

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

E. N. Bennett

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 1-2 / February 1893, pp 40 - 42

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196775, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196775

How to cite this article:

E. N. Bennett (1893). The Gospel According To Peter. The Classical Review, 7, pp 40-42
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196775

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tice of the early Christian church is derived from the express teaching, the *ipsissima verba*, of its Founder. For αὐτῶν here Levi reads αὐτῶν with P₁: and in § 12 λόγοι ἱεροὶ αὐτῶν ἐλέγοντο he substitutes αὐτοῦ (= ἐν τῷ δεσμοῦ τῆς ψῆς) for the same word. But it is

not easy to see why αὐτῶν may not be possessive in both passages.

This publication sufficiently proves the desirability of a new recension of Lucian, and the task is one which the editor is well qualified to undertake. E. C. MARCHANT.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PETER.¹

THE gratitude of all Biblical students is due to M. Bouriant for having recently in the *Mémoires de la mission Archéologique Française* given to the world a fragment of the 'Evangelium Petri,' the MS. of which was allowed by the ignorance or carelessness of its discoverer to lie unnoticed at Cairo for no less than six years. In dealing with the text, which is accompanied by a French translation, M. Bouriant has modestly refrained from any attempts at alteration or emendation. 'J'ai préféré (he says) donner le texte tel qu'il est dans l'original, pensant que les hellénistes et les théologiens sauront gré à un égyptologue de ne point se hasarder sur leur territoire. Les pages qui suivent sont une pure transcription que je me suis attaché à rendre aussi fidèle que possible.' The unfortunate illness of Professor Sanday coupled with the fact that M. Bouriant's transcript lay for nearly three weeks in the Bodleian before a single person in Oxford was aware of its presence there may partially explain the practical monopoly which Cambridge has had in the editing of the Petrine fragments. Yet Oxford was not left in complete ignorance, for on November 29th Mr. Headlam read before an audience at All Souls a full and interesting account of the newly-discovered gospel, which was subsequently published in the *Guardian* of December 7th.

The main point of interest with respect to the fragment before us lies in its relation to the four canonical gospels. All who have as yet handled the subject maintain that it must clearly have borrowed from these. 'To the writer,' says Mr. Robinson in his able introduction, 'they all stand on an equal footing,' and Mr. Headlam asserts that the use of the canonical gospels cannot

be doubted. But is the 'unmistakable acquaintance of the author with our four Evangelists' so clearly proved? If we take 120-140 A.D. as the approximate date of the Evangelium Petri, it is by no means certain that our N.T. gospels (although they doubtless existed) were at all universally known and read at this time in Asia Minor. Even in this brief fragment the divergences from the narratives of the New Testament are very numerous, and it is difficult to see why the writer if he had our gospels before him should have altered and added to their tradition in so marked a manner. When such changes can be traced to a 'tendency' the difficulty of course disappears, but the Gnostic and Doketic bent of the writer cannot account for the majority of the differences, and has, I venture to think, been somewhat exaggerated. For instance, why should our Lord's cry upon the Cross ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δύναμις, κατέλειψάς με be necessarily Doketic? Surely if the writer wished to lay stress on the abandonment of the human Christ by the Λόγος at the Crucifixion, he would scarcely have selected the above words in lieu of the ordinary ὁ Θεός μου κ.τ.λ. which suited Doketism much better,—as we see from Irenaeus' account of the Valentinians, ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν, ὁ Θεός μου εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; μεμνησκέσθαι αὐτὸν ὅτι ἀπελείφθη ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτός ἡ Σοφία κ.τ.λ. (Iren. I. viii. p. 38 ed. Massuet). The quotation merely adds one more to the many indications we possess that in the 2nd and 3rd centuries numerous varieties existed in the Greek rendering of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the present instance, the writer read Eli for Eloi and the ἡλ of Ἰσραὴλ is expressly rendered by δύναμις in the 'Trypho' of Justin, while Aquila and Eusebius translated Eli by ἰσχυρέ and ἰσχύς (cp. Mr. Armitage Robinson's note, p. 21).

A large number of facts are adduced to prove a knowledge of the canonical gospels, but they do not appear to be convincing. That an apocryphal narrative should contain

¹ 1. *The Apocryphal Gospel of Peter: the Greek Text of the Newly-discovered fragment.* 1s. (Macmillan.)

2. *The Gospel according to Peter.*—A lecture by J. Armitage Robinson, B.D. 2s. 6d. (C. J. Clay and Sons.)

3. *A Popular Account of the Newly-recovered Gospel of Peter*, by Prof. J. Rendel Harris. 2s. 6d. (Hodder and Stoughton.)

the guarding and sealing of the tomb recorded by the writer of St. Matthew is indeed very natural, but even here there are so many differences that any direct connection between the two accounts seems improbable. The breaking of the legs is said to be clearly borrowed from St. John; why then is it handled in so utterly different a manner? If the trial before Herod is taken from St. Luke why are the details so varied? No certain inferences can be drawn from the occurrence of a common word like *παρέκλυψαν* or the employment of *καθίζω* in an active sense. The larger Cambridge edition has placed in the margin of the text more than thirty references to our N. T. gospels; but in most of these the similarity is very faint, and few exhibit any close likeness. All that we can safely infer from the fragment is that it made use of certain *διηγήσεις*, written or oral, which contained some facts recorded and others unrecorded by the four canonical gospels. But if such extraordinary corruption and variety of narrative could exist in Christian communities by 125 A.D. what may have happened 40 years before?

As all who have hitherto touched upon the text admit that further emendation is desirable, I have less hesitation in venturing to make the following suggestions.

§ 1. οὐδ' εἰς can hardly be right, as we find in the line before οὐδέις, and such elisions are foreign to the Greek of this fragment. Either an ε has dropped out after οὐδ or else perhaps the words were οὐδέ τις. It is difficult to translate Mr. Robinson's *καὶ βουλευθέντων*, for we cannot well suppose that the Jewish leaders suddenly altered their minds. Moreover this reading neglects the lacuna which one infers from M. Bouriant's edition. *καὶ μὴ βουλευθέντων ἀνέστη Πειλᾶτος* fills up this lacuna and gives a good sense. But if M. Bouriant's [τῶν] indicates that something like this word is visible on the parchment, perhaps *καὶ [περ τινῶν]* may end the first sentence, but in this case, as with Dr. Swete's text, *ἀνέστη Πειλᾶτος* is very abrupt.

The comma after *ποιῆσαι* in Dr. Swete's edition is probably due to a printer's error.

πεφονευμένῳ is a strange word to use of an executed criminal; it does not occur in the LXX. *τῆς ἐορτῆς αὐτῶν* looks very like a gloss.

§ 3. Mr. Harris' *σύρωμεν* is a happy conjecture, but it does not harmonize very well with *ἄθουν*, and this exclamation from our Lord's prosecutors seems somewhat flat. Can the original have been *θυμῶμεν*, let us

'make angry' or 'provoke'—a LXX. word? Perhaps *στανῶμεν* might gain some support from the fact that σ occurs for στ later on in *ἐπισάντας*.

§ 4 *μηδὲνα πόνον* is not satisfactory, for there is no reason for the disappearance of an λ; but may not the final syllable of the first word have caused an ΕΝ to drop out before *πόνον*? *ὡς μηδὲν ἔμπονον ἔχων* would be a further indication of Doketism, and *ἐνπονον* would cause no difficulty for we find *ἐνφανίσαι* in § 11.

Dr. Swete has kept the double augment in *ἐώρθωσαν* and there seems to be need for its erasure. It is a curious coincidence that two of the three Cambridge editions have made *στανρόν* properispomenon in this section. Is there any other instance of *σκελοκοπεῖν*?

§ 5. There appears to be no warrant for the insertion of γάρ after *γέγραπται*. Perhaps the clause is a gloss which has slipped into the text.

The writer follows, probably, a sound tradition in placing the Crucifixion between midday and three o'clock in the afternoon, and further in representing the darkness as extending over *πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν*.

ἔπεσαν τε is not a satisfactory correction of the unintelligible *ἐπέσαντο*; τε is not found in the rest of the fragment, and the words 'and they fell down' are very insipid. Nor again is it probable that the original was (as Mr. Redpath suggests in the *Academy* of Dec. 10th) *περίηρχοντο μετὰ λύχνων νομίζοντες... ἐξίσταντο*. The second clause is much too abrupt and *ἐξίσταντο* is violent. I venture to suggest that the passage ran as follows,—*περίηρχοντο... μετὰ λύχνων, νομίζοντες ὅτι νύξ ἐστι, μὴ πέσειντο* (or perhaps *ἵνα μὴ πέσειντο*). There is no great difference in uncials between *νεπ* and *μην* and the writer elsewhere confuses ε and η.

αὐτῆς ὥρας is a strange expression, though the occurrence of words like *αὐθημερόν*, *αὐθωρεῖ* offer some support to such a use of *αὐτός*. Perhaps the *αὐτός ὥρας* of the MSS. conceal some more serious corruption. As the subject of *ἀνελήφθη* is ὁ Κύριος and the verb can only mean 'was taken up' some degree of confusion seems to exist, for it is still ὁ Κύριος who is placed in the sepulchre. Would not a Gnostic writer have been more precise in describing *what* was taken up?

§ 8. In line 29, *μετά* is a very violent alteration. Had the original been *κατά*, the occurrence of *μετό* after *μέγαν* would have been easily explicable, but *κατά* cannot very well have replaced *μετά*. Dr. Swete

leaves *κατά*, but the resulting sense is ludicrous. Perhaps the corruption lies in *ὁμοῦ* or *ὅμοι* which seems redundant and out of place. Or did the text run originally—*καὶ κυλίσαντες λίθον μέγαν κάτω, τοῦ κεντυρίωνος καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὄντων ὁμοῦ, πάντες κ.τ.λ.?*

§ 10. The *αὐτοί* of the three editions seems to be a certain correction of *αν οἱ* and the Greek is excellent; it is difficult to understand why Mr. Redpath thinks *ἄλλοι* better.

Mr. Robinson's *τοῦ δὲ χειραγωγουμένου* is most convincing. Dr. Swete's *ὑπορθουμένου* is probably due to a slight inconsistency between *ὑπορθοῦν* and *χειραγωγεῖν*. Mr. Redpath's *τὸν δὲ χειραγωγούμενον...ὑπερβαίνοντα* spoils the balance of the clauses and necessitates a violent change in the second participle.

Did *ἐκήρυξας τοῖς κοιμωμένοις* actually form part of the hymn in the Ep. to the Ephesians,

*ἐκήρυξας τοῖς κοιμωμένοις,
ἐγείραι ὁ καθεύδων κ.τ.λ.?*

There is no apparent need for the question after *κοιμωμένοις*, nor again for the change of the MS. reading *ὑπακοῇ* into the nominative. With the dative the Greek runs quite smoothly—'and in response there was heard &c.' As to the concluding words of the sentence Dr. Swete's *τὸ ναί* seems pre-

ferable to *ὅτι ναί* as being nearer to the MS.; and is there any parallel for *ὅτι* introducing the quotation of a *single word*? It is curious to find the technical use of *ὑπακοή* and *τὸ ναί* at so early a date. The latter word is not in all probability an answer ('Yea') to a question, but simply = 'Amen' to the utterance *ἐκήρυξας τ. κοιμωμένοις*. I can find no example of *ναί* as an affirmative response to a liturgical question, but Mr. Brightman has kindly shown me several places where the word is used like *ἀμήν*. For instance in Lord Bute's *Coptic Morning Service*, p. 76, the deacon says *ΔCΠΔΖΕCΘΕ ΔΑΛΗΛΟΥC ΕΝ ΦΙΛΗΜΑΤΙ ΔΓΙΩ* and the congregation answer *ΝΑΙ*. Again *ναί, κύριε* seems fairly common at the end of a prayer, e.g. *Acta Joannis*, ed. Zahn, p. 239, we find *κύριε, βοήθησον ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ σου τοῖς δούλοις· ναί, κύριε*. This solemn 'amen' suits the context better than 'yea,' for even granted the question, it is *not addressed to the Cross at all*.

§ 12. The insertion of *ἥτις* before *φοβουμένη* seems unwarrantable. If any emendation is needed in this section perhaps *δέ* may be inserted after *λαβοῦσα*, on the supposition that it has dropped out before the *με* of the following *μετά*.

E. N. BENNETT.

MORRIS'S EDITION OF THE *PSEUDOLUS* OF PLAUTUS.

The Pseudolus of Plautus. With introduction and notes by E. P. MORRIS. Boston. 1890.

THE basis for the text of this edition is the standard edition of Goetz (Leipzig 1887), which Prof. Morris has followed very closely. This is to be regretted in some measure, for while the superiority of Goetz's edition over preceding ones is unquestionable, there is still much of it that is unsatisfactory, especially the treatment of the *cantica* in the fourth act, where Goetz has been very bold, and also very infelicitous, in his emendations. The few variations in the present text are mentioned with sufficient but not entire completeness in the preface. They are mainly changes in orthography, with a return to the MSS. reading in some cases. Few emendations of other critics are inserted and but one of the editor's own; a change of order in v. 792 where, instead of the MSS.

Nam ego si iuratus peiorem hominem quaerem, Prof. Morris reads *nam ego peiorem hominem si iuratus quaererem*. By this change the sense is slightly benefited; though the passage is probably best considered as a pronounced case of colloquial inexactness.

An introduction of thirty-two pages gathers up what is known of the *Pseudolus*. To this is added a chronological sketch of the development of Roman Comedy, and a slight discussion of the metres of Plautus. It is unfortunate that no edition as yet contains an adequate treatment of this latter subject.

The commentary is very complete and bears abundant evidence of the editor's wide reading in Plautine literature in numerous references to the latest books and dissertations. In a number of notes the editor gives the results of his own labours: especially in those on the interrogative particles,