

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

I am obliged to you for sending on to me Mr. Ferguson's letter regarding my recent article on the Sea of Galilee. In reply I can only state that I never saw any boatmen on that lake rowing differently from our method, namely, with the back to the bow. I was out twice with different sets of boatmen, and they never stood up and *pushed* as the Chinese boatmen, to whom Mr. Ferguson refers.

At Malta I noticed that it is the usual practice for the boatmen thus to shove instead of pull, but the loss of power was so considerable that on a stiff breeze getting up even in those calm waters of the inner harbour, I observed that they generally sat down and pulled as we do.

Still, this is not sufficient data to prove that *pushing* was unknown in the time of Christ; but the fact that *pulling* to-day is universal on the lake certainly is a strong point to be considered, especially when taken in connexion with the conservative East.

I am not acquainted with any work which would decide the matter, so in this case must rely upon my personal observation.

G. A. FRANK KNIGHT.

Bearsden.

Will you kindly let me know through *The Expository Times* which are the best books on the art of public speaking?—W. T.

I really do not know the best books on the art of public speaking. To say the truth, few I have ever seen help me much. I am now writing a series of papers in the *Religious Review of Reviews* on the "Art of Reading," and use what meagre help I can get.

I have some faith, however, in such books as Rush *On the Voice* (America); and Sheridan *On the Art of Reading*, because they deal in principles rather than details.

No doubt your correspondent will find in the *Publisher's Circular*, and catalogues, plenty of modern books on the art of public speaking. He should consult his bookseller on the subject.

JAMES FLEMING.

York.

[We sent the above request to Canon Fleming because of the articles referred to in the *Religious Review of Reviews*, and we believe that W. T. could not do better than consult those articles.—EDITOR.]

The Newly-Found Gospel in its Relation to the Four.

BY THE REV. W. E. BARNES, B.D., FELLOW OF PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE most important preliminary question to be asked with regard to the newly-discovered Fragment of the Petrine Gospel is, undoubtedly, What is its relation to the Canonical Gospels? Do they presuppose it, or does it presuppose them? Or again, Is it entirely independent of them and they of it?

The Petrine Gospel contains, I believe, evidence that the writer knew at least two of our Gospels, St. Matthew and St. Luke, and regarded them as of authority.

This evidence to the Canonical Gospels is important enough to receive some consideration.

Dr. Harnack believes that if, as seems probable to him, Justin Martyr used this Gospel, it must be assigned a date certainly not later than A.D. 100 to 133. If so, we have evidence for St. Matthew's Gospel perhaps as early as the Elder quoted by Papias; and evidence for St. Luke certainly as

early as that of Marcion. If, on the other hand, Dr. Swete be right in placing the composition of the Petrine Gospel between A.D. 150 and 170, we still have evidence earlier than that of Irenæus, and evidence from a fresh quarter, namely, Western Syria.

That the Petrine Gospel belongs to Syria is clear from the following facts: we first hear of its being used in the extreme north-west of Syria at Rhossus on the Gulf of Iskenderun; we afterwards trace it in Palestinian writers—*e.g.* Eusebius of Cæsarea and Cyril of Jerusalem. There is no certain trace of its use in the West.

When we say that the Petrine Fragment contains evidence to the Canonical Gospels, we do not mean that it contains quotations acknowledged or even unacknowledged from our Gospels, nor that it servilely copies them; we mean that it presupposes

them, and so shapes its narrative as to recognise theirs, both generally and in detail. Take, first, what Peter does *not* say. He does not even mention the procession to Golgotha, with the cross first carried by Christ and after by Simon of Cyrene. It is noticeable that neither does St. John mention Simon. How are we to account for the total silence of the Petrine Fragment and the partial silence of the Fourth Gospel with respect to these incidents? Both cases are to be explained by the circumstance that the writers found them sufficiently described in the triple Synoptic narrative. In other words, "Peter," no less than St. John, presupposes the Synoptists.

Again, the Fragment omits the raillery directed at our Lord when on the cross. Why? We again reply because it is described with sufficient fulness in the Synoptic Gospels. A curious confirmation of this view is the fact that "Peter" has taken the words addressed in St. Luke by the penitent to the impenitent thief, remodelled them, and represented them as addressed to the Jews at large. He has, however, left the tell-tale words, "*We* suffer thus on account of the evils which *we* did," to show that the words were originally addressed as St. Luke has them. We must mention one more omission of "Peter," though it is perhaps of less significance than the two foregoing ones. Nothing is said of the presence of the women from Galilee at the crucifixion and at the entombment, while the Synoptists make a point of their presence, and the names of several of them are given in St. Matthew and St. Mark. That "Peter" should omit all these interesting incidents is most easily to be explained by the fact that they were already well known to those for whom his account was written, and he had nothing fresh to add to them.

On the other hand, it may be shown that when the Petrine author does give facts recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, he gives them because he has something fresh—either new details or comment or explanations—to add to them.

A survey of the facts found in the Synoptic Gospels, and treated thus in the Fragment, will, I think, establish this view.

1. Joseph of Arimathea ventures in to Pilate to ask for the body of the Lord. How did he dare? He was "a friend of Pilate" answers "Peter."

2. The Synoptists say a little vaguely that Pilate delivered or betrayed (the same word is used in describing the betrayal by Judas) Jesus to be

crucified; Pilate is passive rather than active. Who then gave the actual order for the crucifixion? The Fragment satisfies the doubt: "Herod the king commandeth the Lord to be taken, saying, Whatever I commanded you to do to Him, do ye it."

3. The penitent thief, according to St. Luke, says of our Lord, "This man did nothing amiss." These words are extremely natural in the mouth of one whose life had been spent in deeds of violence and in open defiance of law, but such negative testimony falls singularly flat on Christian ears. The Petrine author has therefore introduced a positive element, This man *in becoming Saviour of men*, what harm did He to you?

4. No notice, so far as St. Luke's record goes, was taken by the bystanders of the thief's words. Could such words have passed without answer at a time when passion ran so high? In the Fragment the question arising from St. Luke's narrative is answered; the indignation of the Jews is roused, and they bid the executioners prolong his agony by not breaking his legs. It must be remarked by the way that there is no contradiction between "Peter" and St. John over this incident. An angry shout of the Jews at one moment *not* to break the thief's legs, is no proof that they were not broken later on, when, as St. John says, the Sabbath was felt to be near, and the removal and burial of the bodies had become urgent.

5. According to the Synoptic narrative, at the time of the crucifixion darkness covers either all the *land* or all the *earth*, for the Greek word is ambiguous. "Peter," writing later, solves the doubt and says, All Judæa.

6. The Synoptists in their accounts of the crucifixion say nothing about the fulfilment of prophecy, though they imply fulfilment by describing some incidents in appropriate language from the Old Testament. This lack of direct appeal was strongly felt in later time, and to this feeling we owe the comment on the crucifixion of the two thieves in Mark xv. 28 (a verse not found in the earliest authorities): "And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And He was numbered with the transgressors." To the same cause must be ascribed the addition—absent from the best MSS.—to Matt. xxvii. 35: "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." Now St. John, who is later than

the Synoptists, has several direct appeals to prophecy—viz. for the casting of the lots, for Christ's thirst upon the cross, and for the piercing of His side. Similarly "Peter," after mentioning that those who crucified the Lord gave Him "gall with vinegar" (cf. Ps. lxxix. 21), adds expressly, "And they fulfilled all things." St. John and "Peter" both belong to the later time when it is not enough to give the facts, but it is necessary also to show the connexion of the facts with the past.

7. The Synoptists merely say that there was darkness over the land. How dark was it? The Petrine writer explains that it was so dark that lamps were carried, and people supposed that night had fallen.

8. The taking down of the body from the cross is barely mentioned in the Synoptists (see Luke xxiii. 53). Was this incident to be passed by? Was it nothing that the deed of ill was over, and that now friendly hands were tending the Lord's body? To one who was gathering up the un-gleaned fragments of the Lord's life, the Descent from the Cross had deep significance. So Peter gives each detail; they drew the nails from the Lord's hands, they placed Him on the earth, earth shook at the touch of lifeless hands, the sun shone forth again because the evil deed was past.

9. St. Luke says generally that the crowd of spectators returned beating their breasts. Ay, but what were their *thoughts*? "Peter" has supplemented the Third Gospel, interpreting their action in the words, "Woe to our sins, the judgment has drawn nigh, and the end of Jerusalem."

10. The Synoptic Gospels leave us in ignorance of the fate of the disciples after they forsook the Lord and fled. St. John supplements their accounts by saying that the disciple whom Jesus loved stood at the foot of the cross. "Peter" also supplements the older accounts by telling us that the disciples were in hiding because they feared arrest on a charge of desiring to burn the temple. We must feel in this case that both St. John and "Peter" are gathering the fragments which the earlier accounts had left.

11. In the accounts of the application to Pilate for a guard for the sepulchre, the fears of the rulers, according to St. Matthew, are expressed with a reserve which eminently suits the intercourse of the Jews with Pilate, but at the same time obscures the sense to the careless reader: *The last error shall be worse than the first.*

How worse? "Peter" gives a definiteness to the fears of the rulers which they themselves, as St. Matthew represents, no doubt avoided giving: *Lest the people do us harm.*

12. St. Matthew tells us merely that a guard was given, "Peter" adds that the guard was commanded by a centurion named Petronius. Similarly the three Synoptists say that a—nameless—servant of the high priest had his ear cut off by a—nameless—disciple; while St. John, writing later on, says that Simon Peter cut off the ear of Malchus. The lapse of time brings many names out of obscurity, names which could not be revealed before without doing mischief, and also names which only become interesting in later years.

13. Again, St. Matthew is content to say that the sepulchre was sealed, without laying any stress on the circumstance. But the fact is interesting, and "Peter" adds two particulars with regard to it: (1) there were seven seals; (2) on the Sabbath morning a multitude came forth from Jerusalem to see the unbroken seals on the sepulchre.

14. Again, in the Canonical Gospels there is no description whatsoever of the resurrection. The descent of the angel and the rolling away of the stone (Matt. xxviii. 2) are simply signs of an event which has already taken place.

The empty tomb is a challenge to friend and foe to see for themselves, *He is not here.*

The watch became as dead men at the sight of the descending angel (Matt. xxviii. 4).

We naturally ask, Was this all they saw? The Petrine Fragment says, No; the watch saw two men enter the tomb, and two came forth leading between them a third, whose stature overtopped the heavens. This second vision may be only fancy's effort to realise the most tremendous of all Christian facts, though it must still be confessed to be a singularly reverent and reserved attempt, but the silence of the Four Gospels seems still more reverent, still more dominated by the awe of the event itself, and therefore the nearer to the event—

"He told it not, or something sealed
The lips of that Evangelist."

15. The preaching of the Lord to those that sleep, mentioned in the Akhmim Fragment, stands in relation to the rising and appearing of the saints which sleep, as unseen cause to visible effect. St. Matthew, writing first, gives the phenomenon. "Peter," writing later, adds the explanation. The

saints which slept arose (Matthew), being aroused by the preaching of the Lord in Hades (Peter).

16. Pilate, having granted the guard (Matt. xxvii. 63), disappears from canonical history, leaving Christian curiosity unsatisfied on two points: Did tidings of the resurrection reach him? and what effect had the tidings upon him? "Peter" answers both questions; Pilate was informed at once, and proceeded to throw the blame of the crucifixion on the Jews. St. Matthew's account, that the high priests were first told, is doubtless older and more historical. To them the matter was of life and death, to Pilate a troublesome business of which he had washed his hands.

17. In nothing, however, does the Petrine Fragment show more clearly that it depends on the Synoptic narrative, than in its account of the visit of the Magdalene and her friends to the sepulchre. St. Mark and St. Luke tell us that the women went bearing spices to anoint the body of the Lord. But what could they do with unguents if, as was to be expected, the stone was still in the way? The Petrine writer, feeling this difficulty, suggests the solution that the women would leave their offerings at the door. Further, because he felt that spices and unguents were inappropriate gifts when deposited outside the tomb, he has avoided direct mention of them, and makes the women speak merely of the "things which we bring."

So deeply, however, is truth stamped on the Synoptic account, that no such explanatory defence is needed. It is the old story, known from the foundation of the world, of womanly love and reverence starting to do a dangerous and difficult work, without ever caring for or looking at the difficulties in the way. Near the tomb, hard,

everyday doubts arise: Who will roll us away the stone? Yet love carries them on to the end, and they discover that, while their spice-bearing is in vain, their love has reached through death a life beyond.

Throughout this comparison of the Petrine with the Synoptic narrative, I have avoided any discussion of the question whether the details given by "Peter" are historical or imaginary. It does not seem fair to pronounce a verdict while as yet only a part—perhaps a small part—of the gospel lies before us. But it may be pointed out that the Fragment is sober and reserved in tone, and contains none of the wild fancies in which the thoroughgoing Gnostics indulged.

So faint, indeed, are the traces of heretical teaching, that it is quite possible for us, judging from our present Fragment, to conclude that the Gospel was a perfectly honest narrative, adopted by a Gnostic sect rather because it did not contradict, than because it was written in support of their doctrine.

One word, however, must be said. The "Gospel according to Peter" was not one of the Four Gospels of the authority of which Irenæus spoke in such clear tones, writing in Gaul about A.D. 190; nor has any one claimed for it a place among "the Four Gospels delivered to us," which Clement of Alexandria writes of, circ. A.D. 200; nor again did Tertullian at Carthage, writing a few years later, say anything about it when discussing the apostolic authority of the Evangelic Document (*i.e.* the Four Gospels regarded as one volume), by means of which he tells us "John and Matthew implant faith in us, and Luke and Mark refresh it." The Petrine Gospel occupied a lower room than these.

I Timothy iii. 15.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. W. F. SLATER, M.A., MANCHESTER.

THE rendering of the latter part of this verse in the Revised Version is, "That thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." For this we venture to propose the following translation: "That thou mayest know how to behave thyself

in a house of God, which indeed is a church of the living God, a pillar and ground of the truth."

Some have thought that the last clause—"a pillar and ground of the truth"—ought to be connected with the first clause of the following verse: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness." This view gains some plausibility from the