

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

*THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN "JOEL" IN  
THEIR BEARING ON THE QUESTION OF DATE.*

THE question of the date of Joel has been reopened in England by Prof. Kirkpatrick,<sup>1</sup> who, unlike recent English critics, regards the prophecy as early. At the same time, he is with them in admitting that, if Joel was not written in the 9th century (and to be more precise, during the minority of King Joash, 2 Kings xi. f.), it must be post-exilic. This important point of agreement,—the reasons for which need not be restated here, since they can easily be found in the works of Prof. Kirkpatrick, W. R. Smith (*Encyc. Brit.*, art. "Joel"), A. B. Davidson (EXPOSITOR, 1888—3rd series, vol. vii., pp. 208 ff.), and Driver (*Introduction*, pp. 290 ff.)—will form the basis of the present discussion; for it is only by the recognition of this agreement that the argument from parallel passages can become really effective. But there are other evidences which, in the light of this agreement, acquire fresh force; a brief reconsideration of these will make this point clear, and will indicate how the argument from the parallels contributes to the whole cumulative proof.

The chief evidence is that which is drawn from the social and religious conditions reflected in the book. Passing over points of agreement, it will be enough here to re-discuss what continue to be points of disagreement.

1. The references to the surrounding nations.

Egypt, Edom, Philistia, Phœnicia appear as enemies of Judah; the first three are known to have been hostile previous to the reign of Joash; that Phœnicia was also hostile is possible enough, though the fact is not mentioned even at 2 Chronicles xxi. 16. While, however, such references would thus be intelligible in a writing of the 9th

<sup>1</sup> In his valuable work on the *Doctrine of the Prophets* (1892).

century, they would be little, if at all, less intelligible<sup>1</sup> in one of post-exilic origin. On the other hand the mention of the sons of the Greeks (iv.<sup>2</sup> 6) and of "all nations" (iv. 1. 2, etc.), rather than the specification of particular foes, points more to the later than the earlier date.

Turning to the more special references, we must admit that no known facts of post-exilic times *fully* explain them: explanations based on records of the earlier period are fuller but neither complete nor certain. Thus, *e.g.*, Prof. Kirkpatrick explains the reference to Edom by the war of revolt recorded in 2 Kings viii. 20-22; but he has to *assume* that at that time a massacre of innocent Israelites took place (Joel iv. 19): granted the assumption, in itself far from improbable, does a massacre during a regular war of independence justify the terms in which Joel speaks? do they not rather suggest the malignant conduct of the same nation (when independent) which is described more particularly by Obadiah, but also by Jeremiah (xlix. 7 ff.), Isaiah (xxxiv.; lxiii. 1, 7) and Malachi (i. 2 ff.). Again, the reference to the Philistines (iv. 4 ff.) is explained by 2 Chronicles xxi. 16 f.: but this narrative, even if we admit its historical accuracy, refers to a rifling of the king's house (ver. 17), Joel to a rifling of the temple (ver. 5). No satisfactory account of the terms in which Egypt and Phœnicia are referred to by Joel can be found in the records of the 9th century (Kirkpatrick, pp. 61, 62; Driver, *Introd.*, p. 291).

This argument then may be summed up thus: if Obadiah describes events of the 9th century and 2 Chronicles xxi. 16 f. is historical, then while the majority of Joel's references to the nations find fuller explanation in what is

<sup>1</sup> For the post-exilic hostility of the Philistines cf. Neh. iv. 1; Zech. ix. 5-7; of Edom, Mal. i. 2 ff. Egypt, owing to the earliest traditions, was at all times a type of hostility.

<sup>2</sup> References throughout are according to the Hebrew enumeration.

recorded of the 9th century than in what is recorded of the 5th (or subsequent) centuries, and none can be said to be absolutely incompatible with the former, all the references agree with what is known as to the *general* circumstances of the post-exilic period, and one ("the sons of the Greeks") is by that period much more satisfactorily accounted for. At best the balance is but slightly in favour of the early date, and in the opinion of many not at all.

2. The references to the internal condition of the country.

That these excellently suit the post-exilic period is admitted by Reuss, himself an advocate of the early date. He sums them up thus: "The Jews are already scattered throughout the world (iv. 2): they have no king but only elders (i. 2. 14); city and temple exist, but in the midst only of a quite small territory throughout which the trumpet can be heard when it is blown in Jerusalem (ii. 1. 15). The cultus is the chief concern and special attention is paid to fasting (i. 14; ii. 12. 15). Moreover no particular charges are made against the people; nothing is said of idolatry or the high places as in the time of Amos or Hosea."<sup>1</sup> Here then is a condition of affairs which actually existed after the exile, each of the facts finding a natural, complete and satisfactory explanation in the *known* circumstances of that time; on the other hand, to harmonize the facts with the earliest period, assumptions—in some cases probable, in others improbable—have to be made. Two illustrations will suffice to make this clear.

(a) Chap. iv. 1 ff. Adopting the 9th century origin of Joel, Prof. Kirkpatrick has to explain these verses thus: "The dispersion of Israel among the nations . . . is not the deportation of the people *en masse* by its Assyrian and

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften* (A.T.), 2nd ed. p. 260. In two or three cases I have added references to justify particular statements. The significance of ii. 1. 15 is increased by comparing Jer. iv. 5.

Babylonian conquerors, but, as the context shows, the sale of captives to distant nations, vers. 6, 7." But does this satisfactorily account for the words, "I will gather all nations, and I will plead with them there *for my people and for my heritage Israel whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land.*" It is surely more probable to explain them as a reference to the captivity of the whole people than as one to a mere sale of captives, extensive as this at times may have been (cf. Amos i. 6). Again, a forced interpretation of "my land" at the end of the quotation is necessitated by the assumption of an early date; naturally it means the territory permanently possessed by Jehovah's people; here it would only indicate the additional country conquered by preceding monarchs, but in the reign of Jehoram won back again by the neighbouring nations. In any case the term  $\text{קִלְקַל}$  contains a considerable metaphorical element, but as a metaphor it exactly describes the settlement, during the exile, of the surrounding peoples over the deserted country.

(b) The prominence given to the cultus *might* be accounted for in a writing of the time of Joash, by the priestly regency of Jehoiada: but the narrative of 2 Kings xii. 5 f., in which the priests appear in no very favourable light, suggests that his influence was not lasting, and therefore casts doubt on its supremacy even during his lifetime.

In these cases, therefore, and to a less extent in others, assumption is called for by a theory not of late but of early date; the records of no period completely account for every reference in Joel, but they need to make fewest assumptions in explaining the historic background as a whole, who see in Joel not a product of the 9th century, but of post-exilic times.

A similar statement may be made with regard to the linguistic argument: it has sometimes been over-stated, yet it is not devoid of force. The facts upon which it must be

based have been collected by Holzinger in the ZATW for 1889: these justify two general statements. (a) That Joel contains *several* usages, isolated instances of some of which are found in early writings, but which are frequent only later,<sup>1</sup> e.g., הַיּוֹם... (instead of הַיּוֹמִים...); דָּוִד וְיִרְמְיָהּ: the form יְרִיבָנִי to the exclusion of אֲנִיכִי. (b) That it contains words otherwise confined to the later, and, in some cases, the latest literature. These two facts in themselves scarcely warrant Holzinger's conclusion that the book *plainly* belongs to the *latest* period of O.T. literature; but they do render it improbable that it belongs to the earliest (9th century). For Joel, if early, was, as will be shown below, a popular and much read book; this being so, the hypothesis of early date requires this improbable assumption: a word (דָּוִד)—to cite a single instance—expressing the common idea of "end" is used by a widely studied author of the 9th century, disappears for five centuries (so far at least as extant literature is concerned), reappears in the latest books of the O.T. (Eccl. and Chron.), and from that time forward continues to be frequent (for in the Mishna it is common). In the case of Joel the linguistic argument is free from much of the suspicion which in some cases rightly attaches to it.

The evidence for date is becoming cumulative: granted that neither the political and social allusions nor the linguistic phenomena are absolutely incompatible with an early date, yet they are more naturally explained by a late one. I think the same can be shown to be the case with the parallel passages. Hitherto it has been the custom to discuss particular pairs of these parallels by themselves; and the discussion has thus been largely subjective. Reuss points the way to a more conclusive method: "The question fairly arises," he says, "whether

<sup>1</sup> For details and further instances *v.*, besides Holzinger's article, Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 203, 127, 505 (No. 35).

the book as a whole is calculated to give the impression of the author's incapability of writing a single line without stealing a phrase now here, now there, from the older literature" (*Gesch. der H. S.* (A. T.), 2nd ed., p. 259). In effect, therefore, he argues from the *parallels treated as a whole*, assuming that, if Joel quotes any, he quotes all the passages in question. In this assumption he is justified; for if the only alternatives are that Joel wrote before the close of the 9th or after the beginning of the 5th century, it follows that *the parallel passages contained in his book are all quoted from him or<sup>1</sup> all quoted by him*. Reuss regards the latter alternative as improbable; yet when what the former involves is correctly stated, it can scarcely seem less so. It is this: the prophecy of Joel must have been so influential that, in spite of its extreme brevity, it was quoted by an unusual number of later prophets, viz.: Amos, Isaiah (ii. 4), Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Obadiah, Ezekiel, II. Isaiah, Malachi, the author of Isaiah xiii., and also by some Psalmists. Is it easy to point to anything in the book calculated to give it this extraordinary influence? On the other hand the dependence of Joel involved in the other alternative is not so unlikely as Reuss's exaggerated remark suggests.

But the combined argument which Reuss has suggested may be made more detailed and exact, and in consequence more forcible also. For:—

1. Several of the parallels—either in their entirety or in virtue of certain words which they contain—have their affinities solely or chiefly in the later writings; this alone is significant in determining between the alternative theories. But the significance is increased when the very difference between a passage in Joel and its parallel in another book consists in a word or phrase characteristic of the later

<sup>1</sup> The possible exceptions are the parallels in Pss. xlii., lxxix., cxv. None of these exceptions materially affect the argument.

centuries. That a passage in a writer of the 9th century should differ from its parallel in a subsequent writer by the presence of a word elsewhere confined to the later literature would be strange; a single instance would not, indeed, be inexplicable in view of the scantiness of extant writings; but every additional instance—though itself not very convincing—renders the strangeness greater.

2. The variations in some of the parallels as found in Joel have other common peculiarities.

This also finds its natural explanation in the fact that Joel quotes: for that the *same* author, even when quoting from different sources, should quote with variations of the same character is natural: but that *different* authors, quoting from a common source, should follow the same method of quotation is improbable.

Both these statements must now be proved from the available data.

### I.

Parallels which have their affinities in writings of the later centuries.

- (1) כתו אתיכם לחרבות ומזמרותיכם לרמחים Joel iv. 10.  
 וכתתו חרבותם(יהם) לאתים והניתתיהם למזמרות Isa. ii. 4  
 = Mic. iv. 3.

On the inversion of the saying *v. II. A. infra*. The linguistic variation here consists of רמחים (Joel) for הניתות (Isa., Mic.). הנית is a word common to all periods; the case of רמח is different.

(a) It occurs in two early N. Israelitish narratives. Judges v. 8; 1 Kings xviii. 28.

(β) Otherwise it occurs first at the close of the 7th century, and then, with some frequency, in exilic and post-exilic writers. Thus Jer. xlvi. 4; Ezek. xxxix. 9; Num. xxv. 7 (P)<sup>1</sup>; Neh. iv. 7, 10, 15; 1 Chron. xii. 8, 24; 2 Chron. xi. 12, xiv. 7, xxv. 5, xxvi. 14.

<sup>1</sup> The present argument is weakened, though not wholly invalidated, if the



The use of רוח by Joel would therefore be perfectly intelligible if he were

(a) a northern Israelite of the 9th century.

(β) a Judahite of the 5th or subsequent century.

He was not the former, for cf. ii. 1, 15, iii. 5, iv. 1, 6, 16, 17, 20, 21.

In reference to this quotation as a whole it may be added that Zech. viii. 21 shows that the passage containing it drew attention to itself in post-exilic times.

(2) אשפך את רוחי על כל בשר Joel iii. 1, 2.

שפכתי את רוחי על בית ישראל Ezek. xxxix. 29.

One of these can hardly but be dependent on the other, for the phrase שפך את רוח is peculiar; with the suffix it is found only in these two passages: שפך רוח חן ותחנונים occurs at Zech. xii. 10; and a similar idea in the phrases אצק רוחי (Isa. xlv. 3); נתתי רוחי (Isa. xlii. 1; Ezek. xxxvii. 14), cf. ערה רוח, Isa. xxxii. 15. Otherwise the contact of the spirit with men is differently conceived, cf. צלחה רוח, and 2 Kings ii. 15.

It is however in the variation that the chief, if not the whole, evidential value of the parallel lies. Here again the phrase peculiar to Joel (כל בשר) is highly characteristic of the later literature. It is used thus, in Deuteronomy, once (v. 23); Jeremiah, 4 times; Ezekiel, 3 times; II. Isaiah, 5 times; P<sup>1</sup> 18 times; Zechariah<sup>2</sup>, once (ii. 17); Psalms (lxv., cxxxvi., cxlv.), 3 times; Job, once (xxxiv. 15); *i.e.* outside Joel it occurs first at the close of the 7th century, and then constantly down to the latest period (Ps. cxxxvi.); if therefore Joel be early, a phrase subsequently so fre-

*publication* of the Priests' Code be placed earlier than the 6th century. The following abbreviations will be used: P for Priests' Code, JE for the prophetic narratives in the Pentateuch, and H for the Law of Holiness.

<sup>1</sup> In P however the sense of the phrase is often peculiar, *i.e.* "all living things" rather than "mankind."

<sup>2</sup> In Zechariah also, כל בשר significantly occurs in a quotation (from Hab. ii. 20), replacing the כל הארץ of the original.

quent occurs once in his book, then disappears for nearly two centuries—(during which however the following authors, who "quote" from him, lived and wrote—Amos, Isaiah (ii. 4), Micah, Nahum, and Zephaniah), and then reappearing, became a favourite expression.

(3) ואל עמי ידו גורל Joel iv. 3.

ועל נכבדיה (ירושלים) ידו גורל Nah. iii. 10 = Ob. 11.

The phrase *ידו גורל* occurs nowhere else: the verb *ידה*, itself somewhat rare, is found besides only at Lam. iii. 53; Jer. i. 14; Zech. ii. 14; *i.e.* in the immediately pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic literature.

(4) למה יאמרו בנוים איה אלהיכם Joel ii. 17.

In this instance the evidence turns on the saying as a whole, which has an interesting, though in some respects a doubtful, history. The nearest parallels are Pss. lxxix. 10, cxv. 2, where, as in Joel, the sentence itself suggests that it is the heathen who use the words *איה אלהי* as a taunt; the same is implied by the context in Micah vii. 10, and Ps.<sup>1</sup> xlii. 4, 10. If Micah vii. 10 be exilic, this passage too will have its affinities entirely with the exilic or post-exilic literature (the Psalms in question being certainly late); while even if Micah vii. 10 be early, the Joel passage will still have most affinity with the later literature. It must, however, be added that the kernel of the phrase (*איה אלהי*) occurs from the earliest period downwards, and with a variety of meanings, sometimes referring to false gods (*e.g.* Deut. xxxii. 37); sometimes to Yahweh (Mal. ii. 17); cf. further the similar phrases Isa. lxiii. 11; Jer. ii. 6, 8; Job xxxv. 10.

The way in which the saying is introduced in Joel is noticeable: probably the correct translation of the preceding words—*למשל בם*—is "(that the nations) should use a taunt against them"; then the whole expression—*למה יאמרו*

<sup>1</sup> For another point of contact between Joel and Ps. xlii., cf. Joel i. 20 with Ps. xlii. 2.

יגו—may perhaps be taken as the taunt, which would consist in the heathen mockingly repeating the very words which, as the post-exilic literature suggests, were frequently used by the Jews in their appeal to God for help. But the whole expression was certainly no proverb so early as the 9th century, whatever the kernel may have been. If however only the last words constitute the taunt, then the use of the whole is awkward, and may, not unreasonably, be attributed to the fact that in that form it was running in Joel's head, *i.e.* that he quoted it.

(5) **כי חנון ורחום הוא ארך אפים ורב חסד** Joel ii. 13.

Combined with other instances, this has some significance. It occurs once in the earliest literature, Exod. xxxiv. 6 (JE), otherwise only in the post-exilic writings (Pss. lxxxvi. 15, ciii. 8, cxlv. 8; Neh. ix. 17; Jonah<sup>1</sup> iv. 2; and the first half only, 2 Chron. xxx. 9; Neh. ix. 31; Ps. cxi. 4, cxii. 4; cf. also Deut. iv. 31). The following words (ינחם על הרעד) occur in this particular connection only at Jonah iv. 2; in other connections twice in JE (Exod. xxxii. 12, 14), otherwise only in Jeremiah and later writers.

For the sake of giving full force to the argument three other (comparatively) late phrases found in parallel passages in Joel must be added,<sup>2</sup> these are (1) **וידעתם כי אני יהוה**, iv. 17; (2) **אני יי' אלהיכם**, iv. 17; (3) **אני יי' ואין עוד**, ii. 27. These will be more fully considered in another connection below.

There is practically nothing to weaken the force of this argument, *i.e.* there are no clear cases of parallels containing words or phrases used in the earlier but not in the later literature. The only points that could be cited are: (1) The use of **גוים** (Joel i. 4), perhaps connected with Amos iv.

<sup>1</sup> For another striking point of contact with Jonah cf. Joel ii. 14a with Jonah iii. 9a.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also Joel ii. 3a and Ps. 1. 3, xvii. 3 (where for תִּלְקֶה Syr. reads תִּאֲבֵל—  
 ܬܝܠܩܝܘܢ).

9. The word is found only in Joel and Amos. (2) The expressions ידה נורל (iv. 3)—found only in Nahum and Joel—and קבץ פארור (ii. 6), also only found in Nahum and Joel.

In each case the usage is too slight to admit of argument; moreover in the case of (2) it may be noted that Nahum stands about half way between the two possible periods for Joel.<sup>1</sup> At the same time the occurrence of these rare expressions in an imitative writer would be quite explicable; it would merely show a fondness for out-of-the-way expressions used in his models.

## II.

Parallels possessing (in the form used by Joel) common peculiarities.

A. Two of the passages in Joel are the reverse of the parallels in Micah (Isaiah) and the Deutero-Isaiah (Ezekiel).

(1) Joel iv. 10 = Isa. ii. 4 = Micah iv. 3. *v. supra* I. (1).

(2) Joel ii. 3. כגן ערן הארץ לפניו ואחריו מדבר שממה

Isa. li. 3 (cf. וישם מדברה כערן וערבתה כגן י')

Ezek. xxxvi. 35).<sup>2</sup>

Treated singly, it might be difficult to say which form *must* be original, but considered together the case is different; it is more probable that Joel<sup>3</sup> reversed sayings from two different writers than that two different writers took and reversed sayings from the same short work.

B. Two (three?) of the passages as they appear in Joel

<sup>1</sup> The phrase in iv. 1a (בימים ההמה ובעת ההיא) recurs only in Jeremiah xxxiii. 15, l. 4, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Necessary connection between these passages might perhaps be doubted, but it is rendered, to say the least, highly probable by the fact that Joel contains other striking parallels to Ezek. and II. Isaiah. Joel ii. 27 = Isa. xlv. 5, 17; iii. 1, 2 = Ezek. xxxix. 29; iv. 17 = Ezek. xxxix. 38, 17b = Isa. lii. 1b.

<sup>3</sup> Notice also the traces in exilic and post-exilic literature of a free criticism of proverbs and popular sayings, cf. the (probable) parody of Ps. viii. 5 (cxliv. 3) in Job vii. 17, 18, and Ezekiel's treatment of proverbs—xii. 23, xviii. 2.

consist each of two or more parts—one part reappearing in one author, another in a different one.

(1) Joel ii. 3 = Ezek. xxxvi. 35 + Isa. li. 3.

(2) Joel ii. 27 (cf. iv. 17) = Isa. xlv. 5 + (*e.g.*) Ezek. xxxix. 28 + (*e.g.*) Lev. xviii. 2, and

(3) Joel iv. 16 = Amos i. 2 + Isa. xiii. 13.

The most noticeable of these is the second—יודעתם כי—בקרוב ישראל אני ואני יהוה אלהיכם ואין עוד. If Joel is late, it is capable of easy explanation; phrases characteristic of II. Isaiah, Ezekiel, and H, impressed upon his memory by their frequency, have been combined into one. These phrases are: (*a*) יודעתם כי אני יי, Ezek. xxxix. 28 and above 50 times; *v. Driver, Introd.*, p. 279; (*β*) אני יי אלהיכם, Lev. xviii. 2, 4 and often—*id. ib.*, p. 45; (*γ*) אני יהוה ואין עוד, Isa. xlv. 5, 6, 18, 21, 22: (*a*) and (*β*) were already combined by Ezekiel, *e.g.* xxxix. 28; cf. in P, Exod. vi. 7. Occurrences in earlier books are redactional; so at least Kautzsch marks Exodus x. 2 and 1 Kings xx. 13, 28.

It is certainly conceivable that each of the authors who first made frequent use of the phrases combined in Joel's sentence, disentangled from the whole what suited their purpose, but—especially in view of other similar instances—less probable than the theory stated above. It would be additionally strange that three writers should all have borrowed their *characteristic phrases* embodying their fundamental conceptions from one and the same short work.

One other point is worthy of notice: II. Isaiah's phrase, אני יי ואין עוד is in Joel (? under the influence of H's phrase), אני יי אלהיכם ואין עוד—a form manifestly unsuitable for II. Isaiah's purpose of emphasizing the uniqueness of Yahweh, not merely as God of Israel but, as the one true God of the universe; but with Joel there could have been nothing to resist the tendency to combine phrases. This particular combination is indeed in the context suitable; for the prophet's immediate purpose is to assert that in the

future the prosperity which is to take the place of the prevailing distress will show that Yahweh in Israel's midst is their only God.

The other passages need little special notice ; of the third, however, it should be said that, if Joel be early, it does not follow that the author of Isaiah xiii. 6 had to disentangle the part he uses from the whole sentence ; he might equally have been influenced (if at all) by ii. 10. The same, indeed, should be added of Ezekiel and Joel ii. 27 ; the former might have borrowed his phrase equally well from iv. 17.

C. In two passages common to Joel and Amos—Joel iv. 16 (cf. also Jer. xxv. 30) = Amos i. 2*a*, iv. 18 = Amos ix. 13—Joel's version is more highly coloured than that of Amos. This has been frequently discussed with different conclusions (*v. Driver, Introd.*, p. 292) ; but, especially in view of other instances already adduced of parallels in Joel possessing common characteristics, it is more probable that Joel has exaggerated Amos's sentences than that Amos has toned down Joel's. As another instance Joel i. 4 (= Amos iv. 9) may be cited ; of the four terms here used for locust nowhere else do even three occur together.

D. The relation of the parallels to their respective contexts :—It has often been urged that in Joel the passages in question are " embedded in the context " (*e.g.*, Kirkpatrick, p. 64). This is a delicate point to decide, but before it can have much weight it must be shown : (*a*) that *all* the parallels are so " embedded " in the context in Joel ; (*β*) that at least some are not so embedded in the context of the other books in which they occur.

Even here consideration of the parallels taken as a whole is, if anything, against the priority of Joel. The following passages : i. 4 = Amos iv. 9, i. 15 = Isaiah xiii. 6, ii. 10 and

iv. 15=Isaiah xiii. 10, iii. 1, 2=Ezekiel xxxix. 29, iv. 3=Obadiah 11 and Nahum iii. 10, iv. 4=Obadiah 15*b*, iv. 10=Micah iv. 3 (Is. ii. 4), iv. 17=Ezekiel xxxix. 28, iv. 18=Amos ix. 13, seem equally suitable to their respective contexts in Joel and elsewhere.

Only in one case (iv. 16=Amos i. 2) could something be said in favour of Joel's priority; the passage, it may be said, comes abruptly at the beginning of Amos's prophecy. But on the other hand: (a) the passage stands very appropriately as an exordium in Amos; (b) the *נאות הרעים* is very suitable to the shepherd prophet. Again, against the originality of the passage in Joel we note that (a) the scene of the theophany is the *עמק ירושפט* (iv. 2, 12): the *מציון* of iv. 16 seems therefore to be unsuitable, and points to the phrase being borrowed; and (b) the order in verses 15 and 16 (physical portents—15: divine activity—16*a*: physical portents—16*b*) suggests dependence: in a freshly conceived scene we should expect the divine activity to be mentioned first, and all the physical portents to follow. Moreover, if Joel be late, almost the whole description in verses 15–17 is composed of reminiscences.

In the following cases something can be said against the suitability to the context in Joel as compared with the context in the other prophecies:—

(a) ii. 2=Zephaniah i. 15. In Zephaniah this comes as a climax; in Joel it anticipates ii. 10*b*, which in its turn is very suitable to the context in Isaiah xiii.

(β) ii. 3=Ezekiel xxxvi. 35; Isaiah li. 3. In Ezekiel the contrasted picture of the bright future forms a fitting conclusion to the scene of desolation just depicted; in Joel no mention of the extreme fertility of the land has preceded.

(γ) ii. 6=Nahum ii. 11. In Nahum "paleness of the face" forms one of a *series* of statements as to the effect of anguish on various parts of the body; in Joel it stands alone alongside of a general statement of anguish.

(δ) ii. 17, *v.* note under I. (4).

(ε) ii. 27=Isaiah xlv. 5. This could not be more embedded in any context than that in which it appears in Deutero-Isaiah; *v.* note under II. B.

(ζ) iii. 5=Obadiah 17. Here the appended words "as Yahweh said," show that the passage is quoted. As against Prof. Kirkpatrick, who places Obadiah earlier in the ninth century than Joel, this proves nothing; but if Obadiah is dated at the close of the seventh century, it is important.

These instances may or may not form a good argument in favour of a late date, but they more than outweigh anything of the kind that can be cited in favour of the contrary.

Thus the whole argument from the parallels, itself cumulative, points somewhat strongly to the same conclusion that the arguments from the historical allusions and linguistic phenomena suggested; viz., that Joel is a post-exilic writing.

This being so, it may be of interest to focus the light cast by this study of quotations on the nature of Joel's acquaintance with the earlier literature, and on the literary character of the post-exilic age.

(1) The *extent* of Joel's acquaintance with the existing Hebrew Scriptures is shown by the number of different writers whom he quotes; to wit, the JE narrative (?), Amos, (Isaiah ii. 4, or) Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Obadiah, Ezekiel, II. Isaiah (chaps. xiii., xlv., li.), and possibly, though I think not probably, some psalmists.

The most notable writers unquoted are Jeremiah and the Deuteronomist, and perhaps Isaiah. Considering the brevity of Joel's prophecy, the mere absence of direct quotation from any author in no way proves that he was unfamiliar with him, though it may suggest preferences. On the other hand, it would be a little strange that, if Joel were early, he should be quoted so often, both before and after Jeremiah (and Isaiah?) and not at all by him (them?).



(2) The *minuteness* of his acquaintance is shown by the almost unconscious way in which he sometimes quotes (cf. above under I. (4), *ad fin.* and II. B), showing that the rhythm and language of the earlier literature had largely become his own; with him quotation is not the result of laborious memorizing, but of constant reading of the older writings and habituation to their music, seen sometimes in a sentence transferred in full to his own composition, at others in a phrase woven into a sentence (cf. ii. 6), and constantly in the easy rhythm of his periods. At the same time his own later age, with its customary language, betrays itself now and again by the intrusion of words and phrases unknown to the early literature, or else by a halting sentence (cf. Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, § 68, n. 19).

Both his ideas and his words are, no doubt, largely due to his predecessors, and there is so much truth in Reuss's rhetorical question; but the thoughts and language, which he borrowed, passed through his own mind and issued from it, bearing the stamp of his own individuality.

The extent and minuteness of his acquaintance with the the earlier literature age are, therefore<sup>1</sup>, quite enough to account for what has by some been felt to be a difficulty in assigning to Joel a late date, viz., the fluency of his style, which is in striking contrast to the dull—not to say stilted—style of Haggai, and the semi-Rabbinic periods of Malachi, whose writings show few signs of linguistic or phraseological influence of the older writers.

A comparison with the style of Zechariah i.-viii. is also of interest; of this Kuenen (*Onderzoek*, § 80, 4) says: "To some extent also the purity of his (Zechariah's) language must undoubtedly be explained from his dependence on earlier models." Zechariah has more "style" than Haggai, but less fluency and fewer echoes of the earlier rhythm than

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also the style of Zechariah xii.-xiv., on which v. Driver, *Introd.*, p. 293 top).

Joel; his superiority to Haggai is due, it would seem, to a closer acquaintance than his contemporary possessed with the earlier literature; not only does he refer in general terms to the prophetic teaching (Zech. i. 4-6) but also frequently to particular statements, *e.g.*, in i. 12 to Jeremiah xxv. 11, xxix. 10; in iii. 10 to Micah iv. 4; in viii. 13b to Zephaniah iii. 16; and in viii. 21 to Isaiah ii. 3 (=Mic. iv. 2). In these passages there is little or no attempt to reproduce exactly or even approximately the rhythm of the originals; Zechariah is indeed indebted to his predecessors mainly for his ideas, and only secondarily, perhaps only unconsciously, for his style; enough, however, to render even that better than Haggai's, not enough to give it the ease which for the most part marks Joel's. His actual quotations are fewer than Joel's, though his work is almost twice as long. Moreover, the way in which he sometimes quotes only strengthens the conviction that his ear for rhythm was inferior to Joel's; cf. especially Zech. ii. 17 הס כל בשר מפני יהוה with the original in Habakkuk ii. 20 הס מפניו כל הארץ. The other most noticeable quotation is Zech. iii. 2 from Amos iv. 11.

The post-exilic prophetic authors are, therefore, from a literary point of view, of three types: the first, represented by Zechariah, had largely assimilated the ideas and in some degree the style of the older prophets, and consequently wrote plain but not inelegant Hebrew; the second, represented by Joel, were influenced by the ideas and greatly attracted by the style of their predecessors, and so wrote Hebrew, frequently possessing the vivacity and rhythm of earlier days, but now and again unconsciously admitting some characteristic of the later period; the third, represented by Haggai and Malachi, had no doubt a general acquaintance with the teaching of the prophets, but little or none with their language; their style suffers in consequence and forms the transition to the Rabbinic Hebrew.

This is of the more interest inasmuch as it establishes an analogy between the post-exilic prophetic writings and the "Wisdom" and poetical literature of the same period (cf. Cheyne, *Bampton Lecture*, p. 463); and in regard to the last it raises the question afresh: must not the authors of the post-exilic Psalms (especially those possessing a bright and vivid style) have had pre-exilic Psalms as models, just as the post-exilic prophets and "Wisdom" writers had within their own peculiar class of literature classical models?

The comparison with the Psalms is in another respect of some significance; Reuss finds a difficulty in believing that Joel could have been so largely dependent on preceding writers. The general impression given by the book is, he thinks—and rightly—not one of slavish reproduction. But a study of the Psalms shows that in Hebrew, as in other literatures, there may be other reproduction than that which is slavish. The dependent Psalms are of two types: the conventional, "slavishly" reproductive type is illustrated by Psalm lxxxvi., fully analysed by Robertson Smith in *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (2nd ed.), p. 435; the other type is illustrated by Psalm xcvi., an examination of which shows that it is—in all probability—largely composed of quotations from and reminiscences of older Psalms. Thus *v. 1*=xcvi. 10, 11 (parts); *v. 2b*=lxxxix. 15; *v. 3*=l. 3; *v. 4a*=lxxvii. 19; *v. 4b*, cf. xcvi. 9*b*; *v. 5a*=Micah i. 4; *v. 6a*=l. 6; *v. 8*=xlvi. 12; *v. 9a*=xlvi. 3; *v. 9b*=xlvi. 10; and yet this Psalm gives the general impression of vigour, the individuality of the author coming out in the effective way in which he uses the older poems.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I take this opportunity of acknowledging my indebtedness to the kindness of Professor Driver for several suggestions and criticisms, of which I have availed myself in giving the above paper its final form.