Requests and Replies.

Somewhere lately I came across the statement that the clause σοῦ ἐπέστη, in Mt 16, is merely an expansion of ΣΥΕΠΗΣ. The Vatican manuscript and a rendering of Augustine—tu divisti—were alluded to; the inference being that the correct reading is σοῦ ἐπέστη, thou hast said. What is the value of this statement? Is there any further evidence of the same kind?—G. S. L.

It may be confidently asserted that it is impossible to explain ΣΥΕΠΗΣ as an expansion of ΣΥΕΠΗΣ in σοῦ ἐπέστη, thou hast said.

1. The answer σοῦ ἐπέστη (or ἐπέστη) does not fit into the connexion. If it stood in v.17, immediately after the declaration of Peter, σοῦ ἐπέστη, it would be in its place, indeed; but after the intervening words, and especially after the introductory formula, κύριε δέ σοι λέγει ὅτι, an answer like σοῦ ἐπέστη seems impossible.

2. Neither is there any paleographical probability that ΠΕΠΙΩΣ would have arisen from ΠΕΠΙΩΣ. The name Πέτρος was very seldom written in an abbreviated form; the only example, in ancient times, which I know of, is the Vienna Papyrus Fragment from the Fayyum, where it is written ΠΕΠ (see my *Supplementum Novi Testamenti Graeci*, 1896, p. 67).

3. How the Codex Vaticanus B can be quoted in this connexion I fail to understand, nor do I know the passage of Augustine referred to, or any other evidence of the same kind, except the negative, that the word Σοῦ ἐπέστη does not seem to have been quoted by any ecclesiastical writer before Eusebius. A. Resch (Ausserkanonische Evangelienfragmente, ii. 1894, pp. 187-196) seems to lay too much stress on this fact. For it is found in the Syrus Curetonianus—the Lewisianus breaks off, unhappily, at τις 15—and in the Arabic Tatian, as well as in all other witnesses.

Thus far, the above question seems easily to be answered, and that in the negative; but it raises other questions, which do not seem to have received as yet enough attention or found their final solution.

(a) The formula, σοῦ ἐπέστη (Mt 26, 44), or ἔπεις λέγει, has hitherto been said to be a common Eastern mode of affirmation; but Professor Chwolson, an authority in matters of Jewish antiquities, has declared lately that only one example of it has been found by him in Rabbinical literature, and there it has not an affirmative sense, but declines to affirm (see D. Chwolson, 'Das letzte Passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes nach den in Uebereinstimmung gebrachten Berichten der Synoptiker und des Evangelium Johannis, nebst einem Anhang, Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg, vii° Série, Tome xii. n. 1, 1892, p. 88).

1 To me it seems very probable that also in the N.T. σοῦ ἐπέστη is to be understood in this way. Judas asks, 'Is it I?' Jesus answers, 'Thou hast said it (not I); thou hast spoken the fatal word (traitor); look whether it become not true.' Again, before the high priest, 'Tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God!' 'Thou has said, thou hast taken the word in thy mouth; I did not say it, hitherto, neither affirming nor denying, but now I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man,' etc.

Quite recently, a scholar well versed in biblical literature (Professor Jülicher), ridiculed this ex-

1 The connexion is this: R. Jehudah (the redactor of the Mishna) was very ill; the inhabitants of Sepphoris were much grieved about it, and declared they would kill him who should bring the news of his death. His pupil, R. Bar-Kappara, came, with his garments rent, and cried, 'The angels have taken away the sacred tables' (the stones on which the law was written). The people, hearing this, said, 'R. Jehudah is dead,' on which Bar-Kappara replied, 'You have said it, I did not say it;' or, according to another version, merely 'You said it,'
plation, when it came before him in a somewhat
exaggerated form and a less trustworthy connexion
(die Christliche Welt, 1897, ii. 89), apparently be-
cause he did not know the sound foundation on
which it rests. At all events, Westcott-Hort have
shown their wonted circumspection in giving, in
Mt 1614, the alternative explanation στο εἰρήνην, as
question. This shows that it was not certain at all
to them that στο εἰρήνην was such a common or
standing formula of affirmation, as it is commonly
said to have been. Or was it so used after all?

(b) Peter as θυροφόρος.—The other question raised
by the query on Mt 1618 regards the prominent
position assigned to Peter in this passage. A.
Resch, in his Ausserkanonische Paralleltexte (ii. Heft,
1894, pp. 187-196), tried to prove that v. 18 was
unknown during the whole of the second century,
that Tertullian and Origen were the first witnesses
for the text as it stands now (für die fertige canoni-
sche textgestalt), and that even in the fourth
century the text of Mt 1618 remained unfixed
(blieb schwankend). 1 I do not think that he has
made out his case. I believe, on the contrary, that
I have found in the Gospel of Mark, where one
was surprised hitherto to have no parallel passage
to that of Matthew, a saying of Jesus, which seems
to be connected with it. According to Mk 13²,
Jesus is asked by Peter (together with James,
John, and Andrew) about the signs of the
approaching fulfilment. At the end of His answer
He speaks to his above-named disciples the parable
of the man who leaves his house giving authority
to his servants, to each one his own work, and he
distinguishes from the rest of the servants expressly
the θυροφόρος, the porter, "qui etiam pro alitis vigilat,
esque excitare doct; as Bengel justly remarked.
Is it not allowable to think in this connexion
especially of Peter and of Mt 1619? In the
commentaries at my disposal,—that of Dods is not
yet among them,—I find no remark about this con­
nexion; I pointed it out in my Philologia sacra,
1896, p. 48.

(c) Mt 1617 and Gal 116.—A third point in
connexion with Mt 1617, which does not seem to
me to have received as yet sufficient attention
and a satisfying solution, is its relation to Jn 118
and (especially) Gal 116. It seems to me almost
impossible not to recognize a direct literary relation
between these three passages, especially between
Christ's word to Peter, and the statement of Paul
about his conversion; and yet it is very difficult to
say precisely how this connexion is to be explained.
All three passages speak about the true significance
of Christ's person, how it was or is recognised;
all use the expression σορέκ καὶ αἵμα, which is not
so frequent—a look into the concordance shows it
—as is generally presupposed. Mt 1617 and Gal
115 have also the expression δισοκαλίτευκ in com-
mon; in John we do not have the word, but the
idea. Can we believe that Paul, when formulating
the narrative of the most important event of his
life, was guided unintentionally by the narrative of
the similar important moment in the life of Peter?
Or shall we presuppose that Paul imitated pur-
purly the words which were addressed to Peter?
A former generation of critics would even have
been inclined to find a certain jealousy and rivalry
on his side. But if we do not go so far, are we to
presuppose that Paul had already before him a
written account of that word of Jesus to Peter, or
is it sufficient to suppose that Paul knew it only
by hearsay? In either case, Gal 116 would be an
important corroborate the passage in Matthew.
Or—here is the second possibility—are we to
suppose that the passage in Matthew is formulated
under the influence of Gal 1? Is this theory of
the critical school consistent with the way in
which the present generation is accustomed to
view the growth of our Gospels? And what are
we to think about the relation of Jn 118 to both
passages?

Ed. Nestle.

Is there any copy extant of the defence made by
Edward Irving before the Annan Presbytery? The
standard edition of Irving appears to be
that of Gavin Carlyle; but it would be interesting
to know why it excludes what 'Chambers'
Encyclopædia' calls his finest literary work—
the preliminary paper to Ben-Ezra; and his
finest oration—this Annan defence.—B. R. E.

Mr. Gavin Carlyle in reply informs us that he
intended to include both papers in his edition of
Irving, but difficulties arose in connexion with
the publishing which need not be gone into. He
agrees in Chambers' estimate of the Annan defence,
but for a copy of it he is unable to do more than
refer to the British Museum, where anyone may
see and read it.

Editor.