

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1920

SPIRITIST THEOLOGIANS

Theologians have rarely been very popular persons, while they lived, and of late years have been very unpopular. After they were dead,—using the word in its ordinary sense,—some of them have become more popular and gained a fame, wide and lasting, in inverse ratio to their former infamy. Now there is arising among us a new order of theologians at present very popular, who derive their popularity from the fact that they are either dead,—still using the word in the ordinary sense,—or consider themselves to be so related to the dead that they can speak for them, become their amanuenses, see to the publication of their posthumous books, and act in a general managerial capacity for them. Thus the dead in a very realistic sense are now speaking (so it is believed) not as having joined

the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence

but as claiming to revisit the glimpses of the moon, visibly and audibly. Miss Agnes Repplier has with inimitable grace and wit complained to her large circle of admiring readers of “the determined intrusion” of “Dead Authors” who “force an entrance into our congested literary world competing with living scribblers.”¹ It must now be added that the spirits have taken to teaching and lecturing on theology using their agents among the living as partners or organs. They announce their presence by apparitions in haunted houses and elsewhere, by sitting, or standing, for their photographs, usually quite uninvited, by showing

¹ *Atlantic Monthly*, August, 1918.

THE RECLOTHING AND CORONATION OF JOSHUA

Zechariah iii and vi

The clothing anew of the high priest, and the words that were spoken to him on that occasion, as shown in vision, and his coronation, set forth by the prophet Zechariah in a symbolical act, are not doubtful of meaning. Apart from a few details, the teaching is plain. Vision and symbol come at the culmination of prophecy concerning the Messiah, for whom Branch was a recognized name (Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15), and my servant a title of distinction given of late to the lawful king of David's line (Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24, xxxvii. 24, 25; comp. Ps. cxxxii. 10, 17, Hag. ii. 23). In the vision Joshua the high priest is stripped of foul raiment, clad in clean garments, and provided with a clean mitre; and Jehovah retains him in office on condition of obedience, and addresses him, saying, "Thou and thy fellows are typical,¹ for lo! I am bringing my servant Branch; and I have set a stone before Joshua, and I will engrave the graving thereof, and I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day" (Zech. iii). And this vision is followed presently by the significant act of placing not a mitre, but a crown on the head of the high priest. The

¹ The priests are not said to be witnesses ('*edim*) or a testimony ('*eduth*), not an earnest or pledge ('*erabon* and "*arubbah*"); but a *morpheth*. This word is defined by Brown, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 68 f, abridged, thus: 1. *Wonder*, as special display of God's power; 2. *sign* or *token* of future event, 1 Kin. 13:3, 35; *symbolic act* Is. 20:3, Ezek. 12:6, 11; 24:24, 27; cf. Zech. 3:8, *men who serve as a symbol or sign.*" The names of his two children, and of Isaiah himself, embodied the ideas of his prophecies, epitomized his teaching; in their persons also they were symbols of things to come (Isa. viii. 18); they were "signs and wonders." The peculiar deeds done before the people by Isaiah (Isa. xx. 3, "signs and wonders") and Ezekiel (Ezek. xii. 6, 11, xxiv. 24, 27) were typical, and are explained in the context to be typical, of what the future had in store. There is an inner relation between sign and thing signified, between symbol and the thing symbolized.

prophet is directed to set crowns, or a composite crown, on Joshua's head, and say to him in Jehovah's name, "Lo! a man, Branch by name, he, even he shall build the temple of Jehovah;"² and he, he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne, and shall be priest upon his throne (or possibly, on his [Jehovah's] right hand; cp. the Greek text), and counsel of peace shall be between them both." Especially in the coronation scene do expositors of various critical schools see Messiah the priest-king evidently set forth in the words as transmitted.³

² The true temple: the community, the people of Jehovah (Dillmann, *Numeri*, S. 66, Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 448, A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 443, Köhler, *Weissagungen Sacharjas*, S. 207, and others who understand the Branch to be a different person from Zerubbabel). The "house" of Jehovah had already been used in this higher spiritual sense, Num. xii. 7, Jer. xii. 7, Hos. viii. 1, ix. 15. (Calvin, Wünsche, Keil, von Orelli, and others; and in Numbers xii. 7 Dillmann, Baentsch, Gray); Jehovah's land (Hitzig, Nowack, Cheyne, Marti, van Hoonacker, on Hosea; and in Jeremiah and Hosea Giesebrecht, Duhm, Cornill); also Graf, who says, "The people Israel, or rather the land occupied by this people" (on Jer. xii. 7); Jehovah's land in the sense of the state (Hitzig-Steiner on Hos. viii. 1); not the bare land itself, but the household of God erected on it (von Orelli). If the "temple" of Jehovah is used now for the first time in this spiritual sense, the occasion for that use had come. The contrast between the great work of the Messiah and the work which Zerubbabel was doing on the material temple called it into use. It obtained wide currency later.

³ According to Reuss, Joshua "steht aber hier nur als das Vorbild des künftigen Hohenpriesters, des Messias (Spross)"; but Reuss, perhaps with Ewald's reconstruction of the text in mind adds, "Oder fehlt ein ganzes Stück im Text und ist die eine Krone für Serubbabel, da anscheinend Priester und Herrscher geschieden werden und zwischen ihnen Eintracht sein soll?" (*Das Alte Testament: die Propheten*). "The Messiah, named Branch, . . . will unite in his crown the royal and priestly offices, for he will sit on his throne as priest" (Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 448). That the union of the kingly and priestly offices in the Branch is taught in the text transmitted in vi. 9-15 is tacitly admitted by the assertion that the form of statement is due to an editor who changed the text to agree with the conditions of his own day, when the royal authority was actually vested in the high priest: thus, "Der Diaskeuast trug den Verhältnissen Rechnung, wie sie sich tatsächlich gestalteten: der Priester wurde das Haupt der Theokratie, nicht der Davidide" (Wellhausen); and similarly van Hoonacker, "Plus tard, à une époque où les circon-

Expositors are not lacking, however, who obtain an interpretation in which no allusion is made to the priestly office of the Messiah. Usually this result has been attained by altering the text either of one or both prophecies at crucial points. Thus, in chap. vi, after the words "make crowns and set [them] on the head of Joshua, the son of Jehozadak, the high priest," Eichhorn and Ewald⁴ add to the text a further statement "and on the head of Zerubabel." Having inserted these words Ewald entitles the prophetic transaction, "Two crowns for the two leaders, as signs of their future Messianic glory." The address of the prophet (verse 12f) is accordingly made to Zerubabel, the higher official of the two, and Joshua is not alluded to until the words "and shall be priest," in verse 13, are reached, which Ewald renders "and there shall be a priest."⁵

Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, and other members of the same critical school, instead of adding to the Hebrew text, excise the latter part of verse 11, omitting the

stances avaient fait du grand prêtre le chef, en droit, de la nation juive, même dans l'ordre politique (une situation qu'il n'occupait point durant le premier siècle après le retour de l'exil, ni même probablement avant la période grecque), on trouva opportun de ne pas laisser la couronne déposée devant Jehoschoua, mais de la lui faire porter, comme insigne de la souveraineté." Duhm, who gives the preference to Ewald's theory regarding the original form of the text, says that the loss of the words "and on the head of Zerubbabel" from verse 11 is perhaps due not to an oversight, but to an intentional omission, made say at the time when the 110th Psalm was composed (*Theologie der Propheten*, p. 322, Anm. 1).

⁴ Eichhorn, *Die hebräischen Propheten*, 1819, S.354; Ewald, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1828, S.357.

⁵ Hitzig also proceeds on the theory that crowns are contemplated for two persons. He does not lay violent hands on the text itself, but mentally supplies "one of them," instead of "them," in verse 11, so as to make the thought to be "set [one of them] on the head of Joshua." The other crown is intended for the Messiah, to confirm the hope of his speedy appearance. Mentally to supply "one of them" is, however, itself an arbitrary interpretation. The object can be omitted after a verb when it is the same as the object of the preceding verb (Gen. ii. 19).

words, "and set [them] upon the head of Joshua, the son of Jehozadak, the high priest." Next, in verse 12, they alter "him" to "them," and they recommend the insertion of Joshua in verse 13, so as to read, "and Joshua shall be priest." Other changes which they make are minor, and negligible. When these alterations have been made in the text, nobody is represented as actually crowned; but a crown is made out of the gifts brought by three men from Babylon, made for Zerubbabel (he is the Branch), and laid up in the temple as a memorial. The address is spoken to the three men, and declares that Zerubbabel shall build the temple (comp. iv. 9f), and peaceful relations shall exist between him and Joshua.

Far less involved is the alteration of the text suggested and adopted by van Hoonacker, who substitutes "before" for "on the head of," לפני for בראש, in vi. 11, after the analogy of iii. 9. By this one change the text is freed from allusion to a union of the kingly and priestly offices in one person.

The text of chap. iii. 8 also is sometimes altered. Marti, and following him Mitchell, omit the words, "for (or that) I will bring my servant Shoot" or Branch. The clause is deleted as a gloss, not because the words are wanting in the ancient versions, for they are not, but on the ground (1) of "the original teaching" of chapter vi, when the text of that chapter has been recast by the omissions and alterations made by Wellhausen, and (2) because "there is no place for him," the Shoot, i.e., Zerubbabel, in chapter iii, at all. The prophet is there "dealing with the priesthood and its significance. The Shoot represents political power and glory." With that clause omitted, there is no reference to the priests as typical of the Branch. "The idea seems to be that these men, the priests as a class, are prophetic of good to the community they are serving" (Mitchell); they are "the guarantee of a happy future" (Marti).

The ancient versions, however, attest the transmitted text at all crucial points. Not theoretical reconstruction

of the text, therefore, but interpretation has the prior claim. Distinguished leaders in the school of Ewald in later days have returned to this method, rejecting the reconstruction proposed by the founder of the school, and retaining the transmitted text. Why, then, was the crown placed on the head of the high priest? Dillmann states the matter substantially thus: Zerubbabel was Jehovah's anointed, of the house of David, it is true; and his work, it was hoped, represented the first step in the fulfilment of the promises. But the Anointed of Jehovah, the Messiah, the Branch, is yet to come (iii. 8). He will bring the kingdom to completion, and will rule over it as king; and between king and priest there will be perfect harmony. The Branch is the coming king, not Zerubbabel; and the crowns are placed on the high priest's head, not on Zerubbabel's, lest it might seem that Zerubbabel should be proclaimed the Messiah; but, being placed on the high priest's head, the misunderstanding could not arise.⁶ On the other hand Riehm sees the priesthood of the Messiah symbolically proclaimed in the act. The coronation of the high priest typifies the Branch as priest-king; not that the Branch shall execute the priest's office and make atonement for his people, but only that he shall be the head and representative of a priestly nation, cleansed from sin and holy ([Ex. xix. 6, Isa. lxi. 6]). The offices of king and priest are not united in one person.⁷ In an important particular these two expositions lack grammatical support. To carry out their interpretations both Dillmann and Riehm are obliged to render verse 13 "and there shall be a priest on his throne," whereas the co-ordination of the verbs indicates that the true rendering is "and he shall be priest on his throne" (or, "on his [Jehovah's] right hand," as in Ps. cx). The clause is the last of the co-ordinated series, which begins with the emphatic pronoun of the third person, expressed

⁶ Dillmann, *Handbuch der Alttestamentlichen Theologie*, S. 538.

⁷ Riehm, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, S. 332; *Messianische Weissagung*, 1875, S.187; second edition, English translation, 1891, p. 285.

independently of the verb. The structural change, breaking the co-ordination, occurs in the clause that follows, and is marked by the order in which the words are placed.

Still another method has been adopted in dealing with these prophecies. Without altering the Hebrew text of either vision or symbolical action, a meaning much similar to that obtained by the various reconstructions of the text is gotten by a rearrangement of the text aided by interpretation. By adopting this latter method Dr. W. Emery Barnes, Hulsean Professor of Divinity at the University of Cambridge, in editing anew the commentary on Haggai and Zechariah for the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, 1917, has completely revolutionized the exposition of these prophecies which was given by the Ven. T. T. Perowne in the earlier commentary, published in 1890. The text that follows after chap. ii is arranged in this sequence: "iv. 1-6a (As far as, *Then he answered and spake unto me, saying,*); 10b-14 (Beginning, *These seven are the eyes of the Lord*); 6b-10a (Beginning, *This is the word of the Lord, and ending, the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel*); iii. 1-9a (Ending, *saith the Lord of hosts*); vi. 9-15a (Ending, *hath sent me unto you*); v. 1-11; iii. 9b, 10 (Beginning, *and I will remove*); vi. 1-8" (page 39). According to the exposition that is given of these prophecies, facilitated by the rearrangement of the material, but not in every case dependent upon it, these prophecies are concerned largely with the conflicting claims, or the danger of conflicting claims, of the high priest and the civil governor. Thus the two olive trees (iv. 1-6a) represent Joshua and Zerubbabel, the two leaders of the Jewish people. "Both have the glory of standing by the Lord of the whole earth (verse 14), but it is Zerubbabel who is to be (like Solomon) the Temple-builder. He has begun the work, and he (so runs the word of Jehovah) shall finish it" (verse 9). There is honor "for both governor and high priest, but the first place is for Zerubbabel. The prophet [Zecha-

riah] is jealous for the house of David" (p. 44). "The words [of iv. 6b, '*Not by an army nor by power, but by my spirit*'] are a caution to Zerubbabel not to attempt to restore the kingdom to Judah with the help of the sword" (p. 46). The acquittal of Joshua (iii. 1-5) "represents Jehovah's renewed acceptance of the priesthood," but "there is yet Another who is destined by the LORD to stand above the high priest. Joshua must acknowledge the higher claims of him whom Jehovah designates as 'my servant the Shoot'" (verse 8), namely Zerubbabel, to whom is given "the quasi-Messianic title, 'the Shoot'" (p. 39f). Again the prophet teaches (vi. 9-15) that "Zerubbabel the prince is to rebuild the Temple which Solomon the king originally erected: Zerubbabel was to be the unquestioned head of the Jewish people. But Joshua the priest was to receive his share of honor. So Zechariah takes the opportunity of the presentation of the gifts of the household of Zephaniah to pay homage to Joshua. He puts upon his head a crown or chaplet of honor," thus completing "the clothing of the high priest with his distinctive dress (begun in iii. 4, 5)" (p. 56). "At the same time he reminds him that he is priest only, and not prince. His duty is to stand by the throne of another and to assist the man of the Lord's choice, whose title is the Shoot. Only a scion of the house of David (Zerubbabel) can be head of the nation" (p. 55). "A cleansing judgment must overtake the sinners within the Jewish community" (v. 1-4), in the near future or even in the present time. Its guilt, moreover, shall be removed, taken to the land of Shinar, and assigned in permanence to Judah's great enemy, Babylon (pp. 48-51); and God "will search out (literally 'feel') the iniquity of that land in one day" (iii. 9b). "The language . . . is purposely vague, probably because it was not safe to 'talk politics' in the days of the terrible Darius, but the Jews would understand the promise, 'I will *feel* the iniquity of *that land*' to mean, 'I will punish the iniquity of Babylon'" (p. 44). The final vision (vi. 1-8) reveals that "Jehovah himself

will take vengeance on the nations which have oppressed Judah; cp. iv. 6." "Guardian spirits are appointed for Judah; and avenging spirits go to execute punishment upon Babylon" (pp. 52f). Such is the result of rearrangement and interpretation. How jejune it is! How far short it falls of the program of good to Zion outlined in the introductory vision (i. 7-17)! How bitterly disappointing are these visions of petty human jealousy and personal rivalries, actual or threatening, to the high expectations which the introductory vision awakened of Zion's glory!

In the book of Zechariah, according to the theory propounded, the prophecies are in sad confusion. How came they into such disorder? The answer given to this question is the bold assumption that the visions and messages that came to the prophet were not written down either when received or immediately after delivery to the people, but probably the prophet treasured them for a time in his memory, and repeated them to his disciples in no particular order, haphazard, "here a little and there a little," "as occasion served." "His words would be committed to writing by his disciples perhaps before his death, perhaps after it." From these premises the conclusion is drawn that "most probably the present arrangement of his prophecies follows neither the simple order of time, nor the logical order of subjects." (pp. 37f). These assumptions do not represent the critical view. In current opinion Zechariah wrote his prophecies. That he may have allowed them to remain unwritten for a time, but treasured them in his memory, and drew upon them in his public discourse as occasion offered, is indeed possible. The prophet Hosea perhaps did not commit his teaching to writing till toward the close of his life; yet his book was his own composition. According to this analogy the book of Zechariah would be his own, and its arrangement his own. The theory that it was left to the disciples of Zechariah to

cherish his words, gather the fragments of his discourse from sentiments of love and piety, throw them together in wild confusion, and publish them without his supervision, is not "according to analogy." It was not the manner of the prophets. Jeremiah dictated his to an amanuensis (Jer. xxxvi. 2, 4, 18, 32); Habakkuk was told to write his (Hab. ii. 2.); Ezekiel seems to have written his (Ezek. i. 1, 4 et passim). Why not Zechariah too (cp. i. 8f, vii. 4, viii. 18)?

The proposed rearrangement and interpretation are confronted by exegetical difficulties at several crucial points. It is quite forced to interpret Jehovah's charge (iii. 7) to be a command to Joshua to be faithful "to the house of David represented now by the man called 'the Shoot'" (p. 42). For 1. The vision in iii. 1-9a has to do with the cleansing of the high priest from the pollution of sin, and when cleansed he is admonished to walk in Jehovah's ways and keep Jehovah's charge, (in a word, to go and sin no more), and he is promised on that condition his continuance in office. The high priest judged, i. e., governed the temple and directed its services. Joshua is conditionally promised these very honors and duties. Thus, "the promise is personal to him as high priest" (Mitchell). 2. To keep the charge denotes the faithful performance of the duties belonging to each person in his official capacity: to the king (1 Kin. ii. 3), the priest (Lev. viii. 35, Ezek. xl. 45, xlv. 15f), the Levite (Num. iii. 7, 25-38), Israel as the people of God (Deut. xi. 1, Mal. iii. 14), the laity (2 Chron. xxiii. 6). Here the vision concerns Joshua the high priest. He is charged to be faithful to his duty as high priest over the house of God. The explanation that the charge refers to "faithfulness to the house of David represented by the man called 'the Shoot'" is foreign to the passage.

"Thy fellows that sit before thee," who are mentioned in chap. iii. 8, are not "the exiles returned from Babylon," "referred to in vi. 14" (p. 42). Even on the rearrange-

ment of the text, the men spoken of in vi. 10 and 14 have not yet been mentioned by the prophet. "There can be no doubt that the persons here called the fellows, or companions, of Joshua are his associates in the priesthood" (Mitchell; so Wellhausen and commentators of all critical schools). They were accustomed to sit before him in conference to receive instructions; just as the prophet Samuel stood as head over the rank and file of the prophets, and as the prophets sat before Elisha, and the elders sat before Ezekiel (1 Sam. xix. 20, 2 Kin. iv. 38, Ezek. viii. 1, xiv 1.). It is as priests that Joshua and his fellows are typical.

The latter part of verse 9 of chap. iii. speaks of "that land." Professor Barnes transfers this part of the verse and places it after chap. v. verse 11, at the end of the vision that pictures Wickedness imprisoned and removed to the land of Shinar; so that the antecedent of "that land" is the land of Shinar. In the third vision, from which the sentence is separated, no particular land has been mentioned. It does not need to be. In Jer. iii. 1 "that land" is mentioned, but none is named. The antecedent is implied; that land where the people dwell who are spoken of, who do the deeds described. In Zech. iii. 9 there is even less need that an antecedent be expressed in the words that immediately precede. For the holy land is in all minds. It is prominent in the second vision (i. 21); and the third vision reaches a conclusion in the promise that "Jehovah shall inherit Judah as his portion in the holy land, and shall yet choose Jerusalem" (ii. 12). And not only is the land of God's people in all minds, but in this fourth vision, chap. iii, the revelation concerns Joshua the high priest [of Judah] and Branch [the king of Judah], and concludes with the promise that God will take away the iniquity of "that land." It requires no mental effort to perceive what land is meant.

There is another objection to transferring this sentence from iii. 9 to a place after the mention of the land of

Shinar (v. 11), namely the meaning of the verb. The verb means remove or, from a different root, feel. It can have the former meaning in this new position (after v. 11) only if it be allowed to have as its antecedent the land referred to, not in v. 11, but in v. 3, namely the land given to God's people, and which is known as the holy land. The latter sense is not appropriate after v. 11; for the verb nowhere means search out, bring to light, by feeling, but seek information by feeling (Gen. xxvii. 12, 21, 22), seek to find by feeling (Gen. xxxi. 34f, 37, Piel); and the iniquity of the land of Shinar did not need to be groped for, felt for. It cried to heaven.

The paragraph iv. 6b-10a does indeed "promise success to Zerubbabel"; but there is not the least whisper of a warning to Zerubbabel against attempting "to restore the kingdom to Judah with the help of the sword," nor is there the slightest ground for the suggestion that the prophet probably "knew of secret movements towards rebellion in which Judah might be involved." The words of verse 6 are a reminder to Zerubbabel of the truth that success in one's work depends on the Spirit of God. The "success promised" to him is explicitly stated to be in the first instance success in his efforts to rebuild the temple (verse 9f).⁸

⁸ The olive branches (Zech. iv. 12) are not specifically mentioned in the general description (verses 2 and 3); but particulars are not always mentioned in the general description of a vision or allegory. Verse 12 belongs to the transmitted text, and Barnes retains it. There is no need to mutilate the text, as some do, or to change the order. The meaning is clear.

The words addressed to Zerubbabel in verse 6 are a statement of fact. The light of the community burns, feebly no doubt for it was a day of small things; but the light burns because, as shown in vision, two olive trees, two "sons of oil," producers of oil (verse 14) are growing beside the lampstand and from their branches are emptying oil, a constant emblem of the divine Spirit, into the spouts; an unailing source of supply, provided by the God of nature and grace, independent of men. And the prophet is taught the meaning: not by force of arms or might, or power of man; but by the Spirit of God. Such is the encouraging fact. The light will keep burning; and first of all Zerubbabel's efforts, in the face of a mountain

The coronation of the high priest, vi. 9-15, is placed after iii. 1-9a, and the remark is made that "the clothing of the high priest with his distinctive dress (begun in iii. 4, 5) is completed according to the law of Exod. xxix. 6" by putting a golden plate or diadem on the mitre; and "the symbolic action of crowning Joshua is of the nature of a reassurance. Joshua shall hold a place of high honor, yet not he but another is Jehovah's servant charged with the duty and honor of rebuilding the temple." The latter "shall be chief ruler, and Joshua is to be priest beside his throne" (pp. 56f). Three obstacles lie athwart this interpretation of the prophecy: 1. The raiment of the high priest is not explicitly completed anywhere in these prophecies. The ephod and breastplate, essential parts of the official garments of the high priest, are not specified when his clothing is mentioned (iii. 4, 5), and there was no need to specify the golden plate when the mitre was mentioned. In each case the general term includes the particulars. 2. On Joshua's head is placed a crown (*'atarah*); the high priest wore a mitre, and on the mitre a diadem (*neser*, Ex. xxxix. 30f). 3. The diadem of the high priest was not made of two metals, silver and gold, as was the crown that was placed on the head of Joshua. It was simply a plate of pure gold, fastened by cords on the front of the mitre (Ex. xxviii. 36, xxix. 30, Lev. viii. 9). The composite crown, therefore, which the prophet is commanded to make, would not complete the holy attire of the high priest as prescribed by law. Being different from the priestly diadem, it introduces a new feature of some kind, symbolizes something new in the significance of the high priest.

In vi. 13 the translation "and there shall be a priest

of difficulties, to rebuild the temple will be crowned with success. The beginning may seem small; but the sight of the plummet in Zerubbabel's hand has gladdened these seven, the eyes of Jehovah which take note of all things everywhere (iii. 9, 2 Chron. xvi. 9, Rev. v. 6).

beside his throne," is objectionable from the standpoint of syntax. The rendering given in the text of the A. V. and the R. V., "and he shall be" is indicated as the meaning of the prophet by the co-ordination of the verbs. The change of subject takes place in the next announcement by the prophet, and is indicated in the Hebrew text by placing the new subject, "counsel of peace," before its verb.

Such is the latest attempt to unfold the meaning of the visions of Zechariah and the symbolical act which he was directed to perform. The words of the prophet have been kept entire, not one of them has been allowed to fall, only transposed and newly explained; but the theory that is offered to justify rearrangement is wilful, because lacking support, and in the exegesis glaring faults appear.

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.