

ZACHARIAS, SLAIN BETWEEN THE TEMPLE AND THE ALTAR.

THE date of St Luke's Gospel, and consequently the date of Acts, both depend largely on the answer we give to the question: 'Who was the Zacharias mentioned in Mt. xxiii 35 and Lk. xi 50?' The difficulty of identifying this personage was felt before Origen's day. He tells us¹:—

'Those who are reproved here by Christ cannot have destroyed² Zacharias the son of Barachias, [one of the twelve prophets, whose writings we have in our hands; but he means Zacharias the father of John,] (But it is likely, as Josephus says, that Zacharias the father of John is meant), as to whom we cannot prove by the [canonical] Scriptures either that he was the son of Barachias, or that the scribes [and Pharisees] killed him (in the holy Place) [between the Temple and the Altar].

But the following tradition has come down to us, that there was a certain spot around the Temple, where it was lawful for virgins to enter and worship God, but those who had already lost their virginity they did not allow in it. Now Mary, having come to worship after she had given birth to our Saviour, stood in the place of virgins. And when those who knew that she had had child prevented her, Zacharias said to those who were preventing her, that she was worthy of the place of virgins, since she was still a virgin. Therefore the men of that generation killed him between the Temple and the Altar as being plainly a transgressor, and one who permitted a woman to be in the place of the virgins. So they are reproached by the Saviour not as the sons of those who killed the prophets, and Zacharias among the prophets, but as themselves his murderers. [If then the word of Christ is true which He spoke to the Pharisees and scribes who were then present, "whom you killed between the Temple and the Altar", it is not possible for the Zacharias to be meant who is one of the twelve.] But it is not wonderful if it happened that as Zacharias the father of John had the same name as one of the twelve, so was it with his father's father likewise.'

This passage is interesting on many grounds. Here we have only to note that the identity of Zacharias was a question older than the story,

¹ In *Matt.* xxiii 35 (De la Rue, iii 845; Lommatsch, iv 228). The Greek of most of the passage is fortunately preserved in a catena on Luke. The Latin translator is not to be trusted.

² So the Greek, ἀνηρημέναι. The Latin has *dicere*, perhaps having read εἰρημέναι. I enclose in square brackets what is preserved in Latin only, and in round brackets what is only in the Greek.

which was invented to answer it. The story was a 'tradition', and must go back to the second century, perhaps to some apocryphal Gospel.

At the present day no one is likely to support Origen's candidate. There are two rivals only who still shew any claim: the Zacharias of 2 Chron. xxiii, and Zacharias the son of Baruch, whose murder in the Temple is related by Josephus. If the latter is the right man,¹ then the passages of Mt. and Lk. are later, as they stand, than the year of this murder, 69; and it follows that St Luke did not write at the early date which Harnack now champions.

I give the two passages, marking the coincidences of language after Rushbrooke:—

Matt. xxiii

34. Διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς· ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε καὶ σταυρώσετε, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστιγώσετε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν καὶ διώξετε ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν·

35. Ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυνόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου, ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.

36. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἡξεῖ ταῦτα πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην.

Luke xi

49. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν· Ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διώξουσιν,

50. ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης,

51. ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἄβελ ἕως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου·

ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

§ 1. *Zacharias the son of Baruch.*

According to Josephus *Bell. Iud.* iv 5. 4, this Zacharias was a rich man of high character, whom the Zealots wished to kill, because he was a friend of the good and an enemy of the wicked.² Josephus relates the whole incident after the death of Nero and in connexion with the slaying of twelve thousand persons of distinction by the same party of Zealots. Thus the year is certainly 69.

The Zealots chose a jury of seventy respectable men of the people, and accused Zacharias the son of Baruch of designing to betray the city to Vespasian. The accused was imprisoned, but was able to defend

¹ Many German writers assume it as certain. The latest I can refer to is von Dobschütz *Eschatology of the Gospels*, 1910, p. 90, note.

² In Josephus the MSS give for the name of Zacharias's father, Βάρεις (so Niese), Βαρισκαίου and Βαρούχου, but not Βαραχίου,—so Zahn has pointed out (*Einleitung* ii 309).

himself, and to prove the absurdity of the charge. He boldly inveighed against the crimes of the Zealots, and, in spite of the fury of these last, the seventy jurors acquitted him, declaring that they would rather suffer death themselves than that his death should be ascribed to them. But two of the boldest Zealots set upon Zacharias and slew him in the midst of the Temple.

Nobody to-day is likely to hold that the passages of Mt. and Lk. contain words of our Lord which refer prophetically to this Zacharias. Hug, Keim, and Weiss are quoted by Knabenbauer for the view that the Evangelists explain the words of Christ as referring to him. Others more naturally take the words with which St Luke introduces the paragraph (*διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν*) as proving that the whole section was given in the common source of Mt. and Lk. as a citation from a book written in the year 69 or later,¹ and was added to our Lord's 'woes' on the scribes and Pharisees and lawyers as a commentary.

There is, however, no necessity for assuming the existence of such a book. The supposed title 'The Wisdom of God' is too like that of the Wisdom of Solomon. There is no trace extant of such a work. All that needs to be postulated is a prophecy, committed to writing by those who heard it or heard of it. The date is pretty clear. At the moment the prophecy was uttered, Zacharias the son of Baruch was the latest victim of Jewish fanaticism, and the destruction of Jerusalem was imminent. The date will evidently be just after the death of Zacharias and before the final investment of the city by Vespasian.²

The passage was certainly found by Mt. and Lk. in their common source Q, for it occurs in both in the same connexion. Now it is extremely difficult to explain its presence in Q, unless it was a Christian prophecy. It cannot, indeed, have formed part of Q in its original form, not only because that document was certainly of an early date, and was beyond all question current long before 69, but for the simple reason that Q was a collection of discourses of Christ, and evidently contained no extraneous matter of this kind. The passage, if a quotation, is an insertion in a late edition of Q. But the Christian who interpolated it after A.D. 69 was hardly likely to adopt a Jewish pro-

¹ Of course, many (e. g. Harnack *Sayings of Jesus*, 1908, p. 103) think that our Lord Himself is quoting from an apocryphal book of Wisdom, and place its composition at an earlier date. I see no good argument in favour of this view.

² It might be urged that it is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, composed after 70. In this case the murder of Zacharias would be taken as the last crime before the retribution actually began. Even though many other crimes followed, this murder within the precincts of the Temple might naturally be singled out as a culminating outrage. But there seems no object in supposing that the prophecy (no difficult one to make in 69!) was a fraud.

phesy; and it seems perfectly natural to take the words as the utterance of some Christian prophet at Jerusalem in 69—some prophet like Agabus in Acts—who introduces his denunciation of the unbelieving Jews not with the old formula 'Thus saith the Lord', but with the words: 'The Wisdom of God saith.' This would, in fact, be another way of saying: 'The Spirit of Christ saith', for St Paul had taught that Christ is 'the Wisdom of God' (1 Cor. i 24), and had declared that He 'is made *unto us* Wisdom from God', and had called his own higher instruction given to the perfect 'the speaking God's Wisdom in a mystery' (1 Cor. i 30, ii 7). This Christian prophecy would be written down by Christians, or at least repeated and remembered. It would be quite natural to add it as a commentary to our Lord's words in which He declared that the Jews of His own day were as guilty of the blood of the prophets as were their fathers. The interpolator of Q would regard the words as truly words of Christ, spoken not in His lifetime by His own lips, but by the mouth of an inspired disciple, and as amplifying and explaining the denunciations to which he was appending them.

Thus we arrive at a simple and attractive theory. It rests upon three arguments; first, the words of St Luke 'Therefore the Wisdom of God said' suggest that in his source the passage that follows was not a saying of Christ, but a quotation from some prophecy; secondly, we obtain a clear *terminus ad quem* to correspond to the *terminus a quo*—from the blood of Abel, the first ever spilt, to the last of all, the blood of Zacharias the son of Baruch, which was spilt yesterday. All the wickedness of the world is heaped upon the head of the Jews of the generation which had rejected Christ,—this is clearly the meaning of the Christian prophet. Thirdly, Mt., though omitting 'the Wisdom of God said', has retained the prophet's words 'whom you slew', which seem to distinguish Zacharias from the earlier prophets whom not 'you' but 'your fathers' slew.

§ 2. *Difficulties against this identification.*

At first sight it looks so obvious that to correspond with Abel's blood, the first blood shed, we must needs have the latest blood shed by the Jews, that one feels that no objections, however forcible, can destroy the enormous *a priori* strength of the identification of Zacharias slain between the Temple and the Altar with the son of Baruch. This has at least been my feeling. Yet there are many real difficulties.

1. It is hard not to suppose that this Zacharias must have been a Christian, if the prophecy is the utterance of a Christian. For a Christian would scarcely resent so fiercely the murder—even though in the Temple—of a rich and prominent person in Jerusalem who had

utterly refused to join the ranks of the followers of Christ. But if he was really a Christian martyr, he would be more famous. We should expect to hear of him from Christian sources. At all events Mt. and Lk. would know all about him, and in using the interpolation in Q would have no difficulty in understanding who was referred to, and consequently in perceiving the date of the prophecy. But both evangelists as a fact have understood the words as being words of Christ. This is just as certain of Lk. as it is of Mt.; for Luke goes on in *v.* 52 with the woe against the lawyers which this passage interrupts.

2. Even if Zacharias was not a Christian, it is a grave difficulty that we have to suppose that both evangelists misunderstood the interpolation in Q to be a prophecy by Christ, though it was not meant to be thus taken.

3. Mt. has 'son of Barachias'; this is not the same as 'son of Baruch'. However, as there are two Zachariahs in the O. T. who were sons of Barachiah, it is easy to suppose a corruption by a scribe.

4. We are obliged to assume an interpolation of an exegetic nature in Q. This is not impossible. But I know of no other probable example of such a phenomenon.

5. We have to suppose that St Luke and the author of the Greek Matthew both used an edition of Q which was interpolated as late as 69. Now it is not probable that both, or either, should have written more than ten or twelve years later. Yet it seems on other grounds unlikely that they used versions of Q which were identical. On the contrary, it would be easier to suppose that they had access, if not to different redactions, at least to copies which differed to some extent through the variations caused by casual emendators or copyists.¹

These objections are serious, but they are by no means conclusive. They lead up to the graver objection that St Luke cannot have written so late, since he certainly wrote Acts at the date at which he closes the history he tells in that book. I used myself to think this the true date for Acts; but gradually I found myself forgetting my old view, and ready to accept a somewhat later date. On reading Harnack's clever presentment of the reasons for the early date in his recent *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte* (pp. 63 foll.) I find myself driven to accept his arguments, and much inclined to add something to them; this I cannot attempt here. But my conviction has impelled me to look searchingly into the question of Zacharias the son of Baruch.

¹ I must not be understood to hold definitely any views as to the Synoptic problem which I am obliged to assume for the sake of argument. For I avoid actually giving the view to which I am at present most inclined, as it would need arguments and proofs. I am content to follow the most usual opinions, as I do not greatly differ from them.

It might, in the first place, be urged that the passage in Lk. is an interpolation. In favour of this there are two points. First, xi 52 (the verse which immediately follows the passage) is a new woe against the lawyers, continuing the woes against them in *vv.* 46-48. The verses in question, 49-51, do not apply to the lawyers alone, and they interrupt the sequence: they seem to be a comment on *v.* 48. To this, however, it may be replied that the Woe in 47-48 applies to the scribes and Pharisees as well as to the lawyers, as is shewn by the sense, and also by the parallel in Mt. xxiii 29-31 (Mt. has no special denunciation of the lawyers); also, that St Luke has inserted the passage in the place which seemed to him most suitable, regardless of the break which it makes. There is no connexion of sense between *v.* 48 and *v.* 52, so that the omission of the intervening verses does not in the least make for clearness.

Secondly, we know from St Epiphanius that Marcion omitted precisely these verses. I admit that Marcion's text is of first-rate importance, and that even an omission by him may conceivably imply that he did not find the passage in the text he was mangling. But in the present case he was certain to object to the verses. They referred to the Old Testament; they seemed to imply that God had sent a series of prophets to the Jews. They consequently spoiled the series of woes upon the Jews, which must have suited him admirably.

On the other side we have the unanimous witness of all MSS and Versions, and the absolutely Lucan colouring of the style and language. It would be a violent hypothesis to suppose that the author himself inserted the passage in a second edition. I think few now believe in the supposed afterthoughts of St Luke and his second editions.

Let us come to some last difficulties which I cannot explain away:—

a. 'Behold I send unto you wise men and prophets.' Was Zacharias the son of Baruch a wise man or a prophet? Could the speech in which he defended himself and attacked the Zealots be considered a sufficient reason for numbering him among the messengers sent by God to the Jewish people? Perhaps,—but it is a bold assumption.

β. Those who killed him were Zealots, fanatics who had nothing in common with the lawyers whom our Lord is denouncing in the context. St Luke seems to distinguish lawyers (*νομικοί, νομοδιδάσκαλοι*) from the scribes—perhaps as a subdivision of scribes. Whoever they were, they belonged to the respectable classes of whom the Zealots slew twelve thousand about the time they accused Zacharias. The 'lawyers' as a class were the last people to be especially answerable for the death of Zacharias.

γ. Unless Zacharias was a priest on duty, one does not see how he could come to be 'between the temple and the altar', i. e. in the court

of the priests. Josephus says simply 'in the midst of the temple', and represents the Zealots as driving out the seventy jurymen with the flat of their swords. He seems to imagine the whole scene as taking place in the court of the men.

§ 3. *The context and exegesis.*

The interpretation of the passage itself is after all the important matter.¹ It is introduced in the same way by Mt. and Lk.

Matt. xxiii.

29. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τοὺς τάφους τῶν προφητῶν καὶ κοσμεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν δικαίων,

30. καὶ λέγετε, Εἰ ἤμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἂν ἤμεθα αὐτῶν κοινωνοὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν προφητῶν·

31. ὥστε μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφήτας.

32. καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν.

33. ὄφεις γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γέεννης;

Luke xi.

47. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν, οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς.

48. ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνενδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε.

The difference between Mt. and Lk. is considerable. St Matthew gives a plain sequence: 'You Pharisees are hypocrites. You adorn the tombs of the prophets whom your fathers slew, and you declare that if you had lived in their days you would not have slain them. At least you admit that you are the sons of their murderers: fill up the measure of your fathers! for you will indeed do worse than they,—you are vipers, and you will not escape punishment; for I will send you

¹ The passage forms part of a longer section of 'woes' on the scribes and Pharisees. Lk. adds lawyers in a special paragraph. There has been much dislocation of Q, as the following tables will shew. (Mt. xxiii 14 is an ancient interpolation.)

Mt. xxiii = Lk. xi	Lk. xi = Mt. xiii
13	5 ² 37-8
15-22	39-41 25-6
23	42 23
24	43 6
25-6	44 27
27-8	45-6 (4)

Lk., in 37-8, 45, and again in 53, gives the occasions of the discourse, presumably following Q. But Lk. has condensed, omitting the matter of Mt. 15-22.

new prophets, and you will persecute them like your fathers.' In this passage the adorning of the tombs is treated as an honour done to the prophets; the adorners are hypocrites, for in their hearts they are as bad as their fathers, and the future will shew them to be so.

The 'Western' text of Lk. is somewhat similar. It is straightforward enough: *ἀρα μάρτυρές ἐστε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν κτλ. (Dabeg Lucif)*, 'You witness (i. e. pretend) that you do not rejoice in the deeds of your fathers, since they killed them, whereas you build (in their honour)'. This is, of course, one of the usual flat explanations which abound in the 'Western' text. The ordinary reading is undoubtedly the right one, whereas the 'Western' reading has been harmonized with St Matthew. But the true reading is far the more difficult. It is ironical: the building of the sepulchres is not thought of as an honour done to the prophets, but as a continuation and completion of their murder: 'Woe unto you, for you build the tombs of the prophets, whereas your fathers murdered them! And so you are witnesses that you are wholly in sympathy with your fathers: they killed the prophets, and you dig their graves.' The paradox has obviously a deeper meaning: 'Your fathers killed the prophets, and openly rejected their teaching. You, on the contrary, pretend to be very different, and to have your forefathers' actions in horror; you build grand memorials to those whom they murdered. But in reality by your interpretations and traditions you have buried the moral teaching of the prophets in the ornamental sepulchres of formalism, under the pretence of the most scrupulous obedience. Thus you have completed the work your fathers began when they killed the prophets: you have done away with their influence,— they are now not only dead, but metaphorically dead and buried.'

Thus St Matthew and St Luke complete each other. Each has a part of the whole sense. Mt. has chosen what was plain sailing. Lk. gives the paradox, in a very cryptic form; for he has condensed, as is his wont. From a further desire of economizing space he has omitted Mt. 33 altogether, in which verse our Lord is repeating the Baptist's ironical greeting of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Lk. iii 7 = Mt. iii 7). Lk. always avoids anything at all resembling a doublet, whether in action or word.

It is impossible to say just how Mt. 29-33 = Lk. 47-48 ran in Q; but we have seen the general sense. Evidently Mt. and Lk. have looked upon the verses as an introduction to the crucial verses which follow, in which the two evangelists are closer to one another and therefore to Q. The sequence of thought is clear in both: 'it will be seen that you are as bad as your fathers; for prophets will be sent to you, and you will kill and persecute some of them (or kill and crucify and scourge in your synagogues and persecute from city to city).' Evidently

'kill and persecute', the words which are common to both, were the words of Q. Probably Mt. has added 'crucify and scourge in your synagogues' and 'from city to city'; though it is also possible that Lk. has condensed as usual. Mt. gives to these messengers of God names which his Palestinian readers would understand: 'prophets and wise men and scribes', very likely preserving (or slightly amplifying?) the original words of Q. Lk. identifies these messengers with the Christian 'apostles and prophets', of whom his master St Paul says that Christ instituted them in His Church (1 Cor. xii 28; Eph. iv 11) and built it upon them (Eph. ii 20); thus the meaning of the prophecy is made clear to Gentile readers: the Jews had persecuted the Apostles and prophets, and so these had turned to the Gentiles. It would seem, then, that Q did not give the Christian titles as Lk., nor (probably) the detailed description of the sufferings of Christian preachers as Mt. There is, in this case, a certain reticence and restraint in Q, characteristic (one would think) of an early date rather than of a Christian prophet of the year 69.

Both evangelists continue: 'IN ORDER THAT there may come upon you (may be required of you) all the blood . . .' What blood? Surely the sense is clear, and we know what to expect: 'all the blood shed by your fathers', is what is needed, and in fact we find this, and more: 'all the blood shed from the beginning of the world and that shed by your fathers.' There could be no sense in adding: 'and all the blood shed by yourselves', for the point is that the blood which this living generation will shed will make it possible (mark 'in order that') for all former persecution of God's messengers to be visited upon it. For this generation is reserved the final trial; it will accomplish the final rejection of the salvation offered by God, and the punishment of all the past sins of the world and of Israel in rejecting God's messengers will come at last. But this retribution, so long threatened and so long delayed, is not to be visited on the heads of an innocent generation nor even of an inwardly corrupt but outwardly pious generation. No; they are to be shewn up by their own works; the last messengers will come to them; they will persecute and slay them, and then will quite justly come the end,—upon this generation, within the days of those who are now in the prime of life.¹ 'Amen, I say unto you', so we find in St Mark, 'this generation shall not pass away until all these things be fulfilled' (Mk. xiii 30 = Mt. xxiv 34 = Lk. xxi 32).

1. If this exegesis is correct—and I do not see how any other is

¹ A generation in the Old Testament is forty years. There were forty years from this prediction until the siege of Jerusalem; and this was the great period of final trial, the last chance, corresponding to the forty years' trial of the children of Israel in the wilderness; cp. Hebrews iii 17 foll.

possible—then there is no doubt as to the *terminus ad quem* ‘until the blood of Zacharias’: it must refer to blood shed by the fathers of this generation, that is to say, by the Israelites of the past, and not by this generation itself. St Matthew’s ‘whom you killed’ will not mean literally that Zacharias was assassinated by the crowd who were then listening to Christ but signifies ‘you, your nation, you and your fathers, your fathers of whom you are the heirs’.

2. It is thus impossible that Zacharias the son of Baruch, slain by Zealots in 69, should be meant.

3. There can have been no interpolation. The two passages, Mt. 34-36 and Lk. 49-51, explain the verses which precede them; nay, they are demanded by those preceding verses to complete the sense, which is continuous and clear. How is this fact to be reconciled with our former hypothesis that the verses are quoted from a prophet of the year 69? Could an interpolator have inserted anything so extraordinarily apposite? Could an annotator have thrown such a clear light on the preceding verses? Further, can the preceding verses be even understood or justified, if these sentences are omitted? To my mind the matter is entirely clear. The passage, Mt. 29-36 = Lk. 47-51, is all of a piece; it cannot be broken up. Had it not been for the difficulty about ‘Zacharias the son of Barachias’, it would never have entered into the head of any critic to doubt that all was one continuous discourse.

Thus we have reached a clear conclusion: *the Zacharias is not the son of Baruch, and there can have been no interpolation, but we have the original sense of Q. preserved in Mt. and Lk.* We have to find a well-known Zacharias who was slain by an earlier generation of Jews.

§ 4. *Zacharias the son of Jehoiada.*

If these conclusions are correct, then Zacharias the son of Jehoiada was the obvious person to mention. He died towards the end of the kingdom of Judah. There is no later murder of a prophet mentioned in the historical books of the O. T.¹ In Lk. there is no difficulty, for the correct text has only ‘Zacharias’. In Mt. we find ‘the Son of Barachias’, words which are omitted by \aleph^* 6^{ev} 13^{ev} Eusebius—a very poor sum of authorities. The best explanation seems to be that ‘Zacharias the son of Barachias’ was so familiar a combination (as being the name of the Minor Prophet, Zech. i 1, 7; another Zacharias son of Barachias is mentioned by Isaiah viii 2 LXX, perhaps the same as the Zacharias of 2 Chron. xxvi 5) that one of the very first scribes of Mt. introduced the name by a slip of memory—presumably he meant to

¹ Plummer notes that the murder of Uriah by Jehoiakim is chronologically later (Jer. xxvi 23).

write 'Ιωδαε. Hence the invented stories about the father of St John Baptist.

St Jerome in a well-known passage¹ tells us that the Gospel according to the Hebrews had 'son of Joiada'. This might conceivably represent the original text of Mt. ; or else it is a very early and correct gloss.

Correct, for the parallel between Abel and this Zacharias is clear :—

a. Of Abel, we hear that God said to Cain : 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground' (Gen. iv 11).

β. Of Zacharias we read : 'And when he died, he said : 'The Lord look upon it and require it', (שׁוֹרֵי 2 Chron. xxiv 22).

Yet further, St Luke has *ἵνα ἐκζητηθῆ τὸ αἷμα πάντων . . . ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης . . . ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης*. It is hardly necessary to remark that *ἐκζητεῖν ἀπὸ* in the sense of 'require of' is not a Greek expression ; it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament ; it is used only by the LXX, and always as a translation of the verb שׁוֹרֵי.² St Luke is doubtless fond of borrowing expressions from the LXX in order to give a biblical flavour to his narrative ; but it is difficult to suppose that he did so here. The expression was surely found by him in Q.

On the contrary, St Matthew's *ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα κτλ.* seems to be quite clearly assimilated by him to the awful imprecation of the Jews upon themselves, which he alone of the evangelists relates : *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εἶπεν τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν* (xxvii 25). It is perhaps possible to strengthen this inference by noting St Matthew's introduction of *καὶ σταυρώσετε* in v. 34.

We may assume, then, that Q had *ἵνα ἐκζητηθῆ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν*. A reference to Gen. ix 5 is latent, but would hardly be consciously in the mind of the writer. On the other hand the crying out of *the blood* of Abel and the dying words of Zacharias³ 'The Lord

¹ On Matt. xxiii 35 (vol. vii, p. 190). An old Scholion (Matthaei, *Ev. Matt.*, Riga 1788, p. 376) quoted by Zahn (*Gesch. des N. T. Kanons* ii 695) also states that Zacharias son of Jodaë is meant.

² Here, in 2 Chron. xxiv 22, this verb has the absolute sense of punish, avenge ; the English versions have 'require' ; St Jerome gives *requirat*, though the LXX has *κρινάτω*. In Deut. xviii 19 for the same absolute sense the LXX gives *ἐδικήσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ*. But in Ps. x 4 the rendering is *οὐκ ἐκζητήσῃ*, *ibid.* v. 13 *οὐ ζητήσῃ*. The full expression 'require blood' is commoner, and is rendered by *αἷμα ἐκζητεῖν* (Gen. ix 5 ; xlii 22 ; Ezek. xxxiii 6 ; in Ps. xliii 13 *ἐκζητῶν τὰ αἵματα αὐτῶν*) ; the Hebrew is שׁוֹרֵי in every case.

³ Commentators point out how much the Jews made of the murder of Zacharias the son of Jehoiada. I borrow what follows from Knabenbauer, q.v. (*Comm. in Matt.* ii p. 297). In tract Sanhedrin, fol. 96, it is said that 80,000 priests were killed on account of the blood of Z. ; when Nabuzaradan came up to Jerusalem, he saw the blood still bubbling up, until 94,000 had been killed, and Nabuzaradan

look upon it and *require it*', seem to be combined in the use of the familiar phrase *ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα*. It is true that the LXX in 2 Chron. xxiv 22 has: **Ἴδοι κύριος καὶ κρινάτω*; but Q does not use the LXX, and would render *ψῆγῆ* by *καὶ ἐκζητέτω* or *καὶ ἐκζητησάτω*.

§ 5. *The 'Wisdom of God'.*

Mt. has: '*Wherefore* behold *I send unto you . . . you will kill . . .*'; whereas Lk. has: '*Wherefore* also the Wisdom of God said: *I will send unto them . . . they will kill . . .*' In each we find the same *wherefore*, explaining the connexion with the context.

Mt.'s 'I send' is plain enough. But is it likely that these are the very words of our Lord? The scribes and Pharisees would jeer: '*You will send prophets! Who are you? If we kill them, there will be no sacrilege, for they will not be prophets of God.*'

According to St Luke He made the prophecy in a more solemn manner, as a divine word: '*The Wisdom of God hath determined and declares by Me: I will send prophets to them . . . , they will treat them as their fathers treated the former prophets.*' That is to say, '*The Wisdom of God which orders all things (a modern writer would say "Providence") has decided' (ἐπέειπεν, has decreed and will not repent): 'In order that they may shew their likeness to their fathers, I will send prophets to them also, and they will treat them as their fathers treated My prophets of old.*' There is surely nothing very astonishing in such a way of putting the matter. St Luke assumes that his readers will understand that the speaker is Himself the Wisdom of God. But St Matthew, who is not writing for converts of St Paul, points the reference to the Christian teachers by substituting 'I will send to you'; St Luke made this reference clear by saying 'Apostles and prophets'. There seems no reason to doubt that *ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπέειπεν* stood in Q.

In another place in Q, Christ says: '*Wisdom was justified of her children' (Mt. xi 19 = Lk. vii 35).* But in this passage the form is taken from the Old Testament, especially from such passages as Proverbs i 20: '*Wisdom crieth aloud in the street; she uttereth her speech in the broad places' &c., or viii 1: 'Doth not Wisdom cry, and Understanding put forth her voice? . . . at the coming in at the doors, she crieth aloud: Unto you, O men, I call' &c., or ix 3: 'She crieth exclaimed, 'O Zacharias, Zacharias, you have destroyed your best men; do you wish me to destroy all?' A similar story in Midrash Koheleth (ed. Wünsche, 1880, p. 52). The taking of the city by Nabuzaradan was looked upon as vengeance for Z. So in Midrash of Lamentations, &c., and Abraham Ibn Ezra on Lament., and Gittin, 57. Tertullian (*Scorpiae* 8) has '*Zacharias inter altare et aedem trucidatus perennes cruoris sui maculas silicibus assignans*', and St Jerome *in loco* speaks of '*the simpler brethren' as believing this story. I have not seen Berendts *Studien über Zachariasapokryphen und Zachariaslegenden* (1895), nor is it necessary for my present purpose.**

on the highest places of the city.' It is perhaps the first chapter to which our Lord's words refer :—

'Wisdom uttereth her words :

How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity?
 And scorners delight in scorning, and fools hate knowledge?
 Turn you at my reproof . . .
 Because *I have called, and ye refused;*
 I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded;
 But ye have set at nought all my counsel,
 And would none of my reproof.

I will also laugh in the day of your calamity;
 I will mock when your fear cometh;
 When your fear cometh up as a storm,
 And your calamity cometh on as a whirlwind;
 When distress and anguish come upon you.
 Then they shall call upon me, but I will not answer;
 They shall seek me diligently but shall not find me:
 For that they hated knowledge
 And did not choose the fear of the Lord;
 They would none of my counsel;
 They despised all my reproof' (Prov. i 21-30).

We seem to have in Q only a very brief and condensed summary of our Lord's words. Perhaps He may have cited this very passage of Proverbs, where Wisdom makes her complaint that all her reproof has been set at nought, and threatens a terrible retribution. Now at last this retribution is coming relentlessly; Wisdom has spoken: 'I will send my last messengers, and them also you will reject, so that the punishment threatened for so many ages may fall at last, and fall upon those who have deserved it.'¹

At all events I hope this lengthy discussion will have shewn that we have no quotation in Q from a book of Wisdom written after the siege of Jerusalem, nor from a Christian prophet of 69; that there is no interpolation in the two passages, and that the Zacharias who is mentioned is the son of Jehoiada, who called upon God to look upon his blood, and require it.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

¹ Again, let us notice that St Matthew's 'I will send' makes the messengers simply the Apostles and prophets; and yet Mt. adds 'shall crucify'. Had any Christians been crucified by the Jews? Does he not perhaps include the Speaker among the messengers? Lk., on the other hand, explicitly mentions apostles and prophets; but those sent by the Wisdom of God might well include the incarnate Wisdom. I do not urge that either Mt. or Lk. intended this. But all the same it is well to note that in the longer discourse of which we have but an abridgement, our Lord may well have included His own rejection as well as that of His Apostles and prophets, as being the final crime which should bring the last days upon the people of Israel.