

These considerations may make us beware of attaching too much importance to St. Luke's editorial notes. Sir William Ramsay has done much to vindicate St. Luke's trustworthiness as an historian and geographer, but there is another side to the question. St. Luke was not an eye-witness of our Lord's ministry, and the sources upon which he rested for information were not full of details. He would not have made use of such devices as catchwords to connect passages, if he had had complete information. And if his chief authority, St. Mark, was deficient in order, as Papias testifies, St. Luke could not as a rule improve upon him.

It is tempting to suppose that 'Q' simply gave the preface 'John said,' and that St. Matthew filled in the sentence one way, St. Luke in another, both acting by conjecture. But it is quite possible that St. Matthew's preface is original and that in all the four cases which I have mentioned St. Luke has deliberately corrected St. Matthew in accordance with his own prepossessions. For in 7⁸⁰ he expressly asserts that the Pharisees were not baptized by John. And he may have altered all

these passages for the sake of consistency with that assertion, even as St. Matthew altered or suppressed all the passages of St. Mark in which our Lord is said to have been 'at home,' or 'in a house,' presumably out of deference for the assertion that 'the Son of Man had not where to lay his head':—a saying which was true of one part of the ministry, but certainly not of all. The more I study the Gospels, the more convinced I become that enormous pains were taken in preparing them for publication. Of course there need not be any contradiction between St. Matthew and St. Luke in this particular case. For if St. Matthew says that many Pharisees 'came to be baptized,' it does not follow that they were really immersed. The rough reception which they met may well have driven them away. Or St. Luke may only mean that as a class they held aloof from John: a few exceptional cases of baptism by him may have occurred.

The passage will be set right if we read 'the rich' for 'the multitudes,' and if St. Luke was deliberately correcting St. Matthew, he may have inserted 'the multitudes' into both verses, without observing the incongruities.

The Denials of Peter.

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

III. THE HOUSE OF ANNAS AND THE HOUSE OF ISHBOSHETH.

WHILE Jesus was being questioned inside the house of Annas, there occurred below in the courtyard the scene in which Peter denied his Master three times. Before we go on to this scene, it is necessary to describe the general situation more fully, as some difficulties remain.

Mark alone shows that the courtyard was lower than the room or hall where Jesus was examined in the house: He was taken up to the first floor, and not to a room on the ground floor. In the Turkish houses, which we have seen, the ground floor is reserved for store-rooms and private rooms (and in the country often for horses and animals), while the main reception chamber and public room is upstairs.

In front of the house was an open courtyard, in

which Peter was waiting to see the issue of events¹ along with a crowd of slaves and attendants. Admission to the courtyard from the street was through a gateway, where a woman kept watch and ward; she opened the gate when she chose to admit a stranger, and was therefore able doubtless to scrutinize visitors through the closed gate by a grating or other device. This form of house is practically universal now in Asiatic Turkey, and in Syria (so far as my small experience there serves).

That this was the plan of construction of a Jewish house seems proved by the story of the assassination of Ishbosheth; and is quite natural and probable in itself, for the East changes little. You can very safely use modern customs, where these are unaffected by European influence, to illustrate ancient history. We are here referring to the class of house that is used by families

¹ Mt 26⁶⁸.

possessed of some little property: the poor dwell in simple huts. On the other hand, the wealthy families of the local aristocracy used to dwell in more imposing mansions called Tetrapyrgiai,¹ which were built on a plan like that of some modern English colleges with a single quadrangle, and four towers at the four corners, and a gate in the middle of one side. Christ Church in Oxford is a good example in everything except size. This form of construction is still seen in Turkey in the stately khans of the early Turkish period; but it has passed out of use in ordinary life, for there are no local aristocracy and no wealthy persons, and the houses belong to one of the two classes just described; and similarly in Palestine the houses of the 'king' Ishbosheth and of the high priest Annas were of a more modest type.

That this common native type of house is not of modern origin, appears from the fact that it is not well adapted to the harem system. In fact, often there is nowadays a separate house for the women of a family, while the house which contains the public audience chamber is reserved for men alone. If the customary type had been devised after the seclusion and separation of women became a social practice, it would have been adapted to facilitate the practice; and the great houses of early Turkish times were so adapted.

The Tetrapyrgiai² were the property of a class of nobles belonging to a conquering race settled in a new country; and their mansions were equipped as fortresses for defence, intended to hold down the subject population.³ Each Tetrapyrgia was the centre of one of those great estates, which have had so much to do with the development of the serfdom (as distinguished from slavery) that passed from Asia Minor to Europe and was a living curse

¹ Little has been written on these fortified mansions: they are described, and identified for the first time (so far as I know), in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 420. See also *Luke the Physician, and other Studies*, p. 187 (where instead of Pl. xv. read xxiii.); and Rostowzew, *Studien zur Geschichte des röm. Kolonates*, p. 253.

² Both feminine and neuter forms are used—*τετραπύργιον*, Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xiii. 2. 1; Acta SS. Sergii Bacchi 7 Oct. pp. 842 f.; *Anal. Bolland.* xiv. 385; Georgius Cyprius, pp. 150, 152 (Gelzer); *τετραπύργια*, Plutarch, *Eum.* 8; Procopius, who describes the architectural form, *Aed.* iv. 1 (p. 266, Bonn ed.); Strabo, p. 838; Polybius, xxxi. 26. 11.

³ Defence was certainly the purpose of the early Turkish khans. They were fortresses built to shelter and defend caravans from the attacks of the nomads (see *Luke the Physician*, *loc. cit.*).

to Europe until the emancipation of the Russian serfs about 1860. The estates can be traced in Asia Minor from the fifth century B.C. The first historical reference to their influence on social custom is in Lk 2^{2,4}. They created and fostered the idea that the cultivator was attached to the soil; and Augustus (and his successors) recognized this attachment as right, when they ordered every one to return to his own place of origin every fourteenth year for the census. To this order by the Emperor, Luke attributes the journey of Joseph and Mary, which brought it about that Jesus was born in Bethlehem of parents who were settled at Nazareth. The attachment to the soil became more close, until at last the Roman law during the fourth century recognized that the landlord of the estate had a right to the labour of the cultivators who lived on it, and regarded them as defrauding him if they moved away from their home. This recognition constitutes the legal institution of serfdom and the colonate in the full later sense. Such is the principle of the attachment to the home and place of origin (*ἰδία*), which is one of the most brilliant discoveries of modern historical investigation: a few paragraphs from a purely scientific investigation of the principle of the *ἰδία* by Mr. de Zulueta read, evidently quite without intention of that writer, like a commentary on Lk 2^{2,5}.

These Tetrapyrgiai are known both in Syria and still more in Asia Minor; but they were not an institution used by the natives; and they are not to be looked for in the time of Ishbosheth. The would-be king Ishbosheth lived on the family property in a house of a more unassuming class, such as the ordinary well-to-do Turkish family lives in at the present day; and it is worth the pains to examine the two narratives minutely from this point of view. It is only by such minute study that the excellence of both becomes evident and convincing.

It is not to be denied absolutely that the story of Ishbosheth's assassination might be explained in agreement with the construction of a Tetrapyrgia; but the incidents suit more naturally the house of the native class, and suggest in their entirety not the more elaborate and fortified arrangement of

⁴ Lk 2², quoted as authoritative by Rostowzew, *Stud.* 2. *Gesch. des röm. Kolonates*, p. 305.

⁵ *De patrociniis vicorum* in 'Oxford Studies,' 1909, edited by Professor Vinogradoff; Zulueta's essay is really a commentary on a title in the Codex Theodosianus. The pertinent words are quoted in the present writer's *Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of N. T.*, p. 267.

the former, but the general style of management and domestic economy of the latter. Ishbosheth, though claiming to be a king, had evidently no thought of guarding against danger by household precautions of any kind.

It should be added that, while the houses in the Turkish towns and villages are constructed in the same general fashion as in the country, with outer gate, open courtyard, and the dwelling-house proper looking over the courtyard (*αὐλή*), yet owing to conditions of the space available, there are variations in detail: e.g. sometimes the gate adjoins the front of the dwelling-rooms, but more commonly it is opposite to them. Similar variations in the arrangement of Roman houses are due to the same cause; but the general plan and idea of the Roman house is uniform (quite different in plan and intention from the Syrian or Turkish houses).

As Lady Ramsay has stated, and shown clearly by placing the translations from the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint side by side, there are two distinct accounts of the murder of Ishbosheth.¹ These explain the situation differently, and yet, as she says, they are both necessary for a complete picture of the assassins' conduct. Call the accounts A and B: in her comparison of the two translations A is printed in italics. According to A, Baanah and Rechab, in order to obtain entrance, pretended that they were bringing the first corn from the threshing-floor:² this account is incomplete, because it leaves unexplained how they escaped unobserved after the murder. That is explained in B, which tells that even the woman who guarded the gate had gone away to help in the harvest; and, if she whose prime duty it was to be on the watch was absent, *a fortiori* all other servants might have gone out for the same purpose. As Lady Ramsay says, this is the custom; every one goes; no one remains at home. Usually, the master and landlord also goes and looks on, or even helps in the work. The laziness of Ishbosheth, which kept him sleeping in the house, was portentous and exceptional. So far as my experience goes, even people who spend the rest

of the year sitting about with cigarettes and coffee, go out to the harvest, which is the jolliest season of the year: it means food for the ensuing twelve months.

B, however, does not explain how the two assassins had planned to obtain entrance. They could not beforehand count on the absence of the portress from duty; and A here comes in to help; they were to pretend to her that they were bringing corn. When they came to the gate under this pretence, they found that there was no difficulty, because the gate was open and the guardian away. Accordingly they could go in and out without any one to observe them.

After entering unobserved through the open gate, they found themselves in the courtyard in front of the dwelling-house. Here they were 'in the midst of the house,' for the courtyard was part of the house (though outside of the chambers), as appears clearly from other evidence and from Mt 26^b. On the ground floor were the store-rooms for the corn (as already described). Ishbosheth, a fat and lazy man, was sleeping heavily in the heat and audibly: they went into the dwelling-house and into his bed-chamber, and killed him as he lay. To get away was easy: no one noticed or pursued. The brothers Baanah and Rechab took a road which must have been out of sight of the threshing-floor. It seems to be implied that they had a choice of roads, and they chose the one least open to observation. As a rule, in Turkey, the threshing-floor is some distance from the house, and close to the cornfields. There are cases where the threshing-floor of a village is several miles distant from it.

Before passing from this incident we note that the two accounts, while each in itself presenting a story that is outwardly complete, were both taken into the historical work, 2 Kings or 2 Samuel, composed by the ancient Hebrew writer. The Septuagint omits almost the whole of A, but retains a small part (as indicated by the italics in Lady Ramsay's comparison of the two versions). The Hebrew version, which is known to us only from comparatively late manuscripts, omits part of B; but this omission is deliberate and belongs to a class of changes which were introduced into the text (see above, p. 315). The omission of A in the Septuagint is also deliberate. The translators apparently thought that A was unnecessary; and certainly they were right in preferring B, which is

¹ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, April, p. 315.

² It must have been the first, because, after the delivery began, there would come a series of men carrying grain, whereas Baanah and Rechab's business called for privacy. They therefore came before the delivery of grain from the threshing-floor had begun, pretending to be the first.

a more vivid and detailed story ; but thereby they lose an important feature, namely, the difference between the assassins' plan and their actual deed. It is this that makes the Hebrew historian's narrative so complete and convincing.

The two accounts, A and B, read like the evidence of witnesses, perhaps those witnesses who narrated the facts in the investigation which David would naturally institute. They are both immediate, both have the ring of truth ; and they come from imperfect human beings, who tell only what each had specially observed. The author of the history had not seen those events for himself, but he had access to the evidence of eye-witnesses, and he stated this evidence as it was given to him.

The Hebrew historian did not work up the two accounts into a single narrative ; he did not strive after artistic merit ; he gives each account as it was, even although this involves some repetition.

We are not here in presence of a history written

centuries after the events, but with a work composed in contact with immediate witnesses ; and their stories are given side by side, each in its own way, imperfect yet in a sense complete, immediate and convincing. The subsequent fate of this history is one of mutilation and ill-treatment, not of addition and elaboration. This is also the character of the Gospels of Mark and Luke.

It may with good reason be asked whether the custom of using a woman as keeper of the gate, so unlike what one assumes to be the Jewish character in the time of Christ, was not special to and characteristic of the household of the high priest. May it not be an ancient Hebrew custom which the priests maintained after the people had ceased to observe it? Religious history shows many such survivals, where the priestly custom continues to practice some ancient usage.¹

¹ Lady Ramsay points out that Rhoda in Ac 12 is not called a doorkeeper ; she is merely a household slave-girl who runs to open the door when a late visitor knocks.

Literature.

EJECTION.

THE word is not intended to recall that which used to happen sometimes at political meetings when the suffragists were about. It is a philosophical term. It is the subject of a book which Olive A. Wheeler, M.Sc., submitted successfully to the University of London for the degree of Doctor of Science. The book is called *Anthropomorphism and Science* (Allen & Unwin ; 5s. net). But its subject is Ejection. 'My knowledge of self is essentially different from my knowledge of all other objects, including my fellow-men. I can never directly experience another man's thoughts and feelings, nor can I even know directly that he has any thoughts and feelings. Take the simplest possible case as an example. If I suffer pain, the experience is a fact of indubitable certainty. But if another man suffers, the pain is not directly and immediately apprehended by me. How then do I know of its existence? I believe that he suffers because I interpret his expressions, words, and other external accompaniments in the light of my own direct experience of pain. His pain is not,

and never can become, an *object* to me. It is an *eject*—something directly known only in myself when it is *thrown out* of myself and assumed to be in him.' And the process of throwing this something out of myself and assuming it to be in him is Ejection.

Now in Dr. Wheeler's hands Ejection is an instrument of no little theological and philosophical value. The first sin of which we have any record was due to overweening ambition. 'By that sin fell the angels.' It is likely to be the last sin. At the present time it is especially rampant in two spheres of life—the political and the scientific. As a certain nation has been demanding 'Deutschland über alles,' so certain men of more or less scientific knowledge have been claiming the whole universe for science. Theology and philosophy, they say, are simply ignorance ; as science pushes its way across the universe, these usurpers will vanish before it, and science will be 'über alles.'

But Ejection says no. Ejection says that science, philosophy, and theology are all dependent upon herself, and all equally. There is therefore a place