

holy will and work. This was perfectly and entirely the experience of Jesus Christ, because He alone of mankind gave Himself perfectly and entirely to the will of God and the love of men. And all those to the latest time who in spite of their failures and shortcomings, their sins and backslidings, try to endure in His Spirit and to share in His redeeming work, are filling up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ. Let us follow the Sign.

'Christ leads us through no darker rooms  
Than He went through before;  
And he who to God's Kingdom comes  
Must enter by this door.'

#### A Johnson Calendar.

*The Johnson Calendar* (Clarendon Press; 2s. net) is a very clever piece of work. It contains a quotation from the Life and Writings of Samuel Johnson for every day in the year. And such is the range and such the skill of choice that it will

be profitable as well as pleasant to have this much of Samuel Johnson every morning throughout the whole year. The editor, Mr. Alexander Montgomerie Bell, has scrupulously given the source of each quotation, and has added an occasional note from other sources. Take one quotation, from Mrs. Piozzi's *Anecdotes*:

'COME OUT AS I DO, AND BARK.'

As he liberally confessed that all his own disappointments proceeded from himself, he hated to hear others complain of general injustice. I remember when lamentation was made of the neglect shewed to Jeremiah Markland, a great philologist as some one ventured to call him—'He is a scholar undoubtedly, Sir (replied Dr. Johnson), but remember that he would run from the world, and that it is not the world's business to run after him. I hate a fellow whom pride, or cowardice, or laziness drives into a corner, and does nothing when he is there but sit and *growl*; let him come out as I do, and *bark*.'

## The Denials of Peter.

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

### V. THE PROPHECY OF JESUS ABOUT PETER'S DENIAL.

THAT Peter would deny his Master was foreseen and predicted by the latter. The prophecy (or perhaps the forecast of what Jesus saw in Peter's nature) throws some light on the fulfilment; and the occasion of the prophecy must be carefully examined. The examination takes us back into the earliest days of the little assembly at Jerusalem. The tale of Peter was famous from the first day, and was discussed in every group of Christians. The exact facts were settled by comparison. The meaning was canvassed: what did the mysterious words of Jesus hint at? As the days passed their meaning was established. The story, as Mark records it, is the tale that fixed itself in the memory of the first congregation. It takes us back to the beginning of things, and is a witness to the mind of the earliest Christians in the earliest days after the Crucifixion.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The idea that Mark wrote the Gospel as Peter knew it, taking it from Peter's lips (the account in Eusebius, *H.E.* iii.

We have then to attempt to establish what Jesus in this prophecy seemed to the disciples to have in mind; but they thought differently at different times. They knew afterwards that they did not understand His words at the time they were spoken. They perceived later the meaning that lay in them; but, moreover, they did not suddenly attain to a right understanding. They made tentatives; and they even came sometimes to wrong interpretations, which lasted for a time. This is perhaps the most important result which emerges from the present study: it is not a study of illusions and fancies; it is a study of the progress of human souls towards better comprehension of facts and truth.<sup>2</sup>

39, from Papias), seems not to be justified by the character of the Gospel according to Mark. This is the Church's first Gospel, and gives the Church's earliest belief about facts. In this lies its transcendent value. Luke knows it, and sometimes improves, or at least alters, it in reliance on some specially authoritative individual.

<sup>2</sup> The idea often occurs in the Gospels, 'their eyes were holden that they should not know him' (Lk 24<sup>16</sup>, Jn 20<sup>14</sup> 21<sup>4</sup>).

What was the intention and significance of Jesus' words? What did the disciples understand at the time? When and how did they come to understand? The prophecy about Peter was coupled with a certain intimation of departure, reported by different authorities at greater or lesser length and with different signification. What was its bearing? What were the words? The Gospels vary a good deal, both in regard to the words of the prophecy, and still more in respect of the conversation which preceded and followed it.

There is in this matter a difference of record. Mark places the departure of Judas before the rite: Luke puts it after, but tells little about Judas. Luke must be followed in this order. One cannot imagine that the presence of Judas at the rite was wrongly introduced, but one can easily see that the early Church shrank from the thought that the betrayer took part in it, for the early Church at that stage did not understand: the presence of Judas seemed unbecoming. Apparently Jesus intentionally allowed Judas the fullest opportunity to repent or to condemn himself.

That Judas was present at that first sacrament might be inferred also from the remarkable words of Paul (1 Co 11<sup>27</sup>), 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat . . . or drink . . . unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord': such a one shall be involved in the same crime as Judas. He is betraying the Lord as Judas betrayed Him if he takes part unworthily in this commemoration of the Body and the Blood of the Saviour and 'proclaims the Lord's death.' I cannot believe that Paul would have expressed himself thus, unless there had been before his mind the historic case of the unworthy partaker of the first Eucharist. Judas condemned himself, when he failed to use the last and final opportunity to prove himself and to repent and to make himself worthy. There is in all these narratives the feeling that the betrayal was aggravated in guilt and made more hateful by the pretence of brotherhood and fellowship that preceded it. Jesus brought this pretence into higher prominence by giving Judas the sop: it is a special compliment at an Oriental meal to offer one guest a titbit. As Judas ate the sop, accepting the compliment, 'Satan entered into him.'<sup>1</sup> By

<sup>1</sup> John's account is to be preferred, correcting Mark and Matthew; Luke omits the incident, possibly feeling uncertain.

this crowning infamy he delivered himself over to the Power of Evil. Moreover, Paul says that just as Judas had died unable to support the burden of guilt, so some that partook unworthily of the Sacrament had already died: their guilt had killed them. This passage, 1 Co 11<sup>30</sup>, must be read in conjunction with 1 Co 5<sup>5</sup> and 1 Ti 1<sup>20</sup>. The two latter, indeed, describe a curse uttered by Paul; but the Apostle only brings into operation the natural and divine law that crime works out its own punishment, the law by which Judas suffered. It is not Paul's power that chastises in those cases; it is the law of God that punishes, and the moral forces of nature that operate. Accordingly these three passages can be, and ought to be, used in illustration of one another.

According to Jn 22<sup>36f.</sup> the forecast occurred at the supper. Peter caught up an expression of Jesus that He was on the point of departing, and that the disciples could not follow Him, and declared his readiness to die with his Lord. In answer to him the forecast was spoken. Then John adds a long exposition of what was meant by the expression of Jesus, that He was on the point of going away. It had been misinterpreted by Mark (reproducing the early Church tradition), as referring to His going away into Galilee after the Resurrection.<sup>2</sup> The discourse in which John expounds the real meaning, namely, that Jesus is departing to prepare a place for them, is not to be taken as a verbatim reproduction of a discourse spoken at this supper. It conveys John's impression regarding the general spirit of the Saviour's teaching; and probably contains much that was characteristic of His teaching on other occasions. In his Gospel John deals with only a few episodes in the life of Jesus, wonderfully few when they are counted up; and the whole gist of His teaching, *i.e.* all that John has to record of it, is compressed into those few situations. This whole discourse is reported here, because it suits the occasion spiritually.

If John is to be followed, the saying of Jesus partakes more of the nature of a prophecy: before the testing period of the coming daylight has begun, Peter will have failed.

<sup>2</sup> 'After I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee' (Mk 14<sup>28</sup>, Mt 26<sup>32</sup>). That the Lord spoke of going away (as John says) is established by the tradition in Mark. Luke's report is less accurate verbally; but 22<sup>36f.</sup> show that going away was mentioned.

Mark alone speaks of the cock crowing 'twice.' Perhaps the word 'twice' might have dropped from the story, for Oriental apologue clings to the moral, and aims at emphasizing it, and loses hold of what is not essential. But (1) this would not explain why the account of the witness John does not contain the word 'twice': especially if we believe (as the present writer does) that John knew the Gospels at least of Luke and Mark, and wrote accordingly. (2) It would also not explain why Luke and Matthew, who admittedly used the Gospel of Mark as a fundamental authority, cut out the word 'twice': they possessed evidence which led them to omit that word. On the other hand, in a story circulating in the congregation, it would be not improbable that the rhyme 'twice, thrice' (δύς . . . τρίς) should impose itself as making the story effective; the rhyme was perhaps introduced into the popular story, and so Mark heard and wrote it; but the other authorities corrected him.

The weight of evidence, therefore, is in favour of John, and against Mark. But the difference is slight; and the really important thing is that, whichever form is correct, the prophecy or forecast was exactly fulfilled.

Mark, followed by Matthew, seems to place this prophecy, or rather this forecast of the action to which Peter's youth and his impulsive nature would be sure to carry him, in the interval between leaving the supper-room and arriving at the garden. Mark's account, however, is not inconsistent with the supposition that the forecast was spoken at the moment of starting and before actually leaving the house of the supper. If that be so, then according to the early Church oral tradition (which Mark preserves best) the conversation which led to the forecast would be associated with the first move to go forth from the house and to begin this new and great undertaking. Consideration of the circumstances shows that this must have been so. Little conversation would be possible during the dark night-walk<sup>1</sup> from the supper-room through the narrow Oriental streets and down the steep and narrow road to the Kidron and across the stream to Gethsemane; and the conversation could not possibly be general.<sup>2</sup> Any one who has traversed the way down to the

Kidron<sup>3</sup> knows this. We must therefore infer from Mark that the fateful words of Jesus were spoken just before the company went forth into the night.

Luke, on the other hand, with the account given by Mark in his hands, follows an authority which he ranks very high, and distinctly places the forecast of Jesus immediately before they went out of the house. He appends to it some instruction about the kind of preparation that is required for this new enterprise. This is practically the same occasion as Mark has in mind: the company has been warned by the Master that some new undertaking is on hand, it is thinking of starting and is making ready, but has not actually gone out into the night, where they would have to walk in separate small groups. Whether the verb 'they went forth' comes before (Mk., Mt.), or after (Lk.), the forecast is a detail of small consequence; but, as Luke preferred on full examination to make this slight modification of Mark's narrative, we follow him without hesitation.

It may be confidently assumed that the steep and stony footpath which leads down to the Kidron from St. Stephen's Gate is the sort of path by which people descended in the time of Christ. The glen was regarded as unclean; and it was probably this reputation which made Gethsemane and the Mount of Olives a district where Jesus could find privacy and quiet nights so close to the city.<sup>4</sup> It was probably because the glen of the Kidron lay outside the thoughts of men, that the chief priests had to corrupt one of the disciples in order to find out that Jesus usually spent the night there. His days were spent in the full view of men, but He was lost at night. To reach this deep gorge, 385 feet below the Temple area, it is not probable that a well-constructed road like the new modern one, which goes off to the left from the old footpath, existed at the time when the valley was considered unclean. The martyrdom of Stephen is said to have taken place at the point where the old road and the new

<sup>3</sup> I was one of a party numbering about a dozen who went down this road together. In order to talk it would have been necessary to stop the walk for a time, and gather at some point. The theory of general conversation on such a walk is absurd; even more so if the company was listening to a discourse.

<sup>4</sup> On the bearing of this love for the Mount of Olives on the habits of Jesus at Jerusalem, see *The Education of Christ*, pp. 38, 73 ff.

<sup>1</sup> On the darkness, even at full moon, see section II.

<sup>2</sup> Westcott assumes that Jn 15. 16 were spoken during the walk from the house to the Kidron.

re-unite.<sup>1</sup> It was for a purpose like this that the Jews went down to the Kidron; and in ordinary circumstances Jesus might count on finding solitude at Gethsemane, a little way up the steep eastern bank of the gorge, rising to the Mount of Olives.

The occasion of this forecast or prophecy, according to the tradition enshrined in Mark, was that Jesus warned the disciples of the disaster to which they would be exposed during the present night: they would be scattered far and wide. This warning evidently must have been spoken before they actually started from the house: its terms relate to the inception of the new enterprise. Jesus explains that He will go away, and that later they will be re-united with Him. This comforting prophecy is not rightly interpreted in Mark, 'Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee': and John corrects the error; Jesus was going away to prepare for the reunion in a better place.<sup>2</sup> This is one of the many occasions when the disciples recognized in later years that at the time they had not caught the right meaning of the Master's words, but there is hardly any other case where the wrong interpretation stands in the Gospels unnoted.<sup>3</sup> The reason is here that Mark caught and preserved the Church tradition at an extremely early time. The story had already taken form within a few days of the event. The whole Church in Jerusalem was speaking of the forecast, and general consent imposed the form. This form belongs to the time when the Christians in Jerusalem had just begun to hear that Jesus had gone away into Galilee. It is not so late as the Ascension, for after that event there could no longer be any possibility of misunderstanding the words of Jesus about His departure. But, when the tale of Peter was in daily discussion, the news reached Jerusalem that Jesus had appeared in Galilee; then it appeared to all that this was the meaning of His words, 'I go to prepare a place for you'; and so the form was fixed, 'I will go before you into Galilee.' Whence once the popular version in the Church at Jerusalem had been stereotyped, the form remained as fixed as the Church itself.

<sup>1</sup> Kennedy in Hastings' *D.B.*, Baedeker, and personal observation of the steep path, are the authorities in this paragraph.

<sup>2</sup>Jn 13<sup>36</sup> 14<sup>21</sup>: it is instructive to compare Mark's brief note with John's long account of the words used.

<sup>3</sup>Generally there is a warning expressed about the failure of the disciples to see the truth at the moment.

The conversation about going away naturally arose after the departure of Judas from the supper-room, and accompanied the preparation of the disciples to go forth into the night and the street. Judas had remained to the last, till he was actually ordered out of the room. He partook of the meal along with his victim: he had his feet washed by his Master: he took part in the rite which was ever after to be done 'in remembrance of me': he was specially complimented, like an honoured guest, by receiving from the hands of Jesus a chosen morsel, which the Master dipped in the dish and gave to him.<sup>4</sup>

Some commentators attempt to determine the hour of cock-crowing from the Roman system of night-watches. This is a characteristically German method.<sup>5</sup> We, however, should not go to the Romans to learn what cock-crow means, but rather should take the habits of cocks as a guide in the difficult matter of understanding the Roman *vigilæ*, which moderns often quote without knowing how difficult the matter is; a certain amount of inaccurate knowledge passes down from hand to hand; but the ancient divisions of time are obscure, because they were loose.

The speculations of commentators as to the

<sup>4</sup>Jn 13<sup>27-30</sup>, Lk 22<sup>21</sup> (the Fourth Gospel omits the institution of the Sacrament, which is to be placed at 13<sup>1</sup>). The account of John is to be preferred to the others. The latter describe the act as a simultaneous dipping in the dish by the people who partook of the meal. All ate in Eastern fashion from one dish placed in the centre of the circle. At the end the guests mop up the liquid remnants of the food with their bread, and eat the sop which each has in hand. Our view is that the Eucharist and 'the cup after supper' were both finished, and that, as John says, this was a special act of grace and courtesy. Jesus took a last piece of bread, dipped it in the dish, and presented it to Judas. In Western custom the action has no special significance and could not occur, for it is alien to table etiquette; but in Oriental custom it was natural and possible as a special mark of honour to the chief guest.

<sup>5</sup>A German scholar, for example, Chambalu, in *Philologus*, xliv., publishes an elaborate study of the visit of Vespasian to Egypt in 69 A.D. There was an exceptionally high Nile while he was there, and this scholar elicits from Pliny that high Nile takes place in July; and as Vespasian went to Egypt in autumn 69, it follows that he remained there till July 70. This would revolutionize the chronology of the period. Any modern authority on Nile-rising, even the familiar Baedeker, would give the information that Vespasian coming to Egypt in the autumn of 69, would soon after he arrived have the opportunity of seeing a specially high Nile flood in October of that year. The highest floods occur late: the Nile rises rapidly 20th-30th July, but is not at its highest then. Yet this dissertation is still quoted as an authority.

time and manner of cock-crow, usually founded on some misinterpretation of Roman usage, are misleading. Apropos of Mark, who makes Jesus speak of the cock crowing twice, one scholar gathers from the Roman custom in night-watches and divisions of time that 'the first cock-crowing, less certain than the second, might be about midnight: the second towards 3 A.M.'

It is best to go to nature and to popular usage (for cock-crow is really a conventional term arbitrarily applied). A cock may crow at almost any hour. (For this I can vouch, as I have lain awake during hundreds of Asian nights, and often thought of Peter as the cocks crew.) Also in early March 1916, I spent a week beside a poultry yard near London, and heard crowing at any time between 2 and 5.15 A.M. There is, however, a special chorus, usually just before the first gleam of light, but varying in fact by nearly an hour on two successive days, as I have noticed. Probably the first of the chorus becomes sensible of the approach of dawn, and proclaims the fact: the others take up the cry, if it is not too early. There is, thus, a series of isolated crowings, at long intervals, and at last a real chorus; and later comes the dawn of light. This chorus is what the ancients mean by cock-crow. It takes place at night, and yet it is closely associated with the first appearance of dim light.

Cicero was a very early riser. He often speaks of writing letters to his friends at night, by which he means the period before the dawn. He therefore knew the facts; and he says, 'There is no time, whether of night or day, that cocks do not crow.'<sup>1</sup> It was not mere chance crowing that made the bird so important in domestic life, and in the theory of omens. His name in Greek, Alektryon, implies high rank; four syllables carry dignity. He played the part of a clock in an early time when there were no clocks. He intimated the time at night, when it is hard to guess the lapse of time. By day one had the sun as a measure; by night primitive society was dependent on the cock.

There was one cock-crow that was fairly regular. All others were fortuitous. Before the first peep of dawn the crowing of the cock came as a herald of the light. The night was still dark when the cock intimated to all that it was time for active people to be stirring; and religion and folklore set a high value on him.

<sup>1</sup> *De Div.* ii. 26, 54.

The period from midnight to cock-crowing, which is said to be the third Roman watch, is a popular description of the latter part of night, the time when ghosts of the dead are allowed to wander: they must be back in their place before the light begins, and cock-crow is the signal for their departure; as in the ballad of the 'Wife of Usher's Well,'

The cock doth crow, the day doth daw.

Unless they depart at the first sound they will be missed out of their place. There is here no thought of odd crowings at uncertain intervals of the night. There is only the one crowing, and no other, that serves as a mark of time. A critical mind like Cicero's, trained to comparative exactness in such matters (though not to modern standards of precision), found that cock-crow was an unsatisfactory indication of the lapse of time, because a cock might crow at any hour; but popular belief regarded cock-crowing as a definite and single mark of time. Browning, also, connects the crowing with dawn:

'till cock-crow,  
Look out if yonder be not day again  
Rimming the rockrow.'

But the ancients associate the note of the cock with night rather than with day (so both Horace, *Sat.* i. i. 10, and Martial, *Ep.* ix. 70); for the Romans habitually spoke of the last moments before the first dawn of light as night-time.

Cock-crow is not to be understood simply as a mere chance crowing: it is a rough popular estimate of a certain point in the progress of night. There was only one 'cock-crow' in the twenty-four hours, namely, that moment near the dawn. Before that moment arrives, Peter will have failed.

What, then, is to be made of Mark's account, which speaks of the second cock-crow as the fateful term? This would have to be understood as the second morning. It would imply that the whole of the coming period of daylight, when the trial would take place, was left open: *i.e.*, as it was now about 8 or 9 P.M. on Thursday, the prophecy extends the time until 4 or 5 A.M. on Saturday. If the saying of Jesus is to be understood as a forecast of what Peter was likely to do, then Mark is probably right. Jesus knew the impulsive nature of Peter, and dreaded lest he should fail in the test of the day that had just begun. The most

testing period would be likely to begin only after the first cock-crow, at the trial and death of the Lord.

The following is a rough attempt to restore the incidents in this part of the story from the four Evangelists; and it will be seen that John and Mark must be taken here as fundamental. A few additions needed to connect the parts are put in square brackets:—

John	[After the institution of the Lord's Supper as a rite to be done in the Church and the departure of Judas from the supper], Jesus saith . . . 'Whither I go ye cannot come' . . . Simon Peter saith unto Him, 'Lord, whither goest thou?' Jesus answered, 'Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow afterwards. Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren. Yet
Luke	[After the institution of the Lord's Supper as a rite to be done in the Church and the departure of Judas from the supper], Jesus saith . . . 'Whither I go ye cannot come' . . . Simon Peter saith unto Him, 'Lord, whither goest thou?' Jesus answered, 'Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow afterwards. Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren. Yet

Mt., Mk.	I will go before you to prepare for you.' Peter saith unto Him, 'Lord, why cannot I follow thee even now?' [And in like manner the rest all said they would follow Him], and Jesus saith unto them, 'All ye shall be offended (in me this night, <i>Mt.</i> ), for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad.' [And Peter said], 'I will lay down my life for thee, Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death.' And He said, 'Wilt thou lay down thy life for me? I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow (twice, <i>Mk.</i> ), until thou hast denied me thrice.' But Peter spake exceeding vehemently, 'If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee.' Likewise also said they all. <sup>1</sup>
John Luke	[After the institution of the Lord's Supper as a rite to be done in the Church and the departure of Judas from the supper], Jesus saith . . . 'Whither I go ye cannot come' . . . Simon Peter saith unto Him, 'Lord, whither goest thou?' Jesus answered, 'Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow afterwards. Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren. Yet
Mt., Mk.	I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow (twice, <i>Mk.</i> ), until thou hast denied me thrice.' But Peter spake exceeding vehemently, 'If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee.' Likewise also said they all. <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I omit v.<sup>28(32)</sup> showing the misunderstanding of Christ's words that He was going away. Perhaps *Mk* 14<sup>27</sup>, *Mt* 26<sup>31</sup> should come here, but more probably they follow closer after His reference to going away.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Psalm xliii. 6 and the 'Hound of Heaven.'

It is well known that the expression, 'And I will dwell,' in the sentence, 'And I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever,' is not in the Massoretic Text, which reads *וְשָׁבֹתִי*, 'I will return.' As 'I will return' in this connexion makes little or no sense, the translators of the English versions, following the example of the Vulgate, etc., have emended the text to *וְיִשְׁבְּתִי* ('and I will dwell'), assuming that the initial ' has somehow or other been lost by the scribal copyists.

The accidental omission of a ' is, it may be remarked, a very common phenomenon in Hebrew. It is, however, somewhat rare when, as in this case, it is the first root letter, and when there is not another ' at the end of the preceding word. This in itself would not, of course, be sufficient to make one dispute the correctness of the time-honoured emendation.

Another fact has, however, to be taken into

account. The whole line, with the exception of the conjunction, is quoted or embedded in *Ps* 27<sup>4</sup> (where it is probably a gloss), but the important ' is still amissing. There would therefore appear to be some ground for the suspicion that *שָׁבֹתִי* and not *יִשְׁבְּתִי* was what the Psalmist originally wrote.

The question then arises—what meaning can be assigned to *שָׁבֹתִי*? Here the principles of Hebrew parallelism should help us.

The last two verses of the Psalm form a four-lined stanza made up of two pentameter couplets. The first couplet, which in both lines addresses Jahweh in the second person (He is spoken of in the second couplet in the third person), and is complete in itself, pictures Jahweh as a host with the Psalmist as guest:

Thou prepared a table before me | in the presence of my  
foes  
Thou anointed my head with oil | my cup runneth over.

With the next line, however, the imagery completely changes. Instead of the Psalmist representing himself as a guest, he now comes into the picture