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A TRANSLAATION OF THE TEXT.

## PGMGR'S 30SP四, A THAMELATION.

Eut of the Jews no one wamed his hands, neither Herod nor even one oi his judges, and since they did (not) wish to wash, Pilate arose, 2. and, then, Herod, the king, cornands that the fori be taken, sayin@ to them. "Whatsoever I commanded you to do to Hir, that do." 3. Now Joseph, the friend of Pilate and of the Lord, was present, and knowing that they were about to impale Him, he came to Pilate and requested the body of the Lord for burial. 4. And Pilate sent to Herod and asked flor the body, 5 . and Herod said, "Brother Pilate, even if no one had asked for Him, we would have buried dim, inasmech as the Sabbath is near, (about to dawn) for it is written in the lan, the sun must not set on a person slain, before the first day of unlesvensd bread, of their feast.
6. Now they took the Lord and running, pushed him along and said, "Let us drag the Son of God along, since we have control of Him." 7. And they clothed Him with purple and placed Him upon a seat of judgement, saying, "Judge justly, King of Israell" B. And one of them brouint a thorn crown and placed (it) upon the head of the Lord. 9. And some standind by spat upon lis eyes and others slapped tis cheeks (jaws); some pierced Him with a reed and others kept scourging Him and said, "With this honor we honor the Son of God."
10. Ard they brousht two malefactors and impaled the Lord between them, but he kept silent, as if having no suffering. 11. And when tiney straightened the cross up, they wrote, "This is the fing of Israel." 12. And when they had placed the garments in front of Him, they distributed them and cast a lot for them, 15 . but a certain one of those malefactors reproached them saying, "ive for the evil we have done, suffer thus, but this Dne, who has become a Saviour of meri, what injustice has the done you?" 14. and tney were angry at him and commanded that his legs be not broken in order that he might die tortured.
15. Now it was mid-day and darkness covered all Judea and they were troubled and anxious lest the sun should set, while He still lived, for it is written for them, (that) the sur should not set upon a man slain. 16. And a certain one of them said, "Give Him to drink gal with vinegar" and they mixed it and gave (Him) the drink, 17. and they fulfilled all things and completed the sins upon their own heads. 18. Now many went about with lights, thinking that it was night and fell. 19. And the Lord cried out saying, "My Power, My Power, thou hast abandomed men and when He had said this He was taken up.
20.

And the same hour the curtain of toe temple of Jerusalem was torn in twain, 21. and then they drew the nails from the hands of the Lord and placed Hin upon the around and all the earth shook and there was great fear (upon them). 2z. Then the sun shone and it was found to be the ninth hour, 23. but the Jews rejoiced and gave to Joseph His body in order that he might bury it since he was an observer of whatever good deeds He did. 24. Now he took the Lord and washed (Him) and wrapped (Him) in linen and brought (Him) to his private tomb, called the Garden of Joseph. 15. Then the Jews and the elders and the priests, when they saw what evil they had done to themselves, betan to beat upon their breasts and say, "Alas for our sins, the judgement and the end of Jerusalem is near!"
26. Now I, with my companions, was grieved and, wounded in feeling we concealed ourselves, for we were hunted by them as malefactors and as wishing to burn the temple. 87. Over all of these things we fasted and sat sorrowing and weeping night and day until the Sabbath.
28. Now when the scribes and Pharisees and elders had assembled, they heard that all the people were murmuring and beating their breasts saying "If in His death such great signs have come to pass, behold what a Just One He is!". S. The elders were frighten... genet and cate to Pilate, pleadings with him and saying, 30. "Give us soldiers in order that we may guard His tomb for the space of three days, that the disciples may not come and steal Him and the
people understand that He is risen from the dead and do us evil. 31. Now Pilate gave over to them Petronius, the centurion, with soldiers to guard the grave and with them came elders and scribes to the tomb, 32. and being altodether, there in one place, they With the help of the centarion and the soldiers, rolled a huge stone, placed it on the door of the tomb, 33. and besmeared seven seals and, when they had pitched a tent there, they formed a guard. 34. Now on the next day as the Sabbatin nas dawning, arowd came from Jerusalen and the surrounding territory in order that they might see the sealed tomb.
35. Now, during the night in which the Lord's Day dawned, while the soldiers nere on guard, two and two in a watch, there was a great voice in the Heaven, 36. and they saw the Heavens opened up and two men coming down from thence, with a great light and approaching the tomb.37. And that stone which mas pat on the door, of itself rolled and moved away to one side(alond apart) and the grave was opened and botn the young men entered. 38. Then the soldiers, seeing(this) awakened the centurion and the eldera, for they were present also as guarde, 39. and while they were explainine what they had seen, they again beheld three men coming out of tha tomb and the two were supporting the one and across pollowed them 40 . and the heads of the two men extended up to the Heaven but the head of the one that was led by them reached above the Heavens 41 , and they heard a voice from the Heavens saying, "Hast thou preached to them who sleep?" 42. and a reply was heard from the oross, "Yea". 43. Then they together considered with one anotier whether they should go and reveal this to Pilate. 44. And while they were still in consultation, the Heavens ajain appeared as opened and a certain man oame donn and entered the grave. 45. When they saw these things they, with the centurion at night hastened to Pilate, gbandonea the grave they were guarding and related everyting they san, being very anxious and saying "Truly He was the Son of God". 46. Pilate answered and said "I am free from the blood of the Son of God but this seemed best to youn. 47. Then they all went and bedged ant besought him to command the centurion and the soldiers not to speak of what they had seen. 48. "For," they say, "It is expedient for us to be guilty of the greateat sin before God rather than to fall into the hands
of the people of the Jews and be stoned". 49. Then Pilate commanded the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing.
50. Now at the damn of the Lord's Day, Mary Madalene, a disciple of the Lord, (fearful on account of the Jews, since they were inflamed with ander, had not done at the tomb of the Lor $d$, what the momen were accustomed to do over the dead and those that had been loved by them), 51. took her friends along with her and came to the tomb where He was placed, 52, and they were fearful lest the Jews right see them and they said "Even i? we were not able on that day when He was crucified, to weep and lament, even now at His torb let us do this, 53. but who will roll away for us the stone that is placed at the door of the tomb, in order that we may enter and sit by Him and do the things needful? 54. For the atone was a great one and we fear lest some one should see us and if we are not able, ever at the door let us oast what we bring as a memorial of Him and may we meep and wail until we shall come to our own home; 55. And they departed and found the grave opened and they approached and stooped along there and they see there a certain young man, seated in the middle of the grave, handsame and olothed in a brilliant robe, who said to them, 56. "Why have you come? Whom are you seeking? It isn't the One who was crucified is it? He has riaen and gone aray. Now if you do not believe, stoop aside and see the place where He was laid, beoause the is not here for He is risen and fone away to that place from whion He was sent. ${ }^{n} 57$. Then the woten were fearful and fled. 5\%. Now it was the last day of the feast of anleavened bread and many people were goind out on the return to their homes since the feast had ended. 59. But we, the twelve disoiples of the Lord wept and grieved and each, pained at what had core to pass, departed to his own house. 60. Nam $I$, Simon Peter and Andrew, my brother, taking our nets, went away to the sea and there was with us tevi, the son of Alpaeus whom the Lord - . . . .
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## THE PROBABLE RRLATION OF PETBR' 8 ,

TO THE OTHER GOSPELS AS DETERMINSD BY A STUDY OF THE TEXT OF TGE PRAGMENT.

The Probable Relation of Peter's, to the other Gospels as Determined by a Study of the Text of the Fragment.

In this brief study, we shall attempt to prove the following:-

PETER DID NOT WRITE THE FRAGMENT.

1. The attitude of modern critics.
2. The vooabulary.
3. The style.
4. The subject matter.

THE FRAGMENT IS NOT A COMPILATION FROM THE CANONICAL GOSPELS.

1. The order of events is changed from canonical accounts.
2. None of the passages with parallels in the canon, are exact copies.
3. Were it a compilation, some incidents would very likely have been mentioned, to which, as the account stands, no attention is paid.
4. There are twenty-tmo of the sixty verses of the fragment that have no parallel in word or thought, in the canonical gospels.

THE FRAGMENT WAS WRITTEN BY AN ENEMY OF THE JEWS, WAS EASED ON THE CANONICAL GOSPELS AND WAS COMPOSED TO SUSTAIN A THEOLOGICAL DOGMA.

1. An enemy of the Jews mas the author.
2. The writing is based principally upon John'a sooount.
3. The Synoptists are freely used.
4. The writer was a Docetist.

It is with gladness and eagerness that we greet the announced discovery of any material whish incresses our knowledge of the origins of Christianity. The scholarship of to-day is seeking sources. When, in the winter of 1886-87, the French Archeological Mission at Cairo, took from their hiding place, a tomb in Akhmím, in Upper Eogyt, thirty leaves of a vellum manuscript containing fragments of the Eook of Enoch, the Gospel of Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter, it brought to the light valuable accessions to the list of known documents of the early Christian Era, and when M. Bouriant in November, 189 ? edited the text and gave it to the worla, the hearts of scholars rejoiced. With a like feeking of joy, bhough more intense, we now begin the examination of the little fragment of what probably existed in the second century as the "Gospel According to Peter".

PETER DID NOT WRITE THE FRAGMENT.

People of little importance and ability seek notoriety by becomind parasites on the reputation and prestige of leaders. It is strange that we have in our canon no more frot the pen of the great Aposile Peter and this very fact has afforded the impostor a fine opportunity to palm off his products upon the simple-hearted, faithful believers. Notwithstandin』 all of it's internal elaims to Petrine authorship (v.50, Now I, S由mon Reter and Andren - . . ) there are reasons for not accepting it's assertion.

1. The attitude of modern critics.

If there were tenable grounds on which to base arguments for the Petrine authorship of the writind, there would certainly be champions of those reasons among the many students of manuscripts who weigh carefully all evidence both internal and external. Yet among all the writers on this fragment there is no one who dgfends the author in his bold assertion; not even a destructive critic, who, with all his anxiety to weaken our belief in the commonly accepted canon, had enough courage to take up his pen in defense of the suthor's position.
2. Vocabulary.

The languade used does not compare favorably with what is known of Peter's stook of nords. In the epistles of feter there are many classical words such as used by Plato, Plutarch, Philo, Strabo, Pindar, Hesiod, Lucian and others. Peter's vocabulary, as Chase says, "Is a full one, including as it does mords representing the several strata of the language, . - yet none of the words are affected or ofd". There are only four words in the fragrent not found in the
 none of which may be called classical; in fact, all the phrases and words of the writing are common-place and simple. Had Peter written the life of Christ, would he not have used, at least, occasional words and phrases that would oompare favorably with those used in his epistles?
3. The style.

Peter's style in the epiatles, beyond doubt written by him, is such as we might expect, full of vivaoity, revealing strons charaoter, narm affection and adeep, aseured oonviction. His impetuosity and recklessness of esrly yearg in goftened by yeara of zorvice. This gentleness and cnlmegs of notare is shown in the sermon of Acts 2, sfter the penteoostal bsptism of the Holy Epitit. In his letters Peter speaka. with authority and yet. With bumility.

How great is the contrast of style between that of the epistles and that of the fregment In the latter, life is manting, a strong well defined charaoter is not gvident, warm affection can not be geen and signs op a deep conviation are sousht in vain. Humility op spirit is not manifest and where authoritive statementa are made, it is in an arrosisnt manner. On the aubjeot of the Christ, from whom Peter had recaived mo moh and for whom he supfered, he would surely have written with as much vivacity and humility as when writiņ his epistles.
4. The subject matter.

There are several extravadant statementa inconsiatent with the authentic accounts. For example notice the pollowing:- "wishing to burn the templen,v.86. "being all to-gether _ . . they, with the help of centurions and soldiera, rolled a hush stone", v, 32. "the stone which was put on the door of itself rolled and moved away", $v$. 37. "they gidin beheld three men coming out op the tomb and the two
were supporting the one and a cross followed them and the heads of the two men extended up to Heaver but the head of thenthat was led by them reached above the Heavens and they heard a voice from the Heaven sayins"Hast thou preached to them who sleapin and a reply was heard from the oross"Yes"n.v.39-11. Would the Apostle Peter have strayal so far from the faots in the case?

There is abundant proop that the writer of the frapment was not only not a lew himselp but was an extrenist in his hatred of the dews. Peter was not only dew but it is reasonable to suppose that in his references to them he would have used less bitter language, such that they mioht be won over rather than antagonized.

In $v .35$ of ther fragment the "Lord's Day" ( $\dot{\eta}$ KUplaxin) is freely used. This is contrary to N.T.practioe for the word appears only once in the canon, Rev. 1:10. In "The Teaching of the Twelve Apastles" we probably find the earliest application of this term, such as to indicate it's popular employment. The ase then of this name ( $\eta^{*}$ kuplakń) leads us to set a date for the fragment lond after Peter's death.

If Peter wrote this, why does he not apeals of his early visit to the tomb which John montiong? The omisaion can not be a result of his timidity, judging from the way the author uses the personal pronoun in the last verse.

Eusebius, in his "Ecclesiastical History" remarks about Seraphion writing a tract adainat the "Gospel of Peter" which was in circulation at Shossus, little town of Ciliois. This is probably tha only direct reference of that century we have to the "dospel". Is it not preposterous to thinik that a life of Christ writton by the great Apostle Reter could be lost and not be used by the early fathers and the Church in general of the first centuries?

Thus it sears that the only ardument that can be projuoed to prove that Beter wrote the "gospel" is the bold assertion of the pseudoPeter in vabo.

THE PRAGVENT IS NOT A COMPILATION RROM THE CANONICAL GOSPELS.

At first reading it may seem that the author of the frapment has taken incidents from the different gospela and arranged them to suit his onn ideas of the case yet confining himself quite closely to the accepted reoords; but upon careful examination thore is evidence that
such is not the case.

1. The order of events is changed from the canonicslacounts.

In the fragment, Joseph appears upon the scene before the crucifixion ( $v, 3$ ) while in all the canonical accounts, he comes after Jesus is dead and requests the body. According to the fragment it was after that resurrection that Pilate said n an free from the blood of the Son of God" (v.46) while the only canonical writer (Mt.27:24) who records a similar statement places it just after the trial and before the crucifixion. Were this a compilation it is difficult to see how such errors in the order of events given, would be allowed. If the gospels were before the writer at the time of composition he certainry would have tried to make accurate reproduction.
2. None of the passages, with parallels in the canon, are exact copies. In fact there is not even one complete sentence in the whole fragment that has it's exact counterpart in any canonical passage. The following bear a close resemblance, the closest to be found, to their corresponding passages but in esth case some difference is manifest.
a. kxi óaßßx $\quad$. 23:54. The verb form in this oas is different.


 15:46. Matthew here has $v$ movable and the article $\tau \hat{\pi}$.
 27:64 where we have the same except that aúrovi is omitted.
 54. In the latter there is a slightly different arrangement of the words and the addition of outer.

There are many places, at least fifteen, more, in which there is a close parallelism of thought, for example, the fragment says, $v .56$.

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \dot{\eta} \gamma \in ́ \rho \ell \eta$. The differences are sufficient to disprove the compileation theory.

Mary words exactly this sambo appear in both the fragment and the accepted be expected. It would be difficult for any two authors to write upon
like subjects without using similar and generally some of the same phrases and many identical words.

It is strange indeed, if one keep in mind the compilation theory, that there are in the fragment, when compared with the gospels as a whole, fewer likenesses than in the gospels themselves when oompared with one another. Is it not therefore evident that the fragment can not possibly have been a compilation? How could one have compileed pron the gospel accounts and not even have one sentence in his or oduction like same sentience in the material from which he chose?
3. Were it a compilation some incidents would very likely have been mentioned, to which, as the account stands, no attention is paid: There are in the authentic gospel accounts, seven utterances whish Jesus made upon the cross. Not one of these is mentioned. The nearest approach to the gospel account is in v. 19. According to the frapment, Jesus says My power, my power, thou hast abandoned me"; a statement which bears some resemblance to the or recorded in $M$. $27: 46$ and Mk. 15: 34, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The Weaning however is quite different. In st. 27 \& 83 are these words"The tombs were opened and many bodies of the saints: that had fallen asleep verse raised and coming forth out of the tomb after His ressurete tion, they entered into the holy city and appeared to many". This event is unique and worthy of the attention of a compiler. One in arranging a treatise prom accounts containing the above, would certain dy have made some reference to them, at least, to some of tine utterances of the Savior as He hung upon the cross.
4. Twenty-two of the sixty verses of the fragment have no paralel, either of word or thought, in the canonical gospels. Nine of the verses cast reflections on the Jews. A few are details of little importance and some, for example v, 36-12, are devoted to the presentation of an incident incompatible with the accepted gospel accounts. Here we have a description incidents of the resurrection. The leavens open, two men with a great light appear, the huge stone which requir $\div$ ed the strength of many men to put in position, rolls away of itself. The two man enter. Soon three men emerge from the tomb, two supporting the third and a cross following them. The heads op the two men extend Heaven-high but the head of the other reaches still higher! A voice sounds from Heaven, "Cast thou preached to them who sleep?" and the cross replies "Yes"!

It is difficult to understand how a conpiler of the reoord of a given incident wou建d give up more than one third of his space to extraneous matter. It is fair then to conclude that this pradment is not a compilation from the four canonical §ospels; the order of events is not in harmony with them; no passages have exact parallels in word and arrandement; important data is passed by unnoticed and more than one third of the fradment has absolately no direct conneotion with the aooepted gospel aocountis.

THE FRAGUENT WAS WRITTEN BY AN ENEMY OF THE JEWS, WAS EASED ON THE CANONICAL GOSPGLS AND TAS COMPOSED TO SUSTAIN A THEOLOGICAL DOGMA.

1. An enemy of the Jews was the aathor.

In the story, no opportunity to cast reflections upon the Jews, is lost. In the first sentenoe of the eradment they are mentioned. We do not know the preceding discussion but evidently this statement is a reflection. They dij not wash their hands. The second paragraph is wholly given up to a treatment of the indignities heaped upon Christ by ther. In the dospels the soldiera are participants in the insults offered but here all the odium is oast upon the Jews. The sixth verse, of which we have no parallel in thought or word in the accepted gospels, is severe in it's emphasis of the Jewish abuse of Jesus. "Non they took the Lard and ranning, puahed Him along and said "Let us draf the Son of God along since we have control over lim". The following passages alao ahow gigns of a rank hatred toward the Hebrews. v.23. "But the Jems rejoidea"; The shining of the sun dave ovidence to them of their viotory: $v$. 26 , "We concealed ourselves, for we were hunted by them as malefactors and as wishins to burn the temple": $v .48$, "For it is expedient for us to be guilty of the greatest sin before God rather than to fall into the hands of the people of the Jews and be stoned", that is, the sreatest sin before God is to be preferred to the physical suffering and other torture consequent upon a Jowish stoning! $v .50$, "Mary Magdalene, fearful on sooount of the lews, since they were inflamed with anger", was afraid to approach Jesus' tombto pay her respects to the departed: e.52, "and they were fearful lest the Jews might sea them".

It is a significant fact that nine of the twenty-two verses of the fragment whioh have no parallel in wora or thought in the canonioal sospels, evince an animosity adainst the Jewish people. These
passages are conclusive evidence of a bitter prejudice on the part of the writer against the Hebrews. He has gone out of his way to cast reflections upon these children of Abraham.
2. The writing is based principally upon John's account.

It has been shown that the fragment is not a compilation or reediting of the gospel accounts. While this is true, it is not difficult to see that the writer, although not confining himself to the exact words or thought of the gospels, nevertheless has freely taken material from them. Aside from what he obtained from a prejudiced mind and fertile imagination, all of his statements may be traced to parts of the gospel records.

There are certain matters of detail which the pseudo-Peter menlions that are recorded by John alone. It is also noticable that the author of this fragment, with the exception of one insignificant item has the same sequence of events as has John. In vi indioations are strong that Jesus himself bore His cross. John, who is silent upon the matter, is the only writer who does not assert that simon of $0 y r-$ ene bore the cross. The statement "They placed Him upon a seat of judgement ${ }^{n} v .7$, may have come from considering the verb in 19:1s as transitive. At least the ideas of the two passage are related. John's phrase "and they soourged HIm" 19:1, bears a close resemblance to v.9, "others kept scour ding Him". The other writers speak of similear treatment but John alone speaks of"scourding". It is not diffcult to see a close relation between John's statement "Jesus in the midst"19:13, and that of the fragment v. 10 "Lord in their midst" or "between them". The other writers present the same thought but in quite different tarns. John alone mentions breaking the legs of the malefactors, 19:31f. The writer of the fragment probably arranges the story to suit his own fancy but in $v .14$ he also calls attention to "breaking the legs" of one malefactor. In both John's account and the fragment there are two references to stooping. This idea is not advanoed by the synoptists. The fragment says"and they . . . stooped along there" $V .55$ and in $v .56$ "stoop aside and see" while John, refering to Peter, has, 20:5, "and stooping and looking in" and in 20:11 speaking of Mary, "so, as she wept, she stooped and looked into the tomb:" When the writer of the fragment has finished his story of the crucifixion in $v .60$ he says, "Now I, Simon Peter and Andrew, my brother taking our nets, went away to the sea". In the appendix to John's
gospel, when he has finished the story of the oracifixion and the inoidents related thereto, $21: 3$, he says "Simon Peter saith anto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, we also core with thee. They went forth and entered into the boat". John alone of the gospel writers mentions this fishind trip. It is significant that both the writer of the erafment and John bring in the incident after the main narritive is finished and that both use the same title of Peter, "Simon Peter". There may be other details in which the fragment and John's gospel are alikebut inasmuch as there is no such resemblance in the fragment to the synoptic gospels, these are suffioient to show that the false Peter was probably most familiar with John's acoount and that upon it he basei his story of Jesus.
3. The Synoptists are freely used.

From Mattiow some matters of circumstance are taken but the relation is not so close nor is the sequence of events as nearly in harmony as in the case of John. The washing of hands of v. 1 in the Pra』nent no doubt came from Mt. 27:24 where Pilate is described as washing his hands. The earthquake and rending of rocks mentioned in v. 21 of the fragment is much like Matthew's statement, 27:51 "the earth did quake and the rooks were rent". Mathen alone mentions the §uarding and sealing of the tomb, 27:64ff. The fragment v.29-33, with some slight deviations presents about the same thoaght. The coming of the angel, 28:3, probably gave the false Feter the thought" a certain man oane down and untered the graven. Pilate according to v. 46 of the fragment sayg"I am frae from the blood of the son of God but this seemed best to you" while Mattnex, earlier in the narrative, 27:24, recoris Pilate's worda"I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man, see ye to ft". Thus it is easily seen that much at tention is paid to Matther's acoount.

Mark's dospel is probably used in v.53-55, Por those statements resemble olosely Mk.16:3-5. Besides it is possible that the writer of the framment gets his"Levi, the son of Alpheus" from Mk. 2:14 where the same words are found.

But few references are made to Luke's gospel. In $v .5$ of the fragment, the statement"the sabbath drew on ${ }^{n}$ as mentioned before, is quite likely from Lk. 29:54. The "smiting of the breasts" Lk. 23: 48 compares favorably with $v .35$. of the fradnent, "began to beat upon their breasts". The words of the centurion Lk. E3:47 may have given
rise to the statement in $v .2 s$ of the fragment "Behold what a Just One He if". While the"two men" of v. 36 probably grew out of Luke's statement, 24:4, "Behold two men stood by them in dazzling apparel". Although not used so extensively as John, the Synoptists receive attention and one of them, Matthew, is quoted most freely. The ac* counts of Mark and Luke are used only in a few instances, the references to Luke being matters of little importance..
4. The writer was a Docetist.

Docetism, from סóknolg, was one of the earliest and most troublesome heresies with which the church had to contend. The Docetist acknowledged the Divinity of Christ but put in the back-ground His human nature. They argued that His humanity was nothing more than an"appearance". Some said that He was not crucified but that another was and it"seemed like Christ". According\& to their theory Jesus did not suffer nor move about as a wan bat "appeared" as a man, unit we had "the mere semblance of man".

Where are at least two passages in the fragment that point plainIV to such a belief on the part of the author. In $\nabla .10$ is this senfence "He kept silent, as if having no suffering". This statement is made, beyond doubt, to emphasize the docetie belief. For what else could it have been inserted f Again in $v, 19$ there is either a quotasion from some version of the Palma of which we have no account, or the writer has purposely changed and misapplied the wailing voice of the Savior as He hung on the cross. Instead of"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" as given in both Mt. $87: 48$ and Mk, 15:34, there is in the fragment, "My power, my power, thou hast abandoned me" or" hast thou abandoned mel". The attempt here is to show that the power of the Christ, which according to the Docetist's theory, descended upon Him when God said "This day have I begotten thee", had left Him and for that finer He cried.

The writer of the fragment seems to purposely omit any reference to the sayings of Jesus on the cross which show His humanity. No reference is made to His conversation with His mother," Woman, behold thy son", nor is any attention paid to the cry of Jesus later, "I thirst" which unquestionably reveal lis human nature. John, the writer whom the author of the fragment undoubtedly followed more closely than any other, also says"one of the soldiers, with a spear pierced His side and straightway there came out blood and water", 19:34, an unistakable evidence of Christ's physical existence.

In the light of history and the enthusiasm of this class of heretics of that first centuries, we can easily ascribe a reason for such a writing and from the text of the fragment itself see the unmistakable finger-prints of an ardent supporter of the Docetic theory.

With an open mind and with conscientious effort the probable reration of the fragment to the canonical gospels has been sought and we are convincad from the evidence above given; that Peter never wrote it; that it is not a compilation of the gospel is story but that it was written by an enemy of the Jews, one who wished to defend and advance Docetism.

We regret that more of the pseudo-Petrine gospel has not been found and we expectantly await it's discovery and also that of many other similar doouments which will shed much light upon the life and the belief of the early Christian Churoh.

