

one single clergyman ignored the summons, 'and only one is absent for a reason which I cannot regard as a sufficient excuse.' The Charge then delivered has now been published. Its title is *The Church and the Clergy at this Time of War*, by Cosmo Gordon Lang, D.D., D.C.L., Archbishop of York (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net). It consists of three short practical, well-pressed-home addresses on Repentance, Renewal, and Rebuilding.

The Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham, has issued a small volume of 'Thoughts for Stricken Hearts,' under the title of *Christ and Sorrow* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net). Near the end of the book he says: 'I have in my mind's eye a little Parable of Consolation. It consists of an old book-marker, once belonging to my dear mother, and very precious now to me her son. A text is worked on it, in blue silk on the pierced card. A few years ago I found it in a book, after having long lost sight of it. I saw first its "wrong side"; and that was just an unmeaning tangle of confused and crossing threads. Then I turned it round. On the "right side," in beautifully clear letters, *produced by the tangled stitches*, I read these three deep, glorious, eternal words, GOD IS LOVE.' The publishers have made a clever use of this thought. The paper just inside the cover at the beginning shows the wrong side of the book-marker, the paper at the end shows the right side.

The whole process of *Reconciliation between God and Man* has been described by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D., in a book which he has published with that title (S.P.C.K.; 3s. net). Dr. Sparrow-Simpson begins with the Incarnation and ends with the Perpetual Offering of Christ. Between these, as the great operative fact, he places the Death of Christ. And he has no hesitation in saying that it is the Death, and not either the Incarnation or the Perpetual Offering, that is the central reconciling fact. But his object is to show that you ought not to isolate the act of Death and call it everything. If an Incarnate Christ who did not die would have served nothing for reconciliation, so also a dying Christ who was not pre-existent would have been of no avail.

We are glad that Dr. Sparrow-Simpson has used the word Reconciliation. It is a good word which has fallen out of favour. It has a definite and necessary place. Smaller than Salvation, it is larger than Atonement. The end is Peace, the means to the end is best expressed by Reconciliation.

In *The Glory of the Life Laid Down* (Stock; 2s. 6d. net) the Rev. J. K. Swinburne, B.A., Vicar of Shifnal, has sent out some words of comfort for those in sorrow. The little book contains eight addresses, each address a proof that there is no consolation better than that which is found in the Word.

## The Denials of Peter.

BY SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., LITT.D., D.D., EDINBURGH.

### II. THE HIGH PRIEST ANNAS.

WHEN Jesus was brought into Jerusalem there was still a long time to pass before daylight began. This interval had to be spent somehow, and although the party which had arrested Jesus 'led him away to *appear before Caiaphas as judge*,<sup>1</sup> they had to wait until the hour when Caiaphas could take his seat in the High Council for this purpose. John explains the whole situation: 'they seized Jesus and bound him, and led him to be judged by Annas in the first place'—implying that there was in their mind a further destination,

<sup>1</sup> Mt 26<sup>67</sup>.

and so not disagreeing with Matthew, who says, 'they led Jesus away to be tried before Caiaphas.'

Matthew refers to the proper and official trial before the High Council with Caiaphas presiding. The informal investigation before Annas was lost from the common tradition.

In the Revised Version that critical verse of Mt 26<sup>67</sup> is translated, 'they led him away to *the house of Caiaphas*.' This is impossible, for in Greek the preposition *πρός* with the accusative of a personal name cannot mean 'to the house of that person'; but it is technical and idiomatic in the sense of 'to appear before a person as judge in a court of justice,' and this is what is meant in this

place.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Moffatt, in his 'New Translation,' follows the error of the Revisers, although the Authorized Version is right.

The practically universal opinion among scholars, however, is that there is at this point a difference between John and the three Synoptic Gospels; and that the latter unanimously describe Jesus as having been led to the house of Caiaphas. Yet John was an acquaintance of the high priest, and must have known the exact situation.

Doubt, however, has been expressed by Westcott and others whether the scene of the first investigation and of Peter's denials occurred in the house of Annas or in that of Caiaphas, and reasons are set forth in order to prove that there is doubt, and that perhaps John may be understood in the same sense as Mark. I can see no reasonable ground for doubt. Take the statements in order: (1) In John 18<sup>13</sup> Jesus is led away to appear before Annas in the first place; this implies a first investigation, unofficial (because Caiaphas, not Annas, is the official high priest), preliminary to the proper trial before the Council, where Caiaphas would preside.

(2) Then follow the two scenes in question (18<sup>15-23</sup>), in the house of a person who bears the title of high priest (the reason for which is explained by Luke 3<sup>2</sup> and Acts 4<sup>6</sup>).

(3) After this preliminary investigation, 'Annas therefore sent Jesus, bound as he was, to *appear before Caiaphas*' (15<sup>24</sup>). As the result of the trial in his own house, Annas sends the prisoner to Caiaphas for the proper official trial. Then follows the official trial before the Council (which John does not describe, for a reason that will be stated after examination of the circumstances).

(4) After this scene 'they lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas to the official quarters of the Roman governor' (whose confirmation of the Council's capital sentence was needed before it could become effective) (18<sup>28</sup>).

It seems positively irrational to take John to mean that Caiaphas presided both in stage (2) and stage (3), and that, after starting to take Jesus to Annas, they delivered Him before Caiaphas for some unstated reason, and that then Annas reappears and sends Jesus to Caiaphas, when Caiaphas

had just been presiding at the trial of His case. The sole reason for mentioning that Jesus was conducted in the first place before Annas is that He was so conducted, and that Annas then sent Him to be officially judged by Caiaphas [in the second place]. So John says; and, in the face of Luke 3<sup>2</sup>, arguments about the applicability of the title high priest to Annas are beside the mark.

It is clear that Annas had been taking a keen interest in this matter, and with his servants had been engaged in arresting Jesus. He was one of the leading figures in the party of the Sadducees, and his dignity was consulted by leading Jesus before him and holding a sort of preliminary examination which was not official, but in which the feelings and the hatred and even the curiosity of the opponents of Jesus found scope. Those who joined in the arrest were now waiting in the house of the high priest (Mt 26<sup>57</sup>). Mk 14<sup>53</sup> says that the chief priests and the elders and the scribes entered the house along with him. The statement seems strange in Mark's narrative; but it becomes natural when we remember Luke's assertion that they had been present at the arrest. They it was to whom the Tribune gave the prisoner in charge.

It is clear that in all the four narratives there occurred two examinations before bodies of Jews. The second of these is described very briefly in Mt 27<sup>1</sup>, Mk 15<sup>1</sup>, and at greater length in Lk 22<sup>66-71</sup>. That these three passages refer to the same proceedings is clearly marked by the time. Each of the three writers mentions that the action occurred about sunrise. This must be the formal meeting of the Sanhedrim which was held officially to examine the accused and to decide whether or not He should be sent up for trial before the Roman Governor, and, if so, upon what charge the trial should be made. That this is the proper time for a meeting of the High Council is established, if I may quote in evidence a statement which I cannot verify: 'according to the report of Jose Ben Chalaftha it held its sittings from the time of the offering of the daily morning sacrifice.'

The preliminary examination before Annas was, therefore, in keeping with the outrages in the proceedings generally. We may suppose that, when Annas (Jn 18-19) asked Jesus about His disciples and His teaching, he may have been actuated by curiosity and so put an unofficial question, but he had no right to examine the prisoner officially, and the action of an officer in

<sup>1</sup> In Ac 11<sup>8</sup> the meaning 'into the house of' is admitted by some (e.g. Souter's new and excellent *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek N.T.*, though he tacitly rejects it in Mt 26<sup>57</sup>): the meaning there is 'into the society of.'

striking the prisoner in his house had no justification. Annas held no official position before the law: he was only a private citizen who possessed great influence and dignity because he had formerly been high priest, and was considered by his own people to have been unjustly and illegally removed from that position. In his own household he was still spoken of as 'the high priest' (Jn 18<sup>19</sup>), and probably this courtesy was generally accorded to him in the city;<sup>1</sup> but it gave no legal power; there could not be two high priests, and Caiaphas his son-in-law was the high priest in law and fact. Yet this informal and really illegal trial before Annas was, in a sense, 'a preliminary trial,' as John expressly says.

It is, however, evident that the memory of Annas was lost in the popular tradition of the Jerusalem congregation, and that 'the high priest' was generally understood to be Caiaphas, when any name was given to him in the story as usually told in the Jewish Christian families there. Mark, who gives the congregational tradition in its most simple and unadorned fashion,<sup>2</sup> never mentions Caiaphas, but speaks simply of the high priest. Matthew mentions him twice by name, and in a different connexion (26<sup>3</sup>) speaks of 'the courtyard of Caiaphas the high priest.' There can therefore be little doubt that they both thought of Caiaphas in connexion with the trial of Jesus. Luke, however, had the instinct of the historian and the Greek for fact and exact truth; and he discovered and recorded that there were two high priests at this time, of whom he always mentions Annas first (Lk 3<sup>2</sup>, Ac 4<sup>6</sup>); in one case he speaks of 'Annas the high priest and Caiaphas,' but he never names Caiaphas alone as high priest. It is therefore quite fair to interpret him as asserting that Jesus 'was brought into the house of the high priest' Annas, thus confirming expressly the statement of John. Those who consider, as I do, that Luke's history is composed with extraordinary care for the minute details which in different parts of his narrative work into one another, will be disposed to conjecture that there is good reason why he mentions two high priests in 3<sup>2</sup>, and that in some other part of his narrative, viz. here, the

<sup>1</sup> This general custom leads Lk 3<sup>2</sup> to say, in his brief style, that the high priests at this time were Annas and Caiaphas.

<sup>2</sup> That Mark gives here, not the direct narrative of Peter (as Papias and others say about his Gospel), but the common tradition in the earliest Church at Jerusalem, will become more and more clear as the investigation proceeds. I do not assert that this is universal, only that it appears to be so in this episode.

term high priest should be understood accordingly. That this is his meaning will be shown later.

The official meeting of the Council is also alluded to by John in a few words (vv. 24, 38). Before this official meeting it is agreed by all the evangelists that another gathering had occurred in the house of the high priest, and that this gathering finished at cock-crow; while it was going on the denials of Peter were taking place at intervals in the courtyard outside that meeting.

I would go so far as to maintain that there is no authority for supposing that Jesus was ever in the house of Caiaphas that morning. He was led from the house of Annas to the hall where the Council met, wherever that was. But the case for Caiaphas has been so universally accepted that it must be examined further.

To us it would appear strange that a judge shortly before the trial at which he was to preside began, should bring into his house and hold conversation with a person whom he was about to try on a criminal charge, and on whom he was to allow physical outrage to be inflicted. Such conduct on the part of a judge would be condemned as unbecoming and wrong. I once was witness of such a situation in Scotland, where one party in a case was by mischance introduced to the judge who was to preside half an hour before the case was fixed to begin. The judge broke off the conversation the moment that he heard the name, and afterwards he said that it was the most awkward thing which had happened to him in his whole legal experience.

If such be the feeling among us, a feeling obviously founded on right perception of justice and equity, why should we think that the Jews were devoid of such perception of natural fairness? Why should we take it as a matter of course that the president of the supreme Jewish court would allow an accused person to be brought to his house in the night, and would see and converse with him, and look on while the accused was actually struck in the face? If this were recorded, we should have to accept the fact; but, when there is no clear record and a clear contradiction of it, we may set it aside. Annas indeed did it; but evidently he was playing fast and loose with his authority as titular high priest. This was a trial that was held in his house, and yet it was not a trial, according to circumstances.

Further examination of the circumstances shows positively that John is correct, and that Luke

positively confirms him, and that a series of false statements about Jewish custom have been invented and circulated in order to explain how that which never happened did happen. The false statements probably made their appearance at first as hypotheses to account for a supposed but strange fact. Then they were repeated, because they are found in the pages of great scholars, and the hypothetical character was forgotten, and they masquerade as truth. Thus, for example, it is often said that the high priest had an official residence in the Temple enclosure, that the High Council met in his house, and that Annas lived with his son-in-law Caiaphas. Another statement is that Annas and Caiaphas lived in houses adjoining each other, with a common courtyard. These are in origin mere hypotheses concocted to explain why John speaks of the house of Annas here; but they have no foundation, and most of them are demonstrably impossible. Yet from hypotheses they have passed into the learning of the schools, and are laid down as facts in some meritorious and otherwise useful books. I quote one example of the conveyance of these false hypotheses, and the dissemination of mere conjecture as fact: 'The High Priest's house: this was in the Temple enclosure, where, according to Jn 18<sup>12-24</sup>, Annas lived with his son-in-law Caiaphas.' Such transference of errors from book to book is a fruitful source of further error: the next stage is to resort to 'emendation' of the text, or to transposition of the parts, or to rejection of some verses, in order to cure the ills that have been introduced into the Gospels by our own false interpretation of them.

Again, if Annas had no part in the action, it may be asked how John came to make such an error as to bring him into it. No explanation is obvious. On the other hand it is easy to see why his part in the action, if he had any, might have been forgotten or ignored as being unofficial.

It is apparent that either Mark and Matthew have mixed up the meeting of the Council with the assemblage 'in the house of the high priest,' or (as is more probable, confirming John's expression *πρὸς Ἀνναν*, 'to be judged by Annas') the proceedings in the house of Annas were modelled on the procedure of the Sanhedrim. The trial, which was finished by cock-crow, could not possibly be a meeting of the Sanhedrim, which did not sit before sunrise: yet both Mark and Matthew speak of it as 'the chief priests and the whole

council,' and describe the calling of witnesses, and how 'they all condemned him to be worthy of death.' These same writers, however, describe how the Council met to discuss the case at sunrise, agreeing in this with Luke and John. The proceedings at this proper meeting of the Council are not reported by any one except Luke. John does not report it for a reason which will be stated in a later section. Matthew and Mark did not do so, because they had already given a report of similar proceedings as occurring elsewhere before cock-crow.

The belief that Jesus was conducted to the house of Caiaphas then rests on a mistranslation of Matthew and a misinterpretation of Luke, while it flatly contradicts John; yet it apparently must be regarded as belonging to the common tradition in the early Jerusalem Church, until it was expressly corrected by John. Luke avoided falling into it, but did not expressly contradict it. He describes the proceedings of the Jewish Council, where Jesus was condemned, as occurring at sunrise; and he reports nothing about the action 'in the house of the high priest before cock-crow,' except that Jesus was ill-treated there,<sup>1</sup> and that afterwards He was led to the High Council when day was come.

We can now arrange with the highest confidence the exact sequence and almost the hours of the action. Jesus was arrested in the early morning, say about 2 o'clock. He reached the house of Annas before 4 o'clock. Some or many of those who had made the arrest were servants of Annas; and in this house, as being for some reason more convenient, Jesus was detained for about an hour (Luke gives the estimate of time). By that time the hour of meeting of the Council was at hand, and Caiaphas was ready to take his seat as president. Jesus was led to the Council Hall, and there began the trial which is described in Mt 27<sup>1</sup>, Mk 15<sup>1</sup>, and more fully in Lk 22<sup>66-71</sup>: this scene is entirely omitted by John, though its occurrence is clearly indicated in 18<sup>24</sup> and 18<sup>28</sup>. Thence He was led to the Prætorium of the Procurator Pilate about 7 A.M. The trial with the incidents accompanying it lasted till about 12 noon. Then He was taken away to be crucified outside the city. The Synoptists' statement of time (Mt 27<sup>45</sup>, Mk 15<sup>38</sup>, Lk 23<sup>44</sup>) must be taken as a vague estimate current in the tradition, whereas John is accurate, as was said above.

<sup>1</sup> I assume that Lk 22<sup>63-65</sup> describes this scene in the house of Annas.