

and it is well forward. But Dr. Davidson has been giving himself recently to the new volume which is to be a companion to his well-known *Hebrew Grammar*, and the *Hebrew Syntax* is announced for issue by Messrs. Clark in September.

As chairman of the Aberdeen Guild Council of the Church of Scotland, Professor Kennedy of Aberdeen University presented the prizes recently to the successful guild competitors, and as he did so he spoke of the text-books they had used. The success, he said, of Professor Robertson's *The Old Testament and its Contents* was a very remarkable sign of the times, and a still more remarkable sign of the times was what was *in* the book. "If the committee had asked me to write a text-book on the Old Testament, I would have very politely declined the task. Dr. Robertson has discharged the undertaking in a way which perhaps no other man in Great Britain, certainly in Scotland, could have surpassed in tact and scholarship, and in the happy mean between the old conservatism of our grandfathers and the extreme of some of the criticisms of the present day."

Mr. John A. Hamilton, who recently brought out a popular volume entitled *Pulpit Parables for Young Hearers*, is going to publish, through Messrs. Sampson Low, Marston, & Co., in the early autumn, a similar work, to be called *A Mountain Path: and other Talks to Young People*. It will contain parables, fables, and talks about natural things addressed to young people by the author. Some of the parables have already appeared in *The Independent*.

The first edition of *The Church and Social Problems*, by Mr. Scott Matheson of Dumbarton, being sold out, a new and revised edition is being prepared, and will be published by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier in October.

A History of Egypt, in six volumes, from the pen of Professor Flinders Petrie, is to be one of the great announcements of the coming season. And the first volume, carrying the story down to the time of the Hyksos, will even be issued this autumn.

Tischendorf's *Greek Testament* is complete at last. Just before his death in 1873 he had issued the second volume, which completed the text; and the book in its two volumes—*Editio Octava Critica Major*—has given tone to many a library, without once betraying the fact that it was unfinished. But Professor C. R. Gregory of Leipzig knew. Nearly twenty years he has spent upon the third volume, the volume of *Prolegomena*. Ten years ago he issued the first portion of it; and now he has just issued the third and last. It has been an enormous labour. Dr. Gregory has visited libraries in England, France, Italy, Greece, and Turkey to collate their MSS. But the labour has been lightened by the hearty co-operation of scholars, among whom he specially names the late Professor Ezra Abbot. The work is published in Leipzig by Hinrichs, in this country by Williams & Norgate. There is an excellent short criticism of it in the current issue of *The New World*, by Professor Thayer, the editor of the great *New Testament Lexicon*.

The Gospel of Peter.

A CRITICISM AND EXPOSITION.

BY THE REV. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., FINDHORN, FORRES.

OF all the valuable literary discoveries of the present generation, none has awakened so much interest in theological and religious circles as the fragment of the so-called Gospel of Peter found in the tomb of a Christian monk in the Necropolis of Akhmîm, in Upper Egypt, in the beginning of 1887, and then lodged in the Museum of Gizeh. After

many difficulties had been overcome, it was published by the French Archæological Mission in Paris in 1893, from the transcript of the distinguished French scholar, Bouriant. The whole manuscript consists of sixty-six pages of parchment, somewhat smaller in size than an ordinary note-paper sheet, and includes, besides the Gospel of

Peter fragment, a portion of the apocryphal Apocalypse of Peter, and two fragments of the Book of Enoch in the original Greek text. The fragment of the Gospel of Peter, with which alone we have here to do, occupies pp. 2-10, inclusive. It begins with what seems to be a sentence in the middle of a paragraph, and ends with an unfinished sentence. The period of the history covered by the fragment extends from the trial of Jesus to the Resurrection. The copyist was probably led to begin at that particular point as affording the best start for an extract giving the story of the Passion and the Resurrection; while apparently he was stopped by some accident or interruption, leaving a blank sheet and thus showing that he evidently intended to resume his task, which, however, he expected to complete within the limits of a single page. It would seem, from the two or three sentences at the end of the fragment, that the text from which the writer copied his extract went on to describe some appearance or appearances of the Risen One to His disciples in Galilee on their return from their fishing. When we consider the short period dealt with in the fragment, and compare its length with the corresponding portion of any of the four canonical Gospels, we shall be led to the conclusion that the whole Gospel, if executed throughout upon the same scale, must have been at least as long as our four Gospels combined. That it was a Gospel treating of the whole period of Christ's life is indeed evident from the writings of early Church teachers, who are understood to have made use of it as a main source of information. But it is, of course, quite uncertain whether the same proportion was maintained in the treatment of the several parts of the historical narrative. The date of the fragment is apparently not earlier than the eighth century; but the original composition of the Gospel is, on various grounds, assigned by the majority of scholars to the middle of the second century.

The fragment being continuous is of sufficient length to afford material for estimating its doctrinal tendency, and to show at least some of the reasons for which the work was written. It is almost certain from the statement of Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, regarding it, made about A.D. 200, and quoted by Eusebius, that it represented the standpoint of an early Doketic school, but that its departures in this direction were not numerous nor immediately obvious. How far we may with

confidence assert the existence of Doketic elements in the Gospel, and how far critics are entitled to describe it as anti-Jewish in tone and devoted specially to the proof of the divinity of Christ, we shall examine in the later part of this paper. Before dealing with those questions, and in order to prepare the way for their settlement, we shall discuss the relation of this Gospel of Peter to our four canonical Gospels.

This is certainly the question of primary importance in connexion with this gospel fragment: Is it part of a work which is analogous to and practically contemporary with our Gospels, or is it a later production making use of these as its chief or only sources? The latter view has been maintained with abundant learning by our own English scholars, Robinson, Swete, and Rendel Harris, as well as of the great German historian of the Canon, Theodor Zahn, and also by von Schubert of Kiel, who has investigated the subject with most laborious care and most competent scholarship. The former view is advocated by Harnack in the second edition of his work, in which he seeks to show that Peter, whom in his first edition he regarded as dependent upon Justin, is really the original in what is common to both; and this position von Soden seeks to make good by an elaborate detailed investigation and comparison of parallels. We propose to examine candidly the main differences and resemblances that are discernible between Peter and the canonical Gospels, inquiring as to the source and occasion of those differences, whether in respect of additions, or omissions, or divergences of statement, and also as to the explanations that naturally suggest themselves in regard to similarities in expression and coincidences in the statement of facts.

Much has been made by those who argue for an extremely early date for the Gospel of Peter as pre-canonical of the fact that various incidents are recorded in it of which we have no account in our Received Gospels. It is maintained that these are derived from traditional sources, oral or written, similar to and contemporary with the authorities made use of by our Evangelists. Let us look at some of those variations, amplifications, or so-called additions, in order to see if this hypothesis is necessary. We have, first of all, the refusal of the Jews to wash their hands, and the prominence given to Herod at the trial of Jesus. The incident of the hand-washing is introduced by

Matthew (xxvii. 24) in a thoroughly natural way as the act of Pilate, who is represented throughout the canonical narrative as acting in a dramatic and affected manner. This was apparently stated in the passage immediately preceding the opening words of our fragment. There was evidently nothing more needed to suggest what Peter proceeds to state. Matthew's statement was quite sufficient to afford the suggestion, especially to any one anxious to heighten as far as possible the guilt of the Jews, that the people in contrast to Pilate would not wash, but were quite prepared to take the guilt, if there was any, upon their own heads (Matt. xxvii. 25). Peter need have had no other source before him in order to obtain materials for these opening words. Herod is made prominent as king, by implication King of the Jews, so that his acts are theirs; and the people are the executioners of his will, as in our Gospels the soldiers are the executioners of the commands of Pilate. If again, with Völter, we regard verses 3-5 (Joseph's obtaining permission to take and bury the body from Herod through Pilate's mediation) as an interpolation, and there is much to commend such a supposition, we find a later redactor doing with Peter what we are fancying Peter may have done with Matthew's narrative. In any case, the unhistorical representation of Herod as King of the Jews, with a jurisdiction even in Jerusalem superior to that of Pilate, is of itself sufficient to make the authorship of our Gospel impossible even in the early years of the second century. Of a very similar kind is the divergence in regard to the silence of Jesus which the canonical Gospels report in connexion with His trial before Herod (Luke xxiii. 9) and Pilate (Matt. xxvii. 14; Mark xv. 3, 5; John xix. 9), while Peter reports it in connexion with the crucifixion. There is no need to assume a transference here of the earlier silence to a later period: for the canonical account of the darkness that was over the earth and the prevailing fear are quite enough to suggest the idea of the silence of Jesus. Peter, however, adds a reflection of his own, which shows how freely he exercised his imagination upon the facts which had come to his hand. This silence, which the circumstances narrated would quite naturally suggest to any reader, is suggestive to our author of indifference or insensibility to pain on the part of Jesus. His use of a word (*πρόνος*) that occurs in the great Messianic passage of the Old Testa-

ment (Isa. liii. 4), as describing the false external view taken of Christ's sufferings by unbelieving men, seems to show that the author of our Gospel applied the prophetic passage to interpret the meaning of the silence of Jesus, understanding that passage to say that this notion of the Messiah's pain was a mistaken one. And if here again, with Völter, we regard verses 11-13 (referring to the rebuke of the Jews by the penitent malefactor) as an interpolation, we have in verse 14 the anger of the people at Jesus because of His silence which they construe into defiant obstinacy, and their consequent resolution not to break His legs, in order that He might linger on and die in agony. By this interpolation theory, we are freed from the evident perversion of facts in the present text, according to which the Jews refuse to break the legs of the offending malefactor, implying that this was done to Jesus and to the other malefactor. According to the purified text, Jesus offends His executioners by withholding all signs of suffering. Hence in their malicious rage, evidently not believing His insensibility to pain, they resolve that He shall not have His sufferings shortened; but by and by they are face to face with the dread of His life lasting until after sunset, and so bringing a scandal upon them by a glaring breach of the law. Under pressure of this fear, not because of any relenting at the thought of His pain, they mix for Him a poison potion, gall with vinegar, and by thus poisoning Him they fill up the measure of their sins. As thus presented, we have a tolerably homogeneous description of the Jews' treatment of Jesus on the cross, and it certainly reads like a wilfully perverted rendering of the canonical story. The silence attributed to Jesus is not inconsistent with the utterance of the seven words ascribed to Him by our Evangelists, one of which, indeed, is given in a very similar form to that which it bears in Matthew. This silence, which we need not suppose to have been absolute, might appear even to a reader of our canonical Gospels the immediate occasion of much of the bitterness and scoffing which prevailed around the cross. The author's bitter anti-Jewish feeling is quite enough to account for his ascribing the omission of the *crurifragium* in the case of Jesus, not to His being already dead, but to the wish of the Jews to lengthen out His pain. This same feeling is further gratified by a perversion of the story of the stupefying draught which is represented as a

poison potion, and as administered, not by the soldiers, but by the Jews. The additional details of the extraction of the nails from the body when taken down from the cross, the connecting of the earthquake with the laying of the body on the ground, the naming of the place in which the sepulchre lay as "Joseph's garden," all belong to a section which Völter on good grounds regards as an interpolation. When this is removed, verse 25 naturally follows verse 20; the rending of the veil of the temple being just that sign which would most alarm the elders and priests of the Jews. The same may be said of the legendary additions of the two heavenly men (ver. 36), their superhuman stature grotesquely described, and the speaking cross (vers. 39-42). When these evidently much later accretions have been removed, we do not find any additions or divergences which may not be accounted for by the play of a normally active imagination exercised on the Gospels as we have them, motived by a decided anti-Jewish animus and by a very early and elementary Doketic tendency.

In speaking of omissions in our Gospel as compared with the canonical narratives, we should remember that even the comparatively short fragment which we possess is sufficient to show how curiously our author introduced incidents in places where least expected. He gives us, *e.g.*, the story of Joseph's begging the body of Jesus before the story of the mocking and the crucifixion. If we miss some things that we would have expected from one who used the four Gospels as his chief or only source, we can never be sure but that he has introduced them at some other place, either before or after the fragment which has come down to us. The omission of six of the seven sayings on the cross, the piercing of the Lord's side, the rising of many of the dead in the hour of the resurrection, etc., may be explained by the fact that the compiler was making a selection, and that none of these incidents is recorded in all our Gospels. Dr. Swete remarks that of twenty-seven instances of omission stated by him "only three belong to the common tradition of the Synoptists, whilst not a single circumstance which is related by both the Synoptists and St. John has been altogether ignored in the Petrine narrative," and no less than sixteen of the twenty-seven omissions occur in details recorded by one Evangelist only.

The common element in Peter and the canon-

ical Gospels may be seen most clearly in von Schubert, *The Gospel of St. Peter; Synoptical Tables, etc.* (Edin.: T. & T. Clark, 1893, pp. 31), where the parallel passages in the LXX., as well as those in the canonical Gospels, are printed in columns alongside of the text of our fragment, and in a summary form in Swete, pp. xvii-xx, where, by analysis of the contents and by a comparison of expressions used, quite sufficient evidence is advanced to show that each of our four Gospels was most probably before the writer of our fragment. The discussion of what we venture to call the common element in Peter and our Received Gospels has been carried on by the critics in a very unfair way. Thus we find von Soden expending a great amount of acute and ingenious analysis in order to show that every slight divergence in respect either of matter or form necessitates the assumption of the use of another source than any of our Gospels. Such procedure is warrantable only on the hypothesis that the compiler was absolutely without originality or freedom of any kind. This style of criticism can apply only to one who strictly copies down only such facts and expressions as he has before him with literal exactness. This we can easily see, even from the short fragment of his work extant, was not characteristic of our author.

We have already indicated the presence of certain doctrinal tendencies of an anti-Jewish and Doketic order. It is only right that we should remember that our four Evangelists are also in a sense anti-Jewish. They really state all the main facts which constitute the charge against the Jews, as having persistently clamoured for the death of Jesus, and as having secured His crucifixion even against the will of the Roman officials. The author of the Gospel of Peter only adds minor details, mostly consisting of distortions of the facts referred to, for the evident purpose of making the Jews appear even yet more officious in their hostility to Jesus. He has really all the materials for his accusation of the Jews in the canonical Gospels, and he does scarcely more in this direction than here and there assign to the Jews, or to Herod, regarded as their king, certain atrocities and malicious acts of cruelty in which others bore at least a share. That this did not seem to overstep the bounds of historical accuracy must have been the opinion of the early Christians, if the statement of Theodoret be correct that this

Gospel was used by the sect of the Nazareans. The Jewish Christians would not be in the least unwilling to emphasise strongly the guilt of their fathers according to the flesh, but they would not have recognised a gospel which made a point of vilifying the Jews in order to exonerate and exalt the Gentiles.

Much more important is the allegation of a Doketic tendency on the part of the author of our Gospel. This charge is based upon the story of Serapion as given by Eusebius, and on certain statements in the fragment itself. The letter of Serapion is specially interesting, as showing the impression made upon one who had before him not merely our fragment, but the whole work. He evidently thought that, were it not for the heretical tendencies of those among whom it originated, and of those who interested themselves in its circulation, it might have proved a harmless, though unauthoritative, and in regard to details not to be guaranteed, reproduction of the evangelical history. His estimate of the whole Gospel was apparently similar to that which has generally been made of the fragment which we now possess. For when we turn to the two passages usually quoted as evidence of the Doketic tendency of the writer, we find that they are statements which might have been made in orthodox circles without awakening any suspicion of a heretical intention. Of the five incidents, accretions to the canonical narrative, which Swete regards as indications of a Doketic tendency of the writer, two, namely, the supernatural height of the angels and Christ, and the personification of the cross, belong to a section which we regard as a later interpolation, and even if attributed to Peter, they seem to be mere legendary adornments of the tale rather than tendency developments. Other two, namely, His desertion by His "Power," and the representation of His death as a lifting up (*ἀνάληψις*), should be counted as one; the only other being the alleged statement that Jesus on the cross was free from pain. As to the expression *ἀνελήφθη*, it should be enough to point out that it is quite in accordance with the canonical narrative to represent the death-surviving part of the crucified Lord as taken up into heaven and restored again to the body in the sepulchre on the third day. It seems natural to understand the modification of the Old Testament words adopted, according to Matthew and Mark, by Jesus, as our author's interpretation of them, he regarding them

as the expiring cry of Jesus as He felt His life-strength fast ebbing away. That the writer intended to say that the divine part of Jesus was now finally withdrawn from the human and corporeal part, and that the appearances of the forty days were omitted from his Gospel, cannot surely be maintained in view of the fact that Jesus as dead and risen is still, as before, styled "Lord" (*Κύριος*), and that evidently the story begun, where the fragment closes, about the disciples fishing in Galilee, embraced some at least of the early appearances of the Risen One, it may be even out of their proper order, some of those of the great Easter week. It should be noted that Peter unhesitatingly affirms a resurrection: "He is risen and gone away" (ver. 56), and even the redactor, supposed to be more inclined to Doketism, asserts that His body, which had lain in the tomb, is gone (ver. 57). The only other doubtful saying is that which speaks of the silence of Jesus on the cross as like that of one who experienced no pain (*πόνος*). It should be noted here that this statement is a reflection by the writer on the recorded fact of the silence, his own offered explanation of that fact. It is given for what it may be worth. The silence might result from freedom from pain; but evidently the Jews, if we adopt the interpolation theory, and drop out the three verses which follow the statement now under consideration, accounted for this silence on the supposition that He was obdurate, and that His defiant attitude was insulting to them. Instead of being intended doketically, we should regard this little comment of our author as another indication of the anti-Jewish prejudice. Pain these Jews very well knew He suffered in its extremest form, and they had not magnanimity enough to admire the heroism that bears and says nothing.

There seems indeed to be nothing in this fragment to warrant the supposition that the Gospel of Peter was deliberately prepared with the object of favouring a Doketic heresy. It is the work of one who had before him our four Gospels, which he knew to be generally accepted as authoritative. From these, therefore, he drew his materials, giving, however, free play to his imagination in grouping, explaining, and amplifying the statement of facts thus obtained. Some peculiarities of personal taste and feeling are probably enough to account for the legendary additions and corresponding modifications of facts and arrangement by which

his work is differentiated from the canonical Gospels. Though extremely interesting as a specimen of an early free paraphrase of the evangelical narrative, it furnishes no additional detail such as we might expect from a history made up of selections from sources from which the selection known

to us in the four Gospels was made. The want of any steady aim in its divergences from the authoritative sources of church teaching, what we might call its whimsicality, rendered it unacceptable to any considerable body either within or without the Church.

Christ in Islam.

SAYINGS ATTRIBUTED TO CHRIST BY MOHAMMEDAN WRITERS.

By D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., PROFESSOR OF ARABIC, OXFORD.

(From *El-Ghazzali's Revival of the Religious Sciences—continued.*)

63. iv. 157. Christ said: Look not unto the wealth of the people of this world; for the glitter of their wealth takes away the light of their faith.

64. iv. 173. Christ said: Four things can be attained only with toil—silence, which is the beginning of devotion; humility; constant prayer; and poverty.

65. iv. 182. Jesus used to take with Him nothing but a comb and a pitcher. One day, seeing a man comb his beard with his fingers, He cast away the comb; another day, seeing a man drink out of the river with his hands, He threw away the pitcher.

66. iv. 256. Jesus was asked, Why dost Thou not buy an ass to ride? He answered: I am too precious with God for Him to let an ass interrupt my thoughts of Him.

67. iv. 272. Jesus passed by a man who was blind, leprous, crippled, paralysed on both sides, and with his flesh scarred from elephantiasis, but was saying: Praise be to God, who has kept me free from that wherewith He has afflicted many of His creatures. Jesus said unto him: Sir, what form of affliction is that which has been kept away from thee? He answered: O Spirit of God, I am better off than those into whose hearts God has not put that knowledge of Himself which he has put into mine. Jesus said: Thou hast spoken truly; give me thine hand. He gave his hand, and straightway became the fairest and best-looking of men, for God had healed him of his afflictions. So he accompanied Jesus, and shared His devotions.

68. iv. 279. Jesus asked the children of Israel: Where does the seed grow? They answered: In the mould. He said: Of a truth I say unto you, wisdom grows not save in a heart like the mould.

69. iv. 281. Ibn El-Jala said: God revealed unto Jesus: When I examine a man's heart, and

find not therein any love for this world or for the next, I fill it with love of me and sedulously guard it.

70. *Ibid.* Jesus was asked: What is the best of works? He answered: Resignation to God, and love of Him.

71. iv. 284. Jesus said: Blessed is the eye that sleeps and thinks no evil, and wakes unto sinlessness.

72. iv. 298. The apostles asked Jesus: What action is just? He answered: That of him who works for God without desiring that any one should praise him for it.

73. iv. 313. Jesus said: Actions are of three sorts—those which are evidently right, which ye should ensue; those which are evidently wrong, which ye should eschew; and those which are doubtful, which are to be referred to those who know.

74. iv. 332. On the authority of Ta'us: The apostles asked Jesus, Is there any one on earth to-day like Thee? He answered: Yea; whosoever has for his speech prayer, and for his silence meditation, and for his vision tears, he is like me.

75. iv. 354. When Jesus thought on death, His skin dripped blood.

76. iv. 362. Jesus said: Ye company of apostles, pray unto God that this cup (death) may be easy for me; for I fear death with a terror which is like the pains of death.

77. iv. 363. Jesus, passing by a skull, kicked it with His foot, and bade it speak by the will of God. It said: O Spirit of God, I was a king in past time. One day, when I was seated in my kingdom on my throne of state, with my crown on my head and my armies and courtiers around me, the Angel of Death appeared unto me. Then each of my members fell apart, and my spirit went forth to him. Would that all those armies had been but one troop! Would that all that dense company had been solitude!