ZECHARIAH, THE PROPHET OF THE PASSION WEEK.

A thesis
presented to the faculty of
Concordia Seminary,
St. Louis, Missouri,

by

Herbert Hellbusch

in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Master of Sacred Theology. 1928

PREFACE

When looking for a topic for the Master's thesis, the subject "The Passion Week in Zechariah" suggested itself, because it was right in line with a desire to become better acquainted with the language and contents of the Books of the Prophets. In writing the thesis all exegetical and historical helps available were extensively used. Though the chief concern was not so much originality, as to come to a personal conviction, it can nevertheless be said that the conclusions are not founded upon any particular author, but are the result of a comparison of the authors and have their basis on a study of the Hebrew text of the prophecies and the Greek quotations of the fulfilment.

In order not to break up the flow of the essay anymore than was absolutely necessary, most of the references to authors were appended in the foot-notes. Sometimes only the author's thought was given in the body of the essay, and his exact words later quoted in the foot-notes for the sake of handy reference. The aim was, to keep all material not having a direct bearing on the essay out of the body of the thesis. Unless further information is desired concerning the source, no attention need be paid to the foot-notes.

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

INTRODUCTION

Before we take up what Zechariah, "one of the most comforting of the prophets" (1), has to say about the Passion-week, let us locate him in history, and establish, if possible, what contact he had with other prophets. Even the clearest passages of any writer in this way receive more meaning and true worth for the reader.

Zechariah does not leave us in doubt as to his lineage and the time of his activity. He announces himself in the first chapter of his book, as "the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo, the prophet" (2), and the first date given by him is "the eighth month of the second year of Darius" (2). Iddo, the grand-father of Zechariah, filled the post of head of a priestly class (4), and Zechariah succeeded his grandfather in that office (5), Berechiah having died an early death. That proves Zechariah a priest, as well as a prophet. It is also evident that Zechariah was still a young man, when he returned out of captivity and took up his duties, for his grand-father was among those who returned from Babylon.(6).

---

1. Luther Vol. XIV, Paragraph 66: Und ist fürwahr der allertröstlichen Propheten einer, denn er viel liebliche und tröstliche Gesichte vorbringt, und viel süsze und freundliche Worte gibt, damit er das betrübte und zerstreute Volk tröste, den Bau und das Regiment anzufahen, welches bis daher groszen und mancherlei Widerstand erlitten hatte.
2. Zechariah 1,1.
4. Nehemiah 12,4.
5. Nehemiah 12,16.
6. Zechariah 2,4:Run speak to this young man".

Beginning his life's work, as he did, in the eighth month of the second year of Darius Hystaspis, according to the common tabulation, the year 520 B. C. (1), he had the prophet Haggai as a coworker, the latter beginning his work two months earlier (2). Haggai in his book clearly shows that his work consisted in encouraging and assisting in the rebuilding of the temple, but Zechariah is not so concerned about the outward work, as about the inner rebuilding of Israel. He is anxious to bring about a spiritual change in the people themselves.

As his book shows, he has to deal with two kinds of people. The first class, and very likely the majority, were seeking for outward advantages. They had left Babylon and had come to Judea in the hope of worldly prosperity, comfort, and freedom, and cared not for the temple or for the true worship. These Zechariah attempts to awaken from their sinful stupor with a call to repentance (3). He warns them, that unless they will repent, a more fearful judgment than that of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile will befall them. But if they repent they may rejoice in the Lord, their salvation, and in the coming King, the Messiah (4).

The other class were the true believers, whose faith was, however, very weak on account of the outward circumstances. The land was practically a waste place (5), the

---

1. S. G. Green's Chronology.
   Dr. Fürbringer, Einleitung.
2. Haggai 1,1:Sixth month of the second year of Darius.
3. Zechariah 1, 1-6.
4. Zechariah 9,9.
5. Nehemiah 2,17: Ye see the distress that we are in, how Jerusalem lieth waste and the gates thereof are burnt with fire.

temple-building progressed very slowly, and, in fact, God seemed to them to have withdrawn His helping hand, and was no longer furthering their cause as He had promised to do (1). For this they blamed no one but themselves. "It seemed to them that their own sins and those of their fathers were too great for God to have compassion on them again" (2). These people the prophet comforts by pointing to a glorious future (3).

That future is indeed not to be free from God's fearful judgments over the unrepentant sinners (4). Neither is Israel to be securely established as a worldly kingdom. The prophecies of Daniel regarding the four earthly kingdoms are to be fulfilled (5). The countries round about Israel are to fall under God's judgment (6). Hadrach and Hamath, districts of Syria, and Damascus, a city of Syria, come under His curse (7). Tyre shall be destroyed. The Philistines will not remain as a powerful nation (8). Greece, as prophecied by Daniel, is to flourish for a time (9), but it will also finally fall. Amid all this destruction, however, the faithful are not left to dispair. The Lord, their God will overcome all their enemies, and Himself will establish a kingdom, which will not pass away (10). A king shall come out of Judah, who will deliver His faithful ones from all their enemies. Because this is the case Judah may well rejoice, though kingdoms

---

1. Nehemiah 2,20: The God of heaven will prosper us; therefore we his servants will arise and build.
2. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. III, Pg. 298.
3. Zech. 2,9-13
4. Zech. 5.
5. Daniel 2 & 7.
6. Zech. 9,1.2
7. Zech. 9,1.2.
8. Zech. 9,5-7.
9. Zechar.9,13.
10. Daniel 7,13.

rise and fall around them, and they themselves are subjects and slaves of foreign powers. Even while he is foretelling destruction upon the ungodly foreign powers, and upon all those who follow them in their sinful disobedience to God, the prophet breaks out into the triumphant announcement: "Rejoice exceedingly, Daughter of Zion; shout with a loud voice, Daughter of Jerusalem; behold! your king comes to you, just and saved is He, lowly, riding upon an ass, and a foal, the son of she-asses (1).

The prophet, however, does not only call the sinners to repentance and comfort the true children of God. He also gives to them a defined picture of their ultimate and only deliverer. Not only is he to be their king, as the passage just quoted indicated, but he also assumes the role of their Shepherd (2), and as such is smitten by the sword. He is sold for the miserable price of thirty pieces of silver (3), and is pierced and mourned over (4). This will already give the unpredjudiced reader a clear notion as to why Zechariah is called the "Prophet of the Passion week". To justify that phrase more fully, is a part of the task of this treatise. To do that it is necessary to treat at length: The Passion week as Foretold By Zechariah.

---

1. Zechariah 9,9.
2. Zechariah 13,7.
3. Zechariah 11,12.13.
4. Zechariah 12,10

THE PASSION WEEK AS FORETOLD BY ZECHARIAH. (I. ZECHARIAH 9,9)

In treating this subject, the fulfilment of the prophecies must naturally receive a great amount of attention. The Passion week, according to the division of the Churchyear, begins with the Sunday preceeding Easter, commonly known as Palm Sunday. When Christ made His glorious entry into Jerusalem on that day, the multitude going ahead "cut down branches from the trees, and strawed them on the way" (1). The Church in later years imitated this procession, and used Palm branches to indicate their joy. Hence the name for this Sunday.

Now, does the "Passion-prophet" say anything, that may have some bearing on Christ's entry into Jerusalem on that Sunday? It was stated before that Zechariah speaks of the coming King. In the ninth chapter of his prophecies he says:"Rejoice exceedingly, Daughter of Zion; shout with a loud voice, Daughter of Jerusalem; behold! your King comes to you, just, and saved is He, lowly, riding upon an ass, and upon a foal, the son of she-asses". This prophecy is quoted by Matthew, as being fulfilled, when Christ entered Jerusalem on Palm Sunday (2). Since Palm Sunday is the first day of the Passion week, this is the first passage in Zechariah to be considered. Without paying particular attention to the fulfilment of the prophecy, we will first consider the words of the prophet himself, and afterwards see, whether they can be referred to Christ, and to what extent He fulfilled them.

---

1. Matthew 21, 8.
2. Matthew 21, 4.5.

A. THE PROPHECY (9,9):

In the verse immediately preceeding the one just quoted, God, through the prophet, had promised protection to His people and to His House, and destruction to the oppressors(1). He had described the rise and downfall of the world powers and earthly kingdoms, In contrast to these kings around Judah who undergo destruction, He now promises them a king of an entirely different nature. This gives him occasion to bid the people look up and "rejoice". The promise of a king had been given to the people of Israel long before this. In the beginning of the 23. chapter of 2 Samuel (2), they had been told that a just king would appear to them, and the Psalmist had repeatedly prophecied about Him (3). This promise God will be sure to carry out, in spite of the destruction, slavery, and exile, which comes over Israel. What could be more fitting, therefore, than that the prophet, when about to speak of the coming of the king should begin with a call to joy. רני from רנן is the Kal Imparative, and means "to exult, rejoice". Yes, they are called upon to rejoice "exceedingly", מאד. Great and without restraint their joy is to be. The Daughter of Zion is thus called upon to rejoice. The question then is, who is meant by בת־ציון, daughter of Zion. בת like בן is also employed in a wider sense by the Hebrews. " בת with a Genetive of place or country denotes a native of that place.

---

1. Zechariah 9, 8.
2. 2 Samuel 23,3.
3. Psalm 2,6; 24, 7-9; 45.

By a peculiar idiom of the Hebrew and Syriac tongues, the word בַּת, like other feminines, is used by the poet as collective for בָּנִים "sons". The daughter of a city, country, or people, is put poetically for its inhabitants" (1) (2). בַּת־יְרוּשָׁלַיִם is therefore simply a designation for its inhabitants (3).

But Zion was the name of one of the hills upon which Jerusalem was built. Upon it there had been a Jebusite fortress, which David had captured, and into which he had brought the ark. When the temple was built on Mt. Moriah, the temple continued to be included under the name of Zion (4). In a wider sense Jerusalem itself was called Zion. The daughter of Zion, therefore, may well mean the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Thus it is used many times in the Old Testament (5). The statement "Daughter of Zion" is therefore parallel to the following "Daughter of Jerusalem", and the second is for emphasis. This will explain, why the Evangelist Matthew simply says, "Tell ye the Daughter of Zion" (6), using Is. 52, 11 to introduce his words. In a narrow sense both phrases signify the inhabitants of Jerusalem, in a wider sense the Jewish people. In this passage, however, not only the Jews are called upon to

---

1. Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon.
2. Anyone desiring to compare further may consult the following passages: Ps. 45,13; Is. 37,22; Is. 16,1; 52,2; Jer. 4,31; Lam. 4,22; Jer. 46,11; 19,24.
3. Hence has arisen the προσωποποιία so common to the Hebrew poets, by which the whole body of inhabitants in a place is personified as a female", Gesenius. cf. Is.23,12.
4. Davis, Dictionary of the Bible, under "Zion".
5. Zech. 2,10; Is. 1,8; 10,32; 52,1.
6. Matthew 21,5.

to rejoice, but all those who put their trust in the coming king, Jew or Gentile. It is the spiritual Zion that is called upon to rejoice (1), that is the Church of God(2). The Daughter of Jerusalem is called upon to "shout with a loud voice". רנן is the Hiphil Imparative of רנן. In our passage it is used of crying in jubilee (3).

The prophet then states the reason for this rejoicing. Jerusalem is called upon to rejoice, because their king will take up his residence among them (4). מלכך has the suffix of the second singular. The prophet thus stresses the fact that it is "their" king, who is coming. It is that king who is expected by them, and for whom they have been longing. He"who alone is their king, in the full and highest sense of the word, and in comparison with whom no other deserves the name (5) is coming (בא) to them, that is for their particular benefit.

That this king is not a temporal king such as David and Solomon were, is proven by the adjectives applied to Him. The prophet describes Him as "righteous" or"just" צדיק. That could not be said in a full degree of any

---

1. Im bildlichen oder geistlichen Sinn aber heiszt die Tochter Zion die Kirche des Alten und des Neuen Testaments. (Walther, Evangelien Postille, Predigt am Ersten Sonntag des Advents).
2. "A call to the Church to rejoice because of the coming of her king". Moore, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Pg. 226.
3. So also Is. 44,23; Zech. 3,14; Job. 38,7.
4. "Gerade die Einwohnerschaft Jerusalems wird zum Jubel aufgefordert, wohl nicht desshalb, weil Jerusalem als Hauptstadt des Landes, sondern die Residenze des Koenigs ist". Aug. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, Pg. 49.
5. Hengstenberg, Christology, Pg. 396.

king that had so far made his appearance, but it is to a "leading virtue" (1) of the coming king. Other prophets and sacred writers ascribe this same attribute to the coming king. Jeremiah calls Him "the righteous Branch, and a king who shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth"(2). Isaiah speaks of Him as the "righteous servant"(3), who shall "judge the poor with righteousness, and argue with equity for the meek of the earth"(4). And David prophecied concerning Him with the words, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God" (5). He is to carry out the will of the Lord in every respect (6). No temporal king could come up to this requirement.

The coming king is also described as "saved", נוֹשָׁע, the Niphal or passive conjugation being used. There has been much dispute among exegetes concerning this word. Probably the majority of translations render it actively with "Savior" or"Helper" (7). Commentators who defend this position assume that the Niphal has been directly used for the Hiphil, but that is certainly not the case (8). יָשַׁע, according to Hengstenberg, occurs twenty times in .

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology Vol. III, Pg. 397.
2. Jeremiah 23,5.
3. Isaiah 53,11.
4. Isaiah 11,4.
5. 2 Samuel 23,3.
6. August Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 50: "Er läszt sein ganzes Tun durch Jehovah normiert sein".
7. LXX: σωτηρ ; Vulgate: Salvator; Targum: פָּרִיק ; Luther: Helfer.
8. " נוֹשָׁע kann als Niphal von יָשַׁע nach Grammatik und Sprachgebrauch nicht die aktive Bedeutung σωτηρ , sondern nur die passive σωτόμενος-haben".

the Niphal, and always in the passive (1). He very aptly states: "The prophet had no occasion whatever to employ the Niphal participle in an unusual sense; for if this (Savior) had been the meaning he wished to express, there was the word נוֹשִׁיעַ , which is found in more than thirty passages". The prophet undoubtedly meant just what he said, namely, "saved", "protected", or "delivered". The text even receives a deeper meaning this way than if the Hiphil had been used. Using the Niphal, the text implies, that He is not only our Savior, "but endued with salvation". "It implies the sufferings by which that King procured salvation for mankind"(2). To use the words of Dr. Fürbringer: "Dieses Wort (יָשַׁע) heiszt 'mit Heil begabt', aber eben darum "Heil bringend" (3). Selfevidently this can be applied to no temporal king, but only to the one true king, even Christ. Applying the words to Christ, we know, that "He came not for Himself but for us, so in as far as He could be said to be "saved", He was saved not for Himself but for us" (4). Although as true God, Christ says of Himself: Mine own arm has brought salvation upon me (5), yet as true man He can be spoken of as 'saved', for as man He received salvation (not for Himself, but for man, for whose sake He was suffering) from the indwelling Godhead, to impart it to all His.

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology Vol. III, Pg. 397.
2. Pusey, Minor Prophets, Pg. 403.
3. Notes under יָשַׁע in Jer. 23,6 taken in the course in Messianic Prophecies.
4. Pusey, Minor Prophets, Pg. 403.
5. Isaiah 63,5.

As a king and representative of His people, anything that He does, suffers, endures, or procures is of value to His people.

The great king of the future is further described by the prophet as עָנִי . Concerning the meaning of this word much has been written. Gesenius and others take it to be used interchangeably with עֲנָו, which has the meaning of "meek". Thus the LXX render it with πραΰς. Most of the Jewish expositors adopt this rendering, probably, as Hengstenberg suggests, because the idea of a poor king, who came in lowliness, was irreconcilable to their notions of the Messiah (1). עָנִי properly means poor (2), or as Koenig suggests "unterworfen, gedrückt" (3), but it also includes the idea of "meek, or humble". The two words are very closely related. The word is therefore best rendered with "lowly", namely as to outward circumstances, which is accompanied by inward humility (4). One who is poor and bowed down with suffering, is quite likely to be humble also. The first meaning of the word, however, is humble in outward circumstances (5). The king who was

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology Vol. III, Pg. 400.
2. So the Vulgate, Eben Ezra, Calvin, Luther (arm), Coccejus, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Kliefoth, and Koehler.
3. Koenig, Messianische Weissagungen, S. 187:" עָנִי bedeuted zunächst 'unterworfen, gedrückt"; aber dann auch metaphorisch-psychologisch demütig, sanftmütig'.
4. Aug. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 51 & 52: "Der kommende Koenig wird als ein solcher bezeichnet, der in der Schule der Leiden genommen ist, und imfolge dessen auch die Geistesfrucht der Leiden: Demut und Sanftmut aufzuweisen hat.
5. Quotation from Hulsius given in Hengst. Christ. Pg. 401, note: עָנִי may in this case not simply denote a humble man, even to the exclusion of every kind of poverty, nor is such rendering compatible with the nature of the word עָנִי itself, which is not applied to a man who is humble by merit(עֲנָו would be the right word in that case),but to one who is humble in his circumstances.

to come, then was to be without the pomp and the riches usual for kings, who make their appearance on the earth.

Again, this word cannot be applied to any other king, but the Messiah. Not one of the temporal kings came in outward poverty accompanied by meekness and humility. In temporal possessions they rather tried to outdo each other, and some of them were very boastful and arrogant. To the Jews the idea of poverty seemed incompatible with and inapplicable to their coming king, and such a supposition seemed incongruous with the summons to rejoice. The opposite, however, is true. If our King was Himself poor and oppressed, He will certainly have pity upon us in our infirmities (1). It must be remembered that He took this poverty upon Himself voluntarily, not for Himself but for our benefit. The best exegesis on the word עָנִי is perhaps that of the poets:

Er ist auf Erden kommen arm
Dass er unser sich erbarm,
Und in den Himmel mache reich,
Und seinen lieben Engeln gleich.

We are rich, for He was poor;
Is not this a wonder!
Therefore praise God evermore,
Here on earth and yonder!

The term עָנִי may therefore be said to include all the suffering and sorrow of the Messiah, as it is described by Isaiah, in the 53. chapter of his prophecies.

The prophet continues and tells us:"He comes "riding upon an ass, and upon a foal the son of she-asses".

---

1. Moore, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Pg. 229.

The question is, Does this refer to one or to two animals? Taking the וְ as a simple consecutive וְ, it certainly means that two animals are to be employed by Him. Others have taken the second part of the phrase as epexegetical to the first, the וְ taking the meaning "even", or "namely" (1). Koehler ridicules the idea that any exegete should insist upon it that two asses were used (2), but that does not disprove it. Taking the words simply as they read: וְרָכַב עַל־חֲמוֹר וְעַל־עַיִר בֶּן אֲתֹנוֹת

The first impression anyone can get is, that two animals were to be employed. If the second phrase were only to be epexegetical to the first, it seems likely that the prophet would have omitted the וְ or at least the עַל. Hengstenberg says directly: "The repetition of עַל is irreconcileable to the assumption referred to"(3). But whether the repetition of עַל might be reconciled to the idea that the second phrase is an explanation of the first or not, it is not the natural thing. חֲמוֹר in comparison with the second word indicates an older animal, whereas עַיִר is a "young" ass. This is further stressed by בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת. The plural "son of sheeasses" simply indicates the class of animals to which the second belonged(4). Both animals are to be employed by the coming King. That does not imply that He was actually to ride upon both.

---

1. So Hitzig, Koehler, Wright, Koenig and others.
2. Koehler, Nachexilischen Propheten, S.54.
3. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. III, Pg. 401.
4. Koehler: Plural der Gattung; Koenig: Plural der Kategorie.

Both animals being in his sergice, what happened to the one could well be spoken of as happening to the other also (1). When the prophet speaks of two asses in connection with the coming king, we are reminded of the blessing of Jacob, which he gave to Judah (2). There Jacob says of Shiloh, the Prince of Peace: "He shall bind His foal to a grapevine, the son of His she-ass to the fine vine". Noone would claim that only one animal is spoken about in that place. Whether there is any other connection between the two passages, except that Christ is the subject in both cases, is doubtful.

The fact that the King was to ride upon an ass, of necessity indicates, that he is to be a King different from all the rest. Since Solomon's time kings were accustomed to use horses. The sons of judges rode on asses (3), as did also the household of David (4), but Absolom employed horses and chariots (5). Solomon likewise used horses (6). Pusey correctly says (7):"There is no instance of a king, who rode on an ass, save He whose kingdom was not of this world. The prophecy then was framed to prepare

---

1. Speaking of the fulfilment, Hengstenberg says Pg. 408: "Both animals were set apart to the service of the Lord, and the fact of one being covered with garments and mounted implied, as it were, that the other was the same".
2. Genesis 49, 11.
3. Judges 10,4; 12,14.
4. 2 Sam. 16, 1.2; 17,23; 19,26.
5. 2 Samuel 15,1.
6. 1 Kings 4,26; 10,26.
7. Pusey, Minor Prophets, Pg. 403.

the Jews to expect a prophet-king, not a king of this world". It does not refer to an "ideal Messiah" as the majority of the Modernists would have us believe; for it was literally fulfilled, as we shall see in a little while. Neither does it refer to Zerubabel, who in turn is then made a type of Christ (1). Others, who are sometimes mentioned as fulfilling this prophecy, are Nehemia, Judas Maccabeus, John Hirkanus, and Usiah (2). Both immediately preceeding this verse and immediately following it, Jehovah is the subject, and the King is introduced as one who is of equal rank with God Himself. And,to come back once more to the words dealt with before, none of these kings or rulers just mentioned, could be said to be "just, endued with salvation, or lowly". None of them fulfilled the last words: "Riding upon an ass and upon a foal the son of she-asses".

That this King comes riding upon an ass and not upon a horse, as the other kings were want to do, also shows that this King is not intent upon war and conquest, but comes as a peaceful King (3). Why Hengstenberg should reject this and limit the explanation to "humility", is hard to understand. Undoubtedly the idea of humility is also stressed in the phrase, for the king is riding the ass in

---

1. Theodoret, Grotius.
2. Koehler, Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 48.
3. Grotius: This not only indicated his modesty, but also his love of peace; for horses are prepared for war; the ass is an animal of peace". Quoted in Hengstenberg, Christology, Pg. 403.

His royal capacity, contrary to kingly custom. Whereas some commentators have attempted to maintain an honored position for the ass, it is nevertheless true, that the ass is looked upon with some degree of contempt. "The burial of an ass became a proverb for a disgraced end" (1). Hengstenberg, Pusey, and other exegetes bring enough examples to prove the contempt in which the ass was held, to fill several pages (2). Nevertheless Koehler and Wright deny that the phrase indicates humility. Wright, however, suggests, that "although not nesessarily a mark of humiliation or lowliness, yet there seems to be a comparison in this passage between the mode at which the long-expected King of Israel was to come to his people, and the pomp and splendor of the approaches of the Persian monarchs"(3). That comparison certainly is there.

1.Based on Jer. 22,19: Jehoiakim "shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem". Proverb mentioned by Pusey.
2. Hengstenberg Vol. III, Pg.403:"Gen. 44,13 Issachar is called an ass on account of his laziness; Sirach 30,24; 33,24:Fodder, a wand and burden are for the asses". "Mohammed says:'Of all voices that of the ass is the most disgusting; it is the voice of the very degil'". "The ancient Egyptians affirmed that Typhon the evil deity was like an ass, and that this animal was his special favorite. "It is a well-known fact, that in Egypt both Jews and Christians are restricted to the use of the ass, as a mark of inferiority, the horse being reserved for Mohometans". Pusey, Pg. 405:"An ancient writer says:'The Greeks too, not only the Jews, will laugh at us, saying, that the God of the Christians who is called Christ, sat upon an ass'". King Sapor is quoted as saying to Rabbi Samuel, that he would send a splendid horse to the Messiah, Rabbi Samuel defended himself by saying that the ass which the Messiah would ride, would have a 100 colors and a 1000 qualities. This causes Lightfoot to remark sarcastically: "In the deep humility of the Messiah, they dream of pride even in the ass".
3. Wright, The Prophecies of Zechariah, Pg. 237.

As shown by the prophets own word, this prophecy could refer to none other than the Messiah. The natural question then is: How did Christ fulfill this prophecy? This takes us over to the New Testament, to the days when Jesus lived upon the earth.

THE FULFILMENT:

During His third year of public ministry, and shortly before the Passover (1), Jesus had raised Lazarus, his friend and the brother of Mary and Martha, from the dead (2). Lazarus had already been in the grave four days, and hence His raising caused a great stir. So when Jesus came to Jerusalem, the people were in a high pitch of excitement. On Friday before Palm Sunday Jesus had gone from Jericho to His friends Mary, Martha, and Lazarus at Bethany. Some of the people set out in that direction to meet Him as soon as He should come to Jerusalem after the Sabbath (3). On Sunday morning, as all the Evangelists tell us (4), Jesus set out from Bethany to go to Jerusalem with His disciples. "Passing from under the palm trees of Bethany they approached the fig-gardens of Bethphage, the "House of Figs", a small suburb or hamlet of undiscovered site, which lay a little south of Bethany, and in sight of it (5). To this village or some other hamlet near it (6), Jesus

---

1. Very probably in the year 30 A.D.
2. John 11,43; 12,1.
3. Matth. 21, 9; John 12, 11.18.
4. John 12, 12-19; Matth. 21, 1-11; Mark 11, 1-11; Luke 19,2844.
5. Farrar, Life of Christ, Pg. 330.
6. Luke 19,29; Matthew 21,1.

dispatched two of His disciples. He told them that there they would find "an ass tied, and a colt with her", and gave command that they should "loose them and bring them to Him". He also told them that any questions of the owners would be satisfied by saying, "The Lord hath need of them"(1). The disciples did as Jesus had commanded them, and found everything as He had said. They loosed the ass, and the colt and led them to Jesus, placed their outer garments on them, and set Jesus thereon. A large number of people, probably mostly Galileans, had accompanied Jesus from Jericho towards Jerusalem. These were now joined by a multitude coming out of Jerusalem, who seeing Jesus and His disciples prepare thus for the entry, "spread their garments on the way and cut down branches from the trees, and strawed them on the way" (2). And the large multitude, both those that had come out of Jerusalem and were now leading the master into Jerusalem, and the multitude that followed after, cried, saying: "Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the Highest"(3). The road which Jesus and the multitude followed from Bethany to Jerusalem, led around the southern shoulder of the central mass of the Mt. of Olives, between it and the "Hill of Evil Council"(4).

---

1. Matthew 21, 3. 2. Matthew 21,8.
3. Matthew 21, 9; Luke 19,38.
4. Farrar, Life of Christ, Pg. 330:"Three roads lead from Bethany over the Mt. Olives to Jerusalem. One of these passes between its northern and central summits; the other ascends the highest point of the mountain and slopes down through the modern village of Et Tur; the third, which is and always must have been, the main road, sweeps round the southern shoulder of the central mass, between it and the "Hill of Evil Council". The others were rather high mountain paths and as Jesus was attented by so many disciples, it is clear that He took the third and easiest route!

Coming to the highest part of this road where the trail takes a westerly direction, and slopes down toward Jerusalem, the city of the kings, with all its splendor lay before the eyes of the master. Here the procession seems to have halted for a moment. At any rate, there transpired a scene, which has direct bearing on our subject, inasmuch as it brings out very forcibly the character of Christ and the nature of His entry into Jerusalem at this time. The Evangelist Luke tells us (1); "He beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace! But now are they hid from thine eyes". What has this to do with the fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah? Just this: It shows that all the virtues ascribed to the coming king by Zechariah, belonged to Jesus. He was "just, endowed with salvation, and lowly"; or as Matthew says, in citing the fulfilment:"He comes unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of a beast of burden". But let us take up the history of the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem in detail and see the harmony between the prophecy and the fulfilment.

The first thing to be noticed about the four accounts of Christ's entry into Jerusalem is, that the Evangelists Mark (2), Luke (3), and John (4) only make mention of the

---

1. Luke 19, 41.42.
2. Mark 11, 2.3ff: εὑρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον — καὶ εὑρον πῶλον δεδεμένον.
3. Luke 19, 30-35: εὑρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένος — λύοντες δε, αὐτῶν πῶλον — ἐπιρίψαντες αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐπι τὸν πῶλον.
4. John 12,15: Καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.

one animal, the colt, in this connection. Even when making special mention of the fact that a prophecy is fulfilled, as the apostle John does, the exact words of Zechariah are not quoted. Matthew, however, is very careful to state that there were two animals, the ass and the colt,(1) and that both of them were brought to Jesus. What does this signify? It tells us, in the first place, that Jesus rode only on the colt (2), the older animal serving some other purpose. It tells us also, that John, when citing the fulfilment is not concerned about the exact words of the prophet. It is noteworthy that John himself indicates, that he is not bothered about the exact phrase, when he says, in a general way: καθώς ἐστιν γεγραμμένον, "as it is written". Matthew on the contrary, wishes to give more exactly the words of the prophet, and therefore says: "That the saying through the prophet might be fulfilled, when he says". But neither does Matthew make a careful distinction between the prophets he is quoting, and thus introduces the quotation from Zechariah by a statement from Isaiah. That in turn has its own value, because it shows the close connection between Christ's coming and the passage in Isaiah (3):"Behold, thy salvation cometh; behold, his reward is with Him, and His work before Him".The King coming is the salvation of Zion and brings salvation to her.

---

1. Matthew 21, 2: εὑρήσετε ὄνον δεδεμένην καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς —— ἄγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον πῶλον
2. Mark, Luke, John.
3. Isaiah 62,11.

As in the case of Zechariah, many of the exegetes have tried to make the second statement epexegetical to the first, restating the passage:"Behold your king comes to you, meek, and mounted upon an ass, namely upon a colt the son of a beast of burden". That Matthew did not want his quotation to be thus understood is evident, for he used the plural all the way through (1). Meyer recognizes this fact, and therefore says, that Matthew's quotation is due to a misunderstanding of the prophet Zechariah (2). Aside from the fact that he thereby rejects the inspiration and the authenticity of Matthew, such an explanation of the Zechariah passage is forced. It is an attempt to crawl out of the difficulty that exists in the mention of two animals, where apparently only one of the animals was actually needed. The fact that there is such a difficulty is all the more reason for the acceptance of both statements at their face value. Neither is the apparent discrepancy between Matthew's account and the accounts of the other Evangelists any reason for rejecting Matthew or for doubting his accuracy. The other Evangelists do not exclude the use of a second animal, and Matthew's account may therefore be accepted as giving a more detailed history.

What then was the purpose of the older animal? The Bible nowhere directly answers that question. It is significant, however, that in the blessing of Judah, although that blessing is couched in symbolical language, two animals

---

1. cf. Note 1. Pg. 20.
2. H. A. W. Meyer, Kommentar zum Matthäus, S. 402.

are spoken about (1). The older animal, Luther insists, is the outward man, who is burdened with the weight of the Law (2). The younger animal, on the contrary, is the inner man, the spirit, and the will. The Weimar Bibel testifies: With the old ass is meant the Jewish people, and with the younger animal, the Gentiles (3). Pusey, in general, agrees with both when he says: "The ass, an unclean, stupid, debased, ignoble drudge, was in itself a picture of unregenerate man, as slave of his passions and to the devils, toiling under the load of ever-increasing sin. But of man, the Jew had been under the yoke and was broken; the Gentiles were the wild unbroken colt. Both were to be brought under obedience to Christ"(4). This is a very old idea, already being insisted upon by Justin. But no matter how good a sense this gives to the text, there is no direct proof for this interpretation. These exegetes may express a general truth, but it is very doubtful exegesis on these passages. It leads some of the commentators into almost absurd allegorizations. Stoeckhardt explains the fact that two animals were brought, by saying, that the young animal was not accustomed to go alone as yet (5). The Schaff-Lange Commentary agrees with this, stating: "It was necessary, if this foal had never borne a rider, that the mother should

---

1. Genesis 49,11.
2. Luther Vol. XI, Adventspredigt. Ersten Sonntag im Advent.
3. Weimar Bibel under Zechariah 9,9.
4. Pusey, Minor Prophets, Pg. 407.
5. Stoeckhardt, Biblische Geschichte des Neuen Testaments. Christi Einzug in Jerusalem.

be led by its side in order to quiet it for such service"(1). Such an explanation is also probably better animal psychology than exegesis. Schaff-Lange adds:"The Figure was to represent the contrast of the old theocracy and the young 'Ekklesia'". This again agrees with Luther and the Weimar Bible, and it seems the most logical supposition. Luther, however, goes into detail and explains the actions of the apostles, as well as the clothing placed on the animals, symbolically. Even the Mt. of Olives, he says, typifies the grace which the Messiah brings (2). That is stretching the comparison rather far.

The prophet described the King as "just, saved, and lowly". Matthew uses only the one word πραΰς- "meek, or gentle". This word is also used by the LXX in the translation of Zechariah. However, this word together with the ὥδαγγά of the people, and the phrase "ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου," includes all that the prophet said. There is no worldly

---

1. Schaff- Lange, Commentary on Matthew, Pg. 372.
2. Luther, Vol. XI, Adventspredigt, Col. 33:"Gleichwie in den zween Apostèln die Prediger sind bedeuted: also sind in den zween Eseln ihre Schüler udn Zuhörer bedeuted..... Die alte Eselin ist der äuszerliche Mensch; der ist mit Gesetzen und Fürcht des Todes, der Hölle, der Schande oder mit Locken des Himmels, des Lebens, der Ehre gebunden, gleichwie die Eselin gebunden war..... Solch Volk waren sonderlich die Juden, die auf Christum warteten; sind noch alle, die mit Werken und eigenen Kräften sich üben, Gottes Gebote zu erfüllen und den Himmel zu erwerben. Sie sind angebunden mit dem Gewissen an das Gesetz, müssens tun, lieszens aber viel lieber anstehen. Es sind Sackträger, faule Esel und lastbare Schelme... Das Füllen aber, der junge Esel, dasz nie kein Mensch darauf geritten sei, das ist der innerliche Mensch, das Herz, der Geist..... ob er wohl angebunden ist mit dem Gewissen und fühlt das Gesetz hat keine Lust dazu noch Liebe, bisz dasz Christus komme und darauf reite. (Although Christ only rides the'inner man' the other must accompany Him, for both are to enter heaven together Eselin - der Leib, musz Kreuz tragen. Kleider - gute Exempel.

* Die Schaaren oder das Gefolge - die Heiligen vor Christo.

pomp or display, no political demonstration, no rebellion against Rome. The very idea of the whole procession was rather, to show that "His kingdom was not of this world", and thus to correct the false ideas concerning the Messiah prevalent among the Jews. He comes as the spiritual King to bring salvation and to rule over His Church according to the riches of His Grace. He comes to Zion poor, lowly, riding upon an animal, which is itself the symbol of peace. It is a rather humble procession, and as such was derided by the Pharisees (1), and through all times by unbelievers. But for the time being, at least, the people recognized Him as their King and Savior, and showed their zeal for Him by shouting: ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυεὶδ· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. ὡσαννὰ is the Hebrew הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא that is, "save, I pray!" Even though the majority of them soon after changed the tune of their hymn into the death song: "Crucify, crucify Him!" for the present they acknowledged that this was the King, who had been promised them, and for this reason they sang: "Blessed is He coming in the name of the Lord"(2). In this way the words of the prophet were fulfilled, which he spoke concerning Christ's coming to Jerusalem, and Zechariah has in this way foretold in detail, the happenings on the first day of the Passion week.

---

1. Luke 19, 39.
2. Psalm 118,26.

ZECHARIAH 13,7.

It can hardly be expected that all the details of the events occurring during the Passion week should be foretold by a prophet such as Zechariah was. Zechariah did, however, prophecy the suffering and death of the Messiah in no uncertain terms. Such a prophecy we find in the 7. verse of the 13. chapter. We will again first discuss the contents and language of the prophecy, and thereafter pay special attention to the claim of its fulfilment on the night of the betrayal during the Passion week.

A. THE PROPHECY (13,7):

A literal translation of the prophet's words reads: "Sword, awake against my shepherd, and against the man, my fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall scatter, and I will cause my hand to turn upon the little ones". The words נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת tell us very definitely who the speaker of these words is. The great God Himself thus addresses the sword, and speaks to it as to a person. He commands the sword to awake (1), and perform a special piece of work. So far it has seemingly slumbered in inactivity. Now it is called forth from its scabbord in order to strike the shepherd, רֹעִי. This word has the suffix of the first person singular. God calls him "my shepherd". Hence, the person addressed is a shepherd, who has been put over the flock by God Himself. This already indicates who this shepherd is.

---

1. Koehler: Prosopopöie.

Nevertheless curious notions have arisen concerning the application of this word. It has been referred to Jehoiakim, Pekah, Judas Maccabeus, to the false prophets (1) mentioned verse 4-6, and even to the idolatrous Manasseh, and to other kings. As Wright says correctly(2):"These cannot be so designated, even though the shepherd was raised up in judgment. The removal of such a shepherd could only be a blessing to the flock, while the removal of the shepherd is here represented as utterly disastrous". The word רֹעִי could well refer to any God-appointed king, called upon to do a special work, for even the heathen Cyrus is called "my shepherd", Is. 44,28. Cyrus, however, had the special duty of gathering the seattered flock of the children of Israel. The further description of this shepherd tells us why he cannot be an ordinary king, such as Cyrus was.

The prophet does not leave us to guess, who the shepherd might be. He is the same shepherd, who is later rejected and sold for thirty pieces of silver (3). He is the shepherd, who is pierced and slain for the sheep (4), that is, Christ, the Messiah, the one shepherd, whom God through the prophet Ezekiel calls "His servant David"(5), but who is on equality with God(6). Add to this the testimony of Christ, the best expositor of all times, and no doubt concerning the identity of the shepherd can remain. Christ referred these words to Himself on the night

---

1. Moore: Commentary on Zechariah: "Maurer refers it to Jehoiakim, others to Pekah, other to Judas Maccabeue, and others to the false prophets of 4-6".
2. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 435.
3. Zech. 11,13. 4. Zech. 12,10. 5) Ezek. 34,23. 6) Ezek. 34,11-15.
5. Ezek. 34,23. 6. Ezek. 34, 11-15.

of the betrayal. It is not necessary "to add to the authority of the omniscient prophet"(1).

But the prophet Zechariah also gives us a more complete description of the shepherd. In order that all doubt may be removed he adds:"And against the Man, my Fellow". This phrase is an explanation of the first, and applies to the same shepherd. The meaning of the word used here (עֲמִיתִי) is established in the Pentateuch. It occurs eleven times in Leviticus, and means"companion, neighbor, one closely related through common descent, brother, and therefore on equal terms with another" It not only indicates similarity in occupation or position, but equality in every respect. The ancient versions render the phrase variously, but all strive to put the same meaning into the word (2). One whom God calls His עֲמִיתִי and at the same time a גֶּבֶר "man", is a man who is connected with God by a bond of unity as brother to brother, and who is of the same divine essence. That means that this Shepherd is true God and true man. There was,of course, only one Shepherd and King to whom this applies, namely, to Christ, the Messiah. With this all the various interpretations are refuted, which claim that one of the temporal kings of Israel is referred to. Even De Wette and Arnheim agree quite closely with this interpretation.

---

1. Moore, Commentary on Zechariah, Pg. 293.
2. LXX: πολίτης ; Targum: חַבְרִיהּ דְכוּרְסְיֵהּ
Peschito: Vir amicus s dilectus; Aquila:Vir contribulis;
Symmachus: Vir populi mei; Theodotian: Vir proximus eius;
Hieronymus: Vir cohaerans mihi.

De Wette interpretes גֶּבֶר עֲמִיתִי with "the man, my equal", and Arnheim, a Jew, says:"The man whom I have associated with myself".

But not all exegetes agree with that. Some of them claim that the phrase is used in irony of some hostile general (1). The phrase in itself, however, is certainly an honorable epithet, and "we are not at Liberty, to explain according to our fancy such honorable epithets as ironical"(2). Others, such as Koehler and Wright, wish to find in this phrase only an indication of similarity of position; one who stands in the same relation to the sheep, which he feeds as Javeh Himself (3). But, as Keil shows (4), the word contains a deeper meaning. It has the same significance as the statement used by Christ, when He said:"I and the Father are one" (5). "He is the only-begotten of the Father, who is in the bosom of the Father"(6).

Thus Christ, the Messiah is the shepherd, against whom the sword is to awake, and who is to be smitten. The imparative עוּרִי refers back to חֶרֶב. The sword is to do

---

1. Jarchi, and a number of modern interpreters.
2. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 435.
3. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 234:Jehovah nennt somit den zu schlagenden Hirten seinen Genossen, weil derselbe gleich Ihm, ob schon unter Ihm, die Herde zu weiden berufen war".
4. Keil, Commentary on Zechariah, Pg. 660: In der Bezeichnung; Mann der mein 'Nächster' liegt viel mehr als die Einheit und Gemeinsamkeit des Berufs oder dasz derselbe gleich Javeh, die Herde zu weiden habe. Einen gemieteten oder gekauften Hirtenknecht wird kein Herdenbesitzer oder Herr einer Herde seinen עָמִית nennen".
5. John 10,30.
6. John 1,18.

the smiting, not some unnamed individual. The fact that זָכָר is masculine and חֶרֶב feminine is explained by the personification of חֶרֶב , or as Koehler says (1): "Das biblische Hebräische fängt bereits an mit den Femininformen sparsam zu werden" (2). At any rate a revision of the text is not at once necessary, as Ehrlich would have (3). God Himself commands the sword to proceed against His shepherd. This shows that the suffering and death of Christ was a part of the divine plan for man's salvation. The Jews and all those participating in the outward act of putting Christ to death were only responsible and guilty instruments, performing the deed under God's permission, for "without Him they could do nothing", even as Christ Himself said to Pilate:"Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above"(4). Accordingly there is for the time being, a seeming schism between the Persons of the Godhead. God commanded the sword to arise and smite His עָמִית. This was entirely contrary to the Law of Moses, where man is commanded to keep the bonds of relationship inviolate from crime. This is, however, not a proof that a foolish shepherd is here referred to, or that the man here called God's fellow had committed gross wrongs for which He is to be punished. The relationship is broken for the time in spite of the fact that there is perfect harmony between the wills of both.

---

1. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S/ 232.
2. Gesenius Grammar, 144, a; 122, g.
3. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel. Zech.13,7.
4. John 19,11.

The Shepherd is indeed to be punished for sins, but they are not His own. On the contrary, they are the sins of the sheep, which He has taken upon Himself. The rod of punishment which was to be brandished over the sheep because of their disobedience, falls upon the exposed back of the good shepherd. The sins which are committed by the world lie upon the shepherd, because He has willingly loaded them upon Himself, and God looks upon these sins as now belonging to His עמיתי. His love for His good shepherd and fellow does not keep Him from completing the punishment, for His justice demands that the transgression of man be punished. He loved man enough to punish His own Son in their stead. The sword חרב does not indicate the manner of His death, that He is to be slain by the sword. The sword is the symbol of judicial power. The "jus gladii" (1) to the Romans was the right of the government to put any criminal to death in whatever way they deemed suitable. The New Testament teaches the same thing (2). Used in this connection the sword is"the sword of God's justice"(3). On the part of Christ it is also a judicial act, for He endures the penalty of the Law, "whose penal power is symbolized by this sword of divine wrath" (4).

The prophet next tells us the result of this smiting of the Shepherd:"Smite the Shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered". If the Shepherd is taken away from the sheep,

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. IV, Pg. 112.
2. Rom. 13,4:"The ruler beareth not the sword in vain"etc.
3. Matthew Henry Commentary on Zechariah.
4. Moore, Commentary on Zechariah, Pg. 294.

it is quite natural that the sheep will scatter. The only point coming up for a good deal of discussion here, is the question: Who is meant by the sheep? The majority of the modern exegetes refer the phrase to all Israel, and say that the scattering is the dispersion of Israel not many years after Christ's death. That at first glance looks very plausible, and it is necessary to investigate more closely the reasons submitted for this interpretation. The most powerful argument advanced in support of this theory is the following: The flock that the Shepherd was to feed was the whole theocratic people of whom the disciples were but a part (1). This argument is based mainly upon Zechariah 11, where it is asserted, the whole Jewish nation is included under the flock. Others refer to Psalm 100,3, and say:"Once His sheep always His sheep"(2). By analogy Hengstenberg wishes to prove this position correct by quoting 1 Kings 22,17:"I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have no shepherd". Koehler agrees with him and says that, since the Shepherd is the same as the one mentioned 11,4ff, the sheep also must be the same as those mentioned there (3). Will this argument stand the test of closer investigation?

Even if we accept for the moment that in Zechariah 11, all Israel is called the flock, this certainly does not outweigh the immediate context.But Zechariah 11 treats of good and bad sheep alike, as well as also of the good Shepherd and the foolish ones. Here, however, the foolish sheep do

---

1. Wright, Pg. 439; Hengstenberg, 112; Moore 295; Jamieson Fausset and Brown: Scattering of Disciples only partial fulfilment.
2. Jamieson, Fausset and Brown.
3. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten.

not come into consideration, because they have never been gathered, so that they could be dispersed. As Dr. Stoeckhardt has said (1), the fact that the sheep shall be scattered implies that so far they have been following Him and have been closely united with Him. At no time during the life of Christ could this be said of all Israel. The defenders of the "all Israel" theory regard the scattering of the sheep as a punishment of the flock, for such the dispersion of the Jews later on certainly was. The text before us, however, does not speak of any punishment due the sheep, because of their disobedience and cruelty against the shepherd, but the passage treats exclusively of what the shepherd does for the benefit of His sheep. For a time it will happen that they are dispersed because of the removal of the shepherd, but thereafter He will again gather His little ones. With the little ones, accordingly, the same sheep are meant as those that were scattered. In a wider sense all Israel is certainly called the flock of the Lord, and hence such passages as Psalm 100,3 and 1 Kings 22,17. As final authority for the statement that the scattering refers to the disciples, we have the testimony of Christ, when He says that this passage was fulfilled in the scattering of the disciples on the night when He was taken captive in the Garden. In quoting the fulfilment He says(2): "All ye shall be offended of me <u>this</u> night: for it is written, I will smite

---

1. Lehre und Wehre 31, 1885: Weissagung und Erfüllung.
2. Matthew 26,31.

the Shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered abroad!

This is in agreement with most of the older interpretations. Thus Justin Martyr considered the flight of the apostles the complete accomplishment of the Old Testament prediction (1). Ambrose explains it of the scattering of the apostles into every land, and in their proclamation of the Gospel of Christ (2). Jerome refers it to "omnem in Christo multitudinem credentium". Limiting this statement of Jerome's to the time of Christ's suffering and death, it could possibly be accepted, though the New Testament text seems to limit it to the immediate followers of Christ. Others having a similar interpretation are Irenaeus, Theodoret, Draconites, Osiander, and Coccejus (3).

Most of the modern interpreters only make the dispersion of the disciples the beginning of the fulfilment(4). Interpreting the dispersion of the sheep to be a punishment for Israel, they naturally vary also in their interpretation of the last statement, "and I will turn my hand upon the little ones". There are two explanations for this statement, that merit consideration. The one is that the turning of the hand upon the little ones is to be considered as being done in an inimical sense. Thus Koehler understands צְעִירִים "little ones" to be the same as צֹאן "flock".

---

1. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 443.
2. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. IV, Pg. 112, from Ambrose Sermon II on Ps. 118.
3. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 239.
4. "Wenn infolge der Tötung und Hinwegnahme des guten Hirten jener Zustand in Israel eingetreten sein wird, dann wird Jehovah erst das volle Masz des Unheils über Israel herbeiführen, und seine Hand ausrecken zur Züchtigung Israels.

These "little ones","called thus because there are better sheep than they", he says, shall be punished by the Hand of God (1).

Those interpreting the scattering of the sheep as punishment for Israel and the last phrase as a special punishment of only a part of the flock, have difficulty to explain, why those that are called little ones should be singled out for special punishment. The phrase "little ones" is usually used in a good sense.

The other explanation for this statement is that the phrase "turn my hand upon the little ones" is meant in a good sense, namely, the return of a part of the sheep to God's favor. If the dispersal refers to the disciples of Christ, as was shown above that it must, the return of the hand upon the little ones, can only be accepted as having a good meaning. It is not a return to favor of a part of Israel, for Israel as such does not enter into consideration, and הַצֹּאן and הַצְּעִירָה are one and the same sheep (2). הַצְּעִירָה is used here in a similar sense as Christ referred to the "little flock" (3). After the dispersal of the disciples because of the taking away of the Shepherd, God will interpose in favor of "the little ones". The humble followers will be gathered together again and be comforted by the reappearance of the Shepherd. The fulfilment shows this interpretation to be correct.

---

1. Koehler, Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 241.
2. Lehre und Wehre, 31, 1885, S. 267 (Stoeckhardt).
3. Luke 12,32: Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom".

The disciples were gathered together shortly after Easter, and were comforted by His resurrection (1). Jesus Himself puts this light upon our Old Testament text when, immediately after quoting Zechariah He says:"But after I am risen again I will go before you into Galilee" (2). This is equivalent to the phrase as used by the prophet Zechariah.

The whole question hinges somewhat around the meaning of the word וְהָשִׁבֹתִי. With great erudition Koehler discusses the meaning of this word. He says that the word signifies not only a turning, but a "returning" again (3). He is undoubtedly correct in establishing that meaning, but that does not signify, that "to restore the hand to an earlier position must be interpreted in a bad light, as he would have. וְהָשִׁבֹתִי יָדִי does not always stand in the sense of inflicting punishment upon someone. It may indeed have that meaning, as it does for instance, in Psalm 81, 15 (4), but it may also have a good meaning, as in Isaiah 1,25, where it is used to describe a restoration (5). This evidently is the meaning here. As before said, the expression "little ones" leads to the same conclusion "for it evidently indicates the compassion of the Lord for the miserable condition of the strayed sheep"(6).

---

1. John 20, 17-20.
2. Matthew 26, 32.
3. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 239.
4. Ps. 81, 15: I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned my hand against their adversaries.
5. Isaiah 1,25: And I will turn my hand upon thee, and according to pureness purge away they dross, and take away all thy tin.
6. Hengstenberg, Christology Vol IV, Pg. 113

צֹאן הַצֹּאן is a participle and means "those who are little". We can think only of the disciples, who were little, because of the degradation, which they suffered together with their master. Especially, however, were they little in faith, deserting their master at the first sign of danger.

THE FULFILMENT:

The New Testament quotation of this passage could not be left entirely out of consideration in the interpretation of the passage in Zechariah. But the quotation merits more consideration than has been given it, for it is our purpose to show in detail that Zechariah is the prophet of the Passion week. To do that it is necessary to consider the circumstances under which Christ quoted the passage.

Jesus had eaten the last Passover Meal with His disciples on Thursday evening (1). On this occasion, probably as soon as the Passover Meal was completed, Jesus pointed out Judas, the traitor (2), and Judas left the band of disciples to make final arrangements to complete his awful task. Immediately afterwards Christ instituted His Holy Supper (3). Thereafter Jesus and His disciples sang the Halel, and left the large upper room. They descended into a lonely part of the valley of black Kidron. Thence they turned into an enclosed garden, called Gethsemane. On the way to this garden Jesus addressed His disciples, and said: "All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But after I am risen again I

1. Matthew 26, 17.
2. Matthew 26, 25.
3. Matthew 26, 26-28.

3) Matthew 26, 26-28

will go before you into Galilee". Mark agrees almost verbally with Matthew in relating this incident (1). The words which are quoted direcly out of the Septuagint by Matthew read: πάταξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης. The only variation from the Septuagint is that Christ uses the first person future in πατάξω, whereas the Old Testament employed πάταξον - , the imparative. The address to the sword is entirely omitted, and instead of commanding the sword to do the smiting, Jesus quotes the passage to prove that God Himself is causing His Shepherd to be smitten, without any special reference to His judicial power. The meaning of the passage is preserved intact in spite of the change. It shows even more definitely than the Old Testament passage did that God is permitting the smiting of His Shepherd.

The important thing here is that Christ states:"This night you shall be offended in me, for it is written". That is just another way of saying: This night this prophecy of Zechariah shall be fulfilled, for I will be smitten and you my sheep will be scattered. It will be noticed that the last words of Zechariah:"I will turn my hand upon the little ones", are not directly quoted, but Christ uses another statement instead. He says:"But after that I am risen I will go before you into Galilee". These words, spoken in such close connection with the quotation

---

1. Mark 14, 27 compared with Matthew 26, 31.

justify us in claiming that there is a similarity of meaning in the two phrases(1).

No historical proof is needed to show that the disciples were all offended in Him on the night of His betrayal (2), and that they fled from Him in the Garden out of fear for their own lives. With their scattering the close union between the disciples was for the time broken up. They had indeed lost their Shepherd. Edersheim adds a few significant remarks. He says:"This explains many things: The absence of Thomas on the first, and his peculiar position on the second Sunday; the uncertainty of the disciples as evidenced by the words of those on the way to Emmaus; as well as the seemingly strange movements of the apostles - all which are quite changed when the apostolic bond is restored (3). That this scattering happened early on Thursday night is also historically established and need not be considered any further. Hence Zechariah has again shown himself to be the prophet of the Passion week, prophecying the events that were to happen on Thursday night in surprising detail. So far then we have seen that Zechariah foretold events that occurred on the Sunday preceeding Easter and on Thursday night. As we proceed we will find other events during the Passion week foretold by Zechariah.

---

1. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 443:"The closing words of our Lord "I will go before you into Galilee", may possibly convey, as suggested by Reinke, the same thought as expressed in the words of the prophet "I will turn my hand upon the little ones".
2. Mark 14, 50; Matthew 26, 56.
3. Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Pg. 534.

ZECHARIAH 11, 12.13.

Not only did Zechariah foretell the events that were to happen on Palm Sunday, when Christ made His glorious entry into Jerusalem, and the flight of the Lord's disciples on Thursday night. We find some more historical detail of the Passion week foretold in Zechariah, namely, the shameful betrayal of Jesus for thirty pieces of silver by the traitor Judas Iscariot. The prophet's words as they come into consideration are recorded chapter 11 verses 12 and 13. The literal translation of this passage reads:"And I said to them: If it is good in your eyes, give me my wages, and if not, forbear, and they weighed out my wages, thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said to me: Cast it to the potter; the splendor of the price, which I am priced of them; and I took the thirty pieces of silver and I cast it in the house of the Lord to the potter". We will again follow the course pursued in the first two passages, first taking note of the prophet's own words, without special reference to the fulfilment, and thereafter establish the extent of the fulfilment during the Passion week.

In this chapter the prophet contrasts the good shepherd with the foolish ones, and pictures the rejection of the One Good Shepherd, the Messiah, who is represented in the person of the prophet. In verse four the prophet is formally engaged as the Lord's Shepherd, and is ordered to feed His flock, the congregation of Israel. The prophet

then describes, how he took up the work assigned to him, and what poor success he had among stubborn Israel. In all this the prophet is "the type of the One Good Shepherd, and Ruler of His Church"(1)."The sheep foolishly refuse to follow the kind leadership of their Shepherd". God therefore withdraws His favor from the people. Now the prophet continues:"I said unto them". Noone disputes the fact that the prophet is speaking in the person of the Great Shepherd. But to whom is he speaking? With this we plunge into one of the most controverted passages of Zechariah. Variant opinions have been expressed concerning all the rest of the phrases. We shall see, however, that the passage is not as dark as some have tried to make it.

If taken in its immediate context the word אֲלֵהֶם "to them" could refer to the lowly of the flock, concerning whom a statement was made in the preceeding verse. But the wider context forbids such an explanation. The wretched and lowly of the flock, who "perceived that it was the word of the Lord"(2) form only a very small part of the flock, whom the shepherd by God's command set out to feed. Although the shepherd had already broken one of his two staffs, and had thus taken his favor away from the flock as such, he had never relinquished his claim to any portion of the flock, and the main thread of the narrative still concerns the flock as such (3). Much more justifiable than

---

1.Kretzmann, Popular Commentary, Zechariah.
2. Zechariah 12,11.
3. Cf. Keil, Minor Prophets, Pg. 387.

to assume that the wretched are meant by עניי הצאן is the explanation of Hengstenberg, when he says:"He leaves out the smaller and more despised portion of the people, among whom the desired effect had been attained, as was stated in the previous words, and treats with the larger and more powerful portion, whose obstinacy had compelled him to lay down his office"(1). In fact the preceeding words stamp this interpretation as correct, for the prophet deals only with those who reject him, but the wretched are described as "giving heed to him and perceiving that it was the word of Jehovah" (2). This holds against Koehler, who interpretes עניי הצאן as referring to the צאן הטבח (3). Jahn interpretes the word to refer to the shepherds, but Hengstenberg correctly refutes him by pointing out that the flock itself is dealt with in this part of the chapter, whereas "in other cases it is the owner who is treated with" (4).

To this disobedient and larger portion of his flock, who had not previously satisfied him by giving heed to him and recognizing him as the Lord's representative, the prophet appeals:"If it seem good to you give me my wages, and if not, forbear". Their previous owners had used violence on the sheep, had slain them, and had sold them in order to satisfy their own miserliness, and their shepherds had had no pity on them (5). Much rather they

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology Vol. IV, Pg. 39.
2. Zechariah 11, 10.11.
3. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 151.
4. Hengstenberg, Christology Vol. IV, Pg. 38.
5. Chapter 11,5 of Zechariah.

had extorted unjust spoils from them. Not so with the Good Shepherd. He uses no threats or violence, but "gives them this last opportunity of showing their gratitude for all the care bestowed upon them and their appreciation of his tenderness and love" (1).

They had previously shown their contempt for the shepherd by not following him. But the shepherd gives them another chance to show whether they will in future accept his services. If it seems good to them, they are asked to give him his due, and if not they should forebear. According to these words it is left to the pleasure of the flock whether they will bring the due reward to the shepherd or not. The flock had the power to refuse the services of the shepherd, and not to bring the reward which was due him. Elsewhere the prophet gives the people the same kind of power (2). The wages which the shepherd demanded are usually understood to be repentance, faith, and piety of the heart. Only in this way could they reward the shepherd for his services. This demand had been made throughout the history of Israel, but had not been complied with, except on the part of the few "lowly of the flock", who recognized the true shepherd. This is the last appeal made by the prophet as the representative of Christ. It foreshadows the coming of the Messiah, who will then make a personal appeal to the inhabitants of Israel. "Last of all He sent forth His own Son in the hope

---

1. Pulpit Commentary on Zechariah, Pg. 112.
2. Ezek. 2,5.7; Ezek. 3,2; 3, 27: to hear or not to hear.

of obtaining the fruits of the vineyard"(1).

The question, Why was the demand made after the one staff had been broken and not before? presents itself. We answer: The demand was made before through the prophets, but was not heeded. God therefore withdrew His favor in another effort to arouse Israel from their sinful lethargy (2), and to lead them to heed the final demand made in the person of the good shepherd.

The response to this demand is stated in a few words: "They weighed out as my wages thirty pieces of silver". To attempt to repay the services of the good shepherd with a few measly pieces of silver was of course a rank insult. But aside from the fact that this was not the kind of a reward that was desired, and aside from the contemptibleness of the sum, which expressed their utter disregard for his care, the offer of thirty pieces of silver has a much deeper significance. The mention of one month in verse eight, during which time the good shepherd cut off three foolish shepherds, has lead some of the exegetes to suppose that the good shepherd only tended the sheep for one month, and that the thirty pieces of silver, or thirty shekels, were his reward for that month of service, making

---

1. cf. Luke 13, 6-9.
2. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 327:"There is evidence in the Jewish writings composed in or shortly after the era of the Maccabees, of the fact that the change in God's dealing with the Jewish nation was distinctly perceived. Among the writings of that period which recognize that the real cause of the calamities of the people was that the hand of the Lord was heavy on them on account of sins, may be instanced from a very interesting collection of 18 Greek Psalms known by the name of the "Psalter of Solomon".

a wage of a shekel per day (1). Verse 8, however, does not even hint at a limitation of one month's service on the part of the shepherd. Even if such were the case it is more than doubtful whether the month of verse 8 represents a month of 30 days. At any rate verse 13 forbids such an explanation, as we shall see. Needless to say, Jewish interpreters who recognized the disesteem thus shown toward the shepherd by the Jewish people have invented all manner of explanations for the offer of thirty pieces of silver (2). Just a glance into the Old Testament will show us the significance of the thirty pieces of silver. Exodus 21,32 sets the price of a slave, who had been gored to death at thirty pieces of silver. In Hosea 3,2 the prophet pays the same amount for the adulteress, giving half of the price in money, and the other half in kind. The wages given to the good shepherd thus were the same as those given for a slave, especially, as the Exodus passage shows, for a slave who had been killed. In other words it was the death ransom, that is to say, the price given for a slave who had been lost to the master by death. By paying the shepherd thirty pieces of silver, Israel not only put Him into the slave class, thus

---

1. v. Hoffmann and Kliefoth.
2. Pusey, Minor Prophets, Pg. 428, restates them as follows: 30 precepts given to the sons of Noah (Abarb ad loc. p. 219v); 30 dignities of rayalty (Abarb ad loc. p. 292v); 30 righteous in each generation, promised by God to Abraham (Midrash Aggadah in Rashi); or thirty who went up with Nehemiah, or were priests in his time (Eben Ezra); or thirty days of imperfect repentance (Kimchi); or thirty years of the reign of the pious Hasmoneans (Abrah, Toled. in Mc Caul on Zech); or who scrupled not to own that they could not explain them at all (Raschi).

showing their contempt, but they also showed their intent of having the shepherd put out of the way. They despised his goodness, they would have none of his services; they sought to cut him off; and they were ready to pay the penalty which the Law prescribed for the murder of one of so mean a condition (1)(2).

After the insulting price has been offered to him the prophet receives a new order from the Lord, whose representative he is. "The Lord said unto me". The Lord considers the money as offered to Himself and therefore gives the prophet instructions as to what he is to do with the sum. Since His personal work for Israel is thus rejected, God commands the shepherd to throw this contemptible sum "to the potter". The word for throw הַשְׁלֵךְ also expresses the contempt in which the sum is held. It is usually used in the Old Testament to signify the throwing away of something worthless (3). Since the potter undoubtedly belonged to the lowest of the laboring classes,

---

1. Dr. Alexander in the Pulpit Commentary, Pg. 112, Zechariah.
2. Koenig remarks:"Nicht von einer Tötung ist hier die Rede sondern nur von schlechter Belohnung". Wir fügen hinzu:"Diese Belohnung ist aber, obwohl sie seitens des Hirten nicht als solche geforder war, eine Ablohnung, und somit sugleich ein Verwerfen des guten Hirten, und von diesem Verachten bis zu dem im Exodus angedeuteten Tod zu gehen, ist kein so groszer Sprung für den Gedankengang, sintemal der Prophet kurz nachher (12,10; 137) von der Tötung des Hirten redet".
3. Ex. 22,31: Cast it to the dogs; 2 Sam. 18,17: Cast Absolom into a pit; 2 Kings 13,33: Cast it from his presence; 2 Kings 23,12: Cast the dust of them into a brook; Ps. 2,3: Cast away their chords from us; Is. 2,20: Cast idols to the moles and to the bats; Is. 14,49:Cast out of thy grave like an abominable branch; Zech. 5,18: This is wickedness; and he cast it into the midst of the Ephah; etc.

some even identifying the clay with which the potter worked with the potter himself (1), and since הִשְׁלִיךְ means to cast away, some exegetes have found the phrase "to the potter", to be a proverbial expression for contemptuous treatment, the same thing as "to the dogs", "Zum Schinder" (2). Aside from the fact that there is no occasion to assume that there was such a proverbial saying, such a scurrilous expression in this place mars the dignity of the text. Such an explanation is moreover, entirely impossible in view of the action of the prophet, for he says: "I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord". The Jewish interpretation (3) "cast it to the creator" does not need much attention. The potter might typify the Creator, inasmuch as he can create or break a vessel at will, but the two are not identical.

Hengstenberg has a slightly different interpretation. He at once connects the words with Jeremiah 18,2 and 19,2, where Jeremiah is commanded to buy a pitcher from the potter and to go down to the Valley of Hinnom, there to break the pitcher. The Valley of Hinnom had formerly been the scene of an abominable Moloch worship, and King Josiah had defiled it (4). Therefore Hengstenberg, directly connects the potter with the Valley of Hinnom, and thinking

---

1. V. Hoffmann.
2. Schaff-Lange, v. Hoffmann.
3. Followed by Kliefoth.
4. 2 Kings 23, 10.

that the potter had his workshop in that valley, he concluded that the phrase was the same as "unto an unclean place, to the hangman"(1).

Disregarding for a moment, the fallacies in the location of the potter's workshop, it is quite a long stride, to make "to the potter", even were he located in the valley of Hinnom, entirely synonymous with "to an unclean place". It is another question whether this particular potter was the one who furnished the vessels and cooking utensils for the temple. The following would indicate just that: The thirty pieces of silver were cast to the potter in the House of the Lord, which shows that this particular potter had frequent connection with the temple. One particular and seemingly well known potter is spoken of in each case, as is pointed out by the direct article. Although Koehler insists that the article is only the generic use of the article, giving the category under which the potter belonged (2), the article in Jeremiah 18,2 used together with "potter", must indicate a particular potter, for when the prophet gets one of the vessels, no article is used, and he is content to say "a potter's vessel". In the last case he is satisfied merely to point out the class. Now if the potter referred to in our passage was a temple worker, he could certainly not be said to be synonymous to "uncleanliness". But even if the potter did not have business relations with the temple, to make "to the potter" equivalent to "to an unclean place" on the basis of Jeremiah, is taking an un-

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology Vol. IV, Pg.40.
2. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 158.

warranted liberty with the text of Zechariah. That text in Jeremiah plainly shows that the Valley of Hinnom and the potter's work shop were two different places. The prophet is first commanded to go to the potter's house and to get an earthen vessel. Then he is to take the ancients of the people and the ancients of the priests and go forth unto the Valley of Hinnom (1). The only way these two places could be assumed to be identical, would be to understand that Jeremiah went to a workshop of a potter in the Valley of Hinnom, came back to get the elders, and then went again to the Valley of Hinnom. That is saying something the text does not say. All this, to say the least, shows that it is guesswork and forced exegesis to make "to the potter" read"to an unclean place". It might be added that Hengstenberg takes this position in an effort to explain the mention of Jeremiah in a passage in the New Testament, which is evidently connected with Zechariah. More on this point later.

That still leaves us to explain the significance of the phrase "to the potter". One more interpretation calls for a few remarks. Some of the commentators (2) allow a change in the text in this place. Changing the יוֹצֵר to read אוֹצָר "treasury, or treasurer", they say, the original reading was "cast it into the treasury", and it was only changed due to a copyist's error. Even if יוֹצֵר

---

1. Isaiah 19, 1.2.
2. Kimchi, Rückert, Ewald, Cahen, Zunze, Gesenius etc.
   Kimchi: הַיּוֹצֵר לְשׁוֹן אוֹצָר כֵּן (Gesenius Lexicon).

were an otherwise strange word, the context would not permit יוֹצֵר to be the reading. Wright (1), Koehler(2), and others state correctly:"It would be indeed strange that the prophet should receive special direction from Javeh to cast the ignominious price offered for this care into the treasury of the Lord. Dishonorable gains of any kind were not to be brought into the treasury, much less this paltry sum offered to the Lord in mockery and derision". At any rate there is no authority for a change in the text. The LXX has: εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον "into the smelting-stove; the Itale: In conflatorium. These translations also have no basis. יוֹצֵר is a participial noun, derived from the verb יָצַר "to form, fashion, or make", hence and "image-maker, or potter".

To the potter the prophet was directed to cast the thirty pieces of silver. Koehler, although he goes too far, comes close to the correct interpretation when he says: "Wenn Jehovah das Geld gerade einem Töpfer zuwerfen läszt, so will damit dem Volk gesagt sein, dasz diese Summe wohl reichlich grosz genug sei, um damit einem Töpfer zu bezahlen für die Töpfe und Krüge, die man von ihm entnommen hat und deren Wert man so gering ausschlägt, dasz man sich über das Zerbrechen des einen und anderen leicht trösted mit der Möglichkeit, beim Töpfer wieder einen neuen holen zu können.... Die Weidung war damit aber nimmer bezahlt"(3).

---

1. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 331.
2. & 3. Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten, S. 154.

As said above, Koehler goes too far, for the prophet says nothing about a buying of pottery or of the comparative value of the potter's articles. What the text really says is this: The paltry sum was offered as a sign of contemptuous rejection of the Godd Shepherd. The Good Shepherd refuses to accept the money and with the same contempt for the filthy price "intimates the ultimate destination to which in the sight of omniscience, it was directed".

That the Lord really considered the offer an insult is still more evident from the phrase:"The splendor of the price", or "the magnificence of the value that I am valued at of them". In other words:What a contemptible sum to offer me in return for all my labor and care. The prophet then carries out the command of the Lord. He takes the thirty pieces of silver and "casts them to the potter in the House of the Lord". Hengstenberg adduces that the money was first carried to the temple and from there taken to the potter (1). The text does not say that. It says simply:"To the potter in the house of the Lord"(2). That would lead us to conclude that the potter was in the house of the Lord, either on business, or for the sake of worshipping. But the fact that the house of the Lord was the place where the transaction took place, also bears a deeper meaning. The temple was the place where the covenant of God with Israel had so often been renewed by the sacrifices.

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. IV, Pg. 45.
2. אֶל־הַיּוֹצֵר בֵּית־יְהוָה is Accusative loci, answering the question where.

Here the people through their priests appeared in the presence of God, sought and received His blessing. Here also this transaction takes place in the presence of both parties. The people reject God and pay no attention to His entreaties. God therefore also finally rejects stubborn Israel. It was, as Wright says, "The fearful divorce between the people of Israel and Himself"(1). Thus the prophet presents the rejection of the Good Shepherd. This Good Shepherd, whom the people thus refuse to accept, is,of course, the Messiah. Him the prophets repeatedly call the Good Shepherd (2). When He made His appearance in the world He continually referred to Himself as the Shepherd of the sheep (3). He was rejected, despised, and betrayed into the hands of sinners.

THE FULFILMENT:

The Passion story tells us, how the Good Shepherd was rejected by His people. The passage considered above is a part of this Passion story, as it was foretold in prophecy. Let us now note the fulfilment of the prophecy and establish the time when the events foretold by the prophet :chapter 11, verses 12 and 13 occurrred. Especially Matthew notes the fulfilment in the first part of the 27. chapter of his Gospel.

In considering the fulfilment of Zechariah 13,7, we saw that on Thursday evening, Judas the traitor, left the

---

1. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 330.
2. Isaiah 40,11; Zechariah 13,7; Ezekiel 34.
3. Gospel according to St. John,chapter 10.

group of disciples during the Passover meal in the upper room. He had covenanted with the priests to betray Jesus into their hands for thirty pieces of silver (1), and he now went out to gather his men and to take Jesus. On that same night the garden scene transpired. While Jesus was suffering the tortures of hell, Judas was approaching the garden, leading a band of soldiers. Jesus, well knowing what was about to occur, went out to meet him. By means of a kiss Judas identified Jesus to the soldiers. Thereupon Judas dropped out of the scene for a time. We may suppose that he watched the proceedings very closely to see what his master would do. The soldiers lead Jesus to the high priest Caiphas (2). After many false witnesses had risen against Him, Jesus was accused of blasphemy, and condemned to be worthy of death. Because of the Roman supremacy, however, the Jews could not carry out their evil intent of putting Him to death, without the Roman governor's consent. The elders and priests therefore bound Jesus to deliver Him up to Pilate, the governor. This occurred early on Friday morning (3). Judas, who, as before said, had undoubtedly been watching the proceedings, saw Jesus lead before Pilate and knew that He had been condemned to death. This brought about a complete change of attitude in Judas, and we are justified to conclude that he had not expected such a termination for his traitorous act. When Judas saw that Jesus was condemned, he repented

---

1. Matth. 26, 15; Mark 14, 10; Luke 22,5; John 14,30.
2. Matthew 26, 57.
3. Matthew 27, 1.2; Mark 15, 1.

of his deed. His repentance, however, was not a repentance after a goodly nature. It reached no further than the stage of remorse, the pain of guilt, the reproaches of conscience. His repentance, as in the case of Cain, lead to dispair. The money, with which he had soiled his hands, was burning his soul. There was yet the slightest bit of hope that he might redeem his act. He turned once more to the priests, brought the thirty pieces of silver to them and said:"I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood". Whether he hoped thus to bring a testimony for Jesus which would sway the priests, we are not told. We do know, however, that his testimony was true and is valuable, because a person in the position in which Judas was, would look for every possible and imaginable fault in Jesus to excuse his evil deed. Even the priests on this occasion did not deny the innocence of Jesus, but they who should have placed Judas upon the correct path, flippantly answered: What is that to us? See thou to it"(1). As far as they were concerned Judas had performed his work well, and they wished to have nothing to do with him thereafter. As Bengel says:"Impii in facto consortes, post factum deserunt".

When he could not get a real audience with the priests, Judas "cast the pieces of silver into the temple and departed, and went and hanged himself". The question as to the manner of Judas' death need not now concern us. Enough that he cast the money into the temple, even as

---

1. Gospel according to Matthew, chapter 27, verse 4.

Zechariah had foretold, and shortly thereafter departed this life. The word used for temple in this case is ναός, which is not equivalent to ἱερῷ. Naós is the temple proper, where only priests were permitted to enter. Meyer now claims that Judas in his despair ventured into the temple proper and then flung down the money (1). Such a supposition is not necessary. As Schaeffer suggests, he may have "turned toward the opening into the holy place, and having swung the curtain aside, at the same time hurled the money from himself, which was burning his very soul, so that it fell in the interior of the sacred edifice" (2). Meyer and Olshausen object to this, saying that the ἔν in the phrase ἔν τῷ ναῷ forbids such an explanation (3). In this case, they say, εἰς should have been used. However, the New Testament uses εἰς and ἔν interchangeably (4), and ἔν may have the meaning of εἰς. Anyway the accepted reading is εἰς τὸν ναόν (5).

Thus Judas brought the money into the temple, even as Zechariah had done before him. The chief priests took up the money, but they scrupled to put it into the treasury, and after taking council, bought with it the potter's field. The articles indicate that a particular potter and his field are meant, that is, one who was well known. The field was thereafter known as the "Field of Blood". The priests

---

1. H. A. W. Meyer, Commentary on Matthew.
2. Schaeffer, Lutheran Commentary on Matthew, Pg. 362.
3. Herman Olshausen, Biblischer Kommentar (Matthäus), S. 491.
4. Meecham, Light from Ancient Letters.
5. Nestle, Greek New Testament.

had before called the money"blood money" and the field was indeed bought with the money paid for the betrayal of the Good Shepherd. In Acts we are told that Judas bought the field with the reward of iniquity. The apparent discrepancy between Acts and Matthew, the one stating that Judas bought the field, and the other that the priests bought it, is explained by a reference to Jewish law. According to law, the money was to be restored to the owner. If, however, he refused to accept it, an effort would be made to induce him to spend it for some good cause. "By a fiction of law the money was still considered to be Judas', and to have been applied by him to the purchase of the potter's field"(1). Suffice it to add that the point certainly stressed in the last part of the narrative is that fact that a field was bought, and that that field was the field of the potter (2). Now Matthew says:"Then was fulfilled the word of Jeremiah, the prophet, saying:"They received the thirty pieces of silver, the price of Him that was valued, whom they valued of the sons of Israel, and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me". Everyone will admit that there is a close relation between this passage and Zechariah. That prophet stated the price at which the Good Shepherd was rated, and Matthew says:Thirty pieces of silver, the price of Him that was valued". Zechariah attributed the original giving of the

---

1. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament, Synoptic Gospels.
2. τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως — ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀγρὸς αἵματος.

wages to the flock; Matthew attributes it to the priests, as representatives of the flock. Zechariah mentions the potter as the final recipient of the money and so does the fulfilment. In view of this, what is to be done with the name of Jeremiah in Matthew? A number of answers have been suggested, and a few of these will have to be considered before we can satisfy ourselves.

The interpretation, perhaps finding the greatest number of followers, is this, that the one name was substituted for the other by a lapsus memoriae. Thus Augustine, Beza, Jewell, Keil, Koehler, Meyer, and others simply attributed the mention of Jeremiah's name to a slip of the memory. Even Luther seems to have been inclined toward that view, although in the end he passed it off as a question of minor importance (1). Anderson is correct, when he says (2): "This position will not be admitted by any who believe in the plenary inspiration of the apostles; a doctrine fully established on Scripture authority, and which if denied, would annihilate our confidence in their testimony. If their memory might fail, or they might be mistaken in one instance, such might be the case in a hundred".

---

1. Luther, Kommentar zum Zacharja, Col. 1949, Vol. XIV: "Solche und dergleichen Fragen bekümmern mich nicht hoch, weil sie wenig zur Sache dienen. Und Matthäus gleich genug tut, dasz er gewisse Schrift führt, ob er gleich nicht so eben den Namen trifft, sintemal er auch an andern Oertern Sprache führt, und doch nicht so eben die Worte setzt, wie sie inder Schrift stehen. Kann man nun dasselbige leiden, und geschieht ohne allen Gefahr des Sinnes, dasz er nicht so eben die Worte führt, was sollte es denn hindern, ob er den Namen nicht soeben setzt? Sintemal mehr an den Worten denn an den Namen liegt!
2. Anderson, Commentary on Zechariah, Pg. 418.

But, laying aside for the moment the question of inspiration, it is not necessary to admit that Jeremiah is the wrong name in the citation in Matthew.

Others have assumed that the name "Jeremiah" is due to later copyists. This takes on varying forms. Some uphold that Matthew originally did not mention any name, but that some early transcriber remembering the purchase of the field in Jeremiah (1), attributed the quotation to Jeremiah. Others suppose, that Ζριοῦ occurred in the original text of the Evangelist, which an early copyist then mistook for Ἰριοῦ (2). That the original manuscript had no name in the text is a theory without foundation. The better manuscripts contain the name of Jeremiah and it must certainly be retained, unless proof is brought that the prophecy is in no way connected with Jeremiah. In regard to the second phase of this theory, it is necessary to say in the first place that the occurrence of such abbreviations are doubtful; and secondly, if the Evangelist had only wished to connect the prophecy with Zechariah, it is likely that he would have used a general formula, for Zechariah's name is not mentioned in any of the quotations taken from his book. This theory, therefore also proves unsatisfactory.

Then there are those who attribute this part of Zechariah to Jeremiah. We cannot now enter upon the discussion of the canonicity of the last six chapters of Zechariah. Suffice it to say that the theories of critics

---

1. Jeremiah 32, 6-16 (Pulpit Commentary).
2. Wright, Pg. 334, originally brought up by Volckeler in Lud. II, 38.

who reject the last part of Zechariah have been successfully refuted. "The passage in question existed in the Book of Zechariah in the Jewish Canon in the days of the Evangelist, occupying that place in the Septuagint(1).

Origen, Zigabenus, Kuinael, Ewald and others held that Matthew had quoted from an Apocryphal book of Jeremiah. That such an Apocryphal book existed cannot be doubted (2). That this Apocryphal writing contained a reference to the buying of the potter's field, can likewise not be questioned. It is, however, a Pseudo-epistle written by a later writer, and that most likely after the beginning of the Christian era.

Only one more theory need be considered before we begin our explanation. This one is advocated with a good deal more show of right by Lightfoot. He appeals to the order of prophetic writings as listed in the Talmud. According to the list found there, the order of prophets would be: Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, etc. From this the conclusion is drawn that the Evangelist simply mentioned Jeremiah to indicate that the passage occurred in one of the prophets. There is, however, also very little authority for such a supposition.

To understand the mention of Jeremiah's name by Matthew, it is necessary that the quotation be investigated a little closer. The close similarity between the quotation in Matthew and the passage in Zechariah have

---

1. Anderson, Commentary on Zechariah, Pg. 419.
2. Copies of portions of the Epistle are found in the Bodleian Library Oxford, and in the Library of St. Germain in Paris.

already been referred to. That Matthew places ὑπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ for the בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל does not constitute a difference between Zechariah and Matthew, for the one uses the pronoun, and the other substitutes for it the name of the people to whom the pronoun referred. Both show that thirty pieces of silver paid to Judas was the contemptible value placed upon Jesus by the priests as representatives of the people. That Judas originally received the money instead of the prophet is not not an essential difference either, for in either case the price was considered as paid directly to the master in compensation for His services. Closer examination, however, brings out some striking differences between the two passages. In the first place, Matthew stresses the fact that the priests gave the thirty pieces of silver for the potter's field. Zechariah indeed indicates that the money finally comes to the potter, but does not mention the purchase of a field. Then Zechariah emphasizes the fact that this transaction took place in the temple. Matthew mentions the same thing in the mrrative, but in the quotation from the prophets, he does not refer to it. The entire quotation is cited as being fulfilled when the priests took the thirty pieces of silver, and having taken council ἠγόρασεν ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως (1).

These differences, together with the mention of the name of Jeremiah, cause us to look for a reference in Jeremiah

---

1. Matthew 27, 7.

which has to do expecially with the buying of a field. Hengstenberg found a direct reference to Jeremiah in the prophecy of Zechariah, claiming that Zechariah was only restating and applying the prophecy of Jeremiah as recorded in the 19. chapter of that prophet. We saw, however, that the only connection between Zechariah and Jeremiah in that place was the mention of the potter. Hengstenberg, on the basis of his conclusion, claimed that Matthew called his quotation that of Jeremiah, because Jeremiah was the source of Zechariah (1). This theory of course falls when he fails to prove that Jeremiah 19 and Zechariah 11,12.13 are the same prophecy. Hofmann, although he does not maintain that Zechariah is making a direct application of Jeremiah 19, nevertheless claims that Matthew mentioned Jeremiah's name, because of the transaction which took place in the potter's field. Although he goes into elaborate details to establish the meaning of חַקְלָא, the name of the field on which Jeremiah broke the vessel, he overlooks the fact that the fulfilment stresses the buying of the potter's field (2). Of this fact the prophet does not make the slightest mention in the 19. chapter. Jeremiah does, however, speak of the buying of a field in the 32. chapter. There we are told that Jeremiah bought the field of Hananeel, his cousin, which was in Anathoth, in the country of Benjamin, for seven shekels and ten pieces of silver. Israel was about to be led into captivity by

---

1. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. IV, Pg. 40.
2. Hofmann, Weissagung und Erfüllung, S. 126.

Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans, and yet Jeremiah was commanded to buy the field. The prophet explains:"Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; houses and fields and vineyards shall be again possessed in the land"(1). Accordingly a time was to come in which the children of Israel would again be possessors of the land and do in it as they planned. At the time of Jesus the Jews were again in possession of their land. They were buying houses, fields, and vineyards, and so they also, or the priests as their representatives bought the potter's field. The action of Jeremiah thus in a special sense foreshadowed the buying of that field by the Jews, which was thereafter known as the "Field of Blood". In buying this field with the blood money, they established a memorial to their own evil deed and to the treachery of Judas.

A tradition, which dates from the time of Jerome,(2) places this field on the southern side of the Valley of Hinnom. At this place many crusaders are said to have been buried, and the land is such as can furnish clay for the potter. Assuming that this really is the location of the field purchased with the betrayal money, one would be justified in calling to memory the prophecy of Jeremiah 19. The purchase of a field in that particular valley would show that the Lord, who can do with the children of Israel, as He pleases, even as the potter with his vessel, would now certainly also fulfil the prophecy of Jeremiah:"I will

---

1. Jeremiah 32, 15.
2. Smith's Bible Dictionary under "Akeldama".

break this people as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be healed: and they shall bury them in Tophet, till there be no place to bury..... The house of Jerusalem and the houses of the king of Judah shall be as the place of Topheth" (1). Total destruction is to come over the house in Jerusalem. Good and true as this is, it does not directly link up with the statement in Matthew. The purchase of the field in Jeremiah 32 is evidently the Scripture that is quoted by Matthew as being fulfilled in the purchase of the potter's field. The fact that the field which Jeremiah bought was probably some three miles north of Jerusalem, and the potter's field, according to tradition, south of it, does not militate against our interpretation, for not the locality, but the purchase of the field is stressed.

The quotation in Matthew is thus compounded out oftwo prophets, Jeremiah and Zechariah. Such a thing is by no means new to us. We found a similar case in the first passage treated in this essay, where Is. 62,11 and Zech.9,9 were joined into one quotation to show that the prediction concerning the coming of the glorious king to Jerusalem had been fulfilled (2). We might also refer to Matth. 2,23, where a general fulfilment of prophecy is indicated. St. Paul also connects two prophecies of Isaiah (3) in Romans 9,33. The fact that Paul does not mention a particular prophet, does not alter the case, for Mark also quotes a combined prophecy of Isaiah and Malachi as being written

---

1. Jeremiah 19, 11.12.
2. Matthew 21, 5.
3. Romans 9, 33 -- Is. 8,14 & 28, 16.

in Isaiah, the prophet (1). The main object of these quotations is to show that the word of the Lord in the Old Testament found fulfilment in the New Testament. They also show that the prophecies of the prophets are not a disconnected contradictory jumble, but that they all point to the Messiah, and find their fulfilment in Him. Matthew explicitly calls attention to this, when he presents the entire passion history of Christ as a fulfilment of the prophets (2).

We were, however, concerned with the passage in Matthew only inasmuch as it is a reference to Zechariah's prophecy. Zechariah foretold the rejection of the Good Shepherd by the children of Israel, and the payment of thirty pieces of silver as His price. Matthew gives the fulfilment. Zechariah tells us that the thirty pieces of silver were brought into the temple and that the potter was the recipient. Matthew tells us that this was what happened on Friday of the Passion Week. Judas brought the silver to the temple and it ultimately reached the potter. Thus Zechariah once more has shown himself as the prophet of the Passion week, foretelling in astounding detail the setting of the price for the life of Jesus and what happened to the money after it was paid by the people.

Although the plot against Jesus had been brewing for a long time, it was especially on Tuesday after six or on Wednesday that the chief priests and scribes plotted

---

1. Mark 1, 2.3 compared with Malachi 3,1 and Isaiah 40,3.
2. Matthew 26, 56; 26, 24; 26, 54.

together, how they might take Jesus by craft. Both Matthew and Mark tell us that this took place two days before the Passover. The Jewish day began at 6:00 oclock in the evening, and Jesus and His disciples ate the Passover on Thursday evening after six. Two days before the Passover would mark the time as some time after Tuesday at six (1). At that time Jesus was in the house of Simon the leper, in Bethany (2). While there "a woman having an alabastor box of very precious ointment" came in and anointed Him. The disciples tried to stop her, claiming that the ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor. Jesus rebuked the disciples for trying to hinder her. We may suppose that Judas was one of the leaders in this attempt to stop the woman, for his later history reveals him as a greedy and avariscious person. Stung by the rebuke, Judas may then have conceived the idea to betray his master. Add to this the disappointment the worldly-minded Judas must have experienced at the failure of Jesus to proclaim Himself king upon His entry to Jerusalem, and we probably have some of the reasons why Judas went to Jerusalem on the following day, that is, on Wednesday, to bargain with the priests. He approached them and said:"What will ye give me, and I will deliver Him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver"(3). This part of the history also contains a distinct reference to Zechariah. There the prophet as God's representative says:"If ye think good give

---

1. cf. Matth. 26, 2-4; Mark 14, 1.2.
2. Matthew 26, 6.
3. Matthew 26, 14.15.

me my price?" Here Judas asks how much their Lord is worth to them. In both cases the answer is:"Thirty pieces of silver". So the prophet also foretold events occurring on Wednesday.

Summing up, we have so far found occurrences on Palm Sunday, Wednesday, Thursday night, and on Friday morning distinctly foretold by Zechariah. This would already justify us for calling Zechariah the Prophet of the Passion week. There is, however, one more passage which should be considered. The passage yet to be discussed is found in the 10. verse of the 12. chapter of Zechariah.

THE PROPHECY (ZECHARIAH 12, 10):

The literal translation of the passage reads:"And I will pour out upon the House of David, and upon those dwelling in Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look to me, whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him as the mourning upon the only one, and grieve over Him as to grieve over the firstborn".

The sentence is introduced by a ו consecutive and the perfect of נָטָה. It continues the saying of the Lord of Israel, "Which stretcheth forth the heaven, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him"(1). There can be no doubt about it, that the speaker of the first words, who says of himself, "I will pour out", is the Lord Jehovah. When He speaks of Himself as pouring out something, the unstinted bounty of His action is indicated. Whatever it is that He is pouring out, is

---

1. Zechariah 12, 1.

given in so great abundance that it flows over the recipient as a drenching shower, leaving no part of him unaffected (1). In this bountiful way God says, He will pour out the Spirit of Grace and of Supplications.

As long as the usual meaning for the word חן is accepted, there seems to be very little difficulty in determining the correct meaning. Hitzig, Hoffmann, and Ewald fail to show, why the word should here have the meaning of "love, emotion, or groaning",(2) when no such meaning is given to it in the numerous other places where the word is used. The only reason which might be advanced for translating חן with "groaning" could be that the following term תחנונים is related to it, and that the groaning takes on the form of supplication. But this is insufficient to change the meaning of so common a word as חן. Why depart from the usual meaning of "favor, grace"?

The spirit of grace that is poured out is taken by all conservative exegetes to be the spirit of God, which works grace in the hearts of man. The spirit that is poured out is at the same time a spirit of supplication. It is a spirit of supplication because it brings about prayers for grace. It is the spirit that causes the voice of supplication (3). One cannot help but think here of the prophecy made by Joel (4), which was very literally fulfilled on Pentecost, and in the early Church (5).

---

1. Koehler: Wie ein fluidum.
2. Ewald translates with "love", Hitzig "emotion", and Hofmann with "groaning".
3. Psalm 28, 2.6. 4. Joel 2, 28f.
5. Acts 21, 8.9: Philip, the Evangelist, had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy.

This spirit will be poured out over the House of David and over the inhabitants of Jerusalem, according to Zechariah. It is self-evident that the words "the House of David, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" do not mean only the actual children of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. It is a designation for all the people of God, including not only those of low stature, but also those of the upper classes. It is "an individualizing epithet for the whole covenant nation"(1). Jerusalem is mentioned as the representative of the entire nation. That the House of David is mentioned especially, puts a contrast between the upper class, the House of David representing the ruling class (2), and the inhabitants of Jerusalem those over whom they rule. All are to enjoy the same blessings regardless of rank.

The fact that this Spirit of Grace and of Supplication is to be poured out upon those of high and low estate among the people, does not mean that all the children of Abraham according to the flesh will finally undergo a change of mind and heart and turn to the Lord as a nation. The Scriptures nowhere teach a bulk conversion of Israel according to the flesh. On the contrary it stresses the fact that only a remnant shall be saved (3). At the same time the Bible informs us very plainly that this remnant is the spiritual Israel, "who shall be in the midst of many people"(4). In this remnant the Spirit of Grace and

---

1. Keil, Minor Prophets, Pg. 387.
2. Chapter 12, 8: Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the House of David.
3. Is. 10, 20. 21; Joel 2, 32; Micah 4,7. y. Micah 5, 7.8.
4. Micah 5, 7.8.

Supplication brings about true knowledge of sin and guilt, and prayer for forgiveness. In sorrow and repentance they will turn to Him whom they pierced.

The speaker continues:"They shall look upon me, whom they have pierced". We saw before that the speaker is God, and He here says of Himself that He has been pierced. The fact that God should be spoken of as pierced by Israel, has caused commentators considerable worry. As it reads the person suffering and God are identical, and yet different, for in the first clause the suffix "me" is used and later the suffix "him" is applied to the same person. But the only difficulty found unsolvable by Jewish and modern interpreters is the fact that the suffering Savior is placed on the same basis with God, is God Himself, who speaks of Himself as being pierced. Moore correctly says: "The only fact that explains the difficulty is that which they have not yet admitted, that they have crucified and slain the Prince of Peace, who was God manifested in the flesh. As soon as they admit this fact they will see the consistancy of the passage"(1). All manner of exegetical tricks have been employed to make וְדָקְרוּ read differently from what it does. At first, because they scrupled to make alterations in the sacred text, וְדָקְרוּ was written in the margin. This gradually was taken up into some of the texts. At the same time Gog and Magog were made the performers of the deed described. The sense of the passage

---

1. Moore, Zechariah and His Prophecies, Pg. 279.

according to this explanation would be:"Israel looked to him whom Gog and Magog had pierced". The question, to whom אֵלַי refers, would even then not be settled. Some hold, that the suffix in אֵלַי refers to the warriors fallen in the battle. Others refer it to the Son of Jeseph. The numerous passages of Scripture which speak of a suffering Messiah, have caused these to accept that it was the Son of Joseph who suffered and was pierced. This Son of Joseph, they say, was slain in the battle with Gog and Magog. But afterwards the real Messiah, the conquering, victorious Son of David, will make his appearance and will rule undisputedly(1). Others have had a slightly different explanation, which need not be considered.

אֵת occurs very frequently, and unless it were to have the usual meaning here, some further word or explanation would be added. That the reading originally was אֵת and not אֵלַי is made sure by the fact that אֵלַי is the easier reading, and the change from אֵת to אֵלַי is easily accounted for. It would be much more difficult to explain a change from אֵלַי to אֵת. Then also, by far the majority of manuscripts have אֵת, and even Jewish interpretors admit that it is the preferred reading. "Not a single Jewish controversialist has brought forward the reading אֵלַי to refute the Christian interpretation"(2). If the reading could stand the test of investigation, the Jews would not have hesitated to appeal

---

1. With slight variations this was the explanation of Raschi, Aben Esra, Abrabanel, Alschech, and others.
2. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. IV, 85, Quoting De Rossi.

to appeal to it. The whole interpretation falls with the reading.

Hofmann's explanation might merit some attention, because of its peculiar nature. He takes אֵלָי to be a noun with suffix, and makes אֵת the subject of וְדָקָרוּ. His thought would be:"My heroes, that is, the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the House of David, look upon Him who has been pierced". Aside from the fact that אֵל seldom occurs in the meaning of **hero**, such a special mention of the subject would be entirely superfluous, for the subject was previously stated to be "the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the House of David". On the other hand וְדָקָרוּ with the preposition occurs frequently.

The most natural explanation, and the only one the text permits then is, that the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the House of David will look upon the Lord, whom they themselves have pierced, and this Lord is on such an equality with God, that God can say of Himself that He has been pierced. And yet the Pierced One is distinct from the first Person of the Godhead. God, the speaker, continues: "They shall mourn for Him". How wonderfully this agrees with the rest of the Scriptures, which ascribe to the suffering Savior an equality with God, and yet make Him a distinct person, inasmuch as He is also true Man. Had some of the modern exegetes taken a look into the Scriptures, they would not be surprised to hear in our passage that God pictures Himself as suffering. We need only point to the 53. chapter of Isaiah for verification, without making any further remarks.

The phrase וְדָקְרוּ אֵלַי אֵת is simply a relative sentence referring back to אֵלַי (1). To try to change the meaning of the passage by assuming that וְדָקְרוּ is the correct reading, looks like a desperate effort to get out of a hole. There is no authority or reason for a change like that. All the ancient manuscripts testify to וְדָקְרוּ (2). The only text which might seem to give some authority for the change would be the LXX, which reads: Ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσατο. Those translators evidently understood the text in a figurative sense of "assailing with cutting words". It is significant that John, in quoting this passage uses the word ἐξεκέντησαν from ἐκκεντάω, which means, "to dig through", "to pierce". The word דָּקַר always means "to dig through""to pierce".

As the following phrases show, the result of this piercing is that the pierced one is mourned as dead. The prophet uses an illustration to show of what nature this mourning will be. He compares it with the mourning for the death of an only son, and for the death of the first born. These figures were especially illustrative for the children of Israel, who considered it a curse of God, if their children were taken from them. The death of the first-born was the occasion for a special mourning, because he was considered the chief heir. The death of an only son was mourned even more deeply. The prophet Amos

---

1. For a similar construction cf. Jer. 39,8: Jeremiah the prophet, whom they have cast in a dungeon.
2. Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotian, Peschito, Vulgate.

gives a clear picture of the mourning for the only son, chapter 8, verse 10. Such a mourning is to take place among those who look upon the Pierced One.

THE FULFILMENT:

A part of this prophecy is quoted by St. John as being fulfilled when Jesus had died on the cross. Then, instead of breaking His legs, one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side. John continues:"These things were done that the Scripture might be fulfilled,'They shall look on Him, whom they have pierced'"(1). The connection in which the prophecy is quoted by John shows, that the contrast is between the breaking of the bones of the others crucified with Jesus, and the fact that the side of Jesus was pierced. All stress is thus laid on the piercing, as the climax of the mortal sufferings of Christ. Neither the Prophet nor the Evangelist pay particular attention to the instrument used (2).

With the actual piercing of the side of Jesus, the Scripture was fulfilled. "They looked upon Him whom they had pierced". The fact that the Evangelist uses the third person "Him" instead of the prophet's "Me" bears no weight. The Evangelist is simply applying the words directly to Christ. St. Luke narrates the same events as those treated above, without actually quoting the prophecy. He says:"And all the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts, and returned. And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed Him from Galilee, stood afar off,

1. John 19, 37.
2. See explanation of the word "sword" in Zechariah 13.7.Essay.Pg.

beholding these things"(1). "The crowds who had just before been crying out, Crucify Him, here smite upon their breasts, being overpowered with the proofs of the superhuman exaltation of Jesus, and lament over the crucified one and over their own guilt"(2).

Thus again Zechariah has proven himself to be the prophet of the Passion week, foretelling very exactly the events that were to happen on Good Friday, and both Luke and John show the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy. It is true, this looking upon Jesus as the pierced one (3) occurs at various times. Every Christian who is mindful of his sins looks upon Christ, whom he has pierced with his own sins, and he mourns for the fact that it was his guilt that caused the Savior's death. On the part of converted sinners it is a look of repentant sorrow. And there will also be a time when the ungodly will look upon the Pierced One, but they will look upon Him with fear and trembling, even as John says, Revelations 1,7. All that the unbelievers will then be able to do is "to weep and howl because of Him, gibbering in helpless terror in anticipation of the horrible fate which they see before their eyes"(4). The prophecy, however, found its literal fulfilment on Good Friday, when the side of Jesus was pierced and His death was mourned.

---

1. Luke 23, 48.
2. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol.IV, Pg. 75.
3. Bengel: This seeing will occur at various times, partly with repentant sorrow, partly with fear and trembling.
4. Kretzmann, Popular Commentary, Comments on Rev. 1,7.

CONCLUSION:

Zechariah certainly proved to be the prophet of the Passion week. Indeed all of the prophets point to Christ and center around Him, but Zechariah in a special degree foretold the events that were to come to pass during the last week of His life in the stage of humiliation. Beginning with Palm Sunday, Zechariah prophecied concerning Christ's entry into Jerusalem, the plotting of Judas with the elders and pharisees on Wednesday, the dispersal of the disciples after His arrest on Thursday night, the actual betrayal and the bringing of the thirty pieces of silver into the temple, the buying of the potter's field, and the final piercing of Christ's side after His death on Friday. His rejection and death are foretold in no uncertain terms. Certainly no one will deny that Zechariah is justly called the prophet of the Passion week.

****

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Old Testament:

1. Pusey, Minor Prophets.
2. Moore, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.
3. August Koehler, Die Nachexilischen Propheten.
4. C.H.H. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies.
5. Koenig, Messianische Weissagungen.
6. Hengstenberg, Christology, Vol. III and IV.
7. Schaff-Lange, Minor Prophets.
8. Keil, The Twelve Minor Prophets.
9. Lange, Bibelwerk (Theologisch, Homiletisch).
   Die Propheten Haggai, Sachrja, Maleachi.
10. Cook, Holy Bible with Commentary (Zechariah).
11. Pulpit Commentary on Zechariah.
12. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Commentary.
13. Matthew Henry Commentary.
14. Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament.
15. Zellin, Kommentar zum Alten Testament.
    Das Zwölf Propheten Buch.
16. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel.
17. Luther, Auslegung des Sacharja, Vol. XIV, 1768-1976.
18. Stöckhardt, Lehre u. Wehre: Weissagung u. Erfüllung, Vol.31.
19. J. Chr. K. Hoffmann: Weissagung und Erfüllung.
20. Fürbringer, Einleitung; Notizen über Sacharja (class notes)
21. Anderson's Commentary on the Minor Prophets.
22. Gaebelein, Studies in Zechariah.
23. Lowe, Commentary on Zechariah.
24. Dächsels Bibelwerk, Vol. IV & V.

****

New Testament:

1. Meyer, Kommentar zum Matthäus.
2. Schaff-lange, Commentary on Matthew and Commentary on John.
3. Peloubet's, Commentary on Matthew and Com. on John.
4. Lange, Bibelwerk (Matthäus und Johannis).
5. Herman Olshausen, Biblischer Kommentar.
6. Critical Commentary on Matthew.
7. Schaeffer, Lutheran Commentary on Matthew.
8. Keil, Commentary on Matthew.
9. J. Monroe, Gibson, Expositor's Bible.
10. A.B. Bruce, and Marcus Dods, Expositor's Greek New Test.
11. Matthew Henry; Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown; Cook.
12. Luther, Vol. XIII, 1745ff; Vol. XI, 1ff, Adventspredigt.
13. Walther, Evangelien Predigten (Postille). Advent.
14. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament.
15. Meecham, Light from Ancient Letters.
16. Bengels Gnomen Novi Testamenti.

****

Historical:

Historical:

1. Stoeckhardt: Biblische Geschichte des Neuen Testaments.
2. Koehler, Biblische Geschichte.
3. August Neander, The Life of Christ.
4. C. F. Kent, The Life and Teachings of Jesus.
5. David Smith, Days of His Flesh.
6. F. W. Farrar, Life of Christ.
7. Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.

****

Other Helps:

Polyglott Bible, Weimar Bibel, Altenburger Bibel, Hirschberger Bibel, Revised Versions, Herxheimer German Bible with Notes, Nave's Topical Bible, Concordances, Bible Dictionaries, Gesenius Grammar and Lexicon, Thayer, etc.

****