

THE INTRODUCTION TO THE OXYRHYNCHUS SAYINGS.

ΟΙΤΟΙ ΟΙ ΟΙΛΟΓΟΙ ΟΙ . . . . .  
 ΛΗCEN ΙΗC Ο ΖΩΝ Κ . . . . .  
 ΚΑΙ ΘΩΜΑΚΑΙΕΙΠΕΝ . . . . .  
 ΑΝ ΤΩΝΛΟΓΩΝ ΤΟΥΤ . . . . .  
 ΟΥ ΜΗ ΓΕΥCΗΤΑΙ.

ΟΙΤΟΙ ΟΙ ΟΙΛΟΓΟΙ. Such is the reading of the original, since the discoverers vouch for the first *iota*; and a correction is clearly necessary. GH<sup>1</sup> think the simplest course is to omit the initial ΟΙ, when τοῖοι is a late prose use = τοιοῦδε. Others (as Dr Taylor<sup>2</sup>) prefer οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι. Many considerations support this view: (1) the spacing of the letters (reproduced above) suggests οὔτοι οἱ and not τοῖοι,<sup>3</sup> (2) a superfluous οἱ might easily occur by dittography after οὔτοι οἱ, but that it should come to be written before τοῖοι at the beginning of a sentence is incomprehensible: this dittography and the change of I into Y do not seem serious demands; (3) Luke xxiv 44 (quoted by GH) supplies an exact parallel: οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ἡμᾶς. On these grounds I follow Dr Taylor in reading οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι in the text printed at the end of this paper.

The last six letters of the missing portion are, of course, οὓς ἐλά-; the remainder must be filled by an epithet of οἱ λόγοι. GH have suggested θαναμάσιοι which, however, is colourless. Better is Dr Lock's ἀληθινοί (cf. *Αποκ.* cxii 6 οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί). Yet I cannot but think that the word is not sufficiently forcible in its present context. If I am not mistaken, a dominant idea—that of (eternal) life—pervades the *Introduction*. The phrases and ὁ ζῶν, [θανάτου] οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται both convey this, and seem to point back to some key-word now lost. This word was perhaps ζωοποιόι. Why this word seems particularly suitable we shall see presently when the restoration is further advanced. At present it will suffice to quote some parallels: *Ps.* cxviii (cxix) τὸ λόγιόν σου ἐξήσεν με: *John* v 21 ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ, οὕτω καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ: vi 63 τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιούν . . . τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή: *Εφ. Barn.* vi οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ πίστει τῆς ἐπαγγελίας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ζωοποιούμενοι ζήσομεν.

<sup>1</sup> GH = Grenfell and Hunt *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* iv, no. 654.

<sup>2</sup> *The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus* (Oxford 1905) p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Mr Hunt, however, points out that the separation between οἱτοι and οἱ is really very slight, and that, in a text where there is no systematic division, stress cannot justly be laid on a space where it does occur. Thus in l. 7 we have *ενη* ι. In view of this the statement above must be modified.

The crucial question is the completion of l. 2. Current proposals deal with two points: 1. with what followed ὁ ζῶν; 2. with what came before. καὶ Θωμᾶ. 1. GH suggest, but with reserve, κ[ύριος or κ[αὶ ἀποθανών; Dr Hicks (*op. Taylor GH op. cit.*) καὶ ἀληθινός. 2. (a) read Φιλίππῳ or Μαθίῳ (or Μαθαίῳ) for the reasons stated *ad loc.*; (b) Mr Bartlett suggests τοῖς τε ἄλλοις or τοῖς (ἰ) μαθηταῖς; (c) Prof. K. Lake, comparing the usage of *Acta Thomae*, conjectures Ἰουδᾶ τῷ] καὶ Θωμᾶ.

All these conjectures agree in one point, in postulating a second dative dependent upon ἐλάλησεν. And the discoverers treat it as a fact that Thomas was in some way claimed as the authority for the Sayings.

Yet all three views are open to objection. The first and third, indeed, seem quite inadmissible, for they can only be understood to represent the Sayings as the matter of a special revelation. Sayings 2, 3, and 4, with Logia 1, 5, 6, and 7, sufficiently refute this. But τοῖς μαθηταῖς] καὶ Θωμᾶ is not open to such radical objection—unless we compare John xx 26, and call the Sayings post-resurrectional. We can claim that St Thomas is specially mentioned, as is St Peter in Mark xvi 7 εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, in order to shew that he was in some way specially interested. But this is surely a vague and indirect way of indicating one's authority for a document. And when we remember that this unsatisfactory statement with its far-reaching claim rests totally on a conjecture, we may fairly look about for another solution.

Such a solution was suggested to me by Acts i 3, where the author speaking of our Lord says: παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα . . . ὄπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς, and by Mark xvi 11 κάκεινοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῆ καὶ ἐθεάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἠπίστησαν. The editor may well have followed the same line of thought and have fortified his allusion to the resurrection (ὁ ζῶν) by a reference to the proof of it. I therefore read κ[αὶ φανείς τοῖς δέκα, or better, κ[αὶ ὀφθεῖς τοῖς δέκα (see 1 Cor. xv 5-8, Luke xxiv 34, Acts ix 17; cp. xxvi 16<sup>1</sup>). We can now safely refer to John xx 26 ἦσαν ἔσω οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς μετ' αὐτῶν.

The lacuna in l. 3 is less important. GH restore καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτοῖς; but unless we grant that αὐτοῖς is used very loosely, we are in danger of making the Editor quote the following Saying as post-resurrectional. In spite of objections, therefore, I propose to put a stop after Θωμᾶ, and to continue καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτός; the pronoun being strongly emphatic.

We are now free to consider the line of thought. If the editor wrote ζωοποιός in l. 1, he might naturally think fit to vindicate the epithet, and I will present what I take to be his reasoning by means of a paraphrase:

<sup>1</sup> I must express my acknowledgements to Mr F. E. Brightman for the exact wording of this restoration and for the references. I had previously conjectured (amongst other and more clumsy things) κ[αὶ φανερωθεῖς τοῖς ἰ'.

'These are the life-giving words spoken by Jesus ; life-giving, because He who uttered them Himself lives and proved it ; for He was seen by His disciples, so that even the sceptic Thomas was convinced. Above all it was He Himself who claimed this very virtue for His words.'

If this restoration—especially the word ζωοποιούί—be accepted, we shall have gained what has been needed ever since theories of a connexion of ideas between the different Sayings have been given up. We cannot believe that the collection is totally without order and purpose. Considering carefully each Logion and Saying we find that all except two (Logia III and VI) convey cautions, directions, and the like ; they are—to use a much-tried word—' helpful'. That is the same thing as to say they are life-giving, ζωοποιούί.

In conclusion, something must be said as to the alleged formula of the *Introduction*. GH admit that it may add some strength to the theory of Dr Rendel Harris<sup>1</sup> as to the citation-form in St Paul, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp : 'Remember the words of the Lord which he spake . . . and he said.' That theory in itself does not concern us, but its present application does. In the formula mentioned, 'the words' we are bidden to remember are always those quoted immediately afterwards. In the present case οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι, of course, covers the whole collection, while καὶ εἶπεν introduces a single citation. Hence the idea of a lurking formula must be abandoned.

The text as restored above will then run as follows :—

οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ [ζωοποιούί οὓς ἐλά-  
λησεν Ἰη(σοῦ)ς ὁ ζῶν κ[αὶ ὀφθεῖς τοῖς δέκα  
καὶ Θωμᾶ. καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτός· Πᾶς ὅστις  
ἂν τῶν λόγων τούτ[ων ἀκούσῃ θανάτου  
οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται.

'These are the life-giving words which Jesus spake who liveth and was seen of the Ten and of Thomas. Yea, and Himself said : "Whoso heareth these words shall not taste of death".'

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

<sup>1</sup> *Contemporary Review*, September 1897.