

To

My Parents.

26
18

Zecharia cc. 9-14.

Graduation Thesis

by

Abraham S. Auspacher.

vol. I.

Hebrew Union College

Cincinnati Ohio

March. 1900.

Table of Contents:

References.	page
Preface.	"
Contents of	
cc. 9-14.	"
History of critical opinion	
of the Book of Zechariah	"
Integrity of cc. 1-8 th 9-14	"
The Pre-exilic theory	"
The Post "	"
Summary and Conclusion	"

Reference Works.

- ** Driver — Introduction to OT.
- * Turner. The Prophets^{and} Prophecies in Israel
Translation by A. Milroy --- London 1877.
- ** Wellhausen. Die Kleinen Propheten
The Prolegomena. Berlin. 1886.
- *** W. H. Lowe. Hebrew Students Commentary.
- *** C. A. A. Wright. Zechariah² & his Prophecies
Bampton Lectures 1878.
- G. A. Smith. Minor Prophets.
- *** G. L. Robinson. The Prophet Zechariah A.M.T.L. v.12 pp. 1-9.
- Driver. Hebrew Texts. *
- * Ewald. Die Propheten des A.B.
- ** Stade. Sederzacharia ZATW. vol I pp. 1-96. vol. II pp. 151-2²⁴
pp. 275-309.

*) Pre-exilic. **) Post-exilic. ***) Unity.

* This reference, which of course does not belong here, was made because of Taut's dictation and hasty copying.

Preface.

The short essay on the prophecies of Zechariah cc. 9-14, is presented to your honorable body, with a painful sense of its shortcomings. A work of this sort, in order to have even a very modest scientific value, should be attempted only by a scholar, practised in all the intricacies of exegetical interpretation, and whose extensive knowledge of prophetic literature in particular and of Hebrew literature in general is beyond question. The fulfillment of these two conditions however, it will readily be granted, can never, — aside from very

exceptional cases, — be realized in a beginner. In order to acquire the necessary expertness ^{and} linguistic skill, for work of this kind, more leisure is needed than falls to the lot of a student having thirty recitation, and lecture hours a week. When this is remembered, and the very limited time in which this essay had to be completed, is considered, it will be evident that I have written a thesis, which from the very nature of the case, can only be a compilation of other men's views. More I believe cannot be expected. I have worked long and conscientiously toward the completion

of this thesis, and hope it will at least give evidence of a modest ability to handle the apparatus criticism, and as such will be considered satisfactory.

Contents c.c. II-XIV.

Chapter II.*

v.v. 1-8 The prophet begins his predictions by the announcement, that the judgement of the Lord is about to descend upon Damascus, Tyre^{and} Sidon,^{and} advancing steadily will overtake the cities of Philistia, bringing desolation^{and} exile in its wake. A remnant of all the Philistines^s will be converted and serve Jahveh, just as do the inhabitants of Judah^{and} Jerusalem: and in the future Jahve will protect Jerusalem and its people.

v. 9 - end. And now Jerusalem becomes the city of

note on xvn. cf. Stade ZATW vol. I p. 14.

* The suffixes in יִפְּסוּ, יִדְּמוּ, יִשְׁפְּטוּ^{and}

יִשְׁפְּטוּ (v. 7) refer directly to the יִדְּמוּ, ^{and} by metonymy, to all Philistia.

Note 2 v. 12^b

From *משה אשיב לך* it is evident that *משה אשיב לך* is a quotation: and the source of this quotation has been the cause of much speculation among critics. See Howack p. 189. Stade vol. I p. 55. Van Orelli p. 353 refers to Is. 51⁷, as does (p. 252) C. H. H. Wright

Mr. Caulis "Translation of Qimhi's Commentary on Zechariah" (p. 98 ff) furnishes a good example of how the Scriptural Text is often perverted, in the effort to read Jesus into almost every prophetic verse.

the Messianic king, who hails not from the ranks of the high^{and} haughty, but from the pious^{and} down-trodden poor; Jahveh blesses him with victory, and enables him^{*} to destroy the enemies of Ephraim^{and} Judah. In spite of this however, his triumph is not to be one of sword and spear, but - quietly he will come, riding on an ass, the animal of peace, and by a word extending his power from sea to sea. Those bound to Israel by the Covenant of Blood^o, but who are yet in exile, shall be liberated, and receive double recompense for every day of their exile (Stade p. 17)

Note * v¹⁰ ואכריח ואכריח לך (all mss) εξολεθρευσει, or some other form of the third person.

v¹¹ is difficult. Von Orelli (p. 353) translates, "because of thy covenants' blood". which is awkward. Kovack = Deines Blutes Bundes;

but still better to refer back to Ex 24³⁵. but the use should be made of the word ^{not} כרת

Jahve, using Ephraim, Judah^{and} Zion
 as His tools, shall overcome the Grecians,
 and flashing his gleaming sword over the
 basting foes, will sound forth Judah's
 victory on the trumpet. United
 Israel, satiated with the blood* of
 its foes, shall flourish in the land
 made fertile by Jahve,^{and} under His guard-
 ianship shall roam freely about, as
 the flock of His pasture.

*Note V¹⁵ This verse is very corrupt. Klosterman in
 Theo. Lit. Jtg. 1877 (p. 504) emends thus: - וצבאים for
 ואכלו (three Lxx Mss to agree with אכלו),^{and}
כבשו for כחשו. Melh. (p. 190) strikes out, or rather
 emends בני קלע to אבני קלע - and regards
 the phrase " " = בני ירן. Lxx however militates a-
 gainst this - καὶ κατὰ ^{ωσ} τοὺς οὐρανούς οὐρανούς.

But see STADE
 p 18 Note III

Chapter X^{I-II, and 3 - XI³}

X^{1-2, 3} - XI³

VVI^{and II}

Verses I^{and II}* of ch. X form a short interlude⁺ between ch. IX^{and X}. In them the prophet draws the people to task on account of their habitual worship of the Teraphim, and practise of invoking aid from the Diviners, instead of praying directly to Jahveh for rain^{and} other blessings.

V³ to ch. XI³

With verse III, the second Messianic prophecy begins. The prophet portrays the con-

Note *

This small interlude is joined with / preceding by the idea of fertility implied in the words ג' תירוש ו' דגן and מטר + מטר I'.

It is joined with the following by ו' ארצים and רעה ו' צאן 10² in 10³ v. Nowack p. 347.

Note. + Melch. finds no sense in these verses unless verse I be metaphorically interpreted, thus, "Bitter ~~now~~ Regen, zur Zeit - des Spätregens" = "bitter ~~now~~ Teil haben. Teil haben in einer späten Regenzeit. Teil haben in einer späten Zeit."

ditions which must prevail previous to the advent of the Messiah, and goes on to describe the process which will result in the required conditions. God's anger is kindled against the shepherds, viz. the leaders of the people, and He will vent ^{*} His wrath upon them. He will separate the shepherds from His flock, and a new leader shall be raised up from among the people of Judah^o. In the flush and fire of a warlike spirit, they shall rush upon the foe, and wrest victory from those riding upon horses[?]. And having

*
Note V.³

Note the difference between the terms

פָּקֵדָה and אֶרֶב

^o
Note V.⁴

The suffixes in פָּקֵדָה refers not to God but to the people. (Hosack. Melch. & others) But see Stade p. 21 Note II.

? Note

For the different uses of 1 horse as a symbol, see Cheyne on Jer. JQR v¹ p. 77

led* back Ephraim⁺, he will exalt the
House of Judah^{and} Joseph, making heroes
of them both. Beginning with verse III
we are told how Ephraim will be brought
back to Jerusalem? Having increased their
number in a wonderful manner, while
they were in Exile. God calls them together
again to Jerusalem^{and} although he had
scattered⁺ them, yet they had remembered
him^{and} prospered^{and} multiplied[‡] in

Note v⁶

וְהַשְׁבוּתִים = וְהוֹשְׁבוּתִים

Note v⁸

The captivity of at least Ephraim is presupposed
in this verse cf. Driver Int. to OT. p. 326.

Note²

It is Zech's general custom, first to predict an event, and
then to detail the process of its fulfillment, instead of fol-
lowing the usual chronological order (Stade p. 16)

Note[‡] v⁹

וְחַיִּי = וְחַיִּי (LXX). [‡] Note v⁹ The difficulty here is with
the word וְחַיִּי. I[‡] Because as it stands here it must

Note & v. 9 cont.

necessarily have a future signification. Such a meaning however, is out of harmony with the context and directly contradicts v. 6 (וְהָיוּ כְּשֶׁלֹא-זָרְתִּים, "and they shall be as tho' I had not cast them off.") The Trgm indeed

translates by a past tense וְהָיוּ כְּשֶׁלֹא-זָרְתִּים.

IInd From וְהָיוּ it is evident that the antithetical idea to be expected here in וְהָיוּ, is that of "scattering"; figuratively, to send into Exile. But וְהָיוּ is never used in that sense. When employed figuratively it means, "to multiply" cf. Hos. 2²⁵ Jer. 31²¹. To obviate both difficulties

Heb. followed by Howack, emends וְהָיוּ to וְהָיוּ cf. Zech. 2²⁺⁴. E. 5². Is. 41⁶ = "Tho' I have scattered them, yet in far countries they shall remember me." R.V. margin, reads,

"and though I sow them." But see Stade p. 22. note I. 7

number. From Egypt and Assyria they would return in such number that Gilead and Lebanon would be taxed to their full capacity to accommodate them. The Chile they would cross* and the Red Sea*, whose depths dry up as they pass; and with their departure, the sceptre of Assyria and Egypt falls. Thro' Jahveh they will be strengthened, and they shall praise His name.

Notes * v¹¹

The sea here referred to must be the Red Sea, and the river must be the Chile (cf. CHA. Wright p. 295). Melh. ingeniously emends נוצרים to בים צרה and is thus compelled to read צבר for צברו : והוביש for יסיר נגד הוריד. והובישו.

Notes * v¹²

יחלכו for יחללו : וגברתם : וגברתים

(Melh. and Horack.).

Ch. XI vv. I-III

Verses, I-III of ch. XI go with * ch. X^o, in as much, as they represent the effect that Judah's victory (X^o) will have upon the heathen nations[†]. The cedars of Lebanon, the oaks of Bashan, and the forest[‡] of the Jordan symbolize the heathen powers, crying out in distress, upon the realization of their downfall at the hand of Judah and Ephraim[§].

Hols^o φ

See Howack p. 369. * But see Stade p. 68 ss.

" I^o

Melch. p. 192. ‡ γῆρας "Dickicht": undergrowth.

" 3

If as Stade (p. 68 ss.) contends, these three verses are a conscious copy of Jer. xiv³⁴, then we have here a good example of the difference in power, between the two prophets. One, fervid^{and} impulsive, expressing himself in full, well rounded, trenchant style, the other, much feebler^{and} apocalyptic.

Note *

For linguistic justification of this
transposition see Eckardt: ZATW 1893 p. 835.

Chapter XI⁴⁻¹⁷ and XIII⁷⁻⁹. *

Altho ch. XI⁴⁻¹⁷ and XIII⁷⁻⁹ forecast future events, ch. XI contains ~~no~~ prophecy. It deals only with the past, picturing its happenings as steps in a regular program, ordered and directed by Jahveh. Only in XIII⁷⁻⁹ does the prophet open up a future vista, by way of applying the lessons learned from a study of the past, as told in ch. XI⁴⁻¹⁷. The prophet proceeds to remind the people of certain events recently experienced & by a series of symbolic actions to bring home the intended lessons to them. God commands him to fatten the flock that had hitherto been at the

Note *
See
opp. page.

The suggestion to remove 13⁷⁻⁹ from its present place in the text, to the end of XI¹⁷ was first made by Ewald: it was accepted by Stade, Kuenen, Wellh., Gese, Driver & Horack p37.

§ note v¹⁴

This note
belongs to
next page.

Nowack (p. 372-373) registers an objection
to the word ישראֵל, on the ground of
its entire incompatibility with the
context of the chapter: on the author-
ity of two LXX mss. mentioned by him,
he substitutes the word ירושלם

Chole x v¹⁸

For the various interpretations of
שלושת הדורים see Robinson A.T.T.L. vol 12. p. 19. ft. note.
Well knowing the Seleucidian Era in
mind, makes them = three high priests.
For, during the period preceding the
Maccabean War, the change of priests
was very frequent. ה in הדורים is difficult.
Nowack (p. 370) supposes something descriptive
of the three steps to have fallen out
of the text
כחלה = א. ת. י. ע.

Note 8, The mistake was made in copying of putting
the note that belongs here, on the page opposite
page 14

people soon tire of his solicitations in their behalf; and he, renouncing them breaks the staff, "Pleasantness", thus symbolizing the breaking off of peaceful relations between Judah and the surrounding nations; and at the same time convincing them * that the prophet has truth on his side. Shortly afterwards, when the prophet learns too cheaply the people hold his services, in so much as they value them at only thirty^o pieces of silver, he breaks the second staff - "Gands", symbolizing the end of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel (or Jerusalem)[?], and throws the

* ^v כן צניי = כנצני v. note to verse 5 ^o meaning a very small sum. [?] see note on opposite page, opposite

money into the Temple treasury.*

And now the prophet is commanded to set forth the doings of a theocratic Shepherd; one who will care neither for the sick or wounded: but truly, we will come upon him, and for this reason (13⁷⁻⁹)[†]; that the flock may be scattered and only one third remain, which remnant will become God's people, but only after some trial and tribulation[‡]

Holies. v¹³*

האזנה for ה' of. י' fr. י' Sam. 23⁸.

• Here only does prophesying begin.

‡ v⁹ cf. Hosea. 2²⁵

Note & 11⁵

All LXX Mss. including Lucian read -

εὐρησομεν εαυτοισ τοις κατοικοις της Ιερουσαλημ.

"We shall find Jerusalem on our side

∴ מצא = נמצא Targum reads ל' יושבי for ל' יושבי

אמצא ל' אמצא has also been proposed for אמצא ל'

Chapters XII¹ - XIII⁶†

These sections open with a notice of a siege against Jerusalem, in which Judah will take part*. Jahneh smites the horses of the besieging party with blindness and their riders with madness: and Judah alone, — destined in the end to save Jerusalem & shall escape and become an agent of destruction against her former heathen allies. God has helped

Note ‡

on RVB ch. 13¹, see Stade p. 14

Note * v¹

by before יָבִיחַ must be stricken out: The Targ. disregards it. Much depends upon the interpretation

of this verse. Robinson, A.M.S.L. p. 57-60 of vol. 12 tries to make it appear that the sentence, "And Judah shall also take part in the siege against Jerusalem," mean "Judah shall also be besieged."

He is however unsuccessful v. Thowack p. 375 f.

* the opposite page.

Note 21⁸ Notice that each new step is introduced
by כיום הזה. Verse 8 follows directly upon
verse 6.

Judah first so that the pride of Jerusalem
and the House of David should not be-
come overbearing*. But now Jahveh will
protect^o the inhabitants of Jerusalem so
that he who is a weakling shall become
as powerful as David, and David's
House shall become as great as God's
House. But the Heathens that lay siege
to Jerusalem will be destroyed by God
and He will pour the spirit of repentance
over the House of David and over Jerusalem

Note. * v⁷ בית דוד cf. Ez. 8³ In the previous verses Judah
saves Jerusalem; but in this verse it appears
that Judah was saved first; hence the verse
is out of harmony with the context. (Might p. 70)

-dates the verse in Maccabean Times. But the rest of the context can-
not be Maccabean. Belh therefore drops it as a Macc. interpolation

^o - see opp. page.

Note $\Delta v_{12}^{(4)}$ Notice here the formal order so marked
in Chronicles

and they shall look back to the memory
of him whom they have pierced, and be-
negan their cruelty toward him*, and
wail as bitterly as the wailing of Hadad
Rimmon. Moreover the mourning shall be
separately observed in the various great families.

Note * v. 10 י'זח is offensive to many, since it would refer to God.

directly. LXX = επιβλεψομεν προς υεν αρθω

κατωθ' λησαστο: one Mes = εις or ε ξεκερτοχουα.

Stade (ad hoc) reads י'זח, which requires that

חא before נחא be dropped. יקר has been emend-

ed to יקר of. Eccl. 3⁴, figuratively, - "to tremble with fear."

or v. 11

והיה כדבריו ec. is a strong argument for the pre-exilic date
of these chapters. Post-exilic critics have tried hard to refer the
phrase to something else than 2. K 23²⁴⁵⁵. Thus Had, Rimmon
is the ~~Cham~~ God of Assyrians. Jerome says it was a city,

called Macianapolis in his time, but still bearing the name
Rimmonânath. Belh. has successfully combated this assertion.

Δ

see opp. page.

Then will God open a source of forgiveness for David^{us} Jerusalem*, and root out the idols, and do away with prophets; even a prophet's own parents shall advocate his death, on the ground that he preaches lies. In those days, the prophets, ashamed of their calling shall disown their connection with prophecy and say "I am no seer, only a son of the soil." &

Note * for 13 of Ez. 36²⁵

& ו⁵ ארמיה קניני אדם הקוני (Melch.) = "The soil was my possession from my youth."

Chapter XIV

Here the prophet begins with the spoiling of Jerusalem by the Heathens. The city is to be destroyed, its houses plundered, its women degraded and one half its population exiled. For the remaining half, Jahveh provides an avenue of escape: appearing on Mt. Olives, the mountain opens up, revealing a long valley, through which the refugees flee. Jahveh is accompanied by his Holy Ones.

Note* v⁴ ירושלם — אשר (Stade Jt. note p. 36) shows that the prophet was not a Jerusalemite: 12⁷⁵ proves him to have been an inhabitant of rural Judah.??

Note & v⁵ ונסתם in Trgm^{and} לxx = ונסתם זyx = Proper noun?
of Micah 1⁸¹

On that-day there will be neither
 heat or cold* but only toward evening will
 light appear. Perennial streams shall
 flow out of Jerusalem, into the east and
 west seas. On that day God shall be one
 and be universally honored. Jerusalem a-
 lone will remain on its high place, the sur-
 rounding country sinking into valleys and
 dales. The city shall be free of the plagues
 with which Jahveh smites all the

note * v^o קרירות וקפאן "The lustrous ones (stars cf. Job 31²⁰),
 with draw themselves; - draw in their brightness, -
 (cf. Joel 2¹⁰ 4⁵), - are darkened" - Von Orelli (ad hoc).
 Targm = קרירות וקפאן = "Cold and Frost" with the דבר
 Wellhausen emends קפאן to קור

v^o &

יהוה - יהוה

heathen notions* that besiege Jerusalem.
 Those who have not fought against "
 are to make pilgrimages yearly to
 the Temple to observe the חנוכה Festival:
 failing to do so the fertilizing rain
 will fail them, and in case that

*

v¹³ and 14 Throck claims that both verses are
 interpolations; since the thought of v¹³ is continued
 by 15 in verse 14. The verse is furthermore an
 echo of ch. 11. Neth. transposes it to ch. 12.
 Robinson (p. 59-60) translates the בירושלם by
 "at". "Judah shall fight, (the heathen), at
 Jerusalem: he claims the author would have
 used ל instead of ב. Had he wished to con-

vey the idea of, "against". This is hardly true.

Egypt* does not also celebrated סוכות at Jerusalem, the fertilizing rain will also desert her. The very bells of the horns shall bear the inscription, "- Holy to Jahveh," and the pole of the Temple shall be as holy as the bowls of the altar, & those that sacrifice shall cook their offerings therein. In those days the merchants shall be debarred from Temple affairs.

*V¹⁸ LXX omits the אֵל before אֱלֹהִים, thus obtaining the expected sense, from the context. Hoffmann - Schrift^{beweis} - quoted by Wright (p. 538) emends וְלֵאמֹר לֵא - "Then it (Egypt) will thirst, i. e. be deprived of the necessary rain. Absence of rain however would be no hardship for Egypt, since her fertility depended not upon rain, but upon the annual Nile overflow.

History of the Critical Opinions upon
The Book of Zechariah.

In the application of critical methods to the Bible, surely no single book furnishes a more striking history, than does Zechariah. Up to the year 1653 its integrity was never questioned: the Rabbinical commentaries do not anywhere hint of a suspicion against its unity: one or two of the Church fathers commented on the absence of visions in the last half of the book, but never expressed the faintest doubt of a single authorship for all fourteen chapters.

But in 1653, Joseph Mede denied the
 -genuineness of ecc. 9-14. Matthew (27⁹⁻¹⁰)
 -quotes Jer^m. 11¹²⁻¹³ and attributes the
 two verses to Jeremiah. Upon this
 slender evidence, without attempting
 a thorough going critical examination
 of the chapters in question, he assigned
 them to Jeremiah, thus placing him-
 self in the list of pre-exilic critics.

This example was followed within half
 a century, by Hammond, Kidder and
 Whitson, all of whom rank themselves
 in the pre-exilic lists. In 1738 how-
 ever, Carpzov defended the unity of
 the Book. In 1784 came Flügel, Arch-

deacon of Hamburg, with further
 proof of a separate author for the
 last six chapters: and in 1785 Arch-
 bishop Chewcombe gave criticism a new
 impetus, by disputing the integrity of
 chs. 9-14. In these chapters ^{he sees} two dis-
 tinct authors, and assigns three
 chapters to each. Ch. 9, 10, and 11, were writ-
 ten, according to him, much earlier than
 Jeremiah, and before the captivity of the
 ten tribes: probably in time of Hosea:
 chs. 12, 13, and 14, form a distinct prophecy
 written after the battle of Megiddo, &
 most probably before the destruction
 of Jerusalem by the Babylonians.

new-comer's opinion became the prevailing view for nearly a century.

There was a general agreement among critics that cc 9-11 were written by a prophet, like Amos, active entirely in the South, and, a contemporary of Hosea and Isaiah: cc. 12-14 were generally admitted to be a product of the pre-exilic period, previous to the fall of Josiah at Megiddo.

Rosenmüller, (*Scholia in Veteris Testamentum*, 1st ed. 1810), defends the unity of the book; but in 1828 he became a convert to the pre-exilic theory, dating the disputed portion, - as did al-

so Hitzig, in the time of king Uzziah.
 Gesenius, Ewald and Knobel all argued
 for the pre-exilic date of cc. 9-14: yet
 Ewald, altho positively placing cc 9-11,
 "about eight to four years before 586 B.C.E.,
 in the reign of Ahaz", hesitated to put
 cc. 12-14 much earlier than the very threshold
 of the exile.

Bertholdt in 1814 attempted to iden-
 tify the author of cc. 9-11, with the
 Zechariah bn. Jeberachiah mentioned
 in Is. 82. Now altho Hitzig said that
 he who refused to accept the dual
 authorship of cc. 9-14, -denied the rights of
 criticism, there were yet some critics

who ably defended the Unity of the Book. Jahn in 1882, and De Wette who in the earlier editions of his, "Lehrbuch der historischen, kritischen Einleitung," advocated the pre-exilic theory, in the sixth edition, (1847) came out for unity, were among these. Also Hengstenberg, Keil, Stäblein, Köhler and C. H. F. Wright.

T. T. Crowne in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible adopts the unitistic view, but with considerable hesitation. Gratz (1881) separates ch. 17 from the other chapters, and postulates a postexilic date for it.

In 1881-82 with the publication of the first two volumes of Stade's Z.A.T.W. a

new era in the critical opinion of our book was inaugurated. Stade after a thoroughly critical examination, and after debating the question at length, concludes that cc. 9-14 are from one author, and date from the war of the Diadochi c. 306-278 B.C.E. From this time on, the post-Jecharian hypothesis has been very widely accepted, in fact there have been but three dissenting voices; viz. Grützmacher 1892 (pre-exilic) — Lohr (1882)^{and} Robinson (1895) — both minimalist. Gratz (1891), also claimed a pre-exilic date for cc. 9-13, but dated c. 14 in the time of Artaxerxes III. Saltych (1890), Cornill (1892)^{and} Marti (1892), all adhere to a post-Jecharian

- date. Cheyne, Kuenen and Driver, altho believing cc. 9-14 to have their sources in pre-exilic times, still hold that a post-exilic redactor edited them.

Kelhausen, (1892), declares these chapters are a unit dating from Maccabean times; and Eckardt, reasoning from purely linguistic considerations, also dates cc. 9-14, very late. Robinson (1895) comes back to the traditional view; yet his contribution to the subject, like that of Wright, and many others, is marred by religious bias. To sum up: we find that the history of criticism of Zech. gives us three well defined schools - viz: -

I) The traditional school: - That cc 1-14 were written by Zechariah. This view is very completely defended by Knight. Campton Lectures for 1878.

II) The Pre-exilic theory: viz that cc 9-14 are the productions of two distinct authors. cc. 9-11 and 12-14.

III) The Post-exilic theory: That cc. 9-14 are the work of one man, and come from a late Persian, Hellenic ~ Maccabean Time. This is ^{the} view generally accepted to-day.

The general differences between cc. 1-8 and 9-14 will now be noted, and the integrity

of the two portions discussed, ^{and} these three
positions will be examined in the order
named.

The Integrity of cc. 1-8^{and} 9-14.

It is scarcely possible for any reader with the smallest grain of literary sense, to pass from the first eight chapters of the so-called book of Zechariah, to the last six, without feeling that he moves in a totally ^{different} atmosphere.

The nature of the prophecies is at variance. The style of the two portions, if not removed from one another by the whole length of poetry and prose, ^{is} at least so unlike, as to impress even the most casual reader. One notes the feeble and prosaic style of Zech, as it moves plainly along

without adornment of word or phrase,
 and then passes to Dzech^{*}, only to feel
 himself in the presence of another mind.
 There we find no halting. The glow and
 the conciseness are characteristic. The imag-
 ery is grander than that of Zech; and the
 mode of expression and the cast of thought
 is mysterious and lofty, and above all
 we note the different attitude toward
 the Messianic expectation. In Zech. the
 prophet expects the Messianic age to come
 directly after the exile (cc. I^{and} II). This is
 not the case with Dzech, or at least not
 with cc. 13^{and} 14. There the Messianic age
 will be ushered in only after a period of

* = Deutero Zech = cc. 9-14.

painful probation, and a rigid process of purification". "Among minor details the ^{attitude} different towards the horse is remarkable." In the first part the horse is accounted worthy of being used as a symbol (6¹⁻⁷). in the second part he is cut off from Jerusalem (9¹⁰). in the third part he is adorned with bells bearing the inscription "Holiness unto Jahweh" (14²⁰). Then too the whole historical horizon & point of view is changed. In Zech, the Temple and its affairs stand in the center of the prophets vision. In Ezek the critical tone is gone, and one meets with occasional Aramaisms that are totally lacking in Zech. To say that the two parts agree in

* Cheyne J.E.R. vol. I p. 77

in their general tone of comfort to a troubled nation, proves nothing, for what two prophets, no matter how far removed in point of time, do not bring occasional consolation, altho their main message be concerned with another matter?

To account for the difference in style, as Staerkelt^A has done, by saying "~~Der~~ Lehrer wird zum Dämonen", i.e. the prophet changes his functions in the two separate parts of his book, is to gloss over with a phrase, stylistic differences that are fundamental: and Wright's claim that c. 2¹⁰⁻¹⁷ also, "breathes a poetic spirit", is very weak, since

The poetic spirit referred to is by no means very evident, and ^{the} whole argument rests on an isolated case of seven verses out of one hundred and twenty three.

The unitistic critics have of course put forward a number of counter-proofs and arguments in the endeavor to meet the ~~specific~~ differences between Zech. and Izch. pointed out by those who call two or three authors in the fourteen chapters, but it is only necessary to place the respective arguments side by side in order to see how inadequate is the unitistic position. Following are some of the more important.

For Dual Authorship.Unitistic.

- a.) The mention of a king or kingdom in cc. 11⁶ and 13⁷ does not suit the age of Zechariah. His argument can be derived from ch. xi. — since the passage refers not to Jewish but to Gentile kings.
- b.) The mention of the מלך-המלכות in cc. 12⁷ and 13⁷ is inconsistent with the supposition of the authenticity of Dzh. Ez. 34²⁴ 37 speaks of "my servant David", as destined to rule over Israel and Judah in the distant future.
- c.) The allusions to the false prophets ^{as} Jeraphim Mal. (35) speaks of 'sur-cens in his day. cf also 10² and c. 13 speaks against Josephus Antiq. 8.2.5.

a Zecharian authorship

of cc 9-14.

D

700 does not appear in Zechariah, do they appear in Haggai or
 cc. 9-14: nor the "Seven of Palastis" or for that
 Eyes of Jehovah (4¹⁰). These matter in the seventh
 two references not being or eighth chapters of
 found in Zech, show Zechariah itself.
 that the Babylonian influence at work in Zech.
 did not exist in Zech.

E.

Zech. is full of mysterious visions: there is But Zech. has not shown
 visions: they are but "nothing symbolic in Zech. parts of one vision. Besides

For ch. XI is an allegory.
Furthermore cc 1-8 only,
has an "angelus inter-
pres."

cc. 7-8 have no visions.
The use of an "angelus
interpres", in Ezch, would
be inconsistent with the
nature of the prophecies

7.) Zech. has the follow-
ing modes of expression
peculiar to himself.
They do not occur in
Ezch.

והיה דבר יהוה אל-זכריה
אל-

cc. I 1.17. 4.8. 6.9. 7.1.4.8. 8.1.18

2.1.2. 8.2.4.6. כה אמר יהוה זבאות 1.4.14.17

ואשמע את-ציני וארא 2.5.6'

These forms are needed in
Zech. because of the nature
of its contents. Zech. devotes
himself to other matters:

Therefore he ceases to have
use for these formulas.

Moreover similar readings
are to be found in the
vision of Is. 6' & Ez. 1.1-3. 8.1.3. etc.

G.) Zechariah's visions
are all prefixed
with the exact chrono-
logical notices. Giving
his own name (11.7 71²⁸),
and that of his contem-
poraries (3' 4' 8' 10' 7³). This
is never the case in cc. 9-14.

Introductory formulas
are used by Hosea
in the first five chap-
ters, but not at all
in cc. 6-14.

Continuation
of
H.

There are also lacking
in cc. 7^{and} 8.

G.

H.) The form of inscription
used by Zech in 9^{and}
13' is not found in Zech.

The subject
matter of cc. 1-8
does not require
this form.

I) The Messianic picture is
different in the two
(or three), sections

נחמ - Prphet 38.9.6² 13

זכר - King 99.10

14/6 חנניה Himself is hinnah

J. Zech^{and} Ozek both contain
quotations^{of} is true, but
Zech is an original au-
thor influenced here^{and}
there by his predecessors.
Ozek is only an "over-
work", of older prophets,
taking specific pains
to imitate the language
of the past as closely as
possible. In his spec-

Zech^{and} Ozek both have
numerous quotations
from the earlier proph-
ets = (a).

Ozek has many distinct
references to later prophets = (b).

- a- Explicit references to
נב'ים ראשונים in 14-6⁹ 7-17.

Allusion to the fig tree (3¹⁰)
is from Micah 4,7.

cf⁸ recalls Hosea 3³¹

* Stade ZATW. 1882 p. 162.

ial aptitude for borrowing the vocabulary of his forerunners, Ozth may have borrowed the much debated expression (9⁸) מצבר ומשב from his predecessor Zch. 7¹⁴.

76.) Altho these similarities seem conclusive; yet compared ^{with} the following list of linguistic unlikeness, they lose much of their binding force.

Zch. 9^{5.6} - Zeph. 2^{4.5}

Substance of 8²⁰⁻²³

is same as Mich. 4^{1.3} Isa. 2³.

$\frac{Zch.}{10^3} = Ez. 34^{2.17}$

$11^4 = " " 3.4$

$11^3 = Jer. 12^5 50^{44}$

$14^5 = Ez. 47^{1-12}$

$14^{10} = Jer. 31^{38.40}$

and so on

Linguistic similarity is between cc. 1-8 and 9-14. Under this heading a number of words and forms will be found to be common to Zch. and Ozth.

3 ⁹	מוש trans. 14 ⁴ intrans.	34-97. הסיר 1 ¹⁷ -10 ² . נחם
1 ¹⁷	פוע intrans. 18 ⁷ trans.	14 ⁴ - 7 ⁷ בגב. 34-13 ² העביר
6 ¹⁰	גולה exiles. 17 ² exile.	6 ⁶ -9 ¹⁴ . תימן pass. 2 ⁸ -9 ⁵
6 ¹³	הוד Majesty. 10 ³ Goodly.	6 ⁷ -12 ⁹ with ל ^{infir.} בקש
* Zch	ענה = answer. Dzech. = listening	also = "to ask". 21.2 - 11/16
8 ¹⁰	שלח send out. 9 ¹¹ Let free.	1 ⁸ מצולה 10 ¹⁰ (But even if this be the same
11 ⁶	המציא expresses same as שלח.	word, - which is doubtful -), the reading in
3 ⁷	שמר = observe מצוה 11 ¹¹ Hearken.	c/ + is questionable.
Zch.	רעה = Prophetic concept. Dzech. = new.	34-14 ⁴ בגל 7 ¹⁴ 9 ⁸ * מעבר ומשב
8 ²³	ב + העניך 14 ¹³ with accusative.	5 ⁸ - 11 ¹³ העניך. 2 ¹⁴ -10 ⁷ שמח
8 ¹³	to be strong = 10 ¹³ גבר.	11 ⁶ Niph. 12 ¹ נסה
6 ¹ 8 ¹⁵	Reputation expressed by טוב	3 ³ - 11 ⁶ נצל Puhl
9-14	צור for same idea.	5 ¹³ 13 ¹⁰ ספר cc. 1-4 Hiph. Hiph.
a 1-8	כל-הארץ = whole earth. 8	5 ⁴ -10 ³ שלל Pol. Dzech. Dal.
a 9-14	" " = Palestine	5 ⁴ -13 ³ שבר 8 ¹⁰ 11 ¹⁶ סקר
		1 ¹² -10 ⁶ רחם

☆

Eichardt p. 105.

☆

See previous page: column I

Except. 53.6.

7⁶ אכל = eat. ^{but in} 9-14 = consume.

נגז Dugl 2¹³ and 14⁵ Hiphil.*

8^{6, 11, 12} שירת ^{but} יחר 14²

שקר 8⁴ 8¹⁷ - 10² and 13²

11⁷ מטבח " מקל 10¹⁴

2⁸ נצר " בחור 9¹⁷

6^{11, 14} צטרף " נצר 9¹⁶

1^{2, 15} 7¹² קצר " חמה 8¹ 10²

3^{5, 9} צון " הסאת 13¹

2¹⁶ 8¹² נחל " הוריש 9⁴

7¹⁴ שמם " שרד 11^{2, 3}

cc 1-8 תוך " 9-14 never: מעט קרב

cc 1-8 נשא 8 times, 9-14 never. { צמס^{12, 13}
נמס 9¹⁶

8¹⁰ אדם ישראל ^{but} 9¹ אדם ובהמה

etc etc

cc. 1-8 אבי preponderance. 9-14 mostly אנכי

" " אבה with personal pronoun and Participle

cc. 9-14 אנכי with Participle 2¹⁴ 3⁹ 8⁷

& A preponderance of אנכי

denotes a late date

* but in a different sense.

2¹³ = to touch

14⁵ = to reach out to.

An examination of the two columns, will I think, prove convincingly that Jch.^{and} DZch. are two different writers, with distinct interests, ^{and} distinct linguistic ^{and} stylistic peculiarities. It only remains therefore, to ascertain, if possible, the date of DZch, presupposing that cc. 9-14, are from one hand. But if, as is claimed by Kemnace, - and afterwards by Ewald, Knobel ^{and} others cc. 9-14 is the work of two writers: - cc. 9-11 the one, ^{and} 12-14 the other, then it will become our task to determine the time of the two authors, to discuss their points of disagreement, and to examine the relation they bear to one another. Therefore we now

take up the theory which attributes chapters 9 to 11, and 12-14 to two authors respectively, and assigns them a place among the pre-exilic prophets. This is known as the Pre-Exilic theory.

The Pre-exilic Theory.

The theory of which Newcombe was the father, and Ewald the great expositor, held its own up to within twenty years: and even to-day when the hypothesis of Stade and Wellhausen is very generally accepted, it is admittedly difficult to overcome some of the arguments of this claim.

The cogency of Ewald's argumentation has led Driver to the opinion that cc. 9-14 were originally pre-exilic, but were edited and revised by a post-exilic redactor, and Cheyne in summing up the arguments on both sides of the question ^{says that they} are very strong.

^a at least so far as cc. 9-11 are concerned

and that the pre-exilic theory deserves most careful consideration. Its validity however is conditioned upon a successful division of cc. 9-14 into two equal parts cc. 9-11^{*} and 13-14. After the pre-exilic references^{and} allusions in both these sections have been stated, it will become our task to test the integrity of cc. 9-14.

The usual arguments for the pre-exilic authorship of cc. 9-11, are stated below.

I.

It seems well nigh certain from a glance at c. 10¹⁰ that the kingdoms of Israel and Judah must both have existed at the time of the prophet's writing. *Prima vista*,

* plus c. 13⁷⁻⁹

the statements of v. 6^{and} 9 of this chapter may appear to invalidate this assertion, but the phrase, 'I will bring them again', refers only to the exile of northernmost Israel under Tiglath Pileser, and not to the conquest which Sargon completed. This is rendered all the more probable, because from 18¹⁰ it appears that only Lebanon^{and} Gilead were overrun.

II.

Assyria^{and} Egypt occupy the chief places on the historical horizon of Isch X.^{and} this coincides remarkably well with the utterances of Hoshea (cf. 7² 13¹ ^{and} 14³), as well as, of Isaiah (7¹⁷). This argument nar-

round down the date of cc. 9-11 to about
743 to 740.

III

The foreign nations prominent in
Isaiah's time, appear in Ezch. to hold
the same all-important stations: this is
evidenced by passages I¹⁻⁷. They are -
- Damascus, Tyre, Sidon, Hamath,
Philistia, Assyria and Egypt.

IV

We ascertain from c. 9¹¹ that probably
Israel had already suffered at the
hand of the Assyrian: if this be true, the
prophecy falls in place sometime about
773-761: for between these two dates, Israel,

during the reign of Menahem^{*}, first came under the power of Pul[†], King of Assyria. In ch. 11¹⁻³ another invasion is threatened. This may be the one of Tiglath Pileser.

V.

Both saying and idolatry were prevalent (cc. 8¹⁻³). The same crimes are the subjects of Isaiah's condemnation^{||}.

VI

Michah[§] and Isaiah[§] have the same Messianic expectations as Ozah (9^{9,10})

VII

The struggle between Israel and Judah has already begun (11¹⁴) Damascus was threat-

☆ v. 3. N. 15-17 ff. † 1. Chr. 5²⁶ || Is. cc 2nd 7.

§ 54

§ 97

ened about the same time: thus we come to the date of the coalition of Pekah^{and} Rezin; about 739.

VIII

According to ch. 9, Assyria was to march up Egypt by way of Syria, Phoenicia^{and} Philistia. According to the record in Kings this is exactly the line of march the Assyrians did take: both Israel (99-13) - and Judah (98.9) would suffer being right in the path of the invader.

X

Here are some of the points of contact between Zechariah 9 to 11, and some of the earlier prophets Zech. 9.1-7 cf. Amos 1³.

$\text{Zeh} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 9^{10} \\ 10^{45} \end{array} \right.$
 $\text{f.} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Mariat} 9^{5.6} \\ \text{mariat} 5^{10} \end{array} \right.$

Zet. 10^x Mucata 7^{12.13.}

chapters anywhere else, but just at the threshold of the exile.

Following are the pre-exilic allusions and references found in cc. 12-14

I

The death of King Josiah at Megiddo, is still, at the time of the author's writing, a fresh source of grief to the people (12¹¹).

II

The references, (in c. 14¹⁵) to the hostile attitude assumed by Egypt, is best explained by recalling the events of Josiah's and Jehoiakim's reign.

III

ch. 12¹⁰ contains a notice of just such a

persecution as took place under Manasseh.

IV

As in the case of argument 5 for cc. 9-11,
so here also, (13^{2,6}), idolatry and false proph-
ecy are denounced.

I

There is a reference to a king in 13⁷.

II

The earthquake which occurred in king
Egypt's ^{time} ~~time~~ is remembered (14⁵).

III

Notice the parallels between Zech 13¹⁰ and
Amos 8¹⁰ and " " 9³ "
Jeremiah 12⁵ and 49¹⁹.

The relative strength of these two sets of arguments, as compared with the claims of the post-exilic critics, will reveal, as Cheyne^{*} says, that at least those dealing with cc. 13-14, are weak. And altho according to him numbers 1^o-3-^Δ 6 and 7 hold good, still 6 is untenable[‡], and as to 4[†], it may be proven that proph-
saying & false prophets still existed after the Return from Exile.

It now will suit our plan to test the integrity of chs. 9-14, and then see what the post-biblical school has to urge against the arguments just quoted.

It is claimed by those critics who

^{*} J.Q.R. vol. 1. p. 11. ^oI but v. above p. 19

^Δ but v. Helsh article Zeh. Britannica bottom p. 774-75

~~See above~~ [‡] see the columns for this argument.

postulate a dual authorship for cc 9-14, that these two divisions, 9-11 + 13⁷-9 and 13-14 present certain differences sufficiently pronounced, to warrant the assertion that one man could not have been their author. And even those critics who defended the unity of cc 9-14 most strenuously, have had to admit that ch. 14 at first sight, appears to be totally at variance with the preceding chapters.

Dr. Haetz* had devoted himself entirely to this problem. He points out, among other things, that in ch. 14, Jerusalem is captured whereas in ~~in~~ ch. 12. " goes uncaptured.

It seems peculiar to him that the prophet,

* J.Q.R. vol II 1891.

- if both chapters refer to the same event, - began his description with the short introduction ואנכי שב ירושלים סף רצל instead of with the far more dramatic introduction of Chapter 14. This is surely a question well put. Robinson* in his reply to Dr. Gaster's observation, in no way answers these arguments, but proceeds to give a few reasons why c. 14 belongs to cc. 9-13. I quote them at length. גם יהודה 12³ 14¹⁴, shows the same regard for Judah in both sections

10⁴/14¹⁰ פנה 11³/14⁶ יקר 14¹⁷ 10¹ גטם 12¹¹/14⁴ בקצ
 10⁵/14^{3.14} לזחם 14^{4.14} 9^{2.5.9} מאר 14² 13⁸ 9¹⁰ פרת
 Caananites 11^{7.11} 14²¹ Use of hiph. 13⁸ 14¹⁶ יתר.

* A.J.S.L. p. 79 vol. 12.

How the larger question still remains. Do
cc. 9-14 form an integral unit?

In the first place ch. 12 begins with
its own introduction מִשָּׁעַר בְּכָר יְהוּדָה עַל-יְסֻדָּא.

This however only proves that Ozek con-
tains two sections * Secondly the ob-
ject of the two portions appears to be ~~tot-~~
ally at variance. cc. 9-11 busies itself
with the Trans-Jordan country and
with Israel and with Judah (9¹³ 10⁶ 11¹⁴)
and mentions the following nations,
Tyria-9¹ - Greece-9¹³ - Philistia-9³ -
Phoenicia-9² - Egypt^{2nd} & Assyria-10¹⁰.

But ch. 13-14 in spite of its inscription,
concerns itself only with Judah & Jerusalem,

* See Stade p. 14 on אשור.

to the exclusion of Ephraim, and mentions none of the nations spoken of in chs. 9-11, as hostile to Judah, except Egypt.

To these reasons, Eckardt* adds a list of words and linguistic characteristics peculiar to each section.

The writer of cc. 9-11 evidences the following favorite expressions

כִּל 10⁷ 9⁹ גִּבּוֹר 9¹³ 10^{5,7} סֵם חַיִּימוֹת 9³ 10⁶ דָּר 10¹¹ 11²

כִּמְר 9⁵ 10^{2,7,8} שָׁבַע 9⁸ 10⁴

He also has linguistic peculiarities that stand out in distinction to cc. 13-14

רָוַח (9³) He uses for "tower": in 12² it means "siege"

כִּי 9⁴ " " "power" 14⁴ " " "treasure"

בָּקַשׁ 11⁶ " " "to ask" 13⁹ " " "seek" - with? - to do.

* ZATW. 1893 pp. 99-105

11³ means "Masterly"; 13⁴ it means "Mantel".

~~777~~ (April) 9¹⁵ with 24

12⁸ with 743

$825 \cdot 10^{8.10}$ but for the same meaning $908 \cdot 10^2 \cdot 14^{2.14}$

9^6 גארן 10^{11} " " " " " 10^7 תפארת *twice*.

one hand. Thus — o

כל-הארץ in cc 9-14 always means Palestina
never, "the whole earth" 11^{6.16} 13⁸ 13¹² 13²⁰ 14^{9.10}.

אכל always means "consume" with the secondary
idea of "destroy"

זכר in a religious sense 10⁹ 13².

יטב, in passive meaning 9⁵ 13⁶

מזבח adjoining מזבח 9⁵ 14²⁰

מחבה — 9⁵ חבה 10¹ 14¹⁷ גטב

יחר Kiphal 13⁴ 14¹⁰ חרף 9^{6.10} Mph. 10⁵ ~~10⁴~~ 13⁸
13² " 9¹⁰ — 14⁸
חפץ. 10⁵ 14³

מלצמח 9¹⁰. 10³. 14⁶ מצד 9^{2.5.9} 14^{4.14}

חכא 9⁴ 10¹⁰ 13⁷ 13⁴ חרף טאר 9⁷ 13¹⁴ פתח 11¹ 13¹

פבה 10⁴ 14¹⁰ אכבי with Partic. 11^{6.16} 13² etc.

In addition to these considerations the

o

quoted from Eckart ZATW. vol. 12 p 100 ff-

-argument for the integrity of these six chapters, will be strengthened, I think, as we come to appreciate the force of the post-exilic theory, the main claims and arguments of which, we may now proceed to examine fully.

The Post-exile Theory.

The array of facts presented by the critics of the last two decades, in support of this theory, are of undoubted cogency and strength. Unitistic and pre-exile workers have tried in vain to break through the chain of evidence, but I believe an impartial investigation will convince the student, that the evidence which Stade, Cheyne, Melhauser, Nowack - much as they differ in method ^{and} detail - bring forward, proves chapters 9 to 14, ^{is} the work of one man: in all probability a writer living long after the Exile. Following are some of the

facts upon which the "post-exilic theory" builds

A. Linguistic *

אדם opposite 'שָׂרָא' has its only parallel in Jer 32³⁰; hence a later passage.

זָהָב ⁹ = Gold. ψ 68¹⁴ Prov 3¹⁴ & 10¹⁴ 13³⁷ 16¹⁶.

זָהָב ⁹ used in this signification only in Daniel 11⁴ & Job. 41³⁵

זָהָב ⁹ in the older literature only in Ec. 39³⁰ & 32.

but very frequent later. Thren. 3³⁴ Is. 14⁷. Job. 3¹⁸.

five times in the Psalms

זָהָב ⁹ also in Ec. 37^{13, 14} (for the first time); Is. 66¹⁹

זָהָב ⁹ = Youth, does not occur in pre-exilic times except Deut. 32⁷

זָהָב ⁹ an Aramaism ψ 144¹³

Eckhardt p. 79.

כבש 9¹⁵ Jer. twice: once each in Chron.

Ezra and Neh. Special 7¹⁹

אזיז 10¹ synonym ברק 9¹⁴ only in Job. 28²⁶ 38²⁶

גבר 10^{6,12} only in Kohl. 10¹².

נצב 11¹⁰ in Prov. 3¹⁷ 15²⁶ & 37⁴ etc.

כחל 11⁸ Cynicism אפ.לע. Prov. 30²⁴ reads
with * מכהלת.

יקר Aramaism Jer. 30⁵ Ez. 32²⁵ Prov. 30¹⁵
& 49^{13,21} Job. 38¹⁰. in Ezra it occurs ten
times: in Daniel four.

צמית 13⁷⁻⁹ in an abstract sense, occurs on-
ly here.

גוע 13⁸. P in Job. 32²⁰, 9 times. Then once, Job.
8 times, & once.

למען-ל' 13⁷. Ez. 19⁶. 36²⁰ four times in the &.

תחננום Jer. twice, Prov. once. ψ^o six times.

Job. once. Dan. four times.

גד is absent in pre-exilic literature.

קרב 14³ An Aramæism. Dan 7²¹ ψ^o 6 times

Job. Koh. once each.

קדש 17⁵, meaning angel, is post-exilic,
for instance ψ 896. & ⁹ in Daniel etc.

— o —

I might go on to quote Eckardt at length,
in his proof that Dzel. is not only post-
exilic ^{but} very late; but it is only necessary
to refer the reader to his own article*, in
regard to Orthography, scriptio plena^{and}
defectiva etc, and to an attempted refutation
by Robinson^Q, to show with what a scant

* JATW. vol. 12. & AJSJ. vol. 13. pp. 1. 55

measure of success, Eckardt's contentions have been refuted.

In my humble opinion the linguistic argument, even more than that from historical allusion, (for this latter may be misinterpreted) is decisive in determining the time of a literary production: Therefore Eckardt's article "Der Sprachgebrauch von Jac. 9-14" must be considered one of the chief efforts of the post-exilic school. But historic allusions from the prophecies themselves are by no means wanting to strengthen the case for the post-exilic hypothesis. The more important ones are given below.

I.

Chapter IX¹⁻⁷ contains a threat of punishment, without giving a single reason for the dire distress predicted. This is certainly not the custom of the older prophets, as for instance a glance at Amos ch. 1²⁵ will show.

II

The reference to the Greeks certainly requires a late date: all the passages where the ^{griks} appear are post-exilic. ⁹¹³ The Greeks are mentioned as the then existing world power. This is the pivotal argument upon which the central conclusions of Gade^{and} Wellhausen turn.

III.

During the exile Arabian immigrants had occupied Ashdod, and their language, being a mixed dialect, became almost unintelligible to the Jews - Jer. 13²⁴).

The punishment pronounced on Ashdod therefore most certainly requires a date as late as Nehemiah at the very earliest.

IV

The prophecy, descriptive of the siege of Jerusalem in chapter 14 is very different in character from any pre-exilic oracle on the same subject: and the great prominence given to the celebration of the Bar-

vest festival in chap. xiv points to the time when the narrower Levitical ideas of the Chronicler prevailed.

Tabernacles had been celebrated cursorily and without Levitical precision before the time of the Exile - 1 Kgs. 13⁹ - But in Jerh. 8¹⁷ we read. "And all the congregations of them that were come again out of the captivity made booths, and dwelt in the booths. for since the days of Joshua, the son of Nun, unto that day had not the children of Israel done so."

V

If c. 9¹¹⁻¹³ be compared with Is. 42⁷ and 49⁹.

~~it will be seen~~ (also Josephus Antiq. 13.2¹⁵)

it will be seen that a post-exilic ~~that~~
~~a post-exilic~~ origin most readily ex-
 plains the use of such decisive expres-
 sions in regard to the dispersion.

VI

There are also the following references to
 very late prophecies. Zech. 13² cf. Joel c. III.
 Zech. 14² cf. Is. 66²⁴. Zech. 14¹⁷ Isa. 60¹²
 Zech. C. 14 and Is. 16^{to} 35th verses of ch. XL.

In fact Zech. c. 9-14 is kin in spirit and
 thought to Is. XLIV and XLVII, both of which chap-
 ters are of Grecian date.

— o —

After all the arguments pro and con have
 been considered, it will be understood.

how from the mass of conflicting testimony no two, out of the many authoritative critics, have been able to agree in all the details. The post-tillic school has now the upper hand, - rightly so from the greater probability of all its assertions -; but the problem of Dzel is so absorbing and intricate that any day we may expect a new ^{and} fuller criticism that shall shed new light on the subject, and propound a new ^{and} perhaps more convincing position.

In the brief review now completed, we have gone over the principle veins of the

three schools; in the course of the short summary about to follow, we shall see the post-etc. theory further strengthened.

Summary and Conclusion.

We have thus far seen that in all probability Dzeh is postexilic. It yet remains for us to see just where in post-exilic times, these last six chapters, are to be placed.

As has been remarked before, the greater number of post-exilic critics assign a Maccabean time^{and} date to Dzeh, and as Melchhausen is certainly a representative member of this school, it will prove well, both for the sake of brevity and completeness to follow his

reasoning, as given in the Prolegomena.*

The vague predictions of these chapters, despite the assertions of Ewald Thobel and their compilers, has no traceable inner resemblance, — "spiritual affinity to the inspired Amos, Hosea or Isaiah. These prophets were the heralds and preachers of some great, some new and stirring world idea. Amos stood for justice, strict, stern, impartial justice. But where in Ozeq. will you find justice? only murder and bloody victory. Hosea came with the רחמים בדין. His supreme message was Love. But where in Ozeq. can Love be found? instead

* Berlin 1886 p. 438 ff.

there is only vengeance and a narrow nationalistic spirit. In Isaiah's plan the Universality of God is the basic stone, the key stone of his philosophy's arch. But where in Ozah does any such intimation appear? But in its place, marking the decline of prophecy is the ritualistic element always indicative of decadence: why are some of the nations that were hostile to Judah, saved from utter destruction? that they, "shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles

C. 14 '60

In these chapters, Israel, i.e. the Jews.

have no amicable relations with mankind at all. Judah is to glory in the defeat of her foes: "their flesh shall fall away and consume while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their sockets and their tongues shall consume away in their mouth."

c 14th

Jerusalem is to be made the recipient of all the wealth of the fallen enemies — verse ¹³ whose blood they shall drink down as wine and whose bodies they shall tread down with their feet, as though they were only mud in the streets.

Truly it will be hard to prove any man a contemporary of Henea or Amos or

Isaiah who lacks every vestige of a grand spiritual idea. A few parallels may be traced between these prophets and Ozch. but they are mainly linguistic, springing from the archaistic tendency of our author.

In Ozch. indefinite dreamings of future events are indulged in, and contrary to the practice of the three great prophets mentioned: predictions are not founded on Present Realities. Then too the eschatological views are those of Ezekiel, who is responsible for the notion that the Messianic deliverance

will be preceded by a combined
 attack upon ^{and} siege of Jerusalem
 by all the nations, and that the is-
 sue of the contest will be the ut-
 ter rout of the besiegers - Ez. c. 38.

From the reference to the ^{יְהוּדִים},
 the Grecians, as the then existing
 world power (9¹³) it appears that the
 prophecy must be later than the
 time of Alexander. Assyria ^{and}
 Egypt (10¹⁴) stand for the Ptolemaic ^{and}
 Seleucidian kingdoms: and that
 the Jews of later times had ample
 reason to bear these two neigh-
 bors of theirs deep felt hatred, is e-

On account of a disturbance
while copying, this page was over-
looked.

vident from ~~the~~ the passages 1 Macc.

5-6⁸⁻⁵⁵ as compared to Zech. 9.6.7.*

Zech. (ch. 9⁴) makes God say "I will encamp about my house as a garrison, that none pass through or return, that no oppressor shall pass through any more."

This reference suits the Egyptian campaigns of Antiochus Epiphanes remarkably well, for Jerusalem always suffered, both on his outward and his homeward marches.

And what is more, the reference ch. 13⁵⁵ finds its fulfillment in Maccabean times when Judas's

* See also "Religion of Israel. Kuenen. pp. 66-7 ff.
Trans. by A. H. May. Wm^{os} & Kington. London 1875.

victory over the Syrians preceded
the final delivery of Jerusalem.

The context of chapters XI, 4-17 and XIII 7, 9
allows of but one conclusion, entirely
satisfactory and consistent with all
the requirements of the passage.

The three shepherds mentioned in
these verses, are meant to repre-
sent three minions of a foreign
ruler, on account of whose greed
for personal gains (9⁵), the country
suffered all the ills that a mis-
governed country falls heir to.
After a long protracted period of
suffering, God brings redemption

He sends his own shepherd (Judas Maccabeus²), and causes the three ministers to perish in short order. - Verse 8. This may possibly refer to the death of a number of high priests,* for during the period immediately preceding the Maccabean War, the change of high priests was very frequent, and often came about quite suddenly. And as a final proof for this historical setting, we read in verse eight, that the Greeks (Seleucidians) succumb to the might of Judah.

To my mind, all the foregoing is certainly proof conclusive of

* v. Wellhausen's note on v⁸ opp page 14.

the Maccabean date ^{and} author-
 ship of Zechariah 9-14. Surely on
 no other theory can the references
 be half so fully ^{and} satisfactorily
 explained: and Cheyne* says of Dzt,
 "He lived nearer the apocalyptic
 age of which the most noted
 representative is the author, (if we
 should not rather say authors) of
 Daniel."

To those traditionalistic theological
 critics who refuse to admit any
 other but a Zecharian date ^{and} auth-
 orship, only a very few words of ref-
 utation are necessary. They believe

that the picture of the Messianic shepherd in c. xi⁴ can only refer to Jesus of Nazareth. To impart validity to their claim, they are forced to make what is certainly an unwarrantable assumption: viz:-

That in this instance, the prophet preached things and spoke to his hearers of matters, which must have been unintelligible to them. For when the prophet speaks of "him whom you have pierced" it is supposed that all his hearers will immediately understand what man is meant; whereas on the

assumption of the Church, if ^{the man} the prophet spoke of ^{de} Jesus, the people could not have understood him at all, since Jesus only comes with the New Testament times. Moreover the theologians forget that in Ezek[†] the shepherd wears of his office and abandons his flock, while in the New Testament the shepherd gives his life for the flock. and that in Zechariah 12^{12, 13}, the price is paid to the shepherd, but in the New Testament, to the traitor.

And now one great difficulty

* Melh. Britannica article Zechariah

remains: and one moreover not affirmatively answerable, at least as long as we remain in our present state of ignorance concerning the history of the canon. "How did it happen that a prophecy, written as late as Maccabean times was incorporated into the prophetic writings, while Daniel, a prophetic production of the same period was relegated to a place in the Hagiographa. This is the great objection which the pre-exilic critics have urged against postulating a Maccabean date for Ezch. But

Wellhausen asks an equally embarrassing question in reply. How does it come to pass that a prophecy, written, from the pre-exilic point of view, in the time of Amos ^{and} Hosea, in the eighth century, was appended to Zechariah, a prophet of post-babylonian times? This question ~~is~~ is just as unanswerable as the former, and the matter stands without a solution, throwing no weight in the balance for either of the two schools.

In concluding this sketch, it

may be well and fitting to attempt a short general characterization of Deuterojeremiah.

In this prophet we have certainly to deal with an apocalyptic author. The spontaneity of the old masters is gone. The classic grandeur and fervor of the former prophets is lacking: - but not departed forever, since as Cornill thinks we have yet the little Book of Jonah. The unnaturally ornate style, the halting imagination, the inconsistencies, the habit of abandoning Present Realities as a basis for teach-

ing, and of wandering vaguely^{and} indefinitely, these are all characteristic. So also is the prophet's tendency to archaic expressions and references^A — which tendency explains the abundance of pre-exilic indications in chapters IX to XI.

The days of active symbolism are gone too. In times of old, when prophecy was still young^{and} vigorous, an Amor would come before the people, plumb line in hand and in their sight would display it for purpose of illustration of his words. Isaiah, the mighty classic of Israelitish

^A f. i. ref. to Uzziah c. 14.⁵

Prophecy, appears on the highways of the city and in the market place, clothed in sackcloth and with bare feet. But not so with Dych. He is apocalyptic: he delivers an allegory - ch. II - about breaking the shepherd's staff, but he only allegorizes. He does not actually come and do the breaking before the people.

A look at ch. 13¹⁻⁶ is instructive. The people are conscious that prophecy is dead and do not hesitate to wound it with shame. Cornill sees in Dych, the low water mark of Prophecy. Dych. abounds in the blood of the

Leathern. There is no craving after peace
 There is no truly grand imagery, there
 is ^{no} stirring style, there is no justice
 or love in short there is nothing great.
 The book has only historical value, but
 how far removed, and infinitely less
 worthy than the great prophets of the
 days that are dead! Where in these
 words is a love of God or man? Where is
 mercy? - only war, carnage and strife.
 One word will describe the book
 in its relation to the prophetic lit-
 erature, and that one word, is -
 - "Decline".

$$\frac{26}{18}$$