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(4) THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW.\(^1\)
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The Gospels of Matthew and John present the most formidable difficulties to the student of early Christian literary history. The present paper will attempt to deal with some of the problems concerning the origin and dissemination of the Gospel according to Matthew.\(^*\) It may be salutary to begin by surveying the difficulties that have to be met. First is the fact that some sources of early information, which were available for the study of Lukan origins, are not at our disposal for Mt. The Muratorian Canon undoubtedly had something to say about this Gospel; but the relevant part of the document has unfortunately been lost. Again the Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the Gospels fail us for Mt. Our earliest information comes from Papias, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Our second difficulty arises from the existence, in the Eastern part of the early Christian world, of a Gospel or Gospels in 'Hebrew', appearing under a variety of designations and used by a variety of people, and related in some way to Mt. The surviving fragments are more astonishing than edifying; and patristic statements about the Semitic Gospel or Gospels are extremely confused and bewildering. The third difficulty arises out of the other two. It is that our earliest traditions about Mt. speak of a composition by Matthew in 'Hebrew'; the Fathers tend to identify this 'Hebrew' original of Mt. with one or other of the 'Hebrew' Gospels circulating in the East;

\(^1\) A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on the 13th of February, 1946.

\(^*\) Hereinafter Mt. = the Gospel, Matthew = the Evangelist. Both names are used as labels, without prejudice to the question whether they are, in fact, the right labels.
and yet our Gospel according to Matthew is quite clearly a Greek document, made up from Greek sources, of which our Greek Mk. is one. These are the problems we have to face: we may begin by marshalling the scanty evidence from early patristic sources.

1. Traditions Regarding Mt.

Here pride of place belongs to Papias, who has already appeared as the transmitter of earlier tradition regarding the work of Mark. He has a single brief statement about the activities of Matthew. It is as follows:—

Μαθθαίων μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἠμηνευσαυν δ’ αὐτὰ ὃς ἦν δυνατὸς ἐκαστὸς.\(^1\)

'So then, Matthew compiled the oracles in the Hebrew language; but everyone interpreted them as he was able.'

This sentence has been as widely discussed as almost any in the literature of the early Church. The main points are: (1) whether it merely represents the views of Papias himself or is an earlier tradition handed on by him; (2) whether it refers to Mt. (as we know it and also in an earlier Semitic form), or, as many scholars from Schleiermacher to Eduard Meyer have held, to the Synoptic source Q, or to some other document. As these points are of vital importance I propose to examine some recent discussions of them.

The works with which I am particularly concerned are Studies in Matthew by the late Prof. Bacon, and a pamphlet entitled The Logia in Ancient and Recent Literature, by the late Fr. John Donovan. These two writers are agreed on one point—though they differ on almost every other—namely that τὰ λόγια in the Papias fragment meant the Gospel of Matthew and nothing else. Bacon, however, regards the fragment as the composition of Papias himself; Donovan thinks (p. 33) that it came to him from John the Elder. Bacon regards the fragment as worthless: Donovan regards it as early and valuable evidence. Bacon tries to explain the choice of the odd

\(^1\) Papias ap. Eus. HE. iii. 39. 16.
name τὰ λόγια for the Gospel by saying that it is a description of the Gospel in terms of what were for Papias its most important contents, i.e. the five great discourses incorporated in it. Donovan on the other hand maintains that Papias or rather his source called the Gospel τὰ λόγια because that was what τὰ λόγια meant. Bacon—on his view of the matter—has to furnish some explanation of the way in which Papias arrived at the curious conclusions embodied in the fragment: Donovan is not under that necessity.

It will be obvious that the point on which everything turns is that of the meaning of the words τὰ λόγια; but before attempting to deal with that question, I may indicate the points on which I am inclined to agree with the adversary. I should think it probable that Papias himself, at the time when he wrote the words, understood them to refer to the Gospel. Further I should agree with Donovan against Bacon that the fragment on Mt. is tradition derived by Papias from the Elder John—or some similar source.

It has been argued that there is nothing in Eusebius to indicate that the Mt. fragment is traditional material: and it is true that Eusebius does not expressly describe it as such. But there is a certain amount of indirect evidence. There is first the evidence of Papias himself, quoted by Eusebius in HE. iii. 39. 3 f., that he set great store by what was handed down from earlier times and took great pains to acquire such traditional material wherever he could. Second, and even more important, is Eusebius' own estimate of Papias given in this same chapter (§ 13): 'For he evidently was a man of exceedingly small intelligence, as one might say judging from his discourses' (Lawlor and Oulton's translation). Is it likely that Eusebius would have troubled to quote the private opinion of a man, whom he rated as low as this, on a point of such importance? It seems to me that the probabilities are against it and that we are justified in supposing that Eusebius regarded this fragment as a piece of earlier tradition preserved by Papias. He may have been mistaken about that, but that is another question.

If this inference is correct, it cuts at the roots of Bacon's view that Papias' account is Papias' own composition made up
from what he could infer from having in his hands a copy of Matthew’s Gospel with the superscribed name of the supposed author. But we must nevertheless examine the process by which Papias is supposed to have reached his conclusion about the Gospel a little more closely.

‘Matthew compiled the oracles.’ The Gospel purports to be by Matthew. True it contains much more than oracles; but then ‘the oracles’ is not the title of the book but a description of it in terms of its contents, and not the whole contents, but only those things in which Papias was specially interested—the five great discourses compiled out of separate oracles of the Lord.

‘In the Hebrew tongue’ is a simple inference. Papias knew that Jesus and the Apostles spoke not Greek but Aramaic (= Hebrew). Hence the Greek Gospel must first of all have been written in the native language of the Apostle.

‘Every one translated as he was able.’ We know that in bilingual countries the practice obtained in public worship of reading Scripture in the original and then giving a rendering in the vernacular. Papias probably knew this too and used the fact to account for the appearance of Mt. in a Greek dress. But if this is so, we should have expected the imperfect instead of the aorist, to describe what was a regular practice in bilingual churches. The statement of Papias does not read like an attempt to explain how Greek Mt. arose out of a process of casual taming, but like an attempt on somebody’s part to explain the existence of differing Greek versions of an original Aramaic document.

The upshot is that the testimony of Papias to Matthew’s Gospel is pure guesswork and—on Bacon’s view—his guesses are all wrong. The only thing that can be safely inferred is—I suppose—that at the time when Papias wrote, the superscription κατὰ Ματθαίου was already part of the text of Mt.

At this point the question arises again: suppose that Papias is not freely composing, but reporting something from older tradition. What then? Must we accept an interpretation of the tradition—even so ingenious an interpretation as Bacon’s—when all that it does is to make nonsense of our earliest bit of
external evidence? Would it not be worth while to look again and see whether the tradition does not fit the document Q, seeing that it will not fit the Gospel of Matthew. Suppose that what happened was not that Papias made a faulty analysis of the contents of Mt. and then wrote a misleading label and stuck it on the bottle, but that he found a label from another bottle and stuck it on to the Matthew bottle.

This seems to be the reasonable thing to do; but just at this point Donovan enters his protest. For the thesis of his pamphlet is that the words of Papias must refer to the Gospel of Matthew and nothing else because that is what τὰ λόγια means. He proposes to show that from the time of the LXX translation to the days of Papias and long after τὰ λόγια does not mean what we should naturally suppose it to mean, but something else. 'The oracles' is not the right translation. What the right translation varies from place to place, and here in Papias it means 'the Gospel'. It is necessary, therefore, to dispose of this point before we can proceed further.

The task is complicated by the fact that while we are no longer allowed to translate τὰ λόγια by 'the oracles', it is not made clear what we are to say instead in the numerous places where τὰ λόγια occurs. Thus (p. 10) Donovan says, 'After perusal of the various passages where λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ or λόγια τοῦ κυρίου occurs in the O.T., 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 Philo, as in Josephus, λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ is the virtual equivalent of our "Scripture".' In Rom. iii. 2, ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, 'the Apostle is merely proclaiming the historical fact that the Jews held the custody of the Old Testament' (p. 11). In Acts vii. 38 (Stephen's speech) 'λόγια ζωντα 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' (p. 13).

There are two remarks to be made at once on this new interpretation: (i) It is surely very odd that the word λόγια, which proclaims in every letter that it is concerned with the verb
meaning ‘to speak’, should come to mean primarily that which is written, especially when there is such a word as γραφή lying ready to hand.

(ii) It is noteworthy that in order to carry out this interpretation the meaning of τὰ λόγια has to be generalised into something like ‘Scripture’. How we are to get back again to a particular book of Scripture, which is what is required for the Papias passage, is not so clear. But these are merely general objections; and it is in the examination of the particular bits of evidence that this theory reveals its insufficiency. I therefore go on at once to state the results of an independent examination of the evidence.¹

1 LXX and other Greek versions of the O.T.
Here it is possible to distinguish four meanings of the word λόγιον or the plural λόγια:—
(a) Direct oracular communications of God to man or prophetic oracles (6 cases).
(b) Divine commands or precepts (13 cases).
(c) Divine promises (16 cases).
(d) Human utterance in worship (1 case).

In 7 cases the text is corrupt and nothing definite can be determined. In no case is it possible to get away from the idea of utterance. With the single exception—Ps. xviii. (xix). 14, where the meaning is human speech in worship as distinguished from meditation in the heart—all the cases considered, where the text is reliable, clearly indicate that it is God’s utterance that is meant, either directly to a prophet (once to a patriarch) or through such a medium to his people in commands and promises. That these utterances of Jehovah may be written down is not disputed, but that is nothing to do with the case. What is meant by the word is not Scripture but some things which are contained, along with other things, in Scripture, the things, namely, that God has said for the guidance or encouragement of Israel.

(2) Donovan asserts (p. 10) that ‘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

¹The evidence is set out in the Appendix at the end of this article.
Word. It is unnecessary to quote examples, as the deduction drawn cannot be contested. One wonders how one ought to translate such a passage as this from the Contemplative Life (ed. Conybeare, p. 61), νόμος καὶ λόγια δεσπισθέντα διὰ προφήτων καὶ ἡμῶν. Further, according to Schletter (Die Theologie des Judentums, p. 66). λόγιον is the regular word in Josephus for a prophetic utterance foretelling something.

(3) Really detailed discussion of texts by Donovan begins with the four passages in the N.T. where the word occurs. In each of these a better and more natural interpretation is obtained by sticking to the sense or senses of λόγια found in the LXX than by following Donovan. When ‘Scripture’ or an equivocal term like ‘Revelation’ is substituted the passages do not become clearer but more obscure. I take a single example. In Rom. iii. 2, Paul is trying to answer the question what advantage the Jew has over other people, and he begins thus: πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. Donovan (p. 11) says: ‘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.’ Here the second sentence with its ambiguous word ‘Revelation’ rather fogs the clear impression produced by the first sentence. But if we take the meaning to be that the Jews had held the custody of the Sacred Books, how are we to interpret what Paul goes on immediately to ask? ‘Even supposing some of them have proved untrustworthy is their faithlessness to cancel the faithfulness of God?’ (Moffatt). What meaning can we assign to faithlessness in the custody of the O.T.? They had not lost or sold or otherwise made away with the Sacred Books.

We can find a perfectly good and satisfying meaning if we take τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ in the sense that is given in the LXX. There the primary meaning is oracles of God given to prophets; and these oracles can be subdivided into commandments and promises. Then the faithlessness of the Jews is their disobedience to God’s commands; and the faithfulness of God is the fact that he will not go back on his promises. These commands and promises together make up the terms of the Covenant between
God and Israel: and Paul's point is that though Israel has broken the Covenant God still upholds it.

(4) When we turn from the New Testament to the Apostolic Fathers we find that the interpretation of λόγια established for the LXX and found to fit the N.T. passages answers equally well in the four passages in I. Clem., one in II Clem., and one in Polycarp. The same applies to the three examples in Justin Martyr. It would be wearisome to go through them all in detail: the conclusion which I should draw from my observations in these passages is somewhat as follows.

Δόγμα means in the first instance a divine revelation by way of a spoken word—normally the recipient of the λόγιων is a prophet and the process of revelation is audition in contrast to vision. The plural τὰ λόγια indicates a collection of such utterances. It does not mean Scripture as a whole or even a book of Scripture. It means a group of quite definite recognisable things which may be found in certain parts of Scripture. When Philo speaks of τὸ τελευταῖον τῶν δέκα λόγιων, he does not mean by τῶν δέκα λόγιων 10 Bibles or 10 Biblical books but 10 sentences known to us as the Ten Commandments. The passage already quoted from the Contemplative Life makes it clear where the λόγια are chiefly to be found in the O.T.—in the prophetic books. The usage of the LXX shows that the content of the λόγια can be summed up under two heads—commandments and promises of God. And it can fairly be claimed that this definition of λόγια in terms of form and content gives a perfectly good sense when applied to the passages in the N.T. and earliest Christian literature, where the word is used. When, therefore, Papias or his informant says that Matthew compiled τὰ λόγια, the simplest and most natural meaning to be given to the words is that Matthew made a collection of oracles, i.e. sayings analogous to those of the old prophets, uttered by divine inspiration and containing the commandments and promises of God for the new Israel, the Church of Christ.

'Matthew compiled τὰ λόγια in the Hebrew tongue and every man translated them as he was able.' This brief sentence makes four separate assertions:
(a) That a book of λόγια was composed.
(b) That it was composed in the Hebrew tongue (i.e. probably in the spoken language of the Palestinian Jews—at that time = Aramaic. Parallels to this use of 'Hebrew' where 'Aramaic' is meant in Dalman, Gramm., § 1.)
(c) That the composer of this work was named Matthew—presumably the Apostle.
(d) That various people translated it as best they could—doubtless into Greek.

If we try applying these propositions to the Gospel of Matthew we find that they do not fit. As applied to Mt. (a) and (d) are, I think, demonstrably false. One of the really assured results of Synoptic criticism seems to be the priority of Mk.: and, if that is so, Mt. becomes a Greek document from the first and not an Aramaic composition subsequently translated into Greek. It is true that Prof. Torrey in his book, The Four Gospels, maintains the view that Mt. is a translation from Aramaic; but even he has to make allowance for the results of synoptic study by the hypothesis that 'each of the translators, Mt. and Lk., adopts the Greek wording of his predecessor, wherever a faithful use of his source permits him to do so' (p. 275). This would imply that the translator of Mt. had before him, not only the Aramaic original of this Gospel but also the Greek version of Mk.; while Luke, who on Torrey's reconstruction both composed and translated his Gospel, had his own Aramaic original, the Greek version of Mk. and the Greek version of Mt. This seems rather too elaborate to be plausible. Further it is worth noting that among the evidences of translation from Aramaic which Torrey finds in Mt., the most convincing in Marcan contexts are already to be found in Mk. That is to say they are not really evidence for an Aramaic original of Mt. in those sections at all. More than that: where Matthew does not reproduce Mk.'s supposed mis-rendering of a Semitic original, what he does give looks very like a conjectural improvement on Mark's Greek rather than a correction of it from the Aramaic original. A good example of this is Mk. xiv. 72 Mt. xxvi. 75. Mk. has καὶ ἐπὶβαλὼν ἔκλαίειν. ἐπὶβαλὼν has always been a problem. Torrey says it is a literal but unidiomatic rendering of an
Aramaic original which meant 'as he thought upon it'—i.e. his denial of the Lord. But Mt. has neither ἐπιβαλὼν nor anything representing the supposed Aramaic behind 'as he thought upon it'. He has ἔξελθων.

In general it may be said that the notes to Torrey's translation do not prove Aramaic originals for Mt. and Lk. At most they make a case for Aramaic sources behind those Gospels and possibly behind Mk. and Jn. also. Mt. remains a Greek work compiled most probably from Greek sources—of which Mk. in Greek was one. These sources may quite well go back to more primitive Aramaic documents of which they are translations. That the Gospel of Mt. ever existed as a whole in Aramaic I do not believe.

That Mt. consists of λόγια is not correct if we take λόγια in the plain and natural sense. It contains λόγια: indeed, it contains five considerable collections of λόγια; but it is not itself τὰ λόγια. It is a book made up partly of collections of λόγια and partly of narrative.

Finally the statement that Mt. as we know it was the work of Matthew the Apostle is, to say the least, improbable.

Suppose then, seeing that the identification of τὰ λόγια with Mt. breaks down, we try again with the other way and see whether the four statements of Papias will fit Q.

(a) There was a compilation of the Oracles. This as applied to Q is absolutely correct. Q is a compilation of oracles—sayings of Jesus and nothing else, except a few similar oracles of John the Baptist, and a line or two of narrative in the Temptation story. But it may be objected that Q did contain narrative: that the story of the Centurion's servant stood in the document, and that some at least of the Q sayings have narrative settings. The answer is that there is no evidence that the story of the Centurion's servant stood in Q at all. What did stand there was the account of a conversation between Jesus and a Centurion, the point of which was the saying of Jesus, 'I have not found such faith—no, not in Israel'. Nor is there any evidence that the narrative settings of Q sayings belonged to Q. For, after all, what is the ground for believing that anything is derived
from Q? It is verbal agreement between Mt. and Lk. And the narrative settings of Q sayings and conversations is just the place where we do not get this agreement, but wide divergence. In the Centurion passage agreement between Mt. and Lk. begins where the conversation begins and ends where it ends. There is simply nothing to show that Q contained anything except sayings and conversations.

(b) and (c) This document was composed in Aramaic and everyone translated it as best he could. These two statements can be taken together: and the conditions are met if we can show a probability that (1) Q was written in Aramaic and (2) that Mt. and Lk. represent two versions of this Aramaic original. There are several lines of argument tending towards such a conclusion.

(i) The probabilities of the case. The sayings of Jesus were certainly uttered in Aramaic—perhaps some of them in scholastic Hebrew. If a collection of them were made, it would be most probable that it should be by one of his own circle and naturally in the original language. Jesus was regarded as ‘the prophet of Nazareth’ and it was in accordance with custom that the oracles of a prophet should be preserved by his disciples.

(ii) The analogy of the O.T. points to the possibility, at least, of several translations of such a document into Greek. There were at least four Greek versions of the O.T. made at various times and for various reasons.

(iii) We can compare the versions of Mt. and Lk. with parallel cases in O.T. For example the book of Daniel possesses two complete Greek versions, the old LXX and the translation of Theodotion. We select a passage at random and compare the two. The Aramaic passage Dan. vii. 9-14 is turned by LXX into 166 Greek words by θ’ into 157. There is complete agreement in 105 of these and partial agreement in 12. The differences amount to about 27 per cent. of the total. We take a passage of about the same extent from Q—the testimony of Jesus to John the Baptist. Mt. gives it in 158 words, Lk. in 170. There is complete agreement about 115 words, partial agreement about 20 and the difference comes to about 19 per cent. of the total. Mt. and Lk. stand rather closer to one another
than LXX and $\theta$; but the general resemblance is very striking.

(iv) The most cogent evidence of translation is mistranslation. And such evidence is not wanting. The most notable instance is in the well-known Q passage about the cleansing of the inside and outside of the dish. Mt. correctly gives 'cleanse the inside of the dish' while Lk. has the absurd text 'give alms of the inside'. Wellhausen showed that Luke's 'give alms' is a mistranslation of the Aramaic verb rightly rendered by Mt. A similar misrendering may underlie 'Wisdom is justified of her children (works)' and 'He who does not take up his cross . . . is not worthy of me'

cannot be my disciple'}

Fortunately such cases are rare enough to permit us to keep our confidence in the ability of the translators of Q.

(v) There is still another sign of translation in those cases where Mt. and Lk. have different words or phrases either of which is a legitimate rendering of a single Aramaic original. These are more numerous: and I have made a collection of them. All that is required is Hatch and Redpath's concordance to the LXX, Field's Hexapla, and unlimited patience. You start with a Q passage in which Mt. and Lk. are agreeing fairly closely. Then there comes a difference: Mt. uses one word, Lk. another. It may be that these are just different ways of rendering the same Semitic original. The matter can be tested. There are four Greek versions of the O.T. Unhappily three of them survive only in fragments, which are collected in Field's Hexapla and indexed in Hatch and Redpath. We can soon see whether the same divergence occurs in the Greek versions of the O.T. Now the interesting thing is that it does. In quite a number of cases we have exact parallels for the differences of wording in Mt. and Lk. in Greek texts which are undoubtedly translations of the same Hebrew original.

For example: He who does not take up his cross and follow me is not worthy of me (or cannot be my disciple).

Mt. x. 38 = Lk. xiv. 27.

Mt. has the verb λαμβάνει (R.V. 'take up'). Lk. has βαστάζει (R.V. 'bear'). Now in Numbers xiv. 33 f. the verb πλησίασε occurs
twice. In the first case it is translated by βαστάζεω in σ' and
in the second by λαμβάνεω in ο'. Here then we have in Mt.
and Lk. possible alternative renderings of the same Semitic
original; and we know that they are possible because they
actually occur in the Greek versions of the Hebrew O.T.

In Lk. vi. 37: Judge not and ye shall not be judged.
Mt. vii. 1: Judge not that ye be not judged.

Ex. xxx. 20 o': 'and they shall not die' rendering identical
21 o': 'that they die not' \}

Hebrew.

Similarly in I Reg. xxix. 7: o' καί οὐ μή. σ' ἵνα μή.

Lk. x. 6 and Mt. x. 13: And if a son of peace be there your
peace shall rest upon him: but if not, it shall turn to
you again (ἀνακάμψει);

Mt.: let your peace return to you (ἐπιστραφήτω).

The same thing occurs in Ps. lviii (lix) twice, vv. 7 and 15:
o' επιστρ. σ' ανακαμ. and in Ezekiel viii. 17: θ'

επιστρ. σ' ανακαμ. In all cases translating the same
Hebrew verb (בש).

Lk. x. 3: Behold I send you forth as lambs (ἀρναο) in the
midst of wolves.

Mt. x. 16: Behold I send you forth as sheep (πρόβατα)
in the midst of wolves.

Lev. iii. 7: o' ἄρνα. σ' πρόβατον (Heb. בָּשָׂף).

II Regn. vi. 13: o' ἄρνα. σ' πρόβατον (Heb. בָּשְׂף).

I have reserved to the last what seems to me the most inter-
esting and instructive case of all. The Golden Rule is given
by Mt. and Lk. in almost identical words. The main difference
is in the few words at the beginning. Mt. (vii. 12) has πάντα
οὖν ὅσα εἶνανθέλετε; Lk. (vi. 31) καὶ καθὼςθέλετε. In Gen.
xliv. 1 ὅσα εἶναν translates the Heb. רָשָׁה (Tg. רָשָׁה): in Gen.
viii. 21; xviii. 5; xli. 13 καθὼς translates רָשָׁה (Tg. רָשָׁה).
It is thus possible to make the equation ὅσα εἶνα (Mt.) — καθὼς
(Lk.). The πάντα in Mt. is then left in the air. This, however,
is easily explained. In eleven passages where Mt. is parallel
to and presumably dependent on Mk. we have in Mt. some
form of the word πᾶς to which nothing corresponds in the
Markan original. For example in relating the feeding of the four thousand Mk. says (viii. 8): 'and they ate and were satisfied'; Mt. (xv. 37): 'and they all ate and were satisfied'. That is to say one of the literary habits of the author of the First Gospel is to heighten his effects by using the word 'all' from time to time. It is easy to suppose that this is what has happened here. The question remains: which of the two renderings ὃσα ἔαν and καθὼς comes nearer to the mind of Jesus. Both are legitimate renderings of what may be supposed to be the underlying Aramaic: yet there is a subtle difference. ὃσα ἔαν suggests individual acts—things to be done and things not to be done. It could easily become the foundation of a New Law-code. καθὼς on the other hand suggests a manner of behaviour, a motive and spirit that should govern action. I add to this consideration the fact that the use of the pronoun rather than the adverb is in line with Jewish formulations of the Rule.

Hillel (b. Sabb. 31a): דֶּרֶךְ מְטַמֵּרָא לְאִם הָעֹבֵדְךָ
Tob. iv. 15: δ ὅσεῖς ὑμὴν ποιήσῃς.

We may also note that in the two versions of the Lord's Prayer, Mt.'s introductory πάτερ ἡμῶν δ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is a regular Jewish formula, while Luke's πάτερ agrees with our Lord's own practice (Mk. xiv. 36) and with the earliest church usage (Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 15).

This discussion of the Golden Rule seems to me to show how it is possible to do something in detail towards a fairly reliable restoration of Q. Where Mt. and Lk. part company in a Q context there are at least two ways of seeking an explanation of the divergence. One is by applying the knowledge we can get about their editorial methods from comparison between them and Mk. where they are dependent on Mk. This method is illustrated by the πάντα in Mt.'s version of the Golden Rule. The other way is by reference to a possible underlying Aramaic original. In that case we may think that there has been mis-translation in one or other of the versions offered. Or we may
conclude, as in the present case, that both versions are legitimate renderings of the original, but that one is better than the other.

I do not maintain that the facts which we have been considering prove that Q is the Aramaic document called the λόγια in the Papias fragment. But I do maintain that the phenomena presented by Mt. and Lk., in the passages where we may suppose them to have used Q, are consistent with that hypothesis. Three out of the four propositions contained in the Papias testimony fit Q like a glove.

(d) There remains the fourth—that the author of this document was Matthew—presumably Matthew the Apostle. This, of course, cannot be tested in the same way as the others. There is, however, this much to be said for it:

(i) On the supposition that the Papias tradition does refer to Q, we can see that three of its four statements are reliable. There is therefore a presumption that the fourth will also hold good.

(ii) If the Papias statements really refer to Q then they must be much older than the time of Papias. That is, the tradition is thrown back to the end of the first century or the very beginning of the second. It is thus brought very close to the events which it reports.

(iii) An Aramaic original of Q implies a Palestinian authorship and that means a Palestinian Christian. Nobody else in Jewish circles would have the inclination to compile such a record and of those who would be inclined, those would be best qualified for the task who had been—in Lk.'s words—eyewitnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning. There was a Matthew among those who were in close contact with Jesus during his ministry. And there we are. The bits of the puzzle fit in satisfactorily enough. The whole thing is consistent on the supposition, not hard to make, that Papias had this older tradition about Q, and, misled by the mention of Matthew, supposed it to refer to the Gospel current in his day under Matthew's name.

Our conclusion is that the statement reported by Papias refers not to Mt., but to one of the sources of Mt., the document
Q. We now have to consider the other early testimonia in the light of this fact. We may well suppose that statements which speak of a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew prior in composition to all the others are either descended from the original misinterpretation of the tradition in Papias, or else are similar misinterpretations of a parallel tradition.

Irenaeus, iii. 1. 2 ap. Eus. H.E. v. 8. 2: ὥ μὲν δὴ Ματθαίος ἐν τοῖς Ἐβραίοις τῇ ἑδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφήν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Πάντου ἐν Ρώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιώντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

‘Matthew published a Gospel in writing also, among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel and founding the church in Rome’ (Lawlor and Oulton’s translation).

Fragment 27 in Harvey’s edition of Irenaeus (ii. 493) tells us that Mt. was written πρὸς Ἰουδαίους. The Jews desired a Messiah of Davidic descent, and Matthew set out to convince them that Christ was so descended.

Clement of Alexandria is reported by Eusebius (H.E. vi. 14. 5) to have inserted in his Hypotyposes a tradition of the primitive elders (παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων) regarding the order of the Gospels. It begins: προγεγράφθαι ἐλεγεν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας. ‘He said that those of the Gospels that contain genealogies (i.e. Mt. and Lk.) had been written first’. This tradition will not square with the conclusions of Synoptic study.

The principal statements of Origen, as it happens, belong to the period after his removal from Alexandria to Caesarea. They are the Commentary on John, t. vi. 32 (ed. Brooke, i. 148); a scholion on Lk. i. 1 f. (Zahn, G.K. ii. 626 f.); and a passage from the Commentary on Matthew, quoted by Eusebius (H.E. vi. 25. 4). In the first of these Origen gives it as a tradition concerning Matthew that he was the first of the evangelists and produced his Gospel for Hebrew converts from Judaism. In the second he insists that Mt. is not one of the documents referred to in Luke’s preface, since Matthew did not ‘take in hand’ to write a Gospel, but did so ‘being moved by the Holy Spirit’.
The third again reports tradition to the effect that the first Gospel
to be written was that of Matthew the ex-publican who became
an Apostle of Jesus Christ and published it, a composition in
the Hebrew language, for converts from Judaism. It may well
be that this represents the tradition in Caesarea in the first half
of the third century.

Tertullian (adu. Marc. iv. 2) maintains the apostolic origin
of Mt. and Jn.

There are two points, in this small body of material, to
which we should give our attention. The first is the date assigned
by Irenaeus for the composition of Mt. It is a little difficult
to dismiss this as the product of Irenaeus' imagination; and I
should not exclude the possibility that what he reports is in the
main traditional and in its original form referred to Q. Its
application to Mt. would then be a misinterpretation of the
same kind as that in Papias.

The second point to be noticed is the stress laid on the
purpose of the Gospel of Matthew. It is written in 'Hebrew'
for Hebrews. Its purpose is to gain and confirm converts
from Judaism. There can be little doubt that this opinion
was fortified by the fact that in Palestine, where it is most at
home, there coexisted information about a document or docu-
ments actually existing in a Semitic tongue and bearing a more
or less close resemblance to our Mt. We have statements about
this literature from a considerable number of early Fathers from
Irenaeus to Epiphanius and Jerome; and we have a number of
extracts translated into Greek or Latin.

We may begin with the statement of Irenaeus (Haer. I. xxii;
Harvey, i. 213) where, describing the Ebionites he says: solo
autem eo quod est secundum Matthaeum Evangelio utuntur,
et apostolum Paulum recusant, apostatam eum legis dicentes.
Quae autem sunt prophetica, curiosius exponere nituntur; et
circumciduntur ac perseuerant in his consuetudinibus, quae
sunt secundum legem, et Judaico charactere uitate, uti et Hier-
solymam adoren, quasi domus sit Dei. With this should be
compared the account given by Eusebius (H.E. iii. 27), who seems
to be dependent on Irenaeus, but, instead of 'the Gospel ac-
cording to Matthew', has 'the Gospel called "according to the
Hebrews". Irenaeus' description of the Ebionites as a sect using Mt. only, rejecting Paul as an apostate from the Law, interpreting the O.T. (Messianic) prophecies in their own way, maintaining the Jewish Law and the Jewish customs including that of turning towards Jerusalem in prayer, all this gives us a glimpse of people whom we may fairly regard as the lineal successors of the Jewish Christians whom we find in opposition to Paul in the New Testament. Their Gospel is referred to by Origen and Eusebius, and perhaps also by Clement of Alexandria, as τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίος εὐαγγέλιον; and in Eusebius (H.E. iii. 25. 5) we are told that it is used by Ἑβραίων οἱ τῶν Χριστῶν παραδεξάμενοι. By Jerome the people who use the Gospel according to the Hebrews (variously described as ipsum Hebraicum, Evangelium iuxta Hebraeos, Eu. secundum Hebraeos, Eu. quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum, Eu. . . quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authentiam) are called Nazaraei or Nazaraeni. Most probably we should regard this name as the equivalent of the designation applied to the Hebrew Christians by the Synagogue (συναγωγή). The names of the sect (Ebionites, Nazarenes) reflect the speech of Palestine and Syria; the name of their Gospel (according to the Hebrews) reflects the terminology of the Gentile Christian communities.

This Gospel is sufficiently near to Mt. to be taken for the supposed 'Hebrew' original. Eusebius (Theoph. iv. 12) can compare its version of the Parable of the Talents with the text of Mt. and from it obtain a suggestion for the interpretation of Mt. xxv. 29 f. Finally a number of manuscripts of the Gospels (von Soden's Ι' group), which have some connexion with Jerusalem, give readings from τὸ Ἰουδαῖον as marginal notes to the text of Mt. There is a good deal of further evidence, all of which seems to point in the direction of the hypothesis that our Greek Mt. was translated into Hebrew or Aramaic at a very early date for the use of Jewish Christians in Palestine and Syria and that it did not escape modification, though not perhaps to a very great extent, with the passage of time.

For a very clear statement of the matter regarding the terms Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος see G. F. Moore in Beginnings of Christianity, i. 426-432.
There are two bits of Rabbinic tradition which have their bearing on this. First there is the story told in b. *Sabb.* 116*ab* concerning Imma Shalom, Rabban Gamaliel (II), and a (Jewish Christian) philosopher. This incident would be dated about the end of the first century, and in the course of the story the 'philosopher' refers to a written 'Gospel'. The point is that he refers to it by its Greek name εὐαγγέλιον; and the inference is that any written Gospels that were current among Jewish Christians at this date were the literary work of Gentile rather than Jewish Christianity. The other bit of Rabbinic evidence, given in b. *Sanhedrin* 43*ab* names five disciples of Jesus and heads the list with Matthew (Ματθαίου). We may infer that the prominence of Matthew was not unconnected with the earliest traditions which make him the compiler of the oracles of the Lord, and the later ones which attributed our First Gospel and the Semitic version of it to him.¹

The conclusion of the study of the external evidence is that it suggests that the document Q was the work of Matthew; that he composed it in the vernacular of Palestine; that it consisted for the most part of sayings and speeches of Jesus; that various renderings of it (into Greek) were made; and that one of these renderings furnished material for the First Evangelist. Further it would seem that the First Gospel, when made, was very early translated into the Palestinian vernacular for the use of Jewish Christians, and as an instrument of propaganda among Jews. The name of Matthew, which had been mistakenly transferred from Q to the First Gospel, stuck, and continued to stick, until scientific study of the relations between the Gospels made the hypothesis of an original Hebrew Mt. untenable.

Scientific study of the Synoptic Gospels has established clearly enough what Mt. is: it is a revised and enlarged edition of Mk. It has also established fairly clearly that the reviser who produced Mt. betrays no acquaintance with the work of

¹ Of the Gospel used by the Ebionites described by Epiphanius in *Haer.* xxx, I do not think it necessary to say anything here. It is clear that if it began as a version of Mt. it had suffered drastic transformation before Epiphanius became acquainted with it. It does not seem likely that it can supply any light on the origins or early history of Mt.
Luke, nor does Lk. show any sign that its author had access to Mt. As Lk. was written for publication, and Mt. rapidly became very widely known and greatly valued in the Churches, the most likely explanation of this mutual ignorance is that Mt. and Lk. were produced about the same time. I have already argued for a date round about A.D. 70 for the composition of Lk.-Acts; and it seems to me that a date in the decade following the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 is as likely as any for Mt.

Regarding the place of writing there is not much to be said that is not already in the standard works on Introduction to the New Testament. There are strong indications connecting the Gospel with the neighbourhood of Antioch; and if that were the place of origin it would help to explain the rapid dissemination of Mt. in both East and West. In a way Mt. has some resemblances to Josephus’ account of the Jewish war. This was written first in Aramaic soon after A.D. 70 to show the Eastern Jews that such revolts were foredoomed to failure. Shortly afterwards it was translated into Greek. One wonders if the First Gospel was not written about the same time in Greek and quickly translated into Aramaic to tell the same people for whom Josephus wrote, where the true hope of their nation lay.

APPENDIX.

1. ΔΟΣΙΑ in the Greek versions of O.T.

Nu. xxiv. 3, 4. From a poetic utterance put in the mouth of Balaam. B. is subject.

φησιν βαλααμ ύσος Βεωρ,
φησιν ο αυθρωπος ο αληθινος ὡρων,
φησιν ακουων λογια θεου,
ὁστις ὁρασιν θεου εἰδεν κτλ. ν.λ. ἵσχυς

M.T. ομμ κλιμιμ βο βορ
ομ κλιμιμ στομ τον:
ομ κλιμιμ ομοιων ου
ασφρ μοτοιο στοι ιοθο νον

Tg. O. μιμο μο κουμ αλ
Tg. J. μιμο μο κουμ ιι ιαλοιον ζηα

APPENDIX.
Here Λογια θεου (יוסף י$^2$םא$^2$א$^2$) stands in parallelism with δρασιν (י$^2$ץ$^2$ק$^2$יו$^2$$^2$) and the meaning is thereby determined: divine revelations received in the form of auditions as distinct from those received in the form of visions.

Nu. xxiv. 16. From another poetic utterance of Balaam.

ακονων λογια θεου,
επισταμενος επιστημην παρα υψιστου,
kαι δρασιν θεου ιδων κτλ.

The meaning in this case is identical with that in xxiv. 4.

Dr. xxxiii. 9. From the 'Blessing of Moses' to Levi.

ο λεγων τω πατρι και τη μητρι ουχ έορακα σε,
kαι τουσ αδελφουσ αυτου ουκ επεγνω,
kαι τουσ νιουσ αυτου απεγνω.
εφυλαξεν τα λογια σου,
kαι την διαθηκην σου διετηρησεν.

M.T. צי סהרה אתורה

Tg. O. ארי נגרו מטרת מטרל תפקר לא אשתמא
Tg. J. מולד דקרימין נזרך ששב כמאמורהו במדקך

Here τα λογια σου stands in parallelism with την διαθηκησ σου and means the command(s) of Jehovah. Cf. Driver, *ad loc*.


Ps. xi (xii), 6 (7)

tα λογια Κυρου λογια αγνα

M.T. אמרות יוהו אמרות מוהר
Tg. מילך ידווה מילאה דכין

Here the meaning appears to be that the promises of Jehovah—especially those favourable to his people—are reliable, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary.
Ps. xvii (xviii), 30 (31)

ο θεος μου, αμωμος ἢ δδος αυτου,
τα λογια Κυριου πεπυρωμενα
ὑπεραπιστη εστιν παντων των επιευγοντων επ' αυτω.

M.T. ἡ αληθες ὁρκ.

Αμαρτα η η αμαρτα

Τg. ποινη για λητη των πως.

Αναθειμα ἑσοδια μηθυρα

In II Sam. xxii. 31, the LXX version is:

ο ιεχυρος, αμωμος ἢ δδος αυτου,
το ρημα Κυριου κραταιον, πεπυρωμενον:
ὑπεραπιστη εστιν πασιν των πεποιθοσιν επ' αυτω.

M.T. = that of ψ.

Τg. ΙΙ. S. as above.

The sense seems to be much the same as in ψ xi (xii) above.

Ps. xviii (xix), 14 (15).

και εσονται εισ ευδοκιαν τα λογια του στοματοσ μου
και ἡ μελετη τα ακανθια μου ενωπιον σου δια παντοσ.

M.T.

υιων λεπτοις άμεριμν τους μεν υπερ ὑπερ

Τg.

υιων άμεριμνα μεμεριμνατον.

Here λογια of human utterance. The parallelism shows that λ. = the actual utterance as distinguished from the inward thought.

Ps. civ (cv), 19.

μεχρι του ελθειν του λογου αυτου,
το λογιον κυριου επυρωσεν αυτων.

M.T.

ς μερικες σειρας η δεικνυσιν η κυριος Εροθετων

Τg.

ς των δεικνυσιν η κυριος η δεικνυσιν η κυρια.

An account of Joseph in Egypt. The reference of these lines is to Joseph’s divinely inspired interpretation of Pharaoh’s servants’ dreams, Gen. xli. 13.

‘Der Göttliche Ausspruch, die Traumdeutung, liess Joseph als echtes Metall erscheinen, als Besitzer des von Jahwe dem Samen Abrahams mitgegebenen Wortes.’ (Duhm., ad loc.)

Ps. cvi (cvii), 11.

ὅτι παρεπικραναν τα λογια του θεου,
και την βουλην του ψηφιστου παροξυναν.
THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

M.T.  דְרֵדֶתָה אֶמְרֵי־אֵל

Tg.  אֵוְרֵמִי מָרִי דָּאָלָה

Cf. Ps. xiii (xix), 14 above. The antithesis is the same. Here τα λογια του θεου practically = the commandments of God and την βουλην his purpose. Kittel translates 'Geboten . . . Rat'.

Ps. cxviii (cxix), 11.

ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου εκρύψα τα λογια σου,
όπωσ αν μη ἀμαρτίω σοι.

M.T.  בִּלְבַּי תַּמָּת אֱמוּרִים

Tg.  בִּלְבַּי אַשָּׁשַׁת מִקְר

Here the meaning is clearly God's commands.

Ib. 25.  ζησομαι κατα το λογιον σου

M.T.  ζησομαι ύπις δικηρι

Tg.  ασι ύπις δικηρι
to λογιον κ A* R] του λογιον A* T.

The word = the promises of Jehovah (Kittel, ad loc.). It is doubtful whether το λογιον here is true text of LXX. Rahlfs follows the readings of AT: ζησον με κατα τον λογιον σου.

Ib. 38.  στησον τω δουλω σου το λογιον σου,
εις τον φαβον σου.

M.T.  κοπι λעבכרי אמונר אֵשָּׁר ליראתך

Tg.  אַכִּים לַעֲבַכָּר מִרְנָה יִי ליראתך

'v. 38, bittet um den der Gottesfurcht verheissenen Lohn' (Kittel). Hence το λογιον σου = 'thy promise'.

Ib. 41.  και ελθοι επ’ εμε το ελεος σου, Κυριε,
to σωτηριων σου κατα το λογιον σου.

M.T.  תַּשְׁתַּחַת אֱמוּרִים . . .

Tg.  מַחְתָּק וִיה מִמְרִים . . .

Here = promise.

Ib. 50.  ότι το λογιον σου εζησεν με.

M.T.  כ אֱמוּרִים יָנוּהי
to אֱמוּרִים קִימָת יָה

"Sein Trost ist Jahwes Verheissung 49 f." Kittel.

Hence = promise.
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Ps. cxviii (cxsix), 58.

ελεησον με κατά το λόγιον σου

M.T. θύμι σαμαρήτης
Tg. χως θύμι τού μιστήρι

= Promise.

lb. 65. χρηστοτητα εποιησας μετα του δούλου σου,
Kυπε κατά το λόγιον σου. τον λόγιον Κ.:Τ.

M.T. κενβίρη
Tg. όθη δεβίρη

In any case = promise. Here Rahlfs reads κατά τον λόγιον σου.

lb. 67. . . το λόγιον σου εφυλάξα.

M.T. οι άμεροι σεμρήτης . . .
Tg. μείροι γεραίτης . . .

= Command.

lb. 76. γεννηθην δὴ το ελεος σου του παρακαλεσαι με κατα το λόγιον σου τον δουλη σου.

M.T. κεμαροτή τευβόρι
Tg. όθη μεμορί τευβόρι

"Wie du deinem Knecht verheissen." Kittel.

= Promise.

lb. 82. εξελιπον οι οψαλμοι μου εις το λόγιον σου

M.T. κελι πετ οιμορήτηρ
Tg. σεμ πετ οιμορήτηρ

= Promise.

lb. 103. ώσ γλυκα τω λαργηγι μου τα λογια σου.

M.T. μη-γενλοτ ολαττι αμαρτήρ
Tg. μη όλοτ λεμοττι μισμίρη

The context certainly suggests that the meaning here is ‘commands’.


M.T. ιηθων τυ νεβόρι
Tg. ιηθων εσθ τυ νεβ θεβίρι

Promise?

Rahlfs reads κατα τον λόγιον σου.
Ps. cxviii (cxix), 116.

αυτίλαβον κατά το λόγιον σου, καὶ ζησομαι,
καὶ μὴ κατασχωνὴσ με ἀπὸ τὴν προσδοκίαν μου.

M.T. : ἅμαὶ καὶ τὸ λόγιον σου ἁπατή.
Tg. . . . ζησομαι καὶ τὸ λόγιον σου ἁπατή.

Promise.

Ib. 123. 

οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου ἑξελίσσον εἰς τὸ σωτήριον σου
καὶ εἰς τὸ λόγιον τῆς δικαίωσεως σου.

M.T. : οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου ἑξελίσσον εἰς τὸ σωτήριον σου.
Tg. : οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου ἑξελίσσον εἰς τὸ σωτήριον σου.

“deiner gerechten Verheissung.” Kittel.

Promise.

Ib. 124. 

ποιησον μετὰ τοῦ δουλοῦ σου κατά τὸ λόγιον σου
λογιον] ἐλεοσ ἐλ. 

M.T. κεφαλή Tg. ημίκεφαλή

Rahlfs reads ἐλεοσ.

Ib. 133. 

τα διαβήματα μου κατευθύνον κατα τὸ λόγιον σου,
καὶ μὴ κατακυριεύσατά μου πάσα ἀνομία.

M.T. : στέμμα τέκνων ἐκμέρτα ἀσθορίι
Tg. : στέμμα τέκνων ἐκμέρτα ἀσθορίι

The context shows that God’s commands are meant.

Ib. 140. 

πεπουρμένον το λόγιον σου σφόδρα.

M.T. : σφόδρα ἐκμέρτα μαζί
tG. σφόδρα ἐκμέρτα μαζί

= Commandment, as appears from the context.

Ib. 148. 

προεφθάσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου πρὸς ορθρόν,
tοῦ μελετῶν τὰ λογία σου.

M.T. : καρδία τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ ἐκμέρτα καρδιά
Tg. : καρδία τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ ἐκμέρτα καρδιά

Commandments.

Ib. 149. 

της φωνῆς μου ἀκούσον, Κυριε, κατα τὸ λόγιον σου.

M.T. κεφαλή Tg. ημίκεφαλή

Rahlfs reads ἐλεοσ.
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Ps. cxviii (cxix), 158.

εἰδὼν αὐστρεπτοῦντας καὶ εξετηκομήν, ὁτι τὰ λογιά σου οὐκ εὑρίσκαιντο.

M.T. ἀση ἀμερτῷ ἦν σῶμα...
Tg. ρή μιμωρά ἦν τρόμο... Commands.

Ib. 162. αγάλλωσομαι εγὼ επὶ τὰ λογιά σου, ὡς ὁ εὑρίσκων σκυλα πολλα.

M.T. σοι ἀνοικ ἀμερτῷ καμομὼσα σχᾶλ Ῥή:
Tg. ἀνα ἄνα ἄπωρ...

Commands, as appears from the context.

Ib. 169. κατὰ τὸ λογιόν σου συνετισον με.

M.T. ὃς ἐπὶ τὸν ἔδρον
Tg. ὃς μιμωράντας
Promise.

Ib. 170. κατὰ τὸ λογιόν σου ρυσαὶ με.

M.T. καμομωτῷ ἀριτίῳ
Tg. κατα μιμωράντας με τετύχεν
Promise.

Ib. 172. φθεγχαῖντο ἢ γιλωσα μου τὸ λογιόν σου, ὅτι πάσαι αἱ εντολαι σου δικαιοσύνη εστίν.

M.T. οἴ το λογιον ποτα τὰ νοματα σου τὴν ρήσουι σου
Tg. μιμωρά... Commands.

Ps. cxxxvii (cxxxviii), 2 A′E′

M.T. ὁ τοῦ ταῦτα εἰλή−κλι−σμέν ἀμερτῷ

o' ὄτι εμεγαλυνασ επι παύν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἁγιόν σου
o' εμεγαλυνασ γαρ ύπερ πάντα τα ονοματα του σου του ρηςου σου.
a′e′ το λογιον σου.

Tg. ἀοράμ ἂνετάμαν ταύ τὰ σεμερόι τούτοις θεσσατάκεν

Commentators read and regard ἄμερτῳ as a gloss.

On LXX text of this vs. see Hedley in Harvard Theol. Rev., xxvi, p. 72. Rahlfis, following Grabe, adopts λογιόν in his text (conj. emend.) against the ἁγιόν of the MSS.
Ps. cxlvii. 4 (5).

ὅ αποστελλὼν τὸ λόγιον αὐτοῦ τῇ γῇ.
ἐὼς ταχοῦς δραμεῖται ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

M.T. ἀνείπωτος Αρχὴ ἡ-μεροῦς Ἰωάννης Διός
Tg. ... Ῥεμσίδροι Μμίριθος Ἀνατολάν

Command.

Wisdom, xvi. 11.

εἰς γὰρ ὑπομνήσου τῶν λογίων σου ἐνεκεντρικῶς,
καὶ σθενῶς διεσώζοντο. Syriac


Ecclus. xxxvi. 19 (16).

πλησον Σιων αρεταλογιασ σου,
και απο της δοξης σου τον λαον σου.
αρεταλογιασ αραι (apε ΡΑ) τα λογια BntNA vιд.

λαον] ναον is the true reading with Heb. and Syr.

Syr. (Lagarde, p. 37, line 2).

 Manga βομμω Μαγδαληνα Ἄνικον Μισαλ.
Heb. מֶלֶא צֵדָאָה חֹדֶר וּמֶכֶבְדָא אַחַ חָיְלֵל
See Hart, ad loc.

Isaiah, v. 24.

οὐ γὰρ ἠθελήσαν τον νόμον Κυρίου σαβαωθ.
ἀλλὰ τὸ λόγιον τοῦ άγιον Ισραήλ παρακύνην.

M.T. כְּמָאָם אַחַ חֹדֶר יְהוּדָה צְבָאָהָו
Tg. יְהוּדָה אִדֶּרֶשָּדָא נַעַר

אָרָי קֵפָר בָּאוֹרָתָא דִּיוֹחָה צְבָאָהָו
יִמְכַּר קְרֵיָם דִּיוֹרָאָל רַחָקָא

τὸ λόγιον in synonymous parallelism with τον νόμον. For the force of חֹדֶר, cf. Skinner on Is. i. 10: religious direction, prophetic teaching. το λόγιον = the command of God.

Ib. xxviii. 13.

καὶ εσταὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ λόγιον Κυρίου θλιψις επὶ θλιψιων κτλ.

M.T. יְהוּדָה לָהֵם דָּבָר יְהוּדָה

וכ לֵצָא וֹת
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Tg.

זֶר יִר הָכִים פְּרֵעַנְתָּתָה עַל דְּבָרֵךְ עַל פּוֹתֵהַתָּה עַל דִּיאֶנְפּוֹדֵךְ לְמַעְבָּד אַוְרִיהֶהָה וְמַא דִּיאֶנְפּוֹדֵךְ לְבַכַּיּ עַל מַעְבָּד בָּכְנֶמֶשְׂרֹדֶרֶךְ לְסַמְמַיאֵה דָּלָּה יְהוָ הַאָוְרִיהָה וָטַּו.

Here το λόγιον Ἐκ serves to introduce the following oracle.

ISAIAH xxx: 11.

καὶ ἀφελέτε αὐτo ἡμῶν το λόγιον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

M.T.

השביתו מעניי זארך שישראלי

Inner Greek corruption: TOLΟГΙΟΝ

TONΑГΙΟΝ.

Tg.

אָרוֹתֶךָ מִון קְדָמוּת יִת מִלְּמַר קְדָם יִשְׂרָאֵל

Pesh.

סַמְמֵלֵה מִן קְדָם יִשְׂרָאֵל

אֶל

ט' פָּנַסְתֶּה אִכְּ פַּרְשָׁו הַמֵּעֲנִי הַמִּן הַגּוֹי הַמֵּעֲנִי הַיֵּשָּׂרָאֵל.

Tg. appears to combine the readings of LXX and M.T. פִּמְרָה נִגְּרֵה = το λόγιον, אָדוֹאִי = τον ἀγίον. But this may be deceptive and perhaps Tg. may be regarded as paraphrase = mention of the Holy One of Israel. In that case Tg. would appear to give the sense of the protest in M.T. = say no more about the Holy One of Israel!

Ib. xxx. 27.

Ἰδοὺ το ὄνομα κυρίου ἔχεται διὰ χρόνου, καὶ ὁμοίως θυμός ὑμων μετὰ δοξής το λόγιον των χειλεων αυτου, το λόγιον οργης πληρεσ, και ἡ οργή του θυμου ὧν πυρ εδεται.

M.T.

הנה שמייהו הב ממורת ק

בכר אופי בכדי שמייהו שמייהו מלאה זעם

לשתות באש כאנלה:

Pesh.

אַיָּה הָעָה אַיָּה הָעָה לְסַמְמֵל

םָמְּכָּה; מַהָּ; מַהָּ 

םָמְּכָּה; יָדָה; מַהָּ; מַהָּ 

םָמְּכָּה; יָדָה; מַהָּ; מַהָּ

το λόγιον 1ο corresponds to מְשָׁאָה; but the LXX is corrupt at this point.

Ib. xxxii. 9 A'.

נִשְׁמָת שְׁאֵנְתָּה קְמָנָה שְׁמַעֲתָה כְּלִילָה

בכָּה בָּנָה שְׁאֵנְתָּה אֲמָרֶה:

ו' λόγους μου. α' λόγιον μου. ο' τας ρήσεις μου.

θ' τα ρημάτα μου.

Introducing a prophetic oracle.
Summary.

(a) λόγιον or λογια used of direct oracular communications of God to man or of prophetic oracles: Nu. 24:16; Ps. 104 (105)19; Isa. 28:15, 32:10; Jer. 8:26 wrongly ascribed.

(b) λόγιον or λογια = divine commands: Dt. 33:9; Ps. 106 (107)11, 118 (119)11, 67, 100, 133, 140, 148, 158, 160, 179, 147(45); Isa. 5:24.

(c) = divine promises: Ps. 11 (12)8, 17 (18)9, 118 (119)125, 38, 41, 50, 58, [68], 76, 82, (1077), 119, 123, 189, 170; Wisd. 1611. Square brackets indicate that the LXX reading is uncertain.

(d) = human utterance (in worship): Ps. 18 (19)14.

Text corrupt: Ps. 118 (119)124, 149; 137 (138)22; Ecclus. 39, 19 (16); Isa. 30:11, 27.

Conclusion.—In no case is it possible to get away from the idea of utterance. With a single exception—Ps. 18 (19), 14, where the meaning is human speech in worship as distinguished from meditation in the heart—all the cases considered, where the text is reliable, clearly indicate that it is God’s utterance that is meant either directly to a prophet (once a patriarch) or through such a medium to his people in commands and promises. That these utterances of Jehovah may be written down is not disputed but it is nothing to do with the case. What is meant by the word is not Scripture but some things which are contained, along with other things in Scripture, the things namely, that God has said for the guidance or encouragement of Israel.

2. ΔΟΓΙΑ in N.T.

Ac. vii. 38.

οὗτος εστιν ὁ γενομένος εν τῇ εκκλησίᾳ εν τῇ ερημῷ . . . . . . δό εθεξάτω λόγια ζωντα δούναι ἡμῖν . . . .
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Subject of οὐκ ἔσται is Moses.
d. qui accipit eloquia uitentium dare nobis.
Iren. iv. 15, 1 (26, 1): acceptit praecepta dei uiui dare nobis.

Pesh. 

Vulg. qui acceptit uerba uitae dare nobis.

[Date of Iren. Lat. iii or iv a.d., probably the former. Harnack, A.C.L. Chron., II, 320.]
Donovan, p. 13: 'In this passage λογία ζωντα 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.'

The first sentence of this is quite correct. Thus far and no farther D. is entitled to take us. When he goes on to make it equivalently this and inferentially that, he is no longer telling us what the phrase means in its context, but what he would like it to mean for the purposes of his argument. It is worth noticing that the author of the Latin version of Irenaeus (? 3rd cent. a.d.) was apparently still unaware of the 'equivalent' and 'inferential' meanings of λογία ζωντα in this passage; and contented himself with the rendering praecepta, in support of which he could have quoted—on my reckoning—thirteen passages from the LXX.

Ro. iii. 2. WH.

πρωτον μεν [γαρ] ὑπεστευθησαν τα λογια του θεου.

πρωτον] πρωτοι Orig. Eus. μεν (om. γαρ) BD*G al LS(vg)@Boh) Chr. Orig. ½ al.: μεν γαρ ΝΑΩΣ (hl.): γαρ (sine μεν) Orig. ½ Eus.

Moffatt: 'the Scriptures of God.'
Lietzmann (HBNT. (1910), ad loc.): 'Dass mit λόγια "die Verheissungen" (9o) gemeint sind, lehrt das folgende'.

Jülicher (SN?) : 'Gottes Offenbarungs-Worte.' In the exposition further defined thus: '. . . Gott ihnen seine Offenbarungen (das A.T.) anvertraut hat. P mag besonders an. die Verheissungen gedacht haben; deutlich hat er solche Beschränkung aber nicht vollzogen.'

Pesh. 

Vulg. eloquia Dei.

Lipsius (Holtzmann's Hand-Commentar (1891), ad loc.): Vorerst dass sie mit den Verheissungssprüchen Gottes betraut worden sind.

For discussion of this passage see the text of the lecture.

Heb. v. 12.

και γαρ οφειλοντεσ ειναι διδασκαλοι δια του χρονον, παλιν χρειαν εχετε του διδασκειν άμα τινα τα στοιχεια της αρχης των λογιων του θεου, και γεγονατε χρειαν εχοντεσ γαλακτος, ου στερεασ τροφης.
Windisch (HBNT. (1913), ad loc.): τα λογια του θεου ... sind die Worte Gottes, die den Inhalt der zusammenhängenden israelitisch-christlichen Offenbarungsgeschichte und Offenbarungsverkündigung ausmachen.

Hollmann (SNT, ad loc.): Sie haben immer noch mit den Anfangsgründen der von Gott in Christus gesprochenen Worte (1, 2 : 2, 3, ; 6, 1) zu tun, während sie Lehrer sein und Andere unterrichten müssten. Welche Anfangsgründe der Verfasser meint, sagt 6, 1 f.

Moffatt (ICC, ad loc.): 'the rudimentary principles of the divine revelation'.

Donovan (p. 13), winding up a detailed discussion as to the meaning of this passage, says: 'The conclusion as to the meaning of λογια is obvious'—so obvious that he does not say what it is, but continues: 'At any rate, it remains indisputably true that in these two instances of the use of λογια occurring in the Pauline Epistles, the word appears as synonymous either with Revelation or Holy Writ'. That it is synonymous with Revelation we need not trouble to deny. The question is whether the terms Revelation and Holy Writ are so readily interchangeable as D. seems to think. Taking this passage on its merits and in its context it is clear enough that τα στοιχεια της αρχης των λογιων του θεου means much the same thing as του της αρχης του χριστου λογον. And Hollmann is no doubt right in bringing i. 1 f. and ii. 3 into account. God, who in former times had given λογια to the Prophets and through them to Israel, has in these times given them in his son. The new λογια are the demands and promises of God revealed in Christ. The elementary portions of these λογια are further specified in vi. 1 f.: repentance, faith, baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection and, judgement. But the writer contends that there is more in the λογια than that: in other words, there is a deeper meaning in the revelation that God has given in Christ. He is certainly not talking here about O.T. and/or N.T. but about the significance of Christ considered as an oracle of God, newer and better than the oracles given to the prophets and, like the old oracles, requiring understanding.

I Pet. iv. 11.

\[ \text{εἰ τία λαλεῖ, ὦς λογια θεου.} \]
\[ \text{εἰ τία διακονει, ὦς εξ ἰσχυος ἥσα χρηγει ὃ θεος.} \]

Bigg, ICC: 'λογια means Scripture', 'as Scripture speaks', 'with sincerity and gravity'.

Windisch, HBNT: 'wenn einer redet (betrachte er seine Worte) als Worte Gottes'. 'Herausgehoben werden die Lehrer und die Diener der Gemeinde; beiden Gruppen wird gesagt (nicht dass sie ihre gottgegebenen Fähigkeiten auch gebrauchen sondern), dass sie die Kraft, die sie haben und verwenden, als gottgegeben anerkennen, damit in allen Regungen der Gemeinde die All-wirksamkeit Gottes zum Bewusstsein komme 212.'

Gunkel, SNT: 'Redet Jemand, so rede er als ein Sprecher Gottes'.

'Wer eine Gabe des Redens hat, soll sich nicht eitel selbst zur Schau stellen und nichts Eigenes einmischen wollen, sondern bedenken, dass er Gottes Sprecher, Herold ist, dass es "Gottes Sprüche", d.h. seine Orakel, seine Offenbarungen sind, die er verkündet.'
Either interpretation—Windisch’s or Gunkel’s—is preferable to Donovan’s—and Bigg’s—that ‘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’ (p. 13). D. says that it is not necessary to answer the question whether it is the Old revelation or the New that is referred to here. This is a pity, for it would certainly have been useful to preachers to know whether they should mould their discourses after the style of O.T. or N.T. As it seems to me, the real force of the injunction is excellently brought out in Dean Selwyn’s new commentary on I Peter: ‘the speaker in the congregation should reckon himself to be charged not with his own opinions but the utterances of God’.

**Conclusion.**

In every one of the four N.T. instances a better and more natural sense is obtained by sticking to the original sense of λόγια as found in LXX. When ‘Scripture’ or some equivocal term like ‘Revelation’ is substituted the passages do not become clearer but rather more obscure. In every case D.’s argument fails to convince.

3. **ΛΟΓΙΑ in the Apostolic Fathers.**

I Clem. xiii. 4; cit. of Is. lxvi. 2.

Clem. ἐπὶ τινα επιβλεψις, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸν πράνν καὶ ἡσυχιον καὶ τρέμοντα μοῦ τὰ λόγια.


M.T. אהל אלים אלי-לני גח-ררה ורהמ-ל-רבר-

Orig. Hex. ע"ע o’ τον ταπεινον a’ πρανн a’ πτωχונ β’ συντερμμενον.

Skinner, Camb. Bib.: ‘The “word” of the Lord is that spoken by the prophets, and the “trembling” of these devout hearers expresses their scrupulous anxiety to conform with its requirements.’

Duhm., *ad loc.*: ‘die . . . um das Gesetz eifrig bemührte Gemeinde des Zionstempels’.

Marti., *ad loc.*: ‘heilige Ehrfurcht vor meinem Gesetze haben und ihm gehorsam sind’.

Two points are clear. (1) τα λογια is Clem.’s equivalent for τους λογους of LXX. (2) τους λογους of LXX = the commandments of God. That Clem. also takes τα λογια in the same sense is strongly suggested by the immediately following words (xiv. 1): ‘Therefore it is right and holy, my brethren, for us to obey God rather than to follow those who in pride and unruliness are the instigators of an abominable jealousy’ (Lake’s trans.).

Further, it should be noted that the immediately preceding xii. 2 is filled with ethical precepts of Jesus, sayings which illustrate exactly what we should naturally take τα λογια to mean.

There is no support in this passage for any interpretation that would make τα λογια the equivalent of ‘Holy Writ’.
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I. *Clem.* xix. 1.

τοις τε καταδεξαμενοι τα λογια αυτου (God) εν φοβω και αληθεια.

Lake. 'who received his oracles in fear and truth'.

Ltft. 'that received his oracles in fear and truth'.

O.L. qui perceperunt eloquia eius cum timore et ueritate.

Syr. بِمَاءِ حَقَّ وَحَقَّ فِي مَاءِ حَقَّ وَحَقَّ

Donovan. who received God's Oracular Word in fear and in truth.

D. 16f.

'This passage must be taken as affording an instance where λογια primarily refers to Revelation yet with implied connotation of Holy Writ. . . . 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.'

On this it is sufficient to remark that D. achieves his desired result by first of all paraphrasing the text instead of translating it, and then interpreting his paraphrase in the sense which favours the thesis which he is defending. I am content to accept the rendering given by the ancient versions and by Lightfoot and Lake—as also Harnack 'seine Aussprüche'—and to understand the oracles of God to mean what they mean in LXX: the commands and promises of God, with special reference to the former. This fits in well with the whole course of the argument of the epistle in the preceding chapters with its praise of the humble submissiveness of the Old Testament worthies before God.

I. *Clem.* liii. 1.

ἐπιστασθε γαρ και καλως ἐπιστασθε τας ἱεραις γραφαις, ἀγαπητοι και εγκεκρωτε εις τα λογια του θεου.


Scitis enim et bene didicistis sanctas scripturas, dilectissimi et introiustis in eloquia Dei.

introiustis scripsi, non sine scrupulo. Codex perperam: "intonuistis".

Syr.  

Ltft.

For ye know, and know well, the sacred scriptures, dearly beloved, and ye have searched into the oracles of God.

Lake.

For you have understanding, you have a good understanding of the sacred Scriptures, beloved, and you have studied the oracles of God.
Donovan, rightly I think, holds (p. 18) that Clement in this passage 'must have had the Old Testament in mind'. That by τας ἱερας γραφας he means the O.T. may be freely admitted. Whether, as D. maintains, 'τα λογια του θεου becomes for practical purposes synonymous with γραφη' is quite another question. Here again it may fairly be claimed that what is meant by τα λογια του θεου is something which diligent students of the O.T. will find therein. Clement is not saying, 'you know and know well the sacred scriptures and you have searched into the Bible'; but rather, 'you know your Bible well, and in it you have studied closely those utterances of God which are the direct revelation of his will and purpose.'

I. Clem. lxii. 3.

σαφως ἰδειμεν γραφειν ἡμας ανδρας πιστους και ελλογιμωτατους και εγκεκυφοσιν εις τα λογια της παιδειας του θεου.

O.L.

pro certo sciemus scribere uobis urbis fidelibus et probatis et oboedientibus eloquii doctrinae Dei.

Syr.

رًوً مًس يًلًتًبعًا: يًشًصًتً بًمًدً بًجًمً ٢ًلًمً حًلً

Lift.

we knew well that we were writing to men who are faithful and highly accounted and have diligently searched into the oracles of the teaching of God.

we knew quite well that we were writing to men who were faithful and distinguished and had studied the oracles of the teaching of God.

D. p. 18.

. . . 'persons also, who have been students of God's instructive Oracles'.

'It is here Revelation, viewed in its moral and educational effects' (ib.).

On this passage it is to be remarked that where Clement elsewhere uses παιδεια it has quite definitely the sense of discipline—moral training by precept, example, or chastisement. It is therefore natural to take τα λογια της παιδειας του θεου here as having the same shade of meaning. The oracles in question are God's disciplinary oracles, i.e. his commandments. The O.L. translator seems to have felt this when he rendered εγκεκυφοσιν by oboedientibus. That being so we ought not to regard the phrase as meaning 'Revelation viewed in its moral and educational effects' but rather as meaning 'such divine oracles as bear directly on the moral training of God's people'.

II. Clem. xiii. 3.

τα εθνη γαρ, ακοουνα εκ του στοματος ήμων τα λογια του θεου, ὡς καλα και μεγαλα θαυμαζει· επειτα, καταμαθουσα τα εργα ήμων ὃτι ουκ εστιν αξια των ερημων ὡν λεγομεν, ενθει εις βλασφημιαν τρεπονται, λεγοντες ειναι μυθον τινα και πλανην.
Lttf.

‘For the Gentiles, when they hear from our mouth the oracles of God, marvel at them for their beauty and greatness; then, when they discover that our works are not worthy of the words which we speak, forthwith they betake themselves to blasphemy, saying that it is an idle story and a delusion.’

Lttf. takes *τα λ. τ. θεοῦ* here to be ‘a synonyme for the Scriptures’. D. says (p. 27), ‘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 *λογία τοῦ θεοῦ*—i.e. the Scriptures, including the Gospel.’

The context does not support either Lttf. or D. The writer is dealing with the text, Is. lii. 5, *διὰ πάντος τὸ ονόμα μου βλασφημεῖται εν πᾶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ*. He asks How? and the answer of God is *ἐν τῷ μῆνιν ὕμας ἀ βουλομαί*. Then in further explanation of this follows our passage. The Gentiles hear the *λογία* and see how splendidly they are. Then they observe that Christians do not themselves obey these excellent *λογία*, and blaspheme. The phenomenon is as well known in our own day as in the day of II Clem. And the sense in which *λογία* is meant here is crystal clear. It is the oracles as revealing God’s will concerning man’s behaviour. And this is shown still more clearly by the example given immediately afterwards. The oracle concerning love to enemies becomes an occasion of blasphemy among the Gentiles because Christians not only do not obey it but also add to their disobedience failure to love even their friends.

*Ep. Polycarpi. viii. 1.*

καὶ δόν αὐτὸν μεθοδευής τὰ λογία τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς ταύτα ἔδωκεν ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ λέγει μητε ἀναπτασίῳ μητε κρίσιν, οὕτως πρωτοτοκοὶ ἐστὶν τοῦ Σατανᾶ.

Lttf.

And whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgement, that man is the first-born of Satan.

According to D. (p. 20) ‘το μεθοδευήν τὰ λογία τοῦ κυρίου... is obviously “distortion of Holy Writ”’. This ‘could signify either distortion of meaning, or mutilation and interpolation of the sacred books received by the Church’ (p. 21). ‘As he uses τὰ λογία τοῦ κυρίου rather than the more generic τὰ λογία τοῦ θεοῦ, he very probably has in mind the evangelical Scriptures’ (p. 20).

But here again we have to take account of the phrase *πρὸς ταῦτα ἔδωκεν ἐπιθυμίας*. This indicates clearly enough what is meant by the *λογία*. Also the accompanying denial of the resurrection and judgement points in the same direction. The
writer has in mind two directions in which religious perversity can manifest itself. The first is false doctrine about Christ. This is dealt with in the opening clauses of the section. From that he passes to what so often accompanied false doctrine—moral laxity. Twisting the Lord’s oracles to their own lusts and denying the one thing which at that time was the supreme sanction of morality; the belief that all must appear before the judgement seat of Christ to give account of the deeds done in the flesh. λογία bears the same meaning that we have found elsewhere. It may well be that τοῦ κυρίου means that it is the oracles of Christ that are thought of; and the oracles, in that case, will be such things as are found in what is called his ethical teaching.

4. ΛΟΓΙΑ in the Apologists.

Justin Martyr.

APOL. I. 32 (end).
καὶ Ἰησοῦν προπατωρ μεν κατὰ το λογίου γεγενήται, κτέ.
The λογιον here referred to is the prophetical oracle cited just before καὶ Ἡσαυερ... ὁτως εἰς Ἀνατελὲς ὁστρον ἐξ Ἰακωβ, καὶ ἀνθεὸς ἀναβηστῆται απὸ τῆς ρίζης Ιέσσαι. καὶ επὶ τῶν βραχιῶν αυτοῦ ἐβύρῃ ἐλπιονοῦν. This λογιον Justin declares has been fulfilled in Christ. There is no doubt what the word means here. It is the promise of God.

DIAL. xviii. 1 (Otto I. ii. 64).
ἐπειδή γὰρ ανεγινώσκω, ὁ Τρυφων, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογήσας εἶπο, τα ὑπ’ εκείνου τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν διδαχθέντα, οὐκ ἀετοῦν νομίζων πεποιηκεναι καὶ βραχεὰ τῶν εκείνου λόγια προς τοῖς προφητικοῖς ἐπιμνησθείσι.

D. (pp. 29 f.): ‘there emerges a fully literal yet correct translation, “Brief oracles from among His Oracles”’. In modern speech one would rightly render: “brief extracts from the Dominical Oracles”. Later he says (p. 30), ‘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’. To this it is sufficient to reply that it is not necessary to make any of these allegations. It is only necessary to claim, what D. himself admits, that Justin is referring to the ‘Dominical Oracles’. This phrase, in its plain and natural meaning, supplied by Justin in this very sentence—τα ὑπ’ εκείνου τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν διδαχθέντα—is amply sufficient for the purposes of those who think that the document referred to by Papias or his informant is the Synoptic document Q.

But this is not sufficient for D. For him τα λογία τοῦ κυρίου must be made to mean (p. 30) ‘Oracles concerning the Lord’—that is, God’s Word or Revelation as couched in New Testament Scripture’. The subjective genitive—the natural and obvious construction—is quietly turned into an objective genitive. On what grounds? That among the sayings of Jesus, which have just been quoted by Justin, there occurs one very precious item—a little portion of Gospel narrative’. Apparently D. would maintain that there are four Dominical Oracles in the passage:
Oracle 1. ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κτέ.
Oracle 2. καὶ τὰς τραπέζας κτέ.
Oracle 3. οὐνὶ ὅμω, γραμματεῖοι καὶ φαρίσαιοι κτέ.
Oracle 4. οὐνὶ ὅμω, γραμματεῖο κτέ.

There is no hint that he regards them otherwise than as separate items. But one has only to glance at the text of Justin to see that No. 2 is not a separate item at all, but a mere scrap of the narrative context of No. 1. No. 1 is an oracle uttered by the Lord when he overturned the tables of the money-changers in the Temple. The fact is that there are three oracles quoted by Justin from the Lord’s Oracles; and they are genuine oracles. Recognition of this fact saves us from the necessity of supposing that λόγιον in the singular means one thing for Justin and something different in the plural, or that in talking to Jews he would describe the Gospels as τὰ λόγια while in addressing the Roman Senate he would call them τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα.

Dial. cxxiii. 5. (Otto I, ii. 474).
Quotation from Is. v. 24.

Tatian.

Orat. ad Graec. xlii, 2 (ed. Schwartz, TU, IV, i. 42): περὶ μεν οὖν τῆς καθ’ ἑκατὸν τῶν λόγων πραγματείας χρονῶν τε καὶ ἀναγραφῆς αὐτῶν ὡσ οἷον σφόδρα ἄλλη μετὰ πασης ύμων ακριβείας ανεγραφαμεν. Here the text is uncertain, the authorities being divided between λόγων and λόγων. It is clear, however, that the passage sheds no light on the problem with which we are concerned.