

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE IDEAL CITY AND THE REAL.

IN previous papers we have shown how very gradual was the rise of Jerusalem to pre-eminence among the shrines of Israel. Of her long and disturbed promotion, the two most rapid factors had been Isaiah's argument of the Divine purpose in her history and her vindication in 701 as the only inviolable city of the One God. But it was Josiah who rendered this rank indefeasible by realizing the ideal of Deuteronomy and concentrating the national worship in the Temple. Jeremiah, it is true, scorned the popular superstitions which assumed the unique holiness of the Temple, and never set the City of his own day in any precedence to the rest of the land, save a precedence of sin. Yet the Deuteronomic conceptions prevailed; and in looking to the future, even Jeremiah saw not only the Temple rebuilt, but the worship of the northern tribes returning to it in conformity with the Deuteronomic requirements.

For such a centralization of the worship, the religious motives, as we have seen, were high and strong. But they would hardly have achieved so full a victory without the aid of others, which were partly political, having begun with David, and partly economic, having been at work since at least the eighth century. The Monarchy implied the Capital, which replaced the tribal centres and attracted to itself more and more of the national life. To the same focus gathered the trade which Uzziah had fostered, and which must have largely increased through the long reign of Manasseh, and by his position as a vassal in the wide empire of Assyria. Thus the urban forms of society replaced the agricultural, and the capital absorbed the political talent, the military strength and the industrial efficiency of the people. But the classes which represented these were the classes whom

Nebuchadrezzar carried into captivity. It was the wisdom of this conqueror to leave to his new province her peasantry, with a few of their leaders ; but he brought away with him the royal family, the statesmen, the soldiers, the priesthood, the men of substance and the artisans, all of whom he found concentrated in the capital. Thus it came about that the bulk of the Jewish exiles in Babylonia were the men of Jerusalem, to whom their City was everything, and the rest of the land but a fringe about her walls ; while such of their fellow-captives as came from the country had lived for a generation under the spell of the religious rank conferred on her by the Deuteronomic reforms. Thus Jerusalem, at the moment of the Exile, represented not only the actual and efficient nation, but the Divine idea for which the nation lived.

These facts explain what would otherwise appear as a paradox. Jerusalem has hardly fallen, and been drained of her population, when we find her regarded in Jewish literature, not only as still alive, but as if she comprised in herself the significance of all Israel. This is the case even with Ezekiel, who was otherwise so careful to keep in sight the rest of the land up to its ideal boundaries. Not only does he call Jerusalem the *gate of the peoples*,¹ thus emphasizing the commercial power which the Jewish capital had gained through the long reign of Manasseh ; not only does he foresee her restored, as the head and heart of the people, marvellously elevated and fenced from all profane influences by his disposition of the country about her ; but to him Jerusalem is Israel. The nation's guilt in the past has been her guilt.² Their king is *the King of Jerusalem*.³ It is Jerusalem who from beginning to end of the long history has conducted those foreign intrigues in which the national

¹ xxv. 2. 1, LXX.

² Especially xvi., xxii., xxiii.

³ xvii. 12.

apostasy consists, and has been unfaithful with Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia.¹ Not Judah but Jerusalem is *Aholibah*, the adulterous wife of Jahweh.² To Ezekiel, then, the City not only is, but always has been, the People.

And as with Ezekiel, so with his contemporary, the author of the two great dirges, Lamentations ii. and iv.³ These pour their grief chiefly on the City, and similarly use his name for the whole Nation. *Daughter of Sion* is as national a designation as *daughter of Edom*.⁴ The body of Jerusalem is broken, but her spirit still lives, and is called by the poet to bewail her ruin and the death of her children; to pray for her restoration and revenge upon her enemies. It is the same in the somewhat later dirge, Lamentations i. This breaks full upon Jerusalem, and contrasts her not with other towns, but with provinces and nations.

*How alone sits the City
That swarmed with people!
Become as a widow is she,
The chief among nations.
Once princess of provinces,
Thrall is she now.*

Judah is mentioned but twice, the City much oftener. *Jacob* comes in but as a third between *Sion* and *Jerusalem*.

*Sion hath spread out her hands,
None to relieve her.
Of Jacob, Jahweh commanded:
"Round him his foes!"
Jerusalem hath come to be
Noisome among them.*⁵

¹ xvi., xxiii. ² xxiii.

³ EXPOSITOR for April, 1906.

⁴ Lam. iv. 22; cf. ii. 13. *Israel*, *Judah*, *daughter of Judah* are also used, but not so often.

⁵ Verse 17.

In all these dirges Jerusalem or Şion stands for the whole people of God ; not merely mother or mistress of the nation, but the ideal figure in whom Israel is concentrated.

Such, too, is the sense in which she is regarded by the great prophet of the Exile, the author of Isaiah xl.-lv. In one passage he describes the exiles as *naming themselves by the Holy City*.¹ He accepts the identification. He opens by addressing *Jerusalem* and *my people* as one.² He is commanded to *say unto Şion, My people art thou*.³ God, he says, *hath comforted his people, hath redeemed Jerusalem*.⁴ *Behold, I have graven thee on the palms of my hands, thy walls are continually before me*.⁵ When he addresses a promise to *Jacob-Israel*, it is *Şion-Jerusalem* who answers.⁶ This identification, we must note, does not occur in the passages on the Servant of the Lord, who is always Israel or Jacob⁷ ; but everywhere else Şion or Jerusalem is the banished Israel,⁸ the spiritual figure of God's people. This use is continued by later prophets.⁹

The same note is struck by the Psalms of the Exile. The Babylonian captivity is *the captivity of Şion*.¹⁰ *The songs of Jahweh* are the *songs of Şion*.¹¹ It is Jerusalem which the exiles cannot forget, and upon which in the most passionate of these Psalms they pour out their hearts. The metre of Psalm cxxxvii. is somewhat uncertain. The subject, as well as the form of some of the couplets, tempt us to take this, as the ordinary *Kinah* or elegiac measure, alternate

¹ xlviii. 2.

² xl. 1, 2. ³ li. 16.

⁴ lii. 9 ; cf. xlvi. 13.

⁵ xlix. 16.

⁶ xlix. 14 ; see, too, xli. 27 compared with 8 ; li. 8 compared with 1, 2.

⁷ xli. 8 ; xlv. 1, 21 ; xlv. 4 ; xlix. 3 (if, indeed, *Israel* be original to this passage).

⁸ In addition to passages quoted above, lii. 2.

⁹ Zeph. iii. 14 ; cf. Isaiah lix. 20.

¹⁰ Ps. cxxvi. 1. ¹¹ cxxxvii. 3, 4.

lines of three and two accents. But in order to produce this, one has to make some arbitrary elisions, and even then several of what should be the longer lines are too short. As the text stands it falls into lines of two accents or stresses each, except in the last line of verse 3, the first of 4, and the first of 6, in which there are three accents.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. By the rivers of Babel ¹ We sat down and wept, Remembering Sion.</p> | <p>4. How shall we sing the songs of Jahweh On soil that is foreign ?</p> |
| <p>2. On the willows in her midst We hanged up our harps,</p> | <p>5. Jerusalem, if I forget thee, My right hand be withered !²</p> |
| <p>3. For there had our banishers Asked of us songs, Our torturers mirth : “ Sing us of Sion’s songs ! ”³</p> | <p>6. My tongue to my mouth cleave If thou do not haunt me. If I set not Jerusalem Above my chief joy !</p> |

If the Fifty-first Psalm be wholly from the time of the Exile, then we see how the most spiritual of all the exilic writers was able to set the hope of the rebuilding of Sion and of the resumption of the legal sacrifices side by side with his expression of the faith that the *sacrifices of God are a broken spirit and a contrite heart*.

These, then, are the stages which we have been able to follow in the gradual exaltation of Jerusalem : her choice by David as the Capital ; the building of her Temple by Solomon ; the revelation of God’s purpose in her history by Isaiah, with the seal put upon this by her deliverance in 701 ; the concentration of the national worship upon the Temple by Josiah ; and now her captivity, effecting the release of her life from the guilt and the habits of a history which, however divinely guided, had been full of apostasy, and affording to her children the vision of her, seen through

¹ To get a second accent the Hebrew adds the emphatic there.

² Thus plural in the LXX.

³ So Grätz, by transposing the letters תשכח forget to שכח be withered.

the distance and the tears of exile, as the image and the name of the spiritual people of God. Hereafter, whatever may happen to her earthly frame, there will still be, free of its fluctuating fortunes, a Şion and Jerusalem—ideal and immortal. It is from such premises that future generations are to construct their doctrines of *the new Jerusalem* and *the heavenly Jerusalem*, the first sketches of which are indeed already traced by Ezekiel.

Our present duty, however, is to follow the hopes of the restoration of the earthly Şion, till at last these resulted in the return of some of her people and the rebuilding of the Temple.

When the Babylonian exiles began to form such hopes with any distinctness is uncertain. A number of predictions, probably from the period of the Exile, are found in the Book of Jeremiah, but it is impossible to give them an exact date. We must confine ourselves to those whose years we can fix with some approximation. The writers of Lamentations ii. and iv., about 570, and of Lamentations and Psalm cxxxvii., probably somewhat later, are stunned by the completeness of the City's ruin and the utterness of her fall. None of them speculate upon any recovery which may come to her either through the clemency of her destroyers,¹ or by their overthrow; for though these are described with sufficient vividness, it is felt that the matter is one between God and His people. *He has been the Foe, He has ruthlessly ruined and slaughtered.* Hence the finality of the disaster: divinely planned and foretold and divinely performed. Yet just because the worst possible has happened, the air is at last clear. Even God can have nothing left to wreak upon His people. Their *guilt* is *exhausted*, and His wrath must now turn on their enemies.² To so full an end did the Jews

¹ It was about 560 that Jehoiachin was kindly treated by the Babylonian king.

² Lam. i. 21, 22; iv. 22; Ps. cxxxvii. 7-9.

believe the sacred history to have run ; from so low and bare a level must it start again.

It is to this mood of the exiles that their great Evangelist addresses his gospel, weaving his verse to the same measure as that of their dirges.¹

*“ Comfort ye, comfort ye my people,”
Sayeth your God.
“ Speak home to the heart of Jerusalem
And call out to her,
That fulfilled is her servitude,
Her guilt is discharged ;
From the hand of the Lord she hath gotten
Double her sins.”*²

But not immediately does the prophet pass to the return and the restoration. It is his greatness (we see from the arguments which follow) to conceive of his task as first and mainly religious ; the creation of faith in God, the rousing of the nation’s conscience to their calling, the purging of their mind from all prejudice as to the ways the Divine action shall take. Therefore he first speaks to his people of God : in aspects of His majesty so sovereign and omnipotent that not only must the night of despair vanish before them, but Israel’s trust in Him shall include a willingness to believe in two new and very wonderful things : their world-wide destiny, and the selection, not of one of their own princes, but of a Gentile, to be their deliverer. Thus out of all that glory of God in nature, and in history, which the opening chapters so greatly unfold—His sway of the stars and of the nations, His tenderness to His people and His passion to redeem them—there issue gradually the two figures of the Servant and the Anointed ; the blind and plundered captive

¹ The *Kinah* or Elegiac : alternate lines of three and two beats or accents.

² Isaiah xl. 1, 2.

of Babylon, whom God yet destines to be the herald of his religion to the ends of the earth ; and the visible and accredited conqueror, whom God has raised *from the north, from the east*, anywhere out of the far and the unknown, and now—somewhere between 545 and 538—is leading upon Babylon to effect His judgement on the tyrant and to set His people free. Only when this great prologue has been achieved do there break the particular promises of the return and the rebuilding :—

*Who saith of Jerusalem, Be inhabited,
Of the Temple, Be founded !
Of the towns of Judah, Be built again,
Her ruins will I raise.
Who saith to the flood, Be thou dry,
And the streams will I parch.
Who saith of Cyrus, My friend,
My purpose he perfects.
Thus saith Jahweh, the God,
Of his anointed, of Cyrus ;
He, whose right hand I grasped
To bring down the nations,
To open before him the doors,
No gate shall be closed.¹
I, I have roused him in troth ;
His ways will I level.
He it is who shall build up my City,
My captives send forth.²*

The same exalted comforter, or (as some think) another,

¹ xliv. 26—xlv. 1: reconstructed by bringing the last clause of xlv. 28 to 26, and adding from the LXX. *the God* to xlv. 1 ; so Duhm, Cheyne, Marti. It is, of course, conjectural, but the result renders the measure regular. On this ground I have omitted a clause in xlv. 1.

² xlv. 13. The English phrase, in troth, but imperfectly renders צְדָקָה, *in righteousness*, which does not refer to the character of Cyrus, but to that of the action of God, who means to see Cyrus through.

puts no limits to the numbers who shall return, or to the glory of the restoration. *Then thou wilt be too narrow for thine inhabitants . . . thou wilt say in thine heart, Who hath borne me these? . . . Lo, I was left solitary; these, where were they?*¹

*Arouse thee, arouse thee, put on
Thy power, O Sion;
Thy glorious apparel put on,
O City of Holiness.
Rise up, shake the dust from thee,
Captive Jerusalem!
Loosen thy shackles, O captive
Daughter of Sion.²
How beautiful are on the mountains
The feet of the herald!
Who publisheth peace and good news,
Who proclaimeth salvation,
Who sayeth to [the daughter of] Sion:
Thy God is King!
Hark, to thy sentinels calling,
All Together they shout,
As the Lord, eye to eye, they behold
Returning to Sion.
Break ye out, sing together,
Jerusalem's ruins,
For Jahweh hath pitied His people,
Delivered Jerusalem.³*

Cyrus the Great became master of Babylon and the Babylonian Empire in 539. He entered the City without fighting; welcomed and escorted (he claims) by her deity Marduk, who recognized him as his vicegerent.⁴ He speaks of

¹ xlix. 21. LXX. reads: *These of mine, where were they?*

² lii. 1, 2. ³ lii. 7-9.

⁴ The Cyrus Cylinder.

restoring to their own shrines the other Assyrian and Babylonian gods whom Nabonidus had removed to Babylon, and of giving them back their lands. But he says nothing of the Jews or of any other of the tribes captive on Babylonian soil.

At this point the compiler of the Book of Ezra takes up the story. According to him, Cyrus, soon after his capture of Babylon, gave permission to the Jews to return; and immediately, it would seem,¹ over forty thousand left Babylonia for Jerusalem, under *Sheshbazzar*, *prince of Judah*, who is described, too, in an Aramaic document incorporated by the compiler, as *Peḥah*, or *governor of a province*, and as laying the foundation of the Temple.² There is also mentioned in command of the people a *Tirshatha* (Persian *Tarsāta*), similarly *governor of a province*.³ On their arrival at Jerusalem, *in the seventh month*,⁴ the people are said to be under *Jeshu'a ben Jošadak* and *Zerubbabel ben She'alti'el*,⁵ who is called by his contemporary *Haggai*, *Peḥah*, or *governor of Judah*.⁶ The returned exiles at once rebuilt the altar of the burnt-offering, resumed the morning and evening sacrifices, kept the feast of Tabernacles and thereafter all *the feasts of Jahweh*; and engaged masons and carpenters to erect the Temple, and Phœnicians to bring cedar from Lebanon.⁷ Another section from the compiler's hand⁸ states that they set to work *in the second month of the second year*; but certain *adversaries*, by whom the compiler means Samaritans, demanded a share in the work, and when *Jeshua* and *Zerubbabel* refused this, *the people of the land* frustrated the building, and it was postponed till the

¹ Ezra i. compared with ii. 1.

² Ezra v. 14, 16. ³ Ezra ii. 63.

⁴ We are not told the year.

⁵ Ezra iii. 2, like Ezra i. 1-8, from the compiler.

⁶ Haggai i. 14, ii. 2, 21.

⁷ Ezra iii. 3-7. ⁸ Ib. 8-13.

second year of Darius, 520, to which Haggai and Zechariah assign the beginning of new measures to build the Temple.

The Book of Ezra in its present form is so late, and the different sections are so confused, that it is not surprising that all its data have been questioned. Following Koster,¹ a number of scholars have recently asserted (1) that there was no attempt to build the Temple before 520; (2) that there was no return of exiles under Cyrus; and (3) that when the Temple was built the work was that of Jews who had never left the country. I have elsewhere so fully discussed these negative theories,² that here I need only give a summary of the argument against them.

It is true that Haggai and Zechariah do not speak of a Return, nor call the builders of the Temple Golah or B'ne ha-Golah, *Captivity* or *Sons of the Captivity*, but simply *this people*, or *remnant of the people*, or *Judah*. But we must remember that prophets so bent, as these two were, upon encouraging the poor people to use their own resources and trust in God, had little reason for appealing to the Return, or to the royal power which had decreed the rebuilding of the Temple, and all the less reason had they that the first effects of the Return were in contrast with the promises of the "Second Isaiah" so bitterly disappointing. Besides, if Haggai ignores any Return in the past, he equally ignores a Return to come, and in fact says nothing at all about the Exile itself. The argument from his silence, therefore, proves nothing. On the other hand, the testimony that a Return did take place under Cyrus cannot be wholly denied. Even if we set aside the list of the returned families as belonging to a later date, we still have the Aramaic document, which agrees with Haggai and Zechariah in assigning

¹ *Het Herstel van Israel*, 1894; German translation by Basedow, 1896.

² *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii. chap. xvi.

the real beginnings of the new Temple to the second year of Darius, under the leadership of Jeshua and Zerubbabel ; and therefore need not be disbelieved in its statement of the facts under Cyrus. Ezra, too, talks of the Golah in a way¹ which shows that he means by it not the Jews who came up from Babylon with himself, but an older community whom he found in Judah. That such had returned under Cyrus, and at once attempted the rebuilding of the Temple, is in itself extremely probable. The real effective Jerusalem, as we have seen, was the Jerusalem in Exile. It was among them that upon the advance of Cyrus the hopes of restoration had so confidently appeared, that they expressed them as if already realized. We cannot believe that none of these enthusiasts took advantage of the opportunity which there can be no doubt it was consonant to the whole policy of Cyrus to give them, but waited for nearly a century before seeking to return, and meantime left the rebuilding of the Temple to *the people of the land*, who were not only unlikely to have the energy to do the work, but would have done it in a very different spirit to that which inspires the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. "Without the leaven of the Golah, the Judaism of Palestine is in its origin incomprehensible."² And, finally, if *the people of the land* had effected by themselves the restoration of the Temple, it would not have been possible to treat them with the contempt which was shown by the exiles who returned under Ezra and Nehemiah.

These considerations appear to render the fact of a Return under Cyrus and an immediate attempt to rebuild the Temple very probable. And, indeed, some of the scholars who have called Koster's conclusions inevitable, recognize that the life of Jerusalem before the arrival of Ezra cannot be

¹ ix. 4, x. 6, 7.

² Wellhausen, *Geschichte*, p. 160.

explained except by the presence of those higher elements of the national life which had been fostered in Babylonia. They admit a return of some of the exiles before the days of Haggai.

Accordingly the probable course of events was as follows. Cyrus gave orders for the reconstruction of the Temple and despatched to Jerusalem Sheshbassar, an imperial officer, with an escort of soldiers. Some Jews must have accompanied him, both priests and laymen of a rank suitable to the high purpose before them. The Book of Ezra includes both Jeshua and Zerubbabel.¹ That a more general permission was given to the Exiles to return seems certain from the urgency of the appeals to take advantage of it, which their prophet addressed to them.² But, as we shall see, few appear to have responded. Those who did return first rebuilt the altar of the burnt offering. There is no record, and but little probability, of this having been used since the fall of the City. We saw how Jerusalem was avoided by the Jews left in the land, and Ezekiel charges them with idolatry.³ Had sacrifice been continued, the fact must have been memorable enough to have been handed down. But now the morning and evening oblations were resumed, the Feast of Tabernacles observed and afterwards the other feasts. Next Sheshbassar laid the foundation-stone of the Temple and began the building.⁴ Obstruction arose from two directions. The people left in the land had from the very beginning claimed a right to it; and now, we are told,⁵ *they weakened the hands of the people of*

¹ Prof. Sellin, on the ground of Zech. iii. 8b, vi. 12, 13, 15, argues that Zerubbabel did not reach Jerusalem till after Zechariah had begun to prophesy, but the verses quoted are inconclusive.

² Isaiah xlviii. 20, lii. 11 ff., lv.

³ Ezek. xxiii. 25.

⁴ Ezr. v. 16.

⁵ Ezek. xxxiii. 24.

Judah—these the Exiles claimed to be, in harmony with the passages quoted above—*intimidated them from building, and hired counsellors against them all the days of Cyrus, even until the reign of Darius.*¹ Thus from the very foundation of the new Temple began those intrigues with their foreign lords which faction wages against faction down to the very end of the City's history. The other source of hostility was also to prove perennial. The Samaritans, claiming to have worshipped Jahweh since the days of Esarhaddon,² asserted now or later their right to a share in the building of the Temple. If all the host of exiles, registered in Ezra ii., had been present at this time in Jerusalem, they could, with the aid of the Imperial authority, easily have overcome the opposition. That it prevailed shows how small a number had really returned. They now found themselves far from their patron and with no hold as yet upon the land they had come to. The very material they required was in the hands of their adversaries. Stone lay about them in plenty, but ordinary timber grew at a distance, and if the story be correct that even in those early days they made a contract for cedar with the Phœnicians, this had to be carried from Joppa by roads which were either in the possession of, or open to, the Samaritans.³ Apparently the authors of the imperial mandate had not foreseen such obstacles, and its officers felt that their powers were exhausted. Sheshbassar seems to have gone back to Babylon. Cyrus died in 529 and was succeeded by Cambyses, who can have had little sympathy with Jewish ambitions. Bad seasons ensued; the new colonists had to provide for their own shelter and sustenance, and their hearts, like those of many other emigrants to a promised land, grew callous to

¹ Ezra iv. 4, 5.

² ? Sargon.

³ See *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, ii. 219 f., for a modern analogy.

higher interests. We cannot be surprised that the Temple was neglected, or that the builders began to explain the disillusion of the Return by arguing that God's time for the restoration of His house had not yet come.¹

To such a state of mind the prophet Haggai addressed himself upon one of these political occasions, which prophecy had always been ready to use. A new king had ascended the Persian throne, Darius son of Hystaspes, and political agitations were impending. Like their Syrian neighbours, the Jews remained loyal to the throne and appear as a reward to have had a scion of their own royal house, Zerubbabel, confirmed, or now for the first time appointed, as their Peḥah or governor. To him and to Jeshua the high priest, on the first day of the sixth month of the second year of Darius—that is on the festival of a new moon, 520 B.C.—Haggai brought the word of the Lord: a command to build the Temple. It is significant that to men whose experience had fallen so far short of the former promises, this message did not repeat their glories. Like every living word of God, it struck the immediate situation, and summoned the people to the duty lying within reach of them. *Go up into the mountain—the hill country of Judah—and bring in timber and build the House, that I may take pleasure in it and show my glory, saith Jahweh.*² There is no talk here of Phœnician cedar, nor as yet of the desirable things of the nations miraculously poured into the City's lap. Let them do what they could for themselves; this was the indispensable condition of the Lord showing His glory. The appeal to their conscience reached it. *God stirred the spirit of Zerubbabel, and the spirit of Jehoshua, and the spirit of all the rest of the people; and they went and did work in the House of their God on the twenty-fourth day of the same month.*

¹ Hag. i. 2.

² i. 14.

The unflattering words of the prophet had effected a purely spiritual result. Not in vain had the people suffered disillusion under Cyrus, if now their history was to start again from sources so pure.

On the twenty-first day of the next month, when the people had worked long enough to realize the scarcity of their materials and began to murmur that the new Temple would never be like the old, Haggai came with another word, this time of encouragement and of hope. *Courage, all ye people. Get to work, for I am with you—oracle of Jahweh of Hosts and my Spirit stands in your midst! It is but a little while and I will shake heaven and earth . . . and the costly things of all nations shall come in and I will fill this House with glory. Mine is the silver and mine the gold. Greater shall the later glory of this house be than the former, saith Jahweh of Hosts, and in this place will I give peace.*¹ Two other oracles by Haggai explain to the impatient people the tardiness of the moral results of their vigour, and promise to Zerubbabel in an impending overturn of the nations the manifest recognition of his God.²

I have space only to summarize the oracles of Zechariah. (1) He began them, between the second and third oracles of Haggai, with a word that affirmed the prophet's place in the succession of the prophets of Israel³; (2) Two months later, in January or February 519, came his eight visions,⁴ of which the third showed Jerusalem rebuilt no longer as a narrow fortress but spread abroad for the multitude of her population, and the fourth Joshua vindicated from Satan his Accuser, cleansed from his foul garments and invested with the apparel of his office; (3) On the visions there follows

¹ ii. 6-9.

² ii. 10-19, 20-23.

³ i. 1-6.

⁴ i. 7-vi. 9.

an undated oracle, on the use of gifts which had arrived from Babylonia ; a crown is to be made from the silver and the gold, and, according to the present form of the text, to be placed on the head of Jeshua, but there is evidence that it was originally meant for Zerubbabel, at whose right hand the priest is to stand, and there shall be peace between them. (4) In the ninth month of the fourth year of Darius, when the Temple was approaching completion, Zechariah gave a historical explanation of how the Fasts of the Exile arose.¹ (5) And finally there are ten undated oracles summarizing all Zechariah's teaching up to the question of the cessation of the Fasts upon the completion of the Temple in 516, with promises for the future. Jerusalem shall be restored with fulness of old folk and children in her streets. Her people shall return from east and west. God's wrath towards her has changed to grace ; but her people themselves must do truth and justice, ceasing from perjury and thoughts of evil against each other. The Fasts instituted to commemorate her siege and overthrow shall be replaced by festivals ; and the Gentiles shall come to worship Jahweh in her.

These prophecies of Zechariah reveal, during the years that the Temple was building, certain processes which were characteristic of, and results which were decisive for, the whole of the subsequent history of Jerusalem. There was apparently a contest between the civil and religious heads of the community for the control of the Temple and its environs. Here before the Exile the king was paramount, and it was natural for Zerubbabel to claim to continue his authority. But the vision of the prophet decided in favour of the high priest,² and to him the crown was ultimately given that at first had been designed for the Prince.³

¹ vii.

² iii. ³ vi. 9-15.

Zerubbabel, indeed, from what cause we know not, disappears. In the last stages of the building of the Temple we do not hear of a Persian governor, but of *the elders of the Jews*.¹ In fact the exiles, with or without struggles for their national independence, settled down to that state of life which lasted in Jerusalem till the times of the Maccabees. "The exiles returned from Babylon to found not a kingdom but a church."² "Israel is no longer a kingdom but a colony":³ a colony in their own land indeed, but the heart and efficiency of the nation are still in Babylonia, where the system is being constructed under which their life for centuries shall be subject to priestly government and ideals.

Yet the civic hopes which the older prophecy had revealed for Jerusalem are not abandoned. Starting from the glowing love of Jahweh for His people the last prophecies of Zechariah not only promise a full glory to her restoration and a world about her converted to faith in her God, but the conversion of her citizens from the jealousy and fierce rivalry which beset them to justice, kindness and hearty labour bringing forth a great prosperity.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ Ezra v. 3-vi. 15; cf. Guthe, *Geschichte*, p. 268.

² Kirkpatrick. ³ *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, ii. 189.