

HOW OFTEN DID JESUS SAY PETER WOULD DENY HIM?¹

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

The question can be understood in two different senses, and I wish to explore them both. How often was Peter to deny the Lord, and how often did the Lord warn him? I will consider the second question first. Each Gospel records a warning—the relevant passages are Matthew 26:30-35, Mark 14:26-31, Luke 22:31-34, 39 and John 13:36-38, 18:1. For reasons that will presently become apparent I will start to discuss the passages in reverse order.

How Many Warnings?

First, John 13:36-38:

36 Simon Peter says to Him, “Lord, where are you going?” Jesus answered him, “Where I am going you cannot follow me now, but later you will follow me.” 37 Peter says to Him: “Lord, why can’t I follow you now? I will lay down my life for your sake!” 38 Jesus answered him: “You will lay down your life for my sake? Most assuredly I say to you, no rooster can crow until you have denied me three times!”²

Notice the distinctive context that leads into our Lord’s warning. Notice also the emphatic nature of His declaration—by employing a double negative (in the Greek text) He leaves no question but that three denials will take place before the first rooster crows from that moment on. Notice finally where and when this exchange took place. They were in the upper room where they had gathered to observe the Passover. Evidently this conversation between the Lord and Peter came comparatively early in the proceedings, because it was followed by the contents of chapters 14, 15, 16 and 17 before they left the room and went to the garden on the Mount of Olives (18:1).

Second, Luke 22:31-34:

31 Then the Lord said, “Simon, Simon, indeed Satan has asked for you (pl) that he may sift you as wheat, 32 but I have prayed for you (sg) that your faith should not fail, and when you have returned to me strengthen your brethren.” 33 But he said to Him, “Lord, I am ready to go with you both to prison and to death!” 34 So He said, “I tell you, Peter, no rooster can crow this day before you will deny three times that you know me!”

Notice again the distinctive context that leads into our Lord’s warning. It is clearly different from that given in John 13. Notice also that there seems to be an increase in the intensity of their exchange. There is a note of reproach in Peter’s speech, and the use of Peter’s name gives a stern note to the Lord’s response. The addition of “today” (compared to John 13) and the shifting of “thrice” to an emphatic position (in the Greek text—again as compare to John) contribute to the feeling of heightened intensity. Also, now Peter will deny that he even knows Him. Note finally where and when this exchange took place. They were still in the upper room, but this conversation evidently came near the end of the proceedings, because only the contents of verses 35-38 intervened before they left the room and went to the Mount of Olives (22:39). Of course, more may have actually happened than is recorded in 22:35-38, but it seems clear that the warning recorded in Luke is not the same as the one recorded in John, and that the one in John happened first.

I find a comparison of the two warnings in Greek to be impressive and convincing:

John 13:38: “Τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θησεῖς? Ἀμην, ἀμην λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλεκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀπαρνηθῇ με τρίς.”

¹ For those who may have seen the first draft of this paper, that was sent to the Majority Text Society membership over twenty years ago, this draft has been significantly modified and enlarged.

² The emphasis here is on the obligatory absence of any cockcrow until Peter has denied [at least] three times. There is no definite article with ‘rooster’, so it is “a rooster”; the negative is double, therefore emphatic, “absolutely not”. If you have lived where there were a number of roosters, you know that one or another can sound off at any time, and some one of them will crow almost on the hour throughout the night, while at dawn they put on a chorus. It was probably somewhere around 9 p.m. when Jesus issued this warning, and Peter’s first denial probably happened at least five hours later. For not a single rooster to crow anywhere within earshot during that time required supernatural intervention—which is why I render “no rooster can crow” (if an angel can close lions’ mouths [Dan. 6:22], closing roosters’ beaks would be a cake walk).

Luke 22:34: “Λεγω σοι, Πιερρε, ου μη φωνηση σημερον αλεκτωρ πριν η τρις απαρνηση μη ειδεναι με.”

Really, there’s no comparison; they are obviously different (even taking into account that they probably spoke Hebrew, so we are looking at a translation). As in John, here again we have a plain affirmation that three denials [at least] will take place before the first rooster crows.

Third, Matthew 26:30-35:

30 And after hymn-singing they went out to the Mount of Olives. 31 Then Jesus says to them, “All of you will be caused to stumble because of me this night, for it is written: ‘I will strike the Shepherd and the sheep of the flock will be scattered.’ 32 But after I am raised I will go before you to Galilee.” 33 Peter answered and said to Him, “Even if everyone *else* is caused to stumble because of you, **I** will never be caused to stumble!” 34 Jesus said to him, “Assuredly I say to you that this night, before *any* rooster crows, you will deny me three times.” 35 Peter says to Him, “Even if I have to die with you, I will **not** deny you!” All the *other* disciples said the same.

Notice that this exchange took place after they had left the upper room and were on their way to the Garden of Gethsemane. Again the context is distinct from that in Luke or John—here the Lord begins by warning all the disciples. Peter counters by contradicting Him. The Lord’s reiterated specific warning to Peter contains no new elements except that now it is “this very night”. Peter contradicts again, using a double negative for emphasis—he ‘has his back up’ and is starting to get impertinent. It seems clear that Matthew records a third warning to Peter, subsequent to those in Luke and John.

Fourth, Mark 14:26-31:

26 And after hymn-singing they went out to the Mount of Olives. 27 And Jesus says to them, “All of you will be caused to stumble because of me this night, for it is written: ‘I will strike the Shepherd and the sheep will be scattered.’ 28 But after I am raised I will go before you to Galilee.” 29 But Peter said to Him, “Even if all are caused to stumble, yet I will not be!” 30 And Jesus says to him, “Assuredly I say to you that you, today, even this night, before a rooster crows twice, you will deny me three times.” 31 But he spoke the more vehemently, “If I have to die with you, I will certainly not deny you!” And they all said the same.

The first four verses are virtually identical with the parallel passage in Matthew, so we evidently have the same time and place in both. But now we come to verse 30, the despair of those who defend scriptural inerrancy and the delight of their opponents. Our Lord’s statement here differs in several ways from that in Matthew 26:34 but the main problem is the word “twice”. What are we to say: Are Matthew 26:34 and Mark 14:30 contradictory accounts of the same warning?

Before settling for that explanation, the precise turn of phrase in Mark 14:30 invites our attention. I believe it will help to see a word for word rendering of what Jesus said. “Assuredly I say to you that you, today, this very night, before twice a rooster crows, thrice you will deny me.” The Lord’s declaration here seems quite sharp. There is extraordinary emphasis on the second “you”. “Twice” is also heavily emphasized. How are we to account for such severity? Peter’s effort in verse 29 scarcely seems to merit such a reaction—the reaction recorded in Matthew 26:34 seems much more appropriate. And what shall we say to Mark 14:31? Peter’s words here are virtually identical to those in Matthew 26:35 but they are introduced by “but he spoke the more vehemently.” Why the vehement reiteration?

I suggest that the solution is to read the following sequence. Matthew 26:30-35^a then Mark 14:30-31:

Jesus: “All of you will be caused to stumble because of me this night . . .”

Peter: “Though all are caused to stumble because of you, I will never be caused to stumble.”

Jesus: “Assuredly I say to you that this night, before any rooster crows, you will deny me three times.”

Peter: “Even if I have to die with you I will certainly not deny you!”

Jesus: “Assuredly I say to you that you, today, this very night, before a rooster crows twice, you will deny me three times.”

Peter, more vehemently: “If I have to die with you, I will certainly not deny you!”

In other words, Mark omitted the exchange recorded in Matthew 26:34-35^a while Matthew omitted the exchange recorded in Mark 14:30-31^a. (The editorial comment “and they all said the same” comes at the end of the whole episode.)

On three separate occasions Jesus warned Peter that he would deny Him [at least] three times before a rooster crowed during that night. Peter’s responses became increasingly belligerent until after the third warning he even contradicted the Lord with an emphatic double negative (Mat. 26:35). Finally the Lord lost His patience, as it were, and said in effect, “Listen, not only will you deny me three times before a rooster crows once, you will deny me another three times before a rooster crows twice!” For answer Peter repeats his prior statement even more vehemently.

The reader will perceive that in answering the second question I have anticipated the answer to the first one. The Lord warned Peter four times, each Gospel recording a separate instance, and there would be [at least] six denials, three before the first crowing of a rooster (John, Luke, Matthew) and another three before the second (Mark). It remains to enquire whether the several accounts of Peter’s denials will countenance this proposal. The relevant passages are Matthew 26:57-75, Mark 14:53-72, Luke 22:54-62 and John 18:15-27.

How Many Denials?

A cursory reading of these passages suggests that Peter’s denials were provoked by eight different challenges—the maid at the outside entrance (John), a maid in the courtyard (Matthew, Mark, Luke), the same maid a second time (Mark), a different maid in the gateway (Matthew), two different men (Luke, John), and the bystanders on two occasions (John and Matthew, Mark). Although it may be possible to combine one pair or another, there is no reasonable way to get the number down to three. But what if there were at least six denials?

To really get the complete picture we need to plot the relevant information on a chart. We need to know who issued the challenge, where, when, just how was it done, what was Peter’s reaction, and if a rooster crowed. Because of constraints of space and paper size, I will do a Gospel at a time, beginning with John.³

John 18:15-27:

	1 st denial	2 nd denial	3 rd denial
Who?	the gatekeeper (f)	servants and operatives	a relative of Malchus
Where?	outside gate	by the fire	by the fire (?)
When?	at the beginning of the proceedings	a little while after the first one	a little while after the second one (?)
How was it done?	she asks: “You aren’t one of this man’s disciples too, are you?”	they ask: “You aren’t one of his disciples too, are you?”	he asks: “Didn’t I see you with him in the garden?”
What was the reaction?	he says: “I am not!”	he said: “I am not!”	(Peter denied again)
Rooster?	(no)	(no)	immediately a rooster crowed

Luke 22:54-62:

	1 st denial	2 nd denial	3 rd denial
Who?	a servant girl	a man	another man
Where?	by the fire	by the fire (?)	by the fire (?)
When?	fairly early on (?)	a little later	about an hour later
How was it done?	she looked intently and said: “This man was also with him.”	he said: “You also are of them.”	he confidently affirmed: “Surely this fellow also was with him, for he is a Galilean.”
What was the reaction?	he said: “Woman, I do not know him.”	he said: “Man, I am not!”	he said: “Man, I do not know him.”

³ A comparison of the contents of the four Gospels reveals that in the main John supplies information not recorded in the other three; he wrote last, with the purpose of supplementing their accounts. Here again, the three denials he describes are all new information, not to be found in the other three.

reaction?	not know him.”		what you are saying.”
Rooster?	(no)	(no)	immediately, while he was yet speaking, a rooster crowed.

Matthew 26:57-75:

	1 st denial	2 nd denial	3 rd denial
Who?	a servant girl	another girl	bystanders
Where?	by the fire	in the gateway	by the fire (?)
When?	fairly early on (?)	a little later	a little later
How was it done?	approached him saying: “You too were with Jesus the Galilean.”	says to the others: “This fellow also was with Jesus the Natsorean.”	come up to Peter and say: “Really, you too are one of them, because your very accent gives you away!”
What was the reaction?	denied before them all: “I don’t know what you are saying.”	denied with an oath: “I do not know the man!”	began to curse and to swear: “I do not know the man!”
Rooster?	(no)	(no)	immediately a roster crowed

Mark 14:53-72:

	1 st denial	2 nd denial	3 rd denial
Who?	a servant girl	the same girl	bystanders
Where?	by the fire	in the fore-court (?)	by the fire (?)
When?	fairly early on (?)	a little later	a little later
How was it done?	looked at him and said: “You also were with Jesus the Nazarene.”	says to the bystanders: “This is one of them.”	say to Peter again: “Surely you are one of them; for you are a Galilean and your speech shows it!”
What was the reaction?	denied, saying: “I neither know nor understand what you are saying	(he denied again)	he began to curse and to swear: “I do not know this man of whom you speak!”
Rooster?	he went out to the fore-court and a rooster crowed	(no)	a rooster crowed a second time.

If you compare all the parameters—who, where, when, how, what—there really is no way to come out with only three denials; even to come out with only six requires some gymnastics (but I did attempt to do it in the first draft). Let’s try to arrange the events in chronological sequence and see what happens.

John 18:17 gives us what is clearly the first challenge—as the maid who kept the outside door let Peter in, at John’s request, she asked, “You aren’t one of this man’s disciples too, are you?”⁴ Even though John was evidently standing right there, Peter denied, “I am not.” He then went in to stand near the fire in the courtyard. The other Gospels have Peter sitting, while John has him standing. Evidently there were quite a few people about—they could not all sit close to the fire. Presumably they would take turns standing near the fire to warm up and then move away a bit to sit down. Thus they, including Peter, would be alternately sitting and standing.

All four Gospels have Peter in the courtyard near the fire (Mat. 26:58 and 69, Mark 14:54 and 66, Luke 22:55, and John 18:18 and 25) and three of them (Matthew, Mark, John) give some account of the council’s dealings with Jesus before going on with Peter’s denials.⁵ We know from Luke 22:61 that Jesus was at a window that looked out on the courtyard, only with His back to it. John is the only one

⁴ Everyone there, including the girl, knows that John belongs to Jesus, so her question is perfectly natural, without malice—since John is vouching for Peter, she assumes that Peter must also belong to Jesus. John had heard all the warnings, so when Peter denied at the gate, in his presence, John doubtless kept a close eye on him the whole rest of the night. So we have an eyewitness account. Of course Peter himself would also be an eyewitness, but since he was undergoing satanic interference in his mind, his powers of recollection might be impaired.

⁵ It is after midnight and chilly in the courtyard, hence the fire; but there must have been over fifty people in the room where the questioning was going on, and all windows would be open.

who records that the high priest asked Jesus about His disciples (v. 19)—he is facing Jesus and therefore the open window, and would be speaking loudly enough for everyone in the room to hear clearly, so the people in the courtyard also heard everything he said—then in verse 25 we read, “Therefore they said to him, ‘You aren’t one of his disciples too, are you?’” I suggest that verse 25 gives us the second challenge and denial. The guards around the fire, presumably prompted by the high priest’s questioning Jesus about His disciples, put their question to Peter. He answers them as he did the girl at the gate, “I am not.” So far the challengers have only questioned, rather than affirm, but now the tempo quickens.

I take it that the first denials recorded in Matthew (26:69-70), Mark (14:66-68) and Luke (22:56-57) form a single episode. Collating them we may understand the following. A certain serving girl of the high priest came by and saw Peter sitting near the fire. She looked closely at him and said to the others, “This man also was with him” (Luke). She then addressed Peter directly, “You also were with Jesus the Nazarene, of Galilee” (Matthew, Mark). But he denied before them all, saying, “Girl, I don’t know him; I neither know nor understand what you’re talking about!” He then went out to the fore-court, and a rooster crowed (Mark 14:68). Thus, there were [at least] three denials before the first cockcrow.

I say ‘at least’ because the third denial in John probably belongs here as well. In 18:26 the verb “to say” is in the present tense, which seems to suggest a brief interval rather than nearly an hour (Luke 22:59); also the challenge is still framed as a question, “Didn’t I see you with him in the garden?”, rather than a direct accusation, which would fit better toward the beginning than at the end. I see no problem with suggesting that all three of the denials in John were part of the first set and thus he records the first rooster crow. In that event I would understand that there were actually four denials before the first crowing, the three in John plus the first one in the others. Because the rooster crowed “immediately” I imagine that the order would be as follows: the first two in John, in that order, then the first one in the others, and then, as Peter was moving toward the fore-court, the relative of Peter’s victim comes alongside and puts his question, so that Peter is at the fore-court when the first rooster crows (Mark 14:68). Actually, I am inclined to suspect that indeed there were four denials before the first cockcrow, which is recorded by both Mark and John (recall that Jesus neither said nor implied that there would be ‘only’ three).⁶

Now for the next round. In Mark (14:69) the same girl sees Peter again and starts telling the bystanders, “This fellow is one of them.” In Matthew (26:71) a different girl sees him and tells the bystanders, “This fellow was with Jesus the Natsorean.” In Luke (22:58) a man saw him and said, “You also are one of them.” In order to come out with only three denials in the second set, two of these would have to be combined, but as already stated, I am not aware of anything in the Text that rules out the possibility that there could be more than three. It seems to me that there is a progression in Peter’s desperation which culminates in his cursing and swearing. On that basis I would consider the instances in Mark and Luke as forming a single episode (if I had to)—the girl speaks, Peter denies, a man backs the girl up and Peter answers, “Man, I am not.” Then the instance in Matthew would be the sixth denial—notice that now Peter adds an oath! Because of the oath I consider that this denial comes after the other two just mentioned; also, Peter has moved out to the gateway. Actually, I am inclined to suspect that there were also four denials before the second cockcrow, so I will start again on that basis.

The girl that provoked the third denial is not about to let Peter get away with that denial. Whether she followed him out to the fore-court, or he moved back toward the fire, I imagine that Mark 14:69 records the fifth denial. If so, Luke 22:58 records the sixth denial, perhaps near the fire. Peter is definitely uncomfortable; he is getting altogether too much unwelcome attention. He moves out to the gateway (perhaps thinking of abandoning the premises)⁷ where he is challenged by a different girl (Matthew 26:71); Peter denies with an oath (number seven). Luke (22:59) puts ‘about an hour’ between denials six and eight, so perhaps Peter was left alone for a bit. However, the ‘trial’ is over but the bosses are waiting for dawn so they can take Jesus to Pilate. Since the bosses aren’t going home, the guards and employees can’t either—they are obliged to wait out in the cold, bored stiff—so Peter is now the only show in town.

For the eighth denial three Gospels offer a candidate (Mat. 26:73-74, Mark 14:70-72, Luke 22:59-60). The accounts in Matthew and Mark are very similar and evidently parallel. Since Matthew has the rooster crowing “immediately” and Mark “the second time” this has to be last denial—since by now Peter

⁶ The satanic interference in Peter’s mind was so effective that not even the rooster’s crowing woke him up.

⁷ So why didn’t Peter just bolt out the gate at that point? I would say that there was supernatural intervention—he simply was not allowed to leave.

is cursing and swearing it is fitting that it should be. By that time most of the people on the premises would be aware of Peter and his denials. After listening for a while they closed in, citing his accent. The account in Luke has just one man speaking, but his words are in the same vein. This also has to be the last denial because we are told that the rooster crowed while Peter was still speaking. Evidently a number of people were speaking at once (but not in unison), or in rapid succession, and different writers preserve some of the variety of statement. It would appear that they were ganging up on Peter, because he is driven to curse and to swear. And so we have a second set of four denials, before the second cockcrow. Even then it took a direct look from the Lord (Luke 22:61) to break Satan's spell and bring Peter to a realization of what he had done.

But the question may well be asked, why did each Gospel writer report and speak of only three denials (albeit giving different selections) if there were really six or eight?⁸ I suggest that we are looking at a prime example of the grace and sensitivity of God. It would be quite humiliating enough to have denied the Lord three/four times, but to go on to do so another three/four times, even after hearing a rooster crow, would be almost too much to bear. Rather than put the full extent of Peter's ignominy on display the Holy Spirit had each writer give only a partial account, enough for the purposes of the record but without flaying Peter unnecessarily. I find it interesting to note that it is Mark who furnishes the necessary clue that there was to be a second set of denials. The opinion is widely held that Peter influenced the composition of this Gospel, and if so he may have insisted on including the hint as to the extent of his humiliation, whereas the others delicately avoided it.

The Text-critical Problem

Although there are around a hundred textual differences reflected in the printed editions of the Greek Text (in the passages considered), I will confine my remarks here to the set that is especially bothersome in terms of the subject matter of this paper.

There are four places in Mark's account that relate to the two cockcrows: "twice" in 14:30, "and a rooster crowed" in 14:68, "the second time" and "twice" in 14:72. Instances 1, 3 and 4 go together and appear to contradict the account in Matthew, Luke and John. Instance 2 is apparently even worse because according to Mark's account Peter had only denied once when the rooster 'jumped the gun' and crowed before he was supposed to (Jesus had said there would certainly be three denials, as recorded in the other three Gospels). Accordingly, ever since the second century there have been those who tried to 'help' Mark out of his difficulties, tampering with the text.

According to the present state of our knowledge it appears that seven Greek MSS omit "twice" in 14:30 (but they do so in two different ways), nine MSS omit "and a rooster crowed" in 14:68 (but in two ways), five omit "the second time" in 14:72^a, and seven omit "twice" in 14:72^b (two others omit the whole clause). The roster of MSS shifts in each case, as does the versional evidence that sides with the omissions. Only three witnesses are thoroughgoing and omit all four. Codex Aleph, cursive 579 and the Old Latin "c" (it^c). This is a curious state of affairs. If the purpose of the omissions was to make Mark conform to the other Gospels, only Aleph, 579 and it^c have succeeded. Of the seventeen MSS involved, twelve omit only one of the four; one MS omits two of them; and two MSS omit three (there is some doubt here). Unless someone is prepared to show why Aleph and 579 are to be preferred above every other MS (some 1700 for Mark), and it^c above all the rest of the versional evidence, Latin and otherwise, there is really no reason to take the omissions seriously. However, the eclectic school does take them seriously, even without the requisite demonstration.

It appears that the "harder reading" canon has come to the aid of the vast majority of the MSS, at least as far as the editors of the "critical" or eclectic texts presently in vogue are concerned. Instances 1, 3, and 4 are retained in all Nestle and UBS editions (although UBS ascribes "a considerable degree of doubt" to 1 and 3, and "some degree of doubt" to 4—the change in grade here is strange). However,

⁸ Although of course I can't prove it [I wasn't there], I have tended to think that Mark wrote the first inspired account of our Savior's life on earth, for the Roman mind but [the colophons say Matthew wrote first, eight years after Christ's ascension, while Mark wrote two years later]. Then Matthew, with Mark's Gospel open in front of him, wrote the second, for the Hebrew mind. Then Luke, with both Mark and Matthew to hand, wrote the third, for the Greek mind. Then John, with the first three open, wrote to fill in the gaps, preserving important information not provided by the others, for all minds. Now let's consider Peter's denials within that framework. Mark wrote first, with two cockcrows. Matthew speaks of just one cockcrow and changes the second denial (1 and 3 are the same in Mark and Matthew). Luke speaks of just one cockcrow, changes the second denial yet again and provides added information (specific) about the third. So just with these three accounts we are up to five denials. John speaks of just one cockcrow but records three new denials, not mentioned by the other three. If these are inspired accounts, then God did it on purpose, and it is up to us to try to figure out why (see my concluding paragraph).

when it comes to instance 2 (“and a rooster crowed”) we get some variety: Nestle editions 1 to 25 omit the words; Nestle²⁶ and all three UBS editions retain them, but in single brackets (the UBS editors ascribe “a very high degree of doubt” to these words, along with the brackets which themselves signify “dubious textual validity”). Presumably the crucial datum here is that Codex B joins the evidence for omission with instance 2 (but not the others). From W-H through N²⁵ that was enough to banish the words from the Text. One supposes that it was the “harder reading” canon that restored them to UBS and N²⁶, if only in brackets. It seems to me that this case affords a clear example of the superficiality that characterizes the work of the eclectic school—to challenge the authenticity of a reading supported by over 99% of the MSS is unreasonable at any time, but to do so in the face of a perfectly obvious motivation for the omission is irresponsible.

The English versions that I have consulted all retain instances 1, 3 and 4, but deal variously with instance 2. AV, LB, NKJV, Phillips and TEV all retain “and a rooster crowed,” but LB favors us with a footnote: “This statement is found in only some of the MSS.” What might the purpose of such a footnote be? From the use of the word “only” it would appear that the purpose is to raise a doubt in the reader’s mind about the reliability of the Text. Why would they want to do that? The use of the word “some” also invites comment: it is their way of referring to some 1700 MSS, against nine! Will the reader not be deceived?

Jerusalem, NASB, NEB, NIV and RSV all omit the clause, but only Jerusalem does so without comment. The footnote in NEB reads, “Some witnesses insert ‘and a cock crew’.” As in LB, by “some” they mean some 1700 MSS, not to mention massive versional support and almost unanimous lectionary support. Will the reader not be deceived? The footnote in RSV reads, “Other ancient authorities add ‘and the cock crowed’.” The footnote in NIV reads, “Some early MSS add ‘and the rooster crowd’.” The footnote in NASB reads, “Later mss. add: ‘and a cock crowed’.” In order to evaluate such footnotes we would need to know the precise definitions for “ancient”, “early” and “later”. However, I submit that the uninitiated reader of such footnotes will certainly be misled as to the massive evidence against omission.

The case of the NIV invites special comment. It is the only version that offers a footnote at all four instances. At 14:30 we read, “Some early MSS omit ‘twice’.” At 14:68 we read, “Some early MSS add ‘and the rooster crowed’.” At 14:72^a we read, “Some early MSS omit ‘the second time’.” At 14:72^b we read, “Some early MSS omit ‘twice’.” (The meaning of “some” in the second instance is quite different from that in the other three.) What possible reason could the editors have had for including these footnotes? The immediate effect is to call in question the reliability of the Text at those points. Since the NIV editors hold to a high view of Scripture, why would they want to do that? I suppose that it was precisely their concern for the inerrancy of the Text that was at work here. It appears that they did not see any other solution to the seeming discrepancy between Mark and the other Gospels than to imply that Aleph and Old Latin “c” might be right after all. Alas!

The NIV editors are barking up the wrong tree. The worst thing to be done here would be to follow Aleph in deleting all four instances. As already pointed out, the four Gospels record eight different challenges resulting in denials, but no two Gospels have the same selection. So to follow Aleph would force us to try to accommodate eight denials before the first rooster crow, which seems to me to be hopeless. The best thing to be done here is to follow the true Text, which God has graciously caused to be preserved, in this case, in over 99% of the evidence. Peter denied three/four times before the first rooster crow and another set of three/four before the second. The Lord had warned him: “Simon, Simon, indeed Satan has asked for you, that he may sift you as wheat” (Luke 22:31). Peter should have paid attention.

Implications

One question that arises is this: What about the internal integrity of each account? For instance, in John’s account, even if we were to claim that two of the denials occurred before the first rooster crow, while the third denial came after the first and before the second, would this claim do violence to the integrity of John’s Gospel? Why would it? Let’s review the record. In John 13:38 Jesus said to Peter, “Most assuredly I say to you, a rooster shall not crow till you have denied me three times!” The Lord did not say “only” three times—the emphasis is on the obligatory absence of any rooster crow until Peter has denied three times, at least three times (there is nothing in the Lord’s turn of phrase to preclude the possibility that there could be more than three). In the Greek text there is no definite article with “rooster” and there is an emphatic double negative with the verb “to crow”—“a rooster shall not crow!” (These observations also apply in Luke 22:34; in fact, in all four Gospels, in both the predictions and the fulfillments, it is always “a” rooster.)

Turning to John's account of the denials themselves, the first one, at the outside door (18:17), poses no difficulty. The second denial (18:25) likewise poses no difficulty—these two occurred before any rooster crow. But what if the third denial (in John's account, 18:26-27) came after the first crowing?⁹ I see no problem, in principle. The Lord made a statement of fact, correctly recorded by John—there had to be three denials before the first rooster crow. This was precisely fulfilled, the Synoptics supplying the third denial. Nothing in John's account precludes the possibility that there should be subsequent crowings. (Anyone who has lived near roosters knows that they start crowing off and on anytime after midnight and at daybreak put on a concert—it seems obvious to me that the first two crowings were overtly controlled by God so as to match Christ's predictions.) In 18:27, after the third denial recorded by John, we read, "and immediately a rooster crowed." John does not say that it was the first crowing. Someone without access to the other Gospels would naturally assume that John records the first rooster crow, and that the three denials he gives are the whole story—but nothing in John's statement demands that interpretation; it simply arises from incomplete information. The other three present several added denials that are clearly distinct. The several Evangelists provide distinct sets of details, much like the pieces of a puzzle, that must be fitted together to get the whole picture. The several accounts are complementary, not contradictory.

But how about the internal integrity of Mark's account? He is the only one who mentions the second rooster crow, as such, and in fact his account is tied to it. Jesus said, "before a rooster crows twice you will deny me three times," and Mark records three denials before the second rooster crow. Again, Jesus did not say "only" three times, the emphasis is on "you" and "twice". The other Gospels are needed to get the full picture, but Mark's account is entirely self consistent.

And how about Luke? In the warning the emphasis is on the obligatory absence of a rooster crow until Peter has denied three times—at least three times (Jesus did not say "only" three times). After describing three of the denials Luke writes, "and immediately, while he was still speaking, a rooster crowed." "A" rooster—he does not say it was the first. Then Luke has Peter remembering that Jesus said, "Before a rooster crows you will deny me three times." Presumably Peter remembered every detail of all the warnings, but Luke (and each of the other Evangelists) gives only a partial description—in fact, Luke has him recalling the warning recorded by Matthew, not the one he himself gave. A reader having only Luke's account may assume that he told the whole story, but it is an unwarranted assumption. Luke's account is internally consistent yet the precise turn of phrase is such that it does not preclude my proposal.

So what about Matthew? Virtually everything said about Luke above can be repeated here. He has Peter remembering the warning he himself recorded. Again it is "a" rooster. Matthew's account is internally consistent yet the turn of phrase will accommodate my proposal without being violated. All of which brings us back to the question: Why does each Gospel speak of three denials, rather than six, eight or whatever? I don't know; we aren't told. My best guess is that God chose to draw a veil over the full extent of Peter's ignominy (and perhaps to test our disposition when faced with the unexplained). But it remains a plain fact that each Gospel offers a different assortment of challenges and denials, giving a total of at least eight denials.

Another question that I have heard concerns the validity of attempting an exercise such as this at all. I believe that God deliberately brings difficulties into our lives (Job in the ash heap, Abraham on Moriah, Moses herding sheep, Joseph in prison, Daniel with the lions, and on, and on), and puts puzzles in the world, to test our disposition and fiber, and to cause us to grow. "It is the glory of God to conceal a matter, but the glory of kings is to search out a matter" (Proverbs 25:2). [Even if you aren't a king, you get the point.] The case of John the baptizer in prison comes closer to home. He is frustrated, maybe disillusioned; he did his job but his expectations aren't being realized. So he sends two disciples to ask Jesus for an explanation. In effect Jesus answers, "Check the evidence; do your homework," and closes with, "And blessed is he who is not offended because of me" (Matthew 11:6). When faced with the difficult or unexplained we must be careful not to rebel. It is much better to obey the command recorded in 1 Peter 3:15. "Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and always be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you, . . ." Since opponents of a Text with objective authority have used the accounts of Peter's denials as an argument against any idea of inerrancy, I consider that a defense of that inerrancy is in order.

⁹ As the reader knows, I believe the third denial in John comes before the first cock crow, but I am covering this possibility for the sake of those who may prefer to have it in the second set.