# The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures

## Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37

*Wm. Randolph Bynum*

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM 144

BRILL

# The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures

# Supplements to Novum Testamentum

*Executive Editors*

M.M. Mitchell

Chicago

D.P. Moessner

Dubuque

*Editorial Board*

L. Alexander, Sheffield – H.W. Attridge, New Haven

F. Bovon, Cambridge MA – C. Breytenbach, Berlin

J.K. Elliott, Leeds – C.R. Holladay, Atlanta

M.J.J. Menken, Tilburg – J.C. Thom, Stellenbosch

P. Trebilco, Dunedin

VOLUME 144

*The titles published in this series are listed at brill.nl/nts*

# The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures

## Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37

*by*

Wm. Randolph Bynum

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2012

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Bynum, Wm. Randolph.
The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures : illuminating the form and meaning of scriptural citation in John 19:37 / by Wm. Randolph Bynum.
p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; v. 144)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-22843-6 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-22914-3 (e-book) 1. Bible. N.T. John XIX, 37—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Bible. N.T. John—Relation to Zechariah. 3. Bible. O.T. Zechariah—Quotations in John. 4. Bible. O.T. Zechariah XII, 10—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.

BS2615.52.B96 2012
226.5'06—dc23

2012010506

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.nl/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0167-9732
ISBN 978 90 04 22843 6 (hardback)
ISBN 978 90 04 22914 3 (e-book)

Copyright 2012 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

To my wife Kathy and all my family,
to Dwight D. Swanson and George J. Brooke

CONTENTS


Abbreviations ..... xi

I. Introduction ..... 1

John, LXX, and MT ..... 1
Major Theories for the Citation of Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37 ..... 2
An Independent Non-Septuagint Rendering ..... 2
A Forceful Accommodation ..... 2
Another Version such as Theodoret or Theodotion ..... 2
An Edited or Corrected Version of the Old Greek ..... 3
A *Testimonia* Source ..... 3
A Standard Christian Version ..... 4
Affinities with Hebrew ..... 4
The Possibility of R ..... 4
Purpose of this Study ..... 5
John and R ..... 6
Methodology ..... 6

II. Life Setting of the Fourth Gospel ..... 7

Dating ..... 7
The *Birkat ha-Minim* and the Centrality of Torah ..... 8
The Johannine Community and Controversy with Judaism ..... 10
The Audience and Purpose of the Fourth Gospel ..... 12
Conclusion ..... 15

III. John's Use of the Jewish Scriptures ..... 17

Proclamation of Christ ..... 17
From Signs to Passion ..... 18
John Follows Contemporary Practice in Citing the Scriptures 19
Specific Scriptures Used in the Johannine Passion Narrative ... 22
Intertextuality ..... 23
Conclusion ..... 25

IV. The Textual History of Zechariah ..... 27

Introductory Matters ..... 27
Zecharah 1–8 ..... 27
Zechariah 9–14 ..... 28
Unity of Zechariah ..... 28
Zechariah and the Book of the Twelve ..... 30
The Hebrew Text of Zechariah ..... 32
An *Urtext* for Zechariah? ..... 32
Standardisation of the Hebrew Text ..... 34
Extant Textual Evidence ..... 37
The Greek Text of Zechariah ..... 44
The Greek Translation of the Book of the Twelve ..... 44
Earliest Extant Textual Evidence for the Twelve: 8ḤevXIIgr 53
Conclusion ..... 56

V. A Text-Critical Review of Zechariah 12:10 ..... 59

Goal of the Text-Critical Exercise ..... 59
LXX Translation Technique in Zechariah ..... 65
Defining Translation Technique ..... 65
The Importance of Translation Technique ..... 65
Septuagint Faithfulness ..... 66
Translation of צבאות by παντοκράτωρ ..... 68
An Analysis of Hapax Legomena in the Twelve ..... 69
"Evasive Renderings" or "Pseudo-Variants" ..... 70
Distinct *Vorlage*, "Mistranslation," or a "Wrongly Read" Text 70
Translation Technique of Zechariah Twelve ..... 71
Translation of the Hebrew Verb דקר in Zechariah ..... 72
Summary of Translation Technique ..... 73
Text-Critical Issues Regarding Zechariah 12:10 ..... 73
Verb וְהִבִּטוּ—"And they will look" ..... 74
Preposition אלי—"To . . ." ..... 77
Particle את—Sign of the Direct Object ..... 91
Comparing את אשר and ἀνθ' ὧν ..... 93
Verb דקרו—"They pierced" ..... 97
Conclusion ..... 107

VI. John's Scriptural Citations ..... 111

Introduction ..... 111
Verbatim LXX Citations ..... 112
John and the LXX ..... 113
Confluence of John, LXX, and MT Tradition in Verbatim Citations ..... 115
John and the Hebrew ..... 116
Agreement of John with LXX in Contrast to MT ..... 118
Conclusion ..... 118
Quotation with Minimal Variance from LXX ..... 119
Compressed Language from Immediate Context ..... 120
Key-word Insertion ..... 120
John's Editorial and Exegetical Activity ..... 123
Relevance of Hexapla Fragments ..... 125
Conclusion ..... 126
LXX Quotation with Multiple Word Variation ..... 127
Possible Citation of an Alternative Text ..... 128
Hexapla Fragments for Zechariah 9:9 ..... 131
Possible Citation of an Alternative Textual Tradition ..... 132
*Testimonia* Collections ..... 133
John and the Twelve ..... 136
Conclusion ..... 136

VII. Textual Tradition Used for the Citation of Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37 ..... 139

The Text of John 19:37 Compared to Hebrew Textual Traditions ..... 139
A Retroversion of John 19:37 ..... 140
Comparison of John 19:37 with Greek Textual Evidence and other Ancient Versions ..... 147
The Relationship of John 19:37 to Other NT References ..... 147
Second-Century C.E. Revisions ..... 151
Other Ancient Textual Evidence ..... 152
Comparison of John's Citation with R ..... 153
Major Theories for John 19:37 Considered in Relationship to R ..... 156
An Independent Non-Septuagint Rendering ..... 157
A Forceful Accommodation ..... 157
Another Version such as Theodoret or Theodotion ..... 158

An Edited or Corrected Version of the Old Greek ..... 160
A *Testimonia* Source ..... 161
A Standard Christian Version ..... 162
Affinities with Hebrew ..... 163
The Possibility of R ..... 167
Conclusion ..... 168

VIII. Conclusion ..... 171

Some Implications that Follow from this Study ..... 171
Authorship of the Fourth Gospel ..... 171
The Audience of the Fourth Gospel ..... 172
Johannine Interpretation ..... 173
The Meaning of 19:37 for Johannine Theology ..... 173
Zecharian "Bookends" and the Context of II Zechariah ..... 173
Relationship to the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel ..... 175
Relationship to Selected Themes of the Fourth Gospel ..... 176

Selected Bibliography ..... 185
Indices ..... 205

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| AB | Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1993. |
| *APSP* | *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* |
| *ASOR* | *American Schools of Oriental Research* |
| BAG | Bauer, W., W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957. |
| *BASOR* | *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* |
| *BHK* | *Biblia Hebraica.* Edited by R. Kittel. Stuttgart, 1906, 1912, 1937. |
| *BHS* | *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1990. |
| *BRev* | *Bible Review* |
| *BSac* | *Bibliotheca Sacra* |
| *BTB* | *Biblical Theology Bulletin* |
| *CBQ* | *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* |
| *CurBS* | *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* |
| DJD | Discoveries in the Judaean Desert |
| EncJud | Encyclopedia Judaica |
| *ETL* | *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* |
| *ExpTim* | *Expository Times* |
| *HAR* | *Hebrew Annual Review* |
| HRSCS | Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint.* 2 Vols., 1897. Repr., Graz, Austria, 1954. *HTR Harvard Theological Review* |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| *IEJ* | *Israel Exploration Journal* |
| *IOSCS* | *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* |
| *JAOS* | *Journal of the American Oriental Society* |
| *JBL* | *Journal of Biblical Literature* |
| *JETS* | *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* |
| *JQR* | *Jewish Quarterly Review* |
| *JSNT* | *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* |
| JSNTSup | Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series |
| *JSOT* | *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* |
| JSOTSup | Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series |

| | |
|---|---|
| *JSS* | *Journal of Semitic Studies* |
| KBL | Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.* Leiden, 1958. |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| LSJ | Lidell, H.G., R. Scott, H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996. |
| *NTS* | *New Testament Studies* |
| *OTS* | *Old Testament Studies* |
| *RB* | *Revue Biblique* |
| *RelSRev* | *Religious Studies Review* |
| *RevQ* | *Revue de Qumran* |
| *ScEccl* | *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* |
| *Sef* | *Sefarad* |
| StPatr | Studia Patristica |
| *VT* | *Vetus Testamentum* |
| VTSup | Supplements to Vetus Testamentum |
| *ZAW* | *Zeitschrift für die Alttesamentliche Wissenschaft* |

CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

## John, LXX, and MT

A significant dimension of the study of the Fourth Gospel (FG) is the author's use of the Jewish Scriptures.[1] Explicit citations of scriptural verses at key points in the narrative are a most important source for the presentation of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of God" (20:31). The form in which those Scriptures are cited is critical for understanding the particular role each of the citations plays in the development of the Johannine narrative. The form of scriptural citation in the FG, though admittedly complex, does not appear to be accidental or haphazard. Instead, it consistently demonstrates careful conciseness and clarity on the part of the author. The specific purpose that each citation carries within the narrative is closely related to the form in which it is cited.

This study seeks an adequate explanation for the unusual form of Zechariah 12:10 as cited in John 19:37, and the role it plays in the Johannine narrative. The comparison of this citation with known forms of the text reveals that it demonstrates many similarities with the Hebrew Massoretic Text (MT), but does not equal it exactly. On the other hand, it shares not a single word with the Greek Septuagint (LXX) form of the verse. MT and LXX forms do share some common ground with one another, yet they also reflect significant differences from one another. Those differences appear even more unusual in the Minor Prophets (the Twelve) where much of the LXX closely parallels the MT. The differences between the three forms do not lend themselves to any simple explanation. Instead, substantial variations between the three give the impression of irreconcilable differences that would make it difficult, if not impossible, to trace their origin to a single original form from the text of Zechariah. There is much more to the textual history of the passage than a simple translation by the LXX

[1] The term "Jewish Scriptures" refers to the body of authoritative writings accepted as Scripture in Judaism prior to the delineation of a formal canon. Hereafter, they may also be referred to simply as "Scripture" or "the Scriptures." The term will be limited to Jewish Scriptures and not to the writings which became accepted by Christians as New Testament Scriptures.

of a Hebrew text equal to MT, with a subsequent quotation of that translation by John. Simply put, John does not equal LXX, and LXX does not accurately reflect MT.

## Major Theories for the Citation of Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37

The search to explain the form of Zech 12:10 in John 19:37 is not a new quest. Modern scholars have presented numerous theories in an attempt to explain this unique form of citation. The following is a brief summary of those viewpoints.

### *An Independent Non-Septuagint Rendering*

John's variation from the LXX version has long been observed, with possibilities other than MT and LXX entertained as the potential source for his citation. Swete says John uses the LXX as a major source, but in 19:37, he has departed from the LXX and taken a "more or less independent course" with the citation.[2]

### *A Forceful Accommodation*

Some have attempted to explain John's form of citation as modified by John himself for his particular theological agenda. Goodwin, for example, speaks of John's "forcible accommodation" of source material;[3] similarly, Seynaeve places him in the category of innovator for doctrinal reasons.[4]

### *Another Version such as Theodoret or Theodotion*

Some see evidence that John knew this verse in another form from a different translation. Goodwin,[5] Jellicoe,[6] and others[7] have recognised

---

[2] Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914; repr., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989), 398.

[3] Charles Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" *JBL* 73 (June 1954), 73.

[4] Jaak Seynaeve, "Les Citations Scripturaires en Jn. 19, 36–37," *Revue Africaine de Theologie* 1 (1977), 71.

[5] Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" 65–66.

[6] Sydney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 157–171.

[7] See also Jean-Noël Guinot, "Theodoret de Cyr, Une Lecture Critique de la Septante," in *Selon Les Septante* (ed. Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1995), 394; cf. M.E. Boismard, "Critique Textuelle et Citations Patristiques," in *RB* LVII (1950),

commonality between John's citation and Theodoret. In a similar manner, Morris sees a translation which is *like* Theodotion (and Aquila), but is now perished.[8] Dodd explains it as a form which *anticipates* that of Theodotion,[9] and Moo says it shows *possible affinities* with Theodotion.[10] Brown is "reasonably certain" that John's citation stems from an early, perhaps proto-Theodotionic, Greek recension conforming the LXX text to what was becoming the standard Hebrew text of the time.[11] Dorival, Harl, and Munnich have indeed identified it with the version of Theodotion.[12]

### *An Edited or Corrected Version of the Old Greek*

Schuchard believes that John recalls a specific version of Zech 12:10 that may have been an edited or corrected version of the Old Greek,[13] or that he may have had access to such a version that contained marginal emendations.[14]

### *A* Testimonia *Source*

Loisy,[15] Dodd,[16] and Smith[17] have attempted to explain this verse as a citation from a *testimonia* source, that is, a collection of scriptural citations gathered under a particular theme.

---

388–408; M.J. Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text," in *NTS* 4 (1957–58), 139–147; and Bruce M. Metzger, "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," in *NTS* 18 (1971–72), 379–400.

[8] Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971), 823, fn 105.

[9] C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965), 132.

[10] Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield, England: The Almond Press, 1983), 353.

[11] Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (XIII–XXI)* (AB 29A; ed. David Noel Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1970), 938.

[12] Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich, *La Bible Grecque des Septante* (Paris: Editions du CERF, 1988), 277.

[13] Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992), 145–147.

[14] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 145.

[15] Alfred Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile* (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1921), 495.

[16] C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963), 428–429.

[17] D. Moody Smith, "The Setting and Shape of a Johannine Narrative Source," *JBL* 95 (1976), 237.

### *A Standard Christian Version*

Menken concludes that in this citation John used an "extant early Christian version" of the verse which is an "independent Greek translation of the Hebrew."[18]

### *Affinities with Hebrew*

Many have recognised, as Menken has, that this citation has much in common with the Hebrew MT. Sanday has explained that this quotation in 19:37 agrees with the Hebrew and not with the LXX.[19] Hendriksen more accurately states that this citation is "not according to the LXX but *more nearly* according to the original Hebrew,"[20] as does Lightfoot.[21] Barrett believes that John accurately follows the Hebrew, albeit a Hebrew consonantal text without pointing.[22] Menken agrees that the citation quotes the Hebrew, but explains it as a difference in vocalisation.[23] Marsh believes that John has given a personal translation of the Hebrew,[24] as does Humann.[25] Morris agrees that the most natural understanding of the quotation is that John knew and used the Hebrew, but he does not accept it as a foregone conclusion.[26] Hübner also expresses an element of doubt, conceding that the scriptural text available to John may not have been identical with the modern text available to us.[27]

### *The Possibility of R*

Hanhart also observes John's similarity to the Hebrew in this citation, then begins to speak of possibly identifying John's citation with the Greek Minor

---

[18] Maarten J. Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning of the Quotation from Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37," *CBQ* 55 (July 1993), 497, 504.

[19] William Sanday, *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1872), 290. Sanday admits his agreement with Westcott on this point.

[20] William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary* (12 vols.; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1954), 2:439, underlining added.

[21] R.H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1956), 327, italics added.

[22] C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), 23.

[23] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 502.

[24] John Marsh, *The Gospel of St. John* (London: Cox & Wyman, 1968), 623.

[25] Roger J. Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John," *Lutheran Theological Review* I (Fall/Winter 1988–89), 39–42.

[26] Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 823.

[27] Hans Hübner, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1- From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* (ed. Magne Saebo; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 359.

Prophets Scroll, known as 8ḤevXIIgr, or simply "R." He thus believes that R's form of Zech 12:10 might be equal to John's form, which corresponds to the Hebrew, departs from the LXX, and shares content with Rev 1:7.[28] However, he refrains from taking any definitive step.[29]

## Purpose of this Study

The number of widely disparate and often apparently contradictory responses to the matter points up the complexity of the issues raised, as well as the difficulty of responding adequately to those issues by means of a single traditional theory. To date, as evidenced by the variety of opinion on the matter, there has been no theory of citation that sufficiently accounts for all of the available data. Each of the numerous theories advanced does indeed appear to have some credibility and to offer insight into one or more facets of the citation, yet there is none which has fully responded to the entire range of issues raised. The most glaring inadequacy, and the reason why previous answers to the question are simply not satisfactory, is the lack of attention to the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) discoveries in the Twelve and the implications of those discoveries for Johannine citation of the Scriptures. New data from those discoveries, particularly from R, offer significant insights into both the Hebrew and Greek texts of Zech 12:10, as well as John's citation of the verse. This calls for a re-examination of the verse in the light of those discoveries.

A careful study of the form of citation in this instance is of critical importance for a number of reasons: 1) there is no scriptural citation in the FG that is more strategically placed, for not only is it the citation which brings John's Passion Narrative to a close, but it is the final and climactic scriptural citation of the entire FG; 2) the citation carries significant weight in its immediate context regarding John's viewpoint of the crucifixion, but further, as often overlooked in commentary on both theological implications and literary form, it carries great significance in relationship to the frequent use of the verb ὁράω throughout the gospel, as well as providing a key focus for launching the reader into the following resurrection narrative; 3) an adequate understanding of its form will allow one to gain a new perspective, not only upon the verse itself within the immediate context

---

[28] Robert Hanhart, Introduction to *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, by Martin Hengel (trans. Mark E. Biddle; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002), 7.

[29] Hanhart, Introduction, 7.

of the crucifixion episode, but also upon John's overall use of Scripture, and the critical role the citation plays in the theological development of the Johannine narrative. Grasping the form of this citation affords a most significant window of perception into the interpretation of the FG.

## John and R

It is the central thesis of this study that John's citation shares a significant number of characteristics with R, revealing that the best explanation for the form of Zech 12:10 is a citation from R or a similar manuscript. This places John's form in harmony with the LXX correction movement represented by R. The author of the FG thus desires in this instance to cite the Jewish Scriptures in a manner more closely compatible with the predominant Hebrew proto-MT of the era, in contrast to the LXX form of the verse. At the same time, he wishes to cite in a Greek form acceptable to the Jewish-Hellenistic culture of his day.

## Methodology

To begin this study, one's viewpoint regarding John's form of citation in this single instance will be greatly enhanced by locating the FG itself within the early post-Second Temple period where such textual work would be plausible. Thus the first step will be to take a brief look at the life setting of the FG in later first century C.E. Secondly, along with the setting, it is instructive to provide an overview regarding John's use of the Jewish Scriptures. Next, Zech 12:10 will be placed in its historical context in order to understand as much as possible about its ancient setting and subsequent textual development. This will then provide a basis from which to conduct an in-depth text-critical review of both Hebrew and Greek forms of the verse. With a firmer grasp upon the Zecharian passage, the study will then proceed by locating the form of this citation within the context of John's overall explicit scriptural citations. Lastly, John's form of citation will be compared to extant manuscript evidence, and predominant scholarly viewpoints and theories which seek to explain the form of citation will be evaluated. A concluding chapter will look at the implications that follow from this study, and examine the theological significance of this passage in the light of the findings of the entire investigation.

CHAPTER TWO

# LIFE SETTING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The purpose of this chapter is to locate the Fourth Gospel in its *Sitz im Leben* within the early post-Second Temple period. It is not possible to present a highly detailed life setting, for the reconstruction of an original social, religious, and historical context for the FG presents tremendous difficulties. It may indeed be, in Judith Lieu's words, "... an always tentative original setting."[1] Nonetheless, a clearer view of some of the major components of that setting, along with the removal of unrealistic expectations for the same, will aid greatly in understanding Jewish scriptural citation within the narrative of the FG.

## Dating

The identity of the author of the FG may be out of reach for modern scholarship.[2] However, it is traditionally maintained that the FG was written, or at least attained its final form, near the end of the first century C.E. The discovery in 1920 of manuscript fragment P52 set limits on late dating, indicating that the FG was in use "during the first half of the second century in a provincial town along the Nile, far removed from its traditional place of composition...."[3] Since that discovery, there has been broad agreement that the FG can be dated near to 90 C.E., though the author might well have begun the writing long before it reached its final form. Lindars believes the writing of the FG began perhaps in the early 80's.[4] Hengel allows more latitude, seeing a chronological framework of 60/70–100 as the most probable.[5] The exact date is unknown, yet the author's 'school' or

---

[1] Judith Lieu, "Anti-Judaism, the Jews, and the Worlds of the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 182.

[2] No attempt will be made in this study to identify the author of the FG.

[3] Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 39.

[4] Barnabas Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1971), 12.

[5] Martin Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1989), 123.

sphere of activity can be "... placed firmly in the context of the Christian communities of Asia Minor in the last decades of the first century."[6] It is safe to locate the FG within the final years of the first century C.E. in the "eclectic milieu of the late first century Mid-East."[7]

## The *Birkat ha-Minim* and the Centrality of Torah

An approximate date of 90 C.E. for the FG is often supported by the viewpoint that it reflects Jewish-Christian conflict of the era. It is assumed that a breach between church and synagogue is the central factor in the background,[8] with Christians in violent controversy with the Jews and facing expulsion from the synagogue.[9] Such persecution has been linked specifically to the institution of the *Birkat ha-Minim*. This "blessing," the twelfth of eighteen benedictions, was designed to exclude from the synagogue those of heretical beliefs, distinguishing Jews believing in Jesus from other Jews. As a measure against heretics taken by normative Judaism late in the first century, it is commonly attributed to the Jewish leadership of Jamnia. Lindars connects the *Birkat ha-Minim* directly to the context of the FG in which the final breach between the church and the synagogue has been reached,[10] and dates its institution to approximately 85 C.E.[11] Barrett would essentially agree, placing it in the years 85–90.[12] For Pancaro, Jamnia only makes sense if believing Jews are distinguished from non-believing Jews strictly on the basis of faith in Jesus.[13]

However, neither the date of the benediction, nor even of the purported Council of Jamnia itself which supposedly instituted it, retain solid historical verification. Not only is a specific date for Jamnia historically problematic,[14] the exact date the *Birkat ha-Minim* was instituted is

---

[6] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 81.

[7] John F. O'Grady, "Recent Developments in Johannine Studies," *BTB* 12 (1982), 56.

[8] Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, 78.

[9] Robert Kysar, "The Gospel of John in Current Research," in *RelSRev* 9 (October 1983), 316–17.

[10] Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, 12.

[11] Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, 12.

[12] Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (1962), 108.

[13] Severino Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), 531.

[14] R. Timothy McLay, "Biblical Texts and the Scriptures for the New Testament Church," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 40. McLay calls the "council of Jamnia" a "scholarly fiction."

not known, nor is the extent of its application certain.[15] It need not be discounted altogether, but with such uncertainty, it must be seen as one issue to be taken into account among others, and not allowed to have undue importance in colouring one's perception of the setting of the FG.

The controversy behind the FG is broader than that indicated by the *Birkat ha-Minim* alone. This measure is one indicator of a larger reality of post-70 C.E. Judaism that felt the need to close its ranks and defend itself from destruction, preserve unity, and eliminate any source of religious-doctrinal division. Judaism had become a "religion of observance," with Torah at the centre, and with the Sabbath as the fundamental Jewish observance and symbol of adhesion to the covenant.[16]

Palestinian Judaism, however, had been shaped for more than three centuries by its encounter with Hellenism,[17] and was thus not completely faithful to the Jewish scriptural tradition. On the other hand, neither was it completely permeated by the Hellenistic spirit nor entirely a victim of syncretism.[18] Further, there is no clear distinction between 'Palestinian' Judaism and 'Hellenistic' Judaism of the Greek-speaking Diaspora. In Hengels' view, "from about the middle of the third century B.C. *all Judaism* must really be designated '*Hellenistic Judaism*' in the strict sense. . . ."[19]

Nonetheless, Judaism both inside and outside Palestine retained a "dominant central feature in the form of the Torah, despite its confusing multiplicity."[20] Though first-century Judaism was by no means monolithic,[21] still Torah gained absolute significance among those within Judaism who struggled for self-affirmation against Hellenism. Torah became more and more the "exclusive medium of revelation."[22] Even with disputes over interpretation, it still expressed the unity of the Jewish people in distinction from all other peoples.

---

[15] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 114–15.

[16] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 493–95.

[17] See Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (trans. John Bowden; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 1:104, 310–311.

[18] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:310.

[19] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:104, 311.

[20] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:312.

[21] Dennis L. Stamps, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 11, speaks of the ". . . multifarious nature of Judaism in the first century C.E. . . ."

[22] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:312.

In that context, the Christian viewpoint of the centrality of Christ challenged the schema of Hellenistic Judaism.[23] Christianity was misunderstood from the Jewish side as a new sect advocating apostasy from the Law and assimilation, as they saw the nerve centre of the Law attacked.[24] This being the case, however, it was not necessarily a sudden development in the later years of the first century C.E. It is more reasonably viewed as a lengthy process which began even before Paul,[25] or the martyrdom of Stephen. The contention between Christians and Jewish leaders began with Jesus in Jerusalem, and not with a specific historical act of excommunication late in the first century by a specific decision of the alleged Jewish synod of Jamnia.[26]

Pancaro sees the situation behind the FG as one of conflict that began between Jesus and the Jews, and continued with the church and the synagogue, primarily over the question of the Law and the person of Jesus.[27] McHugh sees the ultimate point at issue between Jesus and the Jewish religious leaders to be the teaching of Jesus regarding the very nature of God. It moved from a profound disagreement over the nature of the kingdom of God, to a more fundamental confrontation over the concept of "life" and how one attains it, whether by following Torah, or by following Jesus and receiving the gift of life from the Father.[28] Anderson views the conflict in similar terms: "contrasts to the authority of Moses and the Law can be seen as a factor of raising up Jesus over and against the authority appeals of Jewish religion."[29] Since Jesus was persecuted because of the claims he made about himself, it should come as no surprise that his followers would be persecuted for the same reason.[30] For Pancaro, one can trace a close parallel between the beliefs and attitudes of Jesus and those of the early church, between the reasons which led Jesus into conflict with

---

[23] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:314.
[24] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:314.
[25] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 115.
[26] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 119.
[27] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 492.
[28] John McHugh, "In Him Was Life," in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* (ed. James D.G. Dunn; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1999), 123–158.
[29] Paul N. Anderson, "On Guessing Points and Naming Stars: Epistemological Origins of John's Christological Tensions," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 338.
[30] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 531.

Jewish authorities and those which led his followers into conflict with the synagogue.[31] The conflict did not cease with Jesus' death, but rather continued, and even intensified, as faith in Jesus represented a danger to Judaism.[32]

It would be excessive, however, to find a reference to the situation of the Christian community in the later first century in every detail of the conflict between Jesus and the Jews in the FG. If the essential controversial issue raised in the FG was an attack against Jesus, with unbelieving members of the Jewish community attempting to discredit him and his teaching, no doubt Christians were persecuted in similar ways to Jesus. Yet the main object of the controversy appears to be against their founder Jesus,[33] and details of later continued persecution of the church are not clear.

Consider, for example, Martyn's well-known viewpoint of a two-level drama within the narrative of the FG, where the Word's dwelling among humanity is not just an event of the past, but one which transpires on both the *einmalig*, or original, unique setting, and contemporary levels of the drama.[34] When Martyn uses the issues presented in the FG to reconstruct stages of relationship between John's church and the Jewish community, he is moving into uncertain territory. With limited data available, it is questionable to make specific episodes in the narrative, such as the blind man's healing in John 9, into a paradigm of Jewish-Christian relationships in the later first century C.E. Such issues may be discernible in the relationship between the two communities, but the reconstruction of historical stages in the relationship is far too subjective, and the details are hardly verifiable.[35]

Herein lies the inherent weakness of any attempt to form a detailed description of the Johannine Community by interpretation of references to conflict in the FG. The dynamics of controversy do not allow a precise sociological description of a particular historical Johannine community, and any attempt to reconstruct such a history proves to be an extraordinarily

---

[31] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 492.

[32] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 511.

[33] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 512.

[34] J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 129ff.

[35] Cf. also O'Grady, "Recent Developments in Johannine Studies," 56, who follows Brown in speaking of six major groups within the milieu of the Johannine Community, and who believes that tensions could have developed between the community and the various groups.

difficult undertaking.[36] One must recognise the ambiguity of the clues given and the limited knowledge available regarding the receiving audience. On the other hand, the clues that are available should not be ignored, even if a detailed schema is not possible.[37]

Thus there is considerable debate whether the Johannine Community "represented a specific body of people and Christian congregations, and what the history of such a group might have been."[38] The inability for contemporary scholarship to reach any general consensus regarding the presence of this group or its sociological makeup, is a signal for caution. The message of the FG is broad enough to respond in some dimension to a number of possible issues, but does not offer details regarding any supposed group, or precise phases of its historical development.

## The Audience and Purpose of the Fourth Gospel

To whom, then, is the FG directed? The complexity in the message of the FG allows for various potential responses to that question, as there are a number of possible situations of tension and conflict behind the FG beyond the conflict between the synagogue and the church. These include dialogue with the followers of John the Baptist, who may have been over-exalting their leader; the demand for Roman emperor-worship under the leadership of Domitian (81–96 C.E.) versus the confession of Jesus as God; the docetic inclinations of Gentile Christians that led to worldliness and assimilation,[39] just to mention a few.

Pancaro believes that controversy regarding the Law is central to the author's argument, and pictures the FG as addressed primarily to the Jews, not Gentiles. Arguments are grasped only by those who are well-acquainted with Jewish thought, he claims.[40] John is writing primarily for Jews who already believe, or who are "hidden believers," and only indirectly is he writing to win over non-believing Jews. John's main purpose, in Pancaro's view, is to confirm Jewish Christians in the faith as

---

[36] Thomas L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 21.

[37] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, xi.

[38] Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher, eds., *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), xvi.

[39] Anderson, "On Guessing Points and Naming Stars," 325ff. Anderson believes six or seven crises are to be inferred within the Johannine situation.

[40] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 532.

he counters Jewish attacks against them, in order to prevent them from falling away and returning to the synagogue.[41] Anderson agrees that reassimilation into the synagogue for some is a significant challenge (among several potential areas of conflict) for the Christian community behind the FG.[42] There is support in this viewpoint from Griffith, who holds that a primary issue portrayed in the FG is the "apostasy of Jewish Christians who revert to Judaism."[43] John's missionary purpose is to win over Jews who already believed secretly, but were unwilling to break from the synagogue by openly confessing Jesus, and possibly to win back those who had returned to Judaism because of persecution.[44]

In contrast, Hengel rejects the idea of a primarily Jewish audience for the FG, seeing "clear evidence that the Gospel was written for a mainly Gentile-Christian audience, probably somewhat similar to the earlier Pauline communities."[45] In his viewpoint, the immediate controversy with the Jews is no longer the central theme in the Johannine teaching. Rather, John presents a universal message regarding the person and saving work of Christ which brings salvation equally to Jew and Gentile.[46]

Carson views the FG as both appealing to Christians, as well as confronting non-Christian Jews. The presence of introductory formulae that stress the fulfilment motif in the passion of Jesus, he says, "suggests an audience that needs to be provided with a rationale, a biblical rationale, for the substantial rejection of Jesus by his fellow Jews."[47] A shifting of the focus of primary revelation from the text to the person of Jesus indicates for him that it was spoken to Jewish opponents in dialogue with the Johannine Community. Further, he claims, John is not limiting himself to Jews, but is also deeply interested in evangelising proselytes and God-fearers, who would likely have some knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures.

---

41 Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 534. Even the phrase "that you may believe," to win over to the faith, is compatible, says Pancaro, because "faith in Jn is a dynamic reality which cannot be equated with the initial act of faith."

42 Anderson, "On Guessing Points and Naming Stars," 326.

43 Terry Griffith, " 'The Jews Who Had Believed in Him' ( John 8:31) and the Motif of Apostasy in the Gospel of John," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 191–92.

44 Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 533.

45 Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 119.

46 Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 121.

47 D.A. Carson, "John and the Johannine Epistles," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (ed. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 248.

Carson perceives the use of the Scriptures in the FG as congruent "with either a missionary and evangelistic *Sitz im Leben*, or with one more narrowly aimed at providing Christians with apologetic materials; but it is hard to see how it decisively favours either position."[48]

Brodie sees John making an appeal to all Christians, Jewish and Gentile, regardless of the diversity of their backgrounds. They are rejected by the world and by the Jews, but the gospel is seeking to absorb the painful history, set it in a meaningful context, and move beyond it.[49] Bauckham also views the FG as written for a broad, general Christian audience within a network of communities in a worldwide movement. The intended readership of the FG is not a specific community or definite groups of communities, he says, but an open and indefinite category of any and every Christian community of the author's time where Greek was understood.[50] Bauckham does not believe the FG was written for a particular, isolated, sectarian community. He finds it difficult to sustain scholarship which has viewed the Johannine Community in isolation, or has developed elaborate schemes regarding the stages of the community's history and development, such as Martyn's two-level reading strategy mentioned above.[51]

Bauckham is in agreement with Hengel at this point, who believes that the Johannine school is not to be seen as an isolated, remote community, but one that was open to the mainstream Christian church that was taking shape at the end of the first and beginning of the second century C.E. In contrast to a categorisation that places it among secluded, exclusive groups, such as that of the Qumran Essenes, the Johannine school demonstrates openness. Hengel thus refrains from a detailed reconstruction of a single local group, or any "strictly demarcated special Johannine communities."[52] "There is no distinctive special group order which could mark off the Johannine circle from the communities of the mainstream church. It therefore seems to have been a quite open Christian school."[53]

---

[48] Carson, "John and the Johannine Epistles," 258.

[49] Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 11.

[50] Richard Bauckham, "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 101–103.

[51] Bauckham, "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel," 104.

[52] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 50.

[53] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, 53. Hengel's viewpoint here is based upon his theory that there is to be no separation between the Johannine letters and the Gospel, but that they are bound together in the same historical situation and thus mutually interpret one another.

Issues raised in the FG thus allow for a broad viewpoint regarding the audience to whom John is speaking. Evidence allows for a diverse audience of Jewish and non-Jewish Christians, as well as Jewish and Gentile non-believers. It speaks to those both familiar and unfamiliar with the issues of Judaism in later first century C.E. It is relevant to those who were faced with the relationship with the synagogue, relationship with the Jewish Scriptures,[54] and confronted with questions and challenges regarding the person of Jesus Christ.

## Conclusion

From this brief sketch, we are able to discern some components of the setting of the FG. It is safely dated in later first century C.E. It reflects some dimension of controversy between the Christian community and Judaism, yet the application and extent of the *Birkat ha-Minim* is uncertain. The Judaism to which the FG responds is Hellenistic Judaism, which reflects the dominance of Torah. The conflict that began with Jesus and the Jewish leaders has continued with the growth and development of the Christian church. John's audience is broad and diverse, which includes Jews and non-Jews, Christians and unbelievers, sympathetic listeners and opponents. There are a number of potential areas of dialogue and tension behind the FG.

This sketch offers a setting in which the FG may be plausibly located. It is a helpful orientation for the study which is to follow regarding the evaluation of Jewish scriptural citations within the FG.[55]

---

[54] John's relationship with the Jewish Scriptures, and his biblical textual milieu, will be discussed in succeeding chapters.

[55] Cf. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), xi: "I approach the task of interpretation not by reconstructing the historical situation in the churches to which Paul wrote, not by framing hypothetical accounts of the opponents against whom Paul was arguing, but by reading the letters as literary texts shaped by complex intertextual relations with Scripture."

CHAPTER THREE

# JOHN'S USE OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the use of the Jewish Scriptures by John within the *Sitz im Leben* outlined in Chapter 2. It is a response to the question: how does John use the Scriptures in his presentation of "the Christ, the Son of God" (20:31)? Such an overview will lay necessary groundwork for the more detailed study of scriptural citation ahead.

## Proclamation of Christ

John, as did each gospel author, reflected upon and interpreted the Christ-event that had unfolded before him. In so doing, he found scriptural passages to be critically relevant to that interpretational process. As part of the early Christian community, he was faced with the necessity of explaining the suffering and death of Jesus the Messiah, both for believers and for critics.[1] Granted, resurrection was at the heart of the original kerygma, but positive significance must then be attached to Jesus' death as well, calling for adherence to the theory of a dying and rising Messiah. This was the chief object of attack by unbelieving Jews, says Lindars, and thus the church had to respond to taunts and criticisms.[2] In response to such hostile criticism, the gospel of redemption was proclaimed as well as defended. Believers needed to hear the gospel proclamation, those who doubted needed to be encouraged, and those who would tend to reject the message needed an adequate response to their criticism.

As we have seen, the contextual clues in the FG allow for a fair degree of latitude in one's perception of the needs of the audience and the purpose for writing. Whatever the sociological makeup of the Johannine

---

[1] Cf. Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961), 13. In Lindars' search to return to the original content of NT faith and the process by which it was developed, he saw in the use of scriptural quotations by NT writers evidence of the earliest formulation of Christian doctrine. Lindars agreed with Dodd that key passages as principal testimonies are the sub-structure of all Christian theology.

[2] Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 75–76.

Community and the diversity of John's audience might have been, it is evident that his direct quotation from the Scriptures serves to support his view of Christ and expresses the desire to increase his audience's receptivity to the message.[3] Though the Scriptures were widely accepted as authoritative among his diverse audience, John is not simply quoting an established authority to defend a weak or questionable point of view. For John, when the Scriptures are fully heard and adequately interpreted, they speak the very message that he is proclaiming. When the Scriptures are interfaced with the life and ministry of Jesus, they actually illuminate the significance of Jesus, while at the same time Jesus gives the Scriptures their fullest expression.

## From Signs to Passion

In the presentation of the message in the FG, it is evident that the author views the Scriptures as doing more than offering support. The very life, teachings, and ministry of Jesus are for the Fourth Evangelist a natural outgrowth of the Scriptures. Not only is there no contradiction, but in fact there is a deep sense of continuity between the Scriptures and the FG as Jesus' life and ministry flow in harmony with God's prior self-revelation.

For example, in John 2:17 through 12:15, introductory phrases to scriptural citations such as γεγραμμένον ἐστίν, "it is written," or καθώς ἐστιν γεγραμμένον, "just as it is written," and similar constructions, indicate that Jesus' ministry and teachings were entirely in keeping with the Scriptures. It is important to note, however, a transition from signs to passion given in the summary verse of John 12:37. Here it is stated that in spite of so many signs being done by Jesus, much of his audience did not believe. John thus presents the incomprehensible nature of the rejection of Jesus by so many of the Jewish community, and Jewish leadership in particular: though Jesus carried out his ministry in keeping with the flow of scriptural events and teachings, yet he was rejected by so many of his contemporaries. In presenting this rationale for the rejection of Jesus, John then quotes from Isaiah 53:1 in 12:38 with a new form of introductory phrase: ἵνα πληρωθῇ, "that it may be fulfilled." In so doing, he makes a transition

[3] Christopher D. Stanley, "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; *JSNTSup* 148 (1997)), 46.

to the Passion Narrative, and to the fulfilment of key scriptural passages in the suffering and death of Jesus.

In the Passion Narrative, therefore, John views the events leading up to and including the death of Jesus as the specific fulfilment of certain scriptural texts. These events are now bringing out the full significance of those texts for the salvation of God's people. Here, in the person of Jesus, John presents what he sees as the true and full importance of those verses. Conversely, the texts themselves serve to illumine one's understanding of the meaning of these events in the passion of Christ. For John, the substantive reality to which the Scriptures refer is now being presented in its fullest and final expression in the passion of Christ. In the mutually interpretational relationship of Scriptures and passion events, these key passages give meaning in scriptural categories, concepts and images, to the otherwise seemingly banal events of the execution of a criminal. At the same time, these events in the passion of Christ bring out a new depth of fulfilment for those Scriptures that had not been possible prior to the death of Christ. As the events of Christ's passion unfold, those events bring to light a deeper meaning of the Scriptures, giving them contemporary relevance for believers, and also giving an adequate response to those who would reject Jesus on the basis of their own viewpoint of the Scriptures themselves. John is quoting in a manner which illuminates the abiding relevance of the Scriptures, bringing out their continued meaningful application for his diverse contemporary audience.

## John Follows Contemporary Practice in Citing the Scriptures

In order to continue to gain a better perspective on John's use of specific Scripture verses, it is important to see scriptural citation as it was seen in the first century C.E., and not simply as it may be viewed from a modern perspective. Given our familiarity with a fixed authoritative canon, it is easy to conceive of the engagement of first-century writers with the Scriptures in simplistic terms and in categories that are much too rigid. There is a danger of reading the role and authority of Jewish and Christian canons, after they had been fixed, back into an earlier period.[4]

First of all, the Hebrew Scriptures and their Greek translations were definitely regarded as sacred by Jewish and Christian communities in

[4] W.D. Davies, "Reflections About the use of the Old Testament in the New In its Historical Context," *JQR* LXXIV (October, 1983), 131.

the first century C.E., but those Scriptures were still undefined in detail, and had not yet achieved the express authority of "canon."[5] Further, the biblical text of the era was not to be found in a single, monolithic text, either in Hebrew or Greek, but in pluriform textual traditions existing side-by-side.[6] When we encounter Scripture cited in the NT, we should thus attempt to see it and read it as first-century Jews, and in our case, the audience of the FG, would read it, coming from their midst and their interpretation.[7]

It is also imperative to understand that the social environment of first-century quotation does not equal our modern context. Modern literary standards of printing and citing of other works cannot be applied to first-century writings. Not only was there more than a single textual tradition from which to draw, but the authority for a biblical citation was not found in the precise wording of a fixed text, even during the process of formal standardisation of the Hebrew text in late first century C.E. In keeping with contemporary rhetorical practice, drawing from Jewish Scriptures that supported or illustrated a particular position was a common technique for an author to seal an argument. In such citing of Scripture, there was a long-standing tradition of repeated reinterpretation and even rewriting of portions of the scriptural text in order to draw out its significance for a later time. As the Jewish community was accustomed to the public reading and translation of Scripture, intentional interpolations and 'interpretative renderings' played a large role in scribal practices of the era and were thus "an integral part of every public presentation of a written text, a reality well understood and perhaps even anticipated by ancient audiences."[8] Thus oral recitation, inner-biblical exegesis, and rewritten texts all shaped the way ancient texts were viewed. "Incorporating interpretative elements into the wording of a quotation was a common literary practice throughout the ancient world."[9]

---

[5] Davies, "Reflections About the use of the Old Testament in the New," 136. In addition, as Davies points out, alongside the ancient Scriptures a rich oral legal tradition had developed.

[6] N.B.: Textual pluriformity and its relationship to Johannine citation of the Scriptures will be discussed more fully in the chapters ahead.

[7] Davies, "Reflections About the use of the Old Testament in the New," 134.

[8] Christopher D. Stanley, "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; *JSNTSup* 148 (1997)), 21.

[9] Stanley, "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations," 18–19.

Such apparently intentional adaptation of scriptural citations by NT authors, however, often causes concern to modern readers. In response to that concern, it is not adequate to claim that the authors were unaware that they were not following the precise wording of their original texts, or *Vorlagen*, or that they were simply manipulating the wording of the scriptural text to create artificial proof texts to support their own tendentious arguments.[10] A more adequate viewpoint will recognise, first of all, that it is not possible to know in every case precisely what their *Vorlagen* were. Further, though each author had a unique method of reading and applying the language of Scripture, all were nonetheless following accepted literary standards of the day. NT authors were working "consciously but unreflectively within the bounds of contemporary literary conventions that shaped the way quotations might be handled."[11]

When reading citations of the Scriptures in the FG, therefore, one may ask how much the form of citation, and any interpretative activity in the process of citing, would have been apparent to the intended audience.[12] When John cited a scriptural text, if indeed he altered or adapted the wording in some instances to bring out a point more clearly,[13] such textual variance was an acceptable Jewish exegetical practice[14] that served to make the Scriptures relevant to a contemporary audience.

It is thus unlikely that the form of citation itself was ever a primary issue for John's readers. His citations would have been completely acceptable to his entire audience, Jewish or non-Jewish. Rather, the issue at stake was the application of those Scriptures to the person of Christ. In first-century C.E. terms, John was not manipulating the Scriptures with a heavy hand, nor tearing them from their contextual roots as proof-texts and forcing them to fit a personal theological agenda.

> [Gospel writers were not] engaged in the wholesale adaptation of the OT text to suit their applications. On the contrary, a high degree of correspondence

---

[10] Stanley, "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations," 26–27.

[11] Stanley, "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations," 26–27.

[12] Stanley, "The Rhetoric of Quotations," 52.

[13] Paul Miller, " 'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him': The Gospel of John and the Old Testament," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 128.

[14] Miller, " 'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him,' " 128. As Miller points out, both Jews and Christians wanted to make Scripture meaningful to new situations, but each group had different aims. The Rabbis wanted to shape Jewish identity and practice; Christians wanted to show that the Scriptures anticipated Jesus.

> with known text traditions is characteristic of the verbal OT references in every stratum of the tradition.[15]

When the Passion Narratives of both John and the Synoptics are reviewed, not only is there demonstrated a "high degree of correspondence with known text traditions," but there is also "a remarkable faithfulness to the original context in the way OT verses have been appropriated to interpret the passion."[16]

## Specific Scriptures Used in the Johannine Passion Narrative

From which passages, then, does John draw his scriptural citations? In evaluating the use of the Scriptures in the passion of the FG, Lindars notes that quotations used come from a rather narrow range of writings, i.e., primarily from Isaiah 53, certain Psalms, and Zechariah. First of all, John concentrates the whole story of Isaiah 53 into the single paradoxical idea of "lifting up of the Son of Man."[17] This passage, he says, was used by the church, taking the lead from Jesus himself, to work out the meaning of the death of Jesus: how suffering and death are consistent with the claim to be Messiah, and why this does not of necessity compel belief.[18] Secondly, John uses the Psalms to explain various other aspects of the Passion, including scorn for the humiliations suffered by Jesus, with references made primarily to Psalm 69.[19] Thirdly, regarding the use of Zechariah, Lindars finds in Zechariah 9:9 an explanation for the entry into Jerusalem, and in 12:10 an explanation for the piercing of Jesus on the cross.[20]

Perhaps it is not coincidental that John cites the Twelve only from Zechariah, and specifically from the corpus of chapters 9–14. At a minimum, John accepts the authority and the relevance of two specific passages of that writing for their relationship to his presentation of the passion of Christ. He is in good company with the synoptic writers in doing so, for the significance of Zechariah in the passion of all four Gospels must

---

[15] Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 375.

[16] Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 376–77. See also C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1953). Online: http://www.katapi.org.uk/AccordingToTheScriptures.htm.

[17] Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 79, 83.

[18] Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 79–88.

[19] Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 88–99.

[20] Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 110, 122.

be recognised.[21] Of the four prominent passages that are used in the Gospels, Zech 9:9–10, 11:12–13, 12:10, and 13:7, each features an individual whose description is applied to Jesus in the NT. These different descriptions of a single figure were ultimately related to Yahweh, and Zechariah regarded the composite figure as Messianic.[22]

John's purpose in citing from Zech 9:9 and 12:10 appears to be more than a simple explanation for why Jesus entered Jerusalem and had to die in this particular fashion. John is not shoring up a weak argument with a more prominent authority, nor is he "dependent on scripture for legitimating testimony."[23] He is allowing an ancient voice of prophetic encouragement to speak into an otherwise baffling series of events. These promises continue not only to be relevant to his contemporary audience in some sense of historical parallel, but now also give an added dimension of perception into the Lord's Passion. For John, God's redemptive purposes in the post-exilic prophetic hope envisioned by II Zechariah now offer specific points of insight into the passion of Christ.

## Intertextuality

John's use of specific scriptural quotations reminds us that a text cannot be studied in isolation, but must be seen in a web of texts, or in the "intersection of textual surfaces."[24] A reciprocal relationship between John's writings and the Jewish Scriptures does not allow the one to be read in isolation from the other.[25] One can only understand Jesus in the FG against the backdrop of those Scriptures. John's overall use of citations may reflect various categories of intertextual relationship with their scriptural antecedents. The scenario becomes even more complex when seen in the light of a biblical-textual context that includes a number of potential textual forms and variant readings for a given citation. Both of John's Zecharian citations fall into categories of high complexity, as will be seen ahead. This at once calls for humility and caution in categorising

---

[21] Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 173.

[22] Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 174–75.

[23] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 156.

[24] Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J.L. North* (ed. Steve Moyise; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 14. Here Moyise is quoting J. Kristeva.

[25] Claus Westermann, *The Gospel of John in the Light of the Old Testament* (trans. Siegfried S. Schatzmann; Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), 1.

and analysing intertextual relationships between John's citations and their sources, as well as one's interpretation of the meaning of those texts within the Johannine narrative.

Nonetheless, Moyise's term "dialogical intertextuality," "where the interaction between text and subtext is seen to operate in both directions,"[26] is a phrase that may be helpful in describing John's use of Zecharian quotations. Through John, the voice of II Zechariah speaks on behalf of the uplifted and crucified King Jesus. At the same time, the events of the crucifixion of the one considered Lord by the early Christian church now open up new depths of meaning for the Zecharian passages cited.[27] Here John is by no means presenting an act of "creative correction," "misinterpretation," or even less, a "perverse, wilful revisionism," characteristic of the intertextual relationships between some citations in other literature and their source.[28] Quite the contrary, he is valuing the prophetic tradition in the Twelve as providing insightful interpretation of the events of Christ's Passion.

To what extent a particular audience within the reach of the FG in its contemporary setting would have been aware of the full context of II Zechariah and the intertextual relationships between John's narrative and those writings, is a matter of speculation. However, the effect of Zechariah's textual influence, from a mere superficial first hearing of the cited words alone, to a more profound understanding of the full context of the writing from which the citations are drawn, brings an added dimension to events in the passion of Christ. The triumphal entry, the piercing of Jesus on the cross, and the looking upon him after his piercing, receive the stamp of scriptural authority as illumined by Zechariah.

---

[26] Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the OT in the NT," 17.

[27] Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the OT in the NT," 37. One would be remiss to ignore the postmodern perception of potential "polyvalency" or multiple ways of configuring interaction between texts and subtexts in John's use of Zechariah. Further, one must be aware that every reader brings their own intertexts to the reading of Scripture. Entering one's story-world from John's story-world and vice-versa has the potential to transform both intertextually.

[28] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 17. Here Hays is quoting Harold Bloom's *Anxiety of Influence*.

## Conclusion

In the passion of the FG, the writer presents the final episodes of the life, ministry, teaching, death, and resurrection[29] of Jesus the Christ that flow from significant passages of the Jewish Scriptures. When seen from his mature perspective of post-resurrection reflection upon the Scriptures and the events of the life of Christ, John is proclaiming the Christ who fulfills Scripture, and presenting him as the full revelation of the heart of God. Among various Scriptures cited in the Johannine passion, significant Zecharian quotations are placed at the beginning and conclusion of his passion narrative. Although these two Zecharian citations demonstrate complexity of form, John is citing the Scripture in keeping with contemporary Jewish practice and following accepted literary standards of the day. His final quotation of Zech 12:10 will now be studied in detail.

[29] John does not explicitly cite the Scriptures in his resurrection narrative. However, he does connect the necessity of resurrection to the Scriptures in 20:9.

CHAPTER FOUR

# THE TEXTUAL HISTORY OF ZECHARIAH

An important step toward an adequate understanding of this passage is to place it in its historical context. This chapter will take the passage back historically as far as the data will allow, in order to understand as much as possible about the history of its textual development. This will provide a more adequate perspective from which to evaluate the text-critical issues raised by the verse in Hebrew, as well as its Greek translation.

## Introductory Matters

A brief look at introductory matters for the book of Zechariah will provide a preliminary orientation leading into the textual history of the passage. A definitive stance regarding introductory matters is beyond the limits of this study. Nonetheless, an overview of these issues will enhance one's perspective on the more detailed matters regarding the text of the passage and the verse itself.

### *Zechariah 1–8*

Chapters 1–8 of Zechariah have traditionally been ascribed to the prophet of the same name. He is designated by the Hebrew text as בֶּן־בֶּרֶכְיָה בֶּן־עִדּוֹ son of Berechiah and (grand)son of Iddo, a young man of priestly descent who returned from Babylon with the exiles in later 6th century B.C.E. Textual references in the early chapters of Zechariah allow his public ministry as prophet to be placed within a clear historical context. A contemporary of Haggai, he began his public proclamation in Jerusalem in October/November of 520 B.C.E., and continued for approximately 2 years to November/December of 518 B.C.E.

The content of Zechariah 1–8 is closely connected to the person of the prophet himself and to his ministry of proclamation. No controversy surrounds the identification of the prophet with the writings bearing his name in these chapters, nor is there doubt that at the very least, the hand of the prophet Zechariah himself is behind the essence of their content. One is on safe ground in dating their composition to within a generation

of his public ministry, and Meyers and Meyers may indeed be correct that the work was prepared specifically for the rededication of the Jerusalem temple in 516 B.C.E.[1]

### *Zechariah 9–14*

When one turns to chapters 9–14, commonly referred to as "II Zechariah," the absence of precise historical references in these undated prophecies makes it extremely difficult to place them within a specific historical situation.[2] These chapters no longer seem to be related directly to the years 520–518 B.C.E., or even of necessity to the person of Zechariah himself.[3] Zechariah's name is never mentioned, nor is there reference to any easily identifiable person or event.[4] The information necessary to locate chapters 9–14 within a particular historical context, if available at all for that material, is not readily evident.

### *Unity of Zechariah*

Not only is it difficult to locate II Zechariah historically, but literary differences between chapters 1–8 and 9–14 are quite apparent as well, easily leading one to the conclusion that there is a major disconnect between the two sections. Such significant differences between the two sections, as well as differences within chapters 9–14 themselves, have traditionally been taken as evidence of internal disunity and potentially multiple authorship.[5] Historically, scholars have supported various non-Zecharian solutions for the source or sources of chapters 9–14.[6] Even among contemporary scholars,

---

[1] Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, "Jerusalem and Zion after the Exile: The Evidence of First Zechariah," in *Sha'arei Talmon* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov, assisted by Weston W. Fields; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 122.

[2] Rex Mason, "Why is Second Zechariah so Full of Quotations?" in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence* (ed. Christopher Tuckett; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2003), 26.

[3] David L. Petersen, "The Book of the Twelve / The Minor Prophets," in *The Hebrew Bible Today* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 124.

[4] Kenneth M. Craig, Jr., "Interrogatives in Haggai-Zechariah: A Literary Thread?" in *Forming Prophetic Literature* (ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; Sheffield: JSOT, 1996), 244.

[5] Cf. S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1913), 354; M. Delcor, "Les Sources du Deutéro-Zacharie et ses Procédés d'Emprunt," *RB* 59 (1952), 411; Walter Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), 398–399; Ernst Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (rev. Georg Fohrer; trans. David E. Green; Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 468.

[6] Edward J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950), 270–273, offers a summary of Zecharian authorship theories from Mede to mid-20th century.

there appears to be no consensus that offers a single convincing theory regarding unity or authorship, but rather an admission of the complicated literary process behind these chapters.[7]

In spite of such a complicated scenario, however, there are those who argue in favour of literary unity within chapters 9–14,[8] and even within the entire book of Zechariah,[9] based on various dimensions of comparative vocabulary, linguistic analysis, theological continuity, and grammatical and thematic congruities. Proto-Zechariah is arguably the most significant literary source for the content of II Zechariah.[10] At the very least, Zechariah's influence can readily be seen behind the writing of 9–14. Whether or not any of the material of those chapters comes directly from his own hand or even from the same era, his spirit is evident, and the book is rightly identified with him as prophet.[11] Further, there is evidence that the juxtaposing of 9–14 with 1–8 is not a matter of chance, but speaks at a minimum for a purposeful linking of the two writings with unified themes and identity of purpose.[12]

However, all such discussion must of necessity be based upon analysis of the written text as handed down to us, for there are precious few historical data from the era of original writing to the time of oldest extant manuscript fragments of the book from which to draw any further solid conclusions regarding the early history of the writing.

---

[7] Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, "Zechariah 12:1–13:6," in *Bringing Out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14* (ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd; *JSOTSup 370*; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 132.

[8] Cf. James A. Hartle, "The Literary Unity of Zechariah," *JETS* 35 (June 1992): 145–157; Paul R. House, *The Unity of the Twelve* (Sheffield: Almond Press/Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 96–97; Risto Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1–8 and 9–14* (Abo: Abo Akademi University Press, 1996), 231–232.

[9] Cf. Théophane Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie Malachie* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), 141; Yehuda T. Radday, and Dieter Wickmann, "The Unity of Zechariah Examined in the Light of Statistical Linguistics," *ZAW* 87 (1975): 30–55; Yehuda T. Radday and Moshe A. Pollatschek, "Vocabulary Richness in Post-Exilic Prophetic Books," in *ZAW* 92 (1980): 333–346; Hartle, "The Literary Unity of Zechariah," 145–157; House, *The Unity of the Twelve*, 96–97; Ehud Ben Zvi, "Twelve Prophetic Books or 'The Twelve': A Few Preliminary Considerations," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts* (ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; *JSOTSup* 235, 1996), 125–155; Boda and Floyd, eds., "Zechariah 12:1–13:6," 12; Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 213–235.

[10] Boda and Floyd, eds., "Zechariah 12:1–13:6," 142–143.

[11] Hartle, "The Literary Unity of Zechariah," 157.

[12] R.J. Coggins, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 68; Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 3; Paul Redditt, "Zechariah 9–14: The Capstone of the Book of the Twelve," in *Bringing Out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14* (ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd; *JSOTSup 370*; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 306–308.

### *Zechariah and the Book of the Twelve*

It may very well be impossible to pinpoint the time in which Zechariah's writings were considered authoritative by the Jewish community as prophetic literature, and to be included in the collection of the Twelve Prophets. As history passes the turn of the century in 200 B.C.E., however, one begins to perceive glimpses of the history of Zechariah at the important point of its inclusion in that collection. The collection of the Twelve itself was considered authoritative within the Jewish community by the time of the writing of the prologue to the book of Ben Sira, which recognises the existence of the Twelve in both Hebrew and Greek translation. Ben Sira speaks not only of τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν (Sir Prologue 1), but verse 49:10 in the body of the work refers also to καὶ τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν (Sir 49:10). However, there is no unified agreement as to the date of the prologue itself. Representative estimates include Beentjes at 132 B.C.E.,[13] and Würthwein at 116 B.C.E.[14] Assuming the suggested dates in middle to late second century B.C.E. are valid, then the dating of the original work itself, and by inclusion the reference in 49:10, would of necessity come from an earlier time period, and may best be placed in early second century B.C.E.[15]

There is wide agreement that the collection of the Twelve was considered an authoritative prophetic collection, copied on a single scroll, and meant to be read together by early second century B.C.E.[16] Fuller's DSS research confirms the same, which leads him to claim "that the collection of the twelve definitely achieved final form later than the Pentateuch, although by the beginning of the second century B.C.E. at the latest

---

[13] Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Canon and Scripture in the Book of Ben Sira," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* (ed. Magne Saebo; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 593–594.

[14] Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament* (trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1979), 51.

[15] Cf. Russell Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve: The Evidence from the Judean Desert," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts* (ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; *JSOTSup* 235; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 91, who estimates the date of Ben Sira at approximately 190 B.C.E.; cf. also Beentjes, "Canon and Scripture in the Book of Ben Sira," 593, who claims a dating of 200–180 B.C.E., and who sees "the most plausible inference" for the dating of the original work as ca. 190 B.C.E.

[16] James D. Nogalski, "Intertextuality and the Twelve," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts* (ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; *JSOTSup* 235; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 102; see also Petersen, "The Book of the Twelve / The Minor Prophets," 95.

(Ben Sirah 49:10)."[17] In support, Fuller cites specific Qumran manuscript evidence:

> At about 150 B.C.E., the oldest manuscript evidence seems to confirm that the collection of the Twelve is complete (4QXII a & b). This we knew indirectly from Ben Sirah / Sirach 49.10 (ca 190 B.C.E.) dating to approximately forty years earlier than these manuscripts.[18]

A precise dating of Ben Sira's writing or the collection of the Twelve, however, would give little help in discerning when Zechariah 9–14 was added to chapters 1–8, or if the entire corpus of Zechariah was placed in the collection of the Twelve in its present form.[19] Nonetheless, Qumran manuscripts, i.e., 4QXIIa, e, & g, place Zechariah 9–14 along with 1–8 among the earliest extant fragments.[20] This evidence speaks for a text of Zechariah that includes the entire fourteen chapters in the collection of the Twelve, and which dates to within a half-century of the estimated date of completion of the collection. Whether or not one is willing to date chapters 9–14 to the same era as chapters 1–8 in terms of original composition,[21] it must be acknowledged that earliest extant evidence does indeed place the two sections together in the same collection. While as much as three centuries may have passed between the writing and these extant fragments, the presence of Zechariah's 14 chapters in that collection suggests their acceptance as authoritative prophetic writing by early second century at the latest.

In sum, confirmation from Ben Sira indicates an authoritative collection of the Twelve at about 200 B.C.E., and the oldest extant evidence in Hebrew places Zechariah's entire 14 chapters together at approximately 150 B.C.E. Thus from the earliest evidence regarding the collection, Zechariah 9–14 is meant to be read together with chapters 1–8, and Zechariah 1–14 is meant to be read as an integral part of the Twelve.

---

[17] Russell Fuller, "Textual Traditions in the Book of Hosea and the Minor Prophets," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 253, fn 18.

[18] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 91.

[19] Redditt, "Zechariah 9–14: The Capstone," 312–318, 321, offers a summary regarding views on the addition of Zechariah 9–14 to 1–8 and to the collection of the Twelve.

[20] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 99–100.

[21] Cf. Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 234.

## The Hebrew Text of Zechariah

### *An* Urtext *for Zechariah*?

Little data is available regarding the formation and transmission of the Hebrew text of Zechariah during the early era between the original writing(s) and the oldest extant manuscripts. One cannot answer definitively exactly what the Hebrew text looked like as it left the hand of the writer(s) of Zechariah, nor precisely what happened in the first stages of textual transmission. Further, the earliest extant manuscripts of Zechariah, due to their fragmentary nature, do not allow for a detailed description of the history of the text even from that era.

The complexity of the questions regarding original composition of any book in Scripture leads some to refrain from taking any definitive stance regarding *Urtext, Urschrift*, original or early text, or original composition.[22] It is apparent that the development of a given book of the Scriptures was a layered process, and any search for a supposed "original text" is complex at best.[23]

Tov, for example, admits the existence of variant textual traditions, yet holds to the concept of a single original text, or single finished composition from which all others derived.[24] That single text in the MT tradition continues to be central to his thinking, with other traditions viewed with lesser authority as independent witnesses to the transmission of their contents.[25] In contrast, Ulrich articulates the concept of a "diachronic complexity of the text," seeing at any one time the pluriform nature of the text, with not one, but two or more editions of a given book in circulation.[26]

> Today we have a great deal of new information about the shape of the Bible before 135 C.E. . . . The scriptures were pluriform . . . until at least 70 C.E.,

---

[22] Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 167.

[23] Eugene Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James Vanderkam; Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 92.

[24] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 177.

[25] Cf. George J. Brooke, "On Isaiah at Qumran," in *"As Those Who Are Taught." The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (ed. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 77. Here Brooke challenges Tov's viewpoint.

[26] Eugene Ulrich, "The Community of Israel and the Composition of the Scriptures," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 339.

> probably until 100, and quite possibly as late as 135 or beyond . . . we can now see more clearly that there were multiple literary editions of many of the biblical books . . .[27]

Ulrich sees the multiplicity of textual forms and textual traditions as the norm in the Second Temple period, as opposed to the concept of "occasional aberrations from a single standardized text."[28] His viewpoint of textual development accounts adequately for the evidence from DSS,[29] perceiving "discernible text types or text traditions to which certain MSS belong even though they have minor disagreements with each other."[30]

That diachronic complexity and multiplicity of textual forms applies equally to the prophetic books. Specifically referring to the prophets, Ulrich sees the entire prophetic corpus in its textual traditions moving through a process of editing and "creative reshaping" into the editions that have been handed down to us.[31] Ulrich's viewpoint of diachronic complexity of the text provides a plausible scenario for the development of the biblical text from the era of extant manuscript evidence.

The presence of text types among the DSS that differ substantially from one another, yet which appear to have been viewed with equal religious authority, raises the question whether any *Urtext* of dominant importance existed in that era.[32] In the specific case of Zechariah, one could certainly posit as a working hypothesis a single *Urtext* from which all others were derived, but the earliest manuscript evidence for the book does not favour such a viewpoint. From the vantage point of those earliest manuscripts,

---

[27] Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making," 92.

[28] Eugene Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," *RevQ* 14 (1989), 221.

[29] Eugene Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 89. Ulrich defines what he means by "multiple literary editions: "By multiple literary editions I mean a literary unit . . . appearing in two or more parallel forms . . . which one author, major redactor, or major editor completed and which a subsequent redactor or editor intentionally changed to a sufficient extent that the resultant form should be called a revised edition of that text . . . the fundamental principle guiding this proposal is that the scriptures, from shadowy beginnings until the final, perhaps abrupt, freezing point of the Masoretic tradition, arose and evolved through a process of organic development. The major lines of that development are characterized by the intentional, creative work of authors or tradents who produced new, revised editions of the traditional form of a book or passage."

[30] Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 221.

[31] Ulrich, "The Community of Israel and the Composition of the Scriptures," 330.

[32] Armin Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 27.

one can see evidence for textual pluriformity in a global fashion for the entire Jewish Scriptures, with the same being true for extant fragments of Zechariah. Hebrew manuscript evidence, including the prophets, the Twelve, and Zechariah, though indicating the unmistakable importance of the proto–MT as one tradition, also demonstrates clearly a pluriform textual tradition from 150 B.C.E. through the first century C.E., with little indication of preference or dominance of one textual tradition over another. Adherence to the concept of a single original text may be possible in theory, but is not plausible in view of the extant evidence. Earliest fragments clearly demonstrate pluriform textual traditions.

### *Standardisation of the Hebrew Text*

From an era of multiple literary editions and textual pluriformity, the Scriptures moved to an era of textual standardisation in a single predominant tradition. It is well established that by the end of the first century C.E., a Hebrew recension reflecting the essence of the MT came to have primary authority in Judaism. The cataclysmic events of 70 C.E., together with the resultant political and social realities, elicited responses on the part of Judaism and its religious leadership of the era that led to the establishment of a single official text.[33] The rabbis of that time, with particular manuscripts in hand that survived the flames, so to speak, brought to the place of prominence the text known as the proto–MT.[34] This proto–MT became the standardised Hebrew text for Judaism during the era of 70–135 C.E. There is evidence that the standardisation of the Hebrew text in that era was not an abrupt development, however, but was rather the culmination of factors already at work in the previous two centuries. The call for a uniform and accurate text did not originate at the end of the first century C.E. or the beginning of the second, but evidence for the same can be seen as early as the second century B.C.E.[35] As Van der Woude sees it, standardisation was in process long before A.D. 70, and the events of A.D. 70 should not be

[33] Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of the Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: The British Library, 2002), 14.

[34] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 97. "By the end of the first century C.E., probably before the revolt of Bar Kochba, the form and shape of the text of the Hebrew Bible seems to have been standardized so that the entire Jewish community used a text which was identical in terms of its content as well as its text."

[35] Cf. Moshe Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible, Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judean Desert," *JAOS* 76 (1956), 160–61; Menahem Mansoor, "The Massoretic Text in the Light of Qumran," *VTSup* IX (1963), 311;

seen so much as launching the beginning of textual standardisation, but rather as precipitating the final stage of the process.[36] "There is, however, evidence that also indicates that the last part of the emergence of the text did not happen overnight but forms *the later stages of a longer process of traditio-historical character*."[37] On the other hand, the move toward a standardised text does not of necessity argue for purposeful elimination of rival textual traditions,[38] as the result only of deliberate recensional and text-critical activities.[39]

Though the era of 70–135 C.E. includes this move toward stabilisation, growing predominance, and successive refinement of a particular recension known as the proto–MT, it is true as well that the last two pre-Christian centuries can yet be characterised by diversity of textual traditions, with such alternative textual traditions continuing to exist in parallel fashion.[40] To the extent that Qumran can be seen as giving a reliable suggested scenario for all of Palestine,[41] it offers ample evidence that textual pluriformity existed in a broader context, with such variant texts acceptable to the Jewish community at large.[42] Qumran manuscripts, themselves indicative of the larger biblical textual milieu of the era, do show evidence of a move toward a standardised text, yet they also reflect

---

Robert Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Quere* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971), XL.

[36] Adam S. Van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament," in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism* (ed. J.N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez; Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1992), 162.

[37] Magne Saebo, "From Pluriformity to Uniformity: The Emergence of the Massoretic Text," in *On the Way to Canon: Creative Tradition History in the Old Testament* (*JSOTSup* 191; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 45.

[38] Bertil Albrektson, "Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible," *VTSup* XXIX (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), 62. A contrary viewpoint is expressed, for example, by Federico Perez Castro, *El Códice de Profetas de el Cairo* (Madrid: Cárdenal Cisneros, 1979), 11, who speaks of "… el triunfo de la corriente textual llamada masorética sobre las otras que quedaron desplazadas …"

[39] Van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity," 162. However, the MT is not, of course, a flawless text, as Van der Woude points out, and the fact that the rabbis seemed to show no embarrassment over multitudes of incompatible readings, argues for other factors at work in the emergence of a predominant textual tradition.

[40] Cf. Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," *Pontificum Institutum Biblicum* 48 (1967), 244–250, who sees two major eras in the text's development: 300 B.C.E.–0, characterized by diversity of textual traditions; and 0–150 C.E., the era of stabilization and growing predominance of the 'Massoretic type' text. He also adds a final period of 150 to medieval times, during which there is only minor variation from the Massoretic textual tradition.

[41] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 194.

[42] Brooke, "On Isaiah at Qumran," 74–76.

the presence of various textual traditions existing side-by-side. It may even be said that there was evidently no decided work within the Qumran community toward a single prominent recension,[43] nor is there evidence to suggest that there was exclusive commitment to a specific text type for any particular book.[44] The multiplicity of textual traditions was an issue about which the Qumran community seemed to have little concern; they apparently could live with such textual ambiguity. That diversity and pluriformity of texts existing in Qumran manuscripts indicates that the same general attitude toward Scripture existed beyond the confines of that community.[45] Thus the same can be safely said about other communities, both Jewish and Christian; a fixed text was not considered necessary for a book to have authority, for "... evidently, differing forms of the text were acceptable."[46] Despite the move toward an authoritative text tradition, continued diversity and pluriformity of texts obtained, and simply did not seem to be problematic for Second Temple Judaism.[47] It is evident that it was not necessary, in the mind of the Qumran community, to equate the concept of sacred text with that of a single standardised text,[48] for there appears to have been no "preferred" textual form in their community that could be said to have greater authority than another.[49] As Ulrich clarifies in relationship to canonical development, this was an era, not of "canon" *per se*, but of "canonical process" where a work could be accepted as authoritative apart from the demand for a precisely fixed text.[50] Hebrew textual pluriformity prior to 70 C.E. thus indicates the presence of the MT or proto–MT as a prominent stream, yet one which was

---

[43] Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The Text Behind the Text of the Hebrew Bible," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Hershel Shanks; New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 139–155.

[44] Patrick Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975), 213, 217.

[45] Dwight D. Swanson, "How Rewritten is 'Rewritten Bible,' " (Unpublished manuscript, 2007), 10.

[46] Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1999), 93.

[47] Swanson, "How Rewritten is 'Rewritten Bible,' " 11.

[48] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 97–98.

[49] Dwight D. Swanson, "Timothy H. Lim: Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters," *JSS* 47 (Spring 2002), 153.

[50] Eugene Ulrich, "The Canonical Process and Textual Criticism," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov, with the assistance of Weston W. Fields; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 273ff.

not exclusive of other textual traditions. The proto–MT, which itself was not precisely identical to the later development of the MT, was a prominent textual tradition among several within Judaism at the turn of the era. Whatever viewpoint one might hold regarding the ultimate authority and dominance of the MT tradition after the era of 70–135 C.E., such singular, dominant authority for that tradition cannot be imposed upon the era prior to 70 C.E.

As one includes Zechariah and the Twelve within this broader picture, it is safe to say that the proto–MT of the Twelve, which included Zechariah in its integral fourteen-chapter totality, was moving toward pre-eminence in the last two pre-Christian and the first of the Christian centuries. Though it may have been part of the central textual tradition in Jerusalem temple circles, however, it was not the only one, but continued to be one among various Hebrew textual traditions in existence, as evidenced by DSS textual pluriformity in general, in the Twelve, and in Zechariah.

### *Extant Textual Evidence*

Extant textual evidence for Zechariah does indeed confirm the presence of pluriform textual traditions. Qumran fragments cannot take one directly to the original Hebrew version of the Twelve, yet they certainly offer a wealth of insight regarding early stages of the transmission of the text.

The presence in Cave 4 of seven scrolls of the Twelve indicates a great amount of interest in this material on the part of the Qumran community. It was obviously granted great status,[51] with a largely stable textual tradition.[52] The veneration of the prophetic material is seen in the way the text was handled: the prophets seemed to have a text that was unchanged in the course of interpretation, perhaps indicating authoritative status gained during an earlier stage in the Second Temple period,[53] in contrast to the Torah, which could be "expanded and rewritten."[54]

Although the content of the Book of the Twelve was held in high esteem by the Qumran community, it is true as well that they did use "variant forms of the same text alongside each other,"[55] in the era prior

[51] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 96, "... it is incontrovertible that the community at Qumran considered the Twelve, certainly a collection of reasonably great age, to be the word of Yahweh revealed to the prophets..."

[52] Brooke, "On Isaiah at Qumran," 82.

[53] Brooke, "On Isaiah at Qumran," 82.

[54] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 97.

[55] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 97.

to final standardisation of the Hebrew text. Indeed, Qumran fragments give clear indication of the existence of more than one literary edition for the Twelve.[56] Just as Qumran evidence overall reveals a pluriformity of texts existing side-by-side,[57] the scrolls of the Twelve also reflect a varied textual tradition.

The manuscripts from Cave 4, though they are all "distressingly fragmentary,"[58] give an indication of the textual diversity in Palestine in the second century B.C.E. through the first century C.E.[59] Overall, Fuller divides them into the following categories: 1) 2 out of 7 manuscripts are aligned with the proto–MT tradition; 2) 2 out of 7 are closely aligned with the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint; 3) 2 are considered non-aligned; and 4) one is too small to indicate clear textual character.[60] Even if one does not agree with every category assigned to a particular text, DSS evidence does offer a solid case for more than one literary edition of the Twelve.[61]

In Fuller's analysis of specific biblical and *pesharim* manuscripts of Hosea in 4QXIIc and 4QpHosa, he arrives at the following conclusions:

---

[56] George J. Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (ed. André Lemaire; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 22.

[57] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 169. Tov calls for recognition of four broad categories [speaking of the entire Qumran texts]: 1) texts produced by Qumran scribes; 2) proto–MT and pre-Samaritan texts; 3) texts close to the Hebrew *Vorlage*; 4) and non-aligned texts. With such strong evidence for textual pluriformity, Tov is convinced that for virtually every biblical book one can "almost speak of an unlimited number of texts." However, one cannot overlook the fact that Tov's categories are not universally accepted, and Swanson reminds us that they are certainly not considered by all to be adequate to explain the phenomenon of the biblical manuscripts from Qumran; "the relationships between Tov's categories . . . prove to be much more complicated," Swanson, "Timothy H. Lim," 153.

[58] Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 207.

[59] Russell Fuller, "The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets," *CurBS* 7 (1999), 83. See also Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 87, who indicates the results of his examination of the most ancient manuscript evidence from Qumran for the Hebrew Book of the Twelve: "The ancient manuscript evidence in Hebrew ranges in date from approximately the middle of the second century B.C.E. (4QXIIa&b) to the second half of the first century C.E. (Mur 88). It includes seven scrolls from cave IV at Qumran which date for the most part from the Hasmonean period (ca. 150–30) and seem to have been complete scrolls of the Minor Prophets."

[60] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 87. Cf. Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 22, who would essentially agree with Fuller's categories, but not with every conclusion of Fuller regarding the assignment of individual manuscripts to a certain category.

[61] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 34. There is as much variety for the texts of the Twelve, says Brooke, as for other Scriptures, such as Exodus, Jeremiah, or Psalms.

of the 13 readings that were examined, 7 variants can be described as orthographic; among 4 remaining readings, 2 are unique and difficult to explain; 2 of 4QpHosa equal LXX and do not equal MT. Thus 4QpHosa is an independent witness, he claims, which stands relatively close to LXX.[62] For Fuller, 4QXIIc and 4QpHosa indicate the existence of additional forms of the HB text of Hosea more closely related to G than to M.[63] From his study, it is evident that within DSS manuscripts, there were Hebrew witnesses related to both G and M, yet a majority of Hebrew manuscripts of the Twelve from Cave 4 are closer to the Greek tradition or family than to the tradition or family of M.[64] However, he admits that this is a fine distinction in the Twelve, because the two traditions or families are not so far apart.[65] Fuller's concluding observation after analysing these fragments of Hosea is this: between the last half of the first century B.C.E. and the first part of the first century C.E., Hebrew biblical manuscripts were in use at Qumran which were not identical to either MT or the LXX. This is true for Hosea as well as the text of the Twelve.[66]

Skehan also notes in general that Qumran materials for the Minor Prophets (and Jeremiah) show "notable and extensive differences" from the consonantal MT,[67] suggesting at a minimum two Hebrew textual traditions. In analysing specific fragments, Sinclair studies Hosea 1QXIId (Hosea 1:7–25) and concludes that the text of these fragments agrees with MT and diverges from LXX at only one point. While that point in and of itself provides nothing decisive for the Hebrew textual tradition of Hosea, other published fragments of Qumran Hosea texts, he says, are from the "Palestinian recentional tradition."[68] Overall, this evidence leads Sinclair to posit two textual traditions for Hosea: Palestinian (Qumran and MT), and Egyptian (Septuagint).[69]

---

62 Fuller, "Textual Traditions," 247–251.

63 Fuller, "Textual Traditions," 252. Though a comparison to R would be helpful, Fuller admits, lack of fragments in R precludes comparison, so one cannot say if they stand closer to G or to R.

64 Fuller at that time was not ready to make statements regarding 4QXIIg; mss studied to that point (1991), indicated they were independent witnesses, but also closer to G than to M.

65 Fuller, "Textual Traditions," 253.

66 Fuller, "Textual Traditions," 253.

67 Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," 214.

68 Lawrence A. Sinclair, "A Qumran Biblical Fragment: Hosea 1QXiid (Hosea 1:7–25)," *BASOR* 239 (1980), 64.

69 Sinclair admits that further study is needed to settle the question of text types for the Minor Prophets. In regard to recensional provenance, it is evident that Sinclair is heavily indebted to Cross' theory of textual traditions. Nonetheless, the fact that he sees evidence

Similar conclusions are reached by Collin, whose analysis of the textual history of Micah leads him to argue in favour of three text types for the book.[70] Brooke's analysis of the Twelve in the DSS also leads him to conclusions that are similar regarding multiple Hebrew traditions.[71]

Thus, a number of important conclusions regarding the Twelve can be drawn from the DSS. There are multiple Hebrew textual traditions present. There are witnesses which are related to both LXX and MT, but which are not identical to either of them. A number of texts from Cave 4 are indeed closer to the LXX than to MT, though overall the two main traditions are not far apart.

A look at the specific extant Hebrew fragments for Zechariah quickly reveals that their number is quite limited. Of specific DSS documents, those that contain fragments of Zechariah are 4QXIIa, 4QXIIe, 4QXIIg, and Murabba'at 88. When evidence is limited to those that contain fragments of Zechariah 9–14, they include 4QXIIa, containing a portion of Zechariah 14:18, 4QXIIe, which contains fragments of 12:7–12 (along with some passages from earlier chapters), and 4QXIIg, which contains fragments of Zechariah 10:12–11:2, and 12:1–3. Only 4QXIIe contains fragments from 12:10. It is now important to examine some of the outstanding characteristics of these manuscript fragments.

First of all, as the oldest extant fragment of the Twelve, 4QXIIa carries tremendous significance.[72] The hand is semi-cursive, dating from the early Hasmonean Period, ca. 150–125 B.C.E.[73] It is seen as non-aligned in terms of its textual affiliation, agreeing sometimes with the MT, sometimes with the LXX, and sometimes going its own way,[74] which for Fuller, "demonstrates the variability of the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible. . . ."[75] Brooke agrees that it is textually non-aligned, but he assigns its "irregular

---

of two traditions is indicative of textual pluriformity in Hosea, and perhaps in the entire corpus of the Minor Prophets.

[70] Matthieu Collin, "Recherche sur l'histoire textuelle du Prophete Michee," *VT* 21 (1971): 281–97.

[71] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 30.

[72] Russell E. Fuller, "4QXIIa," in *Qumran Cave 4—X The Prophets* (DJD XV; ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 221. "This manuscript is a copy of the Minor Prophets from the middle of the second century B.C.E., thus making it the oldest extant manuscript of the Twelve. Its significance is not merely its age, but even more so in its palaeography, textual nature, and the order of the books in the final section of the Twelve."

[73] Russell E. Fuller, "The Minor Prophets Manuscripts from Qumran, Cave IV" (PhD diss., Harvard, 1988), 6.

[74] Fuller, "The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets," 83.

[75] Fuller, "4QXIIa," 221.

semicursive hand" simply to mid-second century B.C.E.; and he agrees that its distinctive character shows that it was not an original Qumran manuscript, but was brought from the outside.[76]

This oldest extant witness to the Twelve, which includes a single verse from Zechariah 14:18, gives some very important indicators: it connects Zechariah (9-)14 with Malachi and Jonah in the Book of the Twelve, though with an alternative order of the books;[77] its non-aligned character also speaks for Hebrew textual pluriformity in mid-second century B.C.E.

4QXIIe is seen by Fuller as being very close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, and dating from 75–50 B.C.E.[78] Brooke agrees with a mid-first century B.C.E. dating, but after surveying the variants, finds no significant agreement with the LXX. In contrast to Fuller, he finds it preferable to categorise the manuscript as non-aligned.[79]

4QXIIg is a poorly preserved scroll which presents some unique challenges: "the poor state of preservation of this manuscript poses uncommonly difficult problems."[80] Its hand is described as late Hasmonean or early Herodian, from approximately the last third of the first century B.C.E. It is dated by Fuller at 50–25 B.C.E.,[81] and more generally by Brooke as falling in the last third of the first century B.C.E.[82] Its orthography is fuller than that of MT, adding an occasional י and a frequent ו; it is a "carefully written manuscript with few errors and with nine corrections, all by the original scribe . . . six corrections agree with M, and three disagree."[83] For Fuller it stands close to the proto–MT textual tradition in most readings, though Brooke would readily classify it as non-aligned.[84]

The characteristics of 4QXIIg reveal some important facts. First, the addition of "an occasional י and a frequent ו" tells of the potential source

---

[76] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 21–22.

[77] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 22. Though it is assumed widely that Jonah may indeed follow Malachi, it is also quite possible, as Brooke has aptly pointed out, that Malachi and Jonah may have belonged together closer to the middle of the collection, which again raises the question of two or more literary editions of the Twelve.

[78] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 89, 98. See also Fuller, "The Minor Prophets Manuscripts from Qumran, Cave IV," 117, whose original estimate was ". . . a semiformal hand of the late Hasmonean Period, approximately 75 B.C.E. (+ or –25)."

[79] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 24.

[80] Russell Fuller, "4QXIIg," in *Qumran Cave 4—X The Prophets* (DJD XV; ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 271.

[81] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 98.

[82] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 24.

[83] Fuller, "4QXIIg," 272–274.

[84] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 25.

of variants for Zechariah 12:10 regarding the spelling and vocalisation of אליו/אלי, which will be analysed ahead. Secondly, the presence of corrections in the manuscript, some agreeing with MT and some disagreeing, relates to the issue of correction of manuscripts toward the emerging proto–MT, yet at the same time it does not show slavish adherence to the same. Thirdly, this manuscript dates from the same era as the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll. Though it does not of necessity relate directly to that manuscript, it is indicative of the textual issues at hand in the same era, i.e., fuller orthography, and the presence of corrections, not all of which agree with MT.

The Murabba'at manuscripts are also pertinent to this study. Specifically, Mur88 of the Twelve Prophets does contain fragments of Zechariah 1:1–4, as well as portions of 9 other books of the Twelve. Though there are no fragments of Zechariah 9–14, nonetheless, their characteristics are of great importance.

First of all, they may be dated generally to the second half of the first century C.E.,[85] and perhaps more specifically to some time near the end of that century.[86] As to the text, there is general agreement regarding its close relationship to MT. Greenberg stated that the Murabba'at fragments "agree in every detail with our text."[87] Add to that Mansoor's description: "... which were also *essentially* identical with the Massoretic tradition."[88] F.M. Cross stated that the Murabba'at texts in general testify "to an archetypal recension as the ancestor of all Medieval Hebrew biblical manuscripts."[89] The Murabba'at Minor Prophets Scroll in particular reveals few real variants, and according to Cross, "is virtually identical with the Masoretic consonantal tradition."[90] Van der Woude would also admit only slight variation in his claim that both Masada and Wadi Murabba'at manuscripts contain the MT tradition, "apart from a few most negligible details."[91]

---

[85] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 87.

[86] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 27.

[87] Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible," 165.

[88] Mansoor, "The Massoretic Text in the Light of Qumran," 310, (italics added).

[89] F.M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F.M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975), 184.

[90] F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 29, fn 2.

[91] Van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity," 157.

Fuller also says that the Murabba'at Minor Prophets Scroll has been described as "virtually identical to the Masoretic Text," yet in his own detailed description he lists a number of variations from MT.[92] Those variations include א/ע confusion, *qere/ketib*, inter-linear corrections and additions,[93] though it is indeed fair to describe it as a "proto-Masoretic text."[94] The additions and corrections that it contains, says Fuller, "always correct the text of Mur88 to agree with the reading of the consonantal text of MT. This correction of the text of Mur88 may be indicative of the process of standardisation of the consonantal text."[95]

Brooke agrees that the text is very close to that represented by the MT, but clarifies the variants: as might be expected, there are a few orthographic variants and confusions in words involving *qere/ketib*, but he feels that the only substantial variant is an assimilation to the text of Psalms 77:18 in the hymn of Hab 3:10.[96] The single section of Zechariah in Mur88, i.e., 1:1–4, interestingly enough, is identical to MT to the letter.[97]

It is undeniable that there is a great amount of agreement between Murabba'at and the MT tradition, and additions and corrections always move the manuscript in the direction of agreement with the consonantal MT. However, the differences between Murabba'at and MT should not be passed over lightly, nor should the case be overstated. It is true that the manuscripts "represent in all essentials the textual tradition which is later attested by the medieval masoretes,"[98] but Albrektson cautions that "... there is a striking tendency to overstate the agreement with MT, which is certainly striking, but not complete."[99] Further, "in particular ms 88 ... contains some variants which make it difficult to speak of a strict standardisation affecting every detail."[100] It would be more accurate to say that the Murabba'at fragments in general, and Mur88 in particular, do not argue for *strict* conformity to a standardised text. Their close comparison to MT does speak of the textual climate at the end of the first century C.E. and the movement of standardisation toward the proto–MT. Nonetheless,

---

92 Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 88.

93 P. Benoit, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, "Les Grottes de Murabba'at," (DJD II; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1961), 183; Luis Vegas Montaner, *Biblia del Mar Muerto* (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1980), Xff.

94 Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 88.

95 Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 89.

96 Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 27.

97 Benoit, Milik, and de Vaux, "Les Grottes de Murabba'at," 205.

98 Albrektson, "Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text," 58.

99 Albrektson, "Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text," 58.

100 Albrektson, "Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text," 58.

some variants do exist, and the reality of their fragmentary nature would allow even further potential variation within a broader framework of general conformity to MT.

In sum, it would be fair to the evidence to say that Mur88 in particular, and the Hebrew manuscripts of the Twelve in general, do not offer overwhelming evidence of "significantly diverse textual traditions,"[101] yet they do indeed present evidence of variant textual traditions. A balance between the two realities must be maintained. As Qumran texts in general demonstrate the pluriformity of Hebrew textual traditions during the final centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E., those texts which contain the Twelve Prophets echo that same pluriformity to a limited extent, yet they lend support as well to the evidence for the movement toward standardisation of the Hebrew text. However, it must be admitted that even in the era of final impetus toward standardisation, extant manuscript evidence speaks against strict, precise conformity to MT, and in favour of some degree of continued textual pluriformity.[102]

Regarding manuscript evidence for II Zechariah in particular, although it is quite fragmentary, it parallels other Qumran evidence as it indicates the following: 1) Hebrew textual pluriformity from the earliest extant evidence; 2) latter first century C.E. movement toward the proto–MT, albeit without precise conformity; and 3) some dimension of continued textual pluriformity even into the era of standardisation of the proto–MT.

## The Greek Text of Zechariah

Having examined the Hebrew text of Zechariah, it is important now to turn to the Greek text.

### *The Greek Translation of the Book of the Twelve*

*Date*

It is not possible to pinpoint the date of the translation of the Book of the Twelve into Greek. It is quite relevant to establish parameters for dating the translation, however, indicating the era in which it was translated.

---

[101] Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making," 90. Here Ulrich also footnotes Fuller, "The Minor Prophets Manuscripts from Qumran, Cave IV," 152–54.

[102] Cf. Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie*, 141, regarding textual changes within MT tradition, as well as the evident problems presented in some passages by MT vocalization.

The translation of the Pentateuch provides a beginning point of reference for the subsequent translation of the Twelve. It is widely agreed that the Pentateuch itself was translated in the third century B.C.E. The Letter of Aristeas is a most important witness to the event, and though it admittedly contains some dimension of propaganda, as well as legendary accretions, it nonetheless contains some kernels of historical truth. One can legitimately read it in a general fashion as referring to a translation of the Pentateuch sometime in early to mid-third century B.C.E.[103] If the particular reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus is assumed to be the era,[104] it can then be placed more carefully within the parameters of 285–246 B.C.E.[105] Further, if one follows carefully the detailed historical arguments of Collins, who taps sources independent of Aristeas and yet confirms the essence of that basic report, then one can join her in placing the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek precisely in the year 281: "We must therefore conclude that a translation of the Pentateuch was completed under Ptolemy II, in the closing days of 281 B.C.E."[106]

The letter of Aristeas, however, obviously does not refer directly to the Twelve. There appears to be no historical data that would allow us to decipher the time of the original translation of the Old Greek translation of that corpus (OG12). Such lack of specific historical indicators might lead one to dismiss the issue entirely,[107] but it is at least possible to ascertain the era in which it was translated.

It would seem quite safe, first of all, to assume that the Book of the Twelve was translated after the Pentateuch, which would place it in mid-third century B.C.E. at the very earliest. As seen above, the prologue to the book of Sirach offers some recognition of the existence of the prophetic corpus as a distinct group of writings among the three divisions of

---

[103] Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 55. Cf. also Van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity," 164, who states that Aristeas undoubtedly supports a LXX translation of the Pentateuch in 3rd Century B.C.E.

[104] Cf. F.C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammer of Septuagint Greek* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905; repr., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendricksen Publishers, 1995), 10ff. Though admitting the difficulties in dating, they are inclined to date the original translation of the Pentateuch in the reign of Ptolemy I Soter.

[105] Ellis R. Brotzman, *Old Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1994), 73.

[106] Nina Collins, "281 B.C.E.: The Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek Under Ptolemy II," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990), 477.

[107] As did Kenyon: "When and by whom the other books were added is quite unknown," Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1953), 25.

the Hebrew Scriptures. Three times a similar phrase is used by the writer to describe them: "... διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων..." (Sir Prologue 1, 5), and "... ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων..." (Sir Prologue 24–25). Further, as the author recognises not only the difficulty of his own task of translation, but also the difference between the Scriptures in Hebrew and their translation into Greek, he at the same time tacitly acknowledges the existence of a Greek translation of the entire Scriptures: "Not only this book, but even the Law itself, the Prophecies, and the rest of the books differ not a little when read in the original" (Sir Prologue 24–26 NRSV).

Based on these statements, the translation of the Hebrew Book of the Twelve into Greek would have been complete by the time of the writing of Sirach's prologue. Estimates for the translation of the Twelve range from the beginning of the second century B.C.E. to the end of the same.[108]

Part of the difficulty in dating the translation of the Twelve is the difficulty of dating Sirach's prologue itself. As seen above, the work of Sirach fits well within the early second century B.C.E. and can be placed in the era of the high priesthood of Simon, i.e., from 220–195 B.C.E.[109] In addition, Qumran's oldest manuscript evidence for the Twelve indicates that the collection is complete by mid-second century B.C.E. (4QXII a & b),[110] which gives credence to the reference in Sirach 49:10, and allows for the

---

[108] Brotzman, *Old Testament Textual Criticism*, 73. In a summary viewpoint, Brotzman feels that the entire process of Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures was complete by 150 B.C.E. at the latest. Cf. Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," 81, who is rather noncommittal and nebulous in stating that the OG is "... a translation that started with the Torah probably around 280 B.C.E. and was gradually completed over the next two centuries or so." Cf. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 12: when speaking of the Prophets, Ulrich pushes the date back into the century in which the Pentateuch itself was translated. He believes that the Former Prophets were translated "probably by ca. 200," and sees it as very likely that the Latter Prophets were translated at the same time. John W. Wevers, "Septuagint," in IDB 4:276, is more definite in his estimate: "The whole Old Testament [in Greek] was probably complete by the middle, certainly by the end, of the second century B.C." This is in essential agreement with Thackeray's earlier estimate, who felt that the order of translation was roughly that of the order of the Hebrew Scriptures, with Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve coming near the close of the second century B.C.E.; Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1909), viii. Swete was more precise, stating that it was safe to infer that all the prophets were translated before 132 B.C.E.; Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 24.

[109] Cf. Beentjes, "Canon and Scripture in the Book of Ben Sira," 593–594, who would date the original work ca. 190 B.C.E.

[110] See Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 91.

possibility that the collection of the Twelve Prophets was complete by early second century B.C.E.

Granted, there is little historical evidence upon which to lean in dating the Greek translation of the Twelve. Taking all of the above data into account, however, it is safe to conclude that the OG12 was completed after 281 B.C.E., as early as 200, and quite certainly no later than the last quarter of the second century B.C.E. This places the translation of Zechariah and the Twelve within the parameters of 200–116 B.C.E.

*Place of Translation*

Egypt has commonly been considered the place of translation. If Thackeray had "… no reason to doubt that we are concerned with writings which emanate with few, if any, exceptions from a single country, namely Egypt,"[111] Wevers is not quite so easily convinced: "… a likely though not fully certain presupposition."[112] For Cimosa, on the other hand, the matter of the translation of the Twelve is settled: "the Alexandrian origin of the Greek translation of the Minor Prophets is sufficiently certain."[113] Though there is a measure of doubt, there is no significant scholarly evidence to date that indicates an origin other than Egypt for the translation of OG12.

*Purpose*

If indeed Egypt was the place of translation, the question immediately arises regarding the reason for such a work in that context. The first and most obvious purpose for any translation is to make the translated document available to those who do not comprehend the language of the original. The motives for the translation as mentioned by Aristeas, i.e., the curiosity of the Egyptian ruler regarding the Jewish sacred writings and his desire to complete his library, may be questioned as legendary. Whatever role Ptolemy Philadelphus played in facilitating the translation, it is quite plausible that the primary purpose of the LXX translation of the Pentateuch was to make the Hebrew Scriptures available to the Jewish community in Egypt who, for the most part, no longer understood Hebrew.[114] Further, there is broad agreement that the Scriptures were translated into Greek

---

[111] Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 71.

[112] Wevers, "Septuagint," 276.

[113] Mario Cimosa, "The Greek Translation of Zechariah," in *IX Congress of the IOSCS* 45 (1995), 93.

[114] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" in *ZAW* 99 (1987), 63.

with a liturgical purpose, in order to bring the prophetic readings to the synagogue worship in contemporary language.[115] It is most likely that the OG12 continued that liturgical purpose in synagogue worship, which would include a serious concern for faithfulness to the translated Scripture.

*Translator*

The name of the translator of OG12 has been lost in the sands of time; it appears impossible to know exactly who that person, or persons, might have been. While the name is unknown, the traditional scholarly viewpoint holds that a single hand is behind the translation of the entire corpus of the Twelve.[116] Many prominent voices on the subject tend to agree, though some with caution. For example, Muraoka is certain that as part of the prophetic literature, "... it [OG12] represents a coherent, homogeneous unit."[117] Tov is cautious on the subject: "[It was] apparently produced by one individual or one group...."[118] Cimosa, however, reviews a number of studies on the matter and concludes that "... it is sufficiently sure that there was only one translator."[119] Van der Kooij accepts without argument that OG12 was the work of one translator.[120] More recently, Brooke agrees that it was probably translated by a single person.[121]

There is a considerable amount of consistency and homogeneity to the entire translation of the Twelve that supports that viewpoint. Unity of the Twelve from the hand of a single translator, however, is not a foregone conclusion, as aptly pointed out by C. Robert Harrison, Jr.[122] Harrison may

---

[115] Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 28–29, contrary to the letter of Aristeas, saw the purpose of the Septuagint Pentateuch not to enhance Ptolemy Philadelphus' library, nor to extend acquaintance with the Scriptures to the non-Jewish world, but rather "... to supply a version that would be intelligible to the Greek-speaking Jew when read in the ordinary services of the synagogue." Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 194, agrees in classifying the overall Septuagint translation as a "non-vulgar" text, that is, conservative, and "... preserved with great caution by specific groups who used them in the liturgy."

[116] The same hand is indicated as well for much of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

[117] Takamitsu Muraoka, "Towards a Septuagint Lexicon," *VI Congress of the IOSCS* 23 (1986), 258.

[118] Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present," *VII Congress of the IOSCS* 31 (1991), 351.

[119] Cimosa, "The Greek Translation of Zechariah," 93.

[120] Arie van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Zechariah as Witness to an Early Interpretation of the Book," in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence* (ed. Christopher Tuckett; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2003), 53.

[121] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 33.

[122] C. Robert Harrison, Jr., "The Unity of the Minor Prophets in the LXX: A Reexamination of the Question," *Bulletin of the IOSCS* 21 (1988): 55–72.

not have thoroughly demolished all previous arguments to the contrary, but at the very least, the question of translational unity is still open.

Any person able to carry out such a translation would of necessity be sufficiently literate and learned, and familiar enough with both languages to effect such a work. Of necessity also would be a familiarity with the biblical text. Given the presence of more than a single manner of reading and interpreting the Hebrew text in ancient Judaism, that person would very likely be familiar as well with at least one reading tradition of the biblical text.[123]

It is not a simple matter in analysing the text to discern between two translators, a translator and a subsequent editorial hand, a variation of translation technique or exegetical agenda from the same translator in different passages, or the following of a particular reading tradition. A number of overlapping issues are simultaneously at play in the question of translational unity and must be taken into account, including redactional and editorial history that would include the possibility of more than a single literary edition of a book. Evidence that appears to speak for inconsistencies of translation or for multiple translators, may offer evidence as well for multiple parallel literary editions.

If one assumes that the book of the Twelve was translated by a single person, one would then attempt to explain all purported translation technique, including apparent inconsistencies, within a single translational and exegetical schema. If, on the other hand, one begins by assuming more than a single translator, then one can allow for varying translation technique, word usage, and exegetical nuances as coming from the different perceptions and agenda of multiple translators. Overall, however, rather than assuming multiple translators, it is prudent to hold to the scholarly consensus of a single translator for the Twelve, while giving some measure of flexibility for his translation of various authors and contrasting passages. In sum, without overlooking the presence of some potential evidence to the contrary, the Twelve can safely be considered a translational unity, which, by definition, would mean a single translator for the entire book of Zechariah.

### *A Greek* Urtext*?*

The scenario developed thus far presents a translation of the OG12 in early to mid-second century B.C.E., of Egyptian provenance, making the

[123] Van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Zechariah," 54.

Scriptures available to a Greek-speaking Jewish community for liturgical purposes. If indeed such a conceptual framework is deemed to be accurate, then the translation falls within the era in which it is believed that the Book of the Twelve was finalised in Hebrew as a collection, and meant to be read together.[124]

Since the oldest extant Hebrew manuscripts of the Twelve date from that same era, and indicate quite clearly the presence of multiple literary editions, it should not be assumed that the translation of the Twelve was based upon a *Vorlage* identical to MT. Extant witnesses allow one to posit a textual tradition as *Vorlage* that is similar, but not identical to MT.

The earliest extant Greek manuscript of the Twelve dates from a century later than its original translation at the very least, and possibly as much as two centuries later. Such a complete lack of Greek evidence from the era of translation makes it very difficult to establish any firm conclusions regarding an *Urtext*. If indeed de Lagarde's overall viewpoint of a single *Urtext* for the Septuagint has been more compelling than Kahle's *Targumim* hypothesis,[125] evidence for OG12 does potentially fit within de Lagarde's general theory.[126] The possibility is not to be denied that verbal translation of the Twelve took place in the synagogue before the written translation of OG12 appeared on the scene. However, there appears to be no textual evidence whatsoever for *targumim* in the case of OG12 from the second century B.C.E., or any era afterwards. However, the acceptance of de Lagarde's theory, and the related concept that a translation can be conceived as a single act,[127] must be balanced by the recognition that de

---

[124] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 33. Assuming a single translator, he sees the Septuagint as providing evidence for the collection of the Twelve at the time of its translation.

[125] Albert Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," *VT* XXXV (1985), 298. Pietersma states succinctly his viewpoint that "... the Lagarde-Kahle controversy of so-called *Ur-Septuaginta* versus Targum hypothesis has been decided in favour of Lagarde, and to the best of my knowledge, no current LXX scholar seriously doubts that an *Ur-Septuaginta* did exist."

[126] Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 15, supports this point: "Lagarde's view that the present variation in LXX MSS is traceable back through three ancient recensions to a single original translation receives confirmation by nearly a century of extensive research by a wide spectrum of Septuagintal specialists and by the data available from the Qumran and other very early MSS." Mogens Müller, "The First Bible of the Church," in *JSOTSup* 206 (1996), 43, also agrees, saying that the R Minor Prophets fragments confirm Lagarde's *Urtext* and negate Kahle's targum theory.

[127] Emanuel Tov, "The History and Significance of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* (ed. Magne Saebo; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 52.

Lagarde applied his abstract claim of a single original source for MT in an uncritical fashion to his view of the development of the OG.[128] Such recognition minimises the credibility of de Lagarde's theory.

Further, there is no evidence for OG12 that demands a single original manuscript. If, as earliest DSS evidence indicates, parallel Hebrew editions of the Twelve existed in the same era, there is no data that would demand the verdict of a single *Urtext* for the Greek translation. One could posit more than a single Greek translation of the Twelve as explanation for subsequent variant Greek textual traditions. The "diachronic complexity"[129] of Hebrew textual traditions could conceivably characterise to some extent the production of Greek translations as well. Further, the possibility of an eclectic translation that drew upon parallel Hebrew textual traditions could easily explain apparent translational inconsistencies, as it could also offer an explanation for the apparent presence of multiple translators.

In sum, no available evidence argues persuasively for a single conclusion regarding an original text of OG12. It does allow for a single Greek translation, yet at the same time, it leaves open the possibilities of more than a single original text.

*Translational Issues*

To Alexandrian Judaism, Diaspora Judaism in general, and ultimately to the early Christian community, the OG as a whole was seen as an inspired translation, bringing the ancient Scriptures to a new era. Even further, it was a body of writings that took on an inspired life of its own. Hellenistic Jewish exegetes took no pains to distinguish between the Greek translations and the Hebrew text, using "neither a 'Hebrew Bible' nor an 'Old Testament.' "[130] Strangely enough, it was the Greek wording of the sacred text, not the Hebrew, that was the first to be considered as inalterable and verbally inspired.[131]

At the turn of the era, Philo epitomises the highest possible perception of the LXX Scriptures as no daughter of the Hebrew, but a sister and an equal, even "one and the same" with the original, and in communion with

---

[128] Robert A. Kraft, "Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy's Devanciers, 40 Years Later," in *Bulletin of the IOSCS* 37 (2004), 3. Kraft would call de Lagarde's *Urtext* theory for the LXX, "an ideal abstraction which is actually lost for the entire Greek Bible."

[129] Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," 89.

[130] Folker Siegert, "Early Jewish Interpretation in a Hellenistic Style," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* (ed. Magne Saebo; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 144.

[131] Siegert, "Early Jewish Interpretation in a Hellenistic Style," 144.

the very spirit of Moses.[132] His exalted viewpoint was not the only opinion in circulation, however. The OG might have been quite intelligible and highly esteemed by Alexandrian Jewry, but there is considerable evidence that the translations had not long left the hand of their translators before their inadequacy and inaccuracy was felt, as indicated in the Prologue to Sirach.[133]

This issue is a central concern behind the writing of Aristeas as well, which comes from the same era as Sirach's Prologue. Whatever viewpoint one might hold as to the motivation behind the letter of Aristeas, whether defending the original third-century B.C.E. translation of the Pentateuch against would-be revisers,[134] or defending another subsequent edition, the issue of Hebrew Scriptures in contrast to their Greek translations was evident. The presence of a letter such as Aristeas of necessity presupposes some degree of controversy over the Greek translation in light of the Hebrew textual tradition.[135] The same controversial issue was present at the time of the second century B.C.E. translation of the prophets, and can be seen as a motivating factor behind subsequent correction toward the Hebrew, as evidenced, for example, by the Minor Prophets Scroll.

The LXX in Zechariah is characterised as holding generally close to the MT, but differences must be recognised, both in the possibility of an alternative Hebrew textual tradition as *Vorlage*, as well as differences in vocalisation upon the same consonantal text.[136] Though all the pieces of the puzzle for the origin and transmission of the Twelve in either Hebrew or Greek are by no means available, a very significant and illuminating piece of evidence is found in the fragments of the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll. The fragments represent an attitude toward the Greek translation of the Scriptures that the translation needed correction toward the emerging predominant Hebrew textual tradition. If there was some measure of

---

[132] Sebastian Brock, "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990), 304.

[133] See Sirach Prologue 20. It might be added that Sirach was not dealing primarily with an issue of inspiration, but with the early recognition of the difficulty of translating from Hebrew to Greek. His agenda does not appear to be one of criticizing the LXX *per se*, nor necessarily suggesting that it needed revision, but of perceiving the gap between the two languages.

[134] Sebastian Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," in *The Witness of Tradition. OTS 17* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 23.

[135] Van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity," 165, sees the assumed Hebrew text as "almost certainly" equaling the proto–MT tradition.

[136] Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie*, 143.

hostility in the final two centuries B.C.E. to any idea that the LXX needed revising or correcting, the hands behind this manuscript represented an opposing viewpoint.[137]

### *Earliest Extant Textual Evidence for the Twelve: 8ḤevXIIgr*

Discovered in August of 1952,[138] this group of fragments, designated as 8ḤevXIIgr by its discovery in a cave of Naḥal Ḥever,[139] comprises the oldest extant Greek manuscript evidence available for the Book of the Twelve. Dating of the manuscript is not precise, but is generally established as falling between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E.[140] This manuscript represents the fragmentary remains of a leather scroll of the Minor Prophets in Greek. Its foremost examiner, D. Barthélemy, designated it simply as "R" for "recension", "... je pars de l'hypothèse que R est une recension de la Septante ancienne."[141]

Barthélemy's prolific pen gave the first significant comment upon the manuscript. In September of the year of its discovery, he offered his preliminary assessment: it is a Jewish recension of the OG of the Minor Prophets from the end of the first century C.E.; it is of unknown provenance;[142] it is an attempt to conform more closely to a Hebrew textual tradition; it is a work which played a very important role in its time, initiating the work of revision of the OG that would become the

---

[137] Brock, "To Revise or Not to Revise," 305–307. Brock highlights this coexistence within Judaism of the late Hellenistic and early Roman period, "In Philo and in the Greek XII Prophets fragments, then, we have clear evidence of two completely different, and conflicting, attitudes to biblical translation current around the turn of the common era: the basic point at issue was 'do the original Greek translations require revising or not?' ... two totally different attitudes to Biblical translation, one seeing the need for revision, the other denying this need."

[138] With further fragments excavated from the site in 1961, see Brock, "To Revise or Not to Revise," 302.

[139] Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

[140] Estimates vary considerably. Dominique Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un Chaînon Manquant de L'Histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 (1953), 18–29; repr. in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975), 127–139, for example, leans toward a later date with his estimate of latter first century C.E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 25–26, from handwriting analysis, prefers an earlier date in first century B.C.E. However, the larger parameters regarding dating are generally agreed upon: 50 B.C.E. to 50 C.E.

[141] Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Première Publication Intégrale du Texte des Fragments du Dodécaprophéton. VTSup X* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), 179.

[142] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 90. Here Fuller expresses the doubt that remains regarding the manuscript's origin: "Although R was found in Palestine, the provenance of this manuscript or that of its Hebrew *Vorlage* is not known."

great task of the next generation.[143] As a working hypothesis, he indicated a four-fold textual identification: 1) with the text cited by Justin; 2) with the common base for Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; 3) with the source of the hebrewisms of the Coptic versions; 4) with the Quinta of Origen's Hexapla.[144] Further, Barthélemy stated that R may actually preserve some elements of the ancient OG of the Minor Prophets, in contrast to the modern text of the same as represented by Ziegler's *Duodecim Prophetae*.[145]

Barthélemy's subsequent detailed study of the manuscript provided much added insight, but did not alter the essence of the original hypothesis.[146] Additional work from other scholars has also helped to refine and complement Barthélemy's contribution. First of all, according to Fuller, R represents a Hebrew *Vorlage* very close to the MT, differing from it "only in small ways."[147] Tov notes the word-for-word correspondence of R to the Hebrew text: "... the literal, even pedantic character of R; the tendency to represent consistently every Hebrew word with a corresponding Greek equivalent...."[148] Further, however, Tov is convinced that the proximity between R and the MT is to be explained in terms of R's revision of the LXX not towards the MT *per se*, but rather towards a different Hebrew text that was similar to the MT.[149]

Secondly, R is representative of the movement to correct the OG of the Minor Prophets toward the emerging proto–MT: "[the amendments] show that already before the work on the 'new' translations from the second century C.E. had begun, there had already been attempts to amend the Greek text."[150]

Thirdly, R also shows clear evidence of extensive influence after its time. In this regard, Fuller agrees completely with Barthélemy: "... R agrees especially with Symmachus, Aquila, the so-called 'Theodotion', the so-

---

143 Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un Chaînon Manquant," 18–29.

144 Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un Chaînon Manquant," 18–29.

145 Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 170.

146 Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 46, gave detailed arguments for placing this manuscript within a larger group of translations, called the *kaige* group, for their characteristic translation of the Hebrew וגם by καίγε, under the direct influence of the literalistic hermeneutic of the first century C.E. Palestinian Rabbinate.

147 Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 90.

148 Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 140.

149 Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 146.

150 Müller, "The First Bible of the Church," 41–42.

called Quinta, as well as with W and the biblical text cited by Justin (ca. 130 C.E.)."[151]

It is difficult to overstate the importance of this manuscript. First of all, as a recension, R is, by definition, not an original translation. As an apparently systematic revision of the Twelve Prophets, it is representative of a movement to correct the OG12, which was already in a developed form at that time,[152] to conform more closely to a prominent Hebrew tradition. "Il a seulement fait de son mieux pour rendre la LXX plus fidèle à l'hébreu qu'il avait sous les yeux."[153] Indeed, it is not an isolated phenomenon, but representative of "... widespread activity in Palestinian Jewish circles correcting the LXX on the basis of the Hebrew ...," which can be "... safely taken back into the second half of the second century B.C. ..."[154]

Secondly, though it may demonstrate clear evidence of having been corrected toward a Hebrew text that is very close to MT, its Hebrew *Vorlage* is neither precisely identical to that of the LXX nor to MT. It does represent a Hebrew *Vorlage* that is very close to the MT, as Fuller describes it: "[R is] ... a conscious revision of the LXX to agree with a Hebrew text which was not quite identical with the consonantal text of MT, but differed from it only in small ways."[155] Barthélemy saw the underlying Hebrew text as almost identical to the classical MT: "Le recenseur utilisait un texte hébraique consonantique pratiquement identique au TM classique. ..."[156] The case may have been overstated, however, as Van der Woude clarifies: "[R] ... *shows marked similarities* with the proto-Masoretic tradition which became generally current after 70 A.D."[157] One cannot insist that the *Vorlage* for R be seen as precisely identical to MT or proto–MT tradition, for Hebrew textual pluriformity of the era would allow for more than a single possibility.

Thirdly, R may actually preserve some elements of the ancient OG12 that are in contrast to later LXX manuscripts. Barthélemy is optimistic in this regard: "... mais il est parfaitement possible qu'en certaines de leurs

151 Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 90.
152 Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 18.
153 Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un Chaînon Manquant," 131.
154 Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," 26–27.
155 Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 90.
156 Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 198.
157 Van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity," 161, italics added.

particularités nos fragments préservent le texte de la Septante ancienne, alors que le texte de Ziegler n'en présenterait qu'un état recensé.[158]

Fourthly, R also shows evidence of extensive influence after its time. Barthélemy's hypothesis regarding the influence of R and the movement that produced it upon biblical texts of following generations, has been largely vindicated by subsequent research.[159]

Admittedly, a single fragmentary text cannot be the final definitive statement regarding the entire Greek textual situation of the Book of the Twelve in that particular era. Nonetheless, R does capture some important elements indicative of that situation, offering significant insights into the biblical textual scenario at the turn of the era.

## Conclusion

Each of the issues discussed in this chapter has important ramifications for the study of Zechariah 12:10. Many elements of literary unity between chapters 1–8 and 9–14, including shared words, phrases, and themes,[160] would prompt one to respond to textual questions with a careful consideration not only for the immediate context, but the context of the entire Zecharian corpus as well. This allows one to review issues and attempt to clarify difficulties in II Zechariah from the perspective of similar relevant issues in proto-Zechariah.[161]

If the pluriform nature of Zechariah's oldest fragments is seriously considered in the evaluation of any particular passage, one will allow for more than a single Hebrew textual tradition, and will view MT as one consideration among several, both in the analysis of the Hebrew text and the analysis of the translation of the text into Greek.

The dating of the Greek translation of the Twelve to 200–116 B.C.E., together with the absence of authoritative data regarding translational

---

[158] Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 170. However, the indicators are not clear enough to make a strong case for any particular recension as a textual basis; cf. William W. Combs, "The Transmission History of the Septuagint," *BSac* 146 ( July–September 1989), 265.

[159] Cf. P. Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," *StPatr* 1 (1957), 346, "... the only four known remnants of the Quinta, the Jewish translation found by Origen in Nicopolis near Actium in Greece, have their exact parallel in the text [R]." See also Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 90.

[160] Redditt, "Zechariah 9–14: The Capstone," 306–308.

[161] Van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Zechariah," 59.

*Urtext*, speaks to several significant issues. First of all, the pluriformity of oldest extant Hebrew fragments that date from the same era confirms the presence of more than a single possible Hebrew *Vorlage* in the hands of the translator(s). Once again MT cannot be assumed as the Hebrew text for the translation of the Twelve, neither its consonantal text, nor its vocalisation tradition. Secondly, the absence of extant Greek manuscripts from the era of its original translation precludes the assumption that any particular readings from either Hexapla or major LXX mss of the fourth century C.E. and beyond are of necessity equal to the OG12. Renderings which might differ from MT regarding vocalisation or syntax can be attributed not only to the reading and interpretation of the text current in the milieu of the translator,[162] but also to a variant *Vorlage*, or to more than a single Greek textual tradition.

Thus, when comparing Hebrew and Greek witnesses for a specific passage, one should not assume at the outset that any particular reading is original and the others secondary or edited editions; any of them might indeed prove to be witness to an earlier text form, while the others could reflect secondary editions edited for exegetical or theological motives.[163]

As the oldest extant Greek manuscript for the Twelve, both the readings and characteristics of R must be taken seriously into account when evaluating any particular passage of the Twelve. Since it represents the need felt at the turn of the era to bring the Greek of the OG12 more closely in line with the Hebrew, this precludes once again the assumption that a particular LXX reading is of necessity the OG reading, or that the LXX as such has greater textual validity. Also, since it is not known exactly what Greek manuscript lay on the desk of the reviser, it should not be assumed that it was equal to LXX. R may give glimpses of the OG12 that reflect older, more original, and more accurate readings than traditional LXX or any modern critical text. Since the hand behind R perceived the LXX as needing revision, the LXX reading in any passage of the Twelve may legitimately be called into question, for its accuracy *vis-à-vis* MT or any particular Hebrew text is never a given, but requires careful text-critical evaluation.

R as an extremely influential revision cannot be discounted as aberrant or marginal. Though the entire manuscript of R is fragmentary, and

---

[162] Van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Zechariah," 55.

[163] Cf. Ulrich, "The Canonical Process and Textual Criticism," 283–86, regarding editions of I Samuel and Jeremiah.

only a few verses of Zechariah have survived, it must be given careful consideration in any evaluation of Zecharian texts. Even if the fragments of R are not extant for a particular passage, as is the case with 12:10, yet the existence of R and its characteristics as a revision of the LXX are important to consider while examining a particular textual reading.

These conclusions will be taken into consideration as the investigation of Zech 12:10 continues.

CHAPTER FIVE

# A TEXT-CRITICAL REVIEW OF ZECHARIAH 12:10

This chapter surveys the text-critical issues related to the Hebrew and Greek readings of Zech 12:10. First of all, the goal of this text-critical exercise must be defined as clearly as possible. Next, as the Greek form is a translation from Hebrew, before dealing with the text-critical issues of the verse in Greek, it is necessary to have an adequate overall perspective on LXX translation technique. With that preparatory basis, the text-critical issues of the specific verse in both Hebrew and Greek can then be evaluated in detail by means of a word-by-word and phrase-by-phrase analysis. The study will examine the form of the verse as found first of all in the most widely known and accepted textual traditions, i.e., the Hebrew MT and the Greek LXX. Text-critical issues raised by those texts and the differences between them will be evaluated, with additional insights gleaned from other extant manuscripts and fragments, ancient versions, and citations of the verse.

## Goal of the Text-Critical Exercise

The potential goals of Hebrew textual criticism, LXX textual criticism, and the relationship of the one to the other, are manifold. Thus it is important at the outset to sharpen the focus regarding the expected result of this text-critical exercise. First, a look at Hebrew textual criticism.

One might accept the challenge to seek for the earliest possible form of the text, i.e., the "earliest attested text."[1] The text considered "earliest" should undoubtedly be given great importance. However, even if that text could be discerned, it must be seen in relationship to the larger history of the book and the passage, and its importance balanced by the readings of other extant texts.

[1] Cf. Dominique Barthélemy et al., eds., *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Project* 5 (New York: United Bible Societies, 1980), VII, who have dubbed this the "Second Phase" of Hebrew OT textual development.

If one were to join Tov in reaching for his "ultimate goal" in the process of textual criticism, it would be that of establishing the *Urtext*,[2] or finished Hebrew literary edition accepted as authoritative by Jewish tradition.[3] At best, by Tov's own admission, this is a "presumptuous and precarious undertaking," because often we lack sufficient criteria for deciding upon the original reading.[4] Even further, however, it appears by no means to be an adequate response to the available evidence regarding the developmental process of the text. There may indeed be a measure of legitimacy to the search for the most original reading in a particular passage.[5] Yet the diachronic complexity and pluriform nature of the extant witnesses to the developmental process of the text call into question Tov's goal of establishing an *Urtext*.

One might accept the assumption of Van der Kooij regarding the "original text," that "... it is likely that there has been an original text of a biblical book in the sense of the first (complete) edition."[6] Allowing for the possibility that such a text is either a proto–MT or pre-MT version, one could join him in aiming at that "original" text that underlies available copies and/or editions.[7] Even so, however, one still has not advanced far from Tov's position of attempting to establish an *Urtext*.[8] Van der Kooij's call to "... go as far back as the textual evidence allows and requires"[9] is commendable. However, if one were simply to reconstruct the oldest stage achievable in the textual history of the passage, it would not of necessity be the "original text."

---

[2] Emanuel Tov, "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules," *HTR* 75 (October, 1982), 432.

[3] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 177.

[4] Tov, "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings," 432.

[5] Tov, "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings," 432.

[6] Arie van der Kooij, "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries," in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: The British Library, 2002), 174. "A related question is whether one should define the goal of textual criticism as the establishment of the proto–MT or of an earlier, pre-MT, version. This, of course, depends on the available textual data and their evaluation. In my view, one should aim at the 'original' (complete) text in the sense of the text/edition, whether it is proto–MT or pre-MT, that underlies available copies and/or editions. That is to say, one should go as far back as the textual evidence allows and requires."

[7] Van der Kooij, "Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible," 174.

[8] Nor has one advanced from Reider's earlier viewpoint of using the LXX to establish a pre-MT. Joseph Reider, *An Index to Aquila* (completed and rev. Nigel Turner; *VTSup* XII; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), vii.

[9] Van der Kooij, "Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible," 174.

Weren begins by taking a similar position. He is in favour of such a reconstruction, seeking the hypothetical version, or "archetype," back to which one may trace all extant witnesses. To Weren, it does not seem so important to attempt to achieve as sound a reconstruction of the original text as possible on the basis of the manuscripts and early translations available. Rather, the preference is to focus on the "reconstruction of the oldest stage of the textual history that is achievable to us, which can be referred to with the term 'archetype.' "[10] Weren himself later admits, however, that in many cases, due to immense text-critical problems, that "a conscientious attempt at reconstructing the probable *vorlage* cannot be made."[11] The only feasible option in those cases, he says, may be to print the various recensions side by side in a synoptic presentation.[12]

Weren's admission is the very insight that can serve as a springboard toward a more adequate viewpoint regarding the thrust of textual criticism. In recent years, research on the DSS has caused a paradigm shift in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. It is now recognised that the main focus need not be centred on identifying or reconstructing the *Urtext* of a particular book. Rather, it is possible to give value to each textual witness as it stands. As Ego, Lange, Lichtenberger, and De Troyer say: "... textual witnesses of a given biblical book are recognised to be literary works in their own right," and textual critics "... also study the meaning of individual textual witnesses."[13] Further, careful analysis of the textual history of individual biblical books has led to the conclusion that, for some books, an *Urtext* can no longer be identified; for other books, the scrolls witness to one or more redactions and/or editions of a given book, which could allow for the "plausible reconstruction of the literary development and a suggestion as to which text might be the more original one."[14]

Brooke's analysis of textual variants in the Qumran manuscripts of the Twelve (both scriptural manuscripts and those which explicitly cite Scripture) leads to similar conclusions. He sees nearly all the variants in the biblical texts in the commentaries of the DSS as witnesses of different recensions or traditions which commentators play upon to their

---

[10] Wim Weren, "Textual Criticism: Mother of All Exegesis," in *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (ed. Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch; The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003), 5–6.

[11] Weren, "Textual Criticism: Mother of All Exegesis," 5–6.

[12] Weren, "Textual Criticism: Mother of All Exegesis," 5–6.

[13] Beate Ego et al., eds., *Biblia Qumranica 3B: Minor Prophets* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), ix.

[14] Ego et al., eds., *Biblia Qumranica 3B Minor Prophets*, ix.

advantage.[15] Such data challenge text-critical methods used thus far, he declares, and demand whether the theory of multiple literary editions, rather than variants on a single tradition, might not account better for the evidence.[16]

The search for an *Urtext*, however respectable the motives might be on the part of the textual critic, is in essence the demand for a single textual authority to which all others must become subordinate. It is becoming increasingly apparent that a broader base of authority must be allowed by affirming the legitimacy of pluriform textual traditions.

When one turns to textual criticism of the LXX, it is readily apparent that one possible focus would be to establish the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Jellicoe would agree: "The ultimate goal of LXX textual criticism is the establishing of the *Vorlage* . . . ,"[17] as would Aejmelaeus: the major aim is "reliable recovery of the *Vorlage* through retroversion."[18] However, establishing the confirmed Hebrew *Vorlage* of a particular text is certainly no simple matter.[19] Whatever one might see as the value of LXX textual criticism for retroversion and Hebrew textual reconstruction, Greek evidence varies from passage to passage,[20] and the results can only be approximate at best.

In parallel fashion to Hebrew textual criticism, one might attempt to reach the earliest form of the Greek text. However, the great difficulties of such an endeavour have long been recognised. With such passage of time between original writing and earliest extant manuscripts, one must allow for a considerable amount of editorial and scribal activity. Few would deny the difficulty of the task of discerning what comes from the hand of the translator, and what comes from the copying and transmission of the text. Jellicoe explains: ". . . since all existing texts are contaminated by extraneous readings . . . it is an essential part of the procedure, in working back to the archetype, to identify and eliminate corruptions, scribal and recensional, accidental and intentional."[21] Hayes agrees: this "attempt

---

[15] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 30.

[16] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 42.

[17] Sydney Jellicoe, "Aquila and his Version," *JQR* 59 (April 1969), 326.

[18] Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators* (Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993), 4.

[19] Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 289. In an overarching viewpoint on the issue, Tov admits that there are few attempts to reconstruct the text of biblical books, for theoretical as well as practical reasons, "the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the ancient translations cannot be reconstructed satisfactorily, and often it is impossible to make a decision with regard to the originality of readings."

[20] Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," 213.

[21] Jellicoe, "Aquila and his Version," 326.

to discover 'the earliest Greek text' is itself fraught with enormous problems."[22] In agreement as well, Muraoka recognises that the results of such a search can never lead to absolute certainty, but only to "varying degrees of probability and likelihood."[23] In view of the extant manuscript evidence, the goal of recovering the earliest form of the Greek text is a difficult task indeed and must remain a theoretical ideal.

Nonetheless, Ulrich, referring to the Göttingen critical editions, continues to speak for the practical goal of reaching the "oldest recoverable text," which he would call the "Old Greek."[24] Recovery of the OG text as defined by Ulrich may indeed be a legitimate goal. In contrast to those who would argue for a form of the Hebrew text as the goal of LXX textual criticism, Pietersma calls for just such a recovery: the "fundamental and methodologically primary aim of LXX research," he states, is the "recovery of the O(ld) G(reek) text," which "must always remain the first priority of LXX research."[25]

In light of the fragmentary realities of extant witnesses and the uncertainty of the task of recovering a purported OG text, however, a more adequate viewpoint which includes all extant evidence would respect both Greek and Hebrew literary traditions, without attempting to reduce or adjust one to the other. Fernández Marcos, for example, recognises the "existence of textual pluralism in the period before the Common Era, as well as the polymorphism of texts within the LXX itself, that is to say, the differences evident in the process of translation and transmission of the various books."[26] For him, before attempting restoration of the Hebrew text from LXX textual criticism, it would be more prudent to "reconstruct each of the different traditions in which a particular biblical book has come down to us."[27] If the LXX text represents a different literary

---

[22] John H. Hayes, *An Introduction to Old Testament Study* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979), 80.

[23] Takamitsu Muraoka, "A New Index to Hatch and Redpath," *ETL* 73 (1997), 262.

[24] Eugene Ulrich, "Origen's Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint to the Third Century, C.E.," in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy* (ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen; University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 8–9.

[25] Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," 296, 311. Pietersma does admit that in some respects, this is an ideal. Even though he realizes that it is not an easy task to distinguish between translational aspects and recensional aspects, "Yet it is the *sine qua non* for a correct understanding of what the LXX was and what happened to it along its historical path," 297, 306.

[26] Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 77.

[27] Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 77.

tradition from the *textus receptus*, then that tradition must be respected in its own right.[28] Olofsson is also supportive of such a viewpoint. He is not interested in the oldest text *per se*, but in discerning when the LXX can be adduced as a textual witness, that is, where it reflects a text that is variant from MT.[29]

In the process of pushing as far back historically as the textual evidence allows, multiple textual traditions in Hebrew or Greek that come to light should be recognised and respected. If variant readings allow for resolution within a single textual tradition, the most reliable reading should be sought within that tradition. If the variants speak for more than a single tradition, however, then those multiple traditions must be affirmed. If such a perspective causes difficulty in deciding the more authoritative reading between multiple textual developments, one may have to remain content with a certain amount of textual ambiguity.[30] In such a case, it would be more realistic to attempt to establish a particular textual tradition and simply designate it as such.

In the case of Zechariah, the oldest extant Hebrew fragments are separated from the original writing by a gap of up to 350 years. As indicated previously, those very fragments reflect textual pluriformity. From the approximate time of Greek translation to the oldest extant Greek fragments, there is an additional gap of 100–200 years. With that historical reality in mind, this study will first critique the MT of Zech 12:10 and its variants, in order to arrive at the most reliable reading for that textual tra-

---

[28] Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 79. At the same time, Fernández Marcos recognizes that in most books the LXX variants can, with due caution, be used as an important aid for biblical text criticism and for editing the Hebrew text.

[29] Staffan Olofsson, "Qumran and LXX," in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments, JSOTSup* 290 (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 237.

[30] In the process of textual criticism, it is important to keep in mind text-critical rules. In the final analysis, we must take into account the accumulated wisdom of the textual critics, while ultimately deciding for ourselves what must be the "best text." The general rules of textual criticism will not be explicitly stated or critiqued in this study. Nonetheless, the validity of such guidelines will be recognized and incorporated into the text-critical procedure, while at the same time admitting their limitations; cf., for example, Hayes, *An Introduction to Old Testament Study*, 81; Emanuel Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research," in *Jerusalem Biblical Studies* (ed. Ora Lipschitz and Alexander Rofé; Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981), 12; Tov, "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings," 429, 446; D.C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 45; Peter Kyle McCarter, *Textual Criticism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1986), 21; M. Silva, "Internal Evidence in the Text-Critical Use of the LXX," in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Madrid: Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros," 1985), 151.

dition. If textual witnesses also indicate the existence of any other ancient Hebrew textual tradition or traditions at variance from MT, they will be recognised. In a similar manner, the LXX reading of the passage and its variants will then be critiqued, as well as compared with the results of the Hebrew textual investigation, in order to discern what constitutes the oldest discernible and most reliable reading for the passage. The Greek reading will be sought that most fully balances all available Greek and Hebrew manuscript evidence, that is most in harmony with its literary context, and that leaves the least amount of unresolved textual, grammatical, and syntactical difficulties. That reading will be the one which presents the greatest overall amount of textual certainty. At the same time, any other discernible Greek textual tradition or traditions of the verse will be recognised, and how those traditions relate both to one another and to the Hebrew texts will be affirmed.

## LXX Translation Technique in Zechariah

### *Defining Translation Technique*

An important preliminary step in examining the text-critical issues related to the Hebrew and Greek texts of Zech 12:10 is to gain an adequate perspective on LXX translation technique. One's ability to critique an individual verse of the LXX will be greatly enhanced by a broader viewpoint regarding the issues of LXX translation.

First, the term must be defined. A generic working definition of translation technique is to present a picture of the translator or translators created in our mind: how they worked, what they were aiming at, what was their attitude toward the text they were translating, and what were their capabilities. Translation technique may be seen as nothing more than a "collective name for all the different renderings used by a translator."[31] Put more simply, it is the study of how a translator handled language choices in the transition from source text to translated text.

### *The Importance of Translation Technique*

Some speak out strongly for the importance of translation technique among the principles and procedures of textual reconstruction. Aejmelaeus' calls

[31] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator, "in *VII Congress of the IOSCS* 31 (1991), 24.

us to "... follow the trail of the Septuagint translators, to understand their way of working, the problems they met and how they solved them."[32] Pietersma claims "that a thorough understanding of translation patterns and technique is of pre-eminent importance for the establishment of the critical text ... is not *per se* subject to debate."[33] His viewpoint that "translation technique must be studied as exhaustively as is humanly possible,"[34] is acceptable, and that such study is the search for an "Archimedean Point" from which to critique a particular text, is a point well taken. Olofsson would agree, claiming that translation technique is the starting point for questions concerning the *Vorlage* of a given passage, for one cannot detect that *Vorlage* without having studied the translation technique of a given translator.[35]

A description of the translator's work will definitely aid in explaining the translation of the passage, evaluating the readings, and arriving at the best possible decisions regarding the text. At the same time, an adequate balance must be maintained by keeping in mind the transmission history of the text, the difficulty of distinguishing between translation technique and the editorial process,[36] and the fragmentary nature of extant witnesses to the passage in question. One should thus include awareness of these realities as part and parcel of the analysis of translation technique. The following sections describe a number of the more outstanding characteristics of Septuagint translation technique, focusing ultimately upon Zechariah, and at the same time acknowledging the limits imposed by textual history and extant witnesses.

### *Septuagint Faithfulness*

Recent decades have seen renewed confidence in the faithfulness of the Septuagint translation in general. DSS discoveries and subsequent research upon them are primarily responsible for that new respect. No longer will the Septuagint translators, as Orlinsky says, "... be blamed for dealing promiscuously with their Hebrew *Vorlagen*. ..."[37] There is wide scholarly

---

[32] Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators*, 3.
[33] Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," 298.
[34] Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," 299.
[35] Olofsson, "Qumran and LXX," 232.
[36] Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," 306.
[37] H.M. Orlinsky, "Qumrân and the Present State of O.T. Text Studies: The Septuagint Text," *JBL* 78 (1959), 32.

agreement that the study of translation technique leads to confidence in the Greek translators in general, as Aejmelaeus says, "... each of them in their own way aimed at a faithful rendering of their Holy Scripture."[38] "They showed great reverence for their original and no doubt tried, each in his own way, to do justice to it with their rendering."[39] Hanhart would not only agree with this confidence in the translators, but take that confidence to its fullest expression. Even where the Greek deviates from MT, he holds, it must be taken seriously "as witness to an underlying Hebrew text-form which we are able to reconstruct"; only in the rarest of cases should it be taken as a peculiar expression of the translator meant to be an interpretation or reinterpretation of the *Vorlage*.[40]

Though such comments refer generally to the entire Septuagint, the OG12 translator(s) can be included in the group. The book of Zechariah itself shows individual evidence that stands up well to scrutiny regarding translation faithfulness. For example, Tov's study on the interchanges of consonants (that is, assumed interchanges by way of retroversion) between the MT and the LXX *Vorlage*, gives supporting data.[41] With a single *daleth/resh* interchange, which is also the most frequent type of interchange, Zechariah proves to be among the books with the most stable textual transmission and most careful translation. Whether by a single translator, or two or more, Zechariah is a translation work carefully done. Therefore, one cannot begin with a negative bias regarding the translator or his ability. The initial assumption will be that the translator has given a faithful rendering of the Hebrew, unless it is clearly proven otherwise.

---

[38] Aejmelaeus, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator," 382.

[39] Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" 63.

[40] Robert Hanhart, "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990), 342.

[41] Emanuel Tov, "Interchanges of Consonants between the Masoretic Text and the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov, with the assistance of Weston W. Fields; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 264. Zechariah is listed as having 5 total consonantal interchanges out of a total number of words of 3,128, or a percentage rating of 0.16%. This ranks Zechariah among those books with the lowest percentage of interchange. To give further perspective on Zechariah within Tov's study: Malachi and Haggai have no interchanges, or 0%, while Jeremiah and Ezekiel, for example, are at the upper end with .87% and .88% respectively. The three highest are Nahum, Obadiah, and Hosea, with 2.15%, 2.34% and 2.52%. Tov concludes that the smaller number of interchanges gives evidence of "stable textual transmission and careful translation."

### *Translation of* צבאות *by* παντοκράτωρ

Turning now to more specific characteristics of LXX translation technique within the Book of the Twelve, one outstanding characteristic is the use of παντοκράτωρ, "almighty,"[42] or "All-Powerful, Omnipotent (One),"[43] as translation of the Hebrew צבאות. The translator of the Twelve is the one who uses the term most often, and is likely the inventor of the term: "... est bel et bien l'inventeur, ou du moins le premier utilisateur, du mot dans la LXX. ..."[44] There are 180 occurrences of this translation in the entire Greek Scriptures, with 110 of them in the Twelve. The greatest number of occurrences in a single book are in Zechariah, with 2 in chapter 12. Dogniez sees an exact correspondence between *"tsabaot"* and παντοκράτωρ in Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Haggai, while in Amos, Zephaniah, Zechariah, and Malachi there are relatively few instances of divergence from the MT.[45] From this analysis, Dogniez believes that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Twelve is very close to the MT.[46]

On the other hand, though παντοκράτωρ may be considered the "semantic equivalent" of צבאות,[47] it is not the only Greek translation of the term. An optional rendering in R indicates that there was more than one opinion in circulation as to how this phrase should be translated. Παντοκράτωρ is certainly characteristic of the LXX text, yet the phrase is translated in R, not by παντοκράτωρ, but by τῶν δυνάμεων.[48] The larger LXX phrase, κύριος παντοκράτωρ, consistently appears in R as [tetragrammaton] + τῶν δυνάμεων,[49] with 7 of the 9 occurrences found in Zechariah.[50]

Whether τῶν δυνάμεων of R reflects an earlier Greek tradition, or is a correction of the OG, it is a translation more carefully and literally consistent with the Hebrew צבאות than that of παντοκράτωρ. With this evidence, it is clear that one cannot simply look at παντοκράτωρ in the LXX and make authoritative pronouncements regarding translation technique of

---

[42] LSJ, 1300.

[43] BAG, 613.

[44] Cecile Dogniez, "Le Dieu des Armées dans le Dodekapropheton: Quelques Remarques sur une Initiative de Traduction," in *IX Congress of the IOSCS* 45 (1995), 20.

[45] Dogniez, "Le Dieu des Armées dans le Dodekapropheton," 20–21.

[46] Dogniez, "Le Dieu des Armées dans le Dodekapropheton," 22.

[47] Kenneth L. Barker, "YHWH Sabaoth: 'The Lord Almighty,' " in *The NIV, The Making of a Contemporary Translation* (ed. Kenneth L. Barker; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books, 1986), 106–110.

[48] Tov, ed., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 66–75.

[49] Ego et al., eds., *Biblia Qumranica 3B: Minor Prophets*, 170ff.

[50] The same is characteristic of the *kaige* recension. See Natalio Fernández Marcos, "El Texto Griego de la Complutense en Doce Profetas," *Sef* 39 (1979): 3–26.

this term in the Twelve. Certainly παντοκράτωρ may be described as LXX translation technique, but it is more accurate to say that it is characteristic of a particular LXX recension, and must be compared and contrasted to the use of τῶν δυνάμεων in R.[51]

### *An Analysis of Hapax Legomena in the Twelve*

A significant issue in the translation of the Twelve has been raised by Muraoka's analysis of the manner in which 24 *hapax legomena* were handled.[52] None of these particular words are found in Zech 12:10 (there are no Hebrew *hapax legomena* in the verse). Nonetheless, his conclusions do offer some important insights.

First of all, he sees a high degree of consonance between the LXX and the MT. Of the 24 words analysed, Muraoka says that the LXX *Vorlage* equals the MT in 23 of the 24: "In most cases the translator's *Vorlage* was, it appears, virtually identical with MT. . . ."[53] However, in critique of Muraoka's opinion, 1 variant with MT out of 24 unusual words would be significant enough incidence to be noteworthy, and leads one to the conclusion that the LXX *Vorlage* was not precisely identical with the MT. In support of that viewpoint, Cimosa believes that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG12, somewhat distinct from the MT, "is more likely the original rather than the MT."[54]

Muraoka's second conclusion is this: the translator has sometimes overcome the difficulty of translating obscure *hapax legomena* by manipulating the Hebrew text or relying on conjecture, usually with regard to the general context: ". . . occasionally he appears to be manipulating the Hebrew text in order to overcome what he perceived to be a difficult text."[55] However, such a conclusion reveals Muraoka's assumptions. Assuming manipulation or conjecture not only calls into question the translator's ability and understanding of the languages involved, but also rules out the possibility of a variant *Vorlage*, or a decision to translate at variance with the text for

---

[51] Nonetheless, with the use of either παντοκράτωρ or τῶν δυνάμεων, the safe working assumption is that the proto–MT and the OG12 *Vorlage* are essentially identical at this point, as Dogniez has indicated. Indeed, all potential statements regarding "LXX translation technique" could thus be compared to R, as does Tov, ed., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 99–158.

[52] Takamitsu Muraoka, "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography," *VII Congress of the IOSCS* 31 (1991), 205–222.

[53] Muraoka, "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography," 205.

[54] Cimosa, "The Greek Translation of Zechariah," 95.

[55] Muraoka, "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography," 205.

a particular exegetical or theological agenda. Before accepting Muraoka's conclusion, one must carefully evaluate the particular text in question.

### *"Evasive Renderings" or "Pseudo-Variants"*

Similar to Muraoka's conclusion regarding manipulation or conjecture, Tov perceives in the translation of Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets that certain roots are at times avoided, giving what he calls "evasive" renderings. These produce what he terms a "pseudo-variant" by avoiding a literal or correct translation of the Hebrew.[56] It is not a true variant, because it never existed in any text, but only in the mind of the translator. This perception would allow one to hold to the consensus regarding the OG12 *Vorlage* as essentially identical with the MT, while giving plausible explanation for an occasional glaring variant.[57]

### *Distinct* Vorlage*, "Mistranslation," or a "Wrongly Read" Text*

In addition to Tov's concept of "evasive renderings," there are other distinct possibilities that might offer adequate explanation for the differences between LXX and MT. Cimosa, for example, after an examination of the translation of the entire book of Zechariah, admits that it is sometimes difficult to determine if differences between the MT and the LXX are the result of mistranslation, as he suggests it is in 12:10, whether it is the result of a different *Vorlage*, or whether the differences remain at the level of interpretation.[58] After raising the issues and the questions, however, he then offers no plausible answers to the dilemma.

When Jansma presented "some comments on the translation technique of G,"[59] listing the techniques briefly and succinctly with some examples from the text, he had perceived essentially the same issues raised by Cimosa.

> The differences between G. and M. are many. It is often impossible to decide whether G. had at its disposal a Hebrew text deviating from M. or a text

---

[56] Emanuel Tov, "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," *JSS* 20 (1975), 172.

[57] An unusual variant such as this is indeed found in the LXX of Zech 12:10, which will be analysed later in this chapter.

[58] Cimosa, "The Greek Translation of Zechariah," 95.

[59] T. Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix–xiv," *Studiën* VII (ed. P.A.H. de Boer; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950), 7. The reference is to Swete's 1899 Cambridge edition of the LXX text, with comparisons to Ziegler's *Duodecim Prophetae*.

> identical with M. but very indistinctly written. At the same time one should take account of the possibility of G. having wrongly read a text. . . .[60]

Jansma's insights prove to have enduring relevance to the evaluation of Zechariah, and specifically, 12:10. First, he sees the translator as simplifying a number of Hebrew expressions;[61] secondly, there are times when a different number is used, that is, between singular and plural for the verb form;[62] thirdly, he notes minor additions and omissions to the text, including particles and suffixes;[63] fourthly, he deals with the critical matter of vocalisation: "G. seems to vocalise its Hebrew text in a way differing from M.";[64] and fifthly, in the orthography of the translator, there occur examples of haplography and dittography.[65]

Both Cimosa and Jansma have perceived clearly the dilemma that still persists. Decades of scholarship have gained much ground in analysing differences between LXX and MT, but have not erased the difficulty of discerning what reflects a variant Hebrew tradition, and what might have been a mistranslation or misreading on the part of the translator. If one can have an overall confidence in LXX translators, particularly in Zechariah, nonetheless, individual readings may continue to present such difficulties.

### *Translation Technique of Zechariah Twelve*

A detailed analysis of the LXX and MT of the twelfth chapter of Zechariah, as a significant sampling of the overall translation of II Zechariah, reveals both a measure of continuity between LXX and MT, as well as a number of notable differences. Of the fourteen verses in the chapter, five are virtually identical to MT, i.e., 1, 2, 9, 13, and 14. Three verses could be considered very close, i.e., 4, 5, and 6, with only minor differences, such as a singular noun or adjective in MT that is rendered as a plural in the LXX. Further, the plural in those cases could be seen as implied within the Hebrew and used as plural in Greek to facilitate smoothness of construction and

---

[60] Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text," 46.
[61] Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text," 42.
[62] Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text," 42.
[63] Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text," 43–44.
[64] Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text," 44–45. The reference is to Kittel's 1937 edition of MT.
[65] Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text," 45. These characteristics are an indication for Jansma that the Hebrew *Vorlage* was written in *scriptio continua*. They also indicate either the absence of *matres lectionis*, or at least a number far fewer than MT.

grammatical consistency. Six verses of the fourteen, i.e., 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12, demonstrate a series of differences from MT, both minor and significant, including added or deleted words or phrases, changes in nouns, and differences in verb choices. Some notable differences include the following: 12:3—מעמסה rendered as καταπατοῦμενον; 12:7—תפארת . . . תפארת rendered as καύχημα . . . ἔπαρσις; 12:10—את אשר rendered as ἀνθ᾽ ὧν.

Such a combination of verses in this chapter, some that are identical to MT, along with others which contain notable differences, indicates that one can hold to a view of translational faithfulness where the MT and LXX are the same, and at the same time assume in other places some degree of variation either in the translation or the LXX *Vorlage*. This analysis of Chapter 12 confirms the general truth regarding the Twelve, that the *Vorlage* is close, but not identical to MT. It also points out the possibility that both dimensions of an exegetical translational agenda, as well as a variant *Vorlage*, may be at work in some verses.

### *Translation of the Hebrew Verb* דקר *in Zechariah*

Further insight into the translation of Zechariah can be gained from an analysis of the use of the verb דקר. The only two occurrences of דקר in Zechariah appear in 12:10 and 13:3. Interestingly, assuming MT as *Vorlage*, neither occurrence is translated literally in the LXX, and further, each translation is distinct.[66] In 12:10, it is translated by κατορχέομαι, "dance in triumph over, treat spitefully, to mock at."[67] In 13:3 it is translated by συμποδίζω, "bind the feet together,"[68] or "bind hand and foot."[69] In neither verse is there any indication of a variant reading in the MT for that verb. Unless the translator had before him a variant *Vorlage*, his radical departure from the meaning of the Hebrew verb in these two cases may signal some antipathy toward the Hebrew verb דקר. A literal translation of the verb for "pierced" at the time of translation or editing may have carried some undesirable connotations for the translator and/or the reading audi-

---

[66] J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992), 1:200, 1:137, II:235. Compare the occurrences of the verb דקר, and its LXX translations in Isaiah 13:15: ἡττάω, "be defeated or overcome"; Jeremiah 37:10: ἐκκεντέω "to pierce, to stab"; and Jeremiah 51:4: κατακεντέω "to pierce through, to stab, to kill."

[67] Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, II:251. This connotation is confirmed by LSJ, 930. Both lexicons cite Zech 12:10 as specific reference.

[68] Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, II:451.

[69] LSJ, 1685.

ence that have since been lost.[70] On the other hand, this avoidance of a literal translation gives a tacit indication that one need not posit a variant Hebrew *Vorlage* for דקר in one case, such as 12:10, when a literal translation is avoided in both occurrences.

### *Summary of Translation Technique*

Given the significant level of confidence in the Greek translators as a whole and their fidelity to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, one may begin with a positive viewpoint regarding the translator and his ability. Even in the light of such apparent differences between MT and LXX in a particular passage, it is safe to assume that the translator has given a faithful rendering of the Hebrew, until all the evidence has been carefully evaluated.

On the other hand, it should not be assumed that the LXX *Vorlage* of a particular passage was identical to MT. The translation of the Twelve does indeed reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* very close to the consonantal MT, though it was not of necessity precisely the same, and the possibility of a variant *Vorlage* for the LXX must be granted. However, before a variant *Vorlage* is assumed, its existence in contrast to MT must be demonstrated. In keeping with these general truths, LXX Zechariah overall does indeed show a high level of translational faithfulness, and a *Vorlage* quite close to MT. On more specific points, however, some differences come to light between LXX and MT, not only in Zechariah as a whole, but also in 12:10 in particular. All points mentioned above regarding translation technique will be taken into consideration while doing text-critical work on the passage of 12:10.

## Text-Critical Issues Regarding Zechariah 12:10

This study concentrates on the phrase from the middle of verse 10 of Zech 12. The modern critical texts available provide the basic starting point: i.e., in Hebrew, the MT *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*,[71] or BHS;

[70] For example, the reading may be a later textual emendation in response to Roman law forbidding Jews to carry out the death penalty.

[71] K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990).

and in Greek, Ziegler's *Duodecim Prophetae*.[72] The phrase in Hebrew is: וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ

In Greek it is: καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο.[73]

The preliminary investigation will compare LXX and MT. However, the priority of one text over the other will not be assumed,[74] as Aejmelaeus warns, "it is impossible to know in advance which of them [LXX or MT] most probably has the original reading."[75] Each of the words and phrases, along with variant readings and related textual issues, will be examined.

### *Verb* וְהִבִּטוּ—*"And they will look"*

The first word of the phrase in Hebrew is a hiphil perfect third person plural[76] form of the verb נבט.[77] In the hiphil it means "look, glance toward, look on,"[78] or "look at, towards."[79] With the *waw* consecutive, it may thus be translated "they will look toward or look upon."

There appears to be no textual controversy over the verb in the MT of Zechariah, and no variant readings noted in Hebrew. However, there is a variation of translation in the Greek manuscripts.

#### *ἐπιβλέψονται*

The LXX reads ἐπιβλέψονται, which is a future middle indicative third person plural of ἐπιβλέπω, "to look upon, to look attentively."[80] This is clearly a translation of וְהִבִּטוּ. Such translation of נבט by ἐπιβλέπω is not

---

[72] Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae* (vol. XIII of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum.* Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

[73] For ease of reference, the two will be referred to as MT and LXX, with other variant texts or recensions indicated accordingly.

[74] Cf. J. Weingreen, *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 26.

[75] Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" 87.

[76] Benjamin Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., 1850; repr., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986), 162.

[77] David Baron, *The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1975), 446. Baron sees in this verb an allusion to Numbers 21:9, which reads וְהִבִּיט, and Israel's looking to the brazen serpent for healing while in the desert.

[78] KBL, 588.

[79] William Osburn, Jr., *Hebrew-English Lexicon* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., 1844, 1882; repr., Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1979), 157. This is in spite of the purported "meaning of Heb. uncertain" noted by the Jewish Publication Society in H. Louis Ginsberg, ed., *The Prophets Nevi'im* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1978), 888, fn e.

[80] Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, I:168.

at all uncommon, and is, in fact, the Greek verb that appears also in the prominent passage of Numbers 21:9 of the LXX.

In Ziegler's apparatus, manuscript W[81] is alone in offering for this verse the variant reading ἐπιβλέπονται.[82] Sanders and Schmidt give a helpful clarification in their notes on this verse regarding W, indicating that the first hand gives this particular reading, while a second hand, in agreement with all other manuscripts, gives the correction ἐπιβλέψονται.[83] Although ἐπιβλέπονται is a legitimate verb form in the middle indicative third person plural,[84] it is not a common form in biblical literature, with the exact form occurring neither in the LXX nor in the NT. Perhaps the copyist of W who wrote the form, if not committing a simple error, meant by the change from future to present tense to indicate a contemporary reality related to current events. If so, it would signal a "continuous looking." Such a form in present tense, however, would be difficult to reconcile with other future verbs in the same context, both immediately before: ἐκχεῶ, verse 10a, and afterwards: κόψονται, verse 10b, neither of which has a variant reading in W. With this singular form presented by W, together with the presence of a second hand to note the ἐπιβλέψονται reading as a correction, it seems preferable to view the π of ἐπιβλέπονται as a simple copyist's error. The weight of evidence for the best reading would thus lean decidedly toward the future form of the verb ἐπιβλέψονται.

*ὄψονται*

The principal variant reading in contrast to ἐπιβλέψονται noted in Ziegler's apparatus is Theodoret's use of ὄψονται. Mention of the same is immediately followed by the notation "=Ioh. 19:37."[85] The reading of Theodoret (ca. 393 C.E.–ca. 457 C.E.), Christian bishop of Cyrrhus, Syria, and the antecedents of his biblical text, may be indicative of an early source for this passage.[86]

---

[81] Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 233, designates W as the Freer Greek Ms. V, or Washington Manuscript, and adds this description: "A notable feature of the Washington manuscript lies in the number of readings which are in agreement with, or have been assimilated to, the Hebrew . . ."

[82] Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, Introduction. Ziegler indicates by his notation "W*" that this is an original reading or original version.

[83] Henry A. Sanders and Carl Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 221.

[84] Cf. its use in modern Greek, e.g., Macedonian Press Agency, *Brief News in Greek* (Nov 21, 1997, and Sept 4, 2004); online: *www.hri.org/news/greek/mpe*.

[85] Whether Ziegler is simply noting the identity of the two quotes, or is suggesting Johannine influence upon Theodoret's citation, is not clarified.

[86] Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 157–171. Theodoret was writing from Syria in the first half of the fifth century, but his biblical quotations would appear to reflect

Whatever may have been the textual source from which Theodoret drew, his verb choice is nonetheless a good translation of the Hebrew. Menken would characterise the use of ὁρᾶν as a legitimate, though somewhat weaker translation of וְהִבִּיטוּ: "[ἐπιβλέψονται] is certainly more to the point: ὁρᾶν, 'to see,' [future: ὄψονται] is a somewhat weak translation of the hiphil of נבט, 'to look.' It is not, however, an impossible translation. . . ."[87] There is more to the contrast, however. In analysing the difference between ἐπιβλέπω and ὁράω, the former would indicate attentive observation and involvement of the subject with the object that is viewed, and the latter would carry the connotation of beholding and looking with deeper, penetrating discernment,[88] or even of seeing a vision.[89] Ὁράω would also be more closely in keeping with the verb נבט, which is often associated with a spiritual turning in conversion and renewal, as indicated by the earlier part of Zech 12:10.[90]

In addition to the formal definitions of the verb, it must not be overlooked that ὁράω is clearly associated with prophetic vision in many previous Zecharian passages, such as 1:8; 4:2, 10; 5:2, as well as in numerous other references in prophetic literature.[91] Whatever might have been Theodoret's reason for choosing the verb, ὄψονται is a legitimate translation of the Hebrew, with an added depth of meaning in contrast to ἐπιβλέψονται.

Apart from Theodoret, the use of the verb ὄψονται in this verse has additional support from "ὁ Ἑβραῖος," as cited by Cyril of Alexandria in his commentary on the twelve prophets.[92] The enigmatic nature of "ὁ Ἑβραῖος" as text, person, or recension, has long been discussed. Swete cast deep doubt over the very existence of any such "ὁ Ἑβραῖος."

> The Greek fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries quotes [*sic*] non-Septuagintal renderings from an interpreter who is styled ὁ Ἑβραῖος. ὁ Σύρος

primarily the recension of Lucian, which itself often includes early variants, and reflects older sources.

87 Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 501.

88 Cf. LSJ, 625, 1245, who define the first verb as follows: "ἐπιβλέπω: . . . *look upon, look attentively* . . . 2. c. acc. *look well at, observe,* . . . 3. *face* upwards or downwards," while they define ὁράω as: "I. abs., *see, look* . . . *look to, pay heed* to . . . II. trans., *see* an object, *behold, perceive, observe* . . . III. metaph., of mental sight, *discern, perceive.* . . ."

89 BAG, 290, 581.

90 Boda and Floyd, "Zechariah 12:1–13:6," 163.

91 Cf. HRCS, 1006.

92 Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 12, 319.

> is also cited, frequently as agreeing with ὁ Ἑβραῖος. Nothing is known of these translators (if such they were)....[93]

Ziegler describes "ὁ Ἑβραῖος": "Als Übersetzer (Übersetzungen) werden mit Namen aufgefürt:... ὁ Ἑβραῖος oder ἡ τῶν Ἑβραῖων ἔκδοσις oder οἱ Ἑβραῖοι (εβρ΄)...."[94] He then notes further: "Der 'Hebräer' erscheint gelegentlich bei 86 und Cyr.; er bringt den hebr. Text in griech. Transkription... Cyr. versteht vielfach unter dem 'Hebräer' die M entsprechende wörtliche Übersetzung, gelegentlich die Vulg. des Hi."[95]

Howard, for one, would accept uncritically Barthélemy's description of "ὁ Ἑβραῖος" as the "translation according to the Hebrews," which appears to be based on Jerome's work.[96] Fernández Marcos fully believes that it does indeed represent a recension of the Greek text as translated by one "ὁ Ἑβραῖος."[97] Still, the identification of this person remains obscure, and thus the evaluation of any such reading attributed to the same is difficult. All that can be safely concluded is that such a reading attributed to one ὁ Ἑβραῖος has been handed down from early sources.

One could assume that this ὄψονται reading does not come from a recension of the Twelve, but simply reflects NT Johannine influence, since it is identical to the verb form used by John's citation of the verse. If it is dismissed as Johannine influence, one must ignore the complicated history of ὁ Ἑβραῖος, as well as the possibility of an earlier textual source for Theodoret's reading. If, on the other hand, it is an alternative reading from which John and others drew, it may very well reflect a legitimate parallel Greek recension. Whatever the case of its antecedents, ὄψονται is in harmony with the Hebrew, and is an acceptable translation of נבט.

### *Preposition* אלי*—"To..."*

One of the most perplexing issues in the Hebrew phrase under analysis is the pronominal suffix added to the preposition אל. Recalling that the Hebrew text was yet unpointed at the time of the LXX translation, Hebrew manuscript variants present several possibilities: 1) אֵלַי "to me," which is the

---

[93] Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 56.

[94] Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 107.

[95] Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 108.

[96] George Howard, "The Quinta of the Minor Prophets: A First Century Septuagint Text?" *Biblicum* 55 (1974), 17.

[97] Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a Las Versiones Griegas de la Biblia* (Madrid: Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros," 1979), 144–46.

traditional Massoretic vocalisation; 2) אֵלַי "to whom," a variant vocalisation in construct form based on the identical consonantal MT; 3) אֵלָיו "to him," a variant reading with pronominal masculine singular ending.

*First Person* אֵלַי*—"To me"*

The difficulty raised by the traditional MT reading and vocalisation is the presence of a change in person from first to third, i.e., "look unto **me** . . . and mourn for **him**." Such an abrupt change appears to cause awkwardness in the syntax of the phrase. The BHS critical apparatus indication regarding the two word phrase אֵלַי אֵת: "var lect; l—אֶל vel אֵלַי,"[98] does admit the difficulty, and allows for the presence of variants which potentially offer better syntactical solutions for the phrase.

There is a measure of support for the MT reading with traditional vocalisation in this phrase. In light of the syntactical difficulty of the word and the phrase, however, together with the presence of variant readings, it is wise not to assume traditional MT superiority until all related issues have been investigated.[99]

No one would argue with Delcor and Lamarche that the MT reading is truly the *lectio dificilior*.[100] However, it does not follow immediately and self-evidently that it is therefore the *lectio securior*. Granted, in spite of its awkwardness, it is not grammatically an incorrect construction *per se*.[101] Delcor, for instance, would cite constructions in other Zecharian passages where the text passes brusquely from third person to first person or vice-versa.[102]

One well-known passage within the book of Zechariah that includes a similar textual situation involving pronominal suffixes is found in 2:12. Here Yahweh is quoted as saying the following: כִּי הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּכֶם נֹגֵעַ בְּבָבַת

---

[98] BHS, 1078.

[99] Cf. H.C. Leupold, *Exposition of Zechariah* (London: Evangelical Press, 1971), 238; Joyce G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (TOTC 24; ed. Donald J. Wiseman; Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 1972), 82–84; Baron, *The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah*, 442; Thomas Edward McComiskey, ed., *The Minor Prophets* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1998), 3:1214.

[100] M. Delcor, "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese," *RB* 58 (April 1951), 192; and Paul Lamarche, *Zacharie IX–XIV* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1961), 82fn, "En tout cas selon la critique externe et la critique interne il est préférable de garder אֵלַי."

[101] Thomas V. Moore, *A Commentary on Zechariah* (London: Billings and Sons, 1974), 198, quoting Nordheimer's *Grammar*, par 768, 1, 6).

[102] Delcor, "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese," 193. Delcor cites, for example, Zech 10:5–6, 7–8, and 12:6–7, 8–9. However, in these instances, the abrupt transition is not from first to third person within the same phrase, nor in exactly the same construction as 12:10.

עֵינוֹ "whoever touches you, touches the apple of HIS eye" (NIV, emphasis added). However, this third person suffix in the MT falls in the category of the *tiqqune sopherim*.[103] In a characteristic move of these "scribal emendations,"[104] the text in this instance has been emended from first person, "the apple of MY eye," to third person, "... the apple of HIS eye," thus avoiding an apparently uncomfortable anthropomorphic reference to God. Since the original reading appears to have been in first person, this change of the *sopherim* adds awkwardness where the presence of the first person would have retained syntactical smoothness.

However, the oldest extant witness to the verse, 4QXIIe, as edited by Ego et al., presents a textual difficulty precisely at the point of the pronominal suffix. The purported ו in the text that indicates a third person ending has been noted by the editors as a וֹ, but with a siglum indicating "a demaged [*sic*] (damaged) letter that cannot be safely identified."[105] "The reading of *waw* is note [*sic*] (not) entirely secure ... *Yod* is also possible."[106] Thus, this witness to the verse leaves one with doubt as to the actual letter of the pronominal suffix. It leaves unresolved the question of whether the text read first person, and was thus grammatically smooth, or read third person, avoiding the anthropomorphism, but with grammatical awkwardness.[107]

This textual situation is relevant to the case of 12:10. In contrast to 2:12, the awkwardness of 12:10 remains in the MT, and was never emended by the *sopherim*. However, the emendation of 2:12 could have been the impetus for alternate readings in 12:10 that again would change the first person to the third person, and thus avoid the apparent anthropomorphism. On the other hand, the fact that the scribes apparently saw no need to emend 12:10 argues from silence in favour of the reading that contains the third person pronominal suffix, and that would also avoid the anthropomorphism in textual consistency with 2:12 and other similar cases of pronominal endings.

---

[103] See Luis Díez Merino, "Los Tiqqune Soferim en la Tradición Targúmica," in *Tradition of the Text* (ed. Gerard J. Norton and Stephen Pisano; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 21, "La razón fundamental de la existencia de tales enmiendas es evitar a veces expresiones consideradas como poco delicadas, o bien porque son antropomorfismos demasiado duros."

[104] B.J. Roberts, "OT Text," *IDB* 4:585: "They [*tiqqune sopherim*] are mostly attempts to avoid anthropomorphisms, and, as a rule, consist of a change of suffix to avoid direct reference to God."

[105] Ego et al. eds., *Biblia Qumranica 3B: Minor Prophets*, xvi, 175.

[106] Fuller, "The Minor Prophets Manuscripts from Qumran, Cave IV," 129.

[107] Díez Merino, "Los Tiqqune Soferim en la Tradición Targúmica," 35, mentions a similar change from *yod* to *waw* in Jeremiah 2:11.

With such ambiguity regarding the pronominal suffix, one could allow for the possibility that the present MT is a contaminated text form reflecting the combination of two different constructions: "and they shall look on me," along with "and they shall look at whom they have pierced."[108] It is at least conceivable that the MT does contain an error at this point.[109]

When one takes into account the witness of the versions, however, there is support for the MT *lectio dificilior* reading in first person.[110] The Syriac Peshitta does have the reading "and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced."[111] In general, the Syriac as a faithful translator of the Hebrew Bible does tend to strengthen MT's credentials. However, the presence of possible LXX influence upon the Syriac, as well as the potential of having followed the same translation technique or the same translation tradition, the use of Jewish exegetical traditions, or even of coming to the same conclusion regarding the same translation problem, must be taken into account.[112] Before assuming LXX influence, one must note that there is agreement with LXX only regarding the first phrase, "and they shall look upon me," yet there is complete disagreement with the LXX translation of the following phrase "whom they have pierced." In this latter phrase, the Peshitta closely follows the Hebrew in contrast to the LXX. If LXX influence is present here, it certainly was not present in the latter phrase. It is much more likely that the Syriac in this instance does not reflect LXX influence, but simply translates the Hebrew of the first phrase in a similar fashion.

The Vulgate reads: "et adspicient ad me quem confixerunt," translated as "and they shall look upon me, whom they have pierced."[113] As evident, this version closely follows the MT.[114]

---

[108] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 499.

[109] Emanuel Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. G.L. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 31.

[110] Delcor, "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese," 193, would call this his "diplomatic reasons" for supporting the MT reading, saying that only John's text at 19:37, Lucian's recension, and many of the church fathers, have the third person.

[111] George M. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts, Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, the Authorized Bible of the Church of the East* (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1957), 943.

[112] P.B. Dirksen, "The Peshitta and Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *VT* XLII (1992), 377–78.

[113] James Cardinal Gibbons, ed., *The Holy Bible Translated from the Latin Vulgate* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1914), 1021.

[114] Ronald A. Knox, ed., *The Old Testament, Newly Translated from the Latin Vulgate* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1949), 1445, fn 2. Knox does give credibility to the variant reading that gives 'him' instead of 'me' in some Hebrew manuscripts: "On critical

A Talmud passage repeats the MT consonantal reading, but an English translation of the same attempts to solve the awkwardness: "'And they shall look on me because they have thrust him through, and they shall mourn for him as one mourns for his only son' (Zech 12:10)" (*b. Sukkah* 52a).[115] This is an obvious attempt by the translator to respond to the difficulty of the verse by smoothing out the syntax and differentiating the one to whom they look, Yahweh, from the one pierced, an unnamed "him."

In summary, the reading אֵלַי has the support of the traditional MT. On the other hand, its validity based on its being the *lectio dificilior* must be balanced by the possibility that such a reading may very well represent a mistake or corruption that would make the passage more difficult to understand. The textual ambiguity, and the presence of variant readings in the MT would give credibility to the idea of a contaminated text form. Arguments in favour of the MT text reading that are based on awkward pronoun constructions elsewhere allow for the generic possibility of the same in 12:10. However, the *tiqqune sopherim* reading for 2:12 argues for a similar third person pronominal suffix in 12:10, and against the MT first person suffix. As for the versions, they tend to support the MT reading "to me." The versions can be considered carefully, without assuming they are the final definitive voice.[116]

*Construct* אֵלֶי*—"To whom"*

There is a grammatical alternative compatible with the same consonantal MT: אלי can be vocalised in construct form. Kittel's 1912 edition of the MT, in speaking of the entire phrase אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר uses a single abbreviation: "crrp" [*corruptum*].[117] This notation is then followed by the corresponding phrase from manuscripts of the G text: "εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν." This, he says, equals "אֲשֶׁר [אֵל־] אֵלֶי Cf. Joh 19:37. . . ."[118] Thus importance is given to G [OG], and to its retroversion, which includes the possibility of the alternate vocalisation of אלי, and would also be the evident *Vorlage* of John's citation.

---

grounds, it [the variant 'him'] is less plausible, but it seems to have been current in very early times."

115 Jacob Neusner, ed., *The Talmud of Babylonia VI. Tractate Sukkah* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984), 256.

116 Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 82. Zech 12:10 is "Another verse which became modified in the Versions" with the "tendency . . . to weaken the sense in order to make the meaning more acceptable."

117 BHK (1912), 900.

118 BHK (1912), 900.

In contrast, BHS, "... while preserving a continuity with Kittel's work,"[119] includes a complete revision of the critical apparatus, in which the editors have exercised "considerable restraint in conjectures and retranslations from the ancient versions."[120] It thus deletes in the critical apparatus for this passage any reference to the LXX or retroversions, and indicates simply the variant readings for the phrase in Hebrew, as mentioned above. Thus one is left to consider the retroverted options mentioned by Kittel as possibilities, without the support of later BHS editors.

One could argue for the validity of this alternate vocalisation, which is a poetic form of אלי, which would then be translated "they shall look **on [or unto] whom** they pierced."[121] Dismissing the first person form of MT as impossible, and substituting instead the construct form, has long been considered.[122] Willi-Plein, seeing the MT in this instance as being "... so kaum haltbar ...," argues as well for this "... poetische Nebenform der Praeposition ..."[123] as best solution to the phrase. Admittedly, such a vocalisation is not widespread in the MT, but it does occur, for example, four times in the book of Job.[124]

In sum, this particular variant vocalisation of אלי, "to whom," smoothes out the construction syntactically, while theologically, it removes the apparent difficulty of God being pierced. It has the advantage of being identical with the consonantal MT. Kittel admits the corruption within the text of this phrase, and BHS' admission of the variants for this phrase and suggested readings, together with the presence of such a vocalisation elsewhere in the MT, lends support to this alternative reading.

*Third person* אֵלָיו*—"To him"*

A final possibility to consider among the variations upon this preposition is אליו. With the addition of a *waw*, whether a deliberate interpretative move as a *mater lectionis*, or as an error due to indistinct orthography, the meaning would become "to him/to the one."

---

[119] BHS, xi.

[120] BHS, xii.

[121] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 498.

[122] Theo. Laetsch, *Bible Commentary on the Minor Prophets* (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), 482. Here Laetsch expresses his agreement with Sellin on the matter.

[123] Ina Willi-Plein, "Ein Übersetzungsproblem Gedanken zu Sach. XII.10," *VT* XXIII (1973), 90.

[124] See Job 3:22, 5:26, 15:22, and 29:19.

A previous generation of scholars was divided on the issue. F.F. Bruce provided a translation based on this variant reading: "... when they look on him whom they have pierced...."[125] Bruce questioned the accuracy of the first person: "In the context of the oracle the reading 'on me' (if it is to be retained) would refer to Yahweh, who is the speaker...."[126] His questioning of the first person pronoun, together with the omission of the same in his translation of the phrase, lends his support to the variant reading אֵלָיו.

In contrast, Leupold argued in favour of MT vocalisation. He attempted to explain this variant as a reading substituted in some manuscripts to avoid the anthropomorphism of piercing God: "... a very small minority of manuscripts substituted 'to him' for 'to Me,' thereby demonstrating that they did not grasp the situation or thought the expression too bold that God should say men had pierced Him."[127]

Moore was in essential agreement with this explanation as well, claiming that "they [later Jewish interpreters] changed the text, and made it read [look unto] 'him' instead of 'me.' "[128] Attributing the reading to a marginal note later admitted into the text, he further downplayed its validity by stating that "scarcely any scholar of any note ... admits this interpolation...."[129]

Baron also attributed the variation in this case to a marginal reading that crept into the text:

> In a few MSS, however, the marginal correction—אליו, alav -- 'unto Him,' instead of אלי, elai—'unto Me', was made by Jewish hands; and in several instances this 'Keri,' or marginal reading, has, as is sometimes apt to be the case, crept into the text itself.[130]

In contrast, Hanson's translation of the verse opted for the reading אלו in place of אלי.

> Then I will pour out a spirit of pity and compassion upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, SO THAT they may look UPON THE

---

125 F.F. Bruce, *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1968), 110–111.

126 Bruce, *The NT Development of OT Themes*, 112.

127 Leupold, *Exposition of Zechariah*, 238.

128 Moore, *A Commentary on Zechariah*, 200.

129 Moore, *A Commentary on Zechariah*, 200.

130 Baron, *The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah*, 442.

> ONE whom they have pierced and mourn over him as one grieves for a first-born son.[131]

In the notes explaining his translation, Hanson justified his use of the phrase "the one": "again the ו/י confusion. We should read אלו. . . ."[132] Such a confusion between ו/י would require no stretch of the imagination, for it is an example of one of the "most frequently confused pairs of letters" in the copying and transmission of texts.[133] Gundry is another voice supporting this as the best explanation, indicating that an original *waw* could easily have been omitted by haplography.[134]

More recent scholarship shows little advancement beyond the positions just mentioned. Butterworth, for example, believes that the change in the text from 'him' to 'me' could have been a "purely mechanical mistake: the omission of a *waw*."[135] Menken gives his explanation for this variant: "אליו . . . is not presupposed by any other ancient version, and is probably a late effort to provide a smoother text."[136] Willi-Plein, while arguing for the construct form, appears to be assuming this third person suffix as the MT reading.[137]

There is another potential explanation which provides support for this reading, however. There is a striking resemblance between the phrase והביטו אליו, and a later phrase in the same verse וספדו עליו, which one would naturally expect if the antecedent phrase were in third person. It is quite probable that the עליו of the latter phrase has taken on the ו in parallelism and resonance with the אליו of the former phrase, i.e., והבטו אליו . . . וספדו עליו. In view of such parallelism in close proximity, this may have been the original form of both phrases.

In sum, this variant reading אֵלָיו is believable, and is certainly not an impossible reading. Its disadvantage is, of course, its apparent addition of the letter ו to the consonantal MT. Whether it is the mistaken reading, or the אלי itself is the incorrect reading that is now missing the original ו, is not an easy judgement to make. The *yod/waw* confusion does provide a simple explanation for the origin of the two contrasting readings,

---

131 Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 356, (emphasis added).

132 Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 356.

133 McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 44, 47.

134 Robert Horton Gundry, "*The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), 53.

135 Mike Butterworth, "Structure and the Book of Zechariah," in *JSOTSup* 130 (1992), 215.

136 Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 503.

137 Willi-Plein, "Ein Übersetzungsproblem Gedanken zu Sach. XII.10," 90, see also fn 2.

while the deliberate addition of a ו as *mater lectionis*, whether during the Second Temple period, or as a medieval manuscript clarification, is also reasonable. The clarity and smoothness for the phrase provided by the אֵלָיו variant leaves one with the impression that the אֵלַי itself is the incorrect reading as the result of a *yod/waw* confusion, with the אֵלָיו as original reading.

*πρός με*

The Greek translation of the word אלי in the LXX reading reflects a *Vorlage* identical to the MT with traditional vocalisation: "καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται *πρός με*. . . ." Since the LXX has this reading, some would assume that all Greek versions are the same. Thus, it is not difficult to see why Delcor, in support of the Hebrew reading אלי, has stated that all the versions, including Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, have the same reading.[138] However, his statement appears never to have been challenged, and calls for some qualification.

It is true that Theodotion reads: καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, which does support the reading,[139] and at the same time attempts to straddle both Hebrew readings for the pronominal ending. However, it is not entirely accurate to say that Aquila and Symmachus read the same. Extant fragments of Aquila and Symmachus do not include the entire phrase, with Aquila's fragments presenting simply: . . . σύν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν, and Symmachus' fragments reading: . . . ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεξεκέντησαν,[140] both of which are at variance with the LXX. Admittedly, these two forms of the phrase can be perceived as implying that they follow the prepositional phrase πρός με. Neither fragment, however, demands unequivocally a prior πρός με phrase.

If one assumes a Hebrew *Vorlage* identical at this point to the consonantal MT,[141] Aquila, with characteristic literalism, translates the את אשר by σὺν ᾧ. Such a translation allows for Yahweh to be looked to in association with the pierced one, but not to be identified alone as the actual one

138 Delcor, "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese," 193.

139 Origen, *Hexapla* (ed. Fredericus Field; 2 vols.; Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875), II:1026.

140 Origen, *Hexapla*, II:1026.

141 Cf. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text," 170. Cross's viewpoint regarding Aquila's text is this: "Aquila represents a sequent (to R) attempt to revise this revision in the direction of the official Rabbinic or Massoretic text which had been established by his day."

who is pierced.[142] Aquila's concern for literalistic accuracy, together with his characteristic translation of את by σύν have, as is often the case, overridden the concern for clarity of meaning.

In contrast to and independence from Aquila, Symmachus softens the phrase considerably by his use of ἔμπροσθεν, a preposition which carries the meaning of "before, in front of,"[143] "antes de,"[144] or "in the presence of . . . in the sight of."[145] "It [ἔμπροσθεν] is a reverential way of expressing oneself, when one is speaking of an eminent pers., and esp. of God, not to connect him directly w. what happens, but to say that it took place 'before him.' "[146] Thus Symmachus, in his desire to express what he saw as the spirit of the Hebrew rather than the letter,[147] recasts the phrase in order to take the piercing away from Yahweh directly and put it instead in his presence.

If one were to insist that the MT אלי, followed by the LXX reading πρός με, is the genuine reading, it must be admitted at the same time that both Aquila and Symmachus, whether or not the phrase was originally present in their versions, offer variations of the succeeding phrase that lessen the inherent tension within the entire expression.

Here the issue of Hebrew vocalisation is of critical importance. The Hebrew texts translated into Greek were not vocalised at the time. The possibility of alternative vocalisations has long been recognised, e.g., "G. seems to vocalize its Hebrew text in a way differing from M."[148] Traditional MT vocalisation can at times be called into question. On the other hand, one must admit with Tov that "at the time the LXX was translated, unvocalized Hebrew texts were read publicly, so that some form of reading of the consonantal text must have been known," yet at the same time, ". . . the degree to which the translators were aware of vocalization

---

142 Cf. Willi-Plein, "Ein Übersetzungsproblem Gedanken zu Sach. XII.10," 90, fn 2, who takes Aquila's version in the sense of "*mit* dem [d.h. mit dessen Hilfe] sie durchbohrt haben."

143 Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, I:148.

144 Jorge Fitch McKibben, *Nuevo Lexico Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento* (rev. and ed. B. Foster Stockwell and José Rivas, 1963; El Paso, Texas: Casa Bautista de Publicaciones, 1978), 102.

145 BAG, 256.

146 BAG, 256.

147 Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 98; see also Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 51.

148 Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text," 7. See also D. Winton Thomas, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (ed. H.H. Rowley; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957), 245–246.

is debatable."[149] If indeed there were diverse oral translations of the Bible in Greek circulating in the Diaspora, it would certainly not be strange for a translator to draw from such traditions for a written translation. A vocalisation, or more than one, that varied from MT tradition could easily obtain.[150] Nor would the work of a later reviser be so very far removed from the original processes of either oral or written translations. The presence of "guessing" in certain cases of translation, "often disregarding such details as prefixes or suffixes,"[151] would conceivably serve to explain the presence of Greek variants in a difficult case such as this one regarding the form and vocalisation of אלי.

It is important to note that ὁ Ἑβραῖος does not include the πρός με phrase.[152] The obscurity of the person and/or recension under that title has been discussed above; whether it is to be identified in some way with "the Hebrew" [language][153] or one "Hebrew" [person], is not known for certain. Nonetheless, in opposition to the LXX, the πρός με phrase is omitted entirely.[154]

References to the verse in other early writings offer some additional insight on the subject. The Epistle of Barnabas, though not quoting precisely, alludes to the verse in unmistakable language: "ὄψονται αὐτὸν . . . καὶ ἐροῦσιν . . . Οὐκ οὗτός ἐστιν, ὃν ποτε ἡμεῖς ἐσταυρώσαμεν ἐξουθενήσαντες καὶ κατακεντήσαντες. . . ." (*Barnabas* vii.9). As is evident, the πρός με phrase is again omitted entirely, leaving no hint that such a phrase existed in the original source. This is not to say that Barnabas should be considered as having high value for LXX textual criticism. It is to say that this reference, which comes from late first century or early second century C.E.,[155] is the earliest from outside the New Testament writings, and gives no indication whatsoever of a πρός με phrase. Barnabas' allusion thus speaks against the inclusion of this phrase in his source.

---

[149] Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 161–162.

[150] Cf. James Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators," *VT* 16 (1967), 1–2; James Barr, "Reading a Script without Vowels," in *Writing without Letters* (ed. W. Haas; Manchester University Press, 1976), 85.

[151] Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 164, here agrees with Barr regarding "guessing."

[152] Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 319.

[153] George Brooke views ὁ Ἑβραῖος as referring to the Hebrew of the Hexapla, as expressed in a personal interview with the author, October, 2005.

[154] While outside the scope of this study, support for this reading is also found in two cursives, 130 and 311; see Ziegler's apparatus, which mentions minuscule 130 as omitting the phrase πρός με entirely: "om. πρός με 130' = Ioh." The identical reading is found in manuscript 311, which dates from the twelfth century.

[155] Barnabas, (Lake, LCL), 338.

Justin quotes from Zech 12:10 a number of times, with some variation in form. In Dialogue 14.8, for example, he declares ὄψεται ὁ λαὸς ὑμῶν καὶ γνωριεῖ εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν. Here the phrase πρός με does not appear, nor is its presence implied. In fact, the presence of the unique additional phrase ὁ λαὸς ὑμῶν καὶ γνωριεῖ is consistent with the first verb ὄψεται, and would be inconsistent with πρός με, implying its absence in Justin's source.

Barthélemy, however, would quickly discount the validity of this quotation in Justin's writings, claiming that it is nothing more than a borrowing from the Gospel of John. "En Dial. XIV 8 Justin commet une méprise en attribuant à Osée une brève citation de Za. XII 10 qu'il emprunte en réalitè à l'évangile de S. Jean XIX 37 comme le prouve son texte caractéristique."[156]

Further quotations of the verse by Justin, however, reveal the same lack of the phrase πρός με. In Apology 1:52.12, the text reads καὶ τότε ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν. As is evident, the πρός με is omitted in this instance also, and should not be attributed to Johannine influence nor to Justin's faulty memory.[157] A similar quotation appears in Justin's Dialogue 32:2, which reads ἐπιγνώσεσθε εἰς ὃν ἐξεκεντήσατε.[158] Although he substitutes ἐπιγινώσκω for ὁράω, and puts the entire phrase in the second person plural, the phrase πρός με is once again missing in this quotation, suggesting its absence in Justin's source.

The πρός με phrase thus receives virtually no support from Justin's quotations. It is difficult, however, to attribute its absence to Johannine influence. As Swete perceived evidence of both Justin and Symmachus having drawn from a common earlier source for their quotations in the Minor Prophets,[159] Skarsaune can see echoes of an "Ur-Theodotion" influence, or a direct recourse to the Hebrew text.[160]

---

156 Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 211.

157 Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987), 77. Skarsaune is speaking of Justin's entire larger quotation that includes a number of biblical references, stating that it is "hardly a loose quotation from memory."

158 Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy*, 155.

159 Cf. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 422–423; The significant amount of agreement between Justin and Symmachus in the Minor Prophets led Swete to believe that the two drew from a common earlier source: "... as it is in the highest degree improbable that his [Justin's] text has been altered from the text of Symmachus, or at a later time from a Hexaplaric copy of the LXX., we are led to the conclusion that these readings belong to an older version or recension from which both Justin and Symmachus drew. It is at least possible that many of the readings in which Justin appears to stand alone may be attributable to the same origin." What Swete found to be "startling," i.e., the amount of agreement between Justin and Symmachus in the Minor Prophets, is evidence from the period prior to R's discovery (August, 1952), that supports Barthélemy's conviction that Justin and the second-century revisers of the LXX all drew from an earlier source.

160 Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy*, 77–78.

It is true that Justin's genuine writings are known to us from a single fourteenth-century manuscript in poor condition.[161] Barthélemy also points out the possibility that Justin's quotes contain a *rescriptus* element from the hand of later copiers.[162] Nonetheless, there is no necessity to insist that Justin is quoting from the Gospel of John.[163] The text of Justin's biblical quotations as a whole reflects a literal translational quality that clearly demonstrates the influence of R,[164] and which need not be denied in this case. In sum, the best explanation for the commonality between John and Justin regarding this citation is that they reflect dependency on a common source,[165] and the most likely source is found in R.

A number of other early fathers cite the verse, some including a translation of the πρός με phrase, some not. For example, Cyprian's Latin quotation of the verse includes the "in me" phrase: "Et intuebuntur in me in quem transfixerunt."[166] In contrast, Tertullian cites the verse in this manner: "Videbunt enim eum qui confixerunt."[167]

Thus we are left with a curious dilemma in the case of Zech 12:10: the LXX phrase πρός με, included in Theodotion, and possibly present in the original text of Aquila and Symmachus, receives no support whatsoever from Justin's quotations. Barthélemy's viewpoint regarding the influence of earlier sources, particularly R, upon Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Justin receives broad confirmation. It would thus be true to the evidence available that in the case of Zech 12:10, there were two parallel Greek textual influences present in late first and early second century C.E., one that included the πρός με phrase, and the other that did not. The complete lack of the πρός με phrase in Barnabas and ὁ Ἑβραῖος is further evidence of such a variant textual tradition, not only in Greek, but possibly in both Greek and a Hebrew recension. This influence may have come from two variant LXX versions or revisions, which in turn could be reflective of two variant vocalisation traditions of the emerging proto–MT. If so,

---

[161] Joost Smit Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), 13.

[162] Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 212; see also Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," 343.

[163] Cf., for example, Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (1962), 52: "…to trace its [the Fourth Gospel's] influence upon the thought of the first half of the second century is easy, for it had none."

[164] Tov, ed., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 158.

[165] Cf. Mason, "Why is Second Zechariah so Full of Quotations?" 22, regarding similar passages being dependent upon a third unknown source.

[166] W.O. E. Oesterley, "The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets," *Journal of Theological Studies V* (1903/4), 574–5.

[167] Oesterley, "The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets," 574.

Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion might have felt the tension between one strong vocalisation tradition of the standardised Hebrew text, and an obvious variation presented by a revision such as R. Theodotion attempted to straddle the fence by including both readings; Aquila and Symmachus sought to find a middle ground by lessening the tension with their modifications; and Barnabas, Justin, and ὁ Ἑβραῖος followed the parallel textual tradition, which is also reflected in John's citation.

*Conclusion*

In weighing all of the above discussion, the evidence is mixed regarding the pronominal ending. One could conclude by standing with the consonantal MT and traditional vocalisation of אֵלַי. However, the grammatical and syntactical difficulties presented by the reading, together with the presence of variant readings in both Hebrew and Greek, give evidence of a tremendous amount of question and controversy over the verse as far back as manuscript evidence is available. The MT form as *lectio dificilior* may be the most difficult reading, but not of necessity the best. It could be the most corrupt, with such a corrupted reading followed by subsequent versions.

The presence of the consonantal אלי as original text prior to vocalisation could explain the presence of other forms as subsequent attempts to clarify the meaning, such as אליו. With the πρός με phrase, the LXX translator may have followed the standardised Hebrew text in accordance with a specific tradition of vocalisation. On the other hand, a simple *yod/waw* confusion within early copies of the text can account for the presence of variant forms of אלי. The equation could conceivably be worked either way, with the original reading containing either *yod* alone, *yod-waw*, or *waw* alone, and the alternative forms reflecting the subsequent confusion and attempts at reconciliation.

Thus in sum, a number of variables in the late pre-Christian and early Christian era, including textual pluriformity in both Hebrew and Greek, along with variant Hebrew vocalisation traditions, leaves the door open for the אליו reading as a viable option. This variant reading offers simplicity, syntactical smoothness, and close compatibility with the consonantal MT. External support in the Greek by the omission of the πρός με phrase in Barnabas, ὁ Ἑβραῖος, Justin's quotations, as well as two later minuscules removes the text-critical question from the realm of a purely Massoretic variable, and places it as a textual variant in the era of Hebrew textual standardisation. This leaves the door open for an alternative Hebrew vari-

ant within the proto–MT tradition. Still, a minor textual variation consisting of a pronominal suffix, which at the same time carries a difference in meaning, is well within the parameters of scribal practice for textual variation both prior to and including the era of standardisation. In the final analysis, the אליו form, for all of the reasons mentioned above, and because of the shared *yod* with the MT traditional form, carries a textual viability that rivals that of the traditional MT אלי, and offers an equally plausible Hebrew form.

### *Particle* את*—Sign of the Direct Object*

It is impossible to deal adequately with vocalisations and pronominal endings of אלי without at the same time dealing with the particle את which follows. First, regarding the grammatical function of the particle, it is considered primarily as the *nota accusativi*, or "sign of the definite object,"[168] an "untranslatable particle, used to indicate a definite direct object."[169] To give further clarification: "*called* 'nota objecti' . . . *without any real meaning, precedes (as a rule) the (determined) object*."[170] It can also be seen at times in what Gesenius considers a somewhat irregular use as "resuming loosely some other prep[osition]."[171] The particle את can also be used as a preposition with the meaning of "with, together with,"[172] or "by, near, towards."[173]

If one assumes that the particle in this context refers to the direct object, its presence leads to grammatical difficulties. Hanson admits that the reading with אלו of necessity leads him to consider the את as superfluous.[174] He was not the first to consider this possibility. BHK (1912 edition), as discussed above regarding אל, labels the entire phrase אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר as "crrp" [corruptum], then follows that entry with the corresponding Greek phrase from "mss" of the G text, εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, which equals "(אֵלַי (אֶל-

---

168 J. Weingreen, *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), 56.

169 Harvey E. Finley and Charles D. Isbell, *Biblical Hebrew* (Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1975), 29.

170 KBL, 99.

171 William Gesenius, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (transl. Edward Robinson; ed. Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 85. Zech 12:10 is noted specifically under this definition.

172 KBL, 100.

173 Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, 54.

174 Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 357.

אֲשֶׁר . . ."[175] Kittel thus gives weight to Greek readings which, when retroverted into Hebrew, indicate a different pointing of אלי, and the elimination of the את.

BHS' apparatus notes for the phrase אֵת אֵלַי "var[ia] lect[io]; l[egendum] אֶל־אֵלַי vel אֵלַי," indicating the presence of variants, and suggesting readings that would also eliminate the presence of the את in preference for the simple אֶל or אֵלַי־. This would again make better sense of the phrase and provide a smoother reading.[176]

Gesenius' interpretation of the particle mentioned above as loosely resuming a previous preposition, though grammatically conceivable, does little to solve any difficulties in the phrase.[177] His definition would place the particle in the position of resuming the force of אלי, and indicating an object of the preposition, suggesting the reading "they will look to me, i.e., to whom they pierced." Thus, the identification of the pronominal suffix with the one pierced would remain.

Within the context of Zech 12:10, in addition to grammatical difficulties, the presence of this particle accentuates the problem of anthropomorphism. The preceding phrases of the verse suggest that those upon whom the spirit of grace and supplication has been poured out will look on the Lord, ". . . whereas the connection with what follows obliges the reader to consider the pierced one as a human being, distinct from God."[178] "When one follows the masoretic vocalization and considers את as the *nota accusativi*, one is almost forced to identify God and the pierced one, which creates the problem of a very strong anthropomorphism: how can God be pierced?"[179]

The presence of the את in this context is not incorrect grammar *per se*. However, it is not essential to the meaning of the phrase. At best, it is unnecessary, and at worst, if the pronominal ending of אלי is pointed in first person, it serves to heighten the tension between וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי and אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ.

---

[175] Kittel continues by adding "sed frt את י rudimenta nominis martyris." As to the possible *rudimenta nominis martyris*, the textual evidence seems much too scanty to make any sort of positive identification with a certain name.

[176] Lamarche, *Zacharie IX–XIV*, 81 fn.

[177] Gesenius, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 85. Further, Gesenius' additional scriptural examples given in this case do not neatly fit his grammatical description.

[178] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 499.

[179] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 499.

Before deciding the textual fate of את, however, one must first consider it in relationship to אשר, and the purported LXX translation of the two words את אשר by the phrase ἀνθ᾽ ὧν.

### *Comparing* את אשר *and* ἀνθ᾽ ὧν

The question of an את in the text is not an uncommon problem. Its presence in this case is already under some suspicion, but its addition or omission, as a general rule, does not always affect the sense of the phrase.[180] If את is assumed to be a legitimate part of this text, then along with אשר, the meaning of the two-word phrase would be "that which," "the one which," "him whom" or simply "whom." If את is not considered a part of the text, the אשר alone as relative pronoun would continue to carry the force of "which" or "whom."

A more difficult problem develops when one observes the obvious tension between the את אשר of the MT and its purported translation ἀνθ᾽ ὧν of the LXX. Any attempt to reconcile the Greek and the Hebrew proves to be difficult, and serves to accentuate the incompatibility between the two phrases.

To begin with, Lust's advice that the Septuagint is first and foremost a Greek document is well taken: "Before one concludes that an expression in the LXX is merely a mechanical reproduction of the Hebrew, one should try to understand it as a Greek idiom."[181] In that light, the most direct translation of the phrase ἀνθ᾽ ὧν is a simple "because."[182] It can also be translated as "in return for which," "for this," and it reflects a number of possible Hebrew phrases, including תחת אשר, אל־אשר and עקב אשר.[183]

Interestingly, in reviewing the occurrences of the phrase in the entire Jewish Scriptures, Hatch and Redpath do not list a single instance apart from Zech 12:10 in which ἀνθ᾽ ὧν translates את אשר, but there are numerous occasions where it translates the phrases תחת אשר, אל־אשר, עקב אשר,

---

[180] KBL, 99.

[181] Johan Lust, "Translation-Greek and Lexicography of the Septuagint," *ETL* 67 (1991), 69.

[182] Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 25. "Among particles mention may here be made of the prominence given to such a phrase as ἀνθ᾽ ὧν = 'because', owing to the Hebrew having similar conjunctions formed with the relative אשר."

[183] F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and ed. Robert W. Funk; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 112, par 208.1.

or יען אשׁר.[184] BHK 1937 notes the traditional LXX reading for the entire phrase, ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, saying that it equals (obviously referring to the last three words only: ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο) תחת אשׁר דקרו.

In comparison with other passages, there are two additional Zecharian occurrences of the phrase ἀνθ᾽ ὧν in the LXX, neither of which translates את אשׁר: in 1:15, where it translates the single word אשׁר; then again in 13:4, where it translates למען.

Menken argues for the possibility that ἀνθ᾽ ὧν translates את אשׁר in 12:10 as *accusativus limitationis*, that is, "concerning the fact that," or "because," seeing no need to suppose in this instance that the LXX translated a text differing from the MT.[185] Menken's argument, however, results in a forced compatibility between ἀνθ᾽ ὧν and את אשׁר, leaving him open to the weakness of identifying the meaning of a Greek and Hebrew phrase simply because of their occurrence in the same passage. Menken is not alone in making the identification, however, as Meyers and Meyers indicate: "The syntax is difficult, to be sure, and other translators would simply substitute "because" for '*et 'aser*, an approach adopted by the Targums and subsequent Jewish commentators. . . ."[186]

If indeed the LXX translator was working with a Hebrew *Vorlage* that contained the phrase את אשׁר, it appears that either he has ignored the את, or has forced it with אשׁר into an idiomatic translation of the phrase as a supposed parallel with the phrases תחת אשׁר, אל־אשׁר, עקב אשׁר or יען אשׁר. The former option appears more likely, that he simply ignored the את. On the other hand, if one assumes on the part of the translator a desire for faithful translation, then it could be argued that he had a *Vorlage* before him that did not include the את, or that included a variant phrase, such as תחת אשׁר.

To support the absence of את in the *Vorlage*, the particle in the Hebrew text is most often translated in the LXX by the Greek article.[187] The presence of LXX ἀνθ᾽ ὧν and corresponding absence of the article, could also

---

[184] HRCS, 1:109–110, in agreement with Blass and Debrunner. Even Hatch and Redpath's potential weakness of equating a Greek word or phrase with its corresponding Hebrew solely on the basis of its occurrence in the same passage, further supports the distancing of ἀνθ᾽ ὧν from את אשׁר.

[185] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 500.

[186] Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14* (AB 25; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 337.

[187] Cf., for example, the translation of the את by the Greek article in R compared to LXX, in Tov, ed., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 120.

imply the absence of את in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. In addition, the εἰς ὃν of Theodotion and John also implies the absence of the את. Aquila's revision is alone in suggesting the presence of the את in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

There is another potential explanation for the presence of ἀνθ' ὧν within the LXX text. It is remarkable that there exists a poetic resonance between the use of ἀνθ' ὧν in 12:10, and the use of the same phrase shortly thereafter in 13:4. Both verses demonstrate grammatical and syntactical similarity:

> καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο (12:10)
> καὶ ἐνδύσονται δέρριν τριχίνην ἀνθ' ὧν ἐψεύσαντο (13:4)

The similarity of structure, tense, and even precise word count in these two verses is too striking to be a matter of coincidence. Further, the parallelism of structure, together with the distinct variance of 13:4 from MT by its omission of the negative ולא, would also argue for the influence of the one phrase upon the other. The tremendous amount of text-critical difficulty with 12:10, in contrast to the minimal amount of difficulty with 13:4,[188] could tip the balance in favour of the latter phrase influencing the former as the translator brought the two into conformity with one another.

There is yet another possibility to consider, however, in explaining ἀνθ' ὧν in 12:10. One could see that the translator, having decided for a particular rendering of a word or phrase in the verse, would then move to force the surrounding context to fit that translational decision. If Barr is correct, the reading of an unpointed Hebrew text in the process of translation was a scanning process, back and forth over sentence or phrase, drawing out clues from word patterns, syntax, and semantics, then using those clues to reach the most likely reading.[189] In this instance, the translator would have felt no need to translate word for word in strictly linear fashion, but to fit the translation of an entire phrase more smoothly into what he had already decided should be the translation of a key word.[190] Tov is also well aware of such a possibility: if one word was changed or mistranslated, then the rest of the context had to be conceived differently or manipulated in order to fit the change.

> Several deviations from the MT in ancient translations . . . have caused additional changes in the translation, some of which are seemingly based on a different basis of consonants or vowels . . . Having produced a translation

---

188 Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 321.

189 Barr, "Reading a Script without Vowels," 71–99.

190 Al Wolters, "Semantic Borrowing and Inner-Greek Corruption in LXX Zechariah 11:8," *JBL* 118 (1999), 690.

> which for some reason differed from the MT in an important detail, the translator often realized that his translation of the whole verse made little sense . . . he could then attempt to 'rescue' the sense of the verse within the possibilities provided by the consonantal framework of the *Vorlage*.[191]

If the translator in this case was determined to translate דקר (or רקד) by κατορχέομαι, "dance in mockery" (which will be considered ahead), then it would be absurd for him to translate the previous phrase by "they will look on me whom . . . ," i.e., "they will look on me whom they danced in mockery." Thus, if this were the actual translational scenario, one would say that the translator first opted for "dance in mockery" as translation of a principal verb, then forced את אשר to be translated by ἀνθ' ὧν, "because," in order to make sense of the entire phrase.

Evidence from other versions may also shed some light on the issue. The Syriac and Vulgate respond to the phrase with a simple, direct translation. The Syriac reads "whom," along with the Vulgate "quem."

As also seen above, the second-century C.E. revisions of the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, though each is distinct from the others at this point, are all unanimous in opposition to the traditional LXX. Aquila reads . . . σύν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν, Symmachus reads . . . ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεξεκέντησαν, and Theodotion reads: . . . εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.

Aquila's version speaks for a Hebrew text that read את אשר, but he rigidly translates את as a preposition, and not as a sign of the accusative. Barthélemy rightly notes regarding Aquila's translation of את by σύν that "Et c'est ce σύν gouvernant l'accusatif que la langue grecque ne peut accepter."[192] Theodotion's version could arguably reflect a Hebrew reading of את אשר, but εἰς ὃν as transition from אלי to אשר דקרו works well without the את, and more likely indicates the presence of אשר alone. Symmachus' freedom of translation leaves much room for doubt regarding the Hebrew *Vorlage*, but little doubt that he was responding to the difficulty of the phrase by using a preposition that removed the subject of the sentence from the piercing. If his use of ἔμπροσθεν is a faithful translation of a Hebrew phrase, it is definitely not the exact phrase את אשר. Thus, these three versions together do little to support the presence of את in the MT, while they decidedly speak against the reading of the LXX.

In summary, it is possible to allow for the presence of the את in the MT and the LXX Hebrew *Vorlage*, yet at the same time allow for a consid-

---

191 Tov, "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," 175.

192 Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 15.

erable measure of doubt regarding its inclusion. Variants that suggest its elimination do cast a dark shadow over its presence in the text.[193] If the את appeared in the *Vorlage* of the LXX, in light of the difficulties of reconciling the phrase ἀνθ᾽ ὧν with the את אשׁר of the MT, one is compelled to believe that ἀνθ᾽ ὧν is not a direct and faithful translation of that phrase. Instead, it is best explained as a manipulative mistranslation for motives other than a faithful rendering of the Hebrew. It is conceivable that a variant phrase, such as תחת אשׁר, appeared in the LXX *Vorlage*. However, though that might solve the immediate question of the presence of ἀνθ᾽ ὧν, it then creates other difficulties for the Hebrew syntax of the phrase, e.g., it calls into question the presence of דקרו. The most reasonable explanation for the Hebrew text is that the presence of the את is highly doubtful and likely not to be included, although its inclusion or omission is not critical to the meaning of the passage. The presence of ἀνθ᾽ ὧν in the LXX is best explained as an innovative translation to agree with the decision to use the verb κατωρχήσαντο. Of the three extant attempts at resolution of the difficulty by second-century C.E. revisionists, Theodotion agrees most fully with the MT, with or without the את, and thus offers the best Greek translation of the phrase as it stands in MT.

### *Verb* דקרו—*"They pierced"*

This final Hebrew word of the phrase is well attested in the MT, with no variants indicated. The difficulty comes in attempting to explain the great difference between the verb and the purported translation of the same by the LXX, i.e., κατωρήσαντο.

With clearly a single meaning, דקר is defined as "pierce through (with weapon),"[194] or "pierce, run through, thrust through."[195] Κατωρχέομαι, on the other hand, means "to dance in triumph over, to treat spitefully, to mock at."[196] Not only is it at sharp variance in this instance from the Hebrew דקר, it is also a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX text, though דקר appears numerous times in the Hebrew.

---

[193] If indeed it is to be included in the Hebrew text, it would seem preferable to express the significant measure of doubt by enclosing it within brackets, i.e., [את], as a word "whose presence or position in the text is regarded as disputed," as is the practice in UBS4. Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds., *The Greek New Testament* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, United Bible Societies, 1994), 47.

[194] KBL, 216.

[195] Osburn, *Hebrew-English Lexicon*, 62.

[196] Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, II:251.

The earliest Greek manuscript evidence for this verse[197] is that of W, which has the curious reading κατηχήσαντο. The lexical form of the verb κατηχέω is defined as: "(late word . . . ) . . . *make oneself understood.* 1 . . . *report, inform* . . . 2. *teach, instruct* (Lucian . . . Ps.-Lucian . . . ) in our lit. only of instruction in religious matters,"[198] or "*teach by word of mouth* . . . *instruct* . . . Pass., *to be informed* or *instructed.* . . ."[199] This particular form would thus be an aorist middle indicative third person plural, translated as "they taught or instructed themselves." Sanders and Schmidt, in their notes on the Freer Collection, say of this reading:

> The verb means 'have taught themselves,' while the regular text κατωρχήσαντο means 'have danced in triumph over' . . . Ach has . . . 'have changed themselves,' which approaches somewhat the sense of W. The passage is one of difficulty and the trouble probably arose in the Hebrew.[200]

This reading of W is all the more curious when seen in the light of W's description as reflecting the influence of R, and corrected toward the MT. In this particular case, rather than having been corrected toward the MT, it distances itself, thus appearing to reflect neither the MT nor the influence of R. It is not difficult to make the verb fit syntactically in the construction; the problem is finding a plausible reason for the reading in contrast to both the MT and the LXX reading. The word κατηχέω appears nowhere else in any LXX reading, and there is no obvious explanation for its appearance in this instance.

Since W is indeed an early text,[201] ". . . doubtless pre-hexaplaric and early,"[202] ". . . de mediados o finales del s. III d.C . . . ,"[203] it is not easy to dismiss the reading as a simple curiosity. A scribal copying error, mistaking the ωρ of the LXX for an η, is not a plausible explanation, for the letters would not be easily confused. It could represent an attempt to respond to the LXX reading κατωρχήσαντο by the use of an alternative verb. If the copyist was aware of the difficulty caused by the LXX translation κατωρχήσαντο and could not make sense of such a reading, a deliberate substitution of

---

[197] There is no fragment from the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll that can give any text-critical help with the phrase.

[198] BAG, 424.

[199] LSJ, 927.

[200] Sanders and Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection*, 221.

[201] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 98.

[202] Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," 533.

[203] Fernández Marcos, "El Texto Griego de la Complutense en Doce Profetas," 4.

η for ωρ would offer a potential explanation.[204] With no readily obvious explanation for the reading, it seems best to leave it simply as a singular variant with no other manuscript support, perhaps reflecting a catechetical emphasis and/or an attempt to smooth out the obvious difficulty of κατωρχήσαντο.

Coptic versions offer another unusual reading: "*pro formis (figuris) in quas conversi sunt*,"[205] reflecting a Greek text containing perhaps μεταμορφουσθαι or μετασχηματιζεσθαι,[206] as Ziegler indicates: "(= *ανθ ων μετεμορφουντο?*)."[207]

In contrast to the curious readings of W and the Coptic, the Greek translation ἐξεκέντησαν agrees precisely with the Hebrew דקרו. The entire phrase εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν is found, according to Ziegler's apparatus, in the following: "'L' (86 txt)—407—613—Aethp Armp Iust. Constit. Didymus p. 841 Th. Tht. Cypr. = M," all of which, as indicated, read in harmony with the Massoretic text. Thus the reading has a considerable amount of manuscript support from Lucianic texts,[208] from papyrus and minuscules from IX to XIII centuries, portions of Ethiopic and Armenian manuscripts, as well as several readings from the church fathers.

In addition, the same phrase εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν is, according to Ziegler, "praemittit (-tunt)"[209] in the following: 87mg 68 26 393 449' 919[210] Bas.N.

---

[204] Cf. Max L. Margolis, "Textual Criticism of the Greek Old Testament," *APSP* 67 (1928), 188, 192, regarding a "peculiar substitution."

[205] Willem Grossouw, *The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*, (Rome: Pontifical biblical Institute, 1938), 91.

[206] Grossouw, *The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*, 91.

[207] Ziegler, *Duodecim Prophetae*, 319.

[208] Cf. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, x, and Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," 300, regarding the difficulty of precisely identifying the Lucianic recension.

[209] Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, Introduction.

[210] It is also noteworthy that the Heidelberg fragments of the prophets examined by Adolf Deissmann, "The New Biblical Papyri at Heidelberg," *ExpTim* 17 (1905), 254, designated as papyrus 919, contain the same reading for Zech 12:10 as John's citation in 19:37. It is explained by Deissmann as simply a Christian harmonization, which he sees as a peculiarity of the text: "Finally, it appears to me a peculiarity of the Heidelbergensis that it assimilates such passages as are cited in the New Testament, or are capable of a Christian meaning, as far as possible to their form in the New Testament text, or to the sphere of Christian thought." Cf. Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 500: here Deissman's argument that the original Hebrew verb in the phrase was רקד but was changed in the pre-Christian era to דקר for messianic reasons is soundly criticised by Menken as raising more complications than it solves: "Unfortunately, Deissmann and Merx (to whom Deissmann refers in the article, see Deissman, "The New Biblical Papyri at Heidelberg") do not make clear what kind of messianism this may have been; in fact, the supposed secondary reading created problems instead of solving them. A flaw of Deissmann's view is that he considers

It is noteworthy that the minuscule witnesses listed are commonly classified as representing the Hesychian recension. The person of Hesychius is difficult to identify historically, and his version is not extant as such.[211] In spite of the difficulty of identifying his version, these witnesses are identified in some measure with Hesychius, Alexandria, and Egypt, and are in agreement by including the reading.

The lower part of Ziegler's apparatus also lists the variations of this phrase from Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and "ὁ Ἑβραῖος," which have been considered above in relationship to other words and phrases. Aquila has σὺν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν; Symmachus has ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεξεκέντησαν; Theodotion has ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν; and ὁ Ἑβραῖος has εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν. As is evident, these witnesses are unanimous in supporting the reading ἐξεκέντησαν.

The well-accepted thesis of Barthélemy is that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, concerned about the accuracy of the Greek in relationship to the Hebrew proto–MT, used R as their basic source. There is no question that their reading agrees with the MT, and further, with complete unanimity of the three, it is hardly questionable that the reading ἐξεκέντησαν, quite apart from the question of the previous prepositional phrase, appeared as well in R. The obscurity of "ὁ Ἑβραῖος" has already been discussed. Nonetheless, his agreement at this point with Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, puts him in the company of those who were concerned about the accuracy of the Greek in relationship to the proto–MT.

Taking all of the above into consideration, there is enough support for the reading of ἐξεκέντησαν to give it a very high rating, as opposed to the reading of the LXX. It agrees perfectly with the MT, and receives additional support from a substantial number of cursives and versions. This reading has the potential of being legitimate and original Old Greek as an alternative reading to the traditional LXX. On the other hand, how does one then explain the LXX reading κατωρχήσαντο? Three main possibilities come to the foreground: it is a figurative translation, it reflects a ר/ד transposition, or it is an evasive rendering / exegetical move.

---

the variant readings only of the verbs in Zech 12:10ab, not those of the words between the verbs." Deissman's argument for such a conjectural emendation in pre-Christian times, though noted in the critical apparatus of Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 319, has no convincing support, textually or syntactically.

[211] See Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 80, as well as Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 151, 154–55.

*An OG Figurative Translation*

Some see the translator's use of κατωρχήσαντο as translating the verb דקר in a figurative sense of "reviled" or "insulted." Larkin, for example, views the use of דקר in this case as figurative, and comparable to its use in Proverbs 12:18, or Jeremiah 37:10: "... It is not impossible, therefore, that in Zech 12:10 דקר is used figuratively of an agent of God who is very closely identified with God himself."[212]

These examples given by Larkin, however, need further clarification. The figurative aspect of the Proverbs reference is in the comparison of a tongue that is *like* a real sword piercing, not a figurative piercing. Further, the Jeremiah passage is not accurately described as a figurative "piercing" either, but is rather a hypothetical situation referring to a true piercing. Thus, Larkin's examples are not legitimate as support for a figurative piercing in Zech 12:10.

Further, all other occurrences of the Hebrew verb דקר in the Scriptures are used in their literal, obvious sense, including the same verb in the same form that appears just a few verses later in Zechariah 13:3. This verb for piercing is never used in the Hebrew text in the sense of mocking[213] nor in a symbolic fashion, but only in the sense of a literal piercing.[214]

In support of a figurative translation, on the other hand, the rendering of the same verb in LXX of Zech 13:3 is not a literal translation. In this instance, it is translated by the verb συμποδίζω: "to tie or bind the feet,"[215] "*tie the feet together, bind hand and foot...*."[216] There is common ground in these two verses: both times a literal translation of "piercing" has been avoided by the Greek translation. The obvious contrast, however, is that the two verses use different terminology. If the 12:10 reference is an avoidance of anthropomorphism, there is certainly no anthropomorphism to be avoided in 13:3, for there is no direct reference to God.[217]

Butterworth sees in the presence of דקר in 13:3 a relationship with the previous use of the verb in 12:10, perhaps in the sense of a father and

---

[212] Katrina J.A. Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah* (Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1994), 162–163.

[213] Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 212.

[214] Moore, *A Commentary on Zechariah*, 199.

[215] Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, II:451.

[216] LSJ, 1685.

[217] Cf. Tov, "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," 166. Perhaps the inconsistency should not be surprising. "Since there is hardly any translation unit with the LXX which is even nearly consistent in its choice of translation equivalents, one can hardly express certainty with regard to individual reconstructions."

mother weeping for a child that has been pierced as a false prophet.[218] A literary tie between the two verses is not out of the question, but the context surrounding the two distinct uses of the verb makes the supposed parallel of weeping for the pierced child much less than convincing. If these two Zecharian translations of דקר are related, it is much more plausible to see them as interconnected variants[219] in the sense that both translations are a deliberate avoidance of a literal rendering of the same Hebrew verb, and that within the same Greek textual tradition.

The translations of this verb may be compared with LXX translations of דקר in other passages, though one does not have the option of comparing uses of the Greek verb κατωρχήσαντο, for it is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX. However, the translator may be drawing upon a broader context than modern readers are aware of, including remote contexts.[220] "In a way, all forms of exegesis might be called 'contextual exegesis,' because the translator's concept of 'context' was wider than ours . . . the translation might contain any idea the source text called to mind."[221]

When one explores a broader context for the use of κατωρχήσαντο in extra-biblical writings, the verb is consistently used of dancing in mockery, for example, over a vanquished opponent,[222] or to insult one's stupidity.[223] If this was a conscious move on the part of the translator to render דקר in a figurative sense, it is a rendering that distances itself from the original meaning of the Hebrew. The word does avoid the anthropomorphism of a literal piercing, but the lack of perceptible continuity with the Hebrew verb leads one to believe that other motives and perceptions were at work in the mind of the translator. It appears to be altered intentionally for theological motives.[224]

Whatever the motives of the translator might have been, κατωρχήσαντο cannot be seen as a careful and faithful rendering of the Hebrew verb דקר. Other possibilities of explanation must be sought which are more convincing.

---

218 Butterworth, "Structure and the Book of Zechariah," 215.

219 Cf. Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 223.

220 Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 61.

221 Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 82–83.

222 Cf. Herodotus, *Historiae* 3.151; Aelian, *On the Characteristics of Animals* I:v.54.

223 Plutarch, "How to Tell a Flatterer," *Moralia* 57.

224 Cf. Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 222. Here Ulrich is referring to variant editions of the biblical text, using I Samuel 17–18 as an example. However, the phrase can be applied to this passage as well.

*A* ר/ד *Transposition*

Another possible explanation of the difference between the Greek and Hebrew is that of a ר/ד transposition, transforming the verb דקר into רקד: "…sin autem contrario ordine, litteris commutatis, RACADU, ὠρχήσαντο, id est, *saltaverunt*, intelligitur."[225] Such a transposition of consonants would result in the Hebrew "to pierce" becoming "to skip or to dance,"[226] or "to leap, to skip, to dance for joy."[227] One might assume in this case an indistinct hand in a particular manuscript that left the graphic similarity of ד and ר virtually indistinguishable, leading the translator to a "palaeographical exegesis."[228] It is also possible that the translator had before him a variant *Vorlage* that actually did read רקד. Either option is possible, but a ר/ד transposition because of confusion over graphic similarity is more conceivable. If the translator could not make sense of it one way, he would be tempted to render it the other way.

> Some of these letters were hardly distinguishable in certain periods and in the writing of certain scribes … In practice this meant that scribes sometimes must have pondered whether the word they were about to copy would make more sense when written, for example, with a *daleth* than with a *resh*.[229]

Such a "pseudo-variant" as described by Tov would be a variant that did not exist in the *Vorlage*, but only as an accidental misreading in the mind of the translator.[230]

The ר/ד transposition is the single most frequent type of interchange of Hebrew consonants, either in actual Hebrew manuscripts, or in the perception of the LXX translators.[231] Further, it is a common occurrence in the Twelve.[232] The research of Brooke offers additional support. He documents the same type of transposition, which figures in the Qumran biblical

---

225 Origen, *Hexapla* II: 1026, fn 6.

226 McComiskey, ed., *The Minor Prophets*, 3:1214; see also KBL, 908–909.

227 William Wilson, *Old Testament Word Studies* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1987), 108.

228 Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 155.

229 Tov, "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," 169–170.

230 Cf. Tov, "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," 167. "Nearly all reconstructed variants … should be considered abstract entities, i.e., their actual existence in a Hebrew source cannot be demonstrated."

231 Tov, "Interchanges of Consonants," 265.

232 Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 196–197, sees it as a common occurrence, not only in the Twelve, but also in Jeremiah, which likely came from the same translator's hand. He lists Zechariah as having only one ר/ד interchange. Zech 12:10 is not mentioned specifically, but may be the passage that he is indicating; cf. also Tov, "Interchanges of Consonants," 262.

commentaries as a deliberate exegetical movement of letters to form different words.[233] The frequency of the ר/ד transposition in the perception of the LXX translators as a whole lends support to the view that this indeed may have been the source of the difficulty in this passage.

When one considers the possibility of the actual presence of the reading רקד in a Hebrew manuscript, however, the likelihood is much less convincing. There is no extant Hebrew manuscript to support such a reading. The tiny, yet important, bit of evidence from Qumran 4QXIIe supports instead a root verb ending in ר. The presence of the two letters רו . . . in the fragment of this verse is enough to convince the editors of the manuscript that they are the final letters of the verb דקרו.[234]

Recent further examination of the fragment by Ego et al., indicates the following: the two letters are indeed רו . . . , but the ר, while a damaged letter, is nonetheless a letter that can be safely identified. Once again, the editors are certain that the full word is דקרו.[235] Thus with the presence of a ר, the oldest extant evidence on this verse supports the MT in its reading of דקרו.

Apart from the complete absence of manuscript evidence to support a reading of רקד, there is yet another difficulty. The meaning of this verb, "leaping," "skipping," or "dancing," does not agree with the Greek verb κατωρχέομαι. Such supposed "dancing" that is indicated by רקד appears elsewhere in the Scriptures in the sense of honour or joy, as in I Chron 15:29, and not in the sense of mocking scorn, as κατωρχέομαι would suggest. Delcor's insight is still valid: "On ne trouve pas une seule fois le sens de la LXX dans les rares emplois (8 fois) de ce verbe dans la Bible . . . Ni en hébreu, ni dans les autres langues sémitiques voisines, on ne trouve jamais le sens du grec de la LXX."[236]

Thus, if the LXX translator found the Hebrew verb, or mistakenly thought he read רקד in his *Vorlage*, his rendering of the same by the Greek verb κατωρχέομαι would be a translation contradictory to all other LXX translations of the same verb רקד in the Scriptures. Even if one attributed to the translator a ר/ד transposition as a deliberate exegetical or interpre-

---

[233] George J. Brooke, "The Biblical Texts in Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987), 96.

[234] Russell Fuller, "4QXIIe," in *Qumran Cave 4—X the Prophets* (DJD XV; ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 264.

[235] Ego et al. eds., *Biblia Qumranica 3B: Minor Prophets*, 187.

[236] Delcor, "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese," 194.

tational device,[237] it is not a sufficient explanation, for κατωρχέομαι does not appear in any way to be a legitimate translation of רקד.

Further, if one granted the possibility that the dance suggested by κατωρχέομαι could reflect "certaines danses en l'honeur des idoles,"[238] still, the presence of κατωορχέομαι presents a problem of syntax in that κατωρχέομαι is habitually followed by the genitive or accusative, whereas in this case, the LXX translator uses it in an absolute sense.[239]

Though some still hold to the possibility of רקד in the Hebrew as the best explanation for the LXX reading, as does Muraoka: "... the translator most likely meant רקדו for MT דקרו,"[240] the possibility of the Hebrew verb רקד appearing in the LXX *Vorlage* is unlikely,[241] and is based on speculation alone. Any evidence to support that conclusion is tenuous at best, and there is no further external evidence pointing to such a reading, as Menken sums it up well: "... apart from the LXX, there is no evidence for the reading רקדו."[242]

Whatever the motive of the LXX translator, in the final analysis, neither דקר nor רקד provides compatibility with κατωρχέομαι. If the LXX *Vorlage* included a ר/ד transposition, resulting in the verb רקד, or if the translator misread the text as such, neither option supports a Greek reading of κατωρχέομαι. One must seek a more plausible explanation.

*Evasive Rendering or Exegetical Move*

There is a further possibility that the translator offered a different translation of דקר, not as though reading a Hebrew textual variant, nor misreading the verb written by an indistinct hand, but as a deliberate exegetical move. The Hebrew text did not have to contain the word written as such in order to make such a move, but rather the translator himself could have made such a change for his purposes. If it is assumed that the reading κατωρχήσαντο came from the hand of the original translator, it could be explained as a

---

[237] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 499–500, "Both letter transposition and the interchange of similar consonants were accepted exegetical devices in early Judaism ..."

[238] Delcor, "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese," 196. Delcor claims it is recognition of the sin of idolatry that causes the people in this passage to mourn.

[239] Delcor, "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese," 193.

[240] Muraoka, "A New Index to Hatch and Redpath," 263. See also Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 823.

[241] McComiskey, ed., *The Minor Prophets*, 3:1214. McComiskey represents continued hesitancy on the issue: the LXX rendering is "suspect," "a somewhat awkward Greek rendering," which "does not appear to be a comfortable rendering."

[242] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 499–500.

simple avoidance of anthropomorphism that is so strongly indicated by the Hebrew verb דקר. Such avoidance is a general characteristic of LXX translation technique, as Deist says: "... the translators of the Septuagint tried as far as possible to remove all anthropomorphic references to God."[243] Thus, if the translator did not want to face the disturbing implications of דקר as the apparent piercing of God, he might have used κατωρχέομαι as an avoidance of a literal or correct translation of the Hebrew. Still leaving intact the MT reading of the verb דקר, he would produce a pseudo-variant or evasive rendering by side-stepping the true meaning of the word.[244] "It is not impossible that the translator considered the implication of MT inappropriate and deliberately avoided it."[245]

Stanley claims such "interpretative renderings" were an integral part of the public presentation of written texts:

> While many of the differences between manuscripts were clearly accidental, recent studies suggest that intentional interpolations and 'interpretative renderings' played a greater role in the scribal practices of antiquity than many have recognized.[246]

To see κατωρχήσαντο as an "inadequate rendering"[247] or an "exegetical substitution"[248] is more likely than the idea of a figurative translation. If Zech 12:10 does represent such a case of deliberate mistranslation for exegetical reasons, it would then offer, or at the very least allow, confirmation of the MT reading. Taking into consideration all of the above discussion, the evidence for MT דקר as the single legitimate reading of both the Hebrew MT and the LXX *Vorlage* is quite solid. Neither external nor internal evidence supports the possible variant רקד. Further, the perfect match between דקר and ἐξεκέντησαν, together with the supporting Greek manuscript evidence for this reading, compels one to accept ἐξεκέντησαν as the single legitimate

---

243 F.E. Deist, *Towards the Text of the Old Testament* (transl. W.K. Winckler; Pretoria: N.G. Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, 1978), 187.

244 Tov, "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," 174.

245 Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 157.

246 Stanley, "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations," 23.

247 G.B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint," in *Septuagint Lexicography* (ed. Robert A. Kraft; *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 1 (1972)), 112. This represents Caird's category 2: "Well-attested Greek usage which inadequately renders the Hebrew, because the translator for reasons of his own decided to alter or improve on the original."

248 Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," 86. When Tov speaks of "exegetical substitution," the number of such cases in the Septuagint are, according to him, "very large."

Greek translation. Κατωρχήσαντο must be viewed as an alternative Greek translation that is based upon the same Hebrew *Vorlage*.

## Conclusion

Hebrew evidence for this verse does not indicate any other textual tradition at significant variance from MT. Nonetheless, the MT does contain some points of controversy, primarily surrounding the possible vocalisations of אלי, the possible addition of ו to אלי, as well as the questionable presence of את.

The LXX rendering ἐπιβλέψονται clearly translates the first Hebrew word והביטו, and has strong support as the first Greek word in the phrase. Nonetheless, the synonymous reading ὄψονται of Justin, Theodoret and ὁ Ἑβραῖος is also legitimate, and at the same time, does no violence to the Hebrew.

Regarding the second word in the phrase, traditional Massoretic vocalisation of אלי complicates both the syntax and the theology. A construct vocalisation of אלי is preferable, without discounting the additional possibility of the alternative spelling אליו. Here the LXX rendering leaves many difficulties to be reconciled. It is true that LXX πρός με translates אלי with traditional MT vocalisation. However, regarding the presence of πρός με, the evidence is split: if the phrase is dropped in preference for the alternative construct vocalisation of אלי, it provides a much smoother text. If it is retained in preference for traditional MT consonantal text and vocalisation of אלי, then one must live with awkward syntax and uncomfortable anthropomorphism. The presence of two such possible Greek readings for the phrase, one with πρός με, as found in Theodotion and possibly also in Aquila and Symmachus, and another without, as in Barnabas, Justin, and ὁ Ἑβραῖος, leaves the distinct impression that two Hebrew textual and/or vocalisation traditions, along with their respective Greek translations, parted ways over this preposition and its endings sometime prior to or during the era of the stabilisation of the Hebrew proto–MT.

Regarding the following word את, its presence in the MT does not allow its easy dismissal, but the amount of controversy over its inclusion indicated by the variant readings that exclude it, does cast a shadow over its presence. The entire phrase can function very well, perhaps better, without the את, and there is considerable evidence that would allow for the option of excluding it.

The Greek phrase ἀνθ᾽ ὧν cannot be supported as an accurate translation of את אשר. The phrase is best seen as a forced translation of את אשר that is made to conform to the use of the verb κατωρχήσαντο. The reading εἰς ὃν of Theodotion, ὁ Ἑβραῖος, and various later minuscules, is much to be preferred for its accuracy and compatibility with the Hebrew phrase.

The traditional LXX reading κατωρχήσαντο does not reflect an accurate translation of a Hebrew *Vorlage* in keeping with דקרו of the MT, or proto–MT tradition. The presence of the verb may be attributed to a misreading of the Hebrew *Vorlage*, or to an evasive rendering that loosely but inaccurately reflects a ר/ד transposition. However, the reading κατωρχήσαντο is best explained as an intentional evasive rendering due to an exegetical and theological agenda of the translator, most likely to avoid the anthropomorphism of God being pierced. If it is assumed that κατωρχήσαντο was an early or original OG reading that revisionists Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion found in their Greek scriptural source, then one is compelled to believe that their dissatisfaction led them to correct it consistently to read ἐξεκέντησαν in order to agree more closely with the proto–MT. The LXX form offers little textual certainty *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew MT form, while there is no indication that the LXX translator was reading a significantly variant *Vorlage* at this point. The verb κατωρχήσαντο has no early manuscript support whatsoever, but stands alone as an apparent later textual emendation, yet based on the same Hebrew *Vorlage*. Thus the alternative verb ἐξεκέντησαν, with manuscript support from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and in perfect compatibility with the Hebrew דקר, must of necessity replace κατωρχήσαντο as a more faithful rendering of דקרו.

In sum, the strongest textual candidate for the Hebrew reading of the entire phrase, and that which commends itself as the most likely proto–MT reading, is the following: וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי/אֵלָיו אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ.

As to the Greek reading, if one assumes the LXX form ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο as OG, then it must also be asserted that there were two corrected LXX forms in existence: ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν and ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν. The former would represent a corrected LXX to conform more closely to a textual tradition equal to MT, and the latter a corrected LXX to conform to a proto–MT reading at slight variance from later MT. If the assumption of LXX as OG is not made, then one of the corrected forms might very well itself have been the OG, with the LXX being a later emendation as the result of another exegetical agenda.

Thus the MT וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ and its Greek counterpart ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, stand together as representing one textual and vocalisation tradition. In contrast, a proto–MT reading וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלָיו/אֵלַיִו אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ, and its most closely matching Greek counterpart, ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, represent an alternative textual and vocalisation tradition. The latter are to be preferred as providing the clearest, smoothest, and most precise renderings of the phrase, with the least amount of unresolved textual, grammatical, and syntactical issues.

CHAPTER SIX

# JOHN'S SCRIPTURAL CITATIONS

## Introduction

Having evaluated the scriptural forms of Zech 12:10 in Hebrew and Greek, the next step to an adequate perception of this citation in the Gospel of John is to describe it in relationship to John's other scriptural citations. The purpose of this chapter is, first of all, to provide an overall perspective on the forms and evident textual sources used by John in explicitly citing the Jewish Scriptures. Focus will be made on major categories of citation that define the primary ways in which John cites the Scriptures in relationship to known textual forms. Secondly, the purpose is to locate the form of the citation found in 19:37 within that larger context of John's scriptural citations.

There are 14 readily identifiable explicit scriptural citations in John,[1] nine of which are included in his Passion Narrative. It is not possible in this chapter to deal with each citation in detail. Instead, detailed comment will be reserved for representative citations within each category. The discussion will progress from those categories which appear to be the most evident, to those presenting more complexity. John's forms of scriptural citation present a challenging scenario to anyone who would wish to categorise them. They are most easily categorised in comparison to textual forms that are known to us in the modern era, but such comparison is only a beginning point. The textual realities of the era in which John lived must also be discerned as fully as possible, and must of necessity be taken into account.[2]

It is apparent that John shows a marked tendency to cite the Scriptures carefully and concisely, yet there is wide disagreement regarding the textual basis for his citations. The lack of precise conformity to either MT or

[1] Although there are a number of allusions to Jewish scriptural passages, it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions from such allusions regarding the textual source used by John. The study of those allusions is beyond the scope of this chapter.

[2] Cf. Swanson, "How Rewritten is 'Rewritten Bible'?" 20: "The question is, how can we define 'further' or 'nearer' [from recognized authoritative scriptural text] without prejudicing what 'Bible' we begin with?"

LXX in all but a handful of citations has spawned numerous speculations regarding his textual sources.

Some would hesitate to delineate any single textual tradition as John's main source for scriptural citation.[3] Indeed, it does seem wise not to attempt to force all of John's citations into a single textual tradition, for the evidence is quite diverse, and allowance must be made for multiple possibilities regarding source material. Yet each citation, or group of citations with similar characteristics, raises distinct possibilities, and must be evaluated separately, with an adequate response given to the particular issues that are raised.

## Verbatim LXX Citations

In four instances, John quotes the LXX to the letter:

1)[4] Jn 10:34 citing Ps 82:6
Ἐγὼ εἶπα, θεοί ἐστε
2) Jn 19:24 citing Ps 22:18
Διαμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον
3) Jn 12:13 citing Ps 118:25–26
John: Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου
LXX: εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου
4) Jn 12:38 citing Isa 53:1
Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;
καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;

There are a number of issues raised by John's verbatim LXX citations: 1) John's relationship to the LXX; and 2) the meaning of the confluence of John, LXX, and MT tradition. His use of Ὡσαννά in 12:13 raises the additional issues of 3) John and his translation or transliteration of a Hebrew expression; and 4) the significance of John's agreement with the LXX at slight variance from MT tradition.

---

[3] Hübner, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament," 359. Hübner recognizes the complexity of John's underlying texts: "Sometimes the evangelist possibly referred to the Hebrew original, but at other instances neither the Septuagint nor Hebrew Bible can be identified as the main influence."

[4] N.B.: Citations are numbered in sequence separately from the chapter outline for easier reference.

### *John and the LXX*

If these four were the only passages cited by John, it would be quite a simple matter to discern his scriptural source. The presence and influence of the LXX is quite evident, and its role as a primary source is clear. Due to its obvious prominence in John's citations, some scholars have been unable to conceive of any other source. If one begins with that basic assumption, however, the inclination is then to manipulate all other data to fit the schema. Swete, for example, saw the LXX as a primary source for the scriptural quotations of John. He gave three categories of LXX citation: 1) John at times quotes the LXX verbatim, as in the citations of the first category designated above;[5] 2) John quotes "more freely" in 6:31, 45 and 15:25; and 3) he takes a "more or less independent course" in 1:23, 12:40, and 19:37.[6] Thus assuming LXX priority, Swete was able to fit the vast majority of John's citations into the category of LXX as primary source. Goodwin is another example of one who held the same general assumption that John shows knowledge of the Scriptures primarily through the LXX.[7]

In more contemporary scholarship, Fernández Marcos also notes the influence of the LXX upon NT quotations in general. Though not referring exclusively to John, his insights are important for any study of the citations of the FG. Allowing for the overall complexity of the LXX quotations in the NT, as well as the process of revisions that the pre-Hexaplaric LXX underwent from a very early stage,[8] nonetheless, he concludes that "most of the Old Testament quotations in the New follow the text of the LXX in one of its known forms."[9]

Specifically referring to John, Schuchard sees LXX influence in 13 explicit scriptural citations, each of which is identified by means of a formula: 1:23, 2:17, 6:31 & 35, 10:34, 12:14–15, 38, & 40, 13:18, 15:25, 19:24, 36 & 37. The same basic assumption that motivated Swete continues to carry weight for Schuchard: he believes that he is able to discern a single textual

---

[5] Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 398, does not include 12:13 in this group, but adds to this group those in which John quotes "with slight variants," as in 2:17 and 19:36.

[6] Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 398.

[7] Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" 65. However, to Goodwin's credit, he did admit that John gives indication of knowing other versions as well.

[8] Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 265–66. He is aware of quotations in which a source different from the LXX must be postulated.

[9] Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 265, fn 31.

tradition in these formula citations: that is, the Old Greek, from which basis, he claims, John carries out purposeful editing.[10]

Menken is also in essential agreement that the LXX was John's Bible,[11] but he, like Fernández Marcos, rightfully discerns a more complicated scenario than Swete or Schuchard. Scriptural quotations in John with a recognisable source usually come from the LXX, he says, arguing that most Johannine quotations that are not free paraphrases of scriptural texts, are indeed from the LXX.[12] In the cases where the LXX did not fit John's purpose, however, he claims that he made use of the Hebrew text or an "extant early Christian version."[13] He believes that the remaining eleven quotations are derived from the LXX, but in the majority of them, "John has edited the LXX in various ways, in agreement with current exegetical rules and for christological reasons."[14]

Fernández Marcos and Menken are correct in recognising the complexity of John's scriptural citation. However, as Menken develops his viewpoint regarding John's relationship to the LXX, he can envision essentially only what Swete had seen: in LXX citations, either John quotes, or quotes and edits, the LXX. He sees John as quoting from the LXX to the extent that it fits his purpose, and when it does not, John uses another alternative, which places the burden for variant scriptural citation upon John. It does not seem to be an option for Menken that the LXX itself, not to speak of an alternative Hebrew *Vorlage*, could offer to John a pluriform textual tradition from which he might have drawn.

Septuagint influence behind John's citations cannot be denied, and the presence of verbatim LXX citations does indeed offer a firm beginning point for viewing John's relationship with the LXX. On the other hand, any data in John's citations that indicate a variant from LXX citation need not be forced into a strict comparison between John and LXX alone. That is, one need not be limited to the assumption that disagreement between John and the LXX is a result of deviation from a LXX base. These four cases

---

[10] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, xiii.

[11] Maarten J.J. Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John: Jn 10:34; 12:38; 19:24," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C.M. Tuckett; Leuven: University Press, 1997), 393.

[12] Maarten J.J. Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36: Sources, Redaction, and Background," in *The Four Gospels 1992* (ed. F. van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2117; cf. also John 1:23, 2:17, 6:31, 45, 10:34, 12:13, 38, 16:22, 19:24.

[13] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 367.

[14] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 367.

are only the beginning, and a number of variations on the relationship of John's citations to LXX are possible. In the light of multiple textual traditions, one can begin by assuming a broader range of textual possibilities, in both Greek and Hebrew, available to John in his first-century C.E. biblical textual context.

### *Confluence of John, LXX, and MT Tradition in Verbatim Citations*

In these first four citations, John is citing a text identical to the LXX, which in these cases is an accurate translation of a Hebrew *Vorlage* equal to the MT tradition.[15] If the LXX continued in every case to reflect the MT as its *Vorlage*, the scenario would be quite uncomplicated indeed. Not all of John's citations, however, retain such simplicity. In the light of textual pluriformity, it is more accurate to say simply that the LXX translates a *Vorlage* which at these points happens to coincide precisely with the MT tradition. Otherwise, it would be easy to fall into an erroneous assumption that in the cases where John, LXX, and MT do not agree with one another, John has misquoted or modified the citation, or the LXX has mistranslated its Hebrew text.

For instance, Menken concludes after analysing three of these citations, i.e., John 10:34, 12:38, and 19:24, that "John made use of the LXX, modifying it or departing from it where it did not serve his purposes. . . ."[16] Menken's corollary to that assumption is this: in the three quotations he mentions, John has left the LXX text untouched because the verses fit his purpose as they were, and he had no reason to change them; they offered to John exactly what he needed.[17] At this point Menken's assumptions are evident: that the LXX text available to John must have been equal to the LXX as represented in major manuscripts of fourth century C.E. and beyond, and that John's deviations from that text in other quotations are the result of his modifications of that text for a theological agenda. Menken has apparently not taken into account the possibility that in these 3 (or 4) instances, the Greek text used by John happens to parallel precisely that of the LXX, while in other instances it simply does not. In those cases where it does not, John's source text may exhibit variant readings for a number of possible reasons.

---

[15] See Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 42, regarding Jn 10:34 citing Ps 82:6.

[16] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 369.

[17] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 370.

The exact quotations mentioned could be seen in Menken's terms as "what John needed," i.e., what fit his argument well. John was a creative author, and doubtless every verbatim citation fits well the point John was attempting to make. In these 4 cases, the strength of the LXX textual tradition in harmony with the MT is evident. In other cases where John apparently deviates from the LXX, however, it may be questioned whether or not he was using or manipulating the scriptural text to serve his purposes. No one would discount the possibility that John may have modified a LXX text, but before resorting to such a solution, one must admit that there is more than a single reason to explain textual variation.

### *John and the Hebrew*

The LXX is certainly a significant influence upon John, yet the Hebrew text(s) must also be taken into consideration. Careful analysis of John's quotations in general compared to MT does reveal clear evidence of a strong relationship. More than a century ago, Plummer spoke of John's expertise with Hebrew, citing 6:45, 12:13 and 12:15 for evidence. He believed that the author of the FG was a Jew who knew Hebrew. He saw evidence of direct translation from the Hebrew text in 12:15, and in 6:45 and 12:13 he believed the author demonstrated independent knowledge of Hebrew.[18]

Most scholars do agree that there is definite Hebrew textual influence upon John's citations. Hanson, for example, in addition to an overarching statement regarding the Scriptures as constitutive for John's Gospel, believes that John must have been able to use the Hebrew text.[19] Humann has a similar stance in believing that John never violates the intent of the MT. In two instances, i.e., 13:18 and 19:37, he claims that John translates directly from the Hebrew, using his own vocabulary.[20] Whether or not direct translation can be proven, Hebrew influence upon John's citations is unmistakable. The form of John's Gospel as it has come down to us is, of course, not written in Hebrew. All the while, however, his scriptural quotations can be perceived at a minimum as remaining true to their Hebrew textual antecedents. In the various forms in which John cites the Scriptures, nowhere does he blatantly contradict the essence of known Hebrew textual traditions.

---

[18] Alfred Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. John. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools* (ed. J.J.S. Perowne; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1893), 245, 335.

[19] A.T. Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 250.

[20] Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 39–41.

In citation 3 of this section, Jn 12:13 citing Ps 118:25–26, there is a slight variation from the LXX that demonstrates Hebrew influence.[21] This citation is unique in that it is the only example in which John begins with a transliterated expression. The word Ὡσαννά is not an explicit part of the passage in the LXX, for its occurrence in Ps 118:25 has been translated as σῶσον δή. In contrast to the LXX, John draws his use of Ὡσαννά from a transliteration of the HB הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא from verse 25,[22] and uses it to preface his citation of verse 26. John's transliteration of a well-known Hebrew expression is a mere brief glimpse into his relationship with Hebrew scriptures, yet it offers one indication of how seriously John took those scriptures. The key position of this citation at the beginning of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem would not allow one to view such an exclamation as coincidental. This transliteration, together with John's many other indications of facility with Hebrew language and continuity with the Hebrew text, may be expressive of his devotion to the Hebrew scriptures and his desire for continuity with the community of Israel.[23] The presence of such an expression that would have been recognised by Hebrew-speaking Jews points to at least one sector of the audience to whom John was directing his writings, and illustrates his desire to communicate with those who considered such an expression from their scriptures to be meaningful. Though a single word, his transliteration of Ὡσαννά is indicative of a close relationship with the Hebrew text that runs throughout his scriptural citations. That does not fully explain John's every citation, yet it does

---

[21] John's addition of Ὡσαννά to the beginning of his citation raises the question whether this is truly a verbatim LXX quotation. It is possible to include this citation below in "Quotation with Minimal Variance from LXX." It is included here, however, because the added word stands only in an introductory position, while the rest of the citation is identical to the LXX.

[22] KBL, 412, equates the two expressions and cites Matthew 21:9 as example; BAG, 907, equates the form with both the Aramaic הוֹשַׁעְנָא and Hebrew הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא, and includes the reference of John 12:13 as example; A.T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (6 vols.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930), V:221, cites John's use of the word as "transliteration of Hebrew word"; LSJ, 2040, cites the word as "Hebr. exclam." It is important to note that the shorter form הוֹשַׁע is also a legitimate Hebrew hifil imperative of ישע.

[23] Cf. George J. Brooke, "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process" (Lecture, University of Manchester, undated; online: http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/7th/BrookeFullPaper.htm), 1–2, regarding the Qumran community rule books, who states that "in the reworked and rewritten scriptural texts, that authoritative status had a language preference, and the preference was for Hebrew." Brooke believes that the exclusive use of Hebrew in the community's rule books indicates how the community perceived itself to be in continuity with ancient Israel: they saw themselves as the true heirs of Israel of pre-exilic times, "heirs with a renewed covenant."

indicate one extremely significant factor influencing his use of Scripture. John does indeed generally demonstrate affinities with the Hebrew, yet in some cases the situation is more complex. Even in those cases where his citation is not easily explained by its relationship to Hebrew, however, one cannot build a case for serious variance from the essence of Hebrew textual tradition. On the other hand, if John demonstrates a close relationship to a Hebrew text in a particular citation, care must be taken to avoid a facile identification between the MT and a Hebrew text or texts that might have been available to him during the first century C.E. prior to, or during the process of standardisation. Textual pluriformity in Hebrew, even within the proto–MT tradition itself, allows room for some variance in evaluating any Hebrew influence, or supposed Hebrew *Vorlage*, behind John's scriptural citations.

### *Agreement of John with LXX in Contrast to MT*

Hebrew textual pluriformity offers more than one possibility for explaining the issue of variants between the LXX and MT that is raised, for example, by John 12:38. This quotation, citing Isa 53:1, is a verbatim citation by John of the LXX. In this case, however, John and the LXX are in exact agreement in the addition of Κύριε as opposed to MT, where the word is absent. The presence of Κύριε might indicate that the LXX has added the word for form, style, or clarification, for it is not antithetical to the meaning of the passage. However, one cannot assume in this case that the LXX, followed by John, purposely deviated from the MT tradition. While that may have been the case, it is equally possible that the LXX reflects an alternative parallel *Vorlage* at slight variance from the MT. The fact that John has cited the LXX verbatim against the MT tradition, indicates the prominent position of influence held by the LXX text of this passage and its Hebrew *Vorlage*. In this instance, it is a case of slight variation, though a *Vorlage* more significantly at variance from the MT tradition may be necessary to explain other examples of citation.

### *Conclusion*

In the text of these first four citations, there are no text-critical variants, either in the Johannine text, or in the LXX text of the verses. This indicates that John has quoted from a solid Greek textual tradition that remains constant in the early centuries of its translation and transmission. However, that should not lead to the assumption that all of John's citations can be traced to a single primary source in the LXX, nor that the instances of

confluence between John, LXX, and MT allow one to establish the LXX as the primary basis from which all other Johannine citations are then to be evaluated. One should be cautious of suppositions drawn from the presence of these verbatim citations regarding John's relationship to the LXX in general, or of the LXX's relationship to the MT. It is important to affirm the definite influence of the LXX upon John's citations, but it is equally important to have an adequate view of John's relationship to the Hebrew text in its pluriform possibilities.

In these first four citations, three from Psalms and one from Isaiah, John, LXX, and MT, are all in agreement. Other forms of citation studied below, however, reveal more complex scenarios of relationship between the three, as well as revealing the presence of other potential textual traditions.

## Quotation with Minimal Variance from LXX

In addition to 12:13, which is prefaced by Ὡσαννά, John presents a number of other citations that reveal only a slight variance from the LXX:

5) Jn 1:23 citing Isa 40:3
   John: (Ἐγὼ) φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,
   *Εὐθύνατε* τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου
   LXX: φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,
   *Ἑτοιμάσατε* τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου
6) Jn 2:17 citing Ps 69:9
   John: Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου *καταφάγεταί* με
   LXX: Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου *κατέφαγέν* με
7) Jn 15:25 citing Ps 35:19, 69:4
   John: *Ἐμίσησάν* με δωρεάν
   LXX: *οἱ μισοῦντές* με δωρεὰν
8) Jn 19:36 citing Exod 12:10/46, Num 9:12, Ps 34:20
   John: Ὀστοῦν οὐ *συντριβήσεται* αὐτοῦ
   Exod LXX: Ὀστοῦν οὐ *συντρίψετε ἀπ'* αὐτοῦ
   Num LXX: Ὀστοῦν οὐ *συντρίψουσιν ἀπ'* αὐτοῦ
   Ps LXX: *κύριος φυλάσσει πάντα τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτῶν,*
   *ἕν ἐξ* αὐτῶν οὐ *συντριβήσεται*

There are a number of issues that come to the foreground in this section: 1) when John quotes the LXX with near exactness, but with minimal

variation, a number of possibilities for explanation present themselves: a) as discussed above, the influence of a Hebrew text could be reflected, for if the variant word is a close synonym to the LXX word, he could be translating from Hebrew with his own choice of an alternative word; b) a variant word could reflect a compressed abbreviation of language from the immediate context of the citation; c) if the variant word is used in a significant form in another recognisable scriptural context, then it is quite possible that his desire is to quote a particular text while at the same time inserting a key-word link that evokes the meaning of that additional context; 2) John's exegetical and editorial activity is an overarching issue related to all of these; 3) Hexapla fragments offer relevant insights in certain citations.

*Compressed Language from Immediate Context*

Citation 5, John 1:23 citing Isa 40:3, presents a single word of variance in comparison to the LXX, i.e., an identical verb form with a different root. Where the LXX uses the verb form Ἑτοιμάσατε, John uses Εὐθύνατε. The alternative word used by John can be seen as a synthesis of the phrase that follows in the second half of Isa 40:3, used to capture the heart of the entire passage in a single two-line quotation. Given his penchant for concise quotation, it is possible that John has used Εὐθύνατε as a compressed version of Ἑτοιμάσατε together with the following line εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ, in order to draw from and include the additional thought of the immediate context.

*Key-word Insertion*

Swanson's work on the handling of biblical sources in the Temple Scroll is relevant to this category of citation in John, for "the re-writing of scripture is not an uncommon feature of Second Temple period literature. . . ."[24] In his summary of methodology, he speaks of the use of a scriptural base text which is of primary importance, along with a word-form from a secondary text woven together with the base text to provide a specific nuance of interpretation.[25] His analysis of techniques utilised includes the designa-

[24] Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (vol. XIV of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*; ed. F. Garcia Martinez and A.S. Van der Woude; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 227.

[25] Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 228.

tion of a "word-form insertion" or a "key-word link."[26] These concepts open up new possibilities applicable to the citation of John 1:23 citing Isa 40:3. Εὐθύνατε may have been taken from another context, such as the famous passage found in Josh 24:23, the only other passage in the LXX where the verb is used in this exact form, and inserted in the place of Ἑτοιμάσατε as a key-word link. Such a famous statement could well have been in the mind of John, with the desire to evoke within the memory of his hearers this additional prophetic context and content. If this is truly a conscious key-word insertion from that passage, then John is doing two things: first, he is utilising a Greek word that accurately translates the Hebrew verb, and at the same time he is inserting a word recognisable as evoking another context. This is then an exegetical move to draw the meaning of the two passages together to speak to the issue at hand, giving an additional impact to the citation without distorting its original meaning.

The puzzle in the case of citation 8, John 19:36 citing Exodus 12:10, 46, Numbers 9:12, and Psalms 34:20, becomes more complex, presenting the most problematic citation in this section. It is not difficult to ascertain the possible texts from which John is drawing. The citation obviously shares content with Exod 12:10, 46, and Num 9:12 regarding the paschal lamb, though it also reflects the meaning of Ps 34:20 regarding God's protection for the righteous. The difficulty comes in discerning the relationship between John's citation and the various texts from which he drew.

One voice speaking to the issue is Dale Brueggemann, who is reluctant to identify a primary text and added text or context. In the case of such supposedly composite quotations, Brueggemann describes the author's process overall as "reading several verses in dialogue."[27] Schuchard also side-steps the issue regarding which passage is basic and which is added. John's citation recalls the Pentateuch, he claims, with the selection of the verb συντριβήσεται also recalling Ps 34:20 in order to associate the Pentateuchal passage with the Psalmist's description of God's protection of the righteous person.[28]

---

[26] Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 230.

[27] Dale A. Brueggemann, "The Evangelists and the Psalms," in *Interpreting the Psalms* (ed. Philip S. Johnston and David G. Firth; Leicester: Apollo, 2005), 270. Here Brueggemann is specifically referring to John 19:28, which he sees as quoting more than one Psalm, plus keeping in mind John 4:34. He takes the position that "verbal similarity cannot determine the text(s) being quoted, and context allows both possibilities."

[28] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 138–139.

Menken faces the question of primary and secondary texts, and carefully considers the possibility of either the Pentateuch or Psalms passages as primary. According to legitimate practice in Jewish and Christian exegesis at the turn of the era, he says, John has presented a combination of these analogous texts in his quotation of 19:36.[29] Menken views the almost identical texts of Exod 12:46 and Num 9:12 in both Hebrew and LXX, and of Exod 12:10 LXX, as the possible primary source of John's quotation, except for the verb form.[30] He explains that particular form as the result of John's having combined elements from Ps 34:20 with elements from the Pentateuchal texts, principally regarding the verb form, but also related to Ὀστοῦν and to ἀπ'.[31] In supposing that Ps 34:20 is indeed one of the sources John used, it then appears that two lines of the verse have been contracted into one.[32] Menken concludes, however, that the preferable explanation in this case is that Ps 34:20 is the basic text of the quotation, and that the Pentateuchal texts supply the material for the changes,[33] with the quotation probably coming from the LXX.[34] John's identification of Jesus with the paschal lamb is quite evident from the imagery taken from the Pentateuch, and the verb form συντριβήσεται appears to tie the citation together with the passage from Ps 34. Menken believes it is improbable that the quotation comes from a *testimonia* collection, or that it can be ascribed to John's faulty memory. He believes it is the conscious presentation on John's part of Jesus in two different roles, based on quotations from these analogous biblical passages.[35]

The variety of opinion on the matter is indicative of the ambiguity of relationship between the passages to which John refers. Brueggemann's concept of "verses in dialogue" is non-specific, and broad enough to allow for various relationships between texts. Both Schuchard and Menken are correct in signaling συντριβήσεται as the principal verb form from Ps 34 which serves to connect the passages. The clues may be ambiguous enough to allow for either Pentateuch or Psalms Scriptures as the primary text, yet the closeness of the Pentateuch wording with John's citation inclines one

---

[29] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2105.
[30] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2105.
[31] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2107.
[32] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2110. Ὀστοῦν has come from v. 21a, he says, a practice not uncommon in other cases of John's scriptural quotations, cf. 1:23, 6:31, 45, 12:15, 40.
[33] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2112.
[34] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2117.
[35] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2116–2118.

to see those passages as primary, with the verb form from Psalms added in order to draw upon the meaning of that additional context.

Here Swanson's discussion of word-form insertion and key-word link is insightful for the issues raised in this citation, as well as that of 1:23. Whether John consciously employed compressed language from the immediate context, used "verses in dialogue," or viewed several scriptures as "analogous passages," the presence of a single primary word in his citations is unmistakable. With that insertion as literary device, he is able to express in a single word additional content from the immediate passage, or to evoke the memory of a related passage. By doing so, he thus adds a nuance of content and meaning to his citation without distorting the original verse or contradicting its original context.

### *John's Editorial and Exegetical Activity*

Editorial activity upon the scriptural text for an exegetical agenda was a common and acceptable practice in the era in which John was writing. To begin with, there is a close association of scriptural citation itself and interpretation, for the two are intricately bound together.[36] Even the verbatim LXX citations analysed above can be seen as containing an editorial dimension, if viewed as inserting themselves smoothly in the author's narrative, or offering that author exactly "what he needed."[37] The very use of earlier biblical material in quotation or allusion may serve as a form of exegesis.[38]

Beyond verbatim citations, the use of variant texts may also carry an exegetical dimension, as writers played upon different recensions or textual traditions to their advantage.[39] John could certainly have used such variant texts in an exegetical fashion.

It is also possible to view John himself as carrying out purposeful editing upon the Greek textual traditions at his disposal.[40] When citations vary from known textual forms, and the explanation for the variant is not readily forthcoming, it may represent John's own editorial activity. The

---

[36] Brooke, "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries," 87.

[37] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 382.

[38] Mason, "Why is Second Zechariah so Full of Quotations?" 27.

[39] See Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 30.

[40] Cf. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 151–156, who sees John as deliberately deviating from the LXX, frequently shortening, and at times substituting appropriate synonyms. This he does, says Schuchard, to support his major convictions, that the entire Scripture testifies to Jesus, and that Jesus has fulfilled all of Scripture and is its ultimate significance.

conscious application of established techniques serves as a compelling solution for John's form of citation in some cases.[41]

Of importance among established editorial and exegetical techniques used by John is the Jewish practice of connecting analogous passages from scripture, with "analogous" meaning that they share at least a word or phrase, but often share a larger measure of contents as well. This practice has been referred to above regarding the citation in John 19:36. Menken compares John's exegetical practice to Jewish and Christian exegesis near the beginning of the era: "The combination of two analogous texts from Scripture was considered to be a legitimate practice," with the minimal condition that they have at least one word in common.[42] Schuchard also begins with a premise similar to Menken's, and evaluates John's citations accordingly: "A portion of one passage, then, could be used as a substitute for a portion of the other, or could be appended to it."[43] Brueggemann thinks along similar lines, seeing definite editorial and exegetical activity within John's citations, and particularly those citations from the Psalms.[44]

Citation 7, John 15:25 citing Ps 35:19, (cf. also Ps 69:4, Ps 24:19 and Ps Sol 7:1), may represent an exegetical use of one or more texts. On the simple grammatical level, John's form of citation is a complete and correct sentence in comparison to its being a subordinate clause in the LXX. In addition, the principal verb used by John is in the same tense, voice and number as the verb in the previous clause of the Psalm, i.e., ἐπιχαρείησάν μοι . . . ἐμίσησάν με. That verb is also identical in form with the verb used in the parallel passages of Ps 24:19 and Ps Sol 7:1. The simplest explanation is that John has taken a citation containing a subordinate clause and modified it into a complete sentence. He has used the aorist indicative form of the root verb of the participle, which is the same form found in the previous phrase of Ps 35:19, to present a complete sentence for his citation. In doing so, there is no essential modification to the meaning of the citation. This variation may thus be nothing more on John's part than an editorial move to grammatical clarity and correctness for the sake of citation.

---

[41] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 151–156. Here Schuchard admits his indebtedness to Menken.

[42] Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36," 2112. Cf. also George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context. JSOTSup 29* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 24, regarding Philo's use of analogous biblical texts.

[43] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, xv, and fn 21. See also Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 166, who demonstrates this methodology in 4QFlorilegium.

[44] Brueggemann, "The Evangelists and the Psalms," 263, 270.

On the other hand, closer examination leads to other considerations as well. This citation may have the added dimension of deliberate resonance with the other two contexts mentioned. In analysis of the parallel passages, Ps Sol 7:1 contains the same form as that used by John, but the entire construction is not precisely the same. The fact that Ps 24:19 contains the precise verb form as that used by John, is used in the same type of construction, and appears in a context with the same essential idea of "hating without a cause," could easily be seen as a move on John's part to simplify his concise citation by a merger of the two texts.

Minor editorial changes of this nature within a text can certainly be used to explain a variant form of citation. Brooke notes that quotations in biblical texts of the Twelve in DSS commentaries often include change of person, number, gender, and tense, as well as omissions and paranomasia. These are not new phenomena, he says, but are a continuation of exegetical practices of scribes in the Second Temple period.[45] Thus, minor changes to John's citation, whether a result of his own editorial activity or from the hand behind his quoted text, would be well within accepted practices of the era, and would not be seen as doing violence to that particular biblical textual tradition.

An understanding of editorial and exegetical techniques can aid in explaining otherwise unexplainable variations of citations. Such techniques must be carefully considered along with all other potential explanations for John's form of citation.

### *Relevance of Hexapla Fragments*

Extant Hexapla fragments provide an additional resource for evaluating John's form of citation. Not every case is equally significant, for the extent of the fragments varies greatly. However, they do demonstrate their relevance in many cases. Though they were recorded in an era after the time of John's writing, they potentially reflect textual dynamics that were contemporary with John. Their importance can be seen in the ways that they respond to the textual issues raised, as the textual currents and dynamics at work in later first century C.E. continued their influence in succeeding generations.

For example, with citation 6, John 2:17 citing Ps 69:9, John writes Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου *καταφάγεταί* με, compared to the LXX's Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου

[45] Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 30.

*κατέφαγέν* με. Hexapla fragments reveal the following: LXX: κατέφαγέ με; and Sym: κατηνάλωσέ με. Thus, Symmachus offers an alternative verb to the LXX in his use of καταναλίσκω.[46] His fragment is the only surviving alternative translation, though it is a synonym to the LXX word.

A further use of synonyms as alternative readings to the LXX is observed in the case of citation 5, John 1:23 citing Isa 40:3, John writes: (Ἐγὼ) φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, *Εὐθύνατε* τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου; LXX has: φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, *ἑτοιμάσατε* τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου. In place of John's Εὐθύνατε, and LXX's ἑτοιμάσατε, both Aquila and Theodotion have ἀποσκευάσατε,[47] and Symmachus has εὐτρεπίσατε.[48] It is noteworthy that none of the three revisionists repeats the LXX translation, but together they offer two other possibilities in addition to that of John. At a minimum, these versions reflect multiple possibilities for the word and the verse, whether from a variant *Vorlage*, or from various translations of the same Hebrew verb. These variants may also indicate the difficulty of finding an adequate Greek equivalent for this particular Hebrew verb.

Thus, John's variation from the LXX reading, whether in the form of the verb, or in the use of an alternative verb, is not an unusual or isolated phenomenon for the era. The acceptability of substituting a synonym for the Greek word of the LXX demonstrates that John is at home in the biblical textual context of the era.

## *Conclusion*

The instances in which John's text demonstrates a variance from the LXX illustrate the complexity of the issues raised, and may call for a number of different potential explanations. Such explanations include compressed language from the immediate context of the citation, a word-form insertion or key-word link, and editorial activity for simple clarification, conciseness of citation, or for an exegetical agenda. The substitution of a synonymous Greek word for a particular LXX reading was not uncommon in the era as well. None of these concepts is antithetical to or exclusive of the others as explanation for the form of any specific citation. Overall, John's use of these

---

[46] Cf. Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, II:239, regarding καταναλίσκω: "To spend upon . . . to consume."

[47] Cf. Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, I:55, regarding ἀποσκευάζω: "Lv 14,36 To remove furniture, to strip of furniture." LSJ, 217, has "*pull off . . . clear away* tables . . . *strip of furniture* . . ."

[48] Cf. Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, I:190, regarding εὐτρεπίζω: "4 Mac 5,32 To make ready, to prepare."

methods in citing the scriptural text remains within parameters of literary practice entirely acceptable to both Judaism and Christianity of his day.

## LXX Quotation with Multiple Word Variation

In some citations, the cited verse contains many words of the LXX text in their exact form, but with additional accompanying words or phrases that call for further explanation. In this section, though both citations merit individual treatment due to the variety of related issues that are raised, comments will be limited to citation 10.

9) Jn 6:31 citing Ps 78:24
John: Ἄρτον *ἐκ τοῦ* οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς *φαγεῖν*
LXX: καὶ ἔβρεξεν αὐτοῖς μάννα φαγεῖν
Ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς
10) Jn 6:45 citing Isa 54:13
John: Καὶ *ἔσονται* πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ
LXX: Καὶ *πάντας τοὺς υἱούς σου* διδακτοὺς θεοῦ

In citation 10, LXX and MT are virtually identical, while John stands alone against them both. The differences are as follows: 1) the complete absence in John of the phrase τοὺς υἱούς σου, present in both LXX and its equivalent in MT; 2) the change in John from accusative to nominative case, i.e., from πάντας . . . to πάντες . . . ; 3) the presence of the verb form ἔσονται in John which is absent in LXX and MT.[49]

First of all regarding πάντες, it appears that John has compressed πάντας τοὺς υἱούς σου into the single word πάντες. If John himself did so, then it is a characteristic move on his part toward conciseness and brevity. Another possibility, however, is that John altered πάντας τοὺς υἱούς σου into the single word πάντες as an exegetical move to reflect a more universal application of the concept to a broader audience. This would be in keeping with universal statements of broad application elsewhere in the gospel, e.g., 1:7 and 3:16.

By the use of ἔσονται, John is adding the explicit verb form which makes the phrase into a complete sentence. In keeping with the passive concept of "all being taught," the subject changes to πάντες, and the case of

[49] This entire phrase in the LXX is a subordinate clause in relationship to the previous principal verb θήσω of vs 12.

διδακτοὶ by necessity becomes nominative. Thus this verse is not quoted exactly in harmony with LXX and MT, yet the citation is in keeping with the thought of the passage and its context.

Many of the same explanations may be viable in the cases of multiple-word variation as in the cases of single-word variance from the LXX. It is possible that John has captured additional content from the immediate context of the citation while remaining true to its original meaning; the insertion of key-words or phrases may signal the use of another passage in order to draw upon the meaning of that additional context; and John may demonstrate editorial activity for clarification or for an exegetical agenda. However, in these cases where John's citation adds more than a single word in comparison to the LXX, or where he departs from both LXX and MT, the increased complexity of variance begins to indicate the presence of more than a series of single-word issues. As the extent of variation increases in the next set of citations below, explanations for single-word variance no longer seem to be adequate.

### Possible Citation of an Alternative Text

In this section, more substantive changes in the citations lead to the conclusion that an alternative textual tradition has evidently been chosen. While all four citations merit analysis and comment, only the two from Zechariah will be examined. Details in each citation will first be analysed, after which more general issues will be considered.

11) Jn 12:15 citing Zech 9:9

John: *Μὴ φοβοῦ*, θυγάτηρ Σιών·
ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεται,
*καθήμενος* ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.

LXX: *Χαῖρε σφόδρα*, θύγατερ Σιων· *κήρυσσε, θύγατερ Ιερουσαλημ*·
ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταί *σοι, δίκαιος καὶ σῴζων αὐτός*,
*πραΰς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς* ἐπὶ *ὑποζύγιον καὶ* πῶλον νέον.

With such significant variation between John's citation and the LXX form, the possibilities of how this text might have been handled are numerous. One is struck at once by the significant difference in the first phrase between John's Μὴ φοβοῦ, versus LXX's Χαῖρε σφόδρα. The insertion of a key phrase from another context would offer an immediate and compelling explanation. However, in searching for a possible passage from which John might

have drawn, the references that include the phrase Μὴ φοβοῦ are numerous, and there are many which parallel the same sentiment of Zechariah. Further, Μὴ φοβοῦ was a well-known phrase in NT times, sometimes used by Jesus himself, and quoted most often by Luke's gospel, e.g., Lk 1:30, 8:50, 12:32. However, μὴ φοβοῦ occurs together with θύγατερ in a single LXX reference,[50] Ruth 3:11: καὶ νῦν θύγατερ μὴ φοβοῦ πάντα ὅσα ἐαν εἴπῃς ποίσω σοί. The phrase μὴ φοβοῦ could have been included by John as evocative of this or other contexts of similar sentiment.

One should also note the reference in Zeph 3:14, where the phrase χαῖρε, Θύγατερ Σιων, κήρυσσε, Θύγατερ Ιεροθσαλημ, is precisely the same as that in Zech 9:9, with the exception of the word σφόδρα, whose presence is a text-critical uncertainty.[51] The close identity of the two phrases in the LXX, together with the variation between LXX and MT in the Zephaniah reference, suggests the editorial assimilation of one passage to the other in the transmission of the LXX textual tradition. Therefore, the possibility is still open for variation in one or the other of the two passages that might have originally read μὴ φοβοῦ.

In further observations, the second and third phrases of the verse in John are identical to the LXX. The final phrase, καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου, reflects a more concise rendering than either MT or LXX. That phrase also presents a carefully faithful rendering of the specific Hebrew words that it apparently translates, i.e., רכב . . . על־עיר . . . אתנות. The ambiguous parallelism that resulted in the dual statement cited in Matthew 21:5[52] has also been avoided. Thus, the parallelism of both the first line and the last phrase is not present in John's form, while his form does not vary from the essential thought of the passage, and is true to the essence both of the LXX and the MT.

Scholarly comment on the form of this quotation in John 12:15 is quite diverse. For example, Barrett says, "The source for John's version is obscure . . . no better explanation is at hand than that John quoted loosely from memory."[53] Hübner indicates that Zech 9:9 in Jn 12:15 is a fulfilment

---

[50] There are no LXX occurrences of μὴ φοβοῦ with Θύγατερ Σιων. Compare, however, the appearance of the phrase Θύγατερ Σιων in the following passages from the Twelve: Mic 4:8, Zeph 3:14, Zech 2:14.

[51] Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 283, 310.

[52] Harvey Minkoff, "Searching for the Better Text," *BRev* (August 1999), 27. This parallel reference led to the Italian Renaissance painting by Pietro Lorenzetti that depicts Jesus straddling two animals.

[53] C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (2d ed.; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Westminster Press, 1978), 418.

quotation introduced by καθώς ἐστιν γεγραμμένον; as in Matthew, he believes it is a mixed quotation from more than a single source.[54] Humann's explanation is that Zech 9:9 as cited in 12:15 represents the sense of the passage while making no attempt at precise verbal accuracy. He gives three possibilities: 1) John quotes from memory; 2) he is deliberately substituting one phrase for another; 3) he is conflating two scriptural texts: Zeph 3:14–17 with Zech 9.[55] Hoskyns explains that John clearly refers to Zech 9:9, "but does not cite it verbally. He abbreviates it, substituting Fear not, daughter of Zion . . . for Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion."[56] Plummer agrees that John quoted freely: " . . . the whole is abbreviated . . . he seems to be translating direct from the Hebrew . . . having independent knowledge of Hebrew."[57] Bernard concurs: " . . . a more literal rendering of the Hebrew . . . gives only that part of the prophecy which is relevant. . . ."[58] Brown believes that this may be an example of another compound citation.[59] Bultmann feels that the quote is even more abbreviated than MT, hence wording diverges from LXX.[60] Carson agrees that the quotation is an abridgement, but adds that it does reflect the entire Zecharian context.[61]

To summarise the above statements: the source of John's citation is unknown; there is no precise verbal accuracy in comparison to MT or LXX; it is apparently not a verbal citation; it is a more concise rendering; it may indicate independent knowledge of Hebrew; it is more abbreviated than MT; it significantly diverges from the LXX.

It may very well be true that the opening phrase of this citation was borrowed from Zephaniah or another context. Further, John certainly could have abbreviated his citation. It is also quite evident, however, that John is giving a citation that is clear and concise, and one that not only follows carefully the Hebrew words it translates, but one that is simplified and clarified by avoiding the ambiguity of the synonymous parallelism.

---

[54] Hübner, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament," 358–359. Hübner believes that John's form, like Matthew's, is a mixed quotation, but of a different kind.

[55] Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 45.

[56] E.C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* (ed. F.N. Davey; London: Faber & Faber, 1954), 493.

[57] Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. John*, 254.

[58] J.H. Bernard, *The Gospel According to St. John* (2 vols.; ICC 30–31; ed. A.H. McNeile; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928), 2:425.

[59] Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (*XIII–XXI*), 458.

[60] Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray, R.W.N. Hoare and J.K. Riches; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 418.

[61] D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1991), 433.

John could have drawn from a more concise textual tradition, while the MT or LXX *Vorlage* may have been expansionistic. All of the characteristics of John's citation potentially fit within the framework of a Greek text that differs from the LXX by virtue of translating, or being corrected toward, a Hebrew *Vorlage* more concise than MT. If that were the case, such an affirmation would be a fitting response to all of the above disparate scholarly statements, and provide a convincing solution to this puzzle of John's form and his source of citation.

### *Hexapla Fragments for Zechariah 9:9*

Hexapla fragments for Zech 9:9 record four other variant versions of this verse from Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Quinta, and present additional complications not covered above. The fragments render the verse in various manners, giving the distinct impression of much dispute and variation in the rendering by ancient manuscripts and versions. This again appears to signal multiple textual traditions for the passage, and cautions one against any simple comparison of John with MT and LXX traditions alone.

12) JN 12:40 CITING ISA 6:10
John: *Τετύφλωκεν* αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
*καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν* καρδίαν,
*ἵνα* μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
καὶ *νοήσωσιν* τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ *στραφῶσιν*,
καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.
LXX: *ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ* καρδία *τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ* τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν *ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε* ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς *καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν* καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ *συνῶσιν* καὶ *ἐπιστρέψωσιν* καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.
13) JN 13:18 CITING PS 41:9
John: Ο *τρώγων* μου *τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν* ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ *τὴν* πτέρναν *αὐτοῦ*.
LXX: Ὁ *ἐσθίων ἄρτους* μου, *ἐμεγάλυνεν* ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν.
14) JN 19:37 CITING ZECH 12:10
John: ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν
LXX: ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο

In citation 14, one is struck immediately by the fact that there is not a single word of agreement between John's form of citation and the LXX text. On the other hand, there is close agreement with the consonantal text of the

MT, albeit with a potential variation in text or vocalisation at the point of the pronominal ending of אֵלַי.

It is possible, as seen in other citations above, that John himself translated from a variant Hebrew text, or cited an alternative Greek textual tradition. Whether from John's hand or a cited Greek source, the close compatibility of this citation with the MT consonantal tradition could be explained as a Hebrew text from a proto–MT tradition that was slightly at variance from the MT and its later development of vocalisation. A more detailed evaluation of this citation is the subject of the next chapter. Prior to that evaluation, however, some more general issues will be discussed.

### *Possible Citation of an Alternative Textual Tradition*

John's citations of Scripture overall reflect a strikingly similar textual situation to Qumran textual pluriformity discussed earlier, for one cannot impose upon them any exclusive use of the MT tradition. In instances where John's form of citation defies other textual explanations and at the same time does not demonstrate a clear and direct relationship to the MT, one must allow for the possibility of his having translated from an alternative Hebrew textual tradition at variance from the MT, or having tapped a Greek source that reflects such an alternative Hebrew *Vorlage*. John's variance from the MT, whether a single word or an entire phrase, need not be seen as reflecting LXX deviation from the MT, or of John's careless mishandling of a text, or of his personal manipulation for a particular theological agenda. On the contrary, it may instead reflect the use of diverse textual traditions available in the biblical textual context in which the author of the FG lived and worked. The assumption of a single standardised text in Hebrew in the later years of the first century C.E., or the comparison of John's citations to that Hebrew text alone would be unreasonable and anachronistic.

In analysing John's citations, it is quite apparent that comparison to LXX and MT alone is not adequate in the light of DSS discoveries that reflect textual pluriformity.[62] As Fernández Marcos says, one must take into account the "... fluctuation and the textual pluralism of the proto-Masoretic Hebrew text and the process of successive revisions that the

[62] Cf. Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 42, who points out that John agrees with the LXX against the MT. In doing so, however, Humann reveals that in his comparison of the three, he is assuming MT priority, without any discussion of a possible variant *Vorlage* for the LXX.

LXX text underwent from very early on. . . ."[63] The range of manuscript fragments that sometimes agree with MT tradition, sometimes reflect an apparent LXX *Vorlage* that varies from MT, and at times indicate other alternative textual traditions, allows one to see John's scriptural citations from a more adequate perspective and offers a broader base for analysis and comparison. Such a perspective renders it impossible to maintain an assumption of MT superiority for the Hebrew textual background of any given passage. The MT textual tradition may serve as a beginning point of reference, but it is necessary as well in any given citation to consider pluriform Hebrew possibilities.

## Testimonia *Collections*

Many of John's scriptural citations that are not otherwise easily identified with a known textual tradition, have been relegated to the category of *testimonia* collections, or a *catena* of scriptural citations gathered together under a particular theme. When the presence of additional words and phrases in a particular citation significantly complicates the delineation of textual provenance, this theory is an attractive explanation.[64]

Loisy, for example, shares Swete's perception that John may have used "autre version" other than the LXX, but sees it channelled through a textual collection: "par l'intermédiaire d'un recueil de textes censés messianiques."[65]

Dodd, in the early years following the Qumran discoveries, believed that John drew from a traditional stock of *testimonia* sources for his scriptural citations in the Passion Narrative. Specifically referring to a set of fulfilled prophecies that are distinct from the Synoptics, he said, "these are drawn from parts of Scripture which traditionally supplied such *testimonia*."[66]

Later, Smith continued to believe that John's passion apologetic was based upon scriptural *testimonia*, likely a primitive element in his sources:

> These [formula-fulfilment] quotations are largely derived from or related to a traditional stock of testimonia used by the earliest Christians to interpret Jesus' death. They are probably more primitive in interest, outlook, and form

---

[63] Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 332.

[64] The *testimonia* hypothesis is attributed primarily to J.R. Harris, *Testimonies* (2 vols; Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920).

[65] Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, 495.

[66] Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 427–428.

> than the references and allusions to Scripture which appear so frequently elsewhere in the Gospel.[67]

However, one great difficulty regarding the *testimonia* hypothesis as a potential major source for John's citations, is what little backing it receives in terms of manuscript evidence. In order to evaluate the text of a particular citation in relation to a *testimonia* hypothesis, one needs the control of specific extant evidence of a collection of proof-texts that include the texts that are under scrutiny, or similar texts, before attempting to draw any solid conclusions. One must take into account the existence of Qumran 4QTestimonia,[68] as well as 4Q98g,[69] but their existence argues only for the possibility of that type of source being available for John, and does not argue for his having drawn from such a source in any particular citation. A particular form of citation or specific characteristics do not of necessity argue for a *testimonia* collection as source, as Gundry rightly points out: "... it is impossible to determine which quotations might have belonged to testimony traditions."[70]

Support for a *testimonia* theory behind John's citations also fails to deal with an essential question arising from the hypothesis: that of the textual history of the specific quotations themselves. It is not an adequate explanation for the form of a specific quotation to claim simply that it comes from a *testimonia* source. One must pursue the issue further by asking what the particular *testimonia* source has done to shape the form of that specific quotation. Even if an author cited a *testimonia* collection, there could nonetheless be a perceptible recollection of a specific textual tradition. The weakness of the theory becomes evident in the absence of any indication as to what changes such channelling through a *testimonia* source might have caused to the particular citation under consideration. Further, any testimony source would also by definition have its own original manuscript source, but proponents of the theory offer little explanation for the relationship between testimony sources and the antecedent

---

[67] Smith, "The Setting and Shape of a Johannine Narrative Source," 237.

[68] See Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 311–319, regarding an analysis of 4QTestimonia.

[69] See Dwight D. Swanson, "Qumran and the Psalms," in *Interpreting the Psalms* (ed. Philip S. Johnston and David G. Firth; Leicester: Apollo, 2005), 253. It is true that there are collections of Psalms that seem to reflect a similar situation to the *testimonia* collections. As Swanson has pointed out, some Psalms seem to have been excerpted from a larger collection for particular purposes, such as theological reasons. 4Q98g, for example, illustrates the indistinct territory between 'biblical text' and that which is not-quite-biblical. Excerpted texts can be seen as similar to early Christian *testimonia*.

[70] Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 165.

original sources. Resorting to a such a *testimonia* theory is too often used as a last resort for explaining an otherwise unexplainable form of citation.[71]

Moo would go even further in seriously questioning the validity of any such *testimonia* hypothesis. After consideration of scholarly opinion on both sides of the issue, he not only labels the testimony book theory "unnecessary" as an explanation for the scriptural quotations in the Passion Narratives, but ends up rejecting it altogether.[72] "It must be concluded, then, that the evidence for a testimony book in the OT quotations in the passion texts of the gospels is virtually non-existent. Nothing in these texts would suggest the necessity for such a hypothesis."[73]

One who holds to a *testimonia* theory may take quotations that vary from traditional text forms, such as John 19:37, and relegate them to this obscure and undefined category. However, unless hard evidence is forthcoming regarding a specific extant *testimonia* collection that includes the same, or similar, scriptural passages cited by John, with discernible principles and parameters of variation from known textual traditions, such a theory does little to solve the puzzle of John's, or any other gospel writer's, variant forms of citation. The juxtaposition of scriptural texts in a *testimonia* collection, whether the collection is extant or theorised, primarily concerns the interdependent relationship of those texts in terms of the interpretation of their meaning. It says little or nothing regarding the text-critical issues related to a particular verse. The possibility that John might have drawn from such *testimonia* collections is not disputed.[74] However, the evidence seems much too scanty to allow for definite conclusions regarding the influence of *testimonia* collections upon a particular citation.

---

[71] Cf. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 266, who claims that in cases involving citations that differ from the LXX to the point of posing the problem of alternative quotations (e.g., in his study, quotations by Clement), one must search out the various possible sources for the citation before resorting to the facile options of a citation from memory, adaptations to context, or *testimonia* collections, particularly if the lack of extant materials precludes positive proof.

[72] Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 166, also closes his arguments by rejecting a Testimony Book hypothesis for Matthew's forms of citation.

[73] Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 372–373.

[74] Cf. David C. Mitchell, "The Fourth Deliverer: A Josephite Messiah in *4QTestimonia*," *Biblica* 86 (2005), 545–553, regarding messianic debate 50–65 C.E.

### *John and the Twelve*

When John cites explicitly from the Twelve, he does so only from Zechariah. In comparing the two Zecharian citations found in 12:15 and 19:37, there are significant differences in their form of citation in comparison to LXX and MT, as noted above. John's form in the case of 12:15 exhibits the elements of possible phrase insertion, elimination of parallelism, and characteristic Johannine brevity and conciseness. It also raises the distinct possibility that an alternative text, more concise than LXX or MT, has been cited. John's final scriptural citation in 19:37, as already seen, indicates the same possibility of his having cited an alternative textual tradition. Whether John quoted from such a Greek text at his disposal, or whether he himself translated from a particular Hebrew text, in either case, the citation reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* equal to or at slight variance from MT. At the same time, it suggests an alternative tradition of vocalisation. This is in keeping with the pluriform textual situation of the era, not only for the Scriptures in general, but also specifically for the Twelve. Multiple Hebrew traditions for the Twelve offer a clearer perspective regarding John's citations of Zechariah. They allow for more than a single possibility from which John might have drawn. His citation of 9:9, whether abbreviated by him, or drawn from a more concise text, would nonetheless reflect a Hebrew text very close to MT in the words that it translates. His citation of 12:10 also comes close to MT by remaining within the consonantal framework of that textual tradition. Though the LXX for 12:10 is quite incongruous with MT, presenting a text that is entirely out of character with the rest of Zechariah and the Twelve, John's citation potentially fits within MT tradition. In sum, John's citations of Zechariah remain within the parameters of multiple Hebrew textual traditions for the Twelve presented by the DSS.

## Conclusion

Important indicators for the source of John's scriptural citations are evident. First of all, a definite LXX influence cannot be denied, though one should not assume that the LXX was John's only source, or even his primary source. Hebrew influence is also of utmost significance for John, for his citations never stray far from the MT tradition. At the same time, however, there is indication that John's Hebrew influence may come from a text or texts somewhat at variance from the MT tradition.

When John, LXX and MT are in agreement, it is evident that the parallel strength of the three textual traditions has led to confluence in these par-

ticular passages. Where John agrees with the LXX against MT, it may simply indicate the strength of the LXX tradition at that point which remains constant in the early centuries of its translation and transmission, and its evident *Vorlage* as an alternative Hebrew tradition parallel to MT.

When John quotes with minimal variance from LXX forms, further possibilities for explanation emerge, including the use of compressed language from the immediate context, key-word insertion, editorial and exegetical activity, or substitution of a synonymous term.

Other forms of citation with multiple word variation reveal more complex scenarios of relationship between John, LXX, and MT, as well as potential citation from other alternative textual traditions. Before applying general truths, it is important to look carefully at all issues raised by each individual citation. It is not always possible to solve every difficulty, and a certain level of ambiguity may always remain. Nor is it adequate to relegate any particular citation to an ambiguous or undefined category, such as a purported *testimonia* collection. On the whole, however, if one allows for the presence of multiple Hebrew textual traditions that include a proto–MT at variance from the MT, for a pluriform Greek tradition that offers more than a single LXX recension, and for accepted Jewish editorial and exegetical practices of the first century C.E., all of John's citations fit quite well within that framework, including his citations of the Twelve. If he gives a quotation in harmony with known textual traditions, if he offers single-word variance from those traditions or multiple-word differences, and even if he has apparently cited an alternative textual tradition, when one considers carefully the entire biblical textual milieu of the era, John is not a single step outside of the customs and standards of his day in the use of contemporary textual traditions that would have been acceptable to his entire reading audiences, whether Jewish or non-Jewish.

This viewpoint thus allows a more profound and realistic evaluation of any particular citation, such as that of Zech 12:10. The form of that citation does present unusual difficulties. In locating it within the overall context of scriptural citation in the FG, it is clear that it is not a citation of the LXX, yet it reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that is close to MT. It is quite possible that John cited an alternative textual tradition. Nonetheless, even if that were the case, John continues to remain completely within the biblical textual traditions of his era. The issues raised by that citation will be explored in more detail in the next chapter.

CHAPTER SEVEN

# TEXTUAL TRADITION USED FOR THE CITATION OF ZECHARIAH 12:10 IN JOHN 19:37

If indeed all of John's scriptural citations fit well within the framework of the biblical textual milieu of his era, nonetheless, the form of 19:37 raises a number of complex issues. Here John's form shares not a single word with the LXX. Hebrew influence is evident, yet there is not precise adherence to MT tradition. Scholarly attempts to explain the form of this citation and to discern its textual provenance are manifold. Each has focused on one characteristic or another, but none to date has sufficiently responded to all aspects of the citation. The amount of complexity and disagreement among those responses indicates that a single satisfactory answer to explain the form of this verse is difficult at best.

The goal of this chapter is to present an adequate explanation for John's textual source that remains consistent with extant textual evidence, and at the same time satisfies the demands of the entire range of issues raised by John's form of citation. The text of John 19:37 will be compared to the evidence from Hebrew and Greek textual traditions, and particularly the evidence from R. Major theories that have been advanced regarding the form of John's citation will then be considered in the light of what has been discovered regarding John's relationship to extant textual evidence. From this study, a new possibility for the form of John's citation will emerge that fully responds to all issues raised and all theories that have been advanced thus far, and offers a plausible explanation for John's textual source.

## The Text of John 19:37 Compared to Hebrew Textual Traditions

Given the fact that John's Greek form is completely distinct from the LXX, many have attempted to explain his form of citation, ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, in relationship to the form presented by the MT: וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ. However, though it does show definite affinities with the consonantal MT, it does not appear to be a precise translation of that text.

### *A Retroversion of John 19:37*

The comparison of John's citation with Hebrew textual tradition requires one to discern the Hebrew text that stood behind his citation. Whether one assumes that John cited a Greek source that had translated a particular *Vorlage*, that he cited a text which had modified an older LXX source, or that John himself translated directly from a Hebrew text, the question arises regarding the apparent Hebrew *Vorlage* of this citation. The following word-by-word analysis will respond to that question.

*ὄψονται*

The first word in the phrase is ὄψονται. In the Twelve, the root verb ὁράω frequently translates the Hebrew verb ראה. Though the LXX and the MT are not always entirely consistent in terms of the same Greek word translating a particular Hebrew word, in spite of a few exceptions, there is an overwhelming correspondence between ראה and ὁράω in the Twelve. The same holds true for Zechariah: in 7 instances of its occurrence, a form of ὁράω is used to translate ראה,[1] as indicated by the following comparison between MT and LXX:

| Reference | MT | LXX |
|---|---|---|
| Zech 1:8 | ראיתי | ἑώρακα |
| Zech 4:2 | ראיתי | ἑώρακα |
| Zech 4:10 | וראו | ὄψονται |
| Zech 5:2 | ראה | ὁρῶ |
| Zech 9:5 | תרא | ὄψεται |
| Zech 9:8 | ראיתי | ἑώρακα |
| Zech 10:7 | יראו | ὄψονται |
| (Cf. 12:10 | הביטו | ἐπιβλέψονται) |

It is thus a consistent pattern in Zechariah for ὁράω to translate ראה. On the other hand, the single occurrence of נבט in Zechariah is translated by ἐπιβλέπω in the LXX, not by ὁράω. This raises the question whether the Hebrew verb נבט is at any time translated by ὁράω in the Twelve.

First of all, נבט is normally translated in the Twelve by ἐπιβλέπω, e.g., Amos 5:22, Jonah 2:5, and Habakkuk 1:3, 5, 13 & 2:15. However, there are some instances in the larger scriptural context in which such translation of נבט by ὁράω does occur:

---

[1] An exception is found in 3:4, where a form of ראה is translated by the particle ἰδού, which ordinarily translates הנה.

| | |
|---|---|
| Numbers 12:8 | εἶδε |
| Numbers 23:21 | ὀφθήσεται |
| I Samuel 17:42 | εἶδε (HB: ויראה . . . ויבט) |
| Job 6:19 | ἴδετε |
| Job 28:24 | ἐφορᾷ |
| Psalm 92:11(12) | ἐπεῖδεν |
| Isaiah 38:11 | ἴδω (for both ראה and נבט)[2] |

Thus, for נבט in Zech 12:10 to be translated by ὁράω would not be a grammatical impossibility. Further, the use of the verb in this instance could be related thematically to a similar translation elsewhere in the Twelve, or in the larger scriptural context.

All of the above allows for a number of possibilities regarding John's use of ὄψονται. The first is that ראה appeared in the *Vorlage*, leading to the logical choice of ὄψονται as translation. This possibility is not inconceivable, yet there is no extant evidence to indicate the presence of this verb in any Hebrew manuscript of Zech 12:10. Also, it is not characteristic, either in Zechariah or in the Twelve, for ראה to be followed by אל, though the combination does occur occasionally elsewhere in Scripture.[3] If ראה did occur in the *Vorlage* of this verse, then it would be more natural for it to be followed directly by את, a sequence which does occur three times in the Twelve and is very common throughout the Scriptures. If ראה were present instead of נבט, the following phrase likely would not include אלי, which appears in MT. However, since ὄψονται is a legitimate translation of נבט, and נבט is the only verb occurring in any extant Hebrew manuscript, it thus remains a much more likely candidate for the *Vorlage* than ראה.

The second possibility is that John's source preferred in the translation of נבט to use ὁράω in accordance with previous occurrences of the verb in Zechariah's text. For example, if the future plural indicative ὄψονται was used in 12:10 as a thematic connection with previous uses of the same form in 4:10 and 10:7, as well as the related singular form ὄψεται in 9:5, it could be seen as an exegetical device tying these contexts together. Further, the translator or reviser may have chosen ὁράω in place of ἐπιβλέπω in keeping with other notable uses of the verb in wider scriptural contexts,

---

[2] It should be noted as well that ראה and נבט are sometimes used in synonymous parallelism, e.g., Psalm 91:8, Habakkuk 1:13.

[3] See George V. Wigram, *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1987), 1133.

e.g., Mic 7:16, Joel 3:1, Hab 3:10, and Mal 1:5, its frequent use in Isaiah, and its appearance in the Pentateuch, such as in Exod 3:3.

The third possibility is that John's source preferred the use of ὄψονται in place of ἐπιβλέψονται in keeping with current usage of the verbs at the time of translation or revision. There is a considerable amount of overlap in the meaning of the two verbs, for they are largely synonymous. However, though ὁράω and ἐπιβλέπω are both legitimate translations of נבט,[4] ὁράω may indicate a deeper perception[5] or even connection with prophetic vision. The use of ὁράω would be especially appealing as a verb choice if the author was concerned about the prophetic dimension of the passage, for it would be a stronger verb in this regard than ἐπιβλέπω. Though it is not characteristic of the Twelve to translate נבט by ὁράω, nuances of meaning in the two verbs at the time of translation or revision might have led to the choice of one over the other.

Still another possibility is that John himself chose the verb as his own translation, or as modification of his source. Ὄψονται might thus be seen as John's choice reflecting current usage, for ἐπιβλέπω occurs only three times in the NT: Lk 1:48, 9:38, and Js 2:3, while ὁράω occurs much more frequently.[6] Further, it could also be seen as the verb choice in keeping with previous uses of ὁράω throughout the FG. Ὄψονται would thus represent John's use of a key word as both genuine translation, and at the same time a thematic tie to his own previous narrative.

In the absence of any extant Hebrew evidence to the contrary, נבט continues to stand as the most likely verb for the *Vorlage* of John's citation, with ὄψονται as a legitimate translation. If ὄψονται was the choice of John's Greek source, it was a fitting choice in agreement with previous occurrences of the verb in Zechariah's text. Further, it was in keeping with deeper perception and prophetic vision. If the use of the verb was John's choice, however, not only does it agree with previous usage in Zechariah's text, but it plays a key role elsewhere in the narrative of the FG, and its frequent contemporary usage would offer an additional reason for him to use the verb.

---

[4] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 501.

[5] Cf. Joseph Henry Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: American Book Company, 1889), 451, "to see with the mind, to perceive, know."

[6] Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 39–42.

*εἰς ὃν*

The second phrase is εἰς ὃν. The preposition εἰς expresses relation, such as "towards, in regards to,"[7] and with verbs of looking denotes direction toward an object.[8] The phrase is an acceptable translation of MT אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר with אֵלַי in construct form. It is also a legitimate translation of the phrase אֵלַי אֲשֶׁר, or אֶל אֲשֶׁר without the את. Further yet, this phrase could translate a more concise Hebrew text in the form of the single word אֲשֶׁר. Regarding this latter choice, such correspondence between Hebrew and Greek would be a normal construction, since the four occurrences of this phrase in the LXX correspond in three instances to a simple אשר in the MT, i.e., Num 22:26, I Chron 29:1, and Ezek 10:11, and once to בעלי in Gen 49:23. Thus, the *Vorlage* of this phrase could be as brief as אֲשֶׁר, or as extensive as אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר. The doubt surrounding the presence of את in the MT, the certainty regarding the presence of the preposition אל, together with the lack of any extant Hebrew manuscript to suggest any other construction without a form of אל and אשר together, point to the phrase אֵלַי אֲשֶׁר or אֶל אֲשֶׁר as the most likely form of the text. However, a text containing אֲשֶׁר alone is not to be ruled out.

*ἐξεκέντησαν*

This verb leaves little room for debate that it is a direct translation of דקרו.

*A Retroverted Vorlage*

Thus the retroverted consonantal Hebrew *Vorlage* of John's citation would read as follows: וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי [אֵת] אֲשֶׁר דָּקָרוּ. John's citation is compatible with the consonantal MT, with none of his word choices contradictory or incompatible with that tradition. His concise form of citation demonstrates a level of concern on his part for precision, clarity, and faithfulness. On the other hand, since John's citation resolves the ambiguity of the personal pronoun ending of אֵלַי in first person, and makes better sense of the phrase than MT with traditional vocalisation, it thus argues for John having drawn from a parallel tradition of vocalisation, or from a *Vorlage* which is at slight variance from the MT.

---

7 LSJ, 491.
8 BAG, 227.

*Evidence from DSS in Hebrew Compared to John 19:37*

The previous study of extant manuscript evidence for II Zechariah revealed *en líneas generales* 1) Hebrew textual pluriformity from the earliest fragments; 2) a later first-century C.E. movement of Hebrew texts toward conformity to the proto–MT, albeit without precise conformity; and 3) some dimension of continued textual pluriformity into the era of standardisation of the proto–MT. The analysis of specific DSS fragments of the Twelve also revealed: 1) manuscripts aligned with the proto–MT tradition; 2) others closely aligned with the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint; 3) some non-aligned; and 4) one fragment too small to indicate clear textual character.[9] John's form of citation fits well within that biblical textual scenario.

Further study of particular manuscript fragments in relationship to Zech 12:10 both confirmed those general truths and revealed additional details. 4QXIIa, containing Zech 14:18, is "non-aligned" in terms of its textual affiliation, at times agreeing with the MT, at times with the LXX, and at times going its own way.[10] If one were to take its characteristics and project what likely would have been the reading for 12:10, there would be room for ample freedom, and little specific indication for the exact form of that verse. Perhaps it would have agreed with the LXX, perhaps with MT, perhaps with neither.

4QXIIe includes fragments from Zech 12:7–12. Though the fragments do include Zech 12:10, the evidence from that specific verse is very tiny. Only two letters are visible at the end of the phrase, i.e., רו. The significance of this fragment, however, can hardly be overestimated. The presence of רו does give support for the presence of דקרו, indicating a tradition in harmony with the MT. Whether this manuscript overall stands closer to LXX tradition,[11] or is non-aligned,[12] here it supports a reading that is clearly in agreement with MT, and possibly at variance with the LXX *Vorlage*.

It is important to note an accompanying detail regarding 4QXIIe: the presence of corrections and erasures precisely at the point of רו.[13] Such changes indicate the extent of controversy over the text and the lack of sta-

---

9 Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 87. See also Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 22, who would essentially agree with Fuller's categories, but not with every conclusion of Fuller regarding the assignment of individual manuscripts to a certain category.

10 Fuller, "The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets," 83.

11 Fuller, "The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets," 85.

12 Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 24.

13 Fuller, "4QXIIe," 264.

bility or conformity in copying and interpreting the same.[14] Nonetheless, there is sufficient indication of the presence of רו.

Mur88, which also contains fragments of the Minor Prophets, is closely identified with the MT. It demonstrates definite MT influence without precise conformity to the same, but also gives evidence of having been corrected at some points to agree with the MT. It does not include Zech 12:10, but gives a small sampling of fragments from Zech 1:1–4.[15] Its overall characteristics of close fidelity to proto–MT tradition with possible minor variation, and with corrections made toward the MT tradition, indicate that the same characteristics would have obtained for 12:10. Though the extant text of Zech 1:1–4 is identical to MT, the overall fragmentary nature of the manuscript, together with the variants that exist in other passages, would easily allow for variants such as אליו/אלי.

In summary, even though DSS manuscript fragments of the Twelve that include verses from Zechariah reflect various Hebrew textual traditions, there is no evidence to indicate the existence of any other Hebrew text for Zech 12:10 than that of the proto–MT. That text is potentially equal consonantally to the MT tradition, yet it allows for the possibility of minor variation upon the same. John's careful consistency with the same Hebrew tradition argues in favour of it as *Vorlage* for his citation. Any variation between the evident *Vorlage* of John's citation and the consonantal MT would fit quite easily within the types of variation from MT illustrated by the 4QXII and Mur88 fragments. There is thus no degree of variation between John's citation and the consonantal proto–MT that is outside the parameters of variation exemplified by the pluriformity of Zecharian texts in existence between 150 B.C.E. and 100 C.E.

*Comparison of John's Citation with Massoretic Consonantal Text*

It has been clarified that the most significant point of disagreement between John's citation and the vocalised MT is in regard to the pronominal suffix for אל, that is, the vocalisation of אֵלַי. Traditional Massoretic vocalisation renders it a first person ending, resulting in the translation "to me." An alternative vocalisation in construct form, however, would result in the translation "to whom . . .," with the expectation that the following phrase would indicate more specifically to whom the pronoun refers. Such variations in vocalisation could have come from oral traditions present in the

[14] Fuller, "4QXIIe," 264.

[15] Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve," 88–89.

public reading of Scripture, as Tov indicates: "It is not clear whether one or more different reading traditions were in vogue from the very beginning."[16] Although such vocalisations could reflect ancient exegetical traditions,[17] it is quite evident that formal written Massoretic vocalisation took place much later, from about the fifth century C.E. onwards.[18] Though the Hebrew text reflected by John's citation would have been unpointed, varying traditions of vocalisation were present before standardisation of either text or vocalisation. It is quite likely that a tradition in harmony with later MT vocalisation was current in later first century and early second century C.E. It is also reasonable to assume that an alternative tradition of vocalisation, such as that reflected by John's citation, was in use during the same era, and would be sufficient to explain the form of citation as opposed to the MT tradition.[19]

A modern reader's bias toward the prominence of the MT with traditional vocalisation could lead one to critique John's citation in that light alone,[20] for MT is often assumed without question to be the "original Hebrew."[21] As seen previously, the MT is a most significant source for comparison with scriptural quotations found in John's Gospel. However, it is unwarranted to assume in the comparison that MT is "the Hebrew" or "the original Hebrew," for it is no longer possible to place the MT at the centre of Hebrew textual thinking.[22] One must guard against the additional error of equating MT vocalisation with variant vocalisations that might have been current centuries earlier.

Textual pluriformity of the first century C.E. does not allow for the assumption of MT superiority. Ulrich reminds us that MT is witness to a single form of the ancient Hebrew text, and the MT itself is not one text, but a varied collection of disparate texts.[23] It is not legitimate to assume

---

[16] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d ed.), 41.

[17] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d ed.), 42.

[18] Wurthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 17.

[19] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 502.

[20] Cf. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (XIII–XXI)*, 956, and J.N. Sanders, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (ed. and completed B.A. Mastin; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1968), 413.

[21] Cf. Baruch Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," *IEJ* 12 (1962): 201–207; Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary*, II:439; Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 494, 502, 504; Martin Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture* (trans. Mark E. Biddle; Intro. Robert Hanhart; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002), 29ff.

[22] Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 85.

[23] Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 223.

that the MT, either consonantally, or in regard to its vocalisation, was the only available Hebrew source from which John might have drawn for his citation of Zech 12:10. The strength of his citation is to be seen in its clarity, conciseness, and retention of compatibility with the Hebrew proto–MT tradition, and at the same time, its resolution of the grammatical and syntactical tension inherent within the verse.

*Conclusion*

The Hebrew retroversion of John's citation is equal or nearly equal to MT. The extant evidence from DSS supports a proto–MT consonantal text for Zech 12:10, yet allows for some latitude within that tradition. John's form of citation is explainable by a variant vocalisation tradition based upon a proto–MT text. Such evidence points to a single conclusion when John's citation is compared to Hebrew textual traditions: his citation is in conformity with the best discernible Hebrew consonantal proto–MT, and fits well within the biblical textual milieu of the era.

## Comparison of John 19:37 with Greek Textual Evidence and other Ancient Versions

Having compared John's citation with Hebrew textual evidence, it is now important to compare and contrast his citation with extant Greek evidence as represented by other NT references, by second-century C.E. revisions of the LXX, by other ancient versions, and by R.

### *The Relationship of John 19:37 to Other NT References*

NT Greek textual evidence is represented by two other references to the same verse found in Matthew 24:30 and Revelation 1:7. In both cases, there is an unmistakable allusion to Zech 12:10, yet neither author is attempting to present a precise quotation. However, a careful comparison of John's form of citation with these two references will reveal similarities and differences that will aid in revealing the potential source text from which all three authors may have drawn.

Matthew *24:30: . . . καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται . . .*

Much of the language of this verse is clearly taken from Dan 7:13–14, though significant words, added by Matthew as support for his vision of the coming of the Son of Man, also signal an allusion to Zech 12. First of all, the phrase

καὶ . . . κόψονται equals that found in Zech 12:10 LXX, while τότε appears to be Matthew's addition in parallelism with his previous phrase of 24:30a: καὶ τότε φανήσεται.

The phrase πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ is also drawn from the same Zecharian passage, for it precisely equals Zech 12:14a. It must be noted, however, that these words are an integral part of the entire phrase in Zech 12:14 that continues with αἱ ὑπολελειμμέναι, and not with τῆς γῆς as in Matthew's form. However, the phrase τῆς γῆς itself is found earlier in Zech 12, namely, verse 3b: πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, referring to the nations coming against Jerusalem. Taking in a larger scriptural context, the phrase πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς is well known, coming from the promised blessing through Abraham, beginning with Genesis 12:3. It appears in genitive form in Zech 14:17, and in various similar constructions throughout the writings of the prophets.[24]

Καὶ ὄψονται is a definite reference to the first phrase of Zech 12:10, using the verb ὁράω in place of the LXX verb ἐπιβλέπω.

Thus, Matthew refers in this instance to Zech 12:10 and context, yet his only direct connection with the verse is in the use of the verbs κόψονται and ὄψονται. He does little violence to the entire context of Zech 12 in terms of meaning, yet textually, unlike John, he appears to be piecing together bits and phrases drawn from various places throughout chapter 12, rather than citing a single verse. Further, in the surrounding context of Matt 24:29–31, he draws from a number of additional prophetic passages, including Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Daniel, in presenting a composite citation.

It is also possible that Matthew himself has not composed the citation, but has drawn from a pre-existing collection of scriptures or "florilegium of citations."[25] Even if Matthew has used material from Mark,[26] however, he has expanded the citation by including Zecharian phrases, and the occurrence in the same verse of both κόψονται and ὄψονται, as found in Zech 12:10, is hardly coincidental.

---

[24] See HRCS, II:1445–46.

[25] Paul Foster, "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel," in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence* (ed. Christopher Tuckett; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003), 70.

[26] Foster, "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel," 71.

In sum, the influence of Zechariah[27] upon Matthew's Gospel,[28] and particularly upon 24:30, is undeniable. Matthew has drawn upon Zech 12:10 for his use of κόψονται and ὄψονται, and from the immediate Zecharian context for the phrases αἱ φυλαὶ and τῆς γῆς. The specific content Matthew has in common with John's citation, however, is the single word ὄψονται. If one accepts Menken's insistence that there is no direct textual influence between Matthew and John,[29] one is led to believe that ὄψονται was the verb choice, not of Matthew or John, but of a common Greek source from which both authors drew.

*Revelation 1:7* ...καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς
καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν,
καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτόν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς

Revelation 1:7 is also a definite reference to Zech 12:10, but one which shares more specific content with John than does Matthew.

In the first phrase, the verb ὁράω again appears in place of LXX's ἐπιβλέπω. Ὄψεται is used in the singular rather than plural in keeping with the use of the singular subject ὀφθαλμὸς. The αὐτόν following ὄψεται is a clarifying addition to the phrase in poetic parallelism with the following two lines which also use the same pronoun. It may also be seen as consistent with the phrase from Zech 12:10 καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτόν, which he subsequently quotes. His use of πᾶς ὀφθαλμός reflects his desire to universalise the subject[30] and thus include all humanity in his sweeping eschatological viewpoint.

In the phrase καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, the first three words specify the sub-category of those who will see the Lord at his return, i.e., the very ones who pierced him. Though implicit within the plural subject of the verb ἐξεκέντησαν, these words appear to be the author's addition for clarification. The verb ἐξεκέντησαν is definitely drawn from Zech 12:10 as a faithful translation of the Hebrew דקרו, in stark contrast to the LXX verb κατωρχήσαντο. Here the author of Revelation agrees with both the reference in John, as well as the verb choice of the second-century revisionists

[27] Cf. Yehoshua M. Grintz and S. David Sperling, "Zechariah," *EncJud* (2nd ed.) 21:485, regarding the extensive influence of Zechariah 9–14 upon the Gospel writers.

[28] Foster, "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel," 65ff.

[29] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 504.

[30] Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Use of Scripture in the Pastoral and General Epistles and the Book of Revelation," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 252.

Aquila and Theodotion, along with Symmachus' closely synonymous verb choice of ἐπεξεκέντησαν. Since ἐξεκέντησαν is the verb used in John's citation, it is likely that both John and Revelation drew from the same source, which was distinct from the LXX.[31]

With καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν, the author's citation parallels the LXX of Zech 12:10, in contrast to Matthew's use of κόψονται alone. He then follows with the phrase πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, the components of which, πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ and τῆς γῆς, both appear in Zech 12, but are juxtaposed here in Revelation once again in the same form as that used by Matthew. The commonality with Matthew, together with elements of contrast, indicates that the two drew from a common source, and not that the author was quoting Matthew.

In sum, the phrases καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν, πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ, and τῆς γῆς of Rev 1:7 are drawn from a source which closely parallels the LXX of Zech 12. On the other hand, the verb forms ὄψεται and ἐξεκέντησαν are used in contrast to the LXX. The appearance of these two key verbs in the citation demonstrates textual commonality with John's citation, and argues for use of the same source as John. On the other hand, Revelation's free poetic composition based on the Zecharian citation[32] allows for his having drawn from the same source as John, yet it detracts from any suggestion that he might have been explicitly quoting John.

The single textual point in common with the three citations in Matthew, John, and Revelation, is the use of ὁράω, which sets the three together in opposition to the LXX's use of ἐπιβλέπω. Matthew and John are in agreement with the use of the third person plural form of the verb, while Revelation uses the singular. In addition, Revelation and John are in agreement in their use of the verb ἐξεκέντησαν, which also contrasts to the LXX in faithful translation of the Hebrew verb דקרו. This commonality in word usage of the three citations points toward a Greek text that contrasts with the LXX and strongly favours the proto–MT. Zech 12:10 as reflected in these three NT writings of strongly Jewish character thus argues for a Jewish textual tradition[33] as a common source which is in harmony with the proto–MT.

---

[31] Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, VI:288.

[32] The first phrase of the verse is a reference to Daniel 7:13 θ.

[33] Cf. Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 221, regarding "discernible text types or text traditions."

### *Second-Century C.E. Revisions*

Further light can be shed upon John's form of citation by comparing it to second-century C.E. revisions of the LXX. It is evident that the revisionists recognised the awkwardness of MT, and that they were moving in some manner to resolve that tension. At the same time, significant variations from the LXX express a measure of uncertainty and discomfort with a Greek text that would follow the MT vocalisation tradition of Zech 12:10. As seen previously, the extant fragments of Aquila read . . . σὺν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν; Symmachus reads ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεξεκέντησαν; and Theodotion reads καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.[34]

Aquila and Symmachus appear to be softening the verb ἐκκεντέω as applied to the one speaking, Κύριος παντωκράτωρ. Theodotion, in strict keeping with MT vocalisation and LXX form retains the πρός με, then continues directly with εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν in keeping with MT, but in direct opposition to LXX. He thus maintains both the πρός με and εἰς ὃν phrases in juxtaposition.

John's citation is not precisely equal to any of the three revisionists, but it does share some significant elements. He does not simply modify a preposition in order to resolve the ambiguity and awkwardness, but omits the πρός με phrase entirely. The following phrase, εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, he then shares in its exact form with Theodotion, at the same time sharing the verb ἐξεκέντησαν with Aquila, and its synonymous form ἐπεξεκέντησαν with Symmachus. It can thus be said that John shares with Aquila and Symmachus a reaction to MT form in the first phrase of his citation, and shares with all three revisionists a reaction to LXX in the second phrase. In so doing, however, he retains a unique form that parallels Theodotion in all but the πρός με phrase. All three revisionists, as well as John, may have been working from a common Greek source. If so, then Theodotion, and possibly Aquila and Symmachus, could have modified their reading of the verse to conform to a particular vocalisation tradition, while John did not do so. On the other hand, John may have been working from a similar but parallel source which included a variant vocalisation tradition of the same consonantal text.

[34] θ′ and α′ readings are confirmed by Syrohexapla, see Ziegler, *Duodecim Prophetae*, 319.

*Other Ancient Textual Evidence*

Ancient versions of this verse have been cited previously. The Latin Vulgate follows MT in both text and vocalisation: et adspicient ad me quem confixerunt, resulting in the translation "... and they shall look upon me, whom they have pierced...."[35] In the same way, the Peshitta[36] reads: "and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced."[37] Targum Jonathan reads: ויבעון מן קדמי על דאטלטלו,[38] which may be translated "and they shall pray before me for those who were exiled,"[39] or "and they shall entreat me because they were exiled."[40] Though it is of little text-critical value,[41] it does demonstrate by its paraphrase great discomfort with the MT tradition. It completely restructures the verse, including changing the "looking" to "praying," and the active "pierced" to a passive "exiled," avoiding the awkwardness and assumed anthropomorphism of MT. The Targumic Tosefta reads: ויבעון מיני מטול מא דקרו עממיא למשיח בר אפרים, which can be translated "And they will look to me and inquire of me why the nations pierced Messiah bar Ephraim..."[42] Here the verse reflects a theological restructuring to include discussion of a particular messianic figure. The Targums are thus paraphrastic and expansionistic, displaying their discomfort with the MT tradition.

These versions come from an era later than that of John's Gospel.[43] Though it is uncertain to what extent they reflect textual evidence from an earlier era, they appear to be based on a Hebrew text that conforms to the standardised MT.

---

[35] Gibbons, ed., *The Holy Bible Translated from the Latin Vulgate*, 1021.

[36] Dirksen, "The Peshitta and Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," 390.

[37] Lamsa, ed., *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts*, 943; the same is found in Peshitta Institute, ed., *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), 89.

[38] A. Sperber, ed., *The Bible in Aramaic: Based On Old Manuscripts And Printed Texts* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 1992), 493.

[39] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 501.

[40] K.J. Cathcart and R.P. Gordon, eds., *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989), 218.

[41] Cf. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 25, "the interrelationship of the various targum recensions, the dates of their composition and redaction, and the establishment of the trajectories into which fit the various traditions reflected in those recensions are complex questions indeed...."

[42] David C. Mitchell, "Messiah bar Ephraim in the Targums," *Aramaic Studies* 4.2 (2006), 221–241.

[43] Cf. Mitchell, "Messiah bar Ephraim in the Targums," 231, who argues that the Targumic Tosefta reflects temple debate over Messiah, 55–65 C.E.

The Coptic versions do not vary from the LXX in the first words of the phrase, but depart significantly in the final words of the phrase: *pro formis (figuris) in quas conversi sunt.*[44] Though they may be based upon a relatively early Greek tradition,[45] the difficulty arises in discerning the text upon which they are based, since they reflect neither LXX nor MT. These final words of the phrase may be based upon a variant Greek text that includes the verb μεταμορφοῦσθαι or μετασχηματίζεσθαι.[46]

John's text shares with Vulgate and Peshitta their reflection of MT in all but the "upon me" phrase. With the Targums, John shares the element of reaction to MT, but no further textual particulars. This comparison once again signals John's version as sharing all elements that conform to MT except for the "upon me" phrase, and as unique in omitting the same.

There are some Second Temple references which use phrases similar to those found in Zech 12:10. They confirm the concept of a pierced Messiah and support the identification of Israel as the first-born.[47] However, their allusions provide little text-critical value in the detailed analysis of Zech 12:10 in comparison to John 19:37.

### *Comparison of John's Citation with R*

R represents the oldest extant Greek evidence for the Book of the Twelve. The following comparison of its characteristics with those of John 19:37 reveals common ground that is of singular importance for the analysis of John's citation. First, the basic characteristics of R have been described earlier: 1) its basic four-fold textual identification, 2) its preservation of some elements of the OG of the Minor Prophets, 3) its *Vorlage* which is close to MT, 4) its character as revision of the Greek toward the proto–MT, and 5) its great influence over succeeding generations.

Other more detailed and selective characteristics of R that potentially relate to Zech 12:10 will now be presented, followed by a presentation of the similarities shared by John's citation.[48] 6) It is a literal translation with a tendency to render every Hebrew word with a corresponding Greek

---

[44] Grossouw, *The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*, 91.
[45] Grossouw, *The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*, Preface.
[46] Grossouw, *The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*, 91.
[47] Cf. *Pss. Sol.* 18:4, Sir 36:12, 2 Esd 6:58, 7:29.
[48] N.B.: Characteristics of R are numbered sequentially throughout the following paragraphs. Characteristics shared by John's citation are then matched by the same numbers for greater facility of comparison with one another.

equivalent;[49] 7) since it moves to correct the LXX toward the Hebrew proto–MT, there are some instances in which the LXX reading agrees with MT against R, which might indicate a variant Hebrew *Vorlage* for R;[50] 8) R presents a complex scenario regarding vocalisation: in more than one instance, R reflects a vocalisation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* in agreement with MT and at variance from the LXX;[51] on the other hand, there are a number of cases in which the LXX equals MT against R regarding vocalisation, as well as some cases in which R differs from both LXX and MT, which in turn differ from one another at that point;[52] 9) regarding verb forms, R demonstrates a decided preference for simplex verb forms in contrast to LXX composite forms;[53] even where both R and LXX have composite forms, R is often at variance from the LXX regarding the prefix;[54] R's preference for simplex forms applies to other words as well, e.g., the preference for ὅτι in place of διότι in a number of references;[55] this aspect of R goes hand in hand with 10), in which R often replaces a LXX word by a synonymous word that seemed more appropriate to the revisionist;[56] 11) in place of the LXX κύριος, R has the tetragrammaton in paleo-hebraic script,[57] which is indicative of Hebrew textual influence and the desire to retain the literal name of God in ancient script without translation; 12) also regarding the name of God, in place of LXX παντοκράτωρ, R has τῶν δυνάμεων;[58] more specifically, as seen previously, the larger LXX phrase κύριος παντοκράτωρ consistently appears in R as [tetragrammaton] + τῶν δυνάμεων,[59] with 7 of the 9 occurrences found in Zechariah.[60]

When compared to these characteristics of R, John's citation demonstrates striking similarities: 1) regarding its four-fold textual identification, John agrees with the text cited by Justin; he also shows a great amount of agreement with Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, in contrast to the LXX; though he does not agree with Theodotion regarding the πρός με

[49] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 140.
[50] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 107, 139, 151–153.
[51] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 116, 119. In these cases, R may change the number or even the meaning of the word, and hence the meaning of the entire construction.
[52] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 151–152.
[53] Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," 205.
[54] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 127–128.
[55] Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," 205.
[56] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 128–131.
[57] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 118ff.
[58] Tov, "The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll," 66–75.
[59] Ego, et al., eds., *Biblia Qumranica 3B: Minor Prophets*, 170ff.
[60] Fernández Marcos, "El Texto Griego de la Complutense en Doce Profetas," 3–26.

phrase, the modifications by Aquila and Symmachus of the words which follow betray their hesitancy to repeat uncritically the vocalisation tradition of MT, and their willingness to vary from LXX;[61] 2) as to preservation of elements of the ancient OG of the Minor Prophets, it is quite possible that John may actually preserve some elements of the ancient OG of this text; 3) as with R, John also represents a Hebrew *Vorlage* that is very close, although perhaps not identical to the MT, or it may be identical to the consonantal MT with a variant vocalisation; 4) as R is a revision of the LXX, representing a movement at the turn of the era to bring the Greek of the OG12 more closely in line with the Hebrew proto–MT, John's characteristics also make it equally possible that he is citing a revision of the LXX, bringing Zech 12:10 more closely in line with the Hebrew proto–MT; 5) as R's influence extended well into the next generation, John demonstrates the likelihood of R's influence upon his citation; 6) as R reflects a literal translation with a tendency to render every Hebrew word with a corresponding Greek equivalent, the four words of John's citation could be a literal translation of a Hebrew consonantal *Vorlage* of four words as well that excluded the את and included a variant vocalisation or pronominal ending of אלי; such literal translation would also be evident in the choice of ἐξεκέντησαν as translation of דקרו, in contrast to LXX's κατωρχήσαντο; 7) since R moves to correct the LXX toward the Hebrew proto–MT, the LXX reading at times agrees with MT against R, which might indicate a variant Hebrew *Vorlage* for R; if John's version is a move to correct the LXX toward the Hebrew proto–MT, the LXX reading does indeed agree with MT against John regarding the vocalisation or pronominal ending of אלי, which in turn indicates a variant Hebrew *Vorlage* or vocalisation tradition for John or John's source; 8) as there are a number of cases in which the LXX equals MT against R regarding vocalisation, John may reflect a vocalisation of אלי at variance from MT and LXX; the same controversy surrounding the vocalisation of אלי could explain the textual variants regarding the pronominal endings of the word in the MT, as well as the evident discomfort with the MT reading in second-century C.E. Greek revisions; 9) since R demonstrates a decided preference for simplex verb forms in contrast to LXX composite forms, if R chose ὄψονται in place of ἐπιβλέψονται, as in John's citation, it would be a fitting and characteristic choice of a simplex verb; 10) since R often replaces a LXX word by a synonymous word that

[61] Coptic hebrewisms would not apply in this case; Origen's Quinta is not extant for this verse.

seemed more appropriate to the revisionist, this characteristic applies to the verb choice between ὁράω and ἐπιβλέπω; 11) R has the tetragrammaton in paleo-hebraic script; John's citation does not include the name of God, yet it does, along with his other scriptural citations in general, consistently demonstrate Hebrew influence; 12) as the use of the tetragrammaton followed by τῶν δυνάμεων in R reflects a translation more carefully and literally consistent with the Hebrew יהוה צבאות than that of the LXX κύριος παντοκράτωρ, so John's citation is more carefully and literally consistent with the Hebrew proto–MT than the LXX, and although the name of God does not appear in the citation, both the implied anthropomorphism and the awkward construction inherent in the MT are avoided.

This comparison is of critical importance for the analysis of John's citation. John's characteristics consistently match those of R, indicating the distinct possibility that he quoted R or a Greek text such as R. The similarities between R and John now present R as a potential solution to the question regarding the unique form and the source of John's citation. The lack of actual fragments of Zech 12:10 in R does not allow for specific proof that John quoted from the manuscript.[62] Nonetheless, converging lines of evidence regarding similarities with John point to R as a reasonable and adequate response to the issues raised by the form of John's citation.

## Major Theories for John 19:37 Considered in Relationship to R

Having thus analysed John's citation in comparison to Hebrew and Greek textual evidence, it is now possible to present major theories regarding the textual source of John's citation, and to evaluate them in the light of that evidence, and particularly in relationship to R. Each of those theories brings to light an important facet of John's citation, yet none of them fully encompasses all issues raised by those various facets. When they are considered in relationship to the possibility that John quoted from R, the characteristics of R satisfy the demands of every issue raised by those theories and respond more fully to the entire range of evidence presented.

[62] See Ego, et al., eds, *Biblia Qumranica 3B: Minor Prophets*, 182. Regrettably, the fragments trail off at Zech 9:5.

### *An Independent Non-Septuagint Rendering*

John's variation from the LXX version has long been observed, with possibilities other than MT and LXX entertained as the potential source for his citation. Swete has cited 19:37 as an example of John's having used the LXX as a major source, but at the same time taking a "more or less independent course" with the citation.[63] However, in Swete's further elaboration on the subject, he perceives that the difference may not have been due simply to John's independent handling of the verse, but that John himself may have tapped into another source: "... ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν is a non-Septuagintal rendering of Zach. xii.10, which was perhaps current in Palestine, since εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν appears also in Theodotion (Cf. Aq., Symm., and Apoc. i.7)."[64] Swete perceived this possibility of an "independent course" and a "non-Septuagintal rendering" long before the appearance of Judaean Desert manuscript discoveries. His recognition that the citation departs from the LXX is an obvious given, but his positing of a contemporary Palestinian textual source from which John might have drawn demonstrates his insight into the validity of the citation on its own merit apart from MT and LXX traditions. Every aspect of this potential text posited by Swete's theory fits a characteristic of R: the text's "non-Septuagintal" dimension is explainable by R's revision of the LXX toward a proto–MT text; a textual source possibly current in Palestine fits the dating of R at the turn of the era between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E., as well as the location of its discovery in the Judaean Desert;[65] and the relationship with later LXX revisions is in agreement with Barthélemy's assessment of R as the textual source used for second-century C.E. revisions of the LXX by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.[66] R's characteristics thus co-ordinate well with each of Swete's perceptions regarding John's citation of Zech 12:10.

### *A Forceful Accommodation*

Some have attempted to explain John's form of citation as modified by John himself. Goodwin, for example, used strong language in speaking of John's "forcible accommodation" of source material: "and whatever was the original intent of the source material used, John has forcibly accommodated

---

[63] Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 398.
[64] Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 398.
[65] See Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," 201ff.
[66] Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un Chaînon Manquant," 18–29.

everything to his own purposes."[67] Seynaeve agrees, placing John in the category of innovator for doctrinal reasons, believing that John has adapted the form of the verse to his theological views: "…Jean semble avoir adapte le verset 37 a ses vues theologiques…."[68]

In the absence of an evident or obvious source for the citation, Goodwin and Seynaeve have placed the responsibility for the form upon John's personal innovation. Since John's scriptural citations do not readily follow a pattern of known textual sources in every case, editorial activity is a distinct possibility. However, such potential innovation can be adequately explained by the use of an alternative textual tradition such as R, which was available to John in his contemporary context. Goodwin and Seynaeve simply betray their assumptions that John had only limited forms of the verse, such as MT or LXX, from which to quote.

### *Another Version such as Theodoret or Theodotion*

Goodwin himself offers another theory for the citation. Recognising that John gives evidence of knowing the Scriptures primarily through the LXX, which has been his main source for scriptural citations, Goodwin sees the possibility of his knowing other versions as well.[69] He continues by saying that in 19:37, John shows evidence of knowing it in another form from a different translation, perhaps the same as Theodoret's.[70] Jellicoe has also recognised the commonality between John's citation and Theodoret.[71]

Theodoret does maintain a high estimation of the LXX text,[72] but in this case offers a Greek textual tradition at variance from the LXX.[73] His fifth-century C.E. biblical text in and of itself may not demonstrate high text-critical value,[74] yet its roots potentially reach back to textual traditions that are two to three centuries earlier.

Morris also leans toward the possibility of John's having used another source, stating that Theodotion and Aquila agree with John on this citation. John may have used a translation, he says, which on this point is

---

[67] Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" 73.
[68] Seynaeve, "Les Citations Scripturaires en Jn.19,36–37," 71.
[69] Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" 65.
[70] Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" 66.
[71] Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 157–171.
[72] Guinot, "Theodoret de Cyr, Une Lecture Critique de la Septante," 394.
[73] See Theodoret, *Epistolae* 1308 (PG 83:1435): ὄψονται γὰρ, φησὶν, εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.
[74] Cf. Boismard, "Critique Textuelle et Citations Patristiques," 388–408; Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence," 139–147; and Metzger, "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," 379–400.

*like* Theodotion and Aquila, but is now perished.[75] Dodd offers another nuance on the same theme, stating that the form of Zech 12:10 in this instance *anticipates* that of Theodotion.[76]

Moo takes a more moderate two-pronged approach, designating 19:37 as a citation that is equal to the Hebrew, but also showing *possible affinities* with Theodotion.[77]

Similarly, Brown notes a variant reading of Zech 12:10 in the Vienna Codex that is closer to a literal rendering of the MT that stems from an early proto-Theodotionic recension, conforming the LXX text to what was becoming the standard Hebrew text of the time.[78] He believes that we can be "reasonably certain" that John's shortened form of the citation reflects such an early Greek recension.[79]

Dorival, Harl, and Munnich go one step further in actually identifying this citation with the version of Theodotion: "En Jn 19,37 (voir aussi Ap 1,7), la citation de Za 12,10: 'Celui qu'ils ont transpercé', est conforme à la version de Théodotion et non à la LXX. . . ."[80]

R as another version known to John and at variance with the LXX would be a simple and adequate response to these who see the possibility of John having used another version, and who at the same time recognise common ground with Theodoret and Theodotion. Morris is not entirely accurate in his view that Theodotion and Aquila agree with John on this citation, for there is a measure of agreement, but not exact identity between the forms, as seen above. Here Moo's opinion is more accurate regarding the possible affinities with Theodotion. Brown not only sees the commonality of John's citation with a proto-Theodotionic recension, but also recognizes the possibility of that very text having been corrected or conformed to what was becoming the standard Hebrew text of the time. Dorival, Harl, and Munnich seem not to have examined Theodotion's and John's complete citations in detail. Morris is quite perceptive in his statement that John may have used a translation that is *like* Theodotion and Aquila, which is similar to Dodd's viewpoint that John's form of citation *anticipates* that of Theodotion. However, Dodd seems not to have considered carefully the evidence for the existence of a proto-Theodotionic text.

---

75 Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 823, fn 105.
76 Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 132.
77 Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 353.
78 Brown, *The Gospel According to John (XIII–XXI)*, 938.
79 Brown, *The Gospel According to John (XIII–XXI)*, 938.
80 Dorival, Harl, and Munnich, *La Bible Grecque des Septante*, 277.

Morris' concept of John's having used another translation like Theodotion and Aquila that is supposedly now perished would indicate a common source for the three. Barthélemy's argument for R as the source behind the revisions of Theodotion and Aquila would be an adequate explanation for such a translation, though R is not a translation that has perished entirely, for fragments of the manuscript are still extant.

If one sees Theodoret demonstrating textual roots that have drawn from the R tradition, then it speaks for the continued influence of that revision well into the fifth century C.E. Jellicoe observes commonality between John and Theodoret, for Lucianic texts containing this verse do tend to share common ground both with Theodoret and with John.[81] The four words that Theodoret shares with John, ὄψονται . . . εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, could have originated with the hand behind R, and continued to influence both John's text and Theodoret's textual roots.

### *An Edited or Corrected Version of the Old Greek*

Schuchard offers a multi-faceted viewpoint, giving credence to a number of possibilities for John's textual source. He believes in general that the OG is John's single textual tradition, from which basis he feels that John does purposeful editing. Admitting the possibility of an alternate textual tradition in the case of 19:37, he suggests that John may have used an edited or corrected version of the OG.[82] In one instance, he speaks of the citation in 19:37 as an example "... of the use of a set but independent text form."[83] Later, he continues by saying that the citation does not appear to be OG, in contrast to other explicit citations: "Unlike every other explicit citation of the Old Testament in John's Gospel, however, John 19:37 does not appear to represent a reference to the OG."[84] He then elaborates: "... John goes against the reading of the OG in John 19:37, but it is unclear whether or not this can be taken as evidence for his knowledge of an alternate textual tradition."[85]

Schuchard continues his attempt to capture all the complexity and subtleties of the citation by offering multiple possibilities. He believes that

---

[81] Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 157–171. See also Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae*, 319.

[82] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 145.

[83] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 142. Here Schuchard is indebted to M. Wilcox for this quotation.

[84] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 143.

[85] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 151, fn 1.

John does show evidence of knowing the Hebrew textual tradition, but then later argues that John recalls a Greek version rather than a Hebrew version.[86] Further, he believes that John may have had access to an edited or corrected version of the OG that contained marginal emendations, or perhaps he employed a Greek tradition shared with Theodotion. For Schuchard, the first verb of the phrase, ὄψονται, indicates that John did have in mind a specific scriptural *Vorlage*, since this verb is a suitable synonym for והביתו, and it recalls a specific version of Zechariah 12:10.[87]

The possibility of R as textual source is a meaningful response to the entire range of Schuchard's views. That John himself does purposeful editing could be substituted by the concept that the person behind R did purposeful editing on the basis of a contemporary proto–MT tradition. This would also explain the supposed edited or corrected version of the OG that reflects an alternate textual tradition. R's close compatibility with the Hebrew textual tradition would explain John's closeness to that tradition. If John's citation is a Greek tradition shared with Theodotion, this simply confirms Barthélemy's insistence that Theodotion (or proto-Theodotion) used R as the basis for his own revision of the LXX text toward a proto–MT textual tradition. R also fulfils Schuchard's perception of a specific scriptural *Vorlage* that John had in mind, which recalls a specific scriptural version of Zech 12:10.

### *A* Testimonia *Source*

Dodd's original opinion on John 19:37 relegated this citation to John's apparent use of a *testimonia* source for his scriptural citations in the Passion Narrative: "The incident of the piercing of the side is introduced as a fulfilment of prophecy—of prophecies drawn from a common 'testimony' source. . . ."[88]

The validity of potential *testimonia* sources for John's citations has been evaluated previously. Even if it is assumed that John was truly quoting a Christian *testimonia* source, the compatibility of his citation with a known textual tradition would argue that it is a *testimonium* that accurately

---

[86] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 144, 149.

[87] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 145–147.

[88] Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 428–429. Granted, however, Dodd was primarily concerned about tracing source material for NT theological development, rather than text-critical issues.

quotes its biblical source.[89] John's citation, with additional evidence from Matthew 24:30 and Revelation 1:7 discussed above, represents a discernible Jewish textual tradition for the verse,[90] whether or not one considers it to be a *testimonium*. While a *testimonia* theory might have some validity, positing R as John's source is a more adequate explanation for the unique form of the citation, and for its variation from LXX and MT.

### *A Standard Christian Version*

Menken's perception of a range of issues raised by John's citations leads him to conclude that John generally gives succinct quotes from the Scriptures, with accurate interpretations, and with the LXX as a solid base.[91] When the LXX did not fit John's purpose, however, Menken argues that at times he drew from the Hebrew text, or used an "extant early Christian version."[92] In his treatment of Zech 12:10, Menken says this verse has a peculiar text form that deviates strongly from the LXX; it shows affinities, he says quite accurately, with the Hebrew text and with later Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, but does not equal any of them exactly.[93] Since other early Christian quotations and allusions agree closely in textual form, e.g., Matt 24:30 and Rev 1:7, and he sees no cross-influence between Matthew, Revelation, and John, he states that John uses the "standard early Christian version" of the verse, ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.[94] Later, Menken clarifies his stance by stating that this verse reflects an independent translation of the Hebrew apparently known and used by John in the form of the fixed early Christian *testimonium*.[95] Seemingly closed to the idea that John could be in agreement with a Jewish textual form,[96] he states, "Our conclusion has to be that the early Christian textual form of Zech 12:10ab is an independent Greek translation of the Hebrew."[97]

Interestingly, however, in discussing the quotation of Ps 82:6 in John 10:34, Menken presupposes that the form of this particular citation was

---

[89] Cf. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 151: "... even if John cited from memory, his citations do, in fact, represent precise and therefore perceptible recollections of a specific textual tradition ... the OG."

[90] Cf. Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 221.

[91] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 393.

[92] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 367.

[93] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 494.

[94] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 497.

[95] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 504.

[96] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 497.

[97] Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 504.

"recognizable and comprehensible for John's audience and for those with whom they were arguing," and that it should be connected with "John's Jewish environment."[98] Menken's argument for an "early Christian textual form" of Zech 12:10 in John 19:37 seems incongruous with his viewpoint regarding Ps 82:6 in John 10:34. His assumption is that the presence of a particular quotation in three Christian writings argues for a common Christian source. However, Matthew and Revelation are among the most Jewish of NT writings, and would, like John, be quite likely to cite a Jewish source. The decidedly Jewish character of the three writings, together with Menken's own argument that these three NT citations of the verse show no influence upon one another, argues simply for an independent source, not of necessity for a specifically Christian innovation. The Christian character of the citation in these three instances is not to be found in its particular textual form, but in the theological application made to the person of Christ by the three authors.

None of Menken's arguments precludes the possibility of a Jewish Greek source such as R, and all fit very well within that framework. The succinct nature of John's quotations is in keeping with the attributes of R. R is clearly a recension of the LXX, which would account for Menken's view of the LXX as a solid basis both for John's quotations in general, and this quotation in particular. R can easily be seen as the peculiar text form that deviates strongly from the LXX in this verse. R also has affinities with the Hebrew text, and with the later Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, though it does not exactly equal any of them. Menken's view of an independent translation of the Hebrew could easily fit with the attribute of R's *Vorlage* as close, but not identical to MT, or with an alternate vocalisation tradition behind R. John's drawing upon R as a Jewish Greek text would be a more adequate explanation for John's form of the citation than Menken's concept of using a specifically Christian textual form.

### *Affinities with Hebrew*

Since it is obvious that John's citation is quite at odds with the LXX, one might immediately explain the difference as Sanday has done, that this quotation in 19:37 agrees with the Hebrew and not with the LXX.[99] Further

[98] Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John," 371.

[99] Sanday, *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 290. Sanday admits his agreement with Westcott on this point.

investigation quickly proves, however, that the citation of 19:37 does not precisely align with the Hebrew MT either. Hendriksen is more accurate than Sanday when he says that these words from the prophet are "not according to the LXX but *more nearly* according to the original Hebrew,"[100] with his phrase "original Hebrew" betraying his assumption that the original Hebrew *Vorlage* is equal to the MT. Lightfoot continues with the same line of thinking, clarifying in similar wording that "the Greek here is *nearer* to the Hebrew, than to the LXX, of Zech. 12:10."[101]

In a further refinement regarding Hebrew influence, Barrett believes that John is not dependent upon the LXX, but that he accurately follows the Hebrew, albeit a Hebrew consonantal text without pointing.[102] Barrett continues by saying that John's Greek agrees at this point with Aquila and Theodotion, but his final conclusion is one of complete uncertainty: whether John translated from the Hebrew, or used an existing version, such as a testimony source, Barrett claims that it is impossible to say.[103]

Menken agrees that the citation quotes the Hebrew, but rightly points out the difference in vocalisation over the word אלי. He argues for the alternate construct vocalisation of אֵלַי, calling it a poetic form of אל, and using the same as an explanation for his theory of the Christian textual form of John's quotation in 19:37.[104]

> It is not necessary at this point to hypothesize an otherwise unknown version of the Hebrew consonantal text which would be the basis of the early Christian version of Zech 12:10ab; a different vocalization of the known consonantal text is a sufficient explanation.[105]

Marsh offers another option: that of a personal translation of the Hebrew by John. "Here John makes his own translation of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament," he says, correctly observing that the LXX has completely mistranslated the [last verb of the phrase in] Hebrew as "dance insultingly."[106]

Sanders admits the verse is "cited in a form more akin to the Massoretic Text (which, however, reads 'me' for 'him') than the LXX," but his final statement is also one of complete uncertainty: "it is impossible to say where this rendering originated."[107]

---

100 Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary*, 2:439, emphasis added.
101 Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel*, 327, emphasis added.
102 Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, (1962), 23.
103 Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, (1962), 464.
104 Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 498.
105 Menken, "The Textual Form and the Meaning," 502.
106 Marsh, *The Gospel of St. John*, 623.
107 Sanders, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, 413.

Humann believes in general that Hebrew influence is basic to John's citations, and that John never violates the intent of the Massoretic Text. Within that overall viewpoint, he then places the citation of 19:37 (along with 13:18) in the category of John's direct translation from the Hebrew, using his own vocabulary, with 19:37 having nothing in common with the LXX.[108]

Another variation on the theme of Hebrew influence is offered by O'Rourke, who attributes John's difference to a pesher technique:

> John's wording is a good translation of the Hebrew. The only thing in Jn. which does not correspond to the Hebrew is this: the suffix of אלי is not translated. The omission of the first person reference seems to be another example of a pesher technique.[109]

Morris feels that the most natural understanding of the quotation is that John knew and used the Hebrew, but he does not accept it as a foregone conclusion: "... we cannot regard it as proved that John is translating direct from the Hebrew."[110] Hübner also expresses an element of doubt, believing that at times the evangelist possibly referred to the Hebrew original, but also concedes that the scriptural text available to John may not have been identical with the modern text available to us.[111] Hübner reflects an overall uncertainty regarding John's citations, seeing in some cases a literal correspondence with the Septuagint, yet in other cases a relationship that is not so definite,[112] which one cannot identify as either from the Septuagint or the Hebrew Bible.[113]

The possibility that John quoted from R is an adequate response to all the suggestions above regarding John's use of a Hebrew text. In response to Sanday and Westcott, that this quotation agrees with the Hebrew and not with the LXX, Hebrew influence is characteristic of R, as well as of John's citations in general, and the citation of 19:37 in particular. This description of the quotation fits the characteristic of R as a correction of the LXX toward the Hebrew proto–MT.

---

[108] Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 39–42.
[109] John J. O'Rourke, "John's Fulfillment Texts," *ScEccl* 19 (1967), 440.
[110] Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 823.
[111] Hübner, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament," 359.
[112] Hübner, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament," 359.
[113] Hübner, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament," 359; see also p. 339, where Hübner agrees with Hanhart's general observation that one should consider the Septuagint as being continuously reviewed in terms of correspondence with its Hebrew original, a process also reflected in NT quotations.

Hendriksen and Lightfoot are more accurate than Sanday and Westcott in saying that these words are not according to the LXX, but more nearly according to the Hebrew, recognising the small but significant variation between John and the MT. Their viewpoint would support R's correction of the LXX toward the Hebrew, at the same time allowing for R's proto–MT *Vorlage*, or a vocalisation tradition, at slight variance from the MT text.

When Barrett believes that John accurately follows a Hebrew consonantal text without pointing, his theory aligns with those who argue for John's close conformity to the Hebrew, and at the same time it reminds us that the Hebrew text of the era was indeed unpointed. Barrett's viewpoint is easily explained by R's *Vorlage* that was both unpointed and slightly at variance from the MT.[114] Barrett's uncertainty as to whether John translated from the Hebrew, or used an existing version, such as a testimony source, could be resolved by R as both a translation from Hebrew, and an alternative Greek version.

Menken agrees that the citation quotes the Hebrew, but believes that the citation can be explained simply by a different vocalisation of the Hebrew. Minor variations of R from MT can often be explained by a difference in vocalisation upon the same consonantal text, and thus can explain this instance as well. Marsh states that John gives a personal translation of the Hebrew, in contrast to the LXX's mistranslation of the verse. He thus recognises the LXX's incongruence with the MT of this verse, and John's compatibility with the MT. If R were the source from which John drew, R's compatibility with the MT and contrast to the LXX would be characteristics it would have in common with a purported personal translation of the Hebrew. Conversely, if indeed John himself personally translated from the Hebrew, it is a translation that shares R's characteristics of bringing the LXX into closer harmony with the proto–MT.

Sanders believes that John cited in a form more akin to the MT than the LXX, but feels it is impossible to say where the rendering originated. R's closeness to the MT and contrast to the LXX offer a possibility for explaining what Sanders considers impossible to explain.

Humann perceives that John never violates the intent of the MT, and that in 19:37 he translates directly from the Hebrew, using his own vocabulary. If indeed John never violates the intent of the MT, R also follows MT closely, allowing, of course, for a *Vorlage* at slight variance from MT. This is

[114] Compare, for example, the case of Nahum 3:10, where MT and R reflect the same consonantal text, but different pointing; see Brooke, "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 28–29.

a possibility that Humann appears to overlook. He gives no indication that John could be drawing from an alternative source that departed from the LXX by translating or adapting the text more closely to the Hebrew of the MT or proto–MT. Whether or not the hands behind R translated directly from their Hebrew text, they certainly reviewed the Greek carefully in comparison with their Hebrew text, and some variation in R's vocabulary is sufficient enough explanation for Humann's viewpoint.

O'Rourke claims that the difference in John's citation may be attributed to a pesher technique. In doing so, O'Rourke moves quickly to identify a difference between John's form and the MT with a characteristic of some Qumran materials, without carefully defining what constitutes technique that can be specifically delineated as pesher. It is questionable to ascribe a simple variation in pronominal ending to a pesher technique. R may simply have omitted the ending because it did not appear in its *Vorlage*, or again, because of the use of an alternative vocalisation tradition.

The uncertainty expressed by Morris and Hübner regarding John's relationship to the Hebrew text is indicative of their perception that a close relationship does exist between the two, and at the same time it points up their lack of a full explanation for the nuances of variation between them. The existence of R and its variant *Vorlage* as the source from which John drew is sufficient explanation for an otherwise baffling relationship between his citation and the Hebrew MT.

It is noteworthy that such a number of scholars have seen the affinities of John's citation with the Hebrew of the MT. Some measure of influence from a Hebrew textual tradition is undeniable. These varied statements have simply pointed out the many dimensions of similarities with MT. R was, of course, a LXX text continuously reviewed in relationship to its Hebrew original, thus the interweaving of a LXX text with correction toward a Hebrew proto–MT would solve the dilemma for all these scholars. That John quoted from such a text as R is a fitting response to all theories advanced regarding John and the Hebrew text.

### *The Possibility of R*

A final opinion on the subject comes from Hanhart. He observes John's similarity to the Hebrew in this citation, then begins to talk of identifying John's citation with R, but refrains from taking any definitive step:

> . . . according to the principle of recension observable in the preserved fragments, Old Testament statements such as Zechariah 12:10 וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ

> 'They will look on me whom they have pierced', may have been transmitted in the Minor Prophets scroll not in the sense of the old LXX ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, 'They will look upon me so that they may dance [joyously]', but in the form corresponding to the Hebrew original transmitted in John 19:37 (ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, Cf. Rev. 1:7).[115]

Prior to this statement, in speaking of the continuous comparison of the Greek translations to "the Hebrew original," both in the pre-Christian era of Aquila's predecessors, as well as the era of second-century C.E. translations, Hanhart says the following: "... in light of the text form of the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever, I would explain the divergences transmitted in New Testament material from the LXX form of the text, which stands closer to the Hebrew original, as given in Judaism and not as the result of individual initiative."[116] What Hanhart has said in a general fashion, he then applies specifically to Zech 12:10 and John 19:37, indicating both the Jewish form of the verse, as well as its characteristics shared with R. Hanhart thus believes that R's form of Zech 12:10 might be equal to John's form, which corresponds to the Hebrew, departs from the LXX, and shares content with Rev 1:7. Apart from his misperception and resulting mistranslation of the LXX phrase ἀνθ' ὧν, as well as the verb κατωρχήσαντο in both root meaning and form, Hanhart notes correctly the correspondence between John and the Hebrew MT, as well as the concomitant possibility that John's form of quotation could match that of R. However, Hanhart does not pursue the possibility, nor offer any corroborating evidence at this point to support his perception.

## Conclusion

John's citation represents one of the oldest available stages of the textual history of the verse. It is a reliable witness to a text form in Greek, and its corresponding Hebrew *Vorlage*, which were part of the later first-century C.E. biblical textual milieu in which John lived and wrote. Though it is unique, John's form is in a position of solid textual certainty, legitimacy, and authority equal or superior to any other known form of the text.

Various explanations have been offered for the form of Zech 12:10 as quoted in John 19:37. By the widely disparate and often apparently contradictory theories presented, it is also evident that the citation raises a

---

[115] Hanhart, "Introduction," 7.
[116] Hanhart, "Introduction," 6.

number of complicated textual problems. To date, as evidenced by the variety of opinion cited above, there has been no theory of citation that sufficiently accounts for all of the available data. R as another viable explanation for John's source has only been suggested by Hanhart, but has not been explored in depth by him or any other author.

A comparison of John's citation with R reveals striking similarities. John's citation of R is a solution that speaks to the entire range of textual difficulties, and thus reveals a hidden common denominator threaded through all of the scholarly debate. Each theory regarding the source of the citation reveals a characteristic or facet that is at the same time a characteristic of R, or a dimension of the citation to which R adequately responds. None of the many scholarly statements cited above is contradictory to the possibility that John quoted from R, and indeed, each of them is entirely compatible with that concept. No evidence need be unduly pressed or distorted to support that possibility.

The concept of John quoting from R vindicates the rightly perceived elements of truth in the many disparate scholarly opinions regarding this quotation. The shared characteristics between John's citation and R offer a single answer that is fully adequate to respond to all theories advanced regarding the source of John's citation. In sum, John's citation of Zech 12:10 shares R's characteristics: R was truly an independent non-Septuagintal rendering of the Twelve; R was another version such as that reflected by Theodotion or Theodoret; R was an edited or corrected version of the OG; R demonstrates some characteristics of a *testimonia* source; R satisfies the characteristics of a common source indicated by Matthew, John, and Revelation; R has strong affinities with the Hebrew text; and finally, by virtue of such commonality, R might indeed have contained the form of Zech 12:10 as cited by John.

CHAPTER EIGHT

# CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters, new light has been shed on Zech 12:10 and its citation in John 19:37. Converging lines of evidence point to R as the single best explanation for John's source and form of citation, satisfying the demands of each theory presented and each issue raised regarding the form of his citation.

## Some Implications that Follow from this Study

The following implications are suggested by the results of this study. Though limitations of space have precluded a full investigation of each of them, they are offered here as potentially fruitful areas for further study.

### *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*

The form of this quotation does not, of course, indicate with any precision who the author of the FG might have been. However, it does emphasise a number of key characteristics about that person. His handling of the Scripture in both Greek and Hebrew speaks for a sophisticated level of scholarship and adept language ability on his part. It forcefully argues that he was part of a Jewish community where such texts would be available, valued, and carefully used. He was sympathetic to the concern of his era for biblical accuracy, for fidelity to the proto–MT, and for the correctness of the LXX. Such a view strengthens the argument that the author of John was an insightful Palestinian Jew,[1] whether or not one accepts at face value the veracity of early witnesses Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and the Muratorian Canon, who claimed that the author was the Apostle himself.

[1] Cf. Craig L. Blomberg, "The Historical Reliability of John," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 71–72.

### *The Audience of the Fourth Gospel*

John's concern for textual fidelity indicates his sensitivity to an audience that considered such fidelity important to them. That concern fits well within a situation of dialogue and controversy between the Christian community and the synagogue, discussed earlier as a part of the *Sitz im Leben* of the FG. In such a context of controversy due to the growing disparity between the viewpoints of the synagogue and rabbis on the one hand, and emerging Christianity on the other,[2] John's citation of Scripture is faithful to the best Greek and Hebrew texts of the day, allowing him to speak ably to both Jewish and Christian communities. He argues for scriptural fulfilment in the passion of Christ from the best of both textual worlds:[3] from a widely-accepted consonantal Hebrew text that is at the time of citation moving toward predominance and standardisation, and at the same time, for a Greek-speaking audience, from a corrected LXX text that is accurate and acceptable for both Jewish and Christian readers. This would facilitate meaningful dialogue with the rabbis and the synagogue community, as well as present scriptural authority to the Christian community of both Jewish and non-Jewish believers. This move away from LXX influence toward a LXX corrective movement, all the while maintaining a consistent fidelity to the Hebrew consonantal tradition that is characteristic of all of John's scriptural citations, puts him in the company of those who would desire a scriptural text in the Greek vernacular that is at the same time carefully consistent with the prominent Hebrew textual tradition of the day. Here John's literary and theological genius is evident: his reverence for the Jewish Scriptures makes his citations acceptable to Judaism, as well as those outside the Jewish community. At the same time, his deep insight into the meaning of the ministry and the passion of Jesus within the flow of Scripture, leads him to challenge his audience by the application of those citations to the crucified Jesus.[4]

---

[2] See Francis J. Moloney, "The Johannine Passion and the Christian Community," *Salesianum* 57(1995), 54, 59; Gary M. Burge, "Situating John's Gospel in History," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 39.

[3] Cf. Burge, "Situating John's Gospel in History," 38, who states that the "FE lives where these two worlds, Judaism and Hellenism, merge."

[4] In the case of 19:37, though opponents might argue with the application to Jesus as the pierced one of Zech 12:10, John was not unique in applying this Scripture to a Messianic figure, cf. b. sukah 52. See also Mitchell, "The Fourth Deliverer: A Josephite Messiah in *4QTestimonia*," 545–553.

### *Johannine Interpretation*

This viewpoint regarding John's citation gives one confidence in his integrity and ability to handle scriptural citations. It enhances one's view of the accuracy of the FG in its relationship to the Scriptures, which in turn harmonises with renewed interest in the historical accuracy of the FG.[5] Such insight is valuable for the interpretation of this passage, as well as other passages of the FG. Any truth drawn from an exegetical analysis of this or any particular text must be presented in relationship to an adequate perception of John's biblical textual background and his overall handling of scriptural texts. It is not accurate to ascribe the form of this verse, or any of John's scriptural citations, to a misquotation from memory, to a textual innovation for a personal exegetical agenda, or to a manipulation to conform to his literary and theological purposes, without a full understanding of John's relationship to the biblical textual milieu of his day.

## The Meaning of 19:37 for Johannine Theology

It is now possible to suggest some implications of this study for the theology of the FG. As the strategically placed verse which brings John's Passion Narrative to a close, as well as the final and climactic scriptural citation of the entire FG, an understanding of its form aids not only in the interpretation of the verse itself within its immediate context, but also opens up a deeper understanding of the critical role the citation plays in the Passion Narrative and the theological development of the FG.

### *Zecharian "Bookends" and the Context of II Zechariah*

It is not by accident that John places his two Zecharian quotations in strategic locations at the beginning and end of his Passion Narrative, i.e., in 12:15 and 19:37. With this rhetorical strategy of Zecharian "bookends," as it were, John is making an appeal for the audience to share his perception that the tremendous promises of II Zechariah, made to a discouraged postexilic Jewish community, continue to be relevant to his contemporary audience, and have now become a reality in the person of Christ. John not only agrees with other NT authors that Zech 9–14 is central to an adequate understanding of the meaning of Jesus' passion, but he is also in agreement

[5] See Blomberg, "The Historical Reliability of John," 71.

with the heart of that message in its context.[6] Recognition of the significant role Zech 9–14 plays in the Gospel Passion Narratives[7] helps to fill out one's understanding of John's use of the same.

These two passages chosen by John are arguably two main thrusts or major foci for the entire work of II Zechariah. Seen in this light, John's understanding of the meaning of Christ's passion fits with the whole of the flow of Zech 9–14 in terms of the messianic personage, and the promised future restoration already begun in, during, and through the exile.

Zech 9–14 may be seen as a theodicy for the downfall and exile of Judah, as well as a proclamation of hope for restoration following the return. The humble king who comes riding upon a donkey to bring renewed joy and hope to post-exilic Israel is now fulfilled in the person of the pierced one upon whom all the tribes of Israel will look when God's outpoured spirit of grace and supplication receive an adequate response. In receiving that spirit, the tribes of Israel will recognise their responsibility and guilt in the process that led to his piercing, and the process of mourning will lead them closer to their God, and closer to the promised renewal and restoration. In that renewal of relationship, all may anticipate the accompanying divine promises of cleansing fountain, banishment of idolatry, refiner's fire, and a new day of the Lord with united worship, as presented in succeeding passages of II Zechariah.

John thus takes two key passages and uses them to present the historical reality of the passion and death of Christ as God's judgement upon the world and at the same time the opportunity for redemption. For John, the "coming king" has arrived; the "spirit of grace and supplication" has been poured out; the historically obscure "pierced one" has now been identified. This "coming king" of Zech 9:9 who humbly came with the prospect of salvation and peace is now fulfilled in the Christ who entered Jerusalem, as depicted at the beginning of John's Passion Narrative. The "pierced one" of Zech 12:10 who will be looked upon as God pours out a "spirit of grace and supplication," is now fulfilled in this same Jesus on the cross, and the beholding of this uplifted and crucified king is now the final climactic event of the Johannine passion. John may indeed be using a "Christian exegetical tradition in which Zech. 12:10, in the Hebrew, was applied to Christ's death."[8]

---

[6] Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 427.
[7] Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, online.
[8] Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 210–12.

However, a pierced Messiah is not a Christian invention, for John is in accepted scriptural territory in speaking of the same.[9] Yet more than simply reinforcing an argument, and beyond merely attempting to settle a dispute with adversaries, John is recalling a common bond of prophetic promise from a literary corpus dear to his listening audience, both Jewish and Christian. He uses the powerful authority of the Jewish Scriptures to point to Christ, and to support the reality of new life offered in his death and resurrection.

Thus John's two Zecharian texts seen in context give a more adequate perspective and depth of meaning to Jesus' ministry and death as they enclose the Passion Narrative. They point beyond the heartbreaking realities of a beloved leader who was crucified as though he were a common criminal, to one who in God's power and purpose is seen as paschal lamb, righteous sufferer, pierced Messiah, and now resurrected and life-giving Lord who brings to fruition the promises of II Zechariah.

### *Relationship to the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel*

The purpose of the FG is to bring the audience to faith, or to a renewed and deeper faith, by means of the portrait of Jesus that is presented. This concern is clearly indicated in 19:35 and 20:31 by the phrase "that you may believe." Lindars is correct in seeing behind the FG an "intense evangelistic concern of one who is deeply committed to the finality of the revelation of God in the Jesus of history for faith."[10] Jesus Christ, presented in the prologue as "God's Word of revelation and Son from eternity" is now "sent into the world by the Father to free men and women from the power of sin and death and to give them eternal life."[11] Effectively countering Jewish objections to the meaning of the miracles and the passion of Jesus, and at the same time affirming Christian believers and countering Christian timidity in the face of opposition, his desire is to lead his audience to faith. A dominant key word in this regard, used by John more frequently than any other NT author, is πιστεύειν.[12] Simply knowing the right content is not enough for John, but rather a spiritual "encounter" with the living Christ is

---

[9] Mitchell, "Messiah bar Ephraim in the Targums," 231.

[10] Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, 77.

[11] Martin Hengel, "The Prologue of the Gospel of John as the Gateway to Christological Truth," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 268.

[12] Hengel, "The Prologue of the Gospel of John," 280.

the final goal of John's witness.[13] The Fourth Evangelist wishes to lead the audience to an abiding relationship of faith and trust in Jesus by directing their attention to the Lamb of God, to the true meaning of his miracles, and to the deeper meaning of his passion and death.

The LXX form of Zech 12:10, "they will look to me because they have danced in mockery," would have made no sense and had little or no relevance for John's presentation of Christ and his purpose of leading his audience to faith. In contrast, John's form "they will look on the one whom they pierced" calls for the audience to look upon the crucified Jesus. Such a look, combined with genuine faith, leads to salvation and meaningful relationship with the crucified Lord.

### *Relationship to Selected Themes of the Fourth Gospel*

However, John's purpose, "that you might believe," means more than the initial response of faith alone, for "faith in Jn is a dynamic reality which cannot be equated with the initial act of faith."[14] This leading to faith must be seen in the light of the Christology of the entire gospel, "which embodies John's own deepest Christian faith."[15] Given the strategic location of the citation of 19:37, it is clear that it cannot be separated from the flow of the entire FG. If the person and work of Jesus is the central focus of the FG from which all other considerations flow,[16] then the call to look on the pierced one would include all that has been said in the previous 19 chapters about Jesus. The citation of 19:37 is a call to embody the faith of the entire Johannine narrative that precedes that verse, as well as the resurrection narrative which follows. Though it would be impossible in this study to do justice to every theme in the FG, some representative themes will be explored.

#### *The Use of* ὁράω *and the Subject of* ὄψονται

The wording of the citation, beginning with John's choice of the opening verb ὄψονται, is an important key to understanding the place of this citation within the Passion Narrative, as well as the entire FG. At the very heart of Johannine literary and theological purpose is the call to "come and see," "to behold the Lamb of God," and to "look upon the pierced one," as John

---

[13] Anderson, "On Guessing Points and Naming Stars," 344–45.
[14] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 534.
[15] Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, 79.
[16] O'Grady, "Recent Developments in Johannine Studies," 57.

uses the same root verb in various key passages throughout his gospel.[17] A few examples of that use will suffice: 1:18—"no one has ever SEEN God"; 1:29, 36—"BEHOLD the Lamb of God"; 1:46—"come and SEE"; 1:51—"you will SEE heaven opened"; 14:9—"the one who HAS SEEN me HAS SEEN the Father"; 16:16—"and again a little while and you WILL SEE me"; 19:33—"he SAW"; 19:35—"the one who HAS SEEN"; 20:8—"he SAW and believed"; 20:18—"I HAVE SEEN the Lord"; 20:25—"we HAVE SEEN the Lord . . . unless I SEE"; 20:29—"because you HAVE SEEN me. . . ."

This God whom "no one has ever seen" has now been revealed by the Word made flesh. This incarnation of the divine Logos is the encapsulated essence of the FG, and the one to whom the audience is called upon to direct their gaze and in whom they are to place their faith in obedient trust.[18] To Philip's desire to see the Father, Jesus gives his famous reply, "the one who has seen me has seen the Father" (14:6). In this light, John would view the gazing upon the pierced one of 19:37 as precisely a look at the Son of God who is the revelation of the Father. This is an example of what Blomberg would call the FG's "dramatically high Christology," and how directly Jesus is equated with God.[19] "The summit of religious experience transcending all human possibilities, the *visio Dei*, is given in the faith in Jesus, for in him the Father is present."[20]

It has been noted that in 19:37 John does not follow the LXX nor MT with traditional vocalisation in the first person pronominal ending, i.e., "they will look unto ME. . . ." If John had desired in this citation to identify Jesus directly with Yahweh who is speaking in the original citation, it would have been a simple matter to do so by following that vocalisation tradition. The fact that he does not do so allows him to continue to hold Jesus' humanity and divinity in creative tension, without drifting into a form of docetism or resolving the issue into a facile identity of Jesus with God that would minimise his humanity and his suffering. His form of citation draws attention to the stark reality of the human suffering of a pierced Jesus from whom real blood and water flowed, and his physical helplessness before the ones who delivered him up to be crucified. At the same time, in the gaze upon the pierced one is seen the uplifted and exalted Christ, the

---

[17] Cf. Seynaeve, *Les Citations Scripturaires*, 73, who states: ". . . le verbe ὁράω . . . constitue un des mots-cles dans le vocabulaire theologique de St. Jean."

[18] Hengel, "The Prologue of the Gospel of John," 268, 280.

[19] Blomberg, "The Historical Reliability of John," 75–76.

[20] Hengel, "The Prologue of the Gospel of John," 287.

Son of God. "The Johannine Jesus comes across in the most human—and the most divine—of portrayals *anywhere* in the New Testament."[21]

Simply "seeing" the crucified Lord, however, is not synonymous with "believing," as indicated by 6:36, "you HAVE SEEN me and yet do not believe," and 20:29, "because you HAVE SEEN me . . . blessed are those who HAVE NOT SEEN. . . ." As the crucifixion episode and the piercing bring to a climax the Johannine passion, John bases his testimony upon "seeing" as eyewitness in 19:35, and calls upon the audience to accept the veracity of that testimony as incentive to "believe."[22] He affirms his testimony by a final appeal to the Scriptures which concludes with the citation of Zechariah in a call to "see" or "look upon" the pierced one in transforming faith.

In the immediate historical fulfilment of the crucifixion episode, the verb ὄψονται refers to those eyewitnesses who were there at the foot of the cross, including the eyewitness of 19:35. However, Jewish leaders have also participated in the piercing by their deliverance of Jesus into Pilate's hand, and the Roman authorities from Pilate to the particular soldiers on duty the day of the crucifixion played a significant role in carrying out the sentence. Further, since John is sensitive to the scriptural context from which his citations come, which in this case is Zechariah 12, then the entire public can be seen as participating to some extent in the rejection and piercing of Jesus. This would include both the Jewish community and nascent Christian community, particularly those "secret" disciples who were unwilling to confess their faith publicly. This citation by John is a call for an audience not yet fully committed to Christianity to look in faith upon the pierced one, as well as for a believing Christian audience to continue and to deepen their look of faith. It could also be seen as an optimistic outlook on the author's part that the very ones who pierced Jesus, both the soldier who literally thrust the spear into his side, as well as religious and political leaders who arranged for the piercing, would be among those who look to the crucified one in repentance and mourning, in keeping with the Zecharian context. God's grace poured out upon his people will lead them to look, and when recognising the need to repent and to mourn, his Spirit will then lead them to a salvific view of

---

[21] Anderson, "On Guessing Points and Naming Stars," 314.

[22] Cf. Richard Bauckham, "The Fourth Gospel as the Testimony of the Beloved Disciple," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 137, regarding the inseparable uniting in this instance of historiographical and theological aspects.

the pierced one who is now resurrected, applying an ever deeper meaning of his person and presence to their hearts.

The quotation of 19:37 both ties together previous uses of the verb ὁράω, and launches the reader into the resurrection narrative with a continued focus upon seeing the pierced one. The verb ὄψονται is both a legitimate translation of the Hebrew as well as a thematic tie to John's emphasis upon "seeing" as leading to ontological transformation.[23] The use of ὁράω in John consistently refers to spiritual sight, spiritual perception, and, according to Odeberg, "presupposes entrance into the spiritual reality."[24] Its meaning is much more fitting and meaningful within the Johannine narrative than the LXX's ἐπιβλέψονται would be.

Looking upon the pierced one in a simple, physical dimension is not considered by John in and of itself to have any importance for salvation. However, when one perceives in that look the revelation of God's love in the person of Jesus, it does indeed become "transforming and salvific."[25] If one were to accept Scrutton's insistence that not only is revelation a major theme in the FG, "but also that it is regarded as the primary if not sole means of salvation," then indeed "our experiential knowledge of God in Christ *is* our salvation."[26] In addition, the unique introductory formula of 19:37a that includes the verb λέγει in present active indicative, together with the verb ὄψονται in the future tense within the citation itself, suggests a dimension of continuous fulfilment in the gaze and spiritual transformation of both contemporary and future believers.

*The Law and the Sabbath*

The crucifixion episode is often seen as a natural ending point of the Passion Narrative, with the succeeding burial episode and resurrection narrative treated as entirely new subjects. It is more instructive, however, to see a connectedness between the crucifixion and the following passages, precisely because of the strategic location of the citation in 19:37 and the use of ὄψονται. Chapter 20 is focused upon "seeing" the resurrected Lord in a deeper dimension of faith, whether or not one has had the privilege of physically seeing him. Looking upon the pierced one is not only the

---

[23] Miller, " 'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him,' " 135–136.

[24] Hugo Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel* (Chicago: Argonaut, 1968), 40.

[25] Anastasia Scrutton, " 'The Truth Will Set You Free': Salvation as Revelation," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 359.

[26] Scrutton, " 'The Truth Will Set You Free,' " 362, 365.

close of the Passion Narrative, it is the climactic citation that both draws the reader's attention to the crucified Lord, and at the same time launches one into the resurrection narrative with the call to "see" and "behold" the resurrected Lord with the eyes of faith.[27]

This strategic position of 19:37, however, takes on additional meaning in the light of the role of the Law and Sabbath in the FG. Earlier in the FG, questions regarding the Law and the authority of Jesus,[28] centred around the Sabbath, give rise to the controversy regarding the claim of Jesus to be the Son of God.[29] The "Son's 'exegeting' the Father to the world hinges upon his oneness with the one he represents (John 1:18)."[30] Jesus is thus accused of blasphemy, of being a deceiver, and advocating subversion.[31] The Jews base their accusations on the Law, and John bases his rebuttal on the Law and scriptural revelation. John is not content to show that the accusations the Jews make against Jesus in the name of the Law are ill-founded, but moves on to show how the Law should actually lead to the recognition of Jesus and is in fact violated by those who condemned him.[32] They cannot accept that the Mosaic tradition as given formerly by God has now been brought to perfection in the incarnate Son of God.[33] The Sabbath work of Jesus is not violating the Sabbath at all, but is instead a deeper fulfilment of the Law as Jesus does the very work of the Father. Further, for John, the death of Jesus may even be demanded by the Law as its fulfilment (see 11:47–52).[34] Ironically, the Jewish leaders had condemned Jesus for supposedly breaking the Law. The two final scriptural citations of 19:36 and 37 which close both the crucifixion episode and the entire Passion Narrative demonstrate that in the piercing of Jesus, Jewish leaders and Roman authorities, unbeknown to either group, together fulfilled the Law, as well as the Prophets and the Psalms, to the letter.

---

[27] In this light, the burial episode of 19:38–42, rather than being a statement regarding the faith of the two burial partners, may be instead a final indictment upon their attempt to be hidden believers, i.e., they "see" only a dead Jesus as they bury him in fine Jewish fashion.

[28] Some dimension of controversy regarding the Law in the FG is undeniable. However, cf. Lieu, "Anti-Judaism, the Jews, and the Worlds of the Fourth Gospel," 170: "I am not persuaded that the conflict in John focuses around 'the intensity of their devotion to Torah' or 'to the Law.' "

[29] Moloney, "The Johannine Passion and the Christian Community," 34.

[30] Anderson, "On Guessing Points and Naming Stars," 338.

[31] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 507.

[32] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 508.

[33] Moloney, "The Johannine Passion and the Christian Community," 34–35.

[34] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 508.

Jesus' fulfilment of the Law was at the same time a profound fulfilment of the Sabbath. In his ministry, Jesus had continued to do the Father's Sabbath work, sharing in the divine activity that did not cease on the Sabbath, but instead brought a new dimension of meaning to the seventh day. Though Jesus was accused of being a sinner and thus discredited because of his attitude toward the Law, concretely manifested in his attitude toward the Sabbath, now as resurrected Lord, he has given full depth of meaning to the Sabbath. The work of Jesus gave rise to the "true Sabbath" of the new era,[35] now fully confirmed in his resurrection.

This discussion of the Sabbath as a key element regarding the Law in the FG continues to be evident in 19:31 and 42, where concern is expressed for Sabbath preparation by the use of the word παρασκευή. Following the crucifixion episode, John presents an immediate literary transition to resurrection appearances without any mention of activity on the Sabbath, or even of its mere passing, but only of preparation for its coming. These two verses have a purposeful connection in tying the meaning of the crucifixion directly to the new Sabbath era of resurrection. John's mention of the resurrection of Jesus which takes place τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, "on the first of the Sabbaths" (20:1), may be more than the simple use of a common idiomatic phrase for the first day of the week. It alludes to a new dimension of Sabbath meaning and Sabbath observance. In John's abrupt transition from 19:42 to 20:1, one has passed at once from the day of crucifixion and burial as preparation for the Sabbath to the institution of the New Sabbath itself in the resurrection of Jesus.

*Eternal Life and Judgement*

The concept of "life" or "eternal life" is a key theme in the FG. This phrase, preferred over the phrase "Kingdom of God" in the Synoptics, yet nonetheless Jewish in origin, is now a present reality to be experienced in the saving act of God in the reality of Christ.[36] "In him was life" (1:4), and he has the power to give life. In the raising of Lazarus, for example, Jesus affirms the continuation of life for those who believe in him; he is the source of resurrection, and therefore of life.[37] The goal of the incarnation is "the gift (χάρις) of eternal life in the vision of God, fellowship with the triune God-Father,

[35] Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 508.

[36] Archibald M. Hunter, *According to John: The New Look at the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968), 108.

[37] McHugh, "In Him Was Life," 153–54.

Son, and Spirit."[38] 19:37 is a call for the audience to gaze continually upon the pierced one and thus receive his resurrected presence in their midst by responding to his offer of an ever deeper participation in eternal life.

In looking upon the pierced one, however, the element of judgement may also be present.[39] The one who came not to judge the world, nonetheless brings judgement as one responds positively or negatively to him (e.g., 3:17–21). One cannot remain a spectator in John's audience, but must reach a decision on the matter of relationship to Christ.[40] The call for a step of faith, both for eyewitnesses at the original scene, as for every member of the FG's audience, can also bring negative consequences if rejected. Here John is in harmony with his synoptic colleagues and other NT writers. Certain large sections of the Scriptures, in this case from the book of the Twelve, indicate clearly that the living God is at work in history, his impact being revealed positively as the power of renewal or redemption, and negatively as judgement upon human action. "Taking up this view of history the earliest thinkers of Christianity declared that in the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ this act of absolute judgement and absolute redemption had taken place."[41] This complex event becomes the centre from which the whole history of the people of God is to be understood, both backwards and forwards, and ultimately the history of all humanity. In this case, as well as other cases of scriptural citation, John is grounding his theology in the *kerygma* as illuminated by the prophecies of the Scriptures.[42] He sees the living God in history in the person of Christ, confronting humanity with the challenge to respond to his offer of life, light, and love.

Judgement must be seen in John's terms, however. The form of citation in 19:37 is indicative of its theological content. One might be inclined to read into this citation a final eschatological viewpoint, as seen in Matt 24:30 and Rev 1:7.[43] Judgement in the FG, however, is not primarily centred on condemnation, nor on eschatological finality, but on the offer of salvation (cf. 3:17). Further, it is a judgement not only finalised at the end of the age, but already begun in the present (cf. 16:8–11). John's viewpoint

---

[38] Hengel, "The Prologue of the Gospel of John," 288.
[39] Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 362.
[40] Hunter, *According to John*, 116.
[41] Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, online.
[42] Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, online.
[43] Cf. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 212–214: "…Jn 19:37 could be regarded as the culmination of the Johannine theme of the centrality of the uplifted Christ for the world's judgment (esp. 3:14, 8:28)."

of eschatology as already initiated prompts him to present this most simple expression of looking as literal fulfilment by those at the foot of the cross, and at the same time a continuously extended fulfilment by those of his audience as they look upon the crucified Lord. A dimension of final eschatological judgement and condemnation for those who reject Jesus is not categorically excluded, but the citation is best viewed as an opportunity for the look of faith that leads to salvation. Here is a universal offer for all to look upon the pierced lamb and receive eternal life. The brevity and conciseness of John's form of citation, without the additional eschatological content evident in Matt 24:30 and Rev 1:7, support this viewpoint.

*The Holy Spirit*

The FG presents teaching about the person of the Holy Spirit, who will be the disciples' teacher, the witness to Christ, the one who accuses the world of sin, and the one who completes the revelation of Christ as he guides his followers into all truth.[44] John's Gospel is the result of his and the other disciples' reflection upon the meaning of Christ under the Spirit's leadership. The FG is not a raw historical portrait, says Burge, but a Spirit-led interpretation of the tradition about Christ.[45] The profound *post factum* interpretation of the passion events by John is the realisation of Jesus' promise that the Paraclete would transform their view of the cross, as seen in 14:26, 15:26, 16:7, 16:13.[46]

In the immediate context of Zech 12:10, the mention of the outpouring of a spirit of grace and supplication indicates a potential relationship to the ministry of the Holy Spirit in the FG. Although that original reference is not to be taken of necessity as a clear theological pronouncement about the person and work of the Holy Spirit,[47] still the looking upon the pierced one and the realisation of its significance prompted by the outpouring of God's spirit of grace and supplication would not be incongruous with the theological flow of the FG. Once again, John's sensitivity and faithfulness to the context of his scriptural citations makes it legitimate to suppose that he is including within this citation the understanding that one will see the true significance of the crucified Jesus and respond accordingly only by the insight and prompting of the Holy Spirit. As John himself is

---

[44] Hunter, *According to John*, 113.

[45] Burge, "Situating John's Gospel in History," 43.

[46] McHugh, "In Him Was Life," 157.

[47] An allusion by Zechariah to the outpouring of God's Spirit in Joel 2, though not obvious, is not out of the question.

Spirit-led to draw out the meaning of Zech 12:10 for the crucifixion episode of his Passion Narrative, the readers who respond to the outpoured spirit of grace and supplication as envisioned by Zechariah, will perceive the deeper meaning of the piercing of Christ. That includes insight regarding the responsibility of those who manipulated the political situation to have him pierced, as well as the spiritual meaning for those who look upon the crucified Jesus. In this light, 19:37 is a call to look upon the pierced one, who is now resurrected, as ongoing relationship with the in-breathed Paraclete leads Jesus' true followers to ever deeper understandings of the meaning of his crucifixion, and to profound spiritual transformation in relationship to him.[48]

[48] Cf. I John 3:2b, "... we will be like him, because we will see him as he is" (author's translation).

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I Primary Sources


Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, editors. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Première Publication Intégrale du Texte des Fragments du Dodécaprophéton. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* X. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.

Benoit, P., J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux. *Les Grottes de Murabba'at*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1961.

Ego, Beate, Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Kristin de Troyer, eds. *Biblia Qumranica 3B: Minor Prophets*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.

Kittel, Rudolph, ed. *Biblia Hebraica*. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1906, 1912, 1937.

Origen. *Hexapla*. Edited by Fridericus Field. 2 Vols. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875.

Patrologia graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 Vols. Paris, 1857–1886.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Sanders, Henry A., and Carl Schmidt. *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Tov, Emanuel, ed. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Ulrich, Eugene, Frank Moore Cross, Russell E. Fuller, Judith E. Sanderson, Patrick W. Skehan, and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Qumran Cave 4: X The Prophets*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XV. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Duodecim Prophetae*. 3d ed. Vol. XIII of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.


## II Secondary Sources


Aejmelaeus, Anneli. *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators*. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993.

———. "Septuagintal Translation Techniques—A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account." Pages 381–401 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.

———. "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint." Pages 361–379 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.

———. "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator." *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 31 (1991): 23–35.

———. "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 58–89.

Aelian. *On the Characteristics of Animals*. Translated by A.F. Scholfield. 3 Vols. Loeb Classical Library 446, 448, 449. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Aharoni, Y. "Expedition B—The Cave of Horror." *Israel Exploration Journal* 12 (1962): 186–199.

———. "The Caves of Nahal Hever." *Atiqot* 3 (1961): 148–162.

Albrektson, Bertil. "Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 49–65 in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XXIX*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

———. "Textual Criticism and the Textual Basis of a Translation of the Old Testament." *The Bible Translator* 26 ( July, 1975): 314–324.

Albright, W.F. "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 140–146 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4*. Vol. V of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.

Allenbach, J., A. Benoit, D.A. Bertrand et al., eds. *Biblia Patristica: Des Origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullian*. Anatole, France: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975.

———. *Biblia Patristica: Origène*. Anatole, France: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1977.

Anderson, Paul N. "John and Mark: The Bioptic Gospels." Pages 175–188 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville, KY, and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

———. "On Guessing Points and Naming Stars: Epistemological Origins of John's Christological Tensions." Pages 311–345 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.

Arnaldez, Roger. "L'Influence de la Traduction des Septante sur le Commentaire de Philon." Pages 251–266 in *Études sur le Judaïsme Hellénistique*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984.

Audet, Jean-Paul. "L'Hypothèse des Testimonia." *Revue Biblique* LXX (1963): 381–405.

Baldwin, Joyce G. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentary 24. Edited by Donald J. Wiseman. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 1972.

Ball, E. "Interpreting the Septuagint: Nahum 2:2 as a Case-Study." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 75 (1997): 59–75.

Barc, Bernard. "Du Temple à la Synagogue: Essai d'Interprétation des Premiers Targumismes de la Septante." Pages 11–26 in *Selon les Septante*. Edited by Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich. Paris: Cerf, 1995.

Barker, Kenneth L. "YHWH Sabaoth: 'The Lord Almighty.' " Pages 106–110 in *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*. Edited by Kenneth L. Barker. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books, 1986.

Barnabas, The Epistle of. Edited and Translated by Kirsopp Lake. Vol. 1 of *The Apostolic Fathers*. Loeb Classical Library 24. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Baron, David. *The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1975.

Barr, James. " 'Guessing' in the Septuagint." Pages 19–34 in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm. Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1990.

———. "Reading a Script without Vowels." Pages 71–100 in *Writing without Letters*. Edited by W. Haas. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976.

———. "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts." Pages 381–403 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.

———. "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators." *Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1967): 1–11.

Barrett, C.K. *The Gospel According to St. John*. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.

———. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2d ed. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Westminster Press, 1978.

Barthélemy, Dominique. "L'Enchevêtrement de l'Histoire Textuelle et de l'Histoire Littéraire dans les Relations entre la Septante et le Texte Massorétique." Pages 21–40 in *De Septuaginta*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox. Toronto: Benben Publications, 1984.

———. "Origen et le Texte de l'Ancien Testament." *Études d 'Histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament* 21 (1978): 203–217.

———. "Redécouverte d'un Chaînon Manquant de L'Histoire de la Septante." *Revue Biblique* 60 (1953): 18–29. Repr. pages 127–139 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Barthélemy, Dominique, A.R. Hulst, N. Lohfink, W.D. McHardy, H.P. Ruger, and J.A. Sanders, eds. *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Project—Vol. 5*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1980.

Barton, John. "The Significance of a Fixed Canon of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 67–83 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Bauckham, Richard. "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel." Pages 101–111 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

———. "The Fourth Gospel as the Testimony of the Beloved Disciple." Pages 120–139 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans), 2008.

Bauer, W., W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Beale, G.K. "Revelation." Pages 318–333 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. "Canon and Scripture in the Book of Ben Sira." Pages 591–605 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Twelve Prophetic Books or 'The Twelve': A Few Preliminary Considerations." Pages 125–155 in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*. Edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 235, (1996).

Bernard, J.H. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2 Vols. International Critical Commentary 30–31. Edited by A.H. McNeile. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928.

Black, Matthew. "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971–72): 1–14.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and Edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blomberg, Craig L. "The Historical Reliability of John." Pages 71–82 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Boda, Mark J., and Michael H. Floyd. "Zechariah 12:1–13:6." Pages 131–171 in *Bringing Out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14*. Edited by Mark J. Boda and Michael

H. Floyd. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 370*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
Boismard, M.E. "Critique Textuelle et Citations Patristiques." *Revue Biblique* LVII (1950): 388–408.
———. *L'Évangile de Jean*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958.
Bowker, John. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969.
Brawley, Robert L. "An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28–29." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 427–443.
Brenton, Sir Lancelot C.L. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., 1851. Repr., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003.
Brock, Sebastian. "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint." Pages 11–36 in *The Witness of Tradition. Old Testament Studies 17*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
———. "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation." Pages 301–338 in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990.
———. "Translating the Old Testament." Pages 87–98 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
Brodie, Thomas L. *The Gospel According to John*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
———. *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
Broer, Ingo. "Knowledge of Palestine in the Fourth Gospel?" Pages 83–90 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
Brooke, George J. "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process." Lecture, University of Manchester, undated. Online: http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/7th/BrookeFullPaper.htm.
———. "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" Pages 85–100 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.
———. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 29*. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1985.
———. "On Isaiah at Qumran," Pages 69–85 in *"As Those Who Are Taught." The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
———. "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 19–43 in *Congress Volume Leiden 2004*. Edited by André Lemaire. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
Brotzman, Ellis R. *Old Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1994.
Brown, Raymond E. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 1–8 in *John and Qumran*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.
———. *The Gospel According to John (XIII–XXI)*. The Anchor Bible 29A. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1970.
Bruce, F.F. "The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation." Pages 37–52 in *The Witness of Tradition*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
———. *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968.
Brueggemann, Dale A. "The Evangelists and the Psalms." Pages 263–278 in *Interpreting the Psalms*. Edited by Philip S. Johnston and David G. Firth. Leicester: Apollo, 2005.
Bultmann, Rudolf. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
———. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray, R.W.N. Hoare and J.K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.

Burge, Gary M. "Situating John's Gospel in History." Pages 35–46 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Busto Saiz, José Ramón. "El Texto Luciánico en el Marco del Pluralismo Textual." *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 65 (1990): 3–18.

Butterworth, Mike. "Structure and the Book of Zechariah." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 130 (1992): 212–217.

Caird, G.B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint." Pages 110–112 in *Septuagint Lexicography*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 1. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Carson, D.A. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1991.

———. "John and the Johannine Epistles." Pages 245–264 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Cathcart, K.J., and R.P. Gordon, eds. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989.

Charbonneau, André. "Jésus en Croix, Jésus Élevé." *Science et Esprit* XLV.1 (1993): 5–23.

———. "Jésus en Croix, Jésus Élevé (2e Partie)." *Science et Esprit* XLV.2 (1993): 161–180.

Charlesworth, James H. "What Has the Old Testament to Do with the New?" Pages 39–87 in *The Old and New Testaments: Their Relationship and the 'Intertestamental' Literature*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Walter P. Weaver. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1993.

Chary, Théophane. *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969.

Chester, Andrew. "Citing the Old Testament." Pages 141–169 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Childs, Brevard S. "The Exegetical Significance of Canon for the Study of the Old Testament." Pages 66–80 in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XXIX*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

———. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Cimosa, Mario. "The Greek Translation of Zechariah." *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 45 (1995): 91–108.

Clark, David J., and Howard A. Hatton. *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*. New York: United Bible Societies, 2002.

Clements, Ronald E. *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.

Coggins, R.J. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Cohen, A. *Everyman's Talmud*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1949.

Collin, Matthieu. "Recherche sur l'histoire textuelle du Prophete Michee." *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971): 281–97.

Collins, Nina. "281 B.C.E.: The Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek Under Ptolemy II." Pages 403–503 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990.

Collins, Terry. "The Literary Contexts of Zechariah 9:9." Pages 29–40 in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2003.

Coloe, Mary. "Raising the Johannine Temple." *Australian Biblical Review* 48 (2000): 47–58.

Combs, William W. "The Transmission History of the Septuagint." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 146 (July–September, 1989): 255–269.

Comfort, Philip W. "The Greek Text of the Gospel of John According to the Early Papyri." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 625–629.

Comfort, Philip W., and David P. Barrett. *The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1999.

Conybeare, F.C., and St. George Stock. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905. Repr., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.

Craig, Kenneth M., Jr. "Interrogatives in Haggai-Zechariah: A Literary Thread?" Pages 224–244 in *Forming Prophetic Literature*. Edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House. Sheffield: JSOT, 1996.

Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3d ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

———. "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text." Pages 278–292 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

———. "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert." Pages 177–195 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

———. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran." Pages 147–176 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

———. "The Text Behind the Text of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 139–155 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Hershel Shanks. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*. Fortress Press, 1983.

———. "The Death of Jesus: An Exegesis of John 19:28–37." *Faith and Mission* 5 (Spring, 1988): 64–70.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentarius in xii Prophetas Minores*. 6 vols. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database.

Davidson, Benjamin. *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd., 1850. Repr., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986.

Davies, G. Hinton. "Dancing." Pages 760–761 in vol. 1 of *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G.A. Buttrick. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1962.

Davies, W.D. "Reflections about the Use of the Old Testament in the New in its Historical Context." *Jewish Quarterly Review* LXXIV (October, 1983): 105–136.

de Boer, Martinus C. *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996.

DeConick, April D. "John Rivals Thomas." Pages 303–311 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville, KY, and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Deissmann, Adolf. "The New Biblical Papyri at Heidelberg." *The Expository Times* 17 (1905): 248–254.

Deist, F.E. *Towards the Text of the Old Testament*. Translated by W.K. Winckler. Pretoria: N.G. Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, 1978.

Delcor, M. "Les Sources du Deutéro-Zacharie et ses Procédés d'Emprunt." *Revue Biblique* 59 (1952): 385–411.

———. "Un Problème de Critique Textuelle et d'Exégese." *Revue Biblique* 58 (April, 1951): 289–299.

de Waard, Jan. "La Septante: Une Traduction." Pages 133–145 in *Études sur le Judaïsme Hellénistique*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984.

Dewey, Joanna. "The Gospel of John in Its Oral-Written Media World." Pages 239–252 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville, KY, and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Diez Macho, Alejandro. "Un Nuevo Targum a los Profetas." *Estudios Bíblicos* XV (1956): 287–95.

Díez Merino, Luis. "Los Tiqqune Soferim en la Tradición Targúmica." Pages 18–44 in *Tradition of the Text*. Edited by Gerard J. Norton and Stephen Pisano. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Dimant, Devorah. "The Problem of Non-Translated Biblical Greek." Pages 1–19 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.

Dirksen, P.B. "The Peshitta and Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* XLII (1992): 376–390.

Dodd, C.H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1953. Online: http://www.katapi.org.uk/AccordingToTheScriptures.htm.

———. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965.

———. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963.

Dogniez, Cecile. "Le Dieu des Armées dans le Dodekapropheton: Quelques Remarques sur une Initiative de Traduction." *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 45 (1995): 19–36.

Dorival, Gilles, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich. *La Bible Grecque des Septante*. Paris: Editions du CERF, 1988.

Driver, S.R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1913.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Evans, Craig A. "Jesus and Zechariah's Messianic Hope." Pages 373–388 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 26 (1982): 79–83.

———. " 'The Two Sons of Oil': Early Evidence of Messianic Interpretation of Zechariah 4:14 in 4Q254 4 2." Pages 566–575 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *Introducción a las Versiones Griegas de la Biblia*. Madrid: Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros," 1979.

———. *The Septuagint in Context*. Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. "Some Reflections on the Antiochian Text of the Septuagint." Pages 219–229 in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm. Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

———. "El Texto Bíblico de Dídimo en el Comentario a Zacarías del Papiro de Tura." *Sefarad* 36 (1976): 267–284.

———. "El Texto Griego de la Complutense en Doce Profetas." *Sefarad* 39 (1979): 3–26.

———. "The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina." Pages 408–420 in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*. Edited by Alison Salvesen. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1998.

Finley, Harvey E., and Charles D. Isbell. *Biblical Hebrew*. Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Pres, 1975.

Finley, T.J. " 'The Apple of His Eye' (Babat Eno) in Zechariah II 12." *Vetus Testamentum* XXXVIII ( July, 1988): 337–338.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

———. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis." Pages 33–48 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation,Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Fortna, Robert T., and Tom Thatcher, eds. *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Foster, Paul. "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 65–85 in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.

Freed, Edwin D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Fuller, Russell. "4QXIIa." Pages 221–223 in *Qumran Cave 4—X The Prophets*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XV. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

———. "4QXIIe." Pages 258–265 in *Qumran Cave 4—X The Prophets*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XV. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

———. "4QXIIg." Pages 271–317 in *Qumran Cave 4—X The Prophets*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XV. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

———. "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve: The Evidence from the Judean Desert." Pages 86–101 in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in*

*Honor of John D.W. Watts*. Edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 235. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

———. "The Minor Prophets Manuscripts from Qumran, Cave IV." PhD diss., Harvard, 1988.

———. "The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 7 (1999): 81–95.

———. "Textual Traditions in the Book of Hosea and the Minor Prophets." Pages 247–256 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

García Martínez, Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*. Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

Gesenius, William. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Edward Robinson. Edited by Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Gibbons, James Cardinal, ed. *The Holy Bible Translated from the Latin Vulgate*. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1914.

Ginsberg, H. Louis, ed. *The Prophets Nevi'im*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1978.

Goodwin, Charles. "How Did John Treat His Sources?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 73 (June, 1954): 61–75.

Gordis, Robert. *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Quere*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Editions of the Hebrew Bible—Past and Future." Pages 221–242 in *Sha'arei Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

———. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition." *Pontificium Institutum Biblicum* 48 (1967): 243–290.

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?" Pages 505–556 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990.

Greenberg, Moshe. "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible, Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judean Desert." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76 (1956): 157–167.

Griffith, Terry. "'The Jews Who Had Believed in Him' (John 8:31) and the Motif of Apostasy in the Gospel of John." Pages 183–192 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.

Grintz, Yehoshua, and S. David Sperling. "Zechariah." Pages 482–485 in vol. 21 of *Encyclopedia Judaica*. 2nd ed. Edited by Fred Skolnik. 22 vols. Detroit, Michigan: Macmillan Reference USA, 2006.

Grossouw, Willem. *The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1938.

Guinot, Jean-Noël. "Théodoret de Cyr: Une Lecture Critique de la Septante." Pages 393–407 in *Selon Les Septante*. Edited by Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1995.

Gundry, Robert Horton. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

Hanhart, Robert. "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta in Neutestamentlicher Zeit." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 81 (1984): 395–416.

———. Introduction to *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, by Martin Hengel. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002.

———. "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences." Pages 339–379 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990.

Hanson, A.T. *The Prophetic Gospel*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.
Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
Hanson, Richard Simon. "What's a Massa?" *Bible Review* VII (1991): 22–27.
Harl, Marguerite. "La Bible d'Alexandrie, dans les débats actuels sur le Septante." Pages 7–24 in *La Double Transmission du Texte Biblique*. Edited by Yohanan Goldman and Christoph Uehlinger. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
———. "La Renouvellement du Lexique des 'Septante' d'apres le Témoignage des Recensions, Révisions et Commentaires Grecs Anciens." Pages 239–259 in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1991.
Harrelson, Walter. *Interpreting the Old Testament*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
Harris, Jay M. "From Inner-Biblical Interpretation to Early Rabbinic Exegesis." Pages 256–269 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
Harrison, C. Robert, Jr. "The Unity of the Minor Prophets in the LXX: A Reexamination of the Question." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 21 (1988): 55–72.
Hartle, James A. "The Literary Unity of Zechariah." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35 (June, 1992): 145–157.
Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897. Repr., Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck—U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
Hayes, John H. *An Introduction to Old Testament Study*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1979.
Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
Hendriksen, William. *New Testament Commentary*. 12 Vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1954.
Hengel, Martin. *The Johannine Question*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1989.
———. *Judaism and Hellenism*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
———. "The Prologue of the Gospel of John as the Gateway to Christological Truth." Pages 265–294 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.
———. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle; Introduction by Robert Hanhart. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002.
Herodotus. *Historiae*. 4 Vols. Translated by A.D. Godley. *Herodotus in Four Volumes*. London: William Heinemann, 1971–1981.
Hill, Andrew H. "Dating Second Zechariah: A Linguistic Re-examination." *Hebrew Annual Review* 6 (1982): 105–134.
Hoskyns, E.C. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F.N. Davey. London: Faber & Faber, 1954.
House, Paul R. *The Unity of the Twelve*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990.
Howard, George. "The Quinta of the Minor Prophets: A First Century Septuagint Text?" *Biblica* 55 (1974): 15–22.
Hübner, Hans. "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament." Pages 332–372 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
Humann, Roger J. "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John." *Lutheran Theological Review* I (Fall/Winter, 1988–89): 31–54.
Hunter, Archibald M. *According to John: The New Look at the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968.
Jansma, T. "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix–xiv." *Studiën* VII. Edited by P.A.H. de Boer. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950.
Jellicoe, Sydney. "Aquila and his Version." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 59 (April, 1969): 326–332.

———. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
———. "Some Reflections on the KAIGE Recension." *Vetus Testamentum* 23 (January, 1973): 15–24.
Jewish Publication Society of America. *The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text: A New Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 5677/1917.
Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2000.
Kahle, Paul E. *The Cairo Geniza*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1959.
Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. *Micah—Malachi*. The Communicator's Commentary. Edited by Lloyd J. Ogilvie. Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1982.
Katz, P. "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll." *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957): 343–53.
Katz, Peter, and Joseph Ziegler. "Ein Aquila-Index in Vorbereitung." *Vetus Testamentum* VIII (1958): 264–285.
Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John*. 2 Vols. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2003.
Kenyon, Frederic G. *The Text of the Greek Bible*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1953.
Kieffer, René. "Les Premiers Indices d'une Réception de l'Evangile de Saint Jean." Pages 2225–2238 in *The Four Gospels*. Vol. III of Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
Klein, Ralph W. *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
Knox, Ronald A., ed. *The Old Testament, Newly Translated from the Latin Vulgate*. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1949.
Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
Kohlenberger, John R. III, ed. *The Parallel Apocrypha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
Köstenberger, Andreas J. "Hearing the Old Testament in the New: A Response." Pages 255–294 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.
———. "The Use of Scripture in the Pastoral and General Epistles and the Book of Revelation." Pages 230–254 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.
Kraft, Robert. "Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy's Devanciers, 40 Years Later." *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Bulletin* 37 (2004): 1–28.
———. "Some Observations on Early Papyri and MSS for LXX/OG Study." Online: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/earlypaplist.html, 1–8.
Kysar, Robert. "The Gospel of John in Current Research." *Religious Studies Review* 9 (October, 1983): 314–323.
Laetsch, Theo. *Bible Commentary on the Minor Prophets*. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1956.
Lamarche, Paul. *Zacharie IX–XIV*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1961.
Lamsa, George M., ed. *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts, Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, the Authorized Bible of the Church of the East*. Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1957.
Lange, Armin. "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process." Pages 21–30 in *The Bible as Book*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 2002.
Larkin, Katrina J.A. *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah*. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1994.
Leupold, H.C. *Exposition of Zechariah*. London: Evangelical Press, 1971.
Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
Lieu, Judith. "Anti-Judaism, the Jews, and the Worlds of the Fourth Gospel." Pages 168–182 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.

Lifshitz, Baruch. "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror." *Israel Exploration Journal* 12 (1962): 201–207.
Lightfoot, R.H. *St. John's Gospel*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1956.
Lindars, Barnabas. *Behind the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1971.
———. "Introduction." Pages 1–7 in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.
———. *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM Press LTD, 1961.
Loisy, Alfred. *Le Quatrième Évangile*. Paris: Émile Nourry, 1921.
Lust, J. "Mic 5,1–3 in Qumran and in the New Testament and Messianism in the Septuagint." Pages 65–88 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C.M. Tuckett. Leuven: University Press, 1997.
———. "Translation-Greek and Lexicography of the Septuagint." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 67 (1991): 69–72.
Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992.
Luzárraga, J. "Fondo Targúmico del Cuarto Evangelio." *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 49 (1974): 251–262.
Manns, Frederic. Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Johannique." *Revue Biblique* 92 (1985): 525–538.
Mansoor, Menahem. "The Massoretic Text in the Light of Qumran." Pages 305–321 in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum IX*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
Margolis, Max L. "Textual Criticism of the Greek Old Testament." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 67 (1928): 187–197.
Marquis, Galen. "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique." Pages 405–423 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.
Marsh, John. *The Gospel of St. John*. London: Cox & Wyman, 1968.
Martyn, J. Louis. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.
Mason, Rex. "Why is Second Zechariah so Full of Quotations?" Pages 21–28 in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2003.
Mauch, T.M. "Zechariah." Pages 941–943 in vol. 4 of *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
McCarter, Peter Kyle. *Textual Criticism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1986.
McComiskey, Thomas Edward, ed. *The Minor Prophets*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1998.
McHugh, John. "In Him was Life." Pages 123–158 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135*. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1999.
McKibben, Jorge Fitch. *Nuevo Lexico Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento*. Revised and Edited by B. Foster Stockwell and José Rivas. El Paso, Texas: Casa Bautista de Publicaciones, 1978.
McLay, R. Timothy. "Biblical Texts and the Scriptures for the New Testament Church." Pages 38–58 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.
Menken, Maarten J.J. "The Old Testament Quotation in John 6:45: Source and Redaction." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* LXIV (1988): 164–172.
———. "The Old Testament Quotation in John 19:36. Sources, Redaction, Background." Pages 2101–2118 in *The Four Gospels*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
———. "The Textual Form and the Meaning of the Quotation from Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (July, 1993): 494–511.

———. "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John: Jn 10:34; 12:38; 19:24." Pages 367–393 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C.M. Tuckett. Leuven: University Press, 1997.

Metzger, Bruce M. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968.

———. "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971–72): 379–400.

———. *The Text of the New Testament*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Meyers, Carol L. and Eric M. Meyers. "Jerusalem and Zion after the Exile: The Evidence of First Zechariah." Pages 121–135 in *Sha'arei Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov, assisted by Weston W. Fields. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

———. *Zechariah 9–14*. The Anchor Bible 25. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Miller, Paul. "They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him: The Gospel of John and the Old Testament." Pages 127–151 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.

Minkoff, Harvey. "Searching for the Better Text." *Bible Review* XV (August, 1999): 24–30.

Mitchell, David C. "Messiah bar Ephraim in the Targums." *Aramaic Studies* 4.2 (2006): 221–241.

———. "The Fourth Deliverer: A Josephite Messiah in *4QTestimonia*." *Biblica* 86 (2005): 545–553.

Moloney, Francis J. "An Adventure with Nicodemus." Pages 97–109 in *The Personal Voice in Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger. London: Routledge, 1999.

———. *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1998.

———. "The Johannine Passion and the Christian Community." *Salesianum* 57(1995): 25–61.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield, England: The Almond Press, 1983.

Moore, Thomas V. *A Commentary on Zechariah*. London: Billings and Sons, 1974.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971.

———. *The Gospel According to John*. 2nd ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

Moyise, Steve. "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament." Pages 14–41 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J.L. North*. Edited by Steve Moyise. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Müller, Mogens. "The First Bible of the Church." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 206 (1996): 41–45.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography." *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 31 (1991): 205–222.

———. "The Infinitive in the Septuagint." *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 41 (1995): 259–271.

———. "A New Index to Hatch and Redpath." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 73 (1997): 251–276.

———. "A Septuagint Greek Grammar, but of which Text-Form or -Forms?" *Estudios Bíblicos* 51 (1993): 433–458.

———. "Towards a Septuagint Lexicon." Pages 255–276 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23 (1986): 255–276.

Neusner, Jacob, ed. *The Talmud of Babylonia VI. Tractate Sukkah*. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.

———, ed. *The Talmud of Babylonia XXIIIA. Tractate Sanhedrin*. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.

Nogalski, James D. "Intertextuality and the Twelve." *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*. Edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 235 (1996): 102–124.

———. *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
———. *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
Nurmela, Risto. *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1–8 and 9–14*. Abo: Abo Akademi University Press, 1996.
Odeberg, Hugo. *The Fourth Gospel*. Chicago: Argonaut, 1968.
Oesterley, W.O.E. "The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets." *Journal of Theological Studies* V (1903/4): 76–88, 242–253, 378–386, 570–579.
———. "The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets." *Journal of Theological Studies* VI (1905/6): 67–70, 217–220.
O'Grady, John F. "Recent Developments in Johannine Studies." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 12 (1982): 54–58.
Olofsson, Staffan. "Qumran and LXX." Pages 232–248 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 290. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
Orlinsky, H.M. "Qumrân and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 26–33.
O'Rourke, John J. "John's Fulfillment Texts." *Sciences Ecclesiastiques* 19 (1967): 433–443.
Osburn, Jr., William. *Hebrew-English Lexicon*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd., 1844, 1882. Repr., Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1979.
Pancaro, Severino. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
Parker, D.C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
Patterson, Stephen J. "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and the World of Speculative Jewish Theology." Pages 323–332 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
Payne, D.F. "Old Testament Textual Criticism: Its Principles and Practice." *Tyndale Bulletin* 25 (1974): 99–112.
Perez Castro, Federico. *El Códice de Profetas de el Cairo*. Madrid: Cárdenal Cisneros, 1979.
Perrot, Charles. "L'Inspiration des Septante et le Pouvoir Scripturaire." Pages 169–183 in *Selon les Septante*. Edited by Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995.
———. "La Lecture de la Bible dans la Diaspora Hellénistique." Pages 109–132 in *Études sur le Judaïsme Hellénistique*. Edited by R. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1984.
Person, Raymond F. "Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 167 (1993): 130–131.
Peshitta Institute, ed. *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.
Petersen, David L. "The Book of the Twelve/The Minor Prophets." Pages 95–126 in *The Hebrew Bible Today*. Edited by S. McKenzie and M. Graham. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
———. *Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, A Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1995.
Pietersma, Albert. "A New English Translation of the Septuagint." *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 45 (1995): 177–187.
———. "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues." *Vetus Testamentum* XXXV (1985): 296–311.
Plummer, Alfred. *The Gospel According to S. John. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools*. Edited by J.J.S. Perowne. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1893.
———, ed. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1905.
Plutarch. *Moralia*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library 429. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927.
Polak, Frank. "A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint." Pages 335–347 in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1995.

Porter, Stanley E. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." Pages 79–96 in *Early Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Pryor, Neale. "Use of the Old Testament in the New." Pages 276–286 in *Biblical Interpretation: Principles and Practices*. Edited by F. Furman Kearley, Edward P. Myers, and Timothy D. Hadley. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1986.

Rabin, C. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of the Old Testament Text." *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955): 174–182.

———. "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint." *Textus* VI (1968): 1–26.

Radday, Yehuda T., and Moshe A. Pollatschek. "Vocabulary Richness in Post-Exilic Prophetic Books." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92 (1980): 333–346.

Radday, Yehuda T., and Dieter Wickmann. "The Unity of Zechariah Examined in the Light of Statistical Linguistics." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87 (1975): 30–55.

Redditt, Paul L. "Zechariah 9–14, Malachi, and the Redaction of the Book of the Twelve." *Forming Prophetic Literature*. Edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 235 (1996): 245–268.

———. "Zechariah 9–14: The Capstone of the Book of the Twelve." Pages 305–323 in *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14*. Edited by Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 370*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

Reider, Joseph. *An Index to Aquila*. Completed and Revised by Nigel Turner. *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XII*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Roberts, B.J. "OT Text." Pages 580–594 in vol. 4 of *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1962.

Robertson, A.T. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. 6 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930.

Romeny, Bas ter Haar. "Quis Sit ὁ Σύρος Revisited." Pages 360–398 in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*. Edited by Alison Salvesen. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Saebo, Magne. "From Pluriformity to Uniformity: The Emergence of the Massoretic Text." Pages 36–46 in *On the Way to Canon: Creative Tradition History in the Old Testament*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 191. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

———. *Sacharja 9–14*. Wageningen, Holland: Veenman & Zonen, 1969.

Sanday, William. *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1872.

Sanders, James A. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Biblical Studies." Pages 323–335 in *Sha'arei Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

———. "Understanding the Development of the Biblical Text." Pages 56–73 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Forty Years*. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1991.

Sanders, J.N. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Edited and Completed by B.A. Mastin. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1968.

———. *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1943.

Sandmel, Samuel. *The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction to their Literature and Religious Ideas*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Schaper, Joachim. "The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla." Pages 3–15 in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*. Edited by Alison Salvesen. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1998.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Septuagint and the Temple Scroll: Shared 'Halakhic' Variants." Pages 277–297 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. Translated by David Smith and G.A. Kon. London: Burns and Oates, 1982.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.

Scrutton, Anastasia. " 'The Truth Will Set You Free': Salvation as Revelation." Pages 359–68 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.

Seeligman, I.L. "Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint." *Vetus Testamentum* XI (1961): 201–221.

Sellin, Ernst. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Revised and rewritten by Georg Fohrer; translated by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.

Seynaeve, Jaak. "Les Citations Scripturaires en Jn. 19, 36–37." *Revue Africaine de Theologie* 1 (1977): 67–76.

Sibinga, Joost Smit. *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr: The Pentateuch*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.

Siegert, Folker. "Early Jewish Interpretation in a Hellenistic Style." Pages 130–198 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Silva, M. "Internal Evidence in the Text-Critical Use of the LXX." Pages 151–167 in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Madrid: Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros," 1985.

Sinclair, Lawrence A. "Hebrew Text of the Qumran Micah Pesher and Textual Traditions of the Minor Prophets." *Revue de Qumrân* 11 (1983): 253–263.

———. "A Qumran Biblical Fragment: Hosea 1QXiid (Hosea 1:7–25)." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 239 (1980): 61–65.

Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof from Prophecy*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987.

———. "The Question of Old Testament Canon and Text in the Early Greek Church." Pages 443–450 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Skehan, Patrick. "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament." Pages 264–277 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

———. "The Period of the Biblical Texts from Khirbet Qumrân." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (1957): 435–440.

———. "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism." Pages 212–225 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Smith, D. Moody. "The Setting and Shape of a Johannine Narrative Source." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976): 231–241.

Soggin, J. Alberto. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.

Sperber, A., ed. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Vol. III: The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.

———, ed. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 1992.

Stamps, Dennis L. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal." Pages 9–37 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.

Stanley, Christopher D. "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method." Pages 44–58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 148 (1997): 44–58.

———. "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 148 (1997): 18–27.

Stiglmair, Arnold. "Der Durchbohrte—ein Versuch zu Sach 12." *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 116 (1994): 451–456.

Suggs, M.J. "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text." *New Testament Studies* IV (1957–58): 139–147.

Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. *The Old Testament of the Early Church*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Swanson, Dwight D. "How Rewritten is 'Rewritten Bible'?" Unpublished manuscript, 2007.

———. "How Scriptural is Re-Written Bible?" *Revue de Qumran* 21 (2004): 407–427.

———. "Qumran and the Psalms." Pages 247–261 in *Interpreting the Psalms*. Edited by Philip S. Johnston and David G. Firth. Leicester: Apollo, 2005.

———. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. Vol. XIV of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. Garcia Martinez and A.S. Van der Woude. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.

———. "Timothy H. Lim: Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 47 (Spring, 2002): 153–56.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts." Pages 226–263 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

———. "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran." Pages 5–20 in *The Bible as Book*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: The British Library, 2002.

———. "The Textual Study of the Bible." Pages 321–400 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1909.

Thayer, Joseph Henry. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. New York: American Book Company, 1889.

Thomas, D. Winton. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." Pages 238–263 in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*. Edited by H.H. Rowley. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957.

Tov, Emanuel. "The CATSS Project: A Progress Report." Pages 157–203 in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1991.

———. "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint." Pages 221–242 in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Madrid: Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros," 1985.

———. "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX." Pages 11–47 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by G.L. Brooke and B. Lindars. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.

———. "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules." *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (October, 1982): 429–448.

———. "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" *De Septuaginta*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox. Mississauga, Ontario, Canada: Benben Publications, 1984.

———. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. "The History and Significance of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 49–66 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

———. "Interchanges of Consonants between the Masoretic Text and the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint." Pages 255–266 in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov, with the Assistance of Weston W. Fields. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

———. "Lucian and Proto-Lucian." Pages 293–305 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

———. "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present." *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 31 (1991): 337–359.

———. "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975): 165–177.

———. "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX—Their Nature and Distribution." Pages 64–73 in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: aus Anlass seines 65 Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast and John W. Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

———. "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research." *Jerusalem Biblical Studies*. Edited by Ora Lipschitz and Alexander Rofé. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.

———. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

———. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

———. "Three Dimensions of LXX Words." *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 529–544.

———. "The Unpublished Qumran Texts from Caves 4 and 11." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 101–136.

Tucker, Gene M. "Prophecy and Prophetic Literature." Pages 325–367 in *The Hebrew Bible and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Douglas A. Knight and Gene M. Tucker. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1985.

Tuckett, Cristopher M. "The Fourth Gospel and Q." Pages 281–290 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville, KY, and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

———. "Zechariah 12:10 and the New Testament." Pages 111–121 in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2003.

Ulrich, Eugene. "An Index of the Passages in the Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean Desert (Genesis to Kings)." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 113–129.

———. "An Index of the Passages in the Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean Desert (Part 2: Isaiah-Chronicles)." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 86–107.

———. "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran." Pages 77–93 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James Vanderkam. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

———. "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989): 207–228.

———. "The Canonical Process and Textual Criticism." Pages 267–291 in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov, with the assistance of Weston W. Fields. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

———. "Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint." Pages 67–80 in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Madrid: Textos y Estudios Cardenal Cisneros, 1985.

——. "The Community of Israel and the Composition of the Scriptures." Pages 327–342 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.

——. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1999.

——. "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text." Pages 78–105 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.

——. "Origen's Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint to the Third Century C.E." Pages 3–33 in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*. Edited by Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen. University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.

——. "The Relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for Hexaplaric Studies." Pages 401–407 in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*. Edited by Alison Salvesen. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1998.

——. "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of their Value." Pages 49–80 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.

Van der Kooij, Arie. "The Septuagint of Zechariah as Witness to an Early Interpretation of the Book." Pages 53–64 in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2003.

——. "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries." Pages 167–178 in *The Bible as Book*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: The British Library, 2002.

Van der Woude, Adam S. "Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament." Pages 151–169 in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism*. Edited by J.N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1992.

Vegas Montaner, Luis. *Biblia del Mar Muerto*. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1980.

Verheyden, Joseph. "Assessing Gospel Quotations in Justin Martyr." Pages 361–377 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*. Edited by A. Denaux. Leuven: University Press, 2002.

Weingreen, J. *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

——. *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Weren, Wim. "Textual Criticism: Mother of All Exegesis." Pages 3–16 in *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism*. Edited by Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch. The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1908.

Westermann, Claus. *The Gospel of John in the Light of the Old Testament*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.

Wevers, John W. "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 18 (Fall, 1985): 16–38.

——. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 38 (2005): 1–24.

——. "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version." Pages 84–107 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, Vol. 1—From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

——. "Septuagint." Pages 273–278 in vol. 4 of *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1962.

——. "Text History and Text Criticism of the Septuagint." Pages 392–402 in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XXIX*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

——. "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint." Pages 15–24 in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Madrid: Textos y Estudios Cardenal Cisneros, 1985.

Wigram, George V. *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1987.

Willi-Plein, Ina. "Ein Übersetzungsproblem Gedanken zu Sach. XII.10." *Vetus Testamentum* XXIII (1973): 90–99.

Wilson, William. *Old Testament Word Studies*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1987.

Wolters, Al. "Semantic Borrowing and Inner-Greek Corruption in LXX Zechariah 11:8." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 685–707.

——. "Targumic כרובת (Zechariah 14:20) = Greek κορυφαία?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (Winter, 1996): 710–713.

Würthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1979.

Young, Edward J. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950.

Youngblood, Ronald F. "Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament." Pages 111–118 in *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*. Edited by Kenneth L. Barker. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books, Zondervan, 1986.

# INDICES

## Modern Authors


Aejmelaeus, Anneli 62, 65, 66, 74
Albrektson, Bertil 43
Anderson, Paul N. 10, 13

Baron, David 83
Barr, James 95
Barrett, C.K. 4, 8, 129, 164, 166
Barthélemy, Dominique 53–56, 77, 88, 89, 96, 100, 157, 160, 161
Bauckham, Richard 14
Beentjes, Pancratius C. 30
Bernard, J.H. 130
Blomberg, Craig L. 177
Brodie, Thomas L. 14
Brooke, George J. 32n25, 38n61, 40, 41, 41n77, 43, 48, 50n124, 61, 87n153, 103, 117n23, 125, 144n9, 152n41, 166n114
Brown, Raymond E. 3, 11n35, 130, 159
Bruce, F.F. 83
Brueggemann, Dale A. 121, 122, 124
Bultmann, Rudolf 130
Burge, Gary M. 172n3, 183
Butterworth, Mike 84, 101

Caird, G.B. 106n247
Carson, D.A. 13, 14, 130
Cimosa, Mario 47, 48, 69–71
Collin, Matthieu 40
Cross, F.M. 42

Deist, F.E. 106
De Lagarde, Paul 50, 51
Delcor, M. 78, 85, 104, 105n238
De Troyer, Kristin *See* Ego, Beate
Dodd, C.H. 3, 17n1, 133, 159, 161, 161n88
Dogniez, Cecile 68, 69n51
Dorival, Gilles 3, 159

Ego, Beate 61, 79, 104

Fernández Marcos, Natalio 63, 64n28, 77, 113, 113n8, 114, 132, 135n71
Fuller, Russell 30, 31, 34n34, 38, 39, 40, 40n72, 41, 41n78, 43, 53n142, 54, 55

Gesenius, William 91, 92, 92n177
Goodwin, Charles 2, 113, 113n7, 157, 158
Greenberg, Moshe 42
Gundry, Robert Horton 84, 134, 135n72

Hanhart, Robert 4, 67, 165n113, 167–169
Hanson, A.T. 116
Hanson, Paul D. 83, 84, 91
Harl, Marguerite *See* Dorival, Gilles
Harrison, C. Robert, Jr. 48
Hatch, Edwin 93, 93n184
Hayes, John H. 62
Hendriksen, William 4, 164, 166
Hengel, Martin 7, 9, 13, 14, 14n53
Hoskyns, E.C. 130
Howard, George 77
Hübner, Hans 4, 112n3, 129, 130n54, 165, 165n113, 167
Humann, Roger J. 4, 115n15, 116, 130, 132n62, 165–167

Jansma, T. 70, 71, 71n65
Jellicoe, Sydney 2, 62, 75n81, 158, 160

Kahle, Paul 50, 50n125, 50n126
Kittel, Rudolf 71n64, 81, 82, 92, 92n175

Lange, Armin *See* Ego, Beate
Larkin, Katrina J.A. 101
Leupold, H.C. 83
Lichtenberger, Hermann *See* Ego, Beate
Lieu, Judith 7, 180n28
Lightfoot, R.H. 4, 164, 166
Lindars, Barnabas 7, 8, 17, 17n1, 22, 175
Loisy, Alfred 3, 133
Lust, Johan 93

Marsh, John 4, 164, 166
Martyn, J. Louis 11, 14
Menken, Maarten J. 4, 76, 84, 94, 99n210, 105, 105n237, 114–116, 122, 124, 149, 162–164, 166
Meyers, Carol L. 28, 94

Meyers, Eric M. *See* Meyers, Carol L.
Moo, Douglas J. 3, 135, 159, 182n43
Moore, Thomas V. 83
Morris, Leon 3, 4, 158–160, 165, 167
Moyise, Steve 23n24, 24, 24n27
Munnich, Olivier *See* Dorival, Gilles
Muraoka, Takamitsu 48, 63, 69, 70, 105

Odeberg, Hugo 179
Olofsson, Staffan 64, 66
O'Rourke, John J. 165, 167

Pancaro, Severino 8, 10, 12, 13n41
Pietersma, Albert 50n125, 63, 63n25, 66, 99n208
Plummer, Alfred 116, 130

Redpath, Henry A. *See* Hatch, Edwin

Sanday, William 4, 4n19, 163, 163n99, 164–166
Sanders, Henry A. 75, 98
Sanders, J.N. 164, 166
Schmidt, Carl *See* Sanders, Henry A.
Schuchard, Bruce G. 3, 113, 114, 121, 122, 123n40, 124, 160, 161
Scrutton, Anastasia 179
Seynaeve, Jaak 2, 158, 177n17
Skehan, Patrick 39
Smith, D. Moody 3, 133
Stanley, Christopher D. 106
Swanson, Dwight D. 38n57, 111n2, 120, 123, 134n69
Swete, Henry Barclay 2, 46n108, 70n59, 76, 88, 88n159, 113, 113n5, 114, 133, 157

Thackeray, Henry St. John 46n108, 47, 48n115, 93n182
Tov, Emanuel 32, 38n57, 48, 48n115, 53n140, 54, 60, 62n19, 67, 67n41, 69n51, 70, 86, 87n151, 95, 101n217, 103, 103n230, 103n232, 106n248, 146

Ulrich, Eugene 32, 33, 33n29, 36, 46n108, 50n126, 57n163, 63, 102n224, 146, 150n33

Van der Kooij, Arie 48, 60, 60n6
Van der Woude, Adam S. 34, 35n39, 42, 45n103, 52n135, 55

Weren, Wim 61
Westcott, Brooke Foss 4n19, 163n99, 165, 166
Wevers, John W. 46n108, 47
Willi-Plein, Ina 82, 84, 86n142
Würthwein, Ernst 30

## Names and Subjects

*Accusativus limitationis* 94
Analogous passages 122–124
Anthropomorphism 79, 79n104, 83, 92, 101, 102, 106–108, 152, 156
Archetype 61, 62
Aristeas, Letter of 45, 45n103, 47, 48n115, 52
Authorship of Zechariah 28, 28n6, 29

Berechiah 27
*Birkat ha-Minim* 8, 9, 15

Canon 1n1, 19, 20
Canonical Process 36
*Catena* 133
Christians 1n1, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21n14, 133
  Gentile 12, 14, 15
  Jewish 12, 13–15
Church, Christian *or* Christian Community 8, 10–15, 17, 22, 24, 51, 172, 178
Christ 1, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21–25, 163, 172–177, 179, 181, 182, 182n43, 183, 184
Christology 176, 177
Clement of Alexandria 135n71, 171
Composite quotation 121, 148
Compressed Language 120, 123, 126, 127, 137
Consonantal MT 4, 39, 40, 42, 43, 52, 55, 57, 73, 78, 81, 82, 84–86, 90, 107, 131, 136, 139, 143, 145, 147, 151, 155, 164, 166, 172
Converging lines of evidence 156, 171
Critical Text 57, 66, 73
Crucifixion 5, 6, 24, 178, 179–181, 184

*Daleth/resh* Interchange *or* ד/ר
transposition 67, 100, 103, 103n232, 104, 105, 108
Dead Sea Scrolls *or* DSS 5, 30, 33, 37–40, 51, 61, 66, 125, 132, 136, 144, 145, 147
Diachronic Complexity 32, 33, 51, 60
Diaspora 9, 51, 87
Dittography 71
Docetism 12, 177
Domitian 12

Editorial activity 49, 62, 66, 120, 123–126, 128, 137, 158
*Einmalig* 11
Eschatology 149, 182, 183
Essenes 14
Eternal life 175, 181–183
Evasive Rendering 70, 100, 106, 108
Exegesis
Contextual 102
Inner-biblical 20
Palaeographical 103
Exegetical
Activity 20, 80, 100, 104, 114, 120, 123, 124, 137, 146, 174
Agenda 49, 57, 70, 72, 108, 123, 126, 128, 173
Technique 21, 105, 106, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 141

Formula Citations 114
Freer Collection 98

Göttingen Critical Editions 63

Haggai, Book of 67n41
*Hapax legomena* 69, 97, 102
Haplography 71, 84
Hasmonean Period 40, 41
Hellenism 9
Hidden Believers 12, 180n27
Historical accuracy of the Fourth Gospel 173
Holy Spirit. *See* Spirit (of God)
Hosea, Book of 39, 39n69, 67n41

Iddo 27
Interpretative Renderings 20, 106
Intertextual, *or* Intertextuality 15n55, 23, 24
Introductory Formulae 13, 18, 113, 114, 133, 179
Irenaeus 171

Jamnia, Council of 8, 8n14, 10
Jeremiah, Book of 39, 46n108, 48n116, 67n41, 70, 103n232
Jesus 1, 8, 10–13, 15, 17–19, 21n14, 22–25, 117, 122, 123n40, 129, 133, 172–184
Jewish Community 11, 18, 20, 30, 34n34, 35, 47, 50, 171–173, 178
Johannine Community 11–14, 17–18
John the Baptist 12
Jonah, Book of 41, 41n77
Judaism 1n1, 8–11, 13, 15, 34, 36, 37, 49, 105n237, 127, 168, 172
Alexandrian 51, 52
Diaspora 51
Hellenistic 9, 10, 15
Palestinian 9
Judgement 174, 181–183

Kerygma 17, 182
Key-word Insertion *or* Key-word Link 120, 121, 123, 126, 128, 137
Kingdom of God 10, 181

Lamb of God 176, 177, 183
Law. *See also* Torah 10, 12, 46, 180, 180n28, 181
Lazarus 181
*Lectio dificilior* 78, 80, 81, 90
*Lectio securior* 78
LXX. *See* Septuagint

Malachi, Book of 41, 41n77, 67n41, 68
Massoretic Text 1, 33n29, 35n40, 42, 43, 55, 67n41, 85n141, 99, 132, 146, 165
Proto-Massoretic 6, 34–38, 41, 43, 44, 52n135, 54, 55, 69n51, 89, 107–109, 118, 132, 137, 144, 145, 147, 150, 153–157, 161, 165–167, 171
*Mater lectionis* 82, 85
Messiah 17, 22, 135n74, 152, 152n43, 153, 172n4, 175
Micah, Book of 40, 68
Minor Prophets. *See also* The Twelve 1, 38n59, 38n61, 39, 39n69, 40n72, 41n77, 50n124, 70, 88, 88n159, 98n197, 144n9, 145
Mistranslation 70, 71, 97, 106, 166, 168
Moses 10, 52
Multiple literary editions 33, 33n29, 34, 49, 50, 62, 64
Multiple word variation 127, 129, 137
Murabba'at Minor Prophets Scroll 40, 42, 43
Muratorian Canon 171

Naḥal Ḥever 53, 168
Non-aligned manuscripts 38, 40, 41, 144
*Nota accusativi* 91, 92
*Nota objecti* 91

Old Greek, *or* OG 3, 46n108, 51–53, 57, 63, 81, 100, 108, 114, 160, 161, 162n89
Old Greek of the Twelve, *or* OG12 44, 45, 46, 46n108, 47–51, 55–57, 67–69, 69n51, 70, 73, 155
Ontological transformation 179
Oral Recitation of Scripture 20, 87, 145
Orthography 41, 42, 71, 82

Paleo-hebraic script 154, 156
Paraclete 183, 184
Parallelism 84, 95, 129, 136, 148, 149
  Synonymous 130, 141n2
Paranomasia 125
Paschal Lamb 121, 122, 175
Passion Narrative
  Gospel 135, 174
  Johannine 5, 19, 22–25, 111, 133, 161, 173, 175, 176, 179, 180, 184
  Synoptic 22
Paul, Apostle 10, 15n55
Pentateuch 30, 45, 47, 48n115, 52, 121, 122, 142
Pesher, *or* Pesharim 38, 165, 167
Philo 51, 53n137, 124n42
Pierce, *or* Pierced, *or* Piercing 22, 24, 72, 72n66, 80–86, 92, 96, 97, 101–103, 106, 108, 149, 152, 153, 161, 168, 172n4, 174–180, 182, 183, 184
Pilate 178
Pluriformity *or* Pluriform Textual Traditions 20, 32–38, 38n57, 39n69, 41, 44, 55, 56, 60, 62–64, 90, 114, 115, 118, 119, 132, 133, 136, 137, 144–146
Polymorphism 63
Post-exilic 23, 173, 174
Pre-hexaplaric 98, 113
Proto-Massoretic Text. *See* Massoretic Text
Pseudo-variant 70, 103, 103n230, 106
Ptolemy Philadelphus 45, 47, 48n115

*qere/ketib* 43
Qumran, *or* Qumran Community 14, 35–37, 117n23

R. *See* 8ḤevXIIgr *or* Greek Minor Prophets Scroll
Rabbis, *or* Rabbinic 21n14, 34, 35n39, 54n146, 85n141, 172
Redemption 17, 174, 182
Retroversion 62, 67, 81, 82, 140, 147
Rewritten Scripture 20, 37, 117n23, 120
Resurrection 5, 17, 25, 25n29, 175, 176, 179–182
Retroversion 62, 67, 81, 82, 92, 140, 143, 147
Righteous 121, 175

Sabbath 9, 179, 180, 181
Scripture *or* The Scriptures 1, 1n1, 5, 6, 13–15, 15n55, 17–21, 21n14, 22, 23, 25, 25n29, 32, 33n29, 34, 36, 46, 46n108, 47, 48, 50–52, 61, 67, 68, 93, 101, 104, 111, 113, 116–118, 123n40, 132, 134, 136, 146, 148, 158, 162, 171–173, 175, 178, 182
Second Temple 6, 7, 33, 36, 37, 85, 120, 125, 153
Secret disciples 178
Semantic Equivalent 68
Septuagint, *or* LXX 1, 2, 4, 5, 38–40, 45n103, 46n108, 47, 48n115, 50, 50n124, 50n125, 50n126, 51–55, 57–59, 63–75, 77, 80, 82, 85–87, 89, 93, 94, 96, 97, 101n217, 102–107, 114, 144, 165, 165n113, 166–168, 171, 172, 176, 177, 179
Septuagint Correction Movement 6, 54–56, 155, 172
Simon, High Priesthood of 46
Single word variance 128, 137
Sirach *or* Ben Sira, *See under* Ancient Sources
*Sitz im Leben* 7, 14, 17, 172
Son of God 1, 17, 177, 178, 180
Spirit (of God) *or* Holy Spirit 83, 92, 174, 178, 182, 183, 183n47, 184
Standardisation, *or* Standardised Text 20, 33–36, 38, 43, 44, 90, 91, 118, 132, 144, 146, 152, 172
Synagogue 8, 10–13, 15, 48, 50, 172
Synoptic Gospels 22, 133, 181, 182
Syriac Peshitta 80

*Targum* 152n41
*Targumic Tosefta* 152n43
*Targumim* Hypothesis 50, 50n125, 50n126
Temple Scroll 120
*Testimonia* 3, 122, 133, 133n64, 134, 134n69, 135, 135n71, 137, 161, 162, 169
Tetragrammaton 68, 154, 156
Textual Certainty 65, 108, 168

Textual Corruption 62, 81, 82
Textual Criticism
Hebrew 59, 60, 60n6, 61, 62
Septuagint 59, 62, 63, 64n30, 87
Textual Pluriformity. *See* Pluriformity
*Textus Receptus* 63
Theodicy 174
Theodoret 75, 75n86
*Tiqqune Sopherim* 79, 79n103, 79n104, 81
Torah 8–10, 15, 37, 46n108, 180n28
Translation Technique 49, 59, 65, 66, 68, 69, 69n51, 70, 71, 73, 80, 106
Transliteration 112, 117, 117n22
Transmission History 32, 37, 52, 62, 63, 66, 67, 67n41, 84, 118, 129, 137
Triumphal Entry 24, 117
Twelve, The, *or* The Book of the Twelve 1, 5, 22, 24, 30, 31, 34, 37, 37n51, 38, 38n59, 38n61, 39, 40, 41, 41n77, 42, 44–46, 46n108, 47–50, 50n124, 51–53, 55–57, 61, 68, 69, 72, 73, 76, 77, 103, 125, 136, 137, 140–142, 144, 145, 153, 169, 182

*Urtext or Urschrift* 32, 33, 49, 50, 50n126, 51, 51n128, 56, 60–62

Verb forms
Composite 154, 155
Simplex 154, 155
*Visio dei* 177
Vocalisation 4, 42, 52, 57, 71, 77, 78, 81–83, 85–87, 89–92, 107, 109, 132, 136, 143, 145–147, 151, 152, 154, 155, 163, 164, 166, 167, 177
*Vorlage* 21, 38, 41, 50, 52, 53n142, 54, 55, 57, 61, 62, 66–70, 71n65, 72, 73, 81, 85, 94–97, 103–108, 114, 115, 118, 126, 131–133, 136, 137, 140–145, 153–155, 161, 163, 164, 166–168

Word-form insertion. *See* Key-word insertion

Yahweh 23, 78, 81, 83, 85, 86, 177

Zechariah, Prophet 27, 28
Zechariah, Book of 1, 22, 23, 27–34, 37, 40, 44, 47, 49, 52, 57, 64–67, 67n41, 68, 70–73, 136, 140–142, 145, 149, 154, 178, 184
II Zechariah 23, 24, 28, 29, 31, 44, 56, 144, 173, 174, 175

## Greek Words and Phrases

ἀνθ' ὧν 72, 93–97, 99, 108, 168
γεγραμμένον ἐστίν 18
εἰς ὃν 94, 96, 108, 143, 151
εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν 81, 91, 96, 99, 100, 108, 109, 151, 157, 160
ἐκχεῶ 75
ἔμπροσθεν 86, 96
ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεξεκέντησαν 85, 96, 100, 151
ἐξεκέντησαν 99, 100, 106, 108, 143, 149–151, 155
ἐπιβλέπω 74, 76, 76n88, 140, 141, 142, 148–150, 156
ἐπιβλέπονται 75
ἐπιβλέψονται 74, 75, 76, 107, 140, 142, 155, 179
Ἑτοιμάσατε 119–121, 126
Εὐθύνατε 119–121, 126
θύγατερ Σιων 128, 129, 129n50
ἵνα πληρωθῇ 18
καθώς ἐστιν γεγραμμένον 18, 130
καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο 74, 95
κατηχέω, κατηχήσαντο 98
κατορχέομαι, κατωρχήσαντο 72, 96–102, 104–108, 149, 155, 168
καύχημα . . . ἔπαρσις 72
κόψονται 75, 148–150
κύριος παντοκράτωρ 68, 154, 156
μεταμορφουσθαι 99, 153
μετασχηματιζεσθαι 99, 153
Μὴ φοβοῦ 128, 129, 129n50
ὁ Ἑβραῖος. *See* Hebrew, The, *under* Ancient Sources
ὁράν 76
ὁράω 5, 76, 76n88, 88, 140–142, 148–150, 156, 176, 177n17, 179
ὁ Σύρος 76
ὄψονται 75–77, 107, 140–142, 148, 149, 155, 160, 161, 176, 178, 179
παντοκράτωρ 68, 69, 69n51, 154
παρασκευή 181
πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς 147–150
πιστεύειν 175
πρός με 85–87, 87n154, 88–90, 107, 151, 154

συμποδίζω 72, 101
σύν 86, 96
συντριβήσεται 119, 121, 122
σύν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν 85, 96, 100, 151
σῶσον δή 117
τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων 181
τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν 30, 46
τῶν δυνάμεων 68, 69, 69n51, 154, 156
τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν 30
Χαῖρε σφόδρα 128
χάρις 181
ὠρχήσαντο 103
Ὡσαννά 112, 117, 117n21, 119

## Hebrew Words and Phrases

א/ע confusion 43
אל 77, 78, 81, 91, 92, 141, 143, 145, 164
אל־אשר 93, 94
אלו 83, 84, 91
אלי 42, 77, 78, 78n100, 81–86, 90–92, 96, 107, 132, 141, 143, 145, 155, 164, 165
אליו 42, 78, 82–85, 90, 91, 107, 145
אשר 93, 93n182, 94, 96, 143
את 86, 91–94, 94n187, 95–97, 97n193, 107, 141, 143, 155
את אשר 72, 85, 93, 93n184, 94, 96, 97, 108
בֶּן־בֶּרֶכְיָה בֶּן־עַדּוֹ 27
דקר 72, 72n66, 73, 96, 97, 99, 99n210, 101–106, 108, 143, 144, 149, 150, 155
ד/ר transposition *or Daleth/resh* interchange 67, 100, 103, 103n232, 104, 105, 108
הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא *or* הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא 117, 117n22
וְהַבְּטוּ 74
וְהִבִּטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ 74, 92, 108, 109, 139, 143, 167
י/ו *yod/waw* confusion 79, 84, 85, 90
יען אשר 93, 94
לא 95
מעמסה 72
נבט 74, 76, 77, 140, 141, 141n2, 142
עליו 84
עקב אשר 93, 94
צבאות 68, 156
ראה 140, 140n1, 141, 141n2
רקד 96, 99n210, 103–106
תחת אשר 93, 94, 97
תפארת 72

## Ancient Sources

Barnabas, Epistle of 87, 89, 90, 107
Ben Sira, *or* Sirach
Prologue 30, 45, 46, 52
Prologue 1, 5 46
Prologue 20 52n133
Prologue 24–26 46
49:10 30, 31, 46
Cyprian 89
Cyril of Alexandria 76
Hebrew, The *or* ὁ Ἑβραῖος 76, 77, 87, 87n153, 89, 90, 100, 107, 108
Justin Martyr 54, 55, 88–90, 107, 154
Apology 1:52.12 88
Dialogue 14:8 88
Dialogue 32:2 88
Psalms of Solomon
7:1 124, 125
*Talmud b. Sukkah* 52a 81
*Targum or Targumim* 94, 152, 153
T. Jonathan 152
*Targumic Tosefta* 152
Tertullian 89
Theodoret 2, 3, 75–77, 107, 158, 158n73, 159, 160, 169

## Biblical Manuscripts


1QXIId 39
4QXII
  a 31, 38n59, 40, 40n72, 46, 144
  b 31, 38n59, 46
  c 38, 39
  e 31, 40, 41, 79, 104, 144
  g 31, 39n64, 40, 41
  pHosa 38, 39
4Q98g 134, 134n69
4QTestimonia 134
Armenian Version 99
*Biblia Hebraica* (*Kittel*) *or* BHK 81, 82, 91, 93
*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia or* BHS 73, 78, 82, 92
Coptic Versions 54, 99, 153
  Achmimic 98
*Duodecim Prophetae*, ed. Joseph Ziegler 54, 74–77, 87, 95, 99, 100, 129, 151
Ethiopic Version 99
Greek Minor Prophets Scroll *or* 8ḤevXIIgr, *or* R 5, 6, 42, 52–58, 68, 69, 89, 98, 100, 168
Murabba'at 88, *or* Mur88 38n59, 40, 42–44, 145
P52 7
R. *See* Greek Minor Prophets Scroll *or* 8ḤevXIIgr
Septuagint *or* LXX
  Aquila 3, 54, 85, 86, 86n142, 89, 90, 95, 96, 100, 107, 108, 126, 131, 150, 151, 154, 155, 157–160, 162–164
  Hesychian Recension 100
  Hexapla of Origen 54, 57, 87n153, 88n159, 120, 125, 126, 131
    Quinta 54, 55, 56n159, 131, 155n61
  Lucianic Recension 99, 99n208, 160
  Symmachus 54, 85, 86, 88, 88n159, 89, 90, 96, 100, 107, 108, 126, 131, 150, 151, 154, 155, 157, 162, 163
  Theodotion *or* Proto-Theodotion 2, 3, 54, 85, 88–90, 95–97, 100, 107, 108, 126, 131, 150, 151, 154, 157–164, 169
Syriac Peshitta 80, 96, 152, 153
Vienna Codex 159
Vulgate 80, 96, 152, 153
Washington *or* W 55, 75n81, 98, 99


## Biblical References


*Genesis*
  12:3 148
*Exod*
  3:3 142
  12:10, 46 119, 121, 122
*Numbers*
  9:12 121
  12:8 141
  23:21 141
  21:9 74n77, 75
*Joshua*
  24:23 121
*Ruth*
  3:11 129
*I Samuel*
  17:42 141
*1 Chronicles*
  15:29 104
*Job*
  3:22 82n124
  5:26 82n124
  6:19 141
  15:22 82n124
  28:24 141
  29:19 82n124
*Psalms*
  22:18 112
  24:19 124
  34:20 119, 121, 122, 123
  35:19 119, 124
  41:9 131
  69 22
  69:4 119, 124
  69:9 119, 125
  77:18 43
  82:6 112, 162, 163
  91:18 141n2
  92:11 141
  118:25–26 112, 117
*Proverbs*
  12:18 101

*Isaiah*
6:10 131
13:15 72n66
38:11 141
40:3 119–121, 126
53 22
53:1 18
*Jeremiah*
2:11 79n107
37:10 72n66, 101
51:4 72n66
*Daniel*
7:13 150n32
7:13–14 147
*Hosea*
1:7–25 39
*Jonah*
2:5 140
*Habakkuk*
1:3, 5, 13 140
1:13 141n2
2:15 140
3:10 43
*Zephaniah*
3:14 129
3:14–17 130
*Zechariah*
1–8, *or* Proto-Zechariah 27–29, 31, 56
1:1–4 42, 43, 145
1:8 76, 140
1:15 94
2:12 78, 79, 81
4:2 76, 140
4:10 76, 140, 141
5:2 76, 140
9:5 140, 141, 156n62
9:8 140
9:9 22, 23, 128–131, 136, 174
9:9–10 23
10:7 140, 141
10:12–11:2 40
11:12–13 23
12:1 71
12:1–3 40
12:2 71
12:3 72
12:4 71
12:5 71
12:6 71
12:7 72
12:7–12 40, 144
12:8 72
12:9 71
12:10 1, 2, 5, 6, 23, 25, 42, 56, 58, 59, 64, 69, 70–73, 76, 79, 81, 89, 92–95, 101, 106, 131, 136, 137, 140, 141, 144, 145, 147–151, 153, 155, 156, 157, 159, 161–164, 167–169, 171, 172n4, 174, 176, 183, 184
12:11 72
12:12 72
12:13 71
12:14 71
13:3 72, 101
13:4 94, 95
13:7 23
14:18 40, 41
*Matthew*
21:5 129
24:29–31 148
24:30 147–149, 162, 182, 183
*Luke*
1:30 129
8:50 129
12:32 129
*John*
1:7 127
1:18 177, 180
1:23 113, 119–121, 123, 126
1:29, 36 177
1:46 177
1:51 177
2:17 18, 113, 119, 125
3:16 127
3:17 182
3:17–21 182
6:31 113, 127
6:45 116, 127
10:34 112, 113, 115, 162, 163
11:47–52 180
12:13 112, 113n5, 116, 117, 117n22, 119
12:15 18, 116, 128, 129, 130, 136, 173
12:37 18
12:38 18, 112, 115, 118
12:40 113, 131
13:18 113, 116, 131, 165
14:6 177
14:9 177
14:26 183
15:25 113, 119, 124
15:26 183

16:7 183
16:8–11 183
16:13 183
16:16 177
19:24 112, 113, 115
19:31, 42 181
19:33 177
19:35 175, 177, 178
19:36 113n5, 119, 121, 122, 124, 180
19:37 1, 2, 4, 75, 80n110, 81, 99n210, 111, 113, 116, 131, 135, 136, 139, 140, 144, 147, 153, 156–161, 163–166, 168, 171, 172n4, 173, 176, 177, 179, 180, 182, 184
20:8 177
20:18 177
20:25 177
20:29 177, 178
20:31 1, 17, 175

*1 John*
3:2 184n48

*Revelation*
1:7 5, 147, 149, 150, 162, 168, 182, 183