

## Jesus as Prisoner.

BY THE REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.LITT., HON. M.A. (OXON), PROFESSOR OF  
CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

DURING the eight years which have passed since I published the article on 'The Trial of Jesus' in THE DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS (vol. ii. pp. 749-759), very little material has accumulated except on the fringes of the subject. The chronology has been discussed, particularly in the light of astronomical calculations; sporadic contributions have been made to the criticism of various episodes, notably Dr. Karl Kastner's *Jesus vor Pilatus* (1912), Dr. A. W. Verrall's study of the Lucan account of Jesus before Herod (*Journal of Theological Studies*, x. 322-353), and Miss Brodrick's *Trial and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ of Nazareth* (1908); but hardly any radical change has taken place in the critical position. Perhaps more work has been done on the topographical details than on the historical; which is not surprising, for the critical estimate of these narratives involves not only a comparative study of the Synoptic and Johannine traditions, but a reconstruction of the situation in the light of archæological and antiquarian research. These two lines of inquiry, into the literary data and into the contemporary Jewish situation, react upon one another. The data or probabilities thrown up by the latter, especially, must affect any estimate formed of the latter; they must be allowed to check, if not to determine, the interpretation of the relevant texts at several crucial points.

One illustration of this interconnexion is furnished by the allusions to Jesus as 'bound.' The Synoptic tradition<sup>1</sup> records that He was not bound until the morning after the arrest in Gethsemane, and not until He had been tried by the council; Jesus was bound by the Jews,<sup>2</sup> before being dispatched to Pilate, the binding perhaps denoting that He had been condemned to death. The

<sup>1</sup> Though Luke omits all references to binding (23<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> *i.e.* the mob. There is no absolute proof in any of the Gospels (not even in Lk 22<sup>52</sup>) that Annas was on the spot; the presence of one of his attendants proves nothing. The mob were armed with swords, and with clubs, *i.e.* with the long oak quarterstaff or fighting-bat, 'an old Semitic weapon; handstaves are mentioned in the Book of Samuel and Ezekiel. The bedels and rake-hell band of the chief priests came armed to the garden, to take Jesus, with swords and staves' (Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 147).

Johannine tradition makes the binding take place apparently as a precaution in Gethsemane;<sup>3</sup> Jesus is bound before He is sent to Annas, and bound again (or, still) when He is dispatched to Caiaphas. It would not decide the question finally, if we knew the exact custom followed by the Jews in dealing with a prisoner under arrest, for we cannot assume that the forms of legal procedure would be scrupulously observed under the circumstances. But there is uncertainty even as to these very forms. Was a prisoner kept bound during his examination? Or, was he unbound when he was being tried? The Roman custom seems to have been the former even in Palestine and Syria, if we are to judge from the experience of Paul (Ac 26<sup>29</sup>). But, according to the Johannine<sup>4</sup> as well as to the Synoptic tradition, Jesus was in the hands of the Jews till He was handed over to Pilate. The Fourth Gospel rightly preserves the fact of a two-fold examination of Jesus, before Annas and before Caiaphas, in different places. The latter was the trial proper, if we can speak of any Jewish trial at all. Annas, we are told, sent Jesus *δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα* (18<sup>24</sup>), and the exegesis of *δεδεμένον* partly depends on the view we take of the preliminary proceedings before Annas. If these corresponded to a trial or judicial examination of the prisoner, then it is on the whole more likely that *δεδεμένον* means 'bound again' than 'still bound' or 'bound as he was,'<sup>5</sup> on the assumption that Jews were in the habit of freeing a prisoner when he was being cross-examined by the authorities.<sup>6</sup>

This is not a point, of course, at which we can expect any light from the Synoptic tradition. But

<sup>3</sup> Where the arrest is made by men who include a Roman (18<sup>13</sup>) military detachment. The latter would act as they did in the case of Paul (Ac 21<sup>33</sup>).

<sup>4</sup> Whether the Roman soldiers left Jesus, after consigning Him to Annas, we are not told; but the responsibility for Him throughout the night rested with His Jewish captors.

<sup>5</sup> As in Ac 24<sup>27</sup>, ὁ Φῆλιξ κατέλιπε τὸν Παῦλον δεδεμένον.

<sup>6</sup> It is possible that Ac 22<sup>30</sup> favours the idea that a prisoner was unbound before a Jewish tribunal, for the Roman commander unbinds Paul before taking him into the presence of the Jewish authorities. But the passage is not free from difficulties.

in Mt 26<sup>57</sup> (οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Καϊάφαν) the phrase πρὸς Καϊάφαν, as in Jn 18<sup>24</sup>, raises a topographical question. Where did Caiaphas hold his sitting? The exact locality is doubtful. If πρὸς Καϊάφαν meant simply that Jesus was sent to Caiaphas, *i.e.* to where Caiaphas as high priest was known to have convened the council, it need not have been his house, but the ordinary or a special meeting-place of that body. There is a rabbinic tradition that forty years before the fall of Jerusalem the council met outside the temple precincts, and Derenbourg<sup>1</sup> based on this the conjecture that the council before which Jesus was condemned met in the *chanujoth*, the booths or bazaars held by the powerful family of Annas on the Mount of Olives. But the tradition is not to be accepted unhesitatingly, and Derenbourg's guess has found little favour among those best competent to judge. It is probable that the council was allowed to hold its sederunt outside the temple precincts, under certain exceptional circumstances. The Synoptic tradition may well be correct in making the members gather in the

palace of the high priest Caiaphas, which was not far from the fortress of Antonia, or (more probably) the palace of Herod, where Pilate held his trial. At any rate, these problems of topography are not affected by the phrase πρὸς Καϊάφαν. On the other hand, the meaning of δεδεμένον in Jn 18<sup>24</sup> is partly determined, as I have said, by our conception of what the proceedings under Annas amounted to.

Both points are raised afresh, however, in the interesting hypothesis which Sir William Ramsay has recently put forward in the pages of this magazine (xxvii. 296 f., 360 f., 410 f., 471 f., 540 f.), on 'The Denials of Peter.' They are exactly the sort of points at which an archæologist is sometimes able to correct conventional interpretations of a literary text. As the aim of the hypothesis is to settle the differences between the Synoptic and Johannine traditions and to disentangle the historical sequence, it will be well to have before us a brief table of the relevant episodes in the Synoptic narrative of what occurred between the arrest in Gethsemane and the consignment of Jesus to Pilate on the following morning.

	MARK.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
(A) 14 <sup>53</sup>	night: πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα.	26 <sup>57</sup> night: πρὸς Καϊάφαν τ. ἀ.	22 <sup>54</sup> night: εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀ.
14 <sup>53-64</sup>	cross-questioning and condemnation by authorities.	26 <sup>59-66</sup> cross-questioning and condemnation by authorities.	
14 <sup>65</sup>	maltreatment of Jesus.	26 <sup>67-68</sup> maltreatment of Jesus.	22 <sup>54-62</sup> Peter's denial. 22 <sup>63-65</sup> maltreatment of Jesus.
14 <sup>66-72</sup>	Peter's denial.	26 <sup>69-75</sup> Peter's denial.	
(B) 15 <sup>1</sup>	morning: meeting of council. Jesus bound and sent to Pilate.	27 <sup>1</sup> morning: meeting of council. Jesus bound and sent to Pilate.	22 <sup>66-71</sup> morning: meeting of council, cross-questioning and condemnation by authorities. 23 <sup>1</sup> Jesus sent to Pilate.

Now the Johannine tradition records a double night<sup>2</sup> examination, first by Annas and then by

<sup>1</sup> 'Ces échoppes étaient assez connues à Jérusalem pour qu'on les désignât simplement sous le nom de *chanouïot*, et c'est là que siégeait le sanhédrin lorsqu'il eut quitté le sanctuaire. Là, Jésus fut conduit dans la demeure de Caïphe et de son beau-père Hanan, sur le mont des Oliviers même' (*Essai sur l'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine*, pp. 467-468).

<sup>2</sup> The rabbinic statement of Jose ben Chalafita, which Sir William Ramsay cannot verify (p. 361), seems to be from *Babyl. Sanhed.* 88 b.

Caiaphas: the latter is only mentioned, but under the former (when the canonical order of chap. 18 is retained) some episodes are grouped which correspond more or less roughly to a cross-questioning of Jesus, a certain maltreatment, and Peter's denial.

Instead of placing the informal investigation by Annas before (A), and identifying (A) with the trial under Caiaphas, Sir William Ramsay harmonizes the two traditions by conjecturing that

(A) really was the informal trial under Annas, and that (B) corresponds to the trial under Caiaphas. This hangs from the hypothesis that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was John, who, as an eye-witness, must have had a better knowledge of the course of events than was available to the other Evangelists. I do not enter again into this problem. My point is to show that whatever the merits of the theory may be, it involves a forced interpretation of one or two phrases in the text.

For example, if this theory is to advance, it is essential to account for the remark in Mt 26<sup>57</sup> that Jesus was taken by His captors to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and elders had gathered. Sir William ingeniously surmounts the obstacle by explaining that *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* means the ultimate destination of the party, that the only sense of the Greek is judicial ('to appear before Caiaphas as judge'), but that, as it was not yet time for Caiaphas to preside over the council, Jesus was taken to the house of Annas. Thus there is perfect agreement between Matthew and John, for the latter states that Jesus was taken *πρὸς Ἄνναν πρῶτον* (18<sup>18</sup>), and that Annas sent him on later to Caiaphas (*πρὸς Καϊάφαν*, 18<sup>24</sup>). Furthermore, *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* must have the same sense in Jn 18<sup>24</sup> as in Mt 26<sup>57</sup>, and this leads to the assertion that Jesus never was in the house of Caiaphas at all; the morning trial before Caiaphas took place in the ordinary meeting-place of the council; and *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* never denotes 'to (the residence of) Caiaphas,' as scholars have hitherto assumed.

In the course of his argument he challenges my translation of Mt 26<sup>57</sup> and Jn 18<sup>24</sup>, and even charges me with misunderstanding the Greek in such a way as to distort the evidence of the Gospel text. This is a matter of exegesis, fortunately, not of archæology. Greek is Greek. You do not need to have travelled or dug in the East in order to know the scope of a preposition or of a participle, and I propose, with the Editor's permission, to show that Sir William Ramsay's charges are not well founded.

(1) The first passage is Mt 26<sup>57</sup>: *οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα, ὅπου οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι συνήχθησαν*. The Authorized Version translates *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* by 'to Caiaphas'; the Revisers, noting the *ὅπου* which follows, improved this into 'to the house of Caiaphas,' and I took the same line in my translation. It is quite a common use of *πρὸς*. In N. T.

Greek itself we have two or three decisive parallels, as, for example, in Ac 11<sup>3</sup>, where the circumcision party at Jerusalem charge Peter with lax conduct: *εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς*. Their objection was that he had entered the house of Cornelius and his friends and partaken of food, not that he had joined an open-air picnic. To enter the society of the uncircumcised meant, in this connexion, to enter their house. It is perfectly fair, then, to bring this out in an English rendering by, 'You went into the houses of the uncircumcised and you ate with them.' A still more clear instance of *πρὸς* with the accusative of a personal name implying the house of the person mentioned occurs in Ac 16<sup>40</sup>: *ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς εἰσῆλθον πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν καὶ ἰδόντες παρέκάλεσαν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐξῆλθον*, where *πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν* is another way of saying that when Paul and Silas left the prison they went 'to the house of Lydia' (cp. v. 12). These are Lucan<sup>1</sup> instances, but scholars have noted similar cases of this use of *πρὸς* without the article in the Fourth Gospel, e.g. a passage like this very 18<sup>24</sup>, where Zahn points out that *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* 'kann heissen in die Wohnung des Genannten, und die Verbindung des Namens mit dem Amtstitel an dieser Stelle lässt vermuten dass die Wohnung gemeint ist,' or like 20<sup>2</sup> (*ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν*), where Dr. E. A. Abbott<sup>2</sup> suggests that the repetition of the preposition means simply that 'the two were not living in the same house, and Mary is to be supposed as being accompanied by Peter to the house of the other disciple.' I do not lay much stress on Jn 20<sup>2</sup>, but the general fact is clear, and in order to clinch the matter, I shall quote the first case<sup>3</sup> which occurs to me in the LXX. In Gn 44<sup>14</sup>, 'Judah and his brothers came to [יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּנֵי יוֹסֵף] Joseph's house, for he was yet there.' The Greek translator rendered this, *εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Ἰούδας καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰωσηφ, ἔτι αὐτοῦ ὄντος ἐκεῖ*. Here again the article is absent, as in Mt 26<sup>57</sup>. But it is needless

<sup>1</sup> Luke's equivalent for Matthew's *πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα* and Mark's *πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα* is *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*, and this shows how he understood the preposition and the situation, for he had Mark's text at least before him. As Sir G. A. Smith observes (*Jerusalem*, ii. 571), 'locality is implied also in Mt 26<sup>57</sup>, Mk 14<sup>58</sup>.'

<sup>2</sup> *Johannine Grammar*, 2367.

<sup>3</sup> I notice now one even earlier, where 'the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house' (12<sup>15</sup>, *נָשָׂא בַּיָּדָא*) is rendered *πρὸς Φαραώ*, the inferior variants being *πρὸς (εἰς) τὸν οἶκον Φ*.

to multiply instances of a usage which is familiar to any student of Hellenistic Greek, namely, that *πρὸς* with the accusative of a personal name may mean 'to the house of that person,' like *chez* in French. The LXX is full of instances, e.g. Ex 2<sup>10</sup> 10<sup>1</sup>, 1 S 16<sup>21</sup> 19<sup>7</sup>, 2 S 1<sup>2</sup>, Est 2<sup>16</sup> etc. Whether it is correct to expand the proposition thus, depends altogether on the context, but the rendering is perfectly legitimate.

In view of this, it is amazing to find that Sir William Ramsay dismisses the R.V. of Mt 26<sup>57</sup> as 'impossible, for in Greek the preposition *πρὸς* with the accusative of a personal name cannot mean "to the house of that person"; but it is technical and idiomatic in the sense of "to appear before a person as judge in a court of justice," and this is what is meant in this place. Dr. Moffatt in his "New Translation" follows the error of the Revisers, although the Authorised Version is right.' This is a strong statement, but it is strong only in language. The negative assertion about *πρὸς* is positively erroneous. It must be a recent discovery, for in *St. Paul the Traveller* (first edition, p. 223) Ac 16<sup>40</sup> is rendered by Sir William himself, 'and they went out from the prison and entered into <sup>1</sup> Lydia's house'! The fact is, however, that it is not a discovery at all, but a slip, and a bad slip. Whether the judicial and technical sense of *πρὸς* is applicable to the present passage is another question. So far as grammar goes, it is as possible as the local sense with a verb of motion, but I do not think it probable that the writer of Mt intended to make a subtle suggestion in 26<sup>57</sup>, that Jesus was simply being led away to appear before Caiaphas as judge, since he has just used *πρὸς* in its local sense (v. 18, where both the Authorised and the Revised Versions render *πρὸς σὲ* by 'at thy house'). Even in the parallel Johannine text, there is a detail which militates against the hypothesis that *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* in 18<sup>24</sup> implies 'before Caiaphas as judge,'—I mean the fact that the Evangelist has just (v. 13) written, *ἤγαγον πρὸς Ἄνναν πρῶτον*. Now Sir William Ramsay allows that while *πρὸς Ἄνναν* here is 'to (be judged by) Annas,' the judicial sense <sup>2</sup> does not exclude the local, and the examination before Annas is admitted not only to have taken place in the house of Annas, but to have been merely an informal, unofficial inquiry, pre-

liminary to the real trial before Caiaphas. It is surely natural that, in the absence of any specific indication to the contrary, *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* should have the same meaning as *πρὸς Ἄνναν*, especially when *πρῶτον* seems to link both statements together; and it is illogical to allow the local implication of *πρὸς* in *πρὸς Ἄνναν*, and then to fall foul of those who take *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* in the same way.

In this connexion I must say a word about the Lucan tradition. It has been long disputed whether Luke intended Annas or Caiaphas when he wrote *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*. If he meant Annas,<sup>3</sup>—and there is a good case for this,—then his enigmatic statement about the morning council (22<sup>66</sup>, *συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν*) certainly leaves it an open question where the council meeting was held. If *εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν* denotes the place, it is clear that this was not the house of Annas. But there is nothing to prove that it was the regular meeting-place of the council; it may have been the house of Caiaphas, for all that we know. And *συνέδριον* may mean 'council' as well as 'council-chamber'; it was used in the same broad sense as our 'court,' and *εἰς τὸ συνέδριον* might well mean 'before the court.' So far as the Lucan<sup>4</sup> evidence goes, it does not necessarily prove or disprove that the council met in the house of Caiaphas.

(2) The second passage which has been brought under discussion is Jn 18<sup>24</sup>; *ἀπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα*. As Jesus had been bound already, according to the Fourth Gospel (18<sup>12</sup>), by the time that He reached the palace of Annas, the repetition of 'bound' here is curious. If it occurred in v. 28, it would be more intelligible, for this would bring the Johannine tradition into line with the Synoptic. But the unexpected mention of *δεδεμένον* in the twenty-fourth verse makes one ask why the writer went out of his way to describe Jesus as 'bound,' when He was dispatched by Annas to Caiaphas. Was it because his readers would assume that the prisoner

<sup>3</sup> Wellhausen, who inclines to this view, finds that the original framework of Jn 18 agreed with Lk, but he restores the original by drastically expunging not only v. 24 but *πρῶτον* and *ἀρχιερεὺς ὄν τοῦ ἐναντιοῦ ἐκείνου* from v. 13 and *ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα* from v. 28 (*Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 81).

<sup>4</sup> But *ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα* in Jn 18<sup>28</sup> means 'from the house of Caiaphas,' as Dr. Field (*Notes on Translation of N. T.*, p. 106), recognized, quoting the parallel expression in Mk 5<sup>35</sup> (*ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου*).

<sup>1</sup> I assume this translates *πρὸς*, not the inferior reading *εἰς*.

<sup>2</sup> Which is probably present in Lk 23<sup>7</sup> and Ac 25<sup>21</sup>, in both cases with *ἀναπέμπειν*.

had been unbound during the interview with Annas? This view of the case is not a novelty of exegesis. It has been held by several orthodox and conservative editors of the Gospel, notably by Godet and Westcott.<sup>1</sup> The former thinks that 'Jesus had no doubt been unbound during His examination; this scene over, Annas had Him bound anew to send Him to Caiaphas.' Westcott reads the passage in the same way: 'During the inquiry the Lord would naturally be set free. This explains the notice that He was (again) bound before going on to Caiaphas.' The inference is scarcely natural; we want more evidence for the assumption than seems to be as yet available. Still, it is a fair conjecture, and as I read the narrative in this light, I translate the verse, 'Then Annas had Him bound and sent Him to Caiaphas.' Which is true to the Greek, and not untrue to the spirit and meaning of the story; it simply puts into definite English a view for which there is at least a reasonable amount of probability, as several distinguished predecessors have recognized. This second binding of Jesus was carried out by order of Annas; δεδεμένον by itself means no more than 'in fetters' (δέσμιον), but, when the text is read as I have suggested, there is nothing in Greek grammar to prevent the full meaning of the term being brought out as I have done, since the perfect participle can refer to some previous action by the subject of the active verb in the sentence. I need only cite instances like Ac 9<sup>2</sup> (ὅπως εἴαν τις εὐρηγῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἀνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ), where δεδεμένους denotes a binding carried out under Paul's orders before the prisoners were dispatched to Jerusalem; his letters of authority empowered him 'to put any man or woman in chains . . . and bring them to Jerusalem.' The same construction occurs in Ac 9<sup>21</sup>, in the inferior textual variant (of A, etc.) on Mk 12<sup>3</sup> (ἀπέστειλαν ἡτιμωμένον), and in a passage which I chanced to read this morning in Lucian's *Vera Historia*, i. 41 (ἀντὶ δὲ χειρῶν σιδηρῶν πολύποδας μεγάλους ἐκδεδεμένους ἀλλήλοις ἐπερρίπτουν), where the meaning is that they first tied the polypods together and then threw them as grappling-irons.<sup>2</sup> In Jn 18<sup>24</sup>, instead of writing something like ὁ οὖν

<sup>1</sup> Lagrange (*Évangile selon Saint Marc*, pp 383-384) takes the same view: Jesus was 'probablement détaché pendant l'interrogatoire.' Meyer had anticipated this.

<sup>2</sup> In 3 Mac 3<sup>23</sup> we read similarly, τοὺς ἐννεμομένους . . . ἀποστειλαὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν δεσμοῖς σιδηροῖς πάντοθεν κατακεκλεισμένους.

Ἄννας ἔδησεν αὐτον καὶ ἀπέστειλεν . . . , the author prefers to use the passive participle δεδεμένον, and no law of Greek grammar can be alleged why he should not, if he wanted his readers to understand that Annas had Jesus rebound before dispatching Him to Caiaphas. Whether that is what he meant them to understand is another story. But the Greek at any rate is patient of this interpretation. To understand 'again' with δεδεμένον is not any more difficult than to understand 'still.'

Sir William Ramsay is not pleased with this, however. He declares that such a translation as I have given 'is not possible within the limits of Greek grammar,' and translates the verse, 'Annas therefore sent Jesus bound as He was, to Caiaphas,' adding in a footnote, 'ὁ δεδεμένος, the prisoner.' But the Fourth Evangelist did not write τὸν δεδεμένον, and 'the limits of Greek grammar' are broader than the measure of this hasty statement. I am quite prepared to admit that the Greek can mean, 'bound as he was,' although this would be more natural<sup>3</sup> if v.<sup>24</sup> followed vv.<sup>12-13</sup> immediately, as in the Sinaitic Syriac version. But Sir William Ramsay brusquely sets aside all ancient and modern transpositions of the text, and prefers to work with the canonical order or disorder of the verses. He thinks that Jesus was never unbound in the house of Annas, which he is perfectly entitled to do, although in a speculative moment the harmonizing instinct leads him to suggest that Jesus might have been released from His bonds when under trial before the Jews, in conformity with 'the higher moral standard on which the Jewish nation stood in comparison with the pagan races around.' But what he is not entitled to do is to add that 'into the clear and important statement' of Jn 18<sup>24</sup> 'Dr. Moffatt has introduced a mistranslation which distorts the evidence . . . here he goes wrong, without (so far as I know) any predecessor.' The Johannine sentence is important, but it is not clear; it is not unambiguous except to those who shut their eyes deliberately to the possibilities of the Greek and to the uncertainty of our information about the local conditions. I do not assert dogmatically that it is right to render δεδεμένον as I have done, and wrong to render it 'bound as he was.' The point which I wish to make is simply

<sup>3</sup> As Loisy points out (*Le Quatrième Évangile*, pp. 828-833), the twenty-fourth verse, when δεδεμένον is taken to mean 'bound as he was,' laisse entendre que Hanan renvoie Jésus tel qu'on le lui a amené, sans intermède ni délai.'

that the former translation is legitimate, so far as the Greek goes, and that ultimately it depends on more than grammatical considerations whether δεδεμένον should be rendered by 'bound as he was' or 'bound anew.' It is quite probable that earlier translators, who took the latter view, were content to render the text literally and translate δεδεμένον

by 'bound.' The periphrasis which I have printed may be original, but if it is true to the Greek, it is none the worse for that, and I hope to have indicated in this article that it expresses not inadequately an interpretation of the narrative which has been current for many years among editors of the text.

## Literature.

### THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE HOLY LAND.

If 'the first fine careless rapture' of Palestinian exploration can never be recaptured, there never was a time when the subject had a deeper interest for the serious student of the Bible. It is not only that now we know a great many facts which throw light upon obscure passages; it is that the whole atmosphere surrounding the Book of books has been altered for us. We stand closer to Isaiah and Jeremiah than our fathers did; we sympathize better with their experiences; we receive more intelligently, perhaps also more reverently, the message which they deliver. This is a great gain, a gain which we shall appreciate more and more as time passes.

One of the most diligent and accomplished students of *The Archaeology of the Holy Land* is Mr. P. S. P. Handcock, formerly Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum. Under that title he has published a book (Fisher Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) which will be found to be a convenient handbook to its subject and quite authoritative. Its facts may nearly all be traced in such great books on Palestine as Dr. R. A. S. Macalister's *Gezer*; but here they are presented in short compass and clear arrangement. The following summary of conclusions regarding the religion of the Pre-Canaanites is a good example of Mr. Handcock's skill and knowledge:

'Of the religious customs of the Pre-Canaanite inhabitants of Palestine we know very little, while of their beliefs we know practically nothing. Their temples or sanctuaries were caves, and here they offered sacrifices to their gods. Libations were sometimes poured into cup-shaped hollows excavated in the rock surface above the caves,

from which they were conveyed by channels into the cave sanctuaries below. Meat-offerings as well as drink-offerings were made, and, as already observed, one of the animals that was used as a sacrificial victim appears to have been the pig.'

The book is handsomely produced. The illustrations are numerous, and they are not merely ornamental, they elucidate the text.

### PEPYS.

Old Samuel Pepys can scarcely be ranked among the moralists, but Saml. Pepys, Junr., is undoubtedly a great moral reformer. He has written *A Diary of the Great Warr* (John Lane; 5s. net), which is entertaining and more. The pharisaic and sensual self-satisfaction of his renowned original is only emphasized a little, and then made the mirror in which thousands of men may see their own unlovely likenesses. And, as they see, they must surely repent. Let them see to it that they repent before the war is over. There is still time to give and do something for the winning of the war, perhaps even be something for which the war will be worth winning. That is how Pepys Junr. may be found a great moral reformer.

The style of old Pepys is delightfully preserved.

'Dec. 31, 1914.—Evening mine accompts this night, for the year, I find my gettings are 399*l* 15*s.* less than my last year's, through dividends lost since the warr, whereto be added about 30*l* allowed proportion of enlarged income tax; which is to say, that I am poorer in gettings by 429*l* 15*s.* than I was a year ago. Yet, on the other hand, by my prudent provisions and self-denials, I have abated spendings by above 300*l*; *Items*, saved in discounts of offerings on Lord's Day, 4 pounds 10 shillings; on givings in charity, 15 guineas; on my wife's cloathes, 20 pounds (about); ditto on mine own,