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PREFACE.

Since the founding of the Theological Tripos Examiners have frequently complained, that the Candidates for it do not, as a rule, take pains to acquire an accurate knowledge of even the Elements of the Sacred Tongue. This has been, doubtless, in great measure the fault of the Curriculum, to the requirements of which they have been obliged to conform their studies. It need, however, be a matter of surprise to none, that the Regulations for a Tripos Examination in the chief subjects of a field of learning so wide as that of Theology, should not at the first have been perfect: for "בּלָּהַטַּהֲלָלוֹתְךָ יְשַׁהוֹת," i.e. Il n'y a que le premier pas qui coûte. We have every reason to hope that from the inauguration of the New Regulations for that Tripos will date a new era in the Hebrew scholarship of the University, and that the Theological Tripos will thenceforth send forth into the world scholars as sound in their knowledge of the Elements of Hebrew as did the 'Voluntary Examination' which it superseded. This Student's Commentary has been written with a view to aiding this New Scheme of Theological Studies. The plan of it is as follows:

Words and sentences are treated from a purely grammatical point of view, and in so doing no difficulties have been wittingly avoided, but, rather, some have at times been intentionally raised, when by so doing an opportunity has been afforded of explaining some of the minuta of Hebrew Syntax. Unpointed Hebrew, and Transliteration, have been freely used from considerations of economy. But, if the student will
point for himself the unpointed Hebrew words, and afterwards correct his own vowel-points from a pointed Text, this apparent incompleteness in the Notes will thus be transformed into a distinct advantage. The Hebrew Text quoted in reference to matters of punctuation is that of Baer, in the Books Genesis, Isaiah, Job, Proverbs, Psalms, and The Minor Prophets; in the case of the other Books various editions have at times been consulted.

The 'Remarks' (on the interpretation of the prophecies) are looked upon as of secondary importance, and are consequently printed in smaller type. Enough has, we hope, been given in them, to enable the Student (who is supposed to be studying the Book chiefly with a view to learning the language) to read the prophecies with an intelligent notion of their contents. But, if he should wish to see such questions discussed at much greater length, he may refer to Wright's *Bampton Lectures*.

The Excursus treat of matters, which may perhaps be of some interest to riper Scholars than those, for whom the bulk of the book is intended.

I am much indebted to Rev. A. T. Chapman, Fellow and formerly Tutor of Emmanuel College, for reading the proof-sheets, and for several valuable suggestions, which he has made to me in the course of so doing.

W. H. L.

*Cambridge, May, 1882.*
INTRODUCTION.

PROLEGOMENA TO CHAPTERS I.—VIII.

Personal to the Prophet.

Of the personal history of the Prophet Zechariah hardly anything is recorded. He styles himself "Zechariah, son of Berechiah, son of Iddo, the prophet," which certainly implies that he was the grandson of Iddo. But in Ezra v. 1, vi. 14 he is spoken of as "son of Iddo." This, however, presents no difficulty, for similarly Jehu is mentioned as son of Jehoshaphat son of Nimshi (2 Kings ix. 14), while (ver. 20) he is called merely son of Nimshi. The father of Zechariah, and the father of Jehu, seem to have been (to use an illustration from modern times) somewhat in the position of Abraham Mendelssohn, they could both boast of being the father and the son of a man of reputation. Knobel's supposition, then, that "son of Berechiah" (Zech. i. 1, 7) is an interpolation from Is. viii. 2, where Zechariah son of Jeberechiah is mentioned, is unnecessary. In Ezra v. 1, 2 "Zechariah son of Iddo" is mentioned as prophesying in conjunction with "Haggai the prophet," and being instrumental in bringing about the resumption of the work of rebuilding the Temple. We know nothing further for certain about him, except that he prophesied up to the month of Cislev in the 4th year of Darius. Something may, however, be deduced from circumstantial evidence.

Among the Priests and Levites who came up with Zerubbabel is mentioned "Iddo" (Neh. xii. 4), as one of heads of the priestly families

1 Son of the philosopher Moses Mendelssohn, from whose Biblical Commentary we quote the opinions of Arnswald, and father of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy the musician.
(rāshē haccēḥōvēnīm) in the days of Jeshua (see p. 32) the High Priest. Again in the days of Joiakim, the son of Joshua (the High Priest), a Zechariah son of Iddo is mentioned (ver. 10, 12, 16) as one of the heads of families (rāshē hā‘abhōth), and that evidently among the Priests. From these facts it is deduced by many (and not unreasonably), that Zechariah (like Jeremiah and Ezekiel) was a priest as well as a prophet: and that (supposing the Iddo of Neh. xii. 4, 16 to be the same person that is mentioned in Zech. i. 1), while Zechariah began his ministry during the High-priesthood of Joshua, he was head of his family in the days of Joiakim the son of Joshua. Thus Zechariah's father, probably, died early and never became the head of his family, and Zechariah was a young man at the time of the return from the Captivity.

The times of the Prophet, and occasion of his Mission.

In the first year of his reign in Babylon B.C. 538 (Rawlinson) Cyrus the Great made a decree for the return of the Jewish exiles to Jerusalem, and for the rebuilding of the House of the Lord God of Israel, which was in Jerusalem (Ezr. i. 3). The sum total of the "Congregation" (qāhāl) which came up on this occasion was 42,360 (fathers of families, probably, i.e. about 200,000 free men, women and children), besides male and female slaves to the number of 7,337 (Ezr. ii. 64, 65, Neh. vii. 66, 67). These came up under Zerubbabel (or Sheshbaṣar comp. Ezr. iii. 8, v. 16, Zech. iv. 8), the Head of the Captivity (Rāsh Gālūṭā) son of Shealtiel (Ezr. iii. 2, 8, v. 2 &c., Hagg. i. 1, 12 &c., Matt. i. 12, Luke iii. 27), and Joshua the son of Josedech the High Priest. Zerubbabel is called (1 Chron. iii. 19) son of Pedaiah (son of Jeconiah, son of Jehoiakim), Shealtiel having probably died without male issue, and his brother Pedaiah having (in accordance with Deut. xxv. 5—10) taken his deceased brother's wife. Zerubbabel was thus legal heir of Jehoiachim, king of Judah. Feeble indeed was the people's response to the Persian king's invitation to return to their own country, and remarkably so with those who ought to have been most eager to avail themselves of it, viz. the priesthood. Of them but 4 out of the 24 orders, and of the Levites only 74 (households, probably) returned. After the returned exiles had arrived at their respective cities, as the seventh month was
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approaching they were assembled, as one man, to Jerusalem, and rebuilt the altar of burnt offerings, and from the 1st day of Tishri (see page 10) reestablished the daily sacrifices. They kept also in that month the Feast of Tabernacles¹ (Ezra iii. 1—6) “according to the scripture” (viz. from the 15th to the 22nd² of the 7th month, Lev. xxiii. 33—42). Then in the second month (Iyyār) of the second year of their return (whether this was the second or third year of Darius cannot be decided) energetic measures began to be taken for the building of the Temple, and the foundation thereof was shortly laid amid the blasts of trumpets, the clashing of cymbals, and songs and praises to the Lord “for His mercy (endureth) for ever upon Israel,” while some shouted for joy, and the ancient men, who had seen the Former House, wept, when the foundation of this House was laid before their eyes (Ezr. iii. 8—13). But the building was not destined to be completed at this time. When the Samaritans heard that the community, which had returned from the Captivity, were beginning to rebuild the Temple, they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chiefs of the people, and desired to take part in the work. On their cooperation being declined they set themselves to hinder the Jews in their work, and bribed some of the favourites at the Court of Persia so effectually, that they frustrated the purpose of the people of Judah during the rest of “the reign of Cyrus, even up to the reign of Darius” (Ezr. iv. 1—5);—i.e. from about B.C. 536 to B.C. 529 when Cyrus died, and during the reign of Cambyses, son of Cyrus (B.C. 529—522), and the 10 months (or less) of the reign of the pseudo-Smerdis (or Bardes) B.C. 522—1, and during one year of the reign of Darius, who succeeded Bardes in 521—in all about 15 years³. In the second year of Darius, God raised up Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo (Ezr. v. 1, 2) to prophesy to the Jews which were in Judah and Jerusalem, so that Zerubbabel and Joshua the High Priest and the rest of the people “came and worked at the House of the Lord of Hosts in the 24th day of the 6th month of the second year of Darius,” (Hag.

¹ The fact that this was the first Festival, which they kept on their return, may be an additional reason for the prominence given to it in Zech. xiv. 16, 18. There does not appear to be any sufficient ground for doubting the genuineness of Ezr. iii. 4—6.

² The 22nd called Shmini 'ap'treth is looked on as a separate Festival, régel biph'ne 'açmo (T. B. Succah 47b—48a).

³ For further particulars with regard to the events of this interval see the book of Ezra.
Although it is true that the enemies of Judah and Benjamin were a chief cause of this long neglect of the work of rebuilding, still such neglect seems to have been in great measure caused by remissness on the part of Zerubbabel and Joshua, and the heads of the people. For Haggai on the 1st of the 6th month (i. 1—11) administered to them a scathing rebuke, when he said to them “Is it time for you, you indeed, to dwell in your houses all ceiled, while this House lieth waste?” He calls on them too to “consider their ways,” to call to mind, why it was that they “sowed much, and brought in little,” it is (says he) because “My House is waste, and ye run every one to his own house.” In the 7th month the word of the Lord came again to Haggai, and he foretells the “shaking of the heavens and the earth and the sea,” encourages the people by the promise that “the choicest things of the nations should come” to glorify God’s House (ii. 7, 8), and assures them that “the glory of that House will in later times be greater than at the first” (ver. 9). At this juncture it was, that the first recorded revelation came to Zechariah, in the 8th month, and he is commanded to exhort the people to repentance, and to warn them against neglecting the words of the prophets as their fathers had done before them, if they would not experience their chastisements (i. 1—6).

Contents of Chap. i.—viii.

After the (1) introductory verses (Chap. i. 1—6), Chapters i. 7—viii. 23 fall into two divisions, divided from each other, and from the introduction, by the mention of the exact date of each revelation. They comprise (2) Chap. i. 7—vi. 15, and (3) Chap. vii. and viii.

(2) Chap. i. 7—vi. 15 consists of a series of seven visions, with two appendices—chaps. ii. 6—13—vi. 9—15.

First Vision (chap. i. 7—17).—The horsemen between the myrtles. This vision was intended to convey to the prophet the truth that, though as yet there may be little sign of God’s “overthrowing the kingdoms” (Haggai ii. 22), yet He, with His all-watchful eye, was scanning the horizon, and preparing to fulfil His word.

Second Vision (chap. i. 18—21).—The four horns and four workmen indicate that God would continue to remove the hostility of the Persians, even as He had already broken the power of the Assyrians, Egyptians, and Babylonians.

Third Vision (chap. ii. 1—5).—The man with the measuring line. The enlargement and perfect security of the people of God. An appendix (chap. ii. 6—13), prophetic of the ingathering of the nations in the days of Branch, the Messiah.

Fourth Vision (chap. iii.)—Joshua, the high priest, arraigned before the angel of
the Lord. The forgiveness of the sins of the priesthood and people, whose representative he was.

Fifth Vision (chap. iv.).—The candlestick with the two olive-trees. The diffusion of God's grace by means of His two channels—the priesthood and civil power. It contains a promise (ver. 9) that Zerubbabel's hands should finish the building of the Temple.

Sixth Vision (chap. v. 1—11).—The flying roll, and the woman in the ephah, denoting the curse on sinners, and the banishment of sin.

Seventh Vision (chap. vi. 1—8).—The four chariots. God's judgments on the nations. An appendix (chap. vi. 9—15) describing the crowning of Joshua, which foreshadows the twofold office of Branch, as king and priest. A probable lacuna in the text.

(3) Chaps. vii., viii.—The inquiry concerning the fasts. The prophet's rebuke of the people for their formalism. The answer to their inquiry, in the form of a promise that their fasts should be turned into feasts.

PROLEGOMENA TO CHAPTERS IX.—XIV.

Integrity, Date and Authorship.

The first to call in question the genuineness of these chapters was Mede (the great English writer on Prophecy, who died 1638). He was led to do so in defence of the correctness of the Text of the New Testament. Observing that in Matt. xxvii. 9 a passage, which is evidently a quotation from Zech. xi. 12, 13, is ascribed to Jeremiah, he felt bound to support this authoritative statement of the Evangelist (as he considered it), and in endeavouring so to do he came to the conclusion that there is much in these Chapters which argues their pre-exilian origin. Since his time the question has been repeatedly discussed, with such inconsistent results, that while Hitzig places chaps. ix.—xiv. as early as B.C. 772, in the reign of Uzziah, Eichhorn refers them to "after the battle of Issus, B.C. 333," and Böttcher "after B.C. 330" (see Pusey's "Table of Dates &c."). We now proceed to review the arguments which have been brought forward by the impugners of the genuineness of these chapters, bearing in mind Pusey's weighty remark "It is obvious that there must be some mistake either in the tests applied, or in their application, which admits of a variation of at least 450 years."

I. A difference has been alleged between chaps. i.—viii., and chaps. ix.—xiv., (1) with regard to Style, (2) with regard to Historical Standpoint.
(1) With regard to style it has been urged:

(a) *That the style of chaps. i.—viii. is utterly different to that of chaps. ix.—xiv.* This (speaking generally) we are free to admit. But we cannot admit it as a valid argument against the Unity of Authorship. For, upon the argument of mere *style* it might be maintained that the same author could not have written Zech. i. 1—6, vii. and viii., and i. 7—vi. 15; the first-mentioned passages consist chiefly of rebuke, and in them there is no mention of Čémach, while in the other passage there is nothing but a series of visions, with passages of encouragement and promise interspersed (ii. 10—17, iii. 7—10, vi. 9—15). As for the heading of chap. vii. 1, which ascribes it to Zechariah, it might be put out of the argument for one side or the other, since such critics are in the habit of rejecting such verses as spurious, when they are subversive of their preconceived conclusions. Again, we may adduce cases in which the argument from style has no weight with these critics: e.g. the style of Hos. i.—iii. is utterly different to that of iv.—xiv. and that of Ezek. iv. v. to that of vi. vii. or of xxvii. xxviii. and yet the general integrity of these books is universally admitted.

(b) *That in i. 7—vi. 15 there is nothing but visions, while in ix.—xiv. there are none.* But, there can surely be no reason why a prophet should not relate visions when he sees them, while there is every reason why he should not relate them when he does not see them; neither can there be any reason in the nature of things why a prophet, who once in his life saw a series of visions in one night, should be expected to have all revelations made to him in that particular manner. Zech. i. 1—6, vii. viii. contains no visions, and yet the genuineness of those passages is not doubted. Similarly, Amos vii.—ix. consists wholly of visions, while in i.—vi. there are none; Isaiah, too, and Ezekiel related such visions as they saw, but when they saw none they delivered their message in a different manner. If the thoughtful reader will compare this objection with that which we have said *might* be brought against the unity of authorship of chap. i. 1—6, vii., viii., and chap. i. 7—vi. 15, he will probably come to the conclusion, that one is of as little weight as the other.

(c) *That the angel interpreter, and Satan, and the Seven Eyes disappear from chaps. ix.—xiv.* This is quite natural. They were
part of the visions, and when the visions disappear, they disappear also. It might as reasonably be argued that the Prophet was bound in the latter portion of his prophecies to refer continually to Horses, Chariots, Candlesticks, Horns &c., because, forsooth, he had seen such in his visions!

(8) That (a) Exact dates are given in the former chapters, but none in the latter. So, too, are dates prefixed to Is. vi. 1, Ezek. i. 1—3, vii. 1, xl. 1, &c.—That (b) in chaps. i.—viii. introductory formulas constantly occur, which are wanting in the latter chapters. Similarly Hosea uses introductory formulas in the first five chapters, but none in the last nine. And yet (as we have said) no doubt is entertained of the integrity of that book. Finally the argument from style must always be a doubtful one. Pusey has given an instance of the precarious nature of such arguments in the following. The Laws of Plato an acute German critic imagined to have proved from their style to be not the work of Plato. And yet Jowett (Transl. Plato Dialog. iv. p. 1) has shown their genuineness by 20 citations in Aristotle (who must have been intimate with Plato for some 17 years), by allusions of Isocrates (writing a year after Plato's death), by references of the comic poet Alexis (a younger contemporary), besides the unanimous voice of later antiquity. Further, critics of similar tendencies do not agree on points of style: e.g. Rosenmüller speaks of the first eight chapters as being "prosaic, feeble, poor," and of the remaining six as "poetic, weighty, concise, glowing," (comp. Maurer and Hitzig). Böttcher on the other hand says "In comparison with the lifeless language of these chapters (ix.—xiv.), as to which we cannot at all understand how any can have removed them into so early pre-exilic times, the Psalms attributed to the time of the Maccabees are amazingly fresh." When critics so disagree as to the respective merits of the styles of the two sections, it seems hardly worth while to consider the argument. We will merely remark, that neither sweeping statement is correct. In the first chapters when Zechariah is describing his visions, he uses the natural language of narrative, viz. prose. When (ii. 10—17, vi. 12, 13) he looks forward to the distant future, he speaks in glowing language such as will bear comparison with anything contained in the latter chapters.

(2) A difference with regard to the Historical Standpoint has been urged (a) in particular passages, (β) in the two sections generally.
(a) We have shown in the Commentary that the arguments of those who see in certain passages of chap. ix.—xiv. positive indications of the pre-exilian origin of these chapters are inconclusive. See especially "Remarks" on ix. 1—8, pp. 82—84; ix. 9—17, p. 90; x. 2, p. 91; x. 3—12, pp. 95, 96; xi. 1—3, p. 97, 8, p. 101; xi. 14, p. 104; xii. 1—9, p. 110, 111; xii. 11, p. 16; xiv. 5, p. 124; xiv. 1—21, p. 131, 132.

(β) With regard to the historical standpoint generally, it has been alleged that in chap. i.—viii. the prophet is continually mentioning the rebuilding of the Temple, and the re-inhabiting of Jerusalem; while in chap. ix.—xiv. he is occupied with quite different matters. In the former he mentions his contemporaries, such as Zerubbabel and Joshua, but not so in the latter portion. As regards the Temple and the prophet's contemporaries this is perfectly true, but it is no argument for the pre-exilian authorship of chap. ix.—xiv., nor against their contents having been delivered by Zechariah. For, if our theory as to the date of these chapters be correct, they were written at a time when the rebuilding of the Temple had been long completed, and when those abuses of the Temple-service, which occupy so much of the attention of the Prophet Malachi, had not as yet crept in. The Prophet is occupied in the latter chapters with matters quite different from those with which he is concerned in the former chapters, hence the frequent recurrence in the latter section of the expression "in that day" (ix. 16, xii., xiii., xiv. passim). But, that in the latter section there is no mention of the re-inhabiting of Jerusalem is certainly untrue, see (ix. 16, 17), x. 6, 7, xii. 6, xiv. 10.

The arguments, however, against the pre-exilian origin of these chapters are not merely of a negative kind.

II. We now proceed to adduce from (a) parallel passages, (β) notes of time, &c., what we consider to be

*Internal Evidence in favour of the hypothesis of the Post-exilian Origin of Chap. ix.—xiv.*

(a) The writer of chap. ix.—xiv. shows such a familiarity with the writings of the later prophets as seems to some reconcileable only with
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the supposition that he wrote at a date posterior to them: thus with the so-called Deutero-Isaiah. Compare

Zech. ix. 12a with Is. xlii. 7, xlix. 9, Zech. xii. 1 with Is. li. 13.
 lxi. 1. — — 2 ,, — li. 22, 23.
 Zech. ix. 12b with Is. lxi. 7. — xiii. 9 ,, — xlviii. 10.
 — x. 10 ,, — xlix. 19, 20. — — 16 ,, — lx. 6—9, lxxvi. 23.
 — xi. 15,16 — lvi. 11. — — 17 ,, — lx. 12.

Zephaniah. Compare Zech. ix. 5, 6 with Zeph. ii. 4, 5.

Jeremiah. Compare

Zech. ix. 12 with Jer. xvi. 18.
 — xi. 3 ,, — xxv. 34—36. Zech. xi. 6 with Jer. xxvi. 29—33.
 — — ,, — xii. 5, xlix. 19, (Comp. also with these Zech. viii. 8, l. 44. (The only passages in which G<em>on</em> hayYarden occurs).
 Zech. xi. 5 with Jer. ii. 3, 7.

Obadiah. Compare

Zech. xii. 6 with Obad. ver. 18. Zech. xiv. 9 with Obad. ver. 9.

Ezekiel. Compare

Zech. ix. 2—4 with Ezek. xxviii. 1—23. Zech. xiii. 1, 2 with Ezek. xxxvi. 25,
 — x. 2 ,, — xxxiv. 5, 8. xxxvii. 23.
 — x. 3 ,, — xxxiv. 12,17, — xiii. 8, 9 ,, — v. 2,12; xi. 20.
 especially verr. 4, 5, 16 with verr. 3, 4, — — 8 ,, — xlvii. 1.
 and verr. 9 with verr. 16. — — 13 ,, — xxxviii. 21.
 — xi. 7, 14 ,, — xxxvii. 16—22 — — 14 ,, — xxxix. 10.
 — xii. 10 ,, — xxxix. 29. — — 21 ,, — xlv. 9.

Haggai. Compare

Zech. xiv. 13 with Hag. ii. 21, 22.

Similarly chap. i.—viii., which are of undeniable post-exilian authorship, show a thorough acquaintance with the later prophets. Compare, for example:

chap. ii. 6 (E.V.) with Isa. xlviii. 20, or with Isa. lii. 6, 9; as pre-exilian, consider Is. xl.—lxvi.
chap. ii. 9, 11 (E.V.), and chap. iv. 9, with Ezek. vi. 7, 10, xxxix. 10, &c.; as contemporary with the later prophets.
chaps. iii. 8, vi. 12, with Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15 (Isa. iv. 2);
chap. vi. 15 with Jer. xvii. 24;

1 The date of Is. xl.—lxvi. need not come under consideration here, since most critics who regard Zech. ix.—xiv.
chap. vii. 5—10 with Isa. lviii. 3—7;  
chap. vii. 9 with Ezek. xviii. 8, and Jer. vii. 5—7, xxii. 3;  
chap. vii. 13 with Ezek. xi. 11;  
chap. vii. 14 with Jer. xvi. 13, &c.;  
chap. vii. 8 with Isa. xlviii. 1.

This argument seemed so convincing to de Wette that, after having in the first three editions of his Einleitung declared for two authors, he felt compelled to change his mind, and in his fourth edition admitted the post-exilian origin of Chap. ix.—xiv., and even the possibility of their having been written by Zechariah. We are not, however, prepared to regard this argument as conclusive. We own the difficulty that there is in computing the exact weight due to the argument derived from the consideration of parallel passages, and concur with Cheyne’s pertinent remarks on the subject (The Prophecies of Isaiah, ii. p. 210):

“The argument from parallel passages is sometimes much overrated. How prone we are to fancy an imitation where there is none, has been strikingly shown by Munro’s parallel between the plays of Shakspeare and Seneca (Journal of Philology, Vol. vi. Camb. 1876, pp. 70—72), and even when an imitation on one side or the other must be supposed, how difficult it is to choose between the alternatives!...A recent revolution of opinion among patristic students may be a warning to us not to be too premature in deciding such questions. It has been the custom to argue from the occurrence of almost identical sentences in the Octavius of Minucius Felix and the Apologeticum of Tertullian, that Minucius must have written later than the beginning of the third century, on the ground that a brilliant genius like Tertullian’s cannot have been such a servile imitator as the hypothesis of the priority of Minucius would imply. But Adolf Ebert (Tertullians Verhältniss zu Minucius Felix) seems to have definitely proved that Tertullian not only made use of Minucius, but did not even understand his author rightly.”

(β) There are certain notes of time, &c. in chaps. ix.—xiv. which seem to compel us to admit their post-exilian origin.

1. No mention is made of any king of Israel or Judah, except the Messiah (ix. 9). For chap. xi. 6 evidently refers to the different nations of the world (i.e. הָאָדָם means “mankind,” and הָאָרֶץ “the world”). The expression “from their hand” indicates that several kings are referred to: and so, if “his king” meant an Israelite king, the expression “(and each) into the hand of his king” would imply that each Israelite had a separate king. But the meaning is
"I will deliver mankind into the hand of one another and (each people) into the hand of its king."

2. The manner in which Greece is named (ix. 13) as the chief enemy of Zion (quite different from that of Joel iv. 6, Is. lxvi. 19), besides other historical references, which we have pointed out in our "Remarks," leave us no choice but to understand chap. ix.—xi. as descriptive of the Macedonian and Maccabean periods. While the prophecies of chap. xii.—xiv., which manifestly form one section, would be simply untrue if uttered in reference to any pre-exilian epoch.

3. Except in Mal. i. 1 the expression Massâ d'bhâr YHVH occurs only in chap. ix. 1 and xii. 1.

4. In xii. 11 a place in the tribe of Issachar is called by an Assyrian name.

The reader will perceive that the arguments adduced in II. (a) and (β) answer from the positive side of the argument those objections which in I. (a) and (β) we treated merely from the negative side.

We conclude, therefore, that chap. ix.—xiv. are, equally with chap. i.—viii., of post-exilian origin.

III. The Integrity of Chap. ix.—xiv.

The theory, which Bunsen has called one of the triumphs of modern criticism, that chap. ix.—xi. and chap. xii.—xiv. are the work of two different prophets: viz. chap. ix.—xi. that of a contemporary of Isaiah, perhaps Zechariah son of Jeberechiah (Is. viii. 2), and chap. xii.—xiv. possibly that of Urijah son of Shemaiah (Jer. xxvi. 20—23), falls to the ground with the establishment of the post-exilian origin of the whole section. Archbishop Newcombe, who originated this theory, concluded that chap. ix.—xi. were written much earlier than the time of Jeremiah, and before the captivity of the tribes; but was not so positive as his followers with regard to the pre-exilian authorship of chap. xii.—xiv., though he thinks the mention of idols (xiii. 2) to be in favour of that supposition. We must, therefore, discuss a little more fully what have been termed the grounds for separating chap. xii.—xiv. from chap. ix.—xi.

(1) Chap. xi. has a distinct introductory formula. But since this formula is the same as that of chap. ix. 1, and that a formula which recurs only in Mal. i. 1, this
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argument tends rather in the other direction.—(2) The former chapters speak of Israel and Judah, but the latter do not mention “Israel.” On the contrary chap. xii. 1 states that the whole of the following prophecy is concerning “Israel.”—(3) In the former Syrians, Phoenicians, Philistines, and Greeks are mentioned, but Assyrians and Egyptians described as the most powerful. These chapters belong therefore to early times. We have already shown that the manner in which the Greeks are here described as enemies of Israel fixes the date of these chapters to the post-exilian period. Egypt and Assyria are spoken of (x. 10) as the nations who had carried off the people, and whence they were to be brought back, while in ver. 11 the stereotyped language of former prophets is evidently used in a figurative sense.—(4) The anticipations of the two prophets are different. The first trembles for Ephraim, but for Judah he has no fear. On the contrary, Ephraim and Judah are included equally in the promised protection. The second prophet does not mention the northern kingdom, but is full of alarm for Judah, and sees the enemy laying siege to Jerusalem. “Ephraim” does not denote “the northern kingdom” in chap. ix.—xi. (see Remarks). If Jerusalem was to be besieged at any time after its rebuilding (but see Remarks, p. 132), there is no reason why the same prophet who spoke before in general terms of wars, should not afterwards speak more particularly of a siege. In prophesying concerning a siege of Jerusalem it is only natural that Judah, in which tribe it partly stood, should be especially mentioned. Moreover, as we remarked above, the section is expressly addressed to all “Israel.”—(5) Difference of style: “And it shall come to pass” does not occur in ix.—xi., “in that day” which occurs so often in xii.—xiv. occurs only once in ix.—xi., and “n*um YHVH,” occurs only twice in ix.—xi. There are also favourite expressions in xii.—xiv., such as “all peoples,” “all nations round about,” “family of Egypt,” &c. This is true, but chap. xii.—xiv. are admitted by all to be a separate section, delivered probably on a different occasion to the former section, and pointing on the whole to a much further distant future. These facts are quite sufficient to account for such very slight differences of style.

IV. The Integrity of the whole Book.

With regard to the integrity of the book we must premise, that the fact that a passage occurs in a certain book is not to be regarded as a proof that it was looked upon by those who drew up the Canon as necessarily an integral portion of that book. For, the principle was to insert short compositions into longer ones lest from their lack of bulk they should be lost (יוֹבְּלָרֵא הַבִּשְׁמָרִים). Thus (Vayyiqra Rabba xv. 2) the two verses Is. viii. 19, 20 are ascribed to Beeri (father of Amos), and are said to have been placed there because they were not long enough to form a book by themselves. Again, in T. B. Maccotch 24b the verse Mic. iii. 12 is ascribed, without remark, to Urijah the priest, the co-witness with Zechariah son of Jerebechiah (Is. viii. 2). If therefore
it should be thought that Zech. xi. 1—3; and xiii. 7—9 have no apparent connection with the context in the places in which they stand, it would be quite admissible to suppose them to be fragments, say of Ezekiel, and Jeremiah respectively, which had not been included in those books, and which were now inserted in the prophecies of Zechariah to prevent their being lost. There is no doubt, that we are aware of, expressed in Talmudim or Midrashim as to the genuineness of the last six chapters of Zechariah. On the contrary, chap. xi. 1 is distinctly ascribed to “Zechariah son of Iddo” (T. B. Yoma 39a). While, on the other hand, Rabbi Akivah, in a remarkable piece of exegesis (Maccoth ibid.), identifies Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah with the author of Zech. viii. 4, although he is perfectly aware, that Zechariah prophesied during the time of the Second Temple. (See further Introduction to Zechariah in Bishop Ellicott’s “Old Testament Commentary for English Readers.”)

We have given reasons for assigning the whole of chap. ix.—xiv. to the post-captivity period: we have shown, too, that there is nothing in the style or contents of the two sections of this division (ix.—xi. and xii.—xiv.) to cast any serious doubt on the unity of authorship. We now proceed to adduce some arguments to prove that there is sufficient correspondence between chap. i.—viii. and ix.—xiv. to justify us in default of any positive evidence to the contrary, in regarding the whole book as the work of one prophet.

(1) Both portions exhibit, as we have shown, an extensive acquaintance with the writings of the later prophets.

(2) They both exhibit also an extensive acquaintance with the earlier books, thus: in chap. i. 4—6, chap. vii. 12, reference is made to “the former prophets” generally;

- chap. ii. 12 (E. V. 8) recalls the thought, though not the phraseology, of Ps. xvii. 8;
- chaps. iii. 8, vi. 12, allude to Isai. iv. 2, as well as to Jer. xxiii. 5, and xxxiii. 15;
- chap. iii. 10 is from Mic. iv. 4;
- chap. vi. 13 evidently refers to Ps. cx. 4;
- chap. vii. 8 recalls Hos. ii. 21 (E. V. 19);
- chap. viii. 20—22, in substance may be compared with Mic. iv. 1, 2, Isa. ii. 2, 3.

And in the second part,

- chap. ix. 1—8 bears some resemblance to Amos i. 3, ii. 6;
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chap. ix. 10 (first half) is borrowed from Mic. v. 10, and (second half) from Ps. lxxii. 8;
chap. xiii. 2 is a quotation from Hos. ii. 17, or Mic. v. 12, 13 (comp. Is. ii. 18, 20); and verse 9 from Hos. ii. 20 (E.V. 23);
comp. also chap. ix. 16 with Is. xi. 12;
chap. x. 12 with Mic. iv. 5;
chap. x. 10—12 with Is. xi. 15, xiv. 25, x. 24—27, xxx. 31, &c.;
chap. xii. 8 with Joel iv. 10;
chap. xii. 10 with Joel iii. 1, 2.
chap. xiv. 3 with Is. xxxiv. 1—4;
chap. xiv. 6, 7 with Amos v. 18, 20, Joel iv. (E.V. iii.) 15, Is. xxx. 26;
chap. xiv. 8 with Is. xi. 9, ii. 3, Mic. iv. 2;
chap. xiv. 11 with Amos ix. 13—15;
chap. xiv. 20 with Is. xxiii. 18;
chap. xiv. 21 with Is. iv. 3, xxxv. 8, Joel iv. (E.V. iii.) 17: etc.

But we cannot lay much stress on this argument, since prophets, belonging as they did in most cases to a school, were in all probability acquainted with the works of their predecessors.

(3) In both divisions there are similar if not identical expressions to represent the whole people such as “the house of Israel, and the house of Judah” (viii. 13), “the house of Judah, and the house of Joseph” (x. 6). See further on pp. 90, 110.

(4) Chap. xi. 11 is very similar to ii. 9, 11 [13, 15 Hebr.]. And the promise of x. 1 to that of viii. 12. In both portions Jerusalem is bid rejoice (ii. 10 Hebr. ver. 14, ix. 9), and in both the only king of Israel mentioned is the Messiah.

(5) In both portions there are promises of the bringing back of the exiles (comp. ii. 10—17, viii. 6—8 with ix. 11, 12 and x. 10—12).

(6) In both there is the habit of dwelling on the same thought or word (e.g. ii. 14, 15, vi. 10, vi. 12, 13, viii. 4, 5, viii. 23, xi. 7, xiv. 10, 11, xiv. 4, xiv. 5). In both the whole and its part are mentioned together for emphasis as v. 4, x. 4, and in xii. 11 we have “every family apart,” and then in ver. 12, 13 the specification. In both parts we have the unusual number of five sections to a verse, e.g. vi. 13, ix. 5, 7.

(7) Both divisions are written in Hebrew free from Aramaisms. In both the expression mēqōbhër umishšabh occurs (vii. 14, ix. 8), an expression which occurs elsewhere only in Ezek. xxxv. 7.

(8) The highly poetic language and deep prophetic insight of chap.
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ix.—xiv. we consider as an additional argument in favour of the unity of authorship of the whole book. For the man, to whom in his youth such mystic visions as those of chap. i.—vi. were vouchsafed, is just such an one to whom we should not be surprised to find, that in his later years such profound revelations as those contained in chap. ix.—xiv. were revealed, and who from his poetic and imaginative temperament would be likely to find suitable poetic language and metaphors, with which to clothe them when revealed to him.

The internal evidence being favourable to the hypothesis of the post-exilian origin of chap. ix.—xiv., as well as of chap. i.—viii., and to that of unity of authorship, rather than adverse to it, and there being no positive external evidence to the contrary, we conclude that it is probable that the whole of the so-called book of Zechariah (except perhaps xi. 1—3, and xiii. 7—9) is the work of Zechariah, grandson of Iddo.

V. Probable date of Zech. ix.—xiv.

Holding the view that by divine inspiration prophets are able to predict events, we cannot agree with those who assert that they must always have written after the events which they describe. Further, in the case before us, while chap. ix.—xiii. are a sufficiently accurate description of the chief features of the Macedonian and Maccabean periods to be interpreted as prophetic thereof, they are so vague in detail, and of such an imaginative and idealistic character as to render the supposition that they are descriptive of events which had already taken place extremely improbable. We conclude, therefore (apart from any consideration of authorship), that they were written before Alexander's victorious march through Palestine (B.C. 333). But, though a prophet could foretell events, he would not speak of matters, which could be of no interest to his contemporaries. Zechariah would not, therefore, prophesy concerning the wars of the sons of Zion with the sons of Greece before the Greeks had begun to attract attention in the East (comp. p. 132). Now the first event in connection with the Greeks, which would become notorious in the East, is the burning of Sardis by the Ionians (B.C. 499). These chapters must, then, have been composed after that date (viz. between 499—333 B.C.). Now
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Zechariah was, as we have shown, in all probability a young man when he came from Babylon. Suppose he was 25 years of age in the second year of Darius (520), he would have been but 46 in the year of the burning of Sardis, or 55 in the year of the battle of Marathon (490), or 65 in the year of the battle of Salamis (480). Now, this last great victory, being a naval one, was likely to attract the most attention among the Jews. For, the fleets of the Phœnicians had been requisitioned by the Persians for the subjugation of the Ionians, and the Jews might well have feared that the Greeks, confounding them with the Phœnicians, would wreak a speedy and bitter vengeance on them. We consider therefore that about 479 B.C. (the year after the battle of Salamis) is the date to which the last six chapters of Zechariah may most reasonably be assigned.

Contents of Chap. ix.—xiv.

These chapters consist of two sections: (1) Chap. ix.—xi., (2) Chap. xii.—xiv., each of which commences with the formula Massā d'bhār Adōnāy.

(1) Chap. ix., x. Doom of adjacent nations. The struggles, but eventual triumph and security, of Israel. The coming of the King (chap. ix. 9, seqq.).

" xi. [xiii. 7—9 (?)]. The storm threatens the shepherds (?). Rejection of the Good Shepherd. Doom of the foolish shepherd.

(2) Chap. xii. 1—9. Struggles of Israel with the nations.

" xiii. 1—4. Zeal against prophets in general.

" xiii. 10—14. Mourning over him whom they pierced.

" xiv. 5, 6. General disclaiming of prophetic powers. [chap. xiii. 7—9 (?)].

ZECHARIAH.

CHAPTER I.

In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, came son of Iddo the prophet, saying,

"Came," lit. was (and so elsewhere): LXX. ἐγένετο. "Iddo the prophet," this is, in part, the meaning of the Hebr. according to the traditional accentuation; but the words "the prophet" were originally intended, doubtless, to apply to Zechariah, not to Iddo.

is the fem. of two: it (with its constr.) is the only word which has a letter with dagesh after a moving š'va. The dagesh is forte, representing the lost . The full form of the word would be either (Gesen.) (which, however, is used as the dual of "a year"), or rather (or dropping has a prosthetic Alef, being masc. ithnäi, fem. ithnatäni (or dropping

1 The tradition is: "When a prophet's name is mentioned and that of his father, then he is a prophet, and the father also. When only the prophet's name is mentioned, then his father was not a prophet." 1 R. David Qimchi in his Grammar (Sha'ar digdûq hash-shemôth, sha'ar

2 R. David Qimchi in his Grammar (Sha'ar digdûq hash-shemôth, sha'ar
the prefix and retaining the Nun) thintāni, which is exactly כִּנְתִּיָּה, since Arab. Th often corresponds to Hebr. י, as יָאוֹן "an ox," Arab. Thour.

יָאוֹן, "Darius," has a metheg under the first letter, to indicate that the sh'va under the resh is moving¹. The pointing כִּנְתִּיָּה in Tregelles' English edition of Gesenius (1846) is contrary to the authority of MSS., neither is the word so pointed in Gesen. Thesaurus. [By a remarkable coincidence the sum of the numerical values of the consonants of כִּנְתִּיָּה (4 + 200 + 10 + 6 + 300 = 520) gives the date B.C. of the second reign of Darius, when the prophecies of Haggai and those of the first six chapters of Zechariah were delivered.]

כִּנְתִּיָּה, the Jews always read this word כִּנְתִּיָּה, "The Lord," with the vowels of which it is furnished; unless it is preceded or followed by the word כִּנְתִּיָּה itself, when it is read as כִּנְתִּיָּה (and pointed כִּנְתִּיָּה). Consequently the prefixes ב, ב, ל, (ך), when placed before this word, are pointed as though actually prefixed to כִּנְתִּיָּה, or לָדָא, as the case may be.—כִּנְתִּיָּה is compounded of the stem רכ and י, the latter half of the Sacred Name כִּנְתִּיָּה. The Sacred Name as a termination of Proper names occurs in various forms, e.g. כִּנְתִּי, כִּנְתִ, כִּנְתִ, and כִּנְתִ (2 Kings xviii. 2)

hash-sh'vā) bears witness to the fact that the orientals כִּנְתִּי) read the Hebrew words as eshtaim, eshṭē.

¹ The cuneiform contract-tablets of the time of Nebuchadnezzar all point to a moving sh'vā under the resh, for a moving sh'vā before a yād, even if the yād be pointed with quite a different vowel, should always incline towards an ū sound (Qimchi, ibidem), and in them the syllable is always ū. The forms are (1) Da-ri-ya-u-su, (2) Da-ri-ah-us, (3) Da-ri-ya-mu-us, (4) Da-ri-ya-a-mu-us, (5) Da-ri-ah-u-su, (6) Da-ri-ya-a-uts, (7) Ta-ri-ah-mu-su (Budge). All of these exhibit in the second syllable what could, at the least, be represented in Hebrew only by a moving sh'vā. Nos. (2), (4), (5), (6) and (7) point clearly to a long ū after the yād. The Hebrew was prevented from representing properly the ū or ū of the ultimate before the ū, by the fact that two vowels cannot fall together in Hebrew. It could only have been done by inserting an awkward ū after the ū, thus כֱִנְתִּיָּה.

² But, for all that, the Persian inscription of Behistan points to a short ū. There we read, over and over again, a-d-m D-a-r-y-w-u-sh "I Darius," in which the first letter of a-d-m is the same as the second of the name. Now Adm is the Sanscrit ähäm, Zend āzem, whence I conclude (but I am open to correction) that the first a of Darius was originally short.
for הַשָּׁם (2 Chron. xxix. 1).—The construct of יִשְׂרָאֵל unlike that of יִשְׂרָאֵל (which is but six times יִשְׂרָאֵל) is generally joined to its consequent by a hyphen (מַגָּפֶּה), which has the effect of making the two words into one (which seems to be the effect also of mahpach in Gen. xvii. 17): and then, since a long vowel cannot stand in a closed syllable unless it have the accent or metheg (see Excurs. i. 8), the long ָּא is changed into ָּא or ָּא as אֲבָרֶחֶת בּוֹחָן. The first vowel of בּוֹחָית has metheg or rather munach. (See Excurs. ii. A. 1 and 9 N.B.)—"saying," though sometimes it means "to say." The infinitive construct is בּוֹחָינ when ב is prefixed to it the vowel of ב is ָּא and the א becomes quiescent; but this is not the case with the prefixes ב and ה, thus בּוֹחָינה (Deut. iv. 10), בּוֹחָינה (Josh. vi. 8). With the word בּוֹחָינה, however, the change takes place with all three suffixes, thus בּוֹחָינה, בּוֹחָינה, בּוֹחָינה.

The expression בּוֹחָינה means simply "in the eighth month," without stating the day of the month. Some have maintained that the word בּוֹחָינה (which means "new-moon" and then "month") is used here in a constructio prægnans to denote "the first day of the month." In 1 Sam. xx. 5 בּוֹחָינה does mean "new moon"; comp. 2 Kings iv. 23; Is. i. 13. But, never does the word when used with the def. art. and followed by an ordinal have this meaning. It is true that the בּוֹחָינה of Ex. xix. 1 is by Jewish Tradition said to mean the 1st of Sivân, but the Tradition is hung on the words which come after בּוֹחָינה (see M'citla, T. B. Shabbath 86b and Rashi), and not on any such special meaning of בּוֹחָינה (the Pentateuchal expression for "new moons" being בּוֹחָינה רָאִיתוֹ, Numb. x. 10, &c.). Moreover Haggai (Zechariah's contemporary), when wishing to express the 1st day of the month distinctly, adds the words בּוֹחָינה לְּחָיָה (i. 1). Comp. Gen. viii. 5, 13; Ex. xl. 2, 17; Numb. i. 1; xxix. 1; xxxiii. 38, &c. It would be possible to make the words of our text denote "the 1st day of the 8th month" only by altering the pointing to בּוֹחָינה לְּחָיָה which would mean "on the new moon of the eighth [scil. month]."—בּוֹחָינה לְּחָיָה. This is the regular way of expressing a date.
2 The Lord hath been sore displeased with your fathers.
3 Therefore say thou unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Turn ye unto me, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will turn unto you, saith the Lord of hosts.

from (or rather with respect to) a certain starting point: viz. ב is prefixed to the constr. of הנע, which is followed by the fem. numeral in the absolute, and that again by הב : e.g. (2 Kings xxiv. 12) בִּשְׁנָתוֹ הֶלְלֹל, lit. “In the year eight with respect to his reign.” N.B. The Hebr. construct-form simply denotes a close relation (or annexation) to the following word. “Of” is only one of the meanings expressed by the construct.

This version seems to make Addo identical with Barachias: πρὸς Ζαχαριάν τὸν τοῦ Βαραχίου νιὸν Ἀδω τὸν προφήτην. But, possibly, νιὸν is a corruption of νιὸσ caused by the collocation. In any case τὸν προφήτην must refer to Ζαχαρίαν.

Remarks. In point of time this prophecy in the 8th month, comes in between Hag. ii. 1—9, in the 7th month, and Hag. ii. 10—23, in the 9th month.

Verse 2. Constructions. verbs can take such an acc. (the case-ending being, however, almost lost in Hebr.), e.g. (Ps. xiv. 5) יִחַפְּלֶנְיָהוּ. The use of the absolute infinitive (which is but a subst.) before a finite verb, to intensify its meaning, is only another form of this construction. In Arabic, also, both transitive and intransitive verbs take this cognate acc. (with the case-ending retained), e.g. ūdāba ūdāban “he struck a blow,” and intrans. nāmā nounān “he slept a sleep”; the Hebr. יִשְׁמַעְשֶׁנְיָהוּ “lest I sleep death” (Ps. xiii. 4) is but a slight extension of this construction (comp. for the idea יִשְׁמַעְשֶׁנְיָהוּ “when he slept,” i.e. died—Talm. Jerush.; ou γὰρ ἀπέθανε τὸ κοράσιον, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει, Matt. ix. 24; and the Syr. ἀνέκει he slept, died). The student may here observe that יִשְׁמַעְשֶׁנְיָהוּ is written first without a ’ after the ב, and afterwards (as usually) with the י, thus יִשְׁמַעְשֶׁנְיָהוּ. It is convenient to say that יִשְׁמַעְשֶׁנְיָהוּ and יִשְׁמַעְשֶׁנְיָהוּ take the plural pron-suff.; but as a matter of fact the י which appears before the suffixes is part of the word itself, as the poetic forms יִשְׁמַעְשֶׁנְיָהוּ (Job iii. 22,
When ' is prefixed to the perfect tense, 2nd pers. sing. masc., or 1st sing. com., if the accent remains in its proper place (viz. on the second root-letter) the perfect retains its ordinary meaning; if, however, the verb is to have the force of a future, subjunctive, imperative, &c. the accent 1 is (as a rule) thrown on the last syllable, e.g. (Deut. iv. 30) מַעֲרָן, (Numb. xiv. 15) מַעֲרָן, (Gen. vi. 18) מַעֲרָן, (Ps. lxxxix. 24) מַעֲרָן, (Gen. xvii. 6) מַעֲרָן. In such a case, if the vowel of the first letter be not supported by a šewa, or dagesh forte, that vowel will require metheg (Excurs. II. A. 1): thus we have מַעֲרָן מַעֲרָן, "therefore say unto them." But there are certain cases in which the accent is not thrown on the last syllable: (1) When such a perfect is immediately followed (without a distinctive accent) by the tone-syllable of the succeeding word, as (Deut. xiv. 26) מַעֲרָן מַעֲרָן "and thou shalt eat there." This is in order to avoid the concurrence of two tone-syllables. (On the dagesh in the see Excurs. iii.): (2) With a disjunctive as (Deut. viii. 10) מַעֲרָן מַעֲרָן "and thou shalt eat and be satisfied": (3) In the Qal only of verbs quiescent מַעֲרָן and מַעֲרָן, thus (2 Kings xxi. 13) מַעֲרָן מַעֲרָן "and I will wipe out," (Gen. xvii. 19) מַעֲרָן מַעֲרָן "and thou shalt call." A Perfect thus changed, as מֵעָמָרָה 2 is here, into an Imperative has usually bearing the tone-vowel.

1 Unless we wish to indicate the kind of accent used, we shall mark the tone-syllable (i.e. the accentuated syllable) by a vertical line placed over the consonant bearing the tone-vowel.

2 In transliteration metheg will in future be represented by ' and the tone-accent by ′.
4 Be ye not as your fathers, unto whom the former prophets have cried, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Turn ye now from your evil ways, and from your evil doings: but they did not hear, nor hearken unto me, saith the Lord.

some other verb preceding it. But sometimes, as here, it stands alone, comp. (2 Sam. xiv. 10) לֹ笺ֵב וַיְהַבֵּא לְהַבֵּא אֵלֶּיה. Anyone that saith [ought] unto thee bring him unto me."—Adónay נְבָאֹה. Since neither the NAME YHWH, nor its substitute Adónay, has a constr. form, some Jewish grammarians say that between The NAME and נְבָאֹה the word נְבָאֹה is to be understood (though not read). Thus the expression means "The Lord (God of) Hosts."—אַלְשֵׁי. The E. V. "and I will turn, &c." is admissible; but it would, perhaps, be better to render the words "that I may return unto you." The ordinary form to express "and I will return" is with the final בָּא, e.g. Mal. iii. 7 אַלְשֵׁי נְבָאֹה. In speaking of the Hebr. Imperfect, we must always remember that Arabic, which retains distinctive terminations, and their distinctive meanings, more than any Semitic language, has four (or five) forms of the Imperfect: (1) the Indicative ending in ב, (2) Subj. in ב, (3) Jussive without final vowel (like the Hebr. and colloquial Arab. Imperf.), (4 and 5) the Energetic in ב and ב. Now, while we maintain that the Hebr. Imperf. in ב is often used, merely for the sake of variation of sound, in the same sense as the ordinary Imperf., still it seems to us evident that the final ב sometimes represents the ב of the Arab. Subj. and sometimes the ב of the Energetic. But as the case-endings (where found) have in Hebrew (for the most part) lost their distinctive meaning, so too the mood-endings.

Remarks. Though God had declared (Hag. i. 13, ii. 4) that He was "with them," Hag. ii. 14, 17 shows how much need the people still had of repentance.

Baer (with Leusden) has the metheg incorrectly under the ב (Excurs. ii. A. 1). But he places it correctly in vii. 7, 12, viii. 11, &c.—ויר, which means that the י between ב and ב is superfluous. In such a case the vowels given above are to be read with the consonants which...
the note declares are to be read. Thus here we are to read מְעַלְּלָיִם. Since there is not, elsewhere, such a word as מַעַלְּלָיָה, while the word מַעַלְּלָיָה (in the plur. form only) is very common, it is natural that the traditional reading should be מְעַלְּלָיִם. But, there is a way in which the letters as they stand might be read, and that is מֲעַלְּלָיִם; the objection, however, to this reading is that there is no known plur. מְעַלְּלָיִם, the plur. of מַעַלְּלָיָה being always מְעַלְּלָיִם. But, there is yet another difference of reading, viz. that, while the Western Jews read מְעַלְּלָיִם, the Oriental Jews read מְעַלְּלָיִם (but the Codex Petropolitanus, A.D. 916, inferior in age only to the Camb. MS. Mm. 5. 27, A.D. 856, and that only with respect to the consonants, while it has the Oriental reading in the margin marked as the “correct reading,” has in its text the Western variant). The Oriental may be the correct reading, but the prefixed ב is quite unnecessary, as it might well be supplied from the preceding מְעַלְּלָיִם, as (Hag. i. 10) ב may be supplied before מְעַלְּלָיִם from the מְעַלְּלָיִם which precedes; compare Zech. xiv. 10. But, on the whole, it appears that מְעַלְּלָיִם is a reading which cannot be improved on, the prefix ב being naturally understood after מְעַלְּלָיִם, and the more easily omitted since the word already begins with ב.

The student need hardly be reminded that since מְעַלְּלָיִם is defined by the pron. suff. (הו) the adjective which follows it (being simply an epithet) takes the definite article. When on the contrary the article is omitted the adj. becomes a tertiary predicate, thus Hag. i. 4 should be rendered “Is it time for you, you [I say], to dwell in your houses ceiled as they are (מְעַלְּלָיִם), while this House is in ruins !”

οῖ προφήται ἐμπροσθεν is a very free rendering of the Hebr. It ought to have been rather οἵ ἐμπροσθεν προφήται, or οἵ πρῶτοι προφήται. LXX. προφήται is generally rendered correctly (as here) by ἐπιτηθείματα (comp. i. 6, Hos. ix. 15, xi. 3, Mich. iii. 4, vii. 13).—מְעַלְּלָיִם is also similarly rendered in Zeph. iii. 4 (but in v. 7 by ἐπι-φυλακίς). But in Hos. iv. 9, v. 4, vii. 2 διαβοῦλα is given as the equivalent of מְעַלְּלָיִם.
5 Your fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live for ever?
6 But my words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not take hold of your fathers? and they returned and said, Like as the Lord of hosts thought to do unto us, according to our ways, and according to our doings, so hath he dealt with us.

This appears to us an instance of a slight loss of purity in the Hebr. of the Post-Captivity. Elsewhere we find בָּהַ for “where are they?” and nowhere, except in Job xv. 23 (where there is nothing at all following the word) do we find בְּ except followed by a suff. or subst. The other extant Biblical forms with a suffix are: יְבָּלֶכֶּ ת “where art thou?” (Gen. iii. 9), and יְבָּלֶ “where is he?” (Job xx. 7, &c.), or “where is,” with a noun following (2 Kings xix. 13, Mich. vii. 10). On the ga’yā under the ה of יְבָּלֶל and the ה of יְבָּלֶ see Excurs. ii. B. 2, and A. 7. In any but very incorrect editions there is also sillāq placed under the second yūd, thus: יְבָּלֶל (compare יְבָּלֶל at the beginning of ver. 4). Yich’yā is the real Imperfect “did they keep on living?” comp. (1 Sam. xxii. 12) יְבָּלֶל אֵלֶּנֶּ “did not they keep praising this man?”

Both LXX. and Syr. have (according to the interpunctuation) “Your fathers, where are they and the prophets? Will they live for ever?” But there is no reason why the interpunctuation should not be rejected, and both read “Your fathers, where are they? And the prophets, will they live for ever?” The order of the Hebr. words, apart from interpunctuation, shows that this is the collocation intended.

Rabh (who brought the Mishnah and other traditions into Babylon, and was in a manner the founder of the Talmud Babli) interprets this verse as containing a saying of the Prophet which is objected to by the people. The prophet says “Your fathers, where are they?” The people answer “It is true enough that our fathers are dead—but are the prophets any more alive than they?” To which the Prophet replies “The prophets, indeed, are dead—but their words have come to pass” (T. B. Synhedrim 105 a). This is the only interpretation, which seems to us to give good sense, and it is certainly in accordance with the controversial, not to say colloquial, style of the Post-captivity Prophets. We are glad to see that Keil has adopted this interpretation. Another view of the matter is that Zechariah’s words are equivalent to this: The light of prophecy is dying out: while ye have the light, walk as children of the light. But to us it appears, that to put the words “Do (or did) the prophets live for ever?” into the mouth of Zechariah, is to destroy utterly his argument.

1 Contemporary with Artaban IV. king of Persia, who died A.D. 226.
"But (א) [in spite of what you say]." The word א when used as an affirmative particle denotes the result of some mental process, sometimes incorrect (as in Gen. xliv. 28, Ps. lxxiii. 13), sometimes correct (as in Ps. lxxiii. 1). א is of course the Hif. of ד, and must not be confounded with a verb, parts of which have the same pronunciation, viz. ה, Hif. ד (Ps. lxxiii. 1, Mich. vi. 14, as though from ד which actually occurs in Is. lix. 13, comp. פ Mich. ii. 6) "to remove," Nif. י (Ps. xxxv. 4) "let them start back." Sometimes the former verb is construed with ל (as in Lev. v. 11), or is even used absolutely as (Lev. xxv. 47) "and if the hand of a stranger acquire (wealth)."

After the words רדנומא they introduce סק especifically: perhaps they dittographed the word וי, and read וי. After ל the former supposition is, perhaps, the more probable. For ודי have kai απεκριθηναν reading ו三亚 and understanding it in the uncommon biblical (without an acc. of the thing answered) but later Hebr. sense of replying, comp. Syr. pannā, and Arab. radda.

The Prophet quotes an historical case (from Jeremiah) in proof of what he says; יצער ו (Lam. ii. 17). The first prophecy ends here.

The Vision of the Horseman Among the Myrtles (vv. 7—17).

There are two expressions in Hebr. for the numeral eleven, viz., ימשות (masc.), ימשות (fem.); and ימשות (masc.), ימשות (fem). In Assyrian the numeral one in the masc. is expressed by istin (ינינ) the Hebr. seems to have retained this old numeral in the second form of the compound numeral eleven (comp. ו-סא, &c.) in the fem. as well as in the masc. "Sebat": the names of the months as found in the books of Zech., Esth., and Neh., are most of them of Assyrio-Babylonian origin; they are in use among the Jews to this day. The following is a table of the months:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Month</th>
<th>Old Hebrew Name</th>
<th>Assyrian-Babylonian</th>
<th>Later Hebrew</th>
<th>No. of days in an ordinary year</th>
<th>Corresponding to our</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>תַחַשׁ פְּאֵרוֹב (Ex. xiii. 4—Deut. xvi. 1)</td>
<td>Ni-sa-an-nu.</td>
<td>נון (Neh. ii. 1, Esth. iii. 7).</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>March—April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>דֹּחַ מְצֹע (Non-biblical).</td>
<td>Dhu-mu-zu.</td>
<td>(Non-biblical as the name of a month, but see Ezek. viii. 14, which seems, however, to refer to the sixth month, see ver. 1).</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>June—July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>בָּל (1 Kings vi. 38).</td>
<td>&quot;The eighth month.&quot;</td>
<td>(Rt. שֶׁוֹלֶד cogn. in sense to &quot;to illuminate&quot;).</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Oct.—Nov.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be observed that in an ordinary year the months consist alternately of 30 and 29 days. A month containing 30 days is called נון "full," one containing 29 days is called "defective."
7 Upon the four and twentieth day of the eleventh month, which is the month Šebat, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo the prophet, saying,

8 I saw by night, and behold a man riding upon a red horse, and he stood among the myrtle trees that were in the bottom; and behind him were there red horses, speckled, and white.

The name "Iddō" is here (as in Ezr. v. 1, vi. 14, Neh. xii. 4, 16) spelt with a final ס; but in i. 1 and in Chronicles it is without the final ס.

In mentioning the months, if the numeral required have an ordinal form, that form is used as (i. 1) ברהים השמיאני; but, if the numeral be higher than ten it has no ordinal form, and therefore there is no choice but to use the cardinal: hence we get דש 'the eleventh month." (On the metheg see Excurs. ii. A. 1.)

The name "Iddō" has the accent on the penultimate because it is a masc. nom. (וילם and יִתְלָם) with an additional final ש. But all fem. nouns (subst., adj., and part.) which end in ש have the acc. on the last syll.⁷ thus נָבִיִּין is a fem. noun meaning inheritance, but נְבֵית (Ps. cxxiv. 4) is a masc. noun = נְבֵית "a valley." The additional ש is a remnant of the ending of the accusative case, though in many instances the force of the case is lost, and נָבִיִּין is simply the nominative. The Semitic case-endings were Nom. rm, Oblique in, Acc. am, in Arab. they are still rm, in, an, and after the def. article simply u, i, a. In Hebr. traces of these cases are found, e.g. of Nom. in o as the final י of בְּרֵי (Gen. i. 24), בָּנָי (Numb. xxiv. 3): the Oblique is i, as the final י of בְּרֵי (Ps. ex. 4), and of בְּרֵי (Gen. lxi. 11), &c.: the Acc. in rm used adverbially as להות "suddenly," or in rm as להות "in vain," הָלֹּנָי, &c.: or in rm as לְלָנָי "by night" (Ps. i. 2), and in the final ש denoting "motion to" as מְלָנָי "to the river of Egypt" (Numb. xxxiv. 5). The nom. and oblique case terminations have quite lost their force, it is only the accusatival ending which has (and that in

⁷ Such fem. forms as נִיבָּה (Ps. iii. 3) have the additional ש.
the majority of cases) retained its force.—The word בְּרָה (Is. xli. 19, lv. 13, Neh. viii. 15) "a myrtle," by the absorption of the d and the change of י into כ, becomes in Talmudic (Traditional Pronunciation) asā, in Aram. āsā, and in Arab. ās. — בְּרָה has the simān rāpheh (see Excurs. iv.) over the י, to show that the י is not to be doubled after the qibbuṣ (see on verse 13), and that it is therefore from the Root נָל, and means "depth," "hollow"; and not from Root קֵלָל, and meaning "shady place." The qibbuṣ (י) is only shūriq (גי) written defectively (compare note on בְּרָה in verse 3).—םְרָה (plur. of מְרָה). Observe the dagesh in third root-letter, similarly in the next word, and in בְּרָה "naked" (Gen. ii. 25), only that there the shūriq is anomalously written instead of qibbuṣ before dagesh forte.—םְרָה. It is impossible to speak with any certainty about this word, as it does not occur elsewhere as an adj. of colour. There is, however, a Persian word surch "red," "dun," used of the hair of camels (נַרְש, Zend  urządzenia, Sanscrit  urządzenia "red," "bright"), which the Prophet might have brought from Persia, only that (if Justi be correct) the form of the word in Persian must at that time have been _nrkhra. Again, there is an Arabic word with the י and כ transposed כור, from which comes the adj. ashar "red," used of men or horses, with which most commentators are inclined to identify our word. But, we cannot with some connect it with Talmudic כפר, כפּר and כפוּר "red paint" or "rouge," because that is probably the Greek σορωόν. While, however, כפר does not occur elsewhere in Bibl.-Hebr. as an adj. of colour, it does occur, viz. in (Is. xvi. 8) כפר (another instance of dagesh forte after shūriq), as "its [the vine's] branches" or "clusters." Comp. כפר (Is. v. 2, Jer. ii. 21), and כפר (Gen. xlix. 11), a choice kind of vine, which Abu-l-Walid (Hebr.-Arab. Dict. ed. Neubauer, col. 751) calls שריק, and says that it is the choicest kind grown in Syria. Also כפר "combs" is used with reference to working "flax" (Is. xix. 9).

would mean "by night," but יָפּ (comp. מִוְדָי "to-day") means properly "to-night" (Gen. xix. 5, 34, xxx. 15), and here "on this night" (the night of the 24th) is equivalent to יָפּ (Ex. xii. 12). For, though it is true that the Jews count from the evening, so that the evening of the 24th is regarded as
9 Then said I, O my lord, what are these? And the angel that talked with me said unto me, I will shew thee what these be.
10 And the man that stood among the myrtle trees answered and said, These are they whom the LORD hath sent to walk to and fro through the earth.

the 25th, yet, when a particular day is mentioned, and then such an expression occurs as "in the evening," &c. (Ex. xii. 18), it denotes the evening of that day.—"in a certain hollow": the article is used in the (practically) indefinite sense, as in מִבְּלָן, "a certain fugitive" (Gen. xiv. 13), see my Fragment of T. B. P'sachim, p. 94, note 36.

Hallotalah, תִּוְנָן הוֹכָּרָה. Bēn ḫadassim "sheb bamm'culah, ḫayam'nu τῶν ὑπέων τῶν κατασκιῶν. For יָרָם they seem to have read דְּרָם, a plur. of דָּרָם "mountain," which occurs often in the constr. (e.g. Ps. l. 10), and also with suffixes (e.g. Deut. viii. 9). Some have supposed that they may have read דְּרָם, which they translate ὑπέων in Is. xlv. 2. Either solution supposes י to have been read for ד. Others have suggested that the LXX. merely translated conjecturally, and imagined that "mountains" must be the meaning here, because of the mention of "the two mountains" in vi. 1. For the colours of the horses we have (1) ὀδυμμέθν πορφόροι; (2) στρυγγίμ ψαροί "starling-grey" καὶ ποικίλοι; (3) ἑβαγμένα λευκοί. In chap. vi. they are as follows: (1) as here, both in Hebr. and LXX.; (2) στριχορίμ "black" LXX. μέλαινες; (3) as here, both in Hebr. and LXX.; and then there is (4) ἅρψιμον ἀλασίμιν LXX. ποικίλοι ψαροί. Whence it would appear that the LXX., being unable to understand στρυγγίμ, rendered it ψαροί καὶ ποικίλοι in order to give four colours as in chap. vi. We may note here that the colours in Rev. vi. are λευκός (lābān); πορφός (adōn); μέλας (shāchōr); and χλωρός "pale" (the equivalent, probably, of bārād). For ḥādassām Aq. and Symm. give correctly τῶν μυσσιονων.

Strong  וַיָּנָּה with the Imperfect has the power of drawing back the accent from the ultimate to the penultimate, when no quiescent sh'va or dagesh forte intervenes between the two syllables. Consequently (since we cannot have a long vowel in a closed syllable) the last vowel must be shortened. Thus נָּה becomes נָּה. But in the case of a pausal accent it remains in its original place, thus: נָּה (ver. 10)¹. In the 1st pers. sing. the accent is not

¹ See further in notes on ch. v. 5.
11 And they answered the angel that stood among the myrtle trees, and said, We have walked to and fro through the earth, and, behold, all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest.

drawn back, even when not in pause: thus we have ה֚וּלְיָהּ (Jer. xiii. 7), but the verbs quiescent נָלְיָהּ are an exception¹, e.g. the form נָלְיָהּ (ii. 1), and נָלְיָהּ (iv. 4); so נָלְיָהּ, נָלְיָהּ, and נָלְיָהּ. — נָלְיָהּ, the pres. partic. is the only part of the Qal of this verb that is commonly used in the sense of “speaking” (but we find the past partic. נָלְיָהּ in Prov. xxv. 11, and the infin. with suff. נָלְיָהּ Ps. li. 6). — נָלְיָהּ happens never to occur except with a disjunctive accent, therefore it is always נָלְיָהּ (Gen. xii. 1, Judg. iv. 22) with segol under the second נ, and dagesh forte in the נ. The pausal form of the suffix when it is possessive (not objective) is נָלְיָהּ without dagesh: thus נָלְיָהּ “thy righteousness” (Job viii. 6). Out of pause such a verb would take simply נָלְיָהּ (Gen. xii. 2). — On the metheg of הִתִּיהַלְלָכָה see Excurs. ii. B. 4.

Haddōbher bi (LXX. ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ). The verb dibber is found generally construed with לָלְיָהּ, לָלְיָהּ, or לָלְיָהּ of the person spoken to. But, in the case of God’s speaking by revelation, the preposition ל is often used, perhaps on account of the subjective nature of revelation (comp. Numb. xii. 6, 8, Jer. xxxi. 30, Hab. ii. 1). Māh-hēmmāh ēlēh, the pronoun מַהְָהַלְלָכָה discharges the office of the verb “are”: “I [emphatic] will show thee what these are” (LXX. τί ἐστιν ταῦτα). But above the emphasis is on these: māh-ēlēh “what (are) these?” (LXX. τί φέρεται). Observe the same constructions in iv. 4 and 5; and comp. Ps. xxiv. 8 and 10.

On the first metheg on Vāyyāna see Excurs. ii. B. 3.—Hāʾēsh hāʾōmed, “the man who was standing,” i.e. who has already been mentioned as standing, and therefore, necessarily, to be identified with the man “riding on a bay horse” of verse 8, and also, doubtless, with “The Angel of the LORD” of ver. 11.—Yōshēbēth všhōqāteth is, hardly, a hendiadys for “dwelling at ease” (יִשְׁבֶּבֶת לִבּוּשָׁ).
Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these three-score and ten years?

And the Lord answered the angel that talked with me with good words and comfortable words.

Judg. xviii. 7), since ¶ sometimes (as in Mich. v. 3) has that meaning when standing alone; but, rather, ¶ means "dwelling at ease," and ¶ means "and that, in a state of insolent assumption of security" (comp. ¶ vii. 7, and ¶ 1 Chron. vi. 40).

LXX. for ¶ has κατοικεῖται, as in ii. 5 (Hebr. 9) κατοικηθήσεται (correctly there) for ¶.

Since the NAME YHVH cannot take the article, and the article cannot be put before a noun in construct., it might have been difficult to say whether ¶ meant "an angel of the Lord," or "the Angel of the Lord." But, considering that ¶ is prefixed (which is, as a rule, the case only with defined nouns), and the participle ¶ occurs afterwards (with the def. article), and that ¶ occurs so frequently to denote a particular Angel, it must needs be so here. He is, of course, to be identified with "the man" of verses 8, 10. For, had he been a fresh person introduced here, the construction in the next clause must have been ¶.

¶ "he pitied" is usually construed (as here) with a direct object, or absolutely (as Jer. xxi. 7). But sometimes (e.g. Ps. ciii. 13) with ¶. The construction of ¶ is exactly similar (the only passage in which it is construed with ¶ is Dan. xi. 30).

¶ this is just the construction in the English: "this seventy years," compare vii. 3, and ¶ "this twice" (Gen. xxvii. 36).

Za'amithאֲחַה יִרְפֵּהּ, translating euphemistically. For ¶ shibli'im shanah rov rov (as in Is. lvii. 18, ed. Baer). The simán raphéh over the ¶ denotes (as in ¶ ver. 8) that the letter is not doubled, and that the qibbuc is only a shuriq written short (see Excurs. iv.). So, the word is the same as that which occurs (with suffix) in Hos. xi. 8 ¶. It is a p'a'elistic substantive (not an ad-
14 So the angel that communed with me said unto me, Cry thou, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts; I am jealous for Jerusalem and for Zion with a great jealousy.
15 And I am very sore displeased jective) of the form of הָעָלָה הָעָלָה "special observance" (Ex. xii. 42); on the metheg see Excurs. II. A. 1. Another form of substantive also from the Pi'el of the same verb, and having a meaning similar to that of הָעָלָה הָעָלָה, is נַחְוָא הָעָלָה. These nouns (here mentioned) are used in the plural for the sake of strengthening their meaning.

דְּבָרִים חָם. Had nichumím been an adjective agreeing with

Constructions and interpunction.

דְּבָרִים there would have been no need to place a conjunctive accent on דְּבָרִים (as there is in the preceding clause); for, see the first words of the chapter הבָּרִים דְּבָרִים, where hashsh'mint agrees with chôdesh, and yet דְּבָרִים is furnished with a disjunctive accent pashtâ (which is always placed on the last letter of the word: while, if the tone-syllable be the penultimate, an additional accent of the same form is placed on the consonant which bears the vowel of that syllable). But nichumím is, as we have said, a substantive: we must therefore either take it as in apposition with דְּבָרִים meaning "words [viz.] comfort," or understand דְּבָרִים נַחְוָא הָעָלָה "words [viz. words of] comfort," like יָדְסֹרֹת דְּבָרִים (Josh. iii. 14), which may be taken as equivalent to יָדְסֹרֹת נַחְוָא הָעָלָה "the ark [viz. ark of] the covenant." But see note on iv. 7.—By LXX. Nichumím is rendered as an adj. παρακλητικός.

Verse 14. Words and constructions.

is the perfect used to denote the immediate past, the action being continued in the present: it is best translated by the English present 1. "Thus saith the Lord" in this verse is the same use of the tense. This verb נקֶם when construed with ה (as here, Numb. xxv. 13, &c.) denotes "to be jealous, or zealous, for," but with the acc. (Numb. v. 14), or ב (Gen. xxx. 1), "to be jealous against." On qin'âh g'dolâh compare note on ver. 2.

The adj. נַחְוָא is of the same form as נַחְוָא "green" (which latter

Verse 15. Words.

has no fem. or plur. in use). The doubling of the last letter, substituting a pathach followed by dagesh forte for qâmaq, before the plur. termination occurs also in such forms as the

1 Driver (Hebrew Tenses § 10) compares, rightly, the so-called "aorist of immediate past" in Greek, as ἐδέξαμαι "I welcome."
with the heathen that are at ease: and they helped forward the affliction.

following; הָלַךְ עַל (Gen. xxvii. 4), חָפֵּשׁ (Prov. xxiii. 3, 6); compare also בְּעָלָם, עָלָם, בְּעָלָם plur. מֵעָלָם, מֵעָלָם &c., and our note on a'dumím (verse 8). On הָלַךְ, the Massoreth says מִיָּים, i.e. the pathach of the word is turned into qāmaḵ, although the disjunctive accent on the syllable (viz. zāqef) is not strong enough to have such an effect in most cases.

אני qōqēf is the Present Tense. It seems to be used here, in preference to the Perfect (compare qinnethi ver. 14), because the very word קִפֵּתָה is required in the second section of the verse to be used as an actual Perfect, and it would have been extremely awkward to use the same tense of the same verb in two different ways in the same verse.—אשֶר means here “for,” “because” (= יְנוּ אַשְׁר or יְכִ בַּ נוּ), comp. Gen. xxx. 18, xxxiv. 13, 27, &c.—וְחָמֶת “and they” is emphatic; but not the “אני above (except in so far as there is a contrast between “I” and “they”) because the pronoun is, as a rule, required with the participle, when it represents the Pres. Tense; for a case in which the pronoun of the First Person is supplied with a partic. from a verb in the First Person, which comes in the next verse, see chap. ix. ver. 12.—וָזָרָה. Some would render this “helped the evil,” after the analogy of such passages as לַעֲרָה לְעוּרֵהוּ “to help Hadadezer” (2 Sam. viii. 5). But it seems better to understand (as in Jer. xlv. 11) in the sense of “for evil,” the prefix ל being used as it is after דָּצַרְעַ in 2 Chron. xx. 23, כוֹרַח אָשֶׁר בֵּרֱעָה לְעַשִּׁית “they helped, each against other, for destruction,” i.e. “they helped to destroy each other.” In this example the verb לַעֲרָה is construed with ב “against,” and the substantive with ל is merely complementary. The verb, here, we take as used absolutely, as in Is. xxx. 7, “And as for Egypt, utterly in vain, do they help.” So that we should render כוֹדָם וְזָרָה לָעָרָה “But they helped for evil,” meaning “And they cooperated [with me, but] for evil.”
Therefore thus saith the LORD; I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies: my house shall be built in it, saith the LORD of hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem.

Cry yet, saying, Thus saith the LORD of hosts; My cities through prosperity shall yet be spread abroad; and the LORD shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem.

The LXX. seems to have been read as ἡ, so that they read ἡλενα, partic. of ἠλεν; comp. the form ἕλεν 3rd perf. (Hos. x. 14). For this meaning of sh'ith comp. (Ps. iii. 7) י"ע. For this they give συνεπεθιεντο. The י"ע written close together might give י, and י seems to have been read as י, giving י"ע.

Observe that י"ע is always spelt defectively, i.e. without yad in the last syllable.—On the accent of י"ע, and the dagesh in י, see Excurs. iii. The K'ri י"ע (which form occurs only as k'ri, and that only again in 1 Kings vii. 23, Jer. xxxii. 39) must be read י"ע, after the analogy of י"ע (Gen. xix. 4). The K'thib is י"ע (or, rather, י"ע, ed. Baer); comp. י"ע. Either word would mean "a line."

Sh'abbi should be rendered "I am returned," as the Present complete, rather than as the Prophetic Perfect "I will return" (which grammatically would be equally admissible).

Verse 16. The siman raphah over the י, as he does also י"ע (Mich. ii. 12); see Excurs. iv. In chap. xiii. 7 the same word is used of "being scattered," in a bad sense, and such is the ordinary use of the verb. But in Gen. x. 18 the Niph. (it is exactly equivalent to the Qal in this verb) is used of "being spread," not in a bad sense. And so the Qal is, undoubtedly, used here. The corresponding Arab. fāda yaf'īdu means "to be abundant," in which sense י"ע is, however, the common word in Hebr. See note on ii. 8.—The י of י"ע denotes "on account of," as in י"ע "on account of the multitude of" (ii. 8). LXX. has εἴνα διανομάτων...εν ἀγαθοῖς.
(Qal ناقم unused) may, as far as grammatical form is concerned, be either the Perf. Niphal or Pi'el. But the Niph. constructions mean “to pity,” and is construed with ה, או ה, או (see Dictionaries); while in the Pi'el it means “to comfort,” and is construed with the direct object as in Gen. i. 21, Job ii. 11, and here (and sometimes with a complementary ה or ה of the thing concerning which the comfort is given, as in Is. xxii. 4, Gen. v. 29).—选取 "to choose" is (normally) construed with ה of the thing chosen.

Except 'וד for ה there is nothing in the Hebr. to correspond with the words כָּל אֵין פְּרָד וּמְדַקְּל סֵלֶל וְלַעֲלָו אֶנֶּה יִומּוֹל הַתּ. LXX.
The translators seem to have borrowed the words from ver. 14 (such is the common practice of the LXX., comp. p. 9).

Between the first revelation to Zechariah (i. 1—6), and the series of visions, &c. contained in Zech. i. 7—vi. 15, Haggai had received the revelations of Hag. ii. 10—23. Therein God had foretold “I will shake the heavens, and the earth: and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, &c.” The people were, no doubt, in eager expectation, waiting for this promised overthrow of their enemies. The object of this vision was to assure the prophet (and through him the people) that, though this overthrow had not yet commenced, God’s eyes were open, and He was (as it were) sending forth His angel-scouts to reconnoitre, and that, consequently, He was preparing to perform His word. From the grammatical considerations mentioned above it is certain that “the man who stood among the myrtles,” and “the Angel of the Lord” are identical. We need not, therefore, enter into the controversies, which have arisen on the subject. With regard to the colours of the horses, since “bay” is first mentioned, it is hardly probable that סְרֹעֶקִים means another shade of “red.” I should, therefore, either render it conjecturally “starling-grey,” following the LXX., or suggest that it is a corruption of סְחוֹרִים, “black.” Since the angel-interpreter gives us no clue to any symbolical meaning of the colours, and therefore all interpretations of this kind must needs be merely conjectural, it seems best to suppose that these colours were mentioned, as those most commonly found among horses, for the purpose of making the picture more realistic (or, because they so appeared to the prophet in the vision). The variety of the opinions of those, who attach symbolical meanings to the colours, is in itself sufficient to show how little dependence can be placed on such interpretations. The following are specimens of such interpretation, (1) that of קֵל: The riders on red horses are to cause war and bloodshed, those on pale-grey (סְרֹעֶקִין) to cause hunger, famine and pestilence, those on white go to conquest. But this explanation takes no account of the single horseman on the red (bay) horse. Moreover victory implies bloodshed, as much as does war, so that there is no practical distinction made between the red and the white horses. (2) Ewald deprives “the man standing among the myrtles” of his horse, then he renders the colours of the horses bright-red, brown, grey, and supplies dark-red (from his interpretation of vi. 3). Having thus arranged the colours to his fancy, he compares this vision with that of the chariots in chap. vi., and sees in the
colours the mission of the riders to the four quarters of heaven. The red denotes the East, the brown (=black of chap. vi.) the North, the grey (i.e. lāḥān) the West, the dark red the South! (3) VITRINGA interprets the three colours as follows: red times of war, varicoloured times of varying distress and prosperity, white times of complete prosperity, which were sent on the Jewish people. (4) KLIEFOTH considers the colours to denote the different lands in which the riders discharge their mission, viz. Babylon, Medo-Persia, and the Graeco-Macedonian empire. (5) RABBI MOSHEH ALsheEH, the cabbalist, interprets red of the company of Gabriel which inclines to Strict Justice, straggim of that of Raphael (who is the angel of healing after smiting, that is Justice tempered with Mercy), white of that of Michael who inclines to Free Grace. But enough has surely been said to show the futility of such methods of interpretation. We will only add that, while the author of the Revelation undoubtedly borrows the idea of the different coloured horses from Zech. and gives them such meanings as suit his purpose, it would be most uncritical to interpret Zechariah by means of the book of Revelation. The mystical interpretation of the words myrtles and the hollow are equally fantastic. By some the myrtles are said to represent the Pious, by others the Theocracy, or the Land of Judah; and the hollow is said to symbolize Babylon, or the Degradation into which the Theocracy, or Judah, had fallen. But what need of such far-fetched ideas? A hollow place where there would be water, and shade of trees, is, of course, a most natural place for a troop to be represented as halting at. Whether there was actually such a place near “The Horse-Gate,” well known at that time, we cannot say.

(CHAP. II. in the Hebrew.)

E. V. Chap. I. 18—21, and Chap. II.

(Hebr. ii. 1) 18 Then lifted I up mine eyes, and saw, and behold four horns.

SECOND VISION. THE FOUR HORNS AND THE FOUR SMITHS.

On the form see on i. 9. "a horn," like the name of most things which usually are found in pairs, is ordinarily used in the dual instead of the plural. In this case there are two forms, viz. בְָרִיתָה (Amos vi. 13, Hab. iii. 4), and בְָרִיתָה (Daniel viii. 3, 6, 20). The construct of both is בְָרִיתָה; if from the former the sh'va under the ב is quiescent, if from the latter it is moving; but since ב is not a BeGaDcFath letter there is no means of discovering which is the case here. The plur. בְָרִיתָה (str. qa-r'nōth) is used only of the altar-horns, or (Ezek. xxvii. 25) other artificial horns (compare בְָרִיתָה the artificial feet Ex. xxv. 12, 1 Kings vii. 30); or figuratively as in Ps. lxxv. 11, and here.
Zech. ii. 2-4. 19 And I said unto the angel that talked with me, What be these? And he answered me, These are the horns which have scattered Judah, Israel, and Jerusalem.

20 And the Lord shewed me four carpenters.

21 Then said I, What come these to do? And he spake, saying, These are the horns which have scattered Judah, so that

Verse 2. Words.

Verse 3. Words.

Verse 4. Words.

Verse 5. Words.

Verse 6. Words.

Verse 7. Words.

Verse 8. Words.


Verse 10. Words.

Verse 11. Words.

Verse 12. Words.

Verse 13. Words.


Verse 15. Words.

Verse 16. Words.
no man did lift up his head: but which lifted up their horn over the land of Judah to scatter it.

must be taken as an actual Past, and not as a Prophetic Perfect, because the Perf. Tense הושה, in the subordinate clause, thus limits its meaning.—The expressions ימים, ימים, ימים.

“in proportion to,” are, in any but Post-captivity books, only used with a noun (or pronominal suffix as in Job xxxiii. 6) following. In Lev. xxvii. 8 ומי באיתר תשון דhydration, “in proportion to what (= that which) the ability of the vower may be able to compass,” is no exception; for, the relative היא (or the antecedent understood in it) is the noun after ומי. But in Malachi iii. 9 we do find כי באיתר ידנות ישימורים, governing a relative clause כי באיתר ידנות ישימורים “because that (or since) ye do not keep,” like the more modern Hebr. כי. Now, כי in the passage before us is put for (comp. כי and כי, &c.), only not in the sense in which it is used in Malachi, but as meaning “so that,” Fr. de sorte que, modern Hebr. כי. Thus, in the only two biblical passages in which we have (契机) כי as a relative particle it means “because that” (introducing the cause), and “so that” (the effect).—וימים יא載 which lifted up,” not “which do lift up”: since the tense of the participle depends on the context, and it is here already settled by the Perfect הושה.

[i. 21.] After the words τα διασκορπίσαντα τον Ἰουδα follow και τον Ἰσραήλ κατακέαν, because in ver. 2 (i. 19 LXX.) Israel, as well as Judah, was mentioned.— כי simply και.—

LXX. לוחך Ridley otham byaddoth tou o'xwai avta eis xepas avton, reading לוחך Ridley (as Hiph. of לוחך Ridley) and taking לוחך Ridley = לוחך Ridley! They insert τεσσαρα before κερατα, and read לוחך Ridley as לוחך Ridley, Kyprianou.

The first vision had revealed to the Prophet, that God was about to fulfil His promise of breaking up the self-complacent security of the Gentile world. The second vision is intended to give him additional assurance, by showing how God had already destroyed some of those, who had in time past scattered His people, and by declaring that He would continue to do so. We have already shown in our note on the expression “so that no man did lift up his head,” that the scattering of Israel referred to must be that of the past. We must, therefore, at once reject the interpretation, which would make the four horns refer to the Assyrian, Babylonian, Medo-Persian, and Graeco-Macedonian
(E. V. ii. 1, Hebr. ii. 5) I lifted up mine eyes again, and looked, and behold a man with a measuring line in his hand.

(Hebr. ii. 6) 2 Then said I, Whither goest thou? And he said...
unto me, To measure Jerusalem, to see what is the breadth thereof, and what is the length thereof.

(Hebr. ii. 7) 3 And, behold, the angel that talked with me went forth, and another angel went out to meet him,

(Hebr. ii. 8) 4 And said unto

or obliqua (as here); or “how much!” i.e. ever so much, or many, as in vii. 3; or (in accordance with the custom, so common in languages, of using a question to imply a negation) it is used (Job xxi. 17) in the sense of “How often [how seldom! if ever] is the lamp of the wicked extinguished?”

All infinitives are nouns substantive. Most of them in Hebrew are of a masc. form, as יָּרְכָּה, constr. יָּרְכָּה. But some (especially from verbs יָּרְכָּה and יָּרְכָּה, e.g. יָּרְכָּה, and יָּרְכָּה, “to bring forth,” וּלְבַשׁ “to sit”) are fem. in form: thus יָּרְכָּה “to love the name of the LORD” (from יָּרְכָּה), יָּרְכָּה “and to fear Him” (from יָּרְכָּה). And so from יָּרְכָּה, “to meet,” we have an infin. of a fem. (but always of a construct) form, viz. יָּרְכָּה “to meet the LORD,” יָּרְכָּה “to meet you,” יָּרְכָּה (ver. 7) “to meet him”; in which it will be noticed that (1) an  ה is introduced, as though the root were יָּרְכָּה, (2) the vowel is always thrown back on the  ה, and the  ה is quiescent, thus יָּרְכָּה is for יָּרְכָּה, (compare יָּרְכָּה “his work” for יָּרְכָּה), (3) before another noun, or the heavy suffixes the suffix, the form is יָּרְכָּה: but before the other suffix it is יָּרְכָּה.

[ii. 3.] ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰς τῇ κει, either reading בְּזֵל for בְּזֵל, or giving what they conceived to be the general meaning.

The  ה of יָּרְכָּה is long, it is merely  וְשָׂרֵי written defective, so too the  ה of יָּרְכָּה (ver. 10); see note on i. 3. יָּרְכָּה denotes a male, from infancy (as Moses in the ark of bulrushes, Ex. ii. 6) to the prime of life (as Isaac, when his father was about to sacrifice him at the age of thirty, Gen. xxii. 5—15).—The full form of יָּרְכָּה is
him, Run, speak to this young man, saying, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls for the multitude of men and cattle therein: (Hebr. ii. 9) 5 For I, saith the LORD, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her.

which latter is always masculine, while the former is used once as fem. (2 Kings iv. 25). A fem. form הָלְּאָה occurs once (Ezk. xxxvi. 35). The word הָלְּאָה is compounded of the def. article הַ, an intensive demonstrative element ל, and the ordinary demonstrative pronoun ל, thus ha-llā-zeh exactly corresponds with the Arabic al-la-dhī, which, from being originally a demonstrative, has passed into a relative pronoun "who," "which"; comp. Engl. "that," Germ. "der, die, das."—הָלְּאָה "plains," then "unwalled-towns," "suburbs" (comp. Arab. farz, "a plain"). The word may be taken as used adverbially, or as the accusative of limitation (these being but two different ways of speaking of one and the same construction); compare notes on i. 2.—The verb בָּשָׁנ means not only to "sit," "dwell," "remain," "inhabit," but also "to be inhabited," as here (comp. Is. xiii. 20); such is also the case with the verb בָּש (ibid.). LXX.—[ii. 4] κατακάρπως, freely, for p`rāzōbīh.

On the dagesh in ה of eh`yeh-llāh see Excurs. iii.—Sāḥibīh is a substantive meaning "circuit," it is used here (comp. Ps. iii. 7) in the accusative (but without any distinctive termination) as an adverb "round about."—In the first half of the verse the verb "to be" is followed by the acc. χώμαθ d'sh. We may assume that this is the acc. (and not the nominative as it would be in Latin) from the fact that in Arabic the verb kāna "to be" (together with the verbs of like meaning) takes the acc. after it. In the second half of the verse the same verb is followed by ל, as by the Dative in the Latin example "Exilium est avidis mare nautis." The former construction may be illustrated by such a passage as ver. 13, or Gen. xii. 2 הָלְּאָה וּבְרֶה "And be thou (i.e. and thou shalt be) a blessing"; and the latter by Zech. ii. 15, or Ex. iv. 16 יְהִי לָּךַּו אֶלָה תִּהְיוּ לָּךַּו בָּשָׁנ and Prov. xxix. 13, meaning "deceit," "oppress-
(Hebr. ii. 10) 6 Ho, ho, come forth, and flee from the land of the north, saith the Lord: for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heaven, saith the Lord.

sion," from an unused verb הָנָבִים). There are two other common words of the form כְּלַת, viz. "emptiness," "iniquity" (e.g. אֲלֹהָם מָוֵת. Ps. xciv. 23), and מָוֵת "death," constr. מָוֵת.

יה is often equivalent to וַיָּה "woe!" "alas!" as in Is. i. 4 מַה גָּם יִתְמָר "woe to (or alas for) a sinful nation!"

But here (as in Is. xviii. 1, 2 ... וַיָּה אֲרֵץ יָלְצָה בְּנֵי יָהוּדָה, and Is. iv. 1 וַיָּה כָּל צְמָא לְמָוִת לְמָוִת) it is simply a particle of exhortation and calling. Thus מַה may be correctly rendered "Ho! come ye!" It is practically equivalent to an Impert. There is, consequently, no need to understand a verb בֹּלֵה, or מָוֵת (as E. V. come forth) before מָוֵת. The מ in the middle of מָוֵת is long and accented, it is merely written defectively (comp. note on i. 3).—כָּרָבָךְ. A few MSS. have כָּרָבָךְ, but this reading is of no importance (there is no reading כָּרוּב). The form כָּרוֹב is absal. and constr. fem. Either the absol. or the constr. may precede its noun.—The Pi'el הִפְרָשׁ occurs in all nine times in the Hebrew Scriptures. Once (Ps. lxviii. 15 הִפְרָשׁ שָׁרָה מְלָכָיו) it seems to mean "to scatter." Seven times it is used of stretching forth the hands (Is. i. 15, xxv. 11 bis, lxv. 2, Jer. iv. 31, Ezek. xvii. 21, Ps. cxliii. 6): here it seems to be used in the sense of "spreading abroad," i.e. "multiplying greatly," in which sense הִפְרָשׁ with מ is used, intransitively however (Gen. xxx. 30, Hos. iv. 10, Job i. 10). The verb must be rendered as the Prophetic Perfect "I will spread you abroad as the four winds of heaven."

[ii. 6.] They seem to have understood פֶּרֶאָשִׁי in a bad sense "I will scatter"; then, feeling the difficulty of such an expression being made use of to the people on their return from captivity, they deliberately altered the passage into έκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνίμων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ συνάξω υψός.

The man with the measuring-line seems to be simply a figure in the drama, and is not to be regarded as an angel (as in i. 8): for, he has no message to deliver, and is implicitly rebuked for his folly in endeavouring to measure the city. There is little need to discuss the question whether "is" or
ZECHARIAH II. 11.

(Hebr. ii. 11) 7 Deliver thyself, O Zion, that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon.

"should be" or "shall be" is to be supplied with the expression "how great its width, &c." The Vision refers, no doubt, to the future of Jerusalem, beginning from the time then present. The Interpreting Angel "goes forth," i.e. leaves the Prophet's side, and another angel "comes forth," i.e. appears on the scene, and goes to meet him. In ver. 8 the speaker must be the "other angel," otherwise he appears for no object or purpose. "This young man" is by many commentators understood of the Prophet; but, to us it appears much more probable that it refers to the "man with the measuring-line." He is forbidden to measure the city, not because it was to become too great to be measured, but because it was to extend beyond its boundaries, whatever they might be, on account of the multitude of its inhabitants, &c. This promise was literally fulfilled: for Josephus (Bell. Jud. v. 4 § 2) speaking of Jerusalem in the time of Herod Agrippa says: πληθείς γάρ ὑπερέχον σημεία κατὰ μικρὸν ἔξειρε τῶν περιβόλων, καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὰ προσώπα τρόφον λόφων συμπλήρωσεν ἐπὶ οὐκ ὃλων προῖδαν, καὶ τετάρτων περικύκλιθαι λόφων, ὅσα καλεῖται Βεθέθα, κεῖμενοι μὲν ἀντικρύ τῆς Ἀρτοκλᾶς, ἀποτεμιχμένοι δὲ ὄργανοι βαθῶς. Compare the letter of Aristob to Philocrates, in which a description of Jerusalem after the restoration is given; and the fragments of Hecateus (who flourished under Alexander the Great), in which Jerusalem is described as a city fifty stadia in circumference, and inhabited by 120,000 men.

Although with ethnach (א), is not in the pausal form (after the analogy of ידשת Jer. ix. 3), because the verse being very short (like Gen. i. 1), and the second clause being in apposition with י Thousands in the first clause, the sense does not end with the ethnach sufficiently for the only verb of the sentence to take a pausal form with that accent. Had there been two verbs in the sentence, the first would have had the pausal form; for instance, if the verse had been

"Daughter of Babylon" means inhabitants of Babylon, like "Daughter of Zion" in ver. 14. — בּ is means "gate of God," and is a contraction of ב (comp. ב- of the next verse), the old Assyrian name being Bab ilu, which is a Semitic translation of the still older Accadian ca-dimirra-ci "Place of the Gate of God" (Sayce). יישב means "dwelling with," and is here construed with the acc., as (Ps. v. 5) יישב ימי ימי means י tuner אֲמָם. The instances יישב ירתה (Ps. xxii. 4), יישב יישב יישב (Ps. xxii. 4), יישב יישב יישב, only once apiece; and, as it so happens, not one of them in pause.

1 Other 2nd pers. Impert. Niph. which occur are: יישב יישב יישב, יישב יישב, יישב יישב, יישב יישב, יישב יישב, יישב יישב, יישב יישב, יישב יישb, only once apiece; and, as it so happens, not one of them in pause.
(Hebr. ii. 12) 8 For thus saith the Lord of hosts; After the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you: for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye.

(Hebr. ii. 13) 9 For, behold, I will shake mine hand upon them,

(2 Sam. vi. 2) or הַעֲדוֹת אֲחֵלֻא (Gen. xxv. 27), &c., which are sometimes cited as parallels, are not suitable: for, in them the acc. denotes the thing inhabited, while here it denotes the people with whom the dwelling takes place.

LXX. [ii. 7.] Ὑπὸ Κιιγγὸν they transl. εἰς ξῶν: somewhat similarly in Ezek. xxi. 15 (ver. 10 LXX.) ἁ is translated εἰς.

For ἀναφέρεται the Cod. Petropol. reads ἀναφέρεται ἰδιοκτέσεων is an expression peculiar to this passage. Elsewhere it is [Αισχος]. It seems probable that ἀναφέρεται is a fem. form of ἀναφέρεται (the masc. of which is common in Arab. and Aram.) in the sense of “gate,” “opening,” which would be very suitably applied to the “pupil of the eye.” (But see the Dictionaries.)

Constructions. ἀναφέρεται is sometimes used as an adverb of place, as (Gen. xxii. 13) ἀναφέρεται εἰς ἄνδρα ἀλατ σαιρ “and lo! a ram behind”; or as an adverb of time before a verb, as (Gen. xviii. 5) ἀναφέρεται ὅλος τῆς ἡμέρας “afterwards ye shall pass on,” or, if before a substantive, with a disjunctive accent, as (Ps. lxxiii. 24) ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τρόπους τῆς ἡμέρας “and, afterward, Thou wilt gloriously receive me.” When, however, it is put before a substantive with a conjunctive accent it is a preposition, meaning “after,” as (Gen. ix. 28) ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμέρας “after the flood”; (Ps. lxviii. 26) ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης “after the players on stringed instruments.” So, here, ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης means “after glory hath he sent me,” i.e. posterior to some glory which had already been manifested; or, preferably, “after, i.e. in quest of, glory,” comp. (Lev. xxvi. 33) ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἡρμῆν “and I will draw the sword after you,” i.e. to find you out, reach you.

When two of the same letters come together in the middle of a word, and the first of them be with sh'vā, if this sh'vā be a compound sh'vā, the preceding vowel will (Excurs. ii. B. 6) take fixed-metheg, e.g. לָלֶלִי (xi. 3), but if the sh'vā be a simple moving
and they shall be a spoil to their servants: and ye shall know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me.

(Hebr. ii. 14) 10 Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord.

(Hebr. ii. 15) 11 And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee.

(Hebr. ii. 16) 12 And the Lord shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land, and shall choose Jerusalem again.

The student will observe that Baer points נבד without metheg, while less correct editions have it with a metheg.—The reading of the old editions, and by far the majority of MSS., is לםיריהמם "to their servants," not לִּבְּדוּדֶּהֶם "to those who serve them."—Sh'lachani, the student is reminded that with the 2nd and 3rd sing. perf. of the verb, while the suffix of 1st pers. plur. is always ānū (in or out of pause), that of the 1st per. sing. is ānī out of pause (ver. 15), and ānī in pause: thus we always have the forms נִשְׁלָהָנֻנָה, נִשְׁלָהָנֻנָה out of pause, and נִשְׁלָהָנֻנָה, נִשְׁלָהָנֻנָה in pause.

Ronni is the pronunciation of the first word of this verse, for the נ being in a closed syllable without accent or metheg (Excurs. ii. A. 5) is ̄n not ā; comp. the Infin. Constr. with maqqeph (Job xxxviii. 7) בִּרְנוּרִי הַכְּלָרָה "When the morning stars sang together."—On the accentuation of v'shācanti see notes on i. 3.

When the third root-letter of a verb is a guttural, then in the second pers. sing. perfect instead of sh'va (as חֶפָּל), pathach is placed under this letter as חַפָּל yaddā'at. This pathach is (not furtive, i.e. to be read before the y as in חַפָּל hōdēt, but) merely a helping-vowel, and is to be read after the y, comp. the pathach after the ש of חַפָּל vayyifchad (from חַפָּל) "and he rejoiced."

[ii. 11.] V'nīvā, καὶ καταφεύγονται, a free translation; similarly Jer. i. 5 (xxvii. 5, LXX.). For ā they read אבנ; and for v'shācanti they read v'shāc'ni καὶ κατασκηνώσουσιν.

The expression ad'māth haqqōdešh, "The Holy Land," occurs only in this passage.
(Hebr. ii. 17) 13 Be silent, O all raised up out of his holy habitation, before the Lord: for he is

_Hás_, “hush!” This is probably the imperative Pi’el of הָלַג (cf. הָלַג, הָלַג, הָלָּמָּה), since we have, not only the plur. הָלַכן (Neh. viii. 11), but also the Hiph. (Numb. xiii. 30) הָלַכן “and he stilled.” Some grammarians maintain that it is an interjection, which afterwards became conjugated, like the Arab. haluma (Hebr. הָלָּמָּה “hither”), plur. halumū “come ye hither!” At any rate it is an onomatopoetic; the Arab. is قَاه “sh...!”—רֵגוּר is an anomalous form of Niph. participle from רֵגוּר. The normal form of such participles is with qāmuq in the first syllable, as בִּכְחֵל. The Participle מְלוּאֵל “circumcised” probably comes from מָלוּא, but some take it from מָלוֹא. Such participles seem to follow the analogy of the Imperf. מִלְבָּם. In Jer. xlviii. 11 we have the Perf. Niph. מְלוֹא from מָלוֹא, the root being confounded with מָלוֹא.

[ii. 13.] _Hás, εἰλαβείσθω.__ For מַעֲשֹׂה they give εἰ κεφαλῶν. Elsewhere the LXX. seem to understand the meaning of Ματών.

Remarks. The land of the North is Babylonia (Jer. i. 14, &c.). Those, who had not yet returned, are exhorted to flee from the evils which are impending over Babylon, such as the rebellions of this period and consequent vengeance of Darius (see _Records of the Past_, i. pp. 118—125). Observe the continual change of Person; the Prophet speaks in the first person when he gives the very words of God, and in the third when he merely conveys their general meaning; or (as especially in ver. 15) the personality of the Sent is at times merged in that of the Sender. Vers. 14—17 are distinctly Messianic, and were fulfilled in the Birth of Jesus. But we must not look for the literal fulfilment of the mere details of the prophecy, which are but the background of the picture. The Prophet foresaw the Messianic times from an Old Testament standpoint, and expected the literal choosing-again of Jerusalem; while, as a matter of fact, the fulfilment of the prophecy was the commencement of the rejection of Israel. At the same time we may believe, on the authority of S. Paul, that God hath not cast off His own people, and that a time will come when all Israel shall be saved.
CHAPTER III.

AND he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him.

FOURTH VISION.—JOSHUA THE HIGH PRIEST ARRAIGNED BEFORE THE ANGEL OF THE LORD.

For the probable subject of vayyar'ěni comp. ii. 3.—The first ‘ōmed denotes the state, or circumstances, of the person seen, as (Ex. ii. 11) "And he saw an Egyptian man smiting a Hebrew man." (Comp. i. 18, and see notes on iv. 7.)—The second ‘ōmed stands for היח נ "was standing."—Hāṣṣāṭān lit. "The Adversary." The word is used, as a Proper Name, with def. art., here and in Job i. ii., without the art. in Ps. cix. 6, 1 Chron. xxi. 1.—לְפָשְׁךָ "to act as adversary towards him." This verb occurs nowhere else in the Inf., so that from it we can deduce no rules as to the use of א instead of א in the first syllable. But, the following facts will show how incorrect is the remark of Gesenius (§ 61), "The Inf. of the form בָּשָׁךְ becomes with suffix שׁבָךְ." Even as far as this one verb is concerned, he is in error: for though the constr. infin. is always בָּשָׁךְ, there is only one passage (Gen. xix. 33, 35) in which it takes א in the first syllable with suffixes, while in Deut. vi. 7, xi. 19, Prov. vi. 22 (בָּשָׁךְ) and in Ruth iii. 4 (בָּשָׁךְ) it has א. Then again, from לָלֵל (Jon. ii. 1), which is the only form of the Infin. of this verb, we get בָּלֵל (Job vii. 19).

Similarly the verb כָּסַךְ (and כָּסַךְ), which has only the Infin. in א (Gen. xxxv. 22) (comp. Numb. ix. 22, 1 Kings viii. 12, Job xxx. 6, Ps. lxviii. 19, lxxxxv. 10, 2 Chr. vi. 1), in the only two passages in which it occurs with suffix, takes in one א לָסֵכנָה l'Sho-c'nl (Ex. xxix. 46), and in the other א לָשֵׁכְנוּ l'Shi-c'no (Deut. xii. 5).
2 And the Lord said unto Satan, 
The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; 
even the Lord that hath chosen 
Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this 
a brand plucked out of the fire?
3 Now Joshua was clothed with 
filthy garments, and stood before 
the angel.

4 And he answered and spake 
unto those that stood before him, 
saying, Take away the filthy gar­
ments from him. And unto him 
he said, Behold, I have caused 
thee iniquity to pass from thee, 
and I will clothe thee with change 
of raiment.

The name ידיה and יאה (Mishn. Jer. 38a. 13 &c.),

LXX. then ויהי (Ezr. ii. 2), then ייהי, which in Greek was 
written Ἰησοῦς: then, by adding the nominative-ending ᾱ, it became Ἰησοῦς. Other corruptions of the name are יִשְׁעֵה (T. B. Shabb. 6b), 
ִישָׁה (T. Y. Trumoth, Hal. 1, ed. Krot. 40°), Arab. āsă.

The 1 of וַיִגַּר means "yea," as (Ps. xxvii. 14) יָדְּקוּ...יֶהְךָ (comp.
Verse 2. Zech. vi. 10); sometimes 1 may be rendered "even" (e.g.
Ex. xxv. 9, Zech. vii. 5), or "namely" (Ex. xxxv. 12).
The usual construction of הנל in the sense of "rebuking" is with ב;
contrast Mal. iii. 11, in the sense of "destroying," with the acc.
(ibid. ii. 3); at least, this is the distinction made by R. David Qimchi
(Ps. ix. 6).—Habböcher is, of course, to be referred to YHVH.

Labbash is merely written defective (comp. i. 3)—מִיַּנְיוּי occurs only
in this chap. as an adj. "filthy." Elsewhere we have יְניָּצָה 
and יְניָּחָי as a substantive "filth," "stercus." Verbs which 
take a double accusative in the active, are able to retain one in the 
passive, so that it is not necessary to put_labbah into the constr.; but 
that construction is also admissible, e.g. (Ezk. ix. 11) לֹאָשֵׁמוֹן 
"who was clothed in fine linen." The Qal לָבָשׁ, and לָבָחשׁ, means 
to "put on," "be clothed with," with acc. of the thing put on (once 
with ב, Esth. vi. 8). In the Hiph. it denotes "to clothe another," and 
is generally used with two acc. e.g. (Ex. xxviii. 41) לֹאָשֶׁס תֵּאָתָם 
יְרָא נ "And thou shalt clothe Aaron with them."

Vhalbesh is the Infin. Absl. Hiph. used emphatically, with the 
 omission of the finite verb (comp. תֵּאָתָם. Gen. xli. 43), 
the full construction would be תֵּאָתָם לֹאָשׁ.—
Mach'laşeth "a change of garments" (only again in Is. iii. 22): it is
And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the angel of the Lord stood by.

used in the plural, probably, because it consisted of several different articles of dress (comp. note on vi. 11).

V'halbesh oth'cā mach'elāgôth kai ēνδώσατε αὐτὸν ποδήρη, reading the verb in the Imperative plur., and for oth'cā reading othô. LXX.

Vā'omār, the first person is mī'ra', but the third person vayyōmer (ver. 4, iv. 14, v. 6) is mit'ēl (see note on i. 9).—Yāśēmū Verse 5.

Words, &c.

for the High Priest's turban is ḫāhōr (Ex. xxviii. 4, &c.) ; both words, and also three consecutive words in Is. xxii. 18, are from the same root which means to "fold," "wind." The article in ḫāniph haḥāhōr is definite, denoting "the clean turban" requested above.—The participle ṭōméd here denotes "kept standing (where he was)."

There is a great variety of opinion among commentators with respect to the capacity, in which Joshua is represented as standing before the Angel of the Lord. Theodore, among early expositors, and Hengstenberg, among moderns, maintain that Joshua is seen in the Sanctuary engaged in the work of his priestly office before the Angel of the Lord. Against this view may be urged, that, however high may be the dignity of the Angel of the Lord, it is hardly in accordance with the spirit of the Old Testament to represent the high priest as ministering before him, as if before God. Observe, too, how in i. 12, 13, the Personality of the Angel of the Lord is distinct from that of the Lord Himself. Ewald imagines that at this time the high priest was actually accused, or was dreading an accusation, at the Persian court, and that a defamation and persecution of this kind may be discerned as underlying this vision. But there is no historical trace of any such personal accusation, nor could Joshua be looked upon as the people's representative before the Persian Court, since Zerubbabel was their civil representative. Köhler regards Joshua as standing before the judgment-seat of the Angel, while Satan stands at his right hand (Ps. cix. 6) to accuse him. But, while this interpretation is in the main correct, it must be remembered that no formal judicial process is described in the vision, nor is there any mention of a judgment-seat. Wright's explanation seems to us the best: "The high priest was probably seen in the vision, busied about some part of his priestly duties. While thus engaged, he discovered that he was actually standing as a criminal before the angel, and while the great Adversary accused him, the truth of that accusation was but too clearly seen by the filthy garments with which he then perceived that he was attired."—The filthy garments denote sin (Is. lxiv. 5, comp. iv. 4, Prov. xxx. 9). This sin cannot have been that of marrying strange wives (Ezr. x. 18) as Targ., Qimchi, &c. suppose, for those marriages took place some sixty years later. Nor is Köhler right in referring it to the neglect to rebuild the Temple. For, as Keil
6 And the angel of the Lord protested unto Joshua, saying,

7 Thus saith the Lord of hosts; If thou wilt walk in my ways, and

remarks, had this been the accusation, it would have been rather late, since the active resumption of the work of rebuilding had taken place five months previously (comp. Hag. i. 15 with Zech. i. 7). The view of WRIGHT is almost correct: "The fourth vision (chap. iii.) is connected with the coming of the Lord recorded in chap. ii., in a way similar to that in which the purification of the sons of Levi, spoken of by Malachi, stands related to the prophecy of the coming of the Angel of the Covenant predicted by that prophet (Mal. iii. 1—4).... The high priest was the representative of the priesthood, and the priests representatives of the people of Israel, who were 'a kingdom of priests, &c.' (Ex. xix. 6). Joshua's sin is therefore spoken of in ver. 9 as 'the sin of the land,' whereby the whole people was defiled." It is true, that the priesthood had fallen under special condemnation, "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned my holy things" (Ezek. xxii. 26), so that the sins of the priesthood may well be especially referred to here. But, at the same time Joshua, as the people's representative before God, may be looked on as, in a sense, laden with their sins, as well as with his own and those of the priesthood in particular. We do not, therefore, entirely agree with the last remark we quoted from C. H. H. Wright.—For instances of "standing before" being used of the defendant see Numb. xxxv. 12, Deut. xix. 17, Josh. xx. 6.—With ver. 2 comp. Jude 9.—The persons referred to in ver. 4 are, doubtless, the angels of grade inferior to that of the Angel of the Lord. In this verse the Prophet is assured that the iniquity of Joshua is taken away. He seems to have feared that this might be only a personal absolution, hence his anxiety about the "mitre" (ver. 5). Upon the Miqneopheth was the Ġiq, on which was inscribed Qôdesk l'Adônay, and it was to be always on the forehead of the high priest, "that he might bear the iniquity of the holy things" (Ex. xxviii. 36—38). By the granting of his request, that a clean mitre might be placed on the head of Joshua, he is assured that the high priest is not pardoned only personally, but also in his official capacity.—There is nothing in the word ṭomēd to justify Ewald's statement that the angel, "having risen from the judgment-seat," now lingers, &c.

Vayya'ad is the apoc. Imperf. Hiph. of מֶשָּׁמֶר. The pathach in the last syllable is on account of the י; the normal form of this tense from verbs with medial vav quiescent, is מֶשָּׁמֶר with segol. This verb, when construed with ב, denotes "call another to witness against" (Deut. iv. 26), but also "to testify to," as here; see Jennings and Lowe on Ps. 1. 7 (for other meanings and constructions consult the Dictionaries).

Observe that v'im-eth-mishmarti takes no ga'ayā because it is with a conjunctive accent (Excurs. ii. B. 4). On the form mish-marṭi see note on xi. 3.—The apodosis to im "if," is introduced by אִם "then indeed." Simple ] would have been sufficient to introduce the apodosis (e.g. xiv. 18), but אִם is added.
if thou wilt keep my charge, then thou shalt also judge my house, and shalt also keep my courts, and I will give thee places to walk among these that stand by.

8 Hear now, O Joshua the high

to intensify the declaration, as in a simple sentence like (Job xviii. 5)

“the light of the wicked shall indeed be extinguished”: comp. (Gen. xliii. 22) מַמְרֶפֶן דָּמָּה נְדָע “therefore his blood &c.”: also observe, that מַמְרֶפֶן introduces an interrogative apodosis in Zech. viii. 6. מַמְרֶפֶן is also emphatic. The second מַמְרֶפֶן is used in quite a different sense, it means merely “and also.” Had מַמְרֶפֶן meant “also...and,” we should have expected the following collocation, מַמְרֶפֶן נְדָע... מַמְרֶפֶן נְדָע. Some commentators consider the second מַמְרֶפֶן to be a mere repetition of the former one, for greater emphasis. In this case there is no “and” before the second clause: and so we must render, “Then shalt...: then shalt...”—Chácer “a court” has two plurals, מַמְרֶפֶן וֹיָדִים (e.g. Lev. xxv. 31), and מַמְרֶפֶן וֹיָדִים (e.g. Ezk. xlvi. 22): this latter takes the suffixes in two different ways, viz. (Ps. xcvi. 8) וֹיָדִים וֹיָדִים, and (Ps. c. 4) וֹיָדִים וֹיָדִים (comp. 1 Chron. xxviii. 6).—פָנְתָתִי (on the accentuation see note on i. 3) is dependent on the futures of the preceding clause.—מַמְרֶפֶן is a plur. subst. meaning “places to walk in.” There is a substantive which occurs only in the sing. constr. מַמְרֶפֶן (Ezk. xlii. 4, Jon. iii. 3, 4) and with suff. מַמְרֶפֶן (Neh. ii. 6). Had our word been the plur. of this, we should have expected מַמְרֶפֶן. It appears, therefore, that it must be from an unused word מַמְרֶפֶן, and that its plur. is formed like מַמְרֶפֶן וֹיָדִים (Is. xli. 7), from an imaginary מַמְרֶפֶן וֹיָדִים, and like the plurals of מַמְרֶפֶן and מַמְרֶפֶן which are מַמְרֶפֶן מַמְרֶפֶן and מַמְרֶפֶן מַמְרֶפֶן. The supposition of Ewald, that it is a Hiph. Partic. (of what he calls Aram. form) for מַמְרֶפֶן מַמְרֶפֶן מַמְרֶפֶן “leaders,” would require instead of מַמְרֶפֶן מַמְרֶפֶן to follow.

Mahlečim άναστρεφοµένους, reading probably מַמְרֶפֶן מַמְרֶפֶן LXX.

מַמְרֶפֶן is from the Rt. מַמְרֶפֶן, with which some comp. Arab. יִשְׁט “a sign,” comp. מַמְרֶפֶן וֹיָדִים (Ps. ii. 3) from מַמְרֶפֶן. Anšḗ Words, &c. mophēth lit. “men of sign (portent),” i.e. not men to be wondered at (E.V.), or men standing by as witnesses of the promise (Ewald);
priest, thou, and thy fellows that sit before thee: for they are men wondered at: for, behold, I will bring forth my servant the BRANCH.

9 For behold the stone that I have laid before Joshua; upon one stone shall be seven eyes: behold,

but rather, either men for whom miracles are wrought, or men used to interpret prophetic portents. LXX. has ἄνδρες τερατοσκόποι.—“They” probably includes Joshua. For such a change of person comp. Zeph. ii. 12, “Also ye Cushim slain by my sword are they.”—The צי before היה is not to be translated, it merely introduces the oratio recta, like סרי in the New Test. &c. (comp. Gen. xxix. 33).—מֹאֲבִי can only be taken as a Prophetic Participle, denoting the Future (and so too מְפַתְתֵּךְ in the next verse, which is followed by the Perfect with strong vav umashti “and I will remove”), comp. xii. 2, היה מסחי耸. In such cases there is nothing but the context to guide us to decide, whether the time referred to is near at hand, or distant. Thus, the last-cited passage appears to refer to a distant future; while וְנִלְכָּה (Ezk. xxiv. 17) is shown by the next verse to be the imminent future (comp. Hag. ii. 6).

There is a difficulty in this verse which is so obvious, that one would have thought that it would have occurred to any chance reader of it, whether in the Hebr., or in a translation. And yet it has not been generally mentioned by commentators; indeed we have, as far as we have observed, found it touched on by Arnswald only. It is this: if the Prophet meant by הָאֶבֶן “the stone,” i.e. some particular stone, why does he afterwards say, “on one stone [shall be seven] eyes,” and not rather, “on that stone,” or “on this stone”? Arnswald evades the difficulty by paraphrasing אֶבֶן ’אכָּחָה by אֶבֶן מַלָּחַת; but this is surely not admissible. Accordingly we propose to render הָאֶבֶן “the stones,” viz. the materials for rebuilding the Temple. It is true that, while אֶבֶן is commonly used for “[precious] stones” (e.g. Ex. xxviii. 17, xxxix. 10), מַלָּחַת is generally used for “building stones” (e.g. Zech. v. 4), still we do find אֶבֶן in this latter sense, e.g. (Gen. xi. 3) יָרָה לְהֵמָא דְּבַלְכָּה לַאֲבָנָא "so they had
I will engrave the graving thereof, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day.

... But the question still remains: how are we to take עלי ואבנ אהבה, can it mean “on each stone”? It is quite possible that it may, for the Prophet could not have written שביעי עיניים (the ordinary distributive phrase), since that would have denoted seven different eyes on each stone. But, why did he not use another form of distributive, which would have avoided the repetition, viz. עלי כל אלה וסבכה עיניים, which would have been quite admissible (comp. Esth. ii. 11, iii. 14, iv. 3, viii. 11, 1 Chron. xxviii. 14—18)? This objection can only be answered by calling attention to the fact, that in iv. 2, xii. 12 he does not use the more ordinary distributives. But, should it be thought that this interpretation is not satisfactorily supported by usage, we propose another, and render: “Behold the stones, which I have laid before Jehoshua, upon one particular stone [are] seven eyes.” For this use of the numeral “one” comp. xiv. 7. Practically this latter is much the same interpretation, as that adopted by most commentators, viz. that the Prophet speaks of some particular stone (be it the foundation stone which had been laid in the time of Cyrus, or the stone on which the Ark had formerly stood, or the head-stone, or chief corner-stone); but, we have, we think, explained to our readers the reason why he said “on one stone” instead of “on this stone,” while others have evaded the difficulty.—Observe that here (as in iv. 10) עיניים is construed with a masc. numeral.—The expression pattēch is used of engraving precious stones (Ex. xxviii. 9), gold (ibid. ver. 36), and of carved work (Ps. lxxi. 6), or sculpture (2 Chron. ii. 13).—On the accentuation of umashtē see note on i. 3, on the absence of metheg see Excurs. ii. 1, note. It is impossible to take “And I will remove, &c.” as the sentence engraved on the stone, as many have done; for such an inscription could not possibly commence with נָבֹא conversive and the Perfect. Job xix. 25, “Yet I know, my Vindicator liveth” is in no sense a parallel case (see Delitzsch in loc.).

1 is actually used (Gen. vii. 2) for the of ver. 9; but, then, the preceding sufficiently secures the distributive force of נָשִׁים. Ewald is mistaken (Lehrg. § 313) in taking מְלָכָה אֲחָר (Numb. xvii. 18) as “a rod apiece.” The words imply merely that there should be one rod for the whole family of Levi, although they were divided into Priests and Levites; see Rashi (xixth cent.), Ibn Ezra (xiiith cent.), and Ramban (Nachmanides, xiiiith cent.) in loc.

2 But see Ezek. i. 6, x. 14.
10 In that day, saith the Lord, his neighbour under the vine and of hosts, shall ye call every man under the fig tree.

The Angel of the Lord now proclaims to Joshua a fourfold promise: (a) the confirmation of his official authority, and the elevation of his own spiritual nature; (b) the mission of the Saviour; (c) God's providential care for the House, which was being rebuilt; (d) the peace and prosperity of the nation.—Observe in ver. 7 the introverted parallelism "if thou wilt walk...and keep," "then shalt thou...keep...places to walk." "Walk in my ways" refers to personal holiness, "keep my charge" to the faithful discharge of his official duties. So, on the other hand, "judge my house" and "keep my courts" refers to his spiritual authority as high priest, and "walks among those that stand by" denotes spiritual access among the angels of God's spiritual courts.—Though Zerubbabel is certainly called "my servant" (Hag. ii. 23), the use of the participle, "behold I bring" renders it impossible to interpret the expression "my servant Branch" of him. It can only be referred to the promised Saviour of Israel, or "Branch of the Lorn" (Is. iv. 2), a "Righteous Branch," "Branch of Righteousness" (Jer. xxiii. 5), "a Righteous-one my servant" (Is. liii. 12), "my servant David" (Ezek. xxxiv. 23). See further Remarks on chap. vi. 11—15, and comp. Remarks on ii. 14—17.—On ver. 9 refer back to the notes. EWALD supposes the "seven eyes" to have been engraved on the stone, and thinks that they represent the seven Spirits (Rev. i. 4). But, it seems in every way best to understand the seven eyes as denoting God's special, yet all-embracing Providence, which is being directed towards the stone to watch and protect it. Various symbolical meanings have been given to the stones. The only one of them, which is at all reasonable, is this, that it typified the Messiah (comp. Ps. cxviii. 22, Is. xxvii. 16). But, we prefer the interpretation which we gave above in the notes.—"In one day" cannot refer to "the day of Golgotha" (HENOSTENBERG), for how could ver. 10 be applied to that day? How could xii. 10 sqq., and ii. 9, 10, be possibly referred to the same event? The meaning seems to be simply this, that the completion of the work of rebuilding would be the seal of the people's forgiveness, and restoration to favour.—The wording of ver. 10 is a reminiscence of 1 Kings iv. 25, Mic. iv. 4, &c. It is a renewal of the promise contained in Jer. xxxiii. 6, and a declaration of its speedy fulfilment.
CHAPTER IV.

AND the angel that talked with me, as a man that is wakened out of his sleep,

FOURTH VISION. THE GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.

On the form vayyāshōbh see notes on iii. 5. The simplest rule for deciding the vocalization of a word with a suffix, like יְהַלְוֵי, is the following: when by the addition of a suffix (or accentuated syllable) the accent is drawn towards the end of a word, count back three vowels from this new accentuated syllable (both inclusive), and remove (α) the third vowel if it can be removed; if it cannot, remove (β) the second; (γ) in some cases none of the vowels can be removed. E.g. (α) The Imperf. Hiph. of יְהַנֵּר is יְהַנַּה, when the suffix is added the accent falls on ...rena: now yā is the third syllable from rē, therefore remove the qāmaq and put shēva, and you get יְהַנַּה, similarly חָפִיחֵךְ plur. חָפִיחֵךְ. (β) חָפִיחֵךְ “thou wilt break in pieces,” when it takes the suffix em, cannot lose the third vowel from the accent, viz. pathach, because it is supported by dagesh, therefore remove the second vowel šere, and you get חָפִיחֵךְ, and similarly all Pres. Partic. Qal which have Ơ in the first syllable (which is characteristic of the Partic. and is immovable) lose the second vowel, as לְמָלְךָ plur. לְמָלְךָ. As an instance of (γ) take הֲכָבִיחֵךְ plur. הֲכָבִיחֵךְ, and comp. note on ii. 3.—יְהַנֵּר is the Niph. Imperf. of יְהַנֵּר (of the form of נְהָוִים), the chiriq under the yēd being changed into şere by way of compensation, since the š cannot be doubled.—Since יְהַנֵּר “sleep” comes from Rt. יָנִוי, it loses its first vowel when it takes a suffix, comp. יָנִוי “congregation,” יָנִוי, while יְהַרְאוּ “testimony” (which comes from יְהַרְאָה) retains its vowel, thus יְהַרְאָה. Consequently there is no difference between שְׁנַעַה “his sleep” from שְׁנַעַה, and שְׁנַעַה “his year” from שְׁנַעַה.
2 And said unto me, What seest thou? And I said, I have looked, and behold a candlestick all of gold, with a bowl upon the top of

The C'ṭēḇh (רָאָתה) seems to have arisen from the fact that the words, which follow, rā'ēḇh v'ḥinnēh, which generally mean "I looked, and behold!" are more appropriate to narration, than as the answer to the question: What seest thou? As answer we should have expected יְהַבַּה יְהַבַּה "lo! I see," or יְהַבַּה יְהַבַּה (v. 1) "I see." The "vayyōmer" of the C'ṭēḇh must be looked on as parenthetical, thus: "I looked (said he) and behold," &c., comp. v. 6, 8, and the common introduction in Arabic of qāla "said he" in narration. Taking the Q'rē "and I said," we must understand rā'ēḇh v'ḥinnēh in the sense of "I see, and lo," &c.—יְהַבַּה יְהַבַּה "its bowl" might be explained as from a dār. λεγό, or as standing for רָאָתה (from gullāh ver. 3), as רָאָתה (Hos. xiii. 2) is for בְּרֵיתָם. But, apart from considerations of the difficulty of explaining יְהַבַּה, I regard יְהַבַּה (with the Hē ṣḥēḇ'āh) as the right reading. For, it will be observed that things which must of necessity belong to a candlestick such as "top," or which belonged to the Candlestick of the Tabernacle, viz. "the seven lamps," are marked by the pronom. suff. to denote that they were proper to it, "its top," "its seven lamps," but, when other points are mentioned which would not naturally have been expected, such as the "pipes," the "olive-trees," the "spouts," they are without the pron. suff. Now this "bowl" was not a thing to have been expected: not a thing, in fact, which could be called "its bowl." Therefore, in accordance with some MSS., we read יְהַבַּה יְהַבַּה "and a bowl." For the absol.

form of numeral before a defined substantive comp. (Josh. vi. 4)

— Shibh'āh v'shibh'āh mūcāḡōth lannērōth, it has been disputed whether two numerals joined by y can be distributive, i.e. whether these words can denote "seven pipes apiece to the lamps." It is certain that this is not the usual construction, we should rather have expected shibh'āh mūcāḡōth shibh'āh mūcāḡōth lannērōth (or l'nēr echād), comp. Is. vi. 2. But 2 Sam. xxi. 20 has been aptly cited to the contrary, the passage runs: יִדְיוֹ אִישׁ אֲנָצָבְתָהוּ יִדְיוֹ אֲנָצָבְתָהוּ רְאוֹלִי שֹׁשַׁשׁ עַשְׁיָרָה מַמֵּסֶר which should be rendered "and there was a man who had six fingers to each hand, and six toes to each foot, twenty-four in all."
it, and his seven lamps thereon, which are upon the top thereof:
and seven pipes to the seven lamps,

In 1 Chron. xx. 6 the same passage occurs, but with the following variation, that the words “hands and feet” are not mentioned, it simply says סלע ודי עקר ג' לארשי וסלי ניקרא. Now, those who dispute the distributive sense of סלע וליד say, that “six and six” means that his hands had $6 + 6 = 12$, and his feet had $6 + 6 = 12$, total 24. That is to say, they divide the 24 fingers and toes into two groups of 12 fingers, and 12 toes, each of which groups is represented by סלע וליד. But in giving this explanation they overlook the fact that they take סלע וליד as equivalent to סלע וליד סלع ולידי סלע ולה סלע ולידי סלע ולה סלע לה סלע ולה סלעIFICATIONS}
3 And two olive trees by it, one upon the right side of the bowl, and the other upon the left side thereof.

cancels the הָעָבְרוּ before הָעָבְרָה, and construes the הָעָבְרָה, which follows הָעָלְיוֹן, with that clause, and renders thus, “and its lamps upon it were seven.” This construction is natural enough in Ex. xxv. 37, xxxvii. 23, where the candelabrum is first described, but here “and its seven lamps upon it” is the collocation we should expect. (See above.) —Pressel has made a clever suggestion, viz. that “seven” is repeated on account of its importance as corresponding to “the seven eyes of the Lord.” He would render: “seven (was) the number of its lamps above the same—seven—and seven the number of its pipes.” But, our objection to Hitzig’s translation applies also to this: and, moreover, had this been the meaning of the prophet, it is hardly likely that he would have written הָעָבְרָה in such an equivocal collocation, but would rather have written הָעָבְרָה מחפר “seven in number.” —נֶּר is correctly construed with a masc. numeral (comp. Prov. xx. 27, xxiv. 20, and my Fragment of P'sachim, p. 40, note). —מִתְקַפָּת in the sense of “pipes” is a בְּן. lcyג. Gesen. and Fuerst are wrong in calling it a fem. substantive as the numeral here shows. It is to be considered as a subst. formed from the Hiph. of יָצָק (עֹצַק) viz. mawṣaq = mawṣaq = mōṣaq and then = mōṣaq (comp. מָלָס, and מְסָס “foundation”). The interchange of o and u is not uncommon, thus we have נבּוֹבְcoration (Esth. iii. 15), and נְבּוֹבְcoration (Ex. xiv. 3); קְבּוֹרֵן, usually Qorbán, is in Neh. x. 35, xiii. 31 qurbán; the Biblical מְלָק makes in Rabb. the plur. מְלָקִים; Rabb. מְלָקִים is pronounced Prozbul, and Prozbel; in old Jewish epitaphs we find נפּוֹס for nepos, APOSTVLI for apostoli, MAIVRES for maiores, and ΦΑΟΧΤΙΝΙ for Faustini.

‘אַלָּא “by its side,” as בַּעֲרָה “by the sea” (Ex. xiv. 2), comp. ‘אָל- g’mōlāk “at its left hand.” LXX. has εἰπάνω αὐτῆς.—

Verse 2.

The student should observe that when מ is prefixed to a word beginning with י, the yud quiesces in the chiriq, and no compensation is made for the loss of the i, therefore we have יָלוּל; for this use of יָלוּל see note on v. 3, and comp. ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιρροείσθην στήναι (Xen. Cyr. 2. 2). The construction is different in ver. 11.

So I answered and spake to the angel that talked with me, saying, What are these, my lord?  

Then the angel that talked with me answered and said unto me, Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my lord.

Then he answered and spake unto me, saying, This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.

Who art thou, O great mountain, in illustration of our remarks on i. 9 we will now give several instances of the first person imperfect of verbs, verse 4. Words.

In illustration of our remarks on i. 9 we will now give several instances of the first person imperfect of verbs, verse 4.

It is necessary that the student should observe that the accent on י, being placed before the word, is disjunctive, and therefore the י of דֹּבֶהָר retains the dagesh lene (see Excurs. iii. 1). This accent is called Yathibh. But when it is placed on the tone-syllable as יַבֵּלָה it is conjunctive, and, therefore, the בֹּגָדֶרFaTh letter following is יַפְּדָעַה. This accent is called Mahpacc (comp. p. 3).—The addition of μεγάλη by LXX. is merely a free rendering.

There is no difficulty in the use of יְּוָנ “who?” (not יִּמ “what?”) even if we do not regard “the great mountain” as a personal adversary, or as a personification of oppositions generally. For יְּוָנ is often used where in English we require “what?” Thus (1 Sam. xviii. 18) יְּוָנֵי הָיוֹדָה יִּו “who am I, and who (what) is my
tain! before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain: and he shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it.

life?" (comp. Ex. x. 8, Judg. xiii. 17, Mich. i. 5).—Har-haggādōl “O great mountain”; with the omission of the article before the substantive. “A great mountain” would be hār gādōl; “the great mountain” or “O great mountain” would properly be הָרָה הָגָדוֹל; but the article is sometimes omitted with the noun, e.g. יְהֹוָה “the sixth day” (Gen. i. 31), יְהֹוָה אַבְרָהָא “this Ephrathite” (1 Sam. xvii. 12), for הָיְשָׁה הָאֲפָרָהִית הָאָזֶה (comp. Zech. xiv. 10).—לָמִישָׁה is most graphic; by one single word is expressed “thou shalt become a plain!” For this use of ה with the verb “to be” omitted comp. (Lam. iv. 3) עָלָם לָאָבֹר; and for the omission of other verbs for the sake of terseness comp. (Hos. viii. 1) אֶלְעָבֹד שָׁמְרָנָה עֲלֵיהֶם.­­

“he shall bring out.” The perfect with strong vav is often used, independently of any foregoing verb, to express a future, the expectation of which is rendered reasonable by the statement of the preceding clause, as (1 Sam. xvii. 36) “Both the lion and the bear thy servant slew, this uncircumcised Philistine shall be like one of them.” So here, the statement “Who art thou O great mountain, before Zerubbabel? “[Thou shalt become] a plain!” prepares the way for the promise “he shall bring out.” The ה is better, as in many cases, left untranslated in English.—לָאָבֹר is a אַת. λεγό. (on the simān rāphēh see Excurs. iv.), it can only be regarded as a fem. formation from לָאָבֹד denoting “head,” and must be in apposition with לָאָבֹד, and the two words together must be rendered “the head-stone.” Substantives are sometimes in Hebrew (with or without def. art.) put in apposition, where in Aryan languages we should have a Tat-purusha compound genitively dependent as birth-place, brick-house: thus (ver. 10) we have הָאָבֹד הָבֹר “the lead-weight,” or “plumb-line,” (2 Kings xvi. 14) הָלוֹאָבֹד הָנָשָׁה “the brass-altar,” תָּבָד הָבֹרָה “the brass-oxen” (ver. 17), הָעָבֹד הָנָשָׁה “the corpse-and-ashes-valley” (Jer. xxi. 40), הָעָבֹד הָנָשָׁה “the gold-wreaths” (Exod. xxxix. 17), שֵׁעֲרַע שֵׁעֲרַע “seven-year-famine” (2 Sam. xxiv. 13), מָיִם לָעָבֹד “affliction-water” (1 Kings xxii. 27). The same construction is found in Arabic (with the art.) e.g. aç-çanam udh-dhababu “the gold-image,” aç-culbān ul-khashbu “the
Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,
9 The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house; his hands shall also finish it; and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto you.

wood-crosses.” — ἀνάψεως “with shoutings,” it is the acc. of nearer definition, comp. ἀναίρεσις ὑπ' “with one mouth” (1 Kings xxii. 13). But one cannot state definitely, whether it is in the absol. or the constr. state, because (1) such substantives are of the same form in both states, (2) either construction is admissible, viz. apposition, “With shouts, ‘Grace! Grace! to it’” (see above in this note); or annexation, “With shouts of ‘Grace, Grace! to it’,” as (Ps. lxxxi. 5) “the saying of ‘I know not [the Lord, Ex. v. 2]’ I will take cognizance of.” — Chên, see xii. 10.

It is by no means unusual to find the LXX. treating Hebr. words, as though they were Aramaic: τοῦ καταρθώσαν. Versions.

versions. Is an instance of this. They have taken ἀνάψεως as the Aram. infin. of ὑπ' or ἀναίρεσις; the student will understand this, when he is told that ἀνάψεως is the Aram. for ἀνάψεως τῆς κληρονομίας, reading the word, apparently, ἀνάψεως, comp. ὑπ' (Numb. xxiv. 18) LXX. κληρονομία. Aq. for ἀνάψεως gives ἔντεινοντα. — ἴσωτα χάριτος χάριτα αὐτῆς. Lāh is taken as the simple possessive, thus χάριτα αὐτῆς represents Chên Lāh. ἴσωτα χάριτος represents ἴσωτα χάριτος, the first of these two words being pronounced Tashəweth, a noun from the verb ἴσω, of the form of ἴσω to ἴσε. Ῥνίβα from Ῥνίβα. (This noun in Aram. is generally used of the thing smoothed, e.g. pavement, pillow, bed.) Aq. has ἴσωσσα χάριτος, and Syr. and Vulg. refer the word to the same root.

The note attached to ἰσώσσα means that it has pathach although with ethnách. This form (when from verbs third root-letter y or n) always takes pathach in this syllable, e.g. ἰσώσσα ἰσώσσα (2 Kings ii. 24), ἰσώσσα (Job xxxix. 3), ἰσώσσα (ibidem) and even other verbs, which would otherwise have ġērē (like ἰσώσσα, ἰσώσσα, ἰσώσσα) take pathach in pause, as ἰσώσσα (Hos. iv.
10 For who hath despised the day of small things? for they shall rejoice, and shall see the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel with those seven; they are the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth.

Verse 10. — Words. Since there is no neuter gender in Hebr. the fem. is often used to supply its place either in the sing. as (Numb. xxii. 18) qōnannah ṣōndōlah "any thing great or small," or in the plur. as here (comp. qāsēth Gen. xlii. 7, 30). LXX. gives wrongly ἵπταντες μυρπάς.

On hā'ēbhen hābbâlīl see note on ver. 7.—Bunsen translates this verse "For they who have despised the day of small things, they will rejoice and see the lead-stone in the hand of Zerubbabel; these seven are the eyes of YHVH roaming through the whole earth." This rendering is grammatically defensible, comp. Gen. xlv. 9 (quoted in note on xiv. 17), יְבָלִיל being used (comp. Ex. xxiv. 14, Judg. vii. 3) indefinitely "whosoever" as equivalent to יִנְשָׁא בָה (Ex. xxxii. 33). But it would be a strange thing for the Prophet to promise joy to mockers. Köhler renders vām'chā, &c. "while these seven see with joy," &c.; but this is an impossible translation, since in a clause descriptive of the state or circumstance beginning with וָֽאָ֫ב, the וָֽאָ is usually prefixed to the subject, e.g. יִנְשָׁא בָה בָּה, "the camp being in confident security" (1 Kings i. 40), but never to the Perfect.—The first clause "For, who hath despised the day of small things?" denotes: "surely none (who hopes to achieve great things) ever despised the day of small things!" and so is practically equivalent to a prohibition: "Let none despise the day of small things." After such a clause the perfect with וָֽאָ denotes the result of compliance with the prohibition, "Then shall they see with joy the plummet in the hands of Zerubbabel, [viz.] these seven." Of the two verbs יָ֖שָׁלָה יִנְשָׁא the former is best rendered by the adverbial expression "with joy," comp. (v. 1) יִנְשָׁא אָמֽעַ "and I lifted up again," יָ֖שָׁלָה might similarly be rendered "and I said in reply." The last half of the verse should be rendered "The eyes of YHVH, they are scouring the whole earth"; or, neglect-
11 Then answered I, and said unto him, What are these two olive trees upon the right side of the candlestick and upon the left side thereof?

12 And I answered again, and said unto him, What be these two olive branches which through the two golden pipes empty the golden oil out of themselves?

ing the interpunctuation, we might render the words “The eyes of YHVH are they, scouring the whole world” (for this constr. of the partic. see iii. 1), comp. LXX. ἐπτά οὖτος ὀφθαλμοῖς εἰσὶν κυρίον οἱ ἑπτὰλβποντες. They ought, however, to have omitted the art. before the partic., comp. LXX. of vi. 1. In either case the last half of the verse is a farther description of “these seven.” It need hardly be said that ἱσχύσαι ἔλλην ἸHVH cannot mean “these seven eyes of YHVH,” which would have been ἦν οὐράριον ἡ ἡμέρα (or ἦν ἡ ἀλήθεια or ἦν ἡ ἀλήθεια (comp. Dan. i. 17).

Mal. see Excurs. iv.—The sing. ἐπτάλβατα “a stream” (Ps. lxix. 16), “ear of corn” (Job xxiv. 24), makes plur. ἐπτάλβατα (comp. ἐπτάλβατα plur. ἑκατέρα). The construct (which occurs here only) is pointed ἐπτάλβατα (not ἐπταλβατα) by one of those irregularities of traditional pronunciation, for which no reason can be assigned. The word seems to mean here “pendent bunches of olives.”—It is impossible (with C. H. H. Wright) to render the next clause “which by means of the two channels of gold are pouring forth, &c.,” for in that case we should have had ὡς μέσα τοῖς ἐπτάλβατοι, not since the clause is introduced by ἐπτάλβατα. ἐπτάλβατα is a ἀρ. λεγόμενος. meaning probably “spouts” (see Dictionaries); it is masc., as is shown by the numeral. This clause we render: “which are resting in the two golden spouts.”—

Hebrew must mean “in the hand of,” i.e. resting in; but see note on vii. 7. It can hardly mean “by the side of,” for the figurative expression בים נגש “nigh at hand” (Job xv. 23) will not justify the rendering. To express this it would have been rather בים (ver. 14), בים (1 Sam. xix. 3), בים (1 Sam. iv. 18), בים (2 Sam. xiv. 30), בים (Josh. xv. 46), or בים (Judg. xi. 26).—Israḥ is a ἀρ. λεγόμενος in the sense of “the gold[en oil].” The clause should be rendered “which pour the golden oil out from themselves,” grammatically it refers to the spouts, not to the olive-clusters (which are fem.).
13 And he answered me and said, Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my lord.

14 Then said he, These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth.

By'ád, év tais xéros. — For the át. λεγό. γενέθρωθ they give μνυστήρων.

LXX. — they render τῶν ἐπισχεόντων καὶ ἀπαναγόντων τάς ἐπανυποτίσδας τάς χρυσὰς to them, as to us, hazzáhadbh is a difficulty: we solve it by supposing "the gold" to mean "the golden oil"; they by understanding it as "golden pipes (or funnels)" (comp. ver. 2). καὶ ἀπαναγόντων evidently corresponds to ἐπισχεόντων, which they seem to have read as ἐπισχεόντως the Hiph. Partic. of 'aláh "to go up."

לאה is a substantive of the same form as the proper name לאה.

Verse 14. "Isaac." This word is nowhere else used of oil-for-anointing. It is used to denote oil as the juice of the olive, the produce of the ground, just as tirósh is used of wine as the produce of the vine. But yáin is used of wine fermented for drinking, and shemen of oil prepared for burning (שמן למאחר), or for anointing (מה שמן). On the metheg of há'médím see Excurs. II. A. 9.— יָנ denotes "by," see on ver. 3.

It can scarcely be doubted, that the prototype of this golden candlestick is the candlestick, which was placed in the holy place of the former Sanctuaries "before the Lord, as an everlasting statute for their generations on behalf of the children of Israel" (Ex. xxvii. 21). This Candlestick is not mentioned among the vessels of the Sanctuary brought back from the Captivity. It may be that it was the very lack of this important article of the Temple furniture, that impressed the form of it on the Prophet's mind. Be this as it may, the form of Candlestick of the Vision is evidently based on that of the Temple, and Tabernacle. But, at the same time, that of the Vision differs in several points from the other. In the Candlestick of old the lamps had need to be trimmed every evening, by the Priests, while in this the oil poured itself spontaneously from two olive-clusters, and was communicated to the lamps by such a number of pipes, as in an actual lamp would seem almost impossible. The angel-interpreter declares that the significance of the Vision is this: that all difficulties should subside before Zerubbabel, and that he should complete the building of the Temple, and bring forth the head-stone thereof with shouts of "Grace, grace to it!" But, this was to take place by no human power (such as was used for keeping the lamps of the Candlestick alight in former times), but by the Unction from the Holy One: "Not by might, or by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts," "Do not then," says the direct revelation of the Lord, "despise the small beginnings of the work, and then the eyes of God's all-embracing Providence, which are specially directed on this
work of rebuilding (iii. 9), will yet view with benign satisfaction the completion of this material building by the hand of Zerubbabel.” But, as though the Lord looked with pity on the weakness of human faith, and to explain the meaning of the two olive-clusters, He deigns to reveal to the Prophet the two human instruments by which this work was to be consummated, saying “These (the two olive-clusters) are the two anointed ones,” i.e. Zerubbabel the Prince of the House of David, the civil head, and Joshua, the High-Priest, the religious head. Thus should this Building be completed. And, as the Candlestick of old had been a symbol of the diffusion of the light of Divine Truth by the Congregation of Israel, whose duty it was (and ever is) to be witnesses to the Truth of the Unity of God, so should this new Building become the centre, whence should go forth the Light to lighten the Gentiles, and to be the Glory of His People Israel. (Comp. the close connection in ch. iii. between the assurance of God’s providential care of the work of building, and the promise of the mission of the Messiah.)

CHAPTER V.

THEN I turned, and lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a flying roll.
2 And he said unto me, What seest thou? And I answered, I see a flying roll; the length thereof is twenty cubits, and the breadth thereof ten cubits.

SIXTH VISION.—α. THE FLYING SCROLL. β. THE WOMAN IN THE EPHAH. γ. THE TWO. WOMEN WITH STORKS’ WINGS.

Translate “and I lifted up mine eyes again,” see note on iv. 10.—which we know to be a participle from its being accentuated migra', see note on ver. 4, and on xiv. 18) may be taken as merely an epithet, “a flying scroll,” or better, perhaps, as denoting the circumstance or state, “a scroll, flying” (comp. iii. 1, vi. 1, 5).

LXX. for Megillah have δῆμαρχος, understanding the word in the sense of ἔντεκα “a sickle.” Aquila and Theodotion δεκαθέρα. Gr. Versions.

Symm. κεφαλίς, var. lect. εἶλημα.

From the wording of this verse the reader will perceive the force of our note on the Q’rei and C’thobh of iv. 2.—The expression [measured] by the ammah” is common (comp. Ex. xxvi. 8, &c.). τοὺς (masc. τοὺς ἄνθρωπος) is fem. to agree with ammbth understood in the δ’ ammāh.
3 Then said he unto me, This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole earth: for every one that stealeth shall be cut off as on this side according to it; and every one that sweareth shall be cut off as on that side according to it.

4 I will bring it forth, saith the Lord of hosts, and it shall enter...
into the house of the thief, and into the house of him that sweareth falsely by my name: and it shall remain in the midst of his house, and shall consume it with the timber thereof and the stones thereof.

though it is found (Is. iii. 25 נָתַתְךָ, LXX. κατάλαυφθείς μόνη) of a city being laid waste. The Targ. gives נָתַתְךָ (vapulans) "being judicially-smitten," giving practically the right meaning, and preserving to a certain extent, if not the original word, at any rate the sound of it. They may have taken נָתַתְךָ as a Niph. partic.; or as an Imperf. (see Fragment of T. B. P'sachim, pp. 1—8); or as equivalent to נָתַתְךָ, cf. נָתַתְךָ, even in Bibl. Hebr. There is no reason for supposing (with Gesen.) that they read the word as נָתַתְךָ. The LXX. give essentially the same rendering, either from the Targum or collateral tradition, or translating in accordance with the context. Symm. δόκησεν δῶσαι.

Verse 4. Words. These words are both accentuated mit'el (see note on page 16), consequently they are the 3rd pers. fem. Perfect, not the Pres. Partic. (see note on xiv. 18). נָתַתְךָ stands for נָתַתְךָ, and this is the only instance of final אָכָל becoming אָכָל in the Perfect; but, in the Imperf. we have נָתַתְךָ (1 Sam. xxviii. 15), נָתַתְךָ (Ps. xx. 3); in a fem. partic. pass. נָתַתְךָ (Is. xxxix. 5). The case of the substantive נָתַתְךָ (Ps. viii. 7) is not parallel: for, in the first place, if this stood for נָתַתְךָ we should have expected it to have been accentuated on the first syllable (see note on lây'lah i. 8); secondly, the form נָתַתְךָ (Numb. xxxii. 24) points to a collateral form נָתַתְךָ or נָתַתְךָ. Note that while in Arab. dâ'in ( Palest) means "a single sheep," and the plur. dâ'n ( Palest) means "sheep," there is also a verb dâna-a ( Palest), one meaning of which is (according to Freytag) "multa fuerunt (pecora)."—Since בָּיִת "house" is masc., the suffix of Cîllattâ (3rd fem. Perf. Pi'el of נָבָל) is masc. to agree with it. The only instances of the

1 It is quite within the bounds of possibility that many Hebr. nouns which we call "collectives" are in reality "broken plurals."
5 Then the angel that talked me, Lift up now thine eyes, and with me went forth, and said unto me, See what is this that goeth forth.

3rd masc. suffix with the 3rd fem. Perfect of verbs quiescent יָד are this יָדָה, and יָדָה הָלַח (Prov. vii. 21). The (usual) form of the 3rd fem. Perfect, with 3rd masc. suffix, in the Qal, Hiph. and Polel, is in át-há, e.g. יָדָה (Prov. xxxi. 12), יָדָה (Jer. i. 43), יָדָה (Ezk. xxxi. 4), but with the Pi'él it is always átū, as יָדָה (Prov. xxxi. 1), יָדָה (1 Sam. xvi. 14), יָדָה (Job xxxiii. 20). The full form of the 3rd fem. Perfect is that which occurs in Pause, viz. gāmālāh, when this takes the suffix it reverts to its older form in t, viz. gāmālat. Now observe how, in accordance with the rule given in note on iv. 1, when the accent leaves māl and falls on lát, the vowel third from the accentuated syllable goes away, and we get gāmālāt. The next example cited, viz. ḫeq'āqāth-hu'1, is an instance of a word in which both the second and third vowels from the accent are immoveable. In all the other cases the third vowel (from the accent) is immoveable, but the second has been removed.

ני, contrast the position of the tone in יב (iv. 1). The reason of this difference is, that all verbs, whose last root-letter is X, retain the tone on the ultimate even with vāv conversive, and are, therefore, an exception to the general rule given in our note on i. 9. Thus all such forms from יב are mī'tra', e.g. יב (Gen. vii. 7), יב (viii. 11), and Hiph. ייב (Neh. viii. 2), ייב (Ezk. xl. 3), but commonly ייב; and so ייב (Jon. ii. 11) from יק. And thus also ייב (Gen. xxviii. 17) from יר, and from יר, Qal ייב, ייב (Gen. iv. and xxx. 16), Hiph. ייב (Gen. xv. 5), ייב (Judg. xix. 15), ייב (Gen. i. 12).—But forms, which end in X on account of the apoc. of the final ה, are mī't'el according to rule, e.g. יב

1 A sh'va, be it quiescent or moving, simple or compound, is not a vowel, or a semivowel, nor does it ever count in grammar as a syllable. It is merely a sign to show that there is no vowel belonging to the consonant under which it is placed.
6 And I said, What is it? And he said, This is an ephah that goeth forth. He said moreover, This is their resemblance through all the earth.

7 And, behold, there was lifted (Ps. xviii. 11) from הֵלֵךְ (Job iv. 5) from הָלַךְ; also אָמִיק (Deut. xxxiii. 21), an anomalous form from אָמַק or אֵם.—“What is this that goeth forth?” would be properly mah-zzōth hayyōqēth, our text denotes “what is this goer-forth?” in which two sentences there is a distinction of phraseology, but hardly a difference of meaning. “What is this going forth?” would be mah-zzōth yāqēth.

LXX. καὶ ὑδὲ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον τοῦτο, taking ἡμ as indefinite (comp. p. 46, and LXX. ix. 17), which is impossible in this collocation.

“And I said: ‘What is it?’ And he said: ‘This is an ephah which is going forth: this (continued he) is their appearance in all the earth.’” The use of the def. art. with ἐφαθ is that which writers on the New Test. call monadic. The def. art. in such a case denotes merely a chance specimen of the known class. Thus ἡ ἐφαθ here denotes “a specimen of the thing, you know so well, viz. the ephah-class.” This is a distinct Hebraism. It is common in the Mishnah (see my Fragment of T. B. P'sachim, p. 95, note 36), as well as in Bibl. Hebr. In the Talmudim and Midrashim the idiom becomes still more marked, and we have not “the” but “that” to denote τό. Thus, while ἡ ἐφαθ may mean “that man” (in which sense it is often used to denote “I” (or “thou”), like ἄνηρ ὁ δεῖ, and ὁ ἄνηρ, as equivalent to ἔγω), it very generally stands merely for ἄνηρ τό.—For ὠγημόνερ used parenthetically comp. ver. 8, and note on iv. 2 C'háb.—For יִשְׂו in the sense of “appearance” comp. (Numb. xi. 7)

יִשְׂו כְּנָחָה רַבָּה (comp. Lev. xiii. 53).

For יִשְׂו LXX. has ἀδυία αὐτῶν, reading ἦν. Jerome observes that if the Hebr. word had ἐν instead of ὁδ “recte legetur onam ut LXX. putaverunt.” He seems to have thought that יִשְׂו was of the form of יִשְׂר, and made constr. יִשְׂר (see note on יִשְׂר p. 25). Symm. paraphrases πρὸς τόυτο ἀποβλέπουσιν.

Ciccar is the constr. of Circár (which is a contraction of the unused Circár, comp. פַּרְמֵב which stands for פַּרְמֵב). The word is fem. see (2 Kings v. 5) פַּרְמֵב כַּכִּים כֵּמֶשׁ. It has two plurals פְּרִמֵב in the sense of “talents,” and פַּרְמֵב “cakes of
up a talent of lead; and this is a woman that sitteth in the midst of the ephah.
8 And he said, This is wickedness. And he cast it into the midst of the ephah; and he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof.

bread” (Judg. viii. 5).—חָרָסִי must be taken as the Niph. Partic. fem. like בּוֹזֶא (Deut. xxx. 11): and so too must it be in לֹאָלֶה מְלֵלָה (1 Chron. xiv. 2); unless we point the word חָרָסִי after the form יָֹלֶה (Ps. cxxviii. 23), comp. יָֹלֶה (Is. xxiii. 15), חָרָסִי chap. 1 (Jer. li. 9 q'ri), יָֹלֶה (2 Sam. i. 26).—אָחָד may be easily explained, if only we follow the context and the rules of grammar. It cannot be taken as equivalent to חָרָסִי, “[and I looked] and behold one woman,” because (1) חָרָסִי is never so used, (2) throughout the visions חָרָסִי, חָרָסִי always introduce an explanation of the angel interpreter. This verse, and the first clause of the next one, are merely a continuation of the angel’s words. In verse 7 he points out to the Prophet the scene that was passing before his eyes, and in the beginning of verse 8 he explains its import. The angel says, “And behold (i.e. and you may see) a disc of lead being lifted up, and this [which you now see on the removal of the disc] is a woman sitting in the midst of the ephah, and this (continued חָרָסִי) is Wickedness.”—Isshah achatth might be rendered “a certain woman” as חָרָסִי (1 Sam. i. 1) “a certain man” (רֵעָז); but such a translation would be unsuitable here. Or it may be taken as “one woman.” Or achatth may be used merely as the indef. article, as (Dan. viii. 3) חָרָסִי “a ram.”

חָרָסִי as a very personification of Wickedness, so (2 Chron. xxiv. 7) חָרָסִי is applied to Athaliah.——ןָֹשֶׁל, the singl. imperf. of the Hiph. with vav convers. (as a general rule) takes ℱ instead of ℄ in the second syllable, comp. יָֹבַל (Gen. i. 4), but not so the plur. (usually), thus יָֹבָל (Ezek. xxxix. 14). The angel-interpreter seems to be the agent.—The use of the def. art. identifies theпечат in the הָאָבֵר mentioned above: אָבֵר denotes of the Q'ri with the consonants of the C'thibh.

1 The C'thibh should be read חָרָסִי from חָרָסִי=חָרָסִי. Stade, Gramm. i. p. 241, gives, strangely enough, the vowels
Then lifted I up mine eyes, and looked, and, behold, there came out two women, and the wind was in their wings; for they had wings like the wings of a stork: and they lifted up the ephah between the earth and the heaven.

Then said I to the angel that talked with me, Whither do these bear the ephah?

And he said unto me, To build it an house in the land of Shinar: and it shall be established, and set there upon her own base.
became *hunničah*. On the other hand we find in Biblical Chaldee such a Hophal as יִהְיֶה, "she was set up" (Dan. vii. 4), so that those have some ground to stand on who call this a Chaldaism. But I prefer my own explanation, since the Hebrew of the Post-captivity Prophets is especially (and intentionally) free from Chaldaisms.

LXX. *καὶ εἰρυμάσαε*, either reading יָבֹא as the Hiph. יָבֹא; or else taking יָבֹא for יָבֹא (as in ver. 3), and reading יָבֹא, which Root they render in 1 Sam. ii. 3, 2 Kings xii. 12 by the verb εἰρυμάζω.

This is but one vision in three dissolving views. (a) The flying scroll denotes the curse upon sinners against the Words of the Two Tables (Exod. xx.). The dimensions of the scroll are those of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, and of the porch of Solomon's Temple. Some commentators consider its measurement to be symbolical. If so, it is best to understand it as meaning, that transgression is not to be measured by man's standard of right and wrong, but by that of the Lord, who deigned to give a special sign of His Presence in the Sanctuary. With verse 4 may be compared the well-known story of Glaucus, and the Delphic oracle concerning *Oath*, who "hath a son nameless, handleless, footless, but swift he pursues until he seize and destroy the whole race and house" (Herod. vi. 86). (b) Next a woman, who is Wickedness personified, appears sitting in an ephah. A leaden disc is cast on the mouth of the ephah to prevent her emerging; then (γ) two women, with strong ample wings (the like of which the prophet may have seen in the grotesque figures of Babylon), bear down on the ephah, and carry it off to the land of Shinar, where it is to be finally deposited. This vision appears to be, not only a confirmation of ch. iii. 9, but also an implicit exhortation to the people to leave in the land of their Captivity (the land where mankind first organized a rebellion against God, Gen. xi. 2) the sins, which had caused their deportation thither.

CHAPTER VI.

And I turned, and lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and out from between two mountains;

Seventh Vision.—The Four Chariots.

In the singl. we have בְּרָכָה and מְאָסָּה (ver. 2), but in the plur. always בְּרָכָה, by the common interchange of *a* and *e* (comp. notes on ix. 5, x. 9). That this change is not caused by the heavy termination of the plur. (as C. H. H. Wright, quoting Ewald's § 131) word יָבֹא (Dan. viii. 11) is imaginary on his part, he has read the vowels of the Q'ri with the consonants of the Q'ṭhibb; the word is יָבֹא, or יָבֹא.
and the mountains were mountains of brass.
2 In the first chariot were red horses; and in the second chariot black horses;
3 And in the third chariot white horses; and in the fourth chariot grisled and bay horses.
4 Then I answered and said unto the angel that talked with me, What are these, my lord?

Koehler, supposes) is shown by the fact, that the plur. of תָּנִים is תָּנִים (Song of Songs vii. 8, comp. Gen. lx. 10) while the constr. is equally תָּנִים (Deut. xxii. 32) and תָּנִים (Song of Songs vii. 9): similarly we have תָּנִים (Numb. iv. 9) and תָּנִים (Ex. xxv. 38), comp. the common Rabbinic form of substantive מְנִין "that which is devoted to sacred purposes," which is derived from the Hiph. Infin. מִנֵּין (comp. note on LXX. xiv. 17).—Vhīhārīm hārē n‘chbsheṭh is a nominal clause, comp. v. 9.

The last-mentioned horses have two epithets applied to them, בְּרֹדְדִים. The latter of these cannot possibly be understood as applying to all the four different coloured horses, since in that case the prophet could only have written מִנִּים. It is strange that two epithets should be applied to one set of horses here, and only one to each of the other sets, both here, and in chap. i. But the greatest difficulties in this passage are (a) that, while in this verse the בְּרֹדְדִים are identified with the מִנִּים, in verses 7 and 8 the two are most unmistakably distinguished: and (β) that no mention of the בְּרֹדְדִים is mentioned. The Syr., either having a more correct Hebr. text in this passage, or more probably making a conjectural emendation, omits the word מִנִּים in this verse, and in ver. 7 substitutes מִניִים for בְּרֹדְדִים. And this reading we are compelled to follow, for the present text commits our Prophet to writing in a meaningless style, such as would not be tolerated for a moment in any secular writer. For LXX. see p. 13. For בְּרֹדְדִים Symm. and Theodotion give πελίκων. For מִנִּים (ver. 3) Aq. has καρποῖ, but in ver. 7 he has πυρροῖ as though reading, with Syr., νθαδύμμουμ; in ver. 7 Symm. has υπερφυγίες, and Theod. ἐπηφόροι. In the sense of “strong” מִנִּים would be a δ. λεγό.; but מִנִּים (and בְּרֹדְדִים) is common in this sense (it would, of course, be possible to point מִנִּים.
5 And the angel answered and said unto me, These are the four spirits of the heavens, which go forth from standing before the Lord of all the earth.

6 The black horses which are therein go forth into the north country; and the white go forth after them; and the grisled go forth toward the south country.

7 And the bay went forth, and sought to go that they might walk...
to and fro through the earth: and he said, Get you hence, walk to and fro through the earth. So they walked to and fro through the earth.

8 Then cried he upon me, and spake unto me, saying, Behold, these that go toward the north country have quieted my spirit in the north country.

"Then cried he upon me," this is an old English expression for "calling by name," "calling out for," "summoning" (comp. Verse 8.

"who calls on Hamlet?" Shakespear, Hamlet, iv. 2. 3;

"to cry on, or upon" he uses, however, in a different sense, see As iv. 3. 150, Rom. iii. 3. 101); it is as much stronger than "he called me," as vayyaz'eq ḥālā is than vayyiqra li. יָנָעַר (on the form see note on v. 8) is used of "summoning," "calling together," in Judg. iv. 10, 13, and other forms of the Hiph. in the same sense in 2 Sam. xx. 4. 5.—לִבְנַעַר "have given rest to," E. V. rightly "have quieted" (see note on v. 11). לִבְנַע "spirit" is here used, as in Judg. viii. 3, in the sense of "wrath." For the phrase "to quiet anger" see Ezek. v. 12, xvi. 42, xxiv. 13. LXX. seem to have read רַעֲנַנָו, or perhaps rather רַעֲנִי, since they give Kai ἀνέπαυσαν.

There is no absolute need, on account of the use of the def. art., to understand the "two mountains" as two mountains well known (see notes on i. 8). Since they are spoken of as being "of copper" it is evident that they are ideal, rather than real mountains. HENGSTENBERG supposes that they represent the power of God, which shields His people; BAUMGARTEN thinks that they symbolize the two central points of the world-power. But, though they are ideal, they had probably their prototype in reality. Thus PRESSEL takes them as Zion and Moriah; WRIGHT as Zion and the Mount of Olives. This last seems the more probable, because the Mount of Olives is spoken of in Zech. xiv. 4, and Mount-Zion is represented as the place from which God executes His judgments (Joel iii. 16), and because between them lay the valley of Jehoshaphat, which Joel describes as the judgment-place of the world (iii. 2).—The four chariots are said to be "the four winds of heaven," that is probably, as EWALD says, "they went forth as swiftly as the four winds of heaven into the four parts of the world, driven along, as it were, by the wind-angels as charioteers" (comp. Ps. civ. 4). From ver. 8 we know that, whatever else they were, they were God's agents in executing His just wrath on the nations.—With regard to the difficulties concerning the colours of the horses, which we have mentioned above, HIRZIG ascribes them to the carelessness of the writer. But we agree, rather, with MAURER, who suggests that the use of המַעֲצִים in ver. 7 (whence probably it crept into ver. 3) is due to a blunder of an early copyist. WRIGHT tries to get over the difficulty by supposing that the דַּעַמִּים signify the Babylonian Empire, and that they were introduced into the vision for completeness' sake, but that they were most suitably (JEROME) passed over in the interpretation, because the day of the real power of Babylon had passed away. He maintains that the וָרוּדְדִים (ver. 6) are identical with the המַעֲצִים (ver. 7), as
9 And the word of the LORD came unto me, saying,
10 Take of them of the captivity, even of Heldai, of Tobijah, and of Jedahiah, which are come from Babylon, and come thou the same day, and go into the house of Josiah the son of Zephaniah;

they are in ver. 3, as the text now stands. He supposes that the bruddim are represented as going forth as directed to the land of the south, and then because they were "muzim, "strong," as asking for further permission to traverse the whole world. But the text will not bear any such interpretation. The bruddim (ver. 6) are evidently distinct from the muzim (ver. 7). The text is hopelessly corrupt, and can be made intelligible only by adopting the reading (or emendation) of the Syr:ac. The horses in the chariots are bay, black, white, and iron-grey. These colours have no symbolical significance. They are used merely as the common colours of horses, and to distinguish one chariot from another. The chariots may denote kingdoms, but certainly not those of Daniel. They are at all events God's instruments of vengeance. Two are sent to the North (viz. black, and white) because there were two powers there to be overcome, the remnant of the old Asshur-Babylonian, and the Medo-Persian. The grey go to the South, i.e. to Egypt, which country revolted from Darius, and was reconquered by Xerxes: then after a series of revolts was finally subdued to the Persian power by Ochos, and was afterwards wrested from the hands of Persia by Alexander the Great. The bay seek, and obtain, permission to go through all the earth, signifying probably that Israel's Protector would defend them, not only against their ancient enemies, but also against any who should rise up against them from any quarter whatsoever.

THE SYMBOLICAL CROWNING OF JOSHUA.

Lagach is the Infin. Absol. used emphatically, and stands for the Infin. followed by the Jussive, or Imperative (comp. iii. 4). — הָלַח and הָלַח (of mekhelday) are identical in meaning (see examples in note on xiv. 17). — הָלַח is properly the fem. of the partic. הָלַח (2 Sam. xv. 19), and so is here rightly used of "exiles"; but it is often used for the abstract "exile," e.g. (Ezra iv. 1) הָלַח. On the other hand הָלַח is properly abstract, meaning "exile" (see note on ix. 15), but is often used for the concrete "exiles," e.g. Jer. xxiv. 5. — Ubbathî attah bayyom hahâ "and enter thou thyself that very day." Ubbathî (mi'ra') is the Perf. with vav convers. (see note on v'âmartâ p. 5), it follows naturally after the Imperative implied in הָלַח (see pp. 5, 6). The "thou" and "on that day" are emphatic. — הָלַח is, equally with the ubbathî above, the Perfect with vav convers., but it is accentuated on the penultimate on account of the disjunctive accent, Rb'he (see (2) in the note on p. 5). The ubbathî is repeated, because
11 Then take silver and gold, upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest;
12 And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; 13 Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and 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.

bind it me as a crown, it seems to be used of a single crown, or fillet. This word (in the singl.) is sometimes used of a royal crown, e.g. (2 Sam. xii. 30) their king's crown (on the metheg see Excurs. ii. A. 2). LXX. have here στέφανος.

Verse 12.
not "the man," but "a man of distinction" (comp. Is. xxxii. 12, Zech. viii. 23), ἀνήρ (but see note on xiii. 5).— is placed before mittachtāv because the preceding clause includes the idea of some such word as נב "is coming" (see note on ii. 10).— מַהֲרֵה denotes "from his place," the expression is found again only in Ex. x. 23, comp. tachēthā "in her place" (Zech. xii. 6, xiv. 10).— Observe the intentional use of the verb yigmāch with the name Cēmāch. —The verb הַבְּנֵי is used figuratively, comp. (Gen. xvi. 2) וְאַבְנֵי "perhaps I shall be built up of her." The expression הֶכַל YHVH is also used figuratively (see Remarks below), as are also וּנֵיה (Hos. viii. 1), and בֵית (Hos. ix. 15, Num. xii. 7), viz. of the spiritual community of Israel (comp. oikos Θεοῦ Heb. iii. 6, I Tim. iii. 15).

The הָאֵל is in both cases emphatic, and is used to distinguish Cēmāch from the crowned High-Priest, who merely pre-figured him. The verse should be rendered: "Yea He will build the temple of YHVH [i.e. He will be the true builder], and He will bear majesty, and will sit and rule upon His Throne, and will be a Priest upon His Throne, and a Counsel of Peace will be between Them twain." The expression בֵּית יְהוֹה is difficult. We see no way of interpreting it, except of the only two Persons mentioned in the verse, viz. YHVH and the Priest-King (but see Versions and Remarks). We should rather have expected the expression בִּין אלהיו "between Him and His God": as the words stand they must have sounded most enigmatical to the Prophet's bearers.— advisers, while it is employed in a variety of other significations, is especially used of royal majesty (Ps. xxi. 6, Jer. xxii. 18, Dan. xi. 21).—It seems more natural to take the suff. of cisó "His throne" as referring to
14 And the crowns shall be to Zephaniah, for a memorial in the temple of the Lord.

the Subject of the whole sentence, than to refer it to YHVH. אֵלָי (which seems to have been originally a quadrilateral, comp. Arab. cursiy, Syr. cursyŏ) means an ordinary seat (1 Sam. i. 9, iv. 13), where it is accidental that it was a High-Priest who is mentioned as sitting on it. But the word is used chiefly of a royal throne, e.g. אֶרֶם (Gen. xli. 40), לָוַּהּ מִלְּכָּתוֹ (Deut. xvii. 18), &c.—לָוַּהּ sometimes means “a prince” (as in 2 Sam. viii. 8), but the expression “High-Priest” (ver. 11) precludes that interpretation here.—Another rendering of the last half of the verse is grammatically admissible, viz. “And there shall be a priest near his throne, and a counsel of peace shall be between them twain” (comp. LXX.). For this use of יַסְיֶה comp. iv. 14. This rendering has one advantage over the other, viz. that the interpretation of בֵּן אֲשֶׁרֶה is rendered easier, by supposing the King and the Priest to be different persons. But, on the other hand, since the construction of וַחֵיה is exactly the same as that of וַיְשָׁבָהו and וַעֲבָדִיל, it seems much more natural to suppose that the subject of וַחֵיה is the same as that of the other verbs (see Remarks).

Targum paraphrases ver. 12 thus: “Lo the man, The Messiah His name, is destined to be revealed and anointed [comp. Verses 12, 13. Versions."

Targ. Y., Lev. iv. 3, &c.,] and shall build the temple of YHVH.” The next verse is literally rendered, as we have done (but there are two readings “and shall be a High-Priest,” or “and shall be a ministering Priest”). Syr. omits the last words of ver. 12 ubhānāh eth-hēqāl YHVH, while LXX. omits the first words of ver. 13 ㅗhā yibhēnē eth-hēqāl YHVH: both translators seem to have regarded the words as dittographed, through their not having observed the emphatic force of ㅗh. —For the last half of ver. 13 LXX. give καὶ ἐσται ἵππος ἐκ δεξίῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ βουλή εἰρηνικὴ ἐσται ἀνά μέσον ἀμφοτέρων, substituting ἱπποῦς for ἴππος, and regarding Ἀναρωτίζω, τρόφιμον as two different persons.

בִּינָה seems to be simply a corruption of הִבִּי (ver. 10). One of David’s heroes was called Cheldāy (1 Chron. xxvii. 15), and this name is written בִּינָה (1 Chron. xi. 30), and בִּי לָו (2 Sam. xxiii. 29). Here the same name has become בִּינָה: for the
15 And they that are far off shall come and build in the temple of the LORD, and ye shall know that the LORD of hosts hath sent me unto you. And this shall come to pass, if ye will diligently obey the voice of the LORD your God.

In spite of the contrary opinion being expressed by such Hebr. commentators as Rashi, Qimchi, &c. we maintain that to render ירר as equivalent to הבוא ויהי למל "and this shall happen unto you" is contrary to the usage of the language. The expression ויהי im shaimo' תילק"ון seems to be borrowed directly from Jer. xxxii. 24, where (as in every other passage where a similar expression occurs, viz. Deut. xi. 13, xxviii. 1, Ex. xv. 26, x ix. 5, xxiii. 22) there is an apodosis. Consequently, unless with Hengstenberg we look on this verse as an abrupt aposiopesis, we have no choice but to regard it as a case of a lacuna in the text (משה נאמעינ לפוק see Josh. iv. 1, &c.), the existence of which has not been handed down by Tradition.
For, as Pusey has well remarked, had a crown been placed on the head of Zerubbabel, such an act would have aroused false hopes in the minds of the people of a restoration of the temporal kingdom, which had already been finally abolished (Jer. xxii. 30, Ezek. xxi. 31, 32). The crown was removed “until he should come whose right it is,” viz. “the king who shall reign in righteousness” (Is. xxxii. 1) “and prosper,” as “a Branch of righteousness” (Jer. xxiii. 5). Since Zerubbabel is not even mentioned in this passage, Joshua himself must have felt that the Prophet's words referred to One greater than himself, and that the building spoken of was a spiritual one, to symbolize which the material building was allegorically introduced.—The interpretations of ver. 13 are various—we will note the chief of them. Hitzig holds that the Messiah and an ideal priest are referred to in the clause “counsel of peace shall be between them both.” But we cannot see how the thought of some ideal priest and king, who would coincide in some unity of purpose, could have occurred to the minds of the Prophet's hearers. There would be, moreover, no special reason for speaking of unity as existing between a king and a priest: for, as a matter of history, the priests and kings were seldom at variance, though the prophets and kings were frequently so. Rosenmüller considers that the offices of priest and king are alluded to. But “a counsel of peace” could not be spoken of as existing between two abstracts. Keil takes the words as referring to the two characters of ruler and priest combined in the person of the Messiah. But in this case the clause would be superfluous. Why should there not be unity between two such characters combined in one such person? Kohler thinks that the reference is to the two offices of the Messiah, and that the prophecy speaks of a plan devised by the Messiah in His double character, whereby peace and salvation should be secured to His people. But this is in accord with the modes of thought of neither Old nor New Testament. Such an idea would have been incomprehensible to the Prophet's hearers; and in the N. T. any such unity of design for the salvation of mankind is spoken of as existing between the Father and the Messiah (not between two of the offices of the Latter), e. g. John vi. 38, x. 15—18, iii. 16, 17, Col. i. 19, 20. The opinion of Jerome, Vitringa, Pusey, Wright, &c., is that which we have adopted above in our notes. Seeing that the regal dignity of the Messiah must have been generally recognised in the Prophet’s time (see Jer. xxiii. 5, &c.), and that, from Ps. cx. the combination of the priestly with the kingly office in the person of the Messiah must have been expected by his contemporaries, it seems to us that they would have understood the Prophet to have referred to the same person as “sitting and ruling upon his throne,” and as “being a priest upon his throne”: and that, however they may have taken the words of Isaiah ix. 6, “Wonder Counsellor, El gibbor, Abhi Olam, Prince of Peace,” such words must have somewhat prepared them for the statement, “the Counsel of Peace shall be between Them twain.” To us, who have the advantage of later revelation, there is a fitness apparent in the phraseology, which would have been hidden from them.
CHAPTER VII.

And it came to pass in the fourth year of king Darius, that the word of the Lord came unto Zechariah in the fourth day of the ninth month, even in Chislev;

2 When they had sent unto the house of God Sherezer and Regem-melech, and their men, to pray before the Lord,

3 And to speak unto the priests...
which were in the house of the Lord of hosts, and to the prophets, saying, Should I weep in the fifth month, separating myself, as I have done these so many years?

Then came the word of the Lord of hosts unto me, saying,
5 Speak unto all the people of the land, and to the priests, saying, When ye fasted and mourned in the fifth and seventh month, even those seventy years, did ye at all fast unto me, even to me? 

6 And when ye did eat, and when ye did drink, did not ye eat for yourselves, and drink for yourselves? 

7 Should ye not hear the words which the Lord hath cried by the former prophets, when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity, and the cities thereof round about her, when men inhabited the south and the plain?
8 And the word of the Lord came unto Zechariah, saying,

9 Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Execute true judgment, and shew mercy and compassions every man to his brother:

10 And oppress not the widow, nor the fatherless, the stranger, nor the poor; and let none of you imagine evil against his brother in your heart.

There can be no doubt about הֵמָּה being used for emphasis before the subject of a verb (even when not a passive): moreover in viii. 17 we have an exact parallel. In the verse before us we have (hêlô) et-haddôbhârîm “(are not they) the very things?”, and then follows the relative governed directly by a verb “shêr qârê “which He proclaimed.” So in viii. 17 we have (ći) eth-col-êlîeh “(for) all these very-things (are they),” and then follows “shêr sânéthîî “which I hate.”—פַּרְשָׁת בֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Two renderings, both of which are equally admissible, have been proposed for the following clauses, viz. “when Jerusalem was inhabited, and at peace, and her cities round about her: and the South, and the Lowland was inhabited”: and “when Jerusalem was dwelling in security, and her cities round about her: and the South, and the Lowland dwelling (similarly)”; but see p. 15. והנהגה stands for בְּהוֹרֵי הָגָן בָּרוֹן.

Observe that the predicate yôshâb is in the masc. sing.; comp. (Prov. xxvii. 9) "oil and perfume rejoice the heart.”—

The Negeb is the southern district of Judah extending to Beersheba (Josh. xv. 21 sqq.).—The Sh’phelah (Σεφήλα 1 Macc. xxii. 38) is the Lowland district of Judah, towards the west (Josh. xv. 33 sqq.).

ץָחָהֵתָהּ תָּוָּנְנָאֵמָא. דַּיְּהַבָּה שִׁבָּעֵה קַיָּעָּזְנְיָנְאָה. There is also in ver. 3 a reading תַּעְנָאֵמָא for עַהַא (Field).—לֶאֱלָה et-haddôbhârîm oîv oûvai oî lôyô;—חַהוֹרֵי הָגָן חֶרֶשׁוֹנִים rightly here תָּוָּנְנָאֵמָא תָּוָּנְנָאֵמָא כָּפָר הָבָּיָא (see p. 7).

Mîshpât “mêth “true judgment”: in viii. 16 we have “mêth umîshpât shâlôm “truth, and justice which tends to peace,” comp. Verse 9.

“כּיָּת שָׁלֹם (vi. 13).—Sh’phôtâ is the correct pausal form of shîph’tâ (viii. 16).—ish eth âchina “with one another” (see next verse).

אָל-תָּאָשְׁגָע on the methegs see Excurs. ii. B. 3 and A. i. 6.—The expression תַּעְנָאֵמָא אֶת שִׁבָּעֵה אֶת שִׁבָּעֵהוֹב requires some explanation.—אֵשָׁנָא is in apposition with ēsh, and ēsh means “each,” and so ēsh âchina in Gen. ix. 3 means “each his brother,” that
11 But they refused to hearken, and pulled away the shoulder, and stopped their ears, that they should not hear.
12 Yea, they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in his spirit by the former prophets; therefore came a great wrath from the Lord of hosts.
13 Therefore it is come to pass, is “each other.” But here it does not mean “each his brother,” but “each your brother,” i.e. “one another”; because, seeing that no such formula as (ךֹל or) יָאָרִי אֲשֶׁר (or רִאָר), comes to be used for the second as well as the third person e.g. (iii. 10) יִהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר לְרַעַת, Now, ish ַךָךָּוָּא ַךָךָּוָּא אֱלֹהֵי, ish ַךָךָּוָּא is the objective gen. after râ‘âth, and so the whole expression râ‘âth ַךָךָּוָּא ַךָךָּוָּא means “evil against one another.” In this collocation it is impossible to take ַךָךָּוָּא as the nom. (LXX.) καὶ κακῶς ἐκαστὸς τοῦ ἀπελθὼν αὐτοῦ μὴ μητροκακείαν. But in the more simple and ordinary construction (viii. 17) יָאָרִי יִהְיֶה, ish is the nominative. We need not lay more stress on the expression each his brother (either here or in Gen. ix. 3), than to remember that this Hebrew expression, and others like it, arose from the ethical truth of the brotherhood of all mankind, which is an essential principle of the Hebrew Scriptures. The idiom was afterwards applied to the brute creation and to things inanimate.

The verb ַךָךָּוָּא is, in prose, usually construed with ל and the Infin.

Verses 11, 12—The normal form of the Hiph. Infin. constr. is with ל as l'hagsh'îd, and of the absol. in ל as v'hulbesh (iii. 4).—The expression ַךָךָּוָּא יִהְיֶה הָלֵיהָ בְּרֶשֶׁט recurs only in Neh. ix. 29, it means “and offered a recusant shoulder,” like an animal refusing the yoke.—The יָאָרִי of mishš'mòth denotes “so as not to,” or “in order not to,” in both verses, comp. (Gen. xxvii. 1, &c.) יְנִיחַ אֱלֹהֵי. When, as here, min with the Infin. follows a verb denoting a deliberate act, it is equivalent to יִהְיֶה with the Subj. (comp. Is. vi. 10).—Shâmâ, comp. ix. 13.

Vayyittânâ câteîph sôráreth kai ἐδωκαν νῶτον παραφρονοῦτα.—Shâmâv, explaining the metaphor, ἀπειθη.

In the sing. we have always יִהְיֶה, but the plural in Pause is always יִהְיֶה: so too always יִהְיֶה and יִהְיֶה (e.g. x. 7); but, while the partic. of the one is always יִהְיֶה from shâmâ, that of the other is always יִהְיֶה from sâmâch.—Yâshâr, (on the
that as he cried, and they would not hear; so they cried, and I would not hear, saith the Lord of hosts:

14 But I scattered them with a whirlwind among all the nations whom they knew not. Thus the land was desolate after them, that no man passed through nor returned: for they laid the pleasant land desolate.

munach, to which the note בְּמֶנֶא = "two accents" refers, see Excurs. ii. B. 9. N.B. is the Piel and stands for בְּמֶנֶא, the N being pointed with a full çërê, comp. בֵּן (for unused בֵּן) "bake ye" (only in Ex. xvi. 23), בֵּן (for unused 'tha) "come ye" (Is. xxi. 12, &c.). This is merely a variation in vocalization, but no Aramaism, though it is true that in Syr. an initial N (when pronounced) has always a vowel.— is the 3rd pers. perf. from בָּשֵׁם, the fem. partic. would be בָּשֵׁם.—Shammâh is a subst. meaning "a desolation."

The בָּשֵׁם of ver. 13 and the nàshakeh of ver. 14 show that and are pasts. They should be render "So they kept calling" (comp. note on i. 5) "and I would not hear...but I scattered them (on several occasions)."—לָשֵׁם is used, and not בָּשֵׁם, because the countries of the nations are especially thought of here, comp. (Jer. xvi. 13) מִתָּבֻלָה יַסְתֵּק מְעַל הֵאוֹרִים מִמֵּא וּמֵני מִמֵּא "and I will cast you out of this land into a land," &c.—אֱישׁ לֹא יִשְׁבָּנֵי may be either "whom they knew not," or "who knew not them."—Mössbôher umishshâbh. In Ex. xxxii. 27 we find the Imperatives עַבֵּר שֶׁבֶב "pass ye up and down" (through the camp): in Ezek. xxxv. 7 the participles עַבֵּר שֶׁב denote "all inhabitants." This latter is the meaning here, "so that there were no inhabitants," the מ being privative, comp. (Jer. xlvi. 2) מַגְוָי. In ix. 8 we have exactly the same expression פָּאָרָה וּמְשֶׁבֶת, but there the מ is used in the sense of "on account of," and the expression denotes "on account of him [or the army] that passeth up and down [the country]."—אִשׁ פָּאָרָה is a reminiscence of Jer. iii. 19, and is now looked on as a sort of proper name, hence the omission of the art., comp. Çémâch (iii. 8, vi. 12).—The ordinary constr. in prose of יִשָּׁב (which may be taken as Hiph., or as Qal like יִשָּׁב) is, as here, with the acc. of the thing made, and of
that into which it is made, as (Gen. xxi. 18) "I will make him into a great nation."

For *wayēhā kal čərtaš*, reading יָאוֹן, and consequently the other verbs also are put incorrectly in the future.

CHAPTER VIII.

AGAIN the word of the LORD of hosts came to me, saying,

2 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; I was jealous for Zion with great jealousy, and I was jealous for her with great fury.

3 Thus saith the LORD; I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and Jerusalem shall be called a city of truth; and the mountain of the LORD of hosts the holy mountain.

4 Thus saith the LORD of hosts;
There shall yet old men and old women dwell in the streets of Jerusalem, and every man with his staff in his hand for very age.

5 And the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof.

6 Thus saith the Lord of hosts; If it be marvellous in the eyes of the remnant of this people in these days, should it also be marvellous in mine eyes? saith the Lord of hosts.

7 Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Behold, I will save my people from the east country, and from the west country;

8 And I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God, in truth and in righteousness.

9 Thus saith the Lord of hosts;
Let your hands be strong, ye that hear in these days these words by the mouth of the prophets, which were in the day that the foundation of the house of the Lord of hosts was laid, that the temple might be built.

10 For before these days there was no hire for man, nor any hire for beast; neither was there any peace to him that went out or came in because of the affliction: for I set all men every one against his neighbour.

'Statara (Hebraice יָתָהּ הָרִיבָּה תַּעְיָעַ) "what time he hid himself." (The case of יָרְבָּה́ תַּעְיָעַ Hos. i. 2 is doubtful, for there is a substantive יָרְבָּה́ תַּעְיָעַ Jer. v. 13, comp. R. D. Qimchi's Introd. Poem to his Comm. on Pss.).—Hăăḥēḥāl in apposition with Bēth YHVH: there is no need, with Hitzig, to regard it as a gloss.—רָזְתַּנְבַּנְוָה "for the purpose of being built," i.e. when its foundations were laid for this purpose. LXX. give what they conceived to be the sense of the passage, and render freely ἀρ σε νέρας τεθηκένων...καὶ ὁ ναὸς ἄνε σφικνόδομηται. There is no need to suppose that they read רָזְתַּנְבַּנְוָה (see p. 3, last line).

'Sāḵār "hire" is masc., and with it nīḵyād agrees; but יָנְיָא is attracted into the gender of יִרְבָּה (see note on vi. 6).—Nīḵyād is the 3rd sing. Perf. masc. of יִרְבָּה (on the màʻaric see Excurs. ii. A. 7). The Niph. of this verb occurs only in the Perf. and Partic. It generally means "happened" (Judg. xix. 30), "was caused" (1 Kings xii. 24), "was undone," i.e. "went off" (of sleep, Dan. ii. 1), or (into a swoon, Dan. viii. 27). In Joel ii. 2 נָרְבֵּי deceit means "was not," and so here. Observe that the tense of יָנְיָא is decided by the context.—ָיֵי "on account of" (comp. ix. 8).—יָנְיָא "the enemy," from יָנ (Is. v. 30), Rt. יָנ (comp. יָנ from יָנ, יָנ from יָנ), the qāmāq is on account of the disjunctive accent.—יָנְיָא is the correct reading (not יָנְיָא). Some of these cases, in which we have vā when we should have expected vā, may be explained as being the Imperf. of repeated action, as ὑμίκαι (Judg. vi. 9) "and I kept driving them," הָיָנְיָא (xx. 6) "and kept sending her" (comp. Zech. vii. 14). But others can only be explained as instances of anomalous vocalization as הָיָנְיָא (Judg. xx. 6) "and I cut her in pieces," הָיָנְיָא (2 Sam. i. 10) "and I slew him." Vā shallāch...
11 But now I will not be unto the residue of this people as in the former days, saith the Lord of hosts.
12 For the seed shall be prosperous; the vine shall give her fruit, and the ground shall give her increase, and the heavens shall give their dew; and I will cause the remnant of this people to possess all these things.
13 And it shall come to pass, that as ye were a curse among the heathen, 0 house of Judah, and house of Israel; so will I save you, and ye shall be a blessing; fear not, but let your hands be strong.
14 For thus saith the Lord of hosts; As I thought to punish you, when your fathers provoked me to wrath, saith the Lord of hosts, and I repented not:

ο μωσῆς...οὐκ ἤταν εἰς δόγμαν καὶ...οὐχ ὑπάρχει, not only have they read ἤτοι as ἦτος, from the Rabb. and Aram, ἦτος "to enjoy," but they have taken the initial τ as the Rabb. or Aram. prefix of the Fut. (comp. p. 51); Μῖν ἁγγεῖον...από τῆς θηλεύς καὶ ἕξαποστελέον.

Cayyānim hārishōnim denotes "as in the former days," since after a preposition is often understood, e.g. (Is. ix. 3) ἦτοι "as in the day of Midian."—ἡτοί "I am," or as E. V. "I will be"; there is no need with LXX. to supply any such verb as τοῦτο.—τοῦ "for" introduces an assurance in proof of the statement of ver. 11. Zéra' hashšalām "the seed [which flourishes only in times] of peace," viz. ḫaggēphēn "the vine." In Jer. ii. 21 the word zēra' "seed" is used of ἔτος (see p. 12) in the expression ἔτος ἀληθῆ "genuine seed" (the καλὸν σπέρμα of Matt. xiii. 24). For εἰ zēra' shalām Syr. gives "for the seed shall be in peace." LXX. ἄλλα ἡ δεῖξαι εἰσήκνη, εἴ might possibly stand for ἐκ βίος (as in Gen. xxxi. 16 after a negative sentence); but here there is hardly sufficient contrast between the two sentences to justify this rendering. For ἔτος they read possibly ἔτος, Hiph. of ἔτος, which they render by δείκνυμι in Gen. xlii. 39, &c.

'īrāl (comp. i. 6) in the 1st pers. Perf. this verb occurs here only in its uncontracted form, and only in Jer. iv. 28 contracted. Verses 14—17. Words, Constructions and LXX.
15 So again have I thought in these days to do well unto Jerusalem and to the house of Judah; fear ye not.
16 These are the things that ye shall do; Speak ye every man the truth to his neighbour; execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates:
17 And let none of you imagine evil in your hearts against his neighbour; and love no false oath: for all these are things that I hate, saith the LORD.
18 And the word of the LORD of hosts came unto me, saying,
19 Thus saith the Lord of hosts; The fast of the fourth month, and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth, shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts; therefore love the truth and peace.
20 Thus saith the Lord of hosts; It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities:
21 And the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, here they may have read שָׁבַחַת “I thought,” “I intended,” for שָׁבַחַת; or, perhaps, taking שָׁבַחַת as “again,” they paraphrased the expression by two words of cognate meaning.—רָאַת (ver. 16) etk here means “with.”—Vvsh etk-ra’ath ro’thu see note on vii. 10.—Ct etk-col-ideh “shér sânéthu see note on vii. 7, and add as an example of this construction (Hag. ii. 5) הַתּוֹדֵרֵרוּ אֵשׁ כַדְּחֵי אָתוֹכֵי מְלֻשִׁים. LXX. simply διότι ταύτα πάντα ἑμψίσσα.

Verse 19. LXX. and Constructions.

Verse 20. Constructions and LXX. 

For the expression ἀκήθατ εἰς ἀκήθατ “one to another” comp. Ex. xxxvi. 10, 12, 13.—בַּלַּבּ and בַּלַּבּ (with final ת) are certainly “energetics,” or “voluntatives” here (see p. 6).—The absol. Infin. הָלְכֵכ, though put after the verb is used for the sake of
Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts: I will go also.

22 Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord.

23 Thus saith the Lord of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you.

emphatic, comp. "listen attentively" (2 Sam. iii. 24). "I also will go." On this usage of the 1st pers. sing. see note on vii. 3.

Gam-dau see note on vii. 5. LXX. καὶ συνελεύσονται κατακόουτες πλντες πόλεις εἰς μίαν πόλιν, borrowing the word "five" possibly from Is. xix. 18 "In that day there shall be five cities..., one shall be called..."—לִהְיוּת בֵּיתֵי יָרוּה. and so in Gen. xviii. 18 "five" but the word means "numerous," "strong," not "many."

We find בֵּיתֵי יָרוּה (Gen. vi. 4, &c.), and also בֵּיתֵי יָרוּה (Zech. v. 9).—verse 23.

On the construction of נַח הָאוֹב see note on ver. 20; LXX. εὖν, taking "shér as equivalent to כי “if” (ver. 6), and כי as introducing the apodosis. On כִּנָּפֶק see note on vi. 10.—The number ten is used for an indefinitely large number (e. g. Gen. xxxi. 7). In the passage (Is. iv. 1), which our Prophet seems to have had in mind, the number seven is used in this sense.—The expression שֵׁמוֹת הָבָיְא יָמוּן "languages of the nations" is formed after שֵׁמוֹת הַגְּדוֹלִים "the nations and the languages" (Is. lxvi. 18), comp. Dan. iii. 29, vii. 14, &c.—Cūnāph (constr. כִּנָּפֶק) is the name of the corner of the long flowing garment then worn by the Jews. To each of these בֵּיתֵי יָרוּה the נַח הָאוֹב was attached (Numb. xv. 38): this was the distinctive visible sign of an יָרוּה (Nebuchadnezzar). "For he had heard that he was departed from Lachish."

This mission took place b.c. 518, in the second year after the resumption of the work of rebuilding the Temple (Hag. i. 15), and about two years before its completion (Ezr. vi. 15).—Two hundred and twenty-three men of Bethel and Ai had returned "to Jerusalem and Judah, every one to his own city." (Ezr. ii. 28). The four fasts referred to in viii. 19 are of (17th) Tammuz when a breach was made in the walls of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in.
the eleventh year of Zedekiah (Jer. iii. 5—7): (9th) Abh, when the Temple was destroyed by Nebuzar-adan in the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. lii. 12, 13, 2 Kings xxv. 8—10): (3rd) Tishri when Gedaliah was assassinated (2 Kings xxv. 25, Jer. xii. 2—6) B.C. 587: 10th Tebheth, when Nebuchadnezzar began to lay siege to Jerusalem (2 Kings xxv. 1, Jer. xxxix.) in the ninth year of Zedekiah. (The number of the day of the month is placed in brackets, where from the Biblical account there is some doubt as to the exact day.)—The people of Bethel seem to have been the representatives of all the people, at all events the reply is given to the whole nation (vii. 5). Though the mission came in the ninth month, no question was asked about the fast of the tenth month, but only about that of the fifth month. The reason of this appears to be, that the fast in Abh being in mourning for the destruction of the Temple, it was natural that, now the rebuilding of it had progressed so far, they should inquire whether that particular fast should be kept. The Prophet in his first reply mentions also the fast of the seventh month, which was kept in memory of the assassination of Zedekiah, which took place soon after the destruction of the Temple. The 70 years to which he refers are those between the 7th month B.C. 587 and the 9th month B.C. 518. He does not, even in viii. 19, give a definite answer to their question, but warns them against the sins which brought about the deportation of the nation, and promises that their land shall once more be fruitful and prosperous, and their fasts be turned into feasts, if only they will "love Truth and Peace."—Chap. viii. closes (ver. 20—23) with the promise of a glorious future for Israel, in many nations uniting themselves to them to serve the One Only God; comp. Mic. iv. 2, Is. ii. 2, 3, xlv. 14, and Zech. ii. 10—12, xlv. 16—19. Ver. 23 must not be taken as a direct prophecy of the coming of our Lord, for the expression "a man a Jew" is used in the singular merely for the sake of contrast with the "ten men from all languages of the nations," and in reality denotes not an individual Jew, but the whole Jewish nation (see Is. xlv. 14). At the same time the adoption of Christianity (the true development of Judaism) by the Gentiles was a distinct fulfilment of this prophecy.

CHAPTER IX.

THE burden of the word of the LORD in the land of Hadrach, and Damascus shall be the rest thereof: when the eyes of man, as of all the tribes of Israel, shall be toward the LORD.

ןַעַמְל, which first of all means "a burden," comes afterwards to be very commonly used of "an oracle" or "prophecy" (comp. especially Jer. xxiii. 33—40), and that, generally, of a threatening character. The Root is נָעַמ "to take up"; as a man takes up a burden, so a prophet is said in Hebrew to "take up" his speech, compare (Numb. xxiii. 18) יָעַמ נָעַמ "and he took up his parable." It is only in the post-exilian prophets (Zech. ix. 1, xii. 1, and Mal. i. 1)
And Hamath also shall border thereby; Tyrus, and Zidon, though it be very wise.

that מָשֵׁה is followed by בּ. In Arabic the conjugation, corresponding to the Hebrew Hiphil, of the verb nasha-a means "to lift up," (Hebr. מָשֵׁה) and from it is derived a substantive inšā, which means "composing," "reciting," or "composition."—ינָקַם (some MSS. read יָמַק) is the town and district Ha-ta-ri-ka, near Damascus and Hamath, which is mentioned in several Assyrian inscriptions (Schrader).—In the u is long, and merely written defectively (see note on i. 13); the metheg is placed in accordance with Execris. II. A. 1. The word denotes "its (i.e. of the oracle of the Lord) resting-place or goal."—בּהָדָא denotes "mankind"; there is no need (with J. D. Michaelis) to read אֲרוֹם "Syria," in which case עֵינָי would mean "the whole face of Syria"; comp. Ex. xx. 15, Numb. xxii. 5, 11. (Baer has accidently עֵינָי.

The ב of בֵּרהֵכ denotes "against," as (Is. xxi. 13) מָשֵׁה בּ. "the prophecy against Arabia"; but usually massā is put in construction with the noun following, e.g. מָשֵׁה זכָל (Is. Constructions. xiii. 1).—סְעִילוּ וּעֵינָי אֲרוֹם seems simply to mean "for to the LORD shall the eye of men be directed," comp. (Ps. cxxiii. 2) "As the eyes of servants are unto the hand of their masters...so are our eyes unto the LORD (וְיִלְּכַּנְּל אֲדוֹן)"; only there it is in expectation and here in amazement, &c. It is true that "eye" is here in the singular; but that is an unimportant difference, comp. (Ps. xxxiii. 18) עֵינָי וַאֲדוֹני אֲרוֹים with lxxxiv. 16).—עֵינָי וַאֲדוֹני וַלְשָׁנָה stands for ולְשָׁנָה. "To the LORD is an eye on man, &c."; so too Koehler, comp. Jer. xxxii. 19.

Massā LXX. λήμμα, comp. 4 Kings ix. 25. Aq. ἀρμα. LXX. usually ὀραῖς (Is. xiii. 1), ὀραμα (xxi. 1), or ἦμα (xiv. Versions. 28). Ὅιδρακ LXX. Σάδρακ. Δαμασκόν the locative "in Damascus." For μενταςάθαθ theoria, reading (since the u is written defective) διότι ὁ εἶρησεν ἁνθρώπον κ.τ.λ. taking מָשֵׁה as the obj. gen. "To the LORD is an eye on man, &c."; so too Koehler, comp. Jer. xxxii. 19.

Observe that נַעֲרָה נַעֲרָה הָעָבָר (as also נַעֲרָה הָעָבָר in the next verse) has ga'yyū (Excurs. II. B. 7).—כַּי is a particle which is capable of various significations (see Dictionaries); here it seems best to take it in the sense of "although," as (Ex. xiii. 17) כָּי.
3 And Tyrus did build herself a strong hold, and heaped up silver as the dust, and fine gold as the mire of the streets.

4 Behold, the Lord will cast her out, and he will smite her power in the sea; and she shall be devoured with fire.

5 Ashkelon shall see it, and fear; Gaza also shall see it, and be very sorrowful, and Ekron; for her expectation shall be ashamed; and the king shall perish from Gaza, and Ashkelon shall not be inhabited.

Verse 3.

This verse is somewhat elliptical, the style of this passage being highly poetical. The meaning is that “also against Hamath Tyre and Sidon is the prophecy”; or that “also Hamath Tyre and Sidon shall be its resting-place.” Before tigbol-bah the relative must be understood, thus: “Hamath which borders thereon (viz. on Damascus),” as (Gen. xxxix. 4) יֶלֶדֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל = בָּלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (of the next verse).—Châc’mah LXX. plur. ἐφοροῦσαν.

Verse 5.

For נָרִים Baer (on MS. authority) reads נָרִים (so too נָרִים Mic. vii. 10) like the masc. נָרִים (Gen. xlii. 33). Some old grammarians seem not to have distinguished between צֶרֶה and accentuated segol, thus Rashi (on Ex. i. 20).—לֹא-חָיוֹל seems to be a simple future.—לֹא-כַּוְּרוֹן is grammatically the Hiph. of כָּוֹר, and would properly mean “he has made to dry up,” as in Josh. ii. 10, or “is dried up,” as in x. 11, Joel i. 10. And in this latter sense it may be here used “her hope is dried up.” But it is better to suppose the root to be used in the sense of כָּוֹר “to be put to shame,” “be disappointed” (Joel i. 11, &c.), since such interchange of roots with one weak letter is one of the commonest phenomena of the Hebr. language (and indeed of Semitic languages generally, even as early as Assyrian), see pp. 30, 46.
6 And a bastard shall dwell in Ashdod, and I will cut off the pride of the Philistines.

7 And I will take away his blood out of his mouth, and his abominations from between his teeth: but he that remaineth, even he, shall be for our God, and he shall be as a governor in Judah, and Ekron as a Jebusite.

8 And I will encamp about mine house because of the army, because "her hope (or expectation)," comp. תְּלֵם (Is. xx. 5), Root נָבָם. The pathach of the first syllable is here lightened into segol, as we find אָבַרֹת (not אָבַרֹת), אֲבִיאָרַת (not אֲבִיאָרַת) Abiathar. Comp. notes on vi. 1, x. 9.—“shall not be inhabited” (comp. vii. 7); or “shall not endure” (comp. Gen. xlix. 24).

Mebbath wrongly παραπτώματι αὐτής “her transgression”; perhaps they took hibbit in the sense of παραπτώμα to over-look,” “miss,” and so equivalent to שׁומֶךְ; but Cod. Alex. rightly ἃπε τῆς ἐξελειός αὐτῆς, which may, however, be a mere correction.

Ashdod rightly Ἄσσόρος. The case-ending s may represent the final η (pronounced ηθ, then θ, then ρ), comp. Μαχσάς, for Μαχμάρ Masmad (Hos. ix. 6); or perhaps, seeing that the ρ seems to correspond with the σ, the sh and d became assimilated into ζ, and ζς is merely the termination.

On vəq̄'ānithī see Excurs. ii. A. 1, and 6, and note on i. 3.—On the form see on נְאָמָי (i. 13).—בְּעָלָיו is the dual, from בְּעָלִי, the ה being according to rule assimilated to the נ. On the tone see note on i. 3.

Verse 8. Words. "as a leader," this is the only place in which נְאָמָי is written defectively in the singular, the ה is, of course, long (see on נְאָמָי i. 3).

On the tone of vəq̄'ānīthī see p. 5.—לְיִבְיוֹ means "for the protection of my house," comp. (Ps. cxxiv. 1) לְיִבְיוֹ "if it had not been the LORD, who was on our side."—לְעָבָה "on account of an army," on this use of לְ see on ii. 8. נְאָמָי stands z.
of him that passeth by, and because of him that returneth: and no oppressor shall pass through them any more: for now have I seen with mine eyes.

for נְהַלְגָּא (which is in fact the reading of some MSS.), as נְהַלְגָּא (Ps. iv. 7) stands for נְהַלְגָּא. Some would point the word מַעֲצָבָא "as a garrison," in accordance with 1 Sam. xix. 12, which is, however, the only passage in which the word occurs in the fem. form, elsewhere it is always מַעֲצָבָא. —The נ of the next two words means also "on account of."—For the expression וְזָכַר נָשָׁב for מַעֲצָבָא LXX. has ἀνάστημα, reading, probably, מַעֲצָבָא "a column."—τοῦ μη...μησε, giving to the privative sense it has in vii. 14. Possibly they read the words מַעֲצָבָא לְשָׁב. (Cod. Alex. ἀνάστημα, comp. ἀνάθημα and ἀνάθεμα, σώστημα and σώστημα, &c.)

It is impossible to discuss all the theories which have been propounded with regard to the time of the composition of different parts of Zech. ix. xiv. We will content ourselves with mentioning here the chief arguments, which have been adduced to prove the pre-exilian authorship of ix. 1—8. (1) It has been argued, that Zech. ix. 1—8 is so like to Amos i.—ii. 6 (delivered in the early part of Uzziah's reign, i.e. a few years after B.C. 810), that it seems impossible that two prophecies so similar should have been uttered at periods so wide apart. Now, the only similarity between these two passages is, that in both Damascus, Tyre, Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Ekron are threatened. The dissimilarity, however, is much greater. (α) In Amos we find the Ammonites, Edomites, and Moabites also mentioned, but not so in Zechariah. And this is most natural, for, while in the time of Uzziah these were still powerful nations, on the return from the captivity they were so weak, that when in the time of Nehemiah "Sanballat and Tobiah, and the Arabians and the Ammonites and the Ashdodites" all conspiring to hinder the Jews from rebuilding the Wall of Jerusalem, it was found sufficient to repel them that half of the returned exiles should stand to arms, while the other half went on with the work of building. (β) Amos expressly states that Aram-Damascus should be carried away to Kir, while there is no such intimation in Zech. ix. (γ) Amos speaks of Judah and Israel as separate kingdoms, to be subjected to the same judgments as the other nations, while in Zech. Israel is but one nation (comp. ver. 13 and Remarks there), and is assured of God's protection. (δ) The style of the two passages is not similar. That of Amos i.—ii. 6 is of a marked character, but we find no echo of that style in Zech. ix. 1—8. (ε) It has been urged that this oracle speaks of several cities and kingdoms as independent, which had lost their independence, before the period of the return from exile. Thus Damascus lost its independence when Tiglath-Pileser overthrew Syria in the beginning of the reign of Ahaz, and Hamath was subdued to the Assyrians in the time of Hezekiah. (The
reference to Tyre and Sidon is admitted by the objectors to afford no clear indi­
cation of the early date of the prophecy.) We may reply simply, that Jeremiah
prophesied against Damascus and Hamath even after Nebuchadnezzar had over­
run their territories (Jer. xlix. 23—37), and Jeremiah (xxv. 20) and Ezekiel (xxv. 15—17) denounced judgments on the Philistines, so that it is not strange that a
post-exilian prophet should speak in general terms of the disasters, which would
overtake these nations, when the Medo-Persian empire should be overthrown by the
Greeks.—(2) The prophecy has been supposed
allude to the immunity experienced
by Jerusalem during the irruption of Rezin king of Syria and Pekah king of Israel
into the territories of Judah (2 Kings xvi. 5), as well as during the wars with the
Philistines which occurred during that period (2 Chron. xxviii. 18), and it is further
argued that ch. xi. 14 shows that the struggle between Judah and Israel is looked on
as already begun, at this time when the Prophet threatens Damascus (ix. 1). The
denunciations against Tyre are to be viewed as naturally arising out of the sale of
the Israelite captives at that period by Phoenician merchants (Joel iii. 4—6). But (a)
this were the case it would be most difficult to account for the omission of any notice
of the far more important enemies of Judah at that period, viz. Ammon (2 Chron. xxvi.
8, xxvii. 5), Edom and Moab (Amos i. 11—15, ii. 1—3), and Arabia (2 Chron. xxvi. 7).
(b) The dissolution of the brotherhood between Israel and Judah is distinctly spoken of as in the future. If, then, that passage refers to the revolt
under Jeroboam, it must have been written at a time prior even to 975 B.C., when
Damascus was still included in the kingdom of Solomon, and such threats against
Syria would have been meaningless.—But the strongest argument against such
theories is, that to no period of history does this prophecy (ix. 1—8) apply so
exactly, as to the conquests of Alexander the Great in 333 B.C. The chief points
of the prophecy are, judgments on Syria and Philistia, and the burning of Tyre; the
removal of the king from Gaza, the desolation of Ashkelon, the introduction of a
mixed race into Ashdod, and the eventual fusion of the Philistines with the Jews;
the protection of Israel amid their confusion. Now, when Alexander had completely
shattered the might of Persia, in the battle of Issus, he marched into Syria. He
sent a strong detachment under Parmenio to operate against Damascus, and him­
self with the main body marched against Tyre. And this mighty stronghold, which
had stood a five years’ siege from the Assyrians, and a thirteen years’ siege from the
Chaldeans, was taken by Alexander in seven months, and then (as Q. Curtius says)
“having slain all save those who fled to the temples, he ordered the houses to be set
on fire.” No special mention, it is true, is made of Ashkelon and Ekron in the ac­
counts of the march of Alexander, but Gaza fell after a siege of five months, and
Hegesias (a contemporary of Alexander) especially mentions that “the king of Gaza
was brought alive to Alexander. The breaking up of petty nationalities and the
fusion of races was part of the policy of Alexander.” But no mention is made of
any great conversion of the Philistines to the Jewish religion at this period. While, as late as 1 Macc. x. 83, we hear of a temple of Dagon at Ashdod being
destroyed by Jonathan, after that time the Philistines disappear as a separate
people, and the name of their country “Palestine” became used as the designation
of the whole land. It seems best, therefore, to adopt the view of KöHLER, that
“the prophecy does not merely delineate the events connected with the triumphal
progress of Alexander, but predicts the general events which followed the Greek con­
quest of Palestine, inclusive of the various wars which occurred in the latter days of
9 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, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.

the Grecian supremacy" (comp. Remarks on ver. 9-17). The word Ybhusi seems to be parallel with alluph, and not contrasted with it: therefore, one would suppose it to mean either "Jebusite," in reference to the fact that "they dwelt with the children of Judah in Jerusalem" (Josh. xv. 63); or "Jerusalem itself," in which sense the word is also used (Josh. xviii. 63); and not as equivalent to "Gibeonites" or "Nethinim" who held a servile position (Josh. ix., Neh. x. 28, 29, Ezr. viii. 20, &c.). The promise of protection to Israel given in ver. 8 was signally fulfilled, when Alexander, according to the well-known story (see my Memorbook of Nürnberg, p. 20), spared Jerusalem, and granted the Jews special favours. The meaning of the words "no oppressor (task-master) shall pass through (or over) them any more" is, that the nation would not be again reduced to the position of slaves, as they were by the Babylonians and Persians. And such was the case, for God's protecting care was over them, in fulfilment of the assurance "now have I seen with mine eyes": so that neither did Alexander, nor any of the Seleucian dynasty, ever succeed in enslaving them.

Verse 9. The 1 of ̀hul (the 2nd pers. fem. of imperative Qal of ̀hul) would according to rule be accentuated on the first syllable. But there are many exceptions to the rule (caused perhaps by considerations of euphony), thus Is. li. 9 we have ̀hul ̀hul ʿurī ʿurī, and so too in the first sentences of Judg. v. 12 ʿurī ʿurī, and Is. xxi. 2 ̀hul ˇgurī; while in the second sentence of Judg. v. 12 the accentuation is regular ʿurī ʿurī, as also in shābhā (ver. 12).— ̀hul ̀hul is "to cry aloud," ̀hul ̀hul, the Niph. partic. of ̀hul, can only mean "saved."—̀hul ̀hul is a "he-ass," ̀hul ̀hul a "she-ass."

The 1 of ̀hul does not mean "and" as though he were to come riding on two animals; but "even," "namely," "yea," as Ex. xxv. 9 ̀hul ̀hul ʿbārī "even so shall ye do."—̀hul ̀hul ʿbārī means lit. "son of she-asses," i.e. such a foal as she-asses in general are in the habit of bearing, comp. ̀hul ̀hul ʿbārī "cub of lions" (Judg. xiv. 5).

κῆρυσσε is not a good rendering of harīt. Tischf. mentions no reading ἀλάκαζον. Just. Mart. (Tryph. 53) ἀλάκαζον κῆρυσσε, but (Apol. i. 35) only κῆρυσσε.—Cod. Alex. right, ὁ βασιλεὺς σου. The translation σῶζων for νοσχάτω cannot be justified. πρεμύς would
ZECHARIAH IX. 10—12.

10 And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the heathen: and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.

11 As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water.

12 Turn you to the strong hold, ye prisoners of hope: even to day shall be the correct rendering of 'ănāḇ rather than of 'ănā. Symm. πτωχός. Theod. ἐπακούων. S. Matt. xxi. 5 omits the words δίκαιος καὶ σωτήρ. S. John xii. 15 omits also πρᾶξ, but instead of prefixing “rejoice greatly, cry out" he says μη φοβοῦ, while S. Matt. puts εἰπατε τῇ θυγατρί Σιων, which has been thought to be borrowed from Is. lxii. 11.

Baer edits with the accent on the ultimate (comp. note on i. 3); but some editions have ἡρεμίας ἱεροσόλυμων, with maqēf Verse 10. Words.
and take segol in the last syllable (as a rule), unless they be in pause.—יוֹס שלש mo-shlo (Excurs. i. 7. γ) is the infin. Qal with suffix.

καὶ πλῆθος καὶ εἰρήνη, reading the last ת of dibber as a ת, and joining it to the next word: thus making תַּחַכ שֶלֶש out of לִם. For miyyām “from the sea” they read לִים. LXX.

The preceding verse concludes with a description of the glory of the King; but the glory was not to be his exclusively, therefore "even thou" is prefixed as a nominativus pendens Verse 11. Constructions. to recall the attention to Israel, spoken of in ver. 9 under the figure of בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל and בֵּית יְרוּשָׁלָיִם. The ב of בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית denotes “in consideration of,” as in (Gen. xviii. 28) יִתַּמ בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית יִתַּמ. "in consideration of the five."—Between בֵּית and בֵּית the relative וה is understood, comp. note on ver. 2.

is a ἀπατε λεγό, meaning “fastness” (LXX. ἐν οὐρώμαστι) from “to cut off,” comp. (Is. xxvii. 10) "fortified city."—יוֹס יִשְׂרָאֵל (Josh. xix. 29) “ye prisoners of hope," i.e. ye who are still prisoners in Babylon, but have a great hope set before ye.—בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל "even to-
do I declare that I will render double unto thee; and raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and made thee as the sword of a mighty man.

When I have bent Judah for me, filled the bow with Ephraim, day."

"I announce a double [recompense, which] I will render unto you"; for, if we regard the disjunctive accent under mischnēh, we cannot render it "I declare, Double will I render unto you." But the two translations afford much the same meaning. As in Hab. i. 5 the participle לְוֶלֶל borrows the pronoun of the first person sing. from הָלַל here from the הָלַל of ver. 13. מִשְׁמֶה often means "second"; but here it means "double," as (Is. li. 7) מַשֵּֽה (bosh-tcēm) מְשֵׁה "instead of your shame, double." "instead of your shame, double."

καθήσομαι, reading shābhā (from בָּשָׁב), as Shābhā (from בָּשָׁב).—Instead of "hope" LXX. has τῆς σπαγωγῆς, reading μικρόν miqēwē or miqēvāh "a gathering together" (1 Kings x. 28, &c., Is. xxii. 11), instead of Ῥήμα. —Instead of maggiē we have (by interchange of 1 and 9, and of 1 and 1) μαγγύρ παρουσίας.

רָעָה is the ordinary verb used of "bending" a bow. But the expression מְלָאכֵי יְשׁוֹבֵית is very difficult. In the connection one naturally thinks of the phrase מְלָאכֵי יְשׁוֹבֵית (2 Kings ix. 24) "he filled his hand with a bow," i.e. he took a bow in his hand; but the phrases are not parallel. In the absence of any parallel we must be guided by the sense, and take the verb מִלְּל as denoting "filling" the bow with an arrow (as we speak of loading a gun), i.e. setting an arrow on the string (for which the proper expression is בִּנְקֵי חַי קַע Ps. xi. 2), and render the verse: "For I will bend me Judah as a bow, and set Ephraim in it [as an arrow]." The verbs here (as also skillāchṭi in ver. 11) are in the Prophetic Perfect.

For sāmti "I have placed, i.e. rendered, made," reading māshēti (in transposed order) we have ψηλαφήσω, comp. Gen. xxvii. 12 LXX. y'mushshēnī ψηλαφήσῃ μ.ε.
14 And the Lord shall be seen over them, and his arrow shall go forth as the lightning; and the Lord God shall blow the trumpet, and shall go with whirlwinds of the south.

15 The Lord of hosts shall defend them; and they shall devour, and subdue with sling stones; and they shall drink, and make a noise as through wine; and they shall be filled like bowls, and as the corners of the altar.

"will reveal himself on their behalf," comp. (Ps. xlv. 23) "for thy sake we are killed."—The words אֲדוֹנָיָּי לֹהִים (see note on i. 1).—אֵשׁ is constr. plur. of אֵשׁ; the pathach under the same is a Light Vowel (Excurs. i. 5). This word occurs in the following forms: אֵשׁ, אֶשֶׁר, אֵשֶׁר, אֵשׁ.

אֲדָוָלָּה אֵדָוָלָּה, reading אֵדָוָלָּה "enmity," for תֵּימָן "South." (Possibly also taking the final י for י and reading אֲדָוָלָּה LXX. אֲדָוָלָּה, see note on iv. 2.)

On ובאֲדוָלָּה see notes on i. 3.—בְּזֶה Fut. Hiph. from בּוּז "and shall trample upon sling-stones," viz. in their valorous onslaught upon the enemy.—Observe is correctly accentuated on the last syllable as the perfect plur. of בּוּז; if it had been accentuated on the penultimate it would have been from בּוּז (comp. note on ver. 9).—Baer (p. 83) edits בּוּז which (and not בּוּז) is the reading here and in Jer. v. 22, li. 55.—נָמִי מַיָּה (not "as wine," but) "as with wine," comp. x. 7, and note on viii. 11. —LXX. translated, unless they took it as equivalent to אֵדָוָלָּה and that as equivalent to אֵדָוָלָּה "them."
16 And the Lord their God shall save them in that day as the flock of his people: for they shall be as the stones of a crown, lifted up as an ensign upon his land.

17 For how great is his goodness, and how great is his beauty! corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine the maids.
Zechariah IX.

that in all the cases, it is before מ (only here is the Pālēl) "shall make to grow (or increase)," comp. וַיִּלְאַל יִנְהָר "wealth, if it increase" (Ps. lxii. 11, comp. xcii. 15).

תל is taken in the indefinite sense "whatever" (comp. 2 Sam. xviii. 22, and p. 46), and so the translation runs ὅτι εἰ τι ἀγαθὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰ τι καλὸν αὐτοῦ. Πνεύματι is rendered εὐδαίμον.

This passage is now generally admitted to be Messianic. It falls naturally into two sections. The coming of the King (ver. 9, 10); and the return of the exiles, their glorious victories over the Greeks, and their consequent peace and prosperity (ver. 11—17). Zion is now called on to rejoice in the approaching advent of her long-promised King. And what are His characteristics? He is Righteous (comp. Is. xxxii. 1, liii. 11, Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, &c.), but He is also "afflicted" (comp. Is. lii. 14—liii. 11, Ps. cx. 7), and yet "saved" (see Is. lii. 12, and comp. Ps. cx. 7 with Phil. ii. 7—9, comp. also Acts ii. 23, 24, Eph. i. 19—23, Rom. i. 4). He comes with no military pomp, with neither chariots nor horses, but unostentatiously riding upon a colt of an ass; for, this avoidance of vain display is a mark of the "Servant of YHVH," who "shall not cry, nor lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets" (Is. xlii. 2, comp. Matt. xii. 15—21). At that time the chariot shall be cut off from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem (comp. Mich. v. 9, rather than iv. 3 and Is. ii. 4), which seems to imply that the military power of the nation should have ceased, for He is to be a Prince of Peace, speaking peace to the nations, and establishing His spiritual kingdom (in description of which the old terms used of the territory promised to Israel, Ex. xxiii. 31, comp. Ps. lxxii. 8, Ecclus. xlii. 21 are applied) even to the ends of the earth. The prophecy was, doubtless, fulfilled by our Lord, when He rode into Jerusalem on (the day now called) Palm-Sunday. But He fulfilled it more in spirit than to the letter. That He did not fulfil it literally is sufficiently shown by the fact, that the King is here described as already "saved and afflicted," whereas, in the case of our Lord, His entry into Jerusalem took place before His Passion and before He was "saved" by being "raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father" (Rom. vi. 4). But in spirit He most truly fulfilled it, generally by His whole life of humility, and in particular on that day by illustrating, both to friends and foes, by His symbolical act of riding into Jerusalem on an ass, that His kingdom is not of this world.

But this prophecy was not to be immediately fulfilled. The nation had yet severe sufferings to endure and triumphs to achieve, viz. in those struggles with the "sons of Greece," which render the Maccabean period (a.c. 167—130) one of the most noble pages in Jewish history. Those, who still remained in the land of their exile, are exhorted to come forth (comp. ii. 7—13), confident in the help of the Lord of Hosts, who would wield the reunited Judah and Ephraim (comp. Is. xi. 13) as His weapons of war (comp. Jer. ii. 20): He Himself will appear as their champion, with the rolling of the thunder as His war-trumpet, the forked lightning as His arrows, "the wild storm blowing from the southern desert, the resistless fury of His might." And then, when they had fought the good fight, and not before, God promises "the flock His people" the blessings of peace (ver. 16, 17).
It has been urged as an objection against the post-exilic authorship of this passage that "Ephraim" and "Jerusalem" are mentioned, as though Israel were still separated from Judah. But, on the contrary, Ephraim and Jerusalem are here strictly parallel terms, as are also "Judah" and "Ephraim" (ver. 13), where both are represented as equally opposed to the sons of Javan. The nation was now one (Ezek. xxvii. 22) and known by the names of "Israel" (xii. 1, Mal. i. 1, 5), "all the tribes of Israel" (ix. 1), also the "house of Judah" (x. 3, 6), "house of Joseph" and "Ephraim" (x. 6, 7), besides by those terms mentioned on p. 21. For, now that the "dead bones of the whole house of Israel" were revived (Ezek. xxvii. 11), and "my servant David" was about to be "King over them" (ver. 24), the prophecy of Ezekiel (ver. 16—22) was fulfilled, and the staves (tribes, shibb'te) of Joseph and of Judah had become one in God's hand. Hence the interchangeable terms.

CHAPTER X.

ASK ye of the LORD rain in clouds, and give them showers of rain, to every one grass in the field.

pathach (not chiriq) is the proper vowel for the first syllable to the 2nd fem. sing., 2nd masc. plur. of the Imperative of verbs medial guttural, as רֲחֹנּוּ, שֵׁעֲרֹת, תּוֹגֹר, בְּרוּ הִי, סְשִׁימָה, but because of the initial נ, comp. הָוֵי הָוֵי means "lightnings" (Job xxviii. 27, xxxviii. 25) which precede the rain.—In um'tar-geshem, Geshem the consequent, as is usual with two nouns in construction, qualifies the antecedent. Thus m'tar-geshem denotes "a pouring rain," so מֵתֶּרֶבֶל (Ps. xl. 3) means "the clayey mud"; in Job xxxvii. 6 we have מְשַׁרְרֵת מִלָּה, and then מְשַׁרְרֵת מִלָּה means "for each one," i.e. "for every one" (comp. Gen. xlili. 45 and Zech. vii. 10, viii. 4, 17).

E'eth is taken as the absolute, καὶ ὁ ἑώρας: and πρωτὶν καὶ is introduced before malqeshh "latter rain," borrowing, probably, from Deut. xi. 14, Jer. v. 24.—Ch'zizim is rendered φαντασίας.
2 For the idols have spoken vanity, and the diviners have seen a lie; and have told false dreams; they comfort in vain: therefore they went their way as a flock, they were troubled, because there was no shepherd.

The 3rd plur. perf.  והם being from להם (see note on ix. 15) ought to have been accentuated on the last syllable, but it has been drawn back because the next word is accentuated with a great disjunctive accent of the first syllable. Observe in this verse the interchange of the Perfect and Imperf., merely for the sake of variety of sound.— הניהם the Piel imperf. 3rd pers. plur. The ordinary form is ניהם, in pause ניהם; but, since here the verb ends in י and the last syllable thus becomes closed, and having a long vowel must needs take the accent (Excurs. 1. 8), we get ניהם with metheg under the י in accordance with Excurs. ii. A. 1. The form ending in הוא is shown by a comparison with the kindred languages to be older than the shortened form in ע. Hence it is incorrect to call this an additional nun (ננוסכפ).—רָפָה in the Qal, Niph'al, Pu'al and Hithpa'el is used in the sense of "to be afflicted."

Tr'aphim is variously rendered by LXX., here of ἀποσθεγγόμενοι, in Gen. xxxi. 19, 34, 35 by εἰδωλα. For βᾶς Σίμων: LXX. but ed. Compl. reads εἰξοθοράνησαν, which would represent the Hebr. well enough. For "shepherd" (ר'ה) λαος, reading ר'ה "healer."

The first two verses of this chapter seem to be closely connected with the last two of the preceding chapter. In x. 17 it is promised that corn and wine should make the youth of Israel to flourish. Here the people are exhorted to pray to the Lord to send the latter rain. It is probable, since the prophet mentions only the latter rain, that he was prophesying between the times of the former rains (Marcheshvan and Cisleb), and the latter rains (Nisan). (For the months see p. 10.) Against the post-exilic origin of this passage, and of xiii. 2, it has been objected that, the mention of idols and false prophets harmonizes only with a time prior to the captivity. It is perfectly true that after the captivity idolatry was not, as it had been before, the crying sin of the nation. Still, even if the Prophet be not here reverting to sins of the past which had caused the exile, a reference to Ezr. ix. 1, 2, Neh. vi. 10—14, xiii. 23, 24, Mal. iii. 5, 2 Macc. xii. 40, Acts v. 36, 37, xiii. 6, Josephus, Bell. Jud. vi. 5, § 2, 3, will clearly show how suitable warnings against idolatry and witchcraft might be, even after the return from captivity. With this passage comp. Jer. xiv. 22.—"Because they had no shepherd" might mean "for want of a good monarch" (comp. Ezek. xxiv. 5, 8);
3 Mine anger was kindled against the shepherds, and I punished the goats: for the LORD of hosts hath visited his flock the house of Judah, and hath made them as his goodly horse in the battle.

4 Out of him came forth the corner, out of him the nail, out of him the battle bow, out of him every oppressor together.

5 And they shall be as mighty men, which tread down their ene-

but it cannot mean “because they had no native king”; for they did not go into captivity because they had no king, but on the contrary, they lost their king because they went into captivity. We think, therefore, that the paraphrase of the LXX. “because they had no healer,” i.e. because the True Shepherd of Israel had ceased to guide and protect them, might possibly be defended.

Observe the change of tense from chārāḥ to ephqōd, which is simply, as we hold, for the sake of variety (comp. note on ver. 2).

Verse 3. Constructions. The difference between pāqād ‘al “he punished,” and pāqād followed by the acc. (as in Ex. iii. 16), is here very decidedly marked.

Verse 4. is an adverb, “altogether.” It occurs also in the simple form

possibly in an earlier stage of the language it was regularly declined. In support of this theory of original declension, we may remark that such words as לович “alone” are actually declined לович, לович, לович, לович, לович.

Similarly in Arabic dhā means “this” and dhāka “this-there.” This latter in old classical Arabic is declined, in speaking to one man, dhāka; to one woman, dhāki; to two persons, dhākumā; to several men, dhakum; to several women, dhakunna. But as a rule the simple undeclinable form dhāka is used.

Pinnāh “corner” is read as pānāh “he turned,” and rendered ἐπι-βλέψε (so ἐπινόθ (Mal. ii. 13) ἐπιβλέψα).—Yāthēdāh “nail,” ἐταξε. We saw (ix. 12) that LXX. confound מ and מ, so perhaps they read יול, and understood it as יול (comp. יול = יול = יול = יול (Is. xiii. 20) a verb which is translated by the verb τάσσω (2 Chron. xxxi. 2). Milchāmāh ἐν θηματι reading μοιχαλμα, and taking μι as equivalent to μι (xiv. 10), for μι in the sense of “on account of” (ii. 8).

is the pres. partic. of בוא, from which we should expect

Verse 5. но, but we find also לאקט (from לאקט) 2 Kings xvi. 17, and (naturally enough) לאקט (from לאקט not לאקט) Ezek. xxxii. 30.
mies in the mire of the streets in the battle: and they shall fight, because the Lord is with them, and the riders on horses shall be confounded.

6 And I will strengthen the house of Judah, and I will save the house of Joseph, and I will bring them again to place them; for I have mercy upon them: and they shall be as though I had not cast them off: for I am the Lord their God, and will hear them.

7 And they of Ephraim shall be like a mighty man, and their heart shall rejoice as through wine: yea, their children shall see it, and be glad; their heart shall rejoice in the Lord.

8 I will hiss for them, and gather Since בּ בּ is elsewhere construed with a simple acc., it will be best here to render: “And they shall be like heroes trampling [their enemies] into the mire of the streets.”—יְזֹרְבִּים “and shall be ashamed (see notes on ix. 5 and 8).

_יְזֹרְבִּים_ is a fusion of יְזֹרְבִּים “I will make them to dwell” (Hiph. of יְזֹרְבִּים), and יְזֹרְבִּים “I will make them return” verse 6. (Hiph. of יְזֹרְבִּים ver. 10). The verb is probably intended to have the latter meaning. In Semitic languages the different forms of verbs are often confounded (see notes on ii. 17, iv. 10, ix. 5); nor are we free from such mistakes in English: thus people often say “he lay” for “he laid”; “he flew” for “he fled.”—καθαρσία here means “as though” “quasi,” as (Job x. 19) “as though I had never been”; more usually it means “as” “sicut,” or “when” “quum” “post- quam.”

_יְזֹרְבִּים_ פַּתַּחְתּ is γάγανσα αὐτῶς, comp. ἀγαντισσῷ τίν οὐκ ἐγα- _πημένην_ (Hos. ii. 23 [25]); but Hos. i. 6 οὐκ ἐγαπημένη.

From and _יְזֹרְבִּים_ we may observe that there are two forms of the Perfect of this verb, יְזֹרְבִּים and יְזֹרְבִּים (comp. p. 70). verse 7. In pause all forms from strong verbs take the accent on the second root-letter, unless a long vowel in a closed syllable at the end of the word draw it away (see on ver. 2). הַלָּל “let their heart rejoice.” Comp. the exclamation (Ps. xxii. 27) יִדְּוָי, לְבָכֵנָה לְךָ (Hos. ii. 23 [25]); but Hos. i. 6 οὐκ ἐγαπημένη.

On the form see p. 6 and note on viii. 21. For this use of the verb comp. Is. v. 26, vii. 18.—יְזֹרְבּים יְזֹרְבּים may mean “and they shall multiply as they did multiply [formerly],” verse 8. see Ex. i. 12. Or, better, it is to be taken as an idiomatic expression
them; for I have redeemed them:

9 And I will sow them among the people; and they shall remember me in far countries; and they shall live with their children, and turn again.

10 I will bring them again also out of the land of Egypt, and gather them out of Assyria; and I will bring them into the land of Gilead and Lebanon; and place shall not be found for them.

"they shall increase as they increase"—i.e. "they shall increase to any extent"; this latter is certainly the meaning of the expression in more modern Hebrew. For the promise comp. Jer. xxiii. 3, Ezek. xxxvi. 11.

Imperfects, which have pathach in the second syllable, change it into qāmāq before a suffix, as יְרַעְשׁ, יְרַעְשׁ יְרַעְשׁ יְרַעְשׁ.—Observe the doubling of the last root-letter in the plur. מִרְבָּה “distant places” (see note on i. 15). The sing. of our word is always מִרְבָּה with e in first syllable; but the plur. has also pathach in Is. xxxiii. 17, Jer. viii. 9 (see notes on vi. i, ix. 5).—רְחוּב “and shall live with.” יְשָׁבָה, the י is pointed with qāmāq to prevent the concurrence of two accentuated syllables. This takes place here although הֶם has a disjunctive accent (Tiphchā), comp. (Job iv. 16) בַּֽיוֹתָֽהּ, while more commonly a preceding disjunctive prevents the vav from taking qāmāq, as

...יְרַעְשׁ (Ex. ix. 24).

LXX. ἵππαντον τὰ τεκνα αὐτῶν, reading instead of χαβά, הֶם. χיוֹבֵי, the Pi’el.

lit. "shall not be found,” meaning "there shall not be room enough," comp. Josh. xvii. 16, where, however, הֶם is the subject of the verb. Some take the verb here as impers., others understand מָלַךְ. In Qal לְּאָמֶה means “to reach to” (Is. x. 10), then “to suffice” (Numb. xi. 22), comp. ἰκνόμαν and ἰκανός. (See also note on xi. 6.)

ὑπολείπεν πολύ θαυμάζει somewhat in the sense of ἰκνόμας, or ἰκνόμας (Numb. xxxi. 49), or ἰκνόμας (2 Sam. xvii. 22) "be missing," or "left behind."
11 And he shall pass through the sea with affliction, and shall smite the waves in the sea, and all the deeps of the river shall dry up: and the pride of Assyria shall be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away.

12 And I will strengthen them in the LORD; and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the LORD.

As far as the form of יִבְּרָרִי is concerned, it might be the construct, e.g. יַבְּרָרִי (Numb. xxxiv. 11), in fact the construct is more commonly יִבְּרָרִי than יִבְּרַי. But the def. art. here prefixed to it precludes this interpretation. We must, consequently, translate יַבְּרָרִי as in apposition with יִבְּרַי "through the trouble-sea" (comp. p. 44), the passage of the Red Sea being referred to as a symbol of other sufferings and deliverances.—יֵלֵים must be taken as a second object, or "acc. of limitation."—יָכֹב is intrans., see note on ix. 5.

For ªם of וַתְּבַלְּאֶת רָי to be correct the Hebrew should be יָכֹב. For הָרָד these translators give אָפְּאֵרְבִּיתָרְתָא, and so (Ex. xxxiii. 5) אָפְּאֵרְבִּיתָרְתָא stands for הָרָד.

On the metheg of יִתְּחַלָּלְךָ see Excurs. II. B. 4. Observe that Hithpa'els and Hithpolels take gāmāc in pause, not gērē, e.g. יֵחָלֶת (Prov. xxxi. 30), יֵחָלֶת (no ga'ytā Excurs. II. B. 4. 3). If the second root-letter be מ, the preceding vowel becomes segōl, as יָכֹב (Deut. xxxii. 36).

κατακαυχήσονται for יִתְּחַלָּלְךָ, which they read יִתְּחַלָּלָלָךְ, י being misread for ג, as in Hos. xiii. 13 נַלְּגֶנָךְ is rendered ὁ νιός σου, as though it were Αόνικον, i.e. γράφει for Αόνικον.

"The shepherds" (ver. 8) are the native rulers and spiritual guides (as in Jer. ii. 8, xvii. 16, xxxiii. 1—4; Ezek. xxxiv. 2, &c.); and not foreign rulers and oppressors (as in Jer. vi. 3, 4, xxv. 34—38, xlix. 19). "The he-goats" are to be identified with "the shepherds," or perhaps rather to be regarded as leaders subordinate to them (comp. Ezek. xxxiv.). "Out of him" means probably "from Judah," i.e. the nation in general, or from Judah as the royal tribe; the latter supposition is hardly probable, however, since the Maccabeans were not of the tribe of Judah, but of Levi. Thus, apparently, "shepherd" is used here in a different sense to that in which it is used in the preceding verse. Similarly, noges is not used here in the same sense as in ix. 8. It can here mean...
only a "native ruler," or "one who will oppress" [or subdue] "the heathen."—
"Corner-stone" denotes "a chieftain" (1 Sam. xiv. 38, Is. xix. 13, and so too
"nail" (Is. xxii. 23).—The whole of this passage is closely connected with ix. 11—
15, the verses ix. 16, 17, x. 1, 2 being only a slight digression.—Vers. 5—7 are parallel
with ix. 13—15.—The expression "as though I had not rejected them" seems
clearly to point to a time when the captivity had already taken place.—Ver. 8—12
have been looked on as decided evidence in favour of the pre-exilian origin of the
passage. But, (1) the reference in ver. 11 to the passage of the Red Sea shows that,
if we please, we may regard the other expressions as figurative, viz., that Egypt is
mentioned merely as the typical oppressor of Israel (Hos. viii. 13, ix. 3), as the
Exodus is ever looked on as the typical deliverance (e.g. Is. xi. 16); (2) Assyria may
be mentioned rather than Babylon or Persia, because thither the ten tribes
(Ephraim) had been carried away; or Assyria may actually mean Persia, as in post-
captivity times the king of Persia is also often called the king of Babylon (e.g. Ezra
vi. 22, 2 Kings xxiii. 29: Judith 1. 7, ii. 1, Herod. i. 178–188); (3) it must not be
forgotten that but a small portion of the nation had as yet returned under Zerub-
babel, and that viii. 8 (not to mention ii. 10—17) is quite as expressive of a restora-
tion in the future as this passage, and yet the genuineness of neither ii. 10—17 nor
of viii. 8 has ever been called in question (see Introduction).

CHAPTER XI.

OPEN thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy
cedars.
2 Howl, fir tree; for the cedar is fallen; because the mighty are
spoiled: howl, O ye oaks of Bashan; for the forest of the vintage is come
down.

imperative of לָלַל (see the substantive in next verse). The

verse 2. Words.
singular imperative only occurs once again, viz. Jer. xlvii. 2,
where it is לַלְלָל. — On the names of the trees consult the
Dictionaries. — לָלַל is here (as in Hos. xiv. 4, &c.) equivalent to יִלּ (see
"for"); in the latter part of the verse and in verse 3 we actually have
יִלּ (comp. note on viii. 20). — (קָרַד) means "forest of the
vintage," which does not give good sense. קָרַד (קָרַד), taking
בָּאָגָר as a pass. partic., with the article exceptionally prefixed to the
epithet only (see note on iv. 7), would mean "the inaccessible forest." Or, we might consider קָרַד
בָּאָגָר as a substantive (like קָרַד בָּאָגָר), in which
case the construction would be more regular, and the meaning the
same; but the word בָּאָגָר does not occur elsewhere.
3 There is a voice of the howling of the shepherds; for their glory is spoiled: a voice of the roaring of young lions; for the pride of Jordan is spoiled.

4 Thus saith the Lord my God; Feed the flock of the slaughter;

Verses 3.

Words.

These three verses are regarded by Bleek as a prophecy of the campaign of Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, against the allied forces of Syria under Rezin, and of Israel under Pekah. Very similar terms are certainly used by Isaiah in reference to the march of an army, viz. that of Sennacherib (2 Kings xix. 23, Is. xxxvii. 24). But the wording of Zech. xi. 1—3, which in some points reminds one of Jer. xxv. 34—36, is so vague, that, if it refer to an invasion at all, it would be equally applicable to any which came from the north, whether Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, or Roman. Consequently, although we admit that it would make no perceptible difference to the interpretation of this chapter if this passage were removed, we do not feel that it contains any such internal evidence as would compel us to refer it to pre-exilian times.—Some have looked on these verses as descriptive of a storm bursting over the land from the north.—The Talmudic tradition (T. B. Yoma 39b) is that the passage refers to the destruction of the Second Temple.—If we are to consider these verses as an integral portion of the chapter, we may say that ver. 1—3 announce in general terms perhaps the figure of a storm) the judgment that was coming on the land of Israel, while ver. 4—17 describe the causes which would ultimately bring about this visitation.

Verse 4.

Remarca.

xi. 1—3.

Note on xi. 13—On the metheg and see note on ii. 13 (p. 28).—### Words.

The Jordan” is never called the river Jordan, but simply “the descender” (on account of its physical peculiarities; comp. Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, London, 1875, p. 284). LXX. for Ya’ar habbaq r gives δρυμὸς δύσφυνος. φύαγμα as in Jer. xii. 5.
5 Whose possessors slay them, and hold themselves not guilty: and they that sell them say, Blessed be the Lord; for I am rich: and their own shepherds pity them not.
6 For I will no more pity the inhabitants of the land, saith the Lord: but, lo, I will deliver the men every one into his neighbour's hand, and into the hand of his king: and they shall smite the land, and out of their hand I will not deliver them.

That יִדְרֶנָּה is the plur. here is shown by the verb; but in Is. i. 3 יַעֲלֶה is merely the honorific plural.—יֵדְרֶנָּה. On the meheteg see Excurs. ii. A. 1 and 6 note. The final ל is the 3rd pers. fem. suff.—יֵלְדֶה. On the dagesh see Massoreth hamassoreth, ed. Ginsburg, p. 203. The meaning of the word here is “feel themselves guilty,” comp. Jer. ii. 3, 1. 6, 7.—לְדָעֵן has the נ quiescent after pathach (as in לְדָעֵן); but נֵל is merely נ ל (not for נ ל as it does in 1 Kings xi. 39, or as נ ל stands for נ ל in לְדָעֵן). The strict parallel, therefore, is rather to be found in לְדָעֵן (which stands for the unused לְדָעֵן). The chirq is merely written defective (comp. ver. 8): thus the regular form of the word would be לְדָעֵן. After this plur. denotes that “each one of them does not pity,” comp. (Ex. xxxi. 14) מָתְלֵא לַמָּה לְדָעֵן “those who profane it, each one shall certainly be put to death,” and the sing. yómár after mdvrēhen of this verse.

Lo yeshlamu ou metemelono. Lo yachmol “tehém ouk ἐπαυχὸν οὖντεν ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς (comp. Ezek. xvi. 5); but in the next verse Lo 'ēchmol is rendered correctly ou philoum. 

ימל has in Qal, among other meanings, that of “to happen to” (acc.), e.g. Gen. xliv. 34; whence the Hiph. means “to cause to happen to” (acc.), Job xxxiv. 11. Again the Niph. means “to be present” (Gen. xix. 15); whence the Hiph. has the meaning (1) “to present” “to offer to” (יִיא), (Lev. ix. 12); (2) and also “to cause to come to,” “to deliver up” into the hand (יִיא נ), as here and in 2 Sam. iii. 8.—יִיא נ ל בִּיר רְעֹוְה “into the hands of one another”; similarly in the fem. we have (ver. 9) יִיא נ ל בִּיר רְעֹוְה בַּיִשָׁר רְעוֹתָה “they (fem.) shall eat each other's flesh.” (Comp pp. 69, 70.)
And I will feed the flock of slaughter, even you, O poor of the flock. And I took unto me two staves; the one I called Beauty, and the other I called Bands; and I fed the flock.

verse 7.

The "therefore" cannot refer to the command of ver. 4, since the consequence of that command is already expressed by the "∴" at the beginning of the sentence (see note on viii. 19).

The Lesser Massoreth says that קָּרָּאָה stands for קָּרָּא (E.V., see also p. 55) i.e. "for you O...," viz. for your protection (comp. ix. 3). Or it would be possible to take קָּרָּא as for קָּרָּא (Is. iii. 8) for לֹּאֶרֶס, לֹּאֶרֶס (Job xxxiii. 30) for לֹּאֶרֶס נִפְּהָה, and לֹּאֶרֶס (Jer. xxxix. 7, 2 Chron. xxxii. 10) for לֹּאֶרֶס. If קָּרָּא is here to have the sense of "therefore," it can refer only to the preceding clause; the meanings "truly" (Qimchi), or "yea verily" (Ewald) assigned to it are questionable. Now, קָּרָּא might well after the analogy of קָּרָּא יִנְּעֵי הָאָמָן (Jer. xlix. 20, l. 45) mean, not "the afflicted ones of the flock," but "miserable flock." In this case קָּרָּא would refer back to the words "flock of the slaughter." Thus, we might understand the clause: "Therefore (∴) I fed the flock destined for slaughter, (therefore a most miserable flock)."—But I am inclined (seeing that קָּרָּא "נִיָּזָה הָאָמָן recurs in ver. 11) to suppose that the words have been accidentally introduced here from that later passage; but before the time of the LXX., see below. On the metheq under קָּרָּא see Excurs. ii. A. 2, and B. 4 Exception.—כָּרָּא מָהְלָנָה for מָהְלָנָה (for מָהְלָנָה) is the ordinary plural of קָּרָּא (see Excurs. iv.): the qūph (as in many words) loses its dagesh on losing its vowel; but when it retains the vowel, it does not: as מָהְלָנָה (Ex. xii. 11).—Here we have קָּרָּא the constr. form instead of קָּרָּא the absol., comp. (Gen. xlviii. 22) קָּרָּא הָאָמָן, and 2 Sam. xvii. 22; but it may be a rare form of absol.

For קָּרָּא כָּרָּאוּ eis τὴν Χαθάνισιν, reading קָּרָּא כָּרָּאוּ and omitting קָּרָּא. In ver. 11 they seem to have read קָּרָּא כָּרָּאοֹ. LXX., &c. "Nōmām κάλλος; Aq. and Symm. εἰστὶν πρέπεια."—Chōbhi'hum σχοινία. The verbs are rendered by futures.
8 Three shepherds also I cut off in one month; and my soul loathed them, and their soul also abhorred me.

9 Then said I, I will not feed you: that that dieth, let it die; and that that is to be cut off, let it be cut off; and let the rest eat every one the flesh of another.

10 And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people.

11 And it was broken in that day: and so the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of the Lord.

The Lord Himself is the Shepherd of Israel (Is. xl. 11, Ezek. xxxiv. 11—16), and the ideal shepherd “my servant David” the Messiah (Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24) is His representative. The Prophet is now commanded to personate God in this His office of Shepherd, and to feed (i.e. to protect and take care of His flock) the house of Israel, whom their foreign rulers (their owners, sellers, and shepherds) were grinding down, “for,” saith the Lord, “I will not pity the inhabitants of the world, but will set mankind one against the other (comp. Ezek. xxvi. 30, 33), and deliver each into the hand of his king, &c.,” i.e. He would cause the world to be smitten and broken up with wars and civil tumults: this flock, then, which was “in the world,” if it were not to be “taken out of the world,” would require special protection to “keep it from the evil” (John xvii. 15). Therefore the Prophet takes two staves “Favour” and “Binders” to symbolize God’s gracious protection of His people, and the union which would exist between Judah and Ephraim (Ezek. xxxvii. 16—22).

In the Hebrew text יִפְאֵית is only shortened in appearance, the long chiriq is merely written defective. —[LXX. or simply “three shepherds,” as בֵּית הָרְעִים (1 Sam. xx. 21); or “three of the shepherds,” as מִסְכֵּנַת הָרְעִים “five of the curtains” (Ex. xxvi. 3).—יִפְאֵית occurs only here, and in the C’thibh of Prov. xx. 21 (in the Pu’al), it seems here to mean “to loathe,” בֵּית in Syr. means “afflicted with nausea.” For בֵּיתָלָח LXX. give ἐπω-ρύωντο “roared.”

Verse 9. יִפְאֵית means moribunda moriatur. LXX. τὸ ἀποθνήσκον ἀποθνησκότα. "And they knew that it was so [viz.] that, &c."

Verse 11. בֵּית means “my father knoweth [that it is] so” (1 Sam. xxiii. 17). The rendering “and so (i.e. thus)
they knew,” would have required the collocation הַכֵּסָו—“נִיִּים
have not see note on ver. 7.

On of Xavavai; see on ver. 7. Here they do not omit הָשָׁמֶם
see on ver. 7. They seem to have read לֵילָּהַמִּים הֲחַמֶּם.

This is one of the passages which by certain commentators have been looked on as conclusive proof of the pre-exilian origin of these chapters. We proceed to give a short résumé of the opinions which have been held with regard to it. “One month” has by (a) MAURER been held to be literal month; (β) QIMCHI takes it to mean an indefinitely short period; (γ) VON HOFFMANN thinks that each day stands for seven years, 210 years in all; (δ) WRIGHT takes “each day for a year” (Ezek. iv. 6), and so understands a period of 30 years to be signified by “one month.”—The meaning of the expression “the three shepherds” will, of course, depend on the view taken of the meaning of “one month.” Thus (1) CRAN comments that kings, priests, and prophets are meant, and PUSEY “priests, judges and lawyers,” who having “delivered to the cross the Saviour were all taken away (a) in one month, Nisan, a.d. 33.” But the rejection of the good shepherd is spoken of by the Prophet as posterior to the cutting off of the shepherds. (2) MAURER would interpret the three shepherds of Zechariah (son of Jeroboam II.), his murderer Shallum who reigned but a month, and a third unknown usurper whose downfall speedily took place. But Shallum was certainly murdered by Menahem (2 Kings xv. 10—14), and there is no room for a third unknown usurper. (3) HITZIG would avoid the difficulty by rendering “I removed the three shepherds which were in one month” (in support of which construction he refers, and rightly, to such passages as Ex. xxxiv. 31, Is. xxiii. 17, Ezek. xxvi. 20), and takes them to be the kings Zechariah, Shallum and Menahem, who in about the space of one month sat upon the throne of Israel. But the difficulty is really so obviated. Shallum reigned actually “a month of days” (2 Kings xv. 13), and the events referred to occupied much longer. (3) VON HOFFMANN interprets them of the three empires, Babylonian, Medo-Persian and Macedonian, which lasted 215 years from the captivity to Babylon to the death of Alexander the Great. But it cannot be shown that “a day” is ever used to represent “seven years”; nor can the death of Alexander be said to have put an end to the Macedonian empire. (4) QIMCHI explains them as Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah: (5) ABARBANEL as the three Maccabees, Judas, Jonathan and Simon, but, since the cutting off of the shepherds seems to be looked on by the Prophet as an act of kindness to the flock, which only made their ingratitude the more abominable, it seems better with WRIGHT to understand the 30 years [according to (δ) the “one month”] as those betwixt B.C. 172 when Antiochus Epiphanes desecrated the Temple, and B.C. 141 when the three alien shepherds, Antiochus Epiphanes, Antiochus Eupator, and Demetrius I., were cut off, and the last trace of Syrian supremacy was removed by the expulsion of the Syrian garrison from its fortress in Jerusalem.—But the flock were not grateful for this protection, therefore the Prophet cuts asunder the staff “favour,” to indicate that God would annul the covenant He had made with the nations in behalf of His people (Ezek. xxiv. 25—28). This was fulfilled in the troubles which overtook the nation, when they became corrupted, at the close of the Maccabean period.
12 And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. 13 And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prised at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.

verse 12. This verb is altogether anomalous in its conjugation and accentuation. It occurs only in the Imperative. We have "give thou" (Prov. xxx. 15), and with final ה ר frequently, and accentuated "give a perfect [lot]" (1 Sam. xiv. 41). The fem. occurs only once (Ruth iii. 15), ר נ (mīšāl), but the plur. is (as here) "pieces of silver," but not always, e.g. ר נ (Ex. xxi. 32).

verse 13. "Cloak." Here in accordance with the ordinary meaning of the Root (xi. 2, 3), it seems to signify "glory" "magnificence." elsewhere means "costliness," "honour," "magnificence," here it undoubtedly means "price." The verb elsewhere means "to be precious" originally "to be heavy"; here to "be priced" or "apprized." this is the only instance we can cite of the use of to signify the agent after a passive; but is not uncommon in this sense, e.g. (Ps. xxxvii. 23) י ל מ ל כ ל מ..."만. מֵּאְד generally means "from upon" (anglicè "from off"), or "from near." For this modification of its meaning, when applied to denote "by" of the agent, compare Latin a, &c.
14 Then I cut asunder mine other staff, even Bands, that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel.

14. The word "rapheh," see Excurs. iv. 1 (c)—otho in the singular, referring to the sum of thirty pieces of silver.

"Cast it to the potter...by them." LXX. has kathes autous eli to choneventhriov, kai sképomai ei dokimov estin, ev troton edokimashus uper auton. —choneventhriov, since (1 Kings vii. 15) had our reading, but that they took yogyer to mean, not the workman, but the vessel in which the metal is fused, as we say a "boiler," "wine-cooler," &c. Kai sképomai ei dokimov estin, reading ρηλη δ' αραν ολοιον. For ἡγγυγερ Symm. also has to choneventhriov; but Aq. δ' πλάστης; Syr. "the treasury," for in Aram. an initial γ is sometimes read as α, so that (without any alteration of the consonants) they may have read ὑγεῖρ ἡρακ. (For an instance of the converse viz. of α read as γ see LXX. of xiv. 5.) Three MSS. of Kennicott read ἢρακτας, and five τινας ἵνα, both readings being, doubtless, derived from the LXX.

Since maqili is defined by the pron. suff. i, shenë, which agrees with it, takes by rule the definite article (see note on v. 6).—

verse 14.

"brotherhood" is a daptex leugomeron. ב and ב are not from monosyl. roots, their third radicals become apparent in certain circumstances. Thus their constr. is יב, יב, and in Aram. the plur. of יב is יב with the third root-letter י (which is always interchangeable with י and ע) clearly indicated. In the case before us the third root-letter becomes י, and we get יב. The fem. יב "a sister" stands for יב, and in the plur. (with suff.) the third root-letter appears.
15 And the Lord said unto me, of a foolish shepherd.
Take unto thee yet the instruments

16 For, lo, I will raise up a shep-

sometimes as γ, e.g. (Job i. 4) "my declaration" (Job xiii. 17), which is formed from יִּבְנָי by means of a prosthetic נ.—רָב...רָב as in Gen. i. 7,

an other construction is יִּב (ibid. ver. 6).

Vā'dggā' kai ãπέρρωφα (as in ver. 10). Hā'ach'vād hýn katáσχεσων reading ἀρίσταρχος. Cod. Alex. has δαβίδην, which appears to be a correction from the Hebrew.

The Prophet, still as God’s representative, demands his hire of the flock. He receives the miserable sum of 30 pieces of silver (the price of a foreign slave (Ex. xxi. 32). This he is commanded to “cast to the potter.”

No satisfactory explanation of this phrase can be given. It may be that “to the potter with it” was a proverbial expression for throwing away anything worthless, but it cannot be proved that such was the case. Wright holds that it was thrown to a potter as one of the lowest of the labouring classes. Grotius explains it as indicating that God did not value the 30 pieces more than broken potsherds. Hengstenberg, trying to show that this prophecy is a renewal of Jer. xviii. 1, xix. 4, in order to justify S. Matthew’s quotation of it as from Jeremiah, maintains that “to the potter” means to an unclean place, since the potter of Jeremiah, he holds, had his pottery in the valley of ben Hinnom, which had been made an unclean place by Josiah. Kiißlorn regards God as the Potter, comp. Jer. xviii. 6 sq.—The citation in S. Matt. xxvii. 9 is evidently from memory, and a free paraphrase of the original. Though this prophecy may be said to have been fulfilled on every occasion of Israel’s ingratitude towards their Protector, it was most signally fulfilled, when the chief priests offered the price of a slave for the betrayal of Him, in whose rejection the ingratitude of the nation culminated.—The breaking of the bond of brotherhood between Judah and Israel is represented as succeeding the rejection of the Good Shepherd. But, as that rejection was not one single act, but the sum of many such acts, so this disseverment of the union between Judah and Israel, while it had its commencement in the confusion which followed the cutting asunder of the staff “Binders” (see above), did not reach its climax until the time of those frightful civil contests, which marked the last winter of Jerusalem before it was taken by Titus (see Joseph. Bel. Jud. v.; Milman, Hist. Jews, Bk. xvi.); Maurer, Hitzig and Ewald consider the prophecy to refer to the rupture which took place between Israel and Judah, when Pekah (king of Israel) made an alliance with Rezin (king of Syria) and invaded Judah. But history gives no indication of any bond of union existing between Israel and Judah at that period.

Verse 15.
Words. comp. רְלָא (Lam. iv. 3) and רְלֻא (Prov. v. 9).
herd in the land, which shall not visit those that be cut off, neither shall seek the young one, nor heal that that is broken, nor feed that that standeth still: but he shall eat the flesh of the fat, and tear their claws in pieces.

17 Woe to the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock! the sword shall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye: his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened.

Nā'ar means a "youth," "young man," but is never used of the young of animals. Moreover the mention of the "young" of the flock would not be suitable here, since there would be no need to "seek them," for they would remain with their dams. Hitzig proposes to read בַּנְוָ (for בַּנְוָ) Niph. partic. of הָלָּן "to shake out, scatter." The only objection to this is, that all the other participles are in the fem., and this would be masc. Perhaps the explanation of Gesenius is the best, viz. that הָלָּן is an abstract substantive meaning "scattering," and used for the concrete "that which is scattered" (comp. note on vi. 10).—לְמָה the fem. partic. Niph. denotes "standing firmly," comp. בַּלְמָל כָּל הָאֵדוֹת נֶבֶז (Ps. xxxix. 6).

—Y·calcēl, the Pilpel of לָלָל, denotes here (as in Gen. xlvi. 11) to "provide with sustenance."—Uphar'sēhen is fem., the sing. being בְּלָל, elsewhere the plur. is בְּלָל, whence we conclude that the a under the ב is a "Light vowel" (Excurs. i. 5), and the štēvā under נ consequently moving.—Y·phārēq "tear off" or "in pieces."

Hannd'ar rightly τὸ ἐσκορπισμένον. Y·calcēl κατεπονής, somewhat similarly it is rendered Ps. cxi. 6 (Heb. cxii. 5) οἰκονομησάτω, "will guide his words with discretion" (Prayer-Book Version).

On ḫwy see note on ii. 11.—לְמָה must mean "my shepherd," if we take לְמָה as an adj. "useless" : because the latter has the definite article (see note on ver. 13). But if we take לְמָה as a substantive "uselessness" (comp. Job xiii. 4, לְמָה לְמָה "physicians of uselessness"), it will be the constr., with the old case ending (see p. 11). From the consideration that the expression "my shepherd" recurs in xiii. 7, we prefer the former interpretation. On the form לְמָה see p. 11.—יוֹ (1 Sam. xi. 2) means "eye of the right
The "foolish shepherd" seems to denote all the misrulers of Israel from the
decline of the glories of the Maccabean period to the time when they
willingly proclaimed "we have no king but Caesar."

According to Ewald's theory, chap. xiii. 7—9 is misplaced, and should come
after xi. 17. The passage would then run: "Woe to my useless shepherd, that
forsaketh the flock! A sword [shall descend] upon his arm, and upon his right
eye. His arm shall utterly wither, and his right eye shall be utterly dimmed.
Sword! awake! against my shepherd, and against a man, my fellow ('tis the utter-
ance of YHVH Ĭḇḥā'ūṯ). Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.....
(8) And it shall be in all the land...... (9) ... And they shall say: YHVH is my
God.” If this be the true connection, the “third part,” which was to be tried and
refined, can only be referred to those Jews who embraced the pure religion of Christ,
and to those who, laying aside for ever the idolatry of their ancestors, devoted
themselves thenceforth to the study of the Law.

CHAPTER XII.

The burden of the word of the LORD for Israel, saith the LORD, which stretcheth forth the
heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit
of man within him.

2 Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the

Massāh ʿdḥār Ādōnāy (see ix. 1).—לע “concerning,” not here,
“against” like the ב of ix. 1.—Shāmāyim is the object
after the active partic. nōṭēh, and therefore nōṭēh is in the
absol. form (not in the constr. נא). In such a case we are at liberty
to use the definite article before the partic. e.g. הַבַּשֵׁא לָכֶםָיָּוָים
(Is. xl. 22), even if the object take the form of a pron. suff. as
(Job xl. 19) “He who made him.”—Yōqēr (see notes on xi. 13).

Hinnēḥ ānōtē is more emphatic than simple דִּמַּע. שֵׁם the present
partic. used as a prophetic tense, parallel with
(VER. 3), see p. 36.—Sōph “a bowl” (Ex. xii. 22) makes in
plur. פָּסָה (Jer. lii. 19), פָּסָה (1 Kings vii. 50), comp. יִלָּע “side,”
people round about, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and against Jerusalem.

3 And in that day will I make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people: all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it.

plur. יָדִיב: With saph rá'al comp. בָּזִים (Is. li. 17, 22).—Several interpretations of עִלְיוֹת בַּכָּל גּוֹיִם have been proposed. On the whole it seems best to refer the expression to the word ra'al in the former clause, and to render the second clause: "And also on Judah [shall fall this reeling] during the siege [which is to take place] against Jerusalem." Others would refer to the opening words of the chapter, and explain "And also concerning Judah [is this burden of the word of the Lord]." The rendering of the E. V. cannot be supported; that of the margin "and also against Judah [shall he be which] shall be in siege against Jerusalem," requires too much to be supplied. The explanation of Ewald "And also upon Judah shall it be [incumbent to be occupied] in the siege against Jerusalem," is grammatically correct, as he shows from the expression עִלְיוֹת בַּכָּל גּוֹיִם (1 Chron. ix. 33) "upon them it was incumbent to be occupied in the work." And, if we could understand by it that Judah was to be co-operating with (not against) Jerusalem in the siege (see ver. 5), this translation would have much to recommend it. No infin. לַחְם לָיוֹת, or לַחְם לָיוֹת לָיוֹת, is required, any more than an infin. is wanted in the passage cited from Chronicles.

The word saph besides the meaning of "bowl," has that of "threshold" (e.g. Judg. xix. 27), hence the rendering of the LXX. εἰς πρόθυμα σαλεύμενα, and of the Syr. "a gate of fear." In the last half-verse they understand 'al as ἐν, a certain support for which rendering might be found in such expressions as that of vii. 4 (see notes). The ב of Bammàcôr they seem to take as the so-called Beth essentiae; καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἦστα περιοχῇ ἐπὶ Ιερονοσαλὴμ.

לְמִשְׁמֵשׁ; כְּפ. λέγο. either "a burdensome stone," or "a stone for lifting." לְמָכִית denotes here, "every one that lifteth it up," comp. Is. xlvi. 3 (where the pass. partic. of 'ámás is parallel with מָכַית), also Gen. xlv. 13 "each lifted up [his load] on his ass."—יָשָר is the verb used for "cutting the flesh," a custom forbidden to the Israelites by Lev. xxi. 5. Sârâb yiṣṣārêtā,
4 In that day, saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness: and I will open mine eyes upon the house of Judah, and will smite every horse of the people with blindness.

5 And the governors of Judah shall say in their heart, The inhabitants of Jerusalem shall be my

observe that the Infin. absol. Qal is often used to emphasize a finite verb in a different voice, e.g. Niph. here and (Ex. xxi. 28) לָךָש, comp. Job vi. 2; Pu'al, Gen. xxxvii. 33; Hoph. (Lev. xx. 9, 10, &c.).

λίθον καταπατούμενον...πᾶς ὁ καταπατῶν, since there is a great similarity between the pronunciation of ὁ and ἦ, it seems that the LXX. took the stem μελέω as equivalent to μελέω.—For σάρόν γιγαντία there is possible that they may have read ὡσ, which is used of "hissing in mockery," Zeph. ii. 5, (LXX. iii. 1 σφρει).

Timmāḥān "astonishment," "terror" occurs only here and once in the constr. (Deut. xxviii. 28) מֹרֶךְ מְנֻהַת, the verb is hence the retention of the ה, while from הָרַע (with quiescent הֲלִ unser) we have מְנֻהַ and contracted מְנֻה "thy conception" (Gen. iii. 16). There are two forms of such words in ôn, one disyllabic as מְנֻה, and the other, like those of this verse, trisyllabic, comp. מְנֻה. These latter, in construct and with suffix, seem usually to revert to the other (disyllabic) form, thus we have (Is. lvii. 8) מְנֻה zic-rō-nē, (Lam. iii. 62) heg-yōnām, and constr. מְנֻה chev-yōn, מְנֻה dir'-ōn. But from מְנֻה we have יִבְרֹנֶכ (Gen. iii. 16) 'iq-c'hōnēc (comp. Excurs. ii. in fin.).

Verse 4.

Words.

Verse 5.

Constructions, Readings and Versions.

is a fem. substantive of the form of יִבְרֹנֶכ, בְרֹנֶכ, &c. לִי is the dat. comm. comp. ἑβῆθεν (ix. 8). One of Baer's MSS. reads ἡμέρᾳ Ἐλληστή ἦμέρᾳ. Imperative Pi'el, this seems to have been the reading of Aquila who renders καρέφησον μου. One MS. gives 3rd fem. perf. Qal; but there is no fem. substantive in the sentence with which it could agree. LXX. rendering ἐφύσομεν ἔναντις

1 Comp., for instance, Pirqé Rabbi Eliezer (ii.), where for פִּלְצָנָא we have the variant פִּינָא.
strength in the Lord of hosts their God.

6 In that day will I make the governors of Judah like an hearth of fire among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the people round about, on the right hand and on the left: and Jerusalem shall be inhabited again in her own place, even in Jerusalem.

7 The Lord also shall save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem do not magnify themselves against Judah.

τοὺς κατοικ. κ.τ.λ. seems to have understood ᾿ανώτατος as equivalent to ἐδραίω, and the singular as used for the plural. Three MSS. do give ἐκκλησίας. The Targum seems (as frequently) to combine two meanings, viz. that of Rt. ἐκκλησία, and of Rt. ἐπίθεμα, and paraphrases "salvation hath been found for the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (reading לְיִשְׂרֶאֵל for לַיִשְׂרֶאֵל). Syr. paraphrases "the inhabitants of Jerusalem have been stronger than we." Arab. "We shall find for us," after LXX.

On the metheg of בְּלִיוֹר (Jer. ix. 21, Amos ii. 13, Mic. iv. 12) = בְּלִיוֹר "sheaf." The qādmā over the א of דֵּלָה stands for metheg (Excurs. ii. B. 9, N.B.). Since the ֳ of דֵּלָה is read with the m, the ר is not read, but retained (sometimes) merely because an older form of the word was sam-֜-לֹל. adv. "round about" as in Gen. xxiii. 17, such adverbs were originally substantives in the acc.—Tachtēhā, lit. "under herself," i.e. "in her place" (comp. note on vi. 12).

In translating דָּלָו by δαλόν (which is their rendering of בָּלָו in iii. 2), some suppose the LXX. to have taken the Hebr. word as used by metonymy for the wood burnt therein. But the rend. may be due to a confusion of letters.—Tachtēhā is rendered καθ’ εαυτήν.

On the metheg under לְ thigdal see Excurs. ii. A. 1, and for that under beth-David see Excurs. ii. A. 5. David is usually spelt דָּוִד (without yָד) in the earlier books.

Bārḵšōnāh καθως δ’ ἀρχής. Five MSS. are said to read but none of Baer's MSS. give this reading. The LXX. rendering is, probably, quoad sensum, and the prefix ל a later gloss.
8 In that day shall the LORD defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David; and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the LORD before them.

9 And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem.

Verse 8.

In without prefix or affix is pointed בֹּלֶה; but with prefix בֹּלֶה, and with suffix בֹּלֶה, בֹּלֶה, בֹּלֶה; for construction comp. Ps. iii. 4. — Yoṣhev is used collectively, as may be seen from the bāhēm which follows. — Nıcshālūm means “the weak” as נִכְשָׁל יָאוּר, (1 Sam. ii. 4), and the ב of bāhēm means “among” as in Is. v. 27 וַאֶרֶץ יִוְרָה (and not “against” as in Nah. iii. 3).

The expression “as God,” or “as Gods,” being thought too strong, LXX. paraphrased it by ὁ θεός ὁ θεός, comp. a similar proceeding in ver. 10 and xiii. 3.

Verse 9.

The verb בָּקַשׁ baqēsh is used of God only here, and in Ex. iv. 24.

These chapters xii.—xiv. are marked off as a distinct section by the recurrence of the expression “Burden of the word of the LORD” (comp. ix. 1, xii. 1—9. Remarks. Mal. i. 1). No argument against the post-exilian origin of these chapters can be based on the frequent use of the terms “Judah and Jerusalem,” neither is it true that the author of these last chapters “nowhere mentions Israel,” as verse 1 is distinctly addressed to “Israel.” “Israel” (Zec. xii. 1, Mal. i. 1, 5, ii. 11, 16, Ezr. ix. 1, 4, 15, xi. 10, &c.) is a term constantly used in post-exilian times for the Jewish nation, and as parallel with “Judah and Jerusalem” (Zec. xii.—xiv. passim, Mal. ii. 11, iii. 4): so too “all the tribes of Israel” (Zec. ix. 1). Comp. “Ephraim” ix. 10, 13, x. 7, “Joseph” (x. 6), and “Judah” (ix. 8, 13, x. 3, 6), and “Jacob” (Mal. iii. 6, ii. 12) and see p. 21. All these were to a certain extent interchangeable terms in post-exilian times; but “Jerusalem” or “inhabitants of Jerusalem” is used especially of the inhabitants of the metropolis, as distinguished from the rest of the nation, just as a Parisian is distinguished from a Frenchman. PRESSEL considers the prophecy to refer to the repulse of Sennacherib from the walls of Jerusalem. Against this theory it has been rightly urged, that in the days of Hezekiah, when the royal house was foremost in the ranks of religious reformation, it would be strange that a prophet should speak of the house of David as concerned in the martyrdom of one of God’s prophets. MAURER places the date of chap. xii.—xiv. between the death of Josiah (xii. 11), and the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Chap. xii.—xiii. 6 he supposes to have been written in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, when the prophet expected that the enemy would be driven from the gates of Jerusalem; xiii. 7—xiv. 21, after the
And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon 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 firstborn.

battle of Carchemish, when darker fears intruded themselves upon his mind. — But there is a very strong objection against referring xii. 1—xiii. 6 to a time prior to the captivity. For how can we imagine a prophet at the time, when the house of David was the reigning dynasty, making use of such an expression as “that the glory of the house of David and of the inhabitants of Jerusalem may not be magnified over Judah”? We agree, therefore, with Wright in supposing (at any rate) xii. 1—9 to refer to the period between the restoration from the captivity, and the coming of our Lord, when many nations, “Idumeans, Philistines, Arabians, Ammonites, Tyrians, Syrians, and Greeks made various attempts against the Jewish people and against Jerusalem. They are sometimes successful for a short time, but never for any lengthened period. Their attempts were always foiled, often with great loss to themselves, sometimes to their utter ruin.” It must be remembered, too, that after the time of Zerubbabel the house of David fell into comparative obscurity, and that the great leaders the Maccabees were of the tribe of Levi, and not of the house of David.

LXX. καὶ ἐπιβλέψανται πρὸς μὲ ἀνθ' ὑπαναχθησάντο. Perhaps they read ἡ αὴρ which means to “leap” (this is the reading of one of Kennicott’s MSS.); but more probably they took ἡ αὴρ in the figurative sense of “insulting,” as ἔπικερα “to pierce” is used of “cursing.” Calvin in his Comm. on S. John took this view of the Hebr. verb, and said “metaphorice hic accipitur contumelia pro continua irritatione”; but this sense of the verb is not supported by usage. Besides this passage and xiii. 3, the word occurs only in Numb. xxv. 8, Judg. ix. 54, 1 Sam. xxxi. 4, 1 Chron. x. 4, Is. xiii. 15, Jer. xxxvii. 10, 11. 4, Lam. iv. 9, in all of which (except perhaps Jer. xxxvii. 10, where at any rate it means “severely wounded”) it denotes “to thrust through” so as to kill. The only passage which could be cited to justify a figurative meaning of the word is Prov. xii. 18, where the substantive madq’rōth is used, שָׁם מַדְּמַרְמִים רְבֻךָ “[the words of] an idler-talker are sometimes like sword-thrusts: but the speech of the wise is healing.” But there, the gnomic nature of the composition, and the use of the comparative בּ, prepare one for the figurative use of the word. Such is not the case here. — Aq. σὺν δὲ ἐξεκέντησαν (but then he gives σὺν for the ἐθ of Gen. i. 11). Theodotion καὶ ἐπιβλέψανται πρὸς μὲ εἰς ὑπαναχθήσαν. Syr. and Vulg. “et aspicient ad me quern fixerunt.” All the ancient versions, as we see, read ἡ αὴρ, not ἡ αἰρ.
11 In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon.

12 And the land shall mourn, every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart;

(which is however the reading of some MSS., though the great majority, and all the best, read יִּקְסָם). S. John xix. 37 and Rev. i. 7 cannot be looked on as positive evidence in favour of the reading יִּקְסָם, because, not the actual words, but merely the sense of the passage seems to be given in those two places. The reading יִּקְסָם has, however, been supported by Kennicott, Ewald, Geiger, Bunsen. For לְאָֽיָּהּ לְאַֽיָּהּ LXX. ἀγαπητο, either translating ad sensum, or reading יִּקְסָם.

If we are to interpret this verse as it stands, we must certainly understand "the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" as the subject of the verbs v’hibbittu "and they shall look," and daqaru "they pierced," or rather "thrust-through." So we cannot with Rashi understand the verse to mean, that Israel will look [unto God] in mourning for those slain by the Chaldeans; nor with Ibn Ezra, that all the nations will look unto God to see what He will do to them on account of their having slain the Messiah, son of Joseph (comp. T. B. Succah 52a): for (apart from the question of the subject of the verbs), as Qimron most sensibly remarks, if Messiah son of Joseph be referred to here (and we may add, in Ezek. xxxviii. xxxix. also) why is he not mentioned? Retaining the reading of the Text elay "unto me," some interpret the verb daqaru figuratively "they pierced," i.e. "contemned." The Person might be God Himself, or the Prophet (who seems to have personified the Rejected Shepherd in ch. xi.) looked on as identified (Hrrzna) for the moment with Him that sent him. But surely, such a rendering of daqaru (even supposing it to be admissible, which we do not think to be the case) is too weak to account for the strong expressions which follow, "and they shall mourn over him as with the mourning for an only son, &c.," which can only refer to the case of some one actually slain. We must therefore reject this interpretation of daqaru. If, on the other hand, we take it as meaning "they thrust-through," the first person "unto me" presents great difficulties. For it cannot be referred to God Himself, as that would, as Ewald says, "introduce into the Old Testament the absurd notion that persons will bitterly lament over Yahvé (YHVH) as over one that is dead." Nor can it be explained, primarily, of the two-fold nature of Christ, as that is a notion which could never have suggested itself to a Jew of Zechariah's time. Nor can it be interpreted of the Prophet as representing Him who sent him, for no mention is made of the slaying of such a person, nor is any hint dropped of such a thing even in xi. 13. Ewald would read elav "unto him," and says "we can only say, that at that time a distinguished martyr in the cause of Jerusalem and the house of David and the true religion may have fallen shortly before without receiving the just acknowledgment of the capital, and there may be here reference to him." But this "distinguished martyr" exists only in
13. The family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart; the family of Shimei apart, and their wives apart; 

14. All the families that remain, every family apart, and their wives apart.

the imagination of the commentator. As we see no way of interpreting this passage in its present context, so, at least, as to have been understood by the prophet’s hearers, we propose to place it after xiii. 3. See Remarks, p. 114—117.

CHAPTER XIII.

In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness.

2. And it shall come to pass in

Desertion of Idolatry. Zeal not according to Knowledge.

Slaying of the Prophet. Consequent Mourning.

There is, no doubt, a reference here to Numb. xix. 9 לֶּכֶז יְֻנָּה for water of purification, a means of removing sin is it.” Chattaḥ means “sin,” “offering for sin,” “means of removing sin” (comp. the use of the verb יָכָּחַת in Ps. li. 9, “thou shalt cleanse me,” and יָכָּחַת Numb. xix. 12, “he shall cleanse himself”). Similarly niddāh, while it means especially that sort of ceremonial uncleanness, which requires separation (Lev. xii. 2, &c.), denotes also “the removal of this uncleanness.” So we may here correctly render the words לָכָּחַת וּלָנַדָּה for the removal of sin and uncleanness.” Elsewhere the word is נָדָה in the absol., and נָדָה in the constr.; but here all authorities read נָדָה.

Māqōr πᾶς τῶν, reading μὴ λῆλ, and taking, apparently, the undefined substantive as meaning “every place.”—In rendering לָכָּחַת by εἰς τὴν μετακίνησιν, they appear to have taken נָדָה as the Infin. Hiph. of נָדָה (Niddāh), reverting to the primary meaning of the root.

z.
that day, saith the Lord 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.

3 And it shall come to pass, that when any shall yet prophesy, then his father and his mother that begat him shall say unto him, Thou shalt not live; for thou speakest lies in the name of the Lord: and his father and his mother that begat him shall thrust him through when he prophesieth.
intelligible meaning which the words "and they shall look on me (or him) whom they thrust through," in the place in which they now stand in the Hebrew Text, could have conveyed to the Prophet's hearers, and even to us of the present day they seem enigmatical words suddenly introduced without the idea of "thrusting through" having been supplied by the context: (2) If we place them after ch. xiii. 3, in which the "thrusting through" of a son is distinctly mentioned, the words which commentators have taxed their ingenuity in vain to explain, will convey the simplest and most obvious sense. In a section, in which the phrase "on that day," "and it shall come to pass on that day," occurs so often, it is easy to imagine that a confusion of order may have arisen in early times. If our conjecture (and it is but a conjecture) be correct, the whole passage will run as follows:

(iii.1) In that day shall be a fountain opened, for the house of David and for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for [removal of] sin and of uncleanness.—(2) And it shall be in that day (tis the utterance of YHVH Q'ba'oth) I will cut off the names of the idols from the land, and they shall not be remembered any more; and the [false] prophets and the unclean spirit will I cause to pass away from the land. (3) And it shall be, when a man shall prophesy, then they shall say to him, his father and his mother, they that bare him, "Thou shalt not live, because thou hast spoken lies in the name of YHVH;" and they shall thrust him through, his father and his mother, they that bare him, on account of his prophesying. (xii. 10) Then will I pour out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplication, and they shall look on him, even him whom they thrust through, and they shall mourn over him, as the mourning for an only son, and they shall make bitter mourning over him, as one mourneth bitterly for a first-born. In that day... (14)...and their wives apart.

When, in the blindness of fanaticism, these people should have been led to commit such a crime, as that mentioned xiii. 3, then God would have pity on them, and pour out on them the spirit of grace and supplication, &c. The reader will perceive, that the application of the expression "and they shall look on him whom they thrust through" to our Lord (John xix. 34, 37, Rev. i. 7) is even more appropriate, if the words be taken as we have proposed, than if they were left in their present context. For the passage, as we propose to read it, depicts a Prophet, and a true Prophet, rejected by his own people as a false prophet, and slain by them. What more appropriate passage could be cited relative to our Lord? We must not, however, any more than in xi. 12, 13, confine the application of the prophecy to this single fulfilment, though it is certainly by far the most remarkable and important one.
On the accentuation of \(\text{v'shaphacta} \) see notes on i. 3. Chên seems to denote here "Divine favour," i.e. "grace." Tâch-nânim "earnest supplication" as the result of chên (but I.XX. oikrêmi).—\(\text{havim zâlî} \) "And they shall look on me"; but we prefer to read \(\text{on him} \) (see pp. 112, 115).—\(\text{hâvim zâlî} \), among other meanings, has that of "to contemplate" as (Ps. cii. 20) \(\text{mîn hâmam} \), (Is. lxvi. 2) \(\text{âlîr hâmam} \). The nature of the feelings of the contemplator is decided by the context. Here they are, evidently, those of compunction. For the construction \(\text{hâvim zâlî} \, \text{hâmam} \) "unto me (or him), viz. him whom they thrust through," compare (Jer. xxxviii. 9) \(\text{lîrîv hâmam hâmam} \, \text{hâmam} \, \text{hâmam} \, \text{hâmam} \) (Is. xcv. 7) "to Jeremiah the prophet, him whom they cast into the pit."—\(\text{Hayyâchâd} \), the article is generic, and may be best rendered into English by "a"; in Amos viii. 10 we have \(\text{bâbal hâmâr} \) (where also the next clause contains a derivative of \(\text{hâmâr} \)).—\(\text{hâmûr} \) is the Infin. Absol. Hiph. and may be taken as used emphatically, for \(\text{hâmûr hâmûr} \) (but see note on vii. 5). In the Hiph. this verb is nowhere else used of "mourning bitterly," but in the Pi'el is so used (Is. xxii. 4) \(\text{hâmûr hâmûr} \, \text{hâmûr} \, \text{hâmûr} \).—\(\text{C'hâmûr} \) is the Infin. Construct lit. "as the mourning bitterly for."—We can hardly take \(\text{v'shaph'dhih 'alâv} \) to mean they shall mourn over it (\(\text{ea de re} \)), viz. the crime committed, as that would materially weaken the force of the expressions which follow, "over an only son," "over a first-born."

\(\text{Hadadrimmon} \) "is a city," says Jerome, "near Jezreel, now called Maximianopolis, in the field of Mageddon, where the good king Josiah was (mortally) wounded in battle (2 Chron. xxxv. 22—25) with Pharaoh-necho."—According to Assyriologists, Hadar-Ramman is the proper pronunciation of this word. The fact that a place in the tribe of Issachar was at the time of these prophecies known by an Assyrian name is an additional link in the chain of evidence, which proves them to be of post-exilian origin. The mourning for Josiah became, no doubt, proverbial for a great national mourning.

\(\text{Hadarrimmon} \) is rendered \(\text{poçôs} \) "of a plantation of pomegranates," by way of conjecture (\(\text{rimmûn} \) means pomegranate). LXX. \(\text{M'giddûn} \) is rendered \(\text{ekkoptômênów} \), by revertting to the meaning of the root \(\text{gôdâ} \), \(\text{êkkoôpsatê} \).

\(\text{Mishpâchôth mishpâchôth} \) "each family"; for the repetition of the substantive to denote "each single," compare \(\text{êlîr rûr rûr} \) "each flock by itself" (Gen. xxxii. 17); the \(\text{plur.} \) however is not generally used in this manner, but comp. Ezek. xxiv. 6
4 And it shall come to pass in that day, that the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision, when he hath prophesied; neither shall they wear a rough garment to deceive:

(2 Kings iii. 16, Joel iv. 14, Ex. viii. 10, Gen. xiv. 10 are instances of quite a different use of the repetition of substantives).—Lbhad is often used without suffix (e.g. Ex. xxvi. 9). Comp. note on x. 4.

"Nathan," not the prophet, but the son of David (2 Sam. v. 14). Remarks.

He represents a subordinate branch of the house of Judah.

The patronymic from Simeon is שִׁמְעוֹן (Numb. xxv. 14, Josh. xxi. 4), while that from שְׁמוֹעֵה (Shemei) is שְׁמוֹעֵה (Numb. ii. 12). With the construction מָשְׁחֵת תְּשִׁימֵה יִמְרֵמָה, &c. (Numb. xxvi. 5, 6, 12, 13, &c.).

This Shemei seems to be of the house of Gershon (Numb. iii. 17) a subordinate house of Levi; not the Benjaminite (2 Sam. xvi. 5). Observe the particularization of ver. 12, 13, and the generalization of ver. 14. Remarks.

This seems to point to the general, and yet particular nature of the mourning. For the fulfilment in reference to the Crucifixion see Luke xxiii. 48, Acts ii. 37—41.

**FALSE PROPHETS DISCLAIM THE GIFT OF PROPHECY.**

The Imperf. of יִבְשֶׂה is יִבְשֶׂה, with which may be compared יִבְשֶׂה (unless this latter is to be regarded as a Niph.).—The מְדָה of מֶדֶךְ יְוֹנָם denotes "on account of," comp. ii. 8. For the verb Bosh construed with min, of the thing to be ashamed of, comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 32. With regard to the form of Chizzayon with suffixes see note on xii. 4.—B'henndab'otho = b'henndab'otho of ver. 3. This form with final מ is formed after the analogy of such Infinitives as מַלְשָׁה תְּשִׁימֵה, מַלְשָׁה תְּשִׁימֵה, מַלְשָׁה תְּשִׁימֵה, מַלְשָׁה תְּשִׁימֵה. This is the only instance of a Niph. Infin. in מ from a verb quiescent נל.—On the construction of labhash see note on iii. 3.—On addereth see note on ii. 13.—L'ma'an construed with the Infin. construct. is common, compare Amos ii. 7 מִלְמָשְׁה, Deut. xxix. 18, Jer. vii. 10, &c.

καὶ ἐνδύσονται δέρρων τριχίνων, omitting ήτ. ἀνθ᾽ εὖν LXX.

ἐφευρέαστο is simply a mistranslation.
5 But he shall say, I am no prophet; for man taught me to keep cattle from my youth.
6 And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends.

It must be observed that נָהֲנָה is here, by no means, used to denote a man of importance, as it is when opposed to לֶהָנָה (Ps. xlix. 3). It simply means "an individual:" for, though אדָם occurs in the next clause, it cannot be said to be opposed to אֱשֶׂ. Similarly our Prophet uses אָב הֶבֶר, with no special significance, in ver. 7. "{דָּמָה: "an agriculturist," as in Gen. iv. 2.—תִּנְבָּה (on the simām rāphēh see Excurs. iv.). The verb הָבֶר in the Qal means to "originate," "acquire," "possess," but since it occurs nowhere else in the Hiph., there is great difficulty in determining its exact force in this passage. Some take it as a stronger Qal "to purchase"; others "to sell" (as נָל in Qal is "to borrow," in Hiph. "to lend," and Aram. zābān "to buy," Pa'el zābbēn "to sell"). Others, taking it as a denominative from mig'nēh "possession," deduce the same meaning "to buy." Qimchi makes it a denominative from mig'nēh in the sense of "a flock," and understands it as "made me a herdsman." Whatever be the exact meaning of the word (LXX. γέννησε με), it is clear that the person accused of assuming prophetic powers disavows all such assumption, and claims to be looked on as a simple rustic. Aq. εἶπεν με, Symm. εἶπεν με, Theod. εἶπεν με. On וּוּרִים see note on ix. 17.

Verse 6.

(Prov. xxvi. 13) with תְּבִין הַרְבָּה (xxii. 13), would render it in manibus tuis. Possibly this may be the meaning. But, since חֲלֵיתִי (2 Kings ix. 24) certainly means "in the body," our expression may be taken here to denote "on the chest." (Comp. Bēn 'enēcā Deut. vi. 8, and my Fragment of T. B. Psachim, p. 74, note 4. The expression "between thy hands" in Arab. means simply "before thee," לְהָנָה; but that meaning is not suitable here; neither is it a Hebrew usage.) בֵית denotes "in the house of," comp. Gen. xxiv. 23. —וַאֲמַר "and one will say," i.e. the other will reply, is wrongly rendered by the LXX. καὶ ἰπώ.
7 Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.

The "rough garment" was the ordinary dress of the prophets. If one who was not a prophet wore it, it caused him to be taken for such, and was therefore worn "to deceive." The words of ver. 5 are very similar to those of Amos vii. 14, 15; but the purport of the two passages is very different. Amos declares that though he was a herdsman and had never been brought up as a prophet, still he had received a divine mission, which he intended to perform in spite of Jeroboam II., and Amaziah priest of Bethel. But here the false prophet, when accused of exercising the functions of a prophet, utterly denies the charge. The wounds which he is accused of having inflicted on himself (in idolatrous worship 1 Kings xviii. 28, Jer. xlvii. 5, xlviii. 37), he asserts to have been inflicted on him by others "in the house of his friends." Rosénmüller understands that he confesses to have been punished in his parents' house for false prophecies. Hengstenberg thinks that he acknowledges, with shame, that he had been so wounded in the house of his friends, i.e. in the idol temples. Wright says that perhaps he may have suggested that these wounds were received by him on the occasion of some carousal with boon companions.

**Shepherd smitten. Flock scattered.**

On the accentuation of 'ūrî see notes on ix. 9, p. 84.— "mîthî "my fellow" is a word which occurs only here, and in Leviticus. It seems to be a subst. of the form of אֵלֶג עַל (ix. 15, in plur.) &c., and to denote "fellowship" "neighbourship" in the abstract, and then to be used (as in Lev.) for the concrete (comp. notes on vi. 10, xi. 16). According to the first meaning gebber would be here the constr. and the expression would mean "the man of my fellowship." According to the second (and current use of the word) "mîthî would be in apposition with gebber, and we should render "a man my fellow."—Hâc "smite thou" is in the masc., although 'ūrî agrees correctly with chérebh in the fem.—נִמְתָּשְׁבֹֹתִי "that may be scattered." (On this verb see note on i. 17.) The forms of the 3rd pers. fem. plur. Imperf. in יִי, instead of יִבְּלָה, are common; e.g. נִמְתָּשְׁבֹֹתִי (Ezek. xvi. 55), יִמְתָּשְׁבֹֹתִי (Ex. i. 17), יִמְתָּשְׁבֹֹתִי (Deut. xxi. 21), יִמְתָּשְׁבֹֹתִי (Numb. xxv. 2), יִמְתָּשְׁבֹֹתִי (Gen. xix. 33).

—On the accentuation of vah'shebhóthî see note on i. 3.—The participle יִמְתָּשְׁבֹֹתִי does not occur elsewhere: it can scarcely be taken as equivalent
8 And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the Lord, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third shall be left therein.
9 And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The Lord is my God.

To 
“little ones” (Judg. vi. 15, Ps. cxix. 141): it seems rather to denote “those who make themselves small,” “the humble ones.” The expression “to turn the hand back upon” is often used to denote anger (Amos i. 8, Ps. lxxxxi. 15); but sometimes it signifies loving chastisement (Is. i. 25), and such appears to be its meaning here.

Verse 8. Words. To arrive at τοῖς πομένας μου LXX. must have read τοῖς ἀγρίοις instead of τοῖς. For “μιθῆς they give πολλίν μου. The verb τρηθεῖσαν they considered as active, and rendered ἐκστάσατε; and to make ἡμᾶς correspond with this, they rendered it also by the plur. παράξενα (Matt. xxvi. 31 παράξω).—Ἅγγεῖον τοῖς μικροῖς.

Verse 9. (on the metheg see Excurs. ii. A. 3) denotes “a double portion” (Gen. xliii. 34), comp. πλὴν ἄνωθεν ἀνέθεν (1 Sam. i. 5): here by the expression hashsh’lēshēth, in the second half-verse, it is shown to mean “two thirds.”—Βάθι “in it,” the flock (γένος).—The verb ἔφυγεν “to die,” like ἤλθεν (Is. xvi. 22), has the medial ꜱ as a strong consonant, and not quiescent as in ἄρεω.

Verse 2. ἐβήβηθεν should be so accentuated, as Baer edits; not ἐβήβηθι (see note on i. 3). With the latter accentuation the verb must be looked on as the Prophetic Perfect.—The verb Qārā is construed with ב in the sense of “calling upon” the Name of God &c. (Gen. iv. 26), or of Baal (1 Kings xviii. 26).—עָמָרְתִי (on the placing of the accent pashta see page 16) is the Perfect, which preceded, and followed by Futures, may be used as a Future even without וֹכֶּב convers. comp. (Is. xiii. 10) וֹכֶּב הַשָּׁמַיִם לָא יָהֳל אָדָם הַשָּׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם בָּאָדָם לָא יָהֳל אָדָם: LXX. καὶ ἐρω.

Wright objects to Ewald’s theory that these verses form a sequel to chap. xi., that “the removal of foolish shepherds could only be a blessing to the flock, while the removal of the shepherd is here represented as utterly disastrous.” But since in xiii. 7—9, the figure of the shepherd and his flock is evidently intended to suggest the notion of a leader and his army,
and the death of the leader, even when incompetent, would involve the scattering of the army (this very figure is used by Micaiah in foretelling the death of the wicked Ahab, 1 Kings xxii. 17), this objection does not seem to us conclusive.

But, if we are to reject this suggestion of Ewald, or if we are not to regard this passage as a distinct prophecy by itself (see Introduction), “the shepherd” can only mean some prophet of the Lord, who on account of the sins of the people should be taken away by a violent death. After his death a remnant were to be purified and saved. Ver. 7 is quoted by our Lord (Matt. xxvi. 31, Mark xiv. 27).

CHAPTER XIV.

Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee.

2 For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city.

3 Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle.

One Day, it is known by YHWH.

Hinneth yom bâ lAdonây “behold a day cometh for the Lord”: the expression is exactly equivalent to that of Is. ii. 12, Yôm lAdonây “[there is] a day [coming] for the Lord.”—

Verse 1. Words and constructions.

Verse 2.

Nashâssi is the Niph. Perf. of נָשָׁשׁ, the Niph. occurs only once again (also with habbâtîm), viz. (Is. xiii. 16) מַשָּׂךְ. For verse 2.

Verse 3.

C’yôm must be regarded as an acc. “as at the time of” (see notes on i. 8, viii. 9, 11). With the expression yôm kîlîâmâ comp.

Verse 3. Words, etc.

(Ezek. xxxix. 13) מִזְבַּחְמֹד. On the first metheg of hil-

lîchmîd see Excurs. ii. B. 3.

1 The vowels in the Text belong, of course, to the Q’ri.
4 And his feet shall stand in that
day upon the mount of Olives,
which is before Jerusalem on the
east, and the mount of Olives shall
cleave in the midst thereof toward
the east and toward the west, and
there shall be a very great valley;
and half of the mountain shall
remove toward the north, and half
of it toward the south.

Verse 4.
Words and
constructions.

'Al-p'né "over against," as (Judg. xvi. 3) 'al-p'né Chebhrón "opposite
Hebron."—Miqqédem "towards (or in) the East," and so,
probably, Gen. ii. 8; comp. note on iv. 3, and the expression
mèchevyō, which follows.—Chevyō denotes here, not "half"
(Ex. xxiv. 16, and in the second half of our verse), but "middle"
(Judg. xvi. 3) הַר הַר הַלֵּי "at midnight": thus mèchevyō denotes
"in its midst."—מִרְאֶה לִפְרֹךְ אֶלֶף "opposite Hebron."—Miqqedem
"towards (or in) the East," and so.

Verse 4.
Words and
constructions.

This seems to be merely a variation
of pronunciation. In illustration of the
tendency of ay to be pronounced as ä (ä)
observe that Arab bayna (ḥā) is pro-
nounced bēna, and the Syr. suffix ayea
as ēca, and that in modern Greek α is
pronounced ē aļa ēma (with a very
slight aspiration).

'1 This seems to be merely a variation
of pronunciation. In illustration of the
tendency of ay to be pronounced as ä (ä)
observe that Arab bayna (ḥā) is pro-
nounced bēna, and the Syr. suffix ayea
as ēca, and that in modern Greek α is
pronounced ē aļa ēma (with a very
slight aspiration).

2 לְרוּר (2 Kings xxv. 9) is not
included, since it might mean "great-
man's house." The expression לְרוּר
(2 Chron. xii. 17) is not
sufficient ground on which to found a
statement that the constr. can be used
with an epithet, since the word is a
proper name, and the expression may
be parallel with לְרוּר (2 Chron.
viii. 3).
5 And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee.

here only in the O. T.; for other designations of that hill see 2 Sam. xv. 30, 1 Kings xi. 7, 2 Kings xxiii. 13, Ezek. xi. 23.

'גֶּדֶלֶת ְמַקְדָּשׁ מִגָּדוֹל שָׁפְדָּה - 'עֲמָשָׁה קָאָה קָלוּנֵי, by which word they render also מִלֵּא (Ps. xlv. 6), and לְנֵבָּה (1 Sam. iv. 2).

'נָסָה followed by the acc. can only mean "to flee to"; the translation of Luther vor solchem Thal is inadmissible. For an instance of the construction found here comp. (Ps. xi. 1) 'נָוָה רַבּוֹת צָלָה.

The expression מִלֵּא לָהּ is difficult. In 1 Chron. viii. 38 we find מִלֵּא as the Pausal form of מִלֵּא (as pathach is found often in Pause for gerē, e.g. מִלֵּא Gen. xxiv. 61 &c.). Supposing, then, that the preposition מִלֵּא is the constr. of מִלֵּא (as is probable, comp. מִלֵּא, Ezek. xviii. 18, as the constr. of מִלֵּא), el-אכֶד would mean "to nigh," "to very near." אכֶד would in this case be used independently (as an adverb), as we have shown (ii. 12) that achēr is used. The Prophet turns abruptly from speaking of God "עֲבֹד...וֹחָדָה," to addressing Him "'יםמך": for a similar abrupt transition compare (Song of Songs i. 1) "yish-shāqān...cì-tōbhim dōdātā miyyā'in."

'יהב occurs three times in this verse. According to the Western punctuation it is read 'יהב (see above), but the Oriental reading is 'יהב "and the valley of my mountains shall be closed up" in the first case, and 'יהב in the two other cases: so, too, the Targum and Rashi, and Ibn Ezra. LXX. in all three cases (Symm. and Hex.-Syr. in the first two) read 'יהב, and render the passage: 'כָּל הַפָּרָכָה שֶׁל מַנְּחָה וּמַנְּנָה, כִּי עָלָהּ הָאָמָה גַּחַר, כִּי עָלָהּ הָאָמָה שֶׁל מַנְּחָה. The word 'יהב is merely a corruption of 'נָוָה (לָא); some copies of the Hex.-Syr. give 'אָסָה. Observe that the transliteration of 'יהב by 'נָוָה (reading ו as ya) is just the converse
6 And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear; nor dark:

of the process by which the Syr. gets ḫāṣeēm out of ḫāṣem (xi. 13). Ev raūs ḫēbēm is merely a free translation of mipp'neē. — oi ἄγων μετ' αὐτοῦ, for q'dōshîm immēc. One of Baer's MSS. notes that some correct MSS. read ḫîwān ḫēn; but, the Massoreth states that ḥrēm occurs only in Deut. xxxiii. 3, Ps. xxxiv. 10, and, therefore, q'dōshāv must be looked on as only an emendation. As for ḫēn, it is easy to see how ḫēn might have been written ḫēn, and that read as ḫēm; but still, the transition from the third to the second Person is so thoroughly in accordance with usage, that one cannot see any reason for doubting the correctness of the reading ḫēm.

The earthquake in the days of Uzziah is nowhere mentioned by the sacred historians, and the account given of it by Josephus (Antiq. ix. 10 § 4) must be looked on as apocryphal. Still, so great and lasting was the impression made by that event on the popular mind, that it formed an era from which events were dated (Amos i. 1), and is here referred to as a well-known catastrophe. It has been argued that this reference to the earthquake fixes the date of this prophecy to a time shortly after that event. But, as reasonably might it be argued, that an author who used the expression “they fell to a man, as they did at Thermopylae,” had written shortly after b.c. 480!

The Q'rēh bēth is ḥāḇēr bēth (for there is no occasion, with Gesen., to invent a Niph. of ḫēbēm). The verb is in the masc. although its nominative is fem. comp. ḫēm is ḫēm (Is. xxi. 2). In Job xxxi. 26 yāqār is applied to the Moon, ḫēn ḫēn ḫēn “the moon, sailing resplendent.” So here yqārōth seems to denote “the resplendent heavenly bodies.” The definite article is omitted before yqārōth (as it is before bēth “the stars” ten times, against nine times in which it is expressed). The verb is that found in Ex. xv. 8 ḫēm bēth “the depths became consolidated in the midst of the sea.” The meaning, then, of yqārōth yiqpā’ôn seems to be “the splendid (heavenly bodies) will contract their splendour,” i.e. will wane.—The Q'rē gives the ḫēm. ḫēm (of the form ṭimēmēm bēth ḫēm “and consolidation,” “coagulation.” And the meaning of yqārōth ṭiqippā’ôn is perhaps “[there will be] intense-
7 But it shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord, not
day, nor night: but it shall come
to pass, that at evening time it
shall be light.
8 And it shall be in that day,
that living waters shall go out from
Jerusalem; half of them toward
the former sea, and half of them
toward the hinder sea: in summer
and in winter shall it be.
9 And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one.
10 All the land shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem: and it shall be lifted up, and inhabited in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's winepresses.

It is a disputed point among grammarians whether such forms as 

Verse 10.

Words, etc. letter doubled, are to be regarded as Qal, or Niph.—Baer, here and in Is. xxxiii. 9, edits הַעָרָבָה without the def. article; but the Cod. Petropol. reads הַעַרְבָּה. We prefer this latter reading "like the plain," viz. that now called Al-Ghor, which extends with some interruptions from the slopes of Hermon to the Elamitic gulf of the Red Sea. If we read הַעַרְבָּה, we must suppose that 'Arabâh was already regarded as a proper name (comp. note on vii. 14). נֶגֶב "to the south of" as (Josh. xi. 2) "to the south of Cinerith."—ְרְאֶמֶל is an anomalous 3rd pers. fem. sing. Qal from רָאֶמֶל. A variant is רָאמֶל, which is after the analogy of פַּלּוּץ (Joel ii. 6), comp. עָרֶמֶל "poor" (Prov. x. 4, xiii. 23).—לִמְשָׁחָר, the prefix מַלֵּךְ denotes "from," of place as here (comp. Job xxxvi. 3), or of time as (2 Sam. vii. 19).—שָׁאָר הָאָרִישׁון on the article see p. 44.—מִגְדֵּל stands for mim'migidâl, or לִמְשָׁחָר, the min, or l'min, being understood from לִמְשָׁחָר, or מִגְדֵּל, which precede. Some MSS. read מְמִדָּל (comp. i. 4).—יִקְבּוֹד, the constr. plur. occurs here only, but it is regularly formed from יִקְבּוֹד.

κυκλῶν agreeing, one would suppose, with Κύριος of the preceding verse. This rendering of הָאָרִישׁוֹנָא is defensible (though inappropriate). For an imperfect is often used to describe the state or condition of a person (like the participle, see notes on iii. 1, v. 1), especially for the sake of variety, e.g. (Is. xl. 30) פַּלּוּץ מְמִדָּל הַוָּאֵל, נֵחַ לְעָתוֹ לְוָאֵל (compare the use of הָאָרִישׁוֹנָא after xiv. 18). καὶ τῆν ἑφαμίλιαν, as a free translation, "compassing all the earth, as (it will) the desert," i.e. "all the earth and the desert."—'Pa'mâ, taking נַפֵּל as a Proper Name, which however is always spelt נַפֵּל.καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τύργουν, they carry on 'ad from 'ad shâ'ar happinnîmm, instead of min, as we do.
11 And men shall dwell in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited.

12 And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite all the people that have fought against Jerusalem; Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth.

13 And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great tumult from the Lord shall be among them; and they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbour, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbour.

Baer edits (not בּרֶה but בּּרֶה, this is the pointing of the word in every other passage, whether in the sense of “net,” or of “ban.” Some MSS. read בּּרֶה “sword” (comp. p. 64). The rendering of the Targ. cannot be said to be conclusively in favour of this latter reading: since “slaughter” may be only a paraphrase of “ban”; LXX. has correctly ἀνάθεμα.

תְּלֹאֹן comp. Numb. xxxi. 7, &c.—נְפֶה is the Infin. of מָכָה, it may be taken as the Infin. Absol. used emphatically with Verse 12. the omission of the finite verb (comp. xii. 11); or it may be construct, and be explanatory “and this shall be the plague, &c.” viz. “the rotting of,” comp. the second בּּרֶה in xii. 11.—The suffix of בּּרֶה is distributive, and refers to each of “all the nations,” or to each individual of them. The clause וְהָא וּמֶד הָא רָגֵלָא denotes the state in which he shall be, when overtaken by the plague (comp. p. 46). נְפֶה is the Fut. Niph. 3rd pers. plur. for נְפֶה, comp. Niph. of נְפֶה (2 Kings xxi. 13, Jer. xix. 3); the form נְפֶה (1 Sam. iii. 11) is Hiphil.

For וְהָא וּמֶד הָא רָגֵלָא, this is correct enough quoad sensum: the participle agrees with the persons understood in the LXX.

“And they shall seize each other by the hand,” to grapple together. Hech’צַק is generally construed with ב before ר; but compare רְיָנוֹ... לְאָל רְיָנוֹ... יִלְשָנָא... ‘al “and shall [rise i.e.] be lifted up against.”
14 And Judah also shall fight at Jerusalem; and the wealth of all the heathen round about shall be gathered together, gold, and silver, and apparel, in great abundance,

15 And so shall be the plague of the horse, of the mule, of the camel, and of the ass, and of all the beasts that shall be in these tents, as this plague.

16 And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles.
And it shall be, that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain.

And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, that have no rain; there shall be the plague, wherewith the LORD will smite the heathen that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles.

The reason why the Feast of Tabernacles is specified seems to be as follows. Passover is indeed the chief festival (see Memorbook of Nürnberg, Remarks. p. 20), but then it is a distinctly Jewish festival in commemoration of the Exodus. The Feast of Weeks again, as the festival of the Giving of the Law, is distinctly Jewish. But the Feast of Tabernacles, being the “Feast of Ingathering,” when they rejoice over those things which are provided for the animal nature of man, would be a Festival in which the Nations of the World could rejoice and praise the Giver, as well as the Israelite (see also Introduction).

means “whosoever.” The 1 of 16 introduces the apodosis, comp. (Gen. xlv. 9) “with whomsoever of thy servants it shall be found; he shall die.” “out of” as (Josh. xxi. 16) “nine [cities] out of these two tribes.”

For LXX. give καὶ οὖν έκείνοι προστατήσωνται: Köhler supposes they read ἄλλα ἐν τρίς ἑτέρω τριών λεγέσαι; but, seeing that the Septuagint translators were somewhat acquainted with more modern Hebrew, I should say that they read ἄλλα ἐν τρίς ἑτέρω τριών λεγέσαι (or more probably simple λεγέσαι) lit. “and to them shall be the-making-to-approach-of-the-others”: heggesh would be an Hiphilic substantive of the form of heggesh “comparison.”

is the pres. partic. fem. Qal of בָּרַר, as (Gen. xxix. 6) ... רָלָה בָּרַר “behold his daughter...coming”; but 3rd pers. fem. sing. Perf. Qal, as (ver. 9) ... בָּרָלָה רָלָה and Rachel came.”

The words can only be rendered “And if the family of Egypt go not up, and cometh not,” the participle being used instead of בָּרָלָה merely for the sake of variety of sound. We cannot see that there can be any
19 This shall be the punishment of Egypt, and the punishment of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles.

20 In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HO-
greater objection to this construction, than to the following (Ezek. xxxix. 8) "Lo! it cometh, and shall certainly take place." (The E. V. of Ezek. takes ba'ah, as ba'ah the perfect, in which case it would have been accentuated (see page 16). LXX. understands the phrase correctly àν...μη àναβη μηδε οἶδη. Von Hofmann has suggested the reading ἀλα ὁ λαος, some would supply ὃθε γραφη ἁγγαγημα from the preceding verse, and render "then upon them shall not be rain." The objection to this interpretation is, that in this case we should require zōth (as in the next verse) before τιθη: "This shall be the plague, &c." The rendering "will, then, there not fall upon them the plague, &c.?” (Hitzig, Bunsen and Lange) is better. Here 1 introduces the apodosis (comp. ver. 16, iii. 7), and εί is interrogative nonne? as, certainly, (Ex. viii. 22) "If we slay...will, then, they not stone us?

1α λα ο λαος τιθη ται απο της εκτον ὁ θεος ἡ πτωσις κτλ. simply, omitting εί; two Hebr. MSS. omit εί, and four omit ύιος. We think it quite possible that the εί may have crept into the text from the εί which precedes, or from the εί of the preceding verse. Certainly "Then upon them shall be the plague, with which, &c." is the simplest construction, and affords the best sense.—Some MSS. and many Edd. read κολ between εί and ἁγγαγημα, but it seems to have crept in from τελ-τιθη (ver. 12), comp. xii. 2. 3.

Chattath is the constr. of chattath (see note on xiii. 1). It may mean here "sin," or "punishment" (comp. the frequent use of ש). "bells" is a επ. λεγο. but comp. מצלתים (1 Chron. xiii. 18):
Zechariah XIV. 21.

Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts; and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein: and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts.

Ver. 12 [thus, whatever may be the case in English, in Hebr. the words tingle and tinkle are the same, viz. נַּעַלָּה].—ObserveINUX in the sing. masc. (comp. note on ver. 15); but here, since the verb precedes its nominative, it has no need to agree with it: e.g. (Is. xviii. 5) יִרְחָה פֶּה, (Gen. i. 14) יִרְחָה פָּקָחָה.—Sir in the sing. denotes “a pot” (masc. Jer. i. 13, fem. Ezek. xxiv. 6), its plur. is פיּרָת (Ex. xxxviii. 3); in Amos iv. 2 sírōth perhaps means “hooks.” But פּוּרִים means “thorns,” e.g. (Eccles. vii. 6) כָּכַל חֲמוֹרֵים חַתָּןָה חֲמֵרִי “like the crackling of thorns under a pot” (comp. Ps. lviii. 10).

Mēhēm “of them,” i.e. “some of them,” as many as may be required: comp. (Gen. xxviii. 11) יהָּחָה פֶּאָסָיָה יִשְׁמָכָה “and he took some of the stones of the place.”—בְּכַלְכַל is used in the signification of “merchant” (Job xl. 30, Prov. xxxi. 24), and so the word is understood here by Aquila, and the Chaldee Paraphrase (Targum), followed by Hitzig, Maurer &c.

If this be the meaning, the reference must be to traders who sold pots, cattle, &c., for the sacrifices (comp. John ii. 14—16, Matt. xxi. 12, 13). Remarks. But, though there probably were such in the Temple at this time, it cannot be actually proved that there were. Von Hofmann understands by Canaanite the Gibeonites and Nethinim, who were employed in the menial services of the Temple. Theodoret, Luther, Ewald take it as denoting notorious sinners, devoted to destruction, as were the Canaanites of old. Pressel, combining two interpretations, understands by Canaanite, those who traffic in holy things, and the ungodly and profane. But, it seems best on the whole, to suppose that the prophet, having referred above to the Egyptians, fell naturally into the use of the word “Canaanite” (since they were also the enemies of Israel in days of old), and that he meant by it nothing more than “heathen,” “infidel.”

We almost agree with De Wette that this chapter defies all historical explanation. If we attempt to interpret it of the taking of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, we are met by the following difficulties. (1) Though ver. 1, 2 were only too literally fulfilled on that, and on other occasions, ver. 3—5 were certainly

Concluding Remarks on chap. xiv.

9—2
not fulfilled, for God made no demonstration at that time on behalf of his people. (2) While other pre-exilian prophets foretell clearly the deportation, and subsequent return of the people, our prophet mentions neither deportation nor return, but merely speaks of Jerusalem being inhabited in safety (ver. 10—11). But, if it refer to events after the Captivity, what can those events be? It might perhaps refer to the taking of Jerusalem by Ptolemy, a successor of Alexander, in B.C. 321; or more probably to its pillage by Antiochus Epiphanes in B.C. 167. In this latter case, the language of ver. 3—5 might be looked on as prophetic, in a highly figurative manner, of the deliverance of Israel by God through the instrumentality of the Maccabees: ver. 8, 9 might represent the revival of pure and undefiled religion in those days, and ver. 10 and 11 the peaceful prosperity of that period; but still, we could not in reference to the Maccabean era give any satisfactory account of ver. 16—21. We cannot possibly with EUSEBIUS, CYRIL, and THEODORET refer the prophecy directly to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans (A.D. 70). For, admitting the truth of Eichhorn’s remark “prophets threaten with no people, and promise nothing of any, till the people itself is come on the scene and into relation with their people,” one cannot imagine that at a time when the Greeks were only just come into prominence in connection with the East, the Prophet should speak of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, when Rome was but as yet only an insignificant city, gradually asserting its superiority over the Latin peoples, and still troubled with the dissensions between Patricians and Plebeians. Further, the description of what took place on that occasion, as given by Josephus (Bel. Jud. vi. 9 § 2), which is a direct contradiction of the promises ver. 2—6, 12—15, precludes such an interpretation. The above considerations are independent of any hypothesis as to the authorship of the chapter.—We are compelled therefore to interpret the chapter wholly in a figurative and Messianic sense. The Prophet, to whom were known the traditions of the prophetic schools concerning the times which were to precede the Messianic era, foretells the grievous troubles of “that day.” Speaking in the language of the Psalms of the Theophany (xcvi—xcix) he represents God as revealing Himself for the protection of His people. The day of the Messiah is to be one of great Spiritual Knowledge: Jerusalem is to be inhabited in security: not only is the wealth of all nations to flow thereunto, but the nations themselves are come and do homage to The King, the Lord of Hosts, in Jerusalem. As for those that come not up, on them will fall the direst punishments. In “that day” (he
does not imply that the Law of Moses shall be literally re-established, still less that it shall be abrogated, but there shall be such a diffusion of the knowledge of God, that there shall be a general elevation of everything in sanctity, so that the very bells of the horses shall be engraven with the significant inscription, of the Priest of the High Priest (Qôdesh l'Adonay), and idolatry and unbelief shall all but entirely pass away.—The whole scene, which he depicts, is ideal. To some extent it may be said to have been fulfilled in the Christian Church. But the full consummation of “that day” will not take place, until (1 Cor. xv. 28) “God shall be all in all,” and the voice of the Angel shall proclaim (Rev. xi. 15):

ΕΓΕΝΟΝΤΟ ΑΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΗΜΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕΙ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΙΩΝΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΙΩΝΩΝ.
EXCURSUS I.

RULES FOR SYLLABLE-DIVIDING IN BIBLICAL HEBREW.

1. Every vowelless consonant has a sh'va either expressed or understood. If a word end in a single vowelless consonant the sh'va is not written, thus ל etc., or before maqeph ליעני. If such a vowelless consonant be preceded by a quiescent consonant some editors give it without a sh'va, others (as Baer) with sh'va, thus ל or ל (Mic. iv. 10), הל or הל (ver. 13).

2. A sh'va must be either moving or quiescent. The sh'va under a letter which begins a syllable is called moving, all others are quiescent.

3. Every compound sh'va (, , ) is moving. Every simple sh'va (, , ) under any of the letters י and י in verbs י and י, which is always moving as in י (see Excurs. II. A. 7).

4. (a) When two sh'vas fall together in the midst of a word, the first is quiescent, and the second moving, as יכילע yiq·ṭlā.

(b) A dagesh forte in a vowelless consonant always produces two sh'vas [the one quiescent and the other moving, in accordance with (a)]. Thus the dagesh forte in the ב of יבלו produces a quiescent sh'va under the first p, and a moving sh'va under the second, so that the syllables are mip·p·nē-cēm (standing for min·p·nē-cēm).

5. (a) It would be impossible to pronounce two successive consonants both bearing moving sh'va. Consequently, if in the process of altering the vocalization of a word, as it passes from one grammatical form to another, two moving sh'vas would fall together, the first is

1 See footnote p. 52.
changed into a short vowel. Such a vowel is called a Light (by others a Slight vowel), in Hebr. מַעַן. E.g. if the prefix י be put to a word beginning with a consonant bearing simple moving sh'va, the sh'va of י becomes a Light chiriq.

(β) It follows, of course, from this rule, that a sh'va after a Light vowel is always moving.

N.B. When the conjunction י becomes י it is but a Light vowel (though, when it occurs before a labial bearing a vowel, we use that term in a somewhat extended sense). For grammatical purposes this י is not looked on as a long vowel (see Excurs. ii. A. 1 note). In prosody (which is not native to Hebrew, but borrowed from the Arabic) it is at times looked on as a sh'va, so that י may have the same value in metre as י. The case of the conjunction י is the only one in which a word can begin with a vowel in Hebrew. But the exception is more apparent than real, for י merely stands for ו, ו, or ע.

6. (a) A syllable that ends in a consonant with sh'va either expressed, or understood (see rules 1 and 4), is called closed. A syllable that does not end in a consonant with sh'va (expressed or understood) is called open.

(β) When a consonant is quiescent, no sh'va is understood with it. Consequently an open syllable may end, either in a simple vowel long, or short (see rule 9), or in a vowel with quiescent consonant (or consonants), such as: מ, מ, מ (in מ); מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ; מ, מ, מ, מ.

1 In order to avoid the frequent use of the words “long” and “short,” I vocalize most of the names of the vowels in such a manner as to indicate the sounds which they represent. Thus qāmāq (a); pathach (a); gerē (a); but segol (e); shūrāq (it); but gibbūq (ṣpāthādim) which means “gathering together of the lips” (u); chiriq (i); chiriq (i); chōlem (o); qomoq (o). Some of these words are barbarous in form, but the system has the virtue of being practical.

2 The beginner may need to be reminded that י and ס are never quiescent, but always strong gutturals. The only verbs which ought to be called verbs י are those which end in ס, in which this ה is a strong consonant retained (but, of course, without the mappiq) when followed by another letter, thus from ינ “shone” (Is. ix. 1), we have ינ “their light” (Joel ii. 10). Verbs which end in quiescent י like י, should be termed (as they are by Jewish grammarians) י י י “with quiescent ה as the 3rd root-letter.” It must be remembered, too, that י י ay ay at the end of a word is always a closed syllable (but see Excurs. iii. 1, p. 149).
7. (a) If a B'GaDC•PhaTh letter have a dagesh lene, then it is certain that this letter begins a syllable, as מַלְכִי "my king."

Except (1) in the 2nd pers. sing. fem. Perf. of verbs with three strong consonants, such as רַבָּם, which gives רְבָּם pā-qādī, this is but a shortened form of רְבָּם pā-qādī.-ti. (2) In the apoc. Imperf. of certain verbs quiescent לֵא, of which the second root-letter is a B'GaDC•PhaTh, as רֵבִּים vayyēbhō "and he wept," רֵבִּים vayyēchad "and he rejoiced." The full forms of these Imperfects would be רְבָּם and רְבָּם with the second root-letter hard, consequently in the apoc. form the hard pronunciation of the letter is retained.

(β) But the converse is not true (viz. that if a B'GaDC•PhaTh letter have no dagesh it cannot begin a syllable). For, if the syllable preceding it, either in the same word, or sometimes in the preceding word (see Excurs. III. A. 2), be open (see rule 6), then even an un-dagesh-ed B'GaDC•PhaTh letter may begin a new syllable. E.g. nōb'hēdāh (Jon. i. 14), יִכְלָה va-dhōnāy (Zech. ix. 14), כָּהֹה thic-heh (xi. 17).

(γ) But a B'GaDC•PhaTh letter cannot be without Dagesh lene when preceded by a quiescent sh'va.

Except (1) in the names of the two Towns הָיוֹתֵל Yōg-th'ēl (Judg. xv. 38), יְהֹרִים Yōg-dhām (ver. 56). (2) In some anomalous formations such as יְהֹרִים yar-cāthō (Gen. xl. 13), יְהֹרִים yiq-bhēcā "thy winepress" (Deut. xv. 14, xvi. 13), see Excurs. III. B. 3, N.B. To these it is possible that we ought to add Infinitives Qal with suffixes beginning with a vowel, such as יְהֹרִים (Amos iii. 14) "my visiting," which may be pronounced poq-dhē; but it is possible that the sh'va is moving, and that the word should be pronounced poq'dhē (see rule 9). There are but three instances of such an Infin. with dagesh in the 3rd root letter, viz. יְהֹרִים hopēcī (Gen. xix. 21), יֶהֹרִים nogpō (Ex. xii. 27), יְהֹרִים 'ογפī (1 Chron. iv. 10), see Fragment of T. B. Psachim p. 95, note 36.

8. A long vowel in a closed syllable (see rule 6) must have the tone accent, or metheg (see Excurs. II. 5), as יַבֵּית qātōnī, אֵין dānā "O I pray." Therefore, if the tone be moved from a long vowel it must be (α) shortened as יָבֵית, yēlēc, יֵכַּי yēlēc, יָבֵית vayyēlec; or (β) it must take Fixed metheg, as יְבָּית bēth-ābēc (Gen. xxiv. 23), יְבָּית m'bhārēc (Is. lxvi. 3), see Excurs. II. A. 4. (3). (γ).

9. A short vowel may stand in a closed syllable, either accented or unaccentuated.
A short vowel may also stand in an open syllable: (a) with accent, as qṭṭālānī “he killed me,” nā-ḥal “a valley” (for the older Semitic form nachl), bā-yith (for bayt), ḫēr a hēreph (for hārph), ā yī-gel (for yaql), šāmā-ʿat (for the older šāmā-ʿāt); (β) in the case of Light vowels whether without metheg as 'lāl bā-lʿat, or with metheg as a-tir, chē-shʿcath (Ps. xviii. 12), yē'ārā i-mōrēth (xii. 9), šo-mōrēth (xvi. 1); (γ) when the said short vowel is attached to the consonant immediately preceding the consonant bearing the moving shʿva which always precedes the suff. cēm and cēn as dʿha­rʿcēm, tō-ra-thʿcēm; (δ) in the case of the def. art., or he interrog., prefixed to a monosyllable beginning with a guttural as hā-hā, ha-ḥā, ha-ḥēph; (ε) with metheg in the 3rd syllable from the tone (Excurs. II. A. 1) as qō-dāshēm and (Excurs. II. B. 1) lā-mōnāṭāch; (ζ) anomalously when metheg is on the syllable next before the tone, see Excurs. II. A. 4 Note; and C. 4.

EXCURSUS II.

ON METHEG.²

A small vertical line placed under a letter, in order to show that the voice should dwell slightly on that letter in pronunciation, is called metheg, maʿārēk, or guʿāb.

There are three kinds of Metheg: A, Light Metheg (מַטֶּה), B, Heavy Metheg (מַטֹּה), C, Orthophonic Metheg (מַטָּה).

A.

Light Metheg is of two kinds: I. Ordinary (פָּשָׁה), and II. Fixed (תָּמָאכ).

A. I. ORDINARY METHEG.

1. Ordinary metheg must (unless the intervention of some other rule prevent it) be placed (a) under a consonant bearing a long vowel

² In writing this Excursus we have made use of Baer’s Article in Merx’s Archiv. But as we do not adopt the principles of syllable-dividing therein expressed, we have been compelled to rewrite most of the rules.
third from the tone-syllable (both inclusive); or (β) any such short vowel, provided it be not followed by a consonant bearing sh'va or dagesh forte. E.g. (α) chårâšîm, hârîshônîm, Pôshîrâ, hârîhâtîm, va'ômâr; (β) hâchîllâm, múshabbôth (Ex. xxviii. 11), umîhartêm, yâhårîgûn (Zech. xi. 4).

Note. Rule A. ii. 9 forms an exception to this rule, thus we have סַלִּיאָה הַדְּכַלִּים (not הַדְּכַלִּים).

The conjunction גָּלָה does not take this metheg, thus we have מְרַאֲשֵׁנֶה הַגָּלָה Gen. v. 4 (comp. xii. 1, iii. 10, xi. 4).

Words joined by maqqeph are, of course, treated as one word, thus we have הָעָרָבַת הַגָּלָה (Zech. i. 16), מַעֲמָשָׁנַי (ii. 4), מַעֲמָשָׁה הַגָּלָה (ii. 1).  

2. (α) If the third syllable from the tone be disqualified from taking this metheg, but the fourth be not disqualified, then this fourth syllable takes the ordinary metheg, as מֵאָבָל הַגָּלָה (Zech. i. 4), מֵאָבָל הַגָּלָה (Deut. xvi. 3).

(β) If the fourth be also disqualified, then the fifth may take it, as מֵאָבָל הַגָּלָה (Ezk. xlii. 5), מֵאָבָל הַגָּלָה (Est. i. 18).

(γ) If both the third and fifth be qualified, they will both take it, as מֵאָבָל הַגָּלָה (Numb. xxvi. 31).

(δ) The fourth and fifth may also both take ordinary metheg, as מֵאָבָל הַגָּלָה.

(ε) If both the third and fourth be qualified, only the third takes it, as מֵאָבָל הַגָּלָה (Zech. i. 14, 16).

3. If a word ending in accentuated יֵהָר, סַלִּיאָה, גָּלָה, or בָּרְא, be joined by maqqeph to a word beginning with a consonant with sh'va and accentuated on the first syllable, the consonant bearing the said ָה or ָא, will take metheg: as מְרַאֲשֵׁנֶה מֵאָבָל (2 Kings xii. 8), מְרַאֲשֵׁנֶה מֵאָבָל (Gen. xix. 12), מְרַאֲשֵׁנֶה מֵאָבָל (1 Kings i. 19), מְרַאֲשֵׁנֶה מֵאָבָל (Numb. xviii. 17), מְרַאֲשֵׁנֶה מֵאָבָל (1 Chron. xxviii. 9).
A. II. Fixed Metheg.

Fixed metheg is so called, because nothing short of a change in the form of the word can move it from its place. Thus in rule 9 it will be seen, that Fixed metheg interferes with Ordinary metheg, but that the reverse is not the case.

4. Fixed metheg is used,

(a) To distinguish a long vowel from a short one (in cases where the orthographic sign renders the case doubtful) before a consonant bearing a sh'va in the syllable next before the tone, and to ensure that the said sh'va be read moving.

(1) To distinguish qāmāq from qomoq, as נָלַל אֲדֹלָה “she ate,” but נָלַל אֲדֹלָה “eat thou” (Gen. xxvii. 29), or “to eat” (1 Sam. i. 9). (Comp. also, with metheg Lam. i. 7, Zech. ix. 22, Deut. xv. 9, and without metheg 2 Chron. vi. 42, Ps. lxix. 19, Ex. xxxvi. 2.) בָּשָׁנָה, בָּשָׁנָה (Zech. ii. 11), בָּשָׁנָה, בָּשָׁנָה (Gen. xxxvi. 3), רֹדֶה, יְדֹרֶה, יְדוּרֵי, בַּשָׁנָה (xiv. 21).

(2) Chiriq written defective from short chiriq, as יִרְוָא “they fear” (2 Kings xvii. 28) = יִרְוָא (Ps. xxxiii. 8), distinguished from יִרְוָא “they see” (without metheg); so too יִשְׁרֵעַ “they sleep” (Prov. iv. 16), but יִשְׁרֵעַ “they will change”; and again יִכְלֵל (Josh. xv. 31) = יִכְלֵל (1 Chron. xii. 1. 20), and יִכְלֵל יִפְאִמְכַּד (Gen. xlviii. 20).

(3) Qibbuz written defective for shūrūq as יִנְכַּבּ (Gen. xxxi. 19), יִנְכַּבּ (Deut. xii. 20), יִנְכַּבּ (Zech. i. 4).

(β) To ensure a sh'va being read moving after an evidently long vowel, as in בֵּיתֵכָּד, בֵּיתֵכָּד (supra), מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה, מַכּ הֲפֵה (Gen. xxxvi. 2), יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ, יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ (Deut. xii. 20), יִנְכַּבּ יִנְכַּבּ (Zech. i. 4).

(γ) When a word ends in a syllable with çerë and the accent is drawn back to the preceding syllable, but it is still wished to retain
the ג"ה in the last syllable, a Fixed Metheg (called in this case נ"מ, i.e. Conservative Metheg) is used, as בִּנְיָמִין (Hos. xiv. 10), בִּנְיָמִין (Gen. iv. 16).

**Note.** Had the use of this metheg been confined to such cases it would have been of inestimable value. But unfortunately it is sometimes used with pretonic short qomóç. Thus we have מִדְבָּרָךְ (Obad. ver. 11), where the grammatical consideration that the word comes from מָד, taken with the fact that the Cod. Petrop. reads o, proves that מ is here certainly qomóç not qāmāç. So שְׂמְרֵנָה (Ps. xvi. 1) compared with חָסְמְנָה (xxv. 20) and חָסְמְנָה (xxvi. 1), and so too הַקָּדָשׁ (Ezek. xl. 43), Cod. Petrop. הַקָּדָשׁ.

Again, Ordinary metheg (in the place third from the tone, Rule 1) is as compatible with qomóç, as with qāmāç, thus מִדְבָּרָךְ (Ezek. xlv. 13) is qōdāsháy (not qōdāsháy), as may be seen from the pointing of לְשׁוֹנָה in the same verse, and the vocalization of Cod. Petrop., which is qōdāsháy. While on the other hand מִדְבָּרָךְ (which is from shōresh, as qōdāsháy is from qōdesh) is given by Cod. Petrop. (Jer. xvii. 8, Hos. xiv. 6) as šārāshāv, and מִדְבָּרָךְ (Jer. xlix. 29) as āholēhām, and even מִדְבָּרָךְ (Zech. xxi. 7) as āholē, and מִדְבָּרָךְ (Hab. iii. 2) as pā'ol'cā. With these variations of pronunciation we may compare מִדְבָּרָךְ rōsh plur. מִדְבָּרָךְ rāshm; the Ashkenazic pronunciation of qāmāç as aw or o, and the Sephardic as ā; the pronunciation of מִדְבָּרָךְ by Western Syrians as 'amā, and by Easterns as 'ammā. Taking these phenomena in conjunction with the fact that both systems of vocalization use the qāmāç-sign with sh'va to represent qomóç, we come to the conclusion that, at the time (or times) of the stereotyping of a traditional pronunciation by the writing of vowel-signs, qāmāç and qomóç were much alike in sound. Thus qāmāç would appear to have had the sound, not of the a in father, nor of that in call, nor yet of the oe in coal, but rather an intermediate sound such as of the o in
the Fr. mode, or in the Romaic γεγονότος yeghona tôn. The qomoc
would represent the same sound, only short'.

5. Fixed metheg is also used to enable a long vowel to remain in a
closed syllable, when it has not the tone, as אַלַּחֵת. The use of metheg in this case would of itself not be sufficient
to guarantee the pronunciation of the 院副院长式 as א (see Note on the preceding
page). But, the fact that the 副院长式 must have arisen from א as in א
for א and י (Gen. xxxvii. 17) and י (2 Kings vi. 13), would
predispose one to conclude that the 副院长式 means א. While the fact that
Cod. Petrop. distinctly reads it as qammoc is decisive (see in Is. iii. 14,
v. 9). Three important facts are to be learnt from the Cod. Petrop.
punctuation of the word, (1) the 副院长式 is qammoc, (2) the י is hard, (3) the
י is not doubled (in other words the dagesh in it is lena), thus the word
is not battim or botim, but battim (comp. the Syr. bātē). This case of
an unaccentuated qammoc before a ב'GaDC'FaTh letter with dagesh lena
is, I believe, unique. Another case of the use of this metheg is in
 RESPONS "O I pray," the Cod. Petrop. however does not double the
nun but reads anv (Is. xxxviii. 3). [According to Codex Petropolitanus
the word is mit'el in Jon. iv. 2 anvah.]

6. Fixed metheg is always placed with the vowel preceding the
consonant which bears a compound sh'va, whether the vowel agree
with that in the compound sh'va as אַלַּחֵת; or not, as אַלַּחֵת (Ps.

1 If the student think it strange that
there should be a difference of opinion
about the pronunciation of a vowel in
Hebrew, he is reminded that we have
similar difficulties in English: thus
"cough" is by some pronounced kawf,
and by others käff; "coffee," kawfy and
köffy; "laugh," läf and läff. With re­
gard to the vowel א we will here give
a few facts (kindly communicated to us
by Mr Eiríkr Magnússon). Swedish א
is sounded like English aw but deepy
guttural. The etymol. equivalent in
Danish is aa, which has the same sound
as the Swedish 院 without the guttural
element, and so is more like the English
א. The Icelandic equivalent is ã, pro­
nounced almost like ow in now. Let
us take a few examples showing how
these sounds tend at times to א, and at
others to א. Thus Germ. mahl (mâl),
Ice. mál (mow), Dan. maal (mâl), Swed.
mål (mawl).—Ice. år (owr), Dan. aare
(ore), Swed. år (aww), Engl. oar.—Germ.
Thor (tor), Dan. aare (døre), Swed.
dore (dawre), Ice. dâri (dowry).—Germ.
Lohn (lön), Dan. laan (lön), Swed. lån
(lawn), Ice. lån (lown).
xxxix. 19), comp. Gen. xxii. 6, ii. 12, xxvii. 25.

Note. Sometimes we have a syllable which, according to Rule 1, would take Ordinary metheg, and, according to Rule 6, would take Fixed metheg; in such a case the Metheg is Fixed metheg, e.g. הָרִים (Gen. viii. 5), רָאָה (xviii. 21).

In Zech. xiii. 4 we have the anomalous formation in which the Ordinary metheg is used in accordance with Rule 1; but the regular form (ver. 3) has Fixed metheg, in accordance with Rule 4. (1).

In such a form as הָרִים the Fixed metheg is placed in accordance with both 4. β. and 6.

When such a form as הָרִים becomes הָרִים the metheg becomes the Ordinary metheg (Rule 1), or when הָרִים becomes הָרִים the Ordinary metheg is placed in accordance with Rule 2.

7. All forms of the verbs hayah “he was,” and chayah “he lived,” which have י or י, take Fixed metheg with the preceding letter: thus לָלָה, וְלָלָה, וְלָלָה “and live thou” (Gen. xx. 7), so יִהְיֶה (Gen. i. 29), וְיֹהְיֶה (Deut. xxvii. 9), וְיֹהְיֶה “and be thou” (Gen. xii. 12), וְיֹהְיֶה “and live ye” (xlii. 18).

8. (a) Two Fixed methegs may be placed on a word without any intervening vowel, as לָלָה (Gen. xii. 3), לָלָה (Deut. xxvi. 19).

(β) A Fixed metheg may be placed immediately before an Ordinary metheg, as לָלָה, לָלָה.

9. (a) An Ordinary metheg may precede a Fixed metheg, if at least one syllable intervene, thus לָלָה.

(β) If no syllable intervene the Ordinary metheg is omitted, thus לָלָה (not לָלָה), לָלָה (not לָלָה). Similarly לָלָה (Nah. iii. 19), לָלָה (Zech. xi. 14), לָלָה (xiv. 8),

with no Ordinary metheg with the first syllable, because the next syllable has Fixed metheg.

N.B. Light metheg (Ordinary, or Fixed) may sometimes become a conjunctive accent. Hence the syllable which bears a light metheg may be called the semi-tone-syllable. This change may take place if the word bearing the metheg has a disjunctive accent, and be immediately preceded by a word with a disjunctive accent. E.g. הָלְוַי (Gen. iv. 1), comp. Zech. i. 1, 6, vii. 6, 14, xii. 6, 10, xiv. 2, 21, Hos. xi. 6, Joel i. 17, ii. 2, Obad. 20, Jon. i. 4, &c.

Some of the effects to this semi-tonic value of Light metheg will be seen by a reference to B. 2. (β) and 3°, and III. B. 5.

B.

HEAVY METHEG.

1. Heavy metheg stands with the Article י (or the prefixes י, י, י), when it stands before a consonant with sh'va from which the dagesh forte has been omitted: e.g. נַעַל (Gen. xxxviii. 28): and that even before a Fixed metheg, as הָלְוַי (Mic. iii. 9), הָלְוַי (1 Chr. xxvii. 1).

Exceptions. (α) When the said initial consonant of the word is י, then metheg does not stand with the י of the deft. art., as יָשָּׁנָה (Ex. viii. 1).

(β) Nor on the syllable immediately before the tone, as יָשָּׁנָה (Numb. xxxv. 8).

(γ) Immediately after ordinary metheg, heavy metheg cannot stand, e.g. יָשָּׁנָה (2 Kings ix. 11 in correct copies), where י has no heavy metheg because it is immediately preceded by the ordinary metheg, which stands in accordance with A. i. 2. (α).

2. Heavy metheg is placed, as a rule, with י interrogative (when pointed with full pathach). It is (in the prose books) usually to the
right, instead of the left of the vowel (chiefly for the purpose of distinguishing the interrogative he from the definite article). Thus

\[ \text{Exception. This metheg is not placed} \] 

when the letter after the \( \text{ה} \) is \( \text{א} \), e.g. \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Gen. xxix. 5). 

(\( \beta \)) Nor on the syllable immediately preceding the tone, or the semi-tone (see A. ii. 9, N.B.), e.g. \( \text{יִהְיֶה} \) (Gen. xviii. 24), \( \text{יִדְרָעָלַתִים} \) (Ps. lxxvii. 8).

N.B. In \( \text{יִדְרָעָלַתִים} \) (Gen. xlii. 16) the metheg is of course Fixed metheg (A. 6).

(\( \gamma \)) Nor if a dagesh be put in the letter which follows \( \text{ה} \), as \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Gen. xviii. 21), \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Lev. x. 19); comp. Numb. xiii. 19, 20, Is. xxvii. 7, Job xxiii. 5; or, as it is sometimes, even in \( \text{יִהְיֶה} \), as \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (1 Sam. x. 24, 2 Kings vi. 32).


3. If a word have a disjunctive accent, and the tone-syllable begin with a consonant bearing moving sh'va, and the third syllable from the tone contain \( \text{א} \), \( \text{י} \), \( \text{ו} \) or \( \text{ה} \) “and” followed by a consonant with sh'va, expressed or understood (see Excurs. i. 1 and 4. \( \beta \)), then this vowel third from the tone will take Heavy metheg: e.g. \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Gen. iii. 8), \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Lev. vi. 14).

Exception. If the pre-tonic syllable have a long vowel with Fixed metheg (according to A. 4. a (1), or \( \beta \) (1)), and is not followed by a consonant with a compound sh'va, then the said short third vowel from the tone does not take metheg; e.g. \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Gen. xi. 3), \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Ex. vii. 28), \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (Gen. xxiv. 11), \( \text{לַאֹּתֶהֶם} \) (xix. 22).
But if, in this last case, the compound *sh'va* be under the first of two like consonants, then the original rule holds good, as

3a. Since the *Light* metheg has a certain accent value (see A. 9, N.B.), if the word have a *disjunctive* accent, and the third syllable from the one bearing *light* metheg conform with all the above conditions, it will take *Heavy* metheg, e.g. מִשְׁכָּ֣ב בְּתָנְתָּנָּ֑י (Hab. iii. 6). Compare Ps. xviii. 45, 2 Kings v. 18.

N.B. Of course all the conditions must be fulfilled or the *metheg* will not be placed in the case of 3 and 3a. Thus, if the word have a *conjunctive* accent, or if the tone (or semi-tone) syllable do not begin with a *moving* *sh'va*, or if the third syllable therefrom do not contain *a*, *e*, *i*, *u*, or *u* “and,” the *Heavy* metheg is not placed.

4. If a word with a *disjunctive* accent, have in the pre-tonic syllable *a* or *e*, and the third syllable before the tone-syllable have *e*, *i*, *u*, or *u* “and” followed by *sh'va* expressed or understood, this last mentioned syllable will take *Heavy* metheg: e.g. מִשְׁכְּבָּֽבֶּה (Gen. iii. 24), מִשְׁכָּ֣ב בְּתָנְתָּנָּ֑י (iv. 16), מִשְׁכְּבָּֽבֶּה (Job xxvi. 4), מִשְׁכָּ֣ב בְּתָנְתָּנָּ֑י (Gen. xliii. 15), מִשְׁכְּבָּֽבֶּה (Is. xlv. 14), מִשְׁכָּ֣ב בְּתָנְתָּנָּ֑י (Obad. ver. 20). See further under C. 3.

N.B. As in 3 and 3a, all three conditions must be simultaneously observed or the *Heavy* metheg will not be placed.

**Exception.** Although *miqrá-qôdish* has *a*, not *â*, in the pre-tonic syllable, it always takes *Heavy* metheg, when accentuated with *Pashtâ*, e.g. מָֽקְרָא-ֶֽדִּחֶֽה (Lev. xxiii. 21, 27).

4a. If, in words which would otherwise come under rules 3 or 4, the syllable fourth from the tone-syllable take *Ordinary Light* metheg (in accordance with A. 2. a) then the *Heavy* metheg is dropped from the following syllable, e.g. מָֽקְרָא-ֶֽדִּחֶֽה (Gen. xxiv. 48), מָֽקְרָא-ֶֽדִּחֶֽה (Neh. i. 4), מָֽקְרָא-ֶֽדִּחֶֽה (Deut. iii. 23).
5. With a disjunctive accent the words רעטצמ וונע take heavy metheg under the }, e.g. רעטצמ (Gen. iii. 15), יונע (Lev. xxvi. 16). But not with a conjunctive accent, e.g. יונע (Gen. xvii. 9). Or if the word have such a prefix as will take Heavy metheg (according to rule 3) then the } takes none, e.g. יונע (xxvi. 4).

6. The word ירנינ if accentuated with Pashtā, or if joined to the next word by maqqeph, or ירנינ if joined to the next word by maqqeph, takes Heavy metheg under the }, thus ירנינ (Gen. iv. 8), ירנינ (xii. 15), ירנינ (v. 6).

7. (a) If the Imperf. singl. Qal of a regular verb be joined to the next word by maqqeph, and the ő of the last syllable be changed into o, then the first syllable of the Imperf. takes Heavy metheg, as ]יִּקְרֵא (Job xxiv. 14); comp. Is. xliii. 1, Ps. cxxi. 8, Prov. iv. 4, Job iii. 5, Zech. ix. 2, 3. But the rule is not always observed, e.g. Gen. iii. 16, iv. 7, xli. 12 (ed. Baer).

(b) The rule holds good also with the Infin., with prefix י, as יינית (Gen. xliii. 22); but neither is it consistently observed in this case, comp. Joel ii. 17.

(γ) When the long ő is retained, it takes, of course, Fixed metheg (A. 5) and there is no Heavy metheg, as יִּזְכֵה (Mic. vi. 15). [N.B. The metheg of יִּזְכֵה of that verse is in accordance with B. 4.]

NOTE. A few words take an anomalous metheg, e.g. יִּשְׁמַית (Gen. xvii. 20), מִנְחָסָדֶה (xxx. 16), אִלְּ-חַמְמַגְּזָאָש (Ex. xxix. 21), אִשׁ-יִשְׂרָאֵל (Numb. xxi. 23), אִשׁ-חָאָי (Josh. x. 1), אִלְּ-חַסָדֶה (2 Kings iv. 39), מִכְּכִל-חַמְמַגְּזָאָש (Ezr. i. 4), umigdālīm (2 Chron. xiv. 6), all accentuated with Zargā; comp. מִנְחָסָדֶה (Ps. cvi. 47) with אִלְּ-וֹרְרָס (Baer).

HEAVY METHEG WITH SH'VA.

8. If a word begin with a consonant bearing simple sh'va, and be accentuated with Gershayim (°), or Pazer (°), without a conjunctive accent immediately preceding, and there be at least two vowels between the } and the tone-syllable, then, if the first syllable have not already
Ordinary light metheg the י will take Heavy metheg, e.g. יָּשָּׁם (Gen. x. 14), יָּשָּׁם (Deut. ix. 10).

But in Jer. xxxv. 1 the י of v'ol-chēlō does not take Heavy metheg, because the preceding word is accentuated with munach, comp. Ezek. xx. 40.

And the י of v'amartā (Ezek. xvi. 8) does not take Heavy metheg, because the 'ā has already ordinary metheg.

9. This sh'va-ga'yā¹ also stands on words beginning with a consonant with simple sh'va, (a) when accentuated with Darga (כ) as a duplicate conjunctive before R'bîti (כ) as a initial vowel: (Ex. xxxiv. 21); (β) with Qadma (כ) as duplicate conjunctive before Pashṭā (כ) or T'bir (כ) as a initial vowel: (Numb. vi. 19), הֹחֵלָה הֹכַלְכַּל (Ex. xxix. 23); (γ) with Munāch (כ) as triplicate conjunctive before T'lishā g'dolāh (כ on the first letter), or T'lishā g'tannāh (כ on the last letter) e.g. בֵּית אָנַךְ (Deut. xxv. 19), קְרָא יָאָרֵךְ מְשָׁלָה (Jer. xxxvi. 6).

N.B. In all these cases given in 9 there must be at least one vowel between the sh'va and the tone-syllable: also the syllable beginning with the consonant with sh'va must not carry the Ordinary Light-metheg, or the sh'va-ga'yā will fall away, e.g. Deut. xxiv. 9; but the Fixed Light-metheg does not prevent the presence of sh'va-ga'yā, e.g. Numb. iv. 14.

C.

Orthophonic Metheg.

1. (α) If a word, accentuated with a conjunctive accent, end in pathach 'Ayin and be mit'el, or end in 'Ayin with furtive-pathach and be mit'ra, and the following syllable be accentuated, then the final י takes orthophonic metheg, to prevent its being slurred over in pronunciation: as לָתָא (Prov. xx. 25), לָתָא (Lev. xxvi. 21).

(β) Or, if a word ending in pathach 'Ayin be joined by maqqeph to a word beginning with 'Ayin, as לָתָא (Gen. xi. 25).

¹ There are several additional rules for placing sh'va-ga'yā in the books of Job, Proverbs and Psalms (in which the system of accentuation is different); but they need not be mentioned here.
2. If a word, accentuated with a conjunctive accent, end in (a) pathach and a guttural, or (β) pathach and ṛēsh, or (γ) in āh, and be mitre; or (δ) end in a guttural with furtive pathach and be mitra; then, if the second word begins with a similar (not necessarily a like) letter, the final letter of the first word will take orthophonic metheg: as (α) בֹּקֶה הַשֵּׁלשָׁם (Lev. iv. 26), (β) צִרְיָרָה (Hos. iv. 19), (γ) אֶבְנֵי הַבָּלֶת (Gen. xxviii. 2), (δ) בִּנֵי הַבָּלֶת (xlii. 2).

3. If a word ending in a guttural preceded by pathach be joined by maqgěph to the next word in such a way as to come under Rule 4, then in addition to the Heavy metheg, the guttural will take orthophonic metheg: as בָּלֶת (Gen. xxxiv. 16), בָּלֶת (xxiv. 7).

4. Orthophonic metheg is sometimes used with a pre-tonic short vowel, to ensure the sh'va, which follows, being read moving either (a) regularly, or (β) irregularly, or (γ) in a pronunciation altogether anomalous; e.g. (α) יִשְׂרָאֵל (in some Codd. even יִשְׂרָאֵל) אשִּׁרְיָה, יִשְׂרָאֵל (Is. x. 34), תַּעַרְבוּ (Numb. xxx xi. 12), תַּעַרְבוּ (Josh. v. 2), בִּשֵּׁיתֶבוּ (Ex. xii. 21), כֶּהָהָל, יִשְׂרָאֵל (Is. lxiii. 7, Jer. xii. 16), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Hos. x. 14), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Numb. i. 18), yāh (Ps. lxxi. 11).—(β) יִשְׂרָאֵל (Gen. xxxvi. 23), יִשְׂרָאֵל (ver. 40), יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׂרָאֵל (Ps. xiv. 1), יִשְׂרָאֵל (ciii. 2), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Job xxix. 25, op. Ps. lxv. 5, lxviii. 24, Prov. xxx. 17, Job xxxix. 18), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Gen. i. 11) [בָּלֶת סְבִּקָם, Numb. xxxii. 38, Is. xvi. 8, 9: this word ought, perhaps, rather to come under the rule A. 4, a. 2], יִשְׂרָאֵל (Ex. xxviii. 22) for יִשְׂרָאֵל (ver. 14), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Deut. iii. 10), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Is. liv. 12).

Note.—In the instances given under (β) the metheg seems to perform the duty of the so-called dagesh dirimens, as in 'תָּרָפָה, or תָּרָפָה (Ex. ii. 3), יִשְׂרָאֵל miq̄dāsh, or miq̄dāsh (xv. 17). It would be perhaps better to call it heterophonic metheg.
EXCURSUS III.

DAGESH IN THE FIRST LETTER OF A WORD.

A.

1. If a word beginning with a $B'GaDC'PhaTh$ letter be preceded by a word ending in a non-quiescent consonant, the $B'GaDC'PhaTh$ letter takes dagesh lene, as $יִֽרְאָּה$.

Exceptions. To this rule there are only three exceptions, viz. $יִֽרְאָּה$ (Ps. lxviii. 18), where, perhaps, the word is exceptionally pronounced Adonai, instead of Adonay; $קרְרִֽבְּיָּה$ (Is. xxxiv. 11) where the word is, perhaps, pronounced qau (cow), not qav; and $שָֽלֵֽאָּה$ (Ezek. xxiii. 42) where the word is, perhaps, pronounced shaleu not shâlîv.

2. But if a word beginning with a $B'GaDC'PhaTh$ letter be preceded by a word ending in a long vowel, or quiescent letter, and bearing a conjunctive accent, the $B'GaDC'PhaTh$ letter is $יִֽרְאָּֽה$ (without dagesh), thus (Hos. ii. 5) $יִֽרְאָּֽה$; (iv. 4) $יִֽרְאָּֽה$.

Exceptions. If the second word begin with $בּ$, $בּ$, $בּ$, $בּ$, or $בּ$, the $בּ$ or $בּ$ takes dagesh lene, as (Jud. i. 14) $יִֽרְאָּֽה$; comp. Gen. xlvi. 27, Is. lix. 21, Josh. viii. 24.

But if the first of these letters have a full vowel, rule 2 still holds good, thus $יִֽרְאָּֽה$ (1 Kings xiii. 33).

N.B. Rule A. 2 gives way before B. 4 (a), except in the cases of the prefixes $בּ$ and $בּ$; it also yields to B. 4 ($\beta$), and B. 4 ($\gamma$) exceptions.

3. (a) Also if such a word be preceded by a word ending in a long vowel, or quiescent letter, and bearing a disjunctive accent, the initial
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*BGaDCPhaTh* letter still takes *dagesh lene*, as אֶתֶהֶכֶת (Gen. iii. 15).

(β) Or if the accent be conjunctive, but *P'siq* be placed between the two words, as הָנָּה הָּרְדָה (Amos vi. 2, cf. viii. 9, &c.).

B. 

**Dagesh Conjunctionis.**

1. If a word ending in נָּה be joined by *maqqeph* to a word accentuated on the first syllable, the first letter of the latter word takes *dagesh conjunctionis*, as (Hos. vi. 4) יָשֵּׁשָּׁוהֵו, (viii. 7) יָשֵּׁשָּׁוהֵו, (2 Sam. vii. 13) יָשֵּׁשָּׁוהֵו, (Prov. xv. 1) יָשֵּׁשָהֵו.

2. When הָל or הָל is prefixed to a word by *maqqeph*, the first letter of the word takes *dagesh conjunctionis*, wherever the accent may fall, as הָלָּה (Gen. xii. 18), הָלָּה (xxviii. 16), הָלָּה (Prov. xv. 1), (1 Chr. xxii. 1).

3. If a word end הָּי, and its last syllable begin with a consonant bearing moving *sh'va* and it be joined by *maqqeph* to a word accentuated on the first syllable, the first letter of the second word takes *dagesh conjunctionis*, as יָשֵּׁשָה (Jon. ii. 10), יָשֵּׁשָה (2 Kings vii. 1), יָשֵּׁשָה (Ezek. xvii. 6).

N.B. But if the last syllable do not begin with a consonant bearing moving *sh'va*, there is no *dagesh conjunctionis*, e.g. יָשֵּׁש (Mal. iii. 1), יָשֵּׁש (Ps. cxvi. 18). Neither is there after an Infin. or Impert. Qal with final *he*, e.g. יָשֵּׁש (Deut. xi. 22), יָשֵּׁש (Job xxxii. 10).

4. The first letter of a word accentuated on the first syllable takes *dagesh conjunctionis* under the following conditions:

(a) If it be preceded by a word ending in נ נ נ, accentuated with a conjunctive accent on the *penultimate*, provided the penultimate be the proper tone-syllable of the word, as יָשֵּׁש (Job xxxii. 10).
EXCURSUS III. B. 4, 5.

Exceptions. The prefixes לֹא with simple sh'va do not take this dagesh, e.g. לֹא אִם לֹא (Ex. xxxiii. 12), נֹהַי לֹא (Deut. xxvii. 9).

But לֹא always takes this dagesh, thus לֹא אִם לֹא (Gen. xviii. 25): and after the analogy of לֹא we have in Ps. xix. 3 לֹא אִם לֹא.

(β) If the accent of the former word be drawn back to the penultimate, which would otherwise have had Fixed metheg (in accordance with Excurs. ii. A. 4), as לֹא אִם לֹא (Gen. xix. 38), נֹהַי לֹא (Ps. lxxxiii. 13).

(γ) But if the accent thus drawn back be on a syllable which could not take metheg, no dagesh conjunctionis is used, as לֹא אִם (Ezek. xvii. 8), לֹא אִם (Gen. iv. 6).

Exceptions. Imperfects and Participles of verbs quiescent לֹא are an exception to (γ), thus לֹא אִם לֹא (Hab. ii. 18), לֹא אִם (Prov. xi. 21), אִם לֹא (Gen. i. 11).

(δ) If it be joined by maqgeph to a preceding word ending in ל or ל with metheg on the preceding syllable (in accordance with Excurs. ii. A. 1, note) as לֹא אִם לֹא (Gen. xxi. 3), לֹא אִם לֹא (Numb. xx. 11), לֹא אִם לֹא (2 Chron. ii. 3), לֹא אִם לֹא (Gen. i. 12).

5. Rule 4 (α) holds good when the second word has not the tone, but merely the semi-tone (see Excurs. ii. A. 9, N.B.) on the first syllable, as לֹא אִם לֹא (Gen. xxix. 31), לֹא אִם לֹא (Ex. xxvii. 3), לֹא אִם לֹא (Is. xlv. 21).

Exception. But a B'GaDC'PhaTh letter does not take dagesh in these circumstances, thus לֹא אִם לֹא (Gen. ii. 4), לֹא אִם.
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N.B. From the foregoing rules it will be understood that if the latter of two words have neither the tone nor semi-tone on the first syllable, or if the former end in any open syllable except a, ah, or eh, then the dagesh conjunctionis is not used, e.g. ֶֹ (Numb. xxiii. 11), נֹ (Ezek. xv. 11), (Ps. liii. 21), (Job viii. 29).

6. But, if the first word be melēl and end in a, and the next word begin with a sibilant or liquid, and an accentuated syllable, dagesh conjunctionis is used, as ֶֹ (Gen. xix. 14), הַ (Hos. viii. 10). Also ֶֹ and ֶֹ take dagesh after יָֹ in Gen. xix. 2, Judg. xviii. 19, 1 Sam. viii. 19, Esth. vi. 13.

Delitzsch\(^1\) gives 17 exceptions to the above rules, confirmed by the Massoroth, viz. Ex. xv. 1, 21, xv. 11, 13, 16, Deut. xxxii. 6, 15, Is. liv. 12, Jer. xx. 9, Ps. lxxvii. 16, xciv. 12, cxviii. 5, 18, Job v. 27, Dan. iii. 2, 3, v. 11.

C.

Orthophonic Dagesh.

1. When a word ending with a liquid, is joined by magqeph or a conjunctive accent to a word beginning with the same liquid, the initial liquid of the latter word should take orthophonic dagesh, as אֱֶֹ (Gen. xiv. 23), בֹֹ (Ex. xxxiii. 11), וֹ (Lev. v. 2), רֹ (Exzr. vi. 5).

2. (a) When אֶֹ and אֶֹ come together (as Gen. xxxviii. 9, Hab. i. 6, ii. 6, Prov. xxv. 17), or אֶֹ (as Deut. xxxii. 5), אֶֹ takes dagesh.

(β) Whenever אֶֹ is preceded by the word מֶֹ with a conjunctive accent, the אֶֹ takes dagesh (e.g. Ex. vi. 10, 29, xiii. 1, xiv. 1).

\(^1\) This Excursus is (with a few modifications) merely an epitome of Delitzsch, in his Preface to Baer's edition of the Text of Proverbs.

De primarum vocabulorum literarum dissessatione, in his Preface to Baer's edition of the Text of Proverbs.
EXCURSUS IV.

SOME OF THE USES OF SIMAN RAPHEH.

Siman rapheli (a small horizontal line placed over a letter to show that it has no dagesh) is abundantly used in some MSS. and Edd., and in others hardly at all. In none is it used uniformly.

1. It is used to indicate the intentional omission of a grammatical dagesh forte, (a) after the def. art. as יִדּוֹן (Gen. vii. 4)—but Baer omits it in ver. 23—to show that the yud is not dageshed as it is in יִדֻּשֶה (Is. xxiii. 12), יִדּוֹת לָבַן (lxv. 11).—(β) After he interrog. as יִנְהַר (Amos v. 25).—(γ) After min as מַלְפַש (Gen. xlvi. 21), comp. vi. 16, xxv. 23. —(δ) In the middle of Pi'elistic (or dageshed) forms, as רַיַּק (Gen. xxvi. 14), יִדּוֹ�ט (Is. xiii. 16), so יִדּוֹּק (Hos. vii. 10), but יִדּוֹ (v. 15), מַלְפַש from maq̄āl, but on the contrary מַלְפַש (Jon. iii. 6), comp. Is. xiv. 10, &c., from cissē'.—(ε) With other dageshed forms such as יִדֻּשֶה (Gen. xviii. 5), יִדּוֹ (Job xix. 24), מַלְפַש (Is. xxii. 10); מַלְפַש for te'amán-nāh (Is. ix. 4), מַלְפַש (Amos v. 11), and מַלְפַש (Jon. i. 15).—(ζ) To avoid the doubling of a letter before an anomalous dagesh lene as מַלְפַש (Jon. iv. 11), comp. Zech. iv. 12.—(η) To show, in cases where a quiescent yud or aleph is omitted after seḡol, that the following letter is not to be doubled, as מַלְפַש (Job xvii. 5), comp. Mic. iii. 12, Zech. i. 17, v. 9.—(θ) To mark the omission of the dagesh forte in the objective suffix েֹ (Is. xxxviii. 19), comp. lviii. 8, Job v. 19, Obad. ver. 3, Prov. iii. 3, xxix. 17.
2. Siman Rapheh is also used: (a) to mark the anomalous omission of Dagesh Lene after a quiescent sẖ'va, as הַלָּפֶּה (Gen. xxxii. 18), יִקְבָּה (xlviii. 13), יִקְבָּה (Deut. xv. 4), but xvi. 13 without the siman rapheh, and so too הָרֵבֶּה big-dhō (Hag. ii. 12, Prov. xx. 16), but נְגַדְּנָה neg-dhāh-nā (Ps. cxvi. 18), where the omission of dagesh conjunct. in the nān shows that in such cases the sẖ'va is quiescent (see iii. B. 3, N.B.), מַרְבּוֹ לֵא mar-bhaddim (Prov. vii. 16, xxxi. 22).—(β) Or after a moving sẖ'va as שְׁלֹחַ, see also examples in ii. C. 4.—(γ) To emphasize the correct omission of a dagesh lene, as הַלָּפֶּה (Is. lv. 3), as יִקְבָּה (which in our present texts is found in Lam. iii. 22, 2 Chron. vi. 42), comp. Gen. xix. 33, Ps. xviii. 13, xliv. 9, lxxvi. 4, וְכִלָּו (ex. 3), כִּלָּו (Job iv. 13), מְדּוּ שְׁחָה (Is. v. 28), qashṭothāv (see close of Excurs. ii.), not qashtothāv, וְכִלָּו (xvii. 11).

3. Siman Rapheh is often used (a) to show that the letter after shōruq written defective (י) is not to be doubled, as יִלְתֶּה (Gen. xxv. 39), יִלְתֶּה (xx. 3), יִלְתֶּה (xviii. 16), יִלְתֶּה (Job xi. 15); comp. Is. xv. 4, xlxi. 20, Mic. iv. 3, Zech. i. 13, Gen. xxxi. 26, &c.; יִלְתֶּה (Is. xxi. 10), יִלְתֶּה (Gen. xlvi. 22), and so often to distinguish between roots of the form of בִּנְיָמָה and כִּבְרָם; such is the case also in יִלְתֶּה (Ps. xliv. 11), יִלְתֶּה (lx. 4). Or, to prevent the doubling of a letter after chāriq written defective, as יִלְתֶּה (Is. xvii. 6), יִלְתֶּה (Zech. vii. 3). (β) To distinguish between conjugations, as יִלְתֶּה (Gen. vii. 23) to show that it is Qal, not Niphal, יִלְתֶּה (Joel ii. 16), יִלְתֶּה (Gen. xlii. 16), יִלְתֶּה (Is. xxxv. 4) as being Impert. Qal, not Perf. Pi'el. (γ) To distinguish between like words, e.g. יִלְתֶּה "whither" (Zech. xvi. 8) and even יִלְתֶּה (Ps. cxxix. 7) as differ-
EXCURSUS IV. 3—5.

ing from הַלְדוֹ, "I pray"; between לְדַו מִלְרָע, and מִלְיֶל מִלֶל "why"; to distinguish הָלַנָה (Ps. xxvi. 2) as being from Rt. bāchān, and not the infin. of chānān; the subst. הָלַנָה אָמַל (Zech. xii. 5) from the Imperative Pi‘el; מַלְלַנָה (Job xv. 29) to show that נָא is not the prop. נָא (Hos. viii. 10) to show that the root is not nāthān.

(8) To prevent the involuntary doubling of a consonant after an accentuated short vowel, as הָלַנָה (Job vi. 14); Zech. xiii. 5, Ps. xxx. 4, xxxi. 9, cxxxix. 1, Job ix. 19, xlii. 3; מַלְלַנָה (ver. 9), הָלַנָה (Is. li. 13), מַלְלַנָה (Gen. xlii. 21); מַלְלַנָה "thy dove" (Ps. lxvi. 19) as distinguished from מַלְלַנָה "she will teach thee"; or even after a long vowel as מַלְלַנָה (xxxii. 6).—In Gen. i. 6 מַלְלַנָה to show that the qāmāc is merely euphonic.

4. Siman Rapheh is also used with final hē, (α) to show that though soft it is equivalent to מָלַנָה as מַלְלַנָה (Numb. xv. 31); (β) to show that the hē is really quiescent (and not equivalent to מָלַנָה) Zech. iv. 7, or to show that it is equivalent to מָלַנָה Zech. ix. 8. Comp. Is. xviii. 5, xxi. 3, xxi. 17, 18, xxx. 32, lxv. 18, Job xxxi. 22, cxxxix. 13, Hos. ii. 13, ix. 10, Amos i. 11, Hab. iii. 11, Zeph. ii. 14, Prov. xii. 28, xxi. 22, &c.

5. To indicate that the initial letter of a word is purposely without dagesh, and that the rules given in Excurs. iii. have not been over-looked.

From the foregoing examples it will be seen that (as in the case of metheg, and the sign for qamaq) the utility of Siman rapheh is much impaired by its being used for diametrically opposite purposes.