

---

*SWEETGOSPELHAXMONEY.COM*

**THE LOGIA  
IN ANCIENT AND RECENT  
LITERATURE**

BY

**JOHN DONOVAN, S.J., M.A.**

**CAMBRIDGE**

**W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.**

**1924**

## FOREWORD

STUDENTS of modern Biblical Criticism are aware of the important rôle assigned to the "Logian Document," in the solution of the Synoptic Problem. In the larger issue of Christian Origins, the Logia are likewise of the very greatest importance, because of their bearing on the authenticity of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark.

Hence the need of definitely fixing the meaning of a word, now so important, which was once in fairly common use both in Jewish and Christian literature, from the time of the first appearance of the LXX Version down to the eleventh century A.D.

An attempt is made in this short treatise to trace the exact meaning of this word, in the contexts in which it is known to have been used, whether in the form of *τὰ λόγια*, or *τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, or *τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*, or *κυριακά*, or *τὰ λόγια αὐτοῦ* or *ἐκείνου*, or, lastly, as *θεῖα λόγια*, and *ἱερὰ λόγια*.

If the conclusion reached is not found acceptable, the reader has at least the satisfaction of having set before him a valuable collection of texts, on which perhaps to form a better judgment.

ST. BEUNO'S COLLEGE,  
ST. ASAPH.

## INTRODUCTION

THE word "Logia," quoted in the Papias fragments, has been differently interpreted by different scholars.

One school sees in the "Matthæan Logia" a "Collection of the *Lord's Discourses*" as distinct from a Gospel *Narrative* of words *and works*. This theory was at one time assumed in "*Horæ Synopticæ*." In the second edition of that work this assumption was withdrawn with such reservations as to make it clear that the Author still personally adhered to the identity of the Logian Document (Source Q) with the Matthæan Logia mentioned by Papias. The hypothesis, identifying the Matthæan Logia with the *collection of sayings* of Christ common to Matthew and Luke (Source Q), seems to have originated with Schleiermacher. The identification was not, however, generally accepted by German Critics, who continued to adhere to the designation "Q" (*quelle*) in preference to that of "Logian Document." The latter term, with all its implications, received almost universal welcome on the part of British Critics, especially since its promulgation or rather vulgarization in Hawkins' justly valued work.

A few quotations may suffice to witness to this widespread acceptance.

C. F. Nolloth, M.A., Oriel, in his admirable work, "The Person of Our Lord" (1907), accepts unquestioningly the whole theory implied in the label "Logian Document"; and yet he is very cautious in his statements about Gospel sources. He is careful to distinguish between results on which there is general unanimity among the Higher Critics, and particular theories that have not met with such general approval. Among the latter he ranks Von Soden's dissection of Mark into Petrine and non-Petrine parts. And while making use of this distinction as an *argumentum ad hominem*, and for his own excellent purpose, he does not fail to protest against its arbitrariness. Among the

more or less unanimously accepted hypotheses Nolloth places the two-document theory; and this is perfectly correct as regards the majority of British Higher Critics. When this cautious writer comes to deal with "Q," he unquestioningly accepts the current view, and identifies it with the Matthæan Logia mentioned by Papias. Thus, in his enumeration of Gospel sources (p. 22), we find: "III., Speeches and Sayings of Christ in St. Matthew and St. Luke, taken from a *collection bearing the name and authority of St. Matthew, the Apostle.*"

On page 36 he furnishes a more detailed analysis as follows: "A comparison of the First and Third Gospels shows the existence of a primitive source of the highest importance and authority, containing a *record of Christ's speeches and sayings*. As employed by the Evangelists, it must have been in the Greek language. . . . *Papias of Hierapolis states* (in Euseb. H.E. III. 39) that 'a *collection of the sayings* (of Christ) was made by Matthew in the Hebrew tongue, and everyone interpreted them as he was able.'" This "collection of speeches and sayings" (logia) Mr. Nolloth, relying on supposed internal Gospel evidence, as also on the alleged external evidence of Papias, takes to be a separate and independent work—possibly the only known work—of the Apostle St. Matthew.

Quotations might be multiplied to show how almost universal is the view that sees in Logia, where the word occurs in Christian documents, nothing but a collection of *Christ's sayings*. Even as late as the year 1922 references to this subject may be read in the *Expositor* (February, p. 108; November, p. 350), which illustrates the lasting popularity of this theory, despite Bacon's onslaught in this same journal, October, 1920.

Amid this general chorus of applause, one has to record one discordant note, which came from a critic of some eminence, Gregory, author of "The Oracles of Papias." This writer contends that the Matthæan Logia may indeed have been the work of Matthew, but that they constituted a kind of manual or collection in use among early Christians, especially serviceable to Gospel-compilers. The collection was, however, drawn from the Old Testament, and consisted of "Messianic Prophecies."

Gregory's theory has been somewhat revised by Rendel Harris and again by Professor Burkitt.\* The former surmises that in our earliest Christian period there may have existed a "Book of Testimonies" in the shape of a prophecy-manual, proving that Christ was foretold in the Old Testament. This school of Gregory and disciples, it must be added, has won but few adherents.

Needless to observe that the two interpretations of Logia just mentioned are mutually destructive. It would clearly tax the ingenuity of the most subtle critic so to harmonize them as to satisfy the ordinary reader that "prophecies about the Christ" are identical with "Discourses of Jesus."

If the reader will turn to Sophocles' Greek Lexicon, he will find, under the word *λόγιον*, a brief reference to what may be called the traditional view of Papias' Logia. This lexicographer quotes a passage from Const. Apost. (2. 36), where the word *λόγια* is applied to the Old and New Testaments. He then goes on to cite the sentence in the Papias fragment: *Ματθαῖος . . . τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο*: and he adds the following comment: "This implies that, when Papias wrote, the *Gospel of Matthew* was regarded as a sacred book."

According to this assertion it would seem that the learned compiler of the "Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods," or its later editor, Thayer, was convinced that *λόγια θεοῦ* or *λόγια κυρίου* meant simply "God's Word," and virtually at least even "God's Written Word" or Scripture.

And is not this the meaning commonly attaching to this phrase wherever it is found in Papias' contemporaries, in his predecessors, and most assuredly in his immediate Christian successors?

This question has been raised and already discussed in the work quoted above: "The Oracles of Papias." Yet it will be found there are serious grounds for reviewing the conclusions set forth in the volume with the oracular title, as also the popularly accepted view that persists in seeing in Logia, when used by Christian writers, merely "sayings."

\* See *Expositor*, vol. xx., October, 1920; Bacon's article.

# THE LOGIA IN ANCIENT AND RECENT CRITICISM

## PART I

### MEANING OF ΛΟΓΙΑ IN PAGAN LITERATURE, AND OF ΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ (ΚΥΡΙΟΥ) IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

THE word λόγιον had its home in Greek Literature from earliest times; it was one of the current words in use to denote oracular utterance. In this acceptation it already occurred in Herodotus. In Aristophanes, quoted by Stephanus, we read: "Ὅρα τὸ χρῆμα τὰ λόγια ὥς περαίνεται. "Mark the portent how the oracles are coming to pass!" Thucydides couples λόγια with χρησμοί. Thus, while λόγος was regularly employed of purely human speech, oracular and virtually divine utterance was rendered by λόγιον.

Both words are nevertheless pressed into the service of the Septuagint Translation, to represent the Word of God. With this difference, however, that whereas λόγος remains also the ordinary term for human speech, λόγια is used by the Septuagint exclusively of divine communication. This word occurs in the Old Testament, both in the plural and in the singular form: in the singular to mark individual, isolated, oracular or divine communication; in the plural to denote the Word of God or Revelation in general. It may be safely stated that λόγια in the Old Testament Books is the equivalent of what we are wont to speak of as "*The Inspired Word*" or "*The Word of God*." Divine Revelation looked at collectively is the most frequent

equivalent of *λόγια* after it was appropriated to Old Testament use. Instances may be read in Numbers, Deuteronomy, in the Psalms especially, also in Isaiah. Exact references are available in the Concordances.

The Vulgate rendering of this word is not uniform. Oftenest, perhaps, we find the more appropriate "*Eloquia Dei*"; but elsewhere it is "*Sermones Dei*." The Latin translator seems to have shunned what might be deemed the better rendering, *oracula*; no doubt for much the same reason for which *χρησμός* was discarded in favour of *λόγιον*. *Oraculum*, like *χρησμός*, was probably too closely associated with responses received through the medium of pagan religions. The cleavage should be maintained.

In most of the texts, where *λόγια* is found in the LXX version, it is not explicitly expressive of a *written* Revelation; yet the student becomes conscious of the written oracles behind it all; so that one feels there is implied some reference to that written revelation which all pious Jews believed to be consigned in the Hebrew Scriptures. After perusal of the various passages where *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* or *λόγια τοῦ κυρίου* occurs in the Old Testament, it may be definitely stated that this expression conveys the idea which to us is familiar under the name of "Inspired Word" or "Divine Revelation."

In the writings of Jews who used Greek as the vehicle of their thought, *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* retains its Septuagint meaning. Or, to be more correct, it signifies quite definitely the oracular or divine communications, as collected together in the Old Testament. In Philo, as in Josephus, *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* is the virtual equivalent of our "Scripture." For them it is *θεία γραφή*, nothing less than the Sacred Written Word. It is unnecessary to quote examples, as the deduction drawn cannot be contested.

It may, however, not be amiss to cite here the words of the Author of "The Oracles of Papias." On page 51 he writes: "More usually where Philo used the word *λόγια* he intends specially the O.T. Scriptures."

The excerpt from Josephus cited by this same Author on page 56 establishes the fact that the Jewish historian used the

phrase ἐν τοῖς λογίοις ἔχοντες as equivalent to : "Although they had it recorded *in Holy Writ*." And subsequently this very reference to Holy Writ is repeated in language still more explicit, where an oracle is mentioned as "*likewise recorded in the Sacred Books*" ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εἰρημένος γράμμασιν.

When the same phrase is met with in the Pauline Epistles, it bears the same connotation of "Inspired Word." To St. Paul, as to Josephus and Philo, λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ is tantamount to "Divine Revelation"; it is virtually equivalent to γραφή or Scripture. It occurs twice in the Epistles. In Rom. iii. 1 and 2 we read : "What advantage then hath the Jew? Or what is the profit of circumcision? Much every way: first of all they were entrusted with *the Oracles of God*": ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ.

Here the Apostle is merely proclaiming the historical fact that the Jews had held the custody of the Old Testament. To them had been confided the Revelation of the Old Law, with guardianship of the Sacred Books.

In the above passage λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ denotes simply what we habitually call the Oracular or Inspired Word. This is the Word of God as contained in Holy Writ. Here manifestly the reference is not to the *New*, but to the *Old* Testament.

It will be noticed that, as with Philo, the *whole* of the Old Testament, not any particular portion, is included under "God's Oracles."

In the second passage this word expresses, with like clearness, the *Word of God, Divine Revelation*. But whether the reference in the concrete be to the Revelation of the Old or to that of the New Law, this may at least be subject of discussion. The passage is Heb. v. 12-14, and vi. 1-3 :

"For whereas by reason of time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that someone teach you *the rudiments of the first principles of the Oracles of God* (τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ) and (ye) are become such as have need of milk. For everyone that partaketh of milk is without experience of the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But solid food is for full-grown men, even those who, by reason of habit, have their

senses exercised to discern good and evil. Wherefore let us cease to speak of *the first principles of Christ* (ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον) and press on unto perfection, not laying again foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, or of the teaching of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

It would seem that the concept: "*rudiments of the first principles of God's Revelation*" is not only parallel, but positively identifiable with the concept subsequently rendered in the words: "*the first principles of Christ*," or as might be translated into modern prose, "Christian first principles." The termination of chapter v. seems indeed to express generically the thought which is more specifically expounded at the beginning of chapter vi. Hence as regards the *particular* Revelation which the Author had in mind, the reference may be presumed to refer quite as much to the new as to the older Revelation. Thus we find at short distance of each other two formulæ which are practically expressive of the same idea. Indeed, ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος would seem to be only a stylistic variation, due to instinctive avoidance of monotony, of τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ.

In the latter phrase *στοιχεῖα* may seem at first sight superfluous, but its insertion was necessary for perspicuity, to make it quite clear that ἀρχή, which may mean "beginning" or "principle," belongs to the world of ideas, not to the world of matter. Thus *στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς* is saved from the charge of redundancy. And yet one could hardly quarrel with a critic who should insist that a greater degree of rudimentariness is possibly expressed by τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς elementary principles, than by the parallel ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς λόγος fundamental principles. At any rate the two expressions are substantially the same. Ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος, in philosophic phraseology, might become "First Principles of the System of Christ"—i.e. the Christian System. In the author's mind these are identical with what he here calls also "Elementary Principles of God's Revelation."

The inspired writer is placing before his Jewish Brethren in

the Faith a higher standard of perfection than would be deemed satisfactory in Pagan converts, who had only just mastered *the elements of Christian teaching*. They, the Hebrews, are exhorted to press on beyond this rudimentary stage to higher altitudes of Christian perfection.

The conclusion as to the meaning of *λόγια* is obvious. At any rate, it remains indisputably true that in the two instances of the use of *λόγια* occurring in the Pauline Epistles, the word appears as synonymous either with Revelation or Holy Writ.

From St. Paul we turn to Acts vii. 38. St. Stephen, discoursing before the High Priest and announcing the advent of the Righteous One, the Prophet foretold by Moses, tells his hearers that "the angel spake to 'Moses' in Mount Sinai, and with our fathers: who received *living Oracles* to deliver to us." In this passage *λόγια ζῶντα* is manifestly used to signify the revelation made directly to Moses. It is here, as elsewhere, equivalently "the Inspired Word" and inferentially the Scripture, in which that revelation is recorded.

It is well known that in 2 Peter, St. Paul's writings are spoken of as *γραφή*, Scripture. In the First Epistle of Peter there also occurs a solitary instance of the use of *λόγια*. It presents itself bearing the normal meaning seen in the other New Testament texts. In 1 Peter iv. 11 the word *λόγια* practically amounts to "Inspired Word," and is the equivalent of *γραφή*. "According as each hath received a gift, ministering it among yourselves as good stewards of the manifold grace of God; if any man speaketh, speaking as it were *Oracles of God*"; *εἴ τις λαλεῖ ὡς λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*. Touching the use of charismata for the good of the Church, it will be noticed that St. Peter's teaching very much resembles that of St. Paul. In the passage cited, *λόγια* should more probably be construed as object. Thus the Vulgate has it: *si quis loquitur, quasi sermones Dei*. The grammatical difficulties against taking it as subject are not utterly insurmountable. At any rate the Church speaker is bidden to mould his discourse on *the divine model*; his speech is to be as *the Inspired Word*, the Oracular word of God. To

which revelation, the Old or the New, is the reference in this text? This is a question which it is not necessary, even if it were possible, to answer. The reference may be to all revelation down to the time of writing. At any rate, the main issue is clear: *λόγια θεοῦ* has here its usual value of divinely inspired word or Revelation.

## PART II

## CLEMENT OF ROME, POLYCARP, IRENÆUS

ATTENTION must next be directed to the few texts where the word *λόγια* is encountered in writings of Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Fathers.

Besides occurring in the fragments of Papias, whence discussion originates, the word is met with in the epistle of Clement of Rome, in Polycarp, in Justin, also in the second epistle attributed to Clement of Rome, and in Irenæus.

Before proceeding to a detailed scrutiny of these texts, it should be premised how highly improbable is the contingency that this word should suddenly lose its long-established meaning and previous associations among hearers or among the early readers of St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. Luke. Should it appear, on the other hand, that the word is applied by any of these Fathers to New Testament writings, this fact alone may be taken as strong proof that those books were held to be inspired, were regarded as the Word of God; they were, in short, reckoned on a footing with Old Testament Revelation.

## CLEMENT OF ROME

It is quite obvious that this Father was acquainted with St. Paul's epistles. The latter's words, ideas, phrases, mingle and are dovetailed in with his own thoughts. "Take up the epistle of Blessed Paul," he exhorts the Corinthians, for whom the epistle in question had been written only some forty years previously.

"Why did he write on that first occasion to you, at the outset of the Evangel? Verily it was by inspiration of the Holy Ghost that he despatched to you the monition about himself,

and Kephas and Apollos; because even then you had already started factions" (47. 1).

This appeal to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, with its pointed reference to their former divisions over Kephas, Paul, and Apollos, displays by its appropriateness, on so delicate an occasion, the skill and great tact of the spiritual ruler. And the very naturalness of the request to "take up the Epistle of Blessed Paul" seems to betoken and indeed presuppose familiarity on both sides with the Apostle's letters. It looks as though St. Clement, when he penned that request, had the collection of letters beside him.

Be this as it may, it is quite certain, as Lightfoot has pointed out, that Clement "was imbued with the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians, not to mention several minor letters of St. Paul . . . and, along with these, the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Ap. Fathers I., p. 397).

Moreover, one cannot peruse his only extant letter without being struck by his extensive acquaintance with the Old Testament, which no doubt he studied in the Septuagint version.

Hence one is not surprised to find that this great Roman Bishop, the disciple and successor of Apostles, makes use of the disputed word *λόγια* in three places. In chapter xix. 1 he writes: "The spirit of humility and subjection of so many and such great luminaries, of men on whom testimonials so eulogistic have been showered, brought, by their obedience, betterment not only to us but also to earlier generations, and to those who received *God's Oracular Word* in fear and in truth"—*τούς τε καταδεξαμένους τὰ λόγια αὐτοῦ*. The worthies thus praised are Old Testament personages—Elias, Elisæus, Ezechiel, Abraham, Moses, and David.

It might be urged that the great men enumerated had been in receipt of direct revelation from God. It might also be alleged that all "earlier generations" mentioned enjoyed a like privilege. Yet the fact remains that all such revelations, so far as known, were consigned in the Jewish sacred books, from which Clement drew his knowledge. Hence this passage must be taken as affording an instance where *λόγια* primarily refers to Revelation

yet with implied connotation of Holy Writ. These saints of the Old Law are said to have improved the lot of all those "who accepted the Oracles of God"—i.e. *God's Revelation*. Is Christ's Revelation included here only implicitly? Whatever be the answer to this question, the certainty still remains that in this passage *λόγια τοῦ κυρίου* or *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* retains its normal meaning of Inspired Word or Revelation. In this, as in the other passages, the allusion is to Revelation collectively, and not to any individual component parts or excerpts, much less to sources. Elsewhere, when directly quoting our Lord's historical utterances, Clement most appropriately describes the latter as *λόγοι* not *λόγια*—e.g. *μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 13. 1 (cf. 46. 7)—"being especially mindful of the Lord's words." This is just what should be expected; since Christ *as man* uttered those words in the ordinary way by the instrumentality of human speech. Who could discover any inappropriateness in the use of *λόγοι* rather than *λόγια* when referring to isolated or individual discourses made by Christ *in his human nature*, and not to His Oracular Revelation collectively considered?

And yet each of Christ's *spoken words* were assuredly regarded by His followers as oracular and inspired.

The next instance of the occurrence of *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* in the Clementine Epistle is to be found at the commencement of chapter liii.

Ἐπίστασθε γὰρ καὶ καλῶς ἐπίστασθε τὰς ἱερὰς γραφὰς ἀγαπητοί, καὶ ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ—"You know, Beloved Brethren, you know right well, the Holy Scriptures, and you have pondered (studied closely\*) *the Oracles of God*."

There can be little doubt what is here meant by the Oracles of God. We observe the common antithesis between the *written* and *spoken* word. The Oracles of God are simply God's Word, the Inspired Word, His Revelation; and this is studied or contemplated in *Holy Writ*. When they read Holy Writ, the

\* The verb *ἐγκύπτω* is a favourite expression with Clement for close study of Scripture ("stooping down to look closely at"), cf. *ibid.*, xlv. 2, *ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰς γραφάς*, and xl. 1, *ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως*.

brethren are reminded that they are pondering the *Word of God*. Thus τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ becomes for practical purposes synonymous with γραφή. Neither here, nor indeed in any of the preceding passages, is there the ghost of a shadow of reference to a *Collection* made up exclusively of the Lord's *Discourses* or to a *Manual of Messianic Prophecy*. It so happens that the Scripture quotations immediately preceding the foregoing sentence from Clement are taken from Psalms; while those immediately following refer to events recorded in the Old Testament. As may be expected from one who lived while Apostles were still preaching—in a time, therefore, of transition—the vast majority of Clement's quotations are from the Old Sacred Books, even then of such hoary antiquity. Indeed, he plagiarizes rather than quotes St. Paul. In the passage just discussed Clement must have had the Old Testament in mind, in its entirety of course, and not mere Messianic excerpts.

The third and last Clementine mention of λόγια θεοῦ occurs at the end of chapter lxii., not far from the end of the epistle:

“And we had all the more pleasure in recalling all this to your memory, seeing that we are well aware that we are writing to persons who are believers and most highly distinguished (or “among the very elect”) persons also, who have been students of God's instructive Oracles” (ἐγκεκυφόσι εἰς τὰ λόγια τῆς παιδείας τοῦ θεοῦ—i.e. God's educative Revelation).

Here, again, the expression retains its normal meaning. “God's Educative Oracles” or “God's Oracular Teaching” cannot otherwise be interpreted than as bearing that meaning which previous investigation has already elicited. It is the Inspired Word, that body of doctrine which we call “the Word of God.” It is here *Revelation*, viewed in its moral and educational effects. May it be presumed that here also this term is to be taken as exclusively applied to the older Revelation? There is no absolute evidence to warrant such assumption. At all events, the main point emerges: Clement uses the phrase λόγια θεοῦ in the same generic sense in which it was used by the Septuagint, by Josephus, by Philo, by Peter and Paul, and as it is found in the Acts—namely, as the equivalent of our concept “Word of God.”

## POLYCARP

In the early Fathers we find no crime denounced with so much abhorrence as that of tampering with the Word of God. In dealing with the Sacred Books any addition or subtraction, τὸ προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν—as the scriptural and patristic formula ran—was deemed impious. St. Polycarp, too, warns the Philippians to be on their guard against a practice which was fairly common in his time. He was later in life the contemporary of Marcion and of many Gnostics, who did not scruple to garble both text and meaning of the New Testament books, in order to accommodate them to their pseudo-gnosis. The Philippians are exhorted by him to “display zeal for good, holding aloof from scandals and from false brethren, and from all such as bear the Lord’s name hypocritically, who lead astray vain folk.” Polycarp is clearly hitting at heretics. He goes on (chap. viii.): “For whoso does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, the same is Antichrist; and whosoever fails to confess the witness of the cross, he also is of the Devil. And whoso *distorts the Oracles of the Lord* to his own lusts, and declares that there is neither resurrection nor judgment—such a one is the first-born of Satan. Ὅς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ\* τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας κ.τ.λ.

Commenting on the “denial of the resurrection and judgment” just mentioned, the writer previously quoted, Gregory, remarked: “The doctrine condemned was that of the Sadducees and was not held, so far as I am aware, by any sect of Christians.” This is a bold assertion in the light thrown on this matter by St. Ignatius’ epistles. Most Gnostics, and the Docetæ certainly, came under St. John’s anathema; for by denying the *reality* of “Christ’s flesh” they also denied the fact of His suffering and death. Neither did they stop there. As, in their opinion, Jesus did not really rise from the dead, so they denied to all Christians resurrection after death. Against this doctrine

\* In the summary, entitled Anacephalæosis, of Epiphanius’ Panarion (Migne, P.G. 42, p. 861) we read ἐκάστην λέξιν εἰς τὸν ἑαυτῶν νοῦν μεθοδεύοντες, where the latter term clearly marks distortion of *sense*: “twisting each expression to their own meaning.”

Ignatius thundered, and Polycarp's attitude is fully illustrated by the Ignatian exhortations.

Accordingly, τὸ μεθοδεύειν τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου of the passage recited above, is obviously "distortion of Holy Writ." And there is not the slightest doubt but that Polycarp's strictures are against contemporary heretics, who indulged in this practice. As he uses τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου rather than the more generic τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, he very probably has in mind the evangelical Scriptures. The proof-text quoted is from the First Johannine Epistle. The impious practice anathematized by Polycarp in the words μεθοδεύειν τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου is described by Irenæus as ῥαδιουργεῖν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ.\* Polycarp in this exhortation was not beating the air; he was not denouncing some imaginary or merely hypothetical offence; rather was he dealing with a burning question of the hour.

Pearson (Vind. Ign.) has been at pains to show that not only later Gnostics such as Valentinus, but Marcion also, did not concoct systems *wholly of their own invention*, but built on material left them by their predecessors. Thus Pearson traces the first principles of the Æon system to such early heretics as Simon Magus, Menander, Saturnilus, and above all to Basileides, who died under Hadrian. There is no reason, therefore, for assuming that Valentinus and Marcion—of whose methods we possess ample knowledge—were *the first* to tamper with Scripture. Even Ignatius, whose purpose in writing was neither historical nor didactic, incidentally lets us see an instance of unorthodox interpretation of Scripture. A member of one of the Communities, which the martyr visited on his journey Rome-ward, apparently challenged him on some point of doctrine and called for proof. Ignatius rejoined: γέγραπται, "it is the teaching of Holy Writ." And the reply came prompt: πρόκειται,

\* In classical Greek ῥαδιουργεῖν is used of "reckless, unscrupulous, or knavish conduct." Plutarch used it of "false entries." In the portion of a letter of Dionysius of Corinth to Soter, quoted by Eus. H.E. IV. 23, ῥαδιουργῆσαι is used of *falsification of texts*. Irenæus seems to use this verb in the generic sense of "garbling." For "distortion of *sense*" he seems to prefer ἐφάρμοζεν or μεθαρμόζειν, implying "adaptation."

“it’s a matter of dispute.” We refer the reader to the bishop’s comments on this in Phil. viii. 2.

Hence, although it will not escape notice that Polycarp encountered Marcion in Rome, *rather late in life*, and long after his Epistle had been written, nevertheless it is not too much to suppose that the visitor from Pontus did no more than perfect a practice already in vogue.

Now it is well known that Valentinus and Marcion tampered with the Evangelical writings. Their methods differed. Marcion, as Tertullian appositely expresses it, “corrupted the Scripture with his hands” (i.e. excision); whereas the more deadly Valentinus “corrupted its sense.”\* Or as the same writer has also written: “Valentinus concocted his system to suit the Gospels; Marcion concocted a Gospel to suit his system.” Thus the process termed “distortion” took various forms. It could signify either distortion of meaning, or mutilation and interpolation of the sacred books received by the Church. These modes of corruption will be best illustrated by reference to Irenæus’s great work *Adversus Hæreses*. And there accrues the advantage of further enquiry into the signification of the repeatedly cited phrase *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*.

#### IRENÆUS

Polycarp’s disciple follows a very definite method in his refutation of heresy. He parcels out the heretical system into sections. After exposition of each successive section there follows a sort of scriptural application. This is a dissertation setting forth the scriptural sources on which Gnostics based the grounds of the section of their teaching just given. To speak more correctly, it furnishes the various scriptural texts, or incidents drawn from Scripture, which the heretics endeavoured to *distort* and adapt to their fantastic explanations. In the general preface (Lib. I. 1. 1) we find formulated in general terms the following charge of depravation or perversion of Scripture:

Καὶ διὰ τῆς πανούργως συγκεκροτημένης πιθανότητος παράγουσι τὸν νοῦν τῶν ἀπειροτέρων, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν αὐτούς,

\* Tertull. Lib. de Præscr. chap. xxxviii.

ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰ λόγια κυρίου, ἐξηγηταὶ κακοὶ τῶν καλῶς εἰρημένων γερόμενοι.

“By means of cunningly concocted plausibility (these heretics) mislead the minds of the simple. And they bring them into bondage by *tampering with the Lord's Oracles*, proving themselves incompetent exegetes of noble utterances.”

There can be little doubt what is here meant by *λόγια κυρίου*. He would be a bold man who would deny that it means Scripture. Whether it be the Old, or New, or both, may emerge from the following considerations.

At the very outset of his great work, Irenæus stigmatizes the plausibility whereby Gnostics, in the name of Science, captivated the minds of unsophisticated Brethren. And he further attributes the success of their shady, if plausible, methods to distortion of Dominical Oracles. He proceeds to furnish us with abundant illustrations of this distortion, both in the early chapters of his work and also in others further on. Details are set forth, both of incidents and quotations drawn from Scripture and abused by Gnostics in attempts made to establish Æons and emanations on a scriptural base.

The first such instalment given *is taken wholly from the New Testament*. For instance, the thirty years of the Hidden Life were alleged in some mysterious way to be typified by the thirty Æons of Valentinus. The hours, in the parable of the vineyard, at which the labourers are sent in, 1, 3, 6, 9, and 11, when totalled, amount to thirty. So, according to Christian Science of the second century, these thirty Horai represent thirty Æons. No wonder the Bishop of Lyons exclaims somewhat sarcastically: “Behold their great, marvellous, and unspeakable mysteries, the ripe fruits of their wisdom (or gnosis); these and aught else in the shape of scriptural numbers adaptable to their theories.” Among many Scripture passages cited as utilized in the manner described (Adv. Haer., chap. iii.) is the Pauline sentence *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων τοῦ αἰῶνος* (Eph. iii. 21). This was also crudely and falsely interpreted of the primordial Æons. More quaint still was the Gnostic assimilation of that very common liturgical formula “*per omnia sæcula sæculorum*,” in its

Greek dress: εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Gnostic genius was not lacking in versatility however absurd. Among many other New Testament passages perversely utilized, as Irenæus records, occurs one from Paul which they very much prized as providing a root-word of their system: ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος. Their κένωμα, likewise, could take on a Pauline complexion.

Irenæus continues (I. 3. 9): "Such assertions are common to them all as regards their pleroma figment, in their attempts to accommodate the excellent sayings (of Holy Writ) to their own fabrications."

The foregoing should enable the reader to estimate what is meant by ῥαδιουργεῖν τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου. Seeing, too, that the specimens of depravation given are all taken from the *New Testament*, it would seem that τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου, in the mind of Irenæus, refers rather definitely to the New Testament. Thus emerges the special meaning of Dominical Oracles as "those pertaining to the Lord"—i.e., the New Testament Records of the Lord.

On distortion of *Old Testament* sayings, Irenæus's introductory remarks are as follows: "And it is not only from the *Evangelical and Apostolic Writings* that they endeavour to draw proofs by means of distorted interpretation and falsified exegesis, but they draw also on the *Law and the Prophets*."

This line of argument is again resumed in I. 18. 1:

Ἐκ δὲ τῶν προφητικῶν ὅσα μεταμορφόζουσιν (μεθαρμόζουσιν?) ἀναγκαῖον μνηύσαντα τὸν ἔλεγχον αὐτοῖς ἐπάγειν.

"It next becomes necessary to point out the metamorphosed (adapted) passages from the Prophetic Writings (i.e., O.T.) and thus refute them." This preamble is followed by lists of Gnostic misinterpretation of O.T. extracts and incidents which need not be given in detail.

No apology seems necessary for such lengthy quotation. For it presents the most serviceable commentary on what Irenæus, as well as Polycarp, meant when they spoke of *distortion* of the Lord's Oracles. They were denouncing what went on in their own lifetime, under their own eyes, a practice adopted by all

those sects, of indiscriminate distortion of Scripture. Yet everywhere here *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, but oftener *λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*, wherever the expression occurs, stands for Scripture, not for the "Lord's discourses" only, still less for a "Special Manual of Messianic Prophecies," but generically and univocally for the Scriptures in general, whether of the Old or New Testament. It has been pointed out, though perhaps not adequately established as an invariably prevailing rule, that *λόγια κυρίου* or *κυριακά*, in Polycarp and Irenæus, generally refer to the New Testament. This is distinctly so in the one passage occurring in Justin. The resulting argument in favour of the Papian *λόγια κυριακά* being simply Evangelical Records is as unavoidable as it is cogent.

There remains one important passage of Irenæus in which this disputed word is twice used. In the first section of chapter viii. the author is describing exclusively the methods of Valentinus in tampering with Holy Writ.

"Such is the theory they put forward—a theory neither announced by the Prophets nor taught by the Lord, nor handed down by the Apostles—in which they braggartly lay claim to a knowledge of all things beyond everybody else. This they profess to draw from Scriptures that were never written, trying to make, as the proverb hath it, ropes out of sand. And with a show of probability they endeavour to *adapt to their expositions either the Lord's parables or Prophetic sayings or words of Apostles*, in order that their fiction may not seem devoid of evidence. Moreover, they pass by the order [*τὴν τάξιν: λέξιν* would mean "precise words"] and drift of Holy Writ, and thereby, as far as in them lies, they loosen the limbs of truth. They *transpose and transfigure*, and try one means after another, and thus they succeed by the ill-jointed wisdom of adaptation of *Dominical Scripture*" (Oracles), *Τῇ τῶν ἐφαρμοζομένων κυριακῶν λογίων κακοσυνθέτῳ σοφίᾳ*.

The *λόγια κυριακά*, the false adaptation of which is thus reprobated, are nothing else but the *Oracles pertaining to the Lord*—i.e., the Dominical or Evangelical Scriptures.

The remainder of the first section (chap. viii., bk. i.) is

equally instructive, both as to the meaning of *λόγια*, and as to heretical depravation of Scripture.

“Suppose a skilled artist had wrought the picture of a king in a mosaic of famous gems, and someone were to destroy its human countenance, and, by transposition and fresh adaptation of the precious stones, were to produce the image of a dog or of a fox, and all this in inartistic fashion: and suppose it were then energetically noised abroad that this was the beautiful image of the king, wrought by the clever artist; and let us imagine this declaration to be made by one who simultaneously pointed to the gems as those actually put together by that first great artist, but which had been pitiably misplaced by a later hand to produce the form of the dog. Thanks to the appearance of the gems, simple folk, who had no definite idea of the royal features, might be persuaded into believing that this rotten image of a fox is the noble likeness of their king. And in like manner these fellows weave together their old wives’ tales; and then they proceed to draw from here and there and everywhere words, sentences, similitudes, and so wish to adapt *God’s own oracles* to their fables”—*ἐφαρμόζειν βούλονται τοῖς μύθοις αὐτῶν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*.

The beautiful picture is the portrait of Christ and His Revelation, as set forth in that mosaic of gems here called *τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, and representing the Old, or New, or both Testaments. The caricature is that medley of Christianity, pagan philosophy, and Gnostic fiction, set forth in the gems stolen from Bible or Gospel by heretical writers.

There is not the slightest shadow of doubt but that the Lord’s Logia, in the language of Irenæus, means the Inspired Word, the Word of God, as collectively found in the Sacred Scriptures—those very Scriptures, old and new, which Gnostics so impudently attempted to distort. It may not be amiss to quote one more extract (I. 20. 1) where Irenæus distinctly mentions the fabrication of apocryphal Gospels: “Moreover, they concocted an untold number of apocryphal and spurious Scriptures; and they hawk them about to the bewilderment of the unintelligent, and of such as are unacquainted with the literature of truth.” By this truthful literature the *genuine gospels* are meant.

Irenæus informs us he was a disciple of Polycarp. Papias, if we may trust the authority of Irenæus, was *auditor Joannis, sodalis autem Polycarpi*. Tradition also reckons Ignatius among the disciples of John. In the passage in which Polycarp has penned his denunciation of those who tamper with "the Oracles of the Lord," he quotes, from St. John's First Epistle, the anathema against such as deny that Christ has come in the flesh. These heretics are also condemned by Ignatius. Already in the time of St. Paul there were men in the Church of Corinth who denied the Resurrection. The persons admonished by Paul, condemned by John, are probably forerunners of those denounced by Ignatius, Polycarp, and Irenæus. The three protagonists John, Polycarp, Irenæus seem to have attacked Gnosticism in one or other of its phases. All three stood for Apostolic tradition against the idiosyncrasies of gnosis or pseudo-science.

The testimony of Polycarp and Irenæus to the meaning attached to Logia by Christian writers of the time of Papias would of itself be sufficient to settle this question for ever. There now remains a further remarkable corroboration left us accidentally by Justin.

Before, however, proceeding to Justin, a brief examination of a passage occurring in the so-called second Clementine Epistle may be permitted here. The Author of the *Epistola Secunda ad Corinthios* wrote as follows (II. 13. 3): Τὰ ἔθνη γὰρ ἀκούοντα ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ἡμῶν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς καλὰ καὶ μεγάλα θαυμάζει· ἔπειτα καταμαθόντα τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τῶν ῥημάτων ὧν λέγομεν ἔνθεν εἰς βλασφημίαν τρέπονται. The substance of which is that "The Gentiles, hearing from our mouths the *Oracles of God*, admire their beauty and grandeur. Later, observing our *deeds*, and finding them unworthy of the *words* we speak, they turn to blasphemy."

In the paragraph immediately following we are given a specimen of "what the Gentiles hear," presumably drawn from the Logia. It is nothing but a paraphrase or loose quotation of Luke vi. 32-35: "No thanks (reward) to you if you love those that love you; but (you deserve) thanks (a reward) if you love

enemies and those that hate you.” He then proceeds to comment: “When they have heard this, they are lost in admiration . . . but when they have noticed that we not only do not love enemies, but that we do not so much as love those that love us, they laugh us to scorn, and ‘the Name’ becomes a theme for blasphemy.”

The writer is a Christian teacher addressing a Christian community. Christian practice must be in keeping, he insinuates, with Christian teaching. This Christian teaching pagans learn indirectly from the *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*—i.e. the Scriptures, including the Gospel.

The Gospel at this time was an authoritative source from which Christ’s teaching was obtainable. The *Logia* bear the same meaning as in Irenæus.

The author of this epistle, in a previous passage (8. 5), having occasion to quote another saying of our Lord—the source of which seems to have been Luke xvi. 10-12 “. . . He that is faithful in little is faithful also in much”—tells us explicitly that he is quoting from the Gospel. The introductory words are: “For the Lord says *in the Gospel*.” Had the quotation been drawn from a special manual, distinct from the Gospel, to which modern critics have given the title “*Logia*,” this title would have been used here also. The conclusion is that the two titles could be used indifferently without risk of misunderstanding.

## PART III

## I.—JUSTIN MARTYR

THIS great apologist, who moved about the streets of Rome clad in the garb of a philosopher, was demonstrably familiar with the Gospels. Of these he speaks as "Memoirs done by the Apostles, which are called gospels" (Apolog. I. 66. 3). He further supplies the information that at Christian meetings held on Sundays the "*Memoirs of the Apostles* are read as far as time allows" (Ibid. 67. 3). In an address written for the Emperor and Senate of Rome, it is not to be wondered that, in referring to Evangelical records, Justin would use the classical term ἀπομνημονεύματα with which his hearers might well be supposed to be acquainted.

Mr. Rendel Harris (*Expositor*, May, 1920) has well brought out the significance of that term, already adopted by Xenophon as a label for his history of the *Words and Works*\* of Socrates. The Pagan World would thus be informed that Christians also possessed records of kindred import, telling of the sayings and deeds of Christ. At the same time Justin supplies the esoteric name of these records, when he adds that they are called Gospels. But in dealing with a Jew, Trypho, this philosopher, wisely accommodating himself to his audience, further makes use of a label which a Greek-speaking Jew would better appreciate. This is the term λόγια ἐκείνου.

It occurs in the "Dialogue with the Jew Trypho," chap. xviii. (M.G., Justin, Col. 516). This, however, is not the formula with which previous quotations have made us familiar. Justin does not use *totidem verbis* the label τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου. Yet he

\* Mem. I. 1. 11, and I. 1. 20, λέγων καὶ πράττων.

does virtually and implicitly mention, what amounts to the same, τὰ λόγια ἐκείνου, where ἐκείνος clearly stands for Χριστός.\*

The phrase βραχέα τῶν ἐκείνου λόγια at first glance might be taken to mean "Some short oracles of His." Indeed, an ardent champion of what has been often referred to as the "messianic interpretation" might claim to interpret these logia mentioned by Justin as "prophecies about the Christ." Such interpretation is, however, positively excluded, because it would destroy the contrast forcibly expressed between "*His* logia"—that is, Christ's logia—and "the *Prophetic* Logia." For this antithesis appears in this text as strong as that between the N.T. and O.T.

Justin has been citing passages from *Christian* Scripture; for doing so, he would justify himself to the Jew, who only recognizes the "Prophetic" or O.T. documents. Hence what Justin purported to adduce, what he did actually adduce, were "short extracts from *His* (Christ's) Oracles (βραχέα [λόγια] τῶν ἐκείνου [λογίων]) parallel to, in fact exact, analogues of the familiar label "God's (O.T.) Oracles," mentioned by Philo, Josephus, and the rest.

This will be seen from a study of the text which must now be given *in extenso*: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀνέγνως, ὦ Τρύφων, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογήσας ἔφη, τὰ ὑπὸ ἐκείνου τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδαχθέντα, οὐκ ἄτοπον νομίζω πεποιηκέναι καὶ βραχέα τῶν ἐκείνου λόγια πρὸς τοῖς προφητικοῖς ἐπιμνησθεῖς.

The words τῶν ἐκείνου exhibit the grammatical figure known as ellipsis. We are face to face with a well-known form of Greek abridged diction. βραχέα τῶν ἐκείνου λόγια is merely an abridgment of βραχέα λόγια τῶν ἐκείνου λογίων. Here τῶν ἐκείνου presupposes τὰ ἐκείνου and implies τὰ ἐκείνου λόγια, which is grammatically identical with what has so often been encountered in these pages as τὰ λόγια κυρίου.

When Justin penned the abridgment above mentioned, the latter formula was certainly before his mind. Thus, on complete analysis, there emerges a fully literal yet correct translation, "Brief oracles from among *His* Oracles." In modern speech

\* Compare τὰ λόγια αὐτοῦ in a passage quoted from Clement.

one would rightly render: "brief extracts from the *Dominical Oracles*."

It has already been pointed out that in Philo and in Josephus *λόγια θεοῦ*, "God's Oracles," represent directly the Old Revelation, and indirectly the Old Testament books. The N.T. writers, as also Clement of Rome, use the same formula likewise of O.T. Revelation. The phrase was certainly not confined to isolated oracular utterances such as would be quotations from the Psalms and Prophetic writings; it embraced all O.T. Revelation, including the historical books.

In the passage from Justin the reference is clearly to Christ's Revelation. Context as well as usage render this conclusion unassailable.

The word *λόγιον*, unqualified and in the singular form, seems always to retain its force of an individual item of revelation. In the plural, and also unqualified, it could convey the notion of "items of revelation" or "divine communications." But in the qualified form *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* it is simply the Word of God or Revelation in general with connotation of the O.T. From Polycarp onwards *λόγια κυρίου* tends to be applied more specifically to the whole corpus of Christian Revelation. And this is the force of the expression "His Logia" as found in Justin. To allege that this Christian philosopher is here referring to some unknown *collection* of Christ's sayings, or to an imaginary *manual* of messianic prophecy, or to *Testimonia*, is to ignore the normal value of this formula and to shut one's eyes to the context.

Justin, as the context testifies, is referring to the brief citations he has just made from that body of doctrine generally known as *τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*—i.e., "Oracles concerning the Lord"—that is, God's Word or Revelation as couched in New Testament Scripture.

What was the nature of the extracts actually quoted by Justin? They are practically all definite recorded *sayings* of Christ, *λόγοι Χριστοῦ*. But among them occurs one very precious item—a little portion of Gospel *narrative*. It is the following, and is quoted no doubt as usual from memory: *καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν ἐν τῇ ναῷ κολλυβιστῶν κατέστρεψε.*

"He overturned the tables of the money-changers in the temple." This sentence is found verbatim in our modern N.T. texts, save for the substitution by Justin of *ναός* for the synonym *ἱερόν*. This extract with the rest was, according to Justin, found in the collection which he mentions as *τὰ λόγια ἐκείνου*, which elsewhere he calls "the Gospel," and elsewhere again "Memoirs of the Apostles." Nothing could do more to impose the conviction that Justin quoted the Gospel to the Jew.

The whole passage may now be correctly presented as follows: "Since you read, Tryphon, as you yourself expressly declared, the doctrines taught by our Saviour, whom I have mentioned (*ἐκεῖνος* = the person mentioned), I do not think I have been guilty of any absurdity in also recalling, besides the Prophetic Oracles, short oracles from *His Oracles*."

The context deserves careful study. Justin had just indulged in some quotations from the Christian Gospel. Hitherto, since he was arguing with a Jew, he had confined himself to citations from what he terms the "Prophetic Oracles." This is practically synonymous with "Prophetic Writings," and does not necessarily exclude the non-prophetic portions of the O.T. Justin, while no doubt intending to reassure the Jew, who knew of more than one Christian sect, that his exposition was based on orthodox official documents, makes some sort of apology for quoting the *Christian*, side by side with the Jewish Testament: *πρὸς τοῖς προφητικοῖς ἐπιμνησθεῖς*. Sufficient apology is found in the fact that this Jew was already acquainted with the Saviour's lofty moral teaching, *τὰ διδαχθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος*, elsewhere characterized as *θαυμαστὰ καὶ μεγάλα*.

Now what was the book in which this Jew had read the Saviour's teaching—teaching which Justin has just been quoting from *τὰ λόγια ἐκείνου*?

The book is happily known to us from a declaration of the Jew previously made and set forth in the Dialogue. It is as follows: *Ἰμῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα θαυμαστὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἐπίσταται εἶναι ὥς ὑπολαμβάνειν μηδένα δύνασθαι φυλάξαι αὐτά*. Dial. chap. x. (M.G., Justin, Col. 496 c.).

"Those precepts of yours that are found in the *so-called Gospel* I also know to be passing great, so as to lead to the conviction that none can keep them."

Trypho, as was seen, had confessed to a reading acquaintance with Christ's doctrines *ἐπειδὴ ἀνέγνως ὡς ὁμολογήσας ἔφη*. He had actually made it his business to read them *ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐμέλησεν ἐντυχεῖν αὐτοῖς*. The Gospel precepts had quite overawed the Jew, thanks to the exalted standard of Christian morality. Gospel morality has seemed unattainable to others as well as to this Jew, and it continues to be voted impracticable by many advocates of the categorical imperative and self-imposed ethics. We can afford to pardon the Jew however, as he has been the means of enabling us to realize that the "Saviour's doctrines" which the Jew had read in a book contemptuously styled "*the so-called Gospel*" are seen to be drawn from the same source from which Justin quoted, and which Justin calls *τὰ λόγια ἐκείνου*. No more convincing proof could be required than these dicta of Justin to identify *τὰ λόγια ἐκείνου* with *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, each containing *τὰ διδαχθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος*. To sum up, Justin, dealing with a Jew, adopts on this occasion the language of Philo and Josephus, and speaks of the written records of Christ as *τὰ λόγια ἐκείνου*; before the Roman Senate he speaks of the same record of the *Words and Works* of Christ as *Memoirs*, thus likening them to classical History. Lest he be deemed to be in any way ashamed of the Gospel, he lets it be known that these Historical Memoirs (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*) are also "called the Gospel."

## II.—PAPIAS

Having scrutinized the meaning attaching to the word Logia in the Septuagint, in Philo, in Josephus, in the New Testament; having studied its further application in the writings of Clement, Polycarp, and Justin, surely it is to be presumed that Papias must have used the word with like connotation to what is found in his predecessors, contemporaries, and immediate successors? If to Clement, to Polycarp, to Justin, and to Irenæus, Logia

meant directly "the Word of God" and indirectly Scripture, such, too, must be the assumption of its meaning in Papias.

The title of Papias' lost work, known to have consisted of five books, was *Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις*.

This title appears in all the oldest references to the literary output of this Bishop of Hierapolis, who lived *circa* A.D. 71-140. It is very probably the title given to his work by the author himself.

Curiously enough, this word "exegesis" has ever since been associated with reasoned exposition of the Gospels, and even now stands for Scripture commentary. The later Church Fathers favour the use of the word *διήγησις* to represent *narrative* or historical *exposition*; whereas the parallel term *ἐξήγησις* has been steadily applied to Scripture *Commentary*. Possibly it was Papias who set the fashion; and Church writers are notoriously conservative. In the first place, then, it must be observed that Papias wrote an Interpretation or *commentary* of some kind. Secondly, his Commentary dealt with a subject designated by a name with which the reader should now be familiar—i.e., *λόγια κυριακά*. We have met it more frequently with descriptive genitive as *λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*, than, as here, with attributive adjective. "Dominical Oracles" or "Oracles of the Lord" are one and the same thing. In Polycarp and Irenæus they are the Word of God as contained in Scripture, which it is impiety to garble, and are definitely used of the Christian Scripture *par excellence*—that is, the Gospel. Hence the conclusion seems inevitable that these *λόγια κυριακά*, on which Papias commented, bear the meaning they bear elsewhere—i.e., that of "inspired word" and equivalently Scripture and therefore Gospel.

Thirdly, we find preserved in the Papias Fragments two specimens of his exegesis: one concerning Mark, the other concerning Matthew. Both comments merely report sayings of one John, who is nowadays variously spoken of as the Ancient, the Old Man, the Elder, or the Presbyter. Concerning the author of the second Gospel, a tradition reaching Papias from this venerable source is, that what Mark committed to writing was done "to the best of his recollection," and that it consisted

of "the *Words and Works* of Christ." Papias here makes use of the very expression used by Plato, in the "Phædo," on the memorable occasion when one of the interlocutors calls eagerly for a *full and detailed account* of the events that preceded Socrates' death. The quotation, if it be such, might help to justify the epithet once applied by Eusebius to Papias: ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα λογιώτατος (H.E. III. 36), but subsequently qualified, if not contradicted, by the description: σφόδρα σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν (H.E. III. 39). Thus, on the assurance of this Old Man, or Ancient, who was Papias' senior, possibly his teacher, we learn that Mark's writings about Christ were in the nature of *historical memoirs*. Records of *dicta et facta*, ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα, were commonly classed as ἀπομνημονεύματα or *memorabilia*. Mr. Harris has rendered service in directing attention to the classic example of such histories. It is the *Memorabilia* or *Memoirs* of Xenophon of the *Words and Works* of Socrates.\* Hence we have it on the authority of so early a writer as Papias, and indeed on the authority of a still more ancient and more important witness, that Mark wrote something in the nature of a *history of Christ*.

Further, Mark's record of the *sayings and doings* of Christ is described by Papias or his Mentor under the now familiar title of κυριακὰ λόγια—i.e., Dominical Oracles, precisely the subject of the "Interpretation." For in this same precious fragment Papias also tells us that Mark reproduced Peter's (catechetical) instructions; and he further explains how Peter delivered these instructions according to the needs of his hearers, and "*not as if he were making a book of Dominical Oracles*" (σύνταξιν = σύνταγμα). Here the unexpressed implication "as Mark did" or "as Matthew did" would have been obvious to Papias' readers. And this implication of "οὐχ ὥσπερ" conveys to us precisely what Mark did—i.e., σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιεῖσθαι λογίων. The latter reading is obviously preferable to λόγων.

\* Plato's "Phædo," commonly known as the dialogue on the soul's immortality, is, in the concrete, a record of the last hours of Socrates. The opening question of the eager inquirer, who asks for *full details*, is couched as follows: τί ἦν τὰ λεχθέντα καὶ πραχθέντα; Bekker's ed. "Phæd.," § 4, "what was said and done?" Steph. 58. Jowett seems to have read ἦ not καί.

From this contrast between Peter's labours and those of Mark we get the information—absolutely in harmony with what preceded—that Mark's task was the compilation of a Gospel out of material supplied by Peter, *præter intentionem Petri*. Accordingly, Mark is said to have done his best with material at hand, and to have avoided blunders if he wrote some items *just from memory* and not in (chronological?) order, his object being to reproduce all the matter of his master's (catechetical) instructions, and that "without faults either of omission or commission," to quote Mr. Harris' version.

Accordingly from John the Ancient, through Papias, comes to us the information that Mark's work on the *Words and Works of Christ* was in the nature of reminiscences, *memorabilia*, historical memoirs, in fact a Gospel.

Moreover, Mark's Memoirs of *dicta et facta* are described by Papias in words closely resembling those used by the Author of Acts in describing a previous treatise written by him. "The first treatise I made concerning all Jesus began *to do and to teach* till the day on which he was raised up," Acts i. 1. A record of *teaching and doing*, ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν (ποιηθέντα καὶ διδαχθέντα) cannot, *in form at least*, have differed materially from Mark's record of *words and works*, ἡ λεχθέντα ἡ πραχθέντα.

It is unnecessary, further, to stress the fact that, as Mark wrote λόγια κυριακά, his claim to authorship of a Gospel is unquestionable. It is also clear what was the subject of Papias' commentary or interpretation.

Concerning Matthew, Papias supplies scanty, yet valuable, information. Matthew, he tells us, wrote, or got written (συνετάξατο or συνεγράψατο), *Logia*. The reader knowing what was said about Mark's Logia would require no further enlightenment on this point. He would already know from the note on Mark—even if he might be presumed ignorant of a *word in general use*—that Logia virtually meant Gospel, just as did the Logia of Mark.

But this is not the principal item of information conveyed by the brief note on Matthew. The real statement turns on the origin of Matthew's Logia. Papias learns from John the Elder

that it was originally composed in Aramaic. In fact the psychological predicate of the whole sentence is the *Aramaic* (Hebrew) *origin* of the Matthæan Logia—i.e. of Matthew's Gospel.

There was a time in the past when Christians interpreted (ἡρμήνευσεν) Matthew as best they could. Possibly the Greek version which we still possess was so long in use among Papias' Hellenistic readers, that they needed to be reminded that their copy of Matthew was after all only a translation. It is possible even to infer that there had been more than one attempt before the authorized translation prevailed.

The foregoing, while not professing to be an exhaustive account of the contents of Papias' comments on Mark and Matthew, sets forth their substance fairly accurately.

A summary of the results of this investigation may now be given by way of conclusion.

When the formula *λόγια θεοῦ*, *λόγια κυρίου* first appears in the Septuagint, it is, as was seen, simply the Divine Word or Divine Revelation in general. To Josephus and Philo, the Logia, collectively considered, are the Oracular sacred utterances to be found in Jewish Sacred Books. To these writers the Logia of the Jews were Revelation as consigned in Jewish Scripture.

In St. Paul, in Acts, in 1 Peter, *λόγια θεοῦ* presents the same *generic* meaning, and represents the Oracular or Divine Revelation as found in the Sacred Books. In New Testament writers Logia are equivalently *γραφή*, or Holy Writ. The formula is not used exclusively of any one part or portion (Prophecies, for instance), but of the whole Divine Word as found in Holy Writ.

Attention was called to the fact that it may be a moot-point, whether the reference in one or two of these New Testament passages be not to the New as well as to the Old Revelation. Clement of Rome uses Logia with much the same meaning as that of S. Paul.

As one advances to the early Church Fathers, one realizes that *λόγια κυρίου*, or *λόγια αὐτοῦ*, or *ἐκείνου* has a closer, nay direct, connexion with Christ and His Revelation. In these

Fathers one perceives that *λόγια κυρίου*, while retaining its generic meaning of Inspired Word, has often specific reference to New Testament Revelation. Though the formula adopted by the author of the Second Clementine Epistle is *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, his reference is to Christian Revelation, as may be proved from context.

Hence the inevitable conclusion that Papias was making use of an expression *in already fairly common use*, and that he used it with that definite meaning—i.e. in the sense of Scripture “pertaining to the Lord”—i.e. Christian Revelation as couched in the Gospel.

And this conclusion is strengthened by the internal and circumstantial evidence to be drawn from Papias’ own statements. His positive statement, made on the authority of John who was his senior, that Mark wrote the *dicta et facta* of Christ, points unerringly to the inference that Mark’s *ἀπομνημονεύματα* or Memoirs could have been nothing else but a Gospel. Accordingly the subject of Papias’ five books was *Gospel exegesis*.

### III.—PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS

The foregoing conclusion gains corroborative evidence, which no scholar can afford to ignore, from the consistent usage of Pseudo-Dionysius. It is well known that this philosopher took systematic pains to pass off his writings as the work of the Pauline convert, Dionysius the Areopagite. Now among minor contrivances, adopted to further this impersonation, is the word employed to denote *Revelation* and *Scripture*. It is a curious fact that in all his extant works, when he has occasion to quote from the Testament, Old or New, he very frequently refers to it as *Logia*. His use of this word as synonymous with Scripture is so common that it would be superfluous to give instances. In a recent translation of two treatises made by C. E. Rolt, and published by the S.P.C.K., this translator consistently translates *λόγια* by our word *Scripture*. And he is certainly right. Hence we are left to ponder the significant fact that, in the opinion of an acute thinker and erudite writer, who flourished in

the late fifth or early sixth century, the term which a disciple of St. Paul *would select* to make known to pagan and Christian readers what we know as Revelation, and, in its written form, as Scripture, was precisely the controverted word found in Papias, a younger contemporary of the real St. Dionysius. It is to be presumed that Pseudo-Dionysius was quite as competent to form a judgment on this matter as our modern critics, and he certainly had access to writings now lost. Thus the evidence is very strong, that up to the middle of the second century, not only Jews, but Christians also, made use of the word Logia, especially in speaking to pagans, to denote Revelation whether in its oral or written form. The latter would find the word quite intelligible, seeing that they used it of communications having some similarity, yet so different.

#### IV.—EUSEBIUS AND THE BYZANTINES

Lingering traces of the use of Logia for Holy Writ are found even in Eusebius' History, where the usage has a flavour of archaic diction. In H.E. II. 10 Eusebius, when recounting the death of Herod Agrippa, recalls the reference to this dramatic event occurring in Acts xii. 22, 23, and the historian even quotes the *ipsissima verba* of Luke: "the angel of the Lord suddenly smote him." This explicit quotation from Acts is introduced in the following words: τὸ λόγιον ἱστορεῖ, "the passage in Holy Writ records," or, to give it literally: "The oracular utterance records." Here one has an excellent example of λόγιον used for a single oracular utterance, or divine communication—in this case, a *definite text of Scripture*.

Let us now cite an illustration, drawn also from Eusebius, of the plural λόγια used for Holy Writ.

After mentioning (H.E. VI. 23) the material aid rendered by Ambrosius to Origen, Eusebius goes on to speak of the moral support given by this same friend to foster Origen's "devotion to Scripture." "Yea, furthermore, in the matter of Origen's self-denial and *devotion to Holy Writ* (σπουδὴ περὶ τὰ θεῖα λόγια) the enthusiasm with which he helped to inspire him

passes description." Finally, it must not be forgotten that the normal Christian meaning of *θεῖα λόγια* or *ἱερὰ λόγια* continued to be inherent in this expression, long after Eusebius, and even after the time of Pseudo-Dionysius. It passed on to the Byzantines and was one of their regular synonyms in use for *γραφή*. Without any effort whatever to hunt up this word in Byzantine literature, I have quite accidentally alighted on three instances, which may as well be given here.

In the "Life of St. Evaristus" (Higoumenos in Constantinople), which must have been written in the tenth century, we find : *τράπεζα πολυτελής (αὐτοῖς ἐνομιζέτο) ἡ τῶν θεῶν λογίων μελέτη καὶ ἡ διηλεκτὴς ὑμνωδία*. "A sumptuous spread in their eyes was the (reading of) exercise (drill) in Holy Writ and continuous psalmody" (Analect. Bolland, tome xli., fasc. iii. and iv., p. 302, chap. 9). Two other passages are taken from "Deux Inédits Byzantins sur les Azymes au Début du XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle," published by the Biblical Institute. Here we meet : Simeon 26 (p. 235) *τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος λόγια ἰδίοις κανόσιν ὀρίζονται*. "The Oracles of the Spirit (i.e. the Scriptures) have their own canons of interpretation." And *ibid.* John of Antioch 4 (last sent, p. 246), *ἀκοῇ ἀκούοντες τὰ ἱερὰ λόγια καὶ οὐ συνιέντες*, "listening with their ears to the (Divine Oracles) the Scriptures and not understanding."

#### V.—OXYRRHINCHUS' "SAYINGS"

So far all mention has been purposely omitted of recent discoveries, notably of the Oxyrhynchus papyri, containing "Sayings of Christ." This late collection has been looked on by certain theorists as confirmatory of those views that would represent Logia as being either "A Collection of Sayings of the Lord" or "A Collection of Messianic Prophecies" (Gregory), or "The Book of Testimonies" (Rendel Harris), the latter a collection chiefly, it would seem, of prophecies actually employed in support of Christ's Messiahship. It is not necessary to dwell on this supposed new evidence. The able editor of these texts,

Mr. White, has definitely and advisedly discarded the word *λόγια* and reads *λόγοι*. So the title (we are quoting from a short notice in *Revue Biblique*, April, 1921, p. 294) seems to be *Λόγοι Χριστοῦ*.\* We are here face to face with an early *collection of sayings*, attributed to Christ. Opinions are divided as to the source from which they are drawn. The most likely conclusion points to their being extracts from some Apocryphal Gospel, possibly from the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." This somewhat late "collection of (reputed) Sayings of Christ" differs *toto cœlo* from the works of Mark and Matthew, designated by Papias as *λόγια κυρίου*. But neither did the collector label his collection as Logia.

## VI.—LATEST OPINIONS

Nevertheless, it looks as if the theory underlying that well-known label "*Logian Document*," which seems to have passed into general use, will die hard, and may long continue to leave its taint on British scholarship.

The Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D., who will not be suspected of partiality, writes as follows (*Expositor*, vol. xx., p. 300): "Continental critics do not restrain their astonishment that English and American scholars should still be talking of 'The Logia of Papias' or 'the Ur-Matthæan Logia' as if some other *σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων* were in the mind of Papias, or of his possible informants, than simply our Matthew, which for obvious reasons Greek writers assumed to be translated from the Hebrew. Oxford is not the only 'place where German theories go when they die.'"

Our own views were committed to writing before we lighted on this passage.

Another critic of great authority, the late Dr. Sanday, is quoted by Bacon, in the article just mentioned, as being responsible for the following declaration: "The works to which Papias

\* In a note on page 90, "Hor. Syn.," Sir John Hawkins admits that "the name *λόγιον* is not applied to them in this document."

alludes cannot be our present Gospels in their present form." This has at least the appearance of a mild apology for the now exploded "Ur-Matthæus," the "*Logian* document," etc. Further valuable information is also added for our benefit by Professor Bacon. 'The theory to which Professor Burkitt has unfortunately given support and currency in *Historical Transmission of the Gospels* that the *λόγια κυριακά* which formed the subject of Papias' five books of *ἐξηγήσεις* (*sic*) were not precepts of the Lord at all, and had nothing to do with the "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith," as to which Papias made his enquiries; but were merely a collection of Messianic prophecies from the Old Testament. . . . Professor Rendel Harris has taken up this *erratic* idea with all his customary enthusiasm. In his *Testimonia* he is prepared to carry back such anthologies from the days of Cyprian to the very sources of the Gospels themselves, making the *collector of customs* the first *collector of proof-texts*.' The stricture is not undeserved, and must have been distasteful to the friend who administered it. This spectacle of Sanday and Burkitt and Harris and many others accepting, possibly with undue haste, the theories of Schleiermacher and Cassel or of Gregory, has its lesson of encouragement for such as cling to Horace's axiom *Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*. Be it noted by way of conclusion that Bacon, while reading a much needed lesson to his learned colleagues, incidentally takes occasion to advertise one of his own many heresies on Gospel origins. Burkitt rightly refused to equate "logia of the Lord" merely to "*commandments* (*ἐντολαί*) of the Lord." The latter do not constitute the whole, but only a portion of the "Lord's Revelation," which we possess consigned in the Gospel.

Lest we be taxed with giving a one-sided view of the Professor's opinion on the one matter in which we agree, it may be well to append here another and perhaps clearer statement on the Logian question.

"To imagine Papias, the contemporary of Justin Martyr and the Didache, resorting to any other authority than our own Greek Gospel of Matthew, is to commit an anachronism. We

have no ground whatever for conceiving him as referring to some unheard-of apostolic source, any more than we can reasonably maintain that the whole Christian world was mistaken, which for centuries after resorted to Papias' work as the standard account of the origin of the Gospels; and the Fathers invariably take what Papias says as applying to our Matthew and nothing else. Indeed, there is something almost ludicrous in accusing them of misunderstanding an author *whom they knew and we do not*. The only tenable supposition is that Papias used our Matthew, believing it to be the translation by an unknown hand of an Aramaic writing composed by the Apostle Matthew. Antiquity has absolutely nothing else to report on the subject."

The foregoing may be accepted as a fairly correct presentation of the facts, barring the insinuation about the synchronous literary activity of Papias and his younger contemporary, Justin. According to Irenæus, Eusebius, and the rest, Papias, Ignatius, and Polycarp are contemporaries and more or less *æquales*, but Justin is at least a generation younger. Bacon further holds that Papias wrote his "exegesis" against Marcion. Antiquity has left no evidence of this. It would be nearer the mark to say that Papias had in mind the same heretics as Polycarp, whose letter was written when he was a comparatively young man, and shortly after the martyrdom of Ignatius. On the other hand, nothing is known of the exact date of Papias' death, and it is possible that his polemic may have been directed against Basileides, who flourished under Hadrian. Eusebius, however, when mentioning the labours of Agrippa Castor against Basileides' errors,\* does not include Papias among that heretic's opponents. Neither has Eusebius communicated to us any knowledge of any use made by Justin, in his work against Marcion, of the work of Papias, which Bacon would have us believe was also directed against Marcion, who "came to Rome under Pius, and whose *floruit* lay under Anicetus." That "ancient man" Papias, as Irenæus dubs him, was probably in his grave when Marcion, "the second-century Luther," was at

\* Eus. H.E. IV. 7.

the height of his fame, and when he met the aged and venerable Polycarp in Rome, A.D. 154 or 155.

Bacon's lucid exposition of the true nature of the Logia, and the ridicule heaped on those who still cling to the teaching of Schleiermacher, latent in the "*Logian* document," seems to have so far made little impression. In February *Expositor* (p. 108) of the year 1922, another distinguished critic writes of: "a non-Markan source, commonly called Logia or Q. This non-Markan source may very well have been the Logia of Matthew mentioned by Papias."

Heresies in every branch of learning die hard. The present writer can cite grammatical errors which were thoroughly exploded by well-known scholars some forty years ago, which nevertheless still recur in text-books of yesterday. The quotation from the *Expositor* is from a writer who imagines he is setting forth for the benefit of his less erudite readers the latest scientific view on the Logia.

\* \* \* \* \*

The reader should now be familiar with the use of Logia such as prevailed from the third century B.C. to the tenth of our era, under both the Jewish and Christian dispensations.

A few words on present-day usage will complete this sketch.

Scholars are aware how frequently our scientific nomenclature, in pressing into its service Greek and Latin words to meet the needs of modern technology, has departed from classical usage. Not a few neologisms have in this way been coined that would be unintelligible to the Ancients. Modern Biblical scholars have in like manner overlooked Christian usage in their handling of *λόγια*. While applying it to things Christian, they have nevertheless fallen back, wittingly or unwittingly, on its original pagan signification. Looking on *λόγια* exclusively as "Oracles," likewise regardless of the associated pagan connotations, they have equated it to "Sayings," in contrast to records or narrative. And thus it has been specially appropriated to the "*Sayings* of Christ," as distinct from what is generally understood by Christian revelation in the collective sense.

This limitation of the word to "Sayings" received additional

impetus and confirmation—if indeed it does not owe its origin to this same source—from the premature and unfounded identification of Source Q (the “sayings” common to Luke and Matthew) with the Logia of Matthew mentioned by Papias, which, we contend, was nothing else but Matthew’s Gospel.

Hence, according to the accepted usage of modern experts, logia now stands for “Christ’s Sayings,” whether *Engrapha* or *Agrapha*—i.e., whether found in the Canonical or extra-canonical books. Nor is it necessary to quarrel with this scientific appropriation, which seems to have become current. When there is question of deciding between genuine and counterfeit coinage in words, the sole and ultimate court of appeal is usage, *usus*, which, according to the Horatian motto, is final arbiter.

“*Usus*,

Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi.”