

The Journal *of* *Theological Studies*

JANUARY, 1918

THE GOSPEL OF PETER.

Is the Gospel of Peter an independent witness to the tradition of the Resurrection? That is the ultimate question which the present paper is an attempt to answer. But in order at all to compass this object, it is desirable to have as wide a basis of facts as possible on which to construct our inductions; in other words, we must extend the field of operations to cover the whole of the newly-recovered fragment of Peter, including (that is) its account of the Passion as well as its account of the Resurrection. And further if what we are concerned to know is whether we possess in this apocryphal Gospel any material independent of previously known documents, any traditions unrepresented in our other authorities, it is clear that the most substantial part of the enquiry will have to consist of a systematic investigation of the relation of pseudo-Peter to our four existing Gospels.

To some it may seem that any such enquiry is really superfluous, so great is the antecedent improbability that a document of the date and character of the Petrine Gospel should have preserved any elements of a genuine tradition not otherwise embodied in extant material. But even the merest chance that, for instance, any part of the substance of the lost ending of St Mark may have survived in 'Peter' would be enough to arrest attention and to justify enquiry. And now that Prof. Lake declares himself 'inclined to accept the suggestion that "Peter" was acquainted with and used the lost conclusion of Mark',¹ it is more than ever incumbent on those who dissent from his position to make good their dissent, if they can, by a close and rigorous examination of the conditions, literary and historical, of the

¹ *Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* p. 162; it is rather characteristic that the conclusion here so tentatively phrased is put at another point with much more robust certainty, 'in the Gospel of Peter alone is the sense preserved', p. 72.

problem. In such an investigation it is always a little difficult to decide what should be included as really part of the subject, what should be excluded as having no sufficiently direct bearing. As I propose, in other sections of the work of which this paper forms one chapter, to examine what may probably have been contained in the lost ending of Mark, and whether Matthew and Luke knew the Second Gospel in its original or in its present mutilated form, I shall not enter into details upon these questions ; but it is in my opinion practically demonstrable that the First and Third Evangelists only knew the Second Gospel as we know it ourselves, shorn of its conclusion.¹

A. *The external evidence and the date.*

Of the external testimony to the 'Gospel of Peter' and therewith to its date, there is no need to speak more than very briefly, both because the evidence in itself is slight and also because in the chronological conclusions to be drawn from it there is really not much room for divergence.

ORIGEN *in Matt. x 17* : 'But as to the brethren of Jesus some say that they were sons of Joseph by a former wife whom he had before Mary, basing themselves on a tradition of the Gospel entitled Peter's or of the book of James.'² There is naturally nothing in the extant fragment of 'Peter' to bear out this statement ; but on the other hand there is no reason at all to doubt the testimony of Origen, that this solution of the problem of the 'brethren' of Christ was found in the Gospel of Peter and in the Protevangelium of James.

SERAPION, bishop of Antioch at the end of the second century, wrote (as we learn from Eusebius *H. E. vi 12*) against the Gospel of Peter, 'exposing its false statements for the benefit of certain Christians in the *parochia* of Rhossus'. Rhossus was a town on the Syrian coast, not far to the north-west of Antioch ; and Serapion, in the course of a visitation there, had been appealed to by a section of the Christian community who were dissatisfied as to the regularity of a Gospel established in the local liturgical

¹ If I understand Prof. Lake rightly, he too holds that neither Matthew nor Luke has in fact made use of the lost ending, but he attributes their silence not to ignorance but to intention ; they had the complete Mark in their hands, but willfully disregarded it (p. 72). The innuendo, which he extends also to 'the early church', appears to me to be gratuitous ; but this is not the place to discuss it.

² The passage is from that part of Origen's commentary on St Matthew which is preserved in the original Greek.

usage, and known by the name 'Gospel according to Peter'. Serapion himself had never met with this Gospel; but the fact that its use at Rhossus was, as it appeared, traditional inclined him in its favour, and in the second century at any rate a large measure of liberty and variety prevailed in the lectionaries of different churches. In the first instance, then, he declined to interfere; but when the objectors returned to the charge with allegations of heresy, he borrowed a copy of the Gospel from the Docetae, the sect among whom it was in special use, and on examining it found that, while the greater part of it was innocent enough, there were things on it which did not correspond to 'the orthodox doctrine of the Saviour', and it was just these things which his letter or treatise proposed to isolate and emphasize. From this information, which of course takes us a good deal further than Origen's, we gather that the Gospel was in circulation well before the end of the second century, that there was nothing which immediately and at first sight differentiated it in type from the canonical Gospels, but that on the other hand it was at least compatible with, if it was not rather actually intended to recommend, a Docetic conception of Christ, that is, a denial of the reality of His human nature.

No possible doubt can exist as to the *provenance* of our fragment from the Gospel which Serapion had accepted on a cursory and condemned on a closer inspection: for its author speaks of the apostles in the first person plural as 'we the twelve disciples of the Lord' and of Peter in the first person singular as 'I Simon Peter', while his account of the Crucifixion and Resurrection is definitely Docetic. Christ suffers neither pain nor death; and seeing that He did not die, He could not, of course, in any literal sense rise again from the dead.

But Docetism, however alien to the spirit of apostolic Christianity, was no product of the later second century. It permeates all forms of Gnosticism, from the simplest and crudest to the developed theologies of Valentinus and Marcion; it is singled out as a pressing danger to Christian teaching alike in the letters of St John of Ephesus and of St Ignatius of Antioch. The Gospel of Peter is not, therefore, necessarily later than the sub-apostolic age because it is frankly Docetic. If it was known, as I myself suppose, to Justin Martyr, writing between 150 and

160, an origin in the second half of the second century is at once put out of question. Prof. Lake judges that 'it is probable that it is not earlier than 100 A.D. and not much later than 130 A.D.', and inclines to a date approaching the first of these two limits: I should myself agree that it ought to be placed at a rather early point in the series of Gnostic Christian writings. For the history of Gnosticism represents on the whole a gradual approach to Catholic Christianity; in its earlier stages its alien non-Christian character is much more pronounced, but as we trace its development in the later representatives of the movement the definitely Christian features become more and more predominant. Valentinus and Marcion could in some real sense lay claim to the Christian name, because the Christian element, though not the only one, was still the largest and most obvious in their theology. But Valentinus, with whatever reserve of misinterpretation, accepted the Gospels of the Church, and Marcion's Gospel was not only, like Peter, based on a canonical model, but quite certainly resembled its prototype much more nearly than Peter did. Peter, in fact, would appear to represent about the earliest attempt to rehandle the documents of the Christian tradition in the Gnostic interest. I should put it myself roughly between 115 and 130 A. D.

B. Internal characteristics : relation to the Four Gospels.

That Serapion at first sight found nothing so strange in the Gospel of Peter as to call for its discontinuance in liturgical use, must mean that it was not in all parts so abhorrent to the matter and manner of the Gospels with which he was familiar as to excite his immediate suspicion. Perhaps the description in Eusebius, 'he did not go through the Gospel', may be thought to imply that he looked only at the earlier chapters and, at any rate, did not get to the end. And of course, when we come to think of it, it is likely that a Docetic Gospel, fundamentally as it must differ from our Gospels in its account of the Passion and Resurrection, would not differ superficially to anything like the same extent in its account of the Teaching and Ministry of Christ. If Serapion had opened the Gospel of Peter at the point where it happens to be now accessible to us, he could hardly have failed to express himself at the first reading in the same unfavourable

terms which he used at his second reading ; but the preliminary verdict which he actually gave is instructive, because it implies on the part of the Petrine Gospel a general conformity to the lines of the Gospels to which Serapion was accustomed, a conformity which we may properly assume to have been greater in the rest of that Gospel than in the extant fragment. If then we find ourselves on the whole warranted in concluding for the employment of any of our canonical Gospels as sources for 'Peter's' narrative of the Passion and Resurrection, we may feel reasonably certain that our conclusions would be fortified if the body of his Gospel were at our disposal.

At the end of this paper will be found an English version of the fragment, in which all points of contact with the canonical Gospels are numbered for convenience of reference.

a. The dependence of our fragment upon St Mark is not questioned. Often indeed it is impossible to say—so closely does St Matthew follow St Mark in the narrative of the Passion—whether the apocryphal writer is borrowing from the First or the Second Gospel ; it would even have been feasible to argue, had the Passion stood alone, that St Mark had not been used at all, or at any rate that there was nothing to shew that he had been used. But in the later sections there are quite indubitable indications of connexion with St Mark : from St Mark alone can we explain the word for 'swathing' in linen, (p. 192, no. 61) ; the merely partial movement of the stone, no. 84 ; the phrase 'youth', no. 100 ; while the entire episode of the women at the sepulchre follows closely—not, however, quite exclusively—Mk. xvi 3-8, nos. 95-106.

This being once established, we shall be more ready to see traces of St Mark's influence at more doubtful points in the earlier sections—though it will be seen later on that the Petrine writer had special and obvious ground for giving preference to the Second Evangelist in the latter stages of the fragment preserved to us. But it is needless to enumerate such points, since the employment of St Mark's Gospel is admitted on all sides, and the reader can follow them for himself in the apparatus to the translation given below.

b. Of almost all the peculiar additions which St Matthew's Gospel makes to the Marcan text, the Petrine writer is found to

incorporate at least some feature. He has with Matthew the washing of Pilate's hands, no. 1, together with his disclaimer of responsibility, which has, however, been shifted to a later point, no. 88 : he retains one out of the three signs which Matthew adds to the rending of the veil of the Temple, namely, the earthquake, no. 57 ; while the sealing and guarding of the tomb, about which the other Evangelists are obstinately silent, is as prominent in 'Peter' as it is in Matthew.¹ Here again then we are entitled to deduce a general acquaintance with the First Gospel, and to assume that general acquaintance as an element in the decision about parallels that might in themselves be doubtful. I suspect indeed that throughout the narrative of the Trial and Crucifixion 'Peter' was predominantly following Matthew and not Mark ; at any rate it is worth noting that he shews a special partiality for the phrase 'the Son of God', which at this part of the Gospel story is also peculiarly Matthaean.²

c. If a similar test is applied with regard to St Luke's Gospel, the result will be found to be similar also. The question is not, it must be remembered, whether 'Peter' made an equal use of all the Gospels which he knew and used : even later writers, in days when the equal authority of all the four canonical accounts was unquestioned, might and did draw on the four in unequal proportions, and at the date when the Petrine Gospel was published it is not to be supposed that the canonical position of the Gospels of the Church was quite what it was half a century later. What we really have to ask is only whether the evidence is sufficient to indicate any sort of real knowledge and use of St Luke or of St John, as the case may be.

Now in St Luke's account of the Trial and Crucifixion there are three main sections that are peculiar to his Gospel—the introduction of a hearing before Herod, the sayings of Christ to

¹ I am by no means certain that, when 'Peter' speaks of 'gall with vinegar' as given to Christ on the Cross during the great darkness, no. 47, he is not borrowing the mention of gall from Mt. xxvii 34, where the First Evangelist transforms the 'spiced wine' of St Mark into an echo of Ps. lxi (lxxviii) 22 : though it is perhaps possible that 'Peter' has drawn on the Psalm independently of Matthew. In any case I demur to the suggestion, in Robinson's edition, that 'Peter' has derived his *χολήν μετὰ ὄξους* from the *μετὰ χολῆς* which a very small group of good authorities interpolates after the mention of *ὄξος* in John xix 29, 30 ; it would be at least as likely that the authorities in question had drawn here upon 'Peter' and not *vice versa*.

² Mt. xxvi 63, xxvii 40, 43, 54 ; Peter § 3 *bis*, § 11 *bis*.

the women on the way to Calvary, and the repentance of one of the crucified robbers.¹ Of these three episodes the Petrine Gospel incorporates two. The fragment opens with an allusion to Herod, and indeed he is made to play a much more conspicuous part than even in the Third Gospel; for while in St Luke Herod, like Pilate, finds the prisoner not guilty on every count (xxiii 15) and afterwards drops out of the narrative altogether, 'Peter' makes the whole of the final stages of condemnation and insult, as well as the disposal of the body after death, depend on the authority of Herod alone. That 'Peter' carries his Herodianism to this degree is due of course to his *parti pris* of throwing upon the Jews the exclusive responsibility for the Crucifixion, and there is nothing in this which militates against the probability that he found in St Luke the kernel from which his own account was developed. We know that Luke had special connexions with the Herodian household, and, if *entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*, we have no right, as we have certainly no need, to look elsewhere than to St Luke for the source of 'Peter'. Of the women on the way to the Crucifixion 'Peter' says nothing; why we cannot tell, any more than we can tell why he says nothing of Simon of Cyrene and his bearing of the Cross, though all three Synoptists mention it in this same neighbourhood. Our Gospel-writer borrowed an episode here and a phrase there, as the fancy took him or as his dogmatic prejudices suggested. But if St Luke's episode of the women is passed over, his episode of the repentant robber is reproduced in all its main outlines. Not only are the two criminals crucified with Christ called 'malefactors' with St Luke, rather than 'robbers' with St Mark and St Matthew,² but the story of the repentance of one of them, and of the words with which he contrasts the just fate of himself and his companion with the innocence of 'this man', is an instance of contact with St Luke and St Luke alone which even by itself would be enough to weigh down the scale of probability in favour of a literary connexion between the two writers.

¹ Lk. xxiii 34, the first saying from the Cross, is not part of the genuine text of St Luke, and we must not assume that it was contained in 'Peter's' copy of Luke.

² *κακοῦργοι* . . . *ἀρσῆται*. And the word *κακοῦργος* is adopted again at a later point and in another connexion, quite in 'Peter's' manner, § 7.

The general presumption thus established may now be pertinently reinforced by several apparent echoes of Lucan phraseology; e. g. no. 9 (cf. no. 77) 'sabbath is dawning'¹; no. 53 'he was taken up', a word used in St Luke's writings (and in the Christian creed-hymn of 1 Tim. iii 16) but not by any other Evangelist²; no. 69 'beating their breasts', a detail peculiar to St Luke; peculiar to St Luke is also the form of the centurion's exclamation, that 'of a truth this man was righteous'—for which the older tradition of Mark and Matthew has 'this man was Son of God'—and 'Peter' here echoes Luke by attributing the use of the same epithet to the multitude, no. 70; no. 81 'two men' of the angels at the Sepulchre with Luke, against the single 'youth' of Mark or 'angel' of Matthew.

d. The dependence of 'Peter' on the Fourth Gospel seems to me to be hardly less certain than his dependence on the other three, but the conclusion has to be approached by a rather different route. Obviously 'Peter' would not have found it quite so easy to interweave in the common material the peculiar elements of an account constructed, like St John's, on rather special lines of its own; not to say that some of the most characteristically Johannine touches were illustrative of just that human aspect of the Life and Passion of our Lord which 'Peter' would most wish to suppress—such as the two words from the Cross 'Woman, behold thy son' and 'I thirst'. Here, therefore, the method proper to the circumstances will be to indicate the points which cumulatively seem to establish 'Peter's' acquaintance with St John; it being again no part of the argument to assert that the Four Gospels are jointly used quite in the later sense, as authorities equal because equally canonical.

Attention may fitly be called in the first place and by way of preliminary consideration to the two phrases which are of most frequent recurrence throughout the Petrine fragment, namely 'the Lord' and 'the Jews'. The presence or absence of the term *ὁ κύριος* is a familiar mark of distinction between later and earlier strata of Gospel narrative. It is never found in the

¹ *σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει*. See the excursus on *ἐπιφώσκειν* at the end of this paper, p. 188.

² *ἀναληφθῆναι* also in the Longer Appendix to St Mark, Mk. xvi 19: but I believe it there also to be derived from St Luke (Acts i 2, 11).

narrative parts of our First and Second Gospels. In the story of the Passion and Resurrection the simple δ 'Ιησοῦς is still the predominant usage even of Luke and John, but the alternative phrase δ κύριος is beginning to appear side by side with the other, Luke xxii 61 'the Lord turned and looked upon Peter, and Peter remembered the saying of the Lord', xxiv 34 'the Lord was risen indeed'¹; it is perhaps with intention that in the Fourth Gospel δ κύριος is never found in the Passion narrative, while in the Resurrection narrative it occurs with rather marked frequency, xx 2, 18, 20, 25, xxi 7, 12.

Here then the Gospels of St Luke and St John with their occasional use of δ κύριος represent the transition to its regular use (to the entire exclusion of the name 'Ιησοῦς) by the Petrine author. But though the progressive fondness for the phrase aptly illustrates at any rate the chronological relation of our documents, an actual literary dependence cannot with any confidence be asserted, for it may be merely a question in this case of the literary atmosphere of the writer's day. On the other hand the second constant feature in Peter's terminology noted above does carry us a good deal further in the direction of contact with the Fourth Gospel. By all three Synoptists the responsible agents of the Crucifixion, though in sum they may equal the Jewish nation as a whole, are always enumerated in separate detail, 'chief priests' 'scribes' 'elders' 'multitude': in the Fourth Gospel the nation's rejection of the Christ is regarded as a single and complete thing, and its solidarity in this is meant to be expressed by the current and comprehensive phrase 'the Jews'. This characteristic feature of St John re-appears with monotonous regularity in 'Peter'; and though something may be allowed for a common *milieu* in the progressively anti-Judaic temper of Christians at large, the preponderance of probability seems to be now on the side of actual literary contact.²

But the sort of presumption so far suggested must of course be reinforced by the more definite evidence of correspondence with the language or subject-matter of the Fourth Gospel in cases where community of idea or expression cannot plausibly

¹ In Lk. xxiv 3 the words 'of the Lord Jesus' are probably not genuine.

² On the anti-Jewish side of 'Peter' see further below, p. 174.

be accounted for by community of atmosphere. Such cases may not be very numerous, but in the mass they are quite substantial, and I invite the reader's close attention to the following. The 'seating' of Jesus on the chair of judgement with the mocking salute 'Judge righteously, O King of Israel' (no. 19) is most naturally explained as a misunderstanding of Jn. xix 13, 14 'he sat on the tribunal . . . and said to the Jews "See here is your King"', since the verb *καθίζω* in Greek is used both transitively and intransitively, to 'seat' and to 'sit'. In describing Jesus as 'pierced' or 'pricked' with a reed (no. 29), 'Peter' deserts the verb used here by Mark and Matthew in favour of the verb used by John of the 'piercing' of the side¹; just as the word he selects to describe the scourging (no. 31) is neither the Latinizing *φραγελλώσας* of Mk. xv 15 = Mt. xxvii 26, nor yet the periphrastic *παιδεύσας* of Lk. xxiii 22, but the *ἐμαστιγώσεν* of Jn. xix 1. All three Synoptists tell us that the two robbers were crucified 'one on the right and one on the left'; only 'Peter' (no. 34) and John tell us that Jesus was 'between'. The Synoptists have no record of the breaking of the legs; but it is found—in different forms it is true—in the Fourth Gospel and in 'Peter' (no. 43). 'Peter' speaks of 'the nails' in 'the hands of the Lord' (no. 55); but there is nothing in the first three Evangelists to indicate that Jesus was nailed to the Cross rather than bound, and it is only in St John that we hear of 'the print of the nails'. 'Peter' mentions the 'garden' of Joseph: the 'garden' is one of the most characteristic touches of the Fourth Gospel. 'Peter' is full of the rancour of the Jews not only against Jesus but against His disciples; that is why the disciples conceal themselves, and that is why Mary Magdalene is prevented from anointing the body of Jesus (§§ 7, 12): now there is really not a word in the Synoptic Gospels from which 'Peter' could have derived this interpretation of the history, while on the other hand 'the fear of the Jews' is a definite factor in the recital of the Fourth Evangelist.² If 'Peter's' two phrases,

¹ Jn. xix 34 *ἐνυζεν*: Mk. xv 19, Mt. xxvii 30 *ἐτυπτον*.

² Jn. xix 38, xx 19, 26. It is a pure assumption, unsupported by anything in the context, if Prof. Lake supplies *τοὺς Ἰουδαίους* as the object to *ἐφοβοῦντο* in Mk. xvi 8: if anything is needed, I should prefer 'they feared lest they should be thought to be romancing' on the lines of Lk. xxiv 11. But see p. 182 n. 1.

'until the sabbath' (§ 7) and 'the last day of unleavened bread' (§ 14), which appear to be linked together by the mention, common to both of them, of the grief of the apostles, refer to the day week after the Resurrection, this is a day to which allusion is made in St John only of the four Gospels; but the chronology of 'Peter' is so confused (I am inclined to think that he had no consistent conception of it whatever in his mind) that I should hesitate to build any argument upon it.

But it is especially in the story of the Magdalene, §§ 12, 13, that coincidences are found both in language and in subject-matter which seem to my judgement decisive. The name of Mary Magdalene is prominent in the Passion and Resurrection narratives of all four Gospels; yet though it occurs three times in Matthew, twice or three times in Mark, twice in Luke, on none of these seven occasions is she singled out for isolated mention, the names of one or more of her companions—Mary the mother of James and Joses or 'the other Mary', Salome, Joanna, Susanna—being invariably coupled with hers.¹ In St John on the other hand, though it is true that other holy women are named with her as standing by the Cross, in the Resurrection story the name of Mary Magdalene stands alone and unique. So far as the Fourth Gospel is concerned, we should not have felt sure that any other woman had been present at the sepulchre on Easter morning. Out of St John and the Synoptists 'Peter' constructs in this matter a conflate account. With the Synoptists he speaks of women in the plural: with St John he sets Mary in the foreground, suppresses the names of all other women, and emphasizes her leadership—she 'took with her her friends'. A second point is that Mary is described by 'Peter' (no. 93) as 'a woman disciple of the Lord who was in fear because of the Jews', in terms which seem an obvious echo of St John's description of Joseph of Arimathaea, xix 38. And lastly she 'stoops down' (no. 99) into the tomb and looks in, exactly as she does in Jn. xx 11.²

¹ Mt. xxvii 56, 61, xxviii 1: Mk. xv 40, 47: Lk. viii 2, xxiv 10. In Mk. xvi 1 the names of the women are in my own opinion not part of the original text.

² The verb παρακύπτειν 'to stoop down' is peculiar to St John xx 5, 11; for Lk. xxiv 12 is an interpolation imitated from St John's account—though of course the interpolation *may* have been already present in 'Peter's' copy.

Is it too much to claim that the course of the argument up to this point has led us to an overwhelming presumption in favour of the conclusion that the Passion and Resurrection narratives of all our Gospels were present to the mind or the eyes of pseudo-Peter in the composition of his own writing?

And not only did 'Peter' display this full acquaintance with the work of his predecessors over the same ground, but it even seems that their phraseology was so familiar to him that he was able to transpose it freely and to employ it in connexions quite different to its original use; and perhaps sufficient stress has not been laid on this feature. For, however little weight we should be inclined to attribute to the considerations that will now be adduced if they stood alone, they seem to me to acquire real importance when once contact has been established between 'Peter' and the four Gospels; since they suggest that that contact is not simply the result of a single process of conscious borrowing *ad hoc* from documents mastered only for this special purpose, but the natural self-expression of a mind saturated with the language of the Christian Gospels.

Most obvious are the instances of transference from one part of the Passion and Resurrection narrative to another. Pilate, on receiving the news of the Resurrection, tells the bearers of it 'For myself I am clean of the blood of the Son of God, this was your doing' (no. 88), while in St Matthew this saying accompanies Pilate's washing of his hands in the middle of the Trial. During the darkness of the Crucifixion 'many went about with lights, thinking it was night, and fell' (no. 50), though in St John it was the band brought by Judas for the arrest of Christ who 'went with lanterns and torches' and (a little later on) 'fell to the ground'. On the Cross the Lord 'was silent, as feeling no pain' (no. 35), while it is of the examination by the high-priest that St Mark writes 'he was silent and answered nothing'. In the canonical Gospels the crown of thorns is set on Christ's head by 'the soldiers'¹: if 'Peter', whose cue of course it is to minimize the share of the Roman soldiery, writes instead that 'a certain one of them brought a crown of thorns and set it on the Lord's head', he is consciously or unconsciously echoing the language of the Gospels at another point; 'a certain

¹ Mk. xv 16, 17, Mt. xxvii 27, 29, Jn. xix 2.

one' (Mk. xv 36) or 'one of them' (Mt. xxvii 48) ran and filled a sponge with vinegar.

But we can also perhaps recognize in 'Peter' a less obvious but apparently real influence of the language of New Testament documents in quite other parts of their story. The portents of the Resurrection are described in language borrowed from the canonical accounts of the portents at the Baptism. In § 6 the phrase 'there came a great fear' exactly reproduces the wording of Acts v 5, 11. In § 1 the order 'Whatsoever I have commanded you to do to him, do' suggests a reminiscence of phrases like Jn. xiii 27 'That thou doest, do quickly' and Jn. ii 5 'Whatever he tells you, do'. In § 11 the bidding 'to say nothing of what they had seen' reflects in substance and even verbally sayings contained in a very different setting in the Synoptic Gospels, e.g. Mk. vii 36 'he charged them that they should tell no man', Mk. ix 9 'he charged them that they should relate to no man what they had seen' with its parallels.

Now if the proof which has been elaborated in the course of these pages carries to others at all the same sort of conviction which it brings to myself, we have in this so-called Gospel of Peter a very early testimony to the combined use of all four Gospels of the Church. It would be an anachronism to speak of this common use as exactly a recognition of the canonical authority of the Gospels, if 'Peter' is correctly dated at about 125 A. D., since at that date the idea of canonical authority of the New Testament books, even of the Gospels, was still only in the making. But it is something to have been already able to establish, at a point about sixty years before Irenaeus, fifty years before Tatian, and thirty years before Justin Martyr, the knowledge and use of all four of the canonical Gospels in a single writing.¹

So far the enquiry has been developed on the relatively easy *terrain* of extant documents; we have now to proceed to ask whether, when we have set aside the elements of 'Peter's' composition which may reasonably be referred to those known authorities, what remains over is such, either in bulk or in

¹ Probably the same might be said of the Longer Appendix to St Mark (the Last Twelve Verses), which I do not doubt to be even older than 'Peter': but that is *ἄλλης σκέψεως*.

character, as to render probable the suggestion that he was indebted to other sources as well, and in particular to the lost ending of St Mark. With this view let us examine afresh the text of 'Peter', bearing in mind all through the two main pre-suppositions under the influence of which he has obviously rehandled and re-edited his material, namely his anti-Judaic prejudices and his Docetic Christology. Let us begin by saying something in further detail about these two points.

The first three or four generations of Christian history witnessed a progressive growth in antagonistic relations between the Christian and the Jewish religion. At one end of the series we have the picture, drawn by St Luke in the opening chapters of the Acts, of a Christian community which shared in the Jewish Temple-worship and feasts, which enjoyed the respect of the Jewish populace, which found recruits among the Jewish priesthood, just because its new preaching of the Messiahship and Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth and of the universality of the Salvation to be found in His Name was not conceived of as a substitute for its inherited Judaism but as an addition to it—an addition which was only gradually found to be incongruous with it. At the other end we have Marcion proclaiming the fundamental contradiction between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New; and if this extreme development only took place outside the sphere and sanction of the great Church, yet even among the Catholics some, as we learn from Justin Martyr (*Dial.* § 47), refused the name of Christian and the hand of brotherhood to those Jewish Christians who continued to observe the Jewish law. Much of the process which had carried Christians from the one of these attitudes to the other is familiar to us in the pages of the New Testament. Like other similar evolutions it did not advance by quite regular and even steps: the primitive Evangelist whose personality has been buried under the symbol Q is more anti-Pharisaic than St Mark. But we can trace a change in tone as we pass from St Mark to St Luke, and still more definitely as we pass from St Luke to St John. When St John wrote the breach was already so complete and the condition of tension so ingrained in the minds of ordinary Christian people that, in looking back over the two intervening generations to the days of the Gospel history, it came natural to

the Evangelist to sum up the forces of resistance to the teaching of Christ as, quite simply, 'the Jews'. Between the Fourth Gospel and Marcion pseudo-Peter finds his appropriate place.

The second characteristic of 'Peter'—perhaps even more marked than the first, because in more obvious contrast to the canonical Gospels—is his Docetism. It is probable enough that this feature would have been less striking if we had his whole Gospel before us; there was, as has already been pointed out (p. 164), less room or need for emphasizing it in a narrative of the Ministry than in a narrative of the Passion and Resurrection. It is probable, too, that the writer's Docetism was not quite the exaggerated form of Docetism which meets us in other Gnostic documents—in the Acts of John for instance, according to which Christ, while in appearance hanging on the Cross, was really conversing with the apostle in a cave on the mount of Olives. 'Peter's' position was, however, as definitely Docetic as that of the false teachers against whom St Ignatius, in his letters to Tralles and Smyrna, enforces the truth and reality of the Birth, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. We may conjecture that one reason for the special respect which 'Peter' pays to St Mark's Gospel as an authority—it was natural, to begin with, that a supposed Gospel of Peter should be brought into close connexion with the Gospel which was traditionally regarded as the record of the preaching of the real Peter—was the absence in it of any account of the Nativity; just as I shall suggest further on that a similar attraction lay in the absence, in its present mutilated condition, of any account of the appearances after the Resurrection.¹ Ἀληθῶς ἐγεννήθη, ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη: subtract Birth and Resurrection from the stumbling-blocks with which a Docetic edition of the Gospel would have to deal, and there is left only the Passion narrative to transform before the material of our existing Mark could be made to fit into the purposes of pseudo-Peter.

We proceed now to the examination in rough detail of the subject-matter of the Petrine Gospel.

¹ To the ἀπῆλθεν with which 'Peter' at the close of his Gospel (§ 13) minimizes the Resurrection, 'He has risen and gone away thither whence He was sent', corresponds the κατῆλθεν with which Marcion minimizes the Incarnation at the beginning of his Gospel, 'He came down to Capernaum'.

1. The dominant motive of the first three chapters of the fragment, which deal with the closing stages of the Trial, is the desire to shift the responsibility for the condemnation of Jesus and His Crucifixion from the Romans to the Jews, from the shoulders of Pilate to the shoulders of Herod. The canonical Gospels agree in the picture they give of Pilate's reluctance; if the barer outline of the Marcan account is filled in with fresh touches by the later Evangelists, the proportion of things is not essentially changed; and all four agree nevertheless in throwing on Pilate the sole responsibility for the sentence. But pseudo-Peter detects in Herod a rival magnate whose jurisdiction might be presumed to extend to questions of life and death; once Herod has come into the business, Pilate retires for good, washing his hands in distinction from the rest, in order to make clear his dissociation from their company. No doubt it is for the same reason, to get Pilate off the stage at as early a moment as possible, that 'Peter' has transferred to this point, from its natural place later on in the canonical Gospels, Joseph's request to Pilate that he might have the body for burial.¹ After this Pilate never re-appears on the scene at all, until his sanction is needed for the dispatch of a Roman military guard to the tomb. The mockery of crown and mantle and sceptre and royal salutation, which Matthew, Mark, and John all ascribe to the Roman soldiery (it is apparently attributed in St Luke to the soldiery of Herod and to Herod himself), is by 'Peter' ascribed to the *λαός*, that is to say, the people of the Jews.²

What remains is as well accounted for by the fancy of the writer or his knowledge of the Old Testament as by the hypothesis of a special source. If mention is made not only of Herod but of Herod's 'judges', we may perhaps suppose that these are introduced as experts in the Jewish Law, on the model of the Deuteronomic legislation (cf. Deut. xvi 18, xix 18), with the object of extending the circle of the responsible agents of the Crucifixion. The definite reference to the Deuteronomic law of the burial of criminals is a still clearer example: quite

¹ It will be noticed that the whole of the second section comes in awkwardly, and breaks the natural connexion of § 1 and § 3. It looks as though 'Peter' determined to transfer the episode to this place after he had already constructed this part of his narrative.

² Mk. xv 16-19, Mt. xxvii 27-29, Jn. xix 2, 3, Lk. xxiii 11.

similarly in the following section 'Peter' explains why the legs of criminals were broken, and why the darkness of the Crucifixion was especially agonizing to the Jews. 'Peter' is a scholar in his own way, and likes to make show of his knowledge in elucidation of the obscurer features of the narrative.

2. In the three chapters which describe the Crucifixion itself, the subject is throughout an indefinite 'they', still referring back to the 'people' of § 3; the centurion of Mark and Luke, the centurion and subordinates of Matthew, the 'soldiers' and 'soldier' of John, have all perforce to disappear¹; the actors are Jews from beginning to end. But a dogmatic motive begins to underlie the positive changes at this part of the narrative: the Lord appears to suffer no pain; the only word recorded from the Cross is given in the form 'My Power, my Power, why hast thou forsaken me?' and is followed not by the verb 'expired' or 'gave up the ghost'² but, very significantly, by the verb 'was taken up'. We have here an adumbration, if nothing more, of the Valentinian doctrine that the Aeon Christ left the human Jesus on the Cross; just as the personification later on (§ 10) of the Cross is a step, if only a step, in the direction of the Aeon Stauros. It is not possible to be equally confident that the unexpected appearance of the term 'Saviour' (§ 4) on the lips of the penitent robber has even a vague connexion with the later Gnostic use of Soter as an Aeon; but at any rate the contrast between the robber's language as recorded by St Luke and as recorded by 'Peter' is the contrast between the historical spirit and its opposite. It is conceivable that a Jewish highwayman should have hailed in Jesus of Nazareth the coming King-Messiah; it is quite inconceivable that he should have thought of Him as universal Saviour.

The only details of these chapters which cannot be directly referred to the canonical Gospels on one side, or to Docetic 'tendency-writing' on the other, are (i) that the legs of the penitent robber were not broken; (ii) that in the midday darkness people went about with lights; (iii) that they were anxious lest the sun should have set while the Crucified was still living, and correspondingly

¹ Mk. xv 39, Lk. xxiii 47, Mt. xxvii 54, Jn. xix 32-34.

² Compare Mk. xv 37, Lk. xxiii 46 (ἐξέπνευσεν); Mt. xxvii 50, Jn. xix 30 (ἀφῆκεν or παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα).

gratified when the sun re-appeared; (iv) that when the Lord's body was laid on the earth 'all the earth quaked'. All these features can be simply and sufficiently accounted for without recourse to the hypothesis of special sources. There is the wish to heighten the effect of the picture, to accentuate the attendant conditions of the supernatural darkness, to interpret the meaning of the earthquake as the shiver of the earth when the Lord's dead body touched it. But the common mark of all these, as well as of most of Peter's other non-dogmatic additions to the Gospel story, is that the starting-point of each development is to be found in some episode recorded in one or other of the canonical Gospels.

3. The main characteristics are the same, the main explanation is the same, in the chapters (§§ 7, 8, with the first sentence of § 9) which refer to the period between the Burial and the Resurrection. The emphasis on the remorse of the Jews is exaggerated from the notice in St Luke (xxiii 47, 48) of the behaviour of the crowds; the emphasis on the danger to the apostles is exaggerated from the hints contained in St John (xx 19, 26). The story of the guard is expanded from St Matthew; the special addition that elders and scribes joined the soldiers in keeping guard is added perhaps in order to shew that the Jewish authorities had known by experience and wilfully rejected the evidence for the Resurrection—if that term has any meaning in 'Peter's' theology. But I should not quite like to exclude the possibility that the name of the centurion, Petronius, and the detail that the disciples were accused of intention to set fire to the Temple, may have been already current in tradition and not merely figments of 'Peter's' imagination.

4. Chapters 9-11 contain the story of the Resurrection. In the canonical Gospels there is of course, strictly speaking, no account of the Resurrection at all; it is inferred from the empty tomb, from the message of the angel, from the appearances of the Risen Christ. Here is the most fundamental contradiction between the Gospels of the Church and the Gospel written in the name of Peter. The reverent silence of the canonical records permitted 'Peter' to give free play alike to his dogmatic prepossessions and to the love of the marvellous that colours the apocryphal literature in general, with the result that this section

is the most characteristic portion of his work. Yet even under these conditions he follows the indications of the canonical Gospels when and as far as he can, and builds his superstructure on the basis there provided. Matthew is the only one of the canonical writers who suggests any starting-point for reconstructing the events of the Saturday-Sunday night, as he is also the only one to introduce on to the stage of the Resurrection narrative any other characters than the disciples; 'Peter' attaches himself to Matthew, and skilfully seizes the opportunity to develop and embroider his predecessor's material. In Matthew it is not made quite clear whether the *custodia* (xxvii 65, 66; xxviii 11) or 'soldiers' (xxviii 12) are Jewish or Roman: *σπαριῶται* in the narrative of the Crucifixion means no doubt to all four Evangelists Roman soldiers, but it only occurs once in Matthew's tomb-narrative, and the natural impression which arises out of his account is rather that the Jewish authorities had asked for a Roman guard and had been scornfully bidden in answer to make use of the means at their own disposal. 'Peter' perhaps felt the difficulty, allows for both interpretations, and places at the tomb a Roman centurion, soldiers under his command, and Jewish elders and scribes as well. In Matthew the watch, though they witness the descent of the angel and the removal of the stone (xxviii 2-4), play only a subordinate part to the part of the women: in Peter the women are not yet present at the time of the descent, and the only spectators are the soldiers. In this preliminary stage, where the action is still set within the framework of one of the canonical Gospels, there are four variations in 'Peter' to be noted and accounted for. *a.* The change of the single 'angel' of Matthew into 'two men' finds sufficient authority in the Gospels of Luke (xxiv 4) and John (xx 12). *β.* That the stone 'moved of itself and yielded partially' is again a modification of the narrative of the First Gospel through the influence of the others—Mark does not say that the angel moved the stone, and Luke mentions that the stone was moved before he brings the angels on the scene at all—reinforced by the thaumaturgic tendency that not only makes stones move but crosses walk and talk. *γ.* In every one of our four Gospels it is the chief-priests who direct the movement which culminates in the Crucifixion, and in St Matthew's story of the guard they

are still the protagonists (xxvii 62; xxviii 11); in 'Peter' the *πρεσβύτεροι* take the position of prominence which the Gospels assign to the *ἀρχιερείς*, and the latter are not mentioned at all.¹ His own acquaintance with Judaism did not extend back behind the destruction of the Temple, and he failed to recreate in imagination a polity in which the high priests were the natural rulers and leaders. δ. If the women, according to the three accounts of Mark Luke and John, visited the tomb at dawn and found it empty, then of course the Resurrection, with whatever supernatural manifestations precluded and accompanied it, took place before dawn: Matthew either did indicate the night of Saturday–Sunday, or might be easily thought to have done so²: 'Peter' amplifies the hint, places the angelic descent in the 'night' in which the Sunday dawned, and to make sure that the supernatural visitation escaped neither the eyes nor the ears of the watch, accompanies it with 'a loud cry in heaven' and 'an abundant light'. Possibly in his chronology of the Resurrection he was not uninfluenced by the liturgical celebration of the Easter festival at a night service.

The events of the night were *ex hypothesi* not recorded in the tradition of the disciples' witness; non-Christian evidence was less easy to check, and a second-century writer who wished to describe the Resurrection and to justify his description on the testimony of eye-witnesses was obviously well advised to fasten upon the presence of the watch and to fortify himself by Jewish and heathen testimony. And we may well allow that he was genuinely influenced by the conception that the great things of God must have been made manifest even to unbelievers.

'And while they were relating what they had seen, again they see coming forth from the tomb three men, and the two of them supporting the third, and a Cross following them; and the heads of the two reached as far as heaven, but the head of him whom they escorted overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens saying, "Hast thou preached to them that sleep?" and from the Cross was heard an answering echo, "Yea".'

¹ 'Priests' are once mentioned, § 7, but only in the third place after 'the Jews' and 'the elders'.

² Matt. xxviii 1: see excursus on *ἐπιφώσκειν*, p. 188.

Obviously there is nothing here in the canonical accounts to explain 'Peter's' material; has he then drawn on extra-canonical sources? No doubt in some departments of Gnostic literature much stress was laid on the post-Resurrection period, just because it was easiest to find there a setting for the esoteric teaching of Christ to a private coterie of disciples, which was one of the expedients most commonly in use to bridge over the gap between the tradition of the Church and the theology of the Gnostics. In particular an emphasis on the Cross and still more an emphasis on the Preaching in Hades may have had their roots in legends already current, whether in literary form or no. But there seems no sufficient reason for postulating a special 'source': the framework of 'Peter's' story is dictated directly by the desire to inculcate the teaching that the Risen Christ was not consubstantial with men.

5. Chapters 12 and 13, together with part of one sentence near the beginning of chapter 11, take us back to the canonical framework with a description of the visit of the women to the sepulchre, which, while it seems to incorporate fragments of the Johannine narrative—see above, p. 171—is no doubt based mainly on the Second Gospel; and as we are here approaching the point where the known text of Mark breaks off, our main preoccupation will be to see if there is anything in 'Peter's' version to indicate whether or no his Mark broke off at the same point as ours. Such indications are I think given, both in the form of the message entrusted to the women by the angel and (still more clearly) in the notice of their behaviour after receiving the message.

(a) In St Mark the angel promises an appearance of Christ to the disciples, 'He is risen . . . He goes before you into Galilee, there shall ye see Him'. In 'Peter', on the other hand, the promise of the canonical record is suppressed, and something quite different is put into its place, 'He is risen, and has departed thither whence He was sent'. The form of this saying in 'Peter' may not improbably have borrowed something from the corresponding message to the Magdalene in the Fourth Gospel, 'Go tell my brethren that I ascend to my Father': the substance of it can be most plausibly explained by the hypothesis that 'Peter' suppressed the promise recorded in St Mark,

because the promise in St Mark, as he read it, was never fulfilled. In other words 'Peter', like ourselves, possessed only a mutilated Mark.

(b) This conclusion is strongly supported by the final clause of chapter 12 'then the women fled in fear'. No other Gospel than St Mark emphasizes fear and flight on the part of the women; 'Peter' therefore is copying Mark, whose Gospel, as we know it, breaks off with the words 'they fled from the sepulchre, for they were filled with awe and trembling, and told no one anything, for they feared . . .'. Most critics appear to be agreed that this sentence is itself imperfect, and that, as St Mark wrote it, the women feared something or some one¹; but if it was so completed, 'Peter' shews no knowledge of the complete form, but ends a sentence exactly where our copies end the Gospel.

6. So far we have found two definite indications pointing to the conclusion that 'Peter' (like Matthew and Luke) knew only our present imperfect form of the Gospel of Mark. But Prof. Lake (pp. 161-163) would draw the opposite conclusion from the last words of the Petrine fragment, which immediately follow.

The feast of unleavened bread has come to an end; the crowds who have been present are returning to their homes; the Twelve are overwhelmed with grief, but they too begin to disperse and go separately homewards. Simon and Andrew return to their fishing occupation; and with them was Levi the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord . . . And here alas! the fragment comes to an abrupt end, though we may presumably complete the clause with the words 'called from the receipt of custom', in accordance with the ordinary texts of Mark ii 14.²

It will I think be convenient to the discussion here to treat first of the chapter generally with its introductory statements, and only afterwards to approach the story of the sea of Galilee which Peter is just beginning to relate. On the general question Prof. Lake would lay stress on two arguments.

¹ So Swete, *ad loc.*, quoting Westcott-Hort and Burkiit: so too Lake, p. 71, 'it is much more likely that an object originally followed *ἐφοβούντο γάρ*': see p. 170 n. 2. [Dr Sanday, however, tells me that he believes the sentence to be complete as it stands. And the construction in Mk. x 32 perhaps supports this view.]

² In that verse the Western texts (D and the Old Latin; the Old Syriac is defective) have 'James the son of Alphaeus' in place of 'Levi the son of Alphaeus'.

‘Up to this point the last chapters of the Gospel of Peter seem to be based on Mark. There is thus a certain probability that the redactor [i.e. ‘Peter’] is still using this source.’ I can best illustrate the exact value of this argument if I apply the statement of Prof. Lake, with the necessary changes of name, to the two other Synoptists. ‘Up to this point the last sections of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke seem to be based on Mark. There is thus a certain probability that the redactors [i.e. Matthew and Luke] are still using this source.’ But in spite of this ‘certain probability’, no one is clearer than Prof. Lake that after this point Matthew and Luke did not in fact use Mark. If the balance is to weigh in the other direction in the case of ‘Peter’, it must be on more tangible grounds that the ‘certain probability’.

Prof. Lake’s other argument is that ‘it is also noteworthy that the conduct of the disciples . . . agrees better with what may be best imagined to have been the contents of the lost conclusion than with any other known document’. The reference I suppose is to ‘Peter’s’ account of the apostles’ grief and of the breaking up of their company into smaller groups, which drifted separately homewards. But neither of these features is quite unrepresented in extant documents; the dispersal is assumed in St John’s narrative of the appearance at the sea of Tiberias (xxi 2), the tears and sorrow are emphasized in the Longer Appendix to St Mark (xvi 10); and that the subjective feelings of the disciples receive scantier mention in the canonical records may be quite as reasonably attributed to the relative austerity of the earlier stages of Gospel writing as to any other cause.

I do not think that these arguments help us much. The introductory sentences offer no presumptions, one way or the other, as to the source from which they are drawn. There is more to be said on both sides when we come to the evidence offered by the concluding sentence of ‘Peter’.

Since the scene has shifted to ‘the sea’, we may assume that no appearance of the Risen Christ at or near Jerusalem is recorded: but every one of our complete narratives contains at least one such appearance, and the Gospel of Mark is the only one of the Gospels which *can* have agreed, while the form of the promise to the women in Mark xvi 7 supplies a *prima facie*

ground for supposing that it *did* as a matter of fact agree, on this point with 'Peter'. In other words, 'Peter' records no appearances in Jerusalem, but may be about to record one at the Sea of Galilee; Mark must have recorded an appearance in Galilee, and may not have recorded any in Jerusalem.

This is really the one and only larger argument worth considering in favour of attributing the story in 'Peter' of which the opening words alone are preserved to us, to a source in the lost ending of Mark. Two smaller points on the same side are the name 'Levi the son of Alphaeus', and perhaps also the use of the term 'the sea'. 'Levi son of Alphaeus' is a description peculiar to St Mark, and for what it is worth Prof. Lake is entitled to rely on it as evidence of a connexion between this paragraph and the Second Gospel. If then 'Peter' borrows it, as is reasonable to suppose, from St Mark, it would no doubt be more likely in itself that he borrowed it from that part of St Mark which was parallel to the point which he had reached in his own work. But such a presumption is only valid in the absence of more definite indications, such as do seem to exist on the opposite side. And considering how lightly 'Peter' passes from one source to another, and how easily he harks back (as in the description 'Herod *the king*') to the phraseology of earlier portions of the Gospel, there is no real improbability in his having gone back for 'Levi son of Alphaeus' to the second chapter of St Mark.

The alternative view is, of course, to find in the last chapter of St John the source of this episode in 'Peter'; and the arguments for and against this second view must now be considered.

'Beyond the fact that both "Peter" and John xxi narrate or imply an appearance to the disciples on the Sea of Galilee, there is nothing to support the suggestion; and decidedly adverse to it is the lack of agreement as to the names of the disciples' (Lake, *op. cit.* p. 161).

What does this 'lack of agreement' come to? The Gospel of John reckons a total of seven disciples, five of them named (Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee) with two that are unnamed. The Gospel of Peter names Peter and Andrew his brother, besides Levi the son of Alphaeus; whether it named or implied others we cannot say, for the fragment breaks off here.

Even though the verb preceding the mention of Levi is 'there was with us' and not 'there were with us', it is not quite impossible that other names followed as well. But let us suppose that no others were named; 'Peter' has not overstepped the limits of the Johannine account, for Andrew and Levi may represent his interpretation of the two unnamed disciples. Indeed, to judge by his proceedings in other cases where they can be tested, we can say this of him with fair certainty, that he shews an independence of his predecessors in respect to names out of all proportion to his independence of them in regard to subject-matter. Let us suppose, with Prof. Lake, that St Mark's Gospel was the standard authority of 'Peter'; the names of Barabbas, of Simon of Cyrene and his sons Alexander and Rufus, of Mary mother of James the little and Joses, of Salome, all disappear in the copy, while conversely the name of Petronius is inserted. It cannot therefore be said to be alien to 'Peter's' manner if he suppresses and even inserts names: if St John's Gospel was his authority here, we might be pretty certain that the names of the disciples would be varied from the original.

And Prof. Lake strangely underrates the points of contact between 'Peter' and the Fourth Gospel in the episode, or so much of it as is preserved to us. The fact that both 'Peter' and John bring the Sea of Galilee into the post-Resurrection narrative is in itself a startling coincidence; and it is hardly less remarkable that the two documents agree in making the actors in the story neither the disciples in general nor yet Peter in particular, but a group of named disciples, more than any individual, less than the eleven. There is no real parallel to this in the extant Resurrection narratives¹—nor indeed, apart from the well-known group of Peter James John (Andrew), in the Gospels as a whole. There is no hint of any such subdivision in the Resurrection narrative of the Second Gospel as far as we have it; on the contrary, the message which the women were to convey to 'the disciples and Peter', Mk. xvi 7, can only be supposed to be leading up either to two appearances—one to St Peter in particular and one to the disciples in general—or to a single

¹ 'The disciples', Mk. xvi 7, Jn. xx 18, 19, 25, 26; 'the Eleven', Mt. xxviii 16, 'Mk.' xvi 14; 'the Eleven and they that were with them', Lk. xxiv 33; Peter (Simon), Mk. xvi 7, Lk. xxiv 34.

appearance to St Peter in company with at least the whole group of the Eleven. Least of all can it be said that the phraseology of St Mark lends any countenance to the idea of partial appearances to three or four disciples at a time.

It will I think be conceded that the reasons for connecting this episode in 'Peter' with a known document in Jn. xxi are at least as cogent as the reasons for postulating its source in the unknown ending of Mark. But the question will still rightly be asked, why (on the hypothesis that the Fourth Gospel was the source) does 'Peter' pass over so many other appearances and select this one in particular? At least one appearance of our Lord in St Matthew's Gospel, three in St Luke, and three in St John, are recorded at earlier points than the manifestation by the sea of Tiberias; why are they neglected, and what reason can be given for the neglect of them which would not equally apply to the story of Jn. xxi?

The answer to the first part of this question has been already anticipated (p. 175); 'Peter', as I conceive, deliberately omits from his Gospel anything which suggests that Jesus rose from the dead in a true human body, and it happens that the appearances to the disciples at Jerusalem recorded by St Luke (xxiv 36-43) and St John (xx 26-29) exclude more definitely than any of the others, by their emphasis on 'touching' and 'thrusting the hand', the conception that the Risen Jesus was a bodiless phantom. I believe for my own part, as I have said, that the absence of any appearances of Christ from St Mark's Gospel, as it was then known, was precisely the reason why 'Peter' at this part of his Gospel preferred to follow it.

The answer to the second part of the question is not quite so easy, and must necessarily be more speculative; but I believe that we shall be working on right lines if we emphasize the fact that the appearance by the sea of Tiberias related in Jn. xxi is the only appearance recorded at length in the canonical Gospels which deals specially with St Peter. A Gospel bearing his name could hardly fail to bring him to the forefront at the conclusion of the narrative; and if stress was laid in 'Peter', as in some other Gnostic documents, on traditions specially committed by the Lord to select disciples, the time of such a commission will naturally have been after the Resurrection, and the recipient can

hardly have been any other than the supposed writer of the Gospel, Simon Peter himself.¹ The book would thus find its natural climax. On these lines I should suggest an explanation, in so far as explanation can be offered under such circumstances at all, of the meaning of the episode which the Petrine Gospel was apparently proceeding to narrate.

To sum up the results of this paper. The attempt has been made first to shew (pp. 164-173) that, due regard being had to the circumstances and conditions of the time when 'Peter' wrote, comparison of the documents makes it infinitely more probable than not that he was acquainted with, and in his own Gospel made use of, all four Gospels of the Church. It would be difficult to say what conception could survive of evidence of literary contact, if its cogency was not admitted in this case. But once it is admitted that 'Peter' used the Fourth Gospel as one of his sources, then again it seems at least much more probable that, in the story introduced by the closing words of the extant fragment, he was depending on that Gospel rather than on the lost ending of St Mark, which there is not the least reason (from any other point of view) to suppose had survived as late as the second century A.D. Therefore 'Peter' adds nothing to the witness of the earliest tradition of the Resurrection.

C. H. TURNER.

¹ It is possible that the names of Andrew and Matthew were selected, or substituted for those disciples mentioned in Jn. xxi 2, just because those particular apostles were already being claimed as channels of secret traditions handed down in Gnostic circles. The fabrication of Gnostic Acts of Andrew and Matthew, or of Peter and Andrew, though these may doubtless not have been quite as old as 'Peter', points in the same direction.

[NOTE. Both Dr Sanday and Dr Lock demur (independently) to the combination, on p. 172, of 'Peter' no. 50 with Jn. xviii 3-6; and in face of their opinion I hesitate to adhere to my own. Yet *ἐπεὶ ἄν τε* in 'Peter' is so odd that it seems to me best explained as an echo of an earlier document.]

NOTE ON ἐπιφώσκειν.

THE verb ἐπιφώσκειν is found in two of the Gospels in connexion with time-notice of the Burial and Resurrection narrative. St Luke employs it in his account of the Burial, xxiii 54 καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν, 'it was Preparation-day, and Sabbath was dawning'; St Matthew in his account of the Resurrection, xxviii 1 ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, 'late on Saturday, in the [night] that dawns to the first day of the week'. Clearly both these uses of a verb which ought to mean 'to be dawning' are odd enough to excite investigation.

Prof. Lake (pp. 56-60) feels the difficulty, but has no doubt at all as to the remedy. ἐπιφώσκειν must refer to the dawn: 'there is no evidence for it in Greek in any sense except a reference to sunrise.' You have only to assume that both the First and Third Evangelists forgot at what point in the twenty-four hours the Jews began their days, and all is straightforward: Matthew's 'statement implies a reckoning of days in which the dividing line was sunrise, not sunset' (p. 56), Luke 'did not fully understand or had momentarily forgotten the Jewish time-reckoning, and thought that, according to the law, Joseph of Arimathaea and the women had the whole of Friday evening and night at their disposal' (p. 59).

We begin by testing this counter-hypothesis, and we ask in relation to it the two questions, Is it credible in itself? and Does it harmonize with the contexts?

1. Is it really credible that any Christian of the apostolic or sub-apostolic generations was ignorant at what moment the Jewish day began? The 'redactor of the First Gospel', as Prof. Lake calls him, was presumably a Jewish Christian: the evangelist Luke, Gentile Christian though he was, was the companion of St Paul, and sabbaths were presumably observed in the Apostle's company. But quite apart from any special presumptions about individuals, the whole Christian day-reckoning was derived from the Jewish; the Christian Sunday commenced at sunset as the Jewish sabbath ended, and no Christian can by any conceivable stretch of the imagination have thought of any other hour as the dividing line between day and day of his religious calendar. Least of all could he have been ignorant at what time of day Easter Sunday began.

2. Does it harmonize with the contexts? St Matthew, on the Professor's reading, describes the visit of the women as 'late on the sabbath as it began to dawn towards' Sunday, and paraphrases this as 'the hour before the dawn'; but if a difficulty is thus got over in regard

to ἐπιφώσκειν, a not less serious one surely stares us in the face in regard to ὀψέ. If Prof. Lake finds 'no evidence for ἐπιφώσκειν in Greek in any sense except a reference to sunrise', would he be able to find any evidence for ὀψέ in Greek in any sense except in reference to the hours, let us say roughly, from afternoon to midnight? Therefore the ambiguities in St Matthew are not in the least really cleared away when the Professor has explained that the Evangelist mistook the commencement of the Jewish day. With regard to St Luke he seems to me to be less successful still. Luke, he writes, 'thought that, according to the law, Joseph of Arimathaea and the women had the whole of Friday evening and night at their disposal . . . that the women prepared the spices during the night before the Sabbath'. Dr Lake seems to have overlooked the fact that St Luke records the 'dawning' of the sabbath in verse 54 *before* he notes that the women returned home and began their preparations of spices and ointments. Here again, then, the hypothesis that ἐπιφώσκειν means sunrise does not work.

We must look in some other direction for the solution of the difficulty. And first we will turn to pseudo-Peter, and see what lessons we can learn from his use of the word under debate. Obviously the word caught his notice, for he has employed it at two separate points, and on the second occasion in two successive sentences. In § 2 Herod assures Pilate that he and the Jews would themselves have seen to the burial, for 'sabbath is dawning' (σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει) and the sun must not set on an unburied criminal'. Further on, after the account of the Crucifixion and Burial, we are told in § 9 that 'early, as sabbath was dawning' (πρωίας ἐπιφώσκοντος τοῦ σαββάτου), a multitude came from Jerusalem and the country round to see the tomb sealed; and 'in the night in which the Sunday was dawning' (τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ ἐπέφωσκει ἡ κυριακή), the Resurrection and the portents that accompanied it took place.

Now if 'Peter' uses the verb twice, once in relation to the Burial, where St Luke had used it, and once in relation to the Resurrection, where St Matthew had used it; if moreover he is found to employ it on the first occasion in just the same phrase as St Luke's, *σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει*, and on the second occasion in almost the same phrase as St Matthew's, *τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ ἐπέφωσκει ἡ κυριακή*—the Matthaean phrase *τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ* omits the noun, but 'Peter's' *νυκτί* is I think the correct supplement—then the natural deduction is that on the first occasion 'Peter' is copying Luke, and on the second occasion is copying Matthew. But Prof. Lake does not believe that 'Peter' used Luke at all. In that case it is all the more remarkable that, independently of Luke, 'Peter' appears to use the phrase *σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει*, just as Luke does, of sunset: indeed the case is clearer in Peter, since *σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει* is immediately followed by *ἡλιον μὴ δύνα*. Prof. Lake can no longer

write that there is no evidence for ἐπιφώσκειν in Greek in any sense except a reference to sunrise; for here is evidence in pseudo-Peter. After all, however, this is only an *argumentum ad hominem*; let us suppose it admitted that 'Peter' has borrowed ἐπιφώσκειν from Luke as well as from Matthew, and it still remains true that 'Peter' found no difficulty in adopting the word and interpreting it of the evening. At whatever exact moment of the day he may be supposed to place the conversation between Pilate and Herod on the subject of the burial, the moment to which the conversation looks forward can only be sunset: that 'sabbath is dawning' and that 'the sun may not set on the corpse of a criminal' exposed on the gallows, are two parallel and mutually complementary parts of the argument.¹

What then is the true explanation of St Luke's language? I think it is simply this, that, if you have to employ for the time-definitions of a system that began its day at sunset the terminology of a language which postulated a day that began with sunrise, you will naturally find yourself using expressions of the one that are strictly applicable only to the other. In other words, when St Luke wanted to talk in Greek of the commencement of the Jewish day, he still talked of its 'dawn'.² Some such hypothesis seems to me to involve far fewer difficulties than that which Prof. Lake so lightly assumes to be the only rational one.

¹ It does not necessarily follow either that Matthew used ἐπιφώσκειν of the evening, or that 'Peter' when writing on his own account would do so. In § 9 πρώτας ἐπιφώσκοντος τοῦ σαββάτου, which is 'Peter's' own phrase, naturally means 'early in the day as sabbath was dawning', while his remaining phrase 'the night in which Sunday dawned', if it correctly interprets (as I think it does) St Matthew's τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων 'the . . . which dawned towards Sunday', shews that he could learn from the context to connect ἐπιφώσκειν in one author with night as well as in another with sunset. But I am by no means sure, though the case is not so clear, that St Matthew does not use the word in the same sense substantially as St Luke; if so, the Resurrection will have been placed by him in the *early* hours of the night Saturday-Sunday.

² Archdeacon Allen (on Mt. xxviii 1) tells us that there actually is an Aramaic word meaning both 'dawn' and 'the beginning of the technical day' i. e. evening.

[NOTE. In the translation, pp. 191-195, capital type is used for words and phrases which seem to be derived from the parallel passage in one or other of the Four Gospels, italic type where words or phrases are borrowed apparently from other parts of the canonical writings.]

TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPEL OF PETER.

[Then Pilate washed his hands]

- § 1 But of the Jews none ¹ WASHED HIS HANDS, ¹ Mt. xxvii 24.
 nor did ² HEROD nor any one of his judges; ² Lk. xxiii 7-11.
 and when they would not wash themselves,
 Pilate rose. ⁴ 'Rose': perhaps 'departed'
 (*ἀπέστη* for *ἀνέστη*).
 And then Herod ³ *the king* ordered ⁴ *the*
Lord to be ⁵ SEIZED, telling them, ⁶ 'Whatever
 I have ordered *you* to *do* to him, *do*.' ³ Cf. Mk. vi 14, Mt. xiv 9.
⁴ Lk., Jn., cf. p. 169.
⁵ Mt. xxvii 27, Jn. xix 17.
⁶ Cf. Jn. ii 5, xiii 27?.
- § 2 But Joseph the friend of Pilate and of the
 Lord was present there; and knowing that
 they were going to crucify him, he ⁷ WENT ⁷ Mk. xv 43.
 TO PILATE AND ASKED FOR THE LORD'S BODY
 for burial. And Pilate ⁸ *sent to Herod* and ⁸ Lk. xxiii 7.
 asked for his body; and Herod said, 'Brother
 Pilate, even if some one had not asked for
 him, we ourselves would have buried him,
 seeing that ⁹ SABBATH IS DAWNING.' For it is ⁹ Lk. xxiii 54.
¹⁰ *written in the law* that ¹¹ *the sun should not*
¹⁰ *go down* on one that has been put to death. ¹⁰ Cf. Jn. x 34, xv 25.
¹¹ Cf. Eph. iv 26 (Deut. xxiv
 15 [17]).
- § 3 And ¹² *he handed him over* to the people ¹² Jn. xix 16, Lk. xxiii 25,
 the ¹³ DAY BEFORE *their* FESTIVAL, ¹⁴ THE ¹³ Mk. xv 15 = Mt. xxvii 26.
 UNLEAVENED BREAD; and they seizing the ¹⁴ Jn. xii 1, xiii 1 (cf. vi 4, vii 2).
 Lord began to push him at a run and to ¹⁴ Mk. xiv 12 = Mt. xxvi 17.
 say, 'Let us drag about ¹⁵ *the Son of God*, ¹⁵ Cf. Mt. xxvi 63, xxvii 40,
 having got ¹⁶ AUTHORITY over him.' And ¹⁶ 43, 54 (Jn. xix 7).
 they ¹⁷ CLOTHED HIM ¹⁸ WITH PURPLE, and ¹⁷ Jn. xix 2.
¹⁸ Mk. xv 17 (Jn. xix 2).
¹⁹ Jn. xix 13.
¹⁹ SATE him on the judgement-seat, saying, ²⁰ Mk. xv 18 = Mt. xxvii 29,
 'Judge righteously, O ²⁰ KING ²¹ of Israel.' ²⁰ Jn. xix 3.
 And ²² *one* ²³ of them ²⁴ brought ²⁵ A THORNY ²¹ Cf. Mk. xv 32, Jn. xii 13.
 CROWN and ²⁶ SET it ON THE LORD'S HEAD; ²² Mk. xv 36. ²³ Mt. xxvii 48.
²⁴ Jn. xix 29. ²⁵ Mk. xv 17.
 and others stood up and ²⁷ SPAT IN his eyes, ²⁶ Mt. xxvii 29, Jo. xix 2.
 and others ²⁸ BUFFETED HIS CHEEKS; others ²⁷ Mk. xv 19, Mt. xxvi 67.
 began to ²⁹ prick him ³⁰ WITH A REED, and ²⁸ Mt. xxvii 68, cf. Isa. l 6.
 some to ³¹ SCOURGE him, saying, 'With this ²⁹ Cf. Jn. xix 34.
³⁰ Mk. xv 19.
³¹ Jn. xix 1.
³² Mt. xxvii 9?.
- § 4 And they brought ³³ TWO MALEFACTORS, ³³ Lk. xxiii 32, 33.
 and crucified the Lord ³⁴ BETWEEN them. ³⁴ Jn. xix 18.
³⁶ *But* he was *silent*, as though he had ³⁵ Mk. xiv 61, Mt. xxvi 62.
 no pain.
 And when they had raised the cross, they

³⁶ INSCRIBED on it that ³⁷ 'THIS IS THE KING
²¹ of Israel'.

³⁶ Mk. xv 26.
³⁷ Mt. xxvii 37.
²¹ See above, p. 191.

And laying down his garments before him, they ³⁸ DIVIDED them and CAST the ³⁹ LOT OVER THEM.

³⁸ Mk. xv 24 (Mt. xxvii 35, Lk. xxiii 34).

³⁹ Jn. xix 24.

⁴⁰ BUT ONE OF those MALEFACTORS ⁴¹ REPROACHED them, saying, ⁴² 'WE for the ill which we have done are suffering as we do; BUT THIS MAN, who has become Saviour of men, what wrong hath he done you?' And being angry with him, they gave orders that his ⁴³ LEGS should not be BROKEN, in order that he might die in torment.

⁴⁰ Lk. xxiii 39. ⁴¹ Mk. xv 32 (Mt. xxvii 44).
⁴² Lk. xxiii 41.

⁴³ Jn. xix 31.

⁵ 5 And ⁴⁴ IT WAS midday, AND DARKNESS overshadowed ⁴⁵ ALL Judaea; and they were troubled and anxious to know whether the sun had set, seeing that he was still alive; for it was contained in their scriptures that the sun should not set on any that had been put to death.

⁴⁴ Lk. xxiii 44.

⁴⁵ Mt. xxvii 45.

And ⁴⁶ ONE of them SAID, 'Give him ⁴⁷ *gall* with VINEGAR to drink'; and they mixed it, and ⁴⁸ GAVE IT HIM TO DRINK, and ⁴⁹ FULFILLED ALL THINGS, AND CONSUMMATED their sins on their own heads.

⁴⁶ Mk. xv 36. ⁴⁷ Mt. xxvii 33.

⁴⁸ Mk. xv 36 (Mt. xxvii 48).

⁴⁹ Jn. xix 28, 30.

But many began to ⁵⁰ *go* about *with lights*, supposing it was night, and *tumbled down*.

⁵⁰ Jn. xviii 3, 6.

And the Lord ⁵¹ CRIED aloud, saying, 'My Power, my Power, hast thou FORSAKEN ME?'

⁵¹ Mt. xxvii 46, Mk. xv 34.

And ⁵² HAVING SO SAID, he ⁵³ *was taken up*.

⁵² Lk. xxiii 46. ⁵³ Ac. i 2, Lk. ix 51.

And at that very hour ⁵⁴ THE VEIL OF THE TEMPLE of Jerusalem was burst IN TWO.

⁵⁴ Mt. xxvii 51, Mk. xv 38 (Lk. xxiii 45).

⁶ 6 And then they tore away ⁵⁵ *the nails* from the Lord's *hands*, and ⁵⁶ LAID him on the earth; and ⁵⁷ ALL THE EARTH QUAKED, and ⁵⁸ *great fear came*. Then the sun shone, and it was found to be ⁵⁹ THE NINTH HOUR, and ⁶⁰ THE JEWS rejoiced, and gave Joseph his body to bury it, because he had been seeing what good he did. And receiving the Lord, he washed him and ⁶¹ SWATHED him IN LINEN, and took him into his ⁶² OWN TOMB, called 'Joseph's ⁶³ GARDEN'.

⁵⁵ Jn. xx 25.

⁵⁶ Mt., Mk., Lk., Jn.

⁵⁷ Mt. xxvii 51.

⁵⁸ Ac. v 5, 11.

⁵⁹ Mt. xxvii 46, Mk. xv 34.

⁶⁰ Jn. xix 31, &c.

⁶¹ Mk. xv 46.

⁶² Mt. xxvii 60.

⁶³ Jn. xix 41.

§ 7 Then ⁶⁰ *the Jews* and ⁶⁴ *the elders and the priests*, seeing what harm they had done themselves, began to beat their breasts and to say, ⁶⁵ 'ALAS FOR OUR SINS: judgement and the end OF JERUSALEM IS NIGH.'

⁶⁴ Mt. xxvi 3, xxvii 1.

⁶⁵ Lk. xxiii 48 *v.l.* (but as in p. 166 *n.* 1, Peter may be the source of the *v.l.*).

But I with my companions gave myself up to grief, and we were struck to the heart, and we ⁶⁶ concealed ourselves, for search was being made by them for us as malefactors and as intending to fire the Temple. And at all this we fasted and sat ⁶⁷ MOURNING AND WEEPING night and day until the Sabbath.

⁶⁶ Cf. Jn. xx 19.

⁶⁷ Cf. 'Mk.' xvi 10.

§ 8 But the scribes and ⁶⁸ PHARISEES and

⁶⁸ Mt. xxvii 62, xxviii 12.

ELDERS BEING GATHERED TOGETHER, hearing that the whole people were murmuring and beating ⁶⁹ THEIR BREASTS, saying, 'If all these great signs came to pass at his death,

⁶⁹ Lk. xxiii 48.

see how ⁷⁰ RIGHTEOUS A MAN he was!—

⁷⁰ Lk. xxiii 47.

the elders were afraid and went ⁷¹ TO PILATE and besought him, SAYING, 'Put soldiers at our disposal, in order that they may guard his sepulchre for THREE DAYS, FOR FEAR HIS DISCIPLES COME AND STEAL HIM AWAY, and THE PEOPLE suppose that he has risen from the DEAD and do us harm.' And PILATE

⁷¹ Mt. xxvii 62-66.

put at their disposal to guard the tomb Petronius ⁷² *the centurion* with soldiers, and there accompanied them to the sepulchre elders and scribes. And all of them together that were there with the help of the centurion and soldiers rolled ⁷³ A BIG STONE and set it ⁷⁴ AT THE DOORWAY OF THE SEPULCHRE. And they sealed it with ⁷⁵ *seven seals*, and fixed camp there and kept guard.

⁷² Mk. xv 39.

⁷³ Mt. xxvii 60.

⁷⁴ Mk. xv 46 (Mt. xxvii 60).

⁷⁵ Apoc. vi (cf. Mt. xxvii 66).

§ 9 And ⁷⁶ *early* ⁷⁷ *at Sabbath dawn* a multitude came from Jerusalem and the country round to see the sepulchre as it was sealed.

⁷⁶ Jn. xxi 4. ⁷⁷ Lk. xxiii 54.

But in the night in which the Lord's day ⁷⁸ DAWNED, while the soldiers were on guard, two and two to a watch, there ⁷⁹ *came a* loud *voice* in the heaven, and they ⁸⁰ *saw the heavens opened* and ⁸¹ TWO MEN ⁸² DESCENDING thence, ⁸³ *having a great light*, and standing

⁷⁸ Mt. xxviii 1.

⁷⁹ Mk. i 10, 11, Mt. iii 16, 17, Lk. iii 21, 22.

⁸⁰ Cf. Jn. i 51.

⁸¹ Lk. xxiv 4. ⁸² Mt. xxviii 2.

⁸³ Cf. Mt. iii 15 *cod a.*

by the tomb. And that stone which had been thrust against the doorway moved of itself and ⁸⁴yielded slightly, and the tomb was open and both ⁸⁵YOUTHS entered. ⁸⁴ Cf. Mk. xvi 4.
⁸⁵ Mk. xvi 5.

§ 10 Then those soldiers at the sight awoke the centurion, and also the elders, for they too were present on guard. And as they were relating what they had seen, again they see three men coming out of the tomb, and two of them upholding the third, and a Cross following them; and the heads of the two reached as far as heaven, but the head of the one who was escorted by them passed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens saying, 'Hast thou preached to them that are fallen asleep?' and from the Cross was heard an answer, 'Yea.'

§ 11 Then the party conferred with one another, and determined to go and report matters to Pilate. And while they were still thinking of it, once more they see a vision of the heavens opened, and a man descending and ⁸⁶ENTERING THE SEPULCHRE. ⁸⁶ Mk. xvi 5.

At this sight the centurion and his men hurried off, night though it were, to Pilate, abandoning the tomb where they were on guard: and in great distress they related everything that they had seen, ⁸⁷DECLARING 'OF A TRUTH HE WAS SON OF GOD'. Pilate answered and said, 'I am clean ⁸⁸of the blood of the Son of God; it was your doing.' ⁸⁷ Mt. xxvii 54.
⁸⁸ Mt. xxvii 24.

Then all the party approached and made humble request of him and begged that he would order the centurion and his men to ⁸⁹say nothing of what they had seen. 'For', said they, 'it is better for us to incur very great sin before God rather than to ⁹⁰fall into the hands of the people of the Jews and be stoned.' So Pilate ordered the centurion and his men to say nothing about it. ⁸⁹ Cf. Lk. viii 56, Mt. xvii 9.
⁹⁰ 2 Reg. xxiv 14.

§ 12 And ⁹¹AT DAYBREAK on Sunday ⁹²MARY THE MAGDALENE, a ⁹³DISCIPLE OF THE LORD ⁹¹ Lk. xxiv 1.
⁹² Jn. xx 1.
⁹³ Jn. xix 38.

—who being AFRAID because OF THE JEWS, since they were burning with anger, had been unable to do at the Lord's sepulchre what women are ⁹⁴ WONT to do for their loved ones ⁹⁴ Jn. xix 40. at the moment of death—taking her friends with her, went to the sepulchre where he had been laid: and they were afraid lest the Jews should see them. And they said, 'Although we could not wail and lament on the day when he was crucified, let us do so now at his sepulchre. But ⁹⁵ WHO WILL ⁹⁵ Mk. xvi 3. ROLL AWAY FOR US that stone which was laid at THE DOORWAY OF THE SEPULCHRE, so that we may go in and sit down by him and do what is due? ⁹⁶ FOR it was a BIG stone, and we are afraid of being seen. And if we can do nothing else, let us just throw down at the doorway what we are ⁹⁷ BRINGING ⁹⁸ for ⁹⁷ Lk. xxiv 1. ⁹⁸ Mk. xiv 9. ⁹⁸ Mt. xxvi 13. a memorial of him, and wail and lament all the way home.'

§ 13 And on arriving they found the tomb open; and they approached and ⁹⁹ STOOPED ⁹⁹ Jn. xx 11. in. And they ¹⁰⁰ SEE there A YOUTH SITTING ¹⁰⁰ Mk. xvi 5. in the middle of the tomb, comely and CLOTHED WITH A splendid ROBE, who said to them, 'Why have you come? Whom ¹⁰¹ SEEK YOU? Is it him ¹⁰² WHO WAS CRUCI- ¹⁰¹ Lk. xxiv 5. FIED? He HAS RISEN and departed. But if ¹⁰² Mk. xvi 6, Mt. xxviii 5. you believe it not, stoop in and ¹⁰³ SEE THE ¹⁰³ Mt. xxviii 6. PLACE WHERE HE LAY, that ¹⁰⁴ HE IS NOT ¹⁰⁴ Mk. xvi 6. there; for he has risen and ¹⁰⁵ returned thither ¹⁰⁵ Cf. Jn. xvi 5, 7, 28. whence he was sent forth.' Then the women ¹⁰⁶ WERE AFRAID and FLED. ¹⁰⁶ Mk. xvi 8.

§ 14 Now it was the last day of the Unleavened Bread, and a good many ¹⁰⁷ LEFT on their ¹⁰⁷ Lk. xxiii 48. way back home because the feast was over. But we the Lord's twelve disciples wept and grieved; and ¹⁰⁸ each of us started *homewards* ¹⁰⁸ Cf. Jn. xvi 32. in sore grief for what had happened.

But I, ¹⁰⁹ SIMON PETER, ¹¹⁰ and my brother ¹⁰⁹ Jn. xxi 1-3. Andrew took our nets and went off to the ¹¹⁰ Mt. iv 18 (Mk. i 16). SEA; and there was with us ¹¹¹ Levi the son ¹¹¹ Mk. ii 14. of Alphaeus, whom the Lord . . .