SHORT NOTES

A NOTE ON ZECHARIAH VI 13

Zech. vi 9-15 contains a number of difficult textual and exegetical problems. The purpose of this note is to examine one argument which has frequently been used in discussions of verse 13, and, in so far as this is possible, all other issues raised by the passage will be left to one side. The Revised Version translates Zech. vi 13 “even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be [margin: or there shall be] a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.” The clause “and he shall be [or there shall be] a priest upon his throne” renders the Hebrew v, but the LXX has xal ο ιερεύς έκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ. Most recent scholars emend μετα τύχης to μετά τύχης 1) or μετά τύχης 2), and one of the reasons given for doing this is the fact that it is difficult to understand how the reading of the LXX could have been derived from the Massoretic Text 3). This is the question which will be reconsidered here.

At least two attempts to show that the LXX is a rendering of the Massoretic Text have been made. L. G. Rignell says, “es ist möglich, dass LXX sich an dem Ausdruck ‘Thron’ in Verbindung mit dem Priester gestossen haben kann und den Text geändert hat” 4). A. Petitjean builds on this hypothesis and points out that, though the LXX usually translates kisse' by θρόνος, it does not do so in six other passages 5). One of his examples is unclear: in Deut. xvii 18 the LXX has ετήν καθολή ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ for khesibhî. ’al kisse' mamlakhtî, but it is far from certain that kisse' is represented by ἀρχῆς. Not only are both τοῦ θρόνου and τοῦ διηρροῦ found as variant readings between τῆς and ἀρχῆς, 6) but in Deut. xvii 20 ‘al mamlakhtî (without kisse') is rendered ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ. However, Deut. xvii 14-20 contains instructions about the monarchy, and so the way in which the LXX handles the text of verse 18 does not affect Petitjean’s argument. In the five remaining cases which he cites kisse' is translated by διήρροις. This word is used for the kisse' which was provided by the Shunammite for Elisha (4 Reigns iv 10), for the kisse' on which Folly sits (Prov. ix 14), and for Eli’s kisse' (1 Reigns i 9; iv 13, 18). Petitjean notes that in 4 Reigns iv 10 and Prov. ix 14 it might have seemed inappropriate to use θρόνος, and draws attention to the fact that the high priest is said to have a
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kissē only in 1 Sam. i 9; iv 13, 18 and Zech. vi 13. Thus he concludes that a reluctance to translate kissē in Zech. vi 13 by ἡπώνες would be in line with the practice of the LXX elsewhere. Moreover, in this verse most manuscripts of the LXX interpret the word kohen by adding the article and so give the term a technical meaning which the Hebrew may have been intended to convey 7). Petitjean considers that this provides further support for the view that ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ is “un écart de traduction par rapport au texte originel” (pp. 292 f.). But he fails to explain why this particular rendering was adopted.

A completely different line is taken by M. Bič, who finds in the reading of the LXX “gewisse sektiererische Tendenzen” which are also present in parts of the Pseudepigrapha (for example, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) and, especially, the Dead Sea Scrolls 8). But the only reference he gives is to IQS ix 11, which he thinks mentions two messiahs 9). Petitjean (p. 292, n. 4) comments that he can find no evidence in either the Dead Sea Scrolls or the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs that a priestly messiah was envisaged at the right hand of another messianic figure. However, he does not discuss in this connection the contention that Zechariah “kennt nur einen Messias” 10), and for Bič this is the crux of the matter. Bič explains the last clause of the verse, wašat šalôm tiḥeb bēn šenēhem, by saying, “es wird eben keine Spannungen mehr geben zwischen der weltlichen und der geistigen Macht, denn beide werden dann in einer Hand liegen.” The view that the verse mentions one person only has not been generally accepted by twentieth-century scholarship, which rightly identifies Zerubbabel as the Semah whose work is described in verses 12 and 13a; he was not a priest. Further, in any case it would be most natural to suppose that šenēhem refers to two different people 11). But if this is so the reason which leads Bič to trace a link between the reading of the LXX and sectarian Jewish circles applies equally to the Massoretic Text. It follows that the extra-biblical material which Bič cites cannot be related to the LXX in the way he supposes. Moreover, the LXX presumably puts the high priest in a place of honour at the right hand of the prince, though in a position which is subordinate to him. But IQSa ii 11-14 shows that the priest who presides at the meals of the sect takes precedence over the Messiah of Israel, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs see the relationship of the priestly and secular leaders of the community in similar terms; for example, Test. Judah xxi 2 says, “for to me the Lord gave the kingdom, and to [Levi]