

J. R. S. Original
W. A. C.

J. B. W.

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF ZECHARIAH 9-14

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF ZECHARIAH 9-14

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

in

Partial Fulfillment

of the

Requirements for the Degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Duke K. McCall

September, 1941

Louisville, Ky.

Affectionately Dedicated

to

My Mother and My Wife

150588

THESES

M12d

Original

PREFACE

For some time I have been interested in those little noticed prophetic books of the Old Testament that sprang out of the arid soil of the restored Jewish community. To be sure, they do not scale the heights attained by some of their predecessors; they belong to a day of little things. It is, however, this very sensitiveness to their surroundings, which were so different from anything that had gone before, that gives to Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi a special interest. They reveal by contrast to the greater prophets of the past the nature and extent of the influence of environment on the prophetic movement.

Originally this thesis was to have dealt with the contributions of these post-exilic prophets to the Jewish religion. To do this it was necessary to determine whether the last six chapters of the book of Zechariah, a section longer than both Haggai and Malachi, belonged in the period under study. I expected to spend a week or two reinforcing my agreement with the general trend of critical opinion, which denies that Zech. 9-14 belongs to the time of Haggai, Zech. 1-8, and Malachi. Now, after months instead of weeks of investigation, I am recording the processes and conclusions of that study.

The complications encountered, which drew out the length of time necessary for the task, make it presumptuous to hope that this study will settle forever this crit-

ical problem. Every effort, however, has been made to bring together and evaluate the best opinions on the problem. To this has been added my own observations and judgments based upon independent investigation. With this evidence at hand certain conclusions are proposed as to the date and authorship of Zech. 9-14. No matter who wrote these chapters or when, they retain their value as inspired of God; however, the conclusions here arrived at or others deduced from the evidence here presented are necessary for any study of the development of the prophetic movement.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all who have made these years of preparation at the Seminary possible. It has been a privilege of which I pray to be worthy. I am especially grateful to President John R. Sampey and Dr. Kyle M. Yates, professors in my major subject, for their wise interpretation of God's word, their gracious help and useful counsel. To Dr. J. McKee Adams and Dr. J. B. Weatherspoon I would express my sincere appreciation for the instruction and inspiration provided in my minor courses. I am greatly indebted to Dr. Leo Crismon, associate librarian, not only for capable guidance in the use of the facilities of the Seminary library but also for securing for me from other libraries a number of works not otherwise available.

Duke K. McCall

September, 1941

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I. AN EXAMINATION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR A PRE-EXILIC DATE	11
1. Evidence of a Pre-exilic Date for Zech. 9-11; 13:7-9	14
(1) The Existence of Both the Northern and Southern Kingdoms	14
(2) The Political Horizon of Zech. 9-11; 13:7-9	20
(3) The Three Shepherds of Zech. 11:8	27
(4) The Sins of the People	30
2. Evidence of a Pre-exilic Date for Zech. 12:1-13:6;14	34
(1) Imminence of the Chaldean Siege and Capture of Jerusalem	35
(2) The House of David	38
(3) The "Earthquake in the Days of Uzziah" (14:5) and the "Mourning of Hadadrimmon in the Valley of Megiddon" (12:11)	39
(4) The Dimensions Ascribed to Judah	41
CHAPTER II. AN EXAMINATION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR A POST-EXILIC DATE	44
1. Evidence That the Exile Is Past	45
(1) References To an Exile That Had Occurred	46

(2)	The Condition of Jerusalem as Indicated in Zech. 14:10,11	48
(3)	Cause of Judgment Upon the Heathen Nations	49
(4)	Evidence That Is Incompatible With a Pre-exilic Date	50
2.	Evidence Of a Post-Zecharian Date	51
(1)	The Reference to Assyria and Egypt in Zech. 10:10,11	53
(2)	Relative Prominence of the House of David and the House of Levi	56
(3)	The Participation of Judah in the Siege of Jerusalem	58
(4)	The Mention of the Greeks in Zech. 9:13..	60
CHAPTER III. THE PROBLEM VIEWED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF LANGUAGE AND STYLE		72
1.	Linguistic and Stylistic Evidence For the Date of Chaps. 9-14	73
(1)	Aramaisms in Zech. 9-14	74
(2)	<u>Scriptio Plena</u> As a Proof of a Late Date	76
(3)	The Ending /'	77
(4)	The Absence of the Article	78
(5)	The Setting Forth of the Finite Verb By Means of the Infinitive Absolute	80
(6)	Clumsy Diction and Repetition	81
(7)	The Preponderance of the Form $\text{׳} \text{J} \text{N}$ Over $\text{׳} \text{J} \text{N}$ in 9-14	81
2.	Linguistic and Stylistic Relations Between Chaps. 1-8 and 9-14	83
(1)	Diction and Phraseology	84
(2)	Contrast of Prose and Poetry	90

(3)	Divergence in Tone	95
(4)	Peculiarities of Expression Common to Both Parts of the Book	99
(5)	The Preference For and Frequent Use of Vocatives	101
(6)	The Fondness For the Object Accusative in Narrower As Well As Broader Sense ...	101
(7)	The Use of <i>JN</i> With Suffixes Rather Than the Use of Verbal Suffixes	102
3.	The Integrity of Chaps. 9-14	102
(1)	Evidence For the Division	103
(2)	Evidence For the Unity	104
CHAPTER IV. RELATION OF ZECHARIAH 9-14 TO OTHER PROPHETIC WORKS		106
1.	Dependence of Zech. 9-14 Upon Other Prophetic Works	107
(1)	Relation of Zech. 9-14 to Jeremiah	109
(2)	Relation of Zech. 9-14 to Ezekiel	111
(3)	Relation of Zech. 9-14 to Isa. 40-66 ...	115
2.	Mutual Dependence of Zech. 1-8 and 9-14 On the Same Prophetic Works	120
(1)	Dependent Passages Within Chaps. 1-8....	120
(2)	Dependent Passages Within Chaps. 9-11...	122
(3)	Dependent Passages Within Chaps. 12-14..	123
3.	The Traditional Place of Zech. 9-14 in the Roll of the Prophets	125
(1)	The Closing of the Prophetic Canon	125
(2)	The Name of the Author	126
(3)	Relation to Malachi	127

4. Ascription of Zech. 11:12,13 to Jeremiah By Matthew 27:9,10	129
CHAPTER V. THE PROBLEM VIEWED FROM THE STAND- POINT OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS	132
1. Affinities Between the Religious Ideas of Zech. 1-8 and 9-14	133
(1) The Combination of the Spiritual, Ethical, and Ritual	135
(2) Idea of God	137
(3) Attitude Toward the Heathen Nations	139
(4) Eschatology	141
(5) Messianic Expectation	144
2. The Unity of Zech. 9-14	155
3. Analysis of the Book of Zechariah	157
CONCLUSION	161
BIBLIOGRAPHY	165

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

INTRODUCTION

The book of Zechariah has received comparatively little popular attention. The scholars, in their turn, have tended to pass it by. Except for the piercing rays of Messianic prophecy which shine through the fog of confusion about the book, it might have been shrouded in the same oblivion as the Song of Solomon. These Messianic passages, by their detailed description of events in the life of the Messiah, have kept the flame of interest flickering.

1. Zechariah, the son of Berechiah

The book of Zechariah provides very little information about its author. It does not contain the sort of biographical material found in Isaiah and Jeremiah. His name, Zechariah, was borne by no ^{less} than twenty-nine different characters of the Old Testament. Its popularity was due, no doubt, to its meaning, "Jehovah remembers." This Zechariah is distinguished from the others by his genealogy. He was the son of Berechiah and the grandson of the great priest Iddo. In Ezra 5:1;6:14 he is simply called the son of Iddo after the analogy of other Old Testament passages where men are called the sons of their grandfathers.¹ He was, therefore, a priest as well as a prophet. He began his ministry under the impetus that

1. See Gen. 24:47; 29:15; I Kings 19:16, etc.

comes from being a member of a family of note. Neh. 12:16 lists him as the head of the house of Iddo in the time of the high-priesthood of Joiakim. He was probably born in Babylon and came back from captivity in the caravans of 535 B.C. as a small child.² He was thus a young man when he began writing his prophecies in 520 B.C. Jewish tradition³ ascribes to him a long prophetic ministry.

Zechariah was a contemporary of Haggai, Zerubbabel, and Joshua. The book of Ezra assigns⁴ Zechariah a place alongside of Haggai in instigating the rebuilding of the temple. This is borne out by the dates given in the first eight chapters. His first oracle is dated in November 520 B.C.,⁵ just two months after Haggai's first word to Zerubbabel and Joshua concerning the temple.⁶ "The purpose of his prophecies is also the same as in Haggai," according to Orelli. "They are meant to encourage that work, and to inspire confidence in the future of the nation and of God's kingdom."⁷ Many conjectures have been made about Zechariah,⁸ but they rest upon insecure foundations.

-
2. Smith, G.A., "Zechariah," The Expositor's Bible, XIV p. 265
 3. Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies, p. xvi
 4. 5:1; 6:14
 5. 1:1
 6. Hag. 1:1
 7. Orelli, C. von, The Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 302
 8. Jewish tradition makes him a member of the Great Synagogue. Early Christian writers (4 and 5 A.D.) give plainly legendary stories of his work in Babylon prior to the restoration. (cf. Wright, op. cit., pp. xviiff.) The versions give him a part in the authorship of several of the Psalms, i.e. the Greek version has his name in the titles of 137 and 145-149; the Old Latin in that of 111; The Vulgate in 111, 145f; the Syriac in 125f. and 145-148.

2. The Book of Zechariah

The book of Zechariah is the longest prophetic book springing from the post-exilic period. It occupies the eleventh place in the Book of the Twelve, not only in the English Bible but also in the Hebrew Bible and in the ancient versions. Barnes says of it, "The book of Zechariah might also be described as a compendium of Old Testament Religion, or at least of Prophetic Religion."⁹

The book falls naturally into three divisions. The first, chaps. 1-6, contains prophecies intimately connected with the time of the re-building of the temple. The second, chaps. 7,8, gives the prophet's reply to a question about the necessity of fasting. The third, chaps. 9-14, is an apocalyptic section dealing with the future of the chosen people.

3. A Brief Survey of Zecharian Criticism

Tradition had its way with the integrity of the book of Zechariah until, strange to say, the Cambridge theologian, Joseph Mede, (1632) attacked the genuineness of chaps. 9-11 in the name of conservatism. Moved by the feeling that he should defend the trustworthiness of Matthew, who quoting Zech. 11:12,13, ascribed it to Jeremiah,¹⁰ he argued that these three chapters were really pre-

9. Barnes, W.E., "Zechariah," Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, XXXI, p. xxiii

10. Mt. 27:9,10

exilic and the work of Jeremiah. Other English exegetes immediately rushed through the hole in the dike. Hammond (1653), Kidder (1700), and Whiston (1722) supported Mede's position with slight variations of their own. A vigorous attack was immediately launched against this criticism. So effective was the opposition of such men as Carpoz (1728) that the integrity of the book went unquestioned for the next half century. The problem was transplanted to Germany by Flügge (1784), who offered independent proof that Jeremiah wrote chaps. 9-14.

Archbishop Newcome (1785) inaugurated a new era by distinguishing between 9-11 and 12-14. These, he held, were separate fragments from different periods and by different authors. The first three chapters were written by a contemporary of Isaiah just prior to the fall of Samaria. The last three chapters were composed after the death of Josiah and before the fall of Jerusalem. This, it will be noted, voids the original reason for considering the section pre-exilic by making it impossible for Jeremiah to write 9:12,13. Bauer (1786-90) and Doederlein (1787) followed Newcome's lead. The trend of criticism was set for almost a century. Only a few voices were raised in protest. Some, as Bechhaus (1796), Blayney (1797), and Jahn (1802), defended the unity of the book.

Corrodi (1792) blazed a new path with the suggestion that chap. 9 belonged to the time of Alexander the Great and chap. 14 to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Eichhorn

(1824) finally decided to follow him in this post-Zecharian dating of these sections. Fifteen years later he² gained another disciple in Vatke (1835), but the main argument was still between Zecharian authorship and a pre-exilic date.

Bertholdt (1814) put forward the conjecture that Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, a contemporary of Isaiah,¹¹ was the author of chaps. 9-11. Forberg (1824), Theiner (1828), and Rosenmüller (1828) supported the pre-exilic position. Hitzig (1830) at first held that all of 9-14 was written during the reign of Uzziah; later (1838) he granted that 12-14 was probably subsequent to 9-11. Ewald (1840) thought that 12-14 might belong to the first years of the exile, but in Prophets of the Old Testament he returned to the usually accepted view that a date prior to 586 B.C. was preferred. Other scholars who advocated the pre-exilic position were Maurer (1840), Maier (1842), Bleek (1852), von Ortenberg (1859), Bunsen (1860), and Samuel Davidson (1862). This was the prevailing view of this period and was held by many eminent scholars who did not write upon the subject at any length and so are not listed above.

These years did not find the unity of Zechariah without defenders. Such men as Köster (1818), De Wette (1833), Hengstenberg (1836), McCaul (1837), Hävernack (1839), Moore (1856), Köhler (1862), and Perowne (1863) defended the unity of the book. But these were not the only ones

11. Isa. 8:2

to challenge the popular opinion. Contenders for a post-Zecharian date reappeared, Stähelin (1847), Geiger (1855), and Böttcher (1864). These latter men were so thoroughly rebuffed that no one took up their position for another twenty years.

The controversy continued to rage between those who held to the integrity of the book and those who held to a pre-exilic date. Among the former were numbered Keil (1873), Chambers (1874), Lange (1876), Pusey (1877), Wright (1878), Dods (1879), Delitzsch (1880), and Lowe (1882). Against them were arrayed Pressel (1870), Duhm (1875), Reuss (1876), von Orelli (1882), Montet (1882), and Riehm (1884).

Stade (1881-2) re-opened the whole problem with his incisive study. He concluded that 9-14 was a unity composed between 306 and 278 B.C. He cut such a wide swath that the whole trend of critical opinion has since swung in behind him. Cheyne (1889) decided that the last six chapters of the book were from the same hand and from the post-exilic period. Briggs (1886), Kuenen (1889), Driver (1891), Kautzsch (1897), and others found that 9-11 contained many pre-exilic fragments which had been worked over by a post-exilic redactor. Cornill (1891) thought that 280 B.C. provided the best setting for 9-14. Graetz (1891), though still holding to the pre-exilic origin of 9-13, dated chap. 14 at the time when Artaxerxes III (Ochus) assaulted Jerusalem as a side issue to his cam-

paign against Egypt. Staerk (1891) and Rubinkam (1892) considered all of 9-14 to be post-exilic, with part if not all of the section stemming from the Maccabean period. Wellhausen (1892) and Marti (1892) argued for the unity of 9-14 and placed all six chapters in the Maccabean period. Kuiper (1894) held that 9-14 was a unity from some time after the battle of Issus but before 332 B.C., the time of the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great. Eckardt (1893) concluded upon purely linguistic grounds that 9-14 was a unity but post-Zecharian. Wildeboer and Cornill (1895) adhered to Stade's conclusion.

Kirkpatrick (1892) modified the post-exilic theory to make 9-14 the product of two authors within sixty or seventy years after the first return from exile. Stearns and Elliot (1889) held to the unity of the book, but without contributing any special reason for so doing. Grützmacher (1892) made a last stand for a pre-exilic date. G.L. Robinson (1895) contended that 9-14 belonged to the same years as 1-8, i.e. 518-516 B.C. His work is the last elaborate effort to defend the unity of the book.

Nowack (1897) found four independent oracles of post-exilic origin. G.A. Smith (1900) agreed with Stade as to the unity of 9-14 and its late date. J.R. Sampey (1908) was unconvinced by the arguments against the unity of the book. Bennett (1907), Dummelow (1909), and Eiselen (1909) accepted the post-Zecharian hypothesis.

Mitchell (1912) decided for composite authorship for the section and a date after 333 B.C. Gray (1913), though disturbed by some pre-exilic evidence, decided for a post-Zecharian date. Barnes (1917) broke from the beaten path to argue for a fifth century author, not Zechariah, for all six chapters. His limited discussion produced little comment.

For the past two decades there has been a growing tendency to ignore the problem as settled by the post-Zecharian hypothesis. Creelman (1917), Bewer (1922), and T.H. Robinson (1923) followed the trend. Sellin (1923) harked back to the difficulties encountered by Kuenen, Driver, and others and proposed that the early elements in the prophecies be explained by ascribing them to an apocalyptic writer of the third century who wrote in the character of a pre-exilic prophet. Farley (1925), though uncertain about the exact date, concluded for a post-exilic date. J.M.P. Smith (1925) and Burkitt (1928) found a number of oracles from the Grecian period in 9-14. H.W. Robinson (1937) decided for a date after Malachi and before Alexander the Great. Most recent scholars confine their discussion of the writings of Zechariah to chaps. 1-8 but give no reason for omitting chaps. 9-14. So generally accepted has the post-Zecharian date for these last six chapters become that nothing needs to be said to explain their position.

From this survey of the criticism of the book of Zechariah certain trends appear. The first effort to ascribe chaps. 9-11 to Jeremiah collapsed as soon as the spotlight of scholarship was focused upon it. On the grounds of the historical evidence within the last six chapters of the book, 9-11 was separated from 12-14, and both parts were given pre-exilic dates. There was never much disposition to consider 9-14 a unity as long as a pre-exilic date prevailed. As soon as Stade introduced a careful study of the relation of 9-14 to other prophetic works, the pre-exilic position was almost universally abandoned. The unity of 9-14 was then generally acknowledged by the great weight of scholarship which busied itself in reinforcing Stade's position. There has since then been no real agreement about the presence of divisions in these chapters. Small fragments have been denied to the author of 9-14, and a few critics have made the entire section no more than a collection. Modern critical opinion is almost unanimous in its acceptance of the separation of chaps. 9-14 from 1-8. While the exact date for 9-14 is far from settled, the post-exilic period is at present the hunting ground. For over a half century all of the detailed studies of the problem have concerned themselves with an effort to fit these chapters into a late post-exilic date. It is now proposed, with recent developments of criticism in mind, to re-examine the whole problem, giving special attention to the possibility of an early fifth century date and Zecharian authorship.

CHAPTER I

AN EXAMINATION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

FOR A PRE-EXILIC DATE

CHAPTER I

AN EXAMINATION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR A PRE-EXILIC DATE

A tabulation of the wide variety of opinions as to the significance of the historical evidence found in the last six chapters of Zechariah is in itself sufficient to produce caution. Some suggested dates are as follows:

a. Chaps. 9-14 fit the period of Jeremiah. b. Chaps 9-11 are prior to the fall of Samaria while chaps. 12-14 are just prior to the fall of Jerusalem. c. Chaps. 9-14 fit the years 520-516 B.C. d. Chaps. 9-14 belong late in the life of Zechariah. e. Chaps. 9-14 belong in the fifth century B.C. but are post-Zecharian. f. Chaps. 9-14 come from the Grecian period. g. Chaps. 9-14 are from the Maccabean period. Out of this confusion De Wette concludes that this latter part of the book of Zechariah does not harmonize with the historical conditions of any one period. Other critics resort to the hypothesis of pre-exilic material worked over by a post-exilic redactor as a means of accounting for the conflicting evidence.

It is well to hold in mind the warning of Bleek, who gives the best statement of the principles to be used in

-
1. De Wette, W.M.L., A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, II, p. 479
 2. So Kuenen, Baudisin, Steurnagel, Cheyne, Delitzsch
 3. Bleek, Friedrich, An Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 36,37

reading historical evidence, that in some cases the historical situation of a prophet is merely a matter of inference. Deficient knowledge of the details of the history of Israel often renders an exact and definite identification of the period of writing impossible. However, the exile cut so completely across Israel's history that the least that may be expected of the historical allusions is a definite decision as to whether these chapters are pre-exilic or post-exilic. That will be taken as the main dividing line for the historical evidence. The appearance of Greek influences in the time of Alexander the Great offers still another dividing line for this discussion. On the basis of the historical allusions of these chapters, it should be possible to arrive at a conclusion as to whether they originated before or after Alexander the Great invaded the eastern world.

A guiding principle to be observed is that the manner of reference to an event is more important than the fact that the event is mentioned.⁴ For example, of more importance than a reference to the exile is the question as to whether the exile is assumed as past or predicted as future. The possibility of prophetic predictions is accepted throughout this work.

Most scholars who hold to a pre-exilic date for Zech.

4. Davidson, A.B., Old Testament Prophecy, p. 255

5

9-14 divide it into two sections. Chaps. 9-11;13:7-9 are placed shortly before the fall of Samaria (722 B.C.). Chaps. 12:1-13:6;14 are placed between the death of Josiah and the fall of Jerusalem (610-586 B.C.). For the sake of convenience, this division will be followed.

1. Evidence of a Pre-exilic Date for Zech. 9-11; 13:7-9

Mede first located these chapters in the pre-exilic period on the basis of the ascription of Zech. 11:12,13 to Jeremiah by Matthew. Following out this suggestion of a pre-exilic date, Archbishop Newcome examined the historical allusions, arriving at the conclusion that this section was composed by a contemporary of Isaiah just prior to the fall of Samaria (722 B.C.). The validity of his arguments was generally accepted; so, almost exclusively upon historical grounds, this period has been accepted as the time of the origin of chaps. 9-11 plus 13:7-9.⁶ The reasons given for this position are as follows:

(1) The Existence of Both the Northern and Southern Kingdoms

Terms are used which imply that both kingdoms still

5. Ewald, Bleek, Orelli, Farrar, et al. However, Mede and Flügge placed the whole in the time of Jeremiah while Rosenmüller, Pressel and formerly Hitzig located the whole in the time of Uzziah.
6. Since Ewald first suggested it, Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 1:3 (1837), these verses have usually been taken as the conclusion of chap. 11.

exist, e.g. Ephraim and Jerusalem (9:10), Judah and Ephraim (9:13), house of Judah and house of Joseph (10:6), "the brotherhood between Judah and Israel" (11:14). This forms a decided contrast to the absence of any reference to Israel in chaps. 12-14, where only Judah and Jerusalem appear.⁷ Therefore, the author of 9-11 lived prior to the destruction of Israel.

The force of this argument is destroyed by the presence in Zech. 8:13 of a similar combination of the names of the two kingdoms, "O house of Judah and house of Israel."⁸ This post-exilic passage, according to Delitzsch, is not called in question by any critic. At one stroke, therefore, it becomes apparent that either such expressions were fairly common in the time of the author of Zech. 1-8, or, in direct proportion to the scarcity of such references, here is a strong argument for a connection between Zech. 1-8 and these following chapters. It is plain that the references to Israel and Judah in chaps. 9-11 can not be used per se as evidence for a pre-exilic date.

⁹
Ewald interprets the breaking of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel as a reference to the outbreak of war between Pekah and Ahaz. It may be questioned, however, whether there was ever a time after the rupture under Rehoboam and before the exile when the relation of Judah and

7. 12:2,5,10; 13:1

8. Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Minor Prophets, II, p. 221

9. Ewald, G.H.A., Prophets of the Old Testament, I, p. 306

Israel might be described as a "brotherhood." Robinson¹⁰ holds that the origin of the expression יִשְׂרָאֵל is best explained in a time subsequent to the fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy concerning the "two sticks."¹¹ Pusey¹² thinks that the political and religious schism was healed by the captivity. If these contentions be accepted, the captivity marks the terminus a quo of this prophecy. The other alternatives for those who hold a pre-exilic date are either to follow Rosenmüller¹³ in interpreting the reference as a backward look to the time under Rehoboam when the brotherhood was first broken or to find here a pre-diction¹⁴ of a breach somewhere in the Messianic future. So far as the pre-exilic date is concerned, these last two interpretations are permissive but not positive arguments for that position.

It may be mentioned that two manuscripts of the Septuagint read "Jerusalem" instead of "Israel" in Zech. 11:14. Wellhausen, Nowack, and Driver accept this change in the text. If this change is allowed, the verse no longer links Judah and Israel; so it is no longer a part of this evidence for a pre-exilic date. In no matter what direction one turns, the efforts to date these chapters of

-
10. Robinson, G.L., "The Prophecies of Zechariah With Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 12:22 (1895)
11. Ezek. 37:15ff.
12. Pusey, E.B., The Minor Prophets, p. 324
13. Rosenmüller, E.F.C., Prophetæ Minores, IV, p. 322
14. So Delitzsch, Wright, Hengstenberg, et al.

Zechariah by a specific identification of this verse with a pre-exilic event is thwarted.

It would have been natural for a post-exilic prophet thus to link Judah and Israel. The cessation of the break between the two kingdoms was expected by the prophets before the captivity.¹⁵ That their expectations came to pass at the conclusion of the exile and that the names "Judah" and "Israel" were both applicable to the post-exilic community is indicated by the following:

a. Of the 42,360 people led back from captivity by Zerrubabel, some twelve thousand were without pedigree. Among these must have been a number from the Ten Tribes whose genealogies had been neglected and who could not be assigned to any special portion of the Holy Land.¹⁶ This conjecture is further substantiated by the fact that twelve men presided over the returning company.¹⁷

b. In I Chronicles 9:2,3 five tribes, i.e. Levi, Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, and Manasseh, are recorded as having representatives in the restored community. This alone would have made a reference to both kingdoms accurate.

c. The edict of Cyrus was issued in the name of

15. Isa. 9:13; Ho. 2:2; Ezek. 37:15ff.

16. Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies, pp. 279-281

17. Neh. 7:7; Ezra 2:2

"Jehovah, the God of heaven" to "Whosoever there is among you of all his people" that they should go up to Jerusalem to build a house for "the God of Israel."¹⁸ This edict was published throughout the kingdom of Cyrus, including the cities of the Medes,¹⁹ where Israelite captives had been taken by Sargon.²⁰ Communication between Judah and Babylon was always possible.²¹ There is, therefore, no reason for limiting those who returned to the company of Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The way was open, and such an invitation to return as that of Zech. 2:10 could have been heeded by any captive at any time.

d. It was in keeping with the custom of the returned people to think of themselves as representing all twelve of the tribes. This is apparent from the offerings recorded in Ezra. At the dedication of the temple in the time of Haggai and Zechariah, the people offered "...for a sin offering for all Israel, twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel" (Ezra 6:17). In the time of Ezra it is recorded that "the children of the captivity, that were come out of exile, offered burnt offerings unto the God of Israel, twelve bullocks for all Israel."²²

18. Ezra 1:3

19. Cf. Ezra 6:2 and II Kings 17:6

20. Pusey, op. cit., pp. 324, 325

21. Zech. 6:9

22. Ezra 8:35

e. There were members of the Ten Tribes who²³ were never carried away from their homes. Welch calls attention to the oft forgotten fact that Sargon carried away only 27,280 people from a region which a short time before contained more than forty thousand heads of houses able to pay a capital levy of fifty shekels. Some of those who were left behind may be included in the description of the group which partook of the passover of 535 B.C.

And the children of Israel that were come again out of the captivity, and all such as had separated themselves unto them from the filthiness of the nations of the land, to seek Jehovah, the God of Israel, did eat.²⁴

The second part of this verse is interpreted by Pusey as²⁵ referring to the Israelites in Palestine who had been de-²⁶filed by the religions imported after the captivity.

It is evident, therefore, that the name "Israel" survived not only the fall of Samaria but also the exile of Judah. It continued as a name for the Ten Tribes, and, in²⁷ Ezra and Nehemiah as well as elsewhere, it was sometimes²⁸ used of the whole body of people who composed the restored community. In like manner the name "Jew" later became an appellation for the entire nation and was accepted as a²⁹ designation of honor. Hence, Wright contends that the

23. Welch, A.C., Jeremiah, pp. 7,8

24. Ezra 6:21

25. Op. cit., p. 325

26. II Kings 17:24-41

27. Ezra 2:2,70; 3:1; 4:3,16,21; 7:28; 8:29

28. Neh. 1:6; 7:7; 8:17; 9:1,2

29. Op. cit., p. 246

idea of the "lost tribes" is a myth of later ages.

In both parts of the book of Zechariah "Israel" is used as the name of the whole nation.³⁰ It is also used to designate only the Northern Kingdom. Because of this double use of the name "Israel," the only means of emphasizing that the whole nation was referred to was to use both "Israel" and "Judah." That is what the author of Zech. 9-11 has done. That he would have used such a designation after the exile is not only possible but probable.

(2) The Political Horizon of Zech. 9-11; 13:7-9

It is claimed by those who hold to the pre-exilic origin of these chapters that the political horizon is that of the eighth century B.C. Their reasons are:

a. The judgments announced upon Syria, Philistia,³¹ and Phoenecia are said to reflect the pre-exilic period. The proof of this statement takes three different forms.

(a) It is urged that the judgments pronounced here are parallel to those of Amos 1:1-2;³²6. To this Lowe objects, "Now, the only similarity between these two passages is, that in both Damascus, Tyre, Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon,³³ and Ekron are threatened." Differences

30. 2:2,4; 9:1

31. 9:1-8

32. Bleek, op. cit., p. 165

33. Lowe, W.H., The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah, p. 82

between the two passages to which attention is called are as follows: Amos includes nations not mentioned in Zechariah. Amos makes a distinction between Judah and Israel; in Zech. 9:1 their interests are combined. The style of the two passages is not similar. Also, a different attitude toward the future of the Philistines is displayed.³⁴

It is not necessary to claim a complete absence of connection between the passages. It may be allowed that the author of Zechariah was familiar with the book of Amos. In any case, it is certain that a relation between the two passages would have to be one of dependence on the part of Zechariah. Those who hold to a pre-exilic date find that due to Zech. 10:9,10 the invasion of Tiglath-pileser III is the terminus a quo of this passage in Zechariah, while the book of Amos was written about twenty-five years prior to that event. Only by agreeing with Haupt³⁵ that both Amos and Zechariah are Maccabean can these passages be made to refer to the same situation. His hypothesis concerning the date of Amos is entirely impossible. Elsewhere it will be shown that the author of Zech. 9-14 is in the habit of reaching into the past to take portions from the writings of his prophetic predecessors. These he adapts to his own needs whenever possible, and that is probably what has occurred here.

34. Cf. Amos 1:8 and Zech. 9:7

35. Haupt, Paul, "A Peaceful Colony," Journal of Biblical Literature, 35:290ff. (1916)

36

(b) Farrar and others hold that the refer-
ences to Syria, Phoenecia, and Philistia are made in such
a manner as to indicate that these kingdoms still retained
their prosperity and power at the time these judgments
were pronounced. These kingdoms were brought under subjec-
tion by Tiglath-pileser and his successors.³⁷ They never re-
gained their independence on down through the time of
Darius. Yet, with all of western Asia and Egypt included
in the empire of Darius, Haggai speaks of "nations," "king-
doms," and "thrones."³⁸ It is a mistake to think of ancient
kingdoms as being under the direct rule of the emperor.
³⁹ Mitchell points out that the little states in and about
Palestine were not lost in the shadows of the great powers
which controlled them, but they remained objects of indi-
vidual interest to the Hebrew prophets. Ezekiel prophesied
against Tyre and Sidon.⁴⁰ Jeremiah prophesied against Hamath
and Damascus long after they had become tributaries of
Assyria.⁴¹ Zephaniah pronounced woes upon the Philistines.⁴²
No one would hold that these prophecies had to be written
before these kingdoms lost their independence. In fact,

36. Farrar, F.W., The Minor Prophets, p. 209

37. Goodspeed, G.S., A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians, pp. 233-235

38. Haggai 2:7, 22

39. Mitchell, H.G., "Zechariah," International Critical Commentary, XXV, p. 246

40. Ezek. 28:1-23

41. Jer. 49:23-27

42. Zeph. 2:4-7

43

Cheyne goes to the other extreme and declares that the attitude manifested here toward the Philistines and the woes pronounced upon Ashdod "seem to require" a post-exilic date.

Knowledge of the period during the life of Zechariah is too limited to locate definitely an instance which might have caused the traditional hatreds of these peoples to flame again, but such an occasion is not unlikely. De Wette avoids seeking such an occasion by explaining these names as enigmatical allusions to the great world powers of Zechariah's own day. Others, including Köhler, Wright, and Kirkpatrick, hold that Zechariah was commissioned to announce judgments against the cities of Syria, Phoenecia, and Philistia because all of these cities lay within the territory granted by Divine promise to the children of Israel. This is the best explanation so far suggested. It would explain some of the differences between this passage and the similar passage in Amos. The territory of the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites was not included in the limits assigned to Israel by the law. Further, the judgments pronounced in Zechariah were not only the result of the hostility of these peoples to the Israelites, but were also the result of their own relation to God. This ex-

43. Cheyne, T.K., "The Origin of the Book of Zechariah," The Jewish Quarterly Review, 1:78 (1889)

44. Op. cit., p. 480n

45. Gen. 15:18; Ex. 23:31; Num. 34:1-12; I Kings 4:24; 8:65

46. Deut. 2:4,5,9,19

47. Zech. 9:2,7

planation is also supported by the correspondence of the area involved with the extent of the Messianic kingdom announced in Zech. 9:10. The objection of Delitzsch to this line of thinking, on the ground that Hadrach was not within the boundaries of the land promised Israel, is not very forceful. It is only necessary to recall that "Hadrach" has been taken as the name of the Messiah, the name of some Syrian king, the name of some god, the name of a city near Damascus, and as a mysterious epithet for the whole territory of the kingdom of David to see that the uncertainty of identification vitiates his argument. However, even if Delitzsch were correct in taking the names of these nations as a sort of synecdoche by which the kingdom of the world is meant, a post-exilic date would still be as probable as a pre-exilic date.

(c) Ewald, Grützmacher, and others believe that the judgment prophesied here came to pass in the second invasion of Tiglath-pileser. This argument rests on the presence of the name "Hadrach" and the correspondence with Zech. 9:1-8 of the monuments which give the line of march of the invading force. Neither of these can be pressed. No other eighth century writer uses "Hadrach"; so its presence here has no early paral-

48. Kirkpatrick, A.F., The Doctrine of the Prophets, p. 450
 49. Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., pp. 321-326

lel to draw its dating in that direction. The agreement of the monuments with the order in which these cities are cited is no more exact than the obvious tactics for any invasion of this area would explain. Moreover, this position leaves unexplained the partial captivity indicated in Zech. 10:8-12, which must, for any pre-exilic date to be satisfactory, refer to the invasion of Tiglath-pileser. In these latter verses the invasion is past while in Zech. 9: 1-8 the invasion is future; so they cannot both refer to the incursion of Tiglath-pileser.

b. The use of the names "Assyria" and "Egypt" is considered evidence of a pre-exilic date. Because Assyria had ceased to exist and Egypt was no longer so great a world power after the exile, it is presumed that these would not then be named as the chief among Israel's enemies. It should, however, be borne in mind that Egypt was Israel's hereditary enemy. G.A. Smith points out that the name "Egypt" survived even to the Maccabean period and was used then as a name for the kingdom of the Ptolemies. Also, at almost any time after the exile, Egypt occupied an important place in the thinking of those concerned with world events. Cambyses led an expedition against Egypt in 526 B.C., and Darius led a similar expedition in 517 B.C. The Jews were perhaps involved in the Egyptian revolt

against Artaxerxes in 462-456 B.C. That a post-exilic prophet should not be concerned about Egypt would have been stranger than the appearance of a prophecy against Egypt among his writings.

The effect of the Assyrian oppression upon Israel was so great that the name "Assyria" was ever afterward used of any power which threatened Israel from the north.⁵¹ In Lam. 5:6, which is unquestionably post-exilic, the name "Assyrians" is used when "Babylonians" is meant. The same is true in II Kings 23:29 where Pharoah Necho is said to have gone against "the king of Assyria" though Nebuchadnezzar, a Babylonian, is intended. Of more importance, Ezra 6:22 speaks of the "king of Assyria" when the "king of Persia"⁵² is meant. Mitchell and others claim that "Assyria" was used of the kingdom of the Seleucids. Certainly Zechariah should not be forbidden the use of a term in common use in his day to represent kingdoms of either the past, the present, or the future.

No positive conclusion for a pre-exilic date can be drawn from these references. Neither the fact of their use nor the manner of their use is such as to warrant an early date. Their presence in the writings of a post-exilic prophet would occasion no surprise.

51. Eiselen, F.C., The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament, II, p. 572
 52. Op. cit., p. 294

(3) The Three Shepherds of Zech. 11:8

The identification of the three shepherds of Zech. 11:8 as certain individuals who lived prior to the exile has been used to prove that this section is pre-exilic. It is not, however, to be thought that there is any unity among the scholars in this identification. The following identifications have been suggested: Moses, Aaron, and Miriam (Jerome); Galba, Otho, and Vitellius (Calmet); Eli and his two sons (Burger); Samuel and his two sons (Burger); David, Adonijah, and Joab (Grotius); the three world powers of Daniel - Babylonia, Persia, and Macedonia (Keil) or Assyria, Babylonia, and Persia (Stade); the three offices - prophet, priest, and king (Delitzsch) or priest, judge, and lawyer (Pusey); Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, and Zedekiah (Kimchi); Jehoiakim, Jehoiakin, and Zedekiah (Barnes); Antiochus Epiphanes, Eupator, and Demetrius (Wright); Lysimachus, Jason, and Menelaus (Marti); Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes (Lightfoot); Antiochus III, Seleucus IV, and Heliodorus (Mitchell). This diversity of interpretation creates an attitude of skepticism toward any use of this verse as an evidence of date. A conclusive identification of these shepherds must be demonstrated before this argument can bear any weight.

Among those who hold to a pre-exilic date, Hitzig's interpretation has received the most attention and support. What may be said concerning it will demonstrate the gen-

eral difficulties that are encountered in the other identifications of these shepherds.

53

Hitzig identified the three shepherds as three kings of the Northern Kingdom, Zechariah, Shallum, and Menahem. However, this interpretation is only possible if the limitation "in one month" is removed. According to II Kings 15:8-22, Zechariah reigned six months; Shallum ruled one month; and Menahem ruled ten years. Hitzig attacks the difficulty by making the time limit refer to the rule rather than the destruction of the shepherds. The phrase takes on the meaning, "I removed the three shepherds which were in one month." He pictures one month which saw the end and the span and the beginning of three different

54

reigns. Delitzsch says that this rendering of the phrase by Hitzig is ungrammatical. Wright allows this reading in spite of the omission of the relative pronoun from the Hebrew phrase, but he insists that the expression $\Pi \ 7'$ $\square' \ 7'$, used of Shallum's reign in II Kings 15:13, indicates that he alone ruled a full month, literally, "a month of days." Nevertheless, whether these kings ruled in any one month or not, they were not cut off in one month. The verse reads, "And I cut off the three shepherds in one month; ..." There is no ground for Hitzig's contention that the translation should be "und ich

53. Hitzig, F., Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, p. 145

54. Op. cit., p. 363n

55. Op. cit., p. 319

schaffte weg" instead of "und ich vertilgte."

Two other approaches to the problem of the time limitation have been offered. Mitchell conjectures that the expression "in one month" is a gloss. This habit of editing the Scriptures to suit one's interpretation is to be deplored. He has no reason for dropping this phrase other than difficulty in understanding it. A better solution of the problem is to accept the term "month" as symbolic. This symbolic use of numbers was the practice of Daniel, and may be either borrowed or anticipated here, according to the view accepted of the date of Daniel. Symbolic designations are found in Ezekiel 4:4-6. It should be noted that these other examples of the symbolic use of numbers by the prophets occur in the period of the exile or after. In desperation the majority of critics have accepted "one month" as used in Zech. 11:8 to mean an indefinite short period of time. Unfortunately, when that door is opened, most of the identifications listed above become possibilities.

The difficulty of a positive assertion as to the identity of these shepherds is not all that is involved. There is always the question as to whether the passage has a historical, contemporary, or prophetic reference. For example, Kirkpatrick,⁵⁷ holding to a post-Zecharian

56. Op. cit., p. 306

57. Op. cit., p. 449

date for the passage, allows an identification of these shepherds out of the earlier history of the Northern Kingdom. On the other hand, Wright, holding to Zecharian⁵⁸ authorship of the verse, identifies these shepherds out of the later history of the Maccabean period. No matter which direction the efforts at interpretation of this passage turn, the question of date is as obscure as ever.

(4) The Sins of the People

It is contended that Zech. 10:2 and 13:2-6 indicate that idolatry and false prophecy were the prevailing sins⁵⁹ of the prophet's day; consequently, these prophecies must be dated in the pre-exilic period when such sins were⁶⁰ rampant. That this is true is denied upon two grounds:

a. While it is granted that one would naturally turn to the pre-exilic period as the source of a reference to idolatry and false prophecy, it is denied that the author here treats these as the prevalent sins of his day.⁶¹ Cornill says, "The consultation of the $\square' \text{ } \text{?} \text{ } \text{?} \text{ } \text{?}$ (teraphim) and diviners is depicted in X.2 as an earlier custom and as the cause of the Exile which, too, lies in

58. Op. cit., pp. 312-321

59. Zech. 13:2-6 is linked to this discussion to prevent unnecessary repetition as the arguments concerning both passages are almost identical.

60. So Ewald, Bleek, Grützmacher, et. al.

61. So Wright, Pusey, Robinson, Kirkpatrick

the past ..."⁶² Concerning the verb **שׁוּב**, "to break up,"
⁶³ used in 10:2, Delitzsch says that it is applied to the
pulling up of pegs, to the taking down of tents, and so
involves the idea of wandering into exile. That is the
connection in which it is found here.⁶⁴ Wright calls atten-
tion to the transition from the preceding imperfects to
the perfect tense. This, too, would turn the reference of
the verse to the past. It does not seem to be a prophetic
perfect. However, if it were a prophetic perfect, the
sins spoken of would not belong to the prophet's own day.
If the reference is to the past, as Cornill, Delitzsch,
and Wright hold, not the sins of his own people but the
cause of the exile is before the prophet as he writes.
Apparently the prophet is using the fate of the people in
the past as an incentive to right conduct among his own
people.

Concerning 13:2-6, the tendency among most scholars
is to make it point to the future. Reading the passage
itself would lead to that conclusion.

And it shall come to pass in that day, saith
Jehovah of hosts, that I will cut off the names
of the idols out of the land, and they shall no
more be remembered; and also I will cause the
prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of
the land.

Not the present but "in that day" is the point of inter-

62. Cornill, C., Introduction to the Canonical Books of
the Old Testament, p. 367

63. Op. cit., p. 346

64. Op. cit., p. 269

est upon which the eyes of the prophet are focused. This passage may be connected with the prediction of Hosea 2:17⁶⁵ as a simple reaffirmation of that earlier prophecy. "It is by no means necessary to suppose," as Wright points out, "that those particular sins were common among the people in the days of the prophets."⁶⁶

b. It is not impossible that idolatry and false prophecy could have been mentioned as sins in the period shortly after the exile.⁶⁷ There is considerable evidence for the presence of idolatry in the post-exilic period. The stress which Malachi lays on the danger of marrying "the daughters of a foreign god" is doubtlessly due to the resulting idolatry. In like manner, Nehemiah cautions against foreign marriages because, "Did not Solomon, king of Israel, sin by these things?" The author of Kings attributes the worship of other gods by Solomon to his foreign wives.⁶⁸ The children of these mixed marriages often could not speak the Jewish language.⁶⁹ At best, their instruction in the Jewish religion must have been very imperfect. That idolatry was among the sins of the post-exilic community is further substantiated by the sins condemned in Malachi 3:5. Positive proof of the presence of idolatry is found as late as the Maccabean period.⁷⁰

65. Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 269

66. *Op. cit.*, p. 413

67. So Kirkpatrick, Wright, Pusey, *et al.*

68. I Kings 11:1-8

69. Ezra 9:2ff; Neh. 13:23

70. II Macc. 12:40; Josephus, *Antiquities*, VIII, ii, 5

The condemnation of false prophecy could belong to almost any time in Israel's history. Ewald believes that prophecy was degenerate in the time of Jeremiah, and so he refers 13:2 to that time. Sellin and Cornill follow his line of reasoning and date the passage in the closing hours when the flame of all Old Testament prophecy was dying out. However, this passage is not speaking of true prophetic inspiration. The prophets mentioned here are connected with idols and unclean spirits. Compare I Kings 22:21-23 where Ahab is misled by prophets in whose mouth is a "lying spirit." The prophets of this passage "wear a hairy mantle to deceive." That can only have reference to their attempt to look like a true prophet. These verses should be taken as a prediction concerning the cessation of false prophecy. That a post-exilic prophet might have been concerned about the presence of quack competitors is obvious. The work of Nehemiah was hindered by the prophet Shemiah and the prophetess Noadiah and "the rest of the prophets." This provides conclusive evidence of the use of the word "prophet" with the meaning "false prophet" in the century subsequent to the exile. Here, then, is a strong argument for placing the author of Zech. 13:2-6 in the general period of Nehemiah, for he also uses the word

71. Op. cit., III, p. 50

72. Sellin, E., Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 192

73. Cornill, C.H., The Prophets of Israel, p. 168

74. Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 393

75. Neh. 6:10-14

"prophet" in that way. From the book of Nehemiah something is also learned of the prominent place certain false prophets held after the exile. False prophets themselves are found in the time of the New Testament and are predicted as yet future from the time of Christ.⁷⁶

The sins spoken of in Zech. 10:2 and 13:2-6 are not pictured as the prevalent faults of the author's contemporaries. However, if they were, there is some reason for thinking that these passages are best suited to the post-exilic period.

Summing up this investigation into the historical evidence for the date of Zech. 9-11; 13:7-9, the result is negative so far as a pre-exilic date is concerned. Every historical allusion capable of a pre-exilic identification is at least equally capable of a post-exilic identification.

2. Evidence of a Pre-exilic Date For Zech. 12:1-13:6;14

There has never been as strong a case made out for the pre-exilic origin of these chapters as for the three preceding chapters. Again, however, the historical evidence has furnished the chief support for those who advocate a date after the death of Josiah and before the fall of Jerusalem for these prophecies. The grounds for such a position are as follows:

76. Mt. 7:15; 24:11; Acts 5:36,37; 13:6; I Jn. 4:1

(1) Imminence of the Chaldean Siege and Capture of Jerusalem

It is contended that chaps. 12 and 14 are predictions of the Chaldean siege and capture of Jerusalem. Chapter twelve gives a description of an impending siege of Jerusalem that will issue in the discomfiture of her enemies. In chap. 14 the nations capture Jerusalem, and half of the people are taken captive. These two chapters are considered by some critics to be predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. which were issued shortly before that disaster. The pre-exilic prophets did point to the fall of Jerusalem long before it occurred. The heart of the question here is whether these prophecies fit into the pre-exilic style and atmosphere. Two observations may be made:

a. The author of Zechariah does not designate the enemies who are to attack Jerusalem as was the habit of the earlier prophets. Driver feels that this is very significant. The eighth century prophets often specified Assyria as the nation which would take the people captive. Babylon is also designated by name. Jeremiah even pointed out Nebuchadnezzar as the king whom Judah would have to

77. So. Bleek, Ewald, Hitzig, Orelli, et al.

78. Op. cit., p. 261

79. Isa. 7:17; Mi. 4:10; Hos. 9:3; etc.

80. Isa. 39:6; Jer. 32:5; etc.

81
 serve. In Zech. 12 and 14, instead of a definite power,
 "all nations of the earth" are gathered against Jerusalem.
 Seemingly the author has been influenced by the eschatol-
 82
 ogical traits introduced by Ezekiel. Eiselen contends,

The predictions in chapters 12 and 14 are more
 in accord with...late postexilic writings, than
 with any announcements of the fall of Jerusalem
 found in Jeremiah or other preexilic writings. 83

84
 Driver is justified in his observation that the prophet
 does not have in mind any real enemies but that here is an
 ideal or imaginative element which belongs late in the de-
 velopment of Hebrew prophecy. The attack upon Jerusalem
 is for its purging and to afford an opportunity for the
 vindication of Jehovah's love for his chosen people upon
 their enemies. No particular sins are set forth as the
 cause of the judgment as was the custom of the earlier
 prophets.

b. It is exceedingly difficult to imagine a
 contemporary of Jeremiah, for such this author would be
 according to the usual pre-exilic date, delivering such a
 message of promise as this. Consider some of the state-
 ments of Jeremiah concerning the prophets of his day who
 were lulling the people with a false sense of security.

And they have healed the hurt of the daughter
 of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace;
 when there is no peace. 85

81. Jer. 25:9; 27:6ff; 28:14
 83. Op. cit., p. 577
 85. Jer. 8:11

82. Ezek. 38; 39
 84. Op. cit., p. 233

The prophet that prophesieth of peace, when the word of the prophet shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known, that Jehovah hath truly sent him.⁸⁶

Jeremiah means to say that a prophet who promises anything but disaster to the people of his day is a false prophet. The picture of the ultimate disaster which would befall the enemies of Jerusalem given in Zech. 12 and 14 would have qualified him as a false prophet in the eyes of Jeremiah. Even so staunch an advocate of the pre-exilic date as Ewald comments, "the most distinctive feature of this prophet is his uncommonly elevated and confident hope of the deliverance of Jerusalem and Yuda⁸⁷" In order to explain the conflicting messages of Zechariah and Jeremiah, Ewald guesses that the former lived in the country like Micah and the latter lived in the city like Isaiah. There are two fatal objections to this. First, not the opinion of the prophet but the word of God is supposedly given by both men. God would hardly give contradictory inspiration to two men no matter how far apart they might live. Second, the word of Jeremiah and not the word of Zechariah came to pass; so, according to Jer. 28:9, the latter spoke without a Divine commission. It is, therefore, easier to conclude that this author did not live in the time of Jeremiah.

86. Jer. 28:9

87. Ewald, G.H.A., op. cit., III, p. 50

(2) The House of David

The mention of the house of David (12:7,8,10; 13:1) is taken as an indication that the kingdom of Judah was still in existence at the time this passage was composed. The house of David is spoken of as an object of Jehovah's concern in the present and in the future. What does such a reference signify? ⁸⁸ Pusey calls attention to the fact that it is his house, not any earthly ruler in it which is mentioned. From Ezra 8:2 and I Chron. 3:17-24 it is evident that as late as the time of the Chronicler (circa 300 B.C.) the descendants of David were still reckoned as a ⁸⁹ distinct family. That the Messianic connections with the house of David should have kept it in the forefront of the prophetic consciousness is to be expected. Ezek. 34:23,24; 37:24,25 and other passages written after the exile had begun envision a day when "my servant David shall be king." A reference to the house of David would have been in keeping with the prophetic spirit at any time before or after the exile.

The context of the reference to the house of David in 12:7 is important.

Jehovah also shall save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem be not magnified above Judah.

The place given to Judah as equal to the house of David

88. Op. cit., p. 33189. Eiselen, op. cit., p. 577

and the inhabitants of Jerusalem is a conception which would hardly have found such an expression as this before the exile.⁹⁰ This would seem to belong to a day when the prestige of the house of David had been tarnished by the low estate to which it had sunk. Some reference to a king would surely be expected in these chapters if they were written before the exile. To all indications, the house of David was not ruling at the time these verses were written.

- (3) The "Earthquake in the Days of Uzziah" (14:5)
and the "Mourning of Hadadrimmon in the Valley
of Megiddon" (12:11)

Wellhausen thought that the reference to the "earthquake in the days of Uzziah" was a stronger argument for an Assyrian date than anything noted in chaps. 9-11, and Rosenmüller so far accepted the force of these references as to place all six chapters (9-14) in the reign of Uzziah. There has been little tendency, however, to follow this course. Bleek may be taken as representative of most exponents of the pre-exilic date when he comments on 14:5, "It there refers to the terror at the fearful earthquake ... in a way in which the prophet would not have expressed it, if it had not been some long period of time since it took place."⁹¹ Rabbi David Kimchi interprets "like"⁹²

90. Wright, op. cit., pp. xxxi, 367 91. Op. cit., p. 172
 92. M'Caul, Alex., Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary on the Prophecies of Zechariah, p. 180

as ye fled" to mean "as your fathers fled from before the earthquake." Naturally, the mention of an earthquake in the days of Uzziah is of little importance so far as the date of a passage is concerned if it is spoken of as an event in the distant past. In order to make the author of these chapters a contemporary of Jeremiah, it is necessary to think of this verse as a historical reference. This point is made here because of its bearing on the discussion of 12:11 and not because any modern scholar now considers that these chapters belong in the time of Uzziah. The evidence of 12:11 makes that impossible.

It is rather generally accepted that the death of Josiah (610 B.C.) is intended as the cause of the "mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon." The only important difference of opinion is that held by J.A. Montgomery.⁹³ With the help of several emendations, he finds here a reference to the wailing for "the only begotten of Ramman," a god worshiped in the manner of the Adonis cult. This reading removes the verse from any discussion of date, but it is a strained interpretation. It is better to take Hadadrimmon as the name of a place rather than the name of a god. It then becomes a more exact designation of the place where King Josiah fell in the valley of Meggido during the battle with Pharoah Necho.⁹⁴ It should be kept in

93. "Tarak," Journal of Biblical Literature, 33:78ff. (1914)
 94. Orelli, C. von, Old Testament Prophecy, p. 349n

mind that the death of Josiah was such a national calamity as to be long remembered by the people.

And all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah.
And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah: and all of
the singing men and singing women spake of
Josiah in their lamentations unto this day.⁹⁵

If the Chronicler could so write of the death of Josiah in his day, it is difficult to find any time in the prophetic period after 610 B.C. when the reference in 12:11 could not have been written. If the author of these chapters in Zechariah could have had in hand an account or could have been acquainted with a tradition of an earthquake in the days of Uzziah, one hundred and fifty years before his time, why could he not have been a post-exilic writer with written sources or tradition to acquaint him with the circumstances of such an important event as the death of Josiah? Even today the account of the good king's death is the property of all Old Testament students.

Both of the above verses do no more than establish a terminus a quo for these chapters. There is nothing in either of them which would serve in any wise to indicate a specific period for their writing.

(4) The Dimensions Ascribed to Judah

The dimensions ascribed to Judah in Zech.14:10 are held to be descriptive of the pre-exilic bounds of the land. There is some question as to whether this verse

95. II. Chron. 35:24b, 25a

was ever intended to indicate the limits of the land at the time of writing. It is a part of an eschatological description of the future limits of the land.

And all the land shall be made like the Arabah, from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem; and she shall be lifted up, and shall dwell in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananel unto the king's wine presses.

These landmarks may have been taken from the prophet's own day or from the past or may have been a combination descriptive of no day that has yet come.

Even the long held position that Geba of Benjamin was the northern extremity and Rimmon the southern extremity of Judah at the time this was written has lost its force as a means of proving a pre-exilic date. Graetz accepts this verse as defining the extent of Judah in the time of the writer, but he finds that these limits correspond not to conditions before the exile but to the limits in the time of Nehemiah.⁹⁶ He concludes, "The boundaries assigned to Judah in this prophecy, therefore, clearly point to the post-exilic period."⁹⁷ That this argument has been used to prove both an early and a late date appears strange until Schürer's statement concerning the limits of the post-exilic community is read.

96. Neh. 11:25-36

97. Graetz, H., "Zech. 14," Jewish Quarterly Review, 3: 211 (1891)

The extent of the Jewish commonwealth, . . . , was probably limited to Judea proper, that is, the province lying south of Samaria, which in its range corresponded nearly with the kingdom of Judah of earlier days.⁹⁸

Obviously, if the limits were about the same before and after the exile, no date can be proved by a description which corresponds equally as well to the land at both periods.

This investigation into the purported historical evidence for a pre-exilic date for Zech. 9-14 has demonstrated that no argument has been advanced which is not capable of an equally acceptable explanation in the post-exilic period. On the other hand, under close examination some of these arguments are seen to shift their weight to the later period.

98. Schürer, E., A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Division I, Vol. I, p. 189

CHAPTER II

AN EXAMINATION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

FOR A POST-EXILIC DATE

CHAPTER II

AN EXAMINATION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR A POST-EXILIC DATE

While not so many separate arguments have been pressed for the post-exilic origin of Zech. 9-14 as for the pre-exilic date, a few weighty ones have tipped the scales so that "the prevailing trend of recent criticism has been to assign 'Zech.' ix-xiv to post-exilic times."¹ There has been, however, little agreement among advocates of the post-exilic date as to the exact time of composition of these chapters. With that in mind, the general arguments which point to a post-exilic date will be examined first. Then the indications of a more specific date will be investigated, keeping in mind that these are also arguments for a time subsequent to the exile.

1. Evidence That the Exile is Past

The exile cut through not only the history but all of Israelite life. It had been a catastrophe toward which the prophets pointed with warnings for many centuries. When it finally came to pass, it served not only to refine the nation, but the memory of it became a lash in the

1. Smith, G.A., "Zechariah," The Expositor's Bible, XIV, p. 454

hands of the prophets which they could use to keep the people in line with the Divine purpose. Some indications that the exile had occurred when Zech. 9-14 was written are as follows:

(1) References to an Exile That Had Occurred

Certain verses are found which indicate that there had already been an exile. It is most natural to look for the explanation of these references in the Babylonian exile. Each of these references must be examined to determine its exact force.

In 9:8 Jehovah promises that "no oppressor shall pass through them any more." Lowe interprets this verse to mean, "... the nation would not be again reduced to the position of slaves, as they were by the Babylonians and Persians." That this interpretation is justified is indicated by the fact that "all the tribes of Israel" are being discussed. There were many invasions of both kingdoms. There were, however, no successful conquests of both kingdoms at the same time, nor any time when both kingdoms were in exile together that would fit a pre-exilic date for this verse. The language of this verse and its context clearly indicate that both kingdoms had fallen prey to the nations. Only after the Assyrian conquest of

2. Lowe, W.H., The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah, p. 84

Samaria (722 B.C.) and the Chaldean conquest of Jerusalem (586 B.C.) could the prophet have looked back over the history of his people and, in one glance, have seen both kingdoms in the power of an oppressor.

From 9:11,12 it appears that not only has the captivity taken place, but the captives are expectantly awaiting release. Such an expression as "prisoners of hope" would have been void of meaning before the exile. ³ Cornill finds in these verses a promise of double recompense for the suffering of the exile. These verses do reflect the same feeling that prompted Deutero-Isaiah to write of Jerusalem, ⁴ "... she hath received of Jehovah's hand double for all her sins."

Concerning both the house of Judah and the house of Israel, 10:6 announces,

I will bring them back; for I have mercy upon them; and they shall be as though I had not cast them off: for I am Jehovah their God, and I will hear them.

Coupling this verse with 10:8-10 produces the certain conclusion that both kingdoms have already gone into captivity. The effort to limit the extent of this captivity to that under Tiglath-pileser in 732 B.C. because of the mention here of Gilead and Lebanon is neutralized by the fact that the captives are to return not only from Assyria but also from Egypt. From Jer. 42-43 the flight of some of

3. Cornill, C., Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, p. 366
4. Isa. 40:2

the citizens of Jerusalem into Egypt after the Chaldean invasion of 586 B.C. is indicated. There were considerable Israelite colonies in Egypt after the fall of Samaria, as is proved by the Assuan papyri. But there is no reason for thinking that the partial captivity of 732 B.C. drove any exiles into Egypt. The return of exiles from Egypt does not fit into the years prior to the fall of Samaria, nor can the reference here be made to point to the success of Sargon. If this section had been written shortly after the fall of Samaria, it is unlikely that both Judah and Israel would have been spoken of in the manner found in 9-11. Taken in their context, these references are best explained as indicating that the captivity of both kingdoms is past. That would mean that these chapters were written after 535 B.C.

(2) The Condition of Jerusalem as Indicated in Zech. 14:10,11

5

According to Barnes, the clearest confirmations of a post-exilic date are found in the conditions of Jerusalem as described in Zech. 9-14. The city had risen from the very low depths described in Zech. 1,2, but still she had not reached the prosperity she enjoyed before the exile. The description of the city given in 14:10 is very suggestive:

5. Barnes, W.E., "Zechariah," Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, XXXI, p. xviii

All the land shall be made like the Arabah, from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem; and she shall be lifted up, and shall dwell in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananel unto the king's wine presses.

It is proposed that these places be identified as follows:

"The gate of Benjamin" is the same as "the gate of Ephraim" spoken of in Neh. 12:39. Köhler and others hold that "the first gate" is "the outermost gate" mentioned by Nehemiah. Nehemiah also spoke of "the corner gate" and "the tower of Hananel." "The king's wine presses" probably lay in the royal garden of Neh. 3:15. Pusey agrees with these identifications upon grounds of his own and concludes that the city of Zech. 9-14 corresponded with the city of Nehemiah.

From 14:11 it is learned that Jerusalem had been dwelling under a "curse" from which immediate release was expected. This was the attitude of all of those living in Jerusalem shortly after the close of the exile. Though a more glorious future for the city was always expected, it is not likely that Jerusalem would have been described before the exile as dwelling under a "curse."

(3) Cause of Judgment Upon the Heathen Nations

-
6. Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies, p. 494
 7. Cited by Wright, ibid., p. 495
 8. Neh. 3:1; 12:39
 9. Pusey, E.B., The Minor Prophets, II, p. 327

When judgment is pronounced upon the heathen nations by the author of Zech. 9-14, no explanation or particular accusation of sin is given.¹⁰ This is not in accord with the custom of the earlier prophets, who were careful to state the cause of judgment.¹¹ Post-exilic writers had no need to provide this explanation because all of the accusations of the past had been added up until heathen iniquity culminated in the destruction and desecration of Jerusalem. Consequently, it was recognized by all to whom the post-exilic prophets spoke that the heathen nations deserved the severest retribution.¹² This is the attitude which characterized the author of the last six chapters of the book of Zechariah.

(4) Evidence That is Incompatible With a Pre-exilic date

a. Certain passages in Zech. 9-14 would have been misleading to people facing such a catastrophe as occurred in 722 B.C. or 586 B.C.¹³ Victory and not defeat is announced. Syria, Philistia, Phoenecia, Javan, and "all nations" are to be subdued before the power of

10. See Zech. 9:1-7

11. See Amos 1:3-2:16

12. Eiselen, F.C., The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament, II, p. 572

13. Robinson, G.L., "The Prophecies of Zechariah With Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 12:16 (1895)

¹⁴
 Jehovah. The message of the prophets before the exile was primarily one of doom and punishment for sin. The only hope they offered was on the basis of repentance. This message is to a purged people to whom temporal prosperity is held out (7:17; 10:1) in similar fashion to the promises of Hag 2:19; Zech 8:19. The wealth of the heathen nations is promised them (14:2,14) after the fashion of Hag. 2:8. Viewed from a pre-exilic standpoint, such unconditional promises would have been out of place.

b. The sins of the people no longer occupy the center of this prophet's attention. He is looking at the glorious future. While Hosea commanded the people to "re-¹⁵joice not," this writer can see reasons for saying, "Re-¹⁶joice greatly, O daughter of Zion." In another time Jeremiah's "eyes ran down with tears night and day" as he looked upon the desperate future of his people, but this prophet has no tears to shed. Indeed, the message of the second part of the book of Zechariah is most incongruous with the period before God had accomplished his judgment upon the sins of the people.

2. Evidence of a Post-Zecharian Date

By the term "post-Zecharian" is intended any period so late as to be beyond the possible lifetime of Zechariah

14. Cf. Zech. 9:1-7,13; 12:3-9; 14:12-15

15. Hos. 9:1

16. Zech. 9:9

the son of Berechiah. The two post-Zecharian periods favored by most scholars who believe that these chapters originated subsequent to the life of Zechariah are the Grecian and the Maccabean. Kirkpatrick and Barnes prefer a time shortly after the life of Zechariah the son of Berechiah.

The Maccabean period may be ruled out in the beginning on the ground that had these chapters been written so late as 167 B.C. they could not possibly have become a part of the prophetic canon. The prophetic canon was certainly closed by the end of the third century B.C. This does not, however, exclude the interpretation of certain passages as references to Maccabean events. For example, Pusey holds to Zecharian authorship of these six chapters, but he finds them to be predictions of Maccabean struggles. Again, one might accept Duhm's identification of the three bad shepherds of 11:8 as Jason, Menelaus, and Lysimachus while refusing to agree with him that the author was their contemporary. Consequently, it is not necessary to deal with the many Maccabean interpretations of this part of the book of Zechariah. That is true because, if the element of prediction is allowed at all,

17. So Eichhorn, Vatke, Stade, Mitchell, Driver, et al.

18. So Marti, Wellhausen, Rubinkam, et al.

19. Op. cit., p. 330

20. Duhm, B., The Twelve Prophets, p. 243

21. The comments on the Grecian date are in substance the same as would be used here.

there is no more difficulty in allowing the predictor to stand at 500 B.C. than at 200 B.C. if he is to foretell an event which occurred after 167 B.C.

The following are the arguments advanced for a Grecian date (336-167 B.C.) for Zech. 9-14:

(1) The Reference to Assyria and Egypt in Zech 10:
10,11

The presence of these names has already been discussed in their bearing on the evidence for a pre-exilic date. Here that position is reversed for these names are taken by exponents of a Grecian date as enigmatical designations of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. "Egypt" stands for the kingdom of the Ptolemies and "Assyria" stands for the kingdom of the Seleucids. It was this consideration which induced Stade to give as the time of composition of these chapters a date between 306-278 B.C.²² G.A. Smith agrees in this conclusion.²³ While it may be granted that the kingdoms of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids were sometimes designated by these names, it is not so certain that that is the intention here. The parallel passages used by Stade in his argument are not convincing, for it remains to be proved that Isa. 27:12,13;

-
22. Stade, B., "Deuterozacharja, Eine krit. Studie," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 2:293ff, 305 (1882)
23. Op. cit., p. 461

Ps. 83:9; Mi. 5:4,5 are of Grecian origin. The objections to Stade's conclusion have a negative and a positive side.

a. These names would have received a natural and easy explanation if written under Persian domination. There can be no doubt that "Assyria" was used to mean Persia, e.g. see Ezra 6:22 where the king of Persia is called the "king of Assyria." McCurdy discusses the use of ancient names for prevailing conditions and explains the Biblical use of archaic terms by the fact that "the Bible interests itself primarily not in places, but in their inhabitants."²⁴ Whatever is the explanation, many examples have already been given in the previous discussion of these two names, Assyria and Egypt, to show that post-exilic writers often used old names to indicate contemporary peoples. There are definite Biblical examples of "Assyria" referring to Persia but none that it ever meant the kingdom of the Seleucids. So, at the very least, "Assyria" here does not have to mean the Seleucid empire.

In the Persian period the name "Egypt" could have had its natural meaning. Egypt was still a formidable kingdom and the object of several important Persian invasions. Therefore, it is apparent that a Greek date for the use of these terms is not necessary, and a Persian date is preferred.

24. McCurdy, J.F., History, Prophecy, and the Monuments, I, p. 158

b. The context is a positive argument against Stade's conclusion. In 10:10 Assyria and Egypt are the places from which the captives are to be gathered. It is only by a difficult twist of the imagination that the allusion can be taken as referring to anything but the captivities of 722 B.C. and 586 B.C. Thus it is really ancient Assyria and ancient Egypt that the prophet had in mind. It is not reasonable to suppose that the prophet would use the same names with different meanings in the next verse. That would be the case if "Assyria" and "Egypt" in 10:11 are enigmatical designations of the kingdoms of the Seleucids and Ptolemies. The conclusion is forced that both verses 10 and 11 have a backward reference which gives to these names their natural meaning.

c. The manner of reference to these kingdoms argues for an earlier date. Robinson says, "On the other hand, the prominence with which Egypt is referred to in 14:19 points rather to Persian than Greek times.²⁵" The mention of the "pride" of Assyria and the "scepter" of Egypt in 10:11 does not point to a time subsequent to 306 B.C. when these countries were no longer a unit under Alexander the Great. It points the other way to a time before these countries were conquered by him.

The fact that "Assyria" and "Egypt" could have been used of other kingdoms contains no indication of any spe-

25. Op. cit., p. 64

cific date. However, their presence in the context in which they are found in Zech. 9-14 is best suited to a time shortly after the exile. That the author should have linked them with anticipations of further restoration from exile definitely moves this prophecy out of the Greek period and returns it to the Persian period.

(2) Relative Prominence of the House of David and the House of Levi

26

Sellin discovers in Zech. 12:12-14 an evaluation of the house of Levi as equal to the house of David. From this he concludes that this section of the book was written in the Greek period when the priests were in the ascendance.²⁷ Kirkpatrick used this relation of the two houses as evidence of a post-exilic but not a Grecian date.²⁸ Wright reverses the position of Sellin, and by emphasizing the prominence given the house of David arrives at a Zecharian date. In essence Wright's position is that after the rise of the Maccabees the house of David fell into political insignificance; therefore, the author would not have spoken so much of the family of David had he lived in this later time.

One reading these verses cannot escape the impression that whatever prominence is given to one house is also

26. Sellin, E., Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 192
 27. Kirkpatrick, A.F., The Doctrine of the Prophets, p. 453
 28. Op. cit., pp. 371-374

given to the other. A time in which an equal place was given to both houses in the popular thinking would provide the most probable period of origin for this passage. There is one such period in the history of Israel.

The house of David fell into obscurity after the death of Zerubbabel, but during the life of no other ruler was prophetic attention and hope more concentrated upon the house of David than during his life.²⁹ At the same time the efforts to rebuild the temple gave to the priesthood a prominence which it did not always enjoy. A clear parallel to this passage and a strong indication of a similar attitude is found in Zech. 6:9-15. While recognizing that the latter verses are often emended to make them describe the crowning of Zerubbabel, in their received state it is the priest,³⁰ Joshua, who is crowned. Delitzsch understands the phrase "the counsel of peace shall be between them both" to be a reference to the king and the priest. Thus equal dignity is given to the two offices. The apparent connection between Zech. 6:9-15 and 12:12-14 in attitude and ideas is one of the strongest links between the first and second parts of the book of Zechariah.

Zechariah was a priest of the family of Iddo.³¹ It was only natural for him to exalt the priesthood. He also

29. Cf. Hag. 2:20-23

30. Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Minor Prophets, II, p. 300

31. Zech. 1:1; Ezra 5:1

gave to Zerubbabel, the head of the house of David, the same prominence that Haggai accorded him. For example, in the vision of the golden chandelier there are two olive trees which are the source of the perpetual supply of oil. These olive trees are intended to represent the office of the priest and of the king. Thus the two offices are set side by side just as they are in Zech. 12:12-14.

Instead of necessitating a Grecian date, these verses which give equal prominence to the house of David and the house of Levi are best suited to the time of Zerubbabel. Further, they find their closest parallels in the first chapters of the book of Zechariah.

(3) The Participation of Judah in the Siege of Jerusalem

The usual course of discussion of Zech. 12:2, which is the key verse here, revolves around efforts to emend its reading. Because he finds no help from the different versions as to a satisfactory change in the reading of this verse, Mitchell drops the whole difficult clause as a gloss based on 9:14. The use of this verse as evidence of any date must take account of this uncertainty about the genuineness of the text as it stands. However, the tex-

32. Zech. 4:1-14

33. So Delitzsch, Orelli, Kimchi, Barnes, G.A. Smith, et al.

34. So Wellhausen, Kuenen, Stade, Driver, Barnes, et al.

35. Mitchell, H.G., "Zechariah," International Critical Commentary, XXV, p. 327

tual criticism of the verse thus far is all of an a priori nature.

Accepting the obvious meaning of the verse as it now reads, Kirkpatrick ³⁶ points out that its origin in the fifth century is as easy to understand as at any other time. G.A. Smith asks a pertinent question about a Grecian or Maccabean origin for this description of the attack upon Jerusalem, "But at what period did either of them [the Greeks or Maccabees] induce Judah to take part against her?" ³⁷ As his question implies, there is no indication of such an occasion in the Greek period and no possibility of such in the Maccabean period. The only time in the history of the Jewish people when there was any evidence of collaboration between Judah and the enemies of Jerusalem was during the Chaldean siege of the city. Ewald couples this verse with 14:14 to make them both pre-exilic prophecies of an attack at that time upon the city of Jerusalem by the inhabitants of Judah. That Judah did fulfill such a prophecy is open to question. However, if Judah did attack Jerusalem, such an event may have suggested this picture of what shall occur "in that day" when God will not abandon the city as he did at the time of the Chaldean siege but will "defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem." It is not logical to suppose that a passage which prophesies an attack and a routing of the attackers should be fulfilled by an event which saw the attackers completely victorious. If

36. Op. cit., p. 461

37. Op. cit., p. 479

this verse does mean that Judah is to attack Jerusalem, which is doubtful, it is a prophecy along with 14:14 of something that has not yet come to pass. The eschatological nature of this entire section must be constantly remembered.

(4) The Mention of the Greeks in Zech. 9:13

Without question this is the most important historical reference in the second part of the book of Zechariah. Nowack says,

Entscheidend für die Bestimmung der Zeit, in der diese Capitelreihe entstanden ist, und zwar in dieser uns vorliegenden Gestalt, ist 9:13, wo die / ' ' ' ' als die Hauptfeinde des Volkes Jahves bezeichnet werden.³⁸

This verse has been one of the chief supports of the advocates of both the pre-exilic and the post-Zecharian date. Recently, however, it has been abandoned by exponents of the pre-exilic date for reasons which will be mentioned briefly later. Without this allusion the question of a Grecian date would perhaps never have been raised. It must be examined in detail. The verse is translated as follows:

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.

38. Die Kleinen Propheten, p. 350

a. The textual criticism of this verse takes two directions. First, it is held that the text is corrupt. Steiner³⁹ substitutes for "against thy sons, O Greece" the Targum reading, "against the sons of the people." Graetz⁴⁰ conjectures the reading "Samaria" instead of "Greece." Neither of these has sufficient support, and the latter is beyond question for Samaria is a part of Ephraim which is to be joined with Judah in the battle. Second, "against thy sons, O Greece" is held to be an interpolation.⁴¹ The grounds upon which Kirkpatrick⁴² rejects this phrase are strong. The definiteness of this reference to Greece is not characteristic of the rest of the passage. The context of the verse is characterized by generality, and nowhere else is the enemy addressed in this fashion. The balance of the clauses is disturbed by these words. They form an interruption in the series of metaphors used: Judah is the bow; Ephraim is the arrow; Zion is the sword. Without this phrase the reading would be,

For I bend me Judah for a bow,
Lay Ephraim on it for an arrow,
Wield thy sons, O Zion, for a spear,
And make thee as a hero's sword.⁴³

The differences of reading given by the Septuagint and the

39. Die Zwölf Kleiner Propheten, p. 350, cited by Robinson, op. cit., p. 31
 40. Monats., p. 281, cited by Robinson, loc. cit.
 41. So Duhm, Kuenen, Driver, et al.
 42. Op. cit., pp. 476, 477
 43. Loc. cit.

Targum are indications of uncertainty about this verse.

For these reasons it is not difficult to follow Kirkpatrick in thinking that a Maccabean scribe added "against thy sons, O Greece" as the object of the attack. Mitchell,⁴⁴ Sellin,⁴⁵ and Duhm⁴⁶ reject the phrase for metrical reasons in spite of the fact that its presence would add much to proving their theory about the date of these chapters. Every line of criticism which can be summoned to examine the authenticity of a passage unites in this rejection, with which this writer concurs. However, since there is a possibility of disagreement on this conclusion, the verse will be discussed as it now reads.

b. An examination of all post-exilic Biblical references to the Greeks will provide a background for an examination of some of the contentions about this passage. Genesis 10:2 includes the Greeks (sons of Javan) among the seven sons of Japheth. This verse is probably not post-exilic, but even those who assign it to a post-exilic re-dactor do not date it later than 500 B.C.⁴⁷ Isaiah 66:19, which is probably exilic, includes the Greeks among those who are to hear of the glory of Jehovah, but they are spoken of as a distant people. In Ezek. 27:13, certainly

44. Op. cit., pp. 253,254

45. Op. cit., p. 191

46. Z.A.T.W., p. 190 (1911), cited by Barnes, op. cit., p. xvi

47. So Wellhausen, Kuenen, Cornill, Kautzsch

exilic, the Greeks are pictured as among the commercial nations who include slaves in their commerce. Joel 3:6, which may be post-exilic, speaks of Greece as a market for Israelite slaves. In Daniel are found references to "the king of Greece," "the prince of Greece," and "the realm of Greece." Here "Greece" stands for the Macedonians who overthrew the Persian power rather than for the Seleucid empire. This is the contention of Barnes, which he holds in spite of the fact that he advocates a Maccabean date for Daniel.

From this study it appears that the Greeks were known at least as early as the time of the exile. They are not, however, pictured as having any important direct contact with Israel. Barnes concludes, "In short it must be said that there is nothing in the rest of the O.T. to warrant us in giving to Javan in Zech. ix.13 the sense of the Syro-Grecian power." The examples in Daniel demonstrate the possibility of this name meaning in Biblical use the Macedonian Greeks.

c. The efforts to use Zech. 9:13 to prove a pre-exilic date for this section on the basis of its relation to the mention of the Greeks in Joel 3:6,7 have been given

48. Dan. 8:21
 49. Dan. 10:20
 50. Dan. 11:2
 51. Loc. cit.
 52. Loc. cit.

up. This has been done, first, because it has become customary for modern scholars to assign Joel to a post-exilic date. While this dating of Joel has strong evidence to support it, the wide divergence of opinion, which Eiselen ascribes to "the absence of decisive data on which conclusions may be based," should be borne in mind. In the second place, the parallels between Joel and Zechariah are not as close as was formerly held. The "sons of Zion" in Zechariah are not Israelite prisoners who have been sold to the Greeks, as Hitzig contended. They are Judah and Ephraim, who are to inaugurate the Messianic age by their victory. Unlike Joel, Zechariah is not speaking of distant slave traders whom God will punish but of a people who are to be formidable antagonists of Israel.

d. The relation of "thy sons, O Greece" in Zech. 9:13 to "the kingdom of the Greeks" in I Macc. 8:18 has been perfunctorily assumed to be that of exact parallels. Barnes holds that the two expressions reflect an entirely different historical background. "The kingdom of Greece" can hardly mean anything other than the kingdom of Alexander the Great or its successor, the Seleucid power. The

-
53. So Kuenen, A.B. Davidson, Driver, W.R. Smith, G.A. Smith, W.R. Harper, et al.
 54. Op. cit., pp. 486, 487
 55. Hitzig, F., Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, p. 138
 56. Driver, S.R., Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 349
 57. Smith, G.A., Op. cit., p. 461
 58. Op. cit., pp. xvi, xvii

expression "thy sons, O Greece" suggests a time when Javan was "only an ethnological term for a disunited and widely dispersed race." Thus, while the former can go back no further than the last half of the fourth century B.C., the latter could have been used by Moses in Gen. 10:2 ten centuries earlier.

This is borne out by the context in which "thy sons, O Greece" is found. The whole passage is characterized by generalizations. That this was a definite reference in a passage of generalizations is one of the main grounds for calling the phrase a gloss (Supra), but it is now suggested that the whole may be homogeneous. In that case, taking "thy sons, O Greece" as a vague sort of reference, a date earlier than the Grecian period is demanded. A dilemma results from this suggestion. Either the phrase is a definite expression with possible late parallels such as I Macc. 8:18 but then completely out of harmony with its context, or it is a general expression in contrast to I Macc. 8:18 and so from a date prior to the Grecian period. In the former case the phrase is probably a gloss with no bearing on the date of these chapters; in the latter, it is a strong argument for an early date.

e. Concerning the contention that this passage prophesied or reflected the invasion of Alexander the Great, the following observations are in point. If 9:13 was written before the invasion, the prophecy lacked

Divine inspiration for it was not fulfilled. Here defeat for the Greeks is announced, and nothing that happened to the invasion of Palestine by Alexander can be called a defeat. These verses can hardly have been written after that invasion as a description of it because of the same absence of harmony with the facts. Also, the description of Tyre in 9:3,4 produces the impression that that city had not been captured. Alexander captured Tyre in 332 B.C. which would force the dating of these chapters prior to the Greek period.

60

f. Concerning the position of Stade and those who follow him in assigning the second part of Zechariah to a date between 306-278 B.C., these objections may be urged. According to his position, the Greeks (i.e. Seleucids) in 9:13 are the enemies of Israel. However, in 9:1-10 deliverance is pictured as coming from the north. That is the direction from which the Seleucids would have come while the Ptolemies, who alone would have been greeted with favor at this period, would have come from the south. Therefore, Stade must be wrong either in his effort to show that 9:1-10 describes an invasion by Seleucus I or his son, Antiochus I, or he is wrong in his contention that the Greeks of 9:13 are the Seleucids. The

59. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 252

60. Op. cit., pp. 293ff, 305

61. See Box, G.H., Judaism in the Greek Period, p. 16

Seleucids were the enemies of Israel between 306 - 278 B.C., but there is insufficient reason for holding that 9:13 is an outgrowth of that enmity.

g. The prominence of the Greeks in the time of Zechariah the son of Berechiah would have made a reference by the prophet to them plausible. It has been assumed that such a reference was not possible in his day, and so the presence of "thy sons, O Greece" has been assumed to demand a Grecian date for these six chapters. A study of the history of the Greeks in the general period of Zechariah and of Grecian influence on the Hebrew people as early as that time will substantiate the contention that Zechariah could have written such a verse as 9:13.

The Greeks were prominent on the stage of Persian history from 521 - 480 B.C. Darius Hystaspes (521-486) found it necessary to reconquer his kingdom when he ascended the Persian throne. By 517 B.C. he had moved into Egypt, but his efforts to win the loyalty of the Egyptians by honoring their gods were cut short because of disturbances among the Greeks. In 516 B.C. the Greeks of the Hellespont, Bosphorous, and the island of Samos were subdued and made to submit to Persian authority. Shortly afterward (515 or 512 B.C.), Darius led an army of 800,000 men across the Bosphorous into Europe in pursuit of the Scythians. They

62. See Hall, H.R., The Ancient History of the Near East, pp. 568-586

merely retreated leading him so far from his home bases that, like Napoleon in Russia, the elements defeated him. This failure encouraged the Ionian Greeks to revolt. Sardis, the foremost stronghold of the Persian empire in Asia Minor, was burned by the Athenians in 499 B.C. In 493 B.C. Darius dispatched an army under the son of Gobryas against the Greeks, but, while the islands of the Aegean were recovered, the Greeks were not conquered. For the next three years plans and preparations were made for an expedition to crush Greece. In 490 B.C. Miltiades defeated the Persians at Marathon with a loss of one hundred and ninety-two Greeks as compared with the Persian loss of 64,000 men. Again the whole interest of the Persian empire was centered on preparations for an expedition against this rising people; however, Darius died before plans could be perfected. Xerxes I immediately took up this war as the most important thing facing the Persian empire. The overwhelming Greek victories on sea at Salamis and on land at Platea were the result (480 B.C.). Thus the lords of the sons of Israel suffered ignominious defeat at the hands of the sons of Greece.

To deny to Zechariah any knowledge of these important events is to insist that he was a provincial prophet unlike the world statesmen who had preceded him and whose works he knew and admired. Greece was a world power by the end of the reign of Darius. Its military supremacy over the Persians was common knowledge after 480 B.C. What would be

more natural than that a prophet, in speaking of the victory of his people over the powers of the world as a prelude to establishing the Messianic age, should pick as the representative of those world powers the people who had just demonstrated their military supremacy? In fact, Rob-
⁶³inson is so impressed by this suggestion that he insists that the Greeks were too well known after 480 B.C. to have been referred to in any such indefinite fashion as is found in Zech. 9:13. He goes so far as to conclude that this verse is a positive indication of a date in the period from 518-516 B.C. before the Greeks had become so prominent on the horizon of world history. At least, the possibility of an early date for such a reference is assured.

Greek influence was present in Hebrew life prior to
⁶⁴the rise of Alexander the Great. Robert H. Pfeiffer has made a careful study of the relation of the Hebrews and the Greeks before the time of Alexander. He is puzzled as to how any one of the Hebrew authors "writing about the middle of the 5th century, obtained his information for the history of the Mediterranean in the 7th century." Though unable to understand completely how it came about, he discovers considerable Greek influence upon the fifth century Hebrews in the realm of language, literature, and
⁶⁵philosophy. He concludes, "Even the preceding rapid and

63. Op. cit., p. 68

64. "Hebrews and Greeks before Alexander," Journal of Biblical Literature, 56:91-101 (1937)

65. Ibid., p. 100

inadequate survey may convey some slight picture of the close interrelations between Palestine and the Aegean world."⁶⁶

⁶⁷
H.R. Hall finds that Greek influence was spreading through the eastern world in the time of Nabonidus (558-535 B.C.). The widespread use of Greek mercenaries is evidenced by the report that they were the only ones in Egypt to offer any real resistance to Cambyses (526 B.C.).⁶⁸

There is no reason Zech. 9:13 could not have been written prior to Alexander the Great. On the other hand, there are some evidences which would demand an early date for this verse if the phrase "thy sons, O Greece" is not a gloss. A reference to Greece in the time of Zechariah the son of Berechiah would have been in keeping with the political horizon of his day.

By way of summary of all of the historical evidence, a negative answer must be given to the proposals of either a very early or a very late date for Zech. 9-14. All of the reasons given for insisting upon a pre-exilic date vanish upon close examination. Not only is there an absence of positive indications of this early date, but overwhelming arguments for a post-exilic date abound. Upon the historical evidence alone, this writer is convinced that all thought of a pre-exilic date must be abandoned. In this

66. Ibid., p. 101

67. Op. cit., pp. 561-562

68. Ibid., 563

conclusion the judgment of all recent criticism concurs.

The above decision with regard to the impossibility of a pre-exilic date affects the question of the unity of these six chapters. Mitchell points to this in the following statement,

The defenders of the pre-exilic origin of chs. 9-14, as has been explained, have usually felt themselves compelled to accept the theory of plural authorship. On the other hand, those who refer them to the postexilic period, being relieved from such necessity, incline with Stade to attribute the whole, or at least all but 9:1-10, to a single author.⁶⁹

Thus the historical evidence which demands that 9-11; 13:7-9 be separated from 12:1-13:6; 14 is removed by insistence upon a post-exilic date for the whole section.

With reference to the exact time within the post-exilic period, the historical evidence points to the fifth century B.C. Every line of evidence which permits a Grecian date fits just as easily into the period around 500 B.C. The points which have been discussed line up as follows: The reference to Assyria and Egypt in 10:10,11 makes a date shortly after the exile preferable. The equal prominence given the house of David and the House of Levi is a strong argument for a date contemporary with the author of Zech. 1-8. Judah's participation in the siege of Jerusalem, as supposedly described in 12:2, and the mention of the Greeks in 9:13 are of negative force because of uncertainty about the text. However, if the present reading of 9:13 is accepted, a date prior to 480 B.C. is indicated.

69. Op. cit., p. 257

CHAPTER III

THE PROBLEM VIEWED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF

LANGUAGE AND STYLE

CHAPTER III

THE PROBLEM VIEWED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF LANGUAGE AND STYLE

Language and style have furnished some of the most telling arguments for composite authorship of the book of Zechariah. The approach to this has been twofold. Some critics, notably Eckardt¹ and Stade², have given Zech. 9-14 a post-Zecharian date on the basis of the late development of language and style displayed. Others have been content to conclude from differences in style, tone, and vocabulary that the book was written by more than one author.

1. Linguistic and Stylistic Evidence for the Date of Chaps. 9-14

Despite Eiselen's³ recognition "as a general principle that style and diction by themselves are unsafe criteria for determining the date of a writing," he continues to use them in his arguments. He is representative of most of the critics. The absence of sufficient early literature from Hebrew pens with which to make comparisons has

-
1. Eckardt, R., "Der Sprachgebrauch von Zach. 9-14," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 13:76-109 (1893)
 2. Stade, B., "Deuterozacharja, Eine krit. Studie," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1:1-96 (1881), 2:151-172, 275-309 (1882)
 3. Eiselen, F.C., The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament, II, p. 564

made the use of linguistic and stylistic arguments for the date of a work extremely precarious. Though admitting the failure of their efforts to construct a clear picture of the development of the Hebrew language, scholars almost always include in their critical discussions a statement that the language is either early or late. One's fingers should always be crossed before indulging in any such dogmatic assertions.

The presence of early features in the language of Zech. 9-14 is so universally recognized that there is no value in trying to pick them out. The problem is whether there are late features which could not have been used before a certain time. In other words, once a feature got into the language it might recur at any time, but, knowing when it came into use, no passage containing it could have been written prior to that time. It is for this reason that attention is now concentrated on the contentions of Eckardt and Stade that the language and style of these chapters cannot be earlier than the Grecian period.

(1) Aramaisms in Zech. 9-14

The presence of several words whose roots are often found in later Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic are used to prove a late date for the writing of these chapters. This, however, may be dismissed in the light of the revelations of the Assuan papyri and the Aramaic dockets on Assyrian and Babylonian contract tablets, some of which are dated as

early as the time of Sennacherib. Barnes is justified in saying, "But the occurrence of Aramaic words is no trustworthy indication of a very late date."⁴ This becomes obvious when an Aramaism of Zechariah is found in an admittedly early writing, e.g. $\gamma \rho$ ² of 14:3 occurs in Jer. 20:5; Ezek. 22:25; $\beth \aleph \psi$ of 14:2 is found in Isa. 13:6; Jer. 3:2; $\beth \gamma \gamma$ of 12:2 occurs as a verb in Nahum 2:4 while the form $\aleph \beth \gamma \gamma \aleph$ ⁵ is found in Isa. 51:17,22. Beside these De Wette discovers an Aramaism in Zech. 7:14 which would make anything said of the Aramaisms in chaps. 9-14 applicable to chaps. 1-8.

Alleged Aramaisms are excluded from the evidence entirely by some scholars. Delitzsch ignores them with the statement about the book of Zechariah, "The diction, is on the whole, free from Chaldaisms, and formed upon the model of good early writers."⁶ Wright refuses to lay any stress on the few Aramaisms which are claimed because he is not certain that they are genuine. R.D. Wilson finds only "four or five roots or words in the Old Testament Hebrew that may possibly have been derived from the Aramaic."⁸ Not one of these occurs in Zech. 9-14. Barnes sweeps away any

-
4. Barnes, W.E., "Zechariah," Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, XXXI, p. xix
 5. De Wette, W.M.S., A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, II, p. 447n
 6. Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Minor Prophets, II p. 233
 7. Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies, p. xi
 8. A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament, p. 143

Aramaisms which may be genuine with the remark, "And especially it must be remembered that occasional Aramaisms prove nothing, for they may be due to scribes and not to authors."⁹

(2) Scriptio Plena as a Proof of a Late Date

Eckardt places great weight upon the presence of the full form or scriptio plena 7')7 as evidence of the late authorship of this section. He says that the scriptio defectiva, 7)7, was used "bis zum Ende des 4. Jarhundert. Hierauf tritt die scriptio plena ein."¹⁰ There are, however, four exceptions to this rule. Ecclesiastes, one of the latest books of the Old Testament, uses 7)7¹¹ while three examples of 7')7 are found in the eighth century B.C.¹² These exceptions mitigate the force of Eckardt's argument.

Robinson turns the point of this argument by showing that it is a peculiar habit of the author of both parts of the book to alternate the scriptio plena and the scriptio defectiva. From this he concludes, "In our judgment the orthography of the Book of Zechariah is one of the strongest evidences that it was all written by one hand."¹³ The

-
9. Op. cit., p. xx
 10. Op. cit., p. 90
 11. Ecc. 1:1
 12. Ho. 3:5; Am. 6:5; 9:11
 13. Robinson, G.L., "The Prophecies of Zechariah With Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 12:88 (1895)

weight of the argument may be judged by studying the following examples. In chaps. 1-8: $\square \text{כ}^{\prime} \text{ט} \text{א} \text{ב} \text{ו}$ in 1:2,4,5 is $\square \text{כ}^{\prime} \text{ט} \text{א} \text{ב}$ in 1:6;8:14. $\text{ט} \text{ש} \text{ב} \text{ו}$ in 2:11;5:7 is $\text{ט} \text{ש} \text{ב}$ in 1:11;7:7. $\text{ם} \text{ו} \text{א} \text{י} \text{ם}$ in 3:3 is $\text{ם} \text{ה} \text{א} \text{י} \text{ם}$ in 3:4. $\text{ת} \text{פ} \text{ר} \text{ת}$ in 5:8 is $\text{ת} \text{פ} \text{ר} \text{ת}$ in 5:7. $\text{י} \text{ו} \text{ע} \text{א} \text{נ} \text{ת}$ in 5:9;6:5 is $\text{י} \text{ו} \text{ע} \text{א} \text{נ} \text{ת}$ in 6:1. $\text{ת} \text{ט} \text{ר} \text{ו} \text{ת}$ in 6:11 is $\text{ת} \text{ט} \text{ר} \text{ת}$ in 6:14. $\text{א} \text{ז} \text{ו} \text{ע} \text{א}$ in 8:10 is $\text{א} \text{ז} \text{ע}$ in 2:7. $\text{ד} \text{ע} \text{ו} \text{ד}$ in 1:7;2:16 is $\text{ד} \text{ע}$ in 8:20. $\text{י} \text{ו} \text{ש} \text{ב}^{\prime}$ and $\text{י} \text{ו} \text{ש} \text{ב}$ are both found in 8:20,21.

In chaps. 9-14: $\text{ש} \text{ה} \text{ו} \text{ב}^{\prime} \text{י}$ in 9:5 is $\text{ש} \text{ה} \text{ו} \text{ב} \text{י}$ in 10:5,11. $\text{ר} \text{ה} \text{פ} \text{י} \text{ר}$ in 11:10 is $\text{ר} \text{ה} \text{פ} \text{ר}$ in 11:14. $\text{י} \text{ו} \text{ש} \text{ב}$ in 12:8 is $\text{י} \text{ו} \text{ש} \text{ב}^{\prime}$ in 12:7. $\text{ח} \text{ש} \text{פ} \text{ח} \text{ו} \text{ת}$ and $\text{ח} \text{ש} \text{פ} \text{ח} \text{ת}$ are both found in 12:14.

If the scriptio plena and the scriptio defectiva may be used to prove anything by their presence in the book of Zechariah, it is that the book was written by one author. There is absolutely no basis for the contention that a date subsequent to the fourth century is demanded. To deny that this vacillating orthography is of any use as evidence because the use or neglect of the vowel letters "may be mistakes of copyists," as Mitchell claims, is at least an admission that here is no argument for a late date.

(3) The Ending | |

¹⁴
Eckardt considers | | to be an evidence of late

14. Op. cit., p. 82

development. In Zech. 9-14 he finds the following examples which are used to indicate that these chapters belong in the Grecian period or later: $\text{||} \gamma \chi \zeta$ in 9:12; $\text{||} \text{N} \text{P} \text{P} \text{'}$ in 14:6; and three words in 12:4, $\text{||} \text{H} \text{K} \text{L}$,¹⁵ $\text{||} \text{Y} \text{N} \text{W}$ and $\text{||} \text{G} \text{I} \text{Y}$. According to Robinson, these last three arise out of the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, the terminus ad quem for which is fixed by Driver "as the 18th year of King Josiah (B.C. 621)."¹⁶ The other two have early post-exilic parallels in Zech. 6:14 ($\text{||} \text{K} \text{Z} \text{L} \text{Z}$) and in Hag. 2:17 ($\text{||} \text{P} \text{G} \text{W} \zeta$ and $\text{||} \text{K} \text{I} \text{I}$). The use of the ending by admittedly early writings destroys the value of the five examples in the second part of Zechariah. However they may be explained in the other instances will also apply to their appearance here.

(4) The Absence of the Article

There are nine instances in which the article is omitted. Eckardt contends that there is no explanation other than that the passage is late. There are, however, some explanations which may be suggested. Robinson holds that, "In four of these cases the absence of the article, if not intentional, may be due to the Massoretic vocaliza-

15. Op. cit., p. 54

16. Driver, S.R., Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 86

17. Op. cit., p. 98

tion, ..."¹⁸ In some instances the absence of the article
 may be explained by the poetic character of the passage.¹⁹

Individual instances of omission of the article may find some such explanation as the following: **אָרֶב** in 9:1 may be used in a collective sense to mean "mankind" in which case the article would have been preferred, but it may also be a corruption of **אֲרָב**, Syria, as Klostermann²⁰ conjectures, in which case as a proper name the article would have been unnecessary.²¹ In 9:16 Stade changes **יִשְׂרָאֵל** to read **יִשְׂרָאֵל**, thus supplying the article; however, even as it now stands no article is necessary for it is rendered definite by the following genitive.²² Though **אֲדָמָה** is an adjective gentis usually with the article, its force in 9:7 as a proper name, due to the fact that it is singular,²³ may account for the absence of the article. The rules in regard to the omission of the article when the object that is compared is already defined by means of an attribute may be applied to **אֲרָב** in 10:7.²⁴ Concerning two other examples proposed by Eckardt, **אֲרָב** in 11:2 and **אֲרָב** in 14:10, Kautzsch-Gesenius, Grammar uses them as examples of the regular omission of the

18. Op. cit., p. 54

19. Kautzsch, E., Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 405

20. Cited by Mitchell, H.G., "Zechariah," International Critical Commentary, XXV, p. 263

21. Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 401

22. Ibid., p. 408

23. Ibid., p. 402

24. Ibid., p. 407

25
 article. The absence of the article in 14:5 $\square' \gamma \eta^{-} \gamma$,
 may be due to a regard for hiatus before η , γ , η .²⁶

No claim is here made to an indisputable explanation for every example of omission of the article in Zech. 9-14. The effort has been to show that these chapters display no surprising or excessive instances of this late development in the Hebrew language. There are insufficient examples of the absence of the article in these six chapters to necessitate a late origin for these prophecies. A few instances here may be but anticipations of what became more common a little later.

(5) The Setting Forth of the Finite Verb by Means of the Infinitive Absolute

27
 The contention of Eckardt that the use of the infinitive absolute found in these last chapters of the book of Zechariah, e.g. $\gamma \eta \eta \dots \eta \eta \eta$ in 12:10, is a proof of a late date is not justified. The infinitive absolute is employed to set forth the finite verb in just such a fashion in Zech. 3:4, $\psi \eta \eta \dots \eta \eta \eta$; Zech. 7:5, $\eta \eta \eta \dots \eta \eta \eta$; also four inf. abs. in Hag. 1:6, ... $\eta \eta \psi \dots \eta \eta \eta \dots \eta \eta \eta \dots \eta \eta \eta$ $\psi \eta \eta$. These and other examples of the pre-Grecian use of the infinitive absolute in this manner are found in

25. Ibid., p. 409

26. Loc. cit.

27. Op. cit., p. 98

Kautzsch-Gesenius, Grammar.

(6) Clumsy Diction and Repetition

The charges made against the style of Zech. 9-14 may be readily accepted. The implication of this clumsy diction and repetition is, however, not so clear as Eckardt indicates when he calls it, "ein unverkennbares Merkmal späterer Zeit."²⁹ The difficulty is that the same charges may be made against the first eight chapters. Delitzsch says, "The prophetic addresses are to some extent rich in repetition, especially ch. vii and viii, ..."³⁰ Of the visions in the first part of the book G.A. Smith says, "Here the style is involved and redundant."³¹ Rosenmüller considers the style of the first eight chapters to be "prosaic, feeble, poor."³² Pusey says of the two parts of the book, "In both there is a certain fullness of language, produced by dwelling on the same thought or word."³³ The point is that on the basis of such evidence as this not only chaps. 9-14 but also chaps. 1-8 will have to be given a late date. This argument proves too much.

(7) The Preponderance of the Form 'JN' over 'JN'
in 9-14

28. Op. cit., p. 345

29. Op. cit., p. 99

30. Op. cit., p. 223

31. "Zechariah," The Expositor's Bible, p. 261

32. Cited by Eiselen, F.C., The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament, II, p. 563

33. Pusey, E.B., The Minor Prophets, II, p. 327

Robinson quotes Giesebrecht's law thus, "the later the writing the greater the preponderance in favor of ³⁴ $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{N}$." Eckardt seeks to soften the force of this evidence unfavorable to his date by saying,

Des Rathsels Losung wird also die sein, dass der gelehrte Verfasser von Zech. 9-14 sich mit Bedacht den seltneren Wendung bedient hat, weil ihm dieselbe wuchtiger und feierlicher klang.³⁵

However, the fact remains that in 9-14 $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{N}$ is found but twice (10:6 and 13:9) while $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{J} \text{N}$ is found five times (11:6,16; 12:2; 13:5 twice). In a study of the books generally accepted as of latest origin Robinson discovers³⁶ that $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{N}$ occurs one hundred and nine times as compared to the three times $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{J} \text{N}$ is found. On the other hand, the two examples of $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{N}$ found in 9-14 are to be expected for it occurs one hundred and fifty-five times in Ezekiel, Haggai, Zech. 1-8, and Malachi. Consequently, while the presence of $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{N}$ is of no value in determining the date of these chapters, the presence of $\text{ׁ} \text{J} \text{J} \text{N}$ produces a prejudice in favor of an early date for Zech. 9-14.³⁷

The conclusion from this study of the linguistic evidences as to the date of Zech. 9-14 is in agreement with such sound Hebrew scholars as Barnes, Delitzsch, Ewald, and others, who say that the language is early rather than late. Kuenen so far recognized the force of the linguistic

34. Op. cit., p. 53

35. Op. cit., p. 97

36. Op. cit., p. 54

37. Gray, G.B., A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 230

evidence as being for an early rather than the late date to which he ascribed these chapters that he conjectured an early prophecy reworked by a late apocalypticist. Kautzsch says of Kuenen's position, "According to him ancient fragments survive in chaps. ix-xi and xiii. 7-9, originating mainly in the eighth century (about 745 ff.), arranged by a post-exilic redactor...."³⁸ If the evidence of an early date is so strong as to necessitate any such scheme as that while the supposed late evidence has been shown to be without force, one is led to the conviction that Zech. 9-14 must have been written prior to the Grecian period.

2. Linguistic and Stylistic Relations Between Chaps. 1-8 and 9-14

All scholars who hold to the composite authorship of the book of Zechariah use the difference in language and style of the sections as proof of their contention. There is no denying the fact that variations occur. They are apparent even to the reader of a translation of the book. Whether they are as serious as they have been judged is the matter now to be decided. An examination also needs to be made of those peculiarities which seem to tie the two sections together. Already the custom in both sections of alternating the scriptio plena and the scriptio defectiva has

38. Kautzsch, E., The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 137

been pointed out. The clumsy diction and the wearisome repetition of words and phrases which characterize the whole book have also been noted.

(1) Diction and Phraseology

a. Certain words are employed in a different sense in chaps. 1-8 from the meaning given them in 9-14. If this can be substantiated, it is the most effective single argument for dual authorship suggested by Eckardt.³⁹ The following are some of the proposed examples:

In 1-8 $\overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ר}} \overline{\text{צ}}$ is used as a technical term for prophetic inspiration; in 9-14 it is never so used. The three exceptions, 9:8; 9:14; 12:4, which Robinson⁴⁰ proposes are not tenable on exegetical grounds. This variation in the use of $\overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ר}} \overline{\text{צ}}$ must be allowed.

It is contended that $\overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ר}} \overline{\text{צ}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ר}} \overline{\text{צ}}$ always means "the whole earth" in 1-8 and only "the land of Palestine" in 9-14.⁴¹ That is entirely a matter of interpretation. Perowne interprets it in 5:3 as a reference to "the land of Judah."⁴² At the same time, numerous commentators interpret the phrase in 14:2 as meaning "the whole earth." This exactly reverses the position and makes it a link between the two sections, though a weak one.

39. Op. cit., pp. 104,105

40. Op. cit., p. 82

41. Perowne, T.T., "Zechariah," Cambridge Bible For Schools and Colleges, XXXI, in loco (1886)

42. So Driver, Mitchell, Barnes, et al.

The translation of לָלוּ in 6:10 as "exiles" and the translation of it in 14:2 as "exile" is purely a matter of opinion. Barnes, Driver, Perowne, and others translate it in both 6:10 and 14:2 with the same word, "captivity." Like the author of these verses, the above scholars find that the context can be satisfied by one word; surely no one will claim that they did not write all of the work which bears their name.

It is claimed that in 6:13 כְּדָבָר means "glory" while in 10:3 it means "splendor." Peculiarly enough, Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon⁴³ gives Zech. 6:13 and 10:3 as illustrations of "majesty" as the meaning of כְּדָבָר .

With but few exceptions the whole list of words with supposedly different meanings in the two parts of Zechariah might be treated in the same fashion as above. The exegesis of the examples involved is of such a subjective nature that extreme caution must be used before arriving at a conclusion on this evidence.

The point here is not that there are no instances in which Zechariah uses the same word in different senses. It would have been strange if he did not do so. In fact, such a use of words can be demonstrated as a common characteristic of both parts of the book of Zechariah, e.g. כַּנְפֵי in 5:9 is "wing" and in 8:20 is "skirt"; רוּחַ is "wind" in

43. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, in loco

5:9 and 6:5 but "spirit" in 4:6; 6:8; 7:12 etc.; סָרַח which is "sin" in 13:1 is "plague" in 14:19; בְּרֵיחַ meaning "midst" in 14:1 is "battle" in 14:3. Indeed, if anything can be deduced from this line of evidence, it is that there is a close relation between 1-8 and 9-14.

b. The meaning of certain words used in 1-8 is expressed by synonyms in 9-14.⁴⁴ Some of the examples given are as follows: "Remnant" in 8:6,11,12 is שְׂרֵיט , but in 14:2 it is שְׂרֵיט . "Youth" in 2:8 is נַעַר , but in 9:17 it is בְּנֵי אִי . "Staff" in 8:4 is עֵשֶׂב , but in 11:7,10,14 it is עֵשֶׂב . "Iniquity" in 3:5,9 is עָוֹן , but in 13:1 it is סָרַח . "Possess" is רָחַץ in 2:16; 8:12, but in 9:4 it is שָׂרַח . "Desolate" in 7:14 is עָרָב , but in 11:2,3 it is עָרָב .

The first thing that needs to be noted in evaluating this evidence is that the author of 9-14 is not always ignorant of the synonym used in 1-8. He employs each of the synonyms for "remnant" in 14:2 and in 11:9 respectively. The same is true of the synonyms for "youth" in 9:17, 11:16, 13:5.

The use of synonyms is characteristic of both sections of the book of Zechariah. This may be urged as an argument for unity of authorship. Within the first eight chapters the following are found: "Line" in 1:16 is קוֹנֵי but in 2:5

44. Eckardt, op. cit., p. 105

1178 ז111. "Temple" in 1:16; 3:7; 4:9; 7:3; 8:9 is 11 11 11
 but in 6:12,13,14; 8:9, 11 11 11. "Stand" in 3:4 is 11 11 11
 but in 6:5, 11 11 11. From the last six chapters the follow-
 ing examples may be taken: "Plague" in 14:12,15 is 11 11 11 11
 but in 14:19, 11 11 11 11. "Tent" in 12:7 is 11 11 11, but in
 14:15 it is 11 11 11 11. "Flock" in 10:3 is 11 11 11 but in 9:
 16; 10:2, 11 11 11. "Door" in 11:1 is 11 11 11, but in 14:10
 it is 11 11 11.

While this evidence belongs on the side of unity of authorship of the book of Zechariah, its weakness must be pointed out. The use of synonyms may be found in the work of almost any capable writer. Under no circumstances can it be used as evidence of composite authorship of the book of Zechariah.

c. It is customary to compare the vocabulary of any sections concerning which there is a question as to unity of authorship. Bleek, Eckardt, Mitchell, Cheyne, and others throw out the caution that by a careful selection of words the whole Old Testament may be shown to be the product of one author. Looking at the other side of the problem, Pusey says, "The use of different words in unlike subjects is a necessary consequence of that unlikeness." It is as

45. Op. cit., p. 326

46

easy to overpress the argument on one side as the other.

47 48 49

Mitchell, Driver, and Eckardt give long lists of words and phrases found in one part of the book of Zechariah and not found in the other. The most important are as follows: "The word of Jehovah came unto me" is an introductory formula found eight times in 1-8 and not at all in 9-14. "(Thus) saith Jehovah" is found twenty-three times in 1-8 and only once (9:4) throughout 9-14. "Saying" is found twenty-nine times in the first part and is absent from the last part of the book. "Then shall ye know" is not found in 9-14, though it appears four times in 1-8. "In that day" occurs eighteen times in 9-14 and only three times in 1-8. There are a number of others which are not so impressive.

Though he is convinced that 1-8 and 9-14 are not by the same author, Eckardt says, "Eine Musterung des Vocabelschatzes ergiebt allerdings vielfache Uebereinstimmung." He then allows the following word list as favoring

46. Prof. Stanley Leathes, cited by Pusey, loc. cit., gives a graphic demonstration of the danger of deducing difference in authorship due to variations in vocabulary. He compares three poems of Milton, L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, and Lucidas. The first is a poem of 450 words, the second of 578 words, and the third of 725 words. There are only about 125 words common to the first two, only about 140 common to the last two, only about sixty-one common to all three. It would be easy to argue from this that Milton did not write all three poems, which he did.

47. Op. cit., p. 236

48. Driver, S.R., "Zechariah," The New Century Bible, XXII, pp. 228, 229

49. Op. cit., pp. 104, 105

50. Ibid., p. 104

the unity of the book: $\aleph \beth$ (3:3,4; 14:4); $\aleph \eth$ (2:14; 4:10; 10:7); $\aleph \zeta \psi \eta$ (5:8; 11:12,13); $\aleph \theta \iota$ (1:16; 12:1; 3:2; 11:6); $\aleph \kappa$ (2:12; 14:5); $\aleph \rho \omicron$ (7:5; 12:10); $\aleph \zeta \psi$ (2:13; 14:1); $\aleph \omega$ (8:10; 11:12); $\aleph \rho \psi$ (5:4; 8:17; 10:2; 13:3); $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ (1:12; 10:6); $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ (1:17; 10:2); $\aleph \circ \eta$ (3:14; 9:7); $\aleph \beth \gamma \eta$ (3:4; 13:2). For "south" both parts have $\beth \beth$ in 7:7; 14:4 and $\beth \eth$ in 6:6; 9:14. Of especial importance are $\beth \psi$, passive, in 2:8; 9:5; 12:6 and $\psi \rho \beth$ with \beth and the infinitive in 6:7; 12:9 and also the very important $\beth \psi \eth \beth \gamma \eth$ in 7:14; 9:8.

51

Robinson makes the following additions to the list:

$\beth \zeta \iota$ (3:2; 11:6); $\beth \aleph \eth \psi - \beth \gamma \eth \beth \eth$ (4:11; 12:6; cf. 4:3; 3:1); $\beth \eta$ (2:10; 11:17); $\beth \zeta \eth - \beth \iota \beth$ (2:14; 9:9); $\beth \eta$ (4:7; 12:10); $\beth \gamma \psi$ (8:16; 14:10); $\beth \psi \eth$ (6:13; 9:10); $\beth \eth \beth \aleph$ (9:16; 2:16; 13:5); $\beth \circ \eth$ (4:9; 12:1); $\beth \eth \omega$ (5:3; 9:15; 10:2,7,8); $\beth \aleph \eth$ (6:10; 7:12; 11:10; 14:17). Attention is also called to the use of the expression "one toward another" in its different forms and to the use of $\beth \aleph \aleph$ for the indefinite article.

52

53

54

Lowe marks the fact that the Septuagint has $\alpha \nu \alpha - \sigma \tau \eta \mu \alpha$ in 9:8 as a translation of $\beth \beth \zeta \eth$. This makes a striking parallel with the use of \eth in the privative sense as found in 7:4.

51. Op. cit., p. 87

52. 3:10; 7:9,10; 8:10,16,17; 11:6,9; 14:3

53. 5:7; 12:7

54. Lowe, W.H., The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah, p. 82

55

After studying the diction of 1-8 and 9-14, Perowne arrives at the conclusion that the variations found are only such as the variations in subject matter warrant. There are some serious differences, but there are also certain strong affinities between the language of the two sections. The diction of the book, therefore, would allow but certainly does not demand two or more authors.

(2) Contrast of Prose and Poetry

56

For the most part, chaps. 1-8 are prose. Duhm finds only one poetic fragment in these chapters. Mitchell says of the author of 1-8, "Now and then, however, especially when he is delivering an express message from Yahweh, he falls into a rythmical movement."⁵⁷ He finds a number of instances of districhs, tristrichs, and tetrastichs. It is only fair to add, however, that Mitchell concludes, "Finally, there are not enough of these passages of all kinds and qualities to give him [the author of 1-8] a claim to be called a poet."⁵⁸ Unanimous concurrence might be obtained for this conclusion.

Concerning chaps. 9-14 there is less unanimity of opinion. That these chapters are more poetic than the first eight is accepted by all, but just what parts of this

55. Op. cit., p. 54

56. Duhm, B., The Twelve Prophets, p. 178

57. Op. cit., p. 99

58. Ibid., p. 100

last section are poetic is open to debate. Since Mitchell uses the change from prose in 1-8 to poetry in 9-14 as an argument for composite authorship, his judgment concerning the poetic sections of these last chapters will be suggestive. As it now stands, the ninth chapter is but "little better" in poetic form than the first eight. Mitchell proposes to remedy this "by supplying a few words that have evidently been lost and omitting more that have just as⁵⁹ evidentially been added." One cannot but wonder at the possibility of transforming some sections of 1-8 into poetry by such a drastic procedure. Mitchell finds that chapter ten is made up of four line stanzas with the words measured by the three-tone rule. "The next section (11:4-17 and 13:7-9) consist mainly of a prose narrative...."⁶⁰ There is general agreement with this judgment. Of chapters twelve and fourteen he says, "... although they are on the whole more rythmical than the first eight, there is no sustained movement, like that in chs. 9 and 10,...."⁶¹

⁶² Barnes gives the following table of metrical passages in Zech. 9-13 which are found by Marti and Duhm, two of the most ardent discoverers of metre in the prophetic books.

-
59. Ibid., p. 234
 60. Ibid., p. 235
 61. Loc. cit.
 62. Op. cit., p. xlviii

	<u>Marti</u>	<u>Duhm</u>
9:1-7	Four double stanzas Six lines each	Eight single stanzas Three lines each
9:11	New stanzas begin Four lines each	Old stanzas continue Three lines each
11:4-16	Prose	11:4-14 Three line stanzas
12:1-13:2	Stanzas (irregular) Three lines each	Prose
13:7	One stanza Six lines	Two stanzas Three lines each
13:8,9	Stanzas Six lines each	Prose

The divergence in the opinions of these two excellent scholars is due to the fact that both find it necessary to emend the text in order to produce even the above instances of metrical form. No wonder Barnes concludes from his study of the work of Marti and Duhm,

It looks as though, granted that there are metrical verses to be found, these are embedded in prose passages. ... The divergences of these two scholars are sufficient of themselves to discredit the attempt to find strict prosodial forms here.⁶³

To this judgment about chaps. 9-13 may be added Mitchell's comment on chap. 14, "...it will puzzle most readers to find traces of poetical form, except at the beginning and end of the passage, and here it seems to be unintentional."⁶⁴

It begins to appear that the problem here is not that of a prose section as contrasted with a poetic section.

63. Op. cit., p. 1

64. Op. cit., p. 235

Rather it is a comparison of two sections, one predominantly prose and the other predominantly poetry. The problem is not so clear-cut as it has often carelessly been assumed to be.

65

It may be that Mitchell has unconsciously put his finger on the cause of the difference between the two parts of the book when he finds a connection between the poetic passages of 1-8 and the kind of message the prophet is delivering. In recognition of this same thing Wright explains,

...we cannot consider it strange that the description of that vision of the night season (in 1-8) lacks 'the elevated and imaginative style' of the later prophecies, where the writer, though predicting facts and ideas communicated by Divine inspiration, was yet free to give scope to his own individuality.⁶⁶

In other words, both the subject matter and the manner of inspiration of the first eight chapters was not so conducive to the poetic style as was true of the last six chapters.

An examination of chaps. 1-8 in the light of the foregoing suggestion will determine the truth or falsity of that idea. The poetic form is found in 1:16 where the prophet is not limited to the recitation of the content of his vision.⁶⁷ The night vision of 1:7-6:8 takes its form from the material it handles. It was doubtlessly a real

65. Op. cit., p. 99

66. Op. cit., p. xxix

67. Mitchell, loc. cit.

psychic experience, related subsequently as modified by
 the prophet's interpretation. It bears the same relation
 to the style of Zechariah's public prophetic addresses as
 the style of Ezekiel's visions bears to the other parts of
 his work. T.H. Robinson attributes the presence of so
 much prose in Ezekiel to the effort of the prophet to
 present his ecstatic experiences in detail. The same
 thing is probably true of Zech. 1-8. Perowne observes
 that when 1-8 becomes prophecy proper, as distinct from
 narration or description, the style at once approaches
 that of 9-14, e.g. 2:4-13. Notice that the narration of
 chap. 11 is in prose. Of the prophecy in the last part of
 the sixth chapter Mitchell says that 6:12f. is the best
 example of poetic composition from the hand of Zechariah.

The absence of the poetic form from chaps. 7,8 can be explained by the fact that that message was in the nature of a private conversation given as a reply to the delegation from Bethel. A parallel is found in Jer. 42. It, too, is an answer to a delegation, and is a prose passage in a book that is largely in poetic form. The nature of the message does apparently affect the style of the prophet. The difference in the content of the first and last sections of the book is, therefore, sufficient ex-

-
68. Lofthouse, W.F., "Israel After the Exile," Clarendon Bible, IV, p. 154
 69. Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 145
 70. Op. cit., p. 54
 71. Op. cit., p. 100

planation of the variation in the use of prose and poetry.

72

Wright suggests that the poetry of 1-8 be compared to the poetry of 9-14 and the prose of 9-14 be compared to the prose of 1-8. This obvious suggestion has been overlooked evidently because of the conception that 1-8 was all prose and 9-14 all poetry. A reading of chaps. 4,7,11 reveals that there is no more difference between the prose of chap. 4 and chap. 11 than there is between chap. 4 and chap. 7. No one has denied chaps. 7,8 to Zechariah on the basis of the difference between these chapters and the first six. As to the poetry, 3:7 is a variation on a six-toned model which is exactly reproduced in 13:7-9. In discussing 13:7-9 Mitchell ⁷³ allows that this is an argument favorable to Zecharian authorship.

The mixture of prose and poetry in both parts of the book weakens the force of this argument for dual authorship. By supplying an explanation for the choice of the prophet between prose and poetry in his various discourses, the weight of this argument against Zecharian authorship of 9-14 is removed.

(3) Divergence in Tone

That there is a difference in tone between chaps. 1-8 and 9-14 must be recognized. In passing from one section to the other a change in atmosphere and circumstances is

72. Op. cit., p. xxix

73. Op. cit., p. 235

encountered. That does not, however, indicate that a separate author is demanded for the two sections because the same sort of change in tone may be observed within chaps. 1-8.⁷⁴ A change in tone is not so important as the things which produce such a sense of change. Many things contribute to the variation in tone between 1-8 and 9-14.

75

a. G.A. Smith thinks that one of the main differences is that in the second part of the book the peace and love of peace reflected in the first part is absent. That the atmosphere of peace has disappeared in 9-14 is quite obvious, but 1:12 looked anxiously for a day when that peace would be broken. As for the love of peace, G.A. Smith remembers, in a footnote, that Zech. 9:10-12 indicates the expectation that out of the confusion and war prophesied in chaps. 9-14 would come the reign of the king who should "speak peace unto the nations." The difference in tone in this instance is the result of the fulfillment in the second part of the expectations of the first part.

b. The absence of visions in the second part of the book not only contributes to the difference in tone but has been urged as an argument against Zecharian authorship. It should be remembered that the "visions"

74. Cf. 1:1-6; 1:7-6:15; 7:1-8:23

75. Op. cit., p. 449

76

of 1-8 are in reality but phases of one night vision. Zechariah was not a prophet who received his message primarily through visions. The simple explanation for the lack of visions in chaps. 9-14 is that the prophet had none. That proves nothing unless it can be shown that the temperament of the man who wrote the first eight chapters would have demanded that he have visions for his message in the last part of the book. ⁷⁷ There are some who consider the vision of 1-8 to be a literary device rather than a ⁷⁸ psychic experience. If that were true, the allegory of 11:4-17 would furnish a close parallel. It is, however, more pertinent to note that though Zechariah wrote chaps. 7,8 they contain no visions. Obviously, no such principle may be laid down as to demand that a prophet who once uses a vision should never use anything else.

c. The absence of immediate connection with contemporary events, as indicated by the failure to date the second part of the book, ⁷⁹ has been noted by Mitchell. Dates are frequently attached to visions such as are found ⁸⁰ in 1-8. With the one exception found in Isa. 14:28, ora- ⁸¹ cles such as are found in 9-14 have no dates. By its very

76. Wright, op. cit., p. xxxii

77. Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 233,234

78. So. G.A. Smith, op. cit., p. 274

79. Op. cit., p. 233

80. Cf. Isa. 6:1; Ezek. 1:1-3; 8:1; 40:1; Dan. 7:1

81. Robinson, op. cit., p. 80

nature and purpose this latter section of Zechariah is pointing to future events rather than contemporary matters.

d. Certain features of the first part, such as angels, disappear from the second part of the book.

⁸² Delitzsch points out that the angels of the vision of 1-6 are wanting in chaps. 7,8. The author of 9-14 is not unacquainted with angels. The angel of Jehovah is mentioned in 12:8, and "holy ones" in 14:5 is a reference to angels.⁸³

e. The second part of the book is apocalyptic while the first is not.⁸⁴ Kirkpatrick has correctly located the source of most of the difficulty encountered in studying chaps. 9-14 in this very fact. The apocalyptic nature of the section is the key to its problems. The author of these chapters is looking far out into the future to a time when the prophecies of Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel concerning the restoration and reunion of Israel and Judah under the Messianic king will take place.

It is not possible to produce an unquestioned example of a prophet who used both the apocalyptic and prophetic forms. This is due to the fact that the a priori conclusion has been reached that where both forms exist two authors must be found. Were this not true, Isaiah would⁸⁵ be an example of such a prophet. However, it can no more

82. Op. cit., p. 222

83. Wright, op. cit., p. 479

84. Op. cit., p. 447

85. Cf. Isa. 24-27

be proved that a prophet could not use both of these forms than it can be proved that he could not use both prose and poetry.

Such a breaking down of the elements which produce the difference in tone between 1-8 and 9-14 indicates that the real facts do not demand dual authorship for Zechariah. In every case the same convictions and attitudes are found in both parts of the book.

(4) Peculiarities of Expression Common to Both Parts of the Book

a. The author of both parts of the book has the habit of expanding one fundamental thought into the unusual number of five parallel clauses. ⁸⁶ ⁸⁷ Robinson finds three instances of this in 1-8 and two in 9-14 (1:17; 3:8,9; 6:13; 9:5,7; 12:4). Zech. 6:13 may be given as an example:

And he shall build the temple of the Lord;
And he shall bear the glory;
And he shall sit and rule upon his throne;
And he shall be a priest upon his throne;
And the counsel of peace shall be between them both;

That this should have occurred five times as a result of omissions, additions, and Massoretic errors is a little ⁸⁸ difficult to understand, in spite of Mitchell's contention.

This is one of the affinities between the two sections which prove some sort of close relation between the two

86. Pusey, op. cit., p. 327

87. Op. cit., p. 86

88. Op. cit., p. 243

parts of the book.

b. In both the first eight and the last six chapters there is a tendency to dwell upon each idea expressed.⁸⁹ In the first section these examples are found: Twice the prophet announced the promise of Jehovah to Zion, "I will dwell in the midst of thee."⁹⁰ Twice it is announced that the temple of Jehovah will be built by the Branch.⁹¹ Twice the nations are pictured as seeking Jehovah to pray to him.⁹² The scene in the streets of Jerusalem "in that day" is twice presented.⁹³ In the second section the following are found: Twice the prophet declares, "And I fed the flock."⁹⁴ The parents of the false prophet are twice referred to as the "father and mother who bore him."⁹⁵ Twice the prophet predicts, "And ye shall flee."⁹⁶ Three times he uses the phrase "to keep the feast of tabernacles."⁹⁷

These are links between the two parts of the book of Zechariah. Though they are unable to bear much weight by themselves, they are worth noting as a part of the total picture.

-
89. Robinson, op. cit., p. 85
 90. 2:14,15
 91. 6:12,13
 92. 8:21,22
 93. 8:4,5
 94. 11:7
 95. 13:3
 96. 14:5
 97. 14:16,18,19

(5) The Preference For and Frequent Use of Vocatives

The use of vocatives is characteristic of both parts of the book. The following vocatives are found: "Zion" in 2:11; 9:13; "great mountain" in 4:7; "daughter of Zion" in 2:14; 9:9; "O all flesh" in 2:17; "Joshua" in 3:8; "O sword" in 3:7; "daughter of Jerusalem" in 9:9; "prisoner of hope" in 9:12; "O poor of the flock" in 11:7; "O Lebanon" in 11:1; "O fir tree and oaks of Bashan" in 11:2. It will be noted that these are about equally divided between the first and last parts of the book. Some of the passages in which these examples occur may be so interpreted as to reduce the number of clear cases of apostrophe, but that this is a characteristic of the author of both sections remains evident.

(6) The Fondness For the Object Accusative in Narrower as Well as Broader Sense

This has been recognized as a characteristic of 1-8. "But the same is true of chs. 9-14; indeed there are exactly eight instances in Part I. and seven in Part II."⁹⁹ They are as follows: קצק...קצק in 1:2,15; ...קנא in 1:14; 8:2; קנאה גדולה in 1:14; 8:2; גשגש...גשג in 3:7; גשג...גשג in 5:11; 7:9; 8:16; גשג...גשג in 11:13; גשג...גשג in 7:9; 8:16; גשג...גשג in 11:13; גשג...גשג

98. Robinson, op. cit., p. 8799. Ibid., p. 83

in 13:6; $\pi\theta\lambda\ \&\dots\ \eta\lambda\lambda$ in 14:12,18; $\lambda\pi\dots\lambda\lambda\pi$ in 14:16,18,19.

(7) The Use of $\lambda\lambda$ With Suffixes Rather Than the Use of Verbal Suffixes

The frequent use of the nota accusative, $\lambda\lambda$, with suffixes is observed by Eckardt as being characteristic of Zech. 1-8. However, by his own count,¹⁰⁰ $\lambda\lambda$ with suffixes occurs in these chapters ten times and verbal suffixes occur seventeen times. In the last six chapters the proportion is six to twenty-two. Eckardt mentions this as evidence of an early date. Here it is presented as an argument for unity of authorship for the book. If $\lambda\lambda$ with suffixes is an unusual characteristic of the author of 1-8, it is of all the more importance as evidence of unity of authorship when found to be characteristic also of 9-14.

3. The Integrity of Chaps. 9-14

The only division of these chapters large enough for any use of linguistic evidence is the separation of 9-11; 13:7-9 from 12:1-13:6; 14. Further, this is the only division of Zech. 9-14 that has received much support.¹⁰¹

100. Op. cit., pp. 97,106

101. So. Blöek, Ewald, Orelli, Farrar, Hitzig, et al.

(1) Evidence For the Division

a. In the first chapters "in that day" occurs only twice. In the second part it is found fourteen¹⁰² times. However, Eckardt shows that this is explained by difference in subject matter.

b. Certain words have different meanings in the two sections. קָדָשׁ meaning "glory" in 11:3 is "mantle" in 13:4.¹⁰³ Cornill has shown these to be two different words similar only in spelling. צָרְחָה is "stronghold" in 9:3 and "siege" in 12:2.¹⁰⁴ Eckardt points out that in 9:3 it is intended to be a pun for צָרְחָה .

קָדָשׁ is "power" in 9:4 and "wealth" in 14:14.¹⁰⁵ For these meanings Gesenius lists two different words with the same form. Thus these differences disappear upon examination.

c. Certain ideas are expressed by different words in the two sections, e.g. "pride" in 11:3 is קָדָשׁ , but in 12:7 it is קָדָשׁ ; "collect" in 10:8,10 is שָׁבַע , but in 12:3; 14:2,14 it is קָדָשׁ . This may be granted, but what writer does not know and use a few synonyms?

102. Op. cit., p. 100
 103. Cited by Robinson, op. cit., p. 76
 104. Op. cit., p. 100
 105. Hebrew and English Lexicon, in loco

(2) Evidence For the Unity

a. The following are some of the important similarities between the two parts as pointed out by Eckardt: ¹⁰⁶ **לִשְׁמֹר** is used with the meaning "destroy" in 9:4,15; 11:1,9,16 and also in 12:6. **זָכַר**, "remember," has a religious significance in 10:9 and 13:2. **יָשַׁב** is found in the passive in 9:5 and 12:6. Additional marks of unity are **אֶלֶּל** in 9:6,10; 13:2; **אֶלֶּלֶּלֶּל** in 9:10; 10:3,4,5; 14:2; **אֶלֶּלֶּל** in 9:4; 10:11; 12:4; 13:6,7; **אֶלֶּלֶּל** in 9:7; 11:9; 12:14; **אֶלֶּלֶּל** in 11:1; 13:1.

b. The style of both parts is the same. There is no decisive difference in tone. Both sections are apocalyptic and move in the realm of the future. They both pick up the expressions of their prophetic predecessors and focus them upon that which is yet to come to pass.

Stade, Eckardt, and Kuiper have done valuable work in demonstrating that the language of 9-14 is strongly in favor of the unity of these chapters. It is necessary to suppose two authors with the same modes of expression in order to divide these six chapters.

By way of conclusion, it may be said that the evidence from language and style is not all in agreement except as to the unity of chaps. 9-14. With Wright, who holds to the unity of the entire book, it may be said, "It must be ad-

106. Op. cit., p. 101

mitted that the style of the second portion of the book is
 in many respects different from that of the first part."¹⁰⁷

With G.A. Smith, who holds to the dual authorship of the book, one must concede, "It must be admitted that in language and in style the two parts of the book of Zechariah have features in common."¹⁰⁸ Delitzsch gives a fair evaluation of the differences,

This diversity in the prophetic modes of presentation was occasioned by the occurrence of peculiar facts and ideas, with the corresponding expressions and words; but it can not be proved that there is any constant diversity in the way in which the same thing or the same idea is described in the two parts ...¹⁰⁹

The affinities between the two sections are like strands in a rope, weak in themselves but strong together. They argue that there is some very definite relation between two parts, though they do not absolutely demand unity of authorship.

107. Op. cit., p. xxviii
 108. Op. cit., p. 458
 109. Op. cit., p. 222

CHAPTER IV

RELATION OF ZECHARIAH 9-14 TO OTHER PROPHETIC WORKS

CHAPTER IV

RELATION OF ZECHARIAH 9-14 TO OTHER PROPHETIC WORKS

In the main, it was Stade's ¹deft wielding of the evidence of the relation of Zech. 9-14 to other portions of the Old Testament which changed the current of Zecharian criticism. Since his momentous work, the trend has been to ascribe these six chapters to a post-exilic date. This is done by determining the place of these oracles in the line of prophetic utterances. Then the dating of other books is useful in solving the problem of date here.

1. Dependence of Zech. 9-14 Upon Other Prophetic Works

It is disputed by no one that there are some definite parallels between this second part of the book of Zechariah and other prophetic books. Some critics, as Montet, ²find only a few instances in which the connection is genuine. Other parallels are ascribed to "fortuitous and accidental resemblance." At a minimum these three parallels are allowed: Zech. 9:9,10 with Ps. 72:8; Zech. 10:11 with Isa. 11:15; Zech. 13:3,9 with Hos. 2:19,25. The dependence of Zechariah upon these three passages is unimportant

-
1. Stade, B., "Deuterozacharja, Eine krit. Studie," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1:1-96 (1881), 2:151-172, 275-309 (1882)
 2. Cited by Robinson, G.L., "The Prophecies of Zechariah with Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 12:40 (1895)

for they all belong to the eighth century and so are earlier than any of the proposed dates for Zech. 9-14. Stade is not so miserly in the list of parallels he discusses. He finds so many examples that even those critics³ who agree with his general conclusions are moved to protest that he "has damaged his case by overstatement and exaggeration." His picture of the author of what he calls Deutero-Zechariah is that of a scribe who gathered up a lot of unfulfilled prophecies and redelivered them because of their near fulfillment in his own day (306-278 B.C.).

From compilations by Stade, Kuiper, and Staerk a long list of passages where Zechariah is dependent upon other prophets is listed by Mitchell.⁴ He endorses some fifty cases of dependance by Zechariah on earlier prophets including the following: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Micah, and also Deuteronomy, Job, and Psalms. However, as to the point of dependence, Bleek, Davidson, Grützmacher, and others would take issue with his statement, for they hold that not Zechariah but the other authors have done the copying. Which of these views is correct is the question that must now be discussed. Only undisputed instances of parallelism and only cases where the date of the other passage involved would cast light on the date of Zech. 9-14 will be studied.

-
3. So Eiselen, Mitchell, Kirkpatrick, Kuenen
 4. Mitchell, H.G., "Zechariah," International Critical Commentary, XXV, pp. 237, 238

(1) Relation of Zech. 9-14 to Jeremiah

5

Mitchell finds almost two dozen parallels between the second part of Zechariah and Jeremiah. Some of these points of contact are as follows:

a. Jeremiah 25:34-38 and Zech. 11:1-3 both pro-
⁶
 nounce judgment upon the shepherds. Bleek considers the passage in Zechariah to be the original because in his interpretation it is a literal description of the invasion of Tiglath-pileser while Jeremiah gives only an allegorical presentation of the same thing. This, however, is an exact reversal of the facts. It is the passage in Zechariah which is allegorical in nature. This is evident from the fact that Zech. 11:1-3 is obviously an introduction to the
⁷
 allegory of ver. 4-17. To take Zech. 11:1-3 as literal
⁸
 would make the invading Assyrians confine their main interest to cutting down trees. Wright is positive that the invasion of Tiglath-pileser cannot be meant. The entire eleventh chapter of Zechariah is probably an allegorical picture based upon Jehovah's dealings with his people in connection with the exile. The difference in the point of view of Jeremiah and Zechariah is that, while the former is

5. Op. cit., pp. 237, 238

6. Bleek, F., An Introduction to the Old Testament, II, p. 167

7. So Hengstenberg, Hitzig, Ewald, Robinson, et al.

8. Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies, p. 302

concerned with the event, the latter is concerned with the lesson taught by the event that had already taken place in the life of the people. Jeremiah looks ahead to the event with foreboding; Zechariah casts a look back to it for help in charting the future of his people.

b. Restoration is promised Israel in Jer. 23:1f. and Zech. 10:3-12. In both passages it is promised that the evil shepherds will be punished and that Israel will be gathered, but with a difference. In Zech. 10:6,8 Israel has already gone into captivity and those who are still in exile are exhorted to return home. The Messianic picture of Jer. 23:5 is not so developed or advanced as that of Zech. 9:9,10.⁹ Thus while the two passages have much in common, Jeremiah belongs to an earlier age than Zechariah.

c. The phrase "the pride of Jordan" occurs in Jer. 12:5; 49:19; 50:44 and in Zech. 11:3. It is found nowhere outside of these four passages. Presuming that one of the prophets has borrowed the phrase from the other, it is less likely that Jeremiah should have copied three times the one instance of its use in Zechariah than that Zechariah should have been the borrower.

d. Other expressions in Zechariah seem to be dependent on Jeremiah.¹⁰ The expression "upon the little

9. Robinson, Op. cit., p. 46

10. Ibid., pp. 46,47

ones" in Zech. 13:7 seems to come from Jer. 48:4. The phrase "all the families" used frequently in Zech. 12-14 is found in Jer. 1:15; 2:4; 10:25; 25:9; 31:1; 33:24.

The observations given above produce the conclusion that Zechariah is subsequent to Jeremiah.

(2) Relation of Zech. 9-14 to Ezekiel

Both the first and second parts of the book of Zechariah are related in some way to Ezekiel (593-571 B.C.).
 Using the lines marked out by Stade,¹¹ the following parallels are easily demonstrated.

a. Prophecies directed against the shepherds are found in Ezek. 34 and in Zech. 11:4-17; 13:7-9. (a) In Ezek. 34:2,3,8,10 the shepherds are described as they "that do feed themselves" when they ought to be feeding the flock. While the needs of the sheep are ignored, the fatlings of the flock provide a sumptuous repast for the shepherds. In Zech. 11:4,5 the shepherds are described as serving themselves and becoming rich at the expense of the flock upon which they waste no sympathy. (b) Jehovah says in Ezek. 34:11-14, "I myself, even I will search for my sheep, ... and I will feed them upon the mountains of Israel,...." In Zech. 11:7 Jehovah says, "So I fed the flock of slaughter." (c) Ezek. 34:25 promises a covenant

11. Op. cit., I, pp. 70-75

saying, "I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause evil beasts to cease out of the land." According to Zech. 11:10 this covenant is broken. (d) The result of Jehovah's dealing with the flock is twice affirmed by Ezekiel to be, "and they shall know that I am the Lord." In Zech. 11:11 the result of the preceding action described by the prophet is summed up, "and thus the poor of the flock that gave heed unto me knew that it was the word of the Lord." (e) Both prophets, according to Ezek. 34:1,14 and Zech. 11:4,15, are commissioned to deliver their message concerning the shepherds by a "thus saith the Lord."

The question of dependence is answered by the following considerations: (a) The most important thought is frequently repeated in Ezekiel, e.g. the picture of the shepherds feeding themselves is found in ver. 3,8,10; the description of the flock as diseased, sick, broken, and driven away is found in ver. 4,16; the scattered condition of the flock is pictured in ver. 5,6,8,12,21. It is not probable that the borrower should so dwell upon ideas that he had borrowed. (b) Certain allusions in Zechariah depend upon Ezekiel, e.g. the covenant broken in Zech. 11:10 is the same as that promised in Ezek. 34:25; "in that day" of Zech. 11:11 is easily explained by "the cloudy and dark day" of Ezek. 34:12. (c) The allegory of Zech. 11:4-17 needs some basis that would suggest to its readers an explanation of the figures used. The lessons which the prophet seeks to teach would otherwise always be a part of

an unsolved riddle. This need is answered, at least in part, if Ezekiel is prior to Zechariah. (d) There is evidence that Ezek. 34 has influenced various portions of Zechariah, e.g. the expression of ver. 8, "because there was no shepherd" occurs in Zech. 10:2; the "he-goats" of ver. 17 are found in Zech. 10:3; the declaration of ver. 23, "I will set up one shepherd over them" seems to be the basis of Zech. 14:9, "there shall be one Lord and his name one." Thus a short, compact passage in Ezekiel is shown to have scattered reflections in Zechariah, a fact which points to the earlier date of Ezekiel.

b. Another instance of certain borrowing by one of the prophets is evident in the denunciations against Tyre and Sidon found in Ezek. 28 and in Zech. 9. The following parallels are obvious: (a) Tyre is spoken of as wise in Ezek. 28:3,7,12 and in Zech. 9:2. (b) The abundance of gold and great sea power are referred to in Ezek. 28:4 and Zech. 9:4. (c) Future destruction by fire is prophesied along with casting out by Jehovah in Ezek. 28:16-18 and Zech. 9:4. (d) Ezek. 28:24 says, "there shall be no more a prickling brier unto the house of Israel, nor a hurting thorn of any that are round about them." Zech. 9:8 promises, "And I will encamp about my house against the army that none pass through or return; and no oppressor shall pass through them anymore." (e) Ezek. 28:25,26 promises the gathering of all the people from the lands

into which they shall be scattered; Zechariah describes the preparation of the land for the return of the nation and the coming of the king. Apparently one of these writers knew the prophecy of the other. Point (e) indicates that Zechariah was the later writer. Further, one is predisposed to consider the longer and more detailed account of Ezekiel to be the original. This is strengthened when¹² Stade demonstrates that Zech. 9:1-8 is also based in part upon Amos 1:6-10. It is probable that the one who has demonstrated propensities for borrowing is the borrower in this instance.

c. Certain passages in Zech. 9-14 are related to Ezek. 37,38. The main thoughts of these two chapters in Ezekiel are as follows: (a) Ephraim and Judah will return from exile and be reunited as a nation. (b) After being gathered up, they will dwell safely together in the land of Israel. (c) They will have but one king. (d) Jehovah will wonderfully deliver them from their enemies. (e) This action will serve to magnify Jehovah in the eyes of the nations.

These same thoughts are found scattered throughout the second part of Zechariah. (a) Either Ephraim and Judah are already restored or in the act of being restored (9:10,13; 10:6,7). (b) The people are represented as

12. Op. cit., pp. 46-48

dwelling securely in at least a part of their possession (9:10f.; 14:11). (c) In the future the two kingdoms are to be united under one king (14:9). (d) They are to be attacked by a hostile nation but delivered by Jehovah's intervention (12:2-4; 14:2,3). (e) Jehovah is honored in that everything is made holy (14:20,21).

Psychologically, it is easier to understand how a man might read a unified account and then reflect it piecemeal than to understand how he would be able to gather so many fragments up into a unified account. For this reason it is probable that Zechariah reflects Ezek. 37,38.

Many other passages might be discussed. The ones already used indicate the drift of the wind and something of the strength of this relation between Ezekiel and Zechariah.

(3) Relation of Zech. 9-14 To Isa. 40-66

Since most scholars now place the date of Isa. 40-66 just prior to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, any evidence of dependence upon these chapters by the author of Zech. 9-14 will demand a post-exilic date for the latter. It is generally admitted that these two prophecies are closely related.¹³ Robinson calls attention to the following:¹⁴

a. The promise of Zech. 9:11, "I have sent

13. So Mitchell, Ewald, Hegstenberg, Stade, et al.
 14. Op. cit., pp. 47-49

forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water,"
 15
 reminds one of four similar utterances in Isaiah:

- (a) and they are hid in prison houses:
- (b) saying to them that are bound, Go forth;
- (c) the captive exile shall speedily be loosened; and he shall not die in the pit.
- (d) to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

b. The expression of Zech. 9:12 is rare, "I will render double unto thee," but it occurs twice in
 16
 Isaiah:

- (a) Instead of your shame ye shall have double; ...therefore in their land they shall possess double:
- (b) Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem; ..., that she hath received of Jehovah's hand double for all of her sins.

The dependence of Zechariah on Isaiah is so apparent here that Dillman says of Zech. 9:12 that it is "eine spätere
 17
 Uebersetzung." The passage in Zechariah is more than a revision, but the use of Isaiah is plain.

c. Jehovah is similarly described by both Zechariah and Deutero-Isaiah. The two following examples are found in Zech. 12:1 and Isa. 51:13:

Thus saith Jehovah, who stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him:

15. Isa. 42:22; 49:9; 51:14; 61:1

16. Isa. 61:7; 40:2

17. Cited by Robinson, op. cit., p. 48

Jehovah thy Maker, that stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth;

d. Zech. 12:2 speaks of Jerusalem as "a cup of trembling." This expression is characteristic of Isa. 40-66. In Isa. 51:17 the prophet declares, "thou has drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling," and adds in ver. 22 "even the dregs of the cup of trembling."

e. Of the promise in Zech. 9:9, "Behold thy king cometh," Stade says, "Er hat ihn geformt noch Jes. 62:11." ¹⁸ There is certainly a close parallel here to the verse in Isaiah which says, "Behold thy salvation cometh." Stade also finds in the same discussion that the attributes of the Messianic King of Zech. 9:9, "just" and "saved," are those of Jehovah in Isa. 45:21; Jer. 17:25; 22:4.

f. The eschatological pictures of both prophets are similar. Zech. 14:16 sees a time when,

it shall come to pass, that everyone that is left of all the nations that came up against Jerusalem shall go up from year to year to worship the king, Jehovah of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles.

This verse seems to echo Isa. 55:5 and 56:6,7.

and a nation that knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of Jehovah thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for he hath glorified thee.

Also the foreigners that join themselves to Jehovah, to minister unto him, ... everyone that keepeth the sabbath from profaning it, and holdeth

18. Op. cit., I, p. 53

fast my covenant; ... for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples.

In Zech. 14:12 and Isa. 66:24 the foreigners who do not come up to Jerusalem to keep the religious observances of the sanctuary are cursed.

Both prophets picture a transition to holiness. Isa. 61:6; 62:12 looks for a time when the people shall be as holy as the priest and when they shall be called the "ministers of God." Zech. 14:20,21 describes a time when even the common cooking vessels shall be called holy. Even here there is evidence of a later origin for Zechariah in his somewhat broader catholicity and more extended universalism.¹⁹

In conclusion, not all of the possible examples of parallel passages between Zech. 9-14 and the writings of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah have been discussed. Some have been omitted because there was no indication as to which of the parallel passages was prior. In other cases the evidence of parallelism was indistinct.

Parallels with other books were not included in this discussion because they had no decisive voice with which to speak on the date of Zech. 9-14. The obvious parallels with Joel were omitted because this writer holds to an early date (circa 830-810 B.C.) for the book of Joel. Since there is no evidence that these chapters in Zechariah

19. Robinson, op. cit., p. 49

were written prior to that, any relation with Joel must have been one of dependence on the part of Zechariah. For the same reason, the parallels with the eighth century prophets were not included. However, if the testimony of Mitchell, Stade, and others can be used as sufficient evidence for the presence of parallels with these books, the fact that the author of Zech. 9-14 sometimes borrows from his predecessors is established, and a predisposition to consider him the borrower in other cases is created.

From the nature of these parallels between Zech. 9-14 and the work of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah, the dependence upon the latter by the former and the subsequent date of Zechariah is established. A post-exilic date for these six chapters of Zechariah is demanded. This conclusion is the result not of any decisive single example of dependence on these prophets, but the cumulative evidence is irresistible. Too much may be claimed in one instance and too little in another, but always from each case there is the same impression that Zechariah is the borrower. This does not deprive him of all originality, as Stade does, but simply means that he was well acquainted with the prophets of the past and felt no hesitation in adapting their thoughts and even their phrases to his own use. To that extent it may be said that Stade has overpressed his conclusion, but his careful and complete study of every possible example of parallelism between Zech. 9-14 and the other prophetic works is not without value. He is complete-

ly justified in his conclusion,

Ferner aber hat die bisherige Untersuchung uns bereits den vollgültigen Beweis geliefert, dass wir in Za. c. 9-14 ein nachexilisches Product, ein Buch jünger als Joel vor uns haben.²⁰

2. Mutual Dependence of Zech. 1-8 and 9-14 On the Same Prophetic Works

One of the most important arguments in favor of the unity of authorship of the book of Zechariah is that in both parts there are numerous allusions to the same earlier prophets.²¹ It has just been demonstrated that the dependence is on the side of Zech. 9-14 and not of the pre-exilic and exilic prophets with whom parallels are found. The references in Zech. 1:4-6; 7:7-17 to "the former prophets" would arouse the expectation that the first eight chapters of the book would show some acquaintance with these earlier prophets. It is generally agreed that this is the case. The question here is whether both sections of Zechariah show the same kind of dependence upon the same prophets.

(1) Dependent Passages Within Chaps. 1-8

Zech. 1:4, "Return from your evil ways, and from your evil doings"; cf. Jer. 25:5. Zech. 1:6, "Like as Jehovah of Hosts thought to do unto us, ... so hath he dealt with us"; cf. Lam. 2:17. Zech. 1:12 refers to the seventy years

20. Op. cit., p. 96

21. Wright, op. cit., p. xxxv

of Jer. 25:11 (also cf. Zech. 7:3). Zech. 1:15 condemns the zeal of the nations as in Isa. 10; 47:6. Zech. 1:16 is the same in substance as Isa. 47:25 and is similar to Jer. 31:39. Zech. 1:17, "Jehovah shall yet comfort Zion"; cf. Isa. 51:3. Zech. 2:4 is an expansion of Jer. 31:38,39; Isa. 49:19. Zech. 2:5 may have been suggested by Isa. 4:5; Hag. 1:8; 2:7. Zech. 2:6b, though it may be a gloss,²² seems to be based on Ezek. 2:3. Zech. 2:6, "flee from the land of the north," is based on Isa. 48:20, "flee from the land of the Chaldeans." Zech. 2:8, "the apple of his eye," has affinities with Ps. 17:8. Zech. 2:9, 11 and 4:9, "ye shall know that Jehovah of hosts sent me," was probably borrowed from Ezek. 6:7,10, etc. Zech. 2:11, "many nations," may be a reflection of Mi. 4:2; Isa. 2:3,12. Zech. 2:12, "And Jehovah ... shall yet choose Jerusalem," may be an adaptation of Isa. 14:1. Zech. 2:13, "Be silent, all flesh, before Jehovah; for he is waked up out of his holy habitation," is very similar to Hab. 2:20. Zech. 3:2, "is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" parallels Amos 4:11. Zech. 3:8; 6:12, "the Branch," rest on Isa. 4:2; Jer. 23:5,15. Zech. 3:10, "under the vine and under the fig-tree," is taken from Mi. 4:4. Zech. 4:6 expresses a thought related to Hag. 2:5. Zech. 6:8 expresses the idea of wrath assuaged by punishment found in Ezek. 5:13 etc. Zech. 6:13 may refer to Ps. 110. Zech. 7:9 refers to such state-

22. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 101

ments of the former prophets as are found in Amos 5:24; Ho. 6:6; Isa. 1:16f; Mi. 6:8; Jer. 7:5ff. Zech. 7:11 may refer by "stopped their ears" to Isa. 6:10 and by "turned a stubborn shoulder"²³ to Ho. 4:16. Zech. 8:3 is reminiscent of Isa. 1:16; Jer. 31:20. Zech. 8:4 reflects Isa. 65:20; 8:6 reflects Jer. 32:17,27; 8:7 is reminiscent of Isa. 43:6; 8:8 of Ho. 2:19; Isa. 48:1. Zech. 8:14, "As I thought to do evil unto you, ... and did not repent," may be compared to Mi. 4:1,2; Isa. 2:3.

(2) Dependent Passages Within Chaps. 9-11

In Zech. 9:1 "the word" is used in a sense parallel to Isa. 9:8. Zech. 9:3f. refers to I Kings 10:27 and contains not only the same subject but the same measure and the same number of lines as Am. 9:9,10. The same clear relation is evident between 9:5-7 and Am. 1:6-8. Zech. 9:5,6, concerning the cities of Philistia, is akin to Zeph. 2:4,5. Zech. 9:9 has behind it an elaborate development with a basis in Jer. 23:5; Zeph. 13:4ff; Isa. 61:10; 62:11 etc. Zech. 9:10 is clearly based on Mi. 5:10. Zech. 9:11, "because of the blood of thy covenant I have set free thy prisoners from the pit wherein is no water," is modeled after Isa. 51:14. Zech. 9:16 represents Jehovah as a shepherd as is done often among the prophets but most elaborately in Ezek. 34:10,17. Zech. 10:6 is reminiscent of Jer. 23:6; Isa. 11:

23. R.V., margin

12ff. Zech. 10:9 expresses the same thought as Jer. 23:8; Ho. 11:1; Isa. 11:11; Mi. 7:14ff. etc. "The pride of Jordan" used in Zech. 11:3 is found three times in Jeremiah (12:5; 49:19; 50:44). Zech. 11:4, "the flock of slaughter," resembles Jer. 12:3. Zech. 11:5 is a combination of Ezek. 34:3; Jer. 50:7; Ho. 12:8. The whole allegory of 11:4-17 seems to be dependent upon Ezek. 34.

(3) Dependent Passages Within Chaps. 12-14

Zech. 12:1 is closely related to Isa. 12:2; 42:5; 51:13. Zech. 12:2, "a cup of reeling," resembles Jer. 25:20; 51:7. Zech. 12:6 is reminiscent of Ob. 18. Zech. 12:8 contains the thought of Isa. 31:4ff.; 63:11ff. Zech. 12:10, the reformation wrought by the Spirit, is like Ezek. 36:26 and Jer. 6:26. Zech. 13:1 is quite like Ezek. 36:25. Zech. 13:2 is a quotation from Ho. 2:17. Zech. 13:8,9, two parts of the people cut off while a third is left in the land, is an evident reflection of Ezek. 5:2,12. Zech. 13:9, "and they shall say, Jehovah is my God," resembles Hos. 2:23. Zech. 14:1, "a day of Jehovah," is similar to Isa. 2:22; Ezek. 30:3. There are many parallels between Zech. 14 and Ezek. 38: Cf. 14:2, Ezek. 38:16; 14:3, Ezek. 38:19; 14:12, Ezek. 38:22; 14:13, Ezek. 38:21. Zech. 14:7 expresses the idea of Isa. 30:26; 60:19f. Zech. 14:8, "living waters," is like Ezek. 47:1-12; Joel 3:18. Zech. 14:10 resembles Mi. 4:1; Isa. 2:2; Jer. 31:38,40. Zech. 14:16-19, the nations going up to Jerusalem, has many par-

allels, but Isa. 60:12, 66:23 are most closely related to it. Zech. 14:20f., the spread of holiness, is like Ezek. 48:12. Zech. 14:21, "no more a Canaanite in the house of Jehovah of Hosts," resembles Ezek. 49:9.

It may readily be admitted that it cannot be proved that the author of the book of Zechariah always had before him the verse or passage of the other prophet or prophets he parallels. In some of the instances cited above it is entirely possible that the similarity is due to the common historical, religious, linguistic, and psychological background. For that reason a number of examples have been presented so that, though the number of actual cases of dependence might be reduced, the total weight of the evidence would demonstrate Zechariah's habit of incorporating parts of previous prophecies in his book. The number of examples might have been multiplied, but only those were selected which were accepted as parallels by two or more ²⁴ scholars.

It is thus proved that the author of Zech. 1-8 and of 9-14 were in the habit of using their predecessors. A careful study of the relations that have been demonstrated will show that the author of 1-8 and the author of 9-14 display a marked preference for quotations from the same ones of their predecessors. This is another argument added to the cumulative proof that the author of Zech. 9-14

24. Stade, Wright, Pusey, Kuiper, Staerk, Mitchell, et al.

was the same as the author of Zech. 1-8. If one is unwilling to go that far, at least he must begin to speak, as does Barnes, of "Zechariah the Disciple" as the author of Zech. 9-14.

3. The Traditional Place of Zech. 9-14 In the Roll of the Prophets

Not only all of the tradition of the Christian church but all of the tradition of the Synagogue is united in including Zech. 9-14 in the book written by Zechariah the son of Berechiah. The value of this tradition, however, is unfortunately vitiated by the fact that many generally accepted results of modern criticism went unnoticed through the centuries. There are certain arguments which get their force from the place of Zech. 9-14 with relation to other prophetic works.

(1) The Closing of the Prophetic Canon

The position of these last six chapters in the book of Zechariah is of great importance if one accepts the earlier date for the closing of the canon. Believing that the prophetic canon was closed in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, Delitzsch writes,

... the integrity of the whole is placed beyond the reach of doubt by the testimony of tradition, which is to be regarded as of all the greater value in the case of Zechariah, inasmuch as the collection of the prophetic writings, if not of the whole of the Old

Testament canon, was completed within even less than a generation after the prophet's death.²⁵

The date of the closing of the prophetic canon is, however, still an open question; so the full weight of this argument must await a definite decision on that point.

In the meantime, it may be noted that those who added 9-14 to Zech. 1-8 were dealing, at least in the latter instance, with a work of relative recency. If the witness of the position of a prophecy ever has any bearing upon its date, the position of these six chapters would point to a time between Zech. 1-8 and Malachi. This argument actually gains force by the presumption that 9-14 was added to chaps. 1-8 by a redactor. In that case the redactor must have lived prior to the closing of the canon and so have been closer to the origin of the pieces with which he was dealing than were those who accepted his judgment.

(2) The Name of the Author

The presence of 9-14 in a book bearing the name of Zechariah has given rise to the conjecture, first suggested by Bertholdt, that the author of these chapters was really ²⁶ Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah. Since this Zechariah was a contemporary of Isaiah, it is necessary on this supposition to consider that these chapters were written in the

25. Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary On the Minor Prophets, II, pp. 222, 223

26. Isa. 8:2

eighth century. The presence of these chapters in the book of Zechariah the son of Berechiah is due, then, to the mistaken conclusion of some editor that these men whose names were so similar were really the same. Realizing that the witness elsewhere was so strong for a post-exilic date, Sellin²⁷ proposed a variation of Bertholdt's suggestion. He invented a post-exilic apocalyptist who adopted Zechariah ben Jeberechiah as his nom de plume. These are only guesses resulting from the relation of 9-14 to Zech. 1-8.

(3) Relation To Malachi

The introductory formula "burden of the word of Jehovah" forms a strange link between Zech. 9-14 and Malachi. In all of the Old Testament it is found only in Zech. 9:1; 12:1; Mal. 1:1. G.A. Smith²⁸ holds that this expression was originally a part of the text in Zech. 9:1 and was mistakenly read as a title by some editor. Later it was supposedly attached to the other two prophecies. When combined with the conjecture that the book of Malachi was originally an anonymous work, this provides an attractive theory. Zech. 9-11 and 12-14 and Malachi thus were anonymous independent oracles tacked on to the end of the Book of the Twelve. When the name Malachi was taken from the

27. Sellin, E., Introduction To the Old Testament, p. 193
 28. "Zechariah," The Expositor's Bible, XIV, p. 462

text of that section and placed at its head as the name of its author, Zech. 9-14 was accidentally boxed in and gradually came to be added to the book of Zechariah.

It has never been proposed that Zech. 9-11 and 12-14 and Malachi were written by the same author. Consequently, the presence of this introductory formula in these three places must be due either to the hand of an editor or to copying on the part of the author of Malachi. Once the editorial hand is introduced this connection between 9-14 and Malachi is destroyed. It becomes the superficial product of some redactor's caprice. Many guesses may be made as to why he should have employed the same introduction in these three places. For example, it might be suggested that the introduction originally appearing in Zechariah was added to Malachi just to designate the beginning of that anonymous piece. On the other hand, such a suggestion as that of G.A. Smith is within the range of possibility. The implications here are not at all clear, though it may be granted that the conjectures of those who would use this as an argument for composite authorship of the book of Zechariah are more easily accepted than the others.

29

Barnes points to this relation to Malachi as an indication that Zech. 9-14 belonged in the same general period as that book, i.e. the time of Nehemiah. This argument is effective if it be granted that an editor earlier than the

final redactor of the Book of the Twelve linked Zech. 9-14 and Malachi as three anonymous oracles. Thus the suppositions which provide for composite authorship of the book of Zechariah also points to a fifth century date for chaps. 9-14. However, this argument from the relation to Malachi, which originally seemed to the writer to demand a separate origin for Zech. 9-14 from that of chaps. 1-8, rests so completely on guesses as to have but little independent weight. If on other grounds the separation of 9-14 from 1-8 is demanded, here is a key to the history of these chapters; otherwise, it is easiest to suppose that Malachi simply used an introductory formula first found in Zechariah.

4. Ascription of Zech. 11:12,13 to Jeremiah By Matthew 27:9,10

The difficulties connected with Mt. 27:9,10 have never been satisfactorily solved. The reading "Jeremiah" is critically unassailable. At the same time, the citation is obviously from Zech. 11:12,13. The relation of these verses to Jeremiah has been variously explained. Hengstenberg held that Zechariah simply repeated and enlarged the prophecies of Jeremiah (particularly chaps. 18,

30. Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 375

31. See Brown, F., "The New Testament Witness to the Authorship of Old Testament Books," Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 2:101,102 (1882)

19). Origen proposed some lost writings of Jeremiah as the source of Matthew's quotation. Calovius suggested an orally transmitted prophecy uttered by Jeremiah as the source. Lightfoot and others held that as Jeremiah headed the collection of the prophets, the whole collection was called by his name. Wright, Morrison and others hold that Matthew simply made a mistake. Mede and Flügge were moved to reason that Jeremiah and not Zechariah was the author of this section.

No modern scholar holds that Jeremiah wrote Zech. 9-11. Even if the pre-exilic date is accepted for these three chapters, they belong in the eighth century and not to the time of Jeremiah. The historical evidence here is conclusive. On the other hand, every indication is that this section of Zechariah is post-exilic. Therefore, the ascription of Zech. 11:12,13 to Jeremiah by Matthew cannot be taken to prove that these verses were by his hand.³²

By way of conclusion, the dependence of Zech. 9-14 upon exilic prophecies makes it impossible to consider these chapters as being from any period prior to the exile. It is a characteristic of the author of Zech. 1-8 as well as of the author of 9-14 to borrow from his predecessors.

32. Jude 14,15 professes to quote Enoch, the seventh from Adam. In reality, however, the quotation is from the pseudepigraphical Book of Enoch (1:9). It was a book of Jewish origin about 2 B.C. At least it was not written by Enoch, the seventh from Adam. Thus the N.T. witness to the authorship of a passage cannot be taken as conclusive.

Further, in both cases a preference for the works of the same prophets is in evidence. To this is added the testimony of the position of the book that Zech. 9-14 is prior to Malachi. There is here more evidence for an early post-exilic date than for unity of authorship, though the latter is strongly indicated.

CHAPTER V

THE PROBLEM VIEWED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS

CHAPTER V

THE PROBLEM VIEWED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS

The religious ideas of Zech. 9-14 have an important bearing upon both the date and authorship of these six chapters. By comparing the ideas of this second section of Zechariah with the religious ideas of the first eight chapters it may be possible to determine whether there is any connection between the two parts. At the same time, the degree of development of the ideas expressed will offer some indication of the time of writing.

1. Affinities Between the Religious Ideas of Zech. 1-8 and 9-14

While a man's style may change with his message and his message change with circumstances, there are always certain deep underlying convictions and habits of thought which will be uniform in anything a given individual writes. In a comparatively short work such as the book of Zechariah certain ideas may be expressed and never mentioned or alluded to again. The problem, therefore, is not whether different ideas are expressed in different parts of a book but whether contradictory convictions are proclaimed. It is a waste of time to seek either superficial likenesses or contradictions between these two sections of the book of Zechariah. Only a discussion of the fundamental ideas behind the prophet's utterances

will give decisive results.

Driver states the position of one school of thought about this book when he claims, "Zechariah ... evinces different interests, and moves in a different circle of ideas from those which prevail in chs. ix-xiv."¹ Robinson counters with the assertion, "The fundamental ideas of both parts are the same."² In neither case, however, has any effective investigation been recorded to determine the relative truth of these claims. Driver relies upon the external circumstances reflected in the messages of the two parts of the book. Only when he touches upon the Messianic idea does he get at an underlying part of the prophet's conviction. On the other hand, one might say of the arguments advanced by Robinson what Cheyne says of Kuiper, "By such a method it would be easy to prove that the whole of the Old Testament had but one author."³ In the main Robinson's⁴ arguments are: a. An unusually deep spiritual tone is found throughout the book. b. Hope dominates all of the prophecies. c. God is held to be sovereign over all the earth. d. Jehovah is interested in Judah and Jerusalem. Could not these same things be said

-
1. Driver, S.R., "Zechariah," The New Century Bible, XXII, p. 228
 2. Robinson, G.L., "The Prophecies of Zechariah With Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, p. 84
 3. Cheyne, T.K., "The Origin of the Book of Zechariah," The Jewish Quarterly Review, 1:77 (1889)
 4. Robinson, G.L., The Twelve Minor Prophets, pp. 200-202

of every book in the Old Testament? A study of the fundamental ideas of the author or authors of these chapters needs to be made.

(1) The Combination of the Spiritual, Ethical, and Ritual

There is an unusual mixture of the spiritual, ethical, and ritual elements running through these entire fourteen chapters. The author of both parts of the book seems to have no difficulty in harmonizing all of these elements in his religion.

The purpose of the entire book is sounded in the call to true repentance in Zech. 1:1-7. This repentance is to be a return to Jehovah characterized by a turning from "evil doings." As a result of this ethical reformation the presence of Jehovah is promised them. This promise is expanded in the first, second, third, fifth, and eighth visions. The spiritual force of Jehovah's presence is epitomized in the message to Zerubbabel that he is to succeed, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of hosts." While in chaps. 7,8 the ritual requirement of fasting is abolished and ethical ideals raised instead, the importance placed upon the cult by Zechariah can hardly be overestimated. The fourth vision, which concerns the cleansing of Joshua, the high priest, and the

crown placed on his head, gives the author's attitude toward the formal side of his religion.

This same intermingling of spiritual, ethical and ritual elements is found in chaps. 9-14. The deep spiritual tone is evinced in the consecration of the remnant of the Philistines, in the blessings promised Ephraim, in the baptism of grace upon Jerusalem, in the living waters going forth from Jerusalem, and in the dedication of everything as holy unto the Lord. The ethical note is sounded in the reference to the bad shepherds, in the provision of a fountain for cleansing from sin, and in the purging of the restored people. The prophet's attitude toward the ritual is shown in the place given the house of Levi as equal in importance to the house of David, the importance placed on the feast of tabernacles, the concept of holiness, and the continuance of sacrifices to the time of the end.

This attitude toward the ritual was not characteristic of the pre-exilic prophets, nor was this combination of these three things ever common among the prophets.

-
- 6. Zech. 9:7
 - 7. Zech. 10:12
 - 8. Zech. 12:10
 - 9. Zech. 14:8
 - 10. Zech. 14:20,21
 - 11. Zech. 11:4f.
 - 12. Zech. 13:1
 - 13. Zech. 13:8,9
 - 14. Zech. 12:12,13
 - 15. Zech. 14:16f.
 - 16. Zech. 14:20,21
 - 17. Zech. 14:21

(2) Idea of God

In both sections the prophet speaks as one who knows well him from whom his message has come. In the first part he speaks because at that time "came the word of Jehovah unto Zechariah." In the second part he delivers "the burden of the word of Jehovah." This God whose message he delivers is called "Jehovah Zebaoth." The Septuagint is probably correct in translating "Zebaoth" by *παντοκράτωρ*, i.e. Ruler of all things. Barnes says,

The compound name Jehovah Zebaoth, "Jehovah-Hosts," is used by the Prophet to teach the truth that all the attributes and powers which the heathen ascribe to "Heaven" belong to Jehovah the God of Israel.¹⁸

Not only the name of God but many passages throughout the book of Zechariah describe the universal sovereignty of Jehovah, e.g. 1:14-17; 2:9,12; 4:10; 6:5; 9:1,8,14; 10:3, 5,9,12; 12:2-4,8; 13:7; 14:8,9.

As Robinson pointed out, the special interest of Jehovah in the Jewish people is emphasized in all parts of the book, e.g. 1:17-21; 2:12; 8:3; 9:8,15; 10:3ff.; 11:4ff.; 12:4ff.; 13:1; 14:16ff. This interest in the people is the source of another characteristic of the God of all sections of Zechariah, supernatural intervention in the affairs

18. Barnes, W.E., "Zechariah," Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, XXXI, p. 103

of his people. This is one of the most obvious links between 1-8 and 9-14. In both sections the restoration, the protection, and the victory of Israel over her enemies is pictured as the direct result of the active participation of God in her affairs, e.g. 1:14-17, 18-21; 2:5; 4:6; 6:1-8; 9:1ff.; 10:1ff.; 11:4ff.; 12:8; 14:3. In no case is an intermediate cause interposed between Jehovah and the result, but always he acts directly.

It is characteristic of all of the prophets that they ascribe righteousness to Jehovah. That is found here in 1:15 where Jehovah refuses to allow more punishment for sin than was deserved and in 11:4ff. where concern for the character of the rulers of his people is expressed. In neither section, however, does God's righteousness end in inevitable punishment. Passages in both sections of the book clearly picture Jehovah as a forgiving God, e.g. 1:1-6; 3:1ff.; 5:5ff.; 13:1; 14:16.

A uniform picture of God is presented throughout the book of Zechariah. It is not just that the same attributes can be found in both parts of the book but that emphasis is placed on the same attributes. That this is true has been shown by pointing out the emphasized characteristics of Jehovah and then listing the passages where these aspects are mentioned. Attention is called to the fact that the number of passages from the first and second parts of the book is about equal, at least in the same ratio as eight chapters to six. This is not an artificial

result but was noticed by this writer only after he had already compiled the references.

(3) Attitude Toward the Heathen Nations

Israel lay at the crossroads of the ancient world. It is no wonder that every one of her prophets had a definite attitude and a set policy toward the heathen nations. It is to be expected that a prophet who had just returned from exile to the devastated land of his fathers would be hostile to foreign peoples. That is the attitude of the author of both sections of the book of Zechariah. Not only is he unfriendly, but he pictures God as being likewise angry with them. Though the fact that Judah deserved to be punished is recognized, the nations are condemned for their harshness (1:15), and Babylon is singled out for threats (2:8). The woman called Wickedness is to be transported from the land of Judah to Babylon (5:5-11). This same feeling of hostility to the nations is also demonstrated in 9:1-8,13; 14:12. That there is no good word for Persia in spite of the benignity of her policy toward the prophet's people is significant of the place all contemporary people had in his feeling.

Just here is one of the strongest links that bind all fourteen of these chapters together. The incorporation of the heathen nations into the kingdom of God is one of the most remarkable things about the book of Zechariah. It is an idea reiterated throughout the book

in a form much developed over earlier expressions. The ideal is found as early as the Song of Moses in Deut. 32.¹⁹ Cheyne, however, claims that in Zechariah this great event of the day of the Lord is associated with the Messianic advent in a way peculiar to post-Isaian prophets. Only scattered shadows of the ideal are found before the exile.²⁰ Zechariah, in spite of his attitude toward the foreign people of his own day and in spite of the hostile attitude of the nations to his people, looks for a future day of Jehovah when all causes of division between the nations and the Jews will disappear. In 2:15 the anticipation is expressed that "many nations shall join themselves to Jehovah." That these heathen peoples will worship Jehovah in the manner of the Jews is the expectation of 8:20-23; 9:7; 14:16-19.

²¹

James interprets the conversion of the heathen nations as a sort of selfish nationalism that delights to look to the day when Judah's proud oppressors will become humble supplicants. A more charitable explanation is that it is not so much Judah that is to be exalted as it is the God of Judah. The gods of the heathen nations having failed them while Judah's God has prevailed, all of the nations come voluntarily seeking admission into the company of the

19. Op. cit., p. 79

20. Ps. 87; Joel 2:28; Amos 9:12; Isa. 2:2-4; 11:10-16; Mi. 4:1,2; Zeph. 3:9

21. James, F., Personalities of the Old Testament, p. 409

chosen people. These are to be made welcome because it was the purpose of God all along to bring them to himself. That this ideal, so seldom attained by the prophets, is found in both the opening and closing chapters of both sections of the book of Zechariah clinches the conclusion that the author's attitude toward the nations points to the unity of the book.

(4) Eschatology

"It is important to remember that Zechariah is the prophet of Judah's restoration.²² His message was delivered to a disappointed and discouraged people. They had come back with the promises of a triumphant return given by Deutero-Isaiah ringing in their ears. For fifteen years they had awaited the blessings but had met with only hardship and suffering. Sitting in the shadow of the fire-scarred wreck of the temple, the people looked out over fields and vineyards destroyed by mildew, hail, blasting, and drouth.²³ To suggest, as do Köster, Marti, Torrey, and others, that there had been no return as yet and that these people were of the remnant left in the land does not relieve the picture a bit. These people, and they were returned exiles, were discouraged because of the non-fulfillment of the prophecies concerning the glories of

22. Barnes, op. cit., p. xxvi

23. Cf. Hag. 1:10

the restored community. In this setting it is not at all surprising that God should have raised up a prophet who would project the glory on into the future to a time when the people would meet God's prerequisites for his blessing. Zechariah was that prophet. He encourages hope and action in the present by holding out a victorious future.

In the first part of the book the following promises are found: Existing troubles will be removed if repentance is found among the populace. Outward prosperity is assured Jerusalem; she will be completely restored and thronged by happy crowds with Divine protection as her wall. Those who have not as yet returned from captivity will be restored. Peace will characterize the new day; old men and young children will fill the broad streets. Joy will reign as fasting is turned to feasting. Autonomy will be restored to the nation under the rule of "the Shoot." The heathen nations will acknowledge the sovereignty of Jehovah by coming to Jerusalem to worship him. A new temple is to become the center of all religious life.

Parallels to these promises are found in the second part of the book; however, the form becomes more apocalyptic. Prosperity is offered the people for the asking.

24. 1:1-6

26. 2:6f.; 8:7,8

28. 8:19

30. 8:22

32. 10:1

25. 1:16; 2:4,16; 8:3,8

27. 3:10; 1:17; 6:13; 8:4f.

29. 6:12,13

31. 1:16,17; 3:7; 6:15; 7:2

"Jehovah is with them" is the defeated cry of Judah's
³³ enemies. The remaining exiles are to be restored. ³⁴ Zion's
king will be autonomous not only in his own kingdom but
will have dominion "to the ends of the earth," and his
rule will issue in peace. ³⁵ A future triumph of the nations
over Judah is predicted, an idea not found in 1-8, but
that the final victory belongs to the people of God is as
certain as was ever expressed in the first section. ³⁶ The
remnant of the nations will come to Jerusalem "to worship
the King, Jehovah of Hosts." ³⁷ The temple is to have a
³⁸ prominent place in the life of the world.

The greatest difference of any sort to be found be-
tween 1-8 and 9-14 is in the length of the prophetic per-
spective. It is evident that the first part of the book
looks for the promised blessings in the immediate future.
The stage is set for some immediate action by Jehovah, and
8:3 looks upon this action as already begun. In this ³⁹
Zechariah was in agreement with his contemporary Haggai,
and probably like him expected the blessings in connection
with the completion of the temple. The general disappoint-
ment when these things did not occur is reflected in Hag.
2:10-19 where the prophet in his discussion of holiness
explains why the blessings have been delayed. In some-

33. 10:5

35. 9:9f.; 10:1-12; 12:8; 14:16-19

37. 14:16

39. Hag. 2:6

34. 9:12; 10:6,7

36. 12:1ff.; 14:1ff.

38. 9:8; 14:20,21

thing of the same fashion, the last six chapters of Zechariah push the accomplishment of the day of the Lord into the more distant future. However, the main features of the eschatology of both sections are the same.

(5) Messianic Expectation

There are two general types of Messianic prophecies, those prophecies which deal with the person, the king, and those which deal with the circumstance of the people, the kingdom.⁴⁰ The latter are found in the writings of most of the prophets. They all agree that the coming of the kingdom will usher in a glorious future when God shall dwell with his people. This is to be attained only by the working of God in history. An investigation into Zechariah's teachings concerning the Messianic kingdom would produce little fruit as the views expressed in both sections of the book have the common features which belong to all such prophecies. Their presence does nothing to bind the two parts together. The only noteworthy contribution to the general conception of the Messianic kingdom is the broad outlook of Zechariah, which, according to Goodspeed,⁴¹ is characteristic of post-exilic Messianism.

The book of Zechariah does contain several specific prophecies concerning the person of the Messiah. Their

40. Davidson, A.B., Old Testament Prophecy, p. 311

41. Goodspeed, G.S., Israel's Messianic Hope, p. 89

presence throughout the book does little to hold the parts together; however, their presence in one part and absence from another would have argued strongly for more than one author. Driver, Mitchell, G.A. Smith, and others contend that one of the strongest arguments for dual authorship for the book is found in the contradictory nature of the Messianic prophecies presented in 1-8 and 9-14; therefore, these passages must be carefully examined.

The Messiah of the first eight chapters is designated as "the Shoot."⁴² At this period in Israel's history "Shoot" was as definitely Messianic as $\Pi^3 \Psi \&$ for as late as the time of Deutero-Isaiah the latter term was applied to Cyrus.⁴³ That these references in the third and sixth chapters of Zechariah are Messianic is denied by none, but Marti, Kent, Haupt, Sellin, and a number of others insist that the author intended to refer to Zerubbabel when he spoke of "the Shoot." Since Zerubbabel is obviously not the Messiah of 9-14, this is advanced as a decisive contradiction between the religious ideas of the authors of the two parts of the book.

That Zerubbabel was the Messiah of 1-8 hinges upon the interpretation given the prophetic passage in 6:9-15. The key verses are translated as follows:

42. 3:8; 6:12
43. Isa. 45:1

Yea, take of them silver and gold, and make crowns, and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Jehozadak, the high priest; and speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh Jehovah of hosts, saying, Behold, the man whose name is the Shoot:

Nowhere is Zerubbabel mentioned, but by altering the text the verses are made to say that he was the one who was crowned and was "the man whose name is the Shoot." Haupt states this view,

Both in Zech. 6:13 and Ps. 110:4 Kohen, priest, seems to have been substituted for mal, king, or mosul, ruler just as in Zechariah's prediction of the coronation of Zerubbabel the name of the Davidic scion has been replaced by the name of the high priest Joshua.⁴⁴

Hitzig, Stade, Ewald, and others modify this view to make both Joshua and Zerubbabel the ones who are crowned. One of these two changes in the text must be taken if Zerubbabel is to be considered the Messiah of 1-8.

Zechariah certainly expected great things of Zerubbabel,⁴⁵ but that he believed Zerubbabel to be the Messiah cannot be proved. He did redirect the hope of Israel to the house of David in the person of Zerubbabel, giving to that ruler an importance far beyond his personal and individual consequence, but only as the type of one to come.⁴⁶

That a conjectured change in the text should be the only basis for this argument in itself vitiates the force

44. Haupt, Paul, "The Coronation of Zerubbabel," Journal of Biblical Literature, 37:210 (1918)

45. Cf. 4:6ff.

46. Kirkpatrick, A.F., The Doctrine of the Prophets, p. 434

of the evidence. Further, there is no reason for this change. It was the original intention of the author of Zech. 6:9-15 to describe a typical crowning of Joshua.⁴⁷ Jeremiah had already taught that the Messiah was to have the priestly right of access to God.⁴⁸ It is conceivable that this action in Zechariah is a reflection of that teaching. At least Jer. 23:5; 33:15 may be the source of Zechariah's use of "Shoot" in the way found in his first eight chapters. The Messiah of Zech. 1-8 is a priest-king whose coming will provide means for removing the iniquity of the land.⁴⁹

The Messianic teaching of 9-14 may be discussed under two heads for there are two distinct lines running through these chapters. First, the verses which emphasize the kingly qualities will be studied and then those which depict a Messiah-shepherd.

a. Zech. 9:9,10, which portrays a Messianic King, is one of the great Messianic passages of the Old Testament.

Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem; and the battle bow shall be cut off;

47. Kirkpatrick, op. cit., pp. 439-441

48. Jer. 30:21

49. 3:9

and he shall speak peace unto the nations:
and his dominion shall be from sea to sea,
and from the River to the ends of the earth.

50

51

Briggs finds this to be an early passage. Orelli believes it to be the first passage in which the future human representative of the divine kingly dignity is described in his personal characteristics. In his earlier editions Ewald found this to be a picture drawn by an inferior contemporary of Isaiah and based upon the work of that prophet though with strong affinities to Ps. 72.

52

Driver objects holding that the portrait of the Messianic king seems to be original in Isaiah; consequently, he doubts that this prophecy can be prior to the prophecy of Isaiah as the pre-exilic date for 9-11 would demand.

53

Mitchell finds that 9:9 has behind it a long course of development. The place of this verse in the development of Messianic prophecy may be determined by studying the various characteristics of the Messianic king it presents.

54

(a) He is just ($\rho'7\chi$). This fits in with the ethical character of Jehovah taught throughout the book. This conception of Jehovah and his servant would fit anywhere from the earliest of the prophets to

-
50. Briggs, C.A., Messianic Prophecy, pp. 184,185
 51. Orelli, C. von, Old Testament Prophecy, p. 244
 52. Ewald, G.H.A., Prophets of the Old Testament, I, p. 30 (1875)
 53. Driver, S.R., Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 349
 54. Mitchell, H.G., "Zechariah," International Critical Commentary, XXV, p. 237

the very close of the Old Testament.

(b) He is saved (יָשׁוּב). Great controversy has raged over the translation of this niph'al participle. Bauer sought to make it reflexive, "saving himself." Kimchi gives it the passive sense "saved." This opposes the active voice found in some versions. Bewer paraphrases it to read "vindicated and victorious." Driver, Mitchell, Barnes, and others adopt the passive reading but suggest that the real meaning is not so much "saved" as "victorious through the help of Jehovah." It is on this basis that the Messiah is able to deliver others. This is a new feature not found among the pre-exilic prophets.

(c) He is lowly (יָשׁוּב). Pusey would give this the sense of "afflicted" with a parallel in Isa. 53. Driver prefers to emend יָשׁוּב to יָשׁוּב , following the Septuagint, and connect the idea with Hab. 3:14; Zeph. 3:12 to denote pioussness as opposed to wicked worldliness. Following Mitchell, the best translation is "humble."

55. Cited by Hengstenberg, E.W., Christology of the Old Testament, III, p. 397

56. M'Caul, Alex., Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary on the Prophecies of Zechariah, p. 87

57. Septuagint, Targum, Peshitta, Vulgate

58. Bewer, J.A., The Literature of the Old Testament, p.420

59. Cf. ver. 11,12

60. Robinson, op. cit., p. 34

61. Pusey, E.B., The Minor Prophets, p. 403

62. N.C.B., p. 241

63. Op. cit., p. 274

64
 Robinson cites Rahlfs to show that this idea had its birth
 in the time of the exile. Barnes says that this descrip-
 tion certainly fits no Maccabean chief and therefore dates
 the passage in the fifth century B.C.

(d) He comes riding upon an ass. The nearest parallel to this characterization of the Messiah is the "Prince of Peace" in Isa. 9:6. This is not the sort of representation of the Messiah that would have originated in the Maccabean period when a warrior was the ideal of the people.

(e) His dominion is described as extending from "sea to sea and from the River to the ends of the earth." That the Messiah would possess universal dominion is an undercurrent of the Messianic passages of all ages.

In conclusion, while some of the aspects of this Messianic picture are old, the idea of justice, peace, and universal dominion are here unified in a manner not found in any pre-exilic prophet. The inclusion in the Messianic picture of the idea of meekness and suffering in the manner of Deutero-Isaiah is particularly important. Albert Knudson discusses the three stages of development in Messianic prophecy as follows,

64. Loc. cit.
 65. Op. cit., p. xxx
 66. Kirkpatrick, op. cit., p. 450

Each of these grew to some extent out of the conditions of the time in which it originated. The ideal King was an expression of the strength and confidence of the nation in its youth; the Suffering Servant was the counterpart of the afflicted people of the exile; and the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven fits in with the transcendental and apocalyptic type of thought current toward the close of the Old Testament period.⁶⁷

This prophecy of Zechariah fits in between the second and third stages discussed by Knudson. The influence of the exile upon this prophecy is evident, but, though it is found in an apocalyptic section, it does not have the extreme apocalyptic coloring of the very late Messianic prophecies. To Sellin's contention that this prophecy is pre-exilic in form and post-exilic in content must be added the conviction that it is not later than the close of the fifth century B.C.

b. The Messiah-Shepherd is portrayed in Zech. 11:12,13; 13:7-9; 12:10-13:1. Though Montet, Grützmacher, and Steiner objected to any Messianic interpretation of these passages, they are so interpreted in the New Testament, i.e. Zech. 11:12,13 in Mt. 27:9,10; Zech. 12:10 in Jn. 19:37; Zech. 13:7 in Mt. 26:31. It is of no decisive importance whether these verses were of conscious Messianic import to the prophet or not. The real question is whether God gave his revelation to men in ordered develop-

67. The Religious Teachings of the Old Testament, p. 377

68. Sellin, E., Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 192

ment. In other words, these are Messianic prophecies and may be fitted into the development of Messianic prophecy. If not, God did not give his revelation in ordered sequence; so nothing may be learned of the date of any prophecy from the religious ideas expressed.

69 70 71

Davidson, Delitzsch and Dods are positive in their assertion that the aspect of suffering in the Messianic hope was of post-exilic development. That is the characteristic which binds these three prophecies together. In the first the Shepherd is rejected.

And I said unto them If ye think good, give me my hire; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my hire thirty pieces of silver. And Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter, the goodly price that I was prized at by them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them unto the potter, in the house of Jehovah.⁷²

The closest parallel to this passage is found in Isa. 53:3,

He was despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief ...

In the second prophecy the shepherd is smitten by the sword of Jehovah,

Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones.⁷³

69. Op. cit., p. 258

70. Delitzsch, F., Messianic Prophecies, p. 215

71. Dods, Marcus, "Zechariah," Hand-Books For Bible Classes, p. 65

72. Zech. 11:12,13

73. Zech. 13:7

Here the Messiah is a martyr prince rather than the martyr servant of Isaiah 53; though in both cases the Messiah suffers for the sins of the people under the Divine infliction of judgment.⁷⁴ This difference between Zech. 13:7 and Isaiah is easily understood if the author of 1-8 wrote this passage for it will be remembered that royal prerogatives are always prominent in the Messianic prophecies of the first part of the book of Zechariah.

The third prophecy pictures the shepherd as thrust through by his own people.

And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look unto me whom they have pierced; and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.⁷⁵

The parallel with Isaiah 53 is again obvious.

...we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions ...⁷⁶

In an ultimate sense God did strike him down, as 13:7 indicates, but from another point of view it was the sin of the people which pierced him. Turning to the crucifixion of Jesus, the apparent discrepancies between Zech. 13:7 and 12:10 are removed. A Roman sword pierced his side, but the sovereign God permitted it, and the sin of the

74. Briggs, op. cit., p. 463

75. Zech. 12:10

76. Isa. 53:4,5

people demanded it that a fountain for cleansing from sin might be opened.

The idea of vicarious suffering developed during the exile into the great expressions of Deutero-Isaiah. The author of Zech. 9-14 was not far behind, copying much from his great predecessor but with significant additions of his own.

From this study of the Messianic ideas of Zech. 9-14 two things are apparent. First, this prophecy is definitely post-exilic and yet not much later than the time of the exile. Second, the main features of the Messianic picture in Zech. 1-8 are preserved here. There are differences in the form but not in the content of the Messianic prophecies found in these two parts of the book. Both sections conceive of the Messiah as an individual. They both expect the restoration of Zion's king in the person of the Messiah. As a result of the work of the Messiah, both expect provision to be made for cleansing from sin. There are no distinctive features found only in the book of Zechariah which would demand that the book be a unity, but neither are there any contradictory convictions which would make a division of the book necessary. Wright summarizes his study of this part of the problem of the unity of the book of Zechariah, "The attempts made to discover essential differences in the picture given of the Messianic age in the first and second portions must be

77

viewed as failures."

2. The Unity of Zech. 9-14

A pre-exilic date for the last six chapters of Zechariah demands that there be a different author for 9-11; 13:7-9 and for 12:1-13:6; 14. Since it has been shown that that early date is untenable, it is necessary to examine the supposed difference in religious ideas found in these two sections. ⁷⁸ Kuenen states them as follows: In the first three chapters there is no heathen attack on Jerusalem, no complaint against the false prophets, and no expectation of the conversion of the heathen. In the last three chapters there is no mention of Ephraim, no reference to a return from the exile, no announcement of a punishment on the false shepherds, and no Messianic prophecy. Attention is called to the fact that the argument rests not upon the presence of contradictory ideas but the absence from one part of things found in the other. Surely a prophet does not have to say the same thing every time he writes. There is no contention here that the author wrote all six of these chapters the same day; he may have written these two sections several years apart.

A closer examination of the absence of certain ideas from the two parts of this prophecy may help. In chaps.

77. Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies, p. xxxix
 78. Cited by Smith, G.A., "Zechariah," The Expositor's Bible, XIV, p. 458

9-11 there is no attack upon Jerusalem in the same manner as described in chaps. 12,14. Well, the presence of these two accounts has made Graetz ascribe chap. 12 to a different author from chap. 14; another account would have probably produced three authors. The hostility between Jerusalem and the heathen nations is vividly described in 9:1-8,13. Also, the passing reference to the false prophets in 13:2f. has the same tone as the condemnation of idolatry and of diviners in 10:2. It is a mistake to say that the conversion of the heathen is not mentioned in the first three chapters for in 9:7 it is said of the Philistine, "he also shall be a remnant for our God."

The absence in the second part of ideas of the first may be harmonized in this way. Ephraim is not mentioned, but it is coupled with Judah in the first part to indicate that all twelve tribes are being discussed. All twelve tribes are discussed in the second part, e.g. the meaning of "Israel" in 12:1. There is no mention of the exile, but these chapters describe events which are to occur long after and have no connection with the exile. The absence of any reference to the shepherds is produced only by following Ewald in removing 13:7-9 to the end of chap. 11. That may be allowed, but the fact that 13:7-9 could accidentally slip from the end of chap. 11 to its present

79. Graetz, H., "The Last Chapter of Zechariah," Jewish Quarterly Review, 3:208-219

80. Op. cit., I, p. 305

position indicates that these two sections have had a long⁸¹ history of association. Further, Kirkpatrick finds that this conclusion to chap. 11 produces the best explanation of the mourning in chap. 12. As for the absence of any Messianic prophecy in these last three chapters, it has already been demonstrated that the same Messianic expectation runs through all fourteen chapters of the book of Zechariah.

The main theme of these last six chapters of the book is the ultimate blessed state of the Jewish nation. The reunited nation is purged of all evil within it. Its enemies are destroyed or converted, and Jehovah becomes the active protector of his people. This fact has produced Cheyne's oft quoted conviction that "with, perhaps, one or two exceptions, chaps. ix-xi and xii-xiv are so⁸² closely welded together that analysis is impossible." Indeed, while many suggestive thoughts pass across the prophet's horizon, he uses them all as a part of his effort to portray the triumph of Israel as the inevitable outcome of the dealings of God with the world.

3. Analysis of the Book of Zechariah

An analysis of the book of Zechariah along the lines⁸³ marked out by Delitzsch will indicate the continuity of

81. Op. cit., p. 461
83. Op. cit., pp. 218-220

82. Op. cit., p. 81

ideas which runs through all fourteen chapters. The night-⁸⁴ vision of Zechariah is a sequel to the prediction of Haggai concerning the overthrow of the heathen powers and the development of the Messianic kingdom. The first phase of⁸⁵ Zechariah's vision indicates that the existing peace will soon give way to action on the part of God in the deliver-⁸⁶ance of his people. The second phase points to the breaking of all the heathen powers, i.e. the nations of all four⁸⁷ points of the compass. The third phase shows the expansion⁸⁸ of the kingdom of God without limit. In the fourth part⁸⁹ the restored community of Israel is cleansed from sin and restored to God's favor. The fifth phase of the vision⁹⁰ indicates that the Spirit of God is the sole means of re-⁹¹establishing the nation. The sixth phase envisions the re-⁹²moval of sinners from the land while the seventh concerns the removal of "the spirit of wickedness." Finally, the⁹³ eighth phase of the vision returns to the opening theme, the execution of judgment on the heathen nations. There⁹⁴ follows a symbolical act which points to the completion of the kingdom of God by the Priest-King.

The seventh and eighth chapters are rightly placed as to time of delivery, but the discussion of fasting con-

84. Hag. 2:20-23
 86. 1:18-21
 88. 2:1-13
 90. 4:1-14
 92. 5:5-11
 94. 6:9-15

85. 1:7-17
 87. Barnes, op. cit., p. 132
 89. 3:1-10
 91. 5:1-4
 93. 6:1-8

tained in them is not directly related to either what precedes or follows. However, the same promises for Israel's future and the same attitude toward the heathen nations found in the rest of the book are evident here. Perhaps, as Delitzsch suggests, these chapters connect the other two parts by impressing upon the people the condition upon which the glorious promises for the future depend.

In 9:1-8 the theme of judgment upon the nations is repeated as a prelude to the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. The promise of purification and restoration of the people is repeated in chapter ten. The allegory of chap. 11 depicts the attitude of the Lord toward the recalcitrant covenant nation. A new beginning is made in chap. 12 where a future attack of the heathen upon Jerusalem is repulsed. Then the conversion of the nation to the Messiah, whom it had previously rejected and put to death, is followed by the purification of Jerusalem. The heathen attack is predicted again in chap. 14 with the additional feature of the conversion of these foreigners to Jehovah issuing from their defeat. The climax of the whole book is reached when Jerusalem becomes the religious center of the world. Then the humblest things within the city are sanctified to the Lord. "Thus all parts of the book hang closely together ..."

95. Op. cit., p. 221
 97. 12:10-14
 99. 14:16-22

96. 9:9-17
 98. 13:1-6
 100. Delitzsch, loc. cit.

By way of conclusion, the religious ideas of 9-14 display a development in keeping with the general period of 1-8. These six chapters could not have been written before the exile, nor do they move in the spirit of the Grecian or Maccabean periods. The main features of the religious ideas of 1-8 are preserved in 9-14. They are not expressed in the same way, and apparently not under the same circumstances. Of more significance, however, the same ideas are emphasized throughout the book. Without the support of any other evidence, the religious ideas would lead one to think that the two parts of the book, and there are only two, were written in the same general period by men who were closely associated if not by one man.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

The aim of the writer of this thesis has been to investigate the possibility of an early post-exilic date and Zecharian authorship for Zech. 9-14. An effort has been made to evaluate all of the evidence offered for the various critical positions held with regard to these six chapters. Historical background, language and style, the relation of Zech. 9-14 to other prophetic works, and the religious ideas of these chapters have been studied. Such conclusions as seem warranted from this study are now offered.

It seemed pertinent to determine whether Zech. 9-14 could be treated as a unity. A minute discussion of every possible gloss, editorial revision, transposition of verses, and otherwise questioned passages would have produced a thesis as long as this one. Therefore, what is now said concerns only major divisions of the section, especially chaps. 9-11 and chaps. 12-14. The historical evidence permits the unity of chaps. 9-14. Language and style are more positive and may be almost said to demand the unity of this section. The same relation to other prophetic works is displayed throughout these chapters. Finally, the religious ideas are uniform and argue strongly for the acceptance of Zech. 9-14 as one prophecy made

up of several oracles in something of the fashion of the book of Micah. Whether these six chapters were written at the same time or not, they are, with some minor exceptions, the work of one author.

The apocalyptic nature of Zech. 9-14 makes it impossible to point to the exact occasion of these prophecies. However, by process of elimination, the historical evidence discernable within these chapters indicates that they are certainly post-exilic and pre-Grecian. There is nothing to prevent an early post-exilic date and some evidence to make that the preferred period for the origin of this part of the book of Zechariah. The development of the language and style and the development of the religious ideas point to an early post-exilic date. The relation of these passages to other prophetic works demands a post-exilic date, probably prior to the book of Malachi. Consequently, Zech. 9-14 must be accepted as belonging to the same general period as Haggai, Zech. 1-8, and Malachi.

Conclusions concerning the authorship of Zech. 9-14 are not so easy. The date of these chapters would allow them to fall within the possible lifetime of Zechariah the son of Berechiah. Their presence in his book creates a predisposition to ascribe them to him. The two parts of the book that bears his name have many characteristics in common. Further, the same ideas, hopes, and expectations

prevail throughout the entire book. In the judgment of this writer these arguments are sufficient proof that Zechariah the son of Berechiah wrote Zech. 9-14. It may be allowed that a disciple of the great Zechariah could have produced this section. That would explain certain differences between the two parts, but these differences are not insuperable obstacles to Zecharian authorship. The book of Zechariah, then, is a carefully edited collection of the work of that prophet for the purpose of assuring the people of their final triumph over the forces of evil through Divine intervention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books on Prophecy

- Buttenweiser, Moses, The Prophets of Israel
The Macmillan Co., New York, 1914
- Cornill, C.H., The Prophets of Israel
The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1895
- Davidson, A.B., Old Testament Prophecy
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1903
- Driver, S.R., The Ideals of the Prophets
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1915
- Duhm, Bernard, The Twelve Prophets
Adam and Charles Black, London, 1912
- Eichhorn, J.G., Die Hebraischen Propheten
Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Gottingen, 1816
- Eiselen, F.C., Prophecy and the Prophets
The Methodist Book Concern, New York, 1909
- Eiselen, F.C., The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament (Vol. II)
The Methodist Book Concern, New York, 1923
- Elliott, Charles, Old Testament Prophecy
A.C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1909
- Farley, W.J., The Progress of Old Testament Prophecy
Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1925
- Farrar, F.W., The Minor Prophets
Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, n.d.

- Harrell, C.J., The Prophets of Israel
Cokesbury Press, Nashville, 1933
- Kirkpatrick, A.F., The Doctrine of the Prophets
The Macmillan Co., London, 1909
- Kuenen, Abraham, The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel
Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1877
- Lods, Adolphe, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism
Kegan Paul, French, Trubner and Co., London,
1937
- Orelli, C. von, Old Testament Prophecy
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1885
- Robinson, G.L., The Twelve Minor Prophets
George H. Doran Co., New York, 1926
- Robinson, T.H., Prophecy and the Prophets
Duckworth, London, 1925
- Smith, J.M.P., The Prophet and His Problems
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1914
- Taylor, B.C., Prophecy and the Prophets
The Judson Press, Philadelphia, 1923
- Ward, J.W.G., Portraits of the Prophets
Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1930
- Welch, A.C., Jeremiah
Oxford University Press, London, 1928

2. Commentaries

Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Vol. XXXI)

University Press, Cambridge, 1886

Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Vol. XXXI)

University Press, Cambridge, 1917

Dods, Marcus, Hand-Books for Bible Classes
("Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi")

T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1879

The Expositor's Bible (Vol. XIV)

Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1900

Ewald, G.H.A., Prophets of the Old Testament
(Vols. I, III, V)

Williams and Norgate, London, 1875-81

Gore, C.; Goudge, H.L.; Guillaume, A., A New Commentary
on the Holy
Scriptures

The Macmillan Co., New York, 1928

Hitzig, Franz, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten

Weidmanischen Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1838

International Critical Commentary (Vol. XXV)

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1912

Keil, C.F. and Delitzsch, F., Commentary on the Twelve
Minor Prophets (Vol. II)

T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1880

Lowe, W.H., The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zech-
ariah

The Macmillan Co., London, 1882

M'Caul, Alexander, Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary
Upon the Prophecies of Zechariah

James Duncan, London, 1837

- Moore, T.V., Prophets of the Restoration
Robert Carter and Bros., New York, 1856
- Neumann, W., Die Weissagungen des Sakharjah
J.F. Steinkopf, Stuttgart, 1860
- The New Century Bible (Vol. XXII)
Henry Frowde, New York, 1906
- Nowack, D.W., Die Kleinen Propheten
Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1897
- Orelli, C. von, The Twelve Minor Prophets
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1893
- Pusey, E.B., The Minor Prophets (Vol. II)
Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1885
- Rosenmüller, E.F.C., Prophetæ Minores (Vol. IV)
Joh. Ambros. Barthii, Leipzig, 1828
- Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1879

3. General Works

- Baynes, N.H., Israel Amongst the Nations
Student Christian Movement, London, 1928
- Bewer, J.A., The Literature of the Old Testament
Columbia University Press, New York, 1922
- Bleek, Friedrich, An Introduction to the Old Testament
(Vol. II)
George Bell and Sons, London, 1875
- Box, G.H., Judaism in the Greek Period
Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1932
- Cornill, Carl, Introduction to the Canonical Books of
the Old Testament
Williams and Norgate, London, 1907
- Davidson, A.B., The Theology of the Old Testament
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1922
- DeWette, W.M.L., A Critical and Historical Introduction
to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old
Testament (Vol. II)
Charles C. Little and James Brown, Boston, 1843
- Driver, S.R., Introduction to the Literature of the Old
Testament
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1897
- Eichhorn, J.G., Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Vol.
III)
Widmanischen Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1803
- Goodspeed, G.S., A History of the Babylonians and
Assyrians
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1900

- Gray, G.B., A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1913
- Hall, H.R., The Ancient History of the Near East
Methuen and Co., London, 1927
- James, Fleming, Personalities of the Old Testament
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1939
- Kautzsch, E., A History of the Literature of the Old Testament
G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1899
- Knudson, A.C., The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament
The Abingdon Press, New York, 1918
- Leslie, E.A., Old Testament Religion
The Abingdon Press, New York, 1936
- Lofthouse, W.F., The Clarendon Bible (Vol. IV)
Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1928
- McCurdy, J.F., History, Prophecy, and the Monuments (Vols. I, III)
The Macmillan Co., New York, 1896
- McFayden, J.E., Introduction to the Old Testament
A.C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1906
- Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H., Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament
The Macmillan Co., New York, 1934
- Orr, James, The Problem of the Old Testament
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1906

- Sampey, J.R., The Heart of the Old Testament
Sunday School Board of the S.B.C., Nashville,
1922
- Sampey, J.R., Syllabus for Old Testament Study
Sunday School Board of the S.B.C., Nashville,
1922
- Schürer, Emil, A History of the Jewish People in the
Time of Christ (Div. I, Vol. I)
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1890
- Sellin, E.F.M., Introduction to the Old Testament
George H. Doran Co., New York, 1924
- Wilson, R.D., A Scientific Investigation of the Old
Testament
The Sunday School Times, Philadelphia, 1926

4. Messianic Prophecy

Briggs, C.A., Messianic Prophecy

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1886

Cloag, P.J., The Messianic Prophecies

T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1879

Delitzsch, Franz, Messianic Prophecies in Historical Succession

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1891

Goodspeed, G.S., Israel's Messianic Hope

The Macmillan Co., New York, 1900

Hengstenberg, E.W., Christology of the Old Testament
(Vol. IV)

T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1856-8

Riehm, Edward, Messianic Prophecy

T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1900

5. Encyclopedias

The Encyclopedia Americana (Vol. XXIX)

The Americana Corporation, New York, 1928

The Encyclopaedia Biblica (Vol. IV)

The Macmillan Co., New York, 1903

Encyclopaedia Britannica (Vol. XXIII, 14th ed.)

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., New York, 1929

Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (Vol. IV)

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1902

International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (Vol. V)

The Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915

6. Lexicons, Grammars, and Texts

American Revised Version of the English Bible

Brown, Driver, and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament

Houghton and Mifflin Co., New York, 1907

Gesenius, William, Hebrew Grammar

D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1856

Gesenius, William, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament

Crocker and Brewster, Boston, 1849

Kautzsch, E., Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar

The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1910

Kittel, Rudolph, Biblia Hebraica

Privilegierte Wurtembergische Bibelanstalt,
Stuttgart, 1912

Yates, K.M., The Essentials of Biblical Hebrew

Sunday School Board of the S.B.C., Nashville
1938

7. Publications

American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature
(Vol. XII)

Jewish Quarterly Review (Vols. I, III)

Journal of Biblical Literature (Vols. XXXII, XXXIII,
XXXV, XXXVII, XLVI)

Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and
Exegesis (Vol. II)

Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft
(Vols. I, II, XIII)