



History of the Formation of the Book of Zechariah 9-11

Historia powstania Księgi Zachariasza 9-11

Key words: The Book of Zechariah 9-11, The Book of the Twelve, literary criticism, redaction history, Persian and Hellenistic periods

Słowa kluczowe: Księga Zachariasza 9-11, Księga Dwunastu Proroków, krytyka literacka, historia redakcji, okresy perski i hellenistyczny

Abstract

The article is a reconstruction of the history of the formation of Zech 9-11. The chapters of Zech 9-11 were divided into pericopes, which were then analysed using methods of literary and redaction criticism. The analysis showed that the history of the formation of Zech 9-11 is complex and long – probably from Persian times to the period of the Maccabean wars. The original form of Zech 9-11 included verses 9:1-6a; 10:6.8-10, which predicted the restoration of Israel. Subsequently, the passages dealing with war 10:3b-5.7.11-12 and the later created 9:11-13 were introduced into the book. The next redaction combined 10:3b-5.7.11-12 with 10:6.8-10 and created 9:14-17, combining this passage with 9:11-13. At the next stage, during the Hellenistic period, but probably before the Maccabean era, 11:4-5.7.8b-11.14 was written. After 305 BC, Zech 9:9-10 (without 10α) was written, followed by 11:12-13, then 11:8a and 10:1-2a. The following editorial layer consisted of statements about the shepherds 10:2b.3a; 11:1-3.6.15-17; and Zech 9:6b-8 (the phrase *וְנִשְׂאֵר נָבִי הוּא לְאַלְהֵינוּ* is later). In the

¹ Dr hab. Andrzej P. Kluczyński, Wydział Teologiczny Chrześcijańskiej Akademii Teologicznej w Warszawie.

Maccabean period, Zech 9-11 was supplied with two more glosses, namely על־בְּנֵיךָ יְיָ in 9:13 and in 9:10b α .

Streszczenie

Artykuł jest rekonstrukcją historii powstawania Za 9-11. Rozdziały Za 9-11 zostały podzielone na perykopy, które następnie poddane zostały analizie pod kątem krytyki literackiej i redakcji. Analiza wykazała, że historia powstawania Za 9-11 jest złożona i długa – prawdopodobnie od czasu perskiego do okresu wojen machabejskich. Pierwotną postacią Za 9-11 były wersety 9,1-6a; 10,6.8-10, które zapowiadały odnowę Izraela. Następnie wprowadzono fragmenty traktujące o wojnie 10,3b-5.7.11-12 i powstały później 9,11-13. Następna redakcja połączyła 10,3b-5.7.11-12 z 10,6.8-10 i stworzyła 9,14-17, łącząc ten fragment z 9,11-13. Na kolejnym etapie, w okresie hellenistycznym, ale zapewne przed epoką machabejską powstał 11,4-5.7.8b-11.14. Po roku 305 a Chr. powstał Za 9,9-10 bez 10a α , następnie 11,12-13, później zaś 11,8a i 10,1-2a. Kolejną warstwą redakcyjną były wypowiedzi o pasterzach 10,2b.3a; 11,1-3.6.15-17 oraz Za 9,6b-8 (frazja לְאֵלֵהֶינִי הוּא יְהוָה יִשְׂאֵר נַם-הוּא לְאֵלֵהֶינִי jest późniejsza). W okresie machabejskim Księga Zachariasza 9-11 zaopatrzona była jeszcze w dwie glosy, a mianowicie יְיָ על־בְּנֵיךָ z 9,13 i w 9,10b α .

The aim of the article is to reconstruct the redaction history of the Book of Zechariah 9-11. The distinction between the Book of Proto-Zechariah comprising chapters 1-8 and chapters 9-14 is old and widely recognised. To this day, however, there are disputes about whether chapters 12-14 should be separated from parts 9-11 and called Tri-to-Zechariah (Brzegowy 1995, 94-96; Reventlow 1993, 86-87; Dillard, Longman III 1995, 429-432; Portnoy, Petersen 1984 11-21; Radday, Wickman 1975, 30-55). There is no doubt that chapters 1-8 and 9-14 have a separate history of literary development. Chapters 12-14 are thematically distinct from the earlier passages. This section is eschatological in nature, and chapters 12 and 14 are devoted entirely to the theme of the future attack of the nations on Zion. On the other hand, it seems unlikely that chapter 11 could be the end of the book; on the contrary, it demands a continuation. The final chapter of the Book of Zechariah, on the other hand, by depicting the final salvation of Israel

and the fate of the nations, functions perfectly as the conclusion of the work. Additionally, it seems to allude to themes present throughout the Book of Zechariah. It is therefore possible that sections 9-11 once had a different ending, which we do not currently know. Chapters 12-14 were most likely written later than part 9-11. The dating of chapters 9-14 of the Book of Zechariah is a highly controversial issue in biblical scholarship, with divergent views. It seems that some of the statements of Zech 9-11 can be related to specific historical events. It is possible that Zech 9:13 dates from the time of the Maccabean wars. Obviously, the Jews had contacts with the Greeks also during the Persian period. The Persian empire fought a number of wars against Greece. However, the sense of Zech 9:13 is that it is God stirring up Israel against the Greeks, the sons of Javan, and the words are placed in the context of a speech about the deliverance of God's people. To the greatest extent, therefore, the verse corresponds to the events of the Maccabean uprising and not to the period of the Persian-Greek wars, which, moreover, is not reflected in the rest of the Old Testament texts. The passage Zech 9:9-10 points to the Hellenistic period, as will be discussed later. Arguably, the secondarily added 10a may point to the Maccabean period, since it speaks of Ephraim, and the territory of the toparchy of Aphraim was annexed to Judah in 145 BC. It is possible that 10a was introduced even later, when the Maccabean state was expanding its territory. Although the two above-mentioned verses point to the Maccabean period, this does not mean that the other parts of Zech 9-11 should also be dated to such a late time, especially since the 'Maccabean' passages are few and not very closely related to the context. It can therefore be assumed that the period of the Maccabean wars constitutes the terminus ad quem of the work's composition. K. Elliger saw Zech 9:1-8 as reflection of the conquests of Alexander the Great (Elliger 1975, 145), but the stages of his conquests do not correspond to the order by which the areas in Zech 9:1-8 are listed. After the battle of Issos, Alexander the Great besieged Tyre and then, moving along the coast, attacked Gaza but not

Damascus. He did not engage in warfare in the winter of 332-331, and later returned along the coast to Tyre before heading across the desert to the Euphrates. If the text was to reflect the order of Alexander's the Great conquests, Hamath should be mentioned before Damascus, and Sidon before Tyre (Redditt 1994, 665-666). In Zech 9-11 we do not find texts that can be clearly linked to earlier historical events, and it is therefore difficult to date the oldest parts of this section of the book.

Chapters 9-11 have been separated in the article from 12-14 because of their thematic distinctiveness and, it seems, the difficulty of capturing a common redaction of the two parts. Zechariah 9-11 can be divided into the following units: 9.1-8; 9.9-10; 9.11-17; 10.1-2; 10.3-12; 11.1-3 and 11.4-17². Therefore, this article will be divided into sections discussing the problems of literary criticism and the history of the redaction of individual units and will conclude with a synthetic attempt to reconstruct the formation of Zechariah 9-11. The article is therefore not a detailed commentary on the above-mentioned chapters but is mainly concerned with the two historical-critical exegesis methods: literary and redaction criticism³. Due to the need for brevity typical to the form of the article, translations of individual units will not be presented, only their content divisions. For this reason, too, the discussion of the text's critique will be omitted, except in those places where a different lesson than in the Leningrad Code had to be advocated, which specifically concerns chapters 10 and 11.

Let us therefore look at the issues concerning the first pericope of the Book of Deutero-Zechariah.

² The division into units is sometimes done differently. For example, Alexander Kunz sees the units in chapter 9 in verses 1-10 and 11-17 (Kunz 1998, 60). Assigning verses 9 and 10 to the preceding unit is not convincing primarily for content reasons. Verse 9:8 deals with God's protection of the people while fitting as a closure to the section that speaks of the nations and the area of the land of Israel, in 9 there is a new theme of the king, new characters and a new addressee of the speech.

³ On literary criticism and editorial history, see Slawik 2004.

Zech 9:1-8

The content of the first pericope of the Book of Deuterozachariah is as follows:

1a the term 'oracle' and the statement about the word of YHWH resting in the land of Hadrach and Damascus

1b justification - people turn to YHWH, the tribes of Israel belong to him

2a statement about Chamath

2b-4 statement about Tyre and Sidon

b wisdom of Tyre and Sidon

3 power and wealth of Tyre

4 The conquest of Tyre by the Lord

5-7 statement about the Philistines

5-6 taming of the Philistines

5 fear of Ashkelon, Gaza and Ekron after seeing the fate of Tyre

6a defeat of Ashdod

6b taming of the pride of the Philistines

7 purification and acceptance of the Philistines

8 God as the Protector of Israel

The passage depicts God's intervention in the territory that, according to the Old Testament texts, belongs to Israel (Gen 15:18; Ex 23:31; Lev 13:21; 34:7-11; Deut 1:7; 1 Kings 5:1.4; 2 Kings 14:25.28). God takes the land of Israel in his possession, subdues the enemies of the chosen people and - in the concluding verse 8 - promises protection through his own presence around the Temple. Many exegetes consider the passage to be uniform, with the exception of the first word *נשא*, which begins section 9-11 of the Book of Zechariah and has been inserted secondarily (Rudolph 1976, 169-170; Kunz 1998, 60). In the case of these verses, the question can be raised concerning the relationship of verse 8 to verses 1-7. The first verses deal with Israel's neighbours, while verse 8 speaks of God who is to guard Israel. However, this thematic differentiation does not mean that the verse 8 is secondary, for it expresses a consequence of what verses 7-8 depict: the humiliation of the nations leads to the

emergence of a secure Israel. Verses 6b-8, on the other hand, distinguish themselves from 1-6a, because YHWH speaks in them in the 1st person (which is the case up to verse 13), with the exception of the fragment in v. 7, where there is a reference to “our God” (Redditt 2012, 42). There is also a difference at the level of content. Whereas previously the country of the Philistines was to face punishment, according to verses 6b-7 Philistia is accepted by God, as the Jebusite inhabitants of Jerusalem are. It is probable that v. 6b-8 are secondary. Therefore, since they refer positively to the nations, the closest parallel is to be found in the last chapter of Zechariah, i.e. in 14,16. Probably the latest insertion is the sentence *וְנִשְׂאָר נִם־הוּא לְאֶלְהֵינוּ* in verse 7, due to the change of persons⁴.

How can Zech 9:1-6a be dated? Opinions regarding the dating of the pericope in its original form have varied widely, from pre-exilic times to the Hellenistic era. For example, A. Malamat dates the passage to the period shortly after 720, when Assyria defeated the coalition of the states of Syria and Canaan including Hamath, Damascus and Samaria (Malamat 1950-1951, 149-159). The opposite opinion was expressed by K. Elliger, who dated the passage to the conquests of Alexander the Great who went to conquer Egypt via Canaan. Thus, the direction of the march of the Macedonian army would agree with the order in which the cities appear in the pericope, but, as indicated above, the exact historical order is not preserved in the biblical unit (Elliger 1975, 145). A. Kunz, on

⁴ W. Rudolph defends the unity of the passage using the argument that changes of persons are common in the prophetic books and should not determine uniformity or lack thereof. However, in the case of Zech 9:1-8 there are also differences in content, and each case of differences between persons should be analysed separately. See Rudolph 1976, 167-177. Ina Willi-Plein sees v. 6b-7aa as secondary. According to her v. 8 need not be secondary because God speaks there in the first person, due to the nature of the summary of the whole unit (Willi-Plein 2014, 26). It is possible but not necessary, because v. 8 could be also an appropriate ending for the unit in its final form. The summary could also be written in the 3rd person, so the solution is to accept v. 8 as a secondary together with 6b-7, because the problem of the change of the person is solved in this way.

the other hand, attempts to date the unit (together with verses 9-10) to the period of the fifth war between Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Syria, i.e. 202-198, and especially to its last phase (Kunz 1998, 192-229). After this war, the territory of Canaan passed from the dominion of Egypt to Syria. This change of rule affected all the cities mentioned in the pericope with the exception of Hamath, which was to remain in the buffer zone between the two countries (Kunz 1998, 200-202). P.R. Redditt rightly points out that this description does not exactly fit any of the war campaigns known to us (Redditt 2012, 27). He dates the passage to the Persian period, when it became clear that the events of the renewal in Judah from the early Persian period would not lead to the emergence of an independent kingdom (Redditt 2012, 50). For this reason, the hopes have been detached from historical events and transferred to an undefined future. However, with this interpretation, it is not necessary to date it to the early Persian period. It could just as well be the time of Persian rule or the Hellenistic period. It is most likely that Zech 9:1-6a belongs to the oldest part of the book⁵. Verses 6b-8, on the other hand, were introduced close to the time of the creation of Zech 14.

Zech 9:9-10

The announcement of the coming of the righteous ruler in verses 9-10 is thematically distinct from the surrounding context and must therefore be treated as an independent unit. However, it must be acknowledged that it was most likely placed in its present position on purpose. After taming the neighbouring nations and ensuring Israel's security, the time comes to restore the legitimate authority in Jerusalem. What of the unity of the passage? At the beginning of verse 10, it is surprising that the speaker is God in the first person. This change, however, may indicate literary inconsistency, especially because there is a repetition

⁵ This is also the position taken by A. Kunz (Kunz 1998, 60). According to him, the other parts of Zechariah 9-10 were to be written as supplements to this passage.

of the thought of destroying the instruments of war in v. 10aβ and this part of the verse does not seem to form a parallelism to 10aα. Verses with three colons usually form synthetic or climax parallelisms, while v. 10aβ does not give us any new information, it merely repeats the idea of a synonymous bicolon from v. 10aα. It seems unlikely that v. 10aβ is a later addition as then there would be a disruption of the rhythm of the verse, and the first person problem in 10aα would still not be solved. If, on the other hand, v. 10aα had been introduced secondarily, then verse 10 in its original form would have been formally and content-wise, proper. For this reason, it seems that the unit is not homogenous and that verse 10aα was introduced secondarily into the unit.

In what period of Israel's history could Zech 9:9-10 have been written? Because of the accumulation of concepts belonging to the old royal theology, the unit is sometimes dated the pre-exilic period⁶. Nevertheless, the content of the announcement seems to imply that there wasn't any king in Jerusalem at that time, and that there was an opportunity for the restoration of the kingdom, which was not yet possible under Persian rule. P.L. Redditt believes that Zech 9:9-10 is the oldest passage of chapter 9. According to him, at the time of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah the monarchical hopes associated with Zorobabel were alive, so that the monarchical text should not have been written at a distant time (Redditt 2012, 50). It is clear, however, that we cannot draw this conclusion solely from the subject of the announcement. There is no evidence that Zech 9:9-10 was in any way related to Zorobabel, and the unit itself has some special features that distinguish it from the announcements in Hag 2:20; Zech 3 or Zech 6:9-15. For example, the unit is characterised by the use of the term 'king', the use of which may indicate a period in which the term took on a significant meaning again. We know that in 305 Seleukos I assumed the title of king, so this year could constitute the terminus a quo. Another dating possibility is offered by verse 10.

⁶ This was, for example, the view of B. Otzen (Otzen 1964, 117-118).

Jerusalem/Judah and Ephraim are mentioned together there. This makes it possible to assume that at the time the statement was written, Galilee as an upholder of Jerusalem had not yet come to prominence, and Trans-jordan had lost its importance as an upholder of Samaria (Seebass 1992, 65). It is possible, therefore, that this refers to the time of Nehemiah, when the territory of Ephraim was a serious force and counterweight to Jerusalem. Such a dating, however, contradicts the dating of verse 9. K. Elliger therefore dates the unit to the Maccabean period, and verse 10 to the year 145 BC, when the toparchy of Aphairema was annexed to Judah (1 Macc 11:34; Elliger 1975, 150). However, there is no need to date the entire unit so late. It is most likely that the unit was written after 305, and the beginning of verse 10 about Ephraim may have been written around the year 145 (Kluczyński 2000, 304).

Zech 9:11-17

The next unit of the book is situated in 9:1-17. It appears to be unrelated to the previous two verses.

The division of the text is as follows:

11-13 appeal addressed to “prisoners of hope”

11a address of the statement and the reason - blood of the covenant

11b releasing of prisoners from the dry cistern

12a call for return directed to prisoners

12b announcement of double retribution

13 α Judah and Ephraim as weapons of God on standby

13 $\alpha\beta$ -b stirring up the sons of Zion against the sons of Javan and making them a strong sword

14-15 theophany of God

14 theophany of YHWH (lightning, trumpets and storm)

15a protection of the people and overcoming the missiles of the slingers

15b comparison of the victorious people to the drinkers of wine, the bowls and the corner stones of the altar

16-17 salvation and blessing of the people

16 announcement of salvation justified by the presence
of the diadem stones on earth

17a goodness and beauty

17b fertility in grain and must

The following problems of literary criticism can be found in the text. Some exegetes regard the words *עַל-בְּנֵיךָ יְיָ* in verse 13b as a gloss on the grounds that they interfere with the metre (Meyers, Meyers 1993, 155). Additionally, in the end of the verse, namely in the words *גְּבוּרַת בְּרַב וְשִׁמְחֵיךָ כְּתָרָב*, there is a change of subject, because Zion is the addressee of the announcement. Thus, the mention of the sons of Javan is most likely a later gloss. There is also a difference of persons in the unit. At the beginning - in verses 11-13 God himself speaks in the 1st person. In verses 14-17, He is spoken of in the 3rd person.

Verses 14-15 depict the theophany of YHWH. It should be considered whether the author used an older text describing the theophany and inserted it between verses 11-13 and 16-17. A certain peculiar whole is formed by verses 11-13, since they contain the themes of liberation, the return of the people and YHWH's war. Also - unlike the following verses - they are shaped as a speech of God. It is most likely, therefore, that the original form of the unit was contained in verses 11-13, while the following verses 14-17 were introduced secondarily.

Are verses 14-15 about the theophany secondary in this section? Admittedly, the passage would be understandable without 14-15, but they do fit the whole. First the text speaks of liberation, then of the people going into the battle and finally of God's theophany resulting in victory and blessing. A similar combination of the themes of God as warrior, the people's victory in battle and blessing occurs in the blessing of Moses in Deut. 33:27-29. The description of Israel's blessing in Deut. 33:28 also juxtaposes grain and must. Deutero-Zechariah is based on old traditions from the Pentateuch. Nevertheless, the theophanic verses are so distinct from the rest that they probably once constituted

an independent element, which was used later by the redactor supplementing verses 11-13. Thus, in the passage 10:11-17, the introduction of the statement about “the sons of Javan” in verse 13 is secondary. The unit was originally contained in vv. 11-13 but had no mention of the Greeks. It was then supplemented by verses 14-17, whose author used the old account of YHWH’s theophany and provided the unit with a summary in vv. 16-17⁷.

When might the text of Zech 9:11-17 have been written? The unit in its original form 11-13 was probably written later than 10:3-12 because it combines motifs that are clearly separated there. The completion of these verses by inserting 14-17 was probably done by the final editor of 10:3-12. The gloss *על-בְּנֵי יָוָן* is most likely from the period of the Maccabean wars. Admittedly, C.L. Meyers and E.M. Meyers argue that these words do not necessarily indicate an insurrection in the Hellenistic period, since in the 5th century BC the Persian empire was at war with the Greeks, so Greece may have been in the theological perspective of the Judeans quite early, nevertheless, it is unlikely that the glossator had the Persian-Greek conflict in mind⁸. Verse 13 clearly states that it is a conflict between the Jews and the Greeks, and one in which the Judeans were the offensive party. To the greatest extent, the content corresponds to events at the time of Maccabean wars⁹.

⁷ Ina Willi-Plein sees v. 14 and some parts of v. 15.16.17 as later additions in the sense of “Fortschreibung“ (Willi-Plein 2016, 100). However, the thematic diversity speaks rather in favour of the theory that the whole part 15-17 was secondary.

⁸ Meyers, Meyers 1993, 174. According to P. L. Redditt, the mention of Greeks did not necessarily refer to a situation of war at all, because the sons of Javan are mentioned in Gen. 10:4, Ez. 27:13 mentions Greece among the countries trading with Tyre, and the Greeks appear from the 8th century BC onward in extra-biblical documents in the Near East (Redditt 2012, 46). However not just the mere fact of the mentioning of Greeks, but also the context in which the Greeks are mentioned (Israelites’ attack on the “sons of Javan”) should be considered.

⁹ Therefore, it is difficult to date the introduction of this gloss to the period of the Fifth Syrian War, during which the Jews supported the Seleucids against the Ptolemies. This is because at that time the “sons of Zion” acted against the “sons of Javan” along

A. Kunz dates the passage Zech 9:11-17 to the period of the Maccabean wars (Kunz 1998, 320-324). He comes to this conclusion on the basis of the occurrence of similar motifs found in apocryphal literature relating to the Old Testament, e.g. in the Book of Tobias, the Book of Sirach, and in Qumran literature (Kunz 1988, 301-324). Additionally, according to the exegete, v. 15 seems to correspond to the way the Seleucids waged war. However, this correlation may indicate the reliance of the works of the inter-Testamental period on Zech 9:1-17. It is difficult to accept that the Book of Zechariah may have undergone major redactions during the Maccabean period and later. We would expect only smaller glosses during that time.

Zech 10:1-2

The next short unit is found in 10:1-2. There are no content connections between parts of 10:1-2 and 3-12, except the topic of shepherds in verse 3. The statement consists of three themes. First, in verse 1 it attributes the causality of the rains to YHWH and for that reason the verse begins with a call to ask YHWH for rain. Second, there is a criticism of teraphim and diviners in v. 2a, whose oracles are described as lying, nothingness and evil. Third, there is a metaphorical representation of the situation of a straying people due to the lack of a shepherd in v. 2b. The three themes seem completely separate from one another, so the question arises about the uniformity of this small passage. In the prophetic books of the Old Testament, the theme of YHWH's power to let down rain appears in the context of criticism of idol worship (1 Kings 17-18). Only one similar term appears in Jer 14:22, namely the stem נִשְׁבַּח . Similarly, we can find an attribution to YHWH of the causality and power on the harvest in the context of Baal worship in Hos 2:10, which corresponds to the end of verse Zech 10:1¹⁰. Not only the worship

with another group of "sons of Javan." A gloss in the historical situation at this time would not make any sense.

¹⁰ Teraphs are probably images of idols (Gn 31:19.35; Judg 17:5; 18:14). It is possible

of foreign gods, but also the use of the services of fortune-tellers was forbidden in the Old Testament (Jer. 27:9; 29:8n; Is. 44:25; Reventlow 1993, 101). As already mentioned, verse 2b introduces an entirely new topic, however it cannot stand alone. The statement about rain and diviners is summarized by 2b, which depicts Israel's state of confusion due to idolatrous and improper divination practices.

Verse 2b, which speaks of the loss of the people and the lack of a shepherd, is introduced by the words *על־כֵּן*, and thus provides additional justification. A new theme appears in this verse. So, it is likely that it is also a secondary addition. The question of identification of the missing shepherd is an open question. Did the author have a ruler in mind, or a God who cannot perform this function because the people turn to idols? According to the context, he is probably referring to the God as a shepherd. Thus, the unit of 10:1-2 is inconsistent. Its original form was 1-2a. Verse 2b was inserted secondarily¹¹. The date of the origin of the unit and its connection to the rest of Zechariah 9-11 is an unresolved matter.

Zech 10:3-12

The following thematic passage is situated in Zech 10:3-12¹².

The structure of the unit is as follows:

that the word also means a cultic mask. Teraphs were used to give oracles (Ez 21:26). See Reventlow 1993, 101.

¹¹ P.L. Redditt takes a different position. He believes that the secondary is also v. 2a (along with 2b-3a), because it explains why God's salvation did not come true - due to forbidden practices being performed. See Redditt 2012, 24. I. Willi-Plein thinks that v. 1b is secondary (Willy-Plein 2016, 125), on the basis of metrum and possible connections to Zec. 9,17. However, the small unit with v. 1b is consistent in terms of content in the contrary to the double justification in v.2 and the thematic changes.

¹² There is an unusual form of the verb *והושבוֹרִים* in verse 6. which appears to be a distorted compound of the verbs *שׁוּב* and *שׁוּב*. The Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate render in their translations the *hifil* of the verb *שׁוּב*, while numerous LXX manuscripts render the *hifil* of the verb *שׁוּב*. Given verse 10, where the *hifil* from *שׁוּב* appears, it is most likely to be considered that there was also the same form of the verb in verse 6.

- 3-6a α visitation by YHWH and the struggle of God's people
- 3 announcement of the visitation by YHWH
 - 3a YHWH's anger at the shepherds and announcement of the visitation of the goats
 - 3b YHWH's visitation of his flock and making it a battle steed
 - 4 origin of power from the house of Judah (from YHWH)
 - comparison to the stake, the bow and the oppressor
 - 5 struggle of the people with the help of God
 - 6a strengthening of the house of Judah and the deliverance of the house of Joseph
- 6a β -11 announcement of the bringing of the people
- 6a β announcement of bringing the people motivated by God's mercy
 - 6b α situation of the people as if there was no rejection by God
 - 6b β justification - formula "I am YHWH their God" and God's response to the people
 - 7a α comparison to the mighty man Ephraim
 - 7a β joy of the people and their children
 - 8 bringing the people and their number
 - 9 scattering of the people, remembrance of YHWH and the return
 - 10 bringing of the people from Egypt and Assyria and bringing them to Gilead and Lebanon
 - 11a overcoming the obstacles – hitting the waves of the sea and drying up the Nile
 - 11b taming Assyria and Egypt
 - 12a strengthening the people in YHWH's name
 - 12b conduct of the people in the name of YHWH and the formula of the oracle

The unit is full of content tensions. First, YHWH is spoken of once in the 3rd person (vv. 3b-5.7.11.12), while once YHWH himself speaks in the 1st person (v. 3a.6.8.10). In addition, one should note thematic differences. Some verses present the theme of YHWH's war (3b-5.7.11-12), while others present the issue of the return of the scattered people (6.8-10).

Within the verses dealing with the topic of the return from captivity, we have a number of repetitions. The bringing back of the Israelites is mentioned in vv. 6, 8, 9 and 10. Verse 6 is puzzling due to the mention of Joseph's house in reference to the northern part of the country, since throughout Zechariah 9-14 the term "Ephraim" occurs in this sense (Elliger 1975, 155). For these reasons, the unit appears to have originated as a composition of two different texts. The first one was 3b-5.7.11-12 on the war of the Lord, and the second one - verses 6.8-10 on bringing of the people from the diaspora. Verse 3a most likely comes from an editor linking the two parts together. It is possible that by shepherds this editor meant the foreign rulers of Israel in the diaspora. It is also likely that he wished to link the unit in this way to the pericope found in 11:1-3, as well as the following one in 11:4-17. H. G. Reventlow writes that the layer regarding YHWH's war is older, while the layer about the return to the land would be younger (Reventlow 1993, 102). This conclusion is based on a link to 9:11-17, in which verses 14-15 appear to be old, while parts 11-13 seem to be younger (Reventlow 1993, 98). Verses 14-15 are archaic because they depict YHWH's theophany, while verse 11 by mentioning "the blood of the covenant" refers to Ex 24:8 which is supposed to assume the existence of the Pentateuch in written form. However, H.G. Reventlow's claim does not seem satisfactorily justified. A very late author could also make use of an old statement and the citation of Ex 24:8 does not necessarily imply the completion of the redaction of the Pentateuch. Even the reference to the Pentateuch being in written form does not mean that the layer about the return must be late. There are two arguments in favour of dating the layer about YHWH's war to an earlier period¹³. The first one is the fact that in the unit 9:11-17 the verses

¹³ I. Willi-Plein lists the literary problems in the text and as a main problem sees the change of the persons (Willi-Plein 2016, 156-157). According to her the 1st person layer (10:3a.6.8-10.12) constitutes continuous sequence in the contrary to the 3rd person layer (3b-5.7.11). For this reason, the 1st person layer is original and the verses in 3rd person are secondary additions. In this article however the differences in content were

that speak about YHWH's war (vv. 14-17) are secondary, and second one that the earliest layer in chapter 9 includes statements according to which it is God Himself who performs the work of Israel's restoration without the active participation of the people. According to A. Kunz, the passage (3b-12) can be dated to the early period of the Maccabean wars (Kunz 1998, 365-374). The exegete sees it as a reaction to historical events. According to the message of the biblical unit, Egypt and Assyria are disarmed, and Judah becomes a military force (verbs used in perfectum; Kunz 1998, 365-374). Such a situation would correspond to the years 168-164 BC., that is the period from the beginning of the Maccabean uprising to the cleansing of the Temple. The use of tenses in the perfectum can never be a conclusive criterion deciding whether an utterance is a reaction to events that occurred or a prediction of the events to come. With the dating proposed by A. Kunz, we have the same problem as with the dating of the previous units: it is difficult to assume that in the second century BC, the Book of Zechariah 9-11 was still in *statu nascendi*. It is more probable that in that time the book received minor insertions and changes.

Zech 11:1-3

The penultimate unit of Zechariah 9-11 is found in the first three verses of chapter 11. It is a statement directed against the tall trees. The passage belongs to the genre of prophetic "mockery songs" (Elliger 1975, 158).

Analysing the question of the unity of the passage, it is necessary to raise the question of the relationship of verses 1-2 and v. 3. The verses 1-2 speak about the fall of the trees, while verse 3 introduces the theme of shepherds. Nevertheless, there are also connecting elements, specifically the theme of weeping and destruction. Since in the books of the prophets the fall of the trees, eventually their burning, signifies the defeat of the

rulers (Is. 10:33-34), it is likely that criticism of Israel's leaders is also found here. The shepherds, on the other hand, are also kings and leaders. In the so-called royal cycle of the Book of Jeremiah (Jer. 21:11-23:8), there are statements about trees and the destruction of trees (Jer. 22:6-7; 22:23) along with a motif of criticism of shepherds (Jer. 23:1nn). In Jer. 22:6-7, this probably refers to the announcement of the destruction of the entire country, while 22,23 is a statement against Jerusalem¹⁴. Thus, it is not impossible that the author of Zech 11:1-3 based his writings on motifs found in the royal cycle of the Book of Jeremiah. Therefore, it should be assumed that the unit is uniform. The three verses, using the sentences in perfectum, foreshadow a catastrophe or are a reaction to it. By mentioning the shepherds, the unit is linked to the preceding and following pericope. It should also be asked whether there is a connection with Zech 4:17, directed against the evil shepherd. The passage 11:1-3 seems to fulfil primarily the function of connecting the various content elements of Zech 9-11.

Zech 11:4-17

The next unit is found in Zech 11:4-17 and contains, as it will be shown, allusions to Israel's history¹⁵. The unit is quite easy to distinguish.

¹⁴ See the analysis of the pericope in Kluczyński 2012, 251-275.

¹⁵ The passage Zech 11:4-17 was analysed in the article: The history of the origin and meaning of Zech 11:4-17 (Kluczynski 2019). For this reason, this article will only briefly mention the problems of literary criticism and offer a solution from the above-mentioned article. The text of the passage indicates a need for few emendations. In verse 5, the verb אָמַר in the singular should be changed to the plural. The singular would be unintelligible if the subject is "sellers." The verb אָמַר introduces a statement in the singular, an example of a "seller" of a flock, hence it is possible that the change to the singular occurred under the influence of a statement in independent speech. Verse 5 also contains Masoretic note *Qere* according to which the verb אָמַר should be read as *hiphil imperfectum*. However, more likely is form in *imperfectum consecutivum*. In both cases, however, the sense of the statement is similar. Verses 7 and 11 most likely do not refer to justification and "the poor of the flock" (לִבְנֵי עֵינִי), but to "Canaanites" in the sense of those engaged in trade, i.e. merchants. The lesson of the Masoretic text

Verse 4 begins with a new theme introduced by the messenger formula. In 12:1, on the other hand, the new theme of the invasion of Jerusalem by the nations begins.

The pericope can be divided as follows:

- 4-5 call to graze the flock and the characteristics of the flock
 - 4a messenger formula
 - 4b command to graze the flock
- 5 description of what happens to the flock
 - 5a α butchering of the flock by the buyers without the consequences
 - 5a β blessing of YHWH by the sellers of the herd for the sake of enriching themselves
 - 5b non-sparing the herd by the shepherds
- 6 justification
 - 6a God's non-sparing the inhabitants of the land (oracle formula)
 - 6b α delivering the inhabitants into neighbour's hand and into the hand of the king
 - 6b β destruction of the country and no rescue
- 7-14 grazing the herd
 - 7-9 grazing
 - 7a introduction - grazing the herd for the merchants
 - 7b taking two staffs and naming them
 - 8a removal of three shepherds in one month
 - 8b mutual annoyance
 - 9 decision to abandon grazing the herd and to neglect it
 - 10-13 breaking of the first staff
 - 10 breaking of the staff as a sign of the breaking the covenant with the nations

is to be explained by the copyist's improper division of letters into words. It should be noted that the Septuagint reads the Hebrew text according to the correct division. See Kluczyński 2019, 35-37.

- 11a breaking of the covenant on that day
- 11b recognition by the merchants (Canaanites) of the word of YHWH (formula of the recognition of the word)
- 12 setting a fee for the work on the amount of 30 pieces of silver
- 13 ordering the silver to be melted down in the Temple and handing over the silver
- 14 breaking of the second staff as a symbol of the breaking of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel
- 15-17 useless shepherd
 - 15 command to take the tools of the useless shepherd
 - 16 explanation of the command - God raising up the shepherd and the characteristics of his activity - lack of concern for the herd
 - 17 “woe” cry directed against the shepherd

Questions can be raised about the uniformity of the pericope. The relationship of verse 6 to the whole unit is problematic. Verse 6 seems to be a justification of the command to graze the sheep and an interpretation, while the carrying out of the symbolic action takes place in the following verses. Part 6b also does not seem to fit with the unit because it introduces the theme of a king because of whom the people are to suffer, while the earlier verses speak of people trading sheep and their shepherds. According to K. Elliger and I. Willi-Plein, the verse is a later gloss because it turns harshly against the people of the country, not against the shepherds, and it is not interested in both Israel and Judah (Elliger 1975,161, Willi-Plein 2020, 224). In the remaining verses of the unit, God seems to show mercy toward the flock, in contrast to verse 6.

It is difficult to understand the relationship of verse 8a to the whole unit, which speaks about the removal of three shepherds in one month, and this is because, according to the pericope, the shepherd is to be a prophet. Earlier there was general mention of shepherds (v.4), but the number of shepherds was not specified. Verse 10b, which speaks in

the first person about making the covenant¹⁶ is also strange. One would expect the speaker to be God, not a prophet grazing a flock on God's commission. The relationship of parts 15-17 to 4-14 also needs to be clarified. In verses 4-14, the prophet, upon receiving the command to graze, prepares two sticks for himself. Each time the breaking of each staff results in certain consequences and obtains an interpretation. Admittedly, in the case of breaking the second staff, which is described in verse 14, we are only given the purpose of this action, but this information is both an interpretation and a consequence. Verse 15 presents a new command of God and introduces a new figure of the "foolish shepherd." Unlike the previous command, there is no report here of the performance of a symbolic action - God's oracle follows immediately. Part 4-14 does not demand any continuation. It seems that everything has already been said. The following verses are not a necessary element for the earlier narrative. Within section 15-17, verse 17 is quite distinctive, because it is poetry in contrast to the other verses which are prose. Verses 12-13 also seem unsuitable thematically to the whole. They are not an explanation of the sign of the breaking of the staff. They introduce God's next command and a report on the execution of that command. Additionally, despite the fact that according to the pericope the grazing of the sheep is handled by the prophet, verse 13 explicitly says that God was valued by the merchants.

How can the above-mentioned problems be solved? The unit was most likely created in four stages (see Kluczyński 2019, 361-369). In its original form it included verses 4-5.7.8b-11.14. The second layer would include verses 12-13. At the third stage verse 8a would be introduced, and the fourth layer would include verses 6.15-17. It cannot be ruled out that v. 17 - due to its poetic form - was secondarily introduced into v. 15-16. The unit would then be composed of five stages. The main theme

¹⁶ Arguably, this awkwardness led to the removal of the suffix in the case of the Peshitta and Targum translations.

of the prophetic sign was the breaking of the second staff, that is, the breaking of unity between Judah and Israel (v. 14). It is possible that this should be referred to events in the post-exilic period, namely the so-called Samaritan schism, though it is difficult to determine what specific moment this may refer to - whether the construction of the sanctuary on Mount Garizim, or already the conflict between the two religions in the Maccabean times¹⁷. Most likely, this is how the interpretation of the sign of the breaking of the second staff should be understood. The breaking of the first staff symbolizes the breaking of the covenant with all peoples. Most probably, the breaking of the covenant should be interpreted in accordance with the meaning of Hos 2:2. Thus, it is about the delivery of Israel to the hostile peoples, which is illustrated earlier by the mutual destruction of the flock of sheep (v. 9), which is in turn preceded by the mutual discouragement of the people and the prophet. The introduction of vv. 12-13 was intended to reinforce the accusation by showing that the leaders held both the prophet's and God's work in low esteem.

Later a change in the understanding of the prophetic sign took place. It began to be seen as a picture of Israel's history. The disintegration of unity between Judah and Israel took place after the death of Solomon, who was – according to the biblical narrative – the third king of Israel. Thus, for the sake of clarity, verse 8a, speaking about the removal of the three shepherds, was introduced at stage three. If the shepherds were the rulers of Israel, and the removal of them was followed by the prophet's

¹⁷ According to W. Rudolph the terminus *ad quem* is the Samaritan schism, for the passage has the character of a prediction (Rudolph 1976, 163). However, the passage may not only be a prediction, but a reaction to events that had already taken place. The passage was created from the beginning in written form, no prophetic activity was carried out. The context was no longer prophetic oral annunciation, but the transmission of content in written form. So from the beginning the pericope could be a reflection on events that already took place. The only thing that can be said is that the passage reflects the bad relations between Jerusalem and Samaria. The so-called Samaritan schism is another issue. It is difficult to determine when the definitive schism took place.

discouragement by the people's attitude (which, after all, symbolizes God's attitude and feelings), which results in the country splitting in two, then presumably these three rulers are the first kings of united Israel, namely Saul, David and Solomon. In that case, verse 8a must be understood in connection with 8b. Removing the shepherds would already be an expression of God's annoyance at the people. Thus, the situation prior to the prophet's (God's) seizure of shepherd duties over Israel (vv. 4-6) must refer to the pre-monarchic period. God's discouragement with Israel coincides with the end of the reign of the last of these three rulers, then comes a time of misery for Israel, until the arrival of an evil ruler who destroys the flock. Taking into consideration the fact that when the Hebrew Bible refers to the split between the northern and southern part of the country, it most often refers to the rupture of the personal union under Jeroboam I, we can assume that there is a specific prophetic review of Israel's history.

Fragment 15-17 was introduced at the fourth stage of the redaction of the pericope, , and probably also verse 6. In such a case, verses 15-17 probably refer to the future event, after which God will intervene. It is possible that there are some connections between those verses and the eschatological passages of Zech 12-14.

What is the history of the formation of Za 9-11 based on the survey presented above?

Probably the first version of Zech 9-11 contained the following verses: 9:1-6a; 10:6.8-10. The passage was a foreshadowing of Israel's restoration through God's salutary act - initially God was restoring Israel's territories and then promising to bring back the scattered exiles from the countries of their habitation. It is difficult to say when these verses may have been composed, as they do not reflect any historical events, other than reflecting the Babylonian captivity. Because they foreshadow God's unconditional salvation, and do not place conditions on the people - as is the case, for example, in the layer of the chronicler's redaction of the Book of Zechariah - they refer to the punishment, which was Babylonian

captivity, they include in their salvation perspective both Judah and the northern part – Israel – as do the texts of the Book of Ezekiel (Ez 37:15-28) as well as Proto-Zechariah (Za 3; 6:9-15), it seems that the Persian period may still be the most probable date, although we are not sure of the exact time. This was followed - in three stages - by verses speaking YHWH's war, according to which God will fight using Israel, eventually preparing her for victory. These are passages 10:3b-5.7.11-12 and the slightly later 9:11-13. This was followed by the redaction that combined 10:3b-5.7.11-12 with 10:6.8-10, created 9:14-17 using the old account of YHWH's theophany in verses 14-15. It was also responsible for combining 9:11-13 with 14-17. It is difficult to date these military redactions. Arguably, they should be associated with periods of war and unrest. Either the period of the Greco-Persian wars in the fifth century BC or the invasion of Alexander's the Great armies in 332 BC could be taken into consideration. The next stage should be seen in the emergence of 11:4-5.7.8b-11.14, namely text that reflects the tensions between the Judean and Samaritan communities, possibly the so-called Samaritan schism. The passage was written during the Hellenistic period, but probably before the period of the Maccabean wars. Zech 9:9-10 (without 10α) was also written during this time, but probably after the year 305. Meanwhile, 11:12-13 was introduced into the book, followed later by 11:8a and a statement about rain, teraphs and diviners in 10:1-2a. The last major editorial move came with the introduction of negative statements about shepherds and monarchs¹⁸. This editorial layer would have been responsible for 10:2b.3a; 11:1-3.6.15-17. In the similar period, the introduction of Zech 9:6b-8 must have been inserted, along with the even later phrase *וְנִשְׂאֵר נָם־הוּא לְאֵלֵהֶינּוּ*. The Book of Zechariah 9-11

¹⁸ P.L. Redditt does not accurately date most of the material of Zechariah 9-11, but agrees that the statements about the shepherds are later than most of the material of the Book. Redditt 2012, 72.

would have been supplied with two more glosses from the period of the Maccabean wars, namely the words עַל-בְּנֵיךָ יְיָ in verse 9:13 and 9:10ba¹⁹.

The analysis reveals the lengthy formation of Zechariah 9-11. The oldest texts were probably written in the Persian period, while the last editorial insertions took place during the Maccabean wars.

Bibliography

- Brzegowy, Tadeusz. 1995. "Mesjanizm Deutero-Zachariasza." *Analecta Cracoviensia* 27: 93-109.
- Dillard, Raymond B., and Longman, Tremper. 1994. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Leicester: Zondervan.
- Elliger, Karl. 1975. *Das Buch der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten II: Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kluczyński, Andrzej. 2000. "Ostatnia zapowiedź mesjańska Starego Testamentu." In *Chrystus i jego Kościół*. Ed. Marek Jerzy Ugłorz, 293-307. Bielsko-Biała: Augustana.
- Kluczyński, Andrzej P. 2019. "Historia powstania i znaczenie Za 11,4-17." *Rocznik Teologiczny* 56 (3): 355-370
- Kluczyński, Andrzej P. 2012. "Księżę Pokoju" (Iz 9,5). *Obraz monarchii izraelskiej w księgach prorockich Starego Testamentu*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo ChAT.
- Kunz, Andreas. 1998. *Ablehnung des Krieges. Untersuchungen zu Sacharja 9 und 10*. Freiburg/Basel/Wien/Barcelona/Rome/New York: Herder.
- Malamat, Abraham. 1950-1951. "The Historical Setting of Two Biblical Prophecies on the Nations." *Israel Exploration Journal* 1: 149-159.

¹⁹ The Book of Sirach 49:10f proves that around 190 BC The Book of the Twelve Prophets was already in existence. Of course, this does not exclude the possibility of smaller additions at a later time, but it is rather difficult to expect that large parts of material were introduced after that time. See Rudolph 1976, 164.

- Meyers, Carol L., and Meyers Eric M. 1993. *Haggai Zechariah 9-14. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday.
- Otzen, Benedikt. 1964. *Studien über Deuteriosacharja*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Portnoy, Stephen L., and Petersen David L. 1984. "Biblical Texts and Statistical Analysis: Zechariah and Beyond." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1): 11-21.
- Radday, Yahuda, T. and Wickman, Dieter. 1975. "The Unity of Zechariah Examined in the Light of Statistical Linguistics." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87: 30-55.
- Reddit, Paul L. 1994. "Nehemiah's First Mission and the Date of Zechariah 9-14." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56: 664-678.
- Redditt, Paul L. 2012. *Zechariah 9-14*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. 1993. *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. 1976. *Haggai - Sacharja 1-8 - Sacharja 9-14 - Maleachi*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher.
- Seebass, Horst. 1992. *Herrscherrverheißungen im Alten Testament*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Slawik, Jakub. 2004. *Egzegeza Starego Testamentu. Wprowadzenie do metod egzegetycznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo ChAT.
- Willy-Plein, Ina. 2014. *Deuteriosacharja XIV/7.21*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Willy-Plein, Ina. 2016. *Deuteriosacharja XIV/7.22*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Willy-Plein, Ina. 2020. *Deuteriosacharja XIV/7.23*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft.

CHRZEŚCIJAŃSKA AKADEMIA TEOLOGICZNA
w WARSZAWIE

Rok LXVI

Zeszyt 2

ROCZNIK TEOLOGICZNY

[E-WYDANIE]

WARSZAWA 2024

REDAGUJE KOLEGIUM

dr hab. Jakub Sławik, prof. ucz. – redaktor naczelny

dr hab. Jerzy Ostapczuk, prof. ucz. – zastępca redaktora naczelnego

prof. dr hab. Tadeusz J. Zieliński

dr hab. Borys Przedpełski, prof. ucz.

dr hab. Jerzy Sojka, prof. ucz. – sekretarz redakcji

MIĘDZYNARODOWA RADA NAUKOWA

JE metropolita prof. dr hab. Sawa (Michał Hrycuniak), ChAT

abp prof. dr hab. Jerzy Pańkowski, ChAT

bp prof. ucz. dr hab. Marcin Hintz, ChAT

prof. dr hab. Atanolij Aleksiejew, Państwowy Uniwersytet w Petersburgu

prof. dr Marcello Garzaniti, Uniwersytet we Florencji

prof. dr hab. Michael Meyer-Blanck, Uniwersytet w Bonn

prof. dr hab. Antoni Mironowicz, Uniwersytet w Białymstoku

prof. dr hab. Wiesław Przyczyna, Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie

prof. dr hab. Eugeniusz Sakowicz, Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego
w Warszawie

prof. dr hab. Tadeusz Stegner, Uniwersytet Gdański

prof. dr Urs von Arx, Uniwersytet w Bernie

prof. dr hab. Piotr Wilczek, Uniwersytet Warszawski

Redakcja językowa – Kalina Wojciechowska
Korekta tekstów angielskich – Karen Wasilewska
Skład komputerowy – Jerzy Sojka

BWHEBB, BWHEBL, BWTRANSH [Hebrew]; BWGRKL, BWGRKN, and BWGRKI [Greek]
PostScript® Type 1 and TrueType fonts Copyright ©1994-2013 BibleWorks, LLC.
All rights reserved. These Biblical Greek and Hebrew fonts are used with permission
and are from BibleWorks (www.bibleworks.com)

eISSN: 2956-5685

Wydawnictwo Naukowe ChAT
ul. Broniewskiego 48, 01-771 Warszawa, tel. +48 22 635-68-55
Objętość ark. wyd.: 15,5.

SPIS TREŚCI

ARTYKUŁY

- ANDRZEJ P. KLUCZYŃSKI, *History of the Formation of the Book of Zechariah 9-11* 211
- JAKUB ŚLAWIK, *Porneia (πορνεία) in Acts 15:20.29; 21:25. The meaning and origin of the theme of fornication in the apostolic decree* 237
- *JAKUB ŚLAWIK, *Porneia (πορνεία) w Dz 15,20.29; 21,25. Znaczenie i pochodzenie motywu rozpusty w dekreście apostołskim*..... *7
- GRZEGORZ OLEK, *Motto J.A. Bengela jako rodzaj przedmowy do Novum Testamentum Graece. Interpretacja krytyczna*..... 299
- RAFAŁ MARCIN LESZCZYŃSKI, *Origen's exegetical method and the Catechetical Schools of Alexandria and Caesarea* 321
- *RAFAŁ MARCIN LESZCZYŃSKI, *Metoda egzegetyczna Orygenesesa a szkoły katechetyczne w Aleksandrii i Cezarei* *69
- VIVIANA NOSILIA, *Kiedy adwersarz polemiczny nie boi się Boga i nie wstydzi się ludzi: obraz przeciwnika w „Lithosie” (1644)* 341
- MAREK ŁAWRESZUK, *Prawosławna teologia polityczna i politologia – charakterystyka z perspektywy doktryny prawosławnej*..... 373

RECENZJE

- Е. Дикова “Ритъм и наратив. Календарните двустиишия на Христофор Митиленски и техните южнославянски преводи”.
София: Институт за балканистика с Център по тракология,
Българска академия на науките, 2023. 526 с.
ISBN 978-619-7179-42-2 (МАРИНА ЧИСТЯКОВА)..... 419
- Wykaz autorów 427

*Teksty oznaczone gwiazdką zawarte są wyłącznie w E-Wydaniu.

Contents

ARTICLES

- ANDRZEJ P. KLUCZYŃSKI, *History of the Formation of the Book of Zechariah 9-11* 211
- JAKUB SLAWIK, *Porneia (πορνεία) in Acts 15:20.29; 21:25. The meaning and origin of the theme of fornication in the apostolic decree* 237
- *JAKUB SLAWIK, *Porneia (πορνεία) in Acts 15:20.29; 21:25. The meaning and origin of the theme of fornication in the apostolic decree (polish version)* *7
- GRZEGORZ OLEK, *J.A. Bengels Motto as a kind of introduction to the Novum Testamentum Graecae. A critical interpretation* 299
- RAFAL MARCIN LESZCZYŃSKI, *Origen's exegetical method and the Catechetical Schools of Alexandria and Caesarea* 321
- *RAFAL MARCIN LESZCZYŃSKI, *Origen's exegetical method and the Catechetical Schools of Alexandria and Caesarea (polish version)* *69
- VIVIANA NOSILIA, *When the polemic opponent does not fear God and feels no shame before people: the image of the adversary in "Lithos"* 341
- MAREK ŁAWRESZUK, *Orthodox Political Theology and Politology – Characteristics from the Perspective of Orthodox Doctrine* 373

REVIEWS

- E. Dikova "Rhythm and Narration: The Calendar Distichs of Christopher of Mytilene and Their South Slavonic Translations". Sofia: Institute of Balkan Studies with Center for Thracology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 2023. 526 p. ISBN 978-619-7179-42-2 (MARINA ČISTIÁKOVÁ) 419
- List of authors 427

*Texts marked with an asterisk are available only in the E-Edition.

Wykaz autorów

Andrzej P. Kluczyński, a.kluczynski@chat.edu.pl, Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna w Warszawie, ul. Władysława Broniewskiego 48, 01-771 Warszawa

Jakub Ślawik, j.slawik@chat.edu.pl, Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna w Warszawie, ul. Władysława Broniewskiego 48, 01-771 Warszawa

Grzegorz Olek, g.olek@chat.edu.pl, Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna w Warszawie, ul. Władysława Broniewskiego 48, 01-771 Warszawa

Rafał Marcin Leszczyński, r.leszczynski@chat.edu.pl, Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna w Warszawie, ul. Władysława Broniewskiego 48, 01-771 Warszawa

Viviana Nosilia, viviana.nosilia@unipd.it, Via E. Vendramini, 13, 35137 Padova, Włochy

Marek Ławreszuk, m.lawreszuk@uwb.edu.pl, Katedra Teologii Prawosławnej Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, ul. Ludwika Zamenhofa 15, 15-435 Białystok, Polska