

DR. ABBOTT'S MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA<sup>1</sup>

THE heading of the Second Chapter of Dr. Abbott's *Miscellanea* is as follows : *The disciple that was known unto the High Priest*, the author's purpose being to show that the reference in these words is not, as is generally supposed, to John, the son of Zebedee, but to Judas Iscariot, who had been for some days in communication with the Chief Priests and Pharisees, with regard to their plot against Jesus.

It seems to me that the wording of this allusion is very much opposed to such an explanation. I see no possible reason why he, who is in every Gospel described, over and over again, as the betrayer of Jesus into the hands of sinners, should here be represented as one who had done nothing to forfeit the friendship of the other disciples, though he had come straight from the garden of Gethsemane, bringing Jesus bound with him (John xviii. 12). How are we to reconcile this with John xviii. 15, ἡκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητῆς? Imagine Peter, the most ardent and vehement of all the disciples, who had just used the sword against one of the High Priest's servants, selecting Judas as his companion to the Court where Jesus was to be tried, and accepting his help for admission into that court! But there is no need to argue the point. We read in Matthew xxvi. 37 f. that those who had taken Jesus (viz. Judas with his armed band) led Him away to the house of Caiaphas, but Peter followed Him afar off. Judas and Peter therefore were separated from each other by a wide interval.

Nor is this all : when St. John refers to a disciple without giving him a name, this anonymous use seems always to

<sup>1</sup> *Miscellanea Evangelica*, by E. A. Abbott, Hon. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; Fellow of the British Academy.

carry a peculiar meaning. It refers to what might be regarded as a special good action done by himself, or to some special privilege accorded to himself, though he prefers to leave in obscurity his personal connexion with it, much as St. Paul refuses to boast of being carried up to the third heaven. Thus, in the latter part of this verse, there is no attempt to contrast his own behaviour at the trial, to the disadvantage of Peter ; while, on the other hand, he calls attention to the help he had himself received from his acquaintance with Caiaphas. Similarly in John i. 39 f. two of the Baptist's disciples are recommended to join themselves to "the Lamb of God." One of these is unnamed ; the other is Andrew, who immediately enlists his own brother Simon among the followers of Jesus ; it being understood that John was the first to give his own adhesion to the Lord, but that he himself thinks more highly of the action of the two brothers, Andrew and Peter, for immediately following his example. In John xiii. 21, after Jesus had said "One of you shall betray me," Peter asks the unnamed apostle, who was reclining on the Lord's breast, to inquire from Him who it was of whom He spoke. In John xix. 26 we read that Jesus, seeing His mother at the foot of the cross and the disciple standing by whom He loved, said to His mother, "Behold thy son," and to the disciple, "Behold thy mother"; and that from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home. Again, in chapter xx. 1 f., we are told that Mary Magdalene, when, on her early visit to the tomb, she found the stone rolled away, at once ran to tell Simon Peter, and the other disciple, whom Jesus loved ; and this phrase, "the other disciple" is repeated thrice in the following verses. Again in the final chapter, we meet the phrase "the disciple that Jesus loved" in verses 7 and 20, while in verse 24 we are told that "this is the disciple that wrote these things."

Dr. Abbott thinks that the favourable sense attaching to the neutral phrase, "the other disciple," is due only to the supplementary adjunct, "whom Jesus loved"; so that we might seem to be at liberty to supply the name Judas Iscariot in chapter xviii. 15, after the words "another disciple." He finds a further difficulty in the meaning "known," which is given to *γνωστός* in the R.V. of this and the following verse: "Now that disciple was *known unto* the high priest, and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest; but Peter was standing at the door without. So the other disciple, which was *known unto* the high priest, went out and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter." And no doubt the second occasion of its use in this passage fails to convey the construction of the Greek, *ὁ μαθητῆς ὁ ἄλλος, ὁ γνωστός τοῦ ἀρχιερέως* where *ὁ γνωστός* is used as a substantive, meaning "the acquaintance," and is therefore followed by the genitive, not as before by the dative (*γνωστός τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ*).

We find two similar examples in Luke, one in ii. 44, where the mother of the child Jesus seeks for Him in vain on their return from Jerusalem, *ἀνεζήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν καὶ τοῖς γνωστοῖς*, "They sought him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance"; the other in xxiii. 49, *ιστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*, "All that were known to Him stood afar off." The other instances to be found in the New Testament, amounting to twelve in all, are taken from the Acts, except Romans i. 19, *τὸ γνωστόν τοῦ θεοῦ*, "That which may be known of God," and are used, not of persons, but of things, like *τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστόν ἔστω*.

Dr. Abbott compares five verses in the Old Testament, in which he holds that *γνωστός* must be taken in the same sense which he ascribes to it in the verses from St. Luke and St. John, viz., "familiar friend," though neither of these epithets is implied in *γνωστός*. His quotations are

taken from Psalm lxxxviii. 8, translated in the A.V. "Thou hast put away mine acquaintance far from me"; and v. 18, "Lover and friend hast thou put far from me, and mine acquaintance into darkness" (Ps. lv. 13), *σύ δὲ ἄνθρωπε ἰσόψυχε, ἡγεμών μου καὶ γνωστός μου*, where the R.V. has "It was even thou, a man mine equal, my companion, and my familiar friend." I agree that, in these cases, the translator uses the word *γνωστός* to represent the warm feeling of the original, for which the English has so good an equivalent in "familiar friend." But it would be difficult to find a more unsuitable word to express this warmth, than one that starts from the idea of knowledge without emotion, and that may be joined with hatred as easily as with affection. I do not see that Dr. Abbott's remaining quotations from the Old Testament get beyond this. One is taken from Psalm xxxi. 11, "I am become a reproach, yea unto my neighbours exceedingly, and a terror to mine acquaintance. They that did see me without fled from me." These words describe very well the treatment of lepers among the Jews, but, so far from implying friendship, we are told of those complained of in v. 13, that "they desired to take away my life." The other quotation is from 2 Kings, x. 11, where we read of Jehu's massacre of the house of Ahab, and of all his familiar friends (R.V.) and his priests. Here Dr. Abbott mentions that the A.V. has "kinsfolk," and the margin "acquaintances," either of which would suit better the unsparring fury of Jehu.

Turning back now to the Gospels I see no reason for supposing, with Dr. Abbott (p. 30), that we ought to read "a person in one's bosom," or "in one's counsels," rather than "acquaintance" in Luke ii. 44. It is very unlikely that all the people who were travelling back from Jerusalem were intimate friends. Inquiry would be made of every one, friend or not, provided they were travelling in the same

direction, with the same company. In like manner, who can say that either the apostle John, or Judas Iscariot, was really an intimate friend of Caiaphas? Nonnus, in his metrical paraphrase of the Gospel, endeavours to explain what was John's relation to Caiaphas, in the words quoted by Dr. Abbott in p. 24. I will give first his English quotation, and then the Greek of Nonnus so far as it bears on the question.

“So bearing Jesus with them the spearmen<sup>1</sup> flowed on,  
And in his track went with them afar off Simon,  
And a young man, another companion (of Christ), who from his  
trade of fishing  
Being a friend renowned of the accustomed high priest,  
Running with Christ, came within the God-receiving courtyard.”

On the third and fourth lines Dr. Abbott has the following note:—“*Fishing*: This apparently refers to the occupation of John, the son of Zebedee. But how Nonnus supposed that this could make him ‘A friend of the high priest,’ I cannot even imagine.”<sup>2</sup>

The lines are:—

Καὶ νέος ἄλλος ἑταῖρος, ὃς ἰχθυβόλου παρὰ τέχνης  
γνωτὸς ἔων ἀριδῆλος ἐθήμονος ἀρχιερέως,  
Χριστῷ σὺνδρομος ἦλθεν ἔσω θεοδέγμονος αὐλῆς,

which I should translate, “And another, a young comrade, who, being from his trade of fishing, a well-known acquaintance of his customer, the high priest (literally ‘the customary high priest’) came hastening with Christ within the God-receiving court.”

I see no difficulty in supposing that John, at any rate before he was called to be an apostle, might have carried about for sale fish caught in the sea of Tiberias,<sup>2</sup> whether this

<sup>1</sup> Better, perhaps, to use the general term “soldiers,” since *ἀσπίς* means “shield,” not “spear.”

<sup>2</sup> “Among the Jews the contempt for manual labour did not exist. On the contrary it was esteemed a religious duty, and most earnestly

were tradition or merely conjecture on the part of Nonnus.<sup>1</sup> Jeremy Taylor in his *Life of Christ*, without naming any authority, gives another explanation of John's acquaintance with Caiaphas (vol. iii. p. 234, ed. Heber): "Having sold his possessions in Galilee to Caiaphas, he came and dwelt near Mount Sion, but was, by intervention of that bargain, made known to the high priest, and brought Peter into the house."

So far I have been occupied chiefly with the meaning of the phrase, "the other disciple," and the uses of *γνωστός*. I go on now to discuss Dr. Abbott's view as to the character and behaviour of the principal persons in the narrative, Judas, Caiaphas, John, Peter. Is it true that Judas was the familiar friend of Caiaphas and the intimate partaker of his counsels, as Dr. Abbott maintains on p. 30? The Gospels tell us plainly that he was merely the instrument employed by Caiaphas to carry out the design of the latter for the murder of Jesus. But there is no symptom of friendship on either side, unless we are prepared to call Banquo's murderers the familiar friends and counsellors of Macbeth; and it is indeed a strange sharing of counsels that we read of, the moment the object of the conspirators has been attained. Caiaphas is naturally well pleased with the success of his scheme. All has passed off as it should do: there has been no tumult of the populace. The popularity of the pretended Messiah seems to have been the merest delusion; only just enough left of it to excite the jealousy of Cæsar, and quiet the hesitation of the Roman Governor. Contrast with this what St. Matthew tells us of Judas in xxvii. 3-8.

insisted on, to learn some trade. The absence of wealth in no way implied social inferiority." Edersheim (*Life and Times of Christ*, vol. i. p. 252). So Paul continued his trade as a tent-maker after he had been called to be an apostle.

<sup>1</sup> In *Poli Synopsis* on John xviii. 5, the words "notus pontifici" are explained from Nonnus by the addition "ex arte sua piscatoria."

Early in the morning of Friday there had been another full meeting of the Sanhedrim at the palace of Caiaphas, where it was agreed that Jesus must be put to death, for which, however, the consent of Pilate was needed. Jesus was therefore taken to the praetorium, where the Jews, after vainly attempting to obtain from Pilate the power to crucify Him on their own authority, and afterwards on the charge of blasphemy, were finally driven to accuse Him of inciting the people against Cæsar, and to hint that Pilate himself could be no friend to Cæsar, if he refused to punish the enemies of Cæsar. Even then Pilate made two more efforts to save the prisoner in whom he could find no fault ; he gave the people the choice between Jesus and Barabbas, and finally washed his hands of the shedding of this innocent blood.

St. Matthew tells us that "Judas, when he saw that Jesus was condemned, repented himself." What was this condemnation ? Probably it was that first condemnation on the ground of blasphemy. But Judas may well have believed [that the Roman Governor would not entirely forget the just rule of the Roman courts, and Pilate's reception of the Jewish accusers still held out hopes of acquittal. But when every shift had been tried in vain, when the people cried out in answer to Pilate, "His blood be on us and on our children," when Pilate delivered Him to be scourged and crucified, Judas felt that no further hope remained for *him* ; that *he* must be the first to undergo the curse which his nation had called down on themselves and their children. He brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, and openly confesses that he could no longer endure to retain the price of innocent blood. The Jewish leaders of Church and State only mock at his repentance : "What is that to us ? see thou to that." Judas on this threw down the money in the temple, and

went away and hanged himself. What a change during the twelve hours or so, which had passed since he led the servants and officers of these very men to arrest Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane. Then money seemed to be all in all; then the innocence of the victim appealed, as it would seem, not more to him than to the Pharisees. But now each incident of the passion recalled to him his first conviction that the long-looked-for Messiah had appeared upon earth. I think there is much to be said for the supposition that the leading motive of Judas was, not simply avarice, but impatience at the delay in the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom, which he, with the other disciples, and with his countrymen generally, expected to see triumphing over the Roman power. Judas may have thought that, if once the opposite forces were arrayed against each other, Jesus would make use of His miraculous power and fulfil the hope of Israel.

I venture to add here a quotation from Hogg's *Wider Hope*, p. 283.

“ We are accustomed to look upon Judas Iscariot as the worst character brought before us in the Bible, and yet what a vast reserve of moral feeling is shown in the words, “ I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood,” and in the desperate act by which, apparently without waiting for the last scene on Calvary, he tried to atone for his crime. If we may venture for a moment to carry on our thoughts to the meeting in Hades between the betrayer and the Betrayed: if we may presume to imagine the penetrating yet compassionate gaze—not less compassionate, surely, nor less love-compelling, than that which melted the heart of another less sorely wounded by Satan—is it not a moral certainty, from all we know of the laws of human nature, that out of the midst of that agony of shame and remorse there must have sprung up the consciousness of a love inexhaustible and invincible, which would make even the terrors of “ his own place ” not only endurable, but most welcome to the sufferer, when they were looked upon as the appointed remedy of his sin, the token of a Father's forgiveness to him who rightly received them? And yet, though we may see reason to believe that the sin of Judas has been forgiven, we shall not



think the language of Eastern hyperbole overstrained, when it says of one whose name was destined to be synonymous with 'traitor' till the end of time, "It were better for him if he had never been born."

I turn now to Peter, standing outside the door of the high priest's palace. How did he get there, and with whom? I have already pointed out the difficulties involved in the supposition that he came with Judas. There can be no doubt that, when Jesus forbade any further resistance, on the ground that prophecy must be fulfilled, all the disciples forsook Him and fled. It does not appear that they were pursued with any great activity, excepting the young man mentioned in St. Mark. It seems probable that the two leaders, Peter and John, would quickly meet and arrange to follow cautiously after Jesus. When they reached the court, John was admitted within, being recognised as an acquaintance of the high priest, while Peter had to wait till John could get leave for him to enter. I see no ground at all for supposing that John or Judas should have found it necessary to press Peter to come inside. Peter was always inclined to take the initiative, and would have been startled to hear John, or still more, Judas, addressing him in the words suggested by Dr. Abbott, "Do you not want to know, as I do, what they will do to the Master? You *must* want it. Then come in" (p. 19). It was no doubt rash in Peter to throw himself into the midst of those who had just brought Jesus bound into the court. It was also very rash for Peter to try to walk on the sea; but he did not wait for John to urge his doing so. If he had thought of his own safety, even if he had attended to the warning of his Master, he might have hidden himself where there was no chance of his being found. But to have done so would not have been like Peter or any true disciple. He had followed afar off thinking of nothing else but his imprisoned Master, and

how he might see Him to the end, whatever that end might be. (See Edersheim, vol ii. p. 550.)

Dr. Henry Latham, late Master of Trinity Hall, seems to me to have given a very true interpretation of Peter's behaviour in his *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 434 foll. :

“What Peter really feared was forcible separation from Christ. He was afraid that, if proved to be a follower of Jesus, he would be turned out of the judgment hall of Caiaphas. He would have said or done almost anything to avoid that. It was part of his nature to be mastered by the feeling that was uppermost. He clung to his Master's side with the instinctive fidelity of a Highland henchman to his chief. Thrice he might have gone away, but this he will on no account do. After being noticed he on each occasion moves away and returns only shifting his position. . . . It never occurred to Peter that in saying “I know not the man” he was being disloyal to the Master he loved. He wanted to keep sight of his Master and did not feel bound to speak the truth to a foe. One look of our Lord settles the matter ; it awakens the higher sense of truth, which had gone to sleep when the old instinct of the Oriental peasant, the habit of confronting authority with a flat denial, became dominant in Peter's breast. When the company of Apostles was scattered on their Master's apprehension, the strength they had drawn from association with Jesus vanished at once ; and then Peter dropped from the moral level of a disciple of Christ into the Galilean fisherman he had been before. He had been used to regard officials of Herod, or any ruling power, as his natural enemies, to whom he was not bound to speak the truth, and to this, his old self, he came back now. But though Peter's heart may have acquitted him of cowardly forsaking his Master—though he knew that he would, if need were, have gone with Him to prison and to death—yet he felt that this denial was in words—though only in words—a falling away from perfect loyalty ; it made clear to him, as it may have been meant to do, the weakness of his character in the way of yielding to impulse, and awakened floods of self-contempt ; he went out and wept bitterly.”

I close with a quotation from the sixth chapter of my *Introduction* to the Second Epistle of Peter, in which I contrast the Peter of this Epistle with the Peter of the First Epistle, the Gospels, and the Acts (pp. cviii. to cx:).

Though capable of pondering over what was said to him, Peter more often spoke and acted on the spur of the moment at the prompting of his own generous heart. He was full of initiative, full of confidence, easily elated, but really humble, quick to own where he had been in the wrong, but never despairing; a reverent and devoted, yet a thoroughly free-spoken follower of his Master, as well as a loved and trusted leader of men. He is quick to lay his doubts and difficulties before Jesus: "How oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?" On hearing the words "Whither I go, ye cannot come," he is the one to ask, "Whither goest Thou? Why cannot I follow Thee now?" He is not abashed or silent in presence of Moses and Elijah on the holy mount. He even ventures to rebuke Jesus when He foretold His approaching death, just after He had commended Peter's confession "Thou art the Son of God." His positiveness, combined with docility and readiness to be corrected and instructed, is seen in John xiii. 6, "Lord, dost *Thou* wash my feet? Thou shalt never wash my feet": and then, on hearing the explanation of Jesus, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." So in Acts x. 13 f., on hearing the voice, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat," he breaks out with "Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common and unclean." But his behaviour to Cornelius shortly afterwards shows how thoroughly he had imbibed the spirit of the words, "What God has cleansed, make not thou common." His self-confidence is seen in such words as, "I will lay down my life for Thee," "Though all men should be offended, yet will not I," "Even if I must die with Thee, yet will I not deny Thee." Nor was this mere empty boasting. When the armed band of the chief priests appeared, he drew his sword and attacked them. How was it, then, that his courage so soon failed him? We must remember the circum-

stances of the case. A few days before, Jesus had entered Jerusalem in triumph amid the Hosannas of the multitude. He had spoken mysterious words about the coming of the Kingdom of God : He had warned His disciples to provide themselves with swords. But now He bids Peter put up his sword into its sheath : He tells His disciples to leave Him alone with the powers of darkness. And at the word they all forsook Him and fled, two only venturing to follow at a distance into the Judgment Hall. Under these circumstances, is it right to regard the denial as proving timidity in Peter ? Is Elijah to be called timid because he fled from Jezebel, and was for a brief space inclined to despair of the triumph of right ? Both Elijah and Peter were suffering from reaction : the spirit was willing, but the flesh was weak. It is as if soldiers whose courage had been strained to the highest pitch at the prospect of leading a forlorn hope were suddenly told that their captain had changed his mind, and that they were now to surrender to the enemy. Despair and bewilderment would succeed to high-wrought courage, and so it was with Peter. But one look of his Master's was sufficient to recall him to himself. His deep repentance was followed by no false shame on his own part, and by no reproaches on the part of his fellow-disciples. He is the one to whom the Magdalene first brings the news of the empty tomb. He and John are the first of the apostles to visit the tomb. At the sea of Tiberias we find Peter as usual taking the initiative, and the others as usual following, " I go a fishing," " We also go with thee." Impetuous as ever, on hearing that it was " the Lord " who had foretold the miraculous draught of fishes, Peter leaps into the sea and makes his way to Jesus on the shore. One phrase, in our Lord's colloquy with him, suggests his energetic, independent character : " When thou wast young, thou walkedst whither thou wouldest." The question about John, which

followed immediately afterwards, shows how quickly he resumed his usual tranquility and his thought for his friends.

J. B. MAYOR.

EXEGETICA.

MATTHEW v. 39.

ὅστις σε ραπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

Why the "right" cheek? When one man attacks another, his right hand generally strikes the left cheek of his opponent. Why does Jesus mention that the first blow falls on the left cheek, then? Because, Professor J. Weismann suggests (*Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft* 1913, pp. 175-176), the blow is inflicted with the back of the hand, not with a clenched fist or with the palm of the hand. It is a blow which means insult rather than injury. He points out that in Talmudic law a blow of this kind was specially punished, quoting from the tractate *Baba gama fol. 90a* to show that the fine for it was double that inflicted on a blow of the other kind. Professor Weismann wonders if this relative estimate was not current as early as the days of Jesus. At any rate, he points out that such an interpretation gives a natural and vivid meaning to the words *στρέψον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην*, for, unless the victim and the contemptuous blow turned his face, it would not be easy for the scorner to strike him on the left cheek with the back of his right hand.

MARK vi. 40.

Καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ, κατὰ ἑκάτὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα.

Lagrange's note on π. π. is: "C'est ainsi qu'à Iabnè les