In this section English translations of the relevant manuscript evidence for the *Gospel of Peter* are provided. This comprises of three textual items. First, the large Akhmîm fragment which contains nine continuous pages of text. It has been argued that this is potentially the only extant witness to the text referred to by Serapion as ‘the so-called Gospel of Peter.’ The other two items of textual witness that have been suggested as pertinent to the reconstruction of the text are P.Oxy. 2949 and P.Oxy. 4009. The first, P.Oxy. 2949, has some short snatched of shared terminology, but also some large discrepancies from *Gos. Pet.* 2.3–5a. The fragmentary nature of this text and its limited extent are readily seen. The identification of this text as part of the *Gospel of Peter* is in part motivated by a desire to the text behind the Akhmîm fragment as more securely located in the second century. Although P.Vindob.G 2325 is also sometimes considered relevant to this discussion it is not included here since it has been argued that it is not a textual witness to the *Gospel of Peter*.

The third piece of evidence, P.Oxy. 4009, is even more fragmentary than P.Oxy. 2949 often with only a few letters of a single word preserved on each line. Extensive and speculative reconstruction has led to the suggestion that this text is part of the now otherwise no longer extant section of the *Gospel of Peter*. Part of the motivation for wishing to identify this text as a fragment of the *Gospel of Peter* is that it would then show that the gospel text was not just a Passion account, but in fact recorded events from Jesus’ ministry. Unfortunately, to reach this conclusion the text must be reconstructed to such an extent that the strength of the argument is minimal and the reasoning circular.

The style of translation adopted for the Akhmîm fragment has been that of close representation of the Greek text, rather than dynamic equivalence. The Greek of the Akhmîm fragment is not particularly refined and consequently no attempt has been made to render the English translation using a more elevated linguistic or syntactical construction. The repeated use of conjunctions at the beginning of new clauses is a feature of the Greek text, and this has been preserved in the translation. The ‘translation’ of the two Oxyrhynchus fragments is problematic. This is because no complete sentence or clause is preserved in either of the papyrus texts. At best one can identify individual words, short clusters of words, or occasionally a phrase.
αὐτῶν ἰστῆκει δὲ ἐκεῖ Ἰωσῆφ ὁ φίλος Πειλάτου καὶ τοῦ κυρίου. καὶ εἶδός ὦ, ἵνα σταυρίσειν αὐτὸν μέλλονσιν, ἦλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πειλάτον καὶ ἤτησε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς ταφήν. 4. καὶ ὁ Πειλάτος πέμψας πρὸς Ἡρῴδην ἤτησεν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα. 5. καὶ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἐφη ἀδελφὲ Πειλάτε, εἰ καὶ μὴ αὐτὸν ἦτησε, ἦμεις αὐτὸν ἠθάπτομεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει· γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἥλιον μὴ δύναι ἐπὶ πεφωνεμένων· καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ λαῷ πρὸ μιᾶς τῶν αζύμων, τῆς ἐορτῆς αὐτῶν.

3.6. Οἱ δὲ λαβόντες τὸν κυρίου ὄψουν αὐτῶν τρέχοντες καὶ ἐλεγον· Σύρωμεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐξοσιάν αὐτοῦ ἐσχηκότες. 7. καὶ πορφύραν αὐτὸν περιέβαλλαν, καὶ ἔκαθισαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ καθέδραν κρίσεως, λέγοντες· Δικαιώσεν, βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. 8. καὶ τὶς αὐτῶν ἐνεγκών περιέβαλον ἀκάνθινον ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ κυρίου. 9. καὶ ἔτεροι ἐστάρωσαν ἐνέπτυσαν αὐτοῦ ταῖς ὑφαι, καὶ ἄλλοι τὰς σικυόνας αὐτοῦ ἐράτισαν, ἔτεροι καλάμως ἔνυσαν αὐτὸν, καὶ τὶς αὐτῶν ἐμάστιζον λέγοντες· ταῦτῃ τῇ τιμῇ τιμήσωμεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.