

all, have been slowly changing. A century ago the supreme question relating to that day was—How shall man justify himself before God? Souls of our own day, believing and reverent, often show unconsciously but plainly that for them the centre of interest in eschatology has shifted: it is now the question—How shall God justify Himself before men? how shall He show that all along His administration of His universe has been wise and righteous? It is the preacher's task to show that here also, as in its social aspects, justice is a two-sided thing, and that if we are deeply right in expecting the Judge of all to satisfy our instinct for justice, this very demand on our part may recoil upon ourselves in condemnation if we have failed in righteous dealing towards God and man. If we emphasize the latter side, it is a warning to which the deepest things in nature and life give weight: it makes us tremble in our hope, and turn again from God's righteousness to the gospel of His mercy. But if we preach the former side, as we must sometimes do, it gives us an advent conception real, ethical, and permanent, so that we

can rejoice in our trembling and lift up our heads to look for new heavens and a new earth wherein righteousness shall dwell. Rousseau wrote once in bitter sarcasm to a wealthy and powerful man who had wronged him, 'You belong to a class which relieves you from the necessity of being just,' and human nature on many a flimsy pretext escapes too often from that necessity. Therefore when all is done that can be done along the line of effort and education, we look higher than human nature to bring in the desired consummation. God's day is coming. He Himself is coming, the Just and the Merciful. The souls that realize the meaning of this hope take from it for themselves and for humanity a humble confidence:

Fear not; He made thee dust:

Cling to that sweet word 'Just';

All's well with thee if thou art in Just Hands.

They also learn a grave responsibility,—as the Master said, not to beat their fellow-servants, not to eat and drink with the drunken, but to have lamps lit and loins girt and to be themselves like men who wait for their Lord.

The Denials of Peter.

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

IV. GENERAL FEATURES IN THE SCENE OF THE DENIALS.

It was into the courtyard of a house of this type that Jesus was led somewhere about 3.30 or 4 o'clock on that dark and bleak March morning. He was closely followed to the gate by Peter and John. The Synoptists, indeed, say that Peter followed 'at a distance' (*μακρόθεν*, Lk.; *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*, Mt., Mk.); but there is no real discrepancy between their statement and that of the Fourth Gospel, which says that John entered along with Jesus into the courtyard, and that Peter was standing outside the gate. Both disciples followed separately from one another,¹ and from the guards who were conducting Jesus; but,

although Peter was at a distance, he had to keep near enough to follow the company through the streets; and there occurred a halt somewhere, probably at the outer gate of the house of Annas, when the Roman soldiers handed over the prisoner to the custody of the Jewish leaders and marched away to their barracks in the castle Antonia. There were no Romans at the mock trial in the house of Annas, and no Romans at the legal trial before the official meeting of the High Council which began about sunrise, 6 A.M. This absence led the Synoptists to neglect also their presence at the arrest: in other words, that detail perished from the oral tradition of the early Church in Jerusalem, and only John added it in his Gospel.

During the delays thus caused, Peter came up, and was stopped at the gate by the doorkeeper. She had allowed John to pass because he was a known person in the household; but she stopped Peter, until John, perceiving that Peter had not entered, spoke to her, and induced her to admit

¹ That is suggested (though not proved absolutely) by the Synoptists' silence about John, and it is quite consistent with the expression of the Fourth Gospel; but John when still outside the gate perceived that Peter was there (as will be seen later).

Peter. As John had to go out of the courtyard in order to speak to the gatekeeper,¹ it is evident that the gate was not merely an opening with a door in the wall of the courtyard, but was something distinct and apart: in other words, there was a gateway with a passage and a door at the outer end of the passage, while the gatekeeper had her place in this passage, perhaps in a little porter's chamber. This passage, or whatever exactly it was, is called by Mark *προαύλιον*, and by Matthew (who used Mark) *πυλῶν*.

Jesus was led across the courtyard and up the entrance stairs of the dwelling-house into a large audience chamber, which was the public room, used for receptions and assemblies and in general for conference with visitors. This room looked down over the courtyard:² that is invariable in every Turkish house of this type, so far as I have seen; I have seen hundreds of them in many parts of Asia Minor and a few in Palestine. Annas took his seat at the inner end of the chamber, where he would have received an honoured guest. Jesus, still bound as the Romans had handed Him over to the Jews, stood at the opposite end towards the courtyard, facing towards Annas; but by turning round He could look out over what was being done there. Peter was beneath in the courtyard. John, we cannot doubt, went up to the audience chamber after introducing Peter into the house. His position as one known to the high priest would give him this privilege, but would not entitle a youth like him to a place at the inner end beside Annas. He stood at the outer end near Jesus and His guards.

After the third denial began the maltreatment described in Lk 22⁶³⁻⁶⁵, which went on until about 5.30 A.M. Then Jesus was led away to the High Council, which met at sunrise, about 6 o'clock or a little later.³

It is apparent to the careful reader of Luke that he was conscious of certain analogies between incidents in the life of Jesus and incidents in the

¹ ἐξῆλθεν . . . καὶ εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῶ; A.V. and R.V. both use the term porch in Matthew and in Mark. It is implied, but not named, by John. Luke makes no reference to it.

² καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, Mk 14⁶⁶ (see above, at the beginning of Section III.).

³ We must regretfully abandon the current explanation that Jesus, when He looked at Peter, was being led away through the courtyard, for Luke describes Him as remaining in the house of Annas exposed to ill-treatment for some time after that.

life of Paul. To those which have been mentioned by the present writer elsewhere, he would add the examination before the high priest. In both cases the accused made a statement which was considered by the Jews to be disrespectful to the high priest, and one of the servants in the room struck him. The analogy is not merely superficial, it has a deeper character, and of this, I think, Luke was fully conscious. In each case the high priest is placed in an unbecoming position. In the earlier case he was acting unjustly in so far as he was not officially a high priest, but was pretending to examine the accused before the formal meeting had begun. In the latter case, the high priest was taking his seat as an adviser in the Council as a Roman officer, he was not acting in the fashion that became the high priest of the Jews, but was making himself an instrument in the legal proceedings of a hated alien.

When one reads the two narratives in the Gospel of John and in the Acts, and when one compares Luke with John in respect of the real meaning of the two scenes and the deep analogy which lies between them, then the full consciousness of Luke that this analogy was a true and deep-seated one becomes evident.

Why does not Luke mention this part of the trial of Jesus, if he was conscious of the analogy? The answer touches a most important feature of this subject, that he trusted to general familiarity with the facts.

There are still one or two mistranslations which have affected the interpretation of this narrative in the minds of certain scholars. Dr. Moffatt, in his 'New Translation' of the New Testament, misrepresents the meaning of Jn 18²⁴, which he renders, 'Annas, therefore, had him bound, and sent him to Caiaphas.' The meaning of the three Greek words is 'Annas sent him bound as he was to Caiaphas.' The binding according to John had taken place when Jesus was arrested, and this statement we know to have been inevitably correct. Roman soldiers who arrested a prisoner always bound him, and John, the eye-witness of the scene, says that it was so. Matthew, on the other hand, says, that at the conclusion of the meeting of the Sanhedrim, probably about seven o'clock in the morning, 'they bound Jesus and led him away, and delivered him to Pilate the Governor.' I would here propose a speculation which I have not the knowledge to criticise or to verify; but if it is

correct, it shows one more quite remarkable agreement in detail between John and Matthew. How was a prisoner treated in the Jewish Council who was accused but not yet condemned? Was he left bound while He was under trial? According to Matthew, Jesus was not bound while he was being tried before the Council of the Jews. According to John, Jesus had been bound by the Roman soldiers, and remained bound all the time until He was brought into the presence of Caiaphas, the president of the Council. It would illustrate the higher moral standard on which the Jewish nation stood in comparison with the pagan races around, that the accused person should be released from his bonds while he was under trial.

On the other hand, the treatment of Paul, a Roman citizen, when he was examined before the Roman Governor Festus and the Jewish King Agrippa, forms a marked contrast to the theoretical interpretation of Jewish conduct which is suggested by the comparison of John with Matthew. This Roman whose case Festus had already inquired into and who had appealed to the supreme court of the Empire was, in accordance with Roman practice, kept bound as a prisoner from the time that he was first arrested; and in the palace where he was being tried by the highest officials of the province, he held out his hands in his impassioned appeal to Agrippa, and said, 'I would to God, that not thou only, but also all that hear me this day, might become such as I am, except these bonds.' The dramatic effect produced by the contrast between the freedom and power with which Paul addressed the assembly and the fetters which he displayed on his hands is remarkable. But although Festus immediately afterwards could say that 'this man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds,' Paul continued to wear the fetters to which every prisoner was condemned. The theory and practice of Roman procedure was that the guards in charge of any prisoner were responsible with their lives for his safe custody, and it was left to them to secure themselves by taking every precaution.

After drawing these inferences regarding the proceedings in the house of Annas, we begin to be conscious that John himself has said so plainly in v.²⁴. 'Annas therefore sent Jesus, bound

as he was, to Caiaphas.' Jesus¹ had never been unbound in Annas' house. He was there only the captive in charge of guards, who were responsible with their lives for His custody. He was not yet delivered up to any official; it was not until He was handed over to Caiaphas, the high priest and president of the Council, that the guards could consider their duty to be completed. Until he is condemned, the accused person remains unbound in the Jewish court. But in the house of Annas, where the guards stopped to wait for day and the assembling of the Council, Jesus continued to wear the fetters of custody.

Into this clear and important statement, Dr. Moffatt has introduced a mistranslation which distorts the evidence. In the other case above mentioned, he accepts the mistranslation of others; here he goes wrong, without (so far as I know) any predecessor, rendering, 'Annas, therefore, had him bound, and sent him to Caiaphas.' This misrepresents the Greek, implying that Jesus had been unbound in the house of Annas for examination, and was now rebound at Annas' order and sent on to Caiaphas. This translation is not possible within the limits of Greek grammar. With so many misunderstandings of the facts and the action, it is not wonderful that Dr. Moffatt makes a wholly unjustified transposition in the text of John in order to get some faint show of support from the Fourth Gospel for his misunderstanding of the Synoptists.

This vice of transposition in a work intended for the general public is worthy of strong condemnation. As a device in classical scholarship it has been much misused, and is now largely discredited. Where it is in some few cases permitted by common consent, as in Lucretius several times, the origin of the misplacement is explained by the fact that a whole page has got out of order; but Dr. Moffatt makes his transpositions in the New Testament, sometimes of shorter, sometimes of longer passages, without explanation justified by critical canons, solely on account of the difficulty in understanding the text. You can get rid of almost every difficulty, and also of all character and instructiveness and power, by freely transposing the text of any author and adding a few conjectural 'emendations.'

¹ ὁ δεδεμένος, the prisoner.