



The Prophecies of Zechariah with Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14

Author(s): George Livingstone Robinson

Source: *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. 12, No. 1/2, (Oct., 1895 - Jan., 1896), pp. 1-92

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/527601>

Accessed: 18/06/2008 14:38

---

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=ucpress>.

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](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL  
OF  
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES  
(CONTINUING "HEBRAICA")

---

VOL. XII.      OCTOBER, 1895—JANUARY, 1896.      Nos. 1 AND 2

---

THE PROPHECIES OF ZECHARIAH WITH SPECIAL  
REFERENCE TO THE ORIGIN AND DATE  
OF CHAPTERS 9-14.\*

BY GEORGE LIVINGSTONE ROBINSON, PH.D.,  
Roxbury, Massachusetts.

---

OUTLINE.

LITERATURE.

INTRODUCTION: THE HISTORY OF CRITICAL OPINION.

1. CONTENTS OF THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.
  2. THE PRE-EXILIC HYPOTHESIS EXAMINED.
    - 1) The Historical Argument, or Argument from Historical Allusions.
    - 2) The Christological Argument, or Argument from Messianic Prophecy.
    - 3) The Psychological Argument, or Argument from Parallelisms in Thought and Language between Zech. 9-14 and the other prophets.
  3. THE POST-ZECHARIAN HYPOTHESIS EXAMINED.
    - 1) The Linguistic Argument
    - 2) The Historical Data alleged in favor of a Græco-Maccabean date.
  4. THE INTEGRITY OF ZECHARIAH 9-14.
  5. THE RELATION OF CHAPTERS 9-14 TO ZECHARIAH 1-8.
- SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

\* A Dissertation presented to the Philosophical Faculty of Leipzig, for the purpose of obtaining the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

## LITERATURE.

[The asterisks before certain names indicate that the works of these authors are especially valuable from a critical point of view.]

## 1. AUTHORS WHO ADVOCATE A PRE-EXILIC ORIGIN FOR ZECH. 9-14.

\*Joseph Mede, *Dissertationum ecclesiasticarum triginta quibus accedunt fragmenta sacra*. Londini, 1653; *Works*, 4th ed., London, 1677, pp. 786 sq., 834.

H. Hammond, *Paraphrase and Annotations, etc.* 6th ed., London, 1653, III., pp. 135, 745.

Rich. Kidder, *Demonstration of the Messiah in which the truth of the Christian religion is defended, especially against the Jews*. London, 1700; 2d ed., 1726, pp. 76 sq.

Wm. Whiston, *Essay toward restoring the true text of the O. T. and for vindicating the citations made thence in the N. T.* London, 1722, pp. 93 sq.

\*B. G. Flügge, *Die Weissagungen, welche bei den Schriften des Propheten Sacharja beygebogen sind, übersetzt u. kritisch erläutert; nebst einigen Abhandlungen*. Hamburg, 1784.—Idem, *Beiträge zur orient. u. exeget. Bibliothek, etc.* Hamburg, 1787.

\*Wm. Newcome, *An attempt towards an improved version, metrical arrangement and an explanation of the twelve minor prophets*. London, 1785; new ed., 1836.

G. F. Seiler, *Theolog.-krit. Betrachtung neuer Schriften*. Erlangen, 1786.

J. D. Michaelis, *Neue orient. u. exeget. Bibliothek, I.* Göttingen, 1786.

G. L. Bauer, *Die kl. Propheten mit Comm.* Leipzig, 1786-90.—Idem, *Einleitung*. Nürnberg, 1794.

J. C. Doederlein, *Auserlesene theolog. Bibliothek*. Leipzig, 1787.

Ch. W. Augusti, *Einleitung in das A. T.* Leipzig, 1806-29.

\*L. Bertholdt, *Hist.-krit. Einleit. in sämtliche kanonische u. apokryphische Bücher des A. u. N. T.* Erlangen, IV., 1814, pp. 1697 sq.

\*W. M. L. deWette, *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleit. in das A. T.* Eds. 1-3, Berlin, 1817-29; eds. 4-7 (in which the post-exilic origin of chs. 9-14 is advocated); ed. 5, Berlin, 1840, I., pp. 343-7; ed. 6 (post-humous), Berlin, 1852; ed. 7 (E. Schrader), 1869, pp. 447 sq.

Ed. Forberg, *Comm. crit. et exeget. in Zech. vatic. part. post.* Coburg, 1824.

\*Rosenmüller, *Scholia in V. T.*, IV. Lipsiæ, 1828; VII., 4, pp. 257 sq.

J. A. Theiner, *Comm. über die hl. Schrift. Die zwölf kl. Propheten*. Leipzig, 1828.

\*F. Hitzig, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1830, pp. 25–44.—Idem, *Die zwölf kl. Propheten*. Leipzig, 1838; 2d ed., 1852; 4th ed., besorgt von H. Steiner, Leipzig, 1881, pp. 333–410.

Aug. Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*. Breslau, 1837, II., pp. 166 sq., 280 sq.

\*H. Ewald, *Die Propheten des A. B.* Stuttgart, 1840, pp. 308 sq., 389 sq.; 2d ed., 1867–8.

F. J. V. D. Maurer, *Comm. gramm. hist. crit. in Prophetas minores*. Lipsiæ, 1840, II., pp. 468 sq.

Ed. Meier, *Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Hebräer*. Leipzig, 1856, pp. 306 sq.—Idem, *Die Bearbeitung der zwölf kl. Propheten von Hitzig, Maurer und Ewald*, in *Theol. Jahrbücher von Zeller*, 1st–3d vols., Tübingen, 1842–3.

Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Braunschweig, 1847, I., pp. 280 sq.

\*F. Bleek, *Ueber das Zeitalter von Sach. Cap. 9–14*; *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1852, pp. 247–332; 1857, pp. 316 sq.; *Einleit.* 4th ed., bearbeitet von J. Wellhausen, Berlin, 1878; 5th ed., 1886; 6th ed., 1893.

\*E. F. J. v. Ortenberg, *Die Bestandteile des Buches Sach.* Gotha, 1859.

C. K. J. Bunsen, *Die Propheten*. Leipzig, 1860.—Idem, *Gott in der Geschichte*, I., pp. 449 sq.

Sam. Davidson, *Introduction to the O. T.* London, 1862–3.

\*W. Pressel, *Kommentar zu Hag., Sach. u. Maleachi*. Gotha, 1870.

L. Diestel, Article *Sacharja* in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, 1875.

B. Duhm, *Die Theol. der Proph. als Grundlage etc.* Bonn, 1875, pp. 72, 144, 202 sq.

Ed. Reuss, *La Bible, ancien Test.*; II, *Les prophètes*. Paris, 1876, pp. 179 sq., 349 sq.

\*H. Steiner, *Die zwölf kl. Propheten*. Leipzig, 1881. (See F. Hitzig.)

\*C. Bruston, *Histoire critique de la littérature prophétique des Hébreux*. Paris, 1881, pp. 116–32.

Sam. Sharpe, *History of the Hebrew nation and literature*. London, 1882.

\*H. Graetz, Recension über Stade's *Deuterozacharja* in Frankel's *Monatschrift für die Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judentums*; 1881, pp. 239 sq., 277 sq., 317.

C. v. Orelli, *Die älteste Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches*. Wien, 1882, pp. 272 sq., 327 sq.—Idem, *Ezechiel u. die zwölf kl. Proph.* Nördlingen, 1888.

\*Ferd. Montet, *Étude critique sur le date assignable aux six derniers chapitres de Zech.* Genève, 1882.

Ed. Riehm, Article *Sacharja* in *Handwörterbuch des bibl. Alterthums*; 1875–84.—Idem, *Einleitung* (posthumous). Halle, 1889.

H. L. Strack, *Einleit. in das A. T.*, in Zöckler's Handb. der Theol. Wissenschaften. Nördlingen, 1888; 4th ed., München, 1895.

H. Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*. Göttingen, 4th ed., 1889, pp. 64 and 65.

F. W. Farrar, *The Minor Prophets*, in Men of the Bible Series. New York.

\*G. Grützmacher, *Untersuchung über den Ursprung der in Zach. 9-14 vorliegenden Profetien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der zuletzt darüber vorgetragenen Hypothese*. Berlin, 1892.

R. D. Schlatter, *Einleitung in die Bibel*. 2d ed., Stuttgart, 1894, pp. 266-73.

Aug. Dillmann, *Einleitung in das A. T. u. biblische Theologie* (MS.). Berlin, 1894.

## 2. AUTHORS WHO ADVOCATE A POST-ZECHARIAN ORIGIN FOR CHS. 9-14.

H. Grotius, *Annotationes in V. T.*; 1644; ed. Vogel & Doederlein, II, Halle, 1676.

\*H. Corrodi, *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des jüdischen u. christlichen Bibelkanons*, I. Halle, 1792, p. 107.

H. E. G. Paulus, *Exeg. Handb. über die drei ersten Evangelien*. Lübeck, 1805; Leipzig, 1812; Heidelberg, 1832; pp. 117 sq.

\*J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das A. T.* 3d ed., 1805; 4th ed., 1824; pp. 427 sq., 444 sq.—Idem, *Uebersetzung der hebräischen Propheten*, 1819.

H. P. W. Gramberg, *Krit. Gesch. der Religionsideen des A. T.* Berlin, 1830, II., pp. 520-31 and 635-60.

J. H. W. Vatke, *Bibl. Theol. des A. T.* Berlin, 1835, pp. 553 sq., especially pp. 462 sq. Anm.

A. Geiger, *Urschrift u. Uebersetzung der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judentums*. Breslau, 1855, pp. 55 sq.

\*Fr. Böttcher, *Neue exeg.-krit. Aehrenlese zum A. T.* Leipzig, 1864; 2d ed., pp. 215 sq.

\*B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik*. Leipzig, 1879.—Idem, *De populo Javan parergon*. Gissæ, 1880 (Programm zum Giesener Ludwigstage).—But especially *Deuterozacharja, Eine krit. Studie in Zeitschr. für die alttest. Wissenschaft (=ZATW)*; Giessen, 1881-2, pp. 1-96, 151-72, 275-309.

\*A. Kuenen, *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des ouden verbonds*. Leyden, 1863. (1st ed. in favor of pre-exilic origin of Zech. 9-14; in 2d ed., 1889, post-Zecharian; pp. 380 sq.) German transl., Vol. II., 1892.

\*T. K. Cheyne, Article on *The Date of Zech. 9-14* in *The Jewish Quar. Review*, Vol. I., 1889.

\*H. Graetz, *Zech. 14*, in *The Jewish Quar. Review*, Vol. III., 1891.

C. H. Cornill, *Einleitung in das A. T.* Freiburg, 1891, pp. 196 sq.

S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the O. T.* Eds. 1-3; New York, 1891; Edinburgh, 1891-2.

\*W. Staerk, *Untersuchung über die Komposition u. Abfassungszeit von Zach. 9 bis 14, mit eingehender Berücksichtigung der neuesten Hypothese.* Halle, 1891.

\*J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*; V. Heft. Berlin, 1892; 2d ed., 1893.—Idem, Article *Zechariah* in *Encyc. Brit.*, IX. ed.—Idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.* Berlin, 1886, pp. 438 sq.—Idem, *Beurteilung der Schrift von Graf v. Baudissin, "Studien zur Religionsgeschichte,"* in *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen.* Göttingen, 1877, pp. 185 sq.

\*N. I. Rubinkam, *The second part of the Book of Zechariah.* Basel. 1892.

\*Karl Marti, *Der Prophet Sach.* Freiburg, 1892.—Idem, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1892, Heft 2 und 3.

\*A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets.* London, 1892.

\*R. Eckardt, *Der Sprachgebrauch von Zach. 9-14*; ZATW, 1893, pp. 76-109.

\*A. K. Kuiper, *Zacharia 9-14; eene exegetisch-critische Studie.* Utrecht, 1894.

G. Wildeboer, *De Letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds naar de tijdsorde van haar ontstaan.* Groningen, 1893, pp. 517 sq.

E. Kautzsch, *Die heil. Schrift des A. T. übersetzt.* Freiburg-Leipzig, 1894, Beilagen, pp. 203 sq.

### 3. AUTHORS WHO DEFEND THE UNITY OF THE PROPHECIES OF ZECHARIAH.

\*J. C. Carpzov, *Critica Sacra V. T.* Lipsiæ, 1728, pp. 859 sq.

\*J. H. Bechhaus, *Ueber die Integrität der proph. Schriften des A. B.* Halle, 1796.

Benj. Blayney, *A new translation of the prophecies of Zech., with notes.* Oxford, 1797.

J. Jahn, *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des A. B.* Wien, 1802-3; 2d ed., pp. 669 sq., 675 sq.

\*F. B. Köster, *Meletemata critica et exeg. in Zechariæ prophetæ partem posteriorem, capp. IX-XIV, pro tuenda eius authentia.* Göttingen, 1818.

F. Ackermann, *Proph. min. perpet. annot. ill.* Wien, 1830.

\*M. W. L. de Wette, *Einleitung in das A. T.*; eds. 4-7. Berlin, 1833, 1840, 1852, 1869.

\*E. W. Hengstenberg, *Die Authentie des Daniels u. die Integrität des Sach.* Berlin, 1836.—Idem, *Christologie des A. T. u. Comm. über die messianischen Weissagungen*, III. 3d ed., Berlin, 1856, pp. 243 sq.

A. McCaul, *Rabbi Kimchi upon the Prophet Zech., translated, etc.* London, 1837.

- H. Hesselberg, *Die zwölf kl. Proph.* Königsberg, 1838.
- H. A. C. Hävernick, *Einleitung in das A. T.* Erlangen, 1839.
- \*J. D. F. Burger, *Études exéget. et crit. sur le prophète Zach.* Strassbourg, 1841.
- J. Ch. K. v. Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis.* Nördlingen, 1855, II., pp. 554 sq.; 2d ed., 1860, pp. 603 sq.—Idem, *Weissagung u. Erfüllung;* 1841-4.
- J. G. Herbst (died 1836), *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in die heil. Schriften des A. T.*, hsgg. von B. Welte. Karlsruhe, 1840-44.
- E. Henderson, *The Minor Prophets with Comm., etc.* London, 1845.
- F. W. C. Umbreit, *Praktischer Komm. über die Propheten des A. B.* Hamburg, 1845, Vol. II., pp. 351 sq., 451 sq.
- P. Schegg, *Die kl. Propheten.* Regensburg, 1854-62.
- W. Baumgarten, *Die Nachtgesichte Sacharjas.* Braunschweig, 1854-5.
- T. V. Moore, *The Prophets of the Restoration;* new translation with notes. New York, 1856.
- H. L. Sandrock, *Prioris et posterioris Zachariae partis vaticinia ab uno eodemque auctore profecta.* Breslau, 1857.
- W. Neumann, *Die Weissagung des Sach.* Stuttgart, 1860.
- L. Reinke, *Die messianische Weissagung.* Giessen, 1859-62.
- \*A. Köhler, *Die Weissagungen Sach., Cap. 9-14.* Erlangen, 1861-3.—Idem, Article *Sacharja* in Herzog's Realencyclopaedie, 2d ed., Vol. XIII.
- \*J. J. Stähelin, *Die messianische Weissagungen des A. T.* Berlin, 1847, pp. 125 sq., 173 sq.
- \*Th. Kliefoth, *Der Prophet Sach. übersetzt, etc.* Schwerin, 1862.
- \*J. J. S. Perowne, Article *Zechariah* in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, London, 1863.
- C. F. Keil, *Einleitung u. Komm. zum A. T.;* III., 4th ed.—Idem, *Die zwölf kl. Propheten.* Leipzig, 1853 and 1873.
- \*T. W. Chambers, *Comm. on Zech.* (in Lange's Bible Work). Eng. ed., 1874.
- J. P. Lange, *Sacharja* in Bibelwerk, Part XX. Bielefeld u. Leipzig, 1876.
- W. Drake, *Comm. on Zech.* (Speaker's Comm.). London, 1876.
- E. P. Pusey, *The Minor Prophets.* Oxford and London, 1877.
- \*C. H. H. Wright, *Zech. and his prophecies* (Bampton Lectures), London, 1879.
- \*C. J. Bredenkamp, *Der Prophet Sach.* Erlangen, 1879.
- Marcus Dods, *Hag., Zech., and Mal.* (Handb. for Bible Classes), Edinburgh, 1879.
- \*W. H. Lowe, *The Heb. Student's Comm. on Zech., Heb. and LXX.* London, 1882.
- W. Haehnelt, "Um den Abend wird es licht sein;" *der Prophet Sach. für die Gemeinde ausgelegt.* Leipzig 1891.
- W. H. Green, *Prophets and Prophecy* (MS.). Princeton, 1893.

## INTRODUCTION.

## THE HISTORY OF CRITICAL OPINION.\*

The integrity of Zechariah's prophecies was first questioned about the middle of the 17th century, when Joseph Mede (1653), of Christ Church College, Cambridge, attacked the genuineness of chs. 9-11. His motive was to find, if possible, a satisfactory explanation for the quotation in Matt. 27:9, 10 of Zech. 11:12, 13, attributed by the evangelist to Jeremiah. Accordingly he argued that chs. 9-11 are of pre-exilic origin and the work of Jeremiah. This opened the way for criticism. Hammond (1653), Court-preacher to Charles I., but especially Kidder (1700), Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Whiston (1722), Professor at Cambridge, defended Mede's view, ascribing also chs. 12-14 to Jeremiah; but they were all most strongly opposed by Carpzov (1728), who maintained that only Zechariah could have written these prophecies. After Carpzov nothing more was published against the genuineness of Zech. 9-14 for over half a century, when the question was taken up afresh in England, and about the same time introduced by Flügge (1784), Archidiakonus in Hamburg, into Germany. From 1784 on, the critical opinions of Zech. 9-14 furnish a most striking history.

Archbishop Newcome, Primate of Ireland (1785), inaugurated a new era. He distinguished, for the first time, two separate pre-exilic fragments in chs. 9-14, which he argued belonged to two authors of different times. Chs. 9-11, he maintained, were written before the downfall of Samaria, or about the time of Hosea; while chs. 12-14 were composed between the death of Josiah and the destruction of Jerusalem. The year previous (1784), when Mede's idea was introduced into Germany, Flügge had attempted by means of his anonymous writing to vindicate the quotation of St. Matthew by ascribing the last six chapters of Zechariah to Jeremiah. But Flügge's hypothesis (made like Mede's in the interests of conservatism) was modified by Bauer (1786-90) and Doederlein (1787), who followed the view of Newcome. Against these Corrodi (1792) made a bold stand.

\* Modern criticism never disputes the genuineness of chs. 1-8; on the other hand, tradition has never, without exception, denied the Zecharian authorship of chs. 9-14



He declared himself in favor of the view (first suggested by Grotius, 1644) that these chapters of Zechariah are of late post-Zecharian origin. Between the theory of a pre-exilic origin of these prophecies on the one hand, and the theory of a post-Zecharian on the other, Bechhaus (1796), Blayney (1797) and Jahn (1802) defended the unity of the entire book of Zechariah. Paulus (1805), however, insisted upon a late, post-exilic date, but was vigorously opposed by Augusti (1806) and Bertholdt (1814), who maintained the pre-exilic origin of the chapters in dispute, Bertholdt suggesting for the first time that the author of chs. 9–11 might be the Zechariah son of Jeberechiah mentioned in Isa. 8:2. He consequently assigned these chapters to the reign of Ahaz, and chs. 12–14 to the reign of one of the last independent kings of Judah. With this opinion agreed Gesenius (in his *Commentary to Isaiah*) and de Wette in the first three editions of his *Introduction to the O. T.* (1817–29), and also Forberg (1824); but Köster (1818) defended unity.

The problem by this time had been pretty thoroughly discussed. Eichhorn (1824), who, in the earlier editions of his *Introduction* wavered in his decision, in the fourth edition took a firm stand in favor of a late Græco-Maccabean date. In chs. 9:1–10:12 he found a description of Alexander the Great's invasion in 332 B. C., and in chs. 13:7–14:21, a song of comfort over the death of Judas Maccabeus in the battle with Bacchides, 161 B. C., while chs. 11:1–13:6 were written in the period between, *i. e.*, between the middle of the 4th and 2d centuries B. C. Gramberg (1830) also advocated a post-Zecharian origin for these chapters, maintaining that they were a feeble imitation of older prophecies and an awkward working-over of a pre-exilic prophecy mingled with poetry, entirely disregarding of the time to which they belonged, and having their origin in the last years of the reign of Darius or in the first of Xerxes, 480 B. C. Likewise Vatke (1835) favored this period, explaining the origin of these prophecies in the time of the Egypto-Persian wars, when the Jews were continually having feuds with the neighboring peoples. But the post-exilic theory was not accepted by Theiner (1828), Rosenmüller (1828), or Hitzig (1830), who argued in favor of the reign of Uzziah—a view defended in later times by no one except

Pressel (1870), and given up by Hitzig himself in his Commentary (1838), in which he grants that chs. 12–14 may be later, probably out of the reign of Manasseh. Defenders of the unity of Zechariah were not, however, wanting. Ackermann (R. C., 1830), but especially de Wette (editions 4–7, 1833 sq.) and Hengstenberg (1836), as well as McCaul (1837) and Hävernick (1839) once more advocated unity. Knobel (1837) and Hitzig (1838) on the contrary re-asserted the pre-exilic hypothesis. They were followed by Maurer (1840), and also by Ewald (1840), who, though he assigned chs. 9–11 to the time of Ahaz and preferred the period, “eight to four years before 586 B. C.” for chs. 12–14, was not so confident that these chapters were earlier than the beginning of the exile,—a view taught also by Dillmann in his *Introduction to the O. T.* (1894).

From 1840 on defenders of unity were numerous. Burger and v. Hofmann (1841), Herbst (1842), Henderson and Umbreit (1845), Schegg, R. C. and Baumgarten (1854), Moore and Sandrock R. C. (1856), Köhler and Kliefoth (1862) and Perowne (1863) all defended the genuineness of Zech. 9–14. But during the same period, Meier (1842), Herzfeld (1847), Bleek (1852), v. Ortenberg (1859), Bunsen (1860) and Samuel Davidson (1862) argued for a pre-exilic origin of these chapters; whereas, Stähelin (1847), Geiger (1855), and Böttcher (1864), for a post-Zecharian,—Böttcher placing chs. 9–14 (as already Eichhorn in part) in the period of the wars between the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae at the beginning of the third century. On the other hand, five years previous (1859), v. Ortenberg had considered the pre-exilic theory to be established with “absolute certainty”; and argued that chs. 9–11 with 13:7–9 form a unit coming from the hand of Zechariah mentioned in Isa. 8:2, and that chs. 12:1–13:6 with ch. 14 were written between Josiah’s death (609 B. C.) and the downfall of Jerusalem (586).

Previous to 1870 the question of unity was repeatedly contested, and of the two divisive hypotheses, the pre-exilic theory with various modifications became the prevailing critical view. In 1875 Diestel repeated the statement of Bleek in 1852, that the pre-exilic origin of Zech. 9–14 is one of the “surest results of the modern investigations of the Bible.” T. W. Chambers also (1874)

in summing up the history of criticism says: "The opinion which referred the origin of the controverted chapters to the time of Alexander the Great or of the Maccabean age is now more generally abandoned, and by later writers on the other side is not deemed worthy of reply." And, indeed, it is noteworthy that for nearly twenty years after Böttcher (1864), no one openly defended the post-Zecharian hypothesis. On the contrary, many advocated the pre-exilic theory, among whom are Pressel (1870), Diestel and Duhm (1875), Reuss (1876), Bruston, Steiner (who, p. 370, comments on the unity of the views of modern criticism) and Graetz (1881), v. Orelli and Montet (1882) and Riehm (1884). Those who defended unity in the same period are Keil (1873), Chambers (1874), Lange and Drake (1876), Pusey (1877), Wright (1878), Bredenkamp and Dods (1879), and lastly Lowe (1882), since whom no one has argued openly the integrity of the entire book of Zechariah. Haehnel's popular work (1891) is of no critical value.

With Stade (1881-2) the criticism of Zech. 9-14 took a new direction. In the *ZATW*. he reopened and discussed the question at length, concluding that chs. 9-14 were written in the period of the contests of the Diadochi, *i. e.*, between 306 and 278 B. C. Since the publication of his articles the tendency of criticism is toward a post-Zecharian origin of these chapters. As far as we know, Grützmaker's dissertation (1892) is the only really formidable attempt to reinstate the pre-exilic hypothesis since 1882. On the other hand, many have followed Stade's lead. Cheyne (1888), by a process of reasoning similar to Stade's, arrives at the conclusion that Zech. 9-14 were written either in the late Persian or early Greek period, but certainly pre-Maccabean. Kuenen (1889), Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, 1886) and Driver (1891) are divided in their opinion, allowing that chs. 9-11 may be at least pre-exilic in origin, but confident that a post-Zecharian redactor worked them over, while chs. 12-14 were composed not before 400 B. C. Delitzsch (*Mess. Weissagung*, 1889) favors a post-Zecharian date, though he is uncertain as to the exact time. Cornill (1891) finds the best historic setting between 301 and 198 B. C. Graetz (1891) suggests the reign of Artaxerxes III for ch. 14; but, on the contrary, maintains the

pre-exilic origin of chs. 9–13. Staerk (1891) agrees with Stade for the most part in placing these chapters between 306 and 280 B. C., but excepts the fragments 11:4–17; 13:7–9, which he thinks describe in an allegorical manner the events of 171 B. C. from the standpoint of the following year, 170 B. C. Rubinkam (1892) assigns these prophecies as follows: ch. 9:1–10 to the year 332 B. C. when Alexander stood before Tyre, and chs. 9:11–14:21 to the years following 168 B. C., because they witness to the struggle for independence in the Maccabean age. In reference to the history of critical opinion Rubinkam makes the following noteworthy remark: “It is becoming evident that in spite of the great number of scholars who in the past four or five decades have declared for the pre-exilic origin of the chapters under consideration this theory is ceasing to satisfy. Not only those who for the first time are publishing their opinions upon the subject, but also those (*e. g.*, Kuenen) who have firmly advocated the pre-exilic authorship are declaring for a post-exilic date.”\* This he wrote in 1892. In the same year Wellhausen published his *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, 5. Heft, in which he maintains that Zech. 9–14 is a unit and out of the Maccabean age. Marti (1892) likewise places these prophecies in the 2d century B. C. Kirkpatrick (1892), however, though he partitions the book of Zechariah among three different authors, finds no better or more appropriate period for the historic setting of chs. 9–14 than 485 B. C. Eckardt (1893) endeavors on purely linguistic grounds to prove a much later origin for these chapters. And finally, Kuiper (1894) concludes that they are a unit, having had their origin in the Hellenic period, after the battle of Issus, but before the conquest of Egypt by Alexander, 332 B. C.

From this survey of the criticism of the book of Zechariah it is evident that at present there are three principal hypotheses concerning the origin of chs. 9–14: 1. *The theory that these chapters are of pre-exilic origin*—first suggested by Newcome and Bertholdt, viz., that chs. 9–11 were written shortly before the downfall of Samaria, 722 B. C., and chs. 12–14 shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, 586 B. C. The principal defender of this hypothesis in the last decade is Grützmacher. 2. *The tradi-*

\* Marti also remarks (*Theol. Zeits. aus der Schweiz*, p. 89, 1894): “Doch diese Ansicht (the pre-exilic) erweist sich mehr u. mehr als durchaus unhaltbar.”

*tional view*, which insists that the book of Zechariah is a unit and was written by Zechariah, the contemporary of Zerubbabel. This view has had no pronounced defender since Lowe, 1882. 3. *The post-Zecharian hypothesis*, which allows of either a late Persian, an early Greek, or a Maccabean origin for Zech. 9-14. This is today the popular hypothesis. In fact most of those who have written since 1882 have advocated a late post-exilic date, thus evincing that the post-Zecharian hypothesis, which in 1874 "was not deemed worthy of reply," is renewing its popularity in the circle of a vacillating criticism.

## I.

## CONTENTS OF THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

The prophecies of Zechariah naturally fall into two parts, chs. 1-8 and 9-14, both of which describe the present and look forward into the future.

*Part I. (chs. 1-8)* consists of three distinct prophecies delivered on three different occasions: I. *Ch. 1:1-6, an introduction*, delivered in the 8th month of the 2d year of Darius Hystaspes, 520 B. C. These verses having been spoken three months before the following prophecies are consequently a general introduction; but, one of the strongest and most intensely spiritual calls to a deep and sincere repentance to be found anywhere in the O. T. II. *Chs. 1:7-6:15, a series of night visions followed by an appendix*, delivered on the 24th day of the 11th month of the year 520 B. C., or exactly two months after the corner stone of the temple had been laid (Hag. 2:18). These visions were intended to encourage the people to rebuild God's house. They teach severally the following lessons: 1. God's special care for and interest in his people (1:7-17). 2. Israel's enemies have finally been destroyed (2:1-4). 3. God will re-people, protect and dwell in Jerusalem (2:5-17). 4. The priesthood shall be cleansed, continued and made typical of the Messiah-Branch to come (3:1-10). 5. The visible shall give place to the spiritual (4:1-14). 6. The land shall be purified from outward wickedness (5:1-4). 7. Wickedness shall be actually removed from the land (5:5-11). 8. God's people thus purified shall rest secure in him (6:1-8). These eight visions

are followed by a coronation scene, in which Joshua the high-priest is crowned and made typical of the Messiah-Priest-King whose name is Branch (6:9-15). III. *Chs. 7 and 8, Zechariah's answer to the Bethel deputation concerning fasting*, delivered on the 4th day of the 9th month of the 4th year of Darius, 518 B. C. The prophet's message is divided into four sections by the slightly varying formula, "the word of the Lord came unto me" (7:4, 8; 8:1, 18). 1. Fasting terminates on yourselves (7:4-7). 2. Look at the lesson from your fathers (7:8-14). 3. Contrast the past with the future; instead of a curse Jehovah will send a blessing; instead of evil, good (8:1-17). 4. Your fasting shall be changed to feasting, and many nations shall in that day seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem (8:18-23)..

*Part II. (chs. 9-14).* This part contains two oracles (נִבְיָא) without dates (9-11 and 12-14). I. *Chs. 9-11, an oracle of promise to the new theocracy.* This section contains promises of a land in which to dwell, a return from exile, victory over a hostile world-power, temporal blessings and national strength, closing with a parable of judgment brought on by Israel's rejection of Jehovah as their shepherd. 1. *Ch. 9.* Judah and Ephraim restored, united and made victorious over their enemies, are promised a land and a king. 2. *Ch. 10.* How Israel shall be saved and strengthened. 3. *Ch. 11.* How Israel has been punished for rejecting the shepherding care of Jehovah. II. *Chs. 12-14, the victories of the new theocracy, and the coming day of the Lord.* 1. *Ch. 12.* How Jerusalem shall be besieged by her enemies, but saved by Jehovah. 2. *Ch. 13.* How a remnant of Israel purified and refined shall be saved. 3. *Ch. 14.* An apocalyptic vision of judgment and redemption.

## II.

### THE PRE-EXILIC HYPOTHESIS EXAMINED.

Of the two principal schools of criticism—the one advocating a pre-exilic origin of Zech. 9-14, and the other a post-Zecharian—the pre-exilic hypothesis will be discussed first. This hypothesis, though conditioned by a successful division of chs. 9-14 into two

separate, independent oracles,\* and bound to a literal interpretation of chs. 11 and 14, is worthy of careful examination. We propose to discuss it along three lines,—the historical, the Messianic and the literary.

I. *The Historical Argument, or Argument from Historical Allusions.*—The historical allusions occurring in 9–14 do not all, it must be allowed, point in the same direction. Yet in opposition to the alleged pre-exilic origin of these chapters it is to be observed: 1. *There are reasons for thinking that, in both parts of the Book of Zechariah, the exile is represented as an event of the past, and that the restoration from exile both of Ephraim and Judah, though incomplete, has already been begun.* This is unquestionably true of Part I (*cf.* 1:12; 7:5; 1:16; 8:3; 6:10; 8:13; 8:7, 8; 2:10, 11), but also true of Part II. The exile is treated as a fact. In 10:6 Jehovah declares, “I will strengthen the house of Judah and I will save the house of Joseph and they shall be as though *I had not cast them off.*” The captivity at least of Ephraim is here pre-supposed (*cf.* Driver, p. 326; Kuiper, p. 82). But if it be so that Ephraim has already gone into exile, this admission of itself is disastrous to the pre-exilic hypothesis, as no one since Bauer has ever assigned 9–11 to a period subsequent to 722 B. C. Grützmacher (p. 38) fails to explain this passage satisfactorily, having overlooked vs. 2–5, in which the exile and restoration of Judah are described. Again in 9:8 Jehovah promises to encamp about his house on the army side so that no oppressor shall pass through again (עֵרֵד), from which it is evident that the land of Judah has already been overrun by a foreign foe and the temple desecrated (*cf.* Köhler, and Lowe, p. 84). Further, from 9:9 it is reasonable to infer, inasmuch as a king is promised, that Zion at this time was without a king. An 8th century people would hardly have understood such words. Israel’s restoration, on the other hand, is still incomplete, “Turn

\* The following summary illustrates the great variety of opinion among the advocates of the pre-exilic school: 1) The opinion that 9–14 are wholly or in part the work of Jeremiah (Mede and Flügel); 2) that 9–11 were written in the time of Hosea, whereas 12–14, between the death of Josiah and the fall of Jerusalem (Newcome, Doederlein, etc.); 3) that 9–11 were written by the Zechariah mentioned in Isa. 8:2, in the time of Ahaz, while 12–14 were composed just before 586 B. C. (Bertholdt, Knobel, etc.); 4) that 9–14 is a unit and written in the time of Uzziah (Rosenmüller, Pressel, and formerly Hitzig); 5) that 9–11; 13:7–9 belong to the reign of Ahaz, while 12:1–13:6 and 14 belong to the period between the death of Josiah and the downfall of Jerusalem (Ewald, Dillmann, Grützmacher and others). This last position is the most tenable, and hence will receive special attention here.

you to the stronghold ye prisoners of hope: even today do I declare that I will render double unto thee" (9:12). Such words have no sense if not after the exile (*cf.* Wellhausen, *Encyclopedia Britannica*). They describe the reward Zion is to receive for her exile (*cf.* Cornill, p. 198), and can be explained only in post-exilic times. But again, "I will gather them and they shall return" (10:8-10). "Because of the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit" (9:11), in the last of which the verb שָׁלַחְתִּי is a prophetic perfect, showing that Zion's deliverance had already taken place in God's intention, and was therefore certain to follow, but as yet not having taken place.

2. *The alleged authors of Zech. 9-14 dissociate themselves from any definitely named person or any specific event known to be pre-exilic.* If a whole section of prophecy is to be dislodged from its place in the development of scripture and transferred to an earlier date, there ought to be found in it definite historical allusions which would justify the change. But especially, when the contrast between the two periods is as great as that between the times before and after the exile. In the one case we are dealing with nations under independent kings; in the other, with a congregation having only a civil governor who is subject to a heathen sovereign. In the former period, we are dealing with a people falling deeper and deeper into gross sin; in the latter, with a people weak but disciplined by the lesson of the exile. Before the exile, with a people unwilling to listen to the messengers of Jehovah; after the exile, obeying the word of the Lord (Hag. 1:14; Ezr. 5:2). In view of this, therefore, observe in Zech. 9-14 that, whatever may have been the character of the nation, no ruler is specified by the prophet or named. God alone is described as ruler of his people (9:9, 10; 14:9). The only king mentioned is the Messiah-king (9:9). The kings alluded to in 14:5; 11:6 are kings of the past. The alleged allusion to a ruling king in 13:7-9 (Bleek) is wholly unwarranted, as such an apostrophe to the Sword could never have been uttered by a pre-exilic prophet concerning a ruling king then upon the throne. In 14:5, when the prophet speaks of Uzziah, he adds "king of Judah" as though speaking to a late congregation. The king of Gaza (9:5) was a satrap vassal of the Persian empire as were



the "kings" of Tyre and Sidon, according to Herodotus (8:67). The king of Persia was called "King of Kings" (Dan. 2:36, 37; Ezr. 7:12). It is further to be observed that the "house of David" mentioned in 12:7-12; 13:1 is never described as being in possession of the throne. The fact that the kingly house is closely associated with the priesthood (12:13) and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (12:7, 10; 13:1) as in Jer. 1:18; 2:26; 13:13; 34:19 is no proof, as Grützmacher (p. 36) would maintain, that our prophet is a contemporary of Jeremiah. The same terms might easily be used by a successor of Jeremiah. Furthermore, it is David's *house* only and not any earthly ruler in it of which the prophet speaks. Of it, the house, might well a post-exilic prophet speak, for of David's house the Messiah was to come. The house existed after the captivity and Zerubbabel was its temporary head; but Zerubbabel was only "governor" (Hag. 1:1, 14; 2:2, 21). He was never crowned king, but Joshua (Zech. 6:11). In this connection Driver (p. 330) remarks, "The terms in which the house of David is alluded to, do not necessarily imply that it was the ruling family, though it is true that a preëminence is attached to it (12:7, 8; 13:1); and from 1 Chron. 3:17-24; Ezr. 8:2 we know that the descendants of David were reckoned as a distinct family as late as the time of the Chronicler. The independent position assigned to the house of Levi as a whole, beside the house of David is unlike the representations of the earlier period (*e. g.*, those of Jeremiah, who only names the priests as a class and ranks them after the kings and princes, 1:18; 2:26; 4:9; 8:1-13:13, etc.); on the other hand it would harmonize with post-exilic relations, when the family of David was reduced in prestige, and the tribe of Levi was consolidated." (*Cf.* Cornill, p. 197.) The narrative itself suggests the position of coördinate preëminence which the house of David held after the exile rather than that of absolute supremacy as the reigning house. (*Cf.* Kuiper, p. 85.) 3. *There are passages in chs. 9-14 which, if pre-exilic in origin, would have been obscure and even misleading to a people confronted by the catastrophes of 722 and 586 B. C.* This is seen both negatively and positively. (a) *In the entire absence of any allusion to a specific enemy about to come.* No definite army is named as threatening immediately; no king designated as actually approach-

ing. There is no mention whatever in chs. 9–11 of an Assyrian monarch who would soon besiege and take Samaria as we find in Mic. 5:5, 6; Hos. 9:3; 10:6; 11:5 *sq.* (*cf.* Am. 3:11; 6:14). Neither does Judah stand in peril from the same as in Isaiah's day (Isa. 7:17, 20; 8:7 *sq.*). Instead of Assyria, Javan is painted as the opposing enemy of the theocracy (9:13), and as yet not raised up or threatening. In chs. 12–14, the enemies that are described as coming up against Jerusalem are not the Chaldeans under Nebuchadnezzar, but rather "all nations" (12:2, 3; 14:2; *cf.* Ewald, p. 389, and Grützmacher, p. 49). In Jeremiah, on the contrary, of whom the author of Zech. 12–14 is the alleged contemporary, the Chaldeans are particularly specified as coming against Jerusalem to take it and burn it with fire (Jer. 32:5; 37:8); and in Jer. 25:9; 27:6 *sq.*; 28:14 Nebuchadnezzar is specially designated as the king whom Judah would inevitably serve. (b) *In the absence of any remonstrance against allying with foreigners (e. g., Egypt) for protection.* But *cf.* Hos. 5:13; 7:11; 12:1; 14:3; Isa. 7:4, 20; 30:2 *sq.*; 31:1 *sq.* and Jer. 2:18, 36; 37:7, in which it is expressly forbidden. (c) *In the fact that victory and not defeat is promised.* Jehovah promises to shield Israel when Syria, Phœnicia and Philistia are destroyed (9:8). Against Javan "the Lord of hosts shall defend them" (9:14) and "shall save them" (9:16). In the siege of Jerusalem the Lord will "smite every horse with astonishment and his rider with madness" (12:4). "The Lord also shall save the tents of Judah" (12:7), and "he will defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (12:8). The pre-exilic prophets made no such predictions (*cf.* Am. 7:17; 8:2; 9:8; Isa. 8:4 *sq.*; 9:14; Hos. 8:14; 9:16; Jer. 12:14; 13:19 and frequently). They could not prophesy thus; and indeed it is difficult to see how any true prophet living before the exile could have uttered such predictions as are contained in Zech. 9–14, promising that Jerusalem would be spared when the fate of Jerusalem was evidently sealed. On the other hand the gathering of hostile armies about Jerusalem in post-exilic times was not uncommon (*cf.* Joseph., XI., 7, 8). (d) *In the fact that temporal prosperity and abundance are promised rather than immediate calamity announced.* In 9:17 the victory over Javan is to be followed by abundance of corn and wine.

“Showers of rain and grass in the field” shall also be given (10:1). “The people shall increase as they have increased” (10:8). Jehovah “will strengthen them in the Lord” (10:12). “The feeble shall be as David” (12:8). The wealth of the heathen, “the gold and the silver and the apparel in great abundance” shall be gathered and divided in Jerusalem as spoil (14:2, 14; *cf.* Hag. 2:8). But all this is contrary to what actually happened to Israel and Judah almost immediately after these prophecies are claimed to have been delivered. Such predictions are false, therefore, when viewed from the pre-exilic standpoint; or, they are later interpolations (*cf.* Kuenen, Graetz, etc.). For, the contemporaries of these unknown prophets did not predict temporal prosperity on the eve either of 722 or 586 B. C. Amos predicted catastrophe and desolation (5:27; 6:7, 8; 7:2, 4, 9); Hosea, that they should eat and not be satisfied (4:10), that man and beast should languish (4:3); Isaiah, that they should be hungry and oppressed (3:1, 5; 7:24, 25); Jeremiah, that the whole land would become a desolation (25:11); and these predictions actually came to pass. Those of the unknown prophets did not (*cf.* Köhler, II., p. 309; Kuiper, p. 92, and Cornill, p. 197). On the other hand, the encouraging promises of Zech. 9–14 are in perfect harmony with post-exilic times, and especially in harmony with the consoling declarations of Zech. 1–8. In 8:11 Jehovah declares that he “will not be unto the residue of this people as in the former days.” In 8:15 he says: “I have thought in these days to do good unto Jerusalem and to the house of Judah.” In 1:16, “I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies.” In 2:8, “multitudes of men and cattle shall be in Jerusalem.” In 3:10, every man shall sit under his own vine and fig-tree; and in 8:12, “the vine shall give her fruit and the ground shall give her increase and the heavens shall give their dew,”—types of the highest prosperity. (e) *In the fact that the people are exhorted to rejoice rather than to fear.* In 9:11, the prophet exhorts, “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion” (9:9). He further promises that the heart of Ephraim “shall rejoice as through wine,” yea “their children also shall be glad” and rejoice in the Lord (10:7). But Hosea, the contemporary of this alleged prophet, bids Israel, in view of impending exile, “rejoice not” (9:1). He,

on the contrary, pronounces woe upon them (7:13; *cf.* Am. 6:1). Amos declares that their feasts shall be turned into mourning and all their songs into lamentation (8:10); "wailing shall be in the broad-ways" (5:16). In Zech. 14:16-19 all nations are represented as going up to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles—the most joyous feast of the year. On the contrary, Jeremiah's "eyes ran down with tears night and day" as he predicted Judah's solemn fate (14:17). "For in the name of the Lord," he declared, "I will take from them the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness" (25:10). But here again Zech. 1-8 furnishes striking parallels to Zech. 9-14 (*cf.* Zech. 2:10; 8:19; 13:5). Hence throughout these so-called pre-exilian prophecies of Zech. 9-14, there is sounded forth not one clear note of alarm or warning; judgment rather gives place to hope, warning to encouragement, threatening to joy and gladness,—all of which is most inconsistent with the idea that these chapters are of pre-exilic origin, and that their authors, as is alleged, spoke to their age. On the other hand, they are perfectly consistent with the conditions and promises of post-exilic times.\*

Certain historical allusions are alleged to be found in Zech. 9-14, however, which point to pre-exilic times. They are the following: 1. Zech. 11:8, "*and I cut off the three shepherds in one month.*" This reference is said to fix the date of chs. 9-11. Two interpretations of the "three shepherds" are commonly given: (a) *Hitzig's view*, which identifies them with three kings of the northern kingdom, viz., Zechariah, Shallum and Menahem (2 Kgs. 15:8-14).† But the value of this interpretation is injured by the fact that Shallum alone ruled a full month (2 Kgs.

\* Burger remarks (p. 125): "Il faut s'étonner de ce que les critiques modernes, qui ont tant de sagacité et de pénétration pour trouver des traces de l'exil dans la plupart des autres livres de l'A. T.; p. ex. dans presque tous les psaumes n'aient pas en assez d'intelligence pour découvrir les allusions nombreuses aux temps de l'exil qu'on trouve dans tous les chapitres de la seconde partie de Zacharie: p. ex. ch. 9, la délivrance des prisonniers, et la mention des Grecs, ch. 10, presque en entier, etc."

† Of the score or more interpretations (Bredenkamp says forty) given of the "three shepherds" in Zech. 11:8 these are examples: Moses, Aaron and Miriam (Jerome); Galba, Otho and Vitellius (Calmet); the three world-powers of Daniel—Babylonia, Persia and Macedonia (Keil, Köhler, Kliefoth, Hofmann); Assyria, Babylonia and Persia (Stade); three offices—prophet, priest and king (Ephrem, Theodoret, Cyrill, Delitzsch, Bredenkamp, Kuiper); priests, judges and lawyers (Pusey), Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah (Qimchi), Antiochus Epiphanes, Eupator and Demetrius (Wright, Lowe), Lysimachus, Jason and Menelaus (Rubinkam, Staerk), Judas, Jonathan and Simon (Abarbanel), Pharisee, Sadducee and Essene, etc.

15:13); and Menahem reigned ten years in Samaria (2 Kgs. 15:17). This explanation, therefore, does not satisfy the statement of Zech. 11:8 that they were cut off "in one month." Steiner avoids this difficulty by making the one month relative (b) *Ewald's view* (also that of Orelli, Maurer, Bleek, Kuenen and Dillmann), which declares in favor of Zechariah, Shallum and a usurper, who at the same time quickly rose to power and was immediately put down, but who happens not to be mentioned in 2 Kgs. 15:10-13 (*cf.* Grützmacher, p. 47). But this interpretation is likewise met by serious objections: (1) There is no historical proof that any such usurper ever existed after Shallum. (2) It is not certain that the writer is speaking exclusively to, or of the Israel of the northern kingdom. (3) The time-conditions, "one month," still remain unsatisfied. Strack's suggestion (p. 389) that the pretender rose within the month, is also a mere supposition without historical foundation, and is therefore equally unsatisfactory. Accordingly our proposition stands fast, that the author dissociates himself from pre-exilic persons and events.

2. *Zech. 12:11-14* is a reference alleged to fix the date of chs. 12-14. "In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon." Hadadrimmon is generally supposed to be the place where Josiah was fatally wounded by Pharaoh Necho. (*Cf.* Schrader, Wellhausen, *Skizz. u. Vorarb.*, p. 192, who considers Hadadrimmon to be the name of a God, and Grützmacher, p. 17). Both accounts of Josiah's death state that it was "at" or "in the valley" of Megiddon where his wound was received (2 Kgs. 23:29 and 2 Chron. 35:22). And the Chronicler tells us that not only Megiddon but "all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah," that "Jeremiah wrote lamentations over him and the singing men and the singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day, and made them an ordinance in Israel" (2 Chron. 35: 24, 25). It was a national mourning for a national calamity, the memory of which *long* lingered in the minds of pious Jews.

3. *Zech. 14:5*, "*Ye shall flee like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah.*" But the earthquake here alluded to occurred at least a century and a half before the date assigned for the composition of ch. 14, and yet

the event seems to be just as "fresh in the mind of the author" as the mourning in the valley of Megiddon (*cf.* Bleek, p. 391). Rosenmüller saw the force of this argument and so placed the entire six chapters (9-14) in the reign of Uzziah. Observe "as ye fled," etc. Wellhausen, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, weighing this passage, remarks: "Zech. 14:5 is a stronger argument for a date in the Assyrian period than anything cited from chs. 9-11," and in his *Skizz. u. Vorarb.* (p. 194) argues that "whoever is unwilling to admit the force of this reference forfeits the right to protest against the proposition that sometimes other archaic expressions are intentionally found in later prophecies." It need only be added in the case of Zech. 12:11 and 14:5 that, from the pre-exilic standpoint, the argument in favor of the one passage vitiates the force of the argument in favor of the other. 4. *The names given to the theocracy in 9-14 imply, it is alleged, a pre-exilic date for the entire section; e. g., in 9-11 various terms are employed which indicate that the kingdoms of Israel and Judah are still standing; such as Ephraim and Jerusalem (9:10), Judah and Ephraim (9:13), house of Judah and house of Joseph (10:6), and "the brotherhood between Judah and Israel" (11:14); in 12-14, on the contrary, only Judah, Jerusalem (12:2), inhabitants of Jerusalem (12:5, 10; 13:1), house of David and house of Levi appear, thus showing that the northern kingdom is no longer in existence and that Judah only remains (v. Ortenberg, Knobel, Ewald, Dillmann, Grützmacher, p. 43). Among these the chief allusion is the breaking of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel in 11:14. By this Grützmacher (p. 48) understands "the breaking out of war between Israel and Judah which took place under Pekah of Israel and Ahaz of Judah" (so Dillmann and others). But in history a union existed between Judah and Israel, as Cornill observes (p. 199), only during the reigns of Ahab and Jehosaphat and their next successors. Others claim that no "brotherhood" ever existed between Israel and Judah, in the sense in which the term is here employed, after the schism of Jeroboam I. And indeed there was no real "brotherhood" in the reigns of Jehosaphat and Ahab any more than in the days of Pekah and Ahaz. The expression is a doubtful one, as it can refer either to the original schism of Israel and Judah in the*

days of Jeroboam, to the captivity of Israel in 722 B. C., or to a later rupture which was to happen after the time of the prophet. The origin of the expression  $\text{שְׁנֵי מַטְּוֹת}$  (á. λ.) is most easily explained in post-exilic times when Ezekiel's prophecy of the "two sticks" (37:16 sq.) was fulfilled, and Israel and Judah were really united in religion and government. This harmonizes with the prophet's aim, everywhere making the interest of Israel and Judah the same (9:10, 13; 10:6; 12:1 sq.). To him Israel and Judah are *united*, not merely *coexisting*. Ezekiel's vision had become a fact, Israel and Judah now stood in the relation of a *reunited* brotherhood, "to break which was emblematic," as Delitzsch (p. 218) says: "of the deeper rupture which would one day divide the Jewish people into halves, one holding to the good shepherd, and the other rejecting him." Israel and Judah were both represented in the post-exilic congregation; and as *names*, were both applicable to the post-exilic theocracy for the following reasons: (1) Even before the exile Ephraim became mixed with Judah. Men of Asher, Manasseh and Zebulun, came to Jerusalem to keep the passover of Hezekiah (2 Chron. 30:11). Ephraim also was among them (*cf.* v. 18). Both Israel and Judah joined also in celebrating Josiah's passover feast (2 Chron. 35:18). (2) Among the 42,360 led back under Zerubbabel (Ezr. 2; Neh. 7), about 12,000 were without pedigree, among whom there were doubtless (Oehler) several from the ten tribes whose genealogies had been neglected. Twelve heads of houses, including Zerubbabel and Joshua, presided over them (Neh. 7:7; Ezr. 2:2). (3) From 1 Chron. 9:2, 3 it is obvious that at least five tribes, Judah, Levi, Benjamin, Ephraim and Manasseh were represented among them. Zechariah's call to flee from dwelling in Babylon doubtless brought others (Zech. 2:10). (4) Later, in Ezra's day, the Jews regarded themselves as representatives of the twelve tribes; this is seen in their offering *twelve* goats as a sin-offering at the dedication of the temple (Ezr. 6:17), and in a second sin-offering of *twelve* bullocks for all Israel (Ezr. 8:35). (5) The N. T. mentions Anna of the tribe of Asher (Lk. 2:36), Barnabas of the tribe of Levi (Acts 4:36), and Paul as of the tribe of Benjamin (Phil. 3:5), who in his defense before Agrippa speaks of the twelve tribes as existing in his own day (Acts 26:7). The twelve

tribes are also spoken of in Matt. 19:28; Lk. 22:30; Rev. 7:4; 21:12, all showing that the *names* Israel and Judah survived the exile, and are therefore appropriate appellations in the mouth of a post-exilic prophet. The idea of the "Lost Ten Tribes" is, as Wright remarks, "a myth of later ages" (*cf.* Wellhausen, p. 183). Again, the expressions "house of Israel" and "house of Judah" are no proof of the pre-exilic origin of these chapters for both terms were used after the ten tribes had been carried away (*e. g.*, Jer. 31:27-31). They actually occur once in Zech. 1-8 (*viz.*, 8:13). These terms, however, doubtless attained a broader signification in post-exilic times. The name Israel, for example, is often used as coextensive with the whole nation (*cf.* Ezr. 2:2, 5, 9, 70; 3:1; 4:3; 6:16, 21; 7:28; 8:29; Neh. 1:6; 7:7; 8:17; 9:1, 2; Zech. 2:2, 4). In Mal. 1:5 the prophet speaks of the "border of Israel," referring naturally to the borders of the entire nation (*cf.* 2:11). Zech. 9:1 *sq.* is (as Mal. 1:1) addressed to Israel, but not to Israel of the ten tribes necessarily, as the author expressly says, "as of *all* the tribes," implying that the prophecies of Ezek. 37:16 *sq.*; Jer. 30:3; Hos. 3:5 and Am. 9:9, 14, 15 were now fulfilled in the *ecclesia* of the post-exilic theocracy. That one of the twelve tribes should be lost was from the first regarded as a grievous misfortune (Judg. 21:36). On the other hand, only as representatives of the twelve tribes could the theocracy expect to inherit a right to the covenant promises. Hence the use of these names in a post-exilic prophecy is nothing unusual or extraordinary. 5. *Zech. 14:10, the area occupied by Judah when the prophecy was written.* The expression "from Geba to Rimmon" limits, it is claimed, the origin of 12-14 to a time prior to the captivity (*cf.* Steiner, p. 371). But, while it marks the boundaries of Judah's territory before the downfall of Jerusalem, it also satisfies the conditions after the exile (*cf.* Wellhausen, p. 195). Schürer says (*History of Jewish People*, p. 189), the extent of the Jewish commonwealth during the Persian domination was probably limited to Judah proper, which in its range corresponded nearly with the kingdom of Judah of earlier days." 6. *The national sins according to Zech. 9-14.* It is argued from 10:2; 13:2-6 that idolatry and false prophecy are represented as the *prevailing* sins of the prophet's time, and that, therefore, these



prophecies must have been written before the exile (Dillmann, Grützmacher and others). But from these passages we can hardly conclude that idolatry and false prophecy were the *prevailing* sins at the time of writing; for, one of these passages refers to the past (10:2), and the other is clearly a reference to the future (13:2-6). In 10:2, teraphim, diviners and dreamers are alluded to. But the prophet here is speaking of what happened in the past, before the exile, and which now would be a gross sin for Israel to repeat; therefore he exhorts, "ask of the Lord rain," etc., and not of teraphim and idols, for "they have spoken vanity." In 13:2-6, "the names of the idols," "the prophets," and "the unclean spirit" shall, "in that day," be cut off out of the land (just as "theft" and "lying" are to be removed, in Zech. 5:3-11). The prophet is here describing the future, how the land shall "in that day" be purified from sin and from uncleanness. In neither case does the author speak of idolatry as the sin of the *present* (cf. Bredenkamp, p. 104). If, however, it be insisted that the author of 10:2 was speaking to an 8th century people, his language stands out in decided contrast to that of his contemporaries. Hosea, for example, describes the idolatry of Israel in his day "as a great whoredom from the Lord" (1:2 sq.), for "they sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains and burn incense upon the hills" (4:13). "Ephraim is joined to idols" (4:17). "Of their silver and gold have they made them idols" (8:4; 13:2), yea, "altars to sin" (8:11). "Israel hath forgotten his maker" (8:14), therefore, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself" (13:9). The language of Amos and Isaiah is equally vehement (cf. Am. 4:4 sq.; 5:4 sq.; 8:14; Isa. 2:8; 8:19; 10:11, etc.). But how differently our author expresses himself! He employs nothing but *past* tenses, remarking that "the teraphim have spoken (תִּבְרַיִם) vanity," and "the star-gazers have seen (רָאוּ) a lie," etc. (10:2), and this is the only instance in all his prophecies which hints that he is addressing himself to an idolatrous people. And likewise the author of 13:2-6, speaks as though he were writing in a period when idols and false prophecy\* were remembered, but almost extinct,

\*The prophets referred to in Zech. 13:2 sq. are false prophets: for (a) they are closely associated with unclean spirits, with no intimation of a contrast existing between them; and (b) in v. 4 it is said that they will no longer "wear a rough garment to deceive." God's prophets were not wont to deceive.

only the names and altars and groves of idolatry remaining. Hence he declares that the day is coming when even the *names* of the idols shall cease from the land, when every vestige of idolatry (as Hosea had prophesied, 2:19) and all false prophets would be made to disappear from the midst of Israel. This is very different from the repeated strain of his alleged contemporary, Jeremiah, who continually denounced idols and false prophets (*cf.* 10:14; 19:13; 25:6; 32:35). True, there was always danger of Israel relapsing into idolatry. Intermarriage with the heathen always endangered the worship of Jehovah (Ezr. 9:2 *sq.*; Neh. 13:23-26). Sorcery is denounced by Malachi (2:11; 3:5), and, as Cornill remarks, "as ever increasing." False prophets actually existed in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. 6:7-14, 21). But in Hag. and Zech. 1-8 these evils are not mentioned. In Zech. 10:2 we have more of a warning than an accusation; and in 13:2-6, a promise for the future. This much at least we tenaciously hold, *viz.*, that idolatry and false prophecy are not treated in Zech. 9-14 as the *prevailing* sins of the age.

7. *The enemies of Israel in Zech. 9-14.* These are Assyria and Egypt (10:10-11), Syria, Phœnicia, and Philistia (9:1-7), and Greece (9:13); the mention of whom, it is alleged, fixes the date of these prophecies as pre-exilic. (a) *Zech. 10:10, 11; 14:18, 19; Assyria and Egypt.* The following claims are made with reference to these passages: (a) *that the use of the terms, Assyria and Egypt, by a post-exilic writer is "impossible"* (Graetz, *Monats.*, p. 284). But this is not so certain. No one, for example, would doubt the post-exilic origin of Lamentations, and yet in ch. 5:6 the term "Assyrians" occurs, most probably intended for Babylonians: in 2 Kgs. 23:29, Pharaoh-Necho is described as going up against the "King of Assyria," whereas Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, is meant (*cf.* Kuiper, p. 82); and in Ezr. 6:22 "Assyria" is employed instead of Persia. These instances render it at least possible that in Zech. 10:10, 11 we have a parallel instance (Vatke). We still speak of "Egypt" and "the Egyptians," though the country has passed under many different protectorates since the time of the Pharaohs. Rubinkam suggests a principle by which these references can be explained, *viz.*, the later a prophecy is, the wider is its scope and the less

value can be placed on the use of words and phrases. An earlier writer cannot, of course, use modes of speech which have their birth in later times, but a later writer may be easily influenced by the diction and phraseology of a former age. Forms of expression are slow in changing. In the New Testament, *e. g.*, Jesus speaks of coming into the borders of Zebulun and Naphthali (Matt. 4:13). So here in Zech. 10:10, 11, the prophet was representing the future under the forms of the past. De Wette finally decided to explain these terms as "an affectation of archaism" rather than maintain the pre-exilic origin of these prophecies. Hosea had predicted that Ephraim would be scattered in Assyria and Egypt (7:16; 8:13; 9:3, 6; 11:5, 11), and very naturally, a later prophet, in promising deliverance to Ephraim, would expect the same countries to give them up. ( $\beta$ ) *It is further claimed that these nations were in the height of their power when the prophet wrote* (Flügge, Bertholdt, Bleek, v. Ortenberg, Grützmacher, p. 39, and others). But this claim, while it has some force, would have far greater weight were Assyria and Egypt the subjects of the prophet's thought. Not these, on the contrary, but Ephraim is the main theme of his discourse. Hence we must not press this reference to Ephraim's enemies too far. They were of minor value in the prophet's mind compared with the immense importance of Jehovah's promises to Ephraim, which he was now commissioned to deliver. Furthermore, while it cannot be denied that Assyria and Egypt are spoken of as still in possession of great power, yet it is equally true that the prophet does not speak of them as active, either as helping forward Ephraim's captivity, or as resisting Ephraim's return; which corresponds exactly with post-exilic conditions, when the power of both nations had been broken. Moreover, in v. 10 the prophet speaks rather of the "land" of Assyria and the "land" of Egypt, out of which Ephraim should be gathered, and in v. 11 he strengthens the hope of Ephraim by contrasting the final condition of these heathen countries with the future prosperity of Israel in v. 12. ( $\gamma$ ) *It is further maintained that the special mention of Egypt in 14: 18, 19 indicates that Egypt at that time was Judah's special enemy* (Grützmacher, p. 20). But the particular mention of Egypt in ch. 14 is obviously due to the physical conditions of

that land, with which the author was acquainted. Egypt, being watered by the Nile, needed no rain, hence the prophet is forced to resort to another punishment, viz., plague (*cf.* Hofmann, Hitzig, Köhler, Reuss, Stade, Wellhausen, and others). There is no foundation for imputing to the prophet (as Bredenkamp, p. 199) a moral reason for the special mention of Egypt; for, if the specification lies not in the physical conditions of Egypt, it is difficult to see why Egypt and not Babylon should have been threatened by a prophet who lived, as Grützmacher says, not long before the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

(b) *Zech. 9:1-8, Syria, Phœnicia, and Philistia.* The following claims are made concerning the mention of these nations: (a) *That these kingdoms were still "independent" when the prophet wrote, which in post-exilic times was not the case* (Grützmacher, p. 40). But the text does not state that they were independent, as Kuiper observes (p. 80). They are represented as overcome without resistance. On the other hand, it is not inconsistent with post-exilic conditions that these kingdoms then existed in western Asia. Haggai speaks of "nations" and "kingdoms" and "thrones" (2:7, 22), which, being heathen, would be overthrown, and yet in Haggai's day Darius ruled all western Asia and Egypt. The fact of Phœnicia's importance at the beginning of the 5th century is beyond dispute. Ezekiel's prophecies against Tyre and Sidon (28:1-23) closely resemble those under discussion. Syria, Phœnicia, and Philistia always remained the enemies of Israel—either active or passive. Jeremiah prophesied against Damascus and Hamath long after their loss of independence (732 and 739 B.C.) by Tiglath-pileser III. (Jer. 49:23-27). Judgments were also pronounced upon the Philistines both by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Jer. 25:20; Ezek. 25:15-17); likewise by Zephaniah (2:4-7). After the exile, the Philistines resisted Israel's return (Neh. 4:7, 8) and remained hostile to the Jews and to their religion until the time of the Maccabees (I. Macc. 3:41; 10:83; *cf.* 5:1 *sq.*; Sirach 1:26; Ecclus. 50:26). In short, all these nations were Israel's *hereditary* foes, and, therefore, judgments pronounced against them were always in place (*cf.* Kuiper, p. 80). (β) *It is further urged that 9:1-8 bears a close resemblance to Amos (1:1-2:6) and hence must*

have been delivered at about the same time (Bleek, *Einleit.*, 6th ed., p. 386). But the alleged similarities between these prophecies consist chiefly in the names of the cities threatened; *e. g.* Damascus, Tyre, Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron, and Ashdod are in common. The dissimilarities are much greater and far more striking: (1) The order of the nations threatened. With Amos the order is Syria, Philistia, Phœnicia; in Zech. 9:1-8, Syria, Phœnicia, Philistia. (2) Amos predicts the captivity of Syria (1:5); the prophet in Zech. 9:1-8 does not. (3) Amos prophecies that Tyre shall be burned with fire; our prophet (like Ezek. 28:2-5) rather specifies Tyre's "power in the sea," which shows her importance in commerce, and likewise, prophecies against Sidon (*cf.* Ezek. 28:21-26). (4) Amos includes the Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites as objects of God's wrath, but in Zech. 9:1-8 they are passed over in silence (*cf.* Bredenkamp, p. 84). These were powerful nations in the 8th century B.C. After the exile, on the contrary, they were so weak that Nehemiah, with half of the returned exiles in arms, repelled "Sanballat and Tobiah and the Arabians and the Ammonites and the Ashdodites," who together had conspired to hinder the Jews from rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, while the other half went on with the work of building (Neh. 4:7-8). On the other hand, a post-exilic prophet might very appropriately condemn the Syrians, the Phœnicians, and the Philistines, because, as Köhler suggests, they lay within the rightful boundary of Israel's territory (Ezek. 20:42; 47:13 *sq.*). (5) Amos includes Israel and Judah among the nations upon whom the Lord will presently inflict judgments (2:4 *sq.*); but in Zech. 9:1-8 they are described as a nation under Jehovah's special care, which shows that Jehovah's attitude toward Israel had changed. (6) Amos gives in each case the reason why Jehovah will punish the nations; but the prophet in Zech. 9:1-8 fails to show any real reason why these nations should be destroyed, except that Israel is returning home, and they are occupying Jewish territory. (7) Amos declares that "the remnant of the Philistines shall perish" (1:8); whereas our prophet promises that those which remain shall be as chieftains in Judah, and Ekron as Jebusites incorporated into the nation (9:7). This is a positive proof in favor of the post-exilic origin of Zech.

9:1-8 (*cf.* Kuiper, p. 80). (8) Amos describes the moral condition and sinfulness of Israel; but our prophet pictures Israel as waiting upon the Lord (9:1). (9) Finally, Amos distinguishes between Israel and Judah; but the author of Zech. 9:1-8 makes the interests of "all the tribes of Israel" the same (9:1); *cf.* Graetz, *Monats.*, p. 280). ( $\gamma$ ) *Again, it is claimed that the storm which breaks in upon the kingdoms of Syria, Phœnicia, and Philistia is the second invasion of Tiglath-pileser in 734 B.C.* (Grützmacher, p. 45). This is substantiated by the mention of "Hadrach" (9:1)—an 8th century word—and the almost perfect agreement of the monuments with Zech. 9:1-8. But the name "Hadrach" for Syria, which appears in 8th century inscriptions, may have been employed quite as well by a prophet of the 6th century. No other writer of the 8th century uses the term. It was doubtless the common Assyrian name for Syria, and as such finds its way appropriately in the mouth of an Assyrian-trained prophet who was speaking to a people accustomed to Assyrian appellations and terminology (*cf.* Schrader, *KAT.*, pp. 326, 453). As regards the invasion of Tiglath-pileser in 734 B.C., described in 2 Kgs. 15:29; 16:9, and confirmed by the Assyrian inscriptions, which accords so perfectly with Zech. 9:1-8, it is to be observed: (1) that neither the inscriptions nor the biblical record mention the capture of Tyre (*cf.* Kuiper, p. 77); (2) nor indeed is Philistia mentioned in the Bible account. One thinks more naturally of Uzziah's time in connection with Philistia (2 Chron. 26:6; *cf.* Hitzig-Steiner, p. 369). (3) Our author sees clearly that the invasion will not affect Jerusalem (9:8). (4) Moreover the degree of the dispersion indicated in 9:11-13, 10:6-11 as the result of the alleged invasion can hardly be referred to the devastation of Gilead and Lebanon by Tiglath-pileser, but drives us powerfully to think of times subsequent to the exile (Elmslie). (5) Finally, Grützmacher's interpretation is based upon the supposition that in Zech. 10:3 the prophet hopes that Judah will be able, with the help of Tiglath-pileser, to come through the war with Israel and Syria, and in the future be able to rescue Ephraim from captivity (p. 46). But this interpretation is both unnatural and unnecessary. It is quite as easy to explain Zech. 9, with Hitzig-Steiner (p. 370), in terms of the reign of Jeroboam II. (*cf.* 2 Kgs. 14:28).

(c) *Zech. 9:13*—*Javan, i. e., Ionia or Greece*. “For I have bent Judah for me, I have filled the bow with Ephraim; and I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and will make thee as the sword of a mighty man.” This is the most striking historical illusion in these controverted chapters, the explanation of which must determine in large part the date of these prophecies. The following solutions are offered by the advocates of the pre-exilic hypothesis. (a) *That Zech. 9:13 is explained by Joel 4:6, 7* (Hitzig, Bleek, Ewald, Grützmacher, Montet, p. 23). According to this view, the “sons of Zion” are the Israelitish prisoners sold by the Phœnicians to the Ionians, or sons of Greece (Hitzig), who, already too long in slavery, are to be aroused by Jehovah (Ewald) and set free, as they, too, are parties to the covenant of promise mentioned in *Zech. 9:11, 12* (Bleek). In this case the author is speaking of Hebrew slaves and of Ionian and Arabian tradesmen of the 8th century, B. C. But on the contrary, in the passage before us, we have to do rather with a godless heathen power, the subjection of which must precede the breaking in of the Messianic kingdom (*cf. Kuiper, p. 83*). The “sons of Zion” are Judah and Ephraim, rather than a small band of Hebrew slaves sold into Grecian or Arabian lands (*cf. Bredenkamp, p. 99*). It is not to be supposed that by a successful insurrection of slaves the Messianic age is to be inaugurated. Such an idea is too absurd (Pusey). The context clearly shows that Zion is the subject of the prophecy (9:9–17). It is Zion who is exhorted to rejoice over her coming king (vs. 9, 10); it is Zion who shall be released from prison (vs. 11, 12), and it is Zion (Judah and Ephraim) who shall conquer the “sons of Javan” (vs. 13–17). Pressel felt the force of this claim and consequently gave up the idea that *Joel 4:6, 7* explains this passage. “Zion” is far more probably the post-exilic congregation. But on the other hand, how explain the mention of the “sons of Javan” in the 8th century? Could a prophet of that early age picture Javan of sufficient importance that its defeat would lead to glory? (*Cf. Bredenkamp, p. 99.*) The Greeks are here represented not as a distant and unimportant people such as they would be in the 8th century, B. C., but as a world-power, as Israel’s most formidable antagonist, the victory

over whom inaugurates the Messianic age (*cf.* Driver, p. 326). This is self-evident. Consequently Dillmann (*Commentary on Genesis*, p. 174) frankly allows that Zech. 9:13, as it stands at present, refers to the Macedonian Greeks. And Steiner also admits (p. 381) that "aus dem 8. Jahrhundert eine solche zu begreifen und hinreichend zu motiviren, dürfte schwer fallen." Most defenders of the pre-exilic hypothesis abandon, therefore, the idea that 9:13 is a prophecy of the 8th century, and take refuge in one or other of the two remaining explanations. ( $\beta$ ) *That the text is corrupt* (Graetz, Steiner, Strack, 4th ed. p. 410. *cf.* Kirkpatrick who omits the words  $\text{עַל בְּנֵי־יִרְיָן}$  for the sake of rhythm). For example, Steiner (pp. 381, 2) on the authority of the Targum, which reads  $\text{בְּנֵי עַמְמִיָּא}$ , substitutes for  $\text{בְּנֵי־יִרְיָן}$  the reading  $\text{בְּנֵי הַגּוֹיִם}$  (*cf.* Schlatter, p. 269, "Ueber alle Feinde"), and explains  $\text{יִרְיָן}$  as a later addition which crept into the text, as *e.g.*,  $\text{τοὺς Ἑλληνας}$  in the LXX. translation of Isa. 9:11. But the text as it stands was only possible when it belongs to, or was thought to belong to the post-exilic period (*cf.* Stade, p. 152); moreover, the expression  $\text{בְּנֵי הַגּוֹיִם}$  would in any case occur more naturally in post-exilic writings (*cf.* Kuenen, p. 413). On the other hand, the substitution proposed by Graetz, *Monats.*, p. 281, is still less probable. He conjectures that  $\text{יִרְיָן}$  is a corruption of  $\text{שַׁמְרִיָּן}$  Samaria, and compares with it Zech. 10:6, 12. According to Graetz, consequently, Jehovah stirs up the sons of Zion against the sons of Samaria, *i. e.*, Ephraim and Judah against Ephraim, which is naturally absurd. At best any change of the text is a confession that  $\text{יִרְיָן}$  is inexplicable in pre-exilic times. For as Kuiper observes (p. 13), "the whole question of changing the text rests upon the hypothesis that the prophecy is out of the 8th century and it loses thus as *petitio principii* all worth." The other means of escape is the unsatisfactory refuge of the mediating hypothesis. ( $\gamma$ ) *That Zech. 9:13 is one of the many post-exilic interpolations in these prophecies* (Dillmann, Kuenen, Driver, Cornill, and others). Kuenen, *e. g.*, finds in chs. 9-11, 13:7-9, "fragments for the most part of 8th century origin, which were afterwards worked over and enriched by a post-exilic though awkward redactor." Certain passages, he says, are confessedly inexplicable in pre-exilic times, whereas others must have had



their origin when the two kingdoms were standing. Driver and Cornill share this hypothesis. But we are unable to accept of it chiefly because it is too unsatisfactory. Even Kuenen himself allows that it is not wholly satisfying, and Cornill admits (p. 198) that it does not solve the problem. It is plainly evident, therefore, that on the grounds of the pre-exilic theory a reasonable explanation of Zech. 9:13 is practically unattainable. Later we shall attempt to show that this passage has both an occasion and a teaching purpose in post-exilic times.

II. *The Christological Argument, or the Argument from Messianic Prophecy.*—The real value of this argument is too frequently underestimated, especially by those who hold the pre-exilic hypothesis. We maintain that in the Old Testament the Messianic idea, at first only generic in outline, grows and expands and moves steadily forward with marvelous symmetry, continually approaching more and more its ultimate ideal in Jesus Christ; also that the most decisive criteria by which the date of a given prophecy may be determined are *newness* and *unification*. The latter especially, we hold, is the best mark by which to judge the origin of any Messianic prediction. As the perspective shortens by the lapse of time, different lines of previous Messianic prediction are brought together and unified so as to present a new and more complete picture of the Messiah. When this is done it is an evidence of late date. Zechariah furnishes a most remarkable picture of this sort. He takes the pre-exilic ideas of the Messiah, which like so many independent lines seem to move forward and converge, and he unites them all in Joshua the high-priest (3:8, 9; 6:12, 13).\* He selects the Branch of Jer. 23:5; 33:15; the Servant of Isa. 40–66; the King of Ps. 72 and 110, Isa. 9:6, and 11:1, and the Priest of Ps. 110 and blends

\* There is as little reason for doubting the genuineness of 3:8b (Stade, *Gesch. Israels*, II., p. 125; Marti, *Der Proph. Sach.*, p. 85) as there is for arguing that Zerubbabel is the Messiah (Wellhausen, pp. 176, 179). In 6:12, 13, Marti claims with Ewald and Baur, that both Joshua and Zerubbabel are crowned. But (1) this necessitates the insertion of זרובבל after בראש in v. 11, and of יהושע after ויהיה in v. 13; also the change of אליר in v. 12 to אלהם. (2) Besides, there is no example in the O. T. where a prophet saw in a contemporary the Messiah as already born. (3) Moreover, the prophecy contemplates the Messiah as future (v.12). He is spoken of as a man (v. 12), not as *the* man, and that he is to be a priest (v.13). (4) Finally the crown עֲטֻרֹת (sing. on account of תהיה v. 14; cf. Job 31:36) is to be a type, stored away in the temple. Wellhausen's text is self-made.

them all into one single composite picture of the Messiah and describes him as Servant-Branch-Priest-King (3:8, 9; 6:12, 13); thus heaping upon the high-priest Joshua Messianic terms never before associated by a single author in one and the same person. The same is true of Zech. 9-14. As Delitzsch maintains (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 215), "the author of Zech. 9-14 cannot be a pre-exilic prophet, for the Christological images move in the path in which prophecy was directed by Deutero-Isaiah; the *δόξαι* of the future Christ are supplemented through the preceding *παθήματα* (1 Peter 1:11)." We shall now endeavor to examine the Messianic portions of Zech. 9-14, and for the sake of convenience we shall treat them under two heads, viz., those which describe the Messianic Person, and those which describe the Messianic Times.

1. *The Messianic Person.* (a) *The Messianic King* (9:9, 10). Different views are entertained as to the position of this passage in the development of the idea of Messianic kingship. Orelli (*Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 244), makes it "the first passage in which the future human representative of the divine kingly dignity is described in his personal characteristics" (*cf.* Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 181, 182; Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 185). Ewald (p. 309) is willing to allow only that the Messianic hopes of Zech. 9-11 are "ganz so ausgebildet und gestaltet, ganz so kräftig und so vorwaltend" as the prophecies of Isaiah, and maintains that they are inferior to his in "schlagender Kraft der Rede und lichter Klarheit des Ausdrucks." Graetz (*Monats.*, p. 281) parallels 9:9, 10 with Ps. 72; Steiner (p. 373) with Micah 5:4. Driver, however (p. 327), admits that the priority of Zech. 9:9 *sq.* to Isaiah may be questioned, and remarks with some reluctance that "the portrait of the Messiah-king seems to be original in Isaiah." In examining this passage we wish to apply the tests above mentioned and ask, Is the picture of the Messiah-king in Zech. 9:9, 10 composite? and, Does it imply other descriptions, or add new features to the idea of Messianic kingship? "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy King cometh unto thee." Notice the prophet does not say *a* King, but *thy* King; that is, a definite King, an expected King, a King of whom Zion had heard before. The prophet then proceeds to describe him.

(1) *He is just* (צַדִּיק), for as justice is an essential attribute of Jehovah, so must it also be the cardinal virtue of the King who represents him. This idea is not necessarily original here. The prophet may very easily have borrowed it from Isa. 9:6 or Jer. 23:5, 33:15, or both. (2) *He is saved* (נוֹשָׁע), Jehovah has delivered him and now he is able to deliver others (vs. 11, 12). This is a *new* feature in the characterization of the Messianic King, quite foreign to the pre-exilic prophets. (3) *He is lowly* (עָנִי). This too is a *new* characteristic, and an expression which, according to Rahlfs, had its birth in the time of the exile. It implies affliction, meekness, humility. (4) *He rides upon an ass*. Another mark of lowliness and a figure quite too graphic for the prophetic mind of the 8th century, B. C. It signifies that he will come in the guise of peace. In the time of the Judges, nobles rode on asses in peace and in war; but after the days of Solomon kings rode on horses. This King goes back to the primitive simplicity of Israel. He is a Prince of Peace, even as Isaiah had described him (9:6), and as the psalmist through the figure of Solomon's quiet reign (Ps. 72). But the difference between the psalmist's picture and that of Zech. 9:9, 10 is this: What was in his time a "pious wish" prefigured in the person of a human monarch, becomes later a "categorical prediction" concerning an actual King, the representative of Jehovah (*cf.* Wellhausen, p. 182). (5) Finally his dominion is described as extending from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. This idea of universal dominion is a parallel to that in Psalm 72:7, 8 and Micah 5:2. It completes the picture of the Messiah-King in Zech. 9:9, 10. The ideas of justice, peace, and universal dominion are old. These our prophet unifies, as no single pre-exilic prophet had done, then adds to them other new features which can best be accounted for after the humiliation of the exile. For example, all that is implied in the terms saved and lowly is new. The idea of salvation in connection with the coming Messianic King is in the earlier prophets entirely wanting. The idea of meekness and suffering is found in Isaiah 40-66 but not in connection with the coming king. But in Zech. 9:9-12 the king is not only a ruler of Israel, as Micah pictures him, but also a Saviour. The prophet thus brings for-

ward the spiritual character of his rule. The picture is composite. Messianic prophecy here rises to the height of its consummation in reference to two things: (1) The spiritual nature of the agent by whom the Messianic kingdom will be set up and guided, and (2) The salvation resident in the king whose dominion is world-wide (*cf.* Orelli, p. 247).

(b) *The Messiah-Shepherd,—rejected* (11:12, 13), *pierced* (12:10 sq.), *smitten* (13:7). These three passages though peculiarly difficult are conspicuous on account of their Messianic interpretation in the New Testament. Zech. 11:12, 13 is interpreted Messianically in Matt. 27:9, 10;\* Zech. 12:10 in John 19:37; and Zech. 13:7 in Matt. 26:31. The question for us is, *Did they have a Messianic value to the prophet?* Ewald (p. 390) sees Messianic hopes in 12–14 but explains them as “only the reaction against the unnatural condition into which the cruelty of the Chaldeans had placed Judah against Jerusalem.” Others find no personal Messiah in these chapters (*e. g.*, Montet, p. 84; Grützmacher, p. 42; Steiner, p. 343). But this opinion is based on a literal interpretation of ch. 11:4–17, a change of text in 12:10, and a transposition of 13:7–9 from its present position to the end of ch. 11. Accordingly ch. 11:4–17 is a description of the Syro-Ephraimitish war. The idol-shepherd (11:15–17; 13:7–9) is Pekah, king of Israel (Grützmacher, Dillmann), or as Steiner prefers, the last king of Judah (13:7–9). But this is only speculation. Ch. 11:4–17 is a parable, descriptive of the Shepherd of Israel. Not the Jehovah-Shepherd, for he distinguishes himself from Jehovah (11:13), and not the prophet, for in 11:7 the prophet describes a third individual in the first person, but the Messiah-Shepherd, who finds his clearest expression in 13:7–9. Language such as “my shepherd,” “my companion,” “the third part shall be left in the land and refined,” applies best to the Messiah and to Messianic times. The remaining passage (12:10) is likewise

\*That Matthew should have ascribed this prophetic quotation to Jeremiah deserves but a passing word as no one any longer claims that Jeremiah wrote Zech. 9–11. Of the various theories devised to explain the difficulty the one usually adopted is that of Augustine, Beza, Calvin, Köhler, Keil, Wright, and most moderns, *viz.*, that it was a simple slip of the memory. Some, however, appeal to the original order of the Major Prophets in the Jewish Canon in which Jeremiah stood first. An error of like sort seems to occur in 2 Chron. 36:22, Ezra 1:1, 2, where Isaiah 44:23 is ascribed to Jeremiah (*cf.* Brown, *Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1881–4).

Messianic, because (1) of the language, which identifies the "sender" with the "sent" (*cf.* Hitzig-Steiner, p. 396); (2) the spirit of grace and supplications; and (3) on account of the purification which follows in 13:1. No mere "Propheten-mord" (Steiner, p. 379) satisfies the entire context, or expresses the prophet's vision. We are constrained, therefore, in spite of the difficulties of the prophecy, to look upon these passages as Messianic, and descriptive of the Messianic-Shepherd. In the first instance he is the *hireling-shepherd* (11:4 *sq.*) who performs his task at Jehovah's bidding; in the second he is the *martyr-shepherd* (12:10) who suffers with Jehovah's permission; in the third he is the *companion-shepherd* (13:7-9) who is smitten by Jehovah's fiat. The order is climacteric,—insulted, pierced, smitten: (1) Shamefully rewarded by the flock; (2) Cruelly murdered by his own people; (3) Judicially slain by Jehovah. The first brings judgment; the second produces repentance and opens a fountain for sin and for uncleanness; the third calls forth Jehovah's mercy and directs it upon the "little ones"—the lesson to be taught being that the Messiah is the Shepherd of Israel. The genesis of this idea is found in the pre-exilic prophets. The psalmist had said, "the Lord is my Shepherd" (Ps. 23:1); Jeremiah prophesied judgment upon faithless shepherds (23:1-8), but neither Jeremiah nor the psalmist represents Jehovah as the Shepherd of Israel, much less that the Messiah was Israel's shepherd. It was left for Ezekiel to picture Jehovah as the shepherd of his people. During the exile when Israel was scattered as sheep without a shepherd, Jehovah promises that he will be the shepherd of his people, and gather his scattered sheep as a shepherd gathereth his flock (Ezek. 34:11-16). Our prophet follows Ezekiel, but goes beyond him: for he distinguishes between the Messiah-Shepherd and the Jehovah-Shepherd (Zech. 11:13; 12:10; 13:7). He describes also the fountain of cleansing (13:1). With him it is no temporary lustration in case of defilement, as in Num. 19, nor a mere sprinkling as in Ezek. 36:25, but a perennial fountain, first described by Joel (3:18). But Joel is content with indicating its effect (3:21) without denoting expressly its purifying character. Our prophet explicitly shows that its purpose is to cleanse from sin. Hence, here

again the spiritual side of cleansing is turned forward, and we have here consequently the climax of the idea of atonement in the Old Testament. The good Shepherd is insulted first, then pierced by his people. A spirit of grace and supplication is poured out upon the nation and they repent and are cleansed from sin. Finally the divine fiat goes forth and the wonderful tragedy is complete. The whole is a most remarkable drama, bringing us near the scenes of Calvary. In Isa. 40-66 the prophet enclosed his picture of the Suffering Servant in a bright promise of exaltation; our prophet, on the contrary, increased the terribleness of the nation's crime by showing that it was also the decree of heaven. Well may we say with Orelli, that in Zech. 9-14 "the Messianic idea has attained full reality."

2. *The Messianic Times—Eschatology.* Apocalypse marks the last stages in the development of prophecy. The description of the incorporation of the heathen into the kingdom of God in Zech. 9-14 is, in our judgment, the most remarkable in the Old Testament as it presupposes all that goes before. As Delitzsch remarks, "the author takes from pre-exilic relations emblematic features for his eschatological pictures." His models were Joel and Isaiah. In form and contents he follows Joel 3, and like Isa. 19:19; 66:21, 23 he uses figurative language; for he knew that when these predictions should be fulfilled, this mode of worship would be abolished. The idea that the heathen shall be converted to Jehovah is an old one. It is asserted in its simplest form in the Song of Moses (Deut. 32). Rights of citizenship in Jerusalem are acquired by the heathen in Ps. 87. Amos brings about their conversion by means of spiritual subjugation (9:12); Joel through the outpouring of the spirit (2:28); Zephaniah as the result of divine judgment (3:9); Isaiah opens up a vista of wonderful possibilities, but Isaiah's picture of the Messianic future is often clouded and indistinct (11:10-16). He does not discriminate clearly between the inauguration of the Messianic times and the restoration of Israel from exile. But this confusion of the two events might naturally be expected from a prophet living before that event; for, to one standing on a lofty vantage ground, the distant mountain ranges are not always easy to distinguish. On the other hand, the prophets who lived after the exile are relieved

of this confusion. Their perspective was shorter and their horizon broader. More and more they identified the day of the Lord with the coming of the Messiah. This is especially true of Zech. 9-14. In all these prophecies concerning the unique day which was to come, there is not the slightest proof that the author ever had in mind *the return of Israel from exile*. He was thinking rather of the Messiah and the incorporation of the heathen into the kingdom of God (*cf.* Cheyne, *JQR.*, 1889, p. 79). Haggai watched the nations bringing their costliest possessions to adorn the temple of Jehovah (2:7); Zechariah sees them, as Isaiah and Micah had seen them (Isa. 2:2*sq.*; Mic. 4:1,2), streaming thither to worship Jehovah and eager to share in the privileges of the chosen nation (2:15; 8:20-23); for, to Zechariah, the glory of the second temple lay in its catholicity. The counterpart of this picture is to be seen in Zech. 9-14. As Wildeboer (p. 414) remarks: "this thought (the incorporation of the heathen) governs the whole of chapters 12-14." (1) A remnant of the Philistines, like the ancient Jebusites, inherit the blessings of Judah (9:7). (2) All nations shall in that day go up to Jerusalem from year to year to keep the feast of tabernacles (14:16-19). This last passage is a most appropriate doxology to all Old Testament apocalypse (*cf.* Oehler).

Montet (p. 91) objects, however, to the post-exilic origin of chapter 14, on the ground that the nations are *forced* to come up to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles. They are represented as coming in chains, he claims; compelled to obey, "un ordre, un ordre impérieux et dur, un ordre accompagné de la menace d'un châtement." But the announcement is made simply that all nations shall go up to Jerusalem. It does not say that they *must* go up, or that they do so to avoid punishment. Those who remain behind are the threatened ones. Upon them shall be the plague. Never in the Old Testament are the heathen converted to Jehovah by force. This was not the Old Testament method either before or after the exile. Grützmacher (p. 35) in proof of the same hypothesis, argues that chapter 14 is pre-exilic as all the prophets, from the end of the exile on, only *threaten* the heathen with terrible judgment, *e. g.*, Haggai and Zechariah. This assertion, as is evident, completely reverses the claim of

Montet, but like it is false. For, while it is true that Jer. 12:15-17; 16:19-21 disproves the assertion of Montet, it is likewise true that Zech. 2:15 and 8:20-23, in which many people and strong nations are represented as eager to go up to Jerusalem to worship Jehovah, even taking hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, "We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you," show that the union of the heathen with Israel is a purely voluntary act. So also in Zech. 9-14. God's providence brings it about (*cf.* Cheyne, *JQR.*, 1889, p. 81). We, accordingly, maintain that the prophecies contained in Zech. 9-14, occupy a position of singular importance in the development of Messianic prophecy; that their place is toward the close of prophetic revelation; that they knit together lines of hope and promise concerning the Great Deliverer which before were separate, and add new features to the former descriptions of the pre-exilian prophets. The Messiah-King is not only a just ruler (as described by Isaiah and Micah), maintaining peaceful and world-wide dominion (as in Ps. 72), but he is also *saved* and *lowly*, coming to Zion riding upon an ass. The Messiah-Shepherd not only endeavors to shepherd the flock (as Ezekiel had promised concerning the Jehovah-Shepherd), but is insulted also, pierced and smitten; whereupon, a spirit of grace is poured out (as in Joel) and the nation repents and is cleansed from sin. The Messiah-Shepherd being distinguished from the Jehovah-Shepherd. But towering over all is the prophet's vivid apocalypse of the coming day of the Lord, when through the Messiah's influence all nations will come up to Jerusalem to worship one Jehovah (14:9), and when everything will be consecrated to his service (14:20-21). (*Cf.* W. J. Beecher's idea, that chs. 9-14 may have been edited by Zechariah . . . for the sake of the Messianic doctrines they contain." *Old and New Testament Student*, Oct. 1889, p. 230. Also Elmslie, *Book by Book*, p. 336.)

III. *The Psychological Argument, or argument from parallelisms in thought and language between Zech. 9-14 and the other prophets.*\*—This argument is often overestimated. It

\*The purely linguistic argument as drawn out by Eckardt (*ZATW.*, 1893, pp. 76-109) will be discussed later on, inasmuch as Eckardt makes the "Priester codex," Job, Joel, Habakuk, Micah (in part), Proverbs, and Psalms the basis, or Spiegelbilder of late Hebrew, thus assuming what in part remains to be proven.



means simply that there are certain parallelisms of thought and language between Zech. 9-14 and other Old Testament writings which indicate some degree of dependence one upon the other. The question therefore is, did the author of Zech. 9-14 borrow from others, or they from him? There seems to be reasons for thinking that the author of Zech. 9-14 borrowed from the earlier prophets. Stähelin claimed that this was the case; likewise de Wette and others. Stade practically finds no limit to the parallelisms between Deutero-Zechariah and the former prophets, and in our judgment illustrates how vain it is to measure prophecy by line and plummet (*cf.* Kuiper, p. 116). He traces almost every thought of these chapters to some antecedent prophecy and thus deprives the author of all originality. Indeed the author, he claims, was not a prophet but a scribe who gathered up the unfulfilled prophecies of his own day and re-delivered them because of their near fulfilment (p. 162). The author does not even claim to be a prophet, he continues, but simply copies and combines the ideas of the earlier prophets in a most mechanical manner. But Stade proves too much. He damages his case by overstatement and exaggeration. Yet Kuenen admits that he proves the dependence of Zech. 12-14 on the earlier prophets. Bleek, Davidson, Grützmacher, and others, however, hold that the dependence is on the other side. But it seems more probable, with Perowne, that one prophet should have drawn from many, than that many should have borrowed from one. It is not our purpose to press this argument beyond its legitimate limits. We propose to treat it rather as a *corroboration* of what has been proved elsewhere on separate grounds than as an independent argument. We have, therefore, sifted the various passages that appear as parallelisms between our author and his predecessors, and offer the following only as worthy of careful consideration, holding that these are not only confirmatory of our previous conclusions but also sufficient for our present purpose. We prefer to omit doubtful passages, choosing only those which are conceded to have some degree of dependence on each other; for, as Montet (p. 72) observes: "Some passages have a fortuitous and accidental resem-

blance.”\* Passing by, therefore, some very possible quotations from Micah (5:9-14; 7:12) found in Zech. 9:10, and others from Amos 8:12, Joel 2:28 and Hosea 2:19 which are closely related to Zech. 12:10; 13:1; 14:8, we make the following propositions:

1. *That Zech. 9-14 shows familiarity with Ezekiel, especially with chapters 32-39 (cf. Steiner's admission, p. 369).* That certain marked parallelisms really exist between Ezekiel and Zech. 9-14 is not disputed. The point, therefore, at issue is not, Does a dependence exist? but rather, On whom does it fall? (a) *Ezek. 34:1 sq. and Zech. 11:4-17; 13:7-9,—prophecies against the shepherds.* The similarities between these chapters are obvious (cf. Grützmacher, p. 26): 1) In Ezekiel the shepherds are described as feeding themselves (34:3, 8, 10) instead of feeding the flock (v. 2); as killing them that are fed and eating the fat thereof (v. 3); as neglecting to bind up that which was broken (v. 4), and not caring for the sick, the driven away and the lost (v. 4.) In Zech. 11:4 sq. the possessors of the flock are likewise accused of slaying the sheep and of holding themselves not guilty, and of selling the flock and refusing to pity (v. 5). 2) Therefore, says Jehovah in Ezekiel, “I myself will seek out and feed my flock” (vs. 11-14); and in Zech. 11:7, “I will feed the flock.” 3) Ezekiel declares, I will make with them a covenant of peace (v. 25), that they may dwell safely in the land. In Zech. 11:10, on the contrary, the covenant made in behalf of Israel with all peoples is broken. 4) As a result of Jehovah's dealings with the flock Ezekiel twice affirms, “and they shall know that I am the Lord” (vs. 27, 30); in Zech. 11:11 it is also declared that “the poor of the flock knew that it was the word of the Lord.” 5) Both prophets are also commissioned by a “Thus saith the Lord” (Ezek. 34:1, 14; Zech. 11:4, 15). These are the most important resemblances. On which side is the dependence? Notice the following considerations: 1) Ezekiel frequently *repeats* the most important thoughts, *e. g.*, the idea of

\*Montet (p. 74) rejects all parallels as unworthy of discussion except three: viz. (1) Ps. 72:8 and Zech. 9:9, 10 in which case Ps. 72 is perhaps an 8th century production, borrowed in Zech. 9:9, 10 by a contemporaneous prophet; (2) Isa. 11:15 and Zech. 10:11, this chapter of Isaiah having been written, he thinks, after 722 B. C.; (3) Hos. 2:19, 25 and Zech. 13:2, 9; here he admits that Hosea is borrowed by our author, but that is possible as he assigns Zech. 13:2, 9 to the 6th century.

the shepherds feeding themselves is found in vs. 3, 8 and 10; so too the mention of the fat and strong of the flock (vs. 3 and 16), the diseased, the sick, the broken, the driven away and the lost (vs. 4 and 16); and the fact that the flock are scattered (vs. 5, 6, 8, 12, 21). If Ezekiel were borrowing it is not likely he would so often repeat. 2) Certain allusions in Zech. 11:4 sq. imply a knowledge of Ezek. 34, *e. g.*, the covenant broken in Zech. 11:10 is the same as that promised in Ezek. 34:25. And the "in that day" of Zech. 11:11 is explained by "the cloudy and dark day" of Ezek. 34:12. 3) Our author seems to be influenced by Ezek. 34 in other portions of his prophecies: *e. g.*, the expression "because there was no shepherd" (Ezek. 34:8) occurs in Zech. 10:2; also the "he-goats" עֵזוֹדִים of Ezek. 34:17 in Zech. 10:3. And the declaration of Ezekiel, "I will set up one shepherd over them" (34:23) gives rise to the prediction, "there shall be one Lord and his name one" (Zech. 14:9). *Cf.* also Ezek. 34:28 and Zech. 14:11; Ezek. 34:12 and Zech. 11:11. 4) Zech. 11:4-17 is an allegory, and allegorical language always implies that the facts are familiar from which the lesson to be taught is drawn. The allegory clothes abstract principles in the imagery of a fictitious tale; but in order to understand it, the facts must be known before the mind can appreciate the allegory. (*Cf.* Delitzsch in *Rudelbach u. Guericke's Zeits.*, 1851, p. 309.) This was the case, as we conceive it, with Zech. 11:4-17. The prophet portrayed events to Israel which had long been the subject of thought and consideration. Ezekiel's prophecies were now fulfilled. The two staves of Ezek. 37:16 were long familiar. Israel had rejected the shepherding care of Jehovah and been punished for it, and this it is which furnishes the basis of the allegory. (*Cf.* Kuiper, p. 113, and Stade, *ZATW.*, I., p. 68 sq.) (b) *Ezek. 28:1 sq., and Zech. 9:2 sq.—denunciations against Tyre and Sidon.* 1) Thrice Ezekiel speaks of Tyre as very wise (28:3, 7, 12) also in Zech. 9:2 "though she be very wise." 2) Both prophets speak of her power in the sea (Ezek. 28:4; Zech. 9:4), and of her abundance of gold and silver (Ezek. 28:4; Zech. 9:4). 3) Both declare that God will cast her out (Ezek. 28:16, 17; Zech. 9:4) and that she shall be burned with fire (Ezek. 28:18; Zech. 9:4), 4) Ezekiel further declares that "there shall be *no more* a pricking

brier unto the house of Israel nor any grieving thorn of all that are around about them" (28:24); in Zech. 9:8 also, "I will encamp about my house because of the army, and *no more* shall any oppressor pass through them." 5) Ezekiel further promises that the house of Israel shall be gathered from the people among whom they are scattered and shall dwell in their own land (28:25, 26); in Zech. 9:2 *sq.*, the prophet describes the preparation of the land for the return of the nation and the coming of their king. These coincidences are in themselves singularly remarkable, and the more so inasmuch as in each case the prophets follow the same order of thought. But the important inquiry again is, which prophecy is the older? Doubtless Ezekiel, for as Stade shows (I., p. 46) the section in Zech. 9:1-8 is built up not only of Ezekiel but also of Amos (*cf.* Am. 1:6-10); and this apparently is so convincing to Grützmacher that he does not deny the validity of Stade's claim. (*Cf.* Kuiper, p. 76).\* (c) *Ezek. 37 and 38,—Ephraim and Judah restored and united.* This section of Ezekiel's prophecies seems to give a colouring to Zech. 9-14. The great governing thoughts in these chapters are the following: 1) Ephraim and Judah shall be brought back from exile and united as one nation (37:12, 16 *sq.*). 2) They shall be gathered, and afterwards dwell safely together in the land of Israel (38:8, 11, 14). 3) There they shall have one king (37:22, 24). 4) In that day their enemies shall come up against them but Jehovah will wonderfully deliver them (38:14, 18, 20) and send confusion and pestilence upon their enemies (38:21, 22). 5) Finally, the Lord shall be magnified and sanctified (38:23). How completely these thoughts are reëchoed in Zech. 9-14 is almost beyond dispute: 1) Both Ephraim and Judah are represented as already restored, or in the act of being restored (Zech. 9:10, 13; 10:6, 7). 2) Also as already occupying a part at least of their possessions, and as dwelling securely (9:10 *sq.*, 14:11). 3) And as having in future but one king (14:9). 4) Yet as attacked by hostile nations coming up against them (12:2 *sq.*, 14:2 *sq.*), but as delivered by the wonderful intervention of Jehovah (12:4 *sq.*, 14:3 *sq.*

\*Dillmann (*Comm. on Isa.* p. 210) assigns the prophecy against Tyre in Isa. 23:15-18 to a time after the return from exile, though he places Zech. 9:2-4 in the 8th century B.C. But it is difficult to see why he should shift an Isianic prophecy concerning Tyre to the period of Zechariah, and insist that that of Zech. 9:2-4 belongs to the period of Isaiah.

*cf.* especially Ezek. 38:20 and Zech. 14:4); on the other hand, all the enemies of Israel are described as confused and plagued by Jehovah (14:12, 13, 17). 5) Finally, the Lord is magnified by the universal hallowing of everything to his name (14:20, 21). The resemblances are perfect; the only difference being that the prophecies of the latter are an advance upon the former. Zech. 9–14 is a fulfilment of Ezek. 37 and 38. (*Cf.* Hitzig, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1830). The similarities in language are also noteworthy. Little more could be expected from our prophet had he actually committed these chapters of Ezekiel to memory and written under their inspiration. Grützmacher (p. 27), who reverses the dependence of these authors, fails to show in what respect Zech. 14 must have been the basis of Ezek. 38:17 and 39:8. (d) *Other characteristic expressions common to Ezekiel and Zech. 9–14, whose priority from the passages themselves is uncertain:* 1) Ezek. 5:2–12, in which the prophet describes how the people of Jerusalem shall perish, one-third by pestilence and famine, another third by sword, and another in exile; the lesson being illustrated by the prophet's dividing his hair, at the commandment of the Lord, into three parts; in Zech. 13:8, 9 also, two-thirds of the people are spoken of as doomed to be cut off, while a third part is left as a remnant in the land. The similarities of these two prophecies are observed and emphasized by Köster, de Wette, Hävernick, Hengstenberg and Stade. 2) In Ezek. 38:15 the expression "riding upon horses," רִכְבֵי סוּסִים, occurs also in Zech. 10:5. Grützmacher (p. 27) attempts to show Ezekiel's dependence on Zechariah here; but *cf.* Stade I., p. 66,—his allusion to Ezek. 23:6, 12. 3) In Ezek. 36:26 a "new spirit" is promised, which in 39:29 is poured out upon the house of Israel. This finds a parallel on a much higher spiritual plane in Zech. 12:10. 4) The thought of cleansing is coupled in both prophets with that of the outpouring of the Spirit (Ezek. 36:25–28; Zech. 13:1). Stade finds also in Ezek. 47:1 a basis for Zech. 13:1. (So Köster, de Wette, Kuiper, Hävernick and Lowe; Wellhausen in 36:25). *Cf.* the words "sin" and "uncleanness" in Zech. 13:1 with Ezek. 36:17, 23. 5) The expression "every one against the hand of his neighbour," is common to both (Ezek. 38:21; Zech. 14:13). 6) "If not, forbear" (Ezek. 2:7; 3:11, 27 and Zech. 11:12). 7) "Roaring of young lions" (Ezek. 19:3 sq.

and Zech. 11:3, *cf.* Jer. 25:36-38; 49:19). 8) "No stranger uncircumcised in heart nor uncircumcised in flesh shall enter into my sanctuary" (Ezek. 44:9), an observation closely resembling, though only approximating the thought contained in Zech. 14:21, "no more shall there be the Canaanite in the house of the Lord." 9) Also the formula, "and they shall be my people, and I will be their God" (Ezek. 11:20, *cf.* 30:25, 26; 34:30, 31), finds its counterpart in Zech. 13:9, "it is my people," and "the Lord is my God." All these resemblances, however inconclusive each one may be when taken by itself, help to confirm the conclusion that our prophet was familiar with the prophecies of Ezekiel, and therefore, that he lived after the exile (*cf.* Wildeboer, p. 413).

2. *Zech. 9-14 exhibits acquaintanceship with Jeremiah.* The close relation of these prophecies to each other is, as Grützmacher (p. 25) allows, "unmistakable." This is especially true of Zech. 9-11,—the more important section here, inasmuch as the author of chs. 12-14 is an alleged contemporary of Jeremiah. The parallels to be considered are the following: (a) *Jer. 25:34-38*,—*judgment upon the shepherds*, *cf. Zech. 11:1-3*. Between these passages there is "an indubitable contact," Grützmacher (p. 26) makes Zech. 11:1-3 the original, however, because, as he thinks, it is a literal description of the invasion of Tiglath-pileser, whereas Jeremiah's is rather a modified description of this passage in the form of an allegory. But the contexts of both passages are opposed to this interpretation. That of Jer. 25:34-38 does not easily admit of an allegory, while that of Zech. 11:1-3, on the contrary, invites it. In Jer. 25 the prophet is addressing words of plain and simple, yet forcible warning to the shepherds of Jerusalem; whereas in Zech. 11:1-3, if the description is literal, as is maintained, the invading Assyrians are described as employed chiefly in devastating the country, felling cedars, spoiling forests, destroying the oaks of Bashan, etc. The true explanation of these two related passages, according to our opinion, is this: Jer. 25:34-38 is a simple description of Judah's impending calamity; whereas, Zech. 11:1-3 is an allegorical introduction to the allegory par excellence which follows in verses 4-17. Both together (*i. e.*, Zech. 11:1-3 and 4-17) describe the solemn but historical past of Israel and Judah. The marks of Zechariah's posteriority

are found principally in the context (*cf.* Jer. 25:34; 12:3, and **צֹאן הַהֲרָגָה** of Zech. 11:4, 7). In Jeremiah the days of Israel's slaughter are accomplished; in Zechariah, on the other hand, Israel is admonished to learn a lesson from that slaughter. (b) *Jer. 23:1 sq.—Israel's promised restoration. Cf. especially Zech. 10:3–12.* In both passages, it is announced that the evil shepherds shall be punished and that scattered Israel shall be gathered (*cf.* Grützmacher, p. 26); but with this difference, viz., that in Zech. 10:6, 8, Israel is already gone into captivity while those remaining in exile are exhorted to return home. The picture of the Messianic King in Jer. 23:5 is not nearly so vivid or complete as that in Zech. 9:9, 10 (*cf.* Jer. 17:25; 22:4, **עֲנִי**). Again, the promise in Jer. 23:3 to gather the remnant of Israel out of all countries (*cf.* **וְהַשְׁבוּרִים**) is far less definite than that of Zech. 10:6, "I will strengthen the house of Judah and I will save the house of Joseph and they shall be as though I had not cast them off." And also, Jer. 23:3, "they shall be fruitful and increase," describes, according to our view, an earlier stage in the history of Israel than Zech. 10:8, "and they shall increase as they have increased." (*Cf.* also Jer. 23:8 and Zech. 10:8, 10; Jer. 23:33 *sq.* and Zech. 9:1; 12:1). (c) *Other expressions characteristic of Jeremiah found but once in Zech. 9–11 are the following:* 1) Three times Jeremiah uses the technical phrase, "the pride of Jordan," **גְּאוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן** (12:5; 49:19; 50:44); the same metaphor occurs outside of Jeremiah only once, viz., in Zech. 11:3 (*cf.* Grützmacher, p. 26). The expression is of late origin, probably out of the exile (Köster, p. 80). 2) The use made of **שָׁלַח** "casting away in contempt (Jer. 26:23, 36:30) may well have suggested the phraseology of Zech. 11:13. 3) The word **זָרַע** "sow," employed in a good sense in Jer. 31:27 (but also in Ezek. 36:9, *cf.* Hos. 2:25), finds a corresponding use in Zech. 10:9. 4) The contrast also between the teraphim and soothsayers and the power of Jehovah to give rain stands out strikingly in Jer. 14:22, *cf.* 29:8 *sq.*, but also in Zech. 10:2. 5) Stade finds another parallel between Jer. 46:10, "the sword shall devour and it shall be satiate and made drunk with their blood," and Zech. 9:15, "and they shall devour and drink, etc."

In Zech. 12–14 also, certain passages occur which show the

author's dependence on Jeremiah. Thus in Zech. 14:10, "unto the tower of Hannaneel" and "the gate of the corner," are measurements taken from Jer. 31:38, as v. 40 clearly indicates. And in Zech. 13:7 the phrase, "upon the little ones," is borrowed from Jer. 48:4 (*cf.* 14:3 הַצְעִירִים). And the phrase, "all the families," frequently used in Zech. 12:12-14 is found in different parts of Jeremiah (1:15; 2:4; 10:25; 25:9; 31:1; 33:24).

3. *Close resemblances exist between Zech. 9-14 and Isa. 40-66.* The value of this point is enhanced by the fact that all those who place Zech. 9-14 before the exile, urge an exilic or post-exilic date for Isa. 40-66. We are thus dealing with a prophecy written in their opinion long after the prophecies under discussion, and therefore in no sense the basis of chs. 9-14.\* That a close relation actually exists between these two prophecies in thought and language is openly admitted (Ewald, v. Ortenberg, Hengstenberg, Stade, Grützmacher, and others). Here again, therefore, the important inquiry to be made is, on whose side does the dependence rest? To us it is sufficiently clear that the author of Zech. 9-14 depended on Isa. 40-66 not only for various characteristic expressions, but also for his eschatological pictures. For example, (a) the promise in Zech. 9:11, "I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water," reminds one of *four* similar passages in Isa. 40-66, viz., 42:22, "they are hid in prison-houses" (*cf.* v. 7); 49:9, "say to the prisoners, go forth"; 51:14, "the captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed and that he should not die in the pit"; and 61:1, "to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Bleek acknowledges the resemblance here. Grützmacher passes it over in silence. (b) In Zech. 9:12 the promise occurs, "I will render double unto thee" (*i. e.*, double blessing). This form of expression is somewhat rare, but it occurs in Isa. 40-66 twice; once in 61:7, "for your shame ye shall have double, in their land they shall possess double: everlasting joy shall be unto them;" and in 40:2, "Jerusalem has received double for all her sins." (*Cf.* Jer. 16:18.) Dillmann explains the dependence of Zech. 9:12 on Isa. 40:2 and 61:7 in this instance by making

\* The unity of Isa. 40-66 is not necessarily assumed here as the passages employed in our argument are usually if not universally allowed to be of exilic or early post-exilic origin, (*Cf.* Schian's *Ebed-Jahwe Lieder*, Dissert.; Cornill's *Einleit.*; Duhm's *Jes.*, and Cheyne's *Introduction to Isaiah*.)



Zech. 9:12 "eine spätere Uebearbeitung," but without sufficient reason. (c) In Zech. 12:1 Jehovah is described as "He who stretcheth forth the heavens and layeth the foundations of the earth and formeth the spirit of man within him." This description of Jehovah is an idea frequently found in Isa. 40-66; *e. g.*, 51:13, Jehovah is the Creator, "who stretched forth the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth" נִטָּה שָׁמַיִם וּגְרָ; in 44:24, "that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself." (Cf. 45:12; 40:21, 22; 42:5; 48:13; 51:16.) Here again it is evident that our prophet is the borrower, Grützmaker (p. 28) is unable to decide. (d) In Zech. 12:2 Jerusalem is spoken of as "a cup of trembling," כֶּסֶף רַעַל. This is a characteristic expression of Isa. 40-66. Jeremiah speaks of a "cup of trembling." In Isa. 51:17b, the prophet declares, "thou hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling;" "even the dregs of the cup of trembling" (v. 22, כֶּסֶף רַעַל). (e) Stade finds a further foundation for the announcement in Zech. 9:9, "Behold thy king cometh," in Isa. 62:11, "Behold, thy salvation cometh." He also parallels the attributes of the Messianic King, "just" and "saved" (Zech. 9:9), with the attributes of Jehovah in Isa. 45:21 (*cf.* 61:10; Jer. 17:25; 22:4). (f) The eschatological resemblances between Isa. 40-66 and Zech. 9-14 are particularly striking (*cf.* Grützmaker, p. 28). The vision of our prophet that "all nations shall come up to Jerusalem" to worship, is a thought frequently occurring in Isa. 40-66; *e. g.*, 55:5, "and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee;" 56:6, 7, "mine house shall be a house of prayer for all people" (*cf.* 66:18-20, 23). All these are reëchoed in Zech. 14:16 *sq.* Further, a curse is pronounced by our prophet upon those who refuse to come up to keep the religious observances of the sanctuary: "their flesh shall consume away and their eyes and their tongues shall consume away" (Zech. 14:12; *cf.* Isa. 66:24); and the nature of the punishment described is similar. In Zech. 14:12, 13 plagues of disease are followed by tumult, and that by internecine war; in Isa. 60:12 they utterly waste away and perish out of sight. Lastly, in both prophecies a transition is made to holiness. In Zech. 14:20, 21, the prophet describes a time when holiness shall be inscribed on everything, even on the bells of the

horses; in Isa. 61:6; 62:12, the prophet likewise describes a time when the people shall be as holy as the priests, and when they shall be called the "ministers of God." Just here lies an important distinction between these prophecies, which favors a much later origin for Zech. 14, viz., the broader catholicity and more extended universalism of our prophet which enables him to rise above Hebrew prejudice, and picture even the heathen serving as priests, offering sacrifice in the ordinary cooking vessels of Jerusalem to the Jehovah of Israel.

Thus in these parallelisms between Zech. 9-14, on the one hand, and Isa. 40-66, Jeremiah and Ezekiel on the other, we have the strongest possible *corroboration* of the late origin of Zech. 9-14. Every great section of Zech. 9-14 shows familiarity with the older prophets. Their thoughts were not infrequently our author's thoughts, their order his order, and their phraseology his phraseology. Moreover, great sections of their writings taken as a whole evidently gave rise to paragraphs of Zech. 9-14 taken as a whole (*cf.* especially Isa. 66 with Zech. 14 and Ezek. 34 with Zech. 11:4 *sq.*).

Here then in conclusion are our reasons for arguing a post-exilic date for Zech. 9-14. Whatever else may be shown later on concerning the unity of chs. 9-14, we believe that it has been made reasonably clear, and on grounds of internal evidence alone, that the last six chapters of Zechariah are of post-exilic origin. For, as we have shown, the "historical allusions" are consistent with a late date, the development of "Messianic prophecy" in the O. T. favors it, and the literary and psychological relations of our author to the former prophets corroborate it. Hence, without pressing unduly our claims, we submit that there are good critical reasons for assigning these disputed prophecies to a post-exilic date. We shall next endeavor to determine in what particular period after the exile they had their origin.

### III.

#### THE POST-ZECHARIAN HYPOTHESIS EXAMINED.

If our previous conclusions are accepted, the problem before us now is to decide in which period or periods of post-exilic times these prophecies of Zech. 9-14 find their best historic setting.

Paucity of details in the history of Zechariah's own age has given room for different theories. Many authorities favor a post-Zecharianic date, the most important of whom in modern times are Stade, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Marti, Kautzsch, Cornill, Cheyne, Delitzsch, Kirkpatrick, Rubinkam, Driver, Staerk, Wildeboer, Kuiper and Eckardt. They employ the same critical methods as those whose views we have just discussed, but arrive at widely divergent results. Even among themselves there is a marked difference of opinion. For example, Wellhausen and Marti, representing the extreme view of this school, place these chapters in the 2d century B. C. Wildeboer assigns the date  $\pm 280$ ; Kautzsch, 301; Stade and Cornill, 306-278; Kuiper, the period immediately following 332. Rubinkam and Staerk argue for double authorship—one author having lived, as is alleged, in the time of Alexander the Great, the other in the Maccabean age. Kuenen finds pre-exilic kernels in 9-11; 13:7-9, which were worked over after the exile, but maintains that the whole is pre-Grecian. Graetz suggests for ch. 14 the reign of Artaxerxes III. Delitzsch assigns the whole to the time just before Ezra and Nehemiah or not later than 458 B. C., while Kirkpatrick, though advocating a double authorship, finds no period so suitable as the first year of the reign of Xerxes, 485 B. C. From this ascending scale of individual opinion, therefore, it is evident that there is a gradual approach toward the period in which Zechariah himself lived, viz., the reign of Darius Hystaspes, 521 *sq.* B. C. The balance of opinion, however, is in favor of the period after 333; and hence the prime question to be discussed here is, Are these prophecies of Persian or of Greek origin? Or, more definitely, in view of the dark century between Ezra and Nehemiah and Alexander the Great, of which so little comparatively is known, Are these prophecies early Persian or Graeco-Maccabean?

In examining the conclusions of those who maintain a post-Zecharian origin of these chapters we need constantly to distinguish sharply between the grounds advanced in support of a *post-exilic* and those which argue a *post-Zecharian* date. The former we may for the most part accept; the latter we are bound first to examine. A very large proportion of Stade's extended discussion, for example, proves only that Zech. 9-14 is *post-exilic*.

With this we are no longer concerned. We are concerned, however, with the reasons given by him and others for assigning these oracles to the Graeco-Maccabean age. And to these, therefore, we turn our attention next. They are of two sorts, linguistic and historical.\*

I. *The Argument from Language and Style.*—This argument is weakened unfortunately by two facts: (1) the fact that the author of Zech. 9–14 depends so largely on older prophecies for his thoughts, and consequently more or less for his language; and (2) the fact that these prophecies are very brief, at best not exceeding in length an ordinary newspaper article. Hence, the danger of pressing the linguistic argument too far. Eckardt, who (*ZATW.*, p. 76 sq., 1893) presents a most admirable discussion of the use of language in Zech. 9–14, arrives at the conclusion that these prophecies could have been written “only in Grecian times.” This conclusion we propose to examine.

It is now generally agreed † that the most important marks of the late origin of a Hebrew writing are Aramaisms; *scriptio plena* וֹ and וֹּ; אֲנִי instead of אָנֹכִי; the abstract endings וֹן and וֹּ; the *nota accusativi* אֶת with suffixes; the omission of the article, or its position between the substantive and its adjective; the clumsy repetition of words and groups of words; and the infinitive absolute as a means of setting forth a finite verb.

1. *Aramaisms in Zech. 9–14.* Our author is remarkably free of Aramaic expressions. Such words, *e. g.*, as זָמַן for עָמַן or שָׁ for אָשַׁר, frequently found in the latest literature of the O. T., are entirely wanting in chs. 9–14. Even the few words which do occur, whose roots are often found in later Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic, indicate only the author’s Aramaic tendencies;

\* We set aside any objections which the history of the Canon of the Prophets opposes to the theory that an O. T. prophecy could possibly be as late as the period of the Maccabees. Inasmuch as the term “Canon” being not of Jewish but of Christian origin, it is still an open question whether additions may not have been made after 250 B. C.—the date agreed upon as to the formation of the *prophetic* portion of the O. T. (*cf.* H. E. Ryle, *Canon of the O. T.*, p. 109; Eichhorn, *Introduction to the O. T.*, p. 79; F. Buhl, *Canon and Text of the O. T.* (Eng. Trans.), p. 11; X. Koenig, *Essai sur la Formation du Canon de l’ancien testament*, p. 50; Paris, 1894; Kautzsch, *Die heil. Schrift des A. T.*, 1894).

† *Cf.* the signs of late Hebrew given by Eckardt, *ZATW.*, 1893, pp. 76–109; Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 25th ed., 1889; Buhl, *Heb.-Aram. Handwörterbuch in Verbindung mit Prof. Socin und Zimmern*, 12th ed., 1895; Holzinger, “Sprachcharacter u. Abfassungszeit des Buches Joel” (*ZATW.*, p. 89 sq., 1889); Giesebrecht, “Zur Hexateuchkritik,” and “Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen” (*ZATW.*, p. 177 sq., 1881–2); Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften des A. T.*, 2d ed., 1890.

for, as Eckardt shows, the same words all occur in classical Hebrew. For example, זָוִית (9:15) from זָוִית (cf. Mishna Aramaic זָוִיתָהּ, זָוִיתָהּ, זָוִיתָהּ) occurs in Ps. 144:12. צָהַל (11:8) is א. λ. But cf. מְבַחֵלָה (Prov. 20:21). יָקָר (14:3) occurs in Jer. 20:5; Ezek. 22:25; Prov. 20:15 and frequently in the later books. קָרַב (14:3) is found also in Job 38:23; Eccl. 9:18; Ps. 55:22; 68:31; 78:9; 144:1. רָעַל (12:2) as noun is א. λ.; but as verb, occurs in Nah. 2:4 (cf. Aram. رَعَلَ, Syr. رَعَلَ and Arab. رَعَلَ). The form רָעַלָהּ is found in Isa. 51:17, 22. שָׁגַל (14:2) occurs in Jer. 3:2; Deut. 28:30; Isa. 13:16. These words can only indicate that 9-14 are post-exilic, and in no way, as Eckardt allows, that these chapters are necessarily Greek. Two instances of greater value occur, however, in which the Aramaic ending ה is substituted for the Hebrew א: e. g., מְצַבָּה (9:8) instead of מְצַבָּא, and אֲמַצָּה (12:5) for אֲמַצָּא. But the first root actually occurs with an א in the word צָבָאָה (14:12); and the second in יִמְצֵא, and מִמְצֵא also with א (10:10 and 11:6). This vacillating change of our author from one orthography to another is, as we shall see later, one of his most noteworthy literary characteristics. One other possible Aramaism in these chapters remains to be discussed, viz., the change of an א to י in the word הַיּוֹצֵר (11:13), intended for הַיּוֹצֵר according to many. The proposed emendation, however, is doubtful. For, as Wellhausen (p. 187) shows, the present incorrect reading may be intentional on the part of the Massorettes, in which case this instance cannot be reckoned as an Aramaic usage of our author; or, the text may be correct as it stands. This latter explanation has in its favor the word הַשְּׁלִיךְ (Hiph.), used so commonly in the O. T. in the sense of fling or cast away in contempt (cf. Gen. 37:22; Num. 35:20, 22; Neh. 9:26; 2 Kgs. 7:15; Ezek. 20:8; 23:35; 28:17), which indicates that the thirty pieces of silver are an insult to the Shepherd, and, as we may naturally infer, too profane for the temple treasury.

2. *Scriptio plena* is a proof of late authorship. The name הַיּוֹד especially, according to Eckardt (p. 90), has great worth in determining the period to which these prophecies belong. Down until the end of the 4th century B. C. the custom was to write

*scriptio defectiva* דָּוִד. The full form, or *scriptio plena* דָּוִיד as here, must have been the original orthography of our author, as no copyist would have changed it. Hence, as the *scriptio plena* דָּוִיד is invariably employed in these prophecies, Eckardt concludes (p. 90) that our author must have written in the Greek period. But at most the name "David" occurs only six times in Zech. 9-14 and in a single context of as many verses (12:7-12). Koheleth (one of the latest books in the O. T.) has, on the contrary, דָּוִד (1:1). Hosea and Amos, on the other hand, have דָּוִיד (Hos. 3:5; Am. 6:5; 9:11),—in all four exceptions to Eckardt's rule. Moreover, the date of the transition from the *scriptio defectiva* to the *scriptio plena*, assigned by him to "the end of the 4th century B. C.," is wholly arbitrary, and as far as can be ascertained was not a sudden but a gradual change which took place in the development of Hebrew literature (*cf.* Bonk, *ZATW.*, XI., 127 sq.). Furthermore, the date of a given prophecy can hardly be decided on the basis of a single word and that a proper name. A much more decisive criterion is the *general* custom of the author with reference to full or defective orthography. In this respect Zech. 9-14 is a particularly interesting study. The *scriptio plena* and *defectiva* are confused in a most striking manner; *e. g.*, נָגַשׁ (9:9), but נֹגֶשׁ (10:4); הָפִיר (11:10), but הַפִּיר (11:14); הוֹבִישׁוּ (9:5), but הוֹבִישׁוּ (10:5, 11); יֵשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם (12:7), but יוֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם (12:8); מְשֻׁפָּחוֹת (12:14) and מְשֻׁפָּחוֹת (12:14 twice). Eckardt allows that the orthography of our author is very remarkable.

3. *The preponderance of the form אָנִי over אֲנִי is a further mark of late authorship.* Giesebrecht's law is (p. 256), "the later the writing the greater the preponderance in favor of אָנִי." But, applying this law to the prophecies in hand, as a matter of fact the form אָנִי occurs in 9-14 but twice (10:6; 13:9), whereas אֲנִי five times (11:6, 16; 12:2; 13:5 twice). This unfavorable phenomenon, however, which cannot be accounted for, as Eckardt admits (p. 95) on the ground that the shorter form is borrowed from older passages, is attributed by him "to the deliberate choice of the learned author who made use of the more seldom expression because it had to him a weightier and more solemn

ring" (p. 97). But this is hardly satisfactory in view of the fact that in Lamentations, Koheleth, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles and Daniel אָנֹכִי occurs 109 times against אֲנִי three times; and that in Ezekiel, Haggai, Zech. 1–8 and Malachi אֲנִי is found 155 times, while אָנֹכִי but twice. This shows that the use of אֲנִי became too universal before the 3d century B. C. to allow of the frequent use of אָנֹכִי in Zech. 9–14. Eckardt's attempt to explain the frequent use of הִנֵּה with personal pronoun and participle instead of הִנֵּה with pronominal suffix and participle is correspondingly weak.

4. *The ending וְיָ is, according to Eckardt, a further sign of the late origin of Zech. 9–14; e. g., בְּצִרּוֹן (9:12), יִקְשְׁאוּךָ (14:6) and the three words of like ending in 12:4, viz., הַמְדוּוֹךְ, שְׂגֵעוֹךְ and עִירוֹךְ.* These last three, however, arise out of Deut. 28:28 (which, according to Cornill and Eckardt, is exilic) and therefore are not claimed in proof of Greek origin. The other two find early post-exilic parallels in Zech. 6:14 לְזַפְרוֹךְ and Hag. 2:17 בְּשִׁדְפוֹךְ and וּבִירְקוֹךְ.

5. *The frequent use of the nota accusativi אַת especially with suffixes.* In chs. 9–14 אַת with suffixes occurs but six times: אֹתְכֶם (10:3), אַתְכֶם (11:9), אֹתִי (11:11), אֹתוֹ (11:10; 11:13; 13:9); in Zech. 1–8, on the contrary, nine times: אַחֶם (2:4; 8:8), אַתְכֶם (2:10, 12; 8:13), אַתְּךָ (3:4), אַתְּהָ (5:8), אֹתִי (6:8; 8:14). This unfavorable phenomenon in 9–14 Eckardt endeavors (p. 97) to account for on the part of our author "less through intent than good schooling and subject matter" (cf. Hag. 2:3 אֹתוֹ and 2:17 אַתְכֶם).

6. *Eckardt also observes (p. 98) that the article is strikingly wanting in 9–14 in the following instances: אָדָם (9:1), כִּיבוּסִי (9:7), כְּפָאֵן (9:16), כְּגִבּוֹר (10:7), יַעַר הַבְּצִיר (11:2), שְׁעַר הָרְאשׁוֹן (14:10), כָּל-קִדְשִׁים (14:5), גִּי-הַרִּים (14:5), and לְהַשְׁתַּחֲוֹת לְמִלְכָּה יְהוּדָה (14:16, 17),—in all nine instances. But it is quite possible to reduce this number in importance and value. In four of these cases the absence of the article, if not intentional, may be due to the Massoretic vocalization; e. g., אָדָם (9:1), following the analogy of אָדָם in Isa. 2:9, 11; Deut. 32:8; 2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 11:4; 12:2, 9; 14:2, may be here used in a col-*

lective sense, implying "mankind" in general. Or it may be a corruption of אֲרָם, Syria, in which case the article would be superfluous. Or it may possibly have been omitted on account of the highly poetic character of ch. 9. The proper name כְּבוֹכִי (9:7) without the article also may be explained in one of two ways: either as a mistake of Massoretic vocalization; *e. g.*, כּ may quite as easily be pointed כֶּ (*cf.* Kautzsch-Gesenius, *Gramm.*, 25<sup>te</sup> Aufl., § 126, 3, d); or, the name being singular, the article is not necessary (*cf.* Kautzsch-Gesenius, *Gramm.*, § 125, 2). The form כְּצֹאֵן (9:16) is another doubtful example of the failure of the article. The phrase כְּצֹאֵן עִמּוֹ may mean either "as sheep that are his people" (Steiner), or "as a flock of his people"; both of which are grammatically possible (*cf.* Lowe, p. 88). Or, here again the absence of the article may be laid to the charge of the Massoretet. *Cf.* the parallel cases: Ezek. 36:38 כְּצֹאֵן קָדְשִׁים יְרוּשָׁלַם; Ps. 74:1 מְרִיעִיתָהּ כְּצֹאֵן; and in Zech. 4:7 לְמִישֹׁר. In the case of כְּגִבּוֹר (10:7) parallels are found (*cf.* Kautzsch-Gesenius, *Gramm.*, § 126, 3, d) in Job 16:14 כְּגִבּוֹר for כְּגִבּוֹר, 31:18 כְּאֵב, 38:3 כְּגִבּוֹר, and Ps. 17:12 כְּאֲרִיָה. Furthermore, the article is regularly wanting when the compared subject is already more nearly defined by an attribute, *e. g.*, Isa. 16:2; 14:19; 29:5; Jer. 2:30; Prov. 27:8; Job 30:14. יַעַר הַבְּצוֹר (11:2) is a still more doubtful instance as the necessity of the article depends upon the nature of הַבְּצוֹר whether passive participle or substantive. In case it is a participle the omission of the article before יַעַר is not exceptional, as it expresses the attribute of יַעַר. Kautzsch (*Gramm.*, § 126, 5, Anm. 1, a) explains the absence of the article here and that of the following example advanced by Eckardt, שַׁעַר הָרִאשׁוֹן (14:10), as *regular*. The form כְּלִקְדָשִׁים (14:5) has a parallel in Isa. 28:8. גֵּי־הָרִים (14:5), which Eckardt declares is "ganz abnorm" without the article, falls easily under the rule given by Kautzsch-Gesenius (*Gramm.*, § 126, 5. Anm. 1, a), viz., that the omission of the article may depend upon a regard for *hiatus* before א, ר, ה, *e. g.*, in Zech. 4:7 הָהָר הַגְּדוֹל for הָהָר הַגְּדוֹל (vocative); Ps. 104:18 הָרִים הַגְּבֹהִים (*cf.* 1 Sam. 16:23; Lev. 24:10; Ezek. 34:12; Hag. 1:4; Ps. 143:10; Ezek. 10:9 and Jer. 22:26). One other case remains to be explained, לְהַשְׁתַּחֲוֹת



לְמַלְכֵּי י" (14:16, 17). But here again the omission of the article may be set to the account of the Massoretic punctuation; or, if this be rejected, an exact parallel is found in Ps. 21:1. From an individual study of these words, therefore, it is evident that Zech. 9–14 is not distinguished by a conspicuous absence of the article, as Eckardt claims, and consequently that these prophecies are not necessarily of late origin.

7. *Another characteristic of late Hebrew is the setting forth of the finite verb by means of the Infinitive Absolute; e. g., וְסָפְדוּ וְהָיָה* (12:10). But the Inf. Abs. is employed in setting forth a finite verb even more strikingly in Zech. 1–8 and Haggai; *e. g., וְהִלַּבֵּשׁ . . . וְהִעֲבַרְתִּי* (Zech. 3:4); *כִּי־צִמְתָם וְסָפְדוּ* (Zech. 7:5); *וְזָרְעֵתֶם . . . וְהָבֵא . . . אָכֹל . . . שָׁחוּ . . . לְבוֹשׁ* (Hag. 1:6, with four Inf. Abs.). For examples of the same use of the Inf. Abs. in other pre-Grecian literature, *cf.* Kautzsch-Gesenius, *Gramm.*, §113, 4, a.

8. *Lastly, as another proof of the Grecian origin of Zech. 9–14, Eckardt urges the clumsy diction and weary repetition of these prophecies, especially chs. 12; 13:1–6; 14; e. g., וְיָשְׁבָה וְיָתְהִיָּה* (12:6; 14:10); *לָבָד* (11 times), *בְּמִשְׁפָּחָהּ* (9 times), and *נְשִׂיהָם* (5 times) in 12:12–14, etc. But the unusual idiom concerning Jerusalem, that “she shall dwell in her own place,” is not peculiarly characteristic of 9–14, for a corresponding one occurs in Zech. 6:12 concerning the Branch, *וַיִּמְתָּחֶיךָ וְיִצְמָח* “and he shall grow up out of his own place.” On the other hand, the constant repetition of words is likewise a conspicuous trait of Zech. 1–8; *e. g., עוֹד* (4 times in 1:17), *זָאת* (5 times in 5:5–8), *נָתַן* (3 times in 8:12), *צֹרִים* (4 times in 8:19). *Cf.* also the language of 6:13; 8:14, 15. From this it clearly follows that chs. 9–14 are not necessarily later than chs. 1–8. Neither can it be argued that the word *בְּמִשָּׁא* (9:1; 12:1) is necessarily very late; for already in Jeremiah’s time it was sufficiently familiar to be used in a double sense (*cf.* Jer. 23:33–40). In conclusion, therefore, we are forced to remark that on grounds of the language alone of Zech. 9–14 we are unable to decide that our author wrote “nur in der griechischen Zeit”; but, on the contrary, that he wrote *before* the Grecian times.

II. *The historical data alleged in favor of a Graeco-Maccabean date.*—There are confessedly several passages in Zech. 9–14 which point in the direction of Maccabean times. Wellhausen quotes a remark of Grotius in which he concedes that if he were compelled to dissent from the traditional view and determined the date of Zech. 9–14 by the clear references to the facts of history, these prophecies would have to be assigned to a period not earlier than the time of the Maccabees. The principal and most decisive passages which favor a late date are:

1. *Zech. 14:9*, “*And the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall the Lord be one and his name one.*” This passage, according to Stade (*ZATW.*, 1880–1, p. 169) not only pictures the congregation in Deutero-Zechariah’s time as a theocracy with Jerusalem as the centre; but contains a polemic against the conditions in Greek times when all gods were conceived of as only different representations of one and the same God. It betrays also, he thinks, a repetition concerning Jehovah and his being which was alone then possible. To Jeremiah the gods of foreign peoples were the enemies of God’s people; to Deutero-Isaiah, as no gods; but to Deutero-Zechariah the heathen all worship the true God, but only under different names—hence Hellenic; and accordingly opposed to Mal. 1:11, which pictures the Jews as not yet having learned to respect heathen gods. Such is Stade’s interpretation of 14:9. But, on the contrary, the post-exilic congregation was as truly a theocracy after the return from exile as in the period subsequent to Alexander’s conquest. And the fact that God alone was ruler of his people was, as Stade really admits, the foundation thought of post-exilic Judaism. Indeed it was the basis of the Mosaic religion from the earliest time, as Grützmacher (p. 34) suggests; however, not in the sense that it was after the exile. Then Israel knew no king but God. Zerubbabel was but a governor פְּקִידָה of Judah (Hag. 1:14; 2:2, 21); and never until the time of Aristobulus I. (105 B. C.) did any ruler ever venture to assume the title of king. The Jewish colony after the Restoration were more of a religious sect than a political organization. Zechariah often pictures the close relation of Jehovah to his people (2:14–16; 8:3, 23), and our prophet also describes similar conditions. The “yearning for a fuller

theocracy," which Cheyne (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 120) discovers in Zech. 9–14, is thoroughly consistent with the yearning of a struggling congregation in a land of forsaken idols shortly after the return from exile. The passage indeed does contain "an unusually clear and decided expression of Jewish monotheism," as Wellhausen (p. 195) expresses it, but the idea of monotheism was by no means a new idea in Grecian times. Already the decree of Cyrus was given in the name of "Jehovah, God of heaven" (Ezr. 1:1–4); not that Cyrus worshiped Jehovah under the Jewish name, but that the same God of heaven was at that time known by different names. Later, Jehovah is spoken of as "the Lord of all the earth" (Zech. 6:5). And still later a prophet declares that in all nations the Jews are offering acceptable incense to God, but not so in Jerusalem. This is the meaning of Mal. 1:11; and consequently is in no sense polemicised by our author. Stade's view is therefore incorrect, and the force of his whole argument in favor of the Greek origin of this passage is materially weakened. Kuiper (pp. 110, 132) and Staerk (pp. 98, 99) decline to follow Stade in this instance, declaring with Grützmacher (pp. 34, 35) that the same fundamental thought lies at the basis of both Mal. 1:11 and Zech. 14:9. Further, they see no evidence whatever in Zech. 14:9 of a Greek date for these prophecies.

2. *Zech. 12:2 b.* **וְגַם עַל־יְהוּדָה יִהְיֶה בְּמִצּוֹר עַל־יְרוּשָׁלַם**, which, interpreted by Stade, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Rubinkam and others, means, "And Judah also (forced by the enemy) shall be in the siege against Jerusalem." To Stade this is a proof that the children of the Diaspora had served as soldiers. To Wellhausen it is a description of the hostile relations which actually existed between the city and the country in the beginning of the Maccabean uprising. To another, a parallel passage is found in the book of Enoch (ch. 90:16); viz., "All the eagles and vultures and ravens and kites (*i. e.*, Gentiles) assembled together and brought with them all the sheep of the field (*i. e.*, the apostate Jews of Judea), and they all came together and helped each other to break that horn of the ram (Judas Maccabeus)." The validity of all these claims, however, depends upon the exegesis of Zech. 12:2 *b.*; whether or not Judah is really forced to engage in actual

conflict with the enemy against Jerusalem. It is obvious at once from the present text, that in order to get a subject for  $\text{יְהִיָּה}$  the  $\text{עַל}$  before  $\text{יְהִיָּה}$  is to be cancelled (with Targum, Kuenen, Stade, Wellhausen, Geiger, Marti, Rubinkam and others). The passage then translated reads, "And Judah also shall take part in the siege against Jerusalem"; but this is ambiguous, being capable of the interpretation above mentioned, viz., that Judah shall fight against Jerusalem, but likewise that *Judah shall be besieged*. The latter we take to be the true meaning of the passage and for these reasons: (a) The verb  $\text{יָהָה}$  in connection with  $\text{בַּמְצוֹר}$  implies the passive as in Ezek. 4:3,  $\text{וְהָיְתָה בַּמְצוֹר}$ , "and she (Jerusalem) shall be besieged." Thus in Zech. 12:2 b, as one nation might besiege Jerusalem (a city), so *all* nations, coming up, are practically going to besiege Judah. (b) The LXX. has  $\text{καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἔσται περιοχὴ ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ}$ , which makes Judah the field of battle, and nowhere hints that Judah is opposed to Jerusalem. The *Beth essentia* before  $\text{בַּמְצוֹר}$  indicates that in the mind of the translator the siege was to take place in Judah, *i. e.*, that the conflict was not so much a siege as an open battle (*cf.* Lowe, p. 107). The Koptic version makes this interpretation still more certain by inserting a  $\text{καὶ}$  before  $\text{ἔσται}$  (*cf.* Schulte, *Quartalschr.*, 1895). (c) The context favors this interpretation. Judah is described (12:5, 6) as placing confidence in Jerusalem and then as becoming victorious over the nations, without anywhere hinting that Judah has changed sides or betrayed the enemy. In 12:7 also the prophet makes the interests of Judah and Jerusalem one. This is so evident, that in order to accept of the hypothesis that Judah fights against Jerusalem, Wellhausen (pp. 188 sq.) is forced to throw out this verse as a later interpolation. He also changes  $\text{יְשׁוּרָאֵל}$  in 11:14 to  $\text{יְרוּשָׁלַם}$  in order that the text may read, "break the brotherhood between Judah and Jerusalem." Kuiper's emendations  $\text{יְהִיָּה}$  for  $\text{יְהִיָּה}$ , etc., are quite as arbitrary and unnecessary. Hence as a matter of fact the context does not allow of our thinking that Judah fights against Jerusalem. (d) Further, the parallel passage in Zech. 14:14 (which Wellhausen needlessly transposes to ch. 12) confirms our interpretation of 12:2 b. There the verb  $\text{לָחַם}$  with  $\text{בְּ}$  occurs before the proper name Jerusalem. This construction  $\text{לָחַם}$  with

ב before the name of a city, usually signifies "at," not "against." If the author had wished to express the thought that Judah will fight *against* Jerusalem, he would have said תִּלְחֶם עַל־יְרוּשָׁלַם instead of תִּלְחֶם בְּיְרוּשָׁלַם (cf. Isa. 7:1; 2 Kgs. 12:18; 19:8; Jer. 34:22; 37:8). On the exegesis of Zech. 12:2 *b*, cf. Orelli (pp. 347, 359).

With this interpretation of Zech. 12:2 *b* the alleged parallel in Enoch 90:16 falls away. Moreover, in any case, the language is too obscure and its own interpretation is too uncertain. At best it is a mere coincidence and consequently proves nothing. The commonest traits of Enoch are entirely wanting in Zech. 12:2 *sq.*; e. g., there is no mention of the Chasids or Asideans, who existed as a party for some time before the Maccabean uprising (cf. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, pp. 249 *sq.*); and who, though generally in support of Judas, yet at times were actually antagonistic to him (1 Macc. 7:13). The Chasids defended the law; so long, therefore, as Judas and the Maccabean family endeavored to re-establish the theocracy, so long they carried with them the support of the Chasids; but the moment they laid hands on the high-priesthood, from that moment began the alienation of the Chasids which afterwards developed into a deadly hostility. And further also, as Wellhausen observes (p. 190), though hostile relations actually did exist between the city and the country in the beginning of the Maccabean uprising, "no characteristic of the prophecy under discussion in reality agrees with the conditions of that time. The Maccabees were not the Jews of the low land and they did not join themselves with the heathen out of hatred to the city of Jerusalem, in order finally to fall treacherously upon their companions in war. There is not the slightest hint in our passage of religious persecution; that alone decides, and hence the most important sign of Maccabean times is wanting." Furthermore, it should be observed that the apocalyptic restoration of Israel *as a nation* in ch. 14, is quite incongruous with the later claims of the *individual* as portrayed in the literature of the 2d century B. C., e. g., in the Book of Enoch (cf. Charles, pp. 22, 23).

3. *Zech. 12:12-14, the house of David and the house of Levi.* Stade endeavors to show from this passage that the

coördinate position here assigned to the house of Levi beside the house of David is not only a clear proof that Zech. 9-14 is *post-exilic*, but also *Greek*. He allows that the house of Levi before the Grecian times was already of far greater importance than the house of David; but he claims that it was due to the ancient traditions in favor of the royal house that kept the priesthood (especially in *writings*) in a position of subordination. But, the following observations are to be noted in connection with 12:12-14: (a) *The definition of the author's terms*. It is generally admitted that by the house of David the author intends the government as in Ps. 122:5 (*cf.* Wellhausen, p. 191), and by the house of Levi, the priesthood (*cf.* Mal. 2:4-7, in which Levites are priests). The prophet accordingly divides the community into two parts—the political and the ecclesiastical. He then subdivides these. The house of Nathan he makes a further specialization of the house of David (*cf.* 2 Sam. 5:14), and the house of Shimei, a further specialization of the house of Levi (*cf.* Num. 3:21). By this division the prophet embraces the highest and the lowest in both the civil and religious orders of society. From this division we get an indication of the author's aim and date. (b) *The author's aim*. His aim evidently is to describe how the entire land shall be affected by the murder in 12:10. Every stratum of society shall mourn, he declares, from the highest to the lowest of both political and ecclesiastical ranks of the community. (c) *The author's date*. If the date of our prophet can be determined at all from this passage, it must depend entirely upon the division he makes of society, as the mere mention of the houses of David and Levi can not decide. Such a division would have been absolutely meaningless, according to our opinion, had our prophet lived and written after the priesthood had acquired temporal power in the Graeco-Maccabean age. Indeed such a division of society would lose its fullest import if the author had lived long after the restoration from exile. For (a) after Zerubbabel the house of David fell into comparative obscurity and continued to lose power and influence more and more, until in the time of the Maccabees it was entirely eclipsed. (β) It was during the construction of the temple, as far as we know, that the hopes of Israel centered in both the

royal and sacerdotal houses (*cf.* Zech. 4:9; 6:12, 13). Hence in keeping with these conditions our prophet places them side by side, giving precedence to David because of the historic and Messianic prestige of the house of David, in the same manner in which the prophet Haggai always places the name Zerubbabel before that of Joshua (1:1, 12, 14; 2:4, *cf.* Ezr. 5:2). ( $\gamma$ ) Moreover, the hopes expressed in the context practically render it impossible to make these prophecies late: *e. g.*, the hope contained in 12:8, in which the feeble of Jerusalem are described as becoming in that day as David, etc. Such a hope is absolutely inexplicable in Grecian times, for the house of David had at that time lost too much of its power and glory to inspire a prophet with such a comparison. Again, the promise contained in 9:9 bears upon our passage. It is there clearly indicated that the prophet looked for a *Davidic* Messiah to come. The great leaders of the Maccabees, however, were not of the house of David but of the tribe of Levi (*cf.* Lowe, p. 111): accordingly we must conclude that when the prophet wrote, the house of David was still in possession of considerable prestige and political power. Kuenen sees no proof of Greek origin in this passage.

4. *Zech. 10:10, 11, Assyria and Egypt.* (This passage, singularly enough, is also one of the strongest proofs in support of the pre-exilic hypothesis). Stade maintains (p. 291), "that, by Egypt the kingdom of the Ptolemies is to be understood is self-evident. And just as sure, though vigorously disputed, is it that Assyria must be taken to mean Syria, which it also means in Isa. 27:12, 13 and Ps. 83:9." Consequently he concludes (p. 306), that Deutero-Zechariah lived after 306 B. C.—the date of the first Ptolemy (*cf.* Wellhausen, p. 183). Rubinkam quotes Herodotus (7:63) who says concerning Syria, "the people whom the Greeks call Syrians are called Assyrians by the barbarians." Guthe (*Lectures on O. T. Introd.*, MS.) maintains further that Assyria and Egypt are here described by Deutero-Zechariah not as a *unit*, as they were under Alexander, but as independent kingdoms such as they were after the division under the Ptolemies and Seleucidae in 306 B. C. (*cf.* Mic. 5:4, 5). But there are serious objections to this late date. (*a*) The alleged parallel passages (Isa. 27:12, 13; Ps. 83:9; Mic. 5:4, 5) are most probably earlier than 306 B. C.

as allowed by the most liberal of modern scholars. The popular date, *e. g.*, assigned to Isa. 27 is the *early* post-exilic period (Driver, Dillmann, Ewald, Kuenen, Oort, Delitzsch, and others); and the Greek origin of Mic. 5:4, 5 and Ps. 83 is equally improbable (*cf.* Delitzsch, *Commentary on Psalms*). This argument, therefore, viewed from a critical point of view rests upon an uncertainty. (b) Exegetically also, Stade's conclusion is doubtful. For granted that these passages from Isaiah, Micah, and Ps. 83 could be proven to be of Greek origin, it would still remain to be shown that in the use of the names Assyria and Egypt they furnish an analogy to our passage in hand. Grützmacher denies that אַשּׁוּר in the O. T. ever means Syria (but *cf.* Nöldeke, *Zeitschr. für Assyriologie*, I., pp. 268-273); and Kuiper (p. 134), though he admits that Egypt might mean the Ptolemies, holds that it is doubtful whether אַשּׁוּר means the Seleucidae. He, therefore, finally concludes that Assyria means here the Persian monarchy, and that Assyria and Egypt together refer to the different parts of the Persian kingdom. Kuenen maintains (p. 413) that Stade's "claim is entirely unproven." According to our opinion, there is positive biblical proof for interpreting Assyria to mean *Persia*. For example in Ezr. 6:22 the King of Persia is unmistakably called the "King of Assyria." This passage, we maintain, is a legitimate parallel to Zech. 10:10, 11, and of itself is sufficient to justify an interpretation of our passage in keeping with Persian times. But there are also reasons for thinking that the ancient names Assyria and Babylon lingered in the memories of exilic and post-exilic writers (*cf.* Kuiper p. 134), and that they were used by them to express new conditions. Thus Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, is called in 2 Kgs. 23:29 "King of Assyria;" Cyrus, King of Persia is spoken of in Ezr. 5:13 as "King of Babylon," so also Artaxerxes, King of Persia, is called in Neh. 13:6 "King of Babylon." In a similar manner the term "Assyrians" is employed where "Babylonians" is intended (*cf.* Jer. 2:18; Lam. 5:6). A like use of ancient names for modern conditions is pointed out by McCurdy (*History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, I., p. 158, 1894), in the case of "Canaan"—the ancient name of Palestine—which long after the Hebrews occupied the land still



clung to it and was used instead of "land of Israel" (*cf.* 1 Sam. 13:19, 2 Kgs. 6:23, Isa. 19:24). In explanation of this McCurdy remarks, "the ancient appellation was not excluded, inasmuch as the Bible interests itself primarily not in *places*, but in their *inhabitants*." This we claim holds true in the case of our prophecy, especially 10:11. (c) Again, the context is opposed to Stade's interpretation. In 10:10 Egypt and Assyria are spoken of as the lands to which the people of Ephraim had been banished and from which they were to be brought back to Gilead and Lebanon (*cf.* Zech. 8:7, where it is said they shall be brought back from the east country and the west country, as in Isa. 43:5, 6; 49:12; *cf.* also Hos. 7:16; 8:13; 9:3, 6; 11:5, 11, which predict their places of banishment). The allusion in Zech. 10:10, therefore, is naturally to ancient Egypt and ancient Assyria. If so, it is unreasonable to suppose that the prophet in the next verse under the same terminology refers to the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies. And the fact that the prophet here mentions the "pride" of Assyria and the "scepter" of Egypt does not necessarily place him after 306 B.C., when these countries were no longer a unit under Alexander the Great; for, in 9:6 our prophet speaks also of the "pride" of Philistia, and as a matter of history the "scepter" of Egypt was actually taken away by Darius in 517 B.C. On the other hand, the prominence with which Egypt is referred to in 14:19 points rather to Persian than Greek times; for then Egypt in consequence of her perpetual efforts to throw off the Persian yoke, was naturally brought under the observation of the Jews in Palestine who repeatedly beheld the Persian armies passing on their way to the valley of the Nile. Hence we maintain that Zech. 10:10, 11 is not a witness to the Græco-Maccabean origin of these prophecies.

5. *Zech. 9:13, the Sons of Greece.* "*For I have bent Judah for me. I have filled the bow with Ephraim: and I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and will make thee as the sword of a mighty man.*" This is the chief and all-important passage in support of the post-Zecharian hypothesis. More emphasis is placed upon this passage than upon all others together. Kuiper, *e. g.*, (p. 160) in summing up throws the whole weight of his argument in favor of a Greek date on this verse.

Wellhausen (p. 183) makes it decide the date of these prophecies, while Stade (II., p. 275) declares that the announcement of the  $\text{בְּנֵי יָוָן}$  is *alone* sufficient to prove that these prophecies are after 333 B. C. It is, in short, claimed that we are no longer in the Assyrian, nor the Chaldean, nor indeed the Persian times, but in the Grecian. Two things are especially emphasized in connection with this important passage: (a) that the Sons of Javan are the world-power of Deutero-Zechariah's day, *i. e.*, the Græco-Maccabean world-power; and (b) that they are the enemies of Zion. But in opposition to these claims it should be observed (a) that the Sons of Javan are but *one* of several world-powers within the range of our prophet's horizon (*cf.* 9:1-7, Syria, Phœnicia, Philistia; 12:2 *sq.*, 14:2 *sq.*, all nations, and 10:10, 11 Assyria and Egypt; *cf.* also Hag. 2:22, 23). (b) That the Greeks under Alexander were *not* "the enemies of Zion," and did not fight against the Jews but against the Persians.

In discussing this passage, it is useless to question the genuineness of Zech. 9:13, as Kuenen does (*Einleit.* § 81, n 6), or call it a gloss of Maccabean times, as Kirkpatrick (*Doctr. of Prophets*, pp. 472-3); for the mention of the Sons of Greece is so characteristic of the whole section in which it stands and is so interwoven with the very texture of the entire ninth chapter that to eliminate it destroys the prophet's message concerning the "king of Zion" (9:9). The defeat of Javan inaugurates the Messianic age. Hence we propose to treat 9:13 as an integral portion of the entire context. We are unable, however, to agree with those who advocate its Græco-Maccabean origin. The following reasons have led us, after considerable study, to the conclusion that it is Persian. (a) The prophecy, according to our opinion, is far too indefinite to have been uttered just after the invasion of Alexander the Great (*vs.* Kuiper). No such vague description, or allusion to the march of Alexander can be found elsewhere, so far as we are aware, in all literature. (b) The passage does not describe a *victory* for the Sons of Javan, but rather a *defeat*. This fact in itself is enough to render Kuiper's hypothesis improbable. (c) Stade's interpretation rests on the hypothesis that 9:1-7 describes the expedition of Seleucis; but, as Kuiper remarks in answer to Rubinkam, any one of a half-dozen invasions of Palestine from north to

south would satisfy the description quite as well; *e. g.*, that of Shalmaneser II., or of Nebuchadnezzar (*cf.* Grützmacher, pp. 37–40). (*d*) Zech. 9:11, 12 contains an appeal to those still in exile to return, which, according to our opinion, would have been quite meaningless after the conquest of Alexander; and indeed after Ezra and Nehemiah not so appropriate as earlier. (*e*) In short, 9:13–17 as a whole is not a picture of actual war, but rather an apocalyptic vision of the struggle of Israel with the world-power of the West,—hence its indefinite character and its figurative language.

It is objected, however, that in Zechariah's days the Greeks were still unimportant and had not as yet assumed the rôle of a world-power (Driver). This statement is not supported, however, by all the facts of Scripture and history. In the literature of the Old Testament, for example, Javan appears as a nation of considerable importance before the beginning of the 5th century B. C. In Gen. 10:2 (assigned to P<sup>g</sup>, which, according to Dillmann, Kuenen, Budde, Wellhausen, Cornill, Kautzsch, and others, was written before 500 B. C.) Javan occurs as one of the seven sons of Japheth. In Isa. 66:19 (exilic, according to Driver, Dillmann, Doederlein, Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, deWette, Gesenius, Hitzig, Ewald, and Kuenen; or, shortly after the Restoration—König, Ryssel, and Bleek), Javan is mentioned as one of the remote peoples who had not heard of the fame or seen the glory of the Jewish Jehovah. In Ezek. 27:13 (confessedly exilic) Javan is represented as in commercial relations with Phœnicia. In Joel 4:6 (by many pre-exilic, but doubtful), Javan is a market where the Phœnicians and Philistines found sale for Jewish slaves. Further, in Gen. 10:1–5 “the isles,” or coast lands are mentioned as among the Sons of Javan. In Ezek. 39:6 fire is sent “on Magog and them that dwell securely in the isles.” In Zeph. 2:11, “even all the isles of the nations” are represented as worshipping Jehovah. In Isa. 59:18 the Lord is going to pour out his fury upon his adversaries, yea “to the islands he will repay recompense.” The cause is not stated, but for some reason Jehovah is about to visit the isles with fury. From these passages it is to be observed, (*a*) that Javan is conceived of as a distant but important nation before the beginning of the 5th century B. C.;

(b) that our prophet in Zech. 9:13 is moving within the sphere of acknowledged earlier prophecies; and (c) that he reëchoes the spirit of the former prophets.

Turning to history we obtain more light. (Cf. Nöldeke, *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*, 1887, translated in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, IX. ed., article "Persia:" and Duncker, *Geschichte des Altertums*). Darius Hystaspes was elevated to the throne of Persia in 521 B. C., and ruled 36 years (521–486). His seat was not firm at first (Herodotus 3:127). From the Behistûn inscription we learn that at his accession the empire was in an unsettled condition. One province after another made insurrection against the central government. Nöldeke records twelve different revolts which happened in the first three years (521–519) of Darius' reign, principally in the north and east. The west alone remained quiet, but it was partly in the hands of governors of doubtful loyalty. In 518, however, Darius was compelled to move westward at the head of the royal armies. In 517 Aryandes, governor of Egypt, was removed for having assumed the royal privilege of minting money (cf. Wiedemann, *Gesch.*, p. 236). But the king's visit to Egypt was cut short by the disturbances of the Greeks, who, like the Egyptians, were the perpetual haters of Persian domination. According to Duncker (IV., p. 491, and VI., p. 496), in the year 516 the Greeks of the Hellespont and Bosphorus with the island of Samos were made to submit to Persian rule. The next year (515) Darius led an expedition against the Scythians across the Danube, the failure of which encouraged the Ionians subsequently to revolt. In 500 B. C. the great Ionian revolt took place. In 499, Sardis, the most important stronghold for Persia in Asia Minor, was burned by the Athenians. An army was dispatched by Darius to restore the Persian frontier. In 493 the islands of the Ægean were recovered, but the Greeks were hard to suppress. The next three years were spent in planning an invasion of Greece. Immense preparations were made, as the undertaking was considered prodigious. Soldiers were drawn from all parts of the empire, but to no purpose. In 490 Marathon was fought and Persia was conquered. That defeat marks a turning point in the current of the world's history. The Sons of Javan on the plain of Marathon met the largest and strongest and

best organized of Oriental monarchies and came off victorious. Persia rallied, but never really recovered from the shock. Decimated but not vanquished, preparations were begun for a renewed attack on this new world-power. But as the army was about ready to start on a second campaign into Greece, Egypt revolted and the projected invasion was necessarily postponed. Before Egypt was again reduced Darius died (486 B. C.). Xerxes succeeded to the throne and attempted to carry out his father's project to reduce Greece, but like him was disappointed. His defeat at Salamis in 480 B. C. need not be rehearsed, nor need we sketch the history of Javan further. Enough has been related to show that already in the reign of Darius Hystaspes, the Sons of Greece were a world-power. Not that Greece was *the* world-power of Darius' reign, but that it was *a* world-power and a *threatening* world-power. Zech. 9-14 does not demand that we should think of Greece as the *only* world-power of the prophet's day. The prophet betrays rather a feeling of insecurity from all quarters, which indicates that a general upheaval was taking place. The Sons of Javan were but one of Israel's enemies in the prophet's day, but the Sons of Javan, at the same time, were of great importance, inasmuch as the victory over them carried with it so momentous Messianic interests. The language of ch. 9 is vague and, in our judgment, too vague and too indefinite to have been uttered after Marathon (490 B. C.), or even after the burning of Sardis (500 B. C.); for in that case, the author would have been influenced more by Greece and less by the movements and commotions of the nations. Accordingly we are inclined to believe that our prophet most probably lived in the period before the revolt of the Ionians and the burning of Sardis by the Athenians. Or, more definitely, in view of the political insecurity which these prophecies reflect throughout, that he lived in the time when Darius' armies were moving westward to protect Persian interests in Egypt and Asia Minor, *i. e.*, in the period from 518 till 516 B. C.

How admirably these years suit the character and contents of these prophecies will be manifest from what follows. Not that all the events of Zech. 9-14 can be fitted into and explained by the history of these three years, for this is impossible on any hypothesis, whether pre-exilic or post-Zecharian; but, what to us

is far more important, the events of these three years have left an unmistakable impress upon these confessedly obscure oracles, which must be recognized. We make no attempt to square all the prophetic statements of our author by the facts of history, nor do we presume to interpret any given passage in such a manner that it may meet the requirements of the *greatest* event of its kind in all history; but on the contrary, we have endeavored to grasp first the spirit of the author's oracles, and then to trace, as far as possible, their source and inspiration in history. We have in this way become convinced that our author does not reflect the spirit of his alleged contemporaries in pre-exilic times; nor, on the other hand, breathe the atmosphere of the Jewish theocracy in Græco-Maccabean times; but that he does reflect, on the contrary, the last three years before the dedication of the temple (518–516 B. C.).

Our principal reasons for thinking that these prophecies reflect the events of this period are these:

1. *The temple was still in process of construction.* This is seen (a) *in the Messianic and eschatological character of these prophecies.* In no period was the Jewish mind more aglow with Messianic hope and expectation than in the period just after the return from exile (*cf.* Wellhausen, p. 174), but especially when the temple was reaching completion. Then the hopes of the theocracy practically knew no bound (Zech. 6:12, 13). Their expectations became ideal. The vision, for example, of all nations coming up to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles (ch. 14) is in the highest degree ideal, and was most probably inspired by the hope that when the temple should be completed Zion would become the center of the world's religious life. The author makes no attempt to "plunge into Jewish ceremonial legality" (*cf.* Delitzsch, *Mess. Proph.*, p. 223,) "but only develops a thought already expressed in the old prophetic word (Isa. 2:2 *sq.*; Mic. 4:1 *sq.*)," hence the objection raised by Kautzsch (*Stud. u. Krit.*, p. 777, 1890; *Die heil. Schrift., etc.*, p. 203) and Graetz (*JQR.*, p. 211, 1891), that this vision of Zech. 14 must be later than Ezra and Nehemiah, as not until then did the precept to "dwell in booths" come to be generally observed (Neh. 8:14–17) is groundless. (b) *In the fact that the prophet bases his exhorta-*

tions for the present on the history of the past (11:1-3; 11:4-17; 10:2 sq.; 9:14 sq.; 14:20, 21). This is exceedingly important, inasmuch as it reveals the prophet's method. Haggai and Zechariah employed the same method (Hag. 1:6, 9; 2:3; Zech. 1:4-6; 7:7, 12, *cf.* Borchert, *Stud. u. Krit.*, II., 1895, pp. 228, 247 sq.). Our prophet frequently emphasizes his message to Israel by referring to their experience in the past. And here again, according to our opinion, no period would so readily suggest this method of exhortation or warrant its use, as a time in which the prophet had before him the actual ruins of Israel's former splendor. (c) *In the fact that the prophet makes Israel's chief interests center in Jerusalem* (9:8-12; 12:2-11; 13:1; 14:2, 8-17, 21). This is also the case in Zech. (1:12-17; 2:6, 8, 16; 8:3, 4, 8, 15, 22), and no period could more naturally have caused a prophet to think and speak thus than when the colony was small and dwelt in Jerusalem and the near vicinity. But further, three times the prophet assures his hearers that "Jerusalem shall again be inhabited in her place" (12:6; 14:10, 11)—a thought which, it must be admitted, would have been quite superfluous after the city had been rebuilt and surrounded by walls (*cf.* again, Zech. 1:16, 17; 2:8, 16; 8:4, 8). (d) *In the fact that certain allusions are best explained in these times.* (a) Zech. 9:9, 10; 14:9. In the first of these passages it is stated that the dominion of the Messiah shall extend "from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth;" and in the second that "Jehovah shall be king over the whole earth." Of Alexander the Great could it hardly be said that his dominion should reach only "from sea to sea," for it extended indefinitely into Europe, Asia, and Africa. Of Xerxes it was not the case; nor of Cyrus, for he had no power in Egypt; nor even of Darius after the battle Marathos, for his dominion was then crippled; but of Darius in the period between 518 and 516 the description is exact, for then his dominion did extend from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the earth, and he was king (as far as the Jews of Jerusalem understood) of the whole earth. This is an important observation because these thoughts are of such paramount consequence to the prophet. (β) 9:1-8 is a proof of the prophet's confidence that Jerusalem would not be molested. It mattered not if the royal armies were humbling

Syria, Phœnicia and Philistia on their way to Egypt, they would not harm Jerusalem for she was a loyal Persian city. (γ) 9:12 reflects the hope of the prophet as he addresses the remaining Jews in Babylon and bids them return to the stronghold,—prisoners of hope, אֲסִירֵי הַתְּקוּהָה. (δ) 9:15 and 14:20 refer to the מִזְבֵּחַ, built by the Jews shortly after their arrival in 536 B. C. (Ezr. 3:2). (ε) 13:2-6 is especially appropriate to the period of temple-building, when the people saw the idols of their forefathers prostrate about them and were assured by the prophet that the day would come when every vestige of idolatry and false prophecy would disappear out of the land; “the mention of teraphim and soothsayers (10:2) would be,” as Kautzsch (*Die heil. Schrift*, p. 204) remarks, “very strange in Grecian times.” (ζ) 14:10 does not describe the “gates” of the Jerusalem of Nehemiah’s time, *e. g.*, the שַׁעַר בְּנֵימִין is mentioned in Jer. 37:13, 38:7 and Zech. 14:10, but not in Neh. 3; and the שַׁעַר הַפְּנִים, which occurs also in 2 Kgs. 14:13, 2 Chron. 26:9, Jer. 31:38, was a gate in the *first* wall of Jerusalem, according to Guthe (*Zeits. deutsch. Pal. Vereins*, VIII., p. 280. (η) 14:18 particularizes Egypt, but this is explained by Darius’ prolonged attempt to win the loyalty of the Egyptians by moderating the taxes and ordering, according to Polyænus, a canal to be built between the Nile and the Red Sea. All these passages point more or less definitely to the period just before the completion and dedication of the temple in 516 B. C. Even chapter 11 finds its best historic setting in these years, for, as we have shown, the author was arguing on the basis of the past.\* And we further maintain that our author more truly reflects the political conditions of these years (518-516), than the prophet Zechariah does the historical events of the years 521-518. These were the years when Darius with the royal armies was putting down insurrection after insurrection in the north and east; yet Zechariah says in ch. 1:11, that “all the earth sitteth still and is at rest,”—a statement which was only relatively true, *i. e.*, true for the congregation in Jerusalem.†

\* According to Eichhorn (*Einleit.* IV., p. 449), “chapters 11:1-13:6 have no contents by which we can determine the period of their authorship,”

† Kosters’ idea (*Theolog. Tijds.*, I., 1895, pp. 353-84) that Zech. 1:11 and Hag. 2:18 are witnesses against the restoration of Israel under Cyrus, and consequently, that the first return



2. *Negatively also, there are proofs that Zech. 9-14 were delivered before 516 B. C., e. g., (a) the entire absence of any sort of allusion, direct or indirect, to the revolt of Javan (500 B. C.), to the victories of Greece over Persia (490-480), to Ezra and Nehemiah, to the Great Synagogue, to Alexander the Great, to the influences of Greek civilization and Greek thought, to the growing claims of the individual as opposed to the nation (cf. the Wisdom of Solomon), make it improbable that our author lived after these events. Again (b) the absence of any direct rebuke of glaring sins such as we find in Mal., e. g., the offering of polluted bread (Mal. 1:7), profaning the table of the Lord (1:12), sacrificing the lame and the sick (1:13, 14), causing to stumble at the law, corrupting the covenant of Levi (2:8), dealing treacherously every man against his brother (2:10, 11), even with the wife of his youth (2:14), the putting away of wives (2:16), practicing sorcery, committing adultery and swearing falsely (3:5); or, as in Nehemiah's time, neglecting the Levitical tithes (Neh. 13:10), forsaking the house of the Lord (13:11), treading wine-presses and bearing burdens on the Sabbath (13:15, 16), and marrying wives of the heathen (13:23)—the absence of all allusion to any of these sins of the later post-exilic congregations, leads to the conclusion, not only that the prophet prophesied before the people had fallen into these sins, but that our prophet spoke to *encourage*, not to rebuke, and that his chief aim was, in the midst of surrounding opposition, to inspire Israel to finish the house of the Lord.\**

#### IV.

##### THE INTEGRITY OF ZECHARIAH 9-14.

In the examination of the two hypotheses (the pre-exilic and the post-Zecharian) which has hitherto been made, it is clear that in order to find any really suitable historic setting for these last

from exile must have taken place in the time of Ezra, has too little in its favor to warrant our further notice here. Cf. B. D. Eerdman's article, "De historische Achtergrond van Zach. 1-8" (*Theolog. Tijds.* I., 1895, pp. 152-184).

\* Stade's objection (II., p. 163) that Deutero-Zechariah must have lived after Ezra because though showing acquaintance with the law he makes no attempt to introduce it, assumes that no prophet writing before Ezra could betray familiarity with the law without at the same time showing a marked tendency to extend its influence—an assumption which is entirely unwarranted. The prophet's motive was not legal or political, but moral and religious, and as such was in perfect keeping with the years of temple-building.

six chapters of Zechariah, both hypotheses are embarrassed (especially the former) by the necessity of separating these prophecies into two or more parts and of assigning them to different periods. Individuals differ, however, as to where the divisions shall be made. Rubinkam suggests a break after ch. 9:10; Bleek, at the end of ch. 9; Paulus adds 10:1 to ch. 9; Graetz separates ch. 14 from the rest; Montet and Sharpe divide the whole into five distinct, independent oracles. Staerk excerpts two small sections (11:4-17; 13:7-9) from the body of the prophecy and assigns them to a different age. The majority are content with an almost equal division in two halves (9-11; 12-14). A few representatives of both schools, however, being unwilling to carry the process of dissection quite so far, maintain the integrity of 9-14 at any cost. These are Hitzig, Rosenmüller, Pressel, and Davidson of the pre-exilic school; and Stade, Cornill, Cheyne, Delitzsch, Kuiper, and Wellhausen of the post-Zecharian.

1. *Against Rubinkam*, who divides ch. 9:1-10 from the rest, and observes that the author in 1 Maccabees also springs over a period of 150 years, from Alexander the Great to Antiochus Epiphanes, it may be shown with Cornill, (a) that the "brotherhood" in 11:14 implies, and is explained by ch. 9 where it is taken for granted. (b) And with Wellhausen that the "sons of Ephraim" בְּנֵי־עֵפְרַיִם (10:7) are as little differentiated from Ephraim, as the "foal of an ass" (9:9) from ass; which shows a similarity in mode of expression. (c) But especially the idea contained in 9:8, that "no more" shall Israel be disturbed by the enemy. In 14:11 there is no more utter destruction; in 14:21 no more Canaanites are to be found in the house of the Lord; and in 13:2 no more idols. (d) Various expressions in language bind 9:1-10 to the remaining parts: *e. g.*, כְּטִיטְ הַדּוּצִיּוֹת (9:3; 10:5), קִשְׁתֹּךָ (9:10, 13) נֶאֱמָר (9:6; 10:11; 11:3), the use of גַּם (9:7; 11:12), also אֶלֶף בְּיַהֲדוּדָה (9:7) quoted in 12:5, 6 with an implied parenthesis "of whom I spoke before." (e) Moreover, as Ewald observes, the paragraph beginning with 9:9 ends at 10:2. Hence the proposed division of Rubinkam at 9:10 is practically impossible.

2. *Against Bleek*, who divides ch. 9 from ch. 10, it is obvious that the blessings alluded to in 9:17 are closely connected

with those alluded to in 10:1, 2, being of the same temporal character. For this reason Paulus (III., p. 120 *sq.*) joins 10:1 to ch. 9. The uncommon expression פְּבוֹי־יָיִן occurs in 9:15 and again 10:7. Chapter 9:14–16 also finds a close parallel in 10:5. In the one case arrow, trumpet and sling-stones bring victory; in the other, superior zeal, for they tread down their enemies in the mire of the streets (*cf.* 10:5 and 9:3). Stade observes a further characteristic common to these chapters, *viz.*, “to announce a fact and then give reasons for it.” For example, in 9:9 the liberation of Zion from the heathen and the conversion of the heathen to the Messiah are first announced and then the events leading up to it are described (*vs.* 11–17). So in 10:6, 7 the return of Ephraim is first announced as a result, and then the means of its accomplishment are explained in *vs.* 8–12. For similar reasons, Eichhorn (*Eintl.* IV., p. 479) pronounced chs. 9 and 10 a unit.

3. *Against Staerk*, who separates chs. 11:4–17; 13:7–9 from the remaining portions by a space in time of 150 years, on the following grounds: (*a*) the author of 11:15, he says, appears as a prophet, but the author of 13:2–6 will not be a prophet. (*b*) The author of 11:4 *sq.*, is full of vain scolding and is pessimistic through and through; Deutero-Zechariah, on the contrary, wishes only to comfort; (*c*) 11:8, 14, which on Stade’s hypothesis is inexplicable, he claims is capable of explanation when transferred to other conditions from chs. 9, 10, 12–14. But, (*a*) Staerk’s division is based on the false view of Stade that Deutero-Zechariah is only a scribe and will not be a prophet; and (*b*) on a completely erroneous interpretation of 11:4–17, referring it to the present only, whereas it is an allegory of the past without the slightest touch of pessimism. (*c*) Moreover, the claim that 11:8, 14 can be explained out of Maccabean conditions is very questionable, as no one has ever been able to explain satisfactorily the “three shepherds cut off in one month” (11:8) on the basis of any hypothesis. To these may be added linguistic reasons which oppose the theory of Staerk, *e. g.*, בְּרִית (9:11; 11:10), אָדָר (11:3, 13), הַנְּשִׂארוֹת (11:9; 12:14), יָחַר (13:8; 14:2), וְהַשְּׂבוֹתִים (10:10; 13:7), יָקָר (11:13; 14:6), הַיְּפֵה אֲנֹכִי (11:6, 16; 12:2, *cf.* Eckardt, p. 102); the use of certain words in

a good sense in both parts, *e. g.*, זָרַע (10:9), פִּקְחָה (12:4), on the one hand, and שׁוֹיֵב, (13:7) on the other; and of the Inf. Abs. (11:17; 12:3), etc. We accordingly conclude that these two sections (11:4–17 and 13:7–9) are part and parcel of the entire prophecy (chs. 9–14), or, as Kuiper puts it (p. 130), that they are the indispensable links between the other portions.

4. *Against Bertholdt, Knobel, Maurer, Ewald, Bleek, v. Ortenberg, Kuenen, and others*, who divide chs. 9–14 into two oracles of almost equal length (9–11; 13:7–9 and 12–14). This division is conditioned, however, by the successful removal of 13:7–9 from its present position to the end of ch. 11 in order to furnish the first oracle with a suitable conclusion. Ewald was the first to make this transference; followed by v. Ortenberg, Dillmann, Reuss, Stade, Wellhausen, Grützmaker, and others. Though such a transposition may be possible, there are serious objections to it; (a) 13:7–9 is not parabolic as is 11:4–17, but prophetic; (b) 13:7–9 treats of the future; 11:4–17 of the past (*cf.* Wellhausen, p. 186); (c) 13:7–9 is joined in thought to 14:1, 2 *sq.*, *cf.* the fractional remnants in 13:8 and 14:2. (*Cf.* Schlatter, p. 272; and Montet, p. 68, who prefers to join 13:7–9 and 14:1–21 together as one oracle.) (d) 13:7–9 describes in detail the results of the siege portrayed in ch. 12, and on the other hand, prepares for the apocalyptic description which follows in ch. 14. (e) The shepherd in 13:7 is the Messiah-Shepherd; the “my” standing in contrast to the evil shepherd of 11:15–17 and also the false prophets of 13:2–6. Compare the expression בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה (13:3) and בְּשֵׁמִי (13:9). Hence the present position of these verses is justified, if not essential to the correct understanding of the prophecy (*cf.* Elmslie, p. 332, and Bruston, p. 129). Against the unity of these two oracles, however, our opponents present four different lines of argument, *viz.*, language, thought, Messianic expectation and historical situation. (a) *Style and language.* Kuenen, Grützmaker, and others, note the following inconsistencies: (α) בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא occurs only twice in the first section (9:16; 11:11), but 14 times in the second,—a fact which, as Eckardt shows (p. 100), is explained at once (as also וְהָיָה, used 15 times), by the difference in subject matter. (β) בֵּית דָּוִד is used for Jerusalem (9:9, 13); whereas בֵּית דָּוִד stands

for the royal house (12:7, 8, 10, 12; 13:1). But this is a specious sort of fallacious reasoning, as in 9:9, 10 Zion and Jerusalem stand side by side, while in 12:10; 13:1 Jerusalem and **בֵּית הָיוֹד** are distinctly differentiated. (γ) Certain words have different meanings in the two sections; *e. g.*, **אֲדָרֶת** (11:3) glory, (13:4) mantle. But as Cornill (p. 200) shows, **אֲדָרֶת** of 11:3 and **אֲדָרֶת** of 13:4 are two entirely different words, only similar in sound. Our author was fond of words of similar sound, *e. g.*, **יָרָא וְהִירָא** (9:5), also **יָשַׁב וְיָשַׁב** (9:5, 6), and **אֲדָרִים** (11:2) with **אֲדָרָתָם** (11:3). Again, **מְצוֹר** (9:3) stronghold, but (12:2) siege. But **מְצוֹר** (9:3) is, as Eckardt points out (p. 100), a pun with **צוֹר הַיָּל** (9:4) power; (14:14) wealth. But the **הַיָּל** in 9:4 comes from the root **הַיָּל** not **הַיָּל** (Arab. **حَوْلَة** cf. Socin's *Kurdische Sammlungen*, I., 297) meaning a small frontier wall before a fortress wall; whereas **הַיָּל** in 14:14 is the construct state of **הַיָּל** (Arab. **حَيْل**, **حَوْل**) wealth. (δ) Certain ideas are expressed by different words in the two sections: *e. g.*, "pride" is expressed in 11:3 by **גָּאוֹן**, in 12:7 by **תִּפְאָרֶת**; and "collect" in 10:8, 10 by **קָבַשׁ**, but in 12:3; 14:2, 14 by **אָסַף**. But almost any author ought to be allowed two synonyms, especially when attempting to express slightly different shades of meaning. These are all the linguistic inconsistencies that really exist between these two oracles. On the other hand, the similarities are quite important. Eckardt (p. 101) points out the following: **אָכַל** in sense of destroy (9:4, 15; 11:1, 9, 16, but also 12:6), **זָכַר** in a religious sense (10:9; 13:2), **יָשַׁב** in passive (9:5; 12:6 probably also 14:10, 11), **פָּרַח** Hiph. (9:6, 10; 13:2), **מִלְחָמָה** (9:10; 10:3, 4, 5; 14:2), **הִזְכָּה** (9:4; 10:11; 13:7; 12:4; 13:6). **שָׂאָר** Niph. (9:7; 11:9; 12:14). **פָּתַח** (11:1; 13:1, cf. **פָּקַח** 12:4), **אָלַף** (9:7; 12:5, 6). From this list, it is evident, that the style of the two sections is not "entirely different" (Grützmaker, p. 41); but rather the difference is due to the elevated and poetic character of chs. 9–11, which naturally affords a greater treasury of words, and also to the author's special dependence in these chapters on older prophecy (cf. Kuiper, pp.

144-5). (b) *Thought*. The *denkbeelden*, according to Kuenen, are different and require a double authorship. Thus, in the first section there is no storm of the people against Jerusalem, no complaint against false prophets, no outlook leading up to the conversion of the heathen; while in the second section there is no mention of Ephraim, or of the return of the exiles, or of a punishment of the shepherds, or of the coming of the Messiah. But Kuenen likewise admits of no unity in chs. 9-11; *e. g.*, 9:1-5, 8-10; 10:2, 10, 11; 11:4-14 are pre-exilic; but 9:11, 13; 10:6-9, etc., post-exilic. For similar reasons Montet, (p. 68) and Sharpe (*Hist. of Hebrew Nation and Lit.*, 1882) separate the whole into *five* independent units. There are, however, reasons for thinking that the author of both sections moved in the same circle of ideas; *e. g.*, in 10:2 and 13:2 there is a similar, passing allusion to idolatry. In both sections also there is a similar use made of the same former prophets. Apocalyptic wars leading up to Messianic times are portrayed in both sections. Old proper names cling in the prophet's memory, *e. g.*, Hadrach (9:1) and Hadadrimmon (12:11). The heathen are subjects of God's mercy (9:10; 14:16-19). And the punishment of the shepherds in 11:15-17 is, as Kuiper insists, not entirely absent from 12:8 *sq.* The absence of the name Ephraim in the second section may be explained in two ways: ( $\alpha$ ) either as Hitzig (*Stud. u. Krit.* I., 1830), on the ground that 11:14 gives up the hope of ever uniting the two kingdoms; or better ( $\beta$ ) as Cornill and Kuiper, on the ground that ch. 12 is a necessary conclusion to chapter 11. For the breaking of the staff Beauty (11:7, 10) brings the nations against Jerusalem; and the breaking of Bands (11:7, 14), the disappearance of Ephraim, 11:10 prepares the way for chs. 12-14, and 11:14 for 12:1, 2. No prophecy could well close with 11:17. But further, as Delitzsch observes (*Mess. Proph.*, p. 219), there is a "retrogressive movement" of what is prophesied in both sections. "The two prophetic images in chs. 9:11 are a *hysteron proteron*; for first the future one consumes himself in work for his people, and then is raised from lowliness to a kingdom which rules the world." Sudden transitions are another characteristic of both sections, as Stade proceeds to show. In the first section the author passes quickly from the invasion of Syria, Phoenicia,

and Philistia by a temporal king (9:1-8), to the coming of the Messiah King (9:9), and then back quite as abruptly to the restoration of the exiles who still remained in captivity (9:11). In the second section at the close of 12:8 the prophet's mind leaps from the time when the nations shall be repulsed from Jerusalem to an age of spiritual deliverance (12:10). Again, both sections paint shocking pictures of the destruction and wasting away of the enemies of God's people (11:17; 14:12); on the other hand, the hopes of both sections in behalf of Israel are the same. (c) *Messianic expectation*. Grützmacher argues (p. 42), that, because in chs. 9-11 the prophet expects an individual Messiah—a king, who would bring peace to the people, while in chapters 12-14 the coming of Jehovah is expected, who will bring salvation to his people but judgment upon the heathen, therefore it is "impossible" to suppose that both sections were written by the same author. But this opinion is based, ( $\alpha$ ) on a transposition of 13:7-9 from its true position; ( $\beta$ ) on a misunderstanding of 12:10; 13:1, and ( $\gamma$ ) on his unwillingness to recognize in ch. 14 an apocalypse of the future. Hence there is no cause for division on this basis. (d) *Historical situation*. The first author names Israel and Judah side by side (9:13; 10:6; 11:14); the second, only Judah and Jerusalem. In the first section, Syria, Phœnicia, Philistia, Greece, Assyria, and Egypt are threatened; in the second, "all nations" in general and only Egypt by name (Grützmacher, pp. 42, 43). But, as has been already shown, these peculiarities are due to other causes than difference of authorship.

5. *Against Graetz*, and others who separate chapter 14 from the rest of these prophecies. This is the most difficult problem, according to our opinion, in these prophecies. The difficulty consists in reconciling the two pictures of the nations coming up against Jerusalem in chs. 12 and 14 with unity of authorship. Kuenen (p. 419) does not hesitate to say, that 12:4-6 and 14:12-14 are *onvereenigbaar*. Graetz remarks with considerable force (*JQR*. III., 1891, p. 208), "if both chapters refer to the same event the prophet should have begun with the description of the siege given in ch. 14, which is far more dramatic than the short sentence 'I shall make of Jerusalem a cup of confusion for all nations'

(12:1).” He further maintains that the faint resemblance between these prophecies vanishes on a closer examination. In ch. 12 Jerusalem is described as receiving no injury; in ch. 14, the city is captured. “How can utterances so different,” Graetz asks, “have been linked together in one prophecy?” It must be confessed that the contradiction of statements in this case is without a parallel elsewhere, not even between Parts I. and II. But in our judgment the contradiction is superficial. Chapter 14 is a separate oracle, quite independent of the preceding chapters written by the same prophet but later and under different circumstances,—very possibly shortly before the dedication of the temple in 516 B. C. This is evident from the conclusion of chapter 13:9, “I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The Lord is my God,” which forms a most suitable ending to the former oracles. Chapter 14, however, belongs to chs. 9–13, as the language witnesses; *e. g.*, there is the same regard for Judah in ch. 14 as elsewhere, **יְהוּדָה וְגַם יְהוּדָה** (12:2; 14:14). The following expressions occur in both sections, **בָּקַעַ** (12:11; 14:4); **גָּשָׁם** (14:17; 10:1); **יָקַר** (11:13; 14:6); **פָּנָה** (10:4; 14:10); especially the use of **מִזְרֵק** near **מִזְבֵּחַ** (9:15; 14:20, pointed out by Cornill, p. 200); the mention of the “Canaanites” (according to *LXX.*) in 11:7, 11; 14:21; the use of Niphals, *e. g.*, **יָרַר** (13:8; 14:16), **פָּרַח** (9:10; 13:8; 14:2) and **לָהֵם** (10:5; 14:3, 14), the employment of **מֵאֵר** (9:2, 5, 9; 14:4, 14); the tendency to reminiscence, *e. g.*, the allusions to Josiah and Uzziah (12:11; 14:5); **הִקְנָה** (9:8), *cf.* **מִתְקַנָּה** (14:15); and, finally, the author’s indifferent use of **כָּל־הָעַמִּים** (12:2, 3; 14:12) and **כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם** (14:2; 14:16; 12:9). These instances are enough to show the close relation of ch. 14 to chs. 9–13. And when it is remembered that we are dealing with an apocalypse, all apparent inconsistencies disappear.

Accordingly we conclude, in view of the above observations, that Zech. 9–14 are from the same hand, though we admit with Stade (p. 307), that it can never, of course, be proven that such *must* be the case.\*

\*Cheyne (*JQR.* I., 1889, p. 81) declares, that “with perhaps one or two exceptions, chs. 9–11 and 12–14 are so closely welded together that even analysis is impossible.”



## V.

## THE RELATION OF CHAPTERS 9-14 TO ZECH. 1-8.

Though tradition has never without exception denied the Zecharian authorship of chs. 9-14; yet being of an *uncritical* character, it behooves us critically to examine into the juxtaposition of these chapters in relation to Zech. 1-8. What especially warrants our investigation of this relation of Part II. to Part I. is the fact that even those who defend the integrity of chs. 9-14, deny the integrity of the entire book. The arguments of many, however, are too often overstated and too minutely drawn out. Two caveats are necessary: (a) objections which disprove the unity of chs. 9-14 should never be used against the unity of Zechariah by those who maintain the integrity of the former; and (b) arguments which prove the unity of the entire Old Testament are of no value in substantiating the genuineness of chs. 9-14.

I. *The objections to the Zecharian origin of chapters 9-14.*—  
 1. *No visions* are found in these chapters as there are in Part I. Though this is a very common objection it rests, in our judgment, upon a false basis, viz., that if a prophet sees visions at one time and records them, he must continue to do so, or otherwise keep silence. Amos 1-6 and Hos. 4-14, however, contradict this principle. Even Zech. 7 and 8 do not contain visions and yet they are not denied to Zechariah on this account. Indeed, as a matter of fact, visions actually occur in Part II. only of an historico-parabolic (*e. g.*, 11:4-17) and eschatological character (9:13-17, 12 and 14). As Driver allows (p. 332), "this objection in itself is not incompatible with identity of author." 2. *No dates*, as in Zech. 1:1, 7; 7:1 and Haggai. But dates are frequently attached to visions in the Old Testament (*cf.* Isa. 6:1; Ezek. 1:1-3; 8:1; 40:1; Dan. 7:1), whereas oracles (נְבִיאָה) such as 9-11; 12-14, are always (one exception only in entire Old Testament, viz., Isa. 14:28), found without dates as here (*e. g.*, *cf.* Isa. 13:1; 15:1; 17:1; 19:1; 21:1, 11, 13; 22:1; 23:1; 30:6; Nah. 1:1; Hab. 1:1; Mal. 1:1). 3. *No Satan* is mentioned in Part II. But Satan is never mentioned in any prophecy of the Old Testament elsewhere than in Zech. 3:1, 2. 4. *No interpreting angel* in 9-14.

But this is a most superficial objection as the nature of the oracles in Part II. requires no interpreting angel. The Angel of Jehovah, on the contrary, is mentioned in both parts (3:1 sq., and 12:8), — a fact which is far more noteworthy (*cf.* Grützmacher p. 31). Moreover the **פְּלִי-קַדְשִׁים** of 14:5 are universally interpreted “accompanying angels”; consequently the two parts of Zech. from the standpoint of angelology are not diverse (*cf.* 1:9, 11; 2:1; 3:7; 6:1). 5. No “eyes” in Part II., as in 3:9; 4:10, as though one might reasonably expect to find eyes in the limbs of a human body as well as in the head! 6. *Proper names* are wanting in Part II., *e. g.*, Zerubbabel and Joshua. But neither do these names occur in chs. 7 and 8. Joseph and Ephraim, on the other hand, which are not mentioned in Part I., are synonyms of Israel (9:10, 13; 10:6, 7), and their absence proves nothing. On the contrary, Jerusalem, Judah, house of Judah, and Zion are common to both parts. 7. *The sins* alluded to in the two parts are different (Grützmacher, p. 32); *e. g.*, theft and false-swearing in 5:3, 4, enmity toward one another in 8:17; while in 10:2 seeking teraphim, and in 13:2 sq., false prophecy. But these sins are not of such a nature that they are mutually exclusive, so that it were impossible for them to have existed side by side. What is far more noteworthy is that in both parts the prophet declares that these evils shall be taken away and *removed out of the land* (*cf.* 3:9; 5:9–11; 13:1, 2). 8. *The Messianic pictures* are different. In Part I. the Messiah is **צִמְחָה**—Priest (3:8, 9; 6:12, 13); in Part II. **מֶלֶךְ**, king (9:9, 10). This objection is urged by Kuiper also. But the same argument weighs quite as heavily against the unity of chs. 9–14, which Kuiper passes as of no particular value. Objection is also made to the different pictures given in Parts I. and II. concerning the conversion of the heathen. But in both parts the promises are eschatological (*vs.* Kuiper, p. 94); in both the heathen worship Jehovah voluntarily (*vs.* Montet, pp. 89, 90), and in both the language and thought are similar (*vs.* Grützmacher, p. 32). The one particularly noteworthy picture common to both parts is the coming up of the nations to Jerusalem,—“the middle point of the world” (2:15; 8:20–23; 9:7; 14:16–19, *cf.* Marti, *Sach.* p. 121). 9. *The diction and style* are diverse; Part I. being prose, but Part II. poetry, (in truth,

however, only chs. 9, 10, and 11:1-3 are poetic). Special emphasis being laid on certain formulæ of expression characteristic of one part but disappearing in the other. For example, **יְהוָה** occurs twice in Part I. (6:15; 8:13); whereas in Part II. 18 times. But the same expression is used to prove the disunity of chs. 9-14 (*e. g.*, it occurs but once in 9-11, but 17 times in 12-14); it may be still further employed in the interests of Staerk's hypothesis, for the ratio here is 1 to 17. Hence the force of such argumentation! The same may be said of such expressions as, **כֹּה אָמַר** **יְהוָה**, **וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי**, **כִּי יִצְבְּאוֹת שְׁלַחְנִי**, **יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת**, **וַיְהִי וַיֵּרָא**, and **אֶדְוֶן כְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ**. The prophetic expression **נָאֻם יְהוָה** occurs frequently in both parts, but being so common a formula in the prophets, proves nothing. Also **בַּיָּמִים הַהֵוא**, which occurs but 3 times in Part I. (2:15; 3:10; 6:10), whereas in Part II. 19 times, carries no force with it; for it is to be observed that when Zechariah rises to an apocalyptic vision he uses the same mode of expression (*cf.* **בַּיָּמִים הַהֵמָּה**, 8:23). Again, this expression is used by Kuenen to disprove the unity of chs. 9-14 (for in 9-11 it occurs but twice; in 12-14, on the contrary, 14 times); but in that case it was explained by the difference in subject matter—an explanation which holds good in the present case quite as well.

To these Eckardt (p. 104) adds a list of words which, in his judgment, are irreconcilable with unity of authorship. The following are those of real importance: (a) *Certain words are employed in different senses in Parts I. and II.* Thus **רָאָה** is used in chs. 1-8 mostly in connection with prophetic appearance; in 9-14, never. But compare 12:4; 9:14 and 9:8, which last implies all the visions of chs. 1-6, "For now have I seen (**רָאָה**) with mine eyes." Further Eckardt observes, that **כְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ** in Zech. 1-8 always implies "the whole earth"; whereas in 9-14, Palestine only. But *cf.* 5:3 and 14:9—two undeniable exceptions. Likewise **גִּלְגָּל** exiles in 6:10, but exile in 14:2, and **הוֹדַר** glory in 6:13, but splendor in 10:3. One of Zechariah's characteristics, however, is to use words in different senses, *e. g.*, **כַּנָּה** wing in 5:9, but skirt in 8:20; **הַפֶּטֶח**, sin in 13:1, but plague in 14:19; **קָרַב** midst in 14:1, but battle in 14:3; **רוּחַ** wind (2:10;

5:9; 6:5), but spirit (4:6; 6:8; 7:12, *cf.* 12:1; 13:2; 12:10). This argument also is used against the unity of chs. 9–14, which unity Eckardt defends. (b) *Certain words in Part I. are expressed in Part II. by means of synonyms.* Thus שְׂאֲרִית remnant in 8:6, 11, 12 is expressed by יָהָר in 14:2. But *cf.* הַנְּשָׂאֲרוֹת (11:9; 12:14). Again הַנְּעָר youth (2:8), but בְּחֹרִים (9:17). But *cf.* הַנְּעָר (11:16) and מִנְּעֹרֵי (13:5). Further, עֲטָרָה (6:11, 14), but נֹזֵר (9:16); מִשְׁעֵנָה staff (8:4), but מִקָּל (11:7, 10, 14); עֲוֹן iniquity (3:5, 9), but הַטָּאָה (13:1); נָחַל possess (2:16; 8:12), but הוֹרִישׁ (9:4); שָׁמִים desolate (7:14), but שָׁדַד (11:2, 3). But the use of synonyms is another prominent characteristic of Zechariah, *e. g.*, קוֹ line (1:16), but הַבֵּל מִדָּה (2:5); בַּיִת temple, 1:16; 3:7; 4:9; 7:3; 8:9), but הִיכָל (6:12, 13, 14; 8:9); עָמַד stand (3:4), but יָצַב (6:5). *Cf.* the idea “without walls” in פְּרוּזוֹת (2:8) and הוֹמָת אֵשׁ (2:9). And in Part II., הַמַּגֵּפָה plague (14:12, 15), but הַטָּאָה (14:19); אֹהֶל tent (12:7), but מַחֲנֶה (14:15); עֵדֶר flock (10:3), but צֹאֵן (9:16; 10:2); דָּלָה (11:1), but שָׁעַר (14:10). (c) *Syntax, e. g.*, the Inf. Abs. which in Zech. 1–8 stands sometimes *before* (6:15), sometimes *after* (8:21) the verb intended to be strengthened; in 9–14 on the contrary always *before*. But the Inf. Abs. occurs but twice in 1–8, and but three times in 9–14 (*viz.*, 11:17 twice, and 12:3), a fact which makes Eckardt’s argument somewhat specious (*cf.* further 3:4; 7:5; 12:10). Again Eckardt calls attention to Zechariah’s fondness for the *figura etymologica*, or object accusative in narrower as well as broader sense. But the same is true of chs. 9–14; indeed there are exactly eight instances in Part I. and seven in Part II.: קָצָה (1:2, 15), קָפָא קָנָא קָנָה גְדוּלָה (1:14; 8:2), שָׁמַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת (3:7), הוֹכֵן עַל־מִכְנֹתָה (5:11), הוֹכֵן מִשְׁפָּט (7:9; 8:16); and in Part II., יָקַר יָקַר (11:13), הַמְּפֹת אֲשֶׁר הִפִּיתִי (13:6), נָנַח מִגֵּפָה (14:12, 18), הִגַּב הִגַּב (14:16, 18, 19). In this connection it is also to be observed that in both parts the definition of a proper name is explained by means of a common noun or verb; *e. g.*, . . . וְהַשְׁטָן וְהַשְׁטָן (3:1), צָמָה . . . יִצְמָה (6:12) and וְתָבֵן צוֹר מְצוֹר (9:3).

Further, Eckardt observes that in Zech. 1-8 the prophet shows a preference for  $\text{נִסְּ}$  with suffixes, rather than for verbal suffixes. But according to his own count (pp. 97 and 106)  $\text{נִסְּ}$  with suffixes occurs in Part I. 10 times and verbal suffixes 17 times; whereas, in Part II. the proportion is 6 to 22,—a not very decisive difference, especially since the proportion in Part II. proves (as seen above) the exact opposite of Eckardt's hypothesis, viz., the *early* post-exilic origin of Zech. 9-14.

These are the chief objections to the genuineness of chs. 9-14. We grant that there are differences between them and Zech. 1-8 which at first glance are striking, yet we are not able to conclude that these differences are too great to admit of their integrity, nor to say with Rubinkam, that "what is most characteristically present in 1-8 as a whole, is most characteristically absent from 9-14 as a whole."

II. *The arguments in favor of the Zecharian origin of chs. 9-14.*—In addition to what has already been claimed in support of the genuineness of these prophecies, we offer the following considerations:

1. *The fundamental ideas of both parts are the same.* By this we mean that the deeper we go the nearer we approach unity. We are here forced to differ with Driver (p. 332) who claims that "the dominant ideas and representations of chs. 1-8 are very different from those either of chs. 9-11 or of chs. 12-14." On the contrary the fundamental difference between Parts I. and II. is not subject but nature (*cf.* Wellhausen, *Encyc. Brit.*). Certain similarities are especially noteworthy, viz., (a) *An unusually deep, spiritual tone pervades the entire book.* The call to a true repentance, first sounded forth in the introduction (1:1-7), is developed more and more throughout the entire fourteen chapters, *e. g.*, in the sanctifying of Joshua (3:4), in the message to Zerubabel, "not by might nor by power but by my Spirit" (4:6), in the conditions of future blessing (6:15), in the answer to the Bethel deputation (7:5-9; 8:16 *sq.*); and in Part II. in the consecration of the remnant of the Philistines (9:7), in the blessings to Ephraim (10:12), in the baptism of grace upon Jerusalem (12:10), in the fountain for sin (13:1), in the worship of Jehovah (13:9), in the living waters going forth from Jerusalem

(14:8), and in the dedication of everything as holy unto the Lord (14:20, 21). The tone which tempers these prophecies is an extraordinarily deep and spiritual one. (b) *There is a similar attitude of hope and expectation in both parts.* This is especially important. For example, (a) the return of the whole nation is a prevailing idea of happiness in both parts (2:6, 10; 8:7, 8; 9:12; 10:6, 7). (β) The expectation that Jerusalem shall be inhabited (1:16, 17; 2:16; 8:3, 8; 12:6; 14:11; 14:10). (γ) And that the temple shall be built and become the center of the nation's religious life (1:16, 17; 3:7; 6:15; 7:2, 3; 9:8; 14:20, 21). (δ) Messianic hope is peculiarly strong in both (3:8, 9; 6:12, 13; 9:9, 10; 11:12; 12:10; 13:1, 7-9). (ε) Peace and prosperity are expected (3:10; 1:17; 6:13; 8:12, 19; 9:10, 12, 17; 10:1, 7, 8, 10, 12; 12:8; 14:11; 14:16-19). (ζ) The idea of God's providence as extending to the whole earth (1:14-17; 2:9, 12; 4:10; 6:5; 9:1, 8, 14; 10:3, 5, 9, 12; 12:2; 12:3, 4, 8; 13:7; 14:3, 9). (c) *The prophet's attitude toward Judah is the same in both parts.* It is an attitude of supreme regard for Judah's interests, making them second only to the capital (2:2, 4, 16; 8:19; 1:12; cf. 8:13, 15; 12:2; 14:14; 10:3; 12:4, 6, 7; 14:21; cf. 9:9, 13; 10:6; 11:14; 14:5). (d) *The prophet's attitude toward the nations, the enemies of the theocracy, is the same in both parts.* The whole assembled world are the enemies of Israel (cf. Wellhausen, p. 174). But though they have scattered Judah, Israel and Jerusalem (1:11, and are still coming up to besiege Jerusalem (12:2; 14:2), yet they shall be joined to the Lord in that day (2:15) and worship Jehovah like the Jews (8:20-23; 14:16-19). These are all striking instances of similarity in the fundamental ideas of the two parts.

2. *There are peculiarities of thought common to both parts.*

(a) *The habit of dwelling on the same thought.* For example, twice in rapid succession the prophet announces Jehovah's promise to Zion, "I will dwell in the midst of thee" (2:14, 15). Twice it is told that the branch shall build the temple of Jehovah (6:12, 13). Twice the nations are described as seeking the Lord of hosts to pray to him (8:21, 22). And twice he pictures the scenes in the streets of Jerusalem in that day (8:4, 5). On the other hand, in Part II. twice in one verse the prophet declares,

“And I fed the flock” (11:7). Twice he designates the parents of a false prophet as “the father and the mother who bore him” (13:3). Twice in one verse he predicts, “and ye shall flee” (14:5). And thrice he uses the expression, “to keep the feast of tabernacles” (14:16, 18, 19). (b) *The habit of expanding one fundamental thought into the unusual number of five parallel clauses* (first observed by Köster); e. g., 6:13, (a) “And he shall build the temple of the Lord”; (β) “And he shall bear the glory”; (γ) “And shall sit and rule upon his throne”; (δ) “And shall be a priest upon his throne”; (ε) “And the counsel of peace shall be between them both”; (cf. 9:5, 7; 1:17; 3:8, 9; 12:4). (c) *The habit of referring to a thought already introduced*; e. g., to the Branch (3:8 and 6:12); “eyes” (3:9 and 4:10); measuring line (1:16 and 2:5, 6); idea of choosing Jerusalem (1:17; 2:16 and 3:2); removing iniquity (3:9; 5:3 sq. and 13:2); measurements (2:6; 5:24 and 14:10); colors of horses (1:5 and 6:2, 6); the idea of Israel as a “flock” (9:16; 10:2; 11:4 sq.; 13:7); idols (10:2 and 13:2); of “all nations” (11:10; 12:3 sq., and 14:2 sq.); shepherds (11:3 sq. and 13:7). Also the “one day” of 3:9 and the day of atonement in 14:16. The author of Job furnishes in this instance a good parallel (e. g., Job 39; 9–11; 21–23). (d) *The use made of the cardinal number “two”*; thus two olive trees (4:3), two women (5:9); two mountains (6:1), two staves (11:7), two parts (14:2, 4) with which cf. 6:13; 9:12; 14:8. (e) *The resort made by the prophet to symbolic actions as a mode of instruction*; e. g., the coronation scene in 6:9–15 and the breaking of the two staves in 11:4–14. (f) *The habit of drawing lessons from the past*; e. g., 1:1–7, 15; 7:7, 11–14; 8:11, 13; 9:8; 10:1, 2; 11:4–17 (cf. Ezek. 17 and 19—also parables concerning the past), 12:11; 14:5, 3, 21. All these are peculiarities of thought quite characteristic of our prophet, and worthy of more than passing notice.

3. *Certain peculiarities of diction and style favor unity of authorship.* Eckardt (p. 104) frankly allows that the following word-list has weight in favor of the unity of Zechariah; thus שָׁלַל (2:13; 14:1), שָׁבַר (8:10; 11:12), שָׁקַר (5:4; 8:17; 10:2; 13:3), רָחַם (1:12; 10:6), נָחַם (1:17; 10:2), הִסִּיר (3:4; 9:7) הִעֲבִיר (3:4;

13:2). For "south" both parts have נֶגֶב (7:7; 14:4, 10), and also תִּימָן (6:6; 9:14)). Especially יָשָׁב pass. (2:8; 9:5; 12:6; cf. 14:10, 11), and בִּקְשׁ with לְ and Inf. (6:7; 12:9) but also in sense of *quaero* (8:21, 22; 11:16); and the very noteworthy מֵעֵבֶר וּמִמִּזְבֵּחַ (7:14; 9, 8). These coincidences in vocabulary are undeniably powerful witnesses in favor of unity. To these may be added the following, which in many respects are quite as remarkable; *e. g.*, סָפַד (7:5; 12:10), מִצִּילָה (1:8; 10:11), בִּקְדָה (3:3, 4; 14:4), שָׁמָּה (2:14; 4:10; 10:7), הַשְּׁלִיחַ (5:8; 11:12), נָטָה (1:16; 12:1), נָצַל (3:2; 11:6), עַל־רִמְיִן וְעַל־שִׁמְאוֹל (4:11; 12:6; cf. 4:3; 3:1), הוֹי (2:10; 11:17), בַּת־צִיּוֹן (2:14; 9:9), הָיָה (4:7; 12:10), שָׁעַר (8:16; 14:10), מִשַּׁל (6:13; 9:10), אֲדָמָה (9:16; 2:16; 13:5), יָסַד (4:9; 12:1), כָּמוֹ (5:3; 9:15; 10:2, 7, 8), מֵאֵת (6:10; 7:12; 11:10; 14:17; cf. מִ privative in 7:14; 9:8; LXX., Lowe, p. 82). The use of the expression "one toward another" in its different forms אִישׁ אֶת־אֶחָיו (7:9, 10) and אִישׁ בִּרְעֵהוּ (8:10, 16, 17; 3:10; 11:6, 9; 14:3), אָחָד for the indefinite article (5:7; 12:7). The expressions "holy land" (2:16) and "mount of Olives" (14:4) nowhere else used in the O. T. The similar modes of expression and terminology: (a) עֲבָדִי (3:8) and רָעִי and עֲמִיתִי (13:7). (b) יְהוּדִי (8:23) and יְבוּסִי (9:7). (c) שְׂבָעָה וְשִׁבְעָה (4:2) and מִשְׁפָּחוֹת מִשְׁפָּחוֹת (12:12). The author's preference for and frequent use of vocatives, *e. g.*, Zion (2:11; 9:13), great mountain (4:7), daughter of Zion (2:14; 9:9), O all flesh (2:17), Satan (3:2), Joshua (3:8), O sword (13:7), daughter of Jerusalem (9:9), prisoners of hope (9:12), O Lebanon (11:1), O fir-tree and Oaks of Bashan (11:2), O poor of the flock (11:7). Again, clumsy diction is a characteristic of both parts, *e. g.*, עוֹר (4 times in 1:17). צוֹם (4 times in 8:19), נִתָּן (3 times in 8:12), זָאֵת (3 times in 5:5-8), לָבַד (11 times), מִשְׁפָּחָה (9 times) and נְשִׂיהֶם (5 times in 12:12-14). Lastly, the *scriptio plena* and *scriptio defectiva* alternate most remarkably in both parts: thus in Part I., אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם (1:2, 5), but אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם (1:4, 6; 8:14); יוֹשֵׁבָה (2:11; 5:7), but יוֹשֵׁבַת (1:11; 7:7); צִוְאוֹם (3:3), but הַצִּוְאוֹם (3:4); הַעֲוֹפֶרֶת (5:8), but עֲפֹרֶת (5:7); יוֹצְאוֹת (5:9; 6:5), but יוֹצְאוֹת (6:1); עֲטָרוֹת (6:11), but הָעֲטָרוֹת (6:14); לִיוֹצֵא (8:10), but יוֹצֵא (2:7);



ער (1:17; 2:17), but ער (8:20); יִשְׁבִי and יִשְׁבִי (8:20). In Part II., הוֹבִישׁ (9:5), but הוֹבִישׁוּ (10:5, 11); נוֹגֵשׁ (10:4), but נוֹגֵשׁ (9:9); הָפִיר (11:10), but הָפִיר (11:14); יוֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם (12:8), but יוֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם (12:7); מְשַׁפְּחוֹת, but also מְשַׁפְּחוֹת (12:14). In what other book is the orthography so vacillating? But *cf* further, "גֵּיאִה" and "גֵּיה" (14:5), בְּרִנְבָאוּ Niph. Inf. (13:3) and בְּרִנְבָאוֹ (13:4) also Niph. Inf. from the same root, but formed after the ל"ה manner. Likewise וְהִשְׁבוֹתִים (10:10; 13:7) and וְהוֹשְׁבוֹתִים (10:6); and כָּצֹאן (9:16) with כָּמוֹ צֹאן (10:2). In our judgment the orthography of the Book of Zechariah is one of the strongest evidences that it was all written by one hand.

4. *Zech. 1-8 shows familiarity with the same books of prophecy as those so often quoted by the author of chs. 9-14.* (a) *Zech 1-8 shows familiarity with Ezekiel.* One or two examples will suffice. In Ezek. 35 the announcement "ye shall know that I am the Lord" occurs in vs. 9, 12 and 15. The same thought is found in Zech. 2:13, 15; 4:9; 6:15. This, however, is not so noteworthy in itself; but when it is observed that the unusual idiom מִלְעִבֵר וּמִנְשֵׁב (Zech. 7:14) is found in essentially the same form in Ezek. 35:7, it becomes more striking, as it illustrates the fact that whole sections of earlier prophecy are reëchoed in the book of Zechariah,—and no book more naturally than Ezekiel. Especially is this phenomenon noteworthy when we remember that the preceding chapter (Ezek. 34) containing the figure of the shepherd and his flock was found to form the basis of the allegory in Zech. 11:4-14. The natural conclusion is, that Zechariah was familiar with Ezekiel, and that only when both parts of his prophecies are studied together is their interrelation explained. For other instances, *cf.* Ezek. 11:19, with Zech. 7:12 and Ezek. 11:20 with Zech. 8:8. (b) *Zech. 1:8 exhibits acquaintanceship with Jeremiah.* Thus the inquiry, "would it be marvelous in my eyes?" (Zech. 8:6) seems to have a basis in Jer. 32:27, "Is anything too hard for me?" Also the clause וְהָיָה אִם־שָׁמוּעַ תִּשְׁמָעוּן (Zech. 6:15) is found in Jer. 17:24. But especially the double allusion in Zech. to the "Branch" (3:8; 6:12) which has its foundation in Jeremiah's "Branch of right-

eousness" 23:5; 33:15). Dependent relations also exist between Zech. 7:13 and Jer. 11:11, Zech. 7:14 and Jer. 16:13, Zech. 8:3 and Jer. 31:23. Likewise, according to Wildeboer (*Entstehung des A. T. Kanons*, § 26), between Zech. 1:12 and Jer. 25:11, 12; 29:10, etc. (c) *Close resemblances also exist between Zech. 1-8 and Isa. 40-66.* In Isa. 48:20 Jacob is exhorted to "flee from the Chaldeans," so Zion in Zech. 2:10, *cf.* Isa. 52:11. The expression "in truth and righteousness" (Zech. 8:8) stands in contrast with that in Isa. 48:1, "not in truth nor in righteousness." Zechariah's idea of fasting (chs. 7 and 8) that it terminates on the individual and is of little importance in comparison to executing judgment and mercy, is but an enlargement of the idea in Isa. 58:3-7, where the prophet teaches that true fasting consists in feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, removing burdens and letting the oppressed go free.

5. *Finally, the history of modern critical opinion is a tacit proof of the unity of Zechariah.* As we have already seen, the *variety* of critical opinion is simply marvelous. To almost every century, from Amos to Judas Maccabeus, has modern scholarship assigned chs. 9-14, with comparatively little unanimity. This fact in itself, in our opinion, gives room for doubt as to the present results of criticism; but on the other hand, teaches the appropriateness of prophecy to speak to every age.

One further question remains: viz., how came chs. 9-14, if anonymous, to be added to Zech. 1-8? Answers: 1. *Stade* replies that they were not intended so, as chs. 9-14, with Malachi, formed at one time a small collection by themselves, the antithesis of Mal. 1:11 and 14:9 having caused their separation (*cf.* Kuiper). But this explains only how Malachi and Zech. 9:14 were *separated*, which is altogether gratuitous, as there is no proof whatever that they ever formed one anonymous collection by themselves. The real problem rather is, how came chs. 9-14 to be *added* to Zechariah's prophecies? 2. *Cornill* (p. 204) answers that "chs. 9-14, like Malachi, were anonymous, but *being less of a unit* than Malachi they were united to Zech. 1-8, whereas Malachi was set off by itself." (So also Wildeboer.) But this only shows that chs. 9-14 are not a unit or complete in themselves (*cf.* Kuenen, p.

425; Grützmacher, pp. 50, 51; Kirkpatrick, p. 452; Cheyne, *JQR*. I., 1889, p. 80). We grant the similarity of the three titles, 9:1; 12:1 and Mal. 1:1; but, on the other hand, we ask: (a) If chs. 9-14 are of *pre-exilic* origin, why were they added to the *post-exilic* prophecies of Zechariah and not to Obadiah or Jonah? (b) If of Græco-Maccabean origin, how found they place in the *prophetic* Canon while Daniel did not? Or, if this is not so difficult, why were they not added to Haggai instead of Zech. 1-8? (c) What real evidence have we that 12:1 is not original?

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

Summing up the results of our study of the prophecies of Zechariah we conclude:

1. *That chs. 9-14 are of post-exilic origin;* because (a) the exile is represented as an event of the past. (b) The author dissociates himself from pre-exilic events. (c) Certain passages promising victory and temporal prosperity are so unlike the prophecies of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah,—the alleged contemporaries of the authors of 9-14,—that they could only have been misleading to peoples confronted by the catastrophies of 722 and 586 B. C. (d) The development of the Messianic idea demands a late date, not only on account of the newness of the prophet's pictures and his attempt to unify previous predictions, but also on account of the highly apocalyptic character of these oracles throughout. (e) The manifest dependence of the prophet on Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Isa. 40-66 corroborates the same conclusion. And further, because all the passages brought forward in favor of the pre-exilic origin of these prophecies can, in our judgment, be better explained in the period after the exile; *e. g.*, 9:13, concerning the יְהוָה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is confessedly inexplicable in the eighth century B. C.

2. *That these chapters are not, however, late post-exilic;* because, (a) in matters pertaining to language and style the distinctive characteristics of the Hebrew of Græco-Maccabean times are chiefly wanting. Thus, there are few Aramaisms. The *scriptio plena* and *scriptio defectiva* are strikingly confused. The late form of the Pers. Pron. אַתָּה does not predominate over אַתְּ. The ending ִי is used but twice and consequently has no weight. The

*nota accusativi* אִם with suffixes occurs less often in chs. 9–14 than in Zech. 1–8. The article is not specially wanting; neither is the use made of the Inf. Abs. nor of clumsy diction more pronounced in Part II. than Part I. (b) On the other hand, the historical data alleged in favor of a Græco-Maccabean date are, in our judgment, quite foreign to the prophecies; *e. g.*, (a) 14:9, instead of being a polemic against Mal. 1:11 by a writer living in Grecian times, as Stade claims, is a simple reflection of the age of Darius Hystaspes when the whole world was practically under one sovereign. (β) 12:2 b, instead of making Judah fight with the enemy against Jerusalem, represents Judah as fighting with Jerusalem against the enemy. (γ) 12:12–14 divides the congregation into civil and ecclesiastical divisions, and portrays not Greek but early Persian times before the house of David had degenerated. (δ) Another is 10:10, 11, in which, as in Isa. 27:12; Ps. 83:9; Mic. 5:4, 5, there is absolutely no basis for interpreting Assyria and Egypt to mean the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies; but which, on the contrary, after the analogy of Ezr. 6:22 (*cf.* 2 Kgs., 23:29; Ezr. 5:13; Neh. 13:6) implies Persia and Egypt. (ε) Also 9:13—the chief passage in favor of a late date. For, in our opinion, the reference to the בְּנֵי יָוֶן is too indefinite to be after 333 B. C. Javan experiences defeat instead of victory. The context does not suit Grecian times. Furthermore, the subsequent description in 9:14–17 is apocalyptic.

3. *That these chapters had their origin in the period between 518 and 516 B. C.* For, (a) Javan was already a world-power before the beginning of the 5th century B. C., as shown by both scripture (*cf.* Gen. 10:2; Isa. 66:19; Ezek. 27:13; Joel 4:6), and history; *e. g.*, in 516 B. C. Darius was suddenly called to look after Persian interests in Asia Minor; in 500 the Ionians revolted; a year later the Athenians burned Sardis, and in 490 Marathon was fought and Persia was defeated. These facts show clearly enough that Javan was a world-power in Darius' reign. Our prophecies do not require us to think of the Greeks as the only world-power of the prophet's day. (b) The temple was still in process of construction. This is evident (a) from the exultant Messianic hope and expectation which characterizes these prophecies, and which no age would so naturally have produced as when

the temple was reaching completion. ( $\beta$ ) From the hortatory tone of the prophet, which was especially appropriate in this period,—particularly the prophet's frequent reference to history as an argument for the present. ( $\gamma$ ) From the fact<sup>1</sup> that Israel's chief interests are made to center in Jerusalem where the temple was. ( $\delta$ ) Certain passages are best explained in this period (*e. g.*, 9: 8, 10, 12; 10: 2; 13: 2-6; 14: 9, 10; 18: 20). ( $\epsilon$ ) The absence of all allusion to any single event after the dedication of the temple in 516 B. C. ( $\zeta$ ) Again, no period allows of the unity of chs. 9-14 so well as the years 518-516 B. C.

4. *That these chapters stand in close relation to chs. 1-8, having most probably been composed by Zechariah himself.* The common objections to the unity of the book of Zechariah, viz., that in Part II. there are no visions, no dates, no Satan, no interpreting angels, no eyes, etc., as there are in Part I., have, in our judgment, but little force. Even Eckardt's arguments on the basis of language lose their value, inasmuch as the use of words in different senses and the employment of synonyms are quite as characteristic of each part separately as of both parts together. On the other hand there are positive reasons for attributing these last six chapters to Zechariah, viz., (*a*) the fundamental ideas of both parts are the same. Thus the same spiritual tone and the same attitude of hope and expectation pervade both parts. Likewise the prophet's attitude toward Judah and toward the enemies of the theocracy is the same throughout. (*b*) Certain peculiarities of thought are common to both parts, *e. g.*, the habit of dwelling on the same thought, of expanding it into separate ideas, and of referring to a thought already introduced, especially the habit of drawing lessons from the past. (*c*) Certain peculiarities of diction and style bind Parts I. and II. together, in our opinion, quite as firmly as those which unite chs. 9-11 to chs. 12-14, *e. g.*, (*a*) the words  $\text{לְיָמֵינוּ}$  and  $\text{לְיָמֵינוּ}$  for "south" in both parts,  $\text{שֶׁפֶּקַע}$  in sense of *quaero*, and with  $\text{לֵב}$  and Inf. in the sense of *studeo*, both in both parts, etc. ( $\beta$ ) the frequent use of vocatives throughout. ( $\gamma$ ) The clumsy diction and frequent repetitions in both parts. ( $\delta$ ) But especially the alternating use of *scriptio plena* and *scriptio defectiva*, which characterizes so conspicuously both parts and renders it almost conclusive that one author wrote the whole book.