

# Acknowledgements

This book is an adaptation of my Ph.D. thesis that was not only written *about* exile but also *in* exile. As a temporary exile from Poland to England and Wales, I hoped that my circumstances would stimulate my writing. However, because of the continual help and hospitality of so many people and different institutions, it has been difficult to feel that I have not been at home!

First of all I would like to thank Dr Thomas S. Holland (Evangelical Theological College of Wales, Bridgend), Dr William S. Campbell (University of Wales, Lampeter), Dr Martin O’Kane (University of Wales, Lampeter) and Prof. Philip R. Davies (University of Sheffield) for their stimulation, expertise and help.

I did my research at Evangelical Theological College of Wales, Bridgend (2000-2002), Tyndale House, Cambridge (2002-2003 and July-September 2004) and Biblical Theological Seminary (now Evangelical School of Theology), Poland (2004). I am greatly indebted to the assistance of these institutions.

I stayed at the Evangelical Theological College of Wales and with Bernard and Rosy Palmer, Alan and Bridget Culverhouse, Duncan and Heather Reeves, Peter and Pam Thatcher, Michael and Margo Leach, John and Cheryl Hillier, Jim and Jo Hillier, Philip and Marianne Ross. How can I thank you all?

I am indebted to James Muldoon and especially to Dr Malcolm Elliot-Hogg (Evangelical School of Theology) for their conscientious and patient proof-reading. They made my exilic writing far less obvious.

I am grateful to Blythswood Care (Scotland) for their generous financial support. Without them this research would not have been possible. I am also thankful to Overseas Council Canada, Overseas Council International (USA) via Evangelical School of Theology in Wrocław (Poland) for their additional financial help.

The publication of this book was possible with generosity and friendship of James Alexander and Mary Beth Brown. Thanks go also to Dr Piotr Blumczyński and Dr Wojciech Szczerba (Evangelical School of Theology) for their assistance in publishing.

I dedicate this book to my parents Jan and Jolanta Lorek, my brother Dawid Lorek and my wife Alina Lorek for their boundless love.

Gilead to Tob); 1 Sam 26:19 (driving away of David). In Deut 33:14 and 1 Kgs 2:27 the verb is used with a different sense.

The verb ברח is used in: Judg 9:21 (the escape of Jotham from Abimelech); Judg 11:3 (the escape of Jephthah from his brothers); 1 Sam 19:12, 18; 20:1; 21:11; 22:17; 27:4; 2 Sam 15:14; 19:10; 1 Kgs 2:7 (David's escapes); 1 Sam 22:20 and 23:6 (the escape of David's accompanies); 2 Sam 4:3 (the escape of the Beerothites to Gittaim); 2 Sam 13:34, 37, 38 (the escape of Absalom from David); 1 Kgs 2:39 (the escape of Shimei to Achish); 1 Kgs 11:17 (the escape of Hagad and certain Edomites to Egypt); 1 Kgs 11:23 (the escape of Rezon from Hadadezer); 1 Kgs 11:40; 12:2 (the escape of Jeroboam from Solomon to Egypt).<sup>58</sup>

The scope and the aim of the present chapter on the DtrH does not allow me to investigate the validity of all occurrences of the motif of exile proposed (but not argued) by Klingberg, Hatina and Carroll. Neither is it possible to examine all the potential narratives in which 'exilic vocabulary' occurs. Both scholarly research and occurrences of the specific verbs suggest, however, that most important for the DtrH is the exile of Israel and Judah (2 Kgs 17; 24-25). This will also be confirmed below where the structure and development of the DtrH as proposed by Martin Noth will be outlined.

The aim of the chapter is to show how the macro-story of Israel presented in the DtrH progressively leads to the Assyrian exile of Israel and the Babylonian exile of Judah as well as to investigate how these two exiles are presented in the light of the pre-established pattern of exile.

## 2.2. The Prominence of the Exile of Israel and Judah in the DtrH

### 2.2.1. The Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History

Martin Noth was the first to see the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy – 2 Kings) "as a literary entity and unity."<sup>59</sup> Steven L. McKenzie, evaluating Noth's contribution, notes that his suggestion of approaching the DtrH as a whole still remains valid in scholarly research: "Martin Noth's theory was brilliant. It is amazing that fifty years later we are still assuming the existence of the Deuteronomistic History and discussing how it came to be."<sup>60</sup> Suggesting that the DtrH was not merely the work of an editor but of an author implies that the DtrH was written with a purpose and is not merely a collection of disconnected traditions. Noth proposed that the

<sup>58</sup> The individual occurrences of other verbs can also be mentioned: נרח in 2 Sam 14:13, 14 (exile of Absalom); ירח in 1 Kgs 14:15 (exile of Israel); נטח in 2 Sam 15:20 (David escaping from Absalom); נרד in 2 Kgs 21:8 (exile of Israel); נרד appears in Jos 20:9 (Levites 'sojourning' in Israel), in Judg 19:16 and 2 Sam 4:3 (certain Israelites sojourning within Israel), in 2 Kgs 8:1, 2 (a Shunnamite sojourning in Philistia); נחל in 2 Kgs 16:6 (exile of Judeans from Elath); נחש in 1 Kgs 14:15 (exile of Israel). These individual occurrences will not be discussed in the following study.

<sup>59</sup> Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991) 15.

<sup>60</sup> Steven L. McKenzie "The Books of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History" in Steven L. McKenzie, M. Patrick Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions. The Heritage of Martin Noth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 297. See also Steven L. McKenzie's article on "Deuteronomistic History" in ABD II:160-168.

aim of the author of the DtrH was to present the history of Israel as one of ethical deterioration that finds its final punitive climax in the exile. To illustrate the point, three of Noth's statements follow:

With the final historical catastrophes in view, Dtr. consistently develops the idea of ever-intensifying decline throughout his work; and this is a further support for the thesis that Dtr.'s work is a unity in content and form and that it was all written at the same time, after the fall of Jerusalem.<sup>61</sup>

The meaning which he [the Deuteronomist] discovered was that God was recognizably at work in this history, continuously meeting the accelerating moral decline with warnings and punishments and, finally, when these proved fruitless, with total annihilation.<sup>62</sup>

In general he saw the history of Israel as a self-contained process which began with specific manifestations of power and came to a definitive end with the destruction of Jerusalem.<sup>63</sup>

Scholars analysing Noth's proposal have reworked almost all of its aspects, but the majority of them still sustain the claim that the DtrH shows how Israel, because of its behaviour, ended up in Babylonian exile. "The interpretation of the ultimate goal of the Deuteronomistic History that Noth offered has had little if any success in theological study," comments Timo Veijola, "All agree with him, of course, that the history of Israel and Judah is depicted as a history of growing apostasy, using the Deuteronomic law code as the standard, but there the unanimity ends".<sup>64</sup>

## 2.2.2. Noth's Structural Passages in the Deuteronomistic History

To show this general decline of Israel's faith in God, Noth divided the DtrH into several main periods. He observed that the major changes in the history of Israel are indicated by 'speeches' (Jos 1; 23; 1 Sam 12; 1 Kgs 8:14ff)<sup>65</sup> and 'reflections' (Jos 12; Judg 2:11ff; 2 Kgs 17:7ff),<sup>66</sup> both being interpretations of it.<sup>67</sup> McKenzie

<sup>61</sup> Noth 1991:122.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 137. Timo Veijola, "Martin Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* and Old Testament Theology" in Steven L. McKenzie, M. Patrick Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions. The Heritage of Martin Noth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 121-122 recalls O. Kaiser, *Der Gott des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993) and states that he agreed with Noth.

<sup>64</sup> Veijola in McKenzie, Graham 1994:125.

<sup>65</sup> "... at all the important points in the course of the history, Dtr. brings forward the leading personages with a speech, long or short, which looks forward and backward in an attempt to interpret the course of events, and draws the relevant practical conclusions about what people should do." Noth 1991:18.

<sup>66</sup> "Elsewhere the summarizing reflections upon history which sum up the action are presented by Dtr. himself as part of the narrative, whether because they did not lend themselves to reproduction in speeches or because they were not suitable historical figures to make the speeches." Noth 1991:19.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 18-20.

observes that Noth's structural passages were accepted by scholarship<sup>68</sup> and then adds 2 Sam 7 and 1 Kgs 13, which were also proposed as structural passages.<sup>69</sup>

To confirm that the DtrH aims to show that the history of Israel was headed towards exile, Noth indicated that the transitory 'speeches' and 'reflections' either explicitly or allusively mention this ultimate judgment.<sup>70</sup> Joshua's speech at the end of the period of the conquest implicitly threatens exile for idolatry (Jos 23:15b-16),<sup>71</sup> as does Samuel's speech that, according to Noth, ends the period of judges and begins the period of kings. In 1 Sam 12:25 where Samuel's speech ends, Noth sees an implied warning of exile. He also mentions the last words of Solomon's prayer of dedication (1 Kgs 8:44-53) as clearly pointing to the future exile of Israel. 2 Kgs 17:7ff similarly is one of Noth's structural passages. It deliberates on the end of Israel's existence in the exile to Assyria. It is also important to notice that 2 Kgs 17 should not only be seen as contemplating the exile of Israel but as anticipating the exile of Judah recorded at the end of the DtrH (ch. 24-25). Pauline A. Viviano has noted this point and argues that:

The author [the Deuteronomistic historian] is not simply reflecting upon the reason why the North fell, for the sins recounted are actually sins of Judah. The author's real concern becomes evident; he is most emphatically addressing himself to Judah's situation. Judah is guilty of sin, and it can suffer the same fate as the North.<sup>72</sup>

Rightly, Noth did not discern a warning of exile in the remaining structural passages (Jos 1; 12; Judg 2:11ff). Neither 2 Sam 7 nor 1 Kgs 13 (later recognized also as structural passages) have an explicit threat of exile.

Although Noth did not include Deut 1-4 in his list of structural passages, in his understanding of the DtrH it has a very prominent place. Not only is it a speech of Moses that is a preparation for the subsequent pronouncement of the law (Deut 5ff), but it also functions as an introductory passage to the whole of the DtrH.<sup>73</sup> Noth has observed that this speech, like some of the structural passages, ends with words that threaten the exile of Israel.<sup>74</sup> He pointed particularly to Deut 4:25-28.

<sup>68</sup> Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings. The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (Leiden: Brill, 1991) 3.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 3, n. 3. See Dennis J. McCarthy, "II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," *JBL* LXXXIV (1965) 131-138.

<sup>70</sup> Noth 1991:143.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Noth's words (*ibid.*, 66): "In Joshua 23 Dtr. gives the long speech by Joshua which finishes off the whole occupation story. Dtr.'s account is constructed in such a way that this speech marks the end of an historical epoch and, looking back to the great events now at an end, goes on to warn the people against the gods and cults of the land that has now been taken for a possession, and culminates in a threat of retribution. It cannot be accidental that this threat resembles in meaning and wording the threat at the end of that part of Moses' great speech composed by Dtr. (Deut. 4.25-28, esp. v. 26)." Gordon J. Wenham, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of the Book of Joshua," *JBL* XC (1971) 148 also notes the threat of exile in Jos 23:14ff.

<sup>72</sup> Pauline A. Viviano, "2 Kings 17: A Rhetorical and Form-Critical Analysis," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 556.

<sup>73</sup> Noth 1991:29.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 143.

### e) Conditions in exile

It is not stated whether those who will be exiled with Zedekiah will be faithful in exile. Some of those that went into exile with Jehoiachin are described as unfaithful (2:3; cf. 3:11). The conditions in exile seem to be bearable. Ezekiel has his own house (3:24; 8:1). The elders can meet together (8:1).

## 2. Punishment

### a) The cause of exile

The cause of exile is first of all idolatry (5:6-11; 6:6, 13; 7:20; 8:5-16; 16:1ff), but also social injustice (11:6; 18:1ff; 22:1-16) and international political policies (17:16-17).

### b) The purpose of exile

The reason for exile is purely punitive.

### c) The length of exile

Forty years (4:4), this reflects a lifespan of one generation.

### d) The mitigation of punishment in/to exile

Ezek 5:2 says that those who are exiled are still under the threat of death. Thus mitigation could be understood as being spared death.

### e) The form of exile

Not given.

## 3. Alienation

Although exiled Judah is alienated from the land, she is not alienated from her God (11:16). God's glory is also in exile (11:22-23) and will return with Israel (44:4).

## 4. Return

The promise of return is given. Although 20:34-44 suggests that not only the faithful will be released from exile, nevertheless only the faithful will enter the land. 36:10 implies that the cities will be re-inhabited. With the return of the people, the land will flourish again.

## 5. Remnant

Ezekiel focuses on the idea of the remnant during the time of invasion (9:4-8; 11:13; 12:14-16; 14:14). The concept is understood as physical survival from death. Ezekiel suggests that the righteous will survive (9:4-8; 14:14-23), but they will not be sole survivors (12:14-16). During the return, all people will come back (39:27-28).

### *Second Isaiah*

Isa 40-55 focuses more on the promise of the return from Babylonian exile than on the exile *per se*. Nevertheless Deutero Isaiah assumes a certain view of the exile which is outlined now according to the categories of the pattern of exile.

as happening 'today', Ezra might have in mind those exiles who still remained in Babylon, not necessarily those who had already returned. Lastly, even if the 'captivity' should be interpreted as taking place 'today', referring to those who had returned from Babylon, it still does not necessarily mean that they were still in exile. In this context, it rather explains their relationship to Persia, the relationship of slavery and submission.

In sum, it is suggested that there is a difference between exile and slavery when one considers the state of Israel. When the exile of Israel begins, its slavery begins as well, but when the exile of Israel ends, slavery does not. The exile is possible without slavery, as slavery is possible without exile. These two concepts are not inherently inseparable.

### *Daniel 9*

It is not clear whether Ezra 9 and Neh 9 describe the post-Babylonian situation of Israel by employing the motif of exile. Post-Babylonian Palestinian Israel is understood there neither metaphorically as being in exile nor historically as continuing the Babylonian exile in the land. Dan 9, however, seems to be different in this regard, for here post-Babylonian Palestinian Israel, although historically not in exile, is described metaphorically as experiencing it.

The story of Daniel being taken into Babylonian exile, living his whole life there, then praying for the exile to be ended, clearly employs the motif of exile. If one assumes the widely accepted dating of the book of Daniel (middle of the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE) as well as its place of writing (Palestine), then it appears that this story of Daniel was selected or composed to communicate figuratively the hero's own historical situation in the period of Greek rule over Palestine. It does not automatically mean, however, that the author of Daniel understood his nation to be really in exile. He only pictured it this way. If the history of the author and the story of Daniel are so interpreted, then the question arises what these two have in common, how they could be related with one another. The answer is similar to that reached for Ezra 9 and Neh 9. Both Daniel in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE and Israel in the 2<sup>nd</sup> were under foreign rule and experienced religious persecution. In other words, the author of Daniel used the exilic story to describe a non-exilic situation. This may well be the case because the exilic experience of Israel in Babylon is linked with the non-exilic situation of Israel in Palestine by the basic idea of living under the oppressive rule of a foreign nation. The idea of 70 weeks of years as well as that of the four kingdoms serves to underline the fact that from the Babylonian exile until Greek times Israel lived under foreign rule but is not meant to imply that the historical exile continued after that for Israel in the land.

In a sense, one may still think of prolonged or internal exile in the book of Daniel, but it will be a more theological than literal description. The scholars noted above sometimes do not take into consideration this distinction when describing Israel as being still in exile. The present author stresses the distinction to suggest that in the post-Babylonian era the basic understanding of the motif of exile was still geographical. It could only be applied symbolically to a different scenario by the common factor of bondage.

To express the continual state of Israel's bondage that began with the Babylonian exile Pfeiffer writes:

*Post-Babylonian Exile of Israel: Zechariah 13:7 – 14:2*

The prophetic literature usually uses words based on the root גלה to refer to the Assyrian and Babylonian exile of Israel, Judah and other nations. There is, however, one passage in which the writer employs גולה to describe the post-Babylonian judgment of exile on Jerusalem.<sup>372</sup> Zech 14:1-2 reads:

See, a day is coming for the LORD, when the plunder taken from you will be divided in your midst. For I will gather all the nations against Jerusalem to battle, and the city shall be taken and the houses looted and the women raped; half the city shall go into exile (גולה), but the rest of the people shall not be cut off (כרת) from the city.

According to Meyers and Meyers these verses recapitulate the passage that precedes them (13:7-9),<sup>373</sup> so will be analyzed together below. Zech 13:7-9 reads:

'Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who is my associate,' says the LORD of hosts. Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered (פירץ); I will turn my hand against the little ones. In the whole land, says the LORD, two-thirds shall be cut off (כרת) and perish, and one-third shall be left alive. And I will put this third into the fire, refine them as one refines silver, and test them as gold is tested. They will call on my name, and I will answer them. I will say, 'They are my people'; and they will say, 'The LORD is our God.'

Meyers and Meyers observe that these two passages resemble the events of the Babylonian invasion of Judah and subsequent exile.<sup>374</sup> Specifically, 13:7 recalls the history of Zedekiah (Jer 21:7), and 13:8, by describing the tripartite fate of the people at the invasion, reflects such passages as Ezek 5:1-12. This leads Meyers and Meyers to suggest that these two descriptions of exile refer to the past historical event of Judah's exile and not to the future post-Babylonian cataclysm, "since the notion of another destruction and exile that would accompany the ruler's demise does not seem warranted by prophetic evaluations of postexilic society."<sup>375</sup> However they do not reject the possibility of a future fulfilment of this apocalyptic scenario. For example, on 13:7-9 they note that "this subunit may be anticipating an eschatological catastrophe."<sup>376</sup> Although it has to be admitted that Second Zechariah draws on historical events to construct his apocalyptic images, nevertheless such phrases as the one that begins the second of the two exiles (14:1 has יום־קָאָם 'the day is coming') suggest that the author was thinking of future events.<sup>377</sup>

Although both passages 13:7-9 and 14:1-2 are short and vague, an attempt is now made to discern the shape of the motif of exile which appears in them.

<sup>372</sup> The verbs: שבה, גרש, and נרה are not used in the prophets to describe the post-Babylonian judgment of Israel.

<sup>373</sup> Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1993) 495.

<sup>374</sup> For example, *ibid.*, 495-496.

<sup>375</sup> *Ibid.*, 388.

<sup>376</sup> *Ibid.*, 404.

<sup>377</sup> It is interesting to compare this post-Babylonian warning of Judean exile with, for example, Lam 4:22a, where גלה appears as well. The passage reads: "The punishment of your iniquity, O daughter Zion, is accomplished, he will keep you in exile no longer."

### 5. Remnant

Zech 14:2 uses the noun יִתָּר 'rest, remnant' for those who will be left after the invasion. Zech 13:8 has יִתָּר referring to the same group. This implies that those left in the land are those who will share a covenantal future with Yahweh, after they have been purified (Zech 13:9).<sup>385</sup> It appears that those exiled are not viewed as part of the remnant in Zech 13-14.<sup>386</sup> This seems to be a significant difference with the exile of Judah to Babylon, where the idea of the remnant is usually associated with those who were exiled and not with those who were left behind. The difference points to post-Babylonian eschatological expectations. The land will be restored by expelling who/what is unclean and transforming those left in the land.

### *Zechariah and Post-Babylonian Exile*

Zech 13:7 – 14:2 is not the only Hebrew Bible passage that uses the motif of exile to express the post-Babylonian judgment expectations. Ackroyd observes that Zech 7:13-14

... includes what appears to be a direct quotation of the words of God; in the middle of v. 13 the tense and person change. The judgment of God, 'They will call and I will not listen ... and I will drive them away to all the nations which they do not know,' stands out sharply, though the context makes it clear that the reference is to the events of exile which have already taken place. But by this vivid and unexpected change of tense, the permanence of the divine word is emphasized. What was then true, is so still. It can still appropriately be said that God will do these things if the generation of the prophet fails to make response. The promise of the new age can even now be frustrated by human sin.

7:8-10 underlines this by laying the emphasis on those aspects of obedience which are so commonly stressed in the pre-exilic prophets as marks of the people of God.<sup>387</sup>

In this comment, Ackroyd seems to be saying almost explicitly that post-exilic Israel, if not obedient, would undergo an experience of exile similar to that in Assyria and Babylon.

It is also important to stress that the post-exilic writings often reuse the pre-exilic language of judgment to address Israel. Scholars have observed this in First and Second Zechariah. On Zech 7:5-7 Pierce comments that the Israelites "are charged with a lack of sincerity in worship (7:5-7), and again they are reminded of the resemblance of the present situation to that which existed before the exile (v. 7)."<sup>388</sup> On Second Zechariah he says that its oracles are "somewhat reminiscent of the preexilic prophets" and that they present the remnant "as a miserable

<sup>385</sup> Cf. also Zech 14:16 where the verb is used to describe the remnant that remained after Yahweh's judgment of all nations, which now makes pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Like the Judeans who remained in the land, they also will share in the eschatological salvation.

<sup>386</sup> Meyers and Meyers (ibid., 392) write of those killed and exiled: "the two-thirds that no longer exist ... as part of Yahweh's people."

<sup>387</sup> Ackroyd 1968:210-211, cf. also p. 216.

<sup>388</sup> Roland W. Pierce, "A Thematic Development of the Haggai/Zechariah/Malachi Corpus," *JETS* 27.4 (1984) 408.



flock of sheep doomed to slaughter (Zechariah 11).<sup>389</sup> He also notes that in Zech 11:4-17 "older elements of prophetic speech are recalled to remind Judah of her relation to the 'fathers' and the 'former prophets' (cf. Zech 1:1-6). Some of the material may even have had a pre-exilic *Vorlage*, as Watts suggests."<sup>390</sup>

### *Other Prophets and Post-Babylonian Exile*

To illustrate that Israel was still under the threat of exile in post-Babylonian times, one may recall the words of Joel referring to the exile of Israelites to Greece caused by surrounding nations:

What are you to me, O Tyre and Sidon, and all the regions of Philistia? Are you paying me back for something? If you are paying me back, I will turn your deeds back upon your own heads swiftly and speedily. For you have taken my silver and my gold, and have carried my rich treasures into your temples. You have sold the people of Judah and Jerusalem to the Greeks, removing them far from their own border. (Joel 3:4-6; cf. also v. 2)

The oracles of the prophet to Tyre, Sidon and Philistia for their behaviour towards Israel warns these countries with the same threat of the exile. Joel continues:

But now I will rouse them to leave the places to which you have sold them, and I will turn your deeds back upon your own heads. I will sell your sons and your daughters into the hand of the people of Judah, and they will sell them to the Sabeans, to a nation far away; for the LORD has spoken.

Renz provides historical comment on Joel's threat in 3:7-8:

The people of Sidon were indeed sold into slavery in 345 BC by Artaxerxes III (359-338 BC), while the citizens of Tyre and Gaza were enslaved by Alexander in 332 BC.<sup>391</sup>

There are also other places in the prophetic literature which point to the exilic experience of other nations.<sup>392</sup> Of Obad 7 Foster notes that "this verse reflects the beginnings of the Arab pressure ... by which the Edomites were finally driven from their own territory,"<sup>393</sup> and of Mal 1:2-5 that it alludes to "the expulsion of the Edomites from their territory south-east of the Dead Sea by the Nabataean Arabs."<sup>394</sup>

<sup>389</sup> Roland W. Pierce, "Literary Connections and a Haggai/Zechariah/Malachi Corpus," *JETS* 27.3 (1984) 289.

<sup>390</sup> Pierce *JETS* 27.4:407-408. Pierce refers to J. D. W. Watts, 'Zechariah,' *Broadman's Bible Commentary* (Nashville: Broadman, 1972) 309 as well as to J. G. Baldwin, 'Haggai,' *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1972) 63-64. Cf. also Carroll (1997:72) who notes concerning Zechariah 7-14: "The oracles making up the rest of the Zechariah scroll are very similar to the poems to be found in most of the prophetic scrolls: themes of the destruction of the enemy and the restoration of Judah are mixed with poems about civic strife in Jerusalem."

<sup>391</sup> Renz 2000:33.

<sup>392</sup> The main prophetic passages on the post-Babylonian judgment of the nations include: Mal 1:2-5; Hagg 2:6-9, 20-23; Zech 9-14; Obad; Joel; Isa 49:24-6; 51:7-23; 55:3-5; Ezek 38-39.

<sup>393</sup> Foster 1970:36.

<sup>394</sup> *Ibid.*, 164.