



Conjectures concerning the Date and Authorship of Zechariah IX-XIV

Author(s): Marco Treves

Source: *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 13, Fasc. 2, (Apr., 1963), pp. 196-207

Published by: BRILL

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1516491>

Accessed: 18/06/2008 14:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=bap>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONJECTURES CONCERNING THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF ZECHARIAH IX-XIV

BY

Marco TREVES

Florence (Italy)

Many scholars have noticed that chapters ix-xiv of the Book of Zechariah are not by the same author as chapters i-viii. The style and diction of these chapters are different ¹⁾, the historical situation appears to be different ²⁾, the religious ideas are different ³⁾.

Several scholars have attributed Zech. ix-xiv—either in part or entirely—to the Maccabean age. This opinion seems plausible to me for the following reasons:

1. The language is late and seems to rule out a pre-exilic date ⁴⁾.

¹⁾ “Not only do characteristic words occur in each [of the two sections of the Book of Zechariah] which do not occur in the other; . . . but both parts use the same words with more or less different meanings, and apply different terms to the same objects. There are also differences of grammar, of favorite formulas, and of other features of the phraseology, which, if there be any need, complete the proof of a distinction of dialect so great as to require to account for it distinction of authorship”. George Adam SMITH, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets Commonly Called the Minor*, New York, 1900, II, 459. See also ECKARDT, “Der Sprachgebrauch von Zach. 9-14”, *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft* XIII (1893), pp. 76-109; S. R. DRIVER, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* 1897 (reprinted New York 1956), pp. 331-332; J. WELLHAUSEN, „Zechariah, Book of”, *Encyclopaedia biblica* IV, 5393-5395; H. G. MITCHELL, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*, Edinburg, 1912, pp. 233-236, 243; W. O. E. OESTERLEY and T. H. ROBINSON, *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, London, 1934, p. 411; A. GELIN, *Aggée, Zacharie, Malachie*, Paris, 1948, pp. 22-23; A. LODS, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, Paris, 1950, p. 508; H. H. ROWLEY, *The Growth of the Old Testament*, London, 1950, p. 122.

²⁾ See: SMITH, pp. 449-450, 459-460; J. E. MCFADYEN, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, London, 1932, pp. 258-260; OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, p. 410; H. H. ROWLEY, p. 122; LODS, loc. cit.; J. A. BEWER, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, London, 1950, II, 101.

³⁾ See: SMITH, p. 460; WELLHAUSEN, loc. cit.; MITCHELL, p. 239-243; W. H. BENNETT, *The Religion of the Post-exilic Prophets*, Edinburgh, 1907, p. 124; C. F. KENT, *The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets*, New York, 1910, p. 36, 453; OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, p. 411; ROWLEY, p. 122.

⁴⁾ SMITH, pp. 452-489 analyzes the language of every chapter in detail and remarks that “chaps ix-xiv contain many more Aramaisms than chaps i-viii, and therefore symptoms of a later date”.

2. The author hopes for a return of the exiled Jews from the Diaspora (Zech. x 6, 8-10, xii 6). This, too, rules out a pre-exilic date ¹).

3. Although our author mentions the chieftains of Judah (Zech. xii 5-6) and the house of David (Zech. xii 7-12, xiii 1), no Davidic king is mentioned as reigning in the author's days ²).

4. Independence and security are promised to Jerusalem (Zech. ix 8, xiv 11). We may infer that recently foreign invasions or oppressions had occurred.

5. These chapters contain imitations and reminiscences of several earlier parts of the Bible, including Deuteronomy ³), the Priestly Code ⁴), Jeremiah ⁵), Ezekiel ⁶), Joel ⁷), Job ⁸), the Trito-Isaiah ⁹).

6. The apostrophe to the trees with the invitation to wail in Zech. xi 2 is perhaps more in keeping with the spirit of Hellenistic poetry than with pre-exilic Semitic style ¹⁰).

7. The names "Zion" and "Israel" are used to designate Judea (Zech. ix 9, 13; xii 1). The identification of Israel with Judea is unlikely to have been made at the time when the two separate kingdoms of Israel and Judah were in existence. It points to an age when the the Judeans regarded themselves as the heirs of the Israelitish name and when "Israel" denoted a religion and not a State. Moreover, before Josiah's reform the Temple on Mount Zion was merely one

¹) DRIVER p. 326; WELLHAUSEN, loc. cit.; R. CORNELY, *Historicae et criticae introductionis in U.T. Libros sacros Compendium*, Paris, 1914, p. 466; O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Tübingen, 1934, p. 489; T. H. ROBINSON und F. HORST, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, Tübingen, 1938, p. 206.

²) THOMAS V. MOORE, *The Book of Zechariah*, 1856, (reprinted London, 1958), p. 132; SMITH, p. 451, 482; WELLHAUSEN, loc. cit.; CORNELY, p. 466; KENT, p. 453.

³) MITCHELL, p. 237; GELIN, p. 23.

⁴) SMITH, pp. 474, 482; ROWLEY, p. 122.

⁵) CORNELY, p. 466; MITCHELL, pp. 237-238; M. DELCOR, "Les sources du Deutéro-Zacharie et ses procédés d'emprunt", *Revue biblique* LIX (1952), p. 387.

⁶) CORNELY, p. 466; MITCHELL, pp. 237-238; W. NOWACK, "Zechariah, Book of", *A Dictionary of the Bible*, by J. HASTINGS, Edinburgh, 1909, IV, 968-970; GEORGE FOOT MOORE, *The Literature of the Old Testament*, New York, 1913, p. 211; OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, p. 424; MCFADYEN, p. 262; GELIN, p. 23; DELCOR, p. 386.

⁷) DELCOR, p. 400. The Book of Joel probably belongs to the Ptolemaic period, because the Jews appear to be troubled by Greeks and Egyptians.

⁸) MITCHELL, pp. 237, 239; GELIN, p. 23; DELCOR, p. 391. The Book of Job, on account of its many echoes of Greek literature, must be dated in the Hellenistic period.

⁹) CORNELY, p. 466; MITCHELL, p. 237; DELCOR, p. 387. I agree with R. H. KENNETT, who ascribes the Trito-Isaiah to the second century B.C.

¹⁰) Cf. THEOCRITUS, *Idylls* vii 74; BION, i 31-37; MOSCHUS, iii 1-7.

of the sanctuaries, the one closest to the Royal Palace¹). In 621 it became the only officially recognized place of worship. After 518, when the Palace no longer existed, the Jerusalem Temple became the center and symbol of the Jewish nation. The names "Zion" and "Judea" could be used almost as synonymous. From Zech. xiv 16-21 we learn that the only Temple was in Jerusalem.

8. The two great powers designated under the names of Assyria and Egypt in Zech. x 11-12 are doubtless Seleucid Syria and Ptolemaic Egypt²). Real Assyria had disappeared from the political scene long before. Egypt was not a great power in the Persian period.

9. The following sentence occurs in Zech. ix 13: "I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and will make thee as the sword of a mighty man". The only times when sons of Zion fought against the sons of Greece were in the period from 167 to 85 B.C.³).

10. Battles are mentioned also in Zech. ix 4, 8, 10, 13-15; x 3-5; xii 2, 4, 6; xiv 2, 3, 12, 14. The Jews fought no battles between 586 and 167 B.C.⁴).

11. I suggest identifying the siege of Jerusalem mentioned in Zech. xii 2 with the one laid by Antiochus Eupator in 162 B.C. (1 Macc vi 51-61). Jerusalem was not besieged many times. So there are not many alternatives to this date.

12. The enemy is described with the phrases "all the nations", "all the peoples" (Zech. ix 10; xii 2-3, 6; xiv 2-3, 12, 14, 16-19). This phrase suits the Maccabean war against the Greeks, Edomites, Philistines, etc.⁵).

13. The conversion of the heathen nations to Judaism (Zech. ix 7; xiv 16-18) was an expectation of the Maccabean age. It was expected to follow the victorious conclusion of the wars of religion,

¹) Ernest RENAN, *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, II (1891), p. 142; WELLHAUSEN, loc. cit.; W. H. BENNETT, pp. 121-122; NOWACK, loc. cit.

²) Assyria is Seleucid Syria according to most scholars (e.g. STADE, RUBINKAM, SMITH, WELLHAUSEN, NOWACK, MITCHELL, KENT, G. F. MOORE, LUZZI, MCFADYEN, EISSFELDT, OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, BEWER, PFEIFFER).

³) See: RUBINKAM, DRIVER, SMITH, KENT, LUZZI, MCFADYEN, OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, EISSFELDT, PFEIFFER and BEWER. However, KIRKPATRICK, MITCHELL, HORST, and GELIN expunge the sentence which mentions Greece.

⁴) See KENT, p. 36.

⁵) Antiochus Eupator's army in 162 included "men from other kingdoms, and from the isles of the sea, bands of hired soldiers" totalling 100.000 footmen, 20.000 horsemen, and 32 elephants (1 Macc. vi 29-30).

and to be a kind of ideal compensation for all the forced apostasies from Judaism which the persecution had caused.

14. The general condemnation of the prophets (Zech. xiii 2-5) would have been inexplicable in the period when famous and respected prophets were flourishing ¹⁾.

15. God is called King (Zech. xiv 9, 16-17), probably because the Jews had ceased to recognize the Seleucid kings as legitimate ²⁾.

16. The phrase "there is no shepherd" (Zech. x 2) and the attacks against the shepherds (Zech. x 3; xi 5, 8, 15, 17; xiii 7) suit the periods when the high-priesthood was vacant or held by worthless individuals ³⁾.

Four objections have been raised against the dating of these chapters in the Maccabean age⁴⁾: that the canon of the Old Testament, or at any rate of the prophetic books, had allegedly been closed before the second century B.C.; that Ben Sira, who allegedly wrote ca 200 B.C., mentions the Book of the Twelve Prophets, and therefore must have known a complete edition of it; that a number of phrases and ideas occur in both sections of the book and therefore both must be by the same author; and that the mention of Ephraim and Joseph (Zech. ix 10, 13; x 6, 7) implies a date before 722 B.C., when the kingdom of Northern Israel was suppressed by the Assyrians.

These objections do not seem valid to me: The opinion that the Old Testament canon was closed by Ezra has been exploded ⁵⁾. I know of no closing of the canon before the synod of Jamnia, ca. 100 A.D. Several Old-Testament books are assigned to dates later than the days of Ezra by scholars of repute: Chronicles, Esther, Daniel, certain Psalms, Ecclesiastes, etc. This list is destined to grow longer as the Old Testament is studied more carefully. The latest page is possibly Psalm ii, which PFEIFFER dates in 103 B.C. with good reasons ⁶⁾. I believe I have proved that the dates of the various poems

¹⁾ WELLHAUSEN, SELLIN, NOWACK, HORST, MCFADYEN, ROWLEY.

²⁾ See M. TREVES, "The Date of Psalm xxiv", *Vetus Testamentum*, X (1960), pp. 430-431.

³⁾ See KENT, pp. 458, 460-461.

⁴⁾ By CORNELI, MANLEY, DELCOR, etc.

⁵⁾ On the canon see: P. M. SIMMS, *The Bible from the Beginning*, New York, 1929, pp. 78-83; OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, pp. 5-8; A. LODS, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, Paris, 1950, pp. 1010-1018; Stanley RYPINS, *The Book of Thirty Centuries*, New York, 1951, pp. 300-306; ROWLEY, pp. 169-172; A. WEISER, *The Old Testament: its Formation and Development*, New York, 1961, pp. 342-345.

⁶⁾ PFEIFFER, *The Books of the Old Testament*, New York, 1957, p. 198.

of Ecclesiasticus range from ca. 165 to ca. 140 B.C.¹⁾ The poem on the Famous Men—in which the mention of the Book of the Twelve Prophets occurs—is one of the latest. It was written about twenty years after the Deutero-Zechariah. Moreover Ben Sira does not name the individual prophets of the Book and does not state how many chapters and verses belonged to each prophet. We cannot rule out the possibility that his list differed from ours or that his edition of Zechariah contained only eight chapters, just as the edition of Habakkuk used at Qumran lacked the last chapter.

The similarities between the first and second part of the Book of Zechariah listed by CORNELY are partly imaginary, partly non-decisive. Moreover, as our writer borrowed phrases from several earlier prophets, he may have borrowed some from Zechariah too.

The names “Ephraim” and “Joseph” may have been used in a merely geographical sense for central Palestine, as elsewhere in the Old Testament (2 Chron. xxxi 1; Psalm lxxx 1-2; Jer. iv 15; xxxi 6; l 19; Obad. 18-19), or may refer to the Samaritans²⁾.

In short, I do not see how we can avoid the conclusion that these chapters—in part at least—belong to the Maccabean age³⁾.

Having ascertained the date, let us turn to the problem of identifying the author. We may first examine Zech. xi 4-17.

1. Our author declares: “Thus said the Lord my God: Feed the flock . . . So I fed the flock” (verses 4-7). The flock is the Israelite nation, as elsewhere in the O.T. The man who feeds the flock must be the head of the nation—a ruler, a dictator, a governor, or a high priest. He cannot be any obscure Jew, unknown to history. We are authorized to try to identify him with someone among the prominent

¹⁾ M. TREVES, “Studi su Gesù Ben Sirach”, *La Rassegna mensile di Israel*, XLII (1956).

²⁾ I do not think these names can refer to the legend of the Lost Ten Tribes, surviving in a distant country, because this legend does not appear before the second half of the first century A. D. In earlier writings (the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* and the *Letter of Aristaeas*) the Twelve Tribes of Israel apparently include the Samaritans. This is not incorrect historically, since the Samaritans, just like the Jews, were of mixed, but predominantly Israelitish blood. See A. E. COWLEY, “Samaritans”, *Encyclopaedia biblica*, IV, 4258. As for the Israelites whom the Assyrians had deported in 721, they disappeared from history long before the age of our book.

³⁾ Zech. xi-xiv has been assigned—either entirely or in part—to the Maccabean age by CORRODI, EICHORN, VATKE, WELLHAUSEN, RUBINKAM, ZEYDNER, MARTI, BERNFELD, KENNETT, KENT, SELLIN, DUHM, EISSFELDT, OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, HORST, BEWER, KUHLE, LASSALLE.

persons whose names and careers are recorded in Books of the Maccabees and in JOSEPHUS.

2. The fact that he could cut off three shepherds in one month (verse 8) also shows that he held an exalted political position, above that of the three shepherds, and somehow had the authority to cut them off.

3. Apparently our author was called by the Lord to rescue the sheep from the hands of their possessors (or buyers) (verse 5). We may infer that he did not inherit his position and did not owe it to the Greek king. He seized it through a religiously-inspired rebellion. In short, he was Judas Maccabeus, who rescued the Jews from the hands of the Greek kings and the apostate high priests.

4. Jadas Maccabeus is the only person, to my knowledge, who could boast of having cut off shepherds. It is natural to assume that, when he liberated Jerusalem, he deposed some apostate priests and some officials loyal to the Greeks.

5. Some scholars ¹⁾ identify the "worthless shepherd" of Zech. xi 17 with the wicked high priest Alcimus, who was seized with a palsy (1 Macc. ix 55). This identification seems plausible to me, owing to the similarity of the circumstances. Now Judas was the head of the good Jews in the days of Alcimus. If this verse is contemporaneous with the rest of the chapter we have an additional proof for our conjecture.

Judas Maccabeus seems to be the only individual whose story accords with these five data of the text.

Having tentatively attributed this page to Judas, let us try to interpret some of its verses. The Jews were being slaughtered by their callous buyers, while their sellers rejoiced over the financial profit they had made (Zech. xi 4-5). Presumably these buyers and sellers are the simoniacal priests ²⁾ and the Greek kings who had appointed them for money. We have a fresh confirmation for the date we have suggested, since Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus were the only priests who obtained their office by money. All the others inherited it.

¹⁾ MARTI, DUHM, BERTHOLET, KENT, OESTERLEY and ROBINSON, BEWER.

²⁾ Another allusion to these simoniacal priests probably occurs in Zech. xiv 21: "There shall be no more a trafficker in the House of the Lord of Hosts". I would translate "trafficker" or "trader" with MITCHELL, RUBINKAM, KENT, LUZZI, HORST, HENSHAM, the Revised Standard Version, etc., not "foreigner", because the preceding verses predict that all foreigners will come to worship in the Temple.

The Lord has no more pity on the inhabitants of Judea and delivers every man into his neighbour's hand and into the hand of the king (verse 6). In other words, there were both intestine strife and a persecution ordered by the king. It was in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes that this double calamity occurred. So we have another proof of our date. Judas, called by God, undertakes to pasture the flock, that is to say, to govern the Israelites (verse 7). The two staves—this image is suggested by the figure of the shepherd—are the two principles of Judas' policy: "Clemency" towards the ex-apostates and "Unity" or "Solidarity" of all the Jews against their foreign enemies. But later he repented of having pardoned the sinful Jerusalemites, and later still he thought fit to dissolve the solidarity between Judas and Israel (verse 14). Many unsuccessful attempts have been made to identify the three shepherds cut off in one month (verse 8). The trios of names suggested range from Moses, Aaron, and Miriam all the way to Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. All these conjectures are open to the same objection: that the three shepherds were cut off (i.e. deposed) by the author of the chapter. Even if you do not accept my conjecture that the author is Maccabeus, you must admit that the three "shepherds" were removed from office by a Jewish writer in a single month. Judas effected purges of pro-Greek priests and officials on two occasions: in 164-163 B.C., when he had just liberated Jerusalem (1 Macc. iv 42) and in 161 (1 Macc. vii 24). Our text must refer to one of these two purges. We do not know the names of the shepherds. In any case, the chapter was written after December 164, because the Temple is called "the House of the Lord" (verse 13) and was accessible to the good Jews.

Now let us examine Zech. ix 1-8. This page has been assigned to the age of Alexander the Great by some scholars¹⁾. This conjecture does not seem plausible. God is mentioned in the third person in verses 1, 4, and 7. Therefore God cannot be the speaker. The author says: "I will cut off the pride of the Philistines . . . I will take away his blood . . . I will encamp . . ." Such boastful and authoritative announcements in the first person singular show that the author is the commander-in-chief of the army. It is unlikely that a page by Alexander or by any other Greek military leader should have been included in the O.T. Our commander-in-chief must be a Jew. Besides he calls the Lord "our God" (verse 7), which is a second

¹⁾ CORRODI, EICHHORN, KUIPER, RUBINKAM, CORNILL, MITCHELL.

proof that he is a Jew. He wrote while Ashdod was still standing and Ekron was hostile, and therefore before 147/146 B.C., when Jonathan destroyed Ashdod and annexed Ekron (1 Macc. x 84-89). In all likelihood this page is also by Maccabeus. The phrase "no exactor shall pass through them any more" (verse 8) must have been written not long after an exactor had passed through the glory of the kingdom (Daniel xi 20; 1 Macc. i 29) ¹⁾.

Dr. VOGELSTEIN ²⁾ suggests attributing Zech. ix 1-8 to an ancient seer Zechariah who lived in the days of Uzziah King of Judah in the eighth century B.C. (2 Chron. xxvi 5). Indeed Uzziah warred against Ashdod and other Philistine cities while Jeroboam II king of Israel conquered Damascus and Hamath. VOGELSTEIN's conjecture seems attractive, owing to the similarity of the geographical data. The identity of the names of the authors would have caused this ancient prophecy to be appended to those of the other Zechariah. However, since Zech. ix 1-8 appears to have reminiscences of Ezek. xxviii 3-7, 12, and 18 (or of Amos i 10), to be written by a commander-in-chief, and to have been composed just after an oppressor (or exactor) had passed though Jerusalem, I am inclined to regard my attribution as preferable ³⁾.

The campaigns announced in this page were not carried out by Judas, and only in part later by his brother and successor Jonathan the high priest. Not always do men succeed in carrying out what they plan to do.

A number of O.T. passages voice the wish or the expectation that the Davidic dynasty will reign for ever in Jerusalem or will return to the throne of its ancestors ⁴⁾. Some were presumably penned before 586 and were meant as compliments to young kings or princes of that dynasty. Others were composed after 586 by Jews who resented being ruled by foreign powers and longed for national independence under their traditional ruling family. Of course, the passages of this second group could be published only in the rare periods of inter-

¹⁾ See KENT, p. 453.

²⁾ Max VOGELSTEIN, *Fertile Soil*, New York, 1957, p. 121.

³⁾ Additional evidence in favor of a late date—the mention of the half-breeds, and several late words—is offered by SMITH, p. 464.

⁴⁾ In my opinion, these passages are the following: Genesis xlix 10; 2 Samuel vii 12-16; 1 Kings ii 4, viii 25; ix 5; xi 36; 2 Kings viii 19; 1 Chronicles xxii 10; 2 Chronicles xxi 7; Psalms lxxxix 29, 35-37; cxxii; Isaiah iv 2; ix 1-7; xi 1-10; Jeremiah xxiii 5; xxx 9; xxxiii 15-17; Ezekiel xxxiv 23-24; xxxvii 24-25; Michah v; Zechariah iii 8; vi 12-13.

regnum, turmoil, and confusion, when people could argue about choosing a new ruler. During the long periods of undisturbed Persian, Ptolemaic, Seleucid, Hasmonean, and Roman rule anyone expressing a wish for a change of government would have been promptly tried for treason and executed.

I have often wondered: Were these so-called "Messianic" hopes mere day-dreams of mystics, without any relation to actual circumstances, or was there a family of Davidic princes who posed as Pretenders and had some political following? This question has never been exhaustively discussed, to my knowledge.

Our information about the history of the Davidic family is incomplete. Let us pass it in review. Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, was blinded and deported to Babylon in 586 B.C. after seeing his sons slain by the Chaldeans (2 Kings xxv 7, Jer. xxxix 6-7). His nephew and predecessor Jehoiachin, also called Jeconiah, or Coniah had been deported in 597 (2 Kings xxiv 15, Jer. xxiv 1, xxvii 20) but was released from prison in 561, treated as a prince, and granted an allowance by Evil Merodach, king of Babylon (2 Kings xxv 27-29, Jer. lli 31-34). The family apparently lived in Babylon until the kings of Persia appointed first Sheshbazzar (Ezra i 8, 11, v 14)¹ and then Zerubbabel (Ezra iii 8; Haggai i 1, 14; ii 2, 21) to the post of governor of Judea. It seems that a group of Jews was preparing to crown Zerubbabel king, but the Persians foiled this plan (519 B.C.).² The family continued after Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii 19-21), but we know little about it. One Hattush (1 Chron. iii 22; Ezra viii 2) returned from Babylon to Judea, perhaps in 397 B.C. Hattush's brother's grandsons are the last members of the family mentioned by name in the Old Testament. According to a Jewish tradition³, Hillel the Elder was born in Babylonia and descended from the Davidic princes on his mother's side. According to a Christian tradition, a contemporary of Hillel, a carpenter of Nazareth named Joseph, also belonged to this family. This is not the place to discuss these traditions. But we may ask: What were the Davidic princes doing in the second century B.C.? There are two documents which in all probability belong to the Maccabean age and express a desire for the restoration

¹) Called *Samanassaros*, *Sanabassaros* or *Sabanassaros*, in 1 Esdras ii 12, 15 and vi 18, 20, and possibly to be identified with the Shenazzar of 1 Chron. iii 18.

²) The story is told by A. T. OLMSTEAD (*History of the Persian Empire*, Chicago, 1959, pp. 136-142).

³) Talmud of Jerusalem, *Taanith* iv, 68.

of the House of David. They are Psalm cxxxii ¹⁾ and Is. xi ²⁾. They testify that the Davidic Pretenders still had some adherents.

I base the following conjectures on the literature of the period and particularly on the Book of Zechariah: The Maccabean soldiers who in the years 166-164 were fighting against the Greeks were united by their resolve to win religious freedom for Judaism and reconsecrate the Temple, but had not agreed yet on the form of government to be established in Judea in case of victory. Some of them, as the authors of Psalm cxxxii and Is. xi, would have liked to offer the throne to the Davidic Pretenders. Another faction possibly was willing to anoint Judas, the victorious general, to be king or high priest ³⁾. A third group refused to recognize any human ruler and wanted to elect God himself to be King of the Jews ⁴⁾. There may have been a fourth group, ready to submit to the political rule of the Greeks, provided religious liberty were granted to the Jews ⁵⁾. The dispute must have been decided soon after the liberation of Jerusalem. Apparently Judas refused all honors for himself and for the Davidic Pretenders and declared God to be the only king. This is proved by some Psalms composed in 164-163, which appear to be official hymns of the Temple and address God as king ⁶⁾. Judas' attitude towards the House of David may be learned from the words: "The Lord will give victory to the tents of Judas, that the glory of the House of David and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem

¹⁾ There are two reasons for assigning Psalm cxxxii to the years 167-164: It invites the Lord to return to Zion (verse 8), from whence He must have been temporarily absent, and it mentions the Asideans (verses 9 and 16).

²⁾ R. H. KENNETT, *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah*, London, 1910, p. 68 and 85. I may add some evidence of the late date of this chapter: the phrase "stump of Jesse" implies that the tree has been felled, i.e. that the Davidic dynasty is not reigning; the great extent of the Diaspora in verses 11-12 points to the Hellenistic age; the image of the wolf and the lamb lying together is Greek and has many parallels in Greek and Latin literature (ARISTOPHANES, THEOCRITUS, HORACE, VIRGIL); and the contrast between the meek and the wicked is the contrast between the good Jews and the apostates.

³⁾ In Enoch xlvi the "son of man" who will break the teeth of the sinners and topple the kings from their thrones must be Judas, particularly since the sinners are the apostates who deny the name of the Lord and persecute the synagogues and the faithful. In Enoch xlv and lxii this „son of man" will sit on a throne of glory, presumably as king or high priest.

⁴⁾ Is. xxxiii 22. This chapter is likewise ascribed to the second century by KENNETT p. 85.

⁵⁾ This was the solution actually accepted in 162 (1 Macc. vi 59).

⁶⁾ In my opinion they are Psalms xxiv, xlvii, xciii, and xcv-xcix.

be not exalted above Judas" (Zech. xii 7)¹). The reason for this attitude lies in the fact that the Davidic princes, like the inhabitants of Jerusalem, appear to have polluted themselves in the days of the persecution. Later they seem to have repented. Our author hopes that God "will pour upon the House of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication" (Zech. xii 10). "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the House of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness" (Zech. xiii 1). Here we have an instance of the rite of bathing in running water as a means for removing the pollution of sin²). The reader will recognize here the rite mentioned in the *Rule of the Community* (also called the *Manual of Discipline*).

Judas appears to have discharged the functions of a high priest without assuming the title³). In 162 B.C. the Greek king Antiochus Eupator reconquered Judea, but granted some religious toleration to the Jews. In 152 Jonathan was anointed high priest. In 104 Aristobulus became king. Between the end of the Hasmonean dynasty (in 63) and the accession of Herod (in 37), during another period of interregnum and confusion, a Pharisean poet again turned his thoughts to the House of David (*Psalms of Solomon* xvii), which possibly existed still.

We do not claim we have solved all the problems presented by these chapters⁴), which the critics from St. JEROME to WELLHAUSEN have

¹) The interpreters who translate "Judah" are unable to find any meaning in this verse. If we translate "Judas" the meaning becomes clear.

²) This bathing in running water as a penitential rite for cleansing the penitent of his sins must be distinguished both from the ablutions prescribed for purification from ceremonial uncleanness (Lev. xiv-xvii, Num. xix, Deut. xxiii) and from Christian baptism when this is used as an initiation to a different religion. It perhaps took the place of earlier penitential rites (fasting, sackcloth, ashes). Penitential bathing is also mentioned in the *Life of Adam and Eve*, and was practised by John the Baptist.

³) JOSEPHUS (*Antiq.* XII, x 6, 414 and 419) says that Judas became high-priest. This statement is not supported by the Books of the Maccabees, and it seems improbable that he was regularly anointed. However, Judas did perform some the high-priestly duties such as appointing priests, dedicating the Temple, and offering sacrifices.

⁴) One remark I wish to add. Some commentators believe that the author disdained the salary of thirty piece of silver because he regarded it as too small and flung it into the Temple treasury in a fit of petulance. I think it irreverent to attribute avarice and petulance to this pious writer and I think it historically unlikely that he should boast of such vices in his autobiography. It seems more likely that he donated the money to the Temple out of unselfishness and generosity. Thirty pieces of silver in that age of poverty was not such a small sum. The

called very obscure. However, we have made an effort to solve a few of them. We have been driven to these unexpected conclusions:

1. Zechariah ix-xiv belongs largely or entirely to the Maccabean age.

2. It was written, at least in part, by Judas Maccabeus.

3. The House of David made an attempt to recover the throne ca. 164 B.C., but was thwarted by Judas.

We respectfully submit these conclusions to the readers of *Vetus Testamentum*.

Persian governors of Judea received a salary of forty silver shekels (Neh. v 15). The Temple treasury, which had contained the deposits of widows and orphans (2 Macc. iii 10), had been looted by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. i 23; 2 Macc. v 21). Our author may have donated his salary as a tiny contribution toward the reimbursement of the widows and orphans.