at the same time a literary dependence on that Gospel is not necessarily to be assumed. Now in these Sayings—not in those of the Gospel of the Egyptians hitherto known—we find the idea of the *κόσμος* as the combination of all that which men are to deny themselves; we find the phrase *οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα*, the phrase *ἐν σαρκὶ ὄφθην αὐτοῖς*, the pregnant expression *ἐγὼ εἶμι μετ' αὐτοῦ*, and the word *διψῶντα*.

(6) Epiphanius says that in the Gospel of the Egyptians were contained *πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ὡς ἐν παραβύσῳ μυστηριωδῶς*

ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ σωτήρος. In the fragments previously known to us we have a sufficient proof of this in the dialogue between the Lord and Salome. But a sentence like that in our Sayings, ἔγειρον [ἐξἄρον] τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκεί εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμί could be understood—especially in the third and fourth centuries—only in a mystical sense, and was bound to lead to very suspicious conclusions. For who at that time was likely to suppose that Christ could have spoken quite simply of hard and solitary daily toil? And that other Saying, ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, must very early have led speculative minds into speculative errors; while σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον is also said μυστηριωδῶς.

In all their assignable relations, therefore, these six Sayings agree with what we know of the Gospel of the Egyptians, and nowhere is there any sign of a discrepancy. Hence it appears to be almost a precept of historical criticism: *the new Sayings are extracts from the Gospel of the Egyptians*. For it cannot be supposed that any other Gospel still unknown to us, from which the Logia might have been derived, corresponded so closely with the Gospel of the Egyptians.

If anyone glances over the Sayings from the Gospel of the Egyptians, previously discovered, and these new Sayings too, he cannot feel any doubt that, in spite of all divergences, there is here a very close relation to the Synoptic Gospels, and that the Gospel of the Egyptians must be reckoned part of the *original* evangelic literature in the strict sense of the word. The Hebraising character is also stamped as strongly as it could be upon this Gospel, and in diction, particles, and syntax it displays little, if any, difference from the Synoptics; indeed, it lies vastly nearer to them than does the fourth Gospel. But as soon as we raise the question whether the relation to the Synoptics is

to be taken to show that they were the source of the Gospel of the Egyptians, or whether this Gospel derives from the sources of the Synoptics, then our difficulties begin. In my *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur* I have accepted the second of these positions, and I hold to it. But since in my judgment the new fragments contribute nothing to the decision of this question, I do not refer to it further.

Apart from the question of the sources and historical intermediaries, another question may be raised concerning the historical value, the primary, secondary, or tertiary character of the new fragments. Whatever may be our judgment on this question, it does not decide the question of literary relationship. For, along with considerable dependence upon the four canonical Gospels, a stream of good primary tradition might still have flowed in besides; and, conversely, along with complete independence as regards Luke and Matthew, and with a substructure of the very first rank, the elaborated result might still be very far removed from the original. Now what is the position of our Sayings in this regard?

Unhappily, not much can be said of a satisfactory kind, although there is nothing grotesque, and in this sense nothing apocryphal, in these Sayings. Where they correspond with the Synoptics they may claim our appreciation, but when they deviate from them they are, in my opinion (with the exception of a few certainly important phrases), secondary or even tertiary. The first may be passed over; it coincides with a Synoptic Saying. In the second the allegorical reference given to *νηστεύειν* and *σαββατίζειν* is certainly not primary (rather is it strongly Gentile-Christian). Neither is *κόσμος* nor *οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα* likely to be primary. In the third, the whole of the theological introduction is tertiary, the section *μεθύοντες—διψῶν* certainly not primary, and Jesus labouring "for mankind" is surely secondary. In the sixth the duplicated motive which overloads the

figure is also secondary. What is left is the phrase *πανεὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μου* in 3, *εὔρεϊν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ* in 2, the second half of 5, and Saying 4, although with a certain limitation. This Saying not only finds strong support in Tatian ("Ubi unus est, ibi et ego sum"), but it is very difficult to understand its appearance in the next period; for this period was too definitely world-renouncing to have invented such a concrete presentment of an idea in itself not alien to its thinking. And yet we may not accept the *Christological* conception of the Saying with complete certainty. If it is certain that the Gospel of the Egyptians set God and Christ metaphysically closer together than the Synoptic Gospels or even the Gospel of John did, then it may well be asked whether the emphasis on the presence of Christ was not a peculiarity of the author of this Gospel, and whether the source that lay before him did not mention God Himself. But be that as it may; that God (Christ) is to be found not only in fasting and prayer, but in daily toil, is a proposition of true value, and it must not be overlooked that we have an intentional complement to a pessimistic passage in the "Preacher." We may congratulate ourselves on this enrichment of the evangelic utterances.

Even though the new fragment contributes nothing to the elucidation of the Synoptic problem, and but little to our knowledge of the authentic Sayings of Jesus, in two other directions it is nevertheless of marked importance: (1) It brings to our knowledge a Gospel—the fragments hitherto known by no means made this clear—*which, while it fully maintained the Synoptic type, put a spiritualising Christology into the mouth of Jesus Himself.* That gives us a quite unique parallel to the fourth Gospel. The latter deviates entirely from the Synoptic type, and shapes it anew, but is at the same time more reserved in regard to the reception of theological formulas into the evangelic narrative. Its

theology is prefixed in the Prologue. The supposition lies to hand that the Gospel of the Egyptians has been already influenced by the fourth Gospel. But the fragments hitherto known betray no trace of such influence, and those just discovered do not themselves show so close a relationship as to make the assumption of a *literary* dependence a *necessary* one. (2) It is true that for years past many workers in this field have discussed with me the problem, whence came those wonderful and grotesque Egyptian Gnostic Gospels which reach back to the second half of the second century, if not earlier, and exhibit partly a pan-Christic conception and partly one in which the Christ passes across the stage of this world as a supra-mundane Spirit-Being. These Christologies and "Gospels" must have had some point of attachment and of issue in the early tradition. The Gospel of the Egyptians, as it is made known to us through this new discovery, explains, as it seems to me, this extraordinary phenomenon. For it has a double aspect, and its second, its forward-looking aspect, points to that development in the future. A Gospel which appears in a most antique garb, in which nevertheless Christ says: ἔστην ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὠφθην αὐτοῖς and ἔγειρον τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκεί εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμί, was bound, in a generation of spiritual *finesse* and thirsting for revelation, to let loose an unchecked stream of thoughts and phantasies. If we are not entirely misled, it was this Gospel which gave the impulse to the production of "Gospels," like the Gospel of Eve and those Gospels on which the Pistis Sophia and the writings in the Codex Brucianus are founded.

ADOLF HARNACK.