THE DEPARTURE OF THE DISCIPLES AND CROWDS
FROM JERUSALEM (14.58–60)

58. ἦν δὲ τελευταία ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων καὶ πολλοὶ τινες ἐξήρχοντο ὑποστρέφοντες εἰς τοὺς οίκους αὐτῶν τῇ ἐστή τις παυσαμίνης. 59. ἠμεῖς δὲ οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐκλαίομεν καὶ ἐλυπούμεθα καὶ ἕκαστος λυπούμενος διὰ τὸ συμβάν ἀπηλλάγη εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 60. ἐγὼ δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφός μου λαβόντες ἠμῶν τὰ λίνα ἠμαθῶμεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἦν σὺν ἡμῖν Λευείς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου ὁ ἱερέας...

Text Critical Notes

1. Irregular letter formation is apparent in this word due to the ligature between the first and second letters. The top horizontal stroke of the τ descends on the right-hand side, forming an angel of depression of approximately 40° to the horizontal. This becomes the base of the following ε. The result is that the second letter is slightly raised in comparison to the rest of the letters. This word also represents the scribe’s tendency towards cursive writing.

2. There is somewhat confusing inconsistency in letter spacing at this point. The final τ of πολλοὶ stands closer to the initial letter of τινες than it does to the penultimate letter of πολλοὶ. Furthermore, there is a gap of 2mm between the third and fourth letters of τινες, whereas there is no significant spacing between the final ζ and the initial ε of ἐξήρχοντο which follows.

3. There is an orthographical error in the ending of the form παυσαμίνης, which presumably should read παυσαμένης. This is

---

1001 See the comments on the formation of the letter ε in Gebhardt, Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus, 11.
noted by Swete\textsuperscript{1002} and Vaganay. The latter simply states ‘παυσαμένης (in the ms. mistake for: παυσαμινης).’\textsuperscript{1003} This is another example of an aberrant form due to an itacism. This phenomenon has already been discussed in the commentary,\textsuperscript{1004} and Caragounis provides a detailed examination of this confusion in vowels.\textsuperscript{1005}

4. An orthographical variant occurs here. Instead of the standard spelling θάλασσαν, the scribe writes this word with a double lambda, i.e. θάλλασσαν. This error is noted by most editions of the Greek text,\textsuperscript{1006} or commentaries based upon the Greek of the Akhmím text.\textsuperscript{1007} Robinson corrects the text to the standard lexical form without any comment.\textsuperscript{1008}

5. This final use of the title κύριος, which occurs thirteen times in the narrative, presents an otherwise unattested feature. Here the word occurs anarthrously, where on every other occasion it has been preceded by the definite article.\textsuperscript{1009} This has led most commentators to suggest the conjectural emendation of inserting a definite article before the noun. Although Swete does not correct the text, he does note that both Robinson and Zahn make such a correction.\textsuperscript{1010}

\textbf{Commentary}

14.58a ἦν δὲ τελευταία ᾑμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων. The author’s fondness for temporal markers throughout the narrative has been noted. This is the last such indication that is provided in the extant portion of text. The period of time that has elapsed between the previous scene and this one may be the largest temporal transition in the text, however, there are two differing understandings of what this temporal notice is representing for the author. The first possibility is that

\textsuperscript{1002} Swete, \textit{The Akhmim Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St Peter}, 23.
\textsuperscript{1003} Vaganay, \textit{L’Évangile de Pierre}, 337.
\textsuperscript{1004} See text critical note 3 in the section dealing with Gos. Pet. 12.50, 54.
\textsuperscript{1005} Caragounis, \textit{The Development of Greek and the New Testament}, 500.
\textsuperscript{1006} See Swete, \textit{The Akhmim Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St Peter}, 24;
\textsuperscript{1007} Vaganay, \textit{L’Évangile de Pierre}, 339; Mara, \textit{Évangile de Pierre}, 66.
\textsuperscript{1008} Robinson and James, \textit{The Gospel according to Peter and the Revelation of Peter}, 88.
\textsuperscript{1009} Vaganay also observes this phenomenon, ‘Le mot κύριος a d’ailleurs toujours [except here!] l’article dans notre fragment.’ Vaganay, \textit{L’Évangile de Pierre}, 340.
\textsuperscript{1010} Swete, \textit{The Akhmim Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St Peter}, 24.