

ARTICLE VII.

THE LAST DAYS OF CHRIST; EXEGETICAL NOTES ON
THE BASIS OF MARK XIV. 17—XVI. 20.

BY THE LATE REV. HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D., LL.D.

CHAPTER XIV.

Verses 17-21. — At the Last Supper, Christ foretells the Treachery of Judas, and compels him to leave the Room.

Ver. 17. THE evening here (so also Matthew and Luke) was that of the first day of the Passover or feast of unleavened bread (see ver. 12). The Passover began on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, near the middle of our April, and continued a week, i.e. till the twenty-first of the month. With reference to the day of the week, therefore, on which Christ was crucified, Matthew (xxvi. 17) and Luke (xxii. 7) agree perfectly with Mark. Our Lord was crucified on the day before the Jewish Sabbath, i.e. our Friday, and rose again on the third day, i.e. our Sunday, which, of course, commemorates that event. No difference exists between the four evangelists with reference to the order of the days (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday) of the Passover week on which the crucifixion, the rest in the tomb, and the resurrection took place. The chronological difficulty alleged to exist as to the day of the month on which the Passover was observed by Christ, and he himself was crucified, is one which requires special notice. It is alleged by some that the synoptists represent the day of Christ's death as the fifteenth of Nisan, the great festival on the evening before which the Jews cele-

[NOTE. — Professor Hackett's Notes on the Last Days of Christ are not published here without his consent. He gave this consent while he retained his Professorship at Newton. He then recommended Mr. George H. Whittemore as eminently fitted to prepare and edit the Notes. He afterwards, while at Rochester, revised his Lectures, and the Notes now published are the result of that Revision. Mr. Whittemore was a favorite pupil, a colleague, and an intimate friend of Prof. Hackett, and has edited these Notes with conscientious fidelity.—Eds.]

brated their Passover, while according to John it is said that Jesus was crucified on the day before that, the fourteenth of Nisan, and died at the moment when the Jews sacrificed the Paschal lamb, and were preparing to eat the Passover. The passages in John said to require this view are chiefly xiii. 1; xviii. 28; xix. 14, 31. The three positions here which interpreters have taken are, first, that the writers contradict each other, and cannot be harmonized; secondly, that John states the true order, and that Christ did actually on this occasion anticipate the Passover by a single day, and that we are to reconcile the synoptists with John (so, of the latest commentators, Godet); thirdly, that the synoptists follow here the usual and correct time, and that we are to reconcile John with the synoptists. For arguments establishing this last view as most reasonable, see Robinson, Norton, Andrews, Wieseler (*Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien*, pp. 230-283), Ebrard (*Wissensch. Kritik*, etc., 3d ed., pp. 615-640), and McClellan (*New Testament*, Vol. i. pp. 473-494). I will only remark here that it seems most reasonable, inasmuch as the three synoptists agree with each other, that the three should control the uncertainty of one, viz. John, and not one control the uncertainty of three.

The evening (ὄψις), as results from vs. 14, must be that of the day on which the disciples went to prepare the Passover, i.e. here the evening of the 14th of Nisan, which the Jewish habit of reckoning from evening made, of course, the beginning of the 15th of their month. Matthew (xxvi. 20) has the same expression; but Luke says less definitely (xxii. 14), *When the time came*, i.e. for sitting down to the Passover-meal. Matthew and Mark omit the strife of the apostles as to who should be first, and the Saviour's rebuke of that spirit. This scene took place at the beginning of the meal, and perhaps just as they were taking their places at the table. Luke records this incident in xxii. 24-30, and John records Christ's washing of the feet of the disciples during an early part of the supper (xiii. 1-20). The point at which

the narratives coalesce next is that of Christ's foretelling the treachery of Judas, and that of the traitor's clandestine escape from the room. The time of these last events must have been later in the course of the night. Both Mark here and Matthew (xxvi. 20) say that only Christ and the apostles were present on this occasion. The preposition, here (μετά) and in Matthew, describes the tie more closely than Luke's σὺν αὐτοῖς. Even the friend in whose house they had met appears not to have been among them. Josephus states that though the number might be on such occasions only ten, it rarely included so many as twenty. If women were present, it was the exception, and not the rule. The Karaites, one of the later Jewish sects, suffered none but grown men to be present.

Ver. 18. *And as they reclined* (καὶ ἀνακειμένον αὐτῶν). At first, as we learn from Jewish writers, they were accustomed to sit, as at their ordinary meals; but in later times, when they were accustomed to recline at table, they adopted that position also at the Passover. According to Ex. xii. 11, the Hebrews were required to eat the Passover standing; but that practice had long since been discontinued. The rehearsals of the old history and its teachings were still made prominent; but the old symbology had more or less passed away. *Shall deliver up*, i.e. to his enemies (παράδῳσει, not προδώσει, *shall betray*), states only the act to be done; but that act would be one of perfidy and ingratitude, because one would do it who was then eating with Christ from the same table (ἐσθίων). Matthew says more definitely that this hand of treachery and blood was resting at that moment on the table from which they were eating together.

Ver. 19. *One by one* (εἰς καθ' εἰς), as if the numeral were indeclinable (See Buttmann, N. T. Gram. p. 30). Others regard it as a later Greek idiom, though very uncommon (See Winer, N. T. Gram. p. 249). The negative form of the interrogation, "Is it I?" (μήτι ἐγώ;) repudiates the implication of the question. Judas, as we may infer from Matt. xxvi. 25, was the last of the number to ask if he was

meant, and Christ's answer affirmed the inquiry. This was said, probably, in such a tone that the other disciples did not overhear what passed between Jesus and the betrayer. If we insert here John xiii. 23-26, as probably we should, Jesus after this general intimation of the traitor, in answer to the inquiry who of them would be thus guilty, gave the morsel (*ψωμιόν*) to Jūdas, which made him known, of course, to John, and perhaps to Peter, but not at the same time to the other disciples. It may appear singular that after Judas had been thus pointed out as the traitor nothing was done to prevent his escape; but probably the danger was not thought to be so imminent, and, though the interval was so brief, Judas was already safe among Christ's enemies before the other disciples could arrest him and defeat his purpose.

Ver. 20. It is not meant here, as often understood, that Judas was dipping in the dish at that moment, and was pointed out to the other disciples as the traitor by that coincidence. The dipping in the same dish symbolized the intimacy and friendship existing between those who participated in the act. Here, of course, this sign on the part of Judas was a falsehood and a snare. The dish (*τρουβλίον*) contained the bitter herbs and sauce into which they dipped each one his piece of unleavened bread, and then ate them together.

Ver. 21. *For* (*ὅτι*) states why this treachery must occur, and yet not occur in any such sense as to excuse or extenuate the traitor's guilt. It fulfils, indeed, a purpose of God, but leaves the agent to act or forbear to act, as he chooses. *ἀπάγει*, *goes his way*, or *departs* from life. It is essentially Hebraistic (*אָפַק*), yet with approximate classical sense. *As is written* (*καθὼς γέγραπται*) states the accordance between the fact of Christ's death (not the *manner* of it) and the Old Testament predictions. It will be seen that the language of Mark (see also Matt. xxvi. 24) recognizes most explicitly the occurrence of such predictions. The English deist, Lord Bolingbroke, took the ground that so evident are these prophecies in the Old Testament, that Jesus devised his own death so as to be able to claim that argument for his Mea-

siahship, and to give his disciples the benefit of it in their controversy with the Jews. Supply ἦν after καλόν, as in Matt. xxvi. 24. *It were good for him*, etc. "If these words," says Tholuck, "be taken strictly, there is then certainly in this case an eternal condemnation. For if Judas in the most distant period of time should become holy and happy, then these words of Christ would not be true, that it were better for him not to have been born."

Verses 22-25. — Institution of the Lord's Supper.

With regard to the order of the different parts of the Passover commemoration among the Jews, see a full account under Art. "Lord's Supper," in Smith's Bible Dictionary. Not only the four evangelists, but Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23 sqq.) records the origin of this Christian service. Its existence in the church goes back to a time beyond that of any written monument of Christianity; and when we sit at this table of our Lord, we may feel that we are in the presence of a Christian witness older than any one of the writers of the New Testament.

Ver. 22. *As they are eating* (ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν) means simply, in the course of the Passover meal. *Having blessed* (εὐλογήσας), or *praised*, refers not to the bread, but to God, as the giver of all temporal and spiritual benefits. It corresponds to *having given thanks* (εὐχαριστήσας) in Luke xxii. 19 and 1 Cor. xi. 24. ἄρτον, *a loaf*, as the Greek word signifies, and as the breaking itself (ἔκλασεν) implies. In 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, Paul says very expressly that the church as a unity answers to the loaf unbroken, but the members individually to the parts into which the loaf is broken. *Is my body* (ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου). According to the Protestant view, the copula conjoins the subject and the predicate as equivalent to each other, but according to the Roman Catholic view, as precisely identical. Such expressions as "God is a Rock," "I am the Shepherd," "Ye are the sheep," "I am the Vine, ye are the branches," etc. illustrate a familiar idiom in all languages. The Roman Catholic doctrine arrays

against itself every evidence of the senses. The act of giving the bread corresponds, no doubt, to that of the head of the Jewish household, as he took the unleavened cakes and consecrated them by prayer and thanksgiving. Christ gave them in like manner to the disciples, as memorials of a still greater deliverance secured for them and all believers by his sufferings and death.

Ver. 24. *This (τοῦτο)*, i.e. the cup of wine, *is (symbolizes) my blood, etc.* The wine that they drink in the East is red, and so much the more a fitting symbol of Christ's blood shed for us. The new covenant which this blood ratifies, on the part of man is that of repentance and faith in Christ, and on the part of God that of forgiveness and adoption as his children. The old covenant was that of a perfect obedience on the part of man, and God's approval or condemnation according to the fulfilment or the violation of its conditions. Instead of "Old" and "New Testaments" (which comes to us from the Latin Vulgate, *Testamentum*), the proper designation of our Scriptures would be "Old" and "New Covenants." The distinction, of course, is one of principle, and not of time; for those who believed under the ancient economy anticipated the gospel, and those who in Christian lands rely on their own works perpetuate Judaism. The argument in the Epistle to the Galatians turns on this distinction. *Shed for many (ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν)*, as in Luke also (xxii. 20), states not the design of Christ's redemption on the part of God, for that is universal, but its result as limited by human conduct. Yet even this thought is so expressed as to emphasize the triumph of Christ as the Saviour of men over Satan and all his malignity (see especially Rom. v. 12-19). It will be noticed that Luke and Paul only mention that Christ enjoined this observance as one to exist in his church for all time (see 1 Cor. xi. 23-26). The coincidence in their accounts of the Lord's supper harmonizes perfectly with the evidences of the history in the Acts, and the tradition, also, that Luke and Paul were companions in missionary labors. Whether Paul would state in 1 Cor. xi. 23 sq. that

he received all his knowledge of Christ's institution of the supper from a revelation made directly to him, or had its fuller significance and importance to the church revealed more fully to him, the language of Paul does not absolutely decide. The best interpreters differ very much on this question. Luke (xxii. 20) and Paul (1 Cor. xi. 25) say that Jesus administered the cup after they had supped (*μετὰ τὸ δευπνῆσαι*). This is a remarkable expression, and there seems to be only one way in which it can be understood without violence to the language. I will simply quote here the words of Stanley on this point: "The general description of the gospel narrative would lead us to suppose that the breaking of the bread, as well as the blessing of the cup, *succeeded* the supper, whereas the emphatic words 'After he had supped' imply that the bread was blessed at the commencement and the cup at the end of the supper. That the cup closed the meal agrees with the blessing of the cup after the paschal feast, like a grace at the end; as the blessing of the bread had been like a grace at the beginning" (Commentary on Corinthians, p. 209).

Ver. 25. *No longer* (*οὐκέτι*), as at that time he was doing. The expression indicates that Christ himself partook of these emblems so significant as related to himself, and further we should not expect him to depart on this occasion from his office as the head of the household (See also Matt. xxvi. 29, *ἀπ' ἄρτι*). *Until that day* (*ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκελυῆς*), when, after a brief separation, they should be reunited in the mansions of the Father's house in heaven. With reference to the *kingdom of God* here, Alford quotes Thiersch as saying very justly, though perhaps partially, with reference to the entire sense: "The Lord's supper points not only to the past, but to the future also. It has not only a commemorative, but also a prophetic meaning. In it we have not only to show forth the Lord's death *until he come*, but we have also to *think of the time when he shall come* to celebrate his holy supper with his own, new, in his kingdom of glory. Every celebration of the Lord's supper is a foretaste and prophetic

anticipation of the *great marriage supper* which is prepared for the church at the second appearing of Christ" (Alford on Matt. xxvi. 29). And, I think we may add, this language has hardly less significance if at the same time we understand it also of each believer's personal union with Christ at death; for Paul declares that for him to depart from this life was to be with Christ, and that personal gain he could forego only if it were necessary for the salvation of others. The great public recognition of Christ's disciples at his final coming may have been his nearer thought here; but that recognition presupposes that he had already received them, and made them partakers of his love and fellowship in heaven, as on earth. The one view of the meaning, therefore, does not exclude the other. The two taken together supplement each other. *The wine* in this heavenly kingdom is *new* (*καινός*), because it so transcends any earthly symbol of the joys of Christ's glorified disciples (see Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon* of N. T. Greek, s. v. *καινός*, and Trench's *N. T. Synonyms*, § lx.).

Verses 27-31. — Christ foretells that Peter would deny him thrice, and that all the Apostles would desert him.

Ver. 26. The harmonies generally place ver. 26 after ver. 31 (see on that verse in that place).

Ver. 27. Matthew and Mark agree almost verbally in this section; but Luke and John differ from them by omission, and by slight additions peculiar to each. *Shall be offended* (*σκανδαλισθήσεσθε*), or *made to stumble*, i.e. morally, referring to the flight or dispersion of the disciples when Christ was seized in the garden. *I will smite the shepherd* (*πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα*) is quoted from Zech. xiii. 7, and has the form of a proverb. As such it admits of a manifold verification. It is applied here to Christ, as having it fulfilled in his own experience. It occurs in a passage which was spoken by the prophet directly of Christ, as nearly all interpreters agree who recognize Messianic predictions at all in the Old Testament in that strict sense. (On the passage,

see Hengstenberg in his *Christology*, Pusey on the *Minor Prophets*, and Stier's *Reden Jesu*, Vol. vi. p. 76.) It asserts, as applied here, that the condition, viz. that of the smiting of the shepherd, in this case of Christ, was fulfilled when he was arrested and the disciples were scattered.

Ver. 28. *I will go before, or precede you* (προάξω), i.e. after his resurrection, and there in Galilee renew his intercourse with them. Matthew records the same assurance (xxvi. 32). Christ manifested himself first to his disciples in Judea after his resurrection; but his more prolonged and important interviews with them took place in Galilee. Undoubtedly the greater part of the forty days before his ascension were spent in that region where he had passed the greater part both of his private and of his public life, and where his followers were so much more numerous than in southern Palestine. The verb προάγω takes in the New Testament an accusative, even in this intransitive sense, although πρό by itself governs only the genitive.

Ver. 29. Peter's reply here attaches itself to Christ's intimation in ver. 27. He not only repels the imputation as to himself, but almost denies (εἰ καὶ) that the others can be thus guilty. Yet he then adds (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ) *but not I*, as slightly conceding the possibility as to them which he so confidently repudiates as to himself.

Ver. 30. *To-day* (σήμερον) designates the time more generally, and *this night* (ταύτη τῇ νυκτί) the precise part of the day intended. Matthew, Luke, and John doubtless regarded the cock-crowing as the morning hour, for which it is a general phrase. The interest of the expression as connected with Peter's fall impressed itself deeply on all their minds. Mark mentions the second or later crowing (δύς) as the fatal moment, and the others intend, of course, the same crowing, which was the proper harbinger of day. The regularity of this signal in the East, as travellers say, is so exact as to serve almost as a time-piece. The first cock-crowing is near midnight, and the second just before dawn. The order of the Greek words in Mark is singularly graphic. In our

language we lose very much of this characteristic progression. The statement that such fowls were not kept at Jerusalem at that time is incorrect. They may not have been very common; but, as the Talmud states, they were not unknown, and the Roman inhabitants certainly would not have regarded them as unclean, if that was the feeling of the stricter Jews.

Ver. 31. The other disciples asseverate their fidelity, as well as Peter; for they too had been admonished (ver. 27) that they would fail in the hour of trial.

Ver. 26. Whether this verse follows chronologically here, or after ver. 25, is disputed. Probably the evangelist anticipates here the order by a single remark, and then falls back and supplies what he had omitted. *Having sung* (*ὑμνήσαντες*) the customary Psalms which concluded the Passover celebration. It is probable that before leaving the hall Jesus uttered the sayings which form chapter xiv. in John, though in just what connection we do not know. The words at the close of John xiv. (ver. 31), "Arise, let us go hence," show that Jesus must then have left the room where they had celebrated the Passover, and that what follows must have been spoken on the way to Gethsemane. "Issuing forth thence late at night," says Godet, "they would pass through the silent streets of Jerusalem to the eastern side of the city, and there sitting down perhaps on some declivity which overhung the valley of the Kidron, the Saviour may have uttered and the disciples have heard the teachings which John records in the chapters of his Gospel that follow." *To the mount of Olives* (*εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν*) is indefinite; but the other narratives show that Gethsemane is meant, which was on the side of that mountain near its western foot, as we shall see hereafter.

Verses 32-42. — The Agony in Gethsemane.

John does not mention the agony in Gethsemane; but he certainly shows a knowledge of it, when he says (xviii. 1), "Now there was a garden there, into which Jesus went." On reading these words, every Christian who had the first

three Gospels in his hands would be reminded of what is related in them so memorably connected with that locality. The reason of this omission in John, as well as that of the transfiguration, the institution of the supper, and of many other events, is, that the agony in the garden was so well known in the church when John wrote that he had no reason for recording it anew. Strauss and others of that class admit without hesitation that the writer of the fourth Gospel was well acquainted with the synoptists; but they call him a pseudo-John; not John our Lord's disciple.

Ver. 32. *Into a place, or estate* (*eis χωρίον*, not *πρός*) So Matt. xxvi. 36. See also Acts iv. 34, etc. The proprietor in all probability was a friend of Christ, and his coming at that late hour was no intrusion, but may have been understood and pre-arranged between them. We read in John xviii. 2 that Jesus often resorted thither with his disciples. John speaks of the garden, apparently, as reached by them just across the Kidron and at the foot of Olivet; and hence, though the Saviour often went out of Jerusalem to Bethany, he did not proceed thither on this occasion. With reference to the genuineness of the traditionary site of Gethsemane, see Bib. Dict., Art. "Gethsemane." Dr. Hanua, in his *Life of Christ*, thinks the present Gethsemane would have been too exposed a place at this time of the presence of so many visitors at the Passover. But this objection would apply to almost any other place in the vicinity of the holy city at that particular time. The Saviour's Gethsemane was a private estate; and if the seclusion which Christ sought could be found anywhere, he might expect to find it there. Luke says (xxii. 40) *τοῦ τόπου, the place*, i.e. the well-known one, to which he so often resorted, *κατὰ τὸ ἔθος. While I shall pray* (*ἕως προσεύξομαι*), not in the precise place where he was, but at some distance from them, as Matthew states (xxvi. 36).

Ver. 33. Jesus takes with him as the witnesses of his humiliation and agony the same three disciples who had seen the glory of his transfiguration. He directs the others to

remain in the meantime and pray for strength against temptation in their own behalf (Luke xxii. 40). Yet they were not in the meanwhile far from Christ, as Matthew's deictic *ἐκεῖ* indicates, and Luke's "about a stone's throw" (xxii. 41). *Amazed* (*ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι*) can refer only to the severity of Christ's suffering and its peculiar character as connected with the great mystery of the atonement. The necessity of this vicarious suffering as an economic measure under God's government it hardly falls within my province to consider here.

Ver. 34. *Unto death* (*ἕως θανάτου*), i.e. its region, or very brink. *Remain here* (*μείνατε ὧδε*) shows that Christ having first separated the three disciples from the others now leaves them and separates himself from the three. Yet they are not so far from him but that they can see and hear him.

Ver. 35. Mark states only the fact that Jesus fell to the earth (*ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*) as he prayed. But Luke says that he kneeled (*θεῖς τὰ γόνατα*), and Matthew that he fell upon his face to the ground. These are but different parts of one act: he prayed not standing, but on the ground (Mark), and on his knees there (Luke), and as his feelings became more and more intense bent forward and brought his face to the earth (Matthew). This last posture, especially, showed the Saviour's extremity and earnestness; for it was only in special distress that the Hebrews prostrated themselves when they prayed. What occurs here reminds us of the words of the evangelical prophet: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. . . . He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed" (Isa. liii. 4, 5). The evangelist, though he does not quote the prophet here, records the fulfilment of his words.

Ver. 36. The three evangelists mention the prayer of Christ almost in the same identical words. Mark, who listens here as it were through the ear of Peter, reports Christ's exact words, *Ἀββᾶ, the Father* (*ὁ πατήρ*). The latter expression interprets the former. The Chaldee or

Aramaean idiom annexes the article which the Greek prefixes. The address 'Αββᾶ shows that Christ had not lost his sense of God's favor and love, but had still an unimpaired assurance of his own divine sonship. His last words on the cross, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," testify to the same consciousness. That he had any apprehension, during all these trials, that God was personally displeased with him does not appear, I think, from any rightly interpreted expression in the whole account. *All things are possible* (δυνατά). *If it be possible*, says Matthew (xxvi. 39), with the same meaning. God could interpose even in that extremity, if he would, and rescue Jesus from the power and malice of his enemies. "Thinkest thou," he himself says, "that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send to my aid more than twelve legions of angels?" (Matt. xxvi. 53). But how then should the Scriptures be fulfilled? How, then, without the sacrifice on Golgotha, could propitiation be made for the sins of men for whom Christ must die? The limitation here is purely a moral one. The purpose for which Christ came into the world required this voluntary submission on his part. He must drink, therefore, the cup which was now pressed to his lips. God's purpose must prevail over Christ's individual preference or personal advantage. "In this extremity not what I desire, but what thou desirest," is Christ's answer. At this crisis (Luke) an angel appeared to him, either outwardly, and hence so as to be seen by the three disciples (for whom in part the miracles may have been specially meant), or inwardly, in a state of ecstasy (See Acts x. 10; xxii. 17). The former is more probably the mode of communication, both because it agrees more exactly with Christ's condition in other respects, and because it was meant probably also for the disciples. In both cases we are to suppose that Christ subsequently informed them of this vision of the angel, and of its significance as a testimony to his divine mission, as in the case of the visit of the angels in the desert (Matt. iv. 11).

Ver. 37. Matthew and Mark mention that Jesus came and

awoke the disciples three times; while Luke mentions the fact of his awaking them, but not how often. Luke as a physician (Col. iv. 14) states characteristically that it was their sorrow (*ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης*) which caused the disciples to sleep. It is well known that criminals condemned to die must often be awakened from a sound sleep to be led to the scaffold. The physician Dr. Stroud mentions some remarkable examples of this fact in his treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ. Christ here (so Matthew) addresses himself especially to Peter (yet the three are meant, as we see from Luke), because he had so confidently affirmed that although all should forsake him, yet he would never forsake him in any emergency (Mark xiv. 29).

Ver. 38. *Watch* (*γρηγορεῖτε*) has here the double sense of keeping awake, and being thus awake of guarding themselves against the danger of which Christ has forewarned them. *That* (declarative) *ye may not enter* points out what should be the subject of their prayer in that eventful hour, viz. that they might not be tempted or tried above what they were able to bear. The temptation was inevitable; but the result, in their use of the appointed means, was under their control. Some less correctly make *ἵνα* telic here: *that ye may not come into temptation*. But the moment of trial had already come, and it was the yielding to temptation which Christ would have them avoid by the vigilance and prayer which he enjoins on them. All three of the synoptists record this significant passage in the history. Matthew adds (xxvi. 40) that Jesus desired them to watch with him, as well as for themselves, because the consciousness of their sympathy would strengthen him in this hour of such deep sorrow and humiliation.

Ver. 39. This *again* is the second time that he left them to pray by himself (Matt. xxvi. 42). *Saying the same word* (not words, as in the A. V.) means that this prayer in its essential import was like the first. It has been quoted as if it were an instance of liturgical repetition. But the *word* (*λόγον*) refers to the coincidence or similarity of thought, and not of language.

Ver. 40. This *again* is the second return, after his leaving them the second time. *Their eyes were very heavy*, or *weighed down*, i.e. with drowsiness (*καταβαρυνόμενοι*), to which they yielded (see next verse, and especially Matt. xxvi. 43). This word does not decide of itself whether the drowsiness prevailed or was resisted.

Ver. 41. Mark omits to say that Jesus had left them the third time, but implies it, of course, in this third return to them. Matthew's *πάλιν* (xxvi. 44) supplies that omission. The words that follow (*καθεύδετε*, etc.) are difficult. Matthew's record preserves the same words, and thus shows the interest of the first Christians in them. The verbs that follow here (*καθεύδετε ἀναπαύεσθε*) may be imperative or indicative. In the first case they mean, *sleep on and take your rest*; and since Christ instantly adds that the traitor is just at hand (so also Matthew), he must have said this ironically and reproachfully; for he knew it to be impossible for them to sleep, and could not therefore have seriously meant what he said. An ironical meaning of this nature seems to be very much at variance with the Saviour's unutterable tenderness of spirit at that moment, as evinced by every act and word, and by his knowledge of the cause of their sleeping, implied in Luke's words (xxii. 46) that it arose from the excess of their sorrow and their true-hearted sympathy. Yet very many of the best critics adopt that explanation. The other, and I think better, rendering is, *Do ye still, or now, sleep on and take your rest?* It is then a summons to them to resist that drowsiness which oppressed them, and to follow him as he should now go forth to meet the traitor, and thus show their fidelity to him by such proofs of it as they might be called to render. *It is enough* (*ἀπέχει*), i.e. the sleeping to which they had yielded. The reader feels that our Lord would say even this to them in a tone of forbearance and love. The ironical sense here requires the words to be spoken abruptly and sternly.

Ver. 42. *Arise, let us go*, etc. The summons here is very abrupt, and in this respect Matthew agrees perfectly with

Mark. It is not improbable that the Saviour's watchful eye at that moment caught sight of Judas and his accomplices as they issued forth from one of the eastern gates, or turned round the northern or southern corner of the city walls, in order to descend into the valley. Even if the night was dark (though probably it was not), he could have seen the torches which they carried, and could have felt no uncertainty respecting the object of such a movement at that hour. A few brief moments would suffice to bring them to the foot of Olivet. Judas, as we see from John xviii. 2, was familiar with the place, and could lead them directly to the spot where Jesus was to be found.

Verses 43-52. — Jesus betrayed and made Prisoner.

Ver. 43. If Judas was called Iscariot from Kerioth in Judea (Josh. xv. 25), he was the only disciple who was not a Galilean. The name is obscure, and does not fully decide the point. Possibly his family may have originated there, but had removed to Galilee.

Ver. 44. A sign or signal, as the word imports (*σύνσημον*) had been agreed on between them. The uncial mss. do not always assimilate the *ν* in such cases (See Buttmann, N. T. Gram. p. 8). *Shall kiss* (*φιλήσω*) is a secondary, but frequent sense of this verb. *Safely* (*ἀσφαλῶς*), i. e. with such care as to prevent his escape or rescue.

Ver. 45. *Immediately* (*εὐθὺς*), without delay or hesitation. *βαββαί* recognizes only his professional name or title. *Kissed him tenderly* (*κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν*), i. e. with affected earnestness, or again and again. The stronger word here (it is simply *φιλήσω* in the context) shows how ready Judas was to add hypocrisy to perfidy. Yet this perversion of that sign was altogether needless; for Jesus, in order to spare the disciples, stepped forward and gave himself up to his pursuers, and thus prevented any mistake or conflict (John xviii. 4-9).

Ver. 47. Peter only (mentioned by name in John xviii. 10, and not by the others) drew a sword, which in all proba-

bility he had brought from the guest-chamber in anticipation of the unknown danger of which Christ had there warned them (Luke xxii. 38). According to Luke (xxii. 49) the other disciples also inquired at that moment if they should smite with the sword. But we may understand by this inquiry that the other apostles, struck with Peter's attitude as he unsheathed his sword, and feeling that his act would be their act, inquired if under these circumstances they should repel force by force. It is impossible to believe that Christ's disciples were accustomed to go armed as they went from place to place. The question itself, "Shall we smite?" implies the contrary; for they dared not act, even in this instance, without his permission. John only (xviii. 10) mentions that the smiter was Simon Peter. Matthew says it was one of those with Jesus (xxvi. 51). Mark says that it was a certain one of the bystanders, and Luke (xxii. 50) says that it was *one of them*. Says Godet on this point: "So long as the Sanhedrim yet enjoyed its authority, prudence forbade the giving of Peter's name here in the oral narrative. But after his death and the destruction of Jerusalem John was no longer restrained by the same fears" (Comm. on Luke xxii. 50). Note here, too, that the name of Malchus has been transmitted to us by the only disciple — viz. John — who, well known in the house of Caiaphas (John xviii. 15), knew himself that name. The Greek for *ear* (*ὠτίσιον*) is a diminutive, and according to some means the lappet or tip of the ear (See also Matt. and Luke). But in that later age the primitive and diminutive forms, especially as employed of parts of the human body, were very nearly alike (See Lob. ad Phryn. p. 211). John says that it was the right ear that Peter cut off (so also Luke). Malchus was probably stepping forward at the moment to handcuff or pinion Jesus, and Peter's blow, that was meant to be more effective, reached only the ear. It may have been the right ear, as Stier suggests, (*Reden Jesu*, Vol. vi. p. 268), because a person thus suddenly assailed would instinctively throw his head or body to the left, and thus expose the right ear more than the

other. The Saviour, as his pursuers were about to seize him, asked to be left free for a moment longer (*Ἐἴτε ἕως τούτου*, Luke xxii. 51), and that moment he used in restoring the wounded man to soundness. It will be noticed that Luke the physician is the only one of the evangelists who mentions the act of healing. It was our Lord's last miracle for the relief of human suffering. The hands which had been so often stretched forth to heal and bless mankind were then bound, and his beneficent ministry in that form of its exercise was finished forever. John does not mention the kiss of the traitor, in part, perhaps, because it was then so well known, and in part because he was so intent on relating how Jesus forgot himself, and was concerned only for the safety of his disciples (xviii. 5-9). The sudden panic and dispersion of the crowd and of the soldiers when he said "I am he," we can hardly account for, unless we recognize it, in part at least, as an act of divine power. As to Peter's self-defensive act in the presence of the Roman soldiers, it was itself a strong testimony to his faith; but he had endangered the cause of Christ by his rashness. He had almost taken from the Saviour the right to say, as he subsequently did to Pilate, "If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would be fighting for me" (John xviii. 36). Nay, if Malchus had not been thus healed, Peter himself might have been arraigned and punished as guilty of a seditious act. Luke speaks of Christ's having touched the ear (*ἀψύμενος*) in order to heal it. Some think from this that the ear still adhered slightly to its place.

Ver. 48. *As against a robber* (*ληστήν*, not *thief*, as in A. V.), who had at his command a host of ruffians and assassins (cf. Acts xxi. 38), and could defy all the military force of the city and of the Roman procurator, and yet in open day they had not dared to lift a hand against him. The multitude (*ὄχλος*) on this occasion who came to seize Jesus consisted of a part, at least, of the Roman cohort (John xviii. 3); of the temple guard (Luke xxii. 52; Acts iv. 1; v- 26) acting as the official attendants or police of the high-

priest and Sanhedrim; and, no doubt, many of the crowd, or rabble, who had joined the others. The *staves* or *clubs* (*ξύλων*) were, it would seem, not only such as the people would carry, but formed a part of the equipments of the force. John says that some of them carried lanterns and torches (xviii. 3), which they would need in order to search the hiding-places to which they supposed it possible that Jesus would retreat for concealment. Even if the moon, then at its full, was clear, and the night was a bright one, they would need such helps, because the western side of Olivet abounds in caves and deserted tombs, and, instead of a voluntary surrender, they supposed naturally that Jesus would seek to escape by flight or concealment.

Ver. 49. *But that*, etc. (*ἀλλ' ἵνα*) is elliptical. We supply here, "This takes place," or, "is suffered, that the Scriptures," etc. (See Winer, p. 620). Matthew (xxvi. 56) inserts the omitted protasis, "Now all this took place that," etc. God's purpose or decree in such cases relates to the end to which he will make the sins of men subservient, and not to the acts as necessary on the part of men for the accomplishment of this end.

Ver. 51. It is generally agreed that the unnamed actor in this passage is Mark himself, the author of the Gospel. The circumstantiality of the account and studied suppression of the person's name points significantly to that identification. The mother of Mark, as we see in the Acts, had a house at Jerusalem where the disciples met in time of persecution; and it is likely to have been well situated for concealment and safety. It may have been, therefore, in the valley of the Kidron, and not far from the garden of Gethsemane. The young man, suddenly aroused by the tumult, and hastening out in his night-dress, would naturally follow the crowd, and so much the more on discovering that it was Jesus, of whom he himself was a disciple, whom they were hurrying away, evidently with some murderous design. This is the only place in this Gospel where even in this indirect manner the writer seems to disclose his own personality. As Dean

Alford suggests, some other reason besides the accuracy of a graphic narrator must have gained for this incident its place in the history.

Verses 53, 54, and 66-72. — Jesus brought before the High-priests
Annas and Caiaphas, and Peter's three Denials.

The corresponding passages in the other Gospels are **Matt. xxvi. 57, 58, 69-75**; **Luke xxii. 54-62**; **John xviii. 13-18, 25-27**.

These passages occur thus intermixed in the same Gospel, because Peter's denials and the examination of Christ before the Jewish council were evidently synchronistic, and the actors different persons or classes of persons.

Ver. 53. John states that the Saviour was first (*πρώτον*) brought to Annas, who, we know from Josephus, was at that time the rightful, but deposed high-priest; and as a proof of his importance, and as a reason for this proceeding, John mentions that he was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, the actual high-priest. Dean Alford thinks that the examination of Jesus by this high-priest embraced the same range of inquiry as that before the entire Sanhedrim at the later morning hour — that the same questions were asked, and in the same order, and that the examination was as full and final as the other. But such a repetition seems to be unnecessary, and so much of the night had already passed that it seems impossible to crowd so much into the part of the night that still remained.

Ver. 54. The other evangelists, as well as Mark, mention this act of Peter. Matthew (xxvi. 58) and Luke (xxii. 54) speak of his caution in keeping at a distance, and John refers to himself as the other disciple who accompanied him (xviii. 15). It should be noticed that although John refers to himself several times in his Gospel, he never does so by name, but always in some indirect way, as here. John was known to the high-priest, and had free access to the court, and the porter allowed him to enter without hesitation or challenge. Ewald suggests that he may have been a Levite on the side of father or mother, and so distantly related to the high-

priest. Peter kept at a distance from the crowd till he came to the door, and then, through John's intervention (John xviii. 16), was allowed to enter.

(Ver. 55. Here follows a collateral, and not strictly subsequent, event. While Peter was in the court the Sanhedrim were in one of the upper apartments, canvassing the question of the testimony which they were to urge against Jesus as guilty of some capital offence against Jewish laws which would justify his execution. It is to be borne in mind that they wished if possible to put him to death on some such ground, and it was only an unforeseen necessity that compelled them to invoke the interposition of the Roman power in order to accomplish their end). *Warming himself at the fire*, lit. *at the light*, i.e. of the fire, — so described, perhaps, because Mark thinks of the opportunity which the light afforded for enabling the reader to judge at the same time how the events could be seen which he mentions as there taking place. The expression, at all events, is peculiar and noteworthy. This incident of Peter's warming himself here at the fire on the night before the crucifixion tallies with the climate of the country at that particular time of the year, as well as the present customs of the country. The nights at Jerusalem at that season of the year are very cool, though the days may be warm. After sundown the air soon becomes chilly, and under the open sky a person needs to increase his raiment or have recourse to a fire. Charcoal, or coal made of wood, as here, is still used at Jerusalem, though, owing to the scarcity of wood around Jerusalem, it must be brought from so great a distance as Hebron.

Ver. 66. *Therefore he sent* (John xviii. 24) most naturally means that Annas, after this examination, and as its result (*οὖν*), sent Jesus to Caiaphas. On that supposition Annas and Caiaphas may have lived near each other, — very possibly, as some think, in contiguous houses, or even in different apartments of the same house. Their relation to each other as father-in-law and son-in-law might render this a very natural arrangement. But some interpreters make

the aorist here (*ἀπέστειλεν*) a pluperfect, *had sent*; as if the remark was meant to guard the reader against supposing that such judicial inquiries as those which John mentions could have taken place anywhere except in the palace of Caiaphas the high-priest. The aorist often occurs as pluperfect, but generally in subordinate temporal and relative clauses. Peter was *without* (Matt. xxvi. 69) or outside, i.e. of the hall where Christ was on trial, and at the same time *below* (*κάτω*, Mark), i.e. in the court, because the hall was an upper room. This court, as in the better houses in the East at present, may have been a spacious one open to the sky, around which the edifice was built. It was usually entered from the street through a porch or archway, furnished often with a seat and carpet for the convenience of the porters. Being open to the sky, a fire could be built in this court when the weather required, and that had been made necessary by the season of the year and the night on this occasion.

Ver. 67. Matthew's *one maid servant* (*μία παιδίσκη*, xxvi. 69), i.e. one servant there, is exactly Mark's *one of the maid servants*. A Hebraistic use of this numeral for our indefinite article is not clear in any New Testament passage. Peter was one of the group that stood at the fire and warmed himself, and hence the portress, who had just then left her post, recognized him as one of Christ's disciples, because she herself probably had admitted him, along with John, who was well known there as one of Christ's followers. She asseverates her charge that he was one of that man's followers, with her eyes fixed intently on him (*ἀτενίσασα*, Luke), and with the fullest assurance. The subjective form of the question (*Μή καί*) in John does not necessarily disagree with this; for *μή* may indicate expectation of a negative answer, even when the asker is disposed to believe that about which he inquires, or fears that it may be true (See Winer, p. 511). *And thou* (*καί σύ*) implies, as she well knew, that Jesus had other followers. *The Nazarene* is not here of itself reproachful, but patril only, as elsewhere. The opprobrious sense grew up at a later period.

Ver. 68. Peter declares the charge to be not only false, but unintelligible to him. He does not understand a word or syllable of what she says. Peter's tone, as he said to her *γύνα* (Luke), *woman*, was meant to be contemptuous and defiant. One of Christ's answers to his questioners during this first denial presents our Lord to us in one of the sublimest attitudes of his entire life. He asked his accusers to bring forward their witnesses, if they had anything to allege against him; for he had taught nothing in secret, but everything openly. A bystander resented this as an insult to the high-priest, and struck Jesus in the face with his fist. Christ replied only to this, "If I have spoken ill, convict me legally of it, but if well, why dost thou strike me?" (John xviii. 22, 23). The view of many interpreters has already been alluded to, that John (ver. 24) reminds us that the examination of Christ was taking place during this time in the hall of the high-priest, and that the high-priest was not Annas, to whom he had been first brought, but Caiaphas, to whom Annas subsequently sent him.

Ver. 69. Matthew (ver. 71) says, as well as Mark, that the challenger in the second instance was a woman, and Luke says *Another one* (*ἕτερος*), i.e. if necessary, *person*, either man or woman, but in this instance woman, as the other writers inform us. Luke says (ver. 58) that Peter addressed her as *Ἀνθρώπη*, *man*, i.e. contemptuously, as a woman was often called in Greek usage when a man would speak to a woman, or of her, in the most insulting manner. John (see xviii. 25) returns to Peter's denial, after the interruption occasioned by his speaking of the examination before Annas. "Peter, as I have said [so we may paraphrase the words] was standing and warming himself before the fire; but finding that he was well known there withdrew to the porch, and was there, as the other evangelists relate, recognized again as a disciple." John's *they said* (*εἶπον*), being indefinite, may be said of one person or of several. Very probably others present caught up the words of one, and affirmed them as their own.

Ver. 70. The third denial would seem to have occurred at the fire again. Peter had found no refuge in the porch, and returned again to the court. It was on being confronted there by the relative of Malchus who had seen Peter in the garden that, alarmed and exasperated beyond all control, he uttered his third and most aggravated denial (ver. 71). John here again shows his knowledge of the in-door part of the history. He knew, evidently, not only the portress, but other members of the household. The relative of Malchus saw Peter distinctly enough in the garden to recognize him now as they stood again face to face. In addition to the rest, Peter was in danger of being called to account for an attempt against the life of a body-servant of the high-priest. His speech or mode of pronunciation as a Galilean was still further (*καὶ γάρ*) proof that he was one of Christ's adherents. One peculiarity of this dialect was, that the Galilean confounded his gutturals with each other. A Galilean, for example, as the Talmud relates, asks a Jew, Whose *anar* is this? "I do not understand you," says the Judean. "Do you speak of a lamb to slaughter, or of wine to drink, or of an ass to ride, or of wool for clothing?" The two last consonants are the same, but the initial guttural is in each case different.

Ver. 71. Instead of *he cursed and swore*, as in the A. V., I would prefer to render (though of course with the same meaning), *called down curses on himself and swore, saying*. He affirmed with all the solemnity of an oath that he had no knowledge of this man on trial, and appealed to God to inflict on him all the curses due to perjury if he did not speak the truth in that declaration.

Ver. 72. Instead of *the cock crew* (A. V.), render, *a cock crew*, i.e. one not far off, and hence distinctly heard. We have the same indefinite subject in Matt. xxvi. 74. So also render in ver. 68, though the expression there is perhaps not genuine. The rendering in this verse of *ἐπιβαλὼν* is uncertain almost beyond example. The A. V. has, *he thought thereon*. Some render, *he began to weep*; some, *wept abundantly*.

dantly; some, covered his head and wept; and some, cast himself forth, or hurried out. The ambiguity arises chiefly out of the uncertain object of the participle. The meaning last stated comes nearer to the *having gone out* (ἐξελθών) of Matthew and Luke. It was certainly the very thing that Peter would inevitably do; but a majority of the best interpreters adopt here the first meaning, that of the A. V., supplying τὸν νοῦν. *He wept bitterly*, says Matthew (xxvi. 75), and also Luke (xxii. 62). In those tears we may recognize the fulfilment of Christ's words to Peter when he foretold the sad defection: "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not utterly fail"; and in his subsequent life we may recognize Peter's loyalty to those other words: "And when thou art converted [or, hast turned back from that defection] strengthen thy brethren" (See Luke xxii. 32). The tradition is that Peter died as a martyr at Rome, and asked as a privilege that he might be crucified with his head downward, as unworthy to be crucified as Christ was, because he had denied his Lord and Master. N.B. Dean Alford inserts a very convenient tabular view of the agreements and differences between the four evangelists in their accounts of Peter's denials, on p. 197 of his *How to Read the New Testament* (1870). He gives a very satisfactory explanation of the differences, but ought not to speak of the efforts of more vigorous harmonists as "little dishonesties." It is incumbent on us always to show, as believers in the truthfulness of the Gospels, how the different accounts may be consistent with each other; but we are not required to show that they must have been true only in that particular way, and not in any other. We may often argue in such cases from our ignorance, as well as from our knowledge; for unless an objector knows enough to know that this or that explanation which clears up a difficulty could not possibly have been true, he does not know enough to allege that the contradiction or inconsistency really exists.

(To be continued).