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

difficulty common to almost all the orthodox interpretations of our Lord's cry of forsakeness, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' How can the explanation of that cry be put into words without seeming to infringe on the reality of the Incarnation? Does not M'Leod Campbell come nearest to the truth when he points to the thoroughness with which our Saviour identified Himself with the experiences of the sufferer who wrote the twenty-second Psalm?

Requests and Replies.

Somewhere lately I came across the statement that the clause σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, in Mt 16[18], is merely an expansion of ΣΥΕΙΠΣ. The Vatican manuscript and a rendering of Augustine—*tu dixisti*—were alluded to; the inference being that the correct reading is σὺ εἶπας, *thou hast said*. What is the value of this statement? Is there any further evidence of the same kind?—G. S. L.

It may be confidently asserted that it is impossible to explain ΣΥ ΕΙ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ as an expansion of ΣΥ ΕΙΠ[Ε]Σ, *thou hast said*.

1. The answer σὺ εἶπες (or εἶπας) does not fit into *the connexion*. If it stood in v.[17], immediately after the declaration of Peter, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, it would be in its place, indeed; but after the intervening words, and especially after the introductory formula, κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι, an answer like σὺ εἶπας seems impossible.

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

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

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

(*a*) The formula, σὺ εἶπας (Mt 26[25. 64]), or ὑμεῖς λέγετε, has hitherto been said to be a common Eastern mode of affirmation; but Professor Chwolson, an authority in matters of Jewish antiquities, has declared lately that only one example of it has been found by him in Rabbinical literature, and there it has not an affirmative sense, but declines to affirm (see D. Chwolson, 'Das letzte Passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes nach den in Uebereinstimmung gebrachten Berichten der Synoptiker und des Evangeliums Johannis, nebst einem Anhang,' *Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, vii[e] Série, Tome xli. n. 1, 1892, p. 88).[1] To me it seems very probable that also in the N.T. σὺ εἶπας is to be understood in this way. Judas asks, 'Is it I?' Jesus answers, '*Thou* hast said it (not I); thou hast spoken the fatal word (traitor); look whether it become not true.' Again, before the high priest, 'Tell us whether Thou be the *Christ*, the Son of *God*.' '*Thou* has said, thou hast taken the word in thy mouth; *I* did not say it, hitherto, neither affirming nor denying, but now I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of *Man*,' etc.

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

[1] The connexion is this: R. Jehudah (the redactor of the Mishna) was very ill; the inhabitants of Sepphoris were much grieved about it, and declared they would kill him who should bring the news of his death. His pupil, R. Bar-Kappara, came, with his garments rent, and cried, 'The angels have taken away the sacred tables' (the stones on which the law was written). The people, hearing this, said, 'R. Jehudah is dead,' on which Bar-Kappara replied, אתון קאמריתון אנא לא קאמינא, '*You* have said it, *I* did not say it,' or, according to another version, merely אתון אמריתון, '*You* said it.'

planation, when it came before him in a somewhat exaggerated form and a less trustworthy connexion (*die Christliche Welt*, 1897, ii. 89), apparently because he did not know the sound foundation on which it rests. At all events, Westcott-Hort have shown their wonted circumspection in giving, in Mt 16^{64}, the alternative explanation σὺ εἶπας, as question. This shows that it was not certain at all to them that σὺ εἶπας was such a common or standing formula of affirmation, as it is commonly said to have been. Or was it so used after all?

(*b*) Peter as θυρωρός.—The other question raised by the query on Mt 16^{18} regards the prominent position assigned to Peter in this passage. A. Resch, in his *Ausserkanonische Parallelltexte* (ii. Heft, 1894, pp. 187–196), tried to prove that v.[18] was unknown during the whole of the second century, that Tertullian and Origen were the first witnesses for the text as it stands now (*für die fertige canonische textgestalt*), and that even in the fourth century the text of Mt 16^{18} remained unfixed (*blieb schwankend*).[1] I do not think that he has made out his case. I believe, on the contrary, that I have found in the Gospel of Mark, where one was surprised hitherto to have no parallel passage to that of Matthew, a saying of Jesus, which seems to be connected with it. According to Mk 13^{2}, Jesus is asked by Peter (together with James, John, and Andrew) about the signs of the approaching fulfilment. At the end of His answer He speaks to his above-named disciples the parable of the man who leaves his house giving authority to his servants, to each one his own work, and he distinguishes from the rest of the servants expressly the θυρωρός, the porter, '*qui etiam pro aliis vigilat, eosque excitare debet*,' as Bengel justly remarked. Is it not allowable to think in this connexion especially of Peter and of Mt 16^{19}? In the commentaries at my disposal,—that of Dods is not yet among them,—I find no remark about this connexion; I pointed it out in my *Philologica sacra*, 1896, p. 48.

(*c*) Mt 16^{17} and Gal 1^{16}. — A third point in connexion with Mt 16^{17}, which does not seem to me to have received as yet sufficient attention and a satisfying solution, is its relation to Jn 1^{13} and (especially) Gal 1^{16}. It seems to me almost impossible not to recognize a direct literary relation between these three passages, especially between Christ's word to Peter, and the statement of Paul about his conversion; and yet it is very difficult to say precisely how this connexion is to be explained. All three passages speak about the true significance of Christ's person, how it was or is recognised; all use the expression σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, which is not so frequent—a look into the concordance shows it —as is generally presupposed. Mt 16^{17} and Gal 1^{15} have also the expression ἀποκαλύπτειν in common; in John we do not have the word, but the idea. Can we believe that Paul, when formulating the narrative of the most important event of his life, was guided unintentionally by the narrative of the similar important moment in the life of Peter? Or shall we presuppose that Paul imitated purposely the words which were addressed to Peter? A former generation of critics would even have been inclined to find a certain jealousy and rivalry on his side. But if we do not go so far, are we to presuppose that Paul had already before him a written account of that word of Jesus to Peter, or is it sufficient to suppose that Paul knew it only by hearsay? In either case, Gal 1^{16} would be an important corroboration of the passage in Matthew. Or—here is the second possibility — are we to suppose that the passage in Matthew is formulated under the influence of Gal 1? Is this theory of the critical school consistent with the way in which the present generation is accustomed to view the growth of our Gospels? And what are we to think about the relation of Jn 1^{13} to both passages?

EB. NESTLE.

Ulm.

[1] According to Resch, the original text of Mt $16^{17f.}$ was either, Μακάριος . . . οὐρανοῖς· κἀγὼ σοὶ λέγω, ὅτι πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσίν σου or ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.

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

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

EDITOR.