

beloved apostle ushers in his record of Jesus' farewell discourses to His disciples.

Put these passages together, compare them with the answer before us, and it is clear that Jesus regarded His whole life, down to its minutest particulars, as mapped out for Him by God. God had sent Him, and during the twelve hours of His

working-day His course was clear, to follow every intimation of His Father's will, and walk unflinchingly in the appointed path. His work, whatever it was, and whatever might come of it, must and could be done in His day of work.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

Caputh.

Historical Setting of the Post-Exilic Period of the Old Testament.

SHOWING THE APPROXIMATE PLACE OF ZECHARIAH.

Historical Books.	Prophetical Books.	Sacred History.	B.C.	Profane History.
		Destruction of Jerusalem.	588 555 538	By NEBUCHADNEZZAR. NABONIDOS succeeded. CYRUS occupied Babylon.
{ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 22, 23 } { Ezra i. 1-3a . . . } ,, i. 3b-iii. 7 . . . } ,, iii. 8-13 . . . }		Return of Jews from Exile.	537	
		<i>Foundation of Temple.</i>	536 532	CAMBYSES made King of Babylon.
			529 527	Death of CYRUS. Conquest of Egypt by Cambyses.
Ezra iv. 1-v. 1 . . .		<i>Opposition to Temple-building succeeded.</i>	521	Gomates the Magian, the false Bardes (pseudo-Smerdis) King for seven months.
	Haggai i. 1-11 . . .	<i>Rebuilding of Temple recommenced.</i>	521 520	Election of Darius Hystaspis.
Ezra v. 2 . . .	,, i. 12-15. ,, ii. 1-9. Zech. i. 1-6.		520-519	Revolt of Babylon under Nidinta Bel.
	Haggai ii. { 10-19. 20-23. Zech. i. 7-vi. 8. ,, vi. 9-15. ,, vii. and viii.			
Ezra v. 3-vi. 22 . . .		<i>Completion of Temple.</i>	516 514 500 490 487 485	Second Revolt of Babylon. Ionian Revolt. Battle of Marathon. Revolt of Egypt. Death of Darius, and Accession of Xerxes I.
	Zech. ix.-xiv. . . .	(circa 479)	480 479 465	Battle of Thermopylæ and Salamis. Battle of Platæa. Murder of Xerxes, and Accession of Artaxerxes Longimanus.
Esther i.-x.			462-456 458	Revolt of Egypt.
Ezra vii.-x.		Mission of Ezra.		
Neh. i.-xiii. 3		{ Nehemiah appointed Governor. Walls of Jerusalem rebuilt. }	445	
		Return of Nehemiah to Persia.	433	
	Mal. i.-iv.		430	
Neh. xiii. 4-31		Second Mission of Nehemiah.	425 425	Death of Artaxerxes.

'The Angel that talked in Me.'

THIS unique phrase occurs eleven times in the visions of Zechariah (i. 7-vi. 8), and is not found elsewhere. The Septuagint inserts the phrase also in i. 17 and vi. 5, thus having it thirteen times. We propose briefly to examine its grammatical meaning and its bearing upon inspiration.

I. The Authorized, Revised, and American Versions have 'The angel that talked with me,' without any margin.

The Hebrew [מַלְאָךְ דִּבֶּר בִּי] and the Syriac [ܡܠܐܚܐ ܕܝܒܪ ܒܝ] are both grammatically capable of two translations: (1) 'The angel that talked *in* me' (*vide* Oxf. Heb. Lex. ܩ i. 1), and (2) 'The angel that talked *with* me' (*ibid.* ܩ iii. 3^b); and upon a comparison of the passages where the phrase ܕܒܪ ܒܝ occurs, especially Num. xii. 2, 8, it can scarcely be doubted that the *instrumental* sense of 'with' is the only one it will bear, and that the English idiomatic sense (like the German 'mit') is inadmissible. In the Oxf. Heb. Lex. the English idiom is placed as a *possible* meaning derived from the instrumental, but it is indicated that its admissibility is limited to the phrase ܕܒܪ ܒܝ, and the exact instrumental use is clearly stated both before and after; from all of which we infer the admission to be due to deference to the English versions.

Our first conclusion, then, is, that if 'with' be retained as the translation, it is essential to explain it by a marginal 'by' and reference to Num. xii. 2, 8, otherwise the picturesqueness of the narrative will assuredly produce a false interpretation. Here we may observe that the rendering of Num. xii. 8 is an unavoidable concession to English idiom, and cannot be taken as a basis.

The Septuagint [ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοί] and the Vulgate [angelus qui loquebatur in me] induce a further conclusion, namely, that the instrumental sense of 'with' must be subordinated to the primary sense of 'in.' For the Vulgate will only bear the *local* meaning, in proof of which the following will suffice:—

- (a) In Num. xii. 2 the renderings are *per Moysen* and *nobis*.
- (b) In Num. xii. 8 the rendering is *ei*.

- (c) The Latin *in* in the sense of 'with' (Ger. 'mit') is unknown.

Therefore the Hebrew interpretation of Jerome's day, and the judgment of his own mature learning, were pronounced for the local sense of 'in.' And the Septuagint must be read here in the light of the Vulgate, standing as it does between the Hebrew and the Latin.

Thus it appears that the Revised and American Versions have perpetuated, without mitigation, a grievous mistranslation. They have kept a misleading rendering, against the plainest authority of ancient scholarship. The Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, and Latin unitedly demand to be translated 'The angel that talked in me.'

II. Having thus determined the primary sense of Zechariah's expression, what bearing has it upon the doctrine of Inspiration? The main points suggested seem to be these:—

1. There was, in Zechariah's experience, an indwelling angel (as a *legate* from heaven) informing him of the import of the visions or supersensuous revelations made to the prophet by the Holy Spirit (cf. Oehler's *O.T. Theol.* §§ 210, 211). Note—it seems fruitless to attempt a distinction between an angel indwelling and an angel speaking within us.

2. The general analogy between the functions of the angel and the Church's function of interpretation of Holy Scripture suggests that to-day the Holy Spirit may work by angels of interpretation 'sent forth to minister' in this regard.

3. An analysis of the angel's functions is more suggestive still:

- (a) Revealing the significance of enigmatical visions, i. 9, 19, iv. 4, 5, v. 10, vi. 4. So it is the function of the Church to unfold in the light of the Incarnation and Cross, the significance of the enigmas of individual and social life in every age.
- (b) Conversing with the LORD on behalf of Zechariah (who calls the angel 'my lord'), i. 13. So it is the Church's office to intercede for, and to receive and minister 'good words and comfortable words' to men.
- (c) Shaping the prophet's utterance, i. 14. So

the Church shapes and controls the preacher's message by the evolution and guardianship of doctrine.

- (d) Holding intercourse with angels having other functions, ii. 3. So has the Church to learn what philosophy, ancient religions, law, and national life have to offer to the service of the Christ.
- (e) Awakening the soul to hear and see visions and interpretations, iv. 1, v. 5. So must the Church by organisation and by practical methods arouse men, and so bring truth home that they may see and hear it indeed.

Zechariah has but lightly and incidentally sketched the functions of 'the angel that talked in him,' yet how complete and instructive appears their range when viewed through their analogies in the Church to-day.

ALFRED HUDDLE, M.A.

Leyton.

The Connexion of John xviii. 12-28.

THE connexion of the above verses in St. John's story of the Passion is perplexing in itself; and still more so when compared with the parallel synoptic narratives. Two different readjustments of the section are sketched in the able and acute discussion contributed to the February number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by Mr. J. N. Farquhar, under the title of 'The First Trial of Jesus.' Dr. Friedrich Spitta had proposed, in his recent volume of Essays, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, to read the verses in the following order: 12, 13, 19-24, 14-18, 25b-28. In fact, he transposes vv. 14-18 and 19-24. He conjectures that the latter section, through a blunder of the original copyist, has slipped down out of its proper place between vv. 13 and 14; and that ver. 25a is the copyist's repetition of ver. 18b, rendered necessary by the dislocation that had thus occurred in the middle of the story of Peter's denial. Mr. Farquhar offers a simple, and apparently an easier remedy, carrying ver. 24 back to set it between vv. 14 and 15.

By these expedients, both scholars obviate the two main discongruities of the existing context,

—namely, that Caiaphas and Annas appear to be designated high priest confusedly, and that Peter's denial is divided between the houses of the two. Mr. Farquhar transfers the whole of vv. 15-23 from the house of Annas to that of Caiaphas; Dr. Spitta transfers only vv. 19-23,—the first denial of Peter,—leaving the examination of Jesus where it stands in the received order. The sequence of events according to Spitta was as follows:—*Jesus led to the house of Annas, father-in-law to the high priest Caiaphas, there examined by Caiaphas; then sent by Annas to the house of Caiaphas (who had determined on His death, ver. 14), where He is thrice in succession denied by Peter; finally sent to the Pretorium.* According to Farquhar: *Jesus led to the house of Annas, father-in-law to the high priest Caiaphas (who had officially predicted His death); then sent by Annas to Caiaphas, where Peter denies Him. Meanwhile Caiaphas interrogates Him; finally He is sent to the Pretorium.* Mr. Farquhar's proposal, while slighter in appearance, is thus more sweeping and drastic in effect.

1. It is an obvious, but weighty consideration against the latter order that it reduces the Annas episode to insignificance. Jesus is taken to the house of Annas, simply to be sent away again! The motives to which Mr. Farquhar ascribes the introduction of this incident do not appear to be intimated by the Evangelist. It is *his relation to Caiaphas* which, just at this point, gives importance to Annas in the writer's eyes; and that relationship sufficiently accounts for the prisoner's being brought to Annas' house in the first instance, for the preliminary examination described in vv. 19-23.

2. On this view, moreover, the Jewish authorities proceed in a haphazard fashion that is far from likely. The two priests can have had no proper understanding with each other beforehand. When 'the prisoner falls into the hands' of Annas, as Mr. Farquhar puts it, Annas judges, on the spur of the moment, 'that it would be wisest to allow Caiaphas to act.' And the captors of Jesus take Him to the father-in-law, only to find that he shifts on to the son-in-law the entire responsibility of the case. But the narrative of the Gospels throughout conveys the impression that the measures for the arrest and trial of Jesus were

carefully planned, and executed with promptitude and decision.

3. Further, Mr. Farquhar's scheme supposes that the examination related in vv. 19-23 was 'a portion of the trial of Christ before Caiaphas, more fully described by Mark (xiv. 53-65) and by Matthew (xxvi. 57-68).' The two proceedings are, however, distinct in their features, and have no appearance of continuity beyond the fact that the high priest presides in each case. In Matthew and Mark we witness a solemn public trial; in John, a private inquisition, such as a crafty judge would naturally arrange for in a prosecution like this, so that he might sound the prisoner beforehand and, if possible, make sure of the ground he should take in dealing with Him. Such an inquiry it would have been inconvenient to hold at Caiaphas' house, where the Sanhedrists were assembling (Matt. xxvi. 57); and Annas' house was, presumably, the fittest for this purpose.

Of the counter-objections urged by Mr. Farquhar against Dr. Spitta's order, the force of (a) is not very apparent. When Caiaphas has been called 'high priest of that year' in ver. 13, the 'high priest therefore' of the next sentence (*ex hypoth.* ver. 19) can only be Caiaphas. Objection (b) disappears if we understand *πρὸς* in vv. 13 and 24, as in the parallel sentence of Matt. xxvi. 57, to signify *to the house of* (comp. John xx. 10; Luke xxiv. 12; Acts xvi. 40, and the *Thayer-Grimm Lexicon s.v.*). The last objection (c) —to the severance of vv. 13 and 14—appears to me to be entirely valid; and Spitta would perhaps do better to insert vv. 19-24 after rather than before 14. His reason for holding that ver. 14 follows in thought ver. 24, namely, that the reference it contains to Caiaphas' previously announced intention is John's substitute for the synoptic account of the public trial *at the house of Caiaphas*, is not of decisive force. On the other hand, the reference to Caiaphas' 'prophecy' comes in with great emphasis and aptness where Jesus first confronts the high priest; and it thus indicates from the beginning of the judicial proceedings the fatal and inevitable issue.

Dr. Spitta accounts for the lapse of vv. 19-24 from their original place by supposing that the scribe's wandering eye, in returning to the page of his exemplar after writing ver. 13, lighted on ver. 24 instead of 13, misled by their resemblance, and

that he thus wrote on into the middle of Peter's denial (the original sequel of vv. 24, 14) before discovering his error, when he turned back to insert at that point (ver. 18) the dropped paragraph. This explanation applies about as well to vv. 13, 14 taken together as to ver. 13 alone.

The solution which Mr. Farquhar has hit upon is not new. Cyril of Alexandria suggested it, and was followed by Beza, who like Cyril would read ver. 24 *twice*—first after ver. 14, and then by way of reminder (*miserat Annas*, Beza) a second time parenthetically in its accepted place. Luther adopted the first half of this hypothesis: 'Here' (ver. 14), he says, 'should stand the 24th verse. It is misplaced by the scribe in turning over the leaf, as often happens' (!). See Meyer on ver. 24. The second half of this explanation is preferred by Erasmus, Calvin, à Lapide, Lücke, Cyril, de Wette, Edersheim, and others, who thus reach the same end as Mr. Farquhar, by reading ver. 24 (minus the *ὄντι*) 'retrospectively,' as 'an intercalated notice, referring to what had previously been recorded in vv. 15-23' (Edersheim). It is surely better to move the verse bodily to the required position, with Luther and Mr. Farquhar, than to strain its grammar and text in this way.

On the other hand, one is disposed to agree with Edersheim, as against Westcott, when he says of the suggestion that *Annas and Caiaphas occupied different parts of the same house, with a common courtyard*—a theory adopted to reconcile the continuity of Peter's denial with the removal of Jesus—that the 'conjecture is unlikely in itself, and seems incompatible with the obvious meaning' of ver. 24 (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 548).

If the order of the verses must be rectified (and it is difficult to escape this conclusion), Spitta's transposition appears the more plausible of the two proposed, with the modification above suggested by Mr. Farquhar's criticism. We should then read as follows: vv. 12-14, 19-24, 15-18, 25b-28.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

Headingley College, Leeds.