

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE OXYRHYNCHUS AND OTHER AGRAPHA.

IN Early Church writings there is no lack of allusions to reputed or supposed sayings of our Lord not written down by the Evangelists. Dr Alfred Resch, in his *Agrapha* (1889), classes seventy-four of them as genuine *Logia* and others as *Apocrypha*. Resch's compilation was examined critically by Mr J. H. Ropes, of Harvard, in his *Die Sprüche Jesu die in den kanon. Evang. nicht überliefert sind* (1896). In the next year Grenfell and Hunt brought out the first instalment of the famous Sayings of Jesus found by them on the site of Oxyrhynchus (1897, 1903). On all these I have written in *The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels* and a *Lecture* on the Oxyrhynchus Sayings, both published at the Clarendon Press (1899, 1905). It is proposed here (1) to continue the discussion with especial reference to what I have since read on the Sayings, and (2) to append notes on some of the previously known Agrapha. The three sets of the Sayings will be referred to as the *Logia*, the *New Sayings*, and the *Gospel Fragment* (*Lect.* p. 1).

I. THE OXYRHYNCHUS AGRAPHA.

1. *The New Sayings.*

For a conjectural Greek text of the New Sayings see *Lect.* p. 29 f. In the preface to them as I read it the risen Lord speaks to St Thomas and others (John xx 26, cf. Mark xvi 7 *his disciples and Peter*), in words of the Fourth Gospel varied by the Logiographer so as to serve as an introduction to *these sayings* (*Lect.* p. 4), cf. Luke xxiv 44 f; Acts i 3, *alive after his passion . . . forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God*; Iren. I (p. 26, ed. Harvey), where some are said to have held that He remained on earth eighteen months.

N.S. 1. *Lect.* pp. 5 f, 31] *Saith Jesus, Let him not cease that seeketh . . . until he find, and when he hath found let him marvel. And having marvelled he shall reign, and reigning he shall rest.*

Clement in *Strom.* v quotes the saying nearly as above (*Zahn Gesch. N.T. Kan.* ii 657 n. 2), not telling us whence; and in *Strom.* ii he quotes in substance the latter half of it, with *wonder* (θαυμάζων) for

marvel (θαυμάσθαι), as from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Compare (1) Mark x 23 f, *How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! And the disciples marvelled at his words. . . . It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle . . . And they were astonished out of measure, saying . . . , Who then can be saved?* (2) John v 20, and *greater works than these will he shew him that ye may wonder*, on which Westcott writes, 'It cannot but appear strange at first sight that wonder is given as the object of Christ's works . . . But wonder might give occasion for faith. Under this aspect "wonder" is presented in two remarkable traditional sayings of the Lord preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii 9. 45): *He that wonders shall reign, and he that reigns shall rest: Wonder at that which is before you.*' 'Wisdom', 'the truth' (*Ch. Q. R.*, July, 1904), and other words have been suggested to fill the gap after 'that seeketh'.

Dr J. Vernon Bartlet in the *Contemporary Review*, in No. 1 of the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, and in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, p. 136 (1905), propounds the theory that the Oxyrhynchus collection was known to Clement as 'the local *Gospel according to the Hebrews*', a work of Alexandrine Christians different from Jerome's *Ev. sec. Hebraeos*, N.S. 1 or its equivalent being supposed to be cited 'in loose paraphrastic form' in *Strom.* ii, v. But N.S. 1 is clearly composite, being made up presumably of Clement's two-clause Logion on Wonder and the Kingdom (*Strom.* ii) and an exhortation connecting it with the preface to the Sayings, to the effect that a man should seek and seek until he finds the spirit and power of the Lord's wonderful and life-giving words. The longest form of the Saying is, I think, obviously not the earliest.

Socrates in Plato makes Wonder the beginning of Philosophy; Aristotle applies this to the case of wonder at the heavens; and so Philo on *Special Laws* (M. ii 330 f, cf. i 12), expatiating upon Ex. xxi 26, lays down that philosophy, the source of all truly good things, comes to men from the heaven (cf. James i 17) through the eye (Plato *Tim.* p. 47 B) which admires its wonders. Thus the Platonic saying about wonder may have become familiar to 'Hebrews' in Alexandria and elsewhere. It is further evident that wonder may be the beginning of belief in persons, and thus of religious faith (John iv 48, v 20).

Wonder and Kingship may have come to be associated in different ways. A Stoic might have said, 'He who wonders shall reign', because wonder is the beginning of wisdom: a theologian, that wonder leads to faith, and so to the kingdom of God. That he who reigns shall *rest*, which has nothing to do with wonder, may have been added some time afterwards as an appendix to βασιλεύσει. Disciples of Christ, the

Wisdom of God, looked for the promised 'rest' in His kingdom. According to Mark l.c. a sort of wonder precedes the apprehension of the true nature of the kingdom and the way to it. N.S. 1 may rest partly upon this, but it seems to me to give a confused order with wonder not at the 'beginning' but intermediate to discovery and attainment. If the nucleus of the Saying was philosophic the original word for 'wonder' in it would have been *θαυμάζω*. For *θαυβείσθαι*, which connotes a wonder akin to awe, see also Wisd. xvii 3 and Mark i 27, x 32.

N.S. 2. *Lect.* pp. 7 f, 31 f] This is the longest of the Sayings or Logia, and one of the most obviously composite. It suffices here to quote it briefly, thus, *Saith Jesus, Do ye ask, Who are they that draw us up to the kingdom, if it is in heaven? The things of earth, these are they that draw you. And, The kingdom of heaven is within you, and whosoever shall know himself shall find it.*

Two sayings about the kingdom of heaven are here connected by an editorial 'And', meaning, as in Heb. i 10, 'And he saith in another place' (*Ox. Log.* p. 8). The latter saying is a working up of Luke xvii 21, or the substance of it, with the Greek philosophical, 'Know thyself'. In Philo *De Praem. et Poen.* (M. ii 415, 421) we find illustrations of both. By contemplation, he says, of the world and its order men may rise up as on a sort of heavenly ladder to the thought of God, and he cites the passage from Deut. xxx which was compared with the latter saying in *Lect.* p. 9.

St Ephraim on the *Diatessaron*, as quoted in Syr. M¹ from Moes. pp. 209, 211, gives the sense of Luke l.c. thus: 'The kingdom of God is in your heart . . . not by days of observing . . . in your heart—which he spake of himself who was standing in the midst of them', *in your heart* being perhaps merely a paraphrase. Ciasca (cap. 40) renders the corresponding Arabic by '*intra vos*', and under *أَلَيْسَ* from the same root Lane gives '*mind or heart*'.

N.S. 3. *Lect.* pp. 12 f, 32 f] *Saith Jesus, A man will not hesitate to ask about the place of his (?) . . . many first shall be last, and the last first . . .* This in the papyrus is one of the most defective of the sayings. As I have restored it conjecturally it alludes to the 'many mansions' of John xiv 2. Dr Bartlet makes it a precept: the disciples shall not hesitate to ask Him about the 'place of glory' (Swete) while He is yet with them. In Syr. M see *places* for 'mansions', and cf. Herm. *Sim.* ix 27. 3, 'their *place* is with the angels'.

¹ Syr. M is Professor Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* (Camb. 1904), which gives the Curetonian Version (C) of the Four Gospels and the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest (S). Tatian's *Evang. Harm. Arabica* was brought out by Ciasca at Rome in 1888.

N.S. 4. *Lect.* pp. 14 f, 33] A Saying well restored by the discoverers, and at first sight a seemingly not very interesting repetition of Gospel sayings about the eventual bringing to light of things hidden. But in reality it gives a wholly different turn to them. It promises a revelation to the Gnostic (as Clem. Alex. would say), the intellectual Christian who desires really to know.

N.S. 5. *Lect.* pp. 16 f, 33] This is so defective in the Greek that some restorers have not ventured to complete it. Nevertheless I think it quite likely that the reply of Jesus here to the disciples is a short summing up, more or less in the form suggested in *Lect.* p. 17, of several verses of Matt. vi with an allusion to Col. iii 3 *your life is hid*. In any case I take it to be a certainly composite saying, which answers a series of distinct questions with one comprehensive Logion, to the effect that the Christian's religious observances must not be formal and histrionic but according to truth (John iv 24). The questions being, How should we fast, pray, give alms? and generally, What should we observe and do? The answer as reconstructed begins, 'Ye shall not be as the hypocrites'. Compare in the *Didache*, 'Let your fasts be not with the hypocrites . . . Neither pray ye as the hypocrites' (viii 1 f; cp. ii 6, iv 12, v 1); and 'Your prayers and your alms and all that ye do, so do as ye have it in the Gospel of our Lord' (xv 4).

2. *The Logia.*

See *The Oxyrhynchus Logia* and *Lect.* p. 24 f. Passing over the fragments numbered 1, 4, 8, by the first editors, we have to consider briefly Nos. 2, 3, 5-7.

Log. 2] *Saith Jesus, Except ye fast the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God. And, Except ye sabbatize the sabbath ye shall not see the Father.* Here we have again two sayings connected by an editorial 'And'. About the wrong or exceptional construction 'fast the world' more than enough has been written; but see 1 Cor. vii 31 and they that use the world as not abusing it, where Westcott and Hort give τὸν κόσμον, the world (acc.), without note or comment. Professor Bevan points out that *fast the world* is a good Arabic construction, comparing from Derenbourg and Spiro's *Chrestomathie*, p. 34 (ed. 2, 1892), 'If thou desirest to escape from the chastisement of God, then *fast the world* (صُمِّمِ الدُّنْيَا) and let the breaking-of-thy-fast from it be death.'

'The Father' is a term used by Philo, as near the end of *Vit. Mos.* (M. ii 179), where the departing Moses is summoned by the Father to be immortalized. The Sabbath is described (M. ii 166, 197, 281) as motherless, sprung from the universal Father alone, and ever-virgin;

the birthday of the world, on which heaven and earth keep holiday; a day not for work or vain amusements but for the study of philosophy, for on it God 'saw' all that He had made.

Log. 3] *Saith Jesus, I stood in the midst of the world and in flesh was I seen of them . . . And, My soul grieveth for the sons of men . . .* The change of tense from 'stood' to 'grieveth' is at once accounted for by the hypothesis that 'And' here again connects independent sayings. In the former Jesus is represented as looking back from after the Resurrection to *the days of his flesh* (Heb. v 7). An Apocryphon (Resch. p. 457 f) makes Him point to a certain spot and say, 'This is the middle of the world'.

Log. 5] (1) *Saith Jesus, Wheresoever there be two they are not godless; and where there is one only, I say, I am with him.* (2) *Raise up the stone and there thou shalt find me; cleave the tree and there am I.*

For a full discussion of this see *Ox. Log.* pp. 31-53: the simplest conclusion is as follows. In Matt. xviii 19 f it is said that if two agree in asking anything it shall be done for them, 'For where two or three are gathered together *in my name*, there am I in the midst of them', cf. Ex. xx 24. In (1) Jesus says that He will be even with one only. And (2) He will be, not merely with men assembled in His name and for a religious purpose, but with any one who is faithfully doing his work (Gen. iii 19), clearing ground for cultivation, raising the stone (Is. v 2) and cleaving the tree. This seems to be alluded to in the 'Gospel of Thomas' (*Ox. Log.* p. 93).

That Jesus should promise to be with any *one* is in itself nothing strange (*Lect.* p. 37); but the mention of the 'one only' here in (1), as in the parallel in Ephr. Syr. (Ropes p. 48), is a mark of posteriority to Matt. l. c.; and (2) is an appendix to an appendix.

Log. 6] *Saith Jesus, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country. Neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him.* 'Neither', for *And not*, marks this as another duplex Saying.

Log. 7] This has been shown, I think, to be a more or less late working up of canonical sayings (*Lect.* p. 27), with a historical background. The Church now spread over the world, as in cent. 2, and firmly established is the 'city set (Syr. M & Ciasca, *builf*) on a hill', and it is the house built and founded 'upon a rock'.

3. *The Gospel Fragment.*

This, as I understand it, begins with a recommendation of the simple life: men should not be thinking all day long what they shall eat, drink or wear¹. They are much better than the lilies, 'which *grow* (*αὐξάνει*), neither do they spin'. So I rendered the Greek as deciphered

¹ Syr. C in Luke, 'Do not . . . be occupied in these things'.

by Grenfell and Hunt, but with an 'If' as to its accuracy (*Lect.* p. 19). Satisfied with Dr Bartlet's excellent suggestion, I now read, 'which *card* *not* neither do they spin'. The papyrus being in tatters the reading here must be partly conjectural, but his *οὐ φαίνει* is quite possible and the sense decides for it. Clement in *Paed.* ii 10 (P. 231) and some Gospel manuscripts (Resch p. 226; W. H.) read 'how they neither *spin* nor *weave*'. 'It is quite like reflective tradition to complete the metaphor in *spin not*' (Bartlet), or to go on from *spin* to *weave*. In Matt. vi 28 (Luke xii 27), '. . . how they *grow*; they *toil* not, neither do they *spin*', *grow* and *toil* (I suppose) go together: the flowers have neither to work for a living nor to make clothing artificially. Thus far the fragment is presumably in substance from the canonical Gospels, with arbitrary variations in expression and application.

Next, in answer to the question, When shall we see Thee? comes the saying, *When ye shall be unclothed and not ashamed*, a new version of a known saying to Salome quoted by Clem. Alex. from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. *Ox. Log.* p. 103f connected the then known form with Gen. ii 25, and the 'Gospel Fragment' now confirms the suggestion. It is a question whether the Oxyrhynchus form of the response is prior (Bartlet) to Clement's. It may, on the contrary, be a mystical saying literalized to suit a matter of fact context: in the coming day of Paradise Regained clothes will not be wanted at all, cf. in Karl Pearson's essay on *The Kingdom of God in Münster*, whatever be its exact sense, '. . . then without clothes or treasure the saints shall march out of Münster'.

In *Lect.* p. 36 I ended with the brief statement, which wants a word of explanation, 'Why should this Fragment be imagined to be part of a Gospel?' Its contents 'properly belong to such a variety of contexts that I can only see in it another *selection* of Sayings of Jesus'. The first editors having written of the Fragment, that it 'seems to belong to a Gospel which was *closely similar in form to the Synoptists*', I meant to express the opinion that it apparently did not belong to any such writing: it was not part of a sort of Matthew with a Sermon on the Mount containing the Fragment itself, but merely a third batch of sayings brought together from a variety of contexts. Whether it belonged to some collection of sayings called a Gospel, like Dr Bartlet's *Ev. sec. Hebraeos*, was not under consideration.

4. *Conclusions.*

In the first discussions of the *Logia* more stress was laid upon the possibility of their being of very early date than upon the doubtfulness of it. They are not 'primitive' but composite, and where they embody canonical matter they work it up mostly into later forms. Some of

them at least may be excerpts from apocryphal Gospels of which we do not know the dates. From a short fragment a lost work may be assumed to have been of earlier date than an event or writing to which the complete work actually alluded. The *New Sayings*, which probably belonged to the same collection, seem to allude to the Fourth Gospel, and they combine evangelic matter with scraps of philosophy in the manner of Clement of Alexandria. All things considered, 150 A.D. or later is perhaps a reasonable date for them.

Dr Bartlet regards the Sayings collectively as 'in form a Gospel harmony or fresh synthesis of the Sayings in our Gospels which seemed of most abiding and universal application outside Palestine, taken along with and in the light of others evolved from the canonical and other writings', cf. *Lect.* p. 34. Thus we agree on the main point, viz. that the Oxyrhynchus Sayings presuppose the Gospels, but Dr Bartlet argues hypothetically for an earlier date than I am at present prepared to suggest for them. On the *Logia* he quotes with approval the conclusion that the compiler was a 'Graeco-Egyptian Jew under Palestinian influence . . . who has heartily embraced Christianity, his date being about 120 A.D.' (Sanday, 1897). These and the *New Sayings* being supposed to be remnants of Clement's *Ev. sec. Hebraeos*, the *Gospel Fragment* might be thought to belong to the same. A saying in the *Fragment* may be an older form of a known response to Salome from the Gospel according to the Egyptians, itself quoted by 2 Clem. R. (? 120-140), and thus 'our Hellenistic Gospel', the Sayings of Jesus, may have been compiled 'c. 110 A.D., but certainly not later than 120 A.D.'

I make no objection to this early date for 2 Clem. R., which, as I have given reason to think, may have been quoted as Clement's by Irenaeus (*Journ. of Phil.* xxviii 201f); but I doubt whether the Oxyrhynchus 'Gospel Fragment' is to be classed with the other two fragments, with which it is not homogeneous. In substance, at any rate at the beginning, it is of a lower type, and it has not the repeated formula 'Saith Jesus', on which Dr Bartlet makes the good suggestion that it may have been in regular use in catechesis. Lastly, if the clearly composite N.S. 1 embodies Clement's two-clause form of the Saying, both the *New Sayings* and the *Logia* probably belonged to a compilation which in its entirety was of later date than the *Ev. sec. Hebraeos*.

In his *Fragments d'un Ancien Recueil de Paroles de Jésus, sc. les trois d'Oxyrhynque et celui de Fayoum* (Paris, 1905), Bruston reads in N.S. 3 'to enquire of the elders', and in N.S. 5 'as hypocrites'. At the end he writes, 'Tout ce qu'on peut conclure légitimement, c'est qu'à l'époque où fut faite cette compilation les quatre évangiles canoniques existaient depuis longtemps, puisqu'ils avaient servi de base d'autres écrits du même genre, qui les avaient imités et leur avaient emprunté bon nombre

de paroles caractéristiques de Jésus, pour les développer, les expliquer ou les combiner avec d'autres'.

II. QUAE SUPERAVERTUNT FRAGMENTA.

For the Agrapha literature from Cotelier's day until the eve of the Oxyrhynchus discoveries see Resch (pp. 3 ff) and Ropes (pp. 1 ff). Philo uses 'unwritten' in its classical sense for Heb. 'by (word of) mouth'. The modern use of the term was brought in by J. G. Körner's '*De Sermonibus Christi 'Aγράφου*' (1776), a good critical dissertation of thirty pages with the conclusion that Acts xx 35 contained the one genuine *agraphon* extant. The Agrapha being written and some of them quoted as *graphai*, it may be doubted what is the best definition of them (Resch, pp. 1-3); but in practical agreement with Körner we may say simply that they are reputed or supposed sayings of our Lord (with or without more or less of narrative context) which are not included in the true text of the canonical Gospels. Mr C. G. Griffinhoof's *The Unwritten Sayings of Christ* (1903) will serve as a short preliminary account of them.

In Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, first published under that name in 1860, App. C 'On the Apocryphal Traditions of the Lord's Words and Works' enumerates twenty-one sayings as comparatively well attested and eleven others, the fourth being, 'The Son of God says, *Let us resist all iniquity and hold it in hatred*' (Barn. iv 9). Quoting from this edition, although elsewhere he cites a later, Ropes (pp. 3, 62) does not notice that No. 4 was withdrawn by Westcott—not only by another of the writers quoted—after the publication of the Greek, which showed that the preamble is really, 'As becometh sons of God' (Lat. *decet filiis for dicit filius*). In a note on the last of all Westcott reads it conjecturally, '*They (for I) often desired to hear one of these words and had not one to tell it*'.

In discussing Agrapha we must bear in mind that an express 'Saith Jesus' may be merely explanatory (*Ox. Log.* p. 76 f), and that homilists and the like are apt to mix up their own counsel with their texts¹. In Barn. xv 1, 6 we read, 'Further, it hath been written concerning the Sabbath also in the Ten Words, . . . And keep ye the Sabbath of the Lord holy *with pure hands and a pure heart* . . . Yea, and He saith furthermore, Thou shalt keep it holy *with pure hands and a pure heart*'. So Rendall, with the remark, 'the writer actually builds an argument on words which are an arbitrary addition of his own to the Mosaic enactment'.

Again, 'The prophets having grace from Him prophesied concerning Him' (ib. v 6): the Spirit of Christ in them testified (1 Pet. i 11).

¹ Papias refers to this tendency (H.).

Words of prophets and apostles may thus be vainly imagined to be words of Jesus. His reputed sayings and the evidence for them must accordingly be considered severally on their merits. In what follows I merely put down what has occurred to me from time to time on some of Resch's *Logia* and *Apocrypha*. In one or two cases I had come to the conclusions of Ropes's *Die Sprüche* before seeing it.

Log. 1, Resch pp. 95 f, 135 f, 272 f] The negative (with variants) of what Gibbon called the Golden Rule. Ropes dismisses it summarily as a mere parallel to Matt. vii 12 and Luke vi 31 of little worth.

Resch gives many citations of the *agraphon*, not quite all negative, but something more is wanted to explain what he gives. *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, Addit. Note 11, p. 142 f (ed. 2, 1897), connects the rule with Lev. xix 18, *but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, cf. Rom. xiii 8-10. In Deut. vi 5, xi 1 'love' is followed by Heb. *eth* and an accusative. In Lev. l. c. it is followed by a datival prefix (Heb. *ל*), so that we may render literally, 'Thou shalt love *to* or *for* thy neighbour as-thyself'. Targ. pseudo-Jon. as quoted gives the sense, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself and what thou hatest *for thee* shalt not do to him'. Philo, as cited at the end of the same note, paraphrases 'for thee' and writes, 'That what one hates *to suffer* he should not do'; and the like may be seen in forms cited by Resch. Famous Jewish commentators make Lev. l. c. mean, that a man should *love what is good for his neighbour as for himself*. Compare Justin *Trypho* 93 (p. 321 B), 'And he who loves his neighbour as himself, whatever good things he desires (*βούλεται*) for himself he will desire for him also . . .'; Clem. *Hom.* xii 32, 'For he who loves his neighbour as himself . . . In one word, what he wishes (*θέλει*) for himself he wishes for his neighbour also. This is the law of God and (the) Prophets'.

Near the end of *Jewish Fathers* l. c. I wrote, 'The saying may have been known to Ben Sirā. The principle of it is in Ecclus. viii 5-7 . . . Remember that we all . . . For some of us also &c., xxxi 15 R. V. Consider thy neighbour's liking by thine own'. Afterwards, when the two British Museum folios of the Hebrew of Ecclus. had been edited by the Rev. G. Margoliouth, for the latter verse was found what Prof. Israel Lévi in his *L'Écclesiastique* renders,

Sache que ton voisin est comme toi,
Et considère ce que tu détestes toi-même;

with a note to the effect that it is the saying, What thou hatest *do to no one* (Tob. iv 15), or *do not to thine associate* (Hillel in *Shab.* 31 a). It may be that Ben Sirā was himself paraphrasing words of Torah, or that the saying had been already formulated.

Philo l. c. supplies an illustration of Luke xix 21. To those in

Wetstein and Kuinoel add also from Plato (*Laws* p. 913 C), '... finest and simplest of laws and an enactment of no mean man, who said, *Take not up things thou layedst not down*'.

Log. 5, Resch pp. 98, 142] Origen gives as a reputed and Didymus as an actual saying of the Saviour, *He that is near me is near the fire: he that is far from me is far from the kingdom*. It is a fine saying but not, as some think, hard to account for. According to Old Testament imagery, which would quite naturally be transferred to our Lord, the Deity is or is environed by fire. 'The Lord thy God is a consuming fire', or He descends 'in fire'; cf. 'he is like a refiner's fire', 'Is not my word like a fire?' and see under 'fire' in any Bible Concordance. Justin affirms that the Son, 'our Christ', who is from the Father in the manner of fire from fire, spoke in the form of fire from the bush to Moses (*Apol.* i; *Dial.*).

Log. 6, Resch pp. 98, 143] *Let their temple, O Father, be desolated*. This is a mere ascription of Ps. lxix 26 f (Matt. xxiii, Luke xiii, cf. Acts i) *mutatis mutandis* to the Lord Jesus. So also Ropes, p. 16. Hippolytus *ap.* Resch gives the reason for the imprecation from verse 27 LXX, because they persecuted 'me' (Gr. *δν . . . μου*).

Log. 12, Resch pp. 100f, 150f] Acts xx 35 *It is more blessed to give than to receive*. With reference to a remark of Resch (p. 147) on the *Shepherd of Hermas*, I would suggest that the 'Makarismus' may be alluded to at the end of *Sim.* ii, where it is said in effect, Blessed are they that have *and give*. On giving and receiving see also *Jewish Fathers* p. 90f.

Log. 14, Resch pp. 101, 152 f] *Having received commandment from Him to preach . . . and to baptize into His death*. This suggests that an exclusive reference to the speaker in Matt. xxviii 19, as in Mr Conybeare's more or less hypothetical 'Eusebian' reading with *in my name* and without 'the triune name', should not at once be assumed to be certainly primitive. See in Mark xvi 15 *ap.* Ciasca, *preach my Gospel*; cf. Matt. xxviii 19, Mark xvi 17, Luke xxiv 47 in Syr. M, and Resch *Apocr.* 51, p. 426.

Log. 15, Resch pp. 102, 153 f, 280 f] *The weak shall be saved by the strong*. This is less remarkable than that they should help the strong. Plato (*Laws* p. 902 E) quotes the proverb from building, that large stones do not lie well without small ones; cf. Soph. *Aj.* 158 f, cited by commentators as Jacobson on Clem. *Cor.* xxxvii 4; Herm. *Sim.* ix 7. 5, on the use of small and large stones within and without for the tower. Philo in *Vit. Mos.* II (M. ii 91 f) writes, that 'the bush' is a very weak plant but not without prickles to wound any one who touches it, which is a lesson for men in afflictions not to be disheartened, 'Your weakness is strength'; cf. 2 Cor. xii 9.

Log. 16, Resch pp. 102 f, 154 f, 281 f] 1 Cor. ii 9, 'but as it is written, *Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, And which entered not into the heart of man, Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him*'. Resch gives parallels from Clem. Cor. and other writings. The saying may have come from the Old Testament through the medium of some lost apocryphal writing. In the Collect for All Saints' Day the things not seen, heard, or imagined are called briefly, 'those *unspeakable* joys which thou hast prepared for them that unfeignedly love thee'.

Philo in *De Execr.* (M. ii 433) writes on Deut. xxviii 61, that the proselyte (v. 43), raised to the height of felicity, is pronounced blessed in respect (1) of his conversion to God, and (2) of his receiving *the reward of a sure position (τάξιν) in heaven which it is not lawful to speak of*; whereas the 'nobilis indigena' who has depraved the coinage of his high birth shall be dragged down to Tartarus. Compare Matt. v 12, Luke vi 23; 1 Cor. xv 23 *each in his own τάγμα*; 2 Cor. xii 4; 1 Pet. i 8 *joy unspeakable*; 2 Pet. ii 4 *ραπανάσας*.

Log. 17, Resch pp. 103 f, 167 f, 282] *Keep my mysteries for me and the sons of my house.* A rabbinic play upon Is. xxiv 16, read with *rasi*, 'my secret' (Σ. Θ. ap. Field), Vulg. *Secretum meum mihi, secretum meum mihi*, Syr. *secretum mihi, secretum mihi*. So Hilarius as 'in scripturis', *My mystery for me, my mystery for me*, where Resch misemends the second 'for me'. For Heb. *raz*, 'secret', we can now quote Ecclus. (J. Q. R. xv 463 f). In Holy Scripture, it was argued, there can be no vain repetition. If something is written twice over it must have two senses or applications. In Isaiah l. c. the Targumist sees a revelation of two secrets to the prophet, of reward to the righteous and of retribution to the wicked. The Logion makes the second 'for me' mean 'for my household'. It may be that Matt. xiii 11 (Luke viii 10) alludes to Isaiah l. c. so interpreted.

Log. 25, Resch pp. 107 f, 186 f] There is a 'confusio' which leads to death, and one which leads to life. A saying of well-known type with parallels in Homer, Hesiod, Ecclus. iv 21, &c. See also Herm. *Mand.* vi 1. 1, vii 4, with the notes in the S. P. C. K. edition.

Log. 30, Resch pp. 109, 195 f, 287] *When the two shall be one; and the outer as the inner; and the male with the female, neither male nor female.* So Resch from 2 Clem. R, as the earliest citation of the saying. But the homilist is not to be trusted for critical exactness, although his exegesis is 'harmlos und gut gemeint'. His second clause may have been made up from the clause in Clem. Alex., *When ye shall have trampled the clothing of shame.* In that day there will be no outward veiling the inward, cf. Log. 21 *ἐξωθεν καὶ ἐξωθεν* (Resch p. 173), but sincerity and naked truth (*Lect.* p. 21 f).

The saying about marriage in Gen. ii 24, LXX, *the two shall be one flesh*, is applied to the coming of the Kingdom, the occasion of the marriage of the Lamb (Rev. xix). Whatever it may be imagined to mean in the Logion, it expresses the future in terms of the past. As it was in the beginning so it shall be.

The Midrash, in connexion with Gen. i 26, quotes Ps. cxxxix 5 *Thou hast fashioned me behind and before* (P. B.), with the interpretation that God first made Adam an *androgynos* with *duo prosopa*, a man-woman facing both ways, and then sawed him into two, thus making woman from his *side* (not *rib*). See Gen. Rab. 8 1; Lev. Rab. 14 1; *Jewish Fathers* p. 168. The myth is Platonic. Aristophanes, in the *Symposium*, tells us that originally there was a third sex, man-woman, with two faces looking opposite ways, which Zeus cut into man and woman. These are now drawn to one another, each incomplete being seeking the other moiety of itself. The Talmud teaches that man without woman is not man. See the writer's lectures on the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* p. 86 n. The 'new man', writes Hippolytus, is male-female (Resch p. 287).

Log. 31, Resch pp. 109, 204 f, 288] *To the near and to the far off, whom the Lord knoweth to be His.* For the first part see Is. lviii 19 *Peace, peace, to him that is far off and to him that is near*, cf. *Jewish Fathers* p. 64. As parallel to the remainder Resch quotes 2 Tim. ii 19 *The Lord knoweth them that are his*, which commentators as Alford (cf. Ropes) shew to belong to Num. xvi 5, LXX.

Log. 35, Resch pp. 111, 212 f, 288 f, 464 f] *Let thine alms sweat &c.* There is no need to emend the Greek, ἰδρωάρω being a correct form from a verb in -aw not found elsewhere. See the *Journal of Philology* (xix 148-172) art. 'Traces of a Saying of the Didache', and the paper read in March, 1888, to which it refers.

Log. 39, Resch pp. 112 f, 227 f, 290 f] *In what things I may catch you I will judge you.* In effect a summary of Rev. xxii 11 f, 'He that is unjust, let him be unjust still . . . Behold, I come quickly'.

Log. 40, Resch pp. 114, 229 f] *As He hath said, that our dwelling is in heaven.* Ropes (p. 32), with reference to Resch's view of the Logion, thinks it not an exact citation, but more probably the content of John xiv 2, *In my Father's house are many mansions.* For the word 'dwelling' see Mark v 3; Herm. Vis. iii 8. 8, *he shall have his dwelling in the tower with the saints of God*; Sim. viii 7-9, on the difference of men's dwelling, where I suppose John l. c. to be alluded to. Sim. i speaks of men's 'houses' in their true city not of this world.

Log. 41, Resch pp. 114 f, 230 f] *Ask the great things, and the small shall be added unto you*; cf. James i 5 . . . *wisdom, let him ask.* This is a saying to be taken into account in connexion with 'daily bread' in

the Lord's Prayer and the diverse interpretations put upon it. See on Clem. Alex. and Jerome in *Jewish Fathers* p. 184 f, and on Ciasca's rendering from the Arabic see p. 181.

Log. 42, Resch pp. 115, 233] *To those who thought that God tempts, as the Scriptures say, Quoth He, The evil one is the Tempter.* See 1 Thess. iii 5 and James i 13, ed. Jos. B. Mayor, noting that Ecclus. xv 11 is rendered from the Hebrew in the Cambridge edition (cf. *Wisd.* xi 24),

Say not, My transgression was of God,
For that which He hateth He made not.

In 2 Sam. xxiv 1 God in His anger but in 1 Chron. xxi 1 Satan moves David to number the people, the Chronicler altering the earlier statement in the sense of the Logion. This is one of the parallels to the last petition in the Lord's Prayer according to Matt. vi 13, a clause not in Luke xi 4 (W. H.) and perhaps like the word for 'daily' in the Prayer not quite primitive. In rendering it the Greek Fathers are sometimes said to be 'unanimous for the masculine', *But deliver us from the Evil One* (Plummer in *H. D. B.*), as if every one of them declared for it; whereas the earliest or some of them give no such testimony. To what I wrote on the Prayer in *Jewish Fathers* pp. 124 f, 176 f, a few words may now be added.

In ed. 1, 1877, I ended (ed. 2 p. 130) with Clem. *Cor.* lx 1-3 in the Greek of Bryennius, '... forgive us our iniquities . . . And deliver us from them that hate us wrongfully', as words which *serve as a very ancient paraphrase* of words of the Prayer. A writer on one side inferred that Clement had it in mind; and against this it was contended that the passage was made up from the Old Testament. The reader will judge whether the obvious Old Testament parallels are of any effect as disproofs. Some, I suppose, will incline to the view that if Clement knew the Prayer he must have thought of it when so writing. If not, he has nothing to say about it, and cannot be quoted as one of the 'unanimous'.

St Polycarp to the Philippians] That Polycarp knew the Prayer appears from vi 2, vii 2, 'If then we entreat the Lord that He would forgive us, we also ought to forgive . . . entreating the all-seeing God with supplications that He *bring us not into temptation*' (Harmer), although he refers also to Matt. xxvi 41. But has he anything to say about deliverance from the Evil One? In iv 3, v 3, xi 1, we read, 'far from . . . all *evil*, . . . In like manner the younger men also . . . curbing themselves from all *evil* (*κακῶν*) . . . Withhold yourselves from all *evil* (*malo*)'. While he echoes words of his apostolic teacher (Lightfoot on vii 1), including perhaps 1 John ii 16, 'For all that is *in the world, the lust*' &c. (*Journ. of Phil.* xx 69), Polycarp, like the

Didache, makes no mention of the Evil One (1 John ii 14) in connexion with the Prayer, although he denounces the infidel as 'of the devil' and the 'firstborn of Satan' (vii 1). Upon Lightfoot's argument from the fact that '*the evil thing* is never found in St John's writings', I remarked, 'This suggests more than it was intended to prove' (*J. F.* p. 189), meaning that the Apostle's choice of the masculine in a doubtful case would merely illustrate his preference for it.

St James in i 12-15 personifies the evil Desire, a man's own lust, as the Tempter. Some think that he alludes elsewhere to the Lord's Prayer. In this place was he thinking of its *ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*? or thinking of it as ending, 'Bring Thou not us into temptation', which would so well account for the allegation that it is God who tempts? For the masculine rendering of its last word in the longer form patristic evidence preponderates, but the Church Fathers do not always draw the line between actual and imaginary personality. Hermas in *Mand.* vi 1, with the approval of later writers, represents that there are two angels with a man, one of righteousness and one of wickedness. Like Justin, Clement (*Paed.* ii 10, P. 236), and others, he alludes to the story of the *Choice of Hercules*, on which Philo plays at length in *De Merc. Meretr.* (M. ii 265 f), telling us that two Women dwell with us, one tempting to all manner of evil and the other pleading against her.

The last clause of the Prayer as we have it, whether a Greek addition or a rendering from some Semitic original, is well paraphrased in the Litany,

From all evil and mischief; from sin, from the crafts and assaults
of the devil; from thy wrath, and from everlasting damnation,
Good Lord, deliver us.

With the Prayer compare also Sir. xxiii 1, 4 *Father* (*Syr. my Father*); *Apocr.* 26 (Resch p. 398) for a Marcionite form of *ἐλθέτω κρέ*; Sir. xxviii 1-4 (Mark xi 25) for the principle of the Forgiveness clause.

Log. 43, Resch pp. 116 f, 233 f] *Be trusty bankers*, Gk. *τραπεζῖται*, lit. *tablers*: 'banker' is from *bank*, '7. A bench or table used in various trades' (Murray in *N. E. D.*). Of this saying, commonly thought to be one of the best attested Agrapha, Resch gives numerous citations, beginning with Clem. Alex. Körner objects to its attestation as not of early date, and rejects the saying. In substance it is pre-Christian. Philo, near the end of *De Judice*, writes that a judge should be like a good money-changer (Ropes p. 142).

In vol. xxvii of the *Journal of Philology*, art. 'Herms and Cebes', I wrote, that of this Logion, 'which a succession of Church writers from Clem. Alex. take to mean, "Be as practised *exchangers* who detect and reject base coin", Philo, Cebes, Hermas, Matt. xxv 27 and 1 Tim

vi 20, 2 Tim. i 14 suggest a better interpretation' (p. 315). In *Cebetis Tabula* the Deity bids men not to wonder at the freaks of Fortune, and not to be like dishonest bankers who receive deposits and are unwilling to pay them back on demand. In other words, men are but stewards of the gifts of God.

Log. 59, Resch pp. 133, 261, 292 f] *Lo, I make the last things as the first things.* See *Lect.* p. 22.

Log. 71, Resch p. 301] See 1 Pet. i 12. Some, as Hort, illustrate this from Enoch ix 1, where the archangels look down from heaven, 'shewing an interest in the doings upon earth' (*Journ. of Phil.* xxix 196).

Pericope Adulterae] The substance of the remarks in the S. P. C. K. *Hermas* upon John vii 53-viii 11 is given below with some slight additions.

Westcott and Hort write of the pericope, that 'In the whole range of Greek patristic literature before cent. (10 or) 12 there is but one trace of any knowledge of its existence, the reference to it in the *Apostolic Constitutions* [ii 24], as an authority for the reception of penitents'; overlooking the fact that it was embodied in the *Didascalia*, an earlier Greek work now known only in a Syriac and partly in a Latin translation. Lagarde, in his edition of the *Constitutions* in Greek, gives a marginal reference to the parallel on the pericope in the *Didascalia* in Syriac, and Resch (pp. 36 f, 341) gives it from a Greek retranslation thus, 'And the elders set her that had sinned before Him, and left the judgement to Him and went off. Then the *heart-knowing* Lord enquired of her if the elders had condemned her; and when she said, No, He said to her, Go thy way, neither do I condemn thee'. *Hermas*, in *Mand.* iv, states the case of a wife found 'in some adultery', not improbably suggested by the pericope, and in this *Mandate* only he uses the rare compound *heart-knowing*. Resch (p. 36) regards the pericope as doubtless an uncanonical fragment of the 'Urevangelium', and Ropes (p. 144) writes that there is nothing of importance to allege against the historic worth of the narrative.

Apocrypha] Some of Resch's 'Apocrypha' are fragments of narrative only and not 'Agrapha' according to our definition. His A. 1-5 (p. 343 f) relate, the first to John's baptism in general, and the rest to his baptism of our Lord. With A. 2 cf. A. 14, '*My mother* the Holy Spirit &c.'

A. 4] Coming up from the water He sees the Holy Spirit descending in the form of a dove and *entering into* Him (*εισελθ. εις*); and a voice from heaven proclaims Him the beloved Son, adding 'I this day have begotten thee' (Ps. ii 7)—as the Church says of persons baptized that they are made children of God (A. 4 h, i). Cerinthus (*ap. Iren.*) taught that the Christ in the form of a dove then descended

upon or into Jesus, but departed and flew back (Lat. *revolasse*) before the Passion.

A. 5] A burning and a shining light accompanied the Baptism: a *great light* shone around the place, or a *fire* (cf. Luke xii 49 f) was kindled in the Jordan, or (Ephr. Syr.) the Son Himself was manifested as the Light of the World. See Resch, pp. 357-372. On the eve of the consecration of Polycarp a glory of heavenly light, it is said, shone around all, and one of the brethren (cp. John i. 32 f) saw a vision of a white dove with a halo round it hovering about the head of Polycarp (*Vit. Pion.* § 21 ed. Lightfoot).

The apocryphal embellishments of the account of the Baptism may be traced to Holy Writ expounded *more rabbinico*. In connexion with some of the following remarks upon baptism and the Baptism see *Jewish Fathers* p. 57 f and Addit. Notes 24, 33. On Jewish *Baptism* see the *Jewish Encycl.* s. v.

a. Why should baptism effect or symbolize a birth? The Jewish proselyte was like a new-born child (Jebam. 48 b): he was *καὴν κτίσις*, for he who made one was as if he had *created* him, see Gen. Rab. 39. 14 on Gen. xii 5, comparing the Christian parallels on regeneration through baptism. With reference to Gen. i 2, 3 Milton writes,

And chiefly thou, O Spirit, . . .
 . . . thou from the first
 Wast present, and, with mighty wings outspread,
 Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,
 And mad'st it pregnant: what in me is dark
 Illumine; . . .

The Midrash on Gen. i. c. likens the Spirit to a bird hovering and fluttering. The water there is not a symbol of the *πνεῦμα*, but the material element out of which it brings life. The baptismal rebirth of a man corresponds to the birth of the cosmos, 'Let there be light' applying to both; for (1) Philo in *De Poenit.* (M. ii 406) writes that converts to Jewish monotheism were to be welcomed as men who had recovered sight (cf. 2 Clem. R. *init.*) and from deep darkness had come to see most radiant light, and (2) Justin in *Apol.* i 61 states that Christian baptism was called *φωτισμός*, *illumination*¹. With a word-play the Torah is said to be OR (Prov. vi 23), and 'Aquila uses *φωτίζειν* several times for the hiphal of *וְרָא* in the sense *teach*' (*Cairo Genizah Palimpsests* p. 80).

b. A Christological sense having been read into the whole narrative of the Hexahemeron in the early Church, the Baptism of Jesus would

¹ 'Εν τῷ φωτισμῷ ὑμῶν the Lord says to each through the bishop, 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee' (*Const. Ap.* ii 32).

have been associated with Gen. I. c. and *darkness was upon the face of the waters. And the spirit of God moved* (R. V. marg. brooded) *upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.* According to a Syrian 'Taufliturgie' the Spirit remained (John i 32 f) over the head of the Son and *incubated over the waters* (Resch p. 363). Syr. M in John i 5 reads, 'And He, the light, in the darkness was shining'. Ephr. Syr. I. c. (Resch p. 358) gives poetically the sense of words of the Evangelists, to the effect that Jesus on being baptized, as soon as He emerged from the wilderness of the Temptation, was manifested as a *great light* (Matt. iv 16), the 'true light' which was in the beginning.

Resch's *Agrapha* as a collection was epoch-making, but he classes too many of his fragments as 'Logia', Ropes ends (p. 160 f) with a short list of 'wahrscheinlich echten Agrapha', including John vii 53—viii 11, but passing over other passages of interest rejected by critical editors of the N.T. (p. 132 f). One of the chief questions raised by the discussion of 'aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente' is, whether in that Pericope the Textus Receptus has preserved a narrative of historic worth.

C. TAYLOR.

NOTES ON APOCRYPHA.

I.

NICETA of Remesiana *de Psalmodyae Bono* 3 (p. 70 ed. Burn) says, in a passage preserved only in the MSS A, V (the Bibles of La Cava and of Farfa), 'Neque enim illud volumen temerarie recipiendum est cuius inscriptio est INQUISITIO ABRAHAE (Abrae A) ubi cantasse ipsa animalia et fontes et elementa finguntur. Cum nullius sit fidei liber ipse nulla auctoritate subnixus.'

The name *Inquisitio Abrahæ* does not occur elsewhere: and in the apocryphal books which we possess under Abraham's name there is nothing nearer to Niceta's matter (as both Dom Morin and Dr Burn have seen) than a talking tree.

There is, however, a book in which are set out in detail the hours of the day and night at which animals, fountains, and elements adore their Maker. I mean, of course, the Testament of Adam. The following sentences from it are to the point here (see *Texts and Studies* II 2, *Apocrypha Anecdota* I p. 140).