

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## ***The Gospel according to Peter. The Gospel according to Peter. A Study.* By the author of Supernatural Religion. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894. 6s.**

A. E. Brooke

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 08 / October 1894, pp 365 - 367

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188699, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00188699](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188699)

### **How to cite this article:**

A. E. Brooke (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 365-367 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188699

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

those which beset the *codices* of the *Epp. ad Fam.*, though Lehmann has certainly shown that there are MSS. other than Z1 and W which are independent of M. The problem would indeed be difficult if editors could be persuaded by Mendelssohn to re-open the question of the genuineness of the Bosian *codices*. Schmidt must be added to the list of those who have turned a deaf ear to the theory that Bosius really had access to two MSS., X and Y, which no one but himself ever saw, and from which he was in the habit of quoting readings which varied according as his own views about the emendation of certain passages underwent modification.

Whether one essays oneself the art of conjectural emendation or is merely an onlooker at the attempts of others in this branch of inquiry, one can hardly help noticing how every year increases one's conviction that the art of emendation has no

recognized principles, and that the criterion of certainty is merely subjective and varies with each observer. The emendations which one regards as certain are condemned or neglected, while some wild suggestion which one hesitated to print, and finally cast forth merely in default of any reasonable conjecture, is hailed as a discovery and almost an inspiration. One friend urges one not to publish a conjecture which another finds to be the only contribution to knowledge in the volume. I am quite prepared therefore to find that many readers will see the hand of Cicero in Schmidt's *in qua erat* (Caesar) *erus sceleris* in *Att.* ix. 18, 2, though to me *erus sceleris* seems the worst attempt which has yet been made to emend the *eroscleri* of the MSS. Yet Schmidt writes of his reading, 'Das Nachtsliegende und sicher Richtige aber hat man übersehen.'

R. Y. TYRRELL.

### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PETER.

*The Gospel according to Peter. A Study.*  
By the author of *Supernatural Religion*.  
London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.  
6s.

FEW literary discoveries, or recoveries, have excited more interest in modern times than that of the Fragment of the Petrine Gospel at Akhmim. And, to judge from the works of real importance dealing with it which have been published up to the present time, the interest which it first aroused is by no means slackened. From the lecture given by Prof. Robinson in Cambridge upon it in November 1892, which was published shortly afterwards, to the scholarly and laborious work of von Schubert published towards the end of 1893, probably the most important contribution to the literature of the subject hitherto published, there has been a continuous output of important editions, articles, and reviews. So much good work has thus been forthcoming, and such careful attention has been paid to this Gospel, that although many questions which are raised by it have received no certain answer, and many problems still remain unsolved, the net gain of what may now be regarded as settled beyond reasonable doubt is not inconsiderable.

The appearance of von Schubert's *Die*  
NO. LXXII. VOL. VIII.

*Composition des pseudo-petrinischen Evangelien-Fragments*, and the accompanying Tables (which have been translated into English, and published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1893), and the important review of von Schubert's work by Harnack in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for Jan. 6, 1894, mark a definite stage in the discussion of the Petrine Gospel. This review contains Harnack's most recent judgment on the most important question connected with the Petrine Gospel, its relation to the Four Canonical Gospels, and is of great interest. He prefaces his review of von Schubert with a personal explanation of his own (partial) changes of opinion, showing how such changes were the natural consequence of the conditions under which he was obliged to work. When his second edition was published he saw reasons for doubting his earlier impression that the author of the Fragment was dependent upon the Four Canonical Gospels, though still feeling the weight of the reasons which rendered probable the view that he had used Mark, if not also Matthew, Luke and John. The work of von Schubert has convinced him of the 'probability that our Canonical Gospels, including St. John, underlie the Petrine Gospel.' 'Er hat es wahrscheinlich gemacht, dass unsere Kanonischen Evv. hinter dem

D D

PE liegen, auch das Joh. Ev.' are his exact words.

We may conclude then that, though much remains obscure, some points may now be regarded as practically settled, and it is unlikely that questions connected with them will be again reopened. Thus the anti-Jewish tendency of the Gospel is now beyond dispute, and its Docetic tendency is generally acknowledged, though the precise effect of these considerations on the determination of the sources used by the author is and will be still disputed. The probability also that the author used and mainly depended upon our Canonical Gospels is placed beyond question. This does not of course preclude the possibility of his having made use of other sources of information, oral or written, independent of them. But that he mainly relies (especially in the latter part of the Fragment) on our Four Gospels is the view which holds the field.

The book before us contains a short account of the Akhmim discovery, and a translation of the Petrine Gospel. This is followed by some account of the earliest traces of the Petrine Gospel which can be found in Christian literature of the second century. The main part of the book consists of a careful and elaborate comparison of the new fragment with the Canonical Gospels. A long chapter is devoted to the criticism of Mr. Rendel Harris's article in the *Contemporary Review* (Aug. 1893), and the 'highly evolved prophetic gnosis' which he claims to have discovered in Pseudo-Peter.

The writer finds in almost every case where the Petrine narrative touches parts recorded in the Four Gospels that Pseudo-Peter is independent of the Canonical Gospels and embodies the tradition at an early stage of legendary development, or produces scenes at least as grand and credible as those found in the Canonical Gospels. As a rule he prefers the Petrine account. As he avowedly approaches the questions raised by this Gospel from the stand-point of his book on 'Supernatural Religion' (see p. 20 f.) he can hardly come to his subject without prejudice. It is impossible to give any detailed criticism of his methods and results. The following instances of the results at which he arrives must suffice. The conduct of the Roman Procurator, as described by Pseudo-Peter, is pronounced to be historically far more probable than the 'extraordinary spectacle of a Roman Governor and Judge feebly ex-

postulating with a noisy Jewish mob' (p. 49) as recorded in the Canonical Gospels. 'There is every reason to consider' (on the ground of historical probability) 'that the betrayal by Judas is a later product of the evolved gnosis' (p. 104). 'The expressions of distinct antagonism to the Jews in the fourth Gospel far exceed any in the Gospel according to Peter' (p. 108). 'It is not difficult to see that the cleansing takes place because it is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer, but ye make it a den of robbers.' 'Peter has evidently got an earlier form of the story' (of the Penitent Thief) 'without those much later touches with which the third Synoptist has embellished it' (p. 64). It is unnecessary to make further extracts.

It is unfortunate that the author of the study before us was not in a position to make use of von Schubert's careful work and Harnack's review of it. As a popular summary of the subject, the book would have had more value if the writer had been able to take into consideration Harnack's latest judgment on the most important question which the author discusses. If it is to be regarded as a popular treatise it appears just too early or just too late to have much value. But as the general style and method of the book seem to claim recognition for it as a contribution to the scientific study of the questions with which it deals, it is necessary to point out the serious defects which it exhibits when regarded as a work laying claim to scholarship.

With at least four trustworthy English translations accessible the following novelties should have been avoided:—

(1) ὅτε ὄρθωσαν τὸν σταυρόν, ἐπέγραψαν κ.τ.λ. 'As they set up the cross, they wrote thereon.'

(2) πρὸ μᾶς τῶν ἀζύμων, τῆς ἑορτῆς αὐτῶν. 'Before the first day of the unleavened bread of their feast.'

(3) συμφέρεי γάρ, φασίν, ἡμῖν ὀφλῆσαι μεγίστην ἁμαρτίαν κ.τ.λ. 'For it is better, they said, to lay upon us the greatest sins.'

In conclusion it may be interesting to quote the author's present position with regard to the existence and contents of Tatian's *Diatessaron*. 'This is not the place to discuss again the identity of the supposed "Diatessaron," but it will be sufficient to point out that we have it only in an Arabic version, published and translated by Ciasca, and a translation of the supposed *Armenian version* of the Commentary upon it, ascribed to Ephraem, which again Moesinger, who

edited the Latin version published in 1876, declares to be *itself translated from the Syriac*. In these varied transformations of the text, anything like verbal accuracy must be regarded as totally lost.' (The italics are my own.) It would be rash to venture to interpret this passage!

As a popular treatise the book before us was written at an unfortunate moment, before a *consensus* of scholarly opinion had been reached. As a scholarly contribution to the literature of the subject it has really no claim to consideration at all,

A. E. BROOKE.

#### GROSVENOR HOPKINS ON THE *AGRICOLA* AND *GERMANIA* OF TACITUS.

*Tacitus, the Agricola and Germania*, edited on the basis of Draeger's '*Agricola*' and Schweizer-Sidler's '*Germania*' by A. GROSVENOR HOPKINS. Boston: Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, 1891.

FOLLOWING the general plan of the series to which this edition belongs Prof. Hopkins has adapted two well-known German school-books to the use of American students. The text is mainly that of Halm, whose critical apparatus appears in a modified form at the bottom of the page. A rather full introduction gives a sufficient account of Tacitus and his works, also of the MSS. of *Agricola* and *Germania*. On p. viii. there is a slight confusion between the arguments for the date of publication of the *Annals* and those for the death of Tacitus. Hadrian's resignation of Trajan's Parthian conquests has nothing to do with the time of Tacitus's death. To speak (*ibid.*) of 'that reign of bloodshed and horror which extended, with but slight interruptions, from the rise of Nero to the death of Domitian' is to give the student a very wrong idea of the twelve years of Vespasian and Titus. On p. vii. there is a similar carelessness of statement, which would throw doubt upon one of the few certain dates in Tacitus's life,—that of his praetorship; we are told that 'it is impossible to associate the bestowal of definite official honours with any of these emperors' (*i.e.* the Flavians). More serious is (p. xv.) 'the two most important MSS. of the *Agricola*' for 'the only two.'

The text is accurately printed, and provided with rubrics, which are not always quite reliable clues to the contents of the chapters. Thus cp. 1 'eulogies upon virtue ... are hardly safe even in the age of Trajan'; cp. 6, *dona templorum* is paraphrased 'public funds'; 'probably from Gaul' (cp. 11) is certainly misleading.

In regard to the date of the *Agricola* Prof. Hopkins is still satisfied with the old arguments to prove that it was written shortly before the death of Nerva, rather

than after Trajan's accession [Mommson, Nipperdey, Andresen]. Matters relating to the government of the provinces are clearly explained. Facts as to the legions in Britain (p. 90), the Rhine-Danube *limes* (p. 115), the walls of Hadrian and Antonine (pp. 104-5) are welcome additions to a commentary on the *Agricola*. But the note on the walls is so misplaced as to give a very confused idea of the location of Hadrian's wall. It begins '*Agricola* built a line of forts here'; and 'here' can only refer to the Tanaus, the uncertain location of which is remarked upon just above. The statement that Hadrian utilized forts of *Agricola* is without authority.

The note on l. 3 *plerique* is misleading, but corrected by that on *Germ.* 13. 5. On 25. 5 '*et ipse*: only twice so found in Cicero' aims at greater precision than so controverted a question allows. The translation of 10. 5 *quia... iussum* 'for only so far had we orders' adds a new voyage to the conjectural travels of Tacitus.

We add a few misprints:—p. iii. Hirschfeld for Hirschfelder, Deutsche for Deutschen; p. viii. l. 2, A.D. 95 for 96: l. 22, 118 for 117; p. 16 fin. *lacunum*; p. 84 l. 1, *ειρήμενον*; p. 87 l. 23, A.D. 60 for 61: Caerlaon; p. 101 l. 19, *strategmata*; p. 103 fin. *in bella* for *bello* of text; p. iii. l. 13, A.D. 42 for 43.

In the 'Germany' the elaborate notes of Schweizer-Sidler have been of course much abridged. On the other hand additions have been made from Hehn, Waitz, Grimm, &c., and matters of language and style are much more fully treated of than in the German original. Space forbids a more detailed criticism.

The maps (2) are reproduced (without acknowledgement) from Mommson's *Provinces* and Church and Brodribb's *Germania*. On the former the form 'Themse' survives unaltered. There is an index to the notes.

F. G. MOORE.

Dartmouth College, U.S.A.