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ABSTRACT

“The Earlier Restoration Expectations of Second Zechariah: An Intertextual Analysis of Zechariah 9–10”

Suk Yee Lee
McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
Doctor of Philosophy (Christian Theology), 2012

This dissertation conducts an in-depth study on the ideas about future salvation in Zech 9–10, analyzing the earlier restoration expectations in Second Zechariah. Because of the allusive character of the text, the methodology used in this project is intertextual analysis. We examine the content of Zech 9–10, looking for intertextual markers in the text, with distinctive words/phrases as the starting point. Having established the intertexts, we investigate the sources and their contexts, analyzing how the intertexts are used in the new context of the host and exploring how the antecedents shape the reading of the later text. Finally, we delineate the restoration themes in Zech 9–10 in light of its dialogue with its textual web of allusions.

This dissertation argues that Zech 9–10 leverages earlier biblical material in order to express its view on restoration, which serves as a lens for the prophetic community in Yehud to make sense of their troubled world in the early Persian period, ca. 440 B.C. These two chapters envision the return of Yahweh who inaugurates the new age, ushering in prosperity and blessings. The earlier restoration expectations of Second Zechariah anticipate the formation of an ideal remnant settling in an ideal homeland, with Yahweh as king and David as vice-regent, reigning in Zion. The new
commonwealth is not only a united society but also a cosmic one, with Judah, Ephraim, and the nations living together in peace.

In expressing its vision, Zech 9–10 shows close affinity with Jeremiah’s view on the restoration of the people (Zech 10) and the renewal of leadership (Zech 10:1–5), whereas the corpus adheres to Ezekiel’s perspective on the return of Yahweh and the restoration of the land (9:1–8). For the reinstitution of the Davidic dynasty, the Zecharian text adapts the aspiration of Mic 4–5, affirming the reinstallation of a new David, though, at the same time, the host text deviates from Ps 72, presenting another model of kingship. The Isaianic intertexts contribute mainly in the theme of divine intervention, stressing that the advent of Yahweh will turn around the fortunes of his people.
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INTRODUCTION

The Importance of the Project

Schmid and Steck argue that the main purpose of prophetic literature is to unfold Yahweh’s restoration: “one can see the flow of time for God’s people since the conquest as a time of salvation to judgment (Joshua-Kings) and a time of judgment returning to salvation (Corpus propheticum).”¹ This phenomenon is particularly true with Second Zechariah, a late prophetic work in the restoration era.

The majority of scholars agree that the main emphasis of Zech 9–14 is on Yahweh’s restoration for his people.² Boda contends that these six chapters “announce an imminent restoration inaugurated by the return of God.”³ Meyers and Meyers argue that Second Zechariah anticipates “the ultimate, full restoration of Israel.”⁴ This view is especially vivid when Zech 9:9–10 envisions the coming of a royal figure who will rule with universal peace and 14:16 expects cosmic worship of Yahweh who will reign as king in Jerusalem.

Despite this assertion, few scholars, if any, have examined extensively the restoration expectations in Second Zechariah, apart from some broad strokes.⁵ Even those scholars who have worked substantially on tracing the development of the

¹ Schmid and Steck, “Restoration Expectations,” 45.
² Cf. Nurmiela, Prophets in Dialogue, 233; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 563; O’Brien, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 232; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 280; Webb, Message of Zechariah, 32; Achtemeier, Nahum–Malachi, 146.
³ Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 48.
⁴ Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 29.
⁵ E.g., Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 47.
theological ideals of the restoration from the Deuteronomistic History to the post-exilic prophetic writings tend to cease with Zech 1–8, without considering the perspectives in Zech 9–14. In his classic work *Exile and Restoration*, Ackroyd tracks the themes of restoration in the biblical sources up to First Zechariah only. Around three decades later, Schmid and Steck present in their essay “Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament” the findings on this subject, yet Second Zechariah is still neglected. With the renewal of interest in the Persian period, the edited volume of Knoppers and others, *Exile and Restoration Revisited*, attempts to pull in other post-exilic books, especially Ezra and Nehemiah, but Zech 9–14 is omitted. Works with similar treatment, e.g., Koch’s two volumes, *The Prophets*, which seek to expound the prophetic thought about the future, also dedicate minimal space to Second Zechariah, probably due to the obscurity of the corpus. In view of this, this dissertation intends to fill in the gap by conducting an in-depth study on the ideas about future salvation in

---

6 Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*. Ackroyd’s book is now understood as a revolutionary work in his time. Kratz comments: “*Exile and Restoration* was a protest voiced against previous scholarship often rooted in Christian, if not to say anti-Semitic, prejudices against postexilic Judaism and a religion based on law...[Ackroyd] rediscovered the exilic and postexilic epochs as a formative period for the development of biblical tradition and for the history of Judaism. [He] elevated the literature of the Second Temple period, especially the literature relating to the postexilic prophets, to an honorable status and [was] able to access the theological significance of this literature”; Kratz, “The Relation between History and Thought,” 152–53. However, Kratz also challenges Ackroyd’s approach which draws a sharp distinction between history and thought when tracing the development of tradition. See Kratz, “The Relation between History and Thought,” 152–65. For a full review of Ackroyd’s works, especially his research on the biblical themes of exile and restoration, see Carroll, “Razed Temple and Shattered Vessels,” 93–106.

7 Schmid and Steck, “Restoration Expectations,” 41–81. The article does touch very briefly on a few restoration ideas in Zech 9–14, e.g., the coming king in Zech 9:9–10 (p. 73) and the inclusion of the non-Israelites in Zech 14:16 (p. 79).


9 Knoppers, et al., ed., *Exile and Restoration Revisited*.

10 Koch comments: “Nowhere do the opinions of scholars diverge so widely about prophetic writings as here [Zech 9–14] and no where are the findings of research so uncertain. ... Some of the texts are concerned with internal political conditions. For us they are obscure, because we have no information from other sources which would throw light on them”; Koch, *Prophets II*, 180.
Second Zechariah in order to delineate the kind of restoration perspective embraced in this late biblical prophecy.¹¹

Second Zechariah is known for its obscurity as Koch remarks.¹² The enigmatic nature of the text and the complex web of allusions in the corpus further intensify the interpretative problem.¹³ It is probably with this obscurity in mind that Jerome writes, “obscurissimus liber Zachariae prophetae,”¹⁴ and Childs adds, “Few Old Testament books reflect such a chaos of conflicting interpretation.”¹⁵ In light of this, we need to conduct a thorough investigation rather than a brief treatment of Zech 9–14 in order to depict the restoration expectations in the corpus. However, this kind of meticulous research on these six chapters would generate a massive amount of material that would require more space than is available in this dissertation. Because of the great volume of discussion and the limited space of the project, we confine our scope of inquiry to the first two chapters of Zech 9–14.

¹¹ Similar work has been done by Bergdall on First Zechariah; Bergdall, “Zechariah’s Program of Restoration.”

¹² See Koch’s comment above. Leske claims: “The last part of one prophetic book, Zechariah 9–14, has often been referred to as the most difficult section in the prophetic corpus. Much has been written on various problems and issues in these chapters, with great diversity of interpretation”; Leske, “Context and Meaning,” 663. Petersen contends: “The last nine chapters of the Old Testament … constitute arguably the most difficult texts for the interpreter of the Old Testament”; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 1. According to the MT numeration, Malachi has only three chapters. Therefore, Zech 9–14 plus Mal 1–3 are the last nine chapters of the Old Testament. Cf. Pyper, “Reading in the Dark,” 485; Clark, “Discourse Structure in Zechariah 9–14,” 64.

¹³ See CHAPTER ONE.

¹⁴ Translated as: “The Book of the Prophet Zechariah is the most obscure one”; Jerome, Commentarli in Prophetas Minores, 747, cited in Lamarche, Zacharie IX–XIV, 7.

¹⁵ Childs, Introduction, 476.
The Coherence of Zechariah 9 and 10

Zechariah 9 and 10 is generally treated as a coherent section revealing the earlier aspiration of the restoration hope of Second Zechariah, with 11:4–16 transitioning the readers from the first oracle (Zech 9–11) to the second one (Zech 12–14). Apart from Zech 10:1–2, there are a number of correspondences between these two chapters, on stylistic, thematic, and lexical levels.

1. Both chapters stress the divine intervention which breaks into history to inaugurate the restoration of Yahweh’s people (cf. 9:1–8, 10a, 14–16; 10:6, 8–12a), with war-like language against the nations (cf. 9:1–8; 10:11).  

2. These two chapters are salvation oracles concerning Judah and Ephraim, with a strong expectation for return (cf. 9:12; 10:8–10) and reunion (cf. 9:13; 10:6), which is absent after the breaking of the second staff “Union” in 11:14.  

3. There are a number of shared words in Zech 9 and 10, with some of them appearing exclusively in these two chapters (see Table 1 below).

---


17 Boda, “Reading Between the Lines,” 291.

18 Boda, “Reading Between the Lines,” 289–90.

19 Judah is mentioned 14 times in Second Zechariah: 9:7, 13; 10:3, 6; 11:14; 12:2, 4, 5, 6, 7; 14:5, 14, 21.


21 After the breaking of the second staff “Union” in 11:14, Ephraim disappears from the scene, with only Judah remaining on the stage together with Jerusalem and David in the second oracle. Both Jerusalem and David appear prominently in Zech 12–14. Jerusalem occurs 24 times in Second Zechariah: 9:9, 10; 12:2; 3, 5, 6; 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; 13:1; 14:2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, and David appears 6 times in Second Zechariah: 12:7, 8; 10, 12; 13:1.

22 The lexical parallels between these two chapters and the next unit (Zech 11:1–3) decrease significantly, with only 6 shared words: אָ(א)נ (9:4, 15; 11:1), אָ (9:4; 11:1), וָ (9:6; 10:11; 11:3), הָ (10:2, 3; 11:3), נָ (10:10; 11:1), נָ (10:11; 11:2).
Butterworth comments that the lexical parallels between Zech 10 and Zech 11:1–3 are striking: “It is difficult to imagine that two independent units both contained all three [_plт1קנ, חַיִּים, דוֹר, פֶּן]”; Butterworth, *Structure*, 189. However, Zech 11:1–3 has more shared words, including those three words, with Isa 14 where a judgement is announced against the king of Babylon: “Even the cypress trees (םְּרָדָה) rejoice over you, and the cedars (םְּרָדָה) of Lebanon (םְּרָדָה), saying, ‘Since you were laid low, no tree cutter comes up against us. ... Your pomp (םְּרָדָה) and the music of your harps have been brought down (םְּרָדָה in hophal) to Sheol’” (vv. 8, 11a).

Table 1: The Lexical Parallel between Zech 9 and 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zechariah 9</th>
<th>Zechariah 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:3 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:5 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:4 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:11 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:5 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:5 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:6 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:11 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:11 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9:8 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:11 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:8 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:4 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9:8 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9:9 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9:9 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9:10 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9:10 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:4 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9:12 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:9 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9:13 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9:13 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:3 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9:13 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9:14 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:4 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9:14 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:12 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9:15 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:3 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9:15 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:7 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:16 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:6 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9:16 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:6 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9:16 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
<td>10:2 נִשָּׁנָה בִּימְיוֹנָיו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Word shared exclusively in Zech 9 and 10.
By confining the scope of inquiry to the first two chapters of Zech 9–14, we admit that the restoration ideas depicted in this project have their limitations, in the sense that they could reveal the earlier expectations of the corpus only. This earlier hope for restoration embraced in Zech 9–10 is quite different from the one reflected in Zech 12–14 where the focus has been changed from the return and reunion of Judah and Ephraim under a Davidic ruler to the prominence of Jerusalem (cf. 14:10–11, 16), with Yahweh reigning as king (14:9). Thus, this project is neither an exclusive nor a conclusive study of the restoration perspectives in all of Second Zechariah. It only serves as a foundation for further studies, particularly for the rest of the corpus, so that a comprehensive depiction of the topic in Zech 9–14 may be drawn.

The Approach of the Study

There is a paradigm shift in methodologies in recent scholarship on Zech 9–14, moving away from a traditional historical-critical approach to a more literary one. The main reason for this change is dissatisfaction with hypothetical or even contradictory conclusions derived from historical-critical treatments, particularly prior to 1964. As Coggins comments: “all the supposed allusions to dates and historical situations are so vague and imprecise that there is little likelihood of general agreement, and as a result this [historical-critical] approach to the material has been abandoned by many

---


24 The dividing line of 1964 is due to Otzen’s profound study which presented a thorough account of scholarship on Second Zechariah up to his time of writing. For detailed discussion about the scholarship on Zech 9–14 prior to 1964, see the following works: Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 60–81; Coggins, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 60–66; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 115–26; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 287–90; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 232–59; Otzen, Studien über Deuterosacharja, 11–34; Smith, Micah-Malachi, 166–75, 242–49.
Hanson is probably right that the nature of the corpus is so obscure with loose connections to historical processes that “its relation to history is different from that found in the prophecy of a classical prophet...and failure to recognize this has led to the chaotic state of the scholarship on Zechariah 9–14.” Meyers and Meyers also remind us that the historico-critical method is not applicable to this “late biblical prophecy” as its message is no longer expressed explicitly in terms of plain history.

Person’s observation that “II Zech refers more to eschatological time and earlier biblical material than historical events” is worth noting in our search for the meaning of the text. For example, it has frequently been argued that behind the description of a conqueror in Zech 9:1–8 it is possible to see an historical allusion to the triumphant progress of Alexander the Great through the Levant. However, if the cities mentioned in the passage are seen as alluding to the traditional enemies of the old Davidic kingdom who had threatened the realization of the promise of land to Israel, as Redditt argues, then the meaning of Zech 9–14 would be very different in that, rather than describing the historical conquest of Alexander, the corpus opens with a chapter depicting God’s recapturing of the old Davidic empire for restored Israel in the future. The reapplication of earlier scriptural materials (and traditions) in Zech 9–14 is definitely a

---

25 Coggins, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 63.
26 Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 291.
27 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 15. Due to the redactional nature of the text, Achtemeier reminds us not to pinpoint the historical references of the events as they have become traditional materials within Israel’s theology: “Actual events once lay behind such traditions,...such events have become obscured and lost as the traditions have been passed on and the historical background of the traditions can no longer be recovered”; Achtemeier, Nahum–Malachi, 145.
28 Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 18.
29 Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 102.
30 See CHAPTER THREE.
key feature of the text which we must address in order to delineate the restoration expectations of Yahweh in Zech 9–10.

Nearly all scholars acknowledge and give prominence to the presence of intertextuality in Zech 9–14.\textsuperscript{31} Meyers and Meyers comment: "It may not be an exaggeration to suggest that Zechariah 9–14 surpasses any other biblical work in the way it draws from existing tradition."\textsuperscript{32} This phenomenon is particularly probable in the Persian period which is an important time in the development and consolidation of the Hebrew Bible, thus facilitating literary connections through direct quotations or verbal parallels.\textsuperscript{33} Fishbane claims: "...enough evidence has been assembled to indicate that a

\begin{enumerate}
\item See CHAPTER ONE.
\item Meyers and Meyers, \textit{Zechariah 9–14}, 15–16.
\item Meyers and Meyers point out that recent scholarship on the late biblical era has acknowledged that "the sixth century was a remarkably creative and fruitful period," evidenced by the "existence of extensive proto-canonical activities," and marked by "the emergence of an unprecedented spirit of renewal," thus challenging the harsh views of narrow exclusivism and legalistic ritualism derived mainly from the classic work of Wellhausen. They opine that this renewal continues until the apparent disappearance of the Davidic family from public office in the early fifth century and the subsequent deterioration in the internal affairs of Yehud reflected in Second Zechariah, Malachi and Ezra-Nehemiah; Meyers and Meyers, \textit{Zechariah 9–14}, 17–18. Cf. Wellhausen, \textit{Prolegomena}, 411–25.
\item Meyers and Meyers even suggest that the prophetic oracular discourse in Zech 9–14 might have been delivered originally in a written composition rather than in oral speech, which was a unique character of prophecy during the Persian period. They state that prophecy was shifting away from the oral medium of communication to the written medium and this dramatic change is evidenced by the decline of poetic speech in favor of oracular prose in prophetic speech patterns; Meyers and Meyers, \textit{Zechariah 9–14}, 28–29, 34. This suggestion is supported by Tai's structural analysis of Second Zechariah; Tai, \textit{Prophetie als Schriflauslegung}, 124–25.
\item Sanders suggests that something like the core of the Law and the Prophets was gaining a discernible shape by the middle of the fifth century B.C. He states: "The traumatic experience of the Babylonian exile and the necessity for Israel to seek her identity in the midst of disintegration brought about a flurry of literary activity that resulted in a very early stage of stabilization of aspects of the canonical process that formed the Torah and the Prophets"; Sanders, \textit{Torah and Canon}, 103.
\item Schniedewind, after reviewing six books concerning orality and literacy in ancient Israel, concludes that "the spread of literacy beyond the scribal class began a transformation of Judean society in the late monarchy"; Schniedewind, "Orality and Literacy," 327–332. He marshals recent archaeological evidence and suggests that "the two critical figures in the flourishing of biblical literature were the kings Hezekiah...and Josiah." He claims that the production of biblical literature reaches its climax in the exile, and ends in the Persian period; Schniedewind, \textit{How the Bible Became a Book}, 17, 64–90, 183–90. Though agreeing with Schniedewind's view of the increased importance of writing in the social context of late
learned preoccupation with older prophetic language is characteristic of late biblical
prophecy.\textsuperscript{34} Second Zechariah as a late biblical work standing at the end of the
prophetic tradition, hence, has the potential to draw extensively from a vast number of
stabilized biblical traditions and authoritative materials circulating at that time in written
form.\textsuperscript{35} The prophet may attempt to make sense of a troubled world in light of Israelite
heritage.\textsuperscript{36} In this study, we argue that the final composer of Second Zechariah
appropriates these sacred traditions in order to explicate the promised restoration for the
audience.

monarchial Judah, Floyd questions whether prophetic literature was necessarily produced at that time just
because the practice of writing flourished then. In contrast to Schniedewind's claim that there was a
pre-exilic production of prophetic writings, Floyd argues for a post-exilic development of prophetic books,
attempting to relate the emergence of this genre to cultural changes brought about by exile and restoration.
Floyd and Haak, eds., \textit{Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts}, 12.

Schaper states that this rising importance of writing had a great impact on Judean prophecy. He
argues that “the written serves as the basis for recitation. However, it is not the kind of recitation
characteristic of primary oral societies... but recitation characterized by verbatim repetition, which is the
hallmark of literate societies”; Schaper, “The Death of the Prophet,” 75. Cf. Schaper, “Exilic and
Post-Exilic Prophecy,” 324-42.

Ben Zvi claims that the choice of the written medium in the postmonarchic era effectively creates a
world in which Yahweh’s word is directly accessible only to a few literati, an elite group with high status.
These literati were the ones who composed, edited, read, and reread the biblical literature which was
regarded as the word of Yahweh. They reinterpreted and controlled the word of Yahweh by determining
what source and form the text would take when delivering the divine message. Through linguistic
differentiation, the word of the prophets from the late monarchical period did sound different from everyday
speech in Yehud in the Persian period; Ben Zvi, “Introduction: Writings, Speeches,” 1-29.

Person suggests that the Deuteronomic redactors were the most accomplished and respected scribes,
returning to Yehud in the early post-exilic period with Persian authority to preserve the literature
associated with the temple administration; Person, \textit{Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School},
146-75.

\textsuperscript{34} Fishbane, \textit{Biblical Interpretation}, 498.

\textsuperscript{35} In this dissertation, an early Persian period origin of Second Zechariah, ca. 440s B.C., is adopted, see “Date of Composition” in CHAPTER TWO.

The phenomenon of intertextuality is especially prominent in post-exilic texts. This is true not only
of prophetic books, but also of later biblical historiography or post-exilic psalms.

For the authoritative materials circulating at the time when Zech 9-14 reached its final form, see
“Dating of the Intertexts” in CHAPTER TWO.

\textsuperscript{36} See “Historical Setting” in CHAPTER TWO.
In view of the nature of the text, this dissertation aims at offering an intertextual analysis of Zech 9–10 in order to trace the nature of the earlier restoration expectations in Second Zechariah. As we intend to examine the restoration themes of these two chapters in light of their intertexts, an account of how Zech 9–10 leverages earlier biblical material to express its vision for restoration is also presented. The approach in this project is literary, with its readings based on the final form of the biblical texts rather than the hypothetical outlook of earlier editorial stages. This study of the final form is synchronic, in the sense that the restoration expectations reflected in the final form of Zech 9–10 were once used to address the needs of the audience at the time when Second Zechariah reached its final stage.

The Demarcation of Zechariah 9–10

Past Research

Except for a general consensus on some basic divisions of Second Zechariah, e.g., the delimitation of the text into two oracles, namely, Zech 9–11 and Zech 12–14, there are numerous disagreements on the structural divisions of the corpus. The same phenomenon is true for Zech 9–10 too. Mason accepts that Zech 9:1–8 is a coherent unit

---

37 This project will not get into any historiographic debate, e.g., whether there was a historical exile or not. It is a literary study, researching the restoration traditions presented in the biblical texts. Since much of the biblical material on the themes of exile and restoration seems to presuppose that the Babylonian captivity constituted some kind of watershed in Judean history, this work assumes that there was a historical exile and a historical expectation of its ending with some sort of restoration of the past; see Carroll, "Razed Temple and Shattered Vessels," 97–102. For a radical view that the exile did not happen but was a construction of the Chronicler's work, see Torrey, Ezra Studies, 285–335. Cf. Roberts' review on Torrey's book; Roberts, review of Ezra Studies, 114–16.

which serves as a “pastoral entreaty” to Yahweh’s people, whereas Hanson argues that Zech 9 which adapts the “league-royal cult ritual pattern” is a coherent poetic section, allowing no divisions. Baldwin considers Zech 10:1 as attached to 9:17 in the interest of her chiastic patterning, whereas Redditt takes Zech 10:1–3a as a redactional insertion in the previous collections. Whether Zech 11:1–3 belongs more with chapter 10 as argued by Pierce, is an individual taunt song as contended by Petersen, or is part of the shepherd units as suggested by Boda is still debatable. Disappointed with this present-state of scholarship, Larkin refers to Ginsberg’s work and appeals to the masoretic divisions in the BHS text, looking for the occurrences of the paragraph markings: (a petuhah or open, i.e., a major division) and (a setumah or closed, i.e., a minor division). However, this method of delineation is not without problems, e.g., the after Zech 12:6 interrupts the flow of the text and the after Zech 13:9 is odd for the seemingly more important break between chapters 13 and 14.

40 Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 295, 315.
41 Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 167–72.
42 Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 102–103.
44 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 79.
45 Boda, “Reading Between the Lines,” 290.
46 Larkin, Eschatology, 49–52.

Tov states: “The subdivision itself into open and closed sections... is merely one aspect of a developed system which reflects content exegesis... It is possible that the subjectivity of this exegesis created the extant differences between the various sources. What in one Masoretic manuscript is indicated as an open section may appear in another as a closed section, while the indication of a section may be altogether absent from yet a third source”; Tov, Textual Criticism, 51.

Scott comments: “At one time there was a significant difference between an ‘open’ paragraph... and a ‘closed’ paragraph... Over the years, increasing inconsistency developed concerning this difference in format, and it was largely ignored by the time of Codex Leningradensis, which does not mark the paragraphs with or . These marks are added by the editors of BHS”; Scott, Simplified Guide to BHS, 1. Cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, 9–31.
In the midst of these controversies, we have to define the grounds on which Zech 9-10 can be divided into meaningful units for our subsequent analysis. Two important works on the structural investigation of Second Zechariah have been done. The literary approach of Lamarche (1961) argues that Zech 9-14 is structured around a complex chiastic scheme, serving as a messianic midrash on the Servant Songs in Isa 40-55. Though Lamarche’s view has been well received by some conservative scholars, e.g., Baldwin, his work has been generally criticized as overstretching, imposing the chiastic pattern onto the structure of the text.

The most comprehensive study of the structure of Zech 9-14 is that performed by Butterworth (1992), which uses a specially devised computer-assisted method for analyzing the structure objectively by examining all repeated words for their distinctiveness. Contrary to Lamarche, Butterworth concludes that evidence of a

---

47 In Lamarche’s thesis, the shepherd-king, a representative of Yahweh, came (Zech 9:9-10) but was rejected by the community (11:4-17), and even was pierced (12:10-13:1). However, through his suffering, the coming one brought the purification for the people (13:7-9). Lamarche’s development of a messianic perspective is grounded upon his understanding of the Servant Songs in Isa 40-55. This is obviously very much in harmony with the NT and traditional Christian teaching about the messiah; Lamarche, *Zacharie IX–XIV*, 112-13, 124-147. See Lamarche’s chiastic structure of Zech 9-14 on pages 112-13.


50 Butterworth, *Structure*. 

51 Tigchelaar states that Lamarche’s symmetrical structure “is not convincing. Too often he disregards problems of detail and superimposes an artificial structure on the units”; Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 90.

52 Petersen comments on Baldwin’s structural approach which she has taken over from Lamarche: “the very detail of his [Lamarche’s] theses has struck many as unconvincing, more a tour de force than a compelling explanation of this literature. Lamarche’s hypothesis was based on the notion that a messianic royal figure was central to the message of Zechariah 9–14. Few scholars today hold this to be the case”; Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14*, 28. Cf. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 247. However, Petersen’s claim “few scholars today hold this to be the case” is opposed by Kenneth L. Barker: “But I suspect that the majority of evangelical scholars do hold it to be the case. While I feel free to recommend Petersen’s work because of its strengths, it needs to be balanced by such evangelical commentaries as Baldwin’s, Merrill’s and even my own in the *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*”; Barker, review of *Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi*, 300.

53 Butterworth, *Structure*. 

54 Cf. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 247. However, Petersen’s claim “few scholars today hold this to be the case” is opposed by Kenneth L. Barker: “But I suspect that the majority of evangelical scholars do hold it to be the case. While I feel free to recommend Petersen’s work because of its strengths, it needs to be balanced by such evangelical commentaries as Baldwin’s, Merrill’s and even my own in the *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*”; Barker, review of *Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi*, 300.
concern for structure can be discovered, however, the structuring of Zech 9–14 was so obscure that he cannot present a neat diagram of the structure.\(^{51}\) Apparently, the contradictory conclusions of the works of Lamarche and Butterworth do not contribute much to the illumination of the principles by which Zech 9–10 has been bound together.\(^{52}\)

**Discourse Structure**

Since the Bible is a written text, the examination of Scripture is essentially a language-based discipline.\(^{53}\) The recent work of text-linguistics offers new perspectives on the study of the Hebrew Bible.\(^{54}\) Discourse analysis is a systematic approach to language which studies how texts function in human interaction.\(^{55}\) It addresses both the

---


\(^{52}\) See comments of Person on Butterworth’s study; Person, review of *Structure and the Book of Zechariah*, 133–35.


\(^{54}\) In the last half of the 20th century, one of the most significant developments in the field of linguistics has been the recognition that language in use consists of linguistic units larger than a sentence, which, in the past, had been regarded as the largest unit for linguistic analysis. Discourse analysis or text-linguistics emphasizes that meaning occurs in units of text beyond the sentence level, units designated as “discourses” which become the object of interpretive scrutiny. This shift does not diminish the importance of micro-structure, e.g., phrases, clauses, and sentences on which traditional grammar has focused, since smaller units of text are the building blocks of macro-structure. Text-linguistic investigation operates under the premise that the macro-structure conveys the large thematic ideas that in turn govern the micro-structures, and thus the whole text; Silva, *Explorations in the Exegetical Method*, 81; Taylor, *Text-Linguistic Investigation*, 35, 38.

In this project, the terms “discourse analysis” and “text-linguistics” and the terms “discourse” and “text” are used interchangeably, although some scholars, e.g., Groom, reserve the word “discourse” for oral communication and the term “text” for written record; Groom, *Linguistic Analysis*, 131. Cf. Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 6; Bodine, *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature*, 1.

\(^{55}\) Discourse analysis is the interface of syntax (the organization of forms into meaningful units), semantics (what forms mean), and pragmatics (meanings of these forms in specific linguistic contexts). It examines the linguistic units in their context. A text, as a unity in its environment, must embrace the properties of “cohesion” and “coherence.” Cohesion concerns how linguistic elements of the “surface text” are connected within a discourse. It is the formal link that makes a text tie together internally and with its immediate co-text. Cohesion rests upon grammatical and lexical dependencies. Factors, e.g., person reference, genre, verb aspect, topics, temporal and spatial indicators, connectives and lexical
forms of language used and the meanings those forms convey.\textsuperscript{56} This presupposes that a written text, as a linguistic form, begins with an author's formulation of an idea which is then expressed in a discourse structure by conscious language choices.\textsuperscript{57} Thus, a discourse structure refers to the "patterns" an author uses for signaling meanings and purpose within a discourse. These patterns are formed by functionally-oriented choices that the author makes from the language system. As a result, a discourse structure reflects the writer's conscious effort to design the text in order that the audience can process the intended message.\textsuperscript{58}

Based on the above notion, in the following section we will delineate a discourse structure for Zech 9–10 that is effective in determining the discourse message by examining the forms of language used in the text. The investigation will be divided into two phases: (1) Establishing the unit boundaries—this stage will examine the external limits of each unit through cohesion analysis, identifying relevant division markers;\textsuperscript{59} (2) repetition, may work together to give a text cohesion. Coherence centers on how concepts of the "textual world" are accessible and relevant. A coherent text is one which can convey successfully the text-presented knowledge to its readers, to whom the text makes sense. In order for a text to make sense, an author, when organizing a discourse, may employ other techniques, e.g., prominence, which are formed by choices from the grammar and the lexis, aiming at creating patterns of continuity and variation so that important material will be highlighted. All these properties and techniques attempt to hold a text together in a way that it makes sense to its audience during the communication process. Cf. Long, \textit{Grammatical Concepts}, 151, 55; Westfall, \textit{Discourse Analysis}, 22, 30–31; Wendland, \textit{Discourse Analysis}, 25; Groom, \textit{Linguistic Analysis}, 131–32; Taylor, \textit{Text-Linguistic Investigation}, 39.

\textsuperscript{56} Halliday's approach to discourse analysis interprets language as a system of meanings which are accompanied by forms through which the meanings can be realized; Halliday, \textit{Functional Grammar}, xiv.

\textsuperscript{57} Taylor, \textit{Text-Linguistic Investigation}, 39.

\textsuperscript{58} Westfall, \textit{Discourse Analysis}, 28.

\textsuperscript{59} Cohesion refers to a semantic property of a text that gives the text unity. The underlying assumption is that texts hold together in a unified way via a network of relationships, whether lexical or grammatical, making the text cohesive. Cohesion analysis is "a means of probing the cohesion dynamics of a text in order to discern where significant linguistic shifts occur in a discourse. These shifts can then be analyzed in light of other dynamics of the text to determine if the shift represents an intended boundary marker in the text. The identification of such boundaries is an initial step toward discerning the structure of the text." Thus, cohesion analysis is one of the plausible means that can identify structural patterns; Taylor, \textit{Text-Linguistic Investigation}, 45.
Binding discourse units together—the discourse units identified in the first phrase will be analyzed to observe how they are joined and integrated internally and externally by various formal links.

The investigation will be conducted with the assumption that the Masoretic tradition is the best we have available and to work from that basis rather than to attempt any major reconstruction work. Without adequate evidence, we should not be at liberty to emend whenever the traditional text presents difficulties. Since the study is a literary approach and is synchronic in nature, the concern in this section is with the canonical text as it has been received and not its pre-history.

**Establishing the Unit Boundaries**

It is generally agreed by scholars that the words הַנְּחֹן תָּמִי, which appear in 9:1 and 12:1, serve as major discourse markers which both separate Zech 1–8 from Zech 9–14, and divide Zech 9–14 into two oracles: Zech 9–11 and Zech 12–14. Along with this major opening marker is the shift in topic from the reunion of the divided monarchy in the first oracle to the prominence of Jerusalem in the second oracle.

In the first oracle (Zech 9–11), three initial imperatives, each introducing a shift in topic and/or addressee, are worthy of our consideration as opening signals: 9:9; 10:1; and 11:1. By adopting the proposed imperatives, Zech 9–10 is divided into the

---

60 Clark, “Discourse Structure in Zechariah 9–14,” 70.
61 See above—“The Coherence of Zechariah 9 and 10.”
62 According to Wendland’s work, forceful expression, especially in initial position, is a fairly dependable opening signal. Wendland, *Discourse Analysis*, 42. The imperative בְּמִלָּה in 9:12 does not constitute as a division marker for the noun נַעַר in v. 11 and v. 12 binds the two verses together as a thought unit, with the former announcing the gracious release of the Lord and the latter exhorting the released to return to Zion. Since v. 12 joins nicely with v. 11, both thematically and lexically, thus we do not treat נַעַר as an opening marker.
following units: (1) 9:1–8; (2) 9:9–17; (3) 10:1–12. These three segments will be examined in the following section to see how they are joined and integrated as coherent and cohesive discourses.

**Binding Discourse Units Together**

**Zechariah 9:1–8.** The majority of scholars today accept a delineation of a unit comprising the first eight verses, a view that is sustained on both form- and literary-critical grounds. Zechariah 9:1–8 is marked off by the heading יָד and ends with יָד, which forms an inclusion with יָד in 9:1. In both verses, this word יָד appears in a causal clause and is used as a metaphor emphasizing God’s transcendent and universal character.

**Zechariah 9:9–17.** The opening imperative יָד signals the beginning of a new unit which consists of 9:9–17. The opening of this unit is not only indicated by the imperative, but also marked by the shift in addressee from Yahweh to the audience and the shift in topic from divine judgment of the nations to divine salvation of Daughter Zion. Though Zech 9:9–10 is usually treated as a separate unit, the emphatic expression יָד in v. 11 signifies that Daughter Zion continues as the addressee. Butterworth argues that the conjunction יָד, which presupposes what has gone before, and the pronoun יָד, which refers to the יָד in 9:9, link the poem to the rest of chapter 9. In addition, the shared words and the contrasting images between vv. 9–10 and vv. 11–17

---

63 E.g., Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 41; Butterworth, Structure, 72, 177; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 7; Tai, Prophetic als Schriftauslegung, 10; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 414; Larkin, Eschatology, 50; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 440; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 87.

64 See CHAPTER THREE.

65 E.g., Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 465; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 46; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 169; Petterson, Behold Your King, 135; Sæbø, Sacharja 9–14, 175.

66 Butterworth, Structure, 73.
further bind the unit together: (1) ṣ̱ in v. 9 and v. 16; (2) כָּשָׁר and יָסָר אֲבָדָה in v. 10 and v. 13; and (3) יְהַבַּר in v. 9 contrasting דֶּנֶר בִּיוּר in v. 13. The whole section, vv. 9–17, depicts the consequences arising from the advent of the divine king in vv. 1–8, with vv. 9–10 addressing the coming of an ideal king and vv. 11–17 concerning the creation of an ideal people. The double imperatives in 9:9, together with the double יָסָר in 9:17, form an inclusion around the unit. The exclamatory expression, highlighted by the inclusion, prominently introduces the theme of the unit: the salvation of Yahweh is extremely wonderful.

Zechariah 10:1–12. The initial imperative יָשָׂר in 10:1 constitutes a syntactical break from chapter 9 and introduces a new unit which consists of 10:1–12. This demarcation is further supported by the shift in topic from joyful exclamation to Yahweh’s rebuke. In 9:17 the Jewish youth enjoys the plenteous fruit of the land, whereas in 10:1 the prophet admonishes the community to trust God for the abundant harvest. Since there is no other convincing discourse marker, we will treat 10:1–12 as a whole unit. The phrase יָשָׂר אֲבָדָה, which occurs at the end of 10:12, is a closure marker for the unit. The word יָשָׂר, which appears twice only in 10:1 and 10:12 in this unit, brackets the entire poem. This inclusion highlights prominently the theme of the unit:

Yahweh, as the real leader of the community, is the source of restoration.

---

67 Butterworth, Structure, 179.
69 Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 668.
70 Baldwin follows Lamarche’s division, stating that “there are differences of opinion as to where this section should end, but as 10:2b leads into the ‘shepherd’ theme the break has been made at the end of 10:1”; Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. 167. However, by doing so, two segments (9:17; 10:1) with different tones will be linked together. Moreover, the phrase יָשָׂר אֲבָדָה with “shepherd motif” has already occurred in 9:16.
Some interpreters associate 10:2–3 with 11:1–3 as both units show common
interest in Yahweh’s anger against the shepherds.⁷² Although these units are linked
together thematically, the opening imperative נבֶאת in 11:1 together with the closure
marker נַכַּל at the end of 10:12 signal the beginning of a new unit. The separation of
Zech 11 from Zech 10 is also supported by the shift in addressee from the audience in
10:12 to Lebanon in 11:1 and the shift in topic from restoration to judgment. In addition,
11:1–3 is a coherent poem,⁷³ which, together with the closing poem of the chapter (v.
17), brackets the narrative prophetic sign-acts (vv. 4–16), with the poems denouncing the
shepherds and the narrative condemning the flock. Moreover, as Butterworth argues, the
fact that seven of the sixteen words in 10:11 occur also in 9:1–8 (see Table 2 below),
with both segments dealing “with Israel’s traditional enemies,” suggests that “an inclusio
of some sort is intended.” He contends that this kind of “gather-line” construction may
indicate that “the end of ch. 10 is the end of a major section.”⁷⁴ Furthermore, the
טֹבִית in 10:6 and the בֵּית in 10:12 may form another inclusion, supporting our demarcation
in v. 12.⁷⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Number</th>
<th>Zech 10:11</th>
<th>Zech 9:1–8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>נבֶאת</td>
<td>מַעֲבֵר (v. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>בְּנֵים</td>
<td>בְּנֵים (v. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>נַכַּל</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁷² E.g., Petterson, Behold Your King, 152–59.
⁷³ Zechariah 11:1–3 is a distinct rhetorical unit which shares many points of connection within the
three verses: (1) thematically, they all depict disaster, with the causal כ providing reasons for the lament;
(2) rhetorically, they employ a style demanding attention: וַיְכַל; (3) the anadiplosis technique
draws them into a thought unit: נבֶאת אֶרֶץ; (4) they use imagery from the botanical world, e.g.,; Boda, Haggai,
⁷⁴ Butterworth, Structure, 176.
⁷⁵ See, also, CHAPTER SEVEN.
Overview of the Dissertation

This dissertation is divided into seven chapters, apart from an introduction and a conclusion. The introduction gives an overview of the project, stating its importance, scope and approach. Then, the discourse structure of Zech 9–10 will be defined so that the corpus can be divided into meaning units. The introductory chapter ends with an overview of each chapter, serving as an orientation to the whole project.

Chapter one opens with an evaluation of textual connection approaches to inner biblical allusion, inner biblical exegesis, tradition-history, and intertextuality, explaining why intertextual analysis is the best approach for the present study. Then the section “Hermeneutics of Intertextuality” proposes three interrelated assumptions, acting as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zech 9:1–8</th>
<th>Zech 10:1–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4–5</td>
<td>והכה בִּנְּךָ</td>
<td>והכה בִּנְּךָ (v. 4) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>יִלָּם</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>והבש</td>
<td>הנש (v. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–10</td>
<td>כְּלֵי מַשָּׁלוֹת יָזֶר</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>והוֹדָד</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–13</td>
<td>נָאוֹם אֱלֹהִים</td>
<td>נָאוֹם פַּלְשִׁים (v. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14–15</td>
<td>נִשְׁפָּם יַעֲרָא</td>
<td>נִשְׁפָּה יַעֲרָא (v. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>יַעֲרָא</td>
<td>יְהוָה (v. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* exclusive verbal parallel

Table 2: The Lexical Parallel between Zech 10:11 and 9:1–8

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that Zech 9–10 should be divided into three major units: (1) 9:1–8; (2) 9:9–17; and (3) 10:1–12. This demarcation will form the foundation of our subsequent examination of the corpus. Any grouping below the level of unit will be discussed in the relevant chapters dealing with the intertextual analysis of the text.
strategies of containment for practicing intertextuality in this project. Afterwards, the methodological process adopted in this dissertation will be depicted.

Chapter two begins with the investigation of the origin and setting of Second Zechariah. The final form of the corpus is located in the Persian period, ca. 440s B.C. The historical backdrop and the leadership in Yehud of that time frame are discussed in order to present the political and socioeconomic realities of the audience. The chapter ends with the dating of the intertexts, identifying the biblical materials in circulation when Zech 9–14 reached its final form.

Chapters three to seven offer an intertextual analysis of Zech 9–10, arranged according to the discourse structure listed above. However, the investigation of some units will be divided into two chapters due to the length of our discussion, e.g., the treatment of 9:9–10 in chapter four and 9:11–17 in chapter five. A summary of the findings, including the use of the sources and the intertextual reading of the passage, will be presented at the end of each chapter.

The last chapter is the conclusion of the whole project which presents a synthesis of all the findings. The general ways of leveraging earlier biblical material to express the vision of salvation in Zech 9–10 and the nature of the restoration expectations represented in the corpus will be portrayed. Finally, some suggestions for future intertextual studies on Second Zechariah will be offered.

Having defined the basic parameters of this dissertation, we will proceed now to present the methodology used to examine Zech 9–10.
CHAPTER ONE
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

In chapter one, we have set forth the goal of this dissertation which aims at offering an intertextual analysis of Zech 9-10 in order to depict the nature of the restoration expectations in these two chapters. In the following, we will evaluate various approaches relating to the study of textual connections and define the most appropriate method to accomplish our purpose.

Evaluation of Approach

Second Zechariah is notable for its re-use of earlier authoritative materials and this phenomenon has long been the subject of investigation, beginning with the groundbreaking work of Stade (1881–82)¹ and extending to subsequent inquiries tracing the dependence of Zech 9–14 on other books of the Hebrew Bible, including the studies of Delcor (1952),² Lutz (1968),³ Mason (1973),⁴ Willi-Plein (1974),⁵ Schaefer (1992),⁶

¹ For the work of Stade, see Stade, “Deuterosecharja,” 1–96; 151–72 and 275–309. Stade could be regarded as the first modern scholar to bring sustained focus on the ways in which Zech 9–14 depends upon earlier biblical materials. The rationale behind his work is that there is a linear development of the prophetic movement which helps to date the individual prophetic writings, with the later ones depending on the earlier ones as both of them are part of a progressively established movement (pp. 7–10). He places these six chapters in a prophetic tradition which developed from Jeremiah through Ezekiel to Zech 9–14, with a prominent expectation for the restoration of northern and southern tribes. The primary concern of his work is the origin of Second Zechariah.
² For the work of Delcor, see Delcor, “Les sources,” 385–411. Delcor’s work tries to discern the literary sources which have influenced the writer of Second Zechariah. He claims that the influence is mainly drawn from Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Trito-Isaiah, Job and Joel.
³ For the work of Lutz, see Lutz, Jahwe, Jerusalem und Die Völker. Lutz’s topical-historical
approach examines the relation of Zech 12:1–8 and 14:1–5 to earlier biblical material. After analyzing the texts, Lutz concludes with three main circles of traditions which compose the theme of "Yahweh, Jerusalem and the Nations": (a) the battle of the nations against Jerusalem, (b) Yahweh’s battle against the nations, and (c) Yahweh’s battle against Jerusalem. He suggests that “the battle of the nations against Jerusalem” is the oldest of the traditions which was gradually fused with the other two; Lutz, Jahwe, Jerusalem und Die Volker, 33–110.


Since the time of Stade (1881, 1882), Delcor (1952) and Lutz (1968), the most thorough study concerning the dependence of Zech 9–14 on other Old Testament books has been the doctoral dissertation of Mason, in which, cases of inner-biblical exegesis are investigated in order to “examine the use which is made of this material and to ask whether any general principles of exegesis can be detected.” Mason further aims to see “if the treatment of the material shows the outlook of any particular tradition and whether this throws any light on the circles from which these chapters came”; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” abstract.

In his conclusion, Mason stresses the dependence of Zech 9–14 on earlier biblical material, especially the Major Prophets, of which Second and Third Isaiah exerted the strongest influence. This “fluid and free adaptation” (p. 201) of earlier material mainly occurs in the form of allusive references which is being re-interpreted in a different way and applied in a new context. Mason emphasizes that there is a “very strong continuity of tradition between Proto- and Deutero-Zechariah” (p. 204) and Zech 9–14 reveals a perspective which believes that the prophetic hope, proclaimed in Zech 1–8 (also, previous prophets) are about to be fulfilled. Mason also suggests that Zech 9–14 emanates from a schismatic group, eschatological in outlook, with increasing opposition to the official leadership of their time. With these two main lines of tradition, Mason states that the final form of Zech 9–14 could be dated around 300 B.C.; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 201–206; Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 76, 79–82; Mason, “Relation,” 227–39.

Although not every intertextual link proposed by Mason is accepted without doubt, Mason’s work opened a new route of research which has become popular over the past decades as more and more scholars continue to examine the intertextuality and tradition-historical background of Zech 9–14.

For the work of Willi-Plein, see Willi-Plein, Prophetie am Ende. Willi-Plein’s work proceeds from the examination of the wordings in each small unit, via the form, to the text as a literary composition. Her “literary critical” approach argues that the two parts of Zech 9–14, i.e., chs. 9–11 and chs. 12–14, should be considered as one in the final form of the corpus, with the former focussing more on historical events and the latter on the promised future after the end of the history; Willi-Plein, Prophetie am Ende, 103, 120. She also investigates the dependence of Second Zechariah on the rest of the Hebrew Bible, concluding that the corpus mainly alludes to the Major Prophets and Hosea; Willi-Plein, Prophetie am Ende, 65–94.


For the work of Person, see Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School. This is the revision of his doctoral dissertation accepted at Duke University in 1991. Person’s work argues that the Deuteronomic school was responsible for the canonical form of Zechariah with the addition of II Zech (chs. 9–14) to I Zech (chs. 1–8). He further defines the Deuteronomic school as a scribal guild which reinterpreted earlier material within their particular theological and literary tradition during the exilic and
post-exilic periods. Based upon the studies of Delcor and Mason, he believes that II Zech is a unified work with one single redactor who borrows heavily from earlier prophetic materials. As a result, II Zech is the product of a Deuteronomic "redactor" who brought Zechariah into its final canonical form by reinterpreting I Zech in light of other biblical material, a new historical setting, and expectations of the future; Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 13, 24, 36, 202. His assumption is also affected by Martin Noth’s work on DtrH; Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien.

Person proposes that II Zech was produced sometime between 520 B.C. and 458 B.C. by the Deuteronomists who returned to Jerusalem in the early post-exilic period with Persian authority to preserve the religious texts associated with the temple administration, probably coinciding with Zerubbabel’s mission. They were willing to cooperate with the Persian ruling elite as they believed Yahweh would use the foreign power as an instrument to bring fulfillment of his promise, i.e., the full restoration of Israel. However, when the Persian-supported restoration fell short of their vision, they became increasingly disappointed with the Persian-controlled temple theocracy and developed sharper eschatological hopes of the future, which stressed Yahweh’s initiative in the full restoration, as reflected in Zech 9–14; Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 13, 18, 203–204. Person adopts the conclusion of Hill; see Hill, “Dating Second Zechariah.”

Larkin analyzes the origins of eschatology. She examines, based on Fishbane’s proposal, mantological features and techniques of Second Zechariah in order to identify the formative influence of mantic wisdom on the early development of apocalyptic eschatology; Larkin, Eschatology, 248. Cf. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 443–524.

Larkin investigates mantological exegesis of earlier traditions, allusions and typological connections to Old Testament motifs and concludes that apocalyptic eschatology could have roots in a variety of materials, e.g., liturgical language, dreams and visions. It need not be a product of social conflict alone, nor be formally linked to the wisdom tradition, as indicated in Zech 14, although, to a certain extent in accord with von Rad’s thesis, formal wisdom has some influence on the production of eschatology, as demonstrated in Zech 9–13. Her finding departs from the “dissidence theories” of Ploeger and Hanson and is similar to Cook’s proposal which also challenges the prevailing deprivation theory of biblical apocalypticism; Larkin, Eschatology, 253. Cf. Ploeger, Theocracy and Eschatology; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic; Cook, Prophecy & Apocalypticism.

Tai concludes that Zech 9–14 was redacted in four stages and each stage reveals a distinct tradition orientation: (1) 9:1–11:3 which borrows heavily from Jeremiah; (2) 11:4–16 which depends chiefly on Ezek 34 and 37; (3) 12:1–13:6 which builds mainly on Ezek 36–39; and (4) 14:1–21 which draws on the eschatological dimension of the “Day of YHWH” motif. He states that the composition of the final text was probably completed around the campaign of Alexander in 332 B.C., however, the historical events play a minor role in the interpretation of the text; Tai, Prophez die Schriftauslegung, 7–8.

Tai concludes that Zech 9–14 was redacted in four stages and each stage reveals a distinct tradition orientation: (1) 9:1–11:3 which borrows heavily from Jeremiah; (2) 11:4–16 which depends chiefly on Ezek 34 and 37; (3) 12:1–13:6 which builds mainly on Ezek 36–39; and (4) 14:1–21 which draws on the eschatological dimension of the “Day of YHWH” motif. He states that the composition of the final text was probably completed around the campaign of Alexander in 332 B.C., however, the historical events play a minor role in the interpretation of the text; Tai, Prophez die Schriftauslegung, 7–8.

For the work of Nurmela, see Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue. Nurmela’s work attempts to investigate the dependence of Zech 1–8 and Zech 9–14 on other Old Testament books and on each other by adopting a method based on strictly verbal similarity. In order to minimize the effect of subjective
them examine the intertextual dialogue of Zech 9–14 with earlier biblical materials, they sometimes arrive at different conclusions due to the use of different approaches to this phenomenon. For example, Fishbane’s model of inner biblical exegesis affirms the dependence of Zech 9:9–10 on Gen 49:10–11 by focusing on the similarity in vocabulary, whereas Tai’s tradition-historical approach does not arrive at this conclusion by looking for correspondence in form and tradition. Nurmela’s work on inner biblical allusion concludes that Zech 9–14 is only dependent on Isa 1–11 and Isa 29–31 and this finding challenges the prevailing scholarly opinion that II and III Isaiah are the most important sources for Second Zechariah, a view argued, for example, by Mason. This raises the question of what is the most appropriate method for analyzing the textual connections between Zech 9–14 and other, presumably prior, biblical texts in this project.

During the past five decades scholars interested in the connections between one biblical text and another have used various terms to describe their approaches: (1) inner biblical allusion; (2) inner biblical exegesis; (3) tradition-history; and (4) intertextuality. Each critical term reflects a different “interpretive claim, which in turn represents the use

---


In his conclusion, he states that, in addition to their mutual dependence, both parts of Zechariah are significantly dependent on Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel and this connection is dominated by the theme of salvation. Regarding Zech 9–14, he contends that only a dependence on Isa 1–11 and Isa 29–31 can be demonstrated and this finding challenges the prevailing scholarly opinion that II and III Isaiah are the most important sources of Second Zechariah. He also holds that Deutero Zechariah should not be divided into two parts, i.e. Zech 9–11 and Zech 12–14; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 233–35.

Besides those mentioned above, others brief works on Zech 9–14 in this line include, such works as De Vries, From Old Revelation to New; Laato, A Star Is Rising; Boda, “Reading Between the Lines,” 277–91; Boda and Porter, “Literature to the Third Degree,” 215–54. In addition, Boda and Floyd, Bringing Out the Treasure is also an invaluable work on this topic.

In his conclusion, he examines the proposed interdependent passages with words and phrases occurring exclusively or predominately in a similar context; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 2, 27.
of different methods.” Thus, a brief examination of these terms and their related approaches would be helpful in our methodological delineation.

A precise definition of what constitutes an allusion is the initial task of those who employ the inner biblical allusion approach. Sommer, following Miner, defines allusion as “tacit reference to another literary work, to another art, to history, to contemporary figures, or the like.” For Sommer, in order for an allusion to be recognized, it requires “an echo of sufficiently familiar yet distinctive and meaningful elements” and “an audience sharing the tradition with the poet.” Sommer emphasizes that this approach is author-oriented and diachronic. The focus of this kind of study is to examine primarily how one composition evokes its antecedents and what sources a text utilizes. Thus, the synchronic dimension which concerns the relationship of the text and the reader will not be stressed. Due to an overemphasis on the relationship between the text and its antecedent diachronically, Sommer’s work has been criticized for neglecting to appreciate the wider pictures presented particularly by those highly-allusive texts. In his study, Isa 53 is a veritable mosaic of allusions to several sources, each of which Sommer investigates separately without asking how the chapter reads as a whole, or how any reader could be expected to pick up these complex and intertwined allusions. In addition, because he limits himself to specific sources that have an identifiable literary relationship, he narrowly rules out analysis of the exodus motif

---

13 Petersen, “Methodological Reflections,” 211. The following discussion of these terms has drawn on Petersen’s work; Petersen, “Methodological Reflections,” 210–24.
14 Porter comments: “Allusion has proven to be one of the most difficult notions to define in literary study”; Porter, “Further Comments,” 109.
16 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 10.
17 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 6–7, 10.
18 Houston, review of A Prophet Reads Scripture, 422.
which is so prominent in Second Isaiah, as it cannot be proved whether the prophet was
drawing on specific texts from the tradition.19

The approach based on inner biblical exegesis intends to examine the exegetical
use of earlier biblical material in the host text. The claim that texts are related in an
exegetical manner is a stronger claim than that of an allusion, thus ruling out a number of
possible connections which might not be exegetical. In addition, the inner biblical
exegesis method takes a stabilized literary formulation as its point of departure,
interpreting basically a fixed traditum. As Fishbane explains: “whereas the study of
tradition-history moves back from the written sources to the oral traditions which make
them up, inner-biblical exegesis starts with the received Scripture and moves forward to
the interpretations based on it.”20 So, the focus of this kind of study is on the exegetical
use of already authoritative texts by later author. The fundamental issue of this textual
connection approach is how to determine whether the reuse is exegetical or just allusive.
It is evident that inner biblical exegesis does exist in the Hebrew Bible, however, it is
clear that not all instances in which one text alludes to another involves an exegetical
impulse, e.g., Isa 29:3 in Zech 9:8a.21

Actually those who have worked on textual connections, whether of inner biblical
allusion, e.g., Nurmela, or of inner biblical exegesis, e.g., Mason, occasionally have
turned to the explicit language of tradition history, that is, “reflection about traditions and
the way they work themselves out over time.”22 When Nurmela examined the Zion
tradition and concluded that “Jerusalem in Zechariah is shared by four other Old

19 Linafelt, review of A Prophet Reads Scripture, 123.
20 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 7.
21 See “Allusion to Isa 29:3” in CHAPTER THREE.
22 Petersen, “Methodological Reflections,” 220.
Testament writings: Isa 1–39, Micah, Joel and the Psalms,” his judgment was based on the traiditum rather than the precise form of its textualization. Tai takes up this line of research and deals with both tradition history and specific allusions. In analyzing Zech 9:9–10, he used both the presence of shared lexical data and similar form-critical features to identify the intertexts. Then he turned to the traditions about kings attested in the Psalms to conclude that the Zecharian text refers to the earthly Davidide. The tradition-historical approach is similar to the method based on inner biblical allusion in that both of them are concerned with how one composition evokes its antecedents, with the former focusing on the re-use of traditions and the latter looking into the textual sources.

The concept of intertextuality is so filled with ambiguity that some scholars even suggest that the term should be dropped altogether. However, as reflected in the recent work of Porter, nearly all methods dealing with textual connections nowadays still require extensive clarification. If so, then intertextuality is not unique. Some scholars have negative views on intertextuality as they believe that the rubric, as a “reader-oriented, semiotic method,” is purely synchronic in its approach, thus neglecting

24 Tai, Prophétie als Schriftauslegung, 37–51.
26 Porter, “Further Comments,” 98–110. At the beginning of his paper, Porter comments: “In 1977, I published an article that I thought would no doubt help to clarify, if not lay to rest once and for all, one of the most important and enduring problems in New Testament study—the issue of how one determines when a passage from the Old Testament is used in the New Testament. I was of course wrong in both regards...In fact, it is arguable that since that time the issue has become even more complex, as the categories for discussion have either become, in some circles, more intransigent, or, in other circles, multiplied to greater numbers than they were before...I no longer have the idealized hope of solving the multiplex issues involved, or even of arriving at a standard terminology or approach to the topic, but believe that we must still attempt with all due diligence and effort to clarify the issues involved and their significance for determining how and in what ways the Old Testament is used in the New”; Porter, “Further Comments,” 98–99. Cf. Porter, “Use of the Old Testament,” 79–96.
the diachronic dimension of textual connections of biblical literature, e.g., citation, which is "historical" in nature.\textsuperscript{27} However, this is not necessarily the complete picture.\textsuperscript{28} Floyd is probably right in his argument that the theoretical rubric of intertextuality should "include both the production and reception of texts."\textsuperscript{29} This is particularly true when intertextuality is viewed as a "covering term" for all the possible relations that can be established between texts.\textsuperscript{30} Hatim and Mason remind us that intertextuality is not simply a mechanical process, amalgamating "bits and pieces" culled from other texts, but rather a force, transforming intertexts to accomplish the communicative purpose in the host text.\textsuperscript{31} Thus, both relationships, either between the antecedent text and the author or between the text and the reader, are the main concerns of the intertextual approach. Though the reception aspect lies beyond our scope, critics may attempt to suggest the probable impact that such intertextual insight might make upon the reading of the corpus in its final form or to project the possible rhetorical effects that such connections might have created for the readers when they pick up those complex and intertwined allusions.

\textsuperscript{27} E.g., Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 7. According to Sommer, intertextuality is distinct from allusion/influence. The former one "is concerned with the reader or with the text as a thing independent of its author," thus synchronic in approach, while the latter one "are concerned with the author as well as the text and reader," thus diachronic in approach; Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 6–8.

\textsuperscript{28} Plett claims that there is no single intertextual method, opting, instead, for "intertextualities"; Plett, "Intertextualities," 3–27.


\textsuperscript{29} Floyd, "Types of Intertextuality," 226.

\textsuperscript{30} This term is suggested by Miscall; Miscall, "Isaiah," 44.

Of the four rubrics mentioned above, intertextuality, as a covering term, is the broadest in scope, recognizing the rich textual web created by the interconnections between multiple texts. A broad field of enquiry is necessary because Second Zechariah often incorporates materials from multiple sources, combining texts and traditions into a composite whole within the wider boundaries of "fluid and free adaptation of earlier materials."\(^{32}\) The kind of "allusive word-play"\(^{33}\) in the corpus may suggest that a method based on searching for either verbal connections or traditions alone is too narrow for the task. Approaching the investigation of Zech 9–10 from the more broadly conceived perspective of intertextuality leaves adequate room for the corpus to be reminiscent of another for various reasons and in various ways, thus avoiding the limitations of other textual connection methods discussed above.

Due to the highly allusive character of Zech 9–10, we confine our study to the rubric of intertextuality as its associated approach is broad enough for the task. The intertextual approach suggested here is sensitive to the nature of textual re-use of the corpus. It draws together features from different methods mentioned above. On the one hand, like inner-biblical approaches, it focuses on objective results that can be quantified and analyzed. On the other hand, like tradition-history approaches, it goes beyond the strict verbal parallels to recognize correlated connections. Since we intend to read Zech 9–10 in light of its intertexts, the approach further allows us to discern any possible impact that such intertextual insights might make upon the reading of the corpus as a whole.


Based on this intertextual approach, we will define a particular method suitable for the project. In order to utilize the strength of the rubric but at the same time to avoid its weakness, this dissertation adopts the suggestion of Beal, namely, to contain intertextuality ideologically so that its literary notion can be applied fruitfully to the study of Zech 9–10.\(^{34}\)

**Hermeneutics of Intertextuality**

Intertextuality as a concept is not new in traditional biblical scholarship, though the term itself is of more recent origin.\(^{35}\) The use of texts within texts has been


The term “intertextuality” was first coined by Julia Kristeva as a technical term in literary-critical discussion in 1969 in order to disrupt notions of stable meaning and objective interpretation. She argued: “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double”; Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 66. Kristeva’s *Semeiotike: recherches pour une sémanalyse* (1969) was translated into English as *Desire in Language* in 1980. Although intertextuality was first coined by Kristeva, Tull comments, “it does indeed describe a phenomenon that has emerged in a variety of ways since the dawn of language and philosophy... discussions of some forms of intertextuality can be found at least as far back as Plato and Aristotle”; Tull (Willey), “Intertextuality,” 66.

Drawing on the work of Bakhtin, Kristeva sets out a new mode of semiotics, called semianalysis, which captures a vision of texts as always in a state of production, rather than being products to be quickly consumed. In her approach, not only the text is in process, but also the author and the reader join in a process of continual production of the text. Thus, ideas are not presented as finished, consumable products, but are presented in such a way as to encourage readers themselves to step into the production of meaning. Kristeva’s work stands beside the work of many other seminal poststructuralist critics, e.g., Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and Louis Althusser; Allen, *Intertextuality*, 16, 30–35.

The work of Kristeva is further developed by Barthes, a notable poststructuralist, who declares “the death of the author” (1968) since he believes that literary meaning can never be fully stabilized as the intertextual nature of literary work always leads readers on to new textual relations, thus opening the door to an infinite fluidity of meaning; Barthes, *Image*, 142–48.

Since its appearance in poststructuralist work of the late 1960s, intertextuality has also been explored by critics of more structuralist thought, e.g., Michael Riffaterre (1978) and Gérard Genette (1982). They have adopted the term to draw limits around the relations between texts and the field of critical enquiry, thus arguing against the views of Kristeva and Barthes. For the work of Riffaterre, see
examined as sources in literary-, redaction- and tradition-critical studies, or as patterns within form criticism. Likewise, the study of religious history has long searched for similarities of ideas, motifs, literary patterns, or formulations between texts from differing cultures and religions. However, the advent of the concept of on-going dialogism in poststructuralism, which stresses the interwoven texture of multi-voiced texts, makes intertextuality an increasingly complex subject area. The controversial definitions and contradictory usages of intertextuality make this concept a battleground of various emphases and claims. The major problem, suggested by Beal, is that intertextuality has been developed in poststructuralism as a theoretical rather than a methodological term, thus its notion is too broad to be practical. If intertextuality is not only a perspective on textual production and reception, but also an exegetical methodology addressing relationships between biblical texts, then the first task of an interpreter is to confine intertextuality ideologically by drawing lines of delimitation for it, even though these lines are set arbitrarily or temporarily for a particular purpose. In

Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry*. For the work of Genette, see Genette, *Palimpsestes*. The poststructuralist theories employ the term intertextuality to disrupt notions of meaning, whilst structuralist critics use the same term to argue for certainty of literary meaning. Both stances within the theories of intertextuality have taken very different approaches to the relationship between readers and the literary texts they read. Thus, we should remember that the radical indeterminacy of post-structuralist intertextuality is only one way the term is used and it need not be the only way.

37 For the concept of on-going dialogism, see Bakhtin, *Dialogic Imagination*. The dialogism of Bakhtin is further developed as Kristeva’s intertextuality; see note above. Bakhtin’s work stresses the on-going dialogic nature of language, resulting in the conclusion that no interpretation is ever complete because every word is a response to previous words and elicits further responses: “at any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form. These ‘languages’ of heteroglossia intersect each other in a variety of ways, forming new socially typifying ‘languages’”; Bakhtin, “Discourse,” 291.
39 Beal, “Ideology and Intertextuality,” 27.
order to put strategies of containment in place for practicing intertextuality in this
dissertation, the following hermeneutical issues must be determined.\(^{40}\)

1. The Definition of a Text

2. The Agents of Textual Meaning

3. The Nature of Textual Relationships

The Definition of a Text

What is a Text? This is a foundational question since intertextuality is concerned
with the relationships between texts. In the wider world of literary theory, a text in
intertextuality could be extended beyond literature to encompass all signs (i.e.,
signifiers), thus resulting in a situation as summed up by Derrida: “There is nothing
outside of the text.”\(^{41}\) The poststructuralist further proposes that a text in intertextuality
is a text-as-dialogue which is perpetually and indeterminably referring beyond itself to
other texts and other contexts, thus constituting our linguistic universe (i.e., Derrida’s
“general text”). As Barthes proclaims: “We know now that a text is not a line of words
releasing a single ‘theological’ meaning...but a multi-dimensional space in which a
variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash.”\(^ {42}\) According to this
definition, there are no apparent boundaries to contain a text in relation to other texts and
all texts can contribute continuously to the production of meaning, thus making a
definitive interpretation impossible.

\(^{40}\) These hermeneutical issues are considered in light of the works of Tull (Willey),
“Intertextuality,” 59–90; Stead, Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 18–27.

\(^{41}\) Derrida, Of Grammatology, 158.

\(^{42}\) Barthes, Image, 146.
In order to make an intertextual reading possible, one must delimit the indeterminate “general text” ideologically as a strategy of containment. The proposed definition must place a text somewhere between the closed structure of a single text and the endless fabric of language. In this project, texts in intertextuality will be confined to literary texts, including the *traditum* reflected therein. The contained texts, whether the alluding or the alluded, are set within the canonical writings in the Masoretic traditions, implying that any discussion of intertextuality is only to be found among them. Under this restricted definition, a text could still be interrelated indefinitely with other texts in multiple ways, just as Kristeva depicts: “a mosaic of quotations,” however, within this dialoguing process, the intertexts must be able to be located, though with various degrees of specificity.

The Agents of Textual Meaning

Where does meaning reside? Who are the agents of meaning? In classical theory, authors were given credit for endowing texts with meaning, as Calvin advocates in his *Commentaries* that we should understand and expound “the mind of the biblical

---


44 Most of the traditio-historical studies have focused on the oral stage of tradition transmission, implying that this kind of study is of little help after texts have been combined into a canonical form. However, Fishbane has challenged this implication by showing how the same processes evident in the oral stage continue into the written phase, even within the Hebrew Bible itself; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 1–19.

Boda also agrees that the traditio-historical process is able to function on both the oral and written planes, he comments: “There remains a *traditum* and a *traditio* in both stages, however, in the oral phase there is more room for fluidity, while in the written phase, the distinction between *traditum* and *traditio* is much smaller. ... It is essential to note that the *traditio* is only accessible through the *traditum*. One can only discern the history of the tradition by first properly evaluating the content of the tradition”; Boda, *Praying the Tradition*, 2–3.

45 See “The Nature of Textual Relationships” below.
A reader's job was to seek the authorial intent by following the pathways created by the author. If a text alluded to another text, a reader would be able to recognize that allusion and to recreate the author's purpose in using it. The authors are the only agents of meaning and the texts are the records of their intents.

However, in reality, no actual reader could read exactly the way as intended by an author since they would be inclined to omit allusions embedded while hearing unintended echoes. Because of this, critics have come to recognize the role of readers in the production of textual meaning. Poststructural intertextualists even affirm readers as co-authors of texts, as Kristeva argues: "The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity." Barthes posited in his essay "From Work to Text" that the author has become a paper entity only, who has come undone. He concludes that "the text itself plays," in all its pluralities of possible meanings, "and the reader himself plays twice over: playing the text as one plays a game, he searches for a practice that will reproduce the text." In this view, the text becomes a self-contained world and the reading communities can construct what counts for them as the meaning of the text. These controversial theories lead us to reconsider the agency roles of text and reader in the construction of meaning.

The inquiry of agency in intertextual theory is crucially important, but extremely complex. Historically, the role of readers, and also that of the text, in the making of meaning has been neglected. The significance of messages proceeding beyond what an author could have meant has not always been observed. In order to employ

---

47 Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 66.
48 Barthes, "From Work to Text," 78.
49 Barthes, "From Work to Text," 79.
intertextuality as an exegetical methodology, the complex relationship between author, text, and reader, especially the role of each one in the production of meaning, has to be investigated.

Although not everyone agrees with the theories of the poststructuralists, they should be given credit for reminding us to revisit the role of the reader and also that of the text in the interpretive process. There is an increasing recognition that both “text” and “reader” have irreducible roles to play in the production of meaning. In examining the agency roles of these two partners, Eco’s theory of semiotics which embraces both the active role of reader in determining textual meaning and the confining role of text in providing a frame-limiting interpretation can offer insights for our hermeneutics.\(^50\) Eco explains that “in the process of communication, a text is frequently interpreted against the background of codes different from those intended by the author,” thus, affirming the active role of the reader in determining meaning.\(^51\) However, he further qualifies the situation, “To say that interpretation... is potentially unlimited does not mean that interpretation has no object and that it ‘riverruns’ for the sake of itself... The interpreted text imposes some constraints upon its interpreters.”\(^52\)

This confining character of the text is also argued in Riffaterre’s work which emphasizes that the reader would be led through the textual elements towards the “plot”

\(^{50}\) For Eco’s work, see his *Role of the Reader* (1979) and *Limits of Interpretation* (1990). In his *Reading the Latter Prophets* (2003), Conrad shares the later position of Eco. In some respects, Conrad’s hermeneutical journey is similar to that of Eco’s: first stressing the “role of the reader” (Eco, *Role of the Reader*; cf. Conrad, *Reading Isaiah*; Conrad, *Zechariah*) and then the textual “limits of interpretation” (Eco, *Limits of Interpretation*; cf. Conrad, *Reading the Latter Prophets*); Conrad, *Reading the Latter Prophets*, 15.


\(^{52}\) Eco, *Limits of Interpretation*, 6.
that links them differently from their purely grammatical connections. Riffaterre’s concept is further illustrated in Thiselton’s study which reminds us that the text can also transform its readers by bringing them into a projected narrative-world in which their feelings and imagination are transformed by the world of the text. Wolde also shares this view and contends that readers have to follow the cultural conventions laid down in the texts which restrain the intertextual reading by offering certain possibilities. The confining role of the text is particularly real when we examine the issue of agents of meaning under the concept of transference in which the reader and the text are interdependent. Gadamer’s statement that “the structure of play absorbs the player into itself” is an excellent summary of the above discussion.

In this project, we affirm that a reader has a crucial role to play in arriving at textual meaning, which may range along a spectrum which extends from decoding a meaning to creating a meaning. However, the reader’s involvement in the meaning production process does not bypass the text which has been encoded by the author with textual “markers” in order to guide the reader along the interpretive journey. With this assumption, we propose that biblical textual connections are intentional—though there is

54 Thiselton, New Horizons, 31–35.
57 Gadamer, Truth and Method, 105.
58 A reader’s role in decoding a meaning as well as creating a meaning is especially true when we consider Voelz’s proposal about application: “...as a reader reads, he reads...but that he also reads simultaneously his own life-experience as sign and relates it and its potential meaning to the signs and to the meanings of those signs on the various levels which comprise a text, to make sense of his own life-experience as sign, i.e., to apply the text to himself...It is, then, the text of the life-experience of the interpreter which is being interpreted in each “application,” and this is done by establishing an intertextual relationship between this (life-experience) text and the given text which is, overtly, being interpreted”; Voelz, “Multiple Signs,” 33.
no way to be certain. The author intends the audience to read the text in light of its intertexts.59

Mettinger, by quoting Riffaterre, defines markers as "both the problem, when seen from the text, and the solution to that problem when their other, intertextual side is revealed."60 Iser's gap theory echoes Mettinger's argument: "The indeterminate sections, or gaps, of literary texts are in no way to be regarded as a defect; on the contrary, they are a basic element for the aesthetic response [of the readers]."61 With these markers, Nielsen believes that it is possible for readers to determine where they should draw on their knowledge of intertexts: "I must do this where the text insists on something ... that I cannot immediately understand the meaning of. Something does not quite make sense."62 According to the above, the obscure or awkward expressions in the text could be seen as clues for the readers, alerting them to pick up the embedded allusions during the reading process. This strategy of "obscurity" will be used as one of the measures in detecting intertexts in this project. Above all, our discussion relies on the assumption that readers are capable and willing to fuse their horizons with the horizon of the text, thus allowing the voice of the text to be heard.63 In this dissertation, a responsible and competent reader who can recognize the textual connection in the text is presupposed.

61 Iser continues: "Generally, the reader will not even be aware of them [gaps]...[n]evertheless, they influence his reading...the reader fills in the remaining gaps. He removes them by a free play of meaning-projection and thus himself provides the unformulated connections between the particular views"; Iser, *Prospecting*, 9–10.
63 Wolde emphasizes that it is the role of the reader to regain and actualize the world of the text; Van Wolde, "Trendy Intertextuality?" 48. Cf. Thiselton, *New Horizons*, 33, 252.
It is obvious that intertextuality is text- and reader-oriented; nonetheless, as discussed above, the author still has a role to play in the construction of meaning. Bakhtin’s influential theories remind us that meaning is unique as it belongs to the linguistic interaction of specific individuals within specific social contexts: “not only the meaning of the utterance but also the very fact of its performance is of historical and social significance.” Based on this, the role of cultural boundaries in constraining what is possible for both authors and readers to mean has to be considered. Thus our approach to intertextuality will be both synchronic and diachronic. This approach suggests that the author and the world behind the text are still indispensible as they provide valuable information for a responsible reader to understand the specific contexts of the antecedent text, the interpreting text, and their dialogue. Any synchronic account of a text must be based on diachronic sensibilities of the possible intertexts which constitute the “textual web” and the “dialogue partners” because every text and its interaction are historically and socially conditioned. Thus, the author is still an agent of meaning, though not the only one.

The Nature of Textual Relationships

Literary references to precursor texts or allusions to other texts are not at all a new concept, but rather known to us from Homer and other ancient writers of texts, e.g.,

---

64 Bakhtin and Medvedev, *Formal Method*, 120.
65 The diachronic phase will identify all kinds of inner-biblical connections, study the larger contexts of both texts, and reflect upon how the antecedent is being used within the later text. The synchronic phase will examine the later text to discern the impact that such intertextual insight might make upon the reading of the final form of the corpus within its final textual context; Boda, “Quotation and Allusion,” 297. Cf. Schultz’s detailed analysis on diachronic and synchronic approaches; Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 227–239.
Plato and his theory of imitation. What is significant is the way in which the intertextual relationships between texts are viewed. Under this notion, we need to address two issues—one is connected with form, and the other, strategy.

**Connections on the Formal Level**

How are texts interrelated? In what way does a text connect with its source? The answers to these questions vary from the minimalist, e.g., Bloom, to the maximalist, e.g., Barthes. According to Bloom, each strong poet is the heir of a single poetic father, with the latter text borrowing from the earlier one in a relatively undisturbed atmosphere: “It does happen that one poet influences another, or more precisely, that one poet’s poems influence the poems of the other.” However, Barthes sees texts as being so thoroughly interwoven in the textual web that tracing lines between them becomes impossible as well as meaningless: “The citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable.” Instead of striving at both ends of the scale, this project views connections between texts as encompassing a broad range of possibilities along the continuum, ranging from deliberately marked citations to more subtle echoes of texts, with specific words, phrases, images, themes, forms, and/or structure as connecting devices. This formal relation of the text and its intertexts can be mapped into one of the following categories, ranging on a spectrum from certain identifiability to unknown.

1. Citation—an attributed quotation with acknowledging source;

---

70 The following terms are defined briefly according to the works of Stead and Beal; Stead, *Intertextuality*, 22; Beal, “Glossary,” 21–24. For detailed discussion of the terms, see Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 10–31.
2. Quotation—an identifiable word-for-word repetition, involving three or more shared words;

3. Allusion—an implicit re-use of a sequence of words or ideas, sharing two or more literary features;\footnote{See Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 10--13. Note the different definitions of allusion used by Beal and Porter. For Beal, allusion evokes for the reader a larger textual field by mobilizing unnamed sources. When determining an allusion, the question of whether the author intended to allude to something or not is not a factor; Beal, "Glossary," 21; Porter distinguishes paraphrase from allusion and defines it as an intentional and specific invoking of a definable passage even though it is made in other words and/or other form; Porter, "Further Comments," 108.}

4. Echo—similar to an allusion, but with fewer identifiable elements, probably entailing one or two features or notions;\footnote{Porter writes: "The echo may be consciously intentional or unintentional, and involves not paraphrase of a specific passage, not allusion to a person, place, or literary work, but the invocation by means of thematically related language of some more general notion or concept"; Porter, "Further Comments," 109. The theory of echo was first developed by John Hollander in 1981 and was fully explored in biblical studies by Richard B. Hays in 1989; see Hollander, \textit{Figure of Echo}; Hays, \textit{Echoes}.}

5. Trace—defined as the erasure mark or absence of a text, which leads readers to stray into the margins and off the page.

In mapping the formal relations between the text and its intertexts, the following points should be noted. First, by arranging a spectrum of possibilities, the categories actually blend into one another, and in practice it is difficult to distinguish them definitively, especially between an allusion and an echo. There is an inevitable fluidity between these items.\footnote{Stead, \textit{Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8}, 22.} Second, Zech 9–10 may also contain traces of other texts which we cannot identify, thus we will not register any intertext from this category. Third, the classification of the intertexts into different categories denotes that intertextuality is regarded as a "covering term" for all the possible relations that can be established.
between texts,\textsuperscript{74} or viewed as a broad field grouping together various text-linking approaches which deal with the complex interactions between texts under its “umbrella.”\textsuperscript{75} Fourth, by providing some categories which identify how texts evoke their antecedents, e.g., quotation and allusion, as part of its species, it acknowledges that approaches to intertextuality should be both diachronic and synchronic.\textsuperscript{76}

Closely related to the question of formal ties is the matter of how one determines bona fide connections between texts.\textsuperscript{77} Scholars have suggested a number of criteria to evaluate evidence for dependence, attempting to distinguish genuine intertextualities from coincidental similarities. Foremost among these criteria is the presence of shared lexical features which is regarded by many critics as the most important telltale sign of intertextuality.\textsuperscript{78} However, Floyd challenges us to reflect further on this criterion when mapping the relations between text and intertext. He argues that the frequency of verbal parallels cannot be regarded as the only determinative index, but rather should be complemented by other kinds of analysis that can put the results in a larger literary

\textsuperscript{74} Miscall, “Isaiah,” 44. This approach is different from Sommer’s work which argues for a complete dichotomy between “allusion” and “intertextuality.” However, Sommer’s argument is an over-simplification of the issues, because not all intertextualists are synchronic reader-response critics; see Stead’s discussion. Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 6–10; Stead, Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 22–23.

\textsuperscript{75} Under the concept of “umbrella,” Moyise has proposed three categories: (1) Intertextual echo—faint traces of texts that are probably quite unconscious but can evoke popular theme in the scriptural heritage with one dimensional parameter; (2) Dialogical intertextuality—the interaction between a text and its intertexts is seen to operate in mutual directions; and (3) Postmodern intertextuality—a phenomenon similar to that of the poststructuralist in which a text always points to other texts, thus making the determination of meaning impossible. The third category is the one that Beal calls for delimitation “in order to come up with a coherent meaning”; Moyise, “Intertextuality,” 14–41; Beal, “Ideology and Intertextuality,” 30.

\textsuperscript{76} See “The Agents of Textual Meaning” above.

\textsuperscript{77} See discussion in Miller, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research,” 294–98.

perspective. Floyd’s conclusion is sensible especially when we understand that intertextuality exists on both micro- and macro-levels, e.g., the repetitions of words and phrases in the former and the use of type-scenes and typology in the latter.

Supplementing the heavy reliance on verbal parallels, Delorme suggests the possibility that intertextuality is indicated by the “theme” which governs the literary and rhetorical construction of the book. Those who pursue the tradition-historical approach, e.g., Boda, may recognize the possibility of thematic connections where motifs of a particular tradition are clearly evident. This broader approach runs the danger of subjectivity, as evidenced in Fishbane’s interpretation of Isa 48:21, however, evaluation restricted to verbal repetition alone may distort the result due to the limitations of the field of inquiry, as seen in Nurmela’s work.

In order to avoid the danger of subjectivity, this project gives priority to verifiable lexical data, nevertheless, other literary features, e.g., shared content and formal resemblances, still have a “legitimate place” in our detection of intertexts. They are considered as supplementary devices, in addition to verbal parallels, for identifying textual connections. Though this project does not register intertextuality based on

---

81 Delorme, “Intertextualities about Mark,” 38–42.
82 Boda, Praying the Tradition, 3.
83 The use of theme alone as the only connecting device might involve subjectivity, e.g., in his discussion of Isa 48:21: “They did not thirst when He led them through the deserts. He made the water flow out of the rock for them; He split the rock and the water gushed forth (בְּרִית צֵדֵק),” Fishbane claims to find a “literal pentateuchal allusion”; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 346. It is true that the verse refers to the tradition of the “water from the rock,” which is known primarily from Exodus and Numbers. However, careful examination of the wording of the Isaianic text reveals that its lexical linkages with parallel passages in Exod 17:6 (םֵית, נֵית, נְכַש), Num 20:8 (םֵית), and even Deut 8:15 (וֹלֵל, וֹלָל, וֹלָל) are rather slight, particularly when compared with Ps 78 where the splitting of the rock is recounted in vv. 15 (כָּרָךְ נָשִׁים) and 20 (כָּרָךְ נָשִׁים) instead of לֹא. Thus, the allusion in Isa 48:21 most likely derives from Ps 78 rather than any of the pentateuchal texts. Cf. Tull (Willey), Remember the Former Things, 77–78.
84 Boda, Praying the Tradition, 3.
non-verbal correspondences alone, their presence contributes to the density of the shared features and thus bolsters the argument in favor of literary dependence. In detecting intertexts, the following principles serve as methodological guidelines: 85

(1) For verbal parallels, the likelihood of an intertextual relationship is greater if
   (a) the shared words and phrases are rare or distinctive rather than commonly used ones, e.g., proverbial sayings, idiomatic language, or formulaic expressions; (b) the words share similar contexts, morphologies, syntax, and/or connotations rather than just language; (c) the shared language involves more than only a single word or phrase; and (d) the shared language is a phrase rather than individual shared terms. 86

(2) For non-verbal parallels, an argument in favor of literary dependence is more cogent if (a) there is a great density of parallels between the texts rather than only a few; (b) the series of parallels occur in the same order or formulation in both texts; and (c) the parallels in question are distinctive with unusual characteristics setting them apart. 87

---

85 Cf. the seven "tests" for allusions in Hays, *Echoes*, 29–32: (1) Availability: whether the proposed source was available to the author and/or original readers; (2) Volume: the degree of explicit repetition of words and syntactical patterns; (3) Recurrence: how often that particular source is reused in the text; (4) Thematic Coherence: how well the suggested source fits into the line of argument of the host; (5) Historical Plausibility: whether the proposed source was intended by the author and understood by the original readers; (6) History of Interpretation: whether other readers also detect the alleged allusion; and (7) Satisfaction: whether the proposed reading makes sense to other readers too. For a critique of Hay's seven texts, see Shum, *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans*, 7–11.

86 Cf. the eight methodological principles suggested in Leonard, "Identifying," 246–57.

87 MacDonald, "Introduction," 2.
Connections on the Strategic Level

Why are texts interrelated? For what purpose does a text allude to its source? During the dialogic process, some texts may seek to assert their own meaning by overthrowing another, whereas others may rely on the other texts for their own meaning. Instead of struggling at both ends of the scale, this project regards dialogic relationships as covering a spectrum of possibilities along the continuum, extending from texts nuancing each other to texts contending with each other. The reason for dependence and its implication for interpretation of the later text can be identified with one of the following categories, extending from acknowledgment to rejection:

(1) Authority—(a) of the host text: a lack of confidence may prompt an author to borrow from a work already acknowledged as scripture. Through allusions, an author may claim that the new text is worth reading, just as its predecessors were, thus finding a “place in the ancient divine scheme of things”; (b) of the source text: an acknowledgment of influence may seek to reinforce the authority of a predecessor which the new work claims to have

88 Bloom argues that all literary texts are a strong misreading of those that precede them, he states: “Poetic history ... is held to be indistinguishable from poetic influence, since strong poets make that history by misreading one another, so as to clear imaginative space for themselves”; Bloom, Anxiety, 5, 162.
89 Hollander contends that echoes work constructively, by a process of metalepsis, whereby the meaning of the text is significantly enhanced by hearing the reverberation of the echo: “The revisionary power of allusive echo generates new figuration. ... The final sound will have the quality of summing up the whole series of resonances”; Hollander, Figure of Echo, ix, 92.
90 Stead, Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 24.
91 Bakhtin claims: “Two discourses equally and directly oriented toward a referential object within the limits of a single context cannot exist side by side without intersecting dialogically, regardless of whether they confirm, mutually supplement, or (conversely) contradict one another, or find themselves in some other dialogic relationship (that of question and answer, for example)”; Bakhtin, Problems, 188–89.
a place in the present. Through allusion, a latter text keeps the earlier text alive and maintains its relevance in a new context.\textsuperscript{93}

(2) Exegesis—The exegetical text purports to explain the meaning of a specific earlier text on which the new work depends. An exegetical text is formally dependent on and oriented toward the exegeted one, without which it cannot exist. Generally, the old text is already authoritative while the new one is secondary. By commenting, the author may intend to update and/or preserve the old material for the reader in a new environment (cf. Dan 9:2; Mark 12:26–27).\textsuperscript{94}

(3) Supplement—Authors may summon an earlier text to formulate their own claims, e.g., to bolster their own text (cf. 1 Pet 3:20–21), to relate to a particular tradition (cf. Pss 4; 67),\textsuperscript{95} or to nuance their views by analogy (cf. Jer 2:3).\textsuperscript{96} The new text neither explicates nor revises the old one, but just depends on the source for its impact. The typological correspondence established through connection serves as a rhetorical device, requiring the readers to bring together both works in order to grasp all the nuances of meaning of the new one.\textsuperscript{97} By recalling, the original perception of the host text is enriched when the audience brings the source to bear on the alluding one.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{93} Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 18.
\textsuperscript{94} The term “exegesis” here is confined to a sense narrower than the much broader term, “inner-biblical exegesis,” in the work of Fishbane. Cf. Fishbane, \textit{Biblical Interpretation}.
\textsuperscript{96} Cf. Fishbane, \textit{Biblical Interpretation}, 301–304.
\textsuperscript{97} Cf. Hollander, \textit{Figure of Echo}.
(4) Revision—A new text may restate some aspects of an earlier text while at the same time altering some elements of, adding new materials to, or even reversing some ideas of its antecedent. The new text does not intend to displace the older text, but just to present an innovative variation of its source in order to serve its own purpose, e.g., to widen the scope of application so that the antecedent covers a new situation (cf. Deut 15:12–18),\(^9\) to renew a seemingly unfulfilled prediction so that the prophecy becomes valid again (cf. Isa 16:13–14; Ezek 29:17–20),\(^10\) to leverage the old historical data so that the audience can garner a new perspective on their past (cf. Chronicles).\(^11\)

(5) Polemic—A later text may sometimes argue against its predecessor or repudiate a popular saying (cf. Deut 7:10; Ezek 18:2–3; Mark 10:2–12).\(^12\) By disagreeing, polemical texts attempt to take the place of the texts against which they argue. The juxtaposition of two contradictory ideas helps to sharpen the focus of the new text which would not be possible if the latter text had merely asserted its notion without stressing the departure from the older text.\(^13\)

In mapping the strategic relation between the text and its intertexts, the following points should be noted. First, there are distinctions between exegesis, revision, and polemic, however, we must admit that the boundaries between these categories in specific cases are not always clear in practice. The motivation for dependence may be multiple in one instance, e.g., a later author who changes some ideas in an earlier text

---

\(^9\) Cf. Levinson, *Deuteronomy*; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*.


\(^12\) Cf. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 343–47.

may seek to argue against it, to update its source for a later audience, and, at the same
time, to clarify the meaning of the antecedent. Thus, we will catalogue the major
strategy of each textual connection, while bearing in mind the other motivations behind
the instance. Second, since language is dialogical, we assume that the meaning of the
alluding text is asserted against the background of the complex web of utterances which,
in this project, is the biblical writings which pre-date Zech 9–10, on the assumption that
these writings form part of the thought-world against which the host text was rendered
intelligible to its original audience. Third, by proposing various hermeneutical
significances the intertextual connections might have for the alluding text, this project
agrees with Aichele and Phillips that meaning is not found “inside” texts but rather in the
space “between” texts. With this perspective, we will bring the various intertexts
“between the lines” into focus, not only cataloguing their usage but also reflecting on
their impact on the Zecharian text. Fourth, when examining the intertextual impact
that such literary dependence might make upon the reading of the alluding text, Schultz
reminds us: “A quotation is not intended to be self-contained or self-explanatory; rather
knowledge of the quoted context also is assumed by the speaker or author.” This
project adopts this view and agrees that intertexts are more than just the limited words or

---

106 Aichele and Phillips argue that trying to make sense of any text in isolation is a vain exercise,
for all forms of human expression comprise a seamless, linguistic fabric. Only by reading multiple texts at
the same time can one begin to form an understanding of the entire fabric and thereby supply a piece of it
107 Boda, “Reading Between the Lines,” 291.
108 Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 224. Tull also makes similar claims: “... when the words of a
familiar other are reused, these words subtly awaken in the audience a recollection of their previous
context... Allusions recall for audiences what they already know, making connection between the ‘already
read’ and the ‘now being read,’ so that the new word partakes of qualities already inherent in the previous
text”; Tull (Willey), *Remember the Former Things*, 62. Cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 126; Boda,
“Reading Between the Lines,” 286; Choi, *Traditions at Odds*, 32.
phrases that are shared between texts, but extend to the larger context in which this lexical stock is embedded. Thus, a proper understanding of the intertext’s “original context and meaning” is crucial to our proper understanding of the alluding text.\textsuperscript{109} We will apply this assumption when we analyze the strategy of recalling the sources within the Zecharian text.\textsuperscript{110}

Summary

The three hermeneutical assumptions proposed in this project imply a range of possible intertextual approaches. They serve as strategies of containment for practicing intertextuality: (1) The definition of a text—a text (both the host and the source) is defined as a literary work (including the \textit{travitum} reflected therein) within the canonical writings in the Masoretic traditions which still can interrelate indefinitely with other texts in multiple ways, however, the intertexts must be able to be located, though with different degrees of specificity; (2) The agents of textual meaning—author, text, and reader all are agents in the production of meaning in our hermeneutics of intertextuality. Since the author has completed his literary work and the text now stands alone as the focal point of interpretation, the best approach of intertextuality is one which begins with the texts at hand which bear the markers laid down by the author to assist the readers in their intertextual reading; and (3) The nature of textual relationships—(a) the formal relationships should encompass a broad range of possibilities, mapping these relationships on a spectrum from the deliberately marked citations to the highly subtle echoes, with objective lexical data as the point of departure and other literary features as

\textsuperscript{109} Schultz, \textit{Search for Quotation}, 170.

\textsuperscript{110} A similar approach to the book of Zechariah is found in Wenzel, \textit{Reading Zechariah}. 
supplements; (b) the strategic relationships should cover a spectrum of possibilities along the continuum, extending from texts affirming each other to texts rejecting each other, with the assumption that the meaning of the alluding text is found between the lines during its dialogue with the source, against which the alluding text was rendered intelligible to its original audience.

**Methodological Process**

Based on the intertextual approach defined above, we proceed now to lay out the methodological process of this project. The task begins with the quest for meaning of each unit of Zech 9–10 in its immediate context, as well as in the context of the corpus as a whole. In interpreting the content of the text, all the normal tools of exegesis, including standard lexica and grammars, will be used.\(^{111}\) During the course of doing exegesis great attention will be paid to any intertextual dimension at play, particularly looking for those markers laid down in the alluding text, with distinctive words/phrases as the starting point. Besides specific allusions, all possible “sustained allusions”\(^{112}\) in which multiple scattered references within a larger pericope are detected will also be examined, with shared lexis as the point of departure. However, before registering a sustained allusion, we will evaluate carefully other possibilities in order to avoid the danger of subjectivity.\(^{113}\)

---

\(^{111}\) Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*, 38.

\(^{112}\) Cf. Stead, “Sustained Allusion,” 144–70.

\(^{113}\) E.g., the case of Wenzel who argues that Zech 9:5 depends on Jer 25:20 with the sequence of the Philistine cities as a connecting point. He contends that the fact that Jer 25 is crucial to Zech 1:4 (the opening of First Zechariah) and 11:3 (the closing of the unit 9:1–11:3) supports his argument. However, a thorough examination of other possible connections to Zech 9:5–7 precludes us from registering Jer 25:20 as an intertext of Zech 9:5; see CHAPTER THREE. Cf. Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah*, 206–207.
When identifying intertexts, special consideration will be given to those distinctive, obscure or awkward expressions in Zech 9–10, which are generally regarded as intentionally allusive word-play.\(^{114}\) For employing this strategy of obscurity, Riffaterre’s concept of “ungrammaticality” can give illumination to the task. His thesis explains how a word or phrase placed awkwardly in the present context points to another text which provides the key to its decoding and so aids readers in the production of meaning:

…the dual sign works like a pun. We will see that the pun in poetic discourse grows out of textual ‘roots.’ It is first apprehended as a mere ungrammaticality, until the discovery is made that there is another text in which the word is grammatical; the moment the other text is identified, the dual sign becomes significant purely because of its shape, which alone alludes to that other code.\(^{115}\)

This strategy of identifying an intertext is generally adopted by a number of scholars working on textual connections in Zechariah. In Mason’s doctoral work, he uses rhetorical ambiguities as his point of departure in order to understand how Zech 9–14 is related to other texts.\(^{116}\) Tai’s dissertation also affirms this special character of Second Zechariah: “Die Probleme [the obscurities] mit der Begrifflichkeit Dtsachs lassen sich oft nur unter Rückgriff auf die traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergründe bearbeiten.”\(^{117}\) Nurmela shares the same view: “When the original author alludes to another writing it is entirely natural that the allusion should differ from its context by means of, for instance, a stylistic difference or a transition which may even appear awkward, just as is the case with an allusion to a text of an author of, for instance, the 17th century in a modern

\(^{114}\) See “The Agents of Textual Meaning” above.

\(^{115}\) Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry*, 82.

\(^{116}\) Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material.”

\(^{117}\) Translated as: “The problems [the obscurities] with the concept of II Zech can often be worked out only with recourse to the background of the tradition-history”; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 1.
This measure of detecting intertexts is also emphasized by Stead when he examines the intertextuality of Zech 1–8. If there is ambiguity or “ungrammaticality” in the interpretation of the passage, special efforts would be paid to look for any possible allusions to other parts/traditions of the Hebrew Bible which might provide an exegetical key for our better understanding of the alluding text.

Having established the likely intertexts, we have to examine the literary contexts of the texts, both the host and the source, in order to establish their respective meanings for comparison. Therefore, the examination of the alluding and the alluded contexts will take considerable space in the investigations. After the analysis, we will reflect upon how the antecedent is being used in the new context of the later text, noting whether the intertext is affirmed, reversed, or displaced. Then, we will explore how the intertext and its context shape our reading of the Zecharian text, registering any additional depth of meaning which these intertexts might provide to our understanding of the host text. Finally, we will delineate the restoration themes in Zech 9–10 in light of its intertexts, discerning any possible impact that such intertextual insights might make upon the salvific perspective of the corpus within its final context. In every case, we will use what is clear from the host as the control to evaluate the possible intertext(s) for the text. The context of Zech 9–10 performs an important role in guarding against subjectivity in our project.

In carrying out this project, we understand that even if the proper criteria could be agreed upon, proof of literary dependence is still not fully guaranteed. Miller is

---

120 There are limitations in this kind of study, e.g., even if literary dependence seems likely, one still cannot be certain which form of the source text was available to the author of the alluding text at any
probably right that “a rigid, mechanical application of any set of criteria is imprudent since they are only guidelines and do not hold true in every situation.” As Leonard puts it, “In the search for textual allusions...these principles must be applied carefully, however, and with a recognition of their limitations.” We agree with Sommer that “the weighing of such evidence (and hence the identification of allusions) is an art, not a science.” Thus, in each potential instance of intertextuality, the textual connection will be established by weighing prudently all the supporting evidences, bearing in mind what we have discussed above.

given time; Miller, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research,” 304.
123 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 35. We understand that the original quest for objective, scientific criteria for detecting intertextualities arose at least partly in reaction to the irresponsible handling of the texts by some, however, the arrival of postmodernism has revealed that “objectivity” is to a large extent just a myth, recognizing that there is no such thing as an objective observer. If this applies to “hard” sciences like physics, it is certainly even more pertinent to the study of ancient texts, which is more an art than a science. At least, scholars have not yet been able to come up with a set scientific rules or criteria that match the nature of intertextuality in all its complexity. However, we must emphasize that abandoning the quest for scientific and objective criteria does not mean a return to irresponsibility. Rather, it implies that we see the study of textual connections as normal exegesis—no more and no less “scientific” or “objective” than the exegesis of other biblical documents. Regardless of how one identifies an allusion, one’s main task is to give a satisfying account of the host text, which includes an account of the rhetorical end for which the marked sign is utilized. The proposed interpretation must of course be supported by persuasive reasoning which should consist of an appeal to perceived verbal and/or thematic parallels. Cf. Jauhiainen, Use of Zechariah, 33.
CHAPTER TWO
DATING AND SETTING

Introduction

This project aims to examine the nature of the restoration promised by Yahweh in Zech 9–10 by offering an intertextual analysis of these two chapters. In order to achieve this goal, we have set forth our approach to intertextuality in the previous chapter. The aim of the present chapter is to lay the foundations for the application of our intertextual approach to Zech 9–10: (1) to analyze the origin and setting of Second Zechariah so that the final form of the corpus will be located in a specific time frame and context; and (2) to investigate what biblical texts might have been in circulation when Second Zechariah reached its final form in order to delineate the direction of influence.

Origin and Setting of Second Zechariah

Date of Composition

Among all the studies of Zech 9–14, one of the most widely divided views concerns the date of the text, with conclusions ranging from the late pre-exilic period to the Maccabean period. Mede contended that Zech 9–11 was a pre-exilic work due to

---


However, a pre-exilic date had been challenged by Corrodi who was the first scholar to attribute Zech 9–14 to the post-exilic period, with Zech 9 dated to the time of Alexander the Great and Zech 14 to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Eichhorn allocated Zech 9–10 to the Greek period and Zech 13:7–14:21 to the Maccabean era. Developing Eichhorn’s proposal, Stade argued that Deutero-Zechariah should be dated entirely in the Greek period, between 306 B.C. and 278 B.C. Stade’s argument enjoyed continued popularity and has been supported by a number of scholars, e.g., Mitchell, Rudolph, Tai, and Floyd.

The split in opinion is mainly due to the methodology employed which concentrates almost exclusively on a few isolated historical allusions scattered in Second

---

4 Kidder, *Demonstration of the Messias II*, 199.
8 Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* 4, 444.
10 Mitchell (1912) argues for a Greek origin, with Zech 9:1–8 reflecting the battle of Issus (333 B.C.); Mitchell, et al., *Zechariah*, 258.
11 Rudolph (1976) sees that Zech 9:1–8 reflects the campaign of Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. which he sets as the *terminus a quo* for Second Zechariah. He suggests that the whole corpus came into being between 300 and 200 B.C.; Rudolph, *Haggai—Sacharja 1–8—Sacharja 9–14—Maleachi*, 163–64.
12 Tai (1996) states that the composition of Zech 9–14 was probably completed around the campaign of Alexander in 332 B.C.; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 290.
13 Floyd (2000) relates Zech 9–14 to the revelations received by the prophet Zechariah mentioned in Zech 1:1 although he believes that the corpus originated from some anonymous prophetic figure(s) and argues for an early Hellenistic period (ca. 330–300 B.C.) dating; Floyd, *Minor Prophets* 2, 306, 316.
Zechariah, particularly those found in Zech 9:1–8, 11:8; and 12:10.¹⁴ Those who advocate the Greek origin of Second Zechariah usually take the word ἔνθα in Zech 9:13 as key evidence. Most of them regard Zech 9:1–8 as reflecting the swift advance of Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. and the subsequent mention of Egypt (Zech 10:10–11; 14:18, 19) as reviewing the conditions during the third century B.C. when Judah was ruled by the Ptolemies. However, the mention of ἔνθα in Zech 9:13 does not necessarily require a date after Alexander as this word has already appeared in earlier texts, e.g., Ezek 27:13, Gen 10:2, 4.¹⁵ Also, the appearance of ἔνθα may fit well with the Persian period where the expedition against Athens began early in Darius’s reign (522–486 B.C.). If this “best piece of evidence” for dating Second Zechariah in the Greek period is not secure, then there is no definite evidence in the corpus that requires a Greek/Ptolemaic origin.¹⁶

Regarding Zech 9:1–8, scholars have attempted to relate these verses not only to the battle of Issus in 332 B.C.,¹⁷ but also to various historical manoeuvres, though none of them matches the text perfectly.¹⁸ The divergent results call into question the approach employed in understanding these eight verses.¹⁹ In addition, the conqueror in the text is God and not Alexander or any human being. Concerning the mention of Egypt

---

¹⁴ The following analysis references to Redditt’s work; Redditt, “Nehemiah’s First Mission,” 664–69.
¹⁵ Hanson argues that ἔνθα ἐκ τῆς ᾿Ελληνικῆς is intrusive as a dittography of ἔνθα ἐκ τῆς; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 289.
¹⁷ For the difference between Zech 9:1–8 and Alexander’s campaign in ca. 332 B.C., see Jouguet, Alexander the Great, 21–31.
¹⁸ Scholars take the place-names in Zech 9:1–8 and attempt to identify a conqueror whose route is detailed in the passage, and then they read the texts in light of that in order to attach dates to them.
¹⁹ See “Introduction” in CHAPTER THREE.
in Zech 10:10–11, the country is depicted as one of the places from which the people will return rather than as the place of Ptolemaic rule in the Greek period.\textsuperscript{20}

The use of Zech 11:8 as a chronological indicator is flawed as there are at least forty proposals for the identity of the three wicked shepherds, ranging from Moses, Aaron, and Miriam in ancient Israel to the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes of the Roman period.\textsuperscript{21} Mitchell states that these divergent suggestions together can cover "the whole field of Hebrew history from the Exodus to the conquest of Palestine by the Romans, and including most of the men [humans] and institutions therein of any importance."\textsuperscript{22} Such wide ranging interpretations of 11:8 preclude us from using it as a chronological marker.

The same problem is also found when Zech 12:10 is used as a historical marker to date Zech 9–14. Despite the fact that "the one whom they have pierced" (יִזְתֹּקַל) is Yahweh himself,\textsuperscript{23} scholars relate יִזְתֹּקַל to the various heroes being mourned, e.g., Josiah,\textsuperscript{24} Onias III,\textsuperscript{25} or Simon Maccabeus.\textsuperscript{26} Similar to Zech 11:8, all identifications of the pierced one are considered speculative.

Another reason some suggest a Greek origin of Second Zechariah is the genre of the corpus. Scholars, e.g., Sellin,\textsuperscript{27} consider part of these chapters, particularly Zech 14, as apocalyptic, and thus late. However, there is still no scholarly consensus on the genre.

\textsuperscript{20} See "Gathering and Return of Ephraim" in CHAPTER SEVEN.
\textsuperscript{22} Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 306.
\textsuperscript{23} In Zech 12:10, Yahweh is the speaker, thus the clause יִזְתֹּקַל refers to Yahweh himself.
\textsuperscript{24} Newcome, Attempt towards an Improved Version, 304.
\textsuperscript{25} Stade, "Deuterosacharja 3."
\textsuperscript{26} Oesterley, History II, 269.
\textsuperscript{27} Sellin, Zwölfprophetenbuch, 561.
of Zech 9–14.28 Even if it were apocalyptic literature, this fact would not be definitive for dating the corpus to the Greek period as there are divergent views on the origin of this form of literature. McCall, for example, regards Second Zechariah as apocalyptic literature, but dates these chapters to the Persian period.29

Beyond the above, the means of payment mentioned in Zech 11:12 can hardly be used as a historical indicator for when the use of silver coins replacing weighing silver for mercantile transactions in Yehud occurred is still uncertain.30 The work of Stern indicates that mercantile transactions in Elephantine were carried out by weighed quantities of silver during the fifth century B.C., with the earliest document mentioning coins as a means of payment dating from the year 400 B.C. However, he claims that “metal ingots were still being used by weight as currency in business transactions in the fifth and fourth centuries, though coins were already in everyday use.”31 This evidence

---

28 There are numerous arguments on the genre of Zech 9–14, ranging from prophetic literature to full blown apocalyptic. Achtemeier states that Zechariah, as a whole, is not apocalyptic; Achtemeier, *Nahum–Malachi*, 145. Petersen believes that Zech 9–14 is “best understood as prophetic literature” as it possesses the essential hallmarks of prophetic writings; Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14*, 24. Curtis argues that Second Zechariah is “prophetic literature”; Curtis, *Up the Steep and Stony Road*, 160. Tigchelaar classifies Zechariah’s sermons (Zech 1:1–6; 7:1–8:23), Zech 10, 12–13 as topical, and therefore they cannot be called proto-apocalyptic. He argues that the night visions are a forerunner of the apocalyptic literature and Zech 14 can be treated as proto-apocalyptic; Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End*, 261–62. Baldwin states that Zech 9–14 reveals a “rudimentary” stage of apocalyptic, with “prophetic-apocalyptic” as a medium to convey the messages in the corpus; Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 71–73. Here Baldwin adopts the term “prophetic-apocalyptic” which is coined by Ladd; Ladd, “Why Not Prophetic-Apocalyptic?” 192–200. North claims that scholars who have seen the “various types of artful structuring” in Zech 9–14 “give it...a kinship with the erudite structures of Apocalyptic”; North, “Prophecy to Apocalyptic,” 71. Plöger argues that Trito-Zechariah exhibits changes from prophetic eschatology to apocalyptic; Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology*, 26–52, 78–96. McCall regards these six chapters as apocalyptic literature and argues: “The apocalyptic nature of Zech 9–14 makes it impossible to point to the exact occasion of these prophecies”; McCall, “The Date and Authorship of Zechariah 9–14,” 163. Hanson identifies Zech 9–10 as “early apocalyptic” with Zech 11–14 as a further “transition to full-blown apocalyptic eschatology”; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 27.
might favor a Persian origin rather than a Greek one, however, such a conclusion is still at best tentative.

Efforts at dating Zech 9–14 on the basis of historical allusions seem to be unsuccessful. As discussed before, the nature of this late biblical prophecy is so obscure, with a loose connection to historical processes, that the historical-critical approach has faltered. When examining the origin of Zech 9–14, we should be aware of the language of these six chapters which shifts predominantly to traditional language in depicting their situation, with the prophetic message no longer expressed explicitly in terms of plain history as found in classical prophetic texts. In order to solve the problem, the proposal of Portnoy and Petersen may be helpful. They remind us that the conflicting results of past research are due to the fact that “various methods of biblical study are isolated from one another and each operates in a vacuum.” They argue that “what one methodological perspective can offer only as a tentative conclusion may, when integrated with the results of inquiries according to other methods, serve as important data in constructing a comprehensive conclusion.” This suggestion is sensible in that by examining the corpus from more than one angle, we may obtain a better result with each method supplementing the inadequacy of the others.

Recently, there are three works which have resorted to other methods in order to determine the origin of Zech 9–14. Hanson’s contextual-typological approach is a

---

32 See “The Approach of the Study” in INTRODUCTION.
34 Portnoy and Petersen, “Biblical Texts and Statistical Analysis,” 21. Cf. McCall’s work. In his doctoral study, McCall asserts that in considering the date of Zech 9–14, various perspectives should be considered. In analyzing the origin of Second Zechariah, he examines not only the historical background of it, but also the language and style of the corpus, the relationship of these chapters to other prophetic works, and the religious ideas of this text. By process of elimination, he assigns Zech 9–14 to an early post-exilic date, after proto-Zechariah and prior to Malachi; McCall, “The Date and Authorship of Zechariah 9–14,” 162–63.
literary one which traces the evolution and divergence of the visionary and the
hierocratic groups through texts in Second Isaiah, Third Isaiah, and Zech 9–14. He dates
Zech 9 to the mid-sixth century and Zech 14 to 425 B.C. He states that the corpus
should not be dated to the second century B.C. due to the absence of the fully-developed
apocalyptic features in the writing, e.g., the division into world epochs and the presence
of supernatural adversaries.35

Hill’s analysis of Zech 10–14 is a linguistic one, based upon the typological
approach of R. Polzin (1976), targeting a relative dating scheme which relates Zech
10–14 to other post-exilic literature.36 By analyzing the grammatical and syntactic
features, he states that the post-exilic prophets (Haggai, Zech 1–8, 9–14, Malachi) “can
be placed within the general boundaries of a period extending from ca. 600 to 400–350
B.C.,” thus eliminating suggestions which date Second Zechariah to the Greek or
Maccabean period.37 After considering the historical aspect, Hill concludes that the
chronological possibilities for Zech 10–14 should range from 515–475 B.C.,38 probably
paralleling the “pre-Ezra decline” period (ca. 515–458 B.C.).39 Hill states that, in some

35 Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 27, 324, 400.
36 Hill’s methodology contrasts sharply with other investigations of Zech 9–14, which have relied
heavily on historical data, thematic similarities, and lexical parallels, as well as on descriptions of the
political, religious, and social conditions within the post-exilic Jewish community depicted in the
post-exilic works, Ezra and Nehemiah. In his work, Hill has pointed out a number of flaws in Polzin’s
research and has made adjustments on them. By only examining Zech 10–14 since Zech 9 is poetry, he
avoids the pitfalls of comparing dissimilar materials. Though Hill’s analysis is a linguistic one, he arrives
at his final chronological possibilities partially on the basis of his reconstruction of the history of the
aspects, the vocabulary of the corpus is “more closely aligned with Ezra and Nehemiah” than Zech 1–8.\(^40\)

Since the works of Hanson and Hill have placed Second Zechariah in the early Persian period, Redditt’s socio-literary investigation attempts to further their studies by reconstructing the Judean society of the same time frame in order to see whether it points to the same era. He contends that post-exilic Judah was not only a tiny community, but also a divided and inharmonious one. The conflicts among various groups exhibited in Zech 9–14 fit well the situation of the Jewish community in Persian Yehud depicted in Ezra and Nehemiah.\(^41\) In view of this, Redditt concludes that the final redaction of Second Zechariah reflects a pro-Judahite attack on the Jerusalemite elite who became strong after the first mission of Nehemiah, thus dating the corpus to the second mission of Nehemiah, that is, close to the end of the fifth century B.C.\(^42\)

By using other methodological approaches, the studies of Hanson, Hill, and Redditt locate Second Zechariah in the Persian period, around the late-sixth century to the mid-fifth century B.C. These arguments provide a foundation for our analysis of the origin of the corpus. We are going to examine other perspectives, especially the historical ones, reflected in Zech 9–14, to see whether or not they point to the same time frame. The highly allusive character of Second Zechariah, particularly its allusion to First Zechariah, e.g., 2:14 [2:10] in 9:9a–b, precludes us from dating the corpus before or during the exile.\(^43\) Zechariah 9 begins with the advent of Yahweh who marches from

---


\(^{41}\) See discussion in Redditt, “Nehemiah’s First Mission,” 672–73.


\(^{43}\) There is a scholarly consensus that II Zech postdates I Zech, mainly based upon the observation of literary dependence of II Zech on I Zech. See, for example, Mason, “Relation,” 227–38; Boda, “From
north to south until he reaches the Jerusalem temple (יִרְמָיו, Zech 9:8). The mention of יִרְמָיו here reflects a date in which the rebuilding of Zerubbabel's temple was completed, probably 515 B.C. Based on this, we set the terminus a quo of the corpus as ca. 515 B.C. This beginning date matches a period when drought was still prevailing within the community (Zech 10:1; cf. Hag 1:6, 11; 2:15–19; Zech 8:12).

In Zech 14:10, some pre-exilic ruined landmarks, e.g., Benjamin's Gate (Jer 20:2; 37:13; 38:7) and Corner Gate (2 Kgs 14:13; 2 Chr 26:9; Jer 31:38) which were not rebuilt by Nehemiah (Neh 3:1–32), are used to describe the boundaries of the future Jerusalem. The use of these old names to mark the borders of the new city may indicate that Zech 14 was composed before the completion of the walls of Jerusalem under Nehemiah's first mission.

The tension between the Yehudite community and the Jerusalemite elite revealed in Zech 12–14 (cf. 12:6–7; 12:10–13:1) probably reflects a time when Nehemiah was governor, particularly when Jerusalem was restored at the expense of the ordinary people (cf. Neh 5:1–5). If so, then the Zecharian text most likely indicates a period following 445 B.C. during the tenure of Nehemiah.
In view of this, it is reasonable to set the *terminus ad quem* of Second Zechariah as a date shortly after the beginning of the first mission of Nehemiah but before the completion of the walls of Jerusalem, ca. 445 B.C. This suggestion is in line with the linguistic analysis of Hill who asserts that the language of Zech 10–14 is close to that of Nehemiah. In addition, this ending date fits a period when Damascus and Sidon were the two most important centers in *Abar-Nahara*, with the Phoenicians dominating the traditional Philistine regions. This state of affairs is reflected in Zech 9:1–8 where the word of the Lord is directed against these two influential geo-political regions (Syria and Phoenicia), with the Philistines trembling when they saw the fall of the Phoenicians, their nominal master (v. 5).

The materials that constitute Zech 9–14 were probably composed and redacted over an extensive period, from 515 B.C. to 445 B.C., with the *terminus a quo* reflecting the situation of Zech 9, probably Zech 10 too, and the *terminus ad quem* denoting the circumstance of Zech 14. Despite the fact that various blocks of material within Zech 9–14 have their own backgrounds, nevertheless, the growth of the corpus cannot be conceived as having arisen from the simple juxtaposition of the various blocks. It appears, rather, that at each successive stage in the growth of these six chapters the earlier material was reshaped by the concerns of the later one. Since the reading of this

---


49 See “The Territorial Claim of Yahweh” in CHAPTER THREE.

project is based on the final form of the corpus rather than the hypothetical outlook of
the earlier editorial stages, we set the date for the final form of Zech 9–14 as shortly
after 445 B.C., ca. 440s B.C., reflecting the historical perspective of the third quarter of
the fifth century B.C. 51

51 The date suggested here coincides with recent scholarship on the origin of Second Zechariah. Elizabeth Achtemeier (1986) opines that Zech 9–14 should be treated as later additions to Zech 1–8 and believes that it should be assigned to the last half of the sixth century B.C.; Achtemeier, Nahum–Malachi, 146. Carroll Stuhlmueller (1988) admits that Second Zechariah might be dated around 470–460 B.C., a period before the religious reform of Ezra; Stuhlmueller, Rebuilding with Hope, 117. Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers (1993) date Zech 9–14 to the Persian I period (ca. 539–450 B.C.) in which the prophetic concern was that the present fifth-century conditions were not in line with what early generations had envisioned; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 25–26. Raymond Person (1993), adopting Hill’s conclusion, proposes that if Zech was produced sometime between 520 B.C. and 458 B.C. by the Deuteronomists who returned to Jerusalem in the early post-exilic period with Persian authority to preserve the religious texts associated with the temple administration, probably coinciding with Zerubbabel’s mission; Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 13, 18. David L. Petersen (1995) dates Zech 9–14 to the mid-fifth century B.C. in which Yahwism became a truly international religion, worshiped in diverse settings and at multiple shrines by various sets of communities; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 5–9. Risto Nurmela (1996) dates Zech 1–8 to the last decade of the sixth century B.C. and believes that Second Zechariah should be dated relatively close to First Zechariah, with chapter 14 being compiled later; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 3–4, 234. Mark Boda (2004) also argues for an early Persian period dating of Zech 9–14, ca. 515–445 B.C., in which a great tension between Zechariah’s audience and leadership in Jerusalem was experienced; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 31–34, 44. Julia O’Brien (2004) accepts the conclusion of Meyers and Meyers and sets Second Zechariah in the mid-fifth century B.C., in the context of the Persian-Greek wars; O’Brien, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 232. Petterson (2009) places Zech 9–14 in the first half of the Persian period after the completion of the temple; Petterson, Behold Your King, 3.

Apart from those arguing for a Greek origin (discussed above), there are some other exceptions to the early Persian period origin of Second Zechariah. For example, Mason (1973) suggests that the final form of Zech 9–14 could be dated around 300 B.C. due to two main reasons: (1) Zech 9–14 reveals a perspective which believes that the prophetic hope, proclaimed in Zech 1–8 (also, previous prophets), are about to be fulfilled; (2) the historical setting of Zech 9–14 reflects the fact that the corpus emanates from a schismatic group, eschatological in outlook, with increasing opposition to the official leadership of their time; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 307–309; cf. Mason, “Relation,” 227–39; Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 76. However, the reasons suggested by Mason are too general and they could be used to explain the situation of the mid-fifth century B.C. too. See Redditt’s argument regarding the conflict of the audience. Lacocque (1981) assumes Second Zechariah to be dated around 500–200 B.C and suggests that the conflict reflected in the text existed between the Jerusalem hierocracy and the countryside people; Lacocque, “Zacharie 9–14,” 135–43. The tiny commentary of Lacocque attempts to deal with a number of issues, generally with arguments lacking adequate evidence for further evaluation.
Historical Setting

The audience of Second Zechariah resided in Yehud which comprised the core of the old kingdom of Judah, presumably ca. 440s B.C. During that time, Yehud was a Persian province situated within the satrapy of Abar-Nahara.\(^{52}\) Contrary to Alt, archaeological discoveries in the Jerusalem area indicate that Yehud was granted full provincial status even in the times of the first governor and was not part of the northerly province of Samaria.\(^{53}\) This argument is supported in Avigad’s work:

The defective spelling of \textit{yhw}d [appears on the bullae of very late 6th century B.C. is]...sufficient to indicate that Judah was a separate administrative unit, having

\(^{52}\) Yehud was the Aramaic name of the territory known as Judah before the exile. In the reign of Darius I, the largest units of administrative rule of Persia were the satrapies which included within them smaller units known as provinces. Yehud was one such smaller unit within the larger satrapy of Abar-Nahara, Beyond the River.


\(^{53}\) Alt and his school hold the opinion that Yehud was never an autonomous province, but was annexed to the province of Samaria immediately after the Babylonian conquest. Alt believes that the first governor of Yehud was Nehemiah and both Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel were only envoys of the authorities, commissioned with specific tasks. His argument rests upon the fact that Nehemiah had to fix the breached walls, the ruined buildings, the corrupt administration, the failing economy, and the social turmoil of Yehud, indicating the lack of local rule before him; Alt, \textit{Kleine Schriften II}, 31–37; see especially 332, n 2. Alt’s view was for a long time a consensus, with a number of adherents, e.g., McEvenue, “Political Structure,” 361–64; Petersen, \textit{Haggai and Zechariah 1–8}, 26–27; Redditt, \textit{Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi}, 5–8.

Alt’s thesis cannot stand when the archaeological findings after 1934 shed more light on this issue. Stern, after marshalling some of the evidence from seals, opts for a modified form of Alt’s hypothesis. He suggests that only after Zerubbabel was removed from office was authority over Yehud transferred to Samaria; Stern, “Persian Empire,” 70–87, esp. 72, 82–7; cf. Stern, \textit{Material Culture}, 209–13. There is a growing number of scholars who have abandoned this thesis and adopted a view of Yehud as a separate administrative unit. This is particularly true when a continuous rule of the imperial appointed governors in Yehud in the whole Persian period is identified (see discussion below). See the arguments of Williamson, “Governors of Judah,” 59–82; Japhet, “Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel (1),” 80; Meyers and Meyers, \textit{Haggai, Zechariah 1–8}, xxxiv; Avigad, \textit{Bullae and Seals}, 33–34; Fried, \textit{Priest and the Great King}, 184–88.
its own autonomous internal rule. Further evidence of this is found in the silver coins of the Persian period bearing the name of the province: yhd.\textsuperscript{54}

During the early period of Persian rule, in order to hold together the amalgamation more effectively, the empire adhered to the policy of imperial rule which involved only a minimum of disruption in the conditions of local governance.\textsuperscript{55} With Persian-appointed rulers generally being drawn from among the local populace and the Persian adoption of a policy of religious tolerance, Yehud would have enjoyed a relatively high degree of autonomy in internal affairs.\textsuperscript{56} However, the autonomy granted by the Persians to inhabitants of the various provinces of the empire ceased beginning from 520 B.C. after the defeat of the opponents of Darius I (522–486 B.C.). When his throne was secured, Darius I started to reorganize his empire and consolidate his power. He “installed his major supporters in key positions of leadership” as reward for their loyalty. He also appointed “local leaders who were loyal to him” as governors and

\textsuperscript{54} Since the archaeological context of the finds is unknown, the dating of the material is somewhat problematic. On the basis of palaeography, Avigad dates the script to the sixth century; Avigad, Bullae and Seals, 4, 17, 32. Cf. Carter, Emergence of Yehud, 52, 259–70.

\textsuperscript{55} Weinberg states: “The Persian Empire was an amalgamation, embracing hundred of thousands of miles and millions of inhabitants, differing by their ethno-linguistic belonging, by the specificity and stages of their economic, social, political and cultural conditions, by the character of their traditions, etc. Therefore a \textit{conditio sine qua non} for its foundation and existence was a relative rapprochement and equalization of its heterogeneous parts, not only by help of forcible military means, but also by other ones, including economic, social, administrative measures, etc.” To divide the empire into satrapies that included provinces and autonomous or semi-autonomous formations was one of the effective measures to hold together this amalgamation. In order to avoid one-sided communication from the centre to the periphery as was demonstrated by the administration of the Neo-Babylonian empire, the Achaemenids from time to time furthered the institution of the autonomous city which in some regions of the Persian empire took the form of the citizen-temple community (C-T-C). With this autonomy, this institution created some possibilities of a communication also from the periphery to the centre. An analogous role was also fulfilled by the legal-judiciary system that was functioning at two levels: the common and obligatory for all imperial royal law (אַרְבּוֹנֵים וּאַרְבּוֹנֵים) and the different local laws (תְּמֵנָה וּתְמֵנָה) in the C-T-C (cf. Ezra 7:26). In addition, relative religious tolerance was a constant element of Achaemenid policy and an effective stimulator of acculturation (cf. Ezra 1:2–4); Weinberg, “Transmitter and Recipient,” 97–98. However, Fried does not agree with Weinberg’s view on local autonomy; Fried, Priest and the Great King, 184.

\textsuperscript{56} Dandamaev et al. Culture and Social Institutions, 96–7.
inspectors in his satrapies throughout the kingdom to “further Persian imperial aims.”\textsuperscript{57} This probably explains the appointment of Zerubbabel in Yehud. Person argues that the Deuteronomists also returned to Jerusalem, probably coinciding with Zerubbabel’s mission, with Persian authority to preserve the religious literature of the Jews.\textsuperscript{58} If this is the case, then, not only was the political sphere of Yehud under imperial control, but also the religious sector of the province. Within this milieu, it is not difficult to perceive how Yehud relied heavily on imperial support for the reconstruction of the temple and also for the restoration of the community.\textsuperscript{59}

According to Hoglund, the stricter control imposed on Yehud during the fifth century onwards was mainly due to the political concerns of the Persian empire. In the first three decades of the fifth century B.C., the Greco-Persian wars preoccupied the two superpowers and thus the Persian vassals, e.g., Babylon and Egypt, sought to take advantage of the situation by attempting to carve out a much greater degree of independence. The Persian empire, in view of the widespread disturbance, especially the Egyptian satrapal revolt in ca. 450s, took exceptional measures to tighten their control over the Levant by constructing a series of fortresses throughout the region, thus


\textsuperscript{58} Person contends that “this pattern, in which a native scribal group is commissioned by the Achaemenid administration to preserve their native religious texts, can be found elsewhere in the Achaemenid empire, including the contemporary mission of Udjahorresnet to Sais, Egypt.” He explains that the Deuteronomists were willing to cooperate with the Persian ruling elite as they believed Yahweh would use the foreign power as an instrument to bring fulfillment of his promise, i.e. the full restoration of Israel. However, when the Persian-supported restoration fell short of their vision, they became increasingly disappointed with the Persian-controlled temple theocracy and developed sharper eschatological hopes of the future, which stressed Yahweh’s initiative in the full restoration, as reflected in Zech 9–14; Person, \textit{Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School}, 203–204.

\textsuperscript{59} This might be the milieu of the oracle in Zech 4:6b–10a, encouraging Zerubbabel to rely on Yahweh’s spirit rather than human might and power as the source for the monumental task that lies ahead; Boda, \textit{Haggai, Zechariah}, 271–78; Sweeney, \textit{Twelve Prophets 2}, 657.
preventing local people from aligning themselves with their enemies (cf. Zech 9:12). These fortresses manned by imperial garrisons represented the coercive power of the empire over local affairs in Yehud. Under these circumstances, the political status of the province became even worse, with nearly no power or autonomy, completely dependent upon Persian imperial policies for its existence.

In addition, archaeological work indicates that, during the Persian I period (ca. 539–450 B.C.), Yehud did not recover quickly “in terms of population and material gains from the devastation of the Babylonian conquest.” Faust remarks: “During the entire Persian period, the people of Judah lived in the shadow of the late Iron Age collapse.” Post-collapse Yehud experienced economic stagnation in sharp contrast to the neighboring regions, with a relatively small population in a much-reduced version of the pre-exilic kingdom of Judah. Carter estimates that in the Persian I period there were only 13,350 people in the province which was about one-third the size of the population during the monarchial period, and Jerusalem was approximately 20 per cent of its Iron II size. The settlements of Yehud were relatively rural in nature, not sharing the

60 In Zech 9:12, the noun גִּבְעָה occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible and many exeges have been reluctant to accept it in its existing form, suggesting various emendations. However, Meyers and Meyers, following Hoglund’s argument, contend that “the idea of the exiles returning to their homeland to occupy a ‘fortress’ or ‘stronghold,’ a term that would characterize Jerusalem and Yehud in the mid-fifth century when the Persian government erected a whole string of fortresses in its western provinces to guard against Greek expansion..., fits the historical context and provides a link with the military language of the next three verses of Zechariah 9”; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 142. See discussion in CHAPTER FIVE.


64 Faust, “Settlement Dynamics,” 44.


66 Carter, Emergence of Yehud, 201, 247. This figure in Persian I period is much smaller when compared with the biblical narrative (cf. Ezra 2). For the evaluation of various demographic estimates of the population of Yehud, see Finitsis, Visions and Eschatology, 86–101. Cf. Meyers and Meyers, “Yehud’s
prosperity brought about by the international trade between east and west under Persian imperialism. Heavy tribute was levied by the central government, with nothing benefiting the province that was systematically drained of resources (cf. Neh 5:4). The people of Yehud often fell into debt and were forced into slavery by corrupt leaders (cf. Neh 5:5). Besides internal turmoil (cf. Neh 5:1–5), the audience of Second Zechariah also experienced much external opposition (Ezra 4:6–23; Neh 3:33–4:6 [4:1–12]). The breakdown of leadership further intensified the predicament as were leaders who were only concerned with their own personal interests and a society riddled with corruption (cf. Neh 5:7, 15; cf. Zech 11:16).

Leadership in Yehud

**Davidic Governor**

The dawn of the Persian period marked a key transition for a people who had once enjoyed independent monarchical rule but now existed as a small community in Yehud lacking nation-state status. Sparked by the eternal covenant promised in the oracle of Nathan (2 Sam 7:13) and prompted by some pre-exilic and exilic prophecies, e.g., Jer 23:5 and 33:15, the lineage of David whose ancestors had dominated the southern kingdom for nearly half a millennium arose as the focal point in the projected restoration, particularly involving the reestablishment of Davidic monarchy rule. In this milieu, the expectation of Davidic rule became a prominent issue in sources dealing with existing

---

69 Achtemeier, *Preaching from the Minor Prophets*, 112.
leadership in the Persian province of Yehud and also depicting the leadership of a future age.  

Apparently a Davidide was part of the provincial administration of Yehud at the dawn of the Persian era, though lacking the title of king. In contrast to Alt’s thesis, the account of Davidic leadership in Yehud in the early Persian period is documented in both biblical and archaeological sources which indicate that the political role of the Davidic heirs began with the first return to Yehud in the reign of Cyrus, after his edict of 538 B.C.  

In the biblical sources, three governors of Yehud are mentioned: (1) Sheshbazzar; (2) Zerubbabel; and (3) Nehemiah. Sheshbazzar, the Persian-appointed governor (יוֹדֵךְ), who led the first return and laid the foundations of the temple in Jerusalem, might have been a Davidide (Ezra 1:8; 5:14–16). Around 520 B.C., a Davidic heir, Zerubbabel, the grandson of King Jehoiachin, was appointed governor of Yehud, responsible for the rebuilding of the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem (Hag 1:1, 14; 1 Chr 3:17–19; Zech 4:6–10). Zerubbabel was most likely the last male Davidic descendant to hold a significant position in post-exilic Yehud. Archaeological discoveries indicate that he held

---

70 Meyers and Meyers, “Future Fortunes,” 207.
71 See above—“Historical Setting.”
72 The relationship between Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel is difficult to figure out as: (1) both of them were titled as governor (יוֹדֵךְ) in Ezra 5:14 and Hag 1:1 respectively; (2) both of them were the leaders who laid the foundation of the temple in Jerusalem in Ezra 5:14 and Zech 4:9 respectively; and (3) Sheshbazzar was the head leading the first return in Ezra 1:8, but Zerubbabel was mentioned in the list of the returnees in Ezra 2:2, with the name of Sheshbazzar missing. Meyers and Meyers propose that the name Sheshbazzar may be understood as a corruption with the original name preserved as “Shenazzar” in the Davidic genealogy of 1 Chr 3:18. Thus Sheshbazzar might be the uncle of Zerubbabel according to 1 Chr 3:17–19 and was probably the first governor preceding Zerubbabel; Meyers and Meyers. Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 9–12.

However, Berger disagrees with the proposal of Meyers and Meyers. He argues that the close relationship between the name שֶׁשֶבֶּזֶּזַר and the Akkadian Šaššu-abu-usur (may Šaššu [the sun-god] protect the father) precludes us from equating זהבבֶּזֶּזַר(Ezra 1:8) with Šaššu (1 Chr 3:18); Berger, “Zu den Namen,” 98–100. For other discussions on this issue, see Japhet, “Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel (part one),” 66–98 and Japhet, “Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel (part two),” 218–29.

73 Zerubbabel is really a puzzle. There are problems about his genealogy, the person himself, and his descendants. See Levin, “Zerubbabel: A Riddle,” 14–17.
his post as governor probably until ca. 510 B.C.\textsuperscript{74} The last governor of Yehud mentioned in the biblical sources is Nehemiah, a non-Davidide, who assumed this position around 445 B.C. (Neh 5:14; 12:26).

For the period of some 70 years between Zerubbabel (515 B.C.) and Nehemiah (445 B.C.), no other governor of Yehud is mentioned by name in the biblical source. However, Neh 5:15 seems to suggest that other governors functioned between these two:

"But the former governors [ךפצר תַּחַל] who were before me [Nehemiah] laid burdens on the people and took from them bread and wine besides forty shekels of silver; even their servants domineered the people. But I did not do so because of the fear of God" (italics mine). It is unreasonable to suppose that in Neh 5:15 Nehemiah spoke against Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel, the only governors mentioned at least 70 years before him. Nehemiah probably refers to the situation in Yehud immediately prior to his arrival.\textsuperscript{75}

Apparently there were governors in between Zerubbabel and Nehemiah who administered the affairs of the province with a heavy hand, bleeding the people of the king's tax.

Recent archaeological findings have shed light on the "governor gap" in the book of Nehemiah. According to Avigad's work, at least three other governors could plausibly be placed between Zerubbabel and Nehemiah. One of them was Elnathan whose name appears on a bullae and on the seal of Shelomith, both of them dated to the very end of

\textsuperscript{74} Meyer and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 9.

\textsuperscript{75} Some scholars opine that Nehemiah's words were directed against the governors of Samaria who supposedly controlled Yehud. However, the phrase "the former governors who were before me" should refer to his compatriots rather than some foreign rulers. Moreover, the complaint of the people is directed against their wealthy Jewish brethren, against their nobility, and their officials who exploited them and brought them to the verge of ruin (Neh 5:1–7). See the discussion in Avigad, Bullae and Seals, 34. Moreover, if Yehud is not under Samaria as argued above, then this thesis cannot stand.
the 6th century B.C. Two other governors were Yeho‘ezer and Ahzai whose names were found stamped on tax-gathering jars. Based on some papyrus sources, Fried adds Bagavahya and Yehizqiyah after Nehemiah, thus presenting a continuous rule of the imperial appointed governors in Yehud in the whole Persian period. Below is a reconstructed list of the known governors of Persian Yehud relating to the audience of Second Zechariah:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheshbazzar</td>
<td>ca. 538–520 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerubbabel</td>
<td>ca. 520–510 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elnathan</td>
<td>ca. 510–490 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeho‘ezer</td>
<td>ca. 490–470 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahzai</td>
<td>ca. 470–? B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>ca. 445–410 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagavahya</td>
<td>ca. 410–370 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehizqiyah</td>
<td>ca. 370–333 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all the influential discoveries of Avigad, the seal of Shelomith is of special importance. This official seal suggests that Shelomith, probably the wife of Elnathan, filled a central role in the administration of the province of Yehud, most likely ruling jointly with Elnathan, the governor. As a woman, the fact that she could assume such a high ranking position in the imperial administration was very unusual. Besides being the

---

76 Avigad, Bullae and Seals, 32. See the detailed analysis of the archaeological findings relating to Elnathan and Shelomith in Williamson, “Governors of Judah,” 69–82.
77 Avigad, Bullae and Seals, 35. However, Williamson casts doubt on the certainty of these two governors; Williamson, “Governors of Judah,” 76, n. 56.
79 The reconstructed list is based on Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 14; Fried, Priest and the Great King, 184–87.

In the early Persian period, the governors were appointed officers whose terms of office were most likely not very long. If we take Nehemiah’s twelve-year term as an average, there would have been some five or six governors between him and Zerubbabel. However, their terms could be renewed as Nehemiah’s was. This list is the known governors of Persian Judah available at the present moment; Avigad, Bullae and Seals, 35.
wife of the governor, it may be that her family link played a crucial role in her career. Meyers and Meyers relate Shelomith to the daughter of Zerubbabel in 1 Chr 3:19, a suggestion supported by Williamson. If this is the case, then Davidic leadership might be in force in Yehud through the office of Elnathan, the son-in-law of Zerubbabel, and Shelomith, the daughter of Zerubbabel, for approximately two more decades until ca. 490 B.C. After Elnathan and Shelomith, the continuing fortunes of the Davidic house remain conjectural, for after Shelomith evidence for the convergence between governorship and Davidides is absent.

Emergence of a Theocracy?

Persian domination in Yehud (539–333 B.C.) apparently created a sea-change in the province’s form of government. Following the lead of Wellhausen, many scholars believe that as long as tribute was sent to the Persian empire, the province could enjoy significant autonomy, even allowing for a rise in the power of local priesthoods to fill the political vacuum. As a result, the priesthood in Yehud had the power and the freedom

---

80 See the detailed analysis of the archaeological findings relating to Elnathan and Shelomith in Williamson, “Governors of Judah,” 69–82. Also see Avigad’s work for the image of the seal and his explanation; Avigad, Bullae and Seals, 11–13, 32.
81 Meyers and Meyers, “Future Fortunes,” 208. Meyers mentions: “Shelomith is one among very few women mentioned in the list of the Davidic line in Chronicles. The list, however, is unusual in that it explicitly singles out Shelomith as the sister of Meshullam and Hananiah. It would seem that of the offspring mentioned, the female has been identified in such a way that could well suggest a special role”; Meyers, “Shelomith Seal,” 34.
82 Williamson, “Governors of Judah,” 76.
84 Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 13.
85 Wellhausen, Prolegomena, 420–21. Scholars advocating a self-governing theocracy in Yehud include, e.g., Weinberg, Citizen-Temple Community; Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 63; Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 189; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 79.
to direct the community in a self-governing theocracy. According to Josephus, when Alexander the Great invaded Yehud in 332 B.C., Jaddua, the high priest, was in charge of the province, controlling the auxiliary troops, military equipment, provisions, and even the power of opening the gates of the city to Alexander (Ant. 11.317, 11.326–27). Was there a power vacuum in Yehud? Had Yehud become a theocracy?

Dandamayev contends that the subject people could enjoy a certain degree of self-governance within the Persian empire, particularly before the rule of Darius I. However, Frei questions to what degree these local communities had the authority to regulate their own interests. He argues that the most that the central authority would allow them to do would be to codify the local laws and norms which correspond with imperial intentions. Fried, after examining temple-palace relations in Babylonia, Egypt, Asia Minor, and Yehud, challenges the notion of local autonomy: “Admittedly, the Persians utilized local forms of governance...however...the locus of control was Susa...and the decision-maker a Persian.” She concludes that Persian-period Yehud was not a self-governing theocracy, with local officials, whether priest or lay, holding little real power. Fried further explains the case of Jaddus: “[During the conquest of Alexander], the satrap, Mazday, had fled with Darius down the Euphrates...The Persian soldiers garrisoned in Jerusalem were either fighting with their governor or, like other

---

86 In this work, a “theocracy” refers to a system of government ruled by priesthood, covering the social, economic, and political realms of a society; Cataldo, Theocratic Yehud, 1–5.
89 Dandamaev et al., Culture and Social Institutions, 96–7.
92 Fried, Priest and the Great King, 47.
93 Fried, Priest and the Great King, 233.
soldiers garrisoned throughout the empire, had fled. Yaddua alone was left. The argument of Fried is in harmony with the description of life in the prayer of confession in Neh 9: “Behold, we are slaves today, and as to the land which You gave to our fathers to eat of its fruit and its bounty, behold, we are slaves in it. Its abundant produce is for the kings whom You have set over us because of our sins; they also rule over our bodies and over our cattle as they please, so we are in great distress” (Neh 9:36–37).

If a succession of imperial governors can be established, as shown above, a power vacuum allowing the priesthood to claim power would not have been possible in Yehud during the Persian period. Furthermore, we should not overlook Yehud’s proximity to Egypt, an area that rebelled repeatedly against its imperial overlords, thus impelling the Persians to impose tighter control on the province. In addition, since the province was not under a theocracy before Persian dominion, it would be necessary for us to see evidence of changes on the social, economic, and political levels that reflect the structuring and development of a theocracy. Based on these, we could reasonably challenge the hypothesis that the secular powers of the priesthood were increasing from an early time after the exile. The presence of governors down to the late fourth century

94 Fried, Priest and the Great King, 233.
95 Fried explains: “Every province had an imperial governor, every satrapy a satrap. When the governor or satrap was absent (called to Susa, for example, or to war), the imperially appointed head of the garrison ruled the province or satrapy and implemented his master’s orders. The Arsames letters show that even when away from the province the satrap remained completely in charge. This would have been true in Yehud as well”; Fried, Priest and the Great King, 183.
96 See the discussion of Cataldo regarding whether or not Yehud was a theocracy; Cataldo, Theocratic Yehud, 170–93.
97 Cf. the work of Rooke: “The evidence from the sources for the Persian period is consistent in its picture of the high priesthood in Jerusalem, and indicates that throughout the period the high priest’s authority in the community was confined to matters concerning the Temple and cult”; Rooke, Zadok’s Heirs, 238.
B.C.\textsuperscript{98} would push the date for the emergence of a theocracy down to a much later period, perhaps towards the beginning of the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{99}

Summary

The origin of Second Zechariah is placed in the 440s B.C., with the audience residing in Persian Yehud during the mid-fifth century B.C. At that time, Yehud was a tiny province, with both its political and religious spheres under imperial control. Post-collapse Yehud was relatively poor, struggling with economic stagnation after the devastation of the Babylonian conquest. The breakdown of leadership further intensified the predicament, with the people of the province wrestling with internal turmoil and external opposition.

Second Zechariah originated in this tumultuous period, addressing the needs of the community. Those responsible for the corpus simultaneously upheld and heralded the inherited tradition while also transforming it to meet the needs of the audience. In supplementing the visions of earlier prophets and responding to the political and socioeconomic realities of the original readers, Zech 9–14 envisioned the ultimate, full restoration of the covenant community—the universal recognition of Yahweh’s sovereignty (14:16–19) and the transformation of a human society into a truly sacred one (14:20–21).\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{98} See “Davidic Governor” above.
\textsuperscript{99} Rose, \textit{Zemah and Zerubbabel}, 33.
\textsuperscript{100} Meyers and Meyers, \textit{Zechariah 9–14}, 29.
Dating the Intertexts

As we have made the case that the final form of Second Zechariah is a product of the mid-fifth century, ca. 440s B.C., now we proceed to establish what biblical texts might have been in circulation at that time in order to delineate the direction of influence. There is a general consensus in scholarship that there were a vast number of stabilized traditions and authoritative materials circulating in written form near the end of the Persian I period. Thus, the following will only discuss those corpora in which intertexts are detected and their origins are debatable.

The Pentateuch in ca. 440s

Determining the origin of the Pentateuch is complex in light of the controversial debates surrounding the subject, with scholars dating the corpus from the exilic period to the second century B.C. The classical Documentary Hypothesis set forth by Wellhausen supports the existence of the Pentateuch during the exilic period apart from

---

101 See "Approach of the Study" in INTRODUCTION.
102 Apart from the following, there are two other intertexts detected, one is in the book of Joshua (17:16–18) and the other, in the book of Lamentations (3:31–33).

For the book of Joshua, it is generally agreed that the book is a product of the Deuteronomist with exilic origin, though with some “P-like language” in its final form (e.g., 14:1; 18:1; 19:51); Nelson, Joshua: A Commentary, 9, 18; Butler, Joshua, xxv–xxvi; Woudstra, Joshua, 6. The land allotment section (13:1–21:42) is regarded as a later insertion, however, Nelson claims that the geographic data is not "priestly" but "deuteronomistic"; Nelson, Joshua: A Commentary, 8. Cf. Woudstra, Joshua, 6; Noth, Das Buch Josua.

For the book of Lamentations, a majority of scholars view the corpus as addressing the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C., thus arguing for an exilic origin of the book; Berlin, Lamentations, 33–35; Dobbs-Allsopp, Lamentations, 4; Huey, Jeremiah, Lamentations, 444; Westermann, Lamentations, 54–55; Tull (Willey), Remember the Former Things, 89. Contra Provan who dates Lamentations between the 6th and the 2nd centuries B.C.; Provan, Lamentations, 19.

103 E.g., Vorländer, Entstehungszeit, 337.
104 E.g., Davies, Scribes and Schools, 99–104. See the discussion in Van Seters, Pentateuch; Choi, Traditions at Odds, 15–23.
those Priestly materials which were added to the corpus in the fifth century B.C.\textsuperscript{105}

Though the classic source theory has been seriously criticized,\textsuperscript{106} scholars after the work of Wellhausen generally accept P as the last of the sources, dating it to “the late exilic or postexilic period.”\textsuperscript{107}

To determine the \textit{terminus ad quem} of P is not an easy job, however, building on the work of Polzin, Hill attempts to date P\textsuperscript{8} linguistically to the time of the exile and P\textsuperscript{8} to ca. 450s B.C, connecting the latter source to Ezra’s activity.\textsuperscript{108} Hill’s suggestion is supported by Grabbe who contends: “When we put Ezra 8–10 and Neh 8 together, as part of the common Ezra tradition, it emerges without doubt that the book of the law presupposed included both Deuteronomic and P traditions. It is difficult to go beyond that with any certainty, but the existence of the Pentateuch in much its present form would be quite consistent with this narrative.”\textsuperscript{109} Williamson argues that the material concerning Ezra and Nehemiah was combined by an earlier editor in ca. 430 B.C. before the final composition of the Ezra/Nehemiah corpus in ca. 300 B.C.\textsuperscript{110} He further contends that the pledges made in Neh 10 already reflect “a wide sweep of Pentateuchal

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{105} Wellhausen argues: “The Priestly Code, worked into the Pentateuch as the standard legislative element in it, became the definite ‘Mosaic law.’ As such it was published and introduced in the year 444 B.C., a century after the exile”; Wellhausen, \textit{Prolegomena}. 405.


\textsuperscript{109} Grabbe explains that the P traditions are reflected in “Neh 9–10 and the reference to the Festival of Tabernacles in Neh 8, [suggesting] a knowledge of P as well or, more likely, the complete Pentateuch in much of its present form”; Grabbe, “Law of Moses,” 96–97, 99.

\textsuperscript{110} Williamson, \textit{Ezra, Nehemiah}, xxxvi. Williamson argues that Ezra 1–6 was added to the final composition in ca. 300 B.C., in which time Ezra 7–Neh 13 “already lay before him [the final editor] in substantially its present form; Williamson, “Composition of Ezra 1–6,” 29.
law, embracing P and D."¹¹¹ Since Neh 10 has an independent origin before being redacted into the Ezra/Nehemiah material,¹¹² this indicates that at least most of the Pentateuch existed before ca. 430 B.C. so that the Pentateuchal tradition could be reused in Nehemiah.

By analyzing the form-critical background of Neh 9:5c–37, Boda claims that the prayer in Neh 9 "must have existed prior to its incorporation into either the literary context of Neh 8–10 or the historical context described in Neh 9."¹¹³ He tags Neh 9 as Penitential Prayer whose origin is in the "exilic" period.¹¹⁴ By examining the tradition-historical background of the prayer, he concludes that the writer of Neh 9 relies "on a completed Pentateuch and is drawing elements from different passages into an integrated account."¹¹⁵ This argument is in harmony with several scholarly opinions which claim that the exodus tradition in Nehemiah’s prayer presupposes the existence of the Pentateuch in its present form.¹¹⁶ In light of the above studies, this project assumes that a substantive portion, if not all, of the Pentateuch was available in written form when Zech 9–14 reached its final stage.

The Book of Isaiah in ca. 440s

Since Duhm, there has been a general consensus in Isaiah scholarship that the book of Isaiah should be divided into three parts:¹¹⁷ (1) those parts arising from the prophet Isaiah in the eighth century B.C.; (2) those portions composed by an anonymous

¹¹¹ Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, xliii.
¹¹² Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, 276.
¹¹³ Boda, Praying the Tradition, 11.
¹¹⁴ Boda, Praying the Tradition, 41.
¹¹⁵ Boda, Praying the Tradition, 116.
¹¹⁶ E.g., Pröbstl, Nehemia 9, 81; Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, 314–15.
exilic "Deutero-Isaiah"; and (3) those materials written by a post-exilic "Trito-Isaiah." For the purposes of determining the contents of Isaiah in ca. 440s B.C., it is the third part of Isaiah that is most at issue.

Some scholars, e.g., Steck, argue for a Greek origin of Isa 56–66. Similar to the historical approach to Zech 9–14, Steck's method builds largely upon tracing specific historical allusions in Trito-Isaiah that would provide a ground for connecting the text with an absolute date in history. He contends that the "Homecoming Redaction" points to the historical context after the death of Alexander the Great, with the nations of Assyria and Egypt referring to the empires of Seleucid and Ptolemy respectively. However, most scholars do not opt for this speculative identification of Assyria and Egypt, assuming that they are the nations as named in the text. Without this anchor, the whole dating scheme of Steck cannot stand. Furthermore, even though Steck dates Isaiah 56–66 to the Greek period, he suggests that the redactional addition of Zech 14 to the Twelve was even later, between 240–220 B.C. Thus, from the view of a relative

---


119 For the redaction of Isaiah, see Stromberg, Isaiah After Exile.

120 Steck argues for four main stages of development: (1) Persian Period Redaction (after 515 B.C.); (2) Homecoming Redaction (after 323 B.C.); (3) Penultimate Redaction (after 320 B.C.); and (4) Concluding Redaction (after 302/301 B.C.); Steck, Studien zu Tritojesaja, 278–79.

121 See "Date of Composition" above.


124 For a detailed critique of Steck's theory, see Stead, Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 64–68.
chronology, Steck still agrees that the origin of Second Zechariah is later than that of Trito-Isaiah.125

By applying the contextual-typological method, Hanson dates Isa 56–66 in ca. 510 B.C., with Isa 56:1–8 and 66:7–24 as the final framework added to the corpus by the mid-fifth century B.C.126 The redactional approach of Collins has similar conclusions, with the final edition of the corpus in the mid-fifth century B.C.127 By taking into consideration rhetorical and stylistic concerns, Smith argues that “most of Isa 56–66 should be dated between 538 and 515 B.C.,” with 59:21 and 66:18–24 being the latest parts written around the mid-fifth century B.C.128 Smith’s suggestion is followed by Tiemeyer who contends that the material in Trito-Isaiah stems from around 539 to 520 B.C., with 66:18–24 appended to the corpus roughly in the mid-fifth century B.C.129 Based on the above studies, it is reasonable to assert that a substantive portion, if not all, of the book of Isaiah was in place when Second Zechariah reached its final redaction. The only problematic unit may be Isa 66:18–24 which is regarded by many scholars as the last addition to the Isaianic material, serving together with Isa 56:1–8 as a framework around Isa 56:9–66:17.130

125 Steck, Abschluss der Prophetie, 196–98.
126 Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 32–208, 388–89.
127 Collins, Mantle of Elijah, 45.
128 Smith, Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah, 204–207.
129 Tiemeyer, Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage, 74–80.
130 See Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 388–89; Tiemeyer, Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage, 80.
The Book of Jeremiah in ca. 440s

The book of Jeremiah is the result of a long and complex compositional process, reflected by its lack of literary cohesion and confusing structure. In 1914, Mowinckel, building on the work of Duhm, offered his well-known hypothesis relating to the complicated redaction of the book of Jeremiah, laying down the basic approach of many subsequent works. He considered Jer 46–52 as the latest addition, with the rest of the book dividing into four literary categories: (1) Source A—primarily poetic oracles in Jer 1–25, attributed to Jeremiah with little redactional work; (2) Source B—the prose narrative in Jer 26–45, composed somewhat later than A; (3) Source C—the prose speeches/sermons reflecting a Deuteronomistic style and theology found throughout the book; and (4) Source D—oracles of hope in Jer 30–31, inserted by a redactor with uncertain date. Since Mowinckel, scholars have proposed a variety of redactional theories which can be grouped into three categories—the book of Jeremiah (1) was completed during or shortly after the lifetime of Jeremiah; (2) was produced during the exilic period through a Deuteronomistic redaction(s); and (3) emerged through an ongoing redactional process extending well in the Second Temple period.

Despite these divergent hypotheses, the corpus is generally considered to be the product of Deuteronomistic editors, a hypothesis developed by Hyatt and then

---

132 Duhm, Jeremiah.
134 Cf. Carroll, Jeremiah, 38–50; Stead, Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 55.
135 See the work of Unterman, From Repentance to Redemption; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 1–10.
136 See the work of Thiel, Jeremiah 1–25, 301–2; Thiel, Jeremiah 26–45, 107–12; Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, 122–23, 131–33.
137 See the work of Carroll, Jeremiah; McKane, Jeremiah 1–25.
accepted and refined by numerous commentators. Even Carroll who posits a late date for the origin of Jeremiah, particularly those “positive traditions,” e.g., Jer 30–31; 50–51, also agrees that the Deuteronomistic redaction of the book is clear, though he argues for a late “Deuteronomistic level of redaction.” His main concerns which relate to this project are: (1) Jer 30–31 where the restoration of all Israel is envisioned; (2) Jer 50–51 where the fall of Babylon is announced.

For Jer 30–31, Carroll opts for an origin in the fifth or fourth century for he contends that the hopes expressed in the corpus are “akin to those reflected in the Chronicler’s eirenic account of the history of the monarchy aimed at unifying all the political parties and tribal factions in a dominion of ‘all Israel’.” However, this late date is not the only option as the dream of the reunion of north and south is not rare in the earlier Jeremianic material, e.g., Jer 3:18. In addition, Person’s work on the Deuteronomistic School argues that the restoration themes in the material common to MT-Jer and OG-Jer are heightened in the material unique to MT-Jer, reflecting an early

---


140 Carroll admits: “The function and purpose of the Deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah are clear, but setting and date remain unknown.” He argues: “A later dating of the Deuteronomistic level of redaction provides a more adequate account of the matter and recognizes the creative contribution to the formation of the book made by the Deuteronomists”; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 68–69.

141 See “Allusion to Jer 31:12–13” in CHAPTER FIVE.

142 See “Allusion to Jer 51:50” in CHAPTER SEVEN.

143 Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 72.
post-exilic setting for the final redaction of MT-Jer, probably during the time of Zerubbabel when the Deuteronomists collaborated with the Persians.\textsuperscript{144}

For Jer 50–51, Carroll argues that the representation of Babylon in the corpus indicates the development of the city “as a symbol for the imperial powers ranged against Israel (and Yahweh).”\textsuperscript{145} The lack of realism in the depiction leads him to opt for a post-539 date, though he is reluctant to put a specific date on the corpus.\textsuperscript{146} However, this kind of language in describing the judgment of the Lord on foreign nations/cities is not unique here, examples can be found in earlier traditions, e.g., Ezek 28.\textsuperscript{147} In addition, Holladay’s extensive work on Jer 50–51 argues that around eighty percent of the materials in these two chapters are authentic, demonstrating the characteristic diction of Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{148} In this view, we can conclude that the book of Jeremiah would have been substantively, if not all, in its present form by the mid-fifth century B.C.

The Book of Ezekiel in ca. 440s

The scholarly study of Ezekiel can be divided into three phases.\textsuperscript{149} The first phase was marked by a broad agreement on the authorial unity of the book, contending that the whole corpus bears unmistakably the stamp of the prophet Ezekiel of the early-sixth

---


\textsuperscript{145} Carroll, \textit{Jeremiah}, 68.

\textsuperscript{146} Carroll, \textit{Jeremiah}, 68.

\textsuperscript{147} Most scholars link Ezek 28 to the long siege of Tyre by the Babylonians in the sixth century B.C.; Allen, \textit{Ezekiel 20–48}, 93; Corral, \textit{Against Tyre}; Hals, \textit{Ezekiel}, 200–1.

\textsuperscript{148} Holladay, \textit{Jeremiah 2}, 402–11.

However, within half a century, the pendulum of Ezekiel studies swung to the opposite extreme, arguing that sizable portions of the book were added centuries after the exile. After realizing that the earlier paradigm shift in Ezekiel studies had been driven more by theories about the evolutionary development of religion than from careful analysis of the text, recent scholars on Ezekiel generally agree that the substance of the book was completed by the end of the sixth century B.C.

The Book of the Twelve in ca. 440s

For the books of the Minor Prophets, it is much more complex to determine the direction of the reuse, particularly relating to the book of Joel. Merx wrote: “...der Joel ist gradezu ein Schmerzenskind der alttestamentlichen Exegese.” The absence of concrete historical references in Joel makes it extremely difficult for scholars to arrive at any consensus, dating the corpus anywhere between the ninth and second centuries B.C. In his dissertation, Stead contends that “there probably was a book of Joel in 520 B.C.E.,” arguing against a sea of scholarly views. Since the present work is

---

153 Translated as: “Joel is regarded as a problematic child of the Old Testament exegesis”; Merx, *Prophetie des Joel*, iii.
154 Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 3. Cf. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets 1*, 149. However, most scholars accept that Joel should be dated after 515 B.C. because of (1) the presence of apocalyptic perspective in the book; (2) the highly intertextual nature of the text; and (3) the portrayal of active temple worship in chapters 1–2; Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, 224–26.
155 Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*, 68. After identifying some parallels between the two books, Stead concludes that Joel 2 is an intertext used by Zech 1–2, with the following reason: “This conclusion is borne out by a comparison of the context and tone of each book. On the whole, Joel appears to be more reserved and uncertain about the future, whereas Zech 1–2 is more confident about the future.
focused on the final form of Zech 9–14, instead of a concrete date for Joel, it is better to aim at a relative chronology of the book by investigating the redactional expansions of the Twelve.\textsuperscript{156}

The ancient manuscript remains of the Minor Prophets and the ancient references to them in extra-biblical literature provide incontrovertible evidence that these twelve writings were transmitted on a single scroll and considered as a single corpus, namely, the book of the Twelve Prophets.\textsuperscript{157} Scholars, both ancient and modern, have exerted great effort in examining the internal coherence of the Twelve by analyzing the history behind its composition.\textsuperscript{158} The extensive work of Nogalski brings together the best elements of previous redactional and literary approaches into a new synthesis,

---

\textit{Joel} asks 'Who knows if Yahweh will return?', against which Zech 1:16 declares 'Yahweh is returning' (or 'has returned'). Similarly, Joel 1:12 describes a negative 'before' picture, against which Hag 2:19 gives a much brighter prognosis for the future. In Joel 2:17–19, the nations is still an 'object of sore,' which corresponds to the situation to which Zech 1:13 speaks'; Stead, \textit{Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8}, 98. However, an approach which is more reserved and uncertain about the future also fits well the milieu of a later period, e.g., the mid-fifth century B.C., when the situation turned gloomy.

A recent article from Ganzel also argues for an early date of Joel: "The oracles in the book of Joel were uttered during the early restoration period in Judah, and more specifically, during the seventeen-year period between Cyrus's decree (538–537 BCE) and the prophecies of Haggai (520 BCE), in year two to Darius, before the dedication of the Second Temple"; Ganzel, "Shattered Dream," 3.\textsuperscript{152} Nogalski reminds us that "any discussion of the date of the Book of the Twelve requires careful consideration of several elements: (1) the literary history of the individual writings; (2) the literary history of pre-existing blocks incorporated into those writings for the Book of the Twelve, (3) the possible transmission of more than one writing as part of a previous multi-volume corpus, and (4) the purpose of redactional expansions"; Nogalski, \textit{Redactional Processes}, 279.

\textsuperscript{157} See Nogalski, \textit{Redactional Processes}, 2–19; Jones, \textit{Formation of the Book of the Twelve}, 1–42.\textsuperscript{158} Those who see the Twelve as a redactional composition view it primarily as the effort of redactors who unified the individual works by composing numerous textual insertions into the seams of the text, thus creating various ties among the respective books, e.g., Steck, \textit{Der Abschluss der Prophetie}. Those who see the corpus as an editorial compilation describe it primarily as the work of editors who collected the individual writings into a single volume because of pre-existing ties that were perceived as unifying the respective books, e.g., Schneider, "The Unity of the Book of the Twelve." Actually, most scholars recognize that the Twelve is the product of some degree of both editorial compilation and redactional composition. Cf. Jones, \textit{Formation of the Book of the Twelve}, 13–32.
explaining the unifying ties of the Twelve as well as their origins.\footnote{Nogalski’s doctoral work has been published in two volumes: Nogalski, \textit{Literary Precursors} and Nogalski, \textit{Redactional Processes}.} He argues that the Twelve appeared as different pre-existing corpora before it was redacted as a single book, with Zech 9–14 added to the eleven-book corpus after the expansion of the Joel-related layer, simultaneously with the incorporation of Jonah.\footnote{Nogalski, \textit{Redactional Processes}, 213–80, especially pages 272, 279–80. Nogalski suggests that Jonah might be the last addition to the Twelve, though admitting that further precision is not possible. His thesis is that Jonah 2:3–10 was the last block inserted into the prose narrative when Jonah was incorporated into the Twelve; Nogalski, \textit{Redactional Processes}, 271, 78. The argument that the oldest order of the Twelve had Jonah after Malachi as represented by 4QXIIa is also advocated by some other scholars, e.g., Jones, \textit{Formation of the Book of the Twelve}, 138; Schart, “Reconstructing the Redaction History,” 37–38; Blenkinsopp, \textit{History of Prophecy}, 240–45. However, after considering the redactional stages of Jonah, it is reasonable to assume that even though Jonah might be the last unit entering into the Twelve, a substantive portion of Jonah, particularly the prose of the book, most likely was circulating in written form in the mid-fifth century B.C. when Zech 9–14 was redacted. However, we will assess the directionality of re-use when actual intertexts in Jonah are detected.} Despite the fact that Jonah might be the last addition to the Twelve, Nogalski concludes that the addition of Zech 14 completed “the editorial work on the entire prophetic corpus (Josh-Mal).”\footnote{Nogalski, \textit{Redactional Processes}, 213–80, especially page 279. Dissatisfied with previous scholarship which neglects the manuscript evidence of the LXX, Jones, working on the Twelve according to the LXX sequence, contends that the books of Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah entered into the final collection at the final stage, with Jonah being the latest; Jones, \textit{Formation of the Book of the Twelve}, 138. However, as Schart claims, Jones’s arguments are primarily dependent upon the placement of Jonah at the end of Malachi in 4QXIIa and this arrangement is reconstructed from meager evidence that might not warrant the conclusions Jones draws from it. Schart convincingly argues against the conclusions of Jones which consider the Septuagint order to be older: “The main problem with Jones’s hypothesis is that it does not explain how the Masoretic order came into being. Much more convincing is that the Septuagint placed Amos and Micah immediately after Hosea and left all other writings in the Masoretic order. The reason probably was the historical setting given by the superscriptions; since Hosea, Amos, and Micah prophesied partly under the same kings, they form a closed group to which Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah do not belong”; Schart, “Reconstructing the Redaction History,” 37–38.}
Though Nogalski's hypothesis has met some opposition, his view has been followed in principle by a number of scholars, agreeing that Zech 9–14 was one of the last blocks redacted into the Twelve. Based on the highly intertextual nature of the text, Redditt argues that a redactor, possibly the redactor of Zech 9–14, inserted these six chapters between Haggai-Zech 1–8 and Malachi in the final stage, making Second

---

162 E.g., Barton, Joel and Obadiah, 116–17; Ben Zvi, "Twelve Prophetic Books," 125–57. Ben Zvi argues that nowhere in ancient manuscripts does one find an overarching superscription for “the Twelve,” yet the individual books within the Twelve are clearly marked by their own internal superscriptions.

In a rebuttal to Ben Zvi’s argument, Jones contends: “A rejoinder is possible to Ben Zvi’s invocation of Occam’s Razor, namely, that explaining Obadiah [Ben Zvi’s text case] by reference to a wider composition of the Twelve unnecessarily complicates explanation of its contents. It is equally parsimonious to observe that a separate book of Obadiah is nowhere attested in ancient manuscripts and that to invent such a self-standing circulation again is to complicate unnecessarily the explanation of its location in the scroll of the Twelve”; Jones, “Book of the Twelve as a Witness,” 67 n.10.

163 The redactional approach of Schart arrives at similar conclusion with that of Nogalski, except with Malachi being the last corpus entering into the Twelve, following Zech 9–14 and Jonah; Schart, Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs, 304–306.

Curtis proposes that the books of Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi comprised a single prophetic corpus at an early stage in their history before they were added as the final group to the preexisting collection that became the Twelve. He, similar to Nogalski, believes that the Haggai-Zech 1–8 corpus was once circulated independently. His argument, contra Nogalski, is that this independent corpus was only attached to the Twelve until it came to include Zech 9–14 and Malachi; Curtis, “The Zion-Daughter Oracles,” 166–67. Cf. Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 213–80; Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, xlv–xlivii; Boda, “Messengers of Hope,” 113–31.

Based on the literary interrelatedness between Zech 1–8 and Malachi, Nogalski questions the preexistence of a Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi corpus, arguing that Zech 1–8 and Malachi were joined together and added into the Twelve before the insertion of Zech 9–14. He claims that the insertion of these six chapters really interrupts the literary connections between these two books. He suggests that the former was inserted into the latter in order to solve the contrasting images presented in Zech 8:9–23 in particular. He also contends that after the insertion of Second Zechariah into the Twelve, Malachi was separated from the corpus, turning it into the twelfth book in the book of the Twelve; Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 182–212; Nogalski, Literary Precursors, 53–55; Cf. Steck, Abschluss der Prophetie, 196–98. For a critique of Nogalski’s position, see Schart, “Putting the Eschatological Visions of Zechariah in Their Place,” 333–43. For the argument that Malachi originally followed Haggai/Zech 1–8, see Bosshard and Kratz, “Maleachi im Zwölffprophetenbuch,” 27–46.

Malachi is universally dated to the mid-fifth century, ca. 480–430 B.C., probably contemporary with Zech 9–14; Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 186–87; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 149–51; Redditt, “Nehemiah’s First Mission,” 676–77; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 715–16; Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 137–39; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 5. Hill opts for a range of 515–458 B.C.; Hill, “Dating the Book of Malachi,” 77–89. In view of this, it is reasonable to assume that a substantive portion, if not all, of Malachi was circulating in written form when Second Zechariah was finalized. However, we will assess the directionality of re-use when actual intertexts in Malachi are detected.
Zechariah the "capstone" of the book of the Twelve.\textsuperscript{164} Since Joel was generally accepted as being redacted into the Twelve earlier than Zech 9–14, it is fair to assume that the final redaction of Second Zechariah was composed with an eye on Joel as well as on the rest of the books of the Minor Prophets.\textsuperscript{165}

The Psalter in ca. 440s

While Gunkel sees that the majority of the extant psalms are only post-exilic "spiritualized imitations" of the earlier cultic psalms which now are mostly lost,\textsuperscript{166} Mowinckel contends that almost all concrete psalms were used in community worship in the Jerusalem temple.\textsuperscript{167} In recent scholarship, there is a general consensus that the individual psalm was eventually collected into the five books of the Psalter for liturgical reasons, with a long and complex process of growth.\textsuperscript{168} Though the final edition of the

\textsuperscript{164} Redditt, "Zechariah 9–14: Capstone," 305; cf. Redditt, "Zechariah 9–14, Malachi," 245–68. Collins also arrives at the same conclusion which suggests that the final additions to the Twelve were Zechariah 9–14 and the appendices to Malachi; Collins, \textit{Mantle of Elijah}, 64. Generally, scholars agree that Mal 3:22–24 was added to the Twelve as the conclusion to the book of Malachi and also to the corpus as a whole in the very last stage; cf. Rudolph, \textit{Haggai, Sacharja 1–8, Sacharja 9–14, Maleachi}, 290–93; Nogalski, \textit{Redactional Processes}, 204–10; Petersen, \textit{Zechariah 9–14}, 227–33; Redditt, \textit{Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi}, 185–92; Sweeney, \textit{Twelve Prophets} 2, 748–50.

\textsuperscript{165} In view of the above discussion and the redactional process of each individual book, it is likely that only Jonah 2:3–10 and Mal 3:22–24 were not yet incorporated into the Twelve when Zech 9–14 was finally inserted into the corpus.

\textsuperscript{166} Childs, \textit{Introduction}, 509. Cf. Gunkel and Begrich, \textit{Introduction to Psalms}.

\textsuperscript{167} Mowinckel, \textit{Psalms I}, 29–35. The only few exceptions are the wisdom psalms; Mowinckel, \textit{Psalms II}, 104–106. See Day's comment: "Support for the cultic interpretation of the psalms may be found in the Mishnah and other rabbinic sources, which stipulate various cultic occasions for the use of the psalms. Some of the psalm headings also attest liturgical usage, though they also contain some uncertainties. When we come to the late period, we actually find psalms composed in non-cultic, pious circles, specifically the Psalms of Solomon and the Qumran \textit{Hodayoth} (Thanksgiving Psalms). These differ markedly from our Old Testament psalms in various ways, and their non-cultic orientation highlights all the more the cultic nature of the biblical psalms"; Day, \textit{Psalms}, 15.

Psalter may have been completed in the post-exilic era,\footnote{Gerstenberger, \textit{Psalms, Part I}, 29.} Day reminds us that numerous psalms were written in the pre-exilic time: “in broad terms one can say that there appears to be a predominance of pre-exilic psalms in the first two-thirds of the Psalter and of post-exilic psalms in the last third.”\footnote{Day, \textit{Psalms}, 16. Weiser claims: “The manifold connecting links between the psalms and the cult of the Covenant Festival, as this was celebrated by the tribes of Israel, justify the view that the majority of the psalms came into existence in the pre-exilic period of Israel’s history”; Weiser, \textit{Psalms}, 90.}

Zech 9:10 alludes to Ps 72. As a royal psalm, it is regarded by Wilson as a seam, playing a key role in the formation of the final form of the Psalter.\footnote{Wilson’s work seeks to demonstrate that the Psalter depicts the bankruptcy of the Davidic monarchy. He argues that three seam psalms are used to express this ideology—Ps 2 identifies the king as Yahweh’s adopted son, Ps 72 prays that the king will implement justice, and Ps 89 portrays that the Lord has removed the scepter from David’s house. Wilson, \textit{Editing}; Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 72–82; Wilson, “Use of Royal Psalms,” 85–94.} However, in the present work, we deal with the origin of the individual psalm, Ps 72, whose pre-exilic existence is generally accepted. Though some scholars argue that the royal psalms are messianic hymns, composed during the exilic and post-exilic period as cult songs in early Jewish community services,\footnote{E.g., Gerstenberger, \textit{Psalms, Part I}, 48.} the fact that the kings in the psalms are generally depicted as ones who were installed to reign at the present moment rather than in the future precludes us from any messianic interpretation.\footnote{Day states: “Most modern scholars ... [view] the king [in the royal psalms] as an actually reigning Israelite monarch, admittedly spoken of in idealized language. The reason for this is that throughout the royal psalms the kings is constantly spoken of as one who is already reigning, rather than as one whose arrival on the scene is expected in the future”; Day, \textit{Psalms}, 90.} Thus, we assume that the

\footnotesize
\textit{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{169} Gerstenberger, \textit{Psalms, Part I}, 29.}
\textit{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{170} Day, \textit{Psalms}, 16. Weiser claims: “The manifold connecting links between the psalms and the cult of the Covenant Festival, as this was celebrated by the tribes of Israel, justify the view that the majority of the psalms came into existence in the pre-exilic period of Israel’s history”; Weiser, \textit{Psalms}, 90.}
\textit{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{171} Wilson’s work seeks to demonstrate that the Psalter depicts the bankruptcy of the Davidic monarchy. He argues that three seam psalms are used to express this ideology—Ps 2 identifies the king as Yahweh’s adopted son, Ps 72 prays that the king will implement justice, and Ps 89 portrays that the Lord has removed the scepter from David’s house. Wilson, \textit{Editing}; Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 72–82; Wilson, “Use of Royal Psalms,” 85–94.}
\textit{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{172} E.g., Gerstenberger, \textit{Psalms, Part I}, 48.}
\textit{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{173} Day states: “Most modern scholars ... [view] the king [in the royal psalms] as an actually reigning Israelite monarch, admittedly spoken of in idealized language. The reason for this is that throughout the royal psalms the kings is constantly spoken of as one who is already reigning, rather than as one whose arrival on the scene is expected in the future”; Day, \textit{Psalms}, 90.}}
origins of Ps 72 lay in pre-exilic times.\textsuperscript{174} Since the origin of each psalm is different, ranging from the pre-exilic to the post-exilic periods, each will be discussed in detail when the re-use of other psalms in Zech 9–10 is detected.

Having established what biblical texts were in circulation when Second Zechariah reached its final form (ca. 440s), we now proceed to investigate the intertexts of Zech 9–10.

\textsuperscript{174} For further discussion, see “Allusion to Ps 72” in \textbf{CHAPTER FOUR}.
CHAPTER THREE
THE ADVENT OF THE DIVINE KING:
AN INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF ZECHARIAH 9:1–8

Introduction

The abundance of place names in the oracles of Zec 9:1–8 has attracted great attention from biblical scholars. In examining the toponyms mentioned in these eight verses, many have attempted to relate them to historical manoeuvres, generating a wide diversity of interpretation. Masing argued that the oracles referred to the second campaign of Tiglath-Pileser in 734–32 B.C., while Otzen thought that they were in the reign of Josiah.¹ Stade believed that they related to the conquest of Alexander in 332 B.C., while Sellin opted for the Maccabean period, ca. 150–40 B.C., in which Tyre and Sidon were in opposition to Judas Maccabeaus.² Hanson commented: “each of these solutions can be argued as persuasively as the others…since none of those conquests matches the text perfectly.”³ Rudolph added: “Denn in der Richtung von Norden nach Süden müßte Hamath vor Damaskus und Sidon vor Tyrus stehen.”⁴ In addition, we notice that the conqueror in the text is God and not Alexander or any human beings.

Dissatisfied with these divergent results, recent scholars tend to relate Zec 9:1–8 to the Davidic traditions, claiming that the significance of these cities is that they were

---

¹ For the work of Masing, see Masing, “Die Proklamation des Tab’alsohnes,” 73–98. For the work of Otzen, see Otzen, Studien über Deuterosacharja, 62–123.
² For the work of Stade, see Stade, “Deuterosacharja,” 1–96, 151–72 and 275–309. For the work of Sellin, see Sellin, Zwölfprophetenbuch, 549.
³ Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 290.
⁴ Translated as: “For the direction from north to south, Hamath must stand before Damascus and Sidon before Tyre”; Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 171–72.
the traditional enemies of the old Davidic kingdom.\(^5\) Redditt contends that "Zechariah 9–14 opened with a chapter... depicting God’s recapturing the old Davidic empire (9:1–8)"\(^6\) while Petterson asserts that "The message of the oracle is... that Yahweh is coming to re-establish the kingdom promised to David."\(^7\) We admit that the re-use of earlier traditions is a notable phenomenon in Second Zechariah and this line of enquiry can yield a better result than a historical-critical approach.\(^8\) However, not all the toponyms mentioned in the schema were once traditional enemies of Israel, e.g., Hadrach and Hamath; nor all of them had been included within the Davidic kingdom, e.g., Sidon and Tyre. Moreover, when Zech 9:1–8 was composed, all these regions, together with Israel, were under Persian rule, posing no threat to post-exilic Yehud. If the text alluded to the greatest extent of the Davidic empire, or even a kingdom surpassing that of David, as Hanson argues,\(^9\) we would expect the land east of the Jordan to be mentioned, as Kaufmann states.\(^10\)

\(^5\) E.g., Hobbs, "Language of Warfare," 121; Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 170; Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 219; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 169; Petterson, Behold Your King, 131. Cf. Boda who states: "[these cities] continue as symbols of the early enemies of Israel, who threaten the realization of the promise of land to Israel"; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 413.

\(^6\) Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 102.

\(^7\) Petterson, Behold Your King, 135.

\(^8\) See INTRODUCTION.

\(^9\) Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 320. Cf. Nurmela who argues: "The areas mentioned in 9,1–8 seem to correspond to the limits of David’s empire"; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 196.

\(^10\) The work of Kaufmann reminds us that "in the Bible we find five different conceptions of the Land of Israel corresponding to changes in the historical situation, viz: 1. The Land of Canaan, or the Land of the Patriarchs; 2. Moses’ Land of Israel; 3. Joshua’s Land of Israel; 4. The Land of the real Israelite Settlement; 5. The Kingdom of Israel. The first four conceptions are ethnographic, the fifth imperialistic." Kaufmann states that the ideal boundaries in Ezek 47 and Num 34 belong to the first conception with the extent of the land promised to Israel excluding the Transjordan. This ideal land was given by Yahweh to the Israelites as their home. However, there was a discrepancy between the ancient promise and the actual settlement, he writes: "the ideal Land has boundaries... which conform neither to those of 'the settled area in Palestine’ nor to those of David’s or Solomon’s kingdom” which included the Transjordan; Kaufmann, Biblical Account, 48–50.
If the depiction of the campaign neither matches any specific conquest of the past, nor does the passage allude to any Davidic traditions, then this raises the question of why the biblical writer composed this schema of toponyms at the beginning of the corpus. We contend that the significance of the place names and the military activities in this section can be understood in light of the intertexts of the passage. Based on this, the following will offer an intertextual analysis of Zech 9:1–8, investigating the biblical materials to which the text alludes and the impact such intertextual insights might have made upon the audience. For the sake of discussion, we divide Zech 9:1–8 into three sections: (1) the קִרְבּ of Yahweh (Zech 9:1a); (2) the territorial claim of Yahweh (Zech 9:1b–7); and (3) the protection of Yahweh (Zech 9:8).

**The קִרְבּ of Yahweh (Zech 9:1a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:1a</th>
<th>קִרְבּ 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a A massā'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Zechariah opens with the word קִרְבּ, which also appears in Zech 12:1, functioning both as a title and an introduction to the subsequent oracle, namely, Zech 9–11. The mehuppākh under the ו might indicate a construct chain: “The massā’ of the word of Yahweh.”

Hanson adopts this rendering with a second הָיְתָא added before יָכִין in order to adjust the metric structure in 9:1: “The oracle of Yahweh’s word: Yahweh is against Hadrach.”

However, such an emendation does not have any support in the

---

11 All English translations of Second Zechariah are mine and the English translations of other biblical texts are from NASB95, unless noted otherwise. When the MT numeration does not match with the NASB95 numeration, the former will be used with the latter given in square parentheses, unless noted otherwise.

12 Larkin, *Eschatology*, 54. Cf. NAU, NKJ.

13 Hanson believes that the second הָיְתָא is lost due to haplography; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*,
versions. Without a second הַרְכָּזָה the understanding of a construct chain becomes less compelling. In view of this, we opt for an appositional relationship rather than a possessive one: “A massā’. The word of the Lord is against the land of Hadrach.” with הַרְכָּזָה as an overall heading for Zech 9–11 and הַרְכָּזָה as a specific word-event for Zech 9:1–8.

The construction הַרְכָּזָה occurs exclusively in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1. Based on this, Nogalski argues that “the similarity of the superscriptions in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1 point toward a deliberate shaping on the part of a redactor.” However the uses of the formulation in the three places are quite different. In Zech 9:1, only the word הַרְכָּזָה serves as a superscription with the rest of the verse forming part of a poetic oracle. By contrast, both the first half of Zech 12:1 ( Canal ָהָרְכָּזָה) and the whole of Mal 1:1 ( Canal ָהָרְכָּזָה) function as titles of the corpora, with הָרְכָּזָה denoting Israel as the subject of the oracle in the former one (cf. Mic 1:1) and...

---

294–96.

15 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 90.
16 Glazier-McDonald, Malachi, 26.
17 Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 217.
18 Contra Kashow who argues that both Zech 9 and 12 begin their oracles with the particle הָרְכָּזָה (see Table 3 below); Kashow, “Canonical Function,” unpublished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zech 9:1–3</th>
<th>Zech 12:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>Canal</td>
<td>Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Canal הָרְכָּזָה</td>
<td>Canal הָרְכָּזָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Canal תִּקְבֵּלָה</td>
<td>Canal תִּקְבֵּלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ addressee</td>
<td>Canal תִּקְבֵּלָה</td>
<td>Canal תִּקְבֵּלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Canal יָרְכָּזָה Canal (i) Canal (i)</td>
<td>Canal יָרְכָּזָה Canal (ii) Canal (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Yahweh</td>
<td>Canal יָרְכָּזָה Canal (i) Canal (i)</td>
<td>Canal יָרְכָּזָה Canal (ii) Canal (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) addressee</td>
<td>Canal יָרְכָּזָה Canal (i) Canal (i)</td>
<td>Canal יָרְכָּזָה Canal (ii) Canal (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle begins</td>
<td>Canal הָרְכָּזָה Canal (9:4) Canal הָרְכָּזָה Canal (12:2) Canal הָרְכָּזָה Canal (9:4) Canal הָרְכָּזָה Canal (12:2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: A Structural Comparison between the Openings of Zech 9–11 and 12–14
implying that Israel is the recipient of Yahweh’s word in the latter one (cf. Hag 1:1).\(^{19}\)
The use of הֶדְרוֹשׁ in Zech 12:1 and Mal 1:1 shows close affinity with other superscriptions in prophetic literature.

The lexeme הֶדְרוֹשׁ occurs 67 times in the Hebrew Bible, with 4 occasions referring to names of persons or regions (e.g., Gen 25:14), 35 occasions denoting the bearing of weighty objects or heavy responsibilities (e.g., Exod 23:5; Num 11:11), and 28 occasions depicting prophetic speech or writing.\(^{20}\) Prior to the 1980’s, the definition of הֶדְרוֹשׁ as a reference to prophetic speech was largely dominated by etymological investigation. Most scholars argued that the meaning of the word should be derived from the well-established sense of the lexeme הֶדְרוֹשׁ, referring to something that is literally or figuratively burdensome, thus describing either a prophecy of doom or the hard responsibility of the prophet.\(^{21}\) However, a review of the various prophetic passages in which the word הֶדְרוֹשׁ appears establishes the fact that this word does not always introduce an ominous prophecy (e.g., Jer 23:38). Hence, using etymology to understand a word is not always helpful for understanding the meaning of it at a specific time.\(^{22}\)

In his doctoral work, Weis leveraged form-critical categories and presented a full definition of הֶדְרוֹשׁ as a genre which is a form-critical tag used in a prophetic speech or text with “the intention to expound, on the basis of a particular revelation, the way YHWH’s action/intention will be manifested in human affairs—this to give instruction for the

\(^{19}\) See discussion in Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 24–27.

\(^{20}\) The 28 occasions depicting prophetic speech are: 2 Kgs 9:25; Isa 13:1; 14:28; 15:1; 17:1; 19:1; 21:1, 11, 13; 22:1; 23:1; 30:6; Jer 23:33\(^{23}\), 34, 36\(^{24}\), 38\(^{25}\); Ezek 12:10; Nah 1:1; Hab 1:1; Zech 9:1; 12:1; Mal 1:1; Lam 2:14; 2 Chr 24:27. Of these הֶדְרוֹשׁ is used as part of the superscription in 15 occurrences: Isa 13:1; 15:1; 17:1; 19:1; 21:1, 11, 13; 22:1; 23:1; 30:6; Nah 1:1; Hab 1:1; Zech 9:1; 12:1; Mal 1:1. Among these 15 instances, the use of the word הֶדְרוֹשׁ alone as a title is attested only in Zech 9:1. Cf. Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 338.


\(^{22}\) Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 340.
present or insight into the future."\textsuperscript{23} This innovative view of \textit{-pay} has been applied and developed by subsequent scholars, e.g., Floyd, Sweeney, and Woodcock.\textsuperscript{24} However, the weakness of Weis' thesis is that there are exceptions to patterns that he has highlighted for those \textit{pay} texts.\textsuperscript{25} The deviations should have signalled to Weis that he was not dealing with a unique form.\textsuperscript{26} In addition, one may argue that a number of prophetic speech forms also express Yahweh's intention, e.g., woe oracles and lawsuits which convey God's impending judgment. After reviewing all the \textit{pay} texts, we conclude that this word can only be regarded as a general tag denoting prophetic revelation.\textsuperscript{27} Thus we prefer to understand \textit{pay} within its immediate context rather than as an overarching generic category.

The use of the word \textit{pay} alone as a title in Zech 9:1 is unique in the Hebrew Bible. Is there any significance to this opening \textit{pay} besides introducing the subsequent revelation? Boda suggests that the importance of \textit{pay} can be discerned through a closer look at the traditio-historical relationship between the book of Jeremiah and Second Zechariah. He claims that of all the tradition streams that have influenced Zech 9–14, the Jeremianic one is clearly the strongest.\textsuperscript{28} When we scrutinize the book of Jeremiah, we discover that the greatest concentration of the term \textit{pay} as a reference to prophetic speech in the Hebrew Bible occurs in Jer 23:33–40, a passage within a larger literary context denouncing false prophets (Jer 23:9–40). When condemning the false prophets,

\textsuperscript{23} Weis, "Genre Maššā'," abstract.
\textsuperscript{24} Floyd, \textit{Minor Prophets} 2, 306; Floyd, "
\textit{pay} (Maššā')," 401–22; Sweeney, \textit{Twelve Prophets} 2, 656–57; Woodcock, "Forms and Functions," 1–5.
\textsuperscript{25} See the exceptions in Weis, "Genre Maššā'," 212–13.
\textsuperscript{26} Boda, "Freeing the Burden," 349.
\textsuperscript{27} Oswalt, \textit{Isaiah: Chapters 1–39}, 296.
Jer 23:9-40 gives a comprehensive explication of the word of Yahweh, particularly in v. 29, where the word of the Lord (torah מַלְכָּהּ) is a powerful weapon, like fire that burns straw or like a hammer that shatters rocks. This connotation of the word of Yahweh suits well the nuance of the phrase מַלְכָּהּ used in Zech 9:1b when the subsequent בָּאָלִים is translated with an adversative sense. Besides the term מַלְכָּהּ, the construct מַלְכָּהּ, which appears 440 times in the Hebrew Bible, also finds its greatest concentration in Jeremiah, namely, 69 occurrences.

Does Zech 9:1a allude to Jer 23:33-40? It is likely that מַלְכָּהּ and מַלְכָּהּ which appear in both texts serve as lexical links. Though מַלְכָּהּ occurs in the Zecharian text as a noun, whereas in the Jeremianic passage as a verb, the shared content, in which both texts deal with the problem of false prophecy (cf. Zech 10:2; 13:2-6), may add some weight to our contention. In addition, other parts of Jer 23 (vv.1-4, 7-8) are also significantly alluded to with substantial verbal parallels in Zech 10. In view of the above, we suggest that the מַלְכָּהּ in Zech 9:1 alludes to Jer 23:33-40. A close investigation of the source text sheds light on our understanding of the term מַלְכָּהּ in Zech 9.

Jeremiah 23:33-40

33 "Now when this people or the prophet or a priest asks you saying, ‘What is the oracle (מלכים) of the LORD?’ then you shall say to them, ‘What oracle (מלכים)?’ The LORD declares, ‘I will abandon you.’

---

29 Tai suggests that the phrase מַלְכָּהּ in Zech 9:1; 12:1; Mal 1:1 should be understood with Jer 23:28-40 in mind; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 13.
30 See discussion below.
31 In Zech 9, the construct noun מַלְכָּהּ occurs in v. 1b. In Jer 23:9-40, the word מַלְכָּהּ occurs in Jer 23:33, 34, 36, 38, and the verbal form מַלְכָּהּ appears in Jer 23:17, 35, 37. Apart from these, of the 28 occasions of מַלְכָּהּ depicting prophetic speech, the conjoined appearance of מַלְכָּהּ and מַלְכָּהּ only occurs in 2 Kgs 9:25-26; Zech 12:1; Mal 1:1.
32 See “Allusion to Jer 23:1-4” in CHAPTER SIX and “Sustained Allusion to Jer 23:1-4, 7-8” in CHAPTER SEVEN.
Then as for the prophet or the priest or the people who say, 'The oracle (הֵדֵב) of the LORD,' I will bring punishment upon that man and his household.


For you will no longer remember the oracle (הֵדֵב) of the LORD, because every man's own word will become the oracle (הֵדֵב), and you have perverted the words of the living God, the LORD of hosts, our God.

Thus you will say to that prophet, 'What has the LORD answered you?' and, 'What has the LORD spoken (יָכוֹנֶנֶn)?'

For if you say, 'The oracle (הֵדֵb) of the LORD!' surely thus says the LORD, 'Because you said this word, "The oracle (הֵדֵb) of the LORD!" I have also sent to you, saying, "You shall not say, "The oracle (הֵדֵb) of the LORD!" "'

Therefore behold, I will surely forget you and cast you away from My presence, along with the city which I gave you and your fathers.

I will put an everlasting reproach on you and an everlasting humiliation which will not be forgotten.

Allusion to Jer 23:33–40. Jeremiah 23:33–40 is embedded within a larger context which criticizes false prophets (23:9–40). The pericope (23:9–40) begins with the superscription (הֵדֵb) and the root הֵדֵב or הֵדֵב occurs twenty-three times within it. The whole unit can be divided into six sections: (1) The first section (23:9–12) opens with Jeremiah's heartbroken lament (v. 9), triggered by strong judgment against prophets and priests who committed evils even in Yahweh's house (vv. 10–12); (2) The second section (23:13–15) is another accusation directed against the prophets, especially those of Jerusalem, who have done even worse evil than the prophets of Samaria (vv. 14–15); (3) The third section (23:16–22) is a clear attack on the false prophets who spoke peace out

33 The root הֵדֵב occurs in Jer 23:13, 16, 21, 25, 26, 32 and הֵדֵב appears in Jer 23:9, 11, 13, 14, 15^2x, 16, 21, 25, 26^7x, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37.
of their own mind rather than from Yahweh, leading to the demise of Judah;\(^{35}\) (4) The fourth section (23:23–24) contains three rhetorical questions which serve as the basis for judgment against the false prophets whose wickedness cannot be hidden and whose punishment from God cannot be escaped; (5) The fifth section (23:25–32) accuses the ones who prophesy false dreams which make the people forget Yahweh; and (6) The last section (23:33–40) appears to be a play on the word \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\).\(^{36}\) It begins with a question-and-answer schema—whenever people ask for \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\), tell them that there is no more \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\) from Yahweh for the Lord abandons them (v. 33).\(^{37}\) Thus if anyone presumes to have a genuine \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\), that person will be punished for giving false revelation (v. 34; cf. vv. 38–40). The people are forbidden to use the phrase \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\) as they have perverted Yahweh’s words by perceiving their own words as \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\) (v. 36).\(^{38}\) From the above we may conclude that the term \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\) was synonymous with a prophetic oracle in the time of Jeremiah, though it is used for a negative one in Jer 23:33–40 (cf. 23:34).\(^{39}\)

Petersen contends that Jer 23:34–40 is a “deutero-prophetic” text, an exegetical piece with \(\text{אָשׁרָו}\) inserted later to “prohibit new oracles in the classical prophetic style” (23:34).\(^{40}\) He links the expansion of these verses to the same period as Zech 13:2–6,

---

\(^{35}\) Some scholars, e.g., Holladay, separate 23:16–20 from 23:21–22 as the latter unit shifts to first-person speech. Cf. Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 633.


\(^{38}\) Boda and Porter argue: “this section describes a crisis over the use of masses among false prophets, prophets who claimed to have the d’bar YHWH when they were only speaking their own words”; Boda and Porter, “Literature to the Third Degree,” 230. For the different interpretations of Jer 23:36, see Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 651–52; McKane, “אָשׁו,” 35–54.

\(^{39}\) Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 42.

\(^{40}\) Petersen, Late Israelite Prophecy, 33.
both rejecting prophecy as a means of new revelation.\textsuperscript{41} However, the curtailing of the prophetic process is not unusual in the earlier Jeremianic tradition, e.g., 14:1–15:4, where the prophet is told not to intercede for the people.\textsuperscript{42} If we read 23:34–40 within its larger literary context, we realize that the concern of the passage is not over the means of prophecy, contra Petersen, but rather over the source of prophecy—whether human minds or the Lord (23:16; cf. 23:25, 28, 30). The problem in Jeremiah's time is that the reckless lies of those false prophets led the people astray (23:32), forgetting the name of Yahweh as their forefathers did (23:27). Jeremiah 23:33–40 speaks to a particular crisis of false prophecy related to idolatry at the end of the southern kingdom leading to the judgment of Yahweh upon the disobedient generation.\textsuperscript{43} In Jer 23, the term נָזַע is only reserved for those authentic prophecies originating from Yahweh.

At the beginning of the corpus, Second Zechariah may intend to signal the reversal of the prohibition of נָזַע in Jer 23, indicating the "renewal of prophecy along the lines of earlier prophecy."\textsuperscript{44} The נָזַע, banned prior to the exile, was now available again in the midst of the audience of Zech 9–14. The use of this lexeme would establish


Carroll and Fretheim echo Petersen's conclusion, but with additional concern. Carroll comments that the argument of relating Jer 23:34–40 to the period similar to Zech 13:2–6 "is quite likely, though not capable of demonstrable proof"; Carroll, \textit{Jeremiah}, 480. Fretheim claims that "most likely" Jer 23:33–40 "is concerned to make claims for the prophecy of Jeremiah ... especially with respect to its burdensome message of 'gloom and doom,' in the face of critical voices"; Fretheim, \textit{Jeremiah}, 340. However, Jones argues that Jer 23:33–40 "must be the work of either Jeremiah himself or a prophet in the tradition"; Jones, \textit{Jeremiah}, 315.

\textsuperscript{42} See "Allusion to Jer 14:1–15:4" in CHAPTER SIX.


\textsuperscript{44} Boda, "Freeing the Burden," 356.
authority for the oracular material being introduced, endorsing the role of the prophet as the legitimate mediator of Yahweh in a new era.

Meyers and Meyers also notice this connection and contend that “the possibility that doom is appropriate here [Zech 9:1]…arises because of the destruction proclaimed for Israel’s enemies. Yet the overall message in Second Zechariah is positive for God’s people, unlike that in Jeremiah 23.”

It is true that these eight verses sound favorable to the readers, however, similar accounts of crises over false prophecy are also stressed in Zech 10:1–2 and 13:2–6. If the term וַתַּלְמֹד in 9:1a is used to introduce and structure Zech 9–11 as a whole, the writer may intend to appropriate the Jeremianic tradition to highlight the concern over the crisis in the community too. This is especially true when we look at Zech 9:1–8 together with its other intertexts. If this is correct, then the title וַתַּלְמֹד may be used as a rhetorical marker which not only bolsters the validity of this prophetic work, but also serves as a warning signal at the beginning of the corpus, though the former is the primary purpose of the intertextual connection.

By alluding to Jer 23:33–40, the וַתַּלְמֹד in Zech 9:1 sets the stage for a reading of the corpus which is both encouraging and exhortative. On the one hand, it announces that the word of the Lord has come among Yahweh’s people once again. The Zecharian oracle is the authentic message of the Lord with the prophet being the legitimate mediator of God in a new era. On the other hand, the oracle serves as pastoral exhortation to faithful response to Yahweh’s coming acts in the world. It projects a sense of urgency, stressing that no one can escape from this God (cf. Jer 23:23–24) who will address the crisis of the audience in Zech 9–11.

45 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 89.
The Territorial Claim of Yahweh (Zech 9:1b–7)

The opening of this pericope presents the audience with a number of enigmas. The lack of any verbs of motion in Zech 9:1b makes the translation difficult. Before we proceed, we have to determine the senses of ב and of פִּיטָה, which are interrelated. Some scholars claim that ב is probably locative, denoting that the word of Yahweh was heard in these foreign lands. However, the close parallel construction of Isa 9:7 with ב following רְוֶר may argue for a hostile sense: “The Lord sends a message against Jacob (רְוֶר שְׂלָח אֵלָי יִבְנֵי), and it falls on Israel,” though ב need not carry any such a connotation in all cases, e.g., Hos 1:2.

The word פִּיטָה, assuming that the pronominal suffix is connected to רְוֶר, usually has a favorable sense in the Hebrew Bible, referring either to the resting place of the chosen people, that is, the promised land (e.g., Deut 12:9), or the resting place of Yahweh, that is, the temple (e.g., 1 Kgs 8:56; Isa 66:1–2), thus supporting the locative connotation of ב. However, there is a striking parallel to the use of the root פ in Zech 6:8 in which Yahweh’s wrath finds rest when the northern country is subdued. In view of this correspondence, the word פִּיטָה may refer to the capture of Damascus, denoting that either God’s wrath is brought to rest or the city is included as part of the promised territory, namely, the resting place of the covenant community.

---

47 E.g., Larkin, Eschatology, 55; Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 244; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 90–93.
48 Scholars supporting this view include, e.g., Petterson, Behold Your King, 130; Pierce, “Literary Connectors,” 282; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 294.
49 E.g., Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 244; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 13–14; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 462. Similarly, Hanson opts for “throne dais” by comparing פִּיטָה with פִּיטָה in the Ugaritic texts; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 297.
Zechariah 9:1–8 mostly adopts a hostile tone towards the nations by employing warlike images, particularly reflected in v. 8, where Yahweh encamps as a guard against any oppressor of his people.51 In light of this, we take מָגְנִי as adversative: “against the land of” and identify מִשְׁמַךְ as the capture of Damascus. With this understanding of מִשְׁמַךְ, the phrase מִשְׁמַךְ in 9:1b could imply not only a word of judgment but also a word-event which leads to the downfall of the northern territories, though the divine attack is only mentioned explicitly from v. 4 onwards.

Based on the above assumption, the scene in Zech 9:1b–7 opens with the triumphant return of Yahweh, who marches down from north to south in the Levant, conquering some cities before reaching Jerusalem (v. 8). The areas being subdued can be divided into three groups: (1) the Syrian group (Zech 9:1b–2a); (2) the Phoenician group (Zech 9:2b–4); and (3) the Philistine group (Zech 9:5–7).52 In the following, we will analyze Zech 9:1b–7 according to the geographical locations of the places. As the present scholarly views on this passage generally link these toponyms to either the Davidic tradition or the promised land accounts, in our discussion below, a brief survey of each place, particularly relating to these traditions, will be sketched.

---

51 See “The Protection of Yahweh” below.
52 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 162.
The Syrian Group (Zech 9:1b–2a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:1b–2a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b The word of the Lord is against the land of Hadrach, and Damascus, his resting place 1c (for Yahweh’s eye is on humankind, as well as on all the tribes of Israel),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a and also Hamath, which borders on it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רְבֵרָדָא הֹאֶרֶץ תָּוֶרֶךְ הָכָּמָּס נִבְיָרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָיְלְיוּדְא הָאָנָב יָהוָה מָלֵא יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְעָפְרָה הָאַפְרָה נֶפֶלֶכְה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three Syrian areas, Hadrach, Damascus, and Hamath, are all inland territories located east of Phoenicia. Hadrach, which only appears here in the Hebrew Bible, is the northernmost of the geographic entities mentioned in the schema, with Hamath on its south. Since the northern border of the Israelite lands at their fullest was the entrance of Hamath, Hadrach lay beyond the greatest extent of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom and was outside both the historical and ideal borders of the Israelite kingdom (Num 34:7–8; cf. Ezek 47:17). Information about Hadrach is scarce. It can be a city or a district. Since it appears together with נָרָא, most likely it represents an area rather than a city. Its

53 The phrase in 9:1c is ambiguous, basically related to the translation of the construct chain נָרָא יַהוָה. Without resorting to emendation, generally there are two major interpretations of the text. Some scholars opt for a subjective genitive: “For all humankind and all the tribes of Israel are looking towards Yahweh.” This translation focuses on the reaction of human beings, denoting a sense of expectancy, waiting for Yahweh to take action, cf. Webb, Message of Zechariah, 130. Others prefer an objective genitive with the preceding ְיָהוָה as possessive: “For Yahweh’s eye is on humankind, as well as on all the tribes of Israel,” cf. Petersen, Prophetic Literature, 39–40. This translation, supported by the LXX, stresses the work of Yahweh, implying a sense that Yahweh as the universal Lord is watching over every aspect of human activity, including the activity of his people, to whom God is going to visit. We choose the latter interpretation due to a similar universalistic overtone highlighting Yahweh’s global dominion in Zech 12:1. Reading within context, the elaboration in the second נֹשָר serves to remind the readers to pay close attention to the coming cosmos-wide transformation of Yahweh, both for Israel and the nations. Another reason for choosing the latter interpretation is that its nuanced view matches God’s eye-keeping watch motif at the end of this unit: ְיָהוָה נַעֲדָא (9:8b), with Yahweh’s נַעֲדָא bracketing the whole section (9:1–8). The transcendent character of Yahweh emphasized here also finds its echo in the first vision in Zech 1:7–17 where Yahweh has sent his hosts to patrol the earth. Scholars, e.g., Rudolph, have emended conjecturally to read נְאָדָא (Aram) instead of נַעֲדָא (Adam); Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 167–68. For various emendations of Zech 9:1c, see Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 11–12.

54 Hadrach appears in the inscription of Zakkur (ca. 800 B.C.), depicting the miraculous deliverance of Zakkur and his capital Hadrach from a siege by a coalition of kingdoms headed by Bar-Hadad, son of
function here probably denotes that the divine warrior, Yahweh, is coming from the far north.

Damascus appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible. Functioning as the capital of a key region of Aram during the 10th through 8th centuries B.C., it is well-known as a commercial centre in antiquity. The city had been a rival to Israel since the time of the Israelite settlement, constantly posing grave dangers to the territorial integrity of the tribal portions. Though it was not included in the ideal boundary of Israel (Num 34:1–12), it was at one point subdued and incorporated into the empire of David (2 Sam 8:5–6). Afterwards, it was lost under Solomon’s reign when Rezon captured it and proclaimed himself king (1 Kgs 11:23–25). Damascus continued to pose a threat to the northern borders of Israel throughout the monarchy until the reign of Jeroboam II who probably established it as a vassal of Israel (2 Kgs 14:25, 28). Damascus was defeated by Tiglath-Pileser III in 732 B.C., came under Babylonian domination in 604 B.C., and was a provincial capital under Persian rule. In prophetic literature, oracles against Damascus occur in Isa 17:1–3; Jer 49:23–27; and Amos 1:3–5.

Hamath occurs 36 times in the Hebrew Bible. It borders Israel, with the phrase ע네요ז (entrance of Hamath) being typically used in the Bible to denote a site on the

---

Hazael; Parker, *Stories in Scripture and Inscriptions*, 106–10, 134. Based on Neo-Assyrian texts, some scholars, e.g., Na’aman, relate Hadrach to Hatarikka, a Syrian region having been conquered by Tiglath-pileser in 738 B.C.; Na’aman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors I*, 147–49.

The noun הַמָּרְחָן appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 14:15; 15:2; 2 Sam 8:5, 6; 1 Kgs 11:24

15:18; 19:15; 20:34; 2 Kgs 5:12; 8:7, 9; 14:28; 16:9; 16:10

2 Chr 16:2; 24:23; 28:5, 23;

Song 7:5; Isa 7:8

8:4; 10:9; 17:1

3; Jer 49:23, 24, 27; Ezek 27:18; 47:16, 17, 18; 48:1; Amos 1:3, 5

5:27; Zech 9:1.


The noun הַמָּרְחָן appears 36 times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 13:21; 34:8; Josh 13:5; Judg 3:3; 2 Sam 8:9; 1 Kgs 8:65; 2 Kgs 14:25, 28; 17:24, 30; 18:34; 19:13; 23:33; 25:21; 1 Chr 13:5; 18:3, 9; 2 Chr 7:8, 8:4; Isa 10:9; 11:11; 36:19; 37:13; Jer 39:5; 49:23; 52:9, 27; Ezek 47:16

2 Chr 17, 20; 48:1

Amos 6:2, 14; Zech 9:2.

---
northern boundary of the ideal territory (Num 34:7–8; Ezek 47:16–17, 20). It seems that
Hamath was in good relationship with Israel during David’s reign (2 Sam 8:9–11) and
was under Israelite control during Solomon’s rule (2 Chr 8:4). The city might have
gained independence as Jeroboam II is said to have recovered Damascus and Hamath for
Israel (2 Kgs 14:28). Hamath eventually threw off this control and reached its greatest
power in the 8th century B.C. However, by 720 B.C., it was incorporated into the
Assyrian empire. The Assyrian ravages were so serious that most of the city was
abandoned with settlement largely restricted to the Persian period.

Because of the common appearance of בְּרֵית and כָּל, Larkin suggests that Zech
9:1 contains a piece of mantological exegesis, alluding to Isa 17:1, 7: “The oracle
concerning Damascus (ברית כָּל). ‘Behold, Damascus is about to be removed from being
a city and will become a fallen ruin. . . . In that day man [human] (כָּל) will have regard
for his Maker and his eyes (כָּל) will look to the Holy One of Israel (כָּל).’” The
Isaianic oracle (17:1–8) laments the destruction of Damascus (vv. 1–3) as well as
Ephraim (vv. 4–6). In vv. 7–8, a proper attitude of the people will be developed after the
catastrophic judgment—they will look for their Maker and turn away from idols.

A key element in Larkin’s proposal is her interpretation of Zech 9:1c, that is, “the writer
describes a day on which all eyes are turned to the Lord, and all the tribes of Israel
(including the lost Ephraim) are restored together with Damascus.”

---

59 Larkin, Eschatology, 57.
61 Larkin, Eschatology, 59.
mantological significance for the future of Israel. She contends: “I suggest that this yoking together of the fate of Ephraim with that of Damascus could have been troubling to a post-exilic writer such as Zechariah who was deeply concerned with the restoration of ‘the glory of the children of Israel’ (and specifically of Ephraim in 9:13 and 10:6–12…), and could have prompted him to undertake an important piece of mantological exegesis.”

However, we are reluctant to register this connection for the following reasons: (1) Larkin’s interpretation of Zech 9:1c is questionable (see translation above); and (2) Damascus does not stand out in Zech 9:1–8 from other toponyms as she asserts.

With the demise of Damascus, Sweeney contends that Zech 9:1–2a represents the itinerary of the Assyrian monarch who defeated Damascus at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War (Isa 17:1–3). The argument seems to be weak as the Isaianic text is a prophecy of doom concerning Damascus rather than an account of its invasion in 732–35 B.C. In addition, Hamath is listed third in the schema though it actually lies between Hadrach and Damascus, with the former on the north and the latter on the south. If the list is viewed as the route of a military campaign, the itinerary is irregular. However, if we understand the schema as concerning the boundaries of the promised land envisioned by Ezekiel, then the existing sequence of places causes no difficulty, with Damascus relating to the eastern border and Hamath defining the northern extent of the tribal allotments (Ezek 47:17–18). Zechariah 9:1b–2a depends heavily on Ezek 47:13–20, with נבך, נבך, נבך, נבך, and נבך as catchwords:

---

63 Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 661.
Ezekiel 47:13–20
13 Thus says the Lord God, “This shall be the boundary (:border:) by which you shall divide the land for an inheritance among the twelve tribes of Israel (tribes:); Joseph shall have two portions.
14 “You shall divide it for an inheritance, each one equally with the other; for I swore to give it to your forefathers, and this land shall fall to you as an inheritance.
15 “This shall be the boundary (:border:) of the land: on the north side, from the Great Sea by the way of Hethlon, to the entrance of Zedad;
16 Hamath (-border:) Berothah, Sibraim, which is between the border (:border:) of Damascus (border:) and the border (border:) of Hamath (border:); Hazer-hatticon, which is by the border (border:) of Hauran.
17 “The boundary (border:) shall extend from the sea to Hazar-enan at the border (border:) of Damascus (border:), and on the north toward the north is the border (border:) of Hamath (border:). This is the north side.
18 “The east side, from between Hauran, Damascus (border:), Gilead and the land of Israel, shall be the Jordan; from the north border (border:) to the eastern sea you shall measure. This is the east side.
19 “The south side toward the south shall extend from Tamar as far as the waters of Meribath-kadesh, to the brook of Egypt and to the Great Sea. This is the south side toward the south.
20 “The west side shall be the Great Sea, from the south border (border:) to a point opposite Lebo-hamath (border:). This is the west side.

The phrase heard: appears 47 times in the Hebrew Bible. As a “territorial and political entity” arising in earliest Israel, the term heard: did not fare well under the monarchy and became meaningless after the fall of the united kingdom. The Babylonian conquest further shattered “whatever modicum of reality may have been retained in the concept of a confederation of tribes.” Though the term heard: appears with decreasing frequency, particularly in the later biblical texts, it never disappears. In the Persian

---

period, it takes on new meaning, especially in construct with אֲוָפָיָה, "to represent the ideal of the people restored in their land." This notion of אֲוָפָיָה occurs notably in the vision of the restored land in Ezek 47–48 (Ezek 47:13, 21, 22; 48:19, 29, 31). The city נָחָשָׁן is not mentioned in the tribal allotment in Num 34:1–12 but named three times in the ideal boundary in Ezek 47:13–20. The place נָחָשָׁן is stated once in the former territory allocation (Num 34:8) while four times in the latter one (Ezek 47:16–17, 20). The direct lexical link between the two texts is strong. In addition, both of the boundaries in Zechariah and Ezekiel are represented from north to south. Based on these similarities, we register Ezek 47:13–20 as an intertext of Zech 9:1b–2a.

Allusion to Ezek 47:13–20. The great temple vision (Ezek 40–48) ends with a theological geography, whose thrust is the divine presence (chs. 47–48). The description of the ideal boundaries (47:13–20) is an introduction to the tribal allotment of the land (48:1–29), with vv. 21–23 concerning the inheritance for the resident aliens, an unprecedented concept going far beyond the Torah’s legislation (cf. Exod 23:9; Lev 19:10, 33–34; Deut 24:17–22). At the heart of the new commonwealth stands the temple which is the source of blessing for the land (47:1–12). Each tribe could enjoy equal stake in the new city where Yahweh is present within (48:30–35). Verse 14 lays down a premise that the division of the land is a divine fulfillment of the land promised to the forefathers. However, in order to realize this promise, three conditions must be realized: (1) the inheritance of land (cf. 47:13–20); (2) the acceptance of the aliens (cf. 47:21–23); and (3) the existence of the twelve tribes (cf. 48:1–29).

---

66 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 95.
67 Tai has noted this connection, too; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 21.
By leveraging earlier materials, the advent of the divine warrior, Yahweh, presents a vision in which the deity inaugurates the claim of the promised land, thus satisfying the first condition. With this picture of the restored ideal land, Meyers claims that these eight verses aim at “restoring the historic homeland” of Israel. 69 Though the restoration of the ideal homeland does form one of the major motifs of Zech 9:1–8, we would query why the text about the promised land in Ezekiel rather than Numbers is alluded to. 70 Stevenson argues that the intention to define boundaries in Ezek 47 is to establish territories, asserting Yahweh’s territorial claim as the divine king of Israel. Yahweh is the only “power holder” and all others are “power subjects” in his territories. 71 She argues that the notion of divine kingship in Ezek 40–48 is apparent when the glory of Yahweh returns to the temple (43:4–5) where the Lord delivers his very first statement: “Son of man [human], this is the place of My throne and the place of the soles of My feet” (43:7a). 72 Thus, the primary purpose of the advent of Yahweh is not just to build a commonwealth in its own land, but to create a temple society with Yahweh in its midst as king. The Ezekielian text stresses that the divine presence is the source of blessing for the new "אֲרֵךְ נָפָת (cf. Zech 9:8, 16–17). With these intertextual insights, the

69 Meyers, “Foreign Places,” 165.
70 The argument that Zech 9:1b–2a alludes to Ezek 47 rather than Num 34 is based on the fact that the boundaries in Zechariah and Ezekiel are represented from north to south, whereas the borders in Numbers are described from south to north. In addition, the city "people" is not mentioned in the tribal allotment in Num 34:1–12 but named three times in the ideal boundary in Ezek 47:13–20. Contra Schellenberg who argues that these toponyms are “within the ideal borders of the Promised Land (Numbers 34)”; Schellenberg, “One in the Bond of War,” 106.
71 Stevenson, Vision of Transformation, 164. Stevenson points out that the lack of vertical dimensions in Ezek 40–48 indicates that the text is not a “temple blueprint” as many scholars argue, e.g., Patton, “Ezekiel’s Blueprint for the Temple of Jerusalem.” She contends that the corpus represents a vision of a temple society organized according to a new set of spatial rules, based on a spatial theology of holiness; Stevenson, Vision of Transformation, 4–7, 163.
significance of the schema is that it portrays the territorial claim of Yahweh as well as his military campaign. The geography of the toponyms is important not only in circumscribing the ideal homeland but also in envisioning the restored Israel—a new people who will enjoy Yahweh’s presence and acknowledge Yahweh’s kingship.

The Syrian group passage envisages the fulfilment of the promise of the ideal homeland by Yahweh. In the Ezekielian text, the description of the boundaries is followed by the division of the land. By remaining at the stage of circumscribing the land, the text endows the readers with an expectation and creates for them a vision—the inheritance of the land.

The Phoenician Group (Zech 9:2b–4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:2b–4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b Tyre and Sidon, though she was very wise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a Now, Tyre has built for herself a rampart,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b and has piled up silver as dust,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and gold as mud of streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a Look! The Lord will dispossess her,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and throw her wealth in the sea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b and she will be devoured by the fire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the Syrian group, the Phoenician territory, represented by Sidon and Tyre, plays a different role in the biblical conception of the Israelite boundaries, in which Sidon and Tyre are not mentioned in any text of the promised land (Num 34:1–12;)

---


74 The place name  שדרון appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 19:29; 2 Sam 5:11; 24:7; 1 Kgs 5:15; 7:13; 9:11, 12; 1 Chr 14:1; 2 Chr 2:2, 10; Pss 45:13; 83:8; 87:4; 89:44; Isa 23:1, 5, 8, 152x, 17; Jer 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; Ezek 26:2, 3, 4, 7, 15; 27:2, 32x, 8, 32; 28:2, 12; 29:182x; Hos 9:13; Joel 4:4; Amos 1:9, 10; Zech 9:2, 3.
Ezek 47:15–20) but included in “the land that remains” (Josh 13:4–6). The tribal
allotment of Asher is associated with Greater Sidon and Old Tyre, though the extent of
Asher’s actual control of these lands is questionable (Josh 19:27–29; cf. Judg 1:31–32). 75
Even in the period of Davidic-Solomonic expansion, the Phoenician coast remained
external to Israelite domination. Solomon’s transfer of the twenty Galilean cities in
Asher to Hiram definitely affects the territorial integrity of Israel (1 Kgs 9:11). 76

Although two Phoenician cities are mentioned, only the description of Tyre is
elaborated upon (Zech 9:2b–4). We do not have much information about the
relationship between Sidon and Israel except for some in the reign of Ahab. 77 In the
biblical account, Sidon and Tyre are generally paired, rebuked for similar sinful deeds
(cf. Jer 47:4; Joel 4:4 [3:4]). In the Persian period, Sidon became an important
administrative centre of the empire, with status surpassing that of Tyre. 78 On the other
hand, Tyre is mentioned much more in the Hebrew Bible, especially in the

75 The term תֶּרֶם (the fortified city of Tyre) in Josh 19:29 refers to Old Tyre on the mainland
opposite the island Tyre; Katzenstein, History of Tyre, 65.
76 This transfer seems to be improbable by the Chronicler, thus reversing the action (2 Chr 8:2). See
the discussion in Japhet, I & II Chronicles, 621.
77 First Kings 16:31 refers to an “Ethbaal king of Sidonians” who was the father of Jezebel, the wife
of Ahab. From Josephus, Against Apion, we know that Ethbaal is the king of Tyre whose reign marks the
second golden age of the city. At that time, Tyre and Sidon became a political unit until 701 B.C.;
78 Eiselen states: “The statements of ancient classical writers make it plain that during this entire
[Persian] period Sidon stood out as the most prominent city of Phoenicia... The Persian kings selected
Sidon as their temporary residence, whenever their duties called them westward... In the war against the
Greeks the eighty vessels of the Phoenicians were under the command of the king of the Sidonians, and in
battle the Sidonians were the bravest and most courageous fighters in the Persian fleet”; Eiselen, Sidon, 61.
Jigoulov supports this idea: “…by the time of Xerxes, the city of Sidon had emerged as the central and
most powerful player on the Levantine coast in economic, political and maritime matters. Its citizens
supplied manpower to many military operations of the Persians, for anything from quelling the Ionian
revolt of 499 BCE to the operations against pro-Athenian Cypriot towns. Sidon remained as a satrapal
capital city at least until the middle of the fourth century BCE”; Jigoulov, “Achaemenid Phoenicia,” 141;
cf. Jigoulov, Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia, 166–67. Elayi claims that “Sidon was the leading
Phoenician city in the Persian period”; Elayi, “Studies in Phoenician Geography,” 93–95; cf. Elayi,
“Phoenician Cities,” 13–28. Katzenstein also supports this view: “…in the 6th century... Tyre lost
Deuteronomic history. As a trade port, the city was famous for its great wealth, remarkable wisdom, and impregnable stronghold (Ezek 27:3; 28:3–5). Tyre was never presented as an enemy threatening Israel but rather as an economic partner of the Israelite kingdom. In fact, the king of Tyre supplied much assistance and many materials for more than twenty years for the great building projects of the Davidic-Solomonic era (2 Sam 5:11; 1 Kgs 5:16–27; 9:10). After being besieged by Nebuchadnezzar for 13 years (ca. 585–572 B.C.), Tyre’s power was totally exhausted. Later, it became part of the Persian empire, as a “powerful polity in the Levant, second only to Sidon.”

There are three awkward elements in Zech 9:2b–4: (1) Tyre is mentioned first although Sidon was more important in the Persian empire, and the resulting text disrupts the itinerary of Zech 9:1–8 (v. 2b); (2) a singular נבך with a plural subject נכי is used (Zech 9:2b); and (3) Tyre is singled out as Yahweh’s foe being punished harshly even though she was never a threat to the existence of Israel (Zech 9:3–4).

The mention of Tyre before Sidon in Zech 9:2b may suggest that tradition-historical considerations are more helpful than historical ones for understanding this passage. The prominent place of Tyre in the text could sharpen the focus of the readers, preparing them to seek the real concern of the schema in the tradition of Tyre.

The singular verb נבך with a plural subject נכי in Zech 9:2b has prompted much discussion. BHS suggests נכי be emended to נכז, whereas the LXX opts for a plural verb ἐφρόνησαν, retroverted as נבך (they were wise). Similar to Otzen, Petersen

80 Similar to the case of Hamath, see our discussion above.
81 Otzen, Studien über Deuterosacharja, 237.
argues that Tyre and Sidon serve as “a shorthand reference to the Phoenician coast,” thus a singular verb fits this approach well.\(^{82}\) Though this collective representation is evidenced in the Hebrew Bible, the use of a singular verb with both cities as subject does not occur anywhere in biblical books. Hanson proposes that רן is a secondary intrusion into Zech 9:2b because (1) רן forms the heart of Zech 9:3, so influenced the previous line; (2) רן and ציון are always mentioned together in prophetic literature (e.g. Jer 47:4, Joel 4:4); and (3) רן is especially famous for her wisdom in Ezek 28:3–5. These factors caused conflation.\(^{83}\) Hence, from the text critical point of view, Hanson suggests that the best reading would be one that could reflect the announcement of judgment on Sidon in Zech 9:2b and on Tyre in Zech 9:3–4. However, contra Hanson, Mason believes that Sidon should be secondary as she does not appear again in the text.\(^{84}\) In contrast, the irregularity could be read as an intertextual marker, prompting the readers to find meaning from another text.\(^{85}\) When they consider the subject of the clause—רַעַן מָאָר—, the textual problem in Zech 9:2b functions to direct them to the intertext where either Sidon or Tyre appears together with ציון. In the Hebrew Bible, Sidon is not mentioned as a wise city, whereas Tyre is portrayed as very wise exclusively in Ezek 26–28, with רַעַן appearing in 27:8, 9; 28:3 and מָאָר occurring in 28:4, 5, 7, 12, 17.

The singling out of Tyre as Yahweh’s foe in Zech 9:3–4 also serves as an intertextual clue, linking the audience to the earlier prophecies against the city. In the Hebrew Bible, oracles of judgement against Tyre are attested on 4 occasions: Isa 23:1–14; Ezek 26:1–28:19; Amos 1:9–10 and Joel 4:4–8 [3:4–8]. In Isa 23, a summons


\(^{83}\) Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 298.


\(^{85}\) See CHAPTER ONE.
to lament is used to announce the demise of Tyre, a renowned commercial centre whose massive wealth and incredible power were once praised throughout the world. She was punished by Yahweh because of her pride and arrogance (23:9). The lengthy prophecy against Tyre in Ezek 26–28 asserts the fall of the strongly defended Tyre as she takes pride in her great wisdom and excessive wealth. The brief oracle in Amos announces the divine judgment on Tyre for her involvement in slave trade and her violation of a brotherhood treaty. In Joel, Tyre is accused of plundering the Judean assets and selling the Judean as slaves. With the image of Tyre being destroyed by fire (Zech 9:4b), Smith argues that “the judgment on Tyre (v. 4) almost certainly is influenced by Amos 1:10.” Though in Amos 1:10 Yahweh threatens to send fire upon the wall of Tyre: besides, the punishment of having Tyre being consumed by fire is also attested in Ezek 28:18.

Many scholars have recognized the connection between Zech 9:2b–4 and Ezek 26–28, particularly 28:2–5, where are attested as catchwords. Despite the striking similarities, Petersen casts doubt on this allusion, contending that “one important motif in the Ezekiel Tyrian material, Tyre’s pride, is absent from vv. 3–4, whereas the basic point of Zech 9 involves the demise of a major

---

86 Wildberger, Isaiah 13–27, 403–38; Brueggemann, Isaiah 1–39, 182–85; Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 300–309. The distinctive words shared with Zech 9:2–4 are: 

87 See discussion below.

88 Stuart, Hosea-Jonah, 312; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 208–209. The distinctive words shared with Zech 9:2–4 are: 

89 Stuart, Hosea-Jonah, 267–68; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 176–80; Crenshaw, Joel, 178–84. The distinctive words shared with Zech 9:2–4 are: 

90 Smith, Micah-Malachi, 253.

Phoenician port for no apparent reason.” While the observation of Petersen is right, the word יָמָה does not appear in Ezek 26–28 where the image of Tyre’s pride is inferred by the description of the city. We argue that the intertextual parallel to Ezekiel intends to introduce this important motif יָמָה as we shall discuss.

**Ezekiel 28:2-5**

2 "Son of man [human], say to the leader of Tyre (יָמָה), ‘Thus says the Lord God,
   ‘Because your heart is lifted up
   And you have said, ‘I am a god,
   I sit in the seat of gods
   In the heart of the seas’;
   Yet you are a man [human] and not God,
   Although you make your heart like the heart of God—

3 Behold, you are wiser than Daniel (דניאël);
   There is no secret that is a match for you.

4 "By your wisdom (חִכְךָ) and understanding
   You have acquired riches (יָם) for yourself
   And have acquired gold (בַּשֵּׂם) and silver (כֶּסֶם) for your treasuries.

5 "By your great wisdom (חִכֵּיתָ), by your trade
   You have increased your riches (יָם)
   And your heart is lifted up because of your riches (בַּשֵּׂם).

The two texts demonstrate strong verbal and thematic parallels. In both passages, Tyre is depicted as very wise: יִדְיַקְתִּיךָ in Zech 9:2b and יִדְיַקְתִּיךָ in Ezek 28:3 (cf. Ezek 28:4–5). In Zechariah, Tyre piled up numerous כֶּסֶם and יָם (Zech 9:3), which she also acquired in Ezekiel (instead of יִדְיַקְתִּיךָ the more common word הבנ ת is used for gold in Ezek 28:4). The riches of Tyre are depicted as her הבנ ת in Zech 9:4 and Ezek 28:4–5. Also, within the larger context of the Ezekielian passage, there are two more correspondences. Both texts depict the divine punishment of Tyre as (1) a destruction by fire: יָמָה אָמְרָתָה and יָמָה אָמְרָתָה.
in Zech 9:4 and בְּאָדָם אֲשֶׁר in Ezek 28:18; and (2) having Tyre’s wealth/rubble being thrown into a watercourse: הַעֲרֶנֶת הַעֲרֶנֶת הַבָּשַׁד הַמָּשָׁמַשׁ in Zech 9:4 and הַעֲרֶנֶת הַעֲרֶנֶת הַבָּשַׁד in Ezek 26:12. In view of these resemblances, we register Ezek 28:2–5 as an intertext of Zech 9:2b–4.

Allusion to Ezek 28:2–5. The oracle against Tyre can be divided into two major sections: (1) the prophecies against Tyre (Ezek 26:1–21); and (2) the judgment against Tyre’s king (Ezek 28:1–10), each followed by a lament, namely, 27:1–36 and 28:11–19 respectively. In the first section, Tyre is punished due to her mockery at the fall of Jerusalem (26:2), a reason linking the Tyre material with the tragedy of Israel. In the second section, the pride of the maritime giant will be brought down despite its remarkable wisdom and excessive wealth (28:2b–5).

The echoing and evoking of the oracle of Ezekiel against Tyre raises the question as to why the writer is here using the material. After defining the intertext, Nurmela concludes that the similarities between Zech 9:2b–4 and Ezek 28:3–5 are “not very significant” because allusions to earlier prophets are typical of Second Zechariah. However, we do not agree with Nurmela’s view on the nature of the textual relationship. Mason guesses that probably the king of Tyre personifies the whole “spirit of proud independence, of confidence in the powers of her own wisdom and wealth, her strength and all alliances,” thus the traditional material is reused as a warning to inappropriate leadership within Israel. Mason’s observation, though

---

95 Nunnela, Prophets in Dialogue, 107.
96 See “The Nature of Textual Relationships” in CHAPTER ONE.
hypothetical, is still possible, particularly when we consider the language of the subsequent lament (28:11–19). Zimmerli states that the fate of the king of Tyre “is narrated in terms of primeval man...this prevents the reader...from an overhasty withdrawal of himself from this event. In the pride and fall of the Prince of Tyre, there is repeated the story of ‘primeval man.’ This is ‘Everyman’s story’.98 If the representation of Tyre in the Ezekielian material is typical rather than historical, then the intertextual insights might provoke the readers to ascribe an image of “pride” to the Zecharian Tyre based on the impressive portrayal of the city in the antecedent text. Hence, one of the functions of this allusion to Ezek 26–28 is to rebuke all pride of humanity, setting the stage for the audience to dialogue with the subsequent material—the Philistine group (Zech 9:5–7), where the noun פֶּן appears.

However, the intertextual impact may be highlighted if we examine the strategic place of the prophecy against Tyre in Ezekiel. The oracle against Tyre (Ezek 26–28) is part of the collection of oracles against the nations in chapters 25–32, which lie between the judgment on Israel (Ezek 1–24) and the restoration of the people (Ezek 34–48). The function of the collection (Ezek 25–32) is to give historical events a “Yahweh-focused theological interpretation.”99 The Ezekielian oracles against the nations not only affirm the sovereignty of Yahweh over all human affairs but also signal the turn of fortune of Yahweh’s people.100 The judgment against Tyre prepares the ground for what is anticipated in 28:25–26, a passage at the heart of the whole collection, where Yahweh promises: “They will live in it [the land] securely, and they will build houses, plant

---

98 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 95.
99 Renz, Rhetorical Function, 93.
100 Vawter and Hoppe, Ezekiel, 119.
vineyards and live securely when *I execute judgments* upon all who scorn them round about them” (28:26; italics mine).\(^{101}\)

When we examine the two passages in detail, we discover that the writer of Zech 9–14 deviates from the source text by shifting the executor of the judgment from Babylon (Ezek 26:7, 12; cf. 28:7) to Yahweh himself (Zech 9:4) through the change of the first person speech in Ezekiel to third person announcement in Zechariah. By doing so, the act of punishment will be placed into the hand of the Lord, emphasizing the deity’s direct involvement in the execution of judgment (cf. 28:26). This innovative variation assures the actualization of Yahweh’s promise in 28:25–26. The Tyre material asserts that Yahweh’s purposes on earth will be worked out inexorably; even the impregnable stronghold could not stand in his way.

The intertextual reading of the text stresses that the sovereign Yahweh is the author of all human affairs, including the fate of Israel as well as that of the nations (cf. Zech 9:1c). While the previous oracle (Zech 9:1b–2a) heightens the hope for restoration within the audience, the present oracle (Zech 9:2b–4) reinforces it—Yahweh will remove all obstacles by himself. However, alongside this core message, the intertextual backdrop also alerts the readers to re-examine themselves in light of the fate of Tyre, preparing the audience for the next oracle (Zech 9:5–7).

### The Philistine Group (Zech 9:5–7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:5–7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a Ashkelon will see and fear,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza will writhe with grief,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִתְנָהָה מַפְּרָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{101}\) Renz, *Rhetorical Function*, 94.
As Phoenicia, Philistia is one of the major geographical areas which formed part of “the land that yet remains” to be captured by the Israelites (Josh 13:2–3). The Philistine cities are in territory allotted to Judah and Dan (Josh 15:45–47; 19:43). As Dan was unable to acquire Ekron, it was forced to move to the north and left Judah to contend with the Philistines about the occupation of Ekron (Judg 1:18–19).

The Philistines dominated the Levantine seacoast in the twelfth and eleventh centuries with their centre of power being a Pentapolis comprising Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron (cf. Josh 13:2–3). They had a reputation for being a strong military force with formidable fighters and iron weapons (1 Sam 13:19–21). In Israelite history, the Philistines constantly posed grave threats to the chosen people,

102 The word יְאָרָ֣בֶנָּל meaning “will perish” in 5b can also be translated as “and he will rule.” Thus, the rendering would be “Then a bastard will rule in Ashdod.” However, this does not affect the interpretation of the verse, i.e., the destruction is very serious (see discussion below).

103 The repetition (four times in six words) of the ה (pronominal suffix “his”) in Zech 9:7a functions to anticipate the emphatic “he” (אַחֲרֵי) in the next line. As these pronominal suffixes link to the Philistines, thus those who remained refer to the remnants of the Philistines; see Woodcock, “Forms and Functions,” 112–13. Meyers and Meyers share a similar interpretation: “The leadership of the Philistines will be destroyed, yet here the singular niphal of שָׂר refers to the survival of one individual Philistine leader”; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 115.

104 The noun כָּלַע appears 288 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which 17 occur in prophetic literature: Isa 2:6; 9:11; 11:14; Jer 25:20; 47:1, 42; Ezek 16:27, 57; 25:15, 16; Amos 1:8, 6:2; 9:7; Obad 1:19; Zeph 2:5; Zech 9:6.
especially in the time of the Judges, as seen in the tales of the migration of the tribe of Dan who travelled north in their search for a safe refuge (Judg 18:1). It was in the time of David that the Philistines were being defeated, putting an end to the Pentapolis (2 Sam 5:17–25; 21:15–22). Many of these cities were either subdued or destroyed in the Assyrian and Babylonian periods and later became part of the Persian empire.  

Ashkelon lies directly on the sea coast, in a strategic location on the Via Maris. It was an important Canaanite city long before becoming a part of Philistia and was the leading maritime power during the twelfth to tenth centuries. Though destroyed by the Babylonians, Ashkelon once more became a flourishing seaport under the nominal control of Tyre during the Persian period.

Gaza was a regional centre on the southernmost part of the Levantine coast, with fertile lands and rich wells of sweet water. It lies on the main highway between Africa and Asia, known as “the way of the land of the Philistines” in the Bible (Exod 13:17). During the rule of Darius, Gaza became a strong fortress town for the Persians, assisting in the defeat of the Egyptian rebellions.

Ekron is the northernmost of the Philistine group, situated on the west edge of the inner Coastal Plain, the natural and historical frontier zone that separated Philistia and Judah. It marks the southern boundary of Dan (Josh 19:43) and defines the northern

---

106 The place name יְפִּסְפִּי appears 12 times in the Hebrew Bible: Judg 1:18; 14:19; 1 Sam 6:17; 2 Sam 1:20; Jer 25:20; 47:5, 7; Amos 1:8; Zeph 2:4, 7; Zech 9:5.
108 The place name יְפִּסְפִּי appears 20 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 10:19; Deut 2:23; Josh 10:41; 11:22; 15:47; Judg 1:18; 6:4; 16:1, 21; 1 Sam 6:17; 1 Kgs 5:4; 2 Kgs 18:8; Jer 25:20; 47:1, 5; Amos 1:6, 7; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:5.
110 The place name יְפִּסְפִּי appears 22 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 13:3; 15:11, 45, 46; 19:43;
border of Judah (Josh 15:11). After being destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in 603 B.C., the city was rebuilt at the beginning of the 6th century B.C. with a small population. After this temporary settlement, the excavations of Ekron indicate that the city was abandoned until a small Roman settlement was built on the northern edge of the site.\footnote{111}

Ashdod is a major urban centre, lying also on the Via Maris.\footnote{112} It perhaps even surpassed Ashkelon in importance by the late premonarchic period as it was to Ashdod that the ark was transported after it was captured at Ebenezer (1 Sam 5:1–7). The city was first destroyed by Sargon II and then became a Babylonian province after Nebuchadnezzar’s conquest. The excavations of Ashdod indicate that a Persian occupation is well-represented there, with the city probably serving as an administrative centre.\footnote{113}

In Zech 9:5–7, only four of the five cities of the Philistine league are mentioned, missing Gath which is also not named in other oracles against the Philistines: Jer 25:20, 47:1–7; Ezek 25:15–17; Amos 1:6–8, and Zeph 2:4–7 (see Table 4 below).\footnote{114} The lack of mention of Gath might be due to the fact that the Philistine Pentapolis had become a Tetrapolis with Gath being included in Israel (2 Chr 11:5–12) or the city had a close relationship with David (1 Sam 27:1–28:2 cf. 2 Sam 6:10–11; 15:18–23).\footnote{115}


\footnote{112} The place name שד appears 17 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 11:22; 15:46, 47; 1 Sam 5:1, 5, 6, 7; 6:17; 2 Chr 26:6\footnote{2}; Isa 20:1\footnote{2}; Jer 25:20; Amos 1:8; 3:9; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:6.

\footnote{113} During the Persian period, Ashdod is only mentioned in a few sources, e.g., Neh 4:1–2, Jdt 2:28; Laughlin, \textit{Fifty Major Cities}, 33–36. Cf. Dothan, “Ashdod,” 477–82.

\footnote{114} The place name ה้ appears 33 in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 11:22; 1 Sam 5:8; 6:17; 7:14; 17:4, 23, 52; 21:11, 13; 27:2, 3, 4, 11; 2 Sam 1:20; 15:18; 21:20, 22; 1 Kgs 2:39\footnote{2}; 40\footnote{2}; 41; 2 Kgs 12:18; 1 Chr 7:21; 8:13; 18:1; 20:6, 8; 2 Chr 11:8; 26:6; Ps 56:1; Amos 6:2; Mic 1:10.

Table 4: Oracles against the Philistines

In the threat of judgment against the Philistines (Zech 9:5–7), echoes of earlier prophetic materials can be found. Person argues that Zech 9:5–6 is influenced by Jer 25:20: “The choice of the four Philistine cities and the order in which they are given suggests the influence of Jer 25:20. Of all the possible groupings of Philistine cities, only Jer 25:20 and Zech 9:5–6 have the following sequence of these four Philistine cities: Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, Ashdod.” However, the order of the city-names in Zech 9:5–6 actually is Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ashdod.

On the other hand, Mason suggests an allusion to Amos 1:7–8 as the same four cities are mentioned with similar punishments: “So I will send fire upon the wall of Gaza and it will consume her citadels. I will also cut off the inhabitant of Ashdod, and him who holds the scepter, from Ashkelon; I will even unleash My power

---

upon Ekron, and the remnant of the Philistines (שארכית פלשתית) will perish (אבדה).”

Besides the four city names, both חְרָת, אֵבֶר and חֲרֵת, אֶבֶר are used in Amos 1:7–8 as catchwords, though with different subjects: חְרָת, אֵבֶר מַעַקֵּה in Zech 9:5–6, whereas חֲרֵת, אֶבֶר מַעַקֵּה והַנְּבָרָה הוֹסֵב Мосפִּלְשַתָּה and חֲרֵת, אֶבֶר מַעַקֵּה in Amos 1:8. The remnant of the Philistines is also depicted, but with different fates: אָמֶר הַנְּבָרָה לְאֵלָה הַנַּעַר in Zech 9:7 but אָמֶר הַנְּבָרָה לְאֵלָה הַנַּעַר in Amos 1:8.

However, a similar judgment oracle against these four cities appears also in Zeph 2:4–7 where not only חֲרֵת, אֶבֶר but also שּׁׁב, אֵבֶר and שּׁׁב, אֵבֶר occur as linkage. Another oracle against the Philistines, without naming the four cities, is attested in Ezek 25:15–17, where similar verbal connections can also be evidenced: שּׁׁב, אֵבֶר, חֲרֵת, אֵבֶר, all appearing in the same verse: “Therefore thus says the Lord GOD, “Behold, I will stretch out My hand against the Philistines (שלשˑית), even cut off (וחֵכָית) the Cherethites and destroy (וחֲרָתˑית) the remnant of the seacoast (שלשˑית נַעַר)” (Ezek 25:16). The same phenomenon can be found in Jer 47:1–7 where similar words (שּׁׁב, אֵבֶר) are used in the oracle against Philistines. It seems that these lexical resemblances reflect conventional biblical parlance, or at least language typical of judgment oracles against Philistines. In view of this, we are reticent to register Amos 1:7–8 as an intertext of Zech 9:5–7.

In Zech 9:5a, the oracle against the Philistines starts with an abrupt scene, depicting the tremendous fear of the cities. It is probably the tragedy of Tyre in v. 4 which has provoked this agitation. The demise of the Phoenician city signals that their

---

118 Nurmela arrives at similar conclusion: “an allusion to Am cannot be registered in Zc at this point”; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 182.
hope is dashed: רותבשشכש (Zech 9:5). The noun רותבשש usually has a positive connotation, regarding something with expectation. Apart from here, רותבשש appears also in Isa 20:5–6, where it denotes the vain hope of the Ashdodites who expected that their allies, the Egyptians or Ethiopians, would deliver them from the advancing armies of the Assyrians: “Then they will be dismayed and ashamed (רותבשש) because of Cush their hope (רותבשש) and Egypt their boast” (20:5; cf. 20:1–6). A similar situation might exist here in which the Philistine cities would expect the Phoenicians to rescue them from the approaching divine warrior, Yahweh. Though the source of Ekron’s expectation of help is not directly specified, the close political tie between Ashkelon and Tyre may suggest that the Philistine cities would expect aid from this maritime stronghold.\footnote{The inscription of Eshmunazar II (KAI 14), dated to the last quarter of the sixth century B.C. or the first half of the fifth century B.C., mentions that the Persian king gave some Palestinian coastal cities to Sidon/Tyre. Thus the Philistine cities may have become colonies of the Phoenician powers; Jigoulou, \textit{Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia}, 50–56. See discussion about Ashkelon above.}

Ashkelon and Gaza will be horrified by the coming judgment of Yahweh in Phoenicia: הָיָה אָשֶׁר אָשְׁכֶלון וַתְּכֹעָס אָשְׁכֶלון וַתָּכֹעָס (Zech 9:5a). Apart from here, the qal forms of אָשֶׁר, and אָשֶׁר appear only in Jer 5:20–25 where Judah is condemned. Due to these shared words, we register Jer 5:20–25 as an intertext of Zech 9:5.\footnote{Tai, \textit{Prophetie als Schriftauslegung}, 26–30.}

\textit{Jeremiah 5:20-25}

20 “Declare this in the house of Jacob and proclaim it in Judah, saying,
21 ‘Now hear this, O foolish and senseless people, who have eyes but do not see (אָשֶׁר); who have ears but do not hear.
22 ‘Do you not fear Me (אָשֶׁר)\textit{?}’ declares the LORD. ‘Do you not tremble (אָשֶׁר) in My presence? For I have placed the sand as a boundary for the sea, an eternal decree, so it cannot cross over it. Though the waves toss, yet they cannot prevail; though they roar, yet they cannot cross over it.
23 ‘But this people has a stubborn and rebellious heart; they have turned aside and departed.
‘They do not say in their heart, “Let us now fear the LORD our God, who gives rain in its season, both the autumn rain and the spring rain, who keeps for us the appointed weeks of the harvest.”

‘Your iniquities have turned these away, and your sins have withheld good from you.

Allusion to Jer 5:20–25. The oracle begins with a summons, inviting God’s people to hear the divine word (v. 20–21). These people are foolish and heartless as they have heard Yahweh’s voice and seen the deity’s work but fail to perceive the divine power in creation (v. 21)—the taming of chaos (v. 22) and the governance of the rain (v. 24). The consequence of this ignorance is the lack of corresponding reverence to the Lord (v. 22, 24). The stubbornness of Israel has turned them away from God (v. 23). The iniquities of the people have deprived them of Yahweh’s provision (vv. 24–25).

The divine questions in v. 22 are rhetorical ones, denouncing the Israelites who see (יָדַּר) Yahweh’s greatness but neither fear (כָּרַת) nor tremble (כָּרַת) before the sovereign Lord. The failure of the community leads to an inevitable judgment. Jeremiah 5 ends with an ominous question: “What will you do at the end of it [the land]” (וְהָעֵת לָאָמָה לָאָמָה, v. 31)? 121 Obviously, the passage intends to alert the community to learn a lesson before the end—to see and fear, so that a new future is possible. 122

When we compare Zech 9:5 with its source, we notice that the alluding text has revised the alluded one: (1) the subject of the verbs changes from the Israelites to the Philistines; and (2) the rhetoric of the text shifts from condemning Yahweh’s people who see but do not fear to depicting the aliens who see and fear. The Philistines not only see the fall of Tyre but also fear the might of Yahweh. The innovative variation creates a

121 The expression “at her end” (לָאָמָה) in Jer 5:31 is ambiguous. Holladay suggests that the feminine possessive suffix refers to “the land” in v. 30, which is feminine; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 201.
122 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 201; Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 93–96; Brueggemann, Jeremiah 1–25, 64–65; Allen, Jeremiah, 78–81.
sharp contrast between the two peoples, preparing the readers to understand the surprising twist of the oracle—the remnant of the Philistines (9:7b). The seeing-and-fearing of the foreign people enables Philistia to have a possible future.

In Zech 9:5b, the destruction of the Philistine cities begins. Gaza will lose her king and Ashkelon will be uninhabited. The clause נפשמ בְּאֶרֶץ פְּלִיסִּמְיָה in Zech 9:6a offers a sense that the destruction of the Ashdodites is so tremendous that a פָּלֶסָר can find room to live in the city without any objection. The outcast, פָּלֶסָר, becomes part of the inhabitants of Philistia. In Zech 9:6b–7a, Yahweh will assault the Philistines as a process of refinement. Though the devastation is overwhelming, to the readers’ surprise, this severe judgment of Yahweh serves to create a remnant for the Lord (9:7b–c). This concept is radical in that it not only reverses the adverse fate of the remnant of the Philistines announced in all prophetic literature (Jer 25:20; 47:4–5; Ezek 25:16; Amos 1:8) but also admits the forbidden פּוֹלֶסָר, who dwells in Ashdod before the refinement, into the new commonwealth as part of the remnant of the Philistines.

In Zech 9:7c, two similes are used to express this unprecedented integration of the remnant of the Philistines into the Judahite community: (1) פלטס וּבְיִשָּׂרַי and (2) פלטס וּבְיִשָּׂרַי. The first simile depicts the remnant as an פלטס in Judah. There are different views on the word פלטס. On the one hand, Mason sees the term as referring to “intimate” or “tamed,” i.e., the remnant of the Philistines will “become the intimates of God’s people.” On the other hand, Mitchell claims that when this word appears in the

---

123 The meaning of the Hebrew word פּוֹלֶסָר is uncertain. By referring to Deut 23:4 [3]), most translators render it as “illegitimate birth” (NAU), “illicit union” (NRS), or “half-breed” (NJB). It may be cognate with the root פּוֹלֶס הָר, connoting “be bad” or “corrupt”; HALOT, 595; BDB, 561. Cf. Christensen, Deuteronomy 21:10–34:12, 536; Nelson, Deuteronomy, 275.

124 The refinement process will be discussed below.

Zecharian texts (Zech 9:7c; 12:5–6) it has a collective sense and clearly refers to a group or social unit. Thus it should be rendered as clan.\(^{126}\) Gottwald supports the latter view, contending that יִרְשָׁא, as a social unit, is most appropriate in the archaizing poetic context of Zech 9:7.\(^{127}\) However, Wenham opposes the rendering of יִרְשָׁא as clan: “Though this translation is contextually possible, the fact that a similar term ulp is found with the meaning ‘leader’ at Ugarit…and its consistent translation by the versions as ‘leader’ make this interpretation unlikely.”\(^{128}\) Instead, he proposes to render יִרְשָׁא as “chief.”\(^{129}\)

Since all of its 60 occurrences relate to Edom,\(^{130}\) Wenham argues that يִרְשָׁא is “an Edomite term.”\(^{131}\) In view of this, we render يִרְשָׁא as “tribal chief,” bearing in mind its relationship with Edom. With this connotation, the first simile projects an image that an alien remnant will be accepted with honour, like an Edomite tribal chief, among the Judahites. The second simile alludes to the Jebusites, with Ekron as the representative of the alien cities. Though the Jebusites were destined for destruction (cf. Exod 23:23), they were later absorbed into Israel after David established his capital in Jerusalem (2 Sam 5:6–10). Just as the Jebusites have a place within Yahweh’s people, so too the remnant will be incorporated into the restored community in the new age.

In order to help the readers grasp the radical notion of accepting the alien remnant into their new commonwealth (Zech 9:7b–c), the poet employs the word יִרְשָׁא (9:6a). The

\(^{126}\) Mitchell was among the earliest exegetes to offer such a view; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 269. This view is followed by a number of scholars, e.g., Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 116; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 52; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 113.

\(^{127}\) Gottwald, Tribes of Yahweh, 277–78.

\(^{128}\) Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 338.

\(^{129}\) Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 338.

\(^{130}\) The noun יִרְשָׁא appears 60 times in the Hebrew Bible. Besides the Zecharian texts (9:7; 12:5, 6), the other appearances of the word יִרְשָׁא with the meaning of “tribal chief” include Gen 36:15\(^{5x}\), 16\(^{2x}\), 17\(^{2x}\), 18\(^{4x}\), 19, 21, 29\(^{8x}\), 30\(^{8x}\), 40\(^{8x}\), 41\(^{8x}\), 42\(^{8x}\), 43\(^{2x}\); Exod 15:15; 1 Chr 1:51\(^{4x}\), 52\(^{2x}\), 53\(^2x\), 54\(^{2x}\). All these occurrences relate to Edom.

\(^{131}\) Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 338.
noun יְסֹם is a rare word. Apart from here, it only appears in Deut 23:3 [23:2], a verse within a larger context (23:3–9 [23:2–8]) where certain kinds of people are prohibited from joining the assembly of Yahweh. Based on the exclusive lexical parallel as well as the similar concern about the admission of the alien people into the community, we register Deut 23:3 [23:2] as an intertext of Zech 9:6a, 7b–c.¹³²

**Deuteronomy 23:3–9 [23:2–8]**

3 “No one of illegitimate birth (יְסֹם) shall enter the assembly of the LORD; none of his descendants, even to the tenth generation, shall enter the assembly of the LORD.

4 “No Ammonite or Moabite shall enter the assembly of the LORD; none of their descendants, even to the tenth generation, shall ever enter the assembly of the LORD.

5–7 because…

8 “You shall not detest an Edomite, for he is your brother; you shall not detest an Egyptian, because you were an alien in his land.

9 “The sons of the third generation who are born to them may enter the assembly of the LORD.

**Allusion to Deut 23:3 [23:2].** Deuteronomy 23:3–9 [23:2–8] lays down the laws about the admission to the assembly of Yahweh (יְהוָה).¹³³ Nelson argues that the יְהוָה in Deuteronomy refers not only to the corporate worship as it “has been generalized into a synonym for the national community as a whole.”¹³⁴ The rationale behind this restriction in Deut 23:2–9 [23:1–8] might suggest that “only those who are perfect physically and not the product of some unnatural union should be members of the covenant community in ancient Israel.”¹³⁵


¹³⁴ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*. 278. This argument is reasonable as יְהוָה is nuanced as “all Israel” in 1 Chr 28:8 (cf. Num 16:3; 20:4).

The groups of people prohibited from entering the assembly of Yahweh in Deut 23:3–9 [23:2–8] are: (1) the emasculated (v. 2 [1]); (2) the illegitimate birth (נמסו) (v. 3 [2]); (3) the Ammonites and the Moabites (vv. 3–7 [2–6]); and (4) the Edomites and the Egyptian (vv. 8–9 [7–8]). All of them are not allowed to join the assembly ever, except the last group of people, whose offspring of the third generation qualify for inclusion (v. 9 [8]). The Edomites deserve a better treatment because of their kinship with Israel (אמרת אח, v. 8[7]), a view stemming from the story of Esau and Jacob in Gen 25:21–26. The Edomites are accepted into the assembly for they are the brother of the Israelites, a notion well established by the fifth century B.C.\(^{137}\)

The catchword מִסְרָה is used in different ways in both texts. In Deut 23 מִסְרָה is one of the outcasts excluded forever from the assembly of Yahweh, whereas in Zech 9 מִסְרָה is finally absorbed into the new community after being refined (Zech 9:6b–7a). The host text leverages the earlier congregational act but repudiates it in order to provide a new

---

\(^{136}\) McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 353.

\(^{137}\) Edom is a nation lying on the South and East of the Dead Sea, with the King’s Highway passing through the eastern part of her territory (Num 20:17). The Edomites are represented in the Hebrew Bible as the descendants of Esau, the brother of Jacob (Gen 25:19–34; 27:27–29, 39–40; 36:1, 8, 9, 19, 43; Num 20:14–21; Deut 2:4, 8 23:8; Amos 1:11; Obad 10, 12; Mal 1:2–4; cf. 1 Chr 1:34–54). Bartlett dates Malachi to the early/mid-fifth century B.C., between Haggai/Zechariah and Ezra/Nehemiah. Referring to Mal 1:2–5, he states that the “Esau-Edom identification is well established by the fifth century B.C.”; Bartlett, “Brotherhood of Edom,” 2.

In the United Kingdom, Saul successfully fought against the Edomites (1 Sam 14:47) and David subdued them as his servants (2 Sam 8:14). The subjection of Edom continued until she successfully revolted against the rule of Judah in the time of Jehoram (2 Kgs 8:20). There was continuing hostility from Edom towards Judah and the former was frequently rebuked in the prophetic texts for taking vengeance on the latter despite their brotherly connection (Amos 1:11; Obad 1:12; cf. Joel 3:19; Ezek 25:12–14, 35:15). Edom became the vassal of Assyria, Babylon, and later Persia, with insignificant occupation. By the mid-fifth century B.C., Edom might have been ruined as stated in Mal 1:2–5. Bartlett states: “Edom had ceased to count for anything, as is shown by the absence of any reference to her in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. There is no certain evidence that the Persians took much thought for this mountainous region on the desert fringes of the Trans-Euphrates satrapy”; Bartlett, *Edom and the Edomites*, 174; Bartlett, “Rise and Fall,” 36–37. Myers suggests that Edom probably fell into Arab hands in the mid-fifth century B.C.; Myers, “Edom and Judah,” 386. However, Bartlett argues against Myers’ thesis; Bartlett, *Edom and the Edomites*, 161. Cf. Bartlett, “Edom,” 287–301.
perspective for the audience—admission of alien residents. In what manner would this previously prohibited people be integrated into the audience? They should be accepted in a most inclusive way, אֶנְסָא וְאֵלֵּם (Zechariah 9:7c). The noun אֶנְסָא, as an Edomite term, recalls for the readers the legislation about the Edomites in Deut 23:8 [23:7] where these people are treated with favor based on brotherhood. The intertextual backdrop asserts that the remnant, even though it consists of gentiles, just like the Edomites, who were once excluded from the assembly of Yahweh, are now accepted in the most respectful way, as a tribal leader as well as a brother within Judah.

The juxtaposition of two contradictory ideas, of the alluding and the alluded, is designed to create an impact, motivating the readers to embrace a more inclusive attitude. What is the purpose of nurturing this kind of attitude? There are two possible reasons: (1) to prepare the audience to inherit the land as promised in Ezek 47:13-20, an intertext of Zech 9:1b-2a, where a radical command concerning the inheritance for the resident aliens is followed (47:21-23): “You shall divide it [the land] by lot for an inheritance among yourselves and among the aliens who stay in your midst, who bring forth sons in your midst. And they shall be to you as the native-born among the sons of Israel; they shall be allotted an inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel” (v. 22); and (2) to prepare the audience to accept unreservedly their scattered brothers, the northern exiles, so that they will participate wholeheartedly into their deliverance in order to restore the

---

138 None of the Philistine cities mentioned in Zech 9:5-7 appear in the lists of Ezra-Nehemiah as cities in which Judeans dwelled. Thus, we may infer that Philistia was truly foreign in the mid-fifth century B.C. (cf. Neh 13:23-24).
139 This connection is also noted in the work of Tai; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 30-32.
140 Larkin also discerns this connection but with no further elaboration; Larkin, Eschatology, 61.
twelve tribes of Israel. These two proposals satisfy the last two conditions of inheriting the promised land in Ezek 47–48.

The creation of the remnant of the Philistines is possible only after refinement by Yahweh (9:6b–7a). The seeing-and-fearing of the aliens (Zech 9:5a) alters the nature of Yahweh’s punishment from an act of destruction to an act of purification, a concept developed throughout Second Zechariah, particularly in 13:7–9.

In Zech 9:6b–7a, the cleansing process involves the removal of three abominations from the Philistines: (1) יִשְׂרָאֵל; (2) מֵבָטָן מַעֲשֵׂי מָשָי; and (3) מֶשֶׂה מְדִינְי מַעֲשֵׂי מָשָי. The first charge against the Philistines is their יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is unusual as Philistia is not accused of arrogance in any prophetic oracles. The noun יִשְׂרָאֵל denoting human pride appears notably in Ezekiel (7:20, 24; 16:49, 56; 24:21; 30:6, 18; 32:12; 33:28). The other charges relate to the words מֵבָטָן and מָשָי. Based on the words מֵבָטָן and מָשָי, many scholars link the detestations of the Philistines to cultic defilement and idolatrous practices (cf. Lev 7:21; 17:10–14; 19:26; Deut 12:16, 23; 29:16). The problem with

---

141 Saving the northerners is the core message of the second half of Zech 10. See CHAPTER SEVEN.
142 See “The Syrian Group” above.
143 The word יִשְׂרָאֵל can have a positive nuance—majesty, excellence, glory (cf. Exod 15:7; Ps 47:5; Isa 2:10). However the יִשְׂרָאֵל in Zech 9:6b connotes a negative sense of arrogance. It may refer to those materials that might cause either pride or arrogance, e.g., wealth, power. However, the verb מָשָי usually indicates the cutting off of real things rather than ideas; thus יִשְׂרָאֵל might be used here in both ways to represent abstract pride or wealth as well as the ruler amassing such aspects of power. Cf. Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 112.
146 E.g., Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 113; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 21; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 113; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 413. However, Petersen claims that “explicit language of ritual and purification is not used” in the text; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 51.
this interpretation is that the word יד in the text is in plural form, in contrast to the
Mosaic laws where יד, referring to eating blood, is always singular and never occurs
together with the word זון.147 The word יד in plural frequently denotes the shedding of
blood, e.g., Gen 4:10–11.148 The figurative use of the word זון in the Hebrew Bible, e.g.,
(cf. רעך רעך יבש מַסִּים) ("but the mouth of the wicked conceals violence") in Prov 10:6,
supports our argument that God intends to remove the bloodshed violence in 9:7a.149
The plural יד with the meaning of bloodshed occurs prominently in Ezekiel (cf. 7:23; 9:9;
18:13; 22:2; 24:6, 9). The three abominations of the Philistines mentioned in Zech
9:6b–7a are attested also in Ezek 7:20–24. Based on these striking lexical similarities
and thematic parallels, we register Ezek 7:20–24 as an intertext of Zech 9:6b–7a,
with יר, ות, and ות as catchwords.150

Ezekiel 7:20–24
20 'They transformed the beauty of His ornaments into pride (יִלְּכָּה), and they
made the images of their abominations and their detestable things (כָּתָן כָּתָן)
with it; therefore I will make it an abhorrent thing to them.
21 'I will give it into the hands of the foreigners as plunder and to the wicked of
the earth as spoil, and they will profane it.
22 'I will also turn my face from them, and they will profane My secret place;
then robbers will enter and profane it.
23 'Make the chain, for the land is full of bloody crimes (כָּתָן) and the city is
full of violence.

147 The common appearance of יד and זון occurs 5 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 4:11; 2 Sam 1:16;
2 Kgs 21:16; Prov 12:6; Zech 9:7. All these instances involve bloodshed violence.
148 HALOT, 225. BDB explains that the plural זון has a sense of “abundance, blood in quantity,
hence sometimes of blood shed by rude violence”; BDB, 196. The plural of יד appears 73 times in the
Hebrew Bible: Gen 4:10, 11; Exod 4:25, 26; 22:1, 2; Lev 12:4, 5, 7; 20:9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 27; Deut
19:10; 22:8; 1 Sam 25:26, 33; 2 Sam 1:16; 3:28; 16:7, 8a; 21:1; 1 Kgs 2:5, 31, 33; 2 Kgs 9:7x, 26x; 1 Chr
22:8; 28:3; 2 Chr 24:25; Ps 5:7; 9:13; 26:9; 51:16; 55:24; 59:3; 106:38; 139:19; Prov 29:10; Isa 1:15; 4:4;
Nah 3:1; Hab 2:8, 12, 17; Zech 9:7.
150 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 33.
Therefore, I will bring the worst of the nations, and they will possess their houses. I will also make the pride of the strong ones (ר pantalla) cease, and their holy places will be profaned.

Allusion to Ezek 7:20–24. Ezekiel 7:20–24 is embedded within Ezek 7 which is the last oracle of judgment against Jerusalem before the departure of the glory of Yahweh in Ezek 10. The chapter expresses a strong sense of despair and a desperate situation of crisis: “An end! The end is coming” (ו客户的יל, 7:2; cf. vv. 3, 6). The י in Ezek 7 is not a warning but a sure extinction. It announces the fall of the holy city as a result of the sins of God’s people, with vv. 20–24 focusing on the profanation of the temple (7:24).

In the Ezekielian text, the primary sin of the Israelites relates to ר pantalla, appearing in 7:20 as ר pantalla and 7:24 as ר pantalla, forming an inclusio around 7:20–24. A glance through the uses of the phrase ר pantalla in Ezekiel, we realize that the sources of the people’s pride include the temple (24:21), military force (30:6, 18), and economic prosperity (33:28; cf. 7:19). They depended on these worldly materials rather than Yahweh who will surely address the problems. The second sin connects to ר pantalla (7:20), a word appearing usually together with abomination (שברך) in Ezekiel (cf. 5:11; 7:20; 11:18, 21). It relates to the images and idols on which the community relied, thus profaning the holy sanctuary (37:23). The third sin is ר pantalla (7:23), which refers to their falling short of God’s expectations for their moral lives. Because the land was full of blood crimes and the city was full of violence, the people of Yahweh had to go into exile.

151 Vawter and Hoppe, Ezekiel, 56.
152 Renz, Rhetorical Function, 69; Allen, Ezekiel 1–19, 97–113.
The prophet Ezekiel states clearly that, with all these sins, Yahweh’s people cannot inherit the promised land (33:25–26): “Therefore say to them, ‘Thus says the Lord God, “You eat meat with the blood in it, lift up your eyes to your idols as you shed blood. Should you then possess the land? You rely on your sword, you commit abominations and each of you defiles his neighbor’s wife. Should you then possess the land?”’ Despite the fact that these sinful people have to go into exile, the prophet comforts them with a promissory note: “… I [Yahweh] will deliver them from all their dwelling places in which they have sinned, and will cleanse them. And they will be my people, and I will be their God (37:23). Ezekiel 37:23 ends with a covenant formula, emphasizing that the purpose of the judgment is to restore the covenantal relationship. Thus, the disaster that the Israelites were going to face was actually a process of refinement, allowed by Yahweh, aiming at creating a remnant with spiritual renewal.

The cleansing process of Yahweh’s people in Ezekiel is used as an analogy for the transformation of the Philistines. Similar to Ezek 7:20–24 where Yahweh has taken action to remove the sins of the Israelites, namely, מָכָה, נֵאֶזֶף, קָרֵס, and קְדֵם, in order to create a remnant suitable to possess the Land (cf. 33:25–26; 37:23), the Philistines must also be purified as such before they could be admitted into the assembly of Yahweh. Though the refining process will be severe, after the purging campaign of Yahweh, a remnant suitable to inherit the ideal homeland will be restored (Zech 9:7b–c; cf. Ezek 47:21–23). At that time, even Ekron, which was so difficult to subdue, will be absorbed into the transformed community, like the Jebusites of old, living among the Israelites (Zech 9:7c). Even the outcast מַעֲרָד, like Edom, who had once been excluded from the
covenantal blessings, will become part of the new community, restoring the brotherhood of humankind (Zech 9:7cα).

The typological correspondence established between the host and the source texts serves as an archetype of Yahweh’s transformation program for humanity, including the audience of Second Zechariah, who must be purified before they could inherit the promised land (cf. Zech 10:1–3a; 11:1–3, 17; 12:10–13:9).154 By perceiving the divine refinement through the lens of this typical prophecy in Zech 9:5–7, the readers know that such transformation, though inconceivable, is completely possible in the hands of Yahweh.

At first glance, the Philistine material looks like one of the oracles against the nations in other prophetic literature, as Mason suggests.155 It projects an impression that the Lord simply intends to remove this traditional enemy so that the audience could possess the land. It is true that, at the surface level, the text does convey this message of salvation. However, the radical twist of the pericope invites the readers to reflect on the deeper meaning of the passage in light of its intertexts. By recalling these earlier texts, the reading of the host text is enriched. With the intertextual insights, Zech 9:5–7 is both promissory and exhortative. The oracle summons the audience to faithfully respond to Yahweh’s coming acts in the world. It urges the readers (1) to learn a lesson from the past—to see and fear—which is important for divine transformation; and (2) to nurture an inclusive attitude towards their dispersed brothers and the aliens. The intertextual backdrop reveals that Yahweh’s purpose in Zech 9:1–8 is not only to restore the homeland but also to renew the people so that they would qualify to inherit the land.

154 See subsequent discussions.
The Protection of Yahweh (Zech 9:8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a Now I encamp for my house as a guard, without anyone who passes through and returns, and no more shall an oppressor traverse against them, 8b for now I have seen with my eyes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last word יִבְסִי (Jebusite) in Zech 9:7 connects the readers to Yahweh's בַּיָּהוֹ (house), which is in Jerusalem—the locus of v. 8. The word בַּיָּהוֹ with Yahweh as subject is frequently used of the temple (cf. 2 Sam 7:5–6; 1 Kgs 7:12; 1 Chr 17:5), though it also refers to the earlier tent of worship on six occasions (Judg 18:31; 19:18; 1 Sam 1:7, 24; 2 Sam 12:20 and 1 Chr 9:23). After capturing the territories, Yahweh marches down to his temple in Jerusalem (Zech 9:8). The divine return marks the inauguration of the new age, ushering in God's decisive act of salvation.

Zechariah 9:8 represents a picture that Yahweh will return to Zion and encamp as a guard for his temple with the result that Jerusalem will be free from any oppressors. This idea leads some scholars to relate this verse to certain passages in Proto-Zechariah, particularly 1:16–17 and 2:8–9 [2:4–5], where the themes of divine return and divine protection appear. For the latter passage, since there is no verbal parallel, we are

---

156 We do not agree with Mitchell and Tai who argue that בַּיָּהוֹ refers to the people of Judah rather than the temple based on the subsequent plural מִשְׁרְיָה; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 18; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 269.
157 Since the temple was built in Jerusalem (see Zech 1:16), it is reasonable to suggest that Yahweh was marching towards Jerusalem. Moreover, from Zech 1:16–17 (“I will return to Jerusalem”) and 8:3 (“I will return to Zion”), we find that the terms “Zion” and “Jerusalem” are used interchangeably in Zechariah (also see Zech 9:9).
159 Similar connections are noted by some scholars, e.g., Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material.”
reluctant to register it as an intertext. For the former one, Mason argues for dependence with יָעַבג and יָשַׁר as catchwords: “Therefore thus says the LORD, ‘I will return to Jerusalem with compassion; My house (יָבֵג) will be built in it,’ declares the Lord of hosts, ‘and a measuring line will be stretched over Jerusalem.’ ‘Again (יָשֵׁר), proclaim, saying, “Thus says the LORD of hosts, ‘My cities will again (יָבֵג) overflow with prosperity, and the LORD will again (יָשֵׁר) comfort Zion and again (יָשֵׁר) choose Jerusalem’”’ (Zech 1:16–17). However, the destination of the return is different—in Zech 1, Yahweh returns to Jerusalem where the temple will be built, whereas in Zech 9 the Lord returns to the temple so that oppressive forces no longer (יָשֵׁר...יָשָׁר) work against his people. Besides thematic parallels, the lexical similarities between the two texts are not impressive enough to argue for a literary dependence. In view of this, we do not register Zech 1:16–17 as an intertext of 9:8.

Zechariah 9:8a depicts the approaching divine warrior encamping (יָעַבג) for his house, as a protective shield guarding against any oppressor. Apart from here, the same verbal form יָעַבג appears in the Hebrew Bible exclusively in Isa 29:3, where המַצְפָּה is also attested, a hophal participle of הצָצָה, with מַצְפָּה probably a cognate feminine noun. Both המַצְפָּה and המַצְפָּה are hapax legomena.

24–25; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 119; Sæbe, Sacharja 9–14, 159.


161 The adverb יָשַׁר is a very common word, occurring 491 times in the Hebrew Bible.


163 HALOT, 620; BDB, 663; Gesenius and Tregelles, Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, 500; Jansma, Inquiry, 69.
Isaiah 29:3
I will camp (מון) against you encircling you, and I will set siegeworks against you, and I will raise up battle towers (מעל; cf. מגדל) against you.

In the Hebrew Bible, the qal of מון occurs 143 times, and carries one of two meanings: (1) to encamp in a non-military sense, e.g., the encampment of the patriarch in Canaan (cf. Gen 33:18); and (2) to encamp in a military sense, e.g., the encampment of troops during a military expedition (cf. 1 Sam 4:1). Both Zech 9:8 and Isa 29:3 belong to the latter group with a warlike setting, but with a different emphasis—Isa 29:3 describes an act against Jerusalem, whereas Zech 9:8 depicts the protection of God’s house. Though Ps 34:8 [34:7], which asserts that the angel of the Lord encamps (מון) around those who fear Yahweh as a protection against their enemies, has a closer thematic parallel with the Zecharian text, the Isaiahic one is the better candidate due to impressive similarities: (1) shared words (מון and מעל vs. מון in Ps 34:8 [34:7]); and (2) the same subject (Yahweh, not the angel of the Lord as in Ps 34:8 [34:7]). Based on these correspondences, we register Isa 29:3 as an intertext of Zech 9:8a.

Allusion to Isa 29:3. Isaiah 29:3 is embedded within a pericope (Isa 29:1–8) where Jerusalem’s destiny is announced. The passage is divided into two sections: (1) a divine judgment of Jerusalem (29:1–4) which is followed by (2) a sudden and unanticipated divine deliverance (29:5–8). This depiction corresponds closely with

---

164 In the Hebrew Bible, the qal of מון appears 143 times, 6 of which occur in the prophetic texts: Isa 29:1, 3; Jer 50:29; 52:4; Nah 3:17; Zech 9:8.

165 Based on the exclusive verbal similarity (מון), Nurmela concludes that there is a “probable allusion” to Isa 29:3 in Zech 9:8; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 108–109. Cf. Willi-Plein, Prophetie am Ende, 69; Larkin, Eschatology, 66; Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 175.

166 The explanation here is drawn from the following works, unless noted otherwise; Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1–39, 389–402; Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 373–86; Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 378–83; Brueggemann, Isaiah 1–39, 230–32.

167 There are different scholarly views on the beginning of the section regarding the deliverance of
the historical circumstance in which Jerusalem was under siege during the reign of Hezekiah, but experiencing a miraculous relief with the sudden retirement of the Assyrian army in 701 B.C.\(^{168}\) The pericope asserts that Yahweh is the agent of assault as well as deliverance.

The first section begins with a woe, setting a tone of threat against Jerusalem which relies on its ritual observance rather than Yahweh (v. 1; cf. 1:11–15). The city will be besieged by Yahweh (v. 3) with her people suffering a humiliation as unto death (v. 4). The second section describes the divine deliverance of Jerusalem with Yahweh’s punishment falling on its foes, portrayed in the language of theophany (vv. 5–6). The simile in vv. 7–8 compares the assault of the hostile nations to a dream, asserting that, with Yahweh’s assistance, these threats will be “like a fantasy, as though it had never happened, as though it leaves no enduring effect.”\(^{169}\)

The Isaianic text is not only recalled but also reversed in order to explicate the essence of the new age. By alluding to Isa 29:3, the Zecharian text opens a new vista for the audience, inviting them to view the advent of Yahweh through the lens of the earlier material. Instead of encamping to attack Jerusalem, the Lord comes to protect her inhabitants. With the assistance of Yahweh, God’s people could experience the miraculous salvation of the deity as all oppressive forces will be insubstantial in the face of the deity.

---

\(^{168}\) Scholars generally ascribe this passage to the Assyrian attack in 701 B.C.; e.g., Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 389–402. However, Sweeney opposes this linkage; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39*, 382.

In the inauguration of the new epoch, not only is the judgment oracle in Isaiah reversed, but also the desolation scene in Zech 7:14 is revised. The phrase מַשֵׁר יָמְשָׁפָה causes some trouble for scholars. Jansma regards it as redundant, whereas Hanson treats it as an explanatory gloss, as does BHS. However, we argue that the obscure construction of Zech 9:8a serves as a marker, pointing the audience to its source. Apart from here, the explanatory phrase מַשֵׁר יָמְשָׁפָה appears in exact verbal form only in Zech 7:14. Based on the exclusive lexical parallel and the awkward construction of the phrase, we register Zech 7:14 as an intertext of Zech 9:8a.

Zechariah 7:14

“but I scattered them with a storm wind among all the nations whom they have not known. Thus the land is desolated behind them so that no one went back and forth for they made the pleasant land desolate.”

Allusion to Zech 7:14. Zechariah 1:1–6 and Zech 7–8 are generally regarded as the prose frames of First Zechariah. The closing frame opens with a discussion about fasting (vv. 1–3) which leads to the prophet’s challenge of the intention of observing the ritual (vv. 4–6) and a review of God’s discipline in the past (vv. 7–14). Zechariah 8 begins with a new focus, portraying Yahweh’s blessings as well as ethical demands in the restoration when the Lord returns to Jerusalem.

Because of their disobedience, Yahweh chastised the former generation by scattering them among other nations, resulting in the complete desolation of the land (Zech 7:14). The harsh effects of the destruction of the land is expressed by the phrase

---

171 Besides Zech 7:14, the phrase מַשֵׁר יָמְשָׁפָה in participle absolute also appears in Ezek 35:7, with both texts portraying the desolation of the land after Yahweh’s punishment to Israel and Edom respectively.
172 Meyers and Meyers believe that this is a quotation of Zech 7:14, emphasizing the contrast to the past; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 119. Cf. Schultz, “Ties that Bind,” 34–36.
referring to the absence of people crossing back and forth, probably due to: (1) depopulation caused by the exile; (2) reduction of productive activity due to deportation or military devastation; and (3) the absence of travelers owing to general insecurity resulting from the ruin. 174

In both texts, highlights the actions of Yahweh on behalf of his people—complete desolation in the past (Zech 7:14) and great protection in the future (Zech 9:8). The source is evoked not only to form a contrast, but also to create an expectation. The position of Zech 7:14 in the closing frame of Zech 1–8 is important as it concludes a section depicting Yahweh’s discipline to the past generation with the oracles of salvation and blessing (Zech 8) following it. The allusion endows the readers with a vision, urging them to envisage the coming restoration in the rest of Second Zechariah.

Summary (Zech 9:1–8)

Source Text

In Zech 9:1–8, eight intertexts are detected (see Table 5 below), of which three (no. 2, 3, 6) are recalled from the book of Ezekiel. Among the three Ezekielian antecedents, the text of the ideal boundaries (no. 2) in the great temple vision (Ezek 40–48) serves as the backbone of these eight verses. It is evoked as a supplement in order to unfold the restoration drama in the Zecharian text. In addition, one earlier prohibition (no. 5) and two judgment oracles (no. 7, 8) are summoned and reversed to signal the inauguration of the new age.

174 Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 405.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zech 9:1–8</th>
<th>Intertext</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:1a</td>
<td>Jer 23:33–40</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:1b–2a</td>
<td>Ezek 47:13–20</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:2b–4</td>
<td>Ezek 28:2–5</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>Jer 5:20–25</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:6a, 7b–c</td>
<td>Deut 23:3</td>
<td>polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9:6b–7a</td>
<td>Ezek 7:20–24</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:8a</td>
<td>Isa 29:3</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9:8a</td>
<td>Zech 7:14</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refer to “The Nature of Textual Relationships” (Chapter One)

Table 5: Intertexts of Zech 9:1–8

Intertextual Reading

By leveraging earlier materials, Zech 9:1–8 expresses its vision of restoration. The corpus opens with the advent of Yahweh, marching from north to south in the Levant till he reaches the sacred centre—the temple. The coming of the Lord ushers in prosperity and blessing (Zech 9:16–17), reversing the adverse fortune of the past (Isa 29:3; Zech 7:14). By alluding to Ezek 47, the return of Yahweh represents his territorial claim to kingship, denoting his reign in the restoration era.

The first vision (Zech 9:1b–2a) of the restoration envisions the establishment of an ideal homeland as presented in Ezek 47:13–20. Yahweh will come to conquer the foreign cities, claiming his territories, and preparing the land for his people. The new homeland will enjoy Yahweh’s eye-watching protection (Zech 9:8). The intertextual insights surely heighten the expectation for a new age within the audience.

However, at the beginning of the corpus, Zech 9:1–8 also evokes the conditional nature of the restoration program, insisting on the spiritual renewal of the subject people.
The geography of the toponyms serves to circumscribe the anticipated homeland as well as to envision a restored Israel who acknowledges Yahweh's kingship.

Associated with the first vision is the creation of an ideal people, suitable to dwell in the promised homeland with Yahweh in their midst (cf. Ezek 43:1-7). By using the rhetorical marker קָרָא to introduce and structure the oracle, the prophet recalls for the audience the Jeremianic tradition (Jer 23:33-40). This intertextual insight asserts that the word of Yahweh has been revealed once again among the people and summons them to respond faithfully to the coming of the Lord (cf. Jer 5:20-25). By deviating from the source text (Ezek 28:3-5), the Tyre passage (Zech 9:2b-4) declares that Yahweh's salvation for his people will be worked out inexorably. However, the intertextual insight also reminds the readers to re-examine themselves in light of Tyre's fate. By using the cleansing process of the Philistines (Zech 9:5-7) as an archetype, the corpus invites the audience to believe that Yahweh can transform any situation in favor of the restoration (cf. Ezek 7:20-24). By repudiating the earlier prohibition (Deut 23:3), the intertextual reading exhorts the readers to nurture an inclusive attitude towards the aliens as well as their dispersed brothers, a requirement set forth in Ezek 47-48.

The ultimate restoration includes the formation of an ideal remnant settling in an ideal homeland, with Yahweh as king. At that time, even those nations who were formerly extra-territorial to Israel will be among those to whom peace will be proclaimed (Zech 9:10), recognizing the sovereignty of Yahweh. Even those peoples which had once posed grave threats to Israel will be absorbed into the transformed community, living together in harmony (Zech 9:7cβ). Even those outcasts who had once
been excluded from the covenantal blessings will become part of the new community, restoring the brotherhood of humankind (Zech 9:7α; cf. Ezek 47:21–23).
CHAPTER FOUR
THE RESTORATION OF AN IDEAL KINGSHIP:
AN INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF ZECHARIAH 9:9–10

Introduction

Zechariah 9:9–10 is probably the best known and most discussed passage in Second Zechariah. It is likely due to its re-appropriation in the gospel accounts\(^1\) that some scholars regard the arrival of the king as the centre of the chapter, particularly those arguing for a Davidic hope in the corpus.\(^2\) However we view this segment as one of the blessings (9:9–17) arising from the advent of the divine warrior, Yahweh (9:1–8).\(^3\) Though due to the length of our discussion we divide our investigation of these blessings into two chapters, i.e., vv. 9–10 in ch. 4 and vv. 11–17 in ch. 5, we should bear in mind that these two sections are connected to each other.

Zechariah 9:9–10 comprises a complex poem with a highly allusive character, as Larkin comments: “Zech 9:9–10 is soaked in scriptural allusions.”\(^4\) The pericope alludes not only to earlier texts, but also to former themes and even traditions in order to communicate its message. For the sake of discussion, we will analyze the intertextual connection of the poem under three major categories: (1) the identity of the coming king (Zech 9:9a–c); (2) the attributes of the coming king (Zech 9:9d–f); and (3) the mission of the coming king (Zech 9:10a–d).

---

1 Christian tradition has affirmed that Christ fulfilled this prophecy when he rode into Jerusalem on a donkey before his crucifixion. It is recorded in all four gospels: Matt 21:1–11; Mark 11:1–11; Luke 19:28–40; John 12:12–18. Matthew and John have an explicit quotation of Zech 9:9.
2 E.g., Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 169; Petterson, Behold Your King, 148.
3 See “Discourse Structure” in INTRODUCTION.
4 Larkin, Eschatology, 70.
The Identity of the Coming King (Zech 9:9a–c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:9a–c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9a Rejoice greatly, O Daughter Zion!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b Shout greatly, O Daughter Jerusalem!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c Look! Your king is coming to you!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advent of Yahweh to his צֶדֶק in Zech 9:8 leads immediately to the introduction of his royal reign in Jerusalem. What kind of dominion that will be constitutes the central theme of Zech 9:9–10. These two verses proclaim, presumably from the temple, the approach of a king, entering into the temple city, Jerusalem, from which he will rule the world with peace. Who is that king? The poem does not give us much information about this royal figure. The emphatic construction of 9:9c with הַקִּנֶּה at the beginning endows the clause with a sense of expectancy. The pronominal possessive pronoun of הַקִּנֶּה suggests that this was not just any king, but the king for which the inhabitants of Jerusalem were earnestly looking. If so, would the coming one be a Davidic king?

The identity of the coming king has received a remarkable amount of attention. Some view in him a Judean king of pre-exilic times, e.g., Uzziah or Hezekiah. However, Wellhausen contends that the king of peace will not come from "der in Jerusalem herrschenden Partei der Gottlosen, sondern aus der unterdrückten der...

---

5 Petersen suggests: “One may, therefore, presume that Daughter Zion will respond at the place mentioned in v. 8, namely, ‘my house’ or, more neutrally, the temple, which provides something of a link between” Zech 9:1–8 and Zech 9:9–10; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 57. We agree with Petersen’s suggestion that the proclamation in Zech 9:9–10 should be announced from the temple where Yahweh has said: “for now I have seen with my eyes” (Zech 9:8b).

6 Petterson, Behold Your King, 135.

7 E.g., König, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 358.

8 E.g., Kraeling, “Historical Situation,” 30.
Frommen. Based on the word וַיִּשָּׁמֵר, others suggest either a link with the Servant figure as יִשָּׁמֵר is used of the Servant in Isa 53 or a connection to the concept of sacral kingship in which the king was ritually humiliated during the cultic celebration of the New Year Festival.

In searching for the identity of the coming king, many scholars have observed that, in Zech 9:9a–b, the form of a messenger proclamation addressing the inhabitants of the city collectively in the second person feminine singular as יִשָּׁמֵר or יִשָּׁמֵר and summoning them to rejoice is strikingly reminiscent of two other passages: Zech 2:14 [2:10] and Zeph 3:14.  

Zechariah 2:14 [2:10]

“Sing for joy and be glad, O daughter of Zion (כָּל-רְחֹז); for behold I am coming (וְהוּא בָּכָךְ) and I will dwell in your midst,” declares the LORD.

Zephaniah 3:14

Shout for joy, O daughter of Zion (כָּל-רְחֹז)! Shout in triumph (כָּל-רְחֹז), O Israel! Rejoice and exult with all your heart, O daughter of Jerusalem (כָּל-רְחֹז)!  

9 Translated as: “the ruling party of the ungodly people in Jerusalem, but rather from the oppressed of the pieties”; Wellhausen, Die Kleinen Propheten, 189.  
10 E.g., Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 273; Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 88–89.  
12 The phrase יִשָּׁמֵר appears much less than the phrase יִשָּׁמֵר (25 times), occurring only 7 times in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Kgs 19:21; Isa 37:22; Lam 2:13, 15; Mic 4:8; Zeph 3:14; Zech 9:9. Except Lam 2:15, all appear together with יִשָּׁמֵר. The other occurrences of יִשָּׁמֵר are Ps 9:15 [9:14]; Isa 1:8; 16:1; 52:2; 62:11; Jer 4:31; 6:2, 23; Lam 1:6; 2:1, 4, 8, 10, 18; 4:22; Mic 1:13; 4:10, 13; Zech 2:14 [2:10].  

In the Hebrew Bible, the noun יִשָּׁמֵר plus a toponym is commonly used, designating collectively the inhabitants of a particular place. Meyers and Meyers argue that the use of the feminine singular “daughter” is particularly suggestive of helplessness and dependency, especially in contrast to the masculine plural “sons” in Zech 9:13: “Although women at various stages in life possessed considerable social power, the status of unmarried daughters was probably the one of least independence for women”; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 121, 138.  

13 A number of scholars have detected these connections, e.g., Sæbe, Sacharja 9–14, 177; Willi-Plein, Prophetie am Ende, 170; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 57; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 30–33; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 214; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 39; Smith, Micah-Malachi, 255; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 121; Leske, “Context and Meaning,” 671.
All these three passages employ the *Aufruf zur Freude* form as defined by Crüsemann who argues that this form also occurs in other passages, e.g., Isa 12:4–6; 54:1; Hos 9:1; Joel 2:21–24; and Lam 4:21. According to Boda, the social context of this form was that of military victory: “Those women who were on the winning side would have received news of victory and responded with songs of joy and its accompanying rituals.” Though one may argue that these three verses draw on the common tradition of *Aufruf zur Freude*, the unique elements each shares with Zech 9:9 suggests a direct literary connection beyond form tradition.

There are striking lexical similarities among them: (1) The terms נִשָּׁרָת (Zech 2:14 [2:10]; 9:9; Zeph 3:14) and נִשָּׁרָת מִצְוַת (Zech 9:9; Zeph 3:14) appear in no other example of this form mentioned by Crüsemann except in these three texts; (2) In the reason clause, Zech 2:14 [2:10] links with 9:9 by beginning with the particle וְנָֽהַל followed by יָדָה, associating the rejoicing with the arrival of Yahweh, whereas Zeph 3:14 relates to 9:9 by using the word יָד (Zeph 3:15), connecting the rejoicing to the presence of Yahweh in the midst of his people as king.

Apart from formal and lexical parallels, these three texts also exhibit impressive thematic connections: (1) The contexts of these passages are that of God’s decisive interventions, executing judgment against hostile nations and ushering in salvation for his people (Zech 2:12 [2:8]; Zeph 3:15; cf. Zech 9:1–7); (2) All of them envision the incorporation of the nations into the audience (Zech 2:15 [2:11]; 9:7, 10; Zeph 3:9); (3)

---

14 According to Crüsemann, the *Aufruf zur Freude* (call to joy) form has three basic elements: (1) imperative summons to a personified addressee (city, land); (2) vocabulary drawn from the semantic range of celebratory shouts; and (3) a clause depicting the reason for rejoicing; Crüsemann, *Studien*, 55–65.

15 Boda reminds us to understand the *Aufruf zur Freude* form within its social context—to read it against the backdrop of a military victory. He argues that, in ancient Israel, females were “cast in the position of awaiting news from a battle” (e.g., Judg 5:28–30); Boda, “Daughter’s Joy,” forthcoming. Cf. Floyd, “Welcome Back,” 500–502; Boda, “Redactional Leitmotif.”
Each text shows concern for the return of the Israelites from exile (Zech 2:10–11 [2:6–7]; 9:12; Zeph 3:19–20); and (4) Each mentions the return of Yahweh to dwell among his people (Zech 2:14 [2:10]; 9:8; Zeph 3:15). 16

Besides the above, the Zephanian text demonstrates even more remarkable correspondences with Zech 9:9. The imperative summons to rejoice (<size=12>שׁוּחַ</size>) in Zeph 3:14 is due to Yahweh’s removal of his people’s reproach and his presence in their midst as king ([size=12>נָשַׁמֵּחַ</size>, Zeph 3:15). In that day, the righteous Lord ([size=12>יְהוָה הַצְדִיק</size>, Zeph 3:5; cf. [size=12>יְהוָה</size> of Zech 9:9d) will take away the pride ([size=12>זָאֵם</size>, Zeph 3:11; cf. [size=12>זָאֵם</size> of Zech 9:6b) of his people so that a just and proper remnant feeling no more shame will be formed (Zeph 3:11; cf. 3:5, 3:13). The salvation of Yahweh will preserve a meek and lowly people ([size=12>יְנַעֲנַה</size>, Zeph 3:12; cf. [size=12>יְנַעֲנַה</size> of Zech 9:9e) by delivering ([size=12>נָשַׁמֵּחַ</size> cf. [size=12>נָשַׁמֵּחַ</size> of Zech 9:9d) them from their oppressors (Zeph 3:19) which include the nations (Zeph 3:8) and the corrupt leadership of Judah (Zeph 3:3–4). However, the judgment of the Lord aims not only at refining his people (Zeph 3:11), but also purifying the nations so that both of them will call on the name of Yahweh (Zeph 3:9–10; cf. Zech 9:7b). All these striking similarities demonstrate that Zech 9:9 has a literary connection with Zech 2:14 and Zeph 3.

Since both Zech 2:14 [2:10] and Zeph 3:14 envision the advent of Yahweh as the source of rejoicing, some scholars argue that Zech 9:9 anticipates that the coming one is Yahweh himself who will ultimately rule as king over all the earth without any messiah (Zech 14:9, 16–17; cf. Zeph 3:15). 17 Others suggest that the coming one is the remnant of Judah (cf. Zeph 3:12). 18 Petersen argues:

---

17 Cf. Hanson, <i>Dawn of Apocalyptic</i>, 292–324.
[In Zech 9:9d-e,] the sole exception to this pervasively royal imagery is the term “humble.” Zephaniah 3:12 uses the term “humble” to describe a group... the king could also be so described in [Zech 9:9d-e]. This “corporate” character of kingship is implied in Deutero-Isaiah as well, as in Isa 55:1–5, which refers to the ratification of David’s covenant with all the people. ... [There] is no standard royal or messianic expectation, namely, the return of a real or ideal Davidide... Instead, the poet focuses on collectivities, addressed through the technique of personification.\textsuperscript{19}

However, these suggestions have some interpretative difficulties. The confusion of the identity of the coming king stems largely from a determination of the intended speaker. The poem utilizes both first- (יְהֹוָה, v. 10a), second- (וֹדֵע, v. 9a; יְהֹוָה, v. 9b), and third-person (אָבִי, v. 9c; יְהֹוָה, v. 10c) verbal forms without mentioning the subject explicitly, creating problems for determining the speaker with absolute certainty. If we read Zech 9:9–10 as a coherent poem, then the one who proclaims the good news of the coming king in Zech 9:9 must be the one who cuts off (יְהֹוָה) the weapons in Zech 9:10.\textsuperscript{20} When examining the chapter as a whole, the antecedent of the first-person verb should refer to Yahweh who has just arrived at the הָרָע with his first-person speech ending in Zech 9:8b: יִכְרְג הָרָע יְהוָה וְקֵין.\textsuperscript{21} It is reasonable to assume that the announcement in Zech 9:8 continues in Zech 9:9–10, though the addressees and the

\textsuperscript{19} Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 59. Though Petersen argues for the democratization of kingship, he does speak of “two kings—divine and human—acting in complementary fashion” in p. 60.

The meaning of Isa 55:1–5 is debatable. Boda contends that the Isaianic passage is an invitation encouraging the remnant to seek Yahweh’s abiding love; Boda, “Figuring the Future,” 60. Cf. the works of Petterson and Seitz, both arguing against the view of Petersen; Petterson, “Behold Your King,” 134, n 38; Seitz, Isaiah 1–39, 110. It is true that the Davidic hope will undergo some development in the post-exilic texts, however, the suggestion that the everlasting covenant made with the people will displace the Davidic is not supported by the Isaianic text. In addition, we do not see any intertextual connections between Zech 9:9–10 and Isa 55:1–5.

\textsuperscript{20} Stuhlmueller argues that the prophet speaks in Zech 9:9 with liturgical language while the Lord speaks in Zech 9:10; Stuhlmueller, Rebuilding with Hope, 123. However, we cannot find any evidence supporting this change of speakers in the text.

\textsuperscript{21} It is assumed that the first-person reference in Zech 9:8b (יִכְרְג הָרָע יְהוָה וְקֵין) is attributed to Yahweh, the same as those in 9:7a and 9:8a. Cf. Petterson, Behold Your King, 136.
The coming king mentioned by Yahweh in Zech 9:9 should be the one who speaks peace to the nations in Zech 9:10, with כָּלַא and יְדֵי being inflected as 3ms. The 2fs pronominal suffixes of כְּלָא and יַד indicate that the king and the addressees are different entities. In addition, the coming one is designated as a יָדָא (Zech 9:9c) with the description of being saved (Zech 9:9d) and riding on a donkey (Zech 9:9e) which clearly speaks against those identifications of him as the remnant or Yahweh. Hence the good news in Zech 9:9 is a speech of Yahweh (first person), informing the personified city of Zion (second person) about a royal figure (third person) who is coming to Jerusalem and will exercise a global rule of peace. The king cannot be Yahweh who is speaking or the remnant of Judah who is being addressed.

Obviously, the focus of chapter 9 is on Yahweh. He is the one who marches down the Levant and then takes up residence on his throne (Zech 9:1–8) before presenting Zion with her king (Zech 9:9–10). Finally it is Yahweh who restores his people, culminating with full prosperity (Zech 9:11–17). Though the context underscores that Yahweh himself is king, this emphasis is not incompatible with the notion of providing a human king (cf. Ezek 34:15–23; Mic 4:7–8). Nevertheless, the stress on the sovereignty of Yahweh is essential to a proper understanding of kingship in Israel, and thus a proper understanding of the relationship between Yahweh and the coming royal

---

22 Some scholars also discern this connection between Zech 9:1–8 and Zech 9:9–10; e.g., Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 37; Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 222; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 172.

23 The imagery of a king mounted on a donkey evokes the tradition of charismatic leadership in which human rulers are appointed by Yahweh. Thus the coming king cannot be Yahweh himself. See "The Attributes of the Coming King" below.

24 Duguid, “Messianic Themes,” 268–69. In Ezek 34, Yahweh will be Israel’s shepherd who delivers his flock (v. 22) while at the same time, the Lord will raise up David as the shepherd of his people (v. 23). In Mic 4, Yahweh promises to reign over his people in Mount Zion (v. 7) while at the same time, the Lord will reestablish the “former dominion—the kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem” (v. 8).
figure in Zechariah. In Hebrew tradition, the human king was considered a vice-regent of Yahweh on earth, not the divine sovereign king himself. The earthly king was to rely on Yahweh as his power base. This is seen in Ps 2 where mighty Yahweh installed his king as his representative to whom he declared: “you are my son” (Ps 2:7), with the promise: “I will surely give the nations as your inheritance” (Ps 2:8). The human king and the deity are closely related and not mutually exclusive with the appointed vice-regent in the earth reverencing the divine king in the heavens.  

In the Hebrew Bible, the key to the identification of the divine sovereign king is the exercise of military power, a connection that is made explicit in the Song of Moses (Exod 15:1–19). The Song begins by praising Yahweh as a mighty warrior who subdues his foes (Exod 15:1–3) and ends by declaring his everlasting reign over the whole earth (Exod 15:18). This interweaving of warrior imagery with royal imagery can be discerned in some other psalms depicting Yahweh as king forever (cf. Pss 29 and 47). Likewise, the use of divine warrior language in chapter 9, especially those sections before and after Zech 9:9–10, reminds the audience that it is Yahweh who is the sovereign king. It is the Lord who installs his anointed one in Zion and grants him authority to exercise universal rule on earth.

Moreover, the depiction of Yahweh as king in Zech 14 does not necessarily contradict the appointment of an earthly king in Zech 9. The difference between the two chapters may be one of emphasis rather than contradiction. Zechariah 14 focuses on Yahweh’s universal sovereignty, whereas Zech 9 concerns the earthly vice-regent.  

---

Instead of arguing for the replacement of the human royal figure by the divine king, the opening chapter aims to reveal the right relationship between the two which could prepare the way for the exclusive reign of the divine as shown in the final chapter.  

With all these striking similarities between Zeph 3:14; Zech 2:14 [2:10]; and Zech 9:9, we have to ask whether Zech 9:9 alludes to these other passages. Curtis argues that Zeph 3:14–20 is a linchpin in the latter phases of the growth of the Twelve, with the Zion-Daughter oracles of Zeph 3 and Zech 9 marking the seams of the closure of the corpus. Boda even claims that the development of kingship found in Zech 9–14 “suggests that Zeph 3:14, with its exclusive focus on the kingship of Yahweh, is more likely the latest example, taking its lead from the tradition of Aufruf zur Freude found in Zechariah.” He further concludes that “Zech 2 provided the foundation for Zech 9 and in turn these both provided the foundation for the creation of a portion of Zeph 3.” Though opposed by some, this late date for Zeph 3:14 is supported by a number of scholars, e.g., Nurmeila, who contends: “Zc 9,9 is later than...Zc 2,14, whereas Zp 3,14.17 is dependent on...Zc 9,9 and is thus the latest of these passages.”

29 See “Purpose of Alluding to Davidic Dynasty Tradition” below. Boda argues that the change of kingship in these two chapters, Zech 9 and 14, might reflect a drama that unfolds in the corpus, with Yahweh emerging as the only king after the demise of Zerubbabel’s rule, probably due to the failure of the shepherds in Zech 11. Thus, the difference between the two chapters may indicate the development in the corpus, with the final chapter presenting Yahweh’s sole reign and the beginning one depicting the coming of his vice-regent; Boda, “Reading Between the Lines,” 277–91.

Redditt claims: “The redactor of these chapters [Zech 9–14] considered the reunion of Israel and Judah a dead issue and the restitution of the monarchy problematic. Both of these hopes had been vitiated by the sins of the shepherds, the ruling elite in Jerusalem, including the Davidides. God himself would rule in the future”; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 144.

31 Boda, “Redactional Leitmotif.” Boda’s view contrasts that of Redditt who argues for an earlier date: “it is probably safe to ascribe it [Zeph 3:14–20] to the late exilic or beginning of the Persian period”; Redditt, “King,” 75.
32 Boda, “Redactional Leitmotif.”
33 Nurmeila, Prophets in Dialogue, 217. Mason discerns the remarkable connections between Zech 9:1–10 and Zeph 3:1–20 but with the following conclusion: “We cannot of course claim that Zeph 3:14
the fact that Zeph 3:14 might be contemporary with Zech 9:9, if not later, we only
register Zech 2:14 [2:10] as an intertext of Zech 9:9a–c.34

Allusion to Zech 2:14 [2:10]. Zechariah 2:14 [2:10] is embedded within a pericope
(2:10–17 [2:6–13]) which is appended to the third vision (2:5–9 [2:1–5]). The pericope
serves as a sermonic oracle exhorting the audience to respond to Yahweh’s salvific act.
The oracle includes two sections: (1) a call to escape (vv. 10–13 [6–9]); and (2) a call to
rejoice (vv. 14–17 [10–13]). The first section addresses the exilic community with an
urgent tone, advocating them to flee from the land of their captivity as Yahweh will
punish the captors who have plundered his dearest people.

The second section addresses Daughter Zion using an exuberant tone, summoning
her to rejoice as Yahweh has promised to dwell in their midst (v. 14 [10]). As a result of
the divine presence, many nations will join the covenant community, becoming part of
God’s people (v. 15 [11]). In v. 16 [12], Yahweh asserts his emphasis on the special place
of Judah and Jerusalem in the divine economy: he will repossess the former as his holy
portion and choose the latter again (vv. 16 [12]). The section ends with a solemn call for
silence and reverence as the Lord rouses himself to accomplish his purpose (v. 17
[13]).35

has influenced Zech 9:9–10, since we cannot be sure of its [Zeph 3:14] date. Yet it seems to suggest a
source with a very similar range of ideas, with one important modification, to Zech 9:9–10"; Mason, “Use
stammt, aber es ist evident, daß Zeph 3,14ff thematisch Mi 4,8ff voraussetzt. Wenn Mi 4,8ff als eine
Nachinterpretation in der Exils- bzw. Nachexilszeit entstanden ist, so kann man mit Sicherheit sagen, daß
Zeph 3,14ff nicht früher entstanden ist” (translated as: It is controversial if the text is derived from the
prophet Zephaniah. It is evident that Zeph 3:14ff presupposes Mic 4:8ff. If Mic 4:8ff is a
post-interpretation of the exile and emerged in the post-exilic time, then one can say with safety that Zeph
3:14ff did not emerged earlier); Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 44. For opposition to the late date of
Zeph 3:14, see, e.g., Sweeney, Zephaniah, 196–97.
35 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 231–39; Smith, Micah-Malachi, 194–97; Petersen, Haggai and
Zechariah 2:14 [2:10] is recalled in order to add a nuance to the host text by analogy—the reason of exultation. Without ☻, the cause of rejoicing is obscure in Zech 9:9a–b and scholars have different views on it. Petersen argues that Yahweh’s action in Zech 9:1–8 is the basis for the imperative call to rejoice, whereas Meyers and Meyers contend that the coming of the king is the reason for the emotional outbursts. The reason for jubilation in the antecedent is the reversal of the judgment (2:12–13 [2:8–9]) and the coming of blessing (2:16 [2:12]), which will be accomplished when Yahweh comes amongst his people (2:14 [2:10]). The allusion serves as a transition, joining the first eight verses of Zech 9 to the rest of the chapter. The advent of the deity (9:1–8) will alter the fortune of his people and bring forth blessings to them, both the restoration of an ideal kingship (vv. 9–10) and the transformation of an ideal people (vv. 11–17). The audience should rejoice because the redemptive drama has been unfolded as foretold in First Zechariah. However, the sermonic exhortation of the alluded text not only serves as a reminder but also functions as a summons, urging the readers of the alluding text to respond immediately to Yahweh’s miraculous plan which has been launched. The urgent tone of Zech 2 arouses the community of Zech 9 to look for and cooperate with the divine purpose (v. 17 [13]).

When we compare the source with the host, we find that there is one difference between the two texts—the one who is coming shifts from Yahweh himself (אֱלֹהִים; 2:14) to the future king (אֱלֹהִים הַלֵּאֶבֶן; 9:9c). The “coming” of the deity which is pivotal to the promised restoration in the antecedent is now applied to the future king in Zech 9. This shift in agency signals to the readers that not only the advent of Yahweh but also the

---

Zechariah 1–8, 172–86; Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 161–78.

36 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 56; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 121.
coming of his king is vital to the promised salvation of the readers.\textsuperscript{37} Besides serving as a transition, this allusion also serves to heighten the audience's expectation for the coming of this royal figure.

The Zecharian poem itself does not reveal explicitly the identity of the coming king. Does the allusion to Zech 2 give us some hints about this royal figure? Boda argues that the Daughter Zion oracles in Zech 2:10–17 [2:6–13], together with Zech 3; 4:6b–10a; and 6:9–15, belongs to the secondary level(s) of the redaction of First Zechariah.\textsuperscript{38} Among these secondary materials is the reference in two cases to the promised royal figure “Zemah” (נֶ幔, 3:8; 6:12). Redditt states that the closest parallel to the term נֶ幔 appears in Jer 33:15: “...I will cause a righteous branch (נֶ幔) of David to spring forth (נָנָב).” He contends that the נֶ幔 in the Zecharian text may have referred originally to Zerubbabel, but the best option “is that it refers to another, ‘future’ Davidide.”\textsuperscript{39} Whether the נֶמן refers to Zerubbabel or a future Davidide, apparently it is a redactional note about the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. The rebuilding of the temple in 4:6b–10a further reveals that there is an aspiration of restoring the Davidic kingdom in the secondary redactional materials as the founding of temples was a function of kings.\textsuperscript{40} In view of this, we suggest that Zech 2:14 [10] lies within a pro-Davidic recension where an expectation for a Davidic king is embraced. If so, by alluding to Zech 2:14 [2:10], the coming figure in Zech 9 might be a Davidic king.

\textsuperscript{37} Schultz, “Ties that Bind,” 37.
\textsuperscript{38} Boda, “Redactional Leitmotif.”
Besides Zech 2:14 [2:10], another text, Mic 4:8–9, also demonstrates striking verbal parallels with Zech 9:9a–c, though it is not an Aufruf zur Freude. Both texts concern the restoration of human rule on earth—יהוה in Zech 9:9c and צדוק in Mic 4:8. In the Hebrew Bible, the hiphil of ית memšālāh 'Asara' in Mic 4:8. Based on this, we register Mic 4:8–9 as an intertext of Zech 9:9a–c with ממלך, רות, גבורה, וומא, בת ירושלים as catchwords.41

Micah 4:8-9
8 “As for you, tower of the flock, Hill of the daughter of Zion (בָּאָרֶץ),
To you it will come—
Even the former dominion will come (בְּנֵךְ),
The kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem (גָּאוֹן יֵשָׁר עֹתִי).
9 “Now, why do you cry out loudly (חֲשִׂבָה)?
Is there no king (מלך) among you,
Or has your counselor perished,
That agony has gripped you like a woman in childbirth?

Allusion to Mic 4:8–9. Micah 4:8–9 is embedded within the larger context of 4:1–5:14 [5:15], concerning the future restoration and exaltation of Zion. It is a message of hope to a community in a time of distress. The salvation includes: (1) the exaltation of Zion (4:1–5); (2) the ingathering of the remnant under Yahweh’s eternal reign (4:6–10); (3) deliverance from present predicament (4:9–10); (4) victory over the nations (4:11–13); (5) the advent of an ideal king (4:14–5:3 [5:1–4]); (6) the overthrow of Assyria (5:4–5 [5:5–6]); (7) the remnant as a symbol of judgment among the peoples (5:6–8 [5:7–9]);43 and (8) the cleansing of Israel (5:9–14 [5:10–15]).44

41 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 47–48.
42 There are two more intertexts detected in Mic 4:1–5:14 [5:15]: (1) Mic 5:9 [5:10] is alluded to in Zech 9:10a–b, see “The Mission of the Coming King” below; and (2) Mic 4:5 is recalled in Zech 10:12a, see “The Climax of the Renewal” in CHAPTER SEVEN.
43 There are different views on the simile describing the remnant “as dew,” see Smith, Micah-Malachi, 46–47.
At the beginning of the vision (Mic 4:6–8), Yahweh is proclaimed as king over the remnant forever (4:7). However, in v. 8, daughter Zion is told that the “first rulership” (יהוסר) in Jerusalem will be restored. Apparently, David’s reign was the first kingly rule in Zion, thus, his dominion will return to Jerusalem in the restoration era. Reading vv. 7 and 8 together, an image of a joint rule with Yahweh as king and David as vice-regent is envisioned.

Andersen and Freedman argue that the opening וַיִּהְיוּ and the subsequent הָשְׁלֹם of Mic 4:8 link the verse to 5:1 [5:2] where the coming ruler (יהוּדָה; cf. יֵשָׁנוּ of Zech 9:10d) is the one who will go out from Bethlehem. If the two verses are used to interpret each other, then v. 8 may denote the rise of a new Davidic king from Bethlehem. This Davidic king will shepherd his people in the strength of the Lord (v. 3 [4]) and bring Israel into a projected era of peace (טוֹפֶה of 5:4 [5:5]; cf. Zech 9:10c), with his brothers returning from exile (v. 2 [3]) and his greatness reaching to the ends of the earth (ﬠֵפֶן of v. 3 [4]; cf. Zech 9:10d).45

In Mic 4:9, the focus shifts back to the current desolate situation of Jerusalem. The verse begins by asking Zion why she cries out painfully. Then it explains this question with two rhetorical questions: (1) “Is there no king among you?”—which assumes that there is no king; and (2) “Has your counsellor perished?”—which assumes that advisors are gone too. These rhetorical questions link the agony of Zion to the demise of the kingdom and the removal of human rulers.46

44 Smith, Micah-Malachi, 35–49; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 376–93; Mays, Micah, 93–127; Andersen and Freedman, Micah, 392–499.
45 Andersen and Freedman, Micah, 438–39.
46 Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 384; Andersen and Freedman, Micah, 441–47.
Micah 4:8–9 is recalled in order to sharpen the focus of the audience on the coming restoration. The painful cry (יִשָּׁרָת) in Mic 4:9 is converted into joyful exclamation in Zech 9:9b. The question “Is there no king among you?” in Mic 4:9 receives a reply from Zech 9:9c “Look! Your king is coming to you!” The juxtaposition of two contradictory ideas helps to create an impact for the readers, stressing the reversal of fortune in the new age. By alluding to Mic 4, the Zecharian text not only underscores the eternal reign of Yahweh (9:8; cf. Mic 4:7), but also envisages the restoration of the Davidic rule which has been promised in Micah (9:9; cf. Mic 4:8; 5:1 [5:2]). The depiction of the coming king in Mic 4–5 has remarkable similarities with that of Zech 9:9–10, suggesting the same identification of the two expected royal figures—a Davidic king.

The Attributes of the Coming King (Zech 9:9d–f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:9d–f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9d He is righteous and saved,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9e submissive—he is riding on a he-ass,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9f that is, on a young he-ass, son of she-asses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared with the identity of the coming king, the character of the royal figure is much more elaborated. The arrival of Yahweh (Zech 9:1–8) and his king (9:9–10) is a moment of great exuberance. However, after a summons to celebrate, the text immediately shifts to the attributes of the coming king which meets the requirement of Yahweh for human kingship: (1) righteous (יִשָּׁר),47 (2) being saved (נָעַם),48 and (3) submissive (נָחָשָׁה).49

---

47 The various forms of the adjective יִשָּׁר are attested 206 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which most
Mason argues that all three attributes mentioned in Zech 9 are also found in the
depiction of the Servant of Second Isaiah: הַיּוֹם in Isa 53:11, stating that the Servant shall
make many righteous; נָשִׂיא in Isa 49:6, suggesting that the Servant is the bearer of
Yahweh's salvation; נֶשֶׁע in Isa 53:4, 7, proposing that the suffering of the Servant has a
redemptive effect. He concludes that "we may have here a re-interpretation of the
Messianic role in the light of the mission of the Suffering Servant of Second Isaiah." By linking to the Servant Songs, Mason further suggests that Second Zechariah might
follow the lead of Second Isaiah, modifying the traditional messianic hopes in a
democratizing direction. However, the verbal parallels do not show convincing
evidence for dependence as (1) these three attributes are not rare words and their
common appearance can be found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, e.g., the portrayal of
the saved one in Ps 34; and (2) the adjective נָשִׂיא and the verb נָשַׁיא never appear in the
Servant Songs. Moreover, von Rad reminds us that the function of the Suffering Servant
is a prophetic rather than a royal one: "There are certainly, one or two
expressions...which are typical kingly predicates, but they can be easily enough
explained as incidental expansions of the traditional picture of a prophet. The basic

48 The verbal form of נָשַׁיא appears 205 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which most of its occurrences
are found in the Psalter.
49 The various forms of the adjective נָשִׂיא appear 80 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which most of the
occurrences are found in the Psalter.
51 Mason, "Use of Earlier Biblical Material," 42.
52 Mason, "Use of Earlier Biblical Material," 62. However, we cannot find any evidence of
democratization of the traditional messianic hopes in Zech 9:9–10, especially when no intertext of Second
Isaiah is detected in the poem itself. See "The Identity of the Coming King" above.
function of a king, that of ruling, is absent." The coming one in Zech 9:9c is designated as a יִשֵׂר, which clearly speaks against the identification of him as a prophet.

Attribute (1)—Righteous

The first characteristic of the coming king is יִשֶּׂר. Some scholars understand יִשֶּׂר here in a military sense, translating it as "triumphant," and see the royal figure returning victorious from battle. However, this interpretation does not find any evidence in the poem which speaks of a king coming to proclaim peace.

Achtemeier states: "righteousness is throughout the Bible the fulfillment of the demands of a relationship." Kraus further explains the sense of יִשֶּׂר: "righteousness" in the Old Testament can be understood neither as a norm nor as an absolute ideal... but a relationship... in which Yahweh's own righteousness... will be able to find expression." This view of יִשֶּׂר suits well the royal context of Zech 9:9d.

The attribute יִשֶּׂר is not only one of the most important criteria for kingship but also one of the most familiar concepts of royal ideology. This requirement links to the tradition of kingship in a number of sources, particularly Ps 72, where other literary connections with Zech 9:9-10 are also found. Since the Zecharian poem relates to Ps 72 by means of sustained allusion, we will discuss this dependence later in "The Mission of the Coming King."

54 E.g., Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 294; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 465. Cf. RSV.
58 Stead defines "sustained allusion" as a way of textual connection in which the host text makes multiple references to another text; Stead, "Sustained Allusion," 144–70.
Laubscher argues: “With the appeal to Zion in verse 9, the king, described idealistically here as פ"ע, is linked to the traditional Davidic dynasty.”\(^{59}\) The view of Laubscher finds support in many texts depicting פ"ע as one of the criteria for kingship with Davidic language. Besides Ps 72, connections can also been seen to Jeremiah: “‘Behold, the days are coming,’ declares the Lord, ‘when I will raise up for David a righteous (פ"ע) Branch; and he will reign as king and act wisely and do justice and righteousness (י"ע) in the land’” (Jer 23:5; cf. Jer 33:15–16). In David’s last words, he offers a royal model (or Königsspiegel) by which all future kings should be judged: “He who rules over men [humans] righteously (פ"ע), who rules in the fear of God, is as the light of the morning when the sun rises, a morning without clouds, when the tender grass springs out of the earth, through sunshine after rain” (2 Sam 23:3b–4; cf. 23:1–7).\(^{60}\) The ideal Davidic king prophesied in Isaiah bears both the traits of righteousness and peace: “There will be no end to the increase of his government or of peace (ש"ע), on the throne of David and over his kingdom, to establish it and to uphold it with justice and righteousness (י"ע) from then on and forevermore. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will accomplish this” (Isa 9:6 [9:7]; cf. 11:1–9). It is clear that once again the tradition of Davidic dynasty is evoked.

Attribute (2)—Being Saved

The second description of the coming king is פ"ע. The niphal participle conveys a passive sense and should be translated as “being saved.” Some scholars translate פ"ע with an active sense as “victorious” or “having salvation,” based either on the witnesses

\(^{59}\) Laubscher, “The King’s Humbleness,” 130.

\(^{60}\) Cf. Anderson, 2 Samuel, 266–70; Brueggemann, Samuel, 345–47.
of the ancient versions (e.g., the LXX, the Targum, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate) or viewing the victory of Yahweh in Zech 9:1-8 as being the victory of the king. The king as “a saved one” is a difficult concept since one would expect the royal figure as a “savior.” However, the sense that the coming king is delivered by Yahweh is in harmony with the context, reflected by the preceding and the following Yahweh war passages, where Yahweh is emphasized as the sole deliverer. Zephaniah 3:14 also summons daughter Zion to rejoice and the reason for the celebration given in Zeph 3:17 is that Yahweh gives victories (hiphil imperfect יָשָׁר) as a warrior.

In the Hebrew Bible, the exact verbal form יָשָׁר only appears in Zech 9:9 and Ps 33:16, with both passages mentioning the deliverance of the king.

Psalm 33:16

The king (גֶּדֶר) is not saved (יָשָׁר) by a mighty army; a warrior is not delivered by great strength.

Psalm 33 declares strikingly that the source of deliverance for the king is not his military power: “A horse is a false hope for victory; nor does it deliver anyone by its great strength” (33:17). Rather, the king will enjoy divine protection if he fears the Lord and longs for Yahweh’s lovingkindness (33:18). The Psalm concludes that those who trust in the Lord should rejoice as the deity is their help and their shield (33:20-21). Though the correspondences between the two texts are remarkable, most scholars claim that Ps 33 should be dated relatively late, probably postexilic, and a precise origin seems to be impossible to determine. In view of this, we are reluctant to register Ps 33:16 as an intertext of Zech 9:9d.

---

61 E.g., Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 273; Sæbø, Sacharja 9–14, 186; Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 165; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 465. Cf. RSV, CJB, NIV.

62 E.g., Kraus, Psalms 1–59, 374–75; Gerstenberger, Psalms, Part 1, 145–46; Craigie, Psalms 1–50,
Attribute (3)—Submissive

The third quality of the coming king is יִשְׂרָאֵל. The description of a royal figure as יִשְׂרָאֵל is rare (cf. Ps 86:1) and a king is usually expected to deliver the יִשְׂרָאֵל from distress (cf. Ps 72:12). In the Old Testament, the typical meaning of יִשְׂרָאֵל is “poor, afflicted, oppressed,” mainly related to concrete human realities (e.g. Ps 22:25 [24]). The uses of this word in Zech 7:10; 11:7; and 11:11 all capture this nuance. However, if the immediate context of Zech 9:9–10 does not require יִשְׂרָאֵל to mean poor or afflicted, particularly when relating to a king riding on a donkey and coming with Yahweh, then it could mean “humble” or “meek,” a sense not widely attested. To determine the meaning of יִשְׂרָאֵל, the subsequent clause of the same line, יִשְׂרָאֵל יָשָׁע יִשְׂרָאֵל יָשָׁע, may provide us with some clues.

There are different opinions regarding the imagery of having a king mounted on a donkey instead of a horse. Many scholars relate this imagery to the second sense of יִשְׂרָאֵל—humility, denoting a gentle king coming to proclaim peace rather than waging war. Kraeling states: “The ideal king must be humble...He rides into the city on the colt of an ass—the mount of the peaceful citizen. The prophetic mind of the writer regards this act

271.

64 This meaning is not widely attested, examples include 2 Sam 22:28; Ps 18:28; Isa 66:2; Zeph 3:12.
65 Boda relates the riding on a “lowly” donkey to humility, emphasizing the peaceful rule of the king; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 416–17. Mitchell argues that “the king is described as manifesting his humility by making his entry into his capital mounted, not on a prancing horse suggesting war and conquest, but on an ass”; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 274. Cf. Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 51; Duguid, “Messianic Themes,” 268; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 114; Stuhlmueller, Rebuilding with Hope, 125; Webb, Message of Zechariah, 132; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 129–30; Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 166; Moseman, “Interpreting the Dissonance and Unity,” 132–33.
as programmatic for a reign of peace." However, Yadin argues that mules were more suitable than horses for battle in the hill country of Israel. Laubscher contends that donkeys were domesticated and widespread in ancient Israel, serving as a means of transportation, both in the times of peace as well as in times of war. He also claims that the beast of burden was the traditional riding-animal of Israelite leaders, protesting against the view that riding on a donkey indicates lowly status. Based on this, Laubscher argues that the word יְהָר in Zech 9:9e does not denote "the humility of the king or to describe the peaceful character of the king's rule."

Before proceeding further, we should note that there is an awkward construction in Zech 9:9e–f in the reference to the king riding on a רִובְן as well as a רֹע. The writer seems to have put a lot of emphasis on the animal being mounted: not only רִובְן and רֹע are mentioned, but also בַּרְסֵפִּים. By taking the ר of רִובְּנִי as an explanatory waw, then the coming king is represented as mounted on a רֹע, which is a בַּרְסֵפִּים. This clumsy expression alerts the readers to pay attention to the intertextual dimension in play. The words רֹע and בַּרְסֵפִּים serve as catchwords, prompting the audience to search for the intertext.

---

67 Yadin, Art of Warfare II, 287.
68 Laubscher, “The King’s Humbleness,” 125–26, 130. Hanson states: “The great significance often attached to the lowliness of the ass here in contrast to the horse is based on estimations foreign to the ancient Near East. The ass was in no way unworthy of the noble (Judg 10:4; 12:13 and 2 Sam 16:1–2). Indeed Asherah rides on an ass, an ass decked in splendor and fit for a queen of heaven...Likely Baal too was pictured as riding upon an ass in the procession to the temple”; Hanson, “Zechariah 9,” 43.
69 For the lexical field of רָכָב, רֹע, רְעֵב, and בַּרְסֵפִּים, see Way, “Donkey Domain,” 105–14.
70 Here, the ר is assumed as an epexegetical waw (translates as even, that is) rather than a conjunctive waw (translates as and); Arnold and Choi, A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 147; Seow, A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew, 284. Thus, the coming king was mounted on a young ass.
The words רֶפֶן 71 and רָפֵא 72 appear together in two other instances in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 32:16; 49:11; and of these only Gen 49:11 involves a context related to its usage in Zech 9:9—a ruler, presumably riding, with his רֶפֶן... רָפֵא. In addition, apart from Zech 9:9, the construct chain רֶפֶן רָפֵא occurs only in Gen 49:11. These verbal parallels alert the audience to Gen 49:11 where the root רָפֵא of 49:10; cf. רָפֵא of Zech 9:9c) also appears in v. 10. Based on these striking similarities, we register Gen 49:11 as an intertext of Zech 9:9f.

Genesis 49:11
He ties (רָפֵא; cf. רֶפֶן of Zech 9:11) his foal (רֶפֶן) to the vine,
And his donkey’s colt (רֶפֶן רָפֵא) to the choice vine;
He washes his garments in wine,
And his robes in the blood of grapes.

Allusion to Gen 49:11. Genesis 49:11 is embedded within the farewell blessing of Jacob on Judah (Gen 49:8–12) 73 which is part of the deathbed testament of the patriarch to his sons (Gen 49:3–27). Accounts of the last words of a patriarch are not uncommon in Genesis (cf. Abraham, 24:1–9; Isaac, 27:1–40; Joseph, 50:24–25), however, the deathbed-blessing scene of Jacob is the longest of these, with blessings on his grandsons Ephraim and Manasseh in Gen 48 and on his twelve sons in Gen 49. 74 As the father of the nation of Israel, Jacob includes blessings as well as curses in his final testament, and in so doing provides an allusive preview of the future of the tribes who are to make up that nation.

73 Cf. “Allusion to Gen 49:10” in CHAPTER SEVEN.
74 For the structural analysis of Jacob’s blessings on his grandsons (Gen 48) and on his sons (Gen 49), see Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 459–62.
In Jacob’s tribal sayings (Gen 49:3–27), ten of the twenty-five verses refer to Judah (vv. 8–12) and to Joseph (vv. 22–26), a ratio that corresponds to their importance in the history of Israel, with the other ten sons meriting only fifteen verses. The farewell blessing on Judah (Gen 49:8–12) envisages the glorious future of the tribe: (1) his brothers will acknowledge his preeminence, praising him and bowing down to him (v. 8), (2) he will possess lion-like strength, as a fierce lion seizing its prey with no one daring to challenge it (v. 9); (3) his hegemony will be long lasting, with the symbols of authority, שָׁבַיָּהוּ and פּוֹרֶס, never departing from him and his descendants (v. 10); and (4) his territory will be extraordinarily fertile, even with a young he-ass hitched to the choice vines and garments laundered in wine (vv. 11–12).

The blessing in v. 11 focuses on the extreme fruitfulness of the land rather than political triumph. The harvest of vines is so great that Judah will not worry about them being eaten up by his young ass. The yield of grapes is so abundant that those trampling them in the wine press will not just splash their clothes but also soak them or wash them in it. The verse looks to Judah enjoying the abundant provision of Yahweh, with all his needs being satisfied (cf. Lev 26:3–5).

75 The verb הָלַע in hiphil is a word play on the name הָלַע, echoing Leah’s words at Judah’s birth: “This time I will praise the Lord.” Therefore she named him Judah” (Gen 29:35). In the Hebrew Bible, usually God or his name is the object of praise (cf. Pss 7:18 [7:17]; Isa 12:1; 25:1). There are only three occasions where human beings are said to be praised (Job 40:14; Pss 45:18 [45:17]; 49:19 [49:18]). Cf. Sarna, Genesis, 335; Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 476.

The verb הָלַע in hishtaphel followed by הָלַע could mean bowing down or prostrating oneself before a monarch in homage (cf. Ps 72:11).

76 For the interpretation of the phrase הָלַע הָלַע, see “Allusion to Gen 49:10” in CHAPTER SEVEN.


78 Von Rad comments: “No Judean would tie his ass to a vine, for it would be eaten up, of course. Anyone who can be so careless and who can wash his garment in wine, lives in paradisiacal abundance. Probably these statements intend to say just this in antiquated poetry...he who will come will live in a time of paradisiacal fertility”; von Rad, Genesis, 425.
Despite the impressive lexical parallel between the source and the host, there is one variation in the shared words. Instead of a singular יִצְוָה, a plural יָצְוָה is used in the Zecharian text. The word יִצְוָה in various forms appears thirty-four times in the Hebrew Bible, only two of which relate to riding: Num 22:22 (יִצְוָה) and Judg 5:10 (יָצְוָה).

Because of the parallelism between יִצְוָה and יָצְוָה, a singular יִצְוָה is expected in Zech 9:9f, as in Gen 49:11. Thus, the use of the plural יָצְוָה in the Zech 9 has always caused trouble for commentators. However, this lexical choice in Zech 9:9f may be designed to draw Judg 5:10 into view, a passage where the exact form יָצְוָה appears in connection with a kinglike mount on donkeys (cf. יַרְכֵּב יְלַעֲשֶׂר of Zech 9:9e) in a context of exultation (cf. Zech 9:9a–b) after a military victory (cf. Zech 9:1–8): “You who ride on white donkeys (יַרְכֵּב יָצְוָה), you who sit on rich carpets, and you who travel on the road—sing!” In Judges, the rulers of Israel are depicted as mounted on donkeys (יַרְכֵּב; Judg 10:4; 12:14), thus the ones who ride on white donkeys in 5:10 probably refer to the Israelite rulers. Though the lexical similarity between Zech 9:9 and Judg 5:10 does not show convincing evidence for literary dependence, by using the plural יָצְוָה the Zecharian readers are reminded of the kinglike mount in Judges when they try to read Zech 9:9 in light of Gen 49:11.

What is the purpose of alluding to Gen 49:11? Duguid contends that the warlike tribe of Judah (cf. Gen 49:8–9) is recalled in order to form a contrast to the pacific king in Zechariah. Drawing on Rev 14:20 and 19:13, Duguid claims that washing one’s robes

However, Leske argues that Judah, as a tribal leader, came to Shiloh to celebrate the Feast of Booths: “Judah tied his ass to the vine is an indication that the harvest is over and the vines are now bare”; Leske, “Context and Meaning,” 673.

The plural of יִצְוָה occurs 18 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 12:16; 32:16; 45:23; Judg 5:10; 1 Sam 9:3, 5, 20; 10:2, 14, 16; 2 Kgs 4:22; 1 Chr 27:30; Job 1:3, 14; 42:12; Zech 9:9.


Butler, Judges, 124–27; Moore, Judges, 146–47.
in the “blood of grapes” (דֹּקְךָּנָּn
Gen 49:11d) has “something more in mind than simply abundant fruitfulness. Clothing stained red with the blood (דֹּקְךָּנָּנָּנָּנָּn) of grapes is evocative... of outright warfare.”

Though the image of “trodden the wine press” is commonly used as a metaphor of divine judgment in the Hebrew Bible (Rev 14:19–20; cf. Isa 63:3), this kind of figurative language is not seen in Gen 49:11. Moreover, the connection seems to focus on the fertility of Judah’s territory rather than his military achievement. The image of prosperity envisioned in Gen 49:11 is reinforced by the next verse where the abundance of wine and milk is depicted: “His eyes are dull from wine, and his teeth white from milk” (v. 12). In addition, apart from Gen 49, the expression דֹּקְךָּנָּנָּנָּn occurs exclusively also in Deut 32:14 (דֹּקְךָּנָּn), where abundance of harvest is stressed. Fishbane argues that Gen 49:10–11 is reused due to the prophetic character of the blessing (cf. דֹּקְךָּנָּn דֹּקְךָּנָּn in 49:1): “the obscure temporal expression ‘until...comes’ was adapted by him [Zechariah] to post-exilic, royalist-messianic hopes.”

However, Speiser contends: “it is methodologically precarious to construe the phrase [Gen 49:10c], with rabbinical and later interpreters, as a Messianic allusion to David, who never had much to do with Shiloh.”

We may have some clues regarding the purpose of this allusion if we pay more attention to the lexical parallel: דֹּקְךָּנָּנָּn instead of a singular דֹּקְךָּנָּn may serve to remind the readers of Judges where pre-monarchical leaders are depicted as riding on דֹּקְךָּn and דֹּקְךָּנָּn. This reminder may

---

82 Duguid, “Messianic Themes,” 268.
83 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 501–502. Following the lead of Fishbane, Larkin also argues that there is a mantological connection between Zech 9:9–10 and Gen 49:10–11; Larkin, Eschatology, 70. Sweeney believes that the Zecharian text draws on Gen 49:11 as both of them employ similar language to portray the royal tribe of Judah; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 663. Cf. Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 180.
84 Speiser, Genesis, 366.
sharpen our focus of this dependence. In Gen 49:10, by employing terms like מְלֹא (“scepter”; cf. Judg 5:14) and כָּפָן (“the ruler’s staff”; cf. Num 21:18; Deut 33:21), Judah is portrayed more by analogy with the leaders of the tribal system than with the later kings. If so, then it is most likely an allusion to Judah’s leadership under Yahweh as it was prior to the monarchy. Leske shares this view and argues that the Genesis intertext intends to link Zech 9:9 to Deutero-Isaiah’s vision, advocating “a return to those pre-monarchic times when God alone was to be king (Isa 40:9–11; 52:7), with leadership returned to the people (Isa 55:3–5).” Hence, he contends that the coming figure is Yahweh’s faithful people, suggesting that the role of David had been completely democratized. Though Leske arrives at the same observation as us, that is, alluding to the Israelite leadership of pre-monarchical era, his conclusion of democratization has some interpretative difficulties, as we have discussed above.

If Leske’s conclusion is not valid, then what is the reason for the writer bringing his audience to the pre-monarchic period by recalling Gen 49:11? In the Hebrew Bible, there is no record of a king riding on a donkey (בָּשָׂם), since kings usually rode in chariots and on horses (2 Sam 15:1; Jer 17:25; 22:4; cf. 1 Sam 8:11). The only account appears

85 The participle of כָּפָן appears 11 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 49:10; Num 21:18; Deut 33:21; Judg 5:9, 14; Pss 60:9; 108:9; Prov 31:5; Isa 10:1; 22:16; 33:22, of which 7 are in the poel stem: Gen 49:10; Num 21:18; Deut 33:21; Judg 5:14; Pss 60:9; 108:9; Isa 33:22.
89 See “The Identity of the Coming King” above.
90 There are biblical records of king David’s sons riding on mules (בָּשָׂם): (1) when Absalom took a retaliatory action against Amnon (2 Sam 13:29), the king’s sons mounted on their mules (בָּשָׂם); (2) when Absalom fled from the servants of David (2 Sam 18:9), he rode on a mule (בָּשָׂם); and (3) when Solomon was anointed as king, he mounted on David’s mule (בָּשָׂם, 1 Kgs 1:33, 38, 44). Though the mule belongs to David, there is no biblical record of David mounting on a mule. The noun בָּשָׂם appears 14 times in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Sam 13:29; 18:9; 1 Kgs 10:25; 18:5; 2 Kgs 5:17; 1 Chr 12:41; 2 Chr 9:24; Ezra 2:66; Ps 32:9; Isa 66:20; Ezek 27:14; Zech 14:15. The noun בָּשָׂם appears 3 times in the Hebrew Bible: 1
in 2 Sam 16:2 where the donkeys are for the king's household to ride. The beast of burden was the main riding-animal of prominent rulers (cf. Gen 49:10–11; Judg 5:10; 10:4; 12:14) only before the import of horses, probably since the inauguration of the monarchy, particularly during the reign of Solomon (1 Kgs 10:26, 28; cf. Deut 17:16).

Thus the imagery of the coming “king” mounted on a “donkey” in the “post-exilic” literature most likely relates to the Israelite idea of charismatic leadership which is closely connected with the archaic tribal society and Yahweh war.91

The charismatic rulers of the tribal period were appointed by Yahweh, whereas the kings inherited the throne. The tribal leaders went out to wars with firm reliance on Yahweh for victories (Judg 3:9–10; cf. Judg 2:18) rather than depending on their own military forces as kings did (1 Kgs 10:26–29; cf. 1 Sam 8:10–12). During the time of the tribal confederacy, Israel was one people of Yahweh, ruled by the Lord alone. The concept of Yahweh war stresses the sovereignty of Yahweh who fights for his people, underlining the importance of human trust in the deity for deliverance (Judg 7; cf. Pss 20:7–9; 33:16–17). Hence, the notion of charismatic leadership draws heavily upon the belief that Yahweh is the divine warrior who has exclusive rights to rule over Israel and the human leader is only an appointed representative of the deity.92

The essence of the pre-monarchic charismatic leadership can also be discerned by comparing 1 Kgs 1:5 with 1:33. The latter text is a polemic against the former one. First Kings 1:5 depicts Absalom’s intention to assume the throne relying on his own power,

---

91 After analyzing four passages (Isa 8:23–9:6 [9:1–7]; 11:1–9; Mic 4:14–5:4aα [5:1–5αα]; Zech 9:9–10) in which royal imagery is prominent, Harrelson concludes that: “The period of the judges, the charismatic leaders of Israel, seems to have been of particular importance to the prophets as a source for the portrayal of the coming of the royal figure of the ‘latter days’ and for understanding the function of this leader”; Harrelson, “Nonroyal Motifs,” 164.

92 Hanson, “Zechariah 9,” 44.
whereas 1:33 represents Solomon as the chosen king ruling in the name of Yahweh (cf. 1 Kgs 1:48). First Kings 1 presents two different concepts of rulership: one is based on the king’s own might, symbolized by horses, chariots and an army (1 Kgs 1:5), and the other is based on the king’s dependence on Yahweh, symbolized by riding on an ass (1 Kgs 1:33). In the biblical tradition, “horse” and “chariot” are usually mentioned together as a symbol of human self-reliance and an image of shameful alliance with Egypt, a phenomenon often rebuked by the prophets (cf. Isa 2:7; 31:1–3; Mic 5:9; Hag 2:22; cf. 1 Sam 8:11; Ps 20:7). Thus, the king comes to his people mounted on an ass (Zech 9:9e–f), representing the banishment of the chariot and the horse, rebuking any reliance on earthly power. Thus, the depiction of the king in Zech 9:9 stresses the royal figure’s dependence on Yahweh for victory rather than highlighting that he is a pacifist.

In view of the above, the word יְשָׁרֶה in this royal context functions metaphorically as “humble submission,” expressing the special position of the king in relation to Yahweh. It refers to an attribute of pious trust, submitting oneself in the arm of Yahweh and taking refuge in his holy name (cf. Isa 66:2; Zeph 3:12). This kind of humble submission is well represented in Deut 17:15–20 where the chosen king is

---

93 At a later point where the Deuteronomist turns to narrate the causes of the fall of Solomon, we read: “Now Solomon gathered chariots and horsemen, and he had 1,400 chariots and 12,000 horsemen, and he stationed them in the chariot cities and with the king in Jerusalem” (1 Kgs 10:26). See discussion in Hanson, “Zechariah 9,” 44.

94 Laato (A Star Is Rising, 209–10) continues to argue that these two concepts of the kingship can also be found in Pss 20:7–9 and 33:16–17: The royal ideology of these psalms express the superiority of the ancient Israelite idea of charismatic leadership in contrast to the royal ideology which stresses the king’s own great military power. It is worth noting how important the concept of Yahweh war is in these psalms: Yahweh guarantees the victory, not the greatness of the king’s military might.

95 Besides the negative image, “horse” and “chariot” are also used with positive sense, e.g., Jer 17:25; 22:4. Cf. Beek, “Chariots and the Horsemen,” 1–10.

96 See “The Mission of the Coming King” below.

97 Laubscher, “King’s Humbleness,” 130.
required to observe the Torah so that he may fear the Lord and that his heart may not be lifted up above his brethren. The Deuteronomic constitution states that, by relying on Yahweh rather than horses (v. 16), the king and his sons may continue long in his kingdom (v. 20).

The Mission of the Coming King (Zech 9:10a–d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:10a–d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10a Then I shall cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b and (the) bow of battle will be cut off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c Then he will speak peace to the nations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d and his dominion will be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of earth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two responsibilities of the coming royal figure are mentioned in the Zecharian poem: (1) establishing peace (וֹרֶדֶם שָׁלוֹם, Zech 9:10c); and (2) cosmic dominion (משה, Zech 9:10d). However, before we search for the intertexts of these lines, we have to investigate in what circumstances the king will carry out his duties (Zech 9:10a–b).

Setting of the Mission

After the imperative calls for rejoicing and the description of the royal figure, Zech 9:10 declares Yahweh’s intention to remove all military equipment (9:10a–b) before portraying the responsibilities of the king (9:10c–d). Being influenced by the clause וֹרֶדֶם שָׁלוֹם, many scholars argue that the “cutting off” of the weapons is to

---

98 In Zech 9:10, the verb חרב (and I shall cut off) in the MT is rendered as ἔξολοθρεύων (and he shall destroy) in the LXX. We are inclined to keep the Hebrew reading for the following reasons: (1) the Hebrew reading is more difficult than the Greek one; (2) the first person reading which stresses Yahweh’s triumphant act is more in line with the context of Zech 9. See discussion below.
secure the newly established kingdom, ensuring the cessation of violence in the future.\footnote{E.g., Hanson, \textit{Dawn of Apocalyptic}, 321; Ollenburger, \textit{Zion the City of the Great King}, 143; Meyers and Meyers, \textit{Zechariah 9–14}, 131–32. Petersen argues that the Persian empire used the tactic of militarization as one way to impose imperial control over Yehud, thus the poet envisioned a kind of demilitarized dominion that would provide a decided change for the province; Petersen, \textit{Zechariah 9–14}, 59.}

However, it is the weapons of God’s people which are banished rather than those of the nations to whom peace is proclaimed. Apart from here, the hiphil of חרב with Yahweh as subject denoting a sense of cutting off both נַעֲלֹתָיו and נַעֲלֵי of Israel appears exclusively in Mic 5:9 [5:10]. Based on these striking verbal parallels, we register Mic 5:9 [5:10] as an intertext of Zech 9:10a–b.\footnote{Tai, \textit{Prophetie als Schriftauslegung}, 48.}

\begin{quote}
Micah 5:9 [5:10]
“\begin{quote}
It will be in that day,” declares the LORD,
“\begin{quote}
That I will cut off (ךָתַם) your horses ( NSLog) from among you
And destroy your chariots (ךָתַם).
\end{quote}
\end{quote}
\end{quote}

Allusion to Mic 5:9 [5:10]. Micah 5:9 [5:10] is embedded within a larger context of 4:1–5:14 [5:15], concerning the future restoration and exaltation of Zion.\footnote{For the analysis of Mic 4:1–5:14 [5:15], see above, “The Identity of the Coming King,” as Mic 4:8–9 is one of the intertexts of Zech 9:9a–c.}

Micah 5:9–14 [5:10–15] is the concluding pericope depicting Yahweh’s promise to purge militarism and idolatry from the audience. The rationale behind this divine action is to secure the proper relationship between the deity and his people (cf. 5:12 [5:13]). The cutting off of the horses and chariots in Mic 5:9 may compel the remnant to trust Yahweh for the future security of the nation.\footnote{Sweeney, \textit{Twelve Prophets} 2, 376–93; Smith, \textit{Micah-Malachi}, 35–49; Mays, \textit{Micah}, 93–127.}

The divine oracle in Micah is recalled to nuance the Zecharian text by analogy, illuminating the host text with the motivation of the cutting off—removing all distractions that obstruct the proper relationship between Yahweh and his people. The intertextual reading also informs the audience that the purge
of the audience is a part of the restoration program of Yahweh as prophesied in Micah 5 (cf. Zech 12:10–13:9).

When we examine closely the context of Zech 9:9–10, we discover that the setting for the king to exercise peaceful rule over the entire world is one of hostility. While Zech 9:8a represents the continuous existence of oppressors, Zech 9:13–15 depicts scenes of warfare. In the midst of these threatening situations, the king cannot rely on his own “horse” and “chariot” which, as argued above, symbolize human self-reliance and foreign alliance, and which, as discussed above, have been cut off (Zech 9:10a–b). Instead, he reigns without any armament, only depending on Yahweh for his victory. He must rely on the Lord to subdue the enemies so that a peaceful reign may be achieved.103 Similar to Mic 5:9, the emphasis of Zech 9:10a–b is on trust in the Lord. This nuance of relying on Yahweh alone finds its echo in the rhetorical insert in First Zechariah: “‘Not by might nor by power, but by my spirit,’ says the Lord of hosts” (Zech 4:6b). This theme also finds its parallel in Zech 9:9d where the king is depicted as one “being saved” (יָשָׁב).  

103 Zechariah 9:9–10 depicts the approach of the royal figure as being accompanied by the march of the Divine warrior Yahweh, whose triumph over the enemies (Zech 9:1–8) resulted in the peaceful dominion of his vice-regent. According to the work of Ollenburger, this description partakes in a general Near Eastern belief that views the accession of a new human king as the inaugural event in a new era characterized by peace and well-being. He states that this tradition is well illustrated by a text of Ashurbanipal depicting the worldwide peace following his installation as king by Marduk: “At the command of Assur, father of the gods, Marduk...He raised me above the other king’s sons and named my name for the kingship...At the proclamation of my honored name, the four regions of the world were glad and rejoiced. The kings of the Upper and Lower seas, vassals subject to my father, sent me tidings of their joy at my assumption of the kingly office. The hurled weapons of the enemy sank to the ground. The well-organized enemy broke their battle line. Their sharp lances came to a stop, they brought their drawn bows to rest...In city and in home, a man took nothing from his neighbor by force. In the whole land, no gentleman did any evil...No deed of violence was committed. The lands were quiet. The four regions of the world were in perfect order, like the finest oil”; Luckenbill, Ancient Records, #987; cf. Ollenburger, Zion the City of the Great King, 143.
Mission (1)—Establishing Peace

The first mission of the coming king is to speak peace to the nations: דָּבֶר ‏ָלָּלָּלִים ‏(Zech 9:10c). The clause דָּבֶר ‏ָלָּלָּלִים appears eight times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 37:4; Esth 10:3; Pss 28:3; 35:20; 85:9; 122:8; Jer 9:7 [9:8]; and Zech 9:10. Tai argues that the ones who speak peace in Jer 9:7 [9:8] are the prophet and the priest mentioned in Jer 6:13b–14. He also contends that Ps 85:9 is a kind of divine oracle communicated to the community by either a priest or a cultic prophet. Based upon these two usages, Tai concludes that “...die Aufgabe des Königs in Sach 9,10 eine Aufgabe des Priesters oder eines Kultpropheten ist.” However, when we examine the subjects of “speaking peace” in other passages, e.g., Pss 35:20; 122:8, we discover that, contra Tai, it is the psalmist who complains that the foe is not speaking peace in the former poem and it is the pilgrim who wishes peace to be within Jerusalem in the latter one.

The construction דָּבֶר ‏ָלָּלָּלִים often has the sense of promise, denoting that the promised thing will surely come to pass (cf. Gen 28:15; Deut 1:11; 6:3; 9:28; 12:20; Josh 13:33). Since the setting of Zech 9:9–10 is one of hostility, the mission of “speaking peace” in Zech 9:10c may denote the king’s promise of peace to the hostile nations, urging them to submit to Yahweh and his king in a time of war (cf. Deut 20:10–12).

---

104 A similar idiom also appears in Deut 20:10: “When you approach a city to fight against it, you shall offer it terms of peace (דָּבֶר ‏ָלָּלָּלִים).”
105 Translated as: “The task of the king in Zech 9:10 is a task of the priest or cultic prophets”; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 42.
106 BDB, 181; HALOT, 210.
107 See “Setting of the Mission” above.
108 A similar case occurs in Deut 2:26–33 where the Israelites offered peace (דָּבֶר ‏ָלָּלָּלִים) to Sihon, who refused it. This led to a war between the two parties. Cf. Judg 21:13 where the whole congregation of Israel sent an offer of peace (דָּבֶר ‏ָלָּלָּלִים) to the Benjamites after the defeat of the tribe.
The king has to offer peace in a vulnerable situation, that is, after the disarmament of his people (Zech 9:10a–b). The royal figure must have great confidence in Yahweh, relying on the Lord to accomplish his mission. In sum, the responsibility of speaking peace to the nations stresses the trust of the king in the deity.109

Mission (2)—Cosmic Dominion

The speech in Zech 9:10d contains significant allusions to Ps 72:8, with the exact phrase יְהֹוָה יִשָּׁרֵי תַּמְדִידָה יִשָּׁרֵי תַּמְדִידָה occurring exclusively in both texts in the Hebrew Bible.110 Besides this striking connection, other catchwords, e.g., מְלֶךָ (72:1, 10–11), רַצִיִּים (72:7, cf. 72:1–3),晊ֵי (72:4, 13), וֹיַ (72:2, 4, 12), פְּלַס (72:3, 7), וֹי (72:11, 17), all serve to bind the psalm as a whole closely to Zech 9:9–10. Based on these remarkable lexical similarities, we register Ps 72 as an intertext of Zech 9:9–10.

Psalm 72
1 Give the king (כתוב למלך) Your judgments, O God,
   And Your righteousness (כתוב למדינת) to the king’s son (כתוב למלך).
2 May he judge Your people with righteousness (כתוב לcrollק),
   And Your afflicted (כתוב לבעל) with justice.
3 Let the mountains bring peace (כתוב לשלום) to the people,
   And the hills, in righteousness (כתוב לברצון).
4 May he vindicate the afflicted of the people (כתוב לברצון),
   Save (כתוב לברצון) the children of the needy,
   And crush the oppressor.
   ...
7 In his days may the righteous (chershem) flourish,
   And abundance of peace (כתוב לשלום) till the moon is no more.

110 Numerous scholars have discerned this intertextuality; e.g., Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 415; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 195; Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 182; Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 89; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 137. Larkin contends that “Zech 9:10 has transformed the hymnic petition of Ps 72:8 into an oracles of salvation, then the transformation of genre is an example of mantological exegesis”; Larkin, Eschatology, 75.
8 May he also rule from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth.

10 Let the kings of Tarshish and of the islands bring presents;
    The kings of Sheba and Seba offer gifts.

11 And let all kings bow down before him,
    All nations serve him.

12 For he will deliver the needy when he cries for help,
    The afflicted also, and him who has no helper.

13 He will have compassion on the poor and needy,
    And the lives of the needy he will save.

17 May his name endure forever;
    May his name increase as long as the sun shines;
    And let men bless themselves by him;
    Let all nations call him blessed.

Sustained Allusion to Ps 72. Psalm 72 is a royal psalm, containing a prayer for the king at the beginning of his reign, probably forming part of the coronation ceremony. It sets out an idealized picture of the king's rule, focusing on his provision of justice for the poor, the universal extent of his dominion, and the general ethos of prosperity and well-being that prevails. The psalm consists of five stanzas and one concluding statement with stanzas four and five echoing the themes in stanzas one and two respectively, thus foregrounding stanza three as the most important part of the poem—the king's cosmic dominion: י dalle שֵּׁדֶנֶּה רַעַשְׁנֵה תֶּרֶשׁ סֶבֶה בְּשֶׁבֶת מָה הָיָה חֶסֶד הַיְּהוָה (v. 8).  

---

111 Psalm 72, as a royal psalm, probably has its origin in the pre-exilic period. Smith and Weiser suggest that it is the Zecharian text alluding to the Psalm; Smith, Micah-Malachi, 257; Weiser, Psalms, 502–504. Nurmela registers this as a probable allusion to Ps 72; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 96. See “The Psalter in ca. 440s” in CHAPTER TWO.

(1) The first stanza (Ps 72:1–4) begins with an intercession for the king (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:9c) who functions as Yahweh’s agent by extending God’s righteousness (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:9d) and justice to God’s people, especially the afflicted (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:9e). The proper action of the king brings the Lord’s blessings to the land, with peace (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:10c) and righteousness (כְּכֶלֶת) forming part of the creation, and with the afflicted (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:9e) being delivered (כְּכֶלֶת).113

(2) The second stanza (Ps 72:5–7) contains a prayer for the king’s longevity so that the long reign of the king might bless the people of Yahweh, like rain watering the land, enabling the field to bear righteousness (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:9d) and peace (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:10c).

(3) The third stanza (Ps 72:8–11) declares the hope that the king’s dominion may extend over the entire earth (כְּכֶלֶת; cf. Zech 9:10d).114

113 See “The Attributes of the Coming King” above.
114 The boundaries of this kingdom are ambiguous, with different interpretations. Redditt explains that the “River” in the OT was usually the Euphrates and “the earth” which can be translated as “the land” might refer to the Promised Land (cf. Exod 23:31; 1 Kgs 5:1). Hence, Zech 9:10 might well have in mind the Davidic empire; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 115; Redditt, “Israel’s Shepherds,” 633; cf. Larkin, Eschatology, 75–77; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 664. Hanson suggests “it is the area which the visionaries believed would be restored to the faithful on the day of Yahweh’s conquest on behalf of his people. The borders of that area are not arbitrarily set, but outline what ancient Israelite tradition held to be the ideal kingdom of the Jews”; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 317.

The noun כְּכֶלֶת means stream or river, and often refers to the Euphrates, usually without the article in poetry; HALOT, 677; BDB, 625. The plural word כְּכֶלֶּן suggests ceasing, hence end or extremity. The phrase כְּכֶלֶּן כְּכֶלֶּן only appears 12 times in poetry: Deut 33:17; 1 Sam 2:10; Pss 2:8; 22:28; 67:8; 72:8; 98:3; Prov 30:4; Isa 45:22; 52:10; Mic 5:3; Zech 9:10. It points to the extreme limits of the earth, probably referring to Spain in the ancient minds, used especially hyperbolically; HALOT, 79; BDB, 67. Thus, the boundary of this ideal kingdom might extend from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean Sea and from the Euphrates to Spain. However, כְּכֶלֶת may also be a reference to the great stream that flows from the temple in Israel’s visions of Zion (cf. Ps 46:5; Ezek 47). In this case, the psalmist would be envisioning the dominion of the king extending from Jerusalem over the entire earth; Tate, Psalms 51–100, 221. Hence, in more symbolic geography, the vision of the Psalm might extend from one side of the land mass, where it meets the sea/river, to the ends of the other side, where it meets sea/river again, i.e. the entire earth;
God is asked to make all nations, including those who are hostile and distant, submit in service to the just and life-giving king.

(4) The fourth stanza (Ps 72:12–14) echoes the theme of the first stanza, asking that the life-giving king may establish justice and deliver the afflicted (כע) in his kingdom.

(5) The fifth stanza (Ps 72:15–17) echoes the theme of the second stanza, requesting long life for the king and urging the people to pray continually for him so that he may be constantly sustained by divine blessing.

(6) Psalm 72:18–20 is a concluding statement with Ps 72:18–19 acting as a benediction and Ps 72:20 as a postscript to the preceding section and also to the whole collection of the second book of Psalms (Pss 42–72). These

---


In view of the above, we agree with the suggestion of Meyers and Meyers who expound: “In sum, the ‘sea to sea’ combination, intensified by the imagery of the next line (‘river to the ends of the earth’), constitutes language that conveys the universality of the king’s domain. The directional imagery functions as a kind of merism: all points and thus everything in between”; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 137.

115 Whether the benediction and the postscript were originally part of Ps 72 or they were later editorial additions inserted precisely for the purpose of indicating the ends of the second book of Psalms is still debatable. Regarding the benediction, Mowinckel argues: “...these ‘doxologies’ are not meant to be the end of a book but are earlier liturgical additions to the individual psalms concerned”; Mowinckel, *Psalms II*, 197, n.3. The great variety among the four doxologies of the first four collections of psalms speaks against the argument that they are introduced by a single redactor intending to mark the conclusions of each collection. Wilson remarks: “That this variety is not limited to the omission and/or addition of phrases, but extends to the formal makeup of those words and phrases...supports a diverse origin of these doxologies...They are instead integral parts of the Psalms they accompany and have their origin in the liturgical milieu of the cult”; Wilson, *Editing*, 183–86.

For the postscript, Wilson claims that the fact that it “stands after the concluding doxology (72:18–19) can best be explained if the postscript is part of an editorial movement to bind together the two preceding collections into a recognized unit. The ‘prayers of David son of Jesse’ which are here ended would appear to refer now to the whole combined collection (2–72)”; Wilson, “Use of Royal Psalms,” 88–89; cf. Wilson, *Editing*, 185. Creach also claims that the first two collections of the Psalter are seen “as the primary building blocks to which other collections were added. This idea is often carried further to suggest that these two collections were united at some point to form an early ‘collection of collections’”; Creach, *Yahweh as Refuge*, 108. However, Mitchell disagrees with Wilson and contends: “...this view,
concluding notes serve as a reminder that God alone is the giver of justice, life, and power. All praise and glory should go to him.

Why does the Zecharian text allude to Ps 72? Nurmela suggests that an echo of Ps 72 in Zech 9:9–10 is probably due to the proximity of the reference to David’s empire in Zech 9:1–8. However, we have already pointed out that the toponyms in Zech 9:1–8 do not correspond to the limits of the Davidic empire. When comparing the source with its host, we discover that the allusion in the Zecharian poem recalls basically the ideas of the first three stanzas of the Psalm, culminating with the cosmic reign of the king (Ps 72:8–11). Both Ps 72 and Zech 9:9–10 portray a king, probably a Davidic one, however, with contrasting perspectives. The prayer in Ps 72 presents an ideal picture of a successful king, whereas the Zecharian text reveals an unexpected image of an afflicted royal figure. In Ps 72:2, the king judges the people with יָרֵע, whereas in Zech 9:9d the royal figure depends on Yahweh to declare him as יִפְרֵע. In the source text, the king delivers (יַשִּׁר) the afflicted (יִשְׁרֵע) (Ps 72:4), whereas in the host text, the royal figure is

---

116 Nurmela argues that the place names mentioned in Zech 9:1–8 seem to correspond to the limits of David’s empire. Thus, the evoking of Ps 72 in Zech 9:9–10 intends to highlight the connection between Zech 9:1–8 and Zech 9:9–10; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 195–96.

117 See CHAPTER THREE.
an afflicted figure (חן) who needs salvation (נשא) (Zech 9:9d–e). Not only is the
depiction of the king but also the destiny of the nations at variance in both passages. In
the alluded psalm, the king subdues the nations with them paying tribute and serving
him (Ps 72:9–11), whereas in Zech 9 the royal figure speaks peace to the nations
resulting in a peaceful reign (Zech 9:10c). Besides these, the role of Yahweh in both
texts is also divergent. In Ps 72, the Lord plays a passive role, remaining in the
background and being addressed in a prayer. The deity is expected to grant his justice to
the king so that the royal figure will rule successfully. However, in Zech 9, Yahweh is
an active divine warrior (Zech 9:1–8), claiming his territory before presenting his king to
Zion. The deity continues to dominate the scene, controlling human affairs (cf. 9:10a–b).
To the surprise of the readers, the climax of the petition in Ps 72:8, the cosmic dominion
of the king, will be fulfilled by the submissive royal figure in Zech 9, as Yahweh
proclaims: נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים נַשְּא מִיִּים (v. 10d). 118

Psalm 72 is recalled but modified in order to provide a new perspective for the
audience. The innovative variation of its source reinterprets the status of the human king
in relation to the sovereignty of the divine king. The success of the vice-regent depends
totally on Yahweh’s declaration of him as זך rather than his own possession of God’s
一切都 (Ps 72:2). The עני condition of the coming king compels him to long for Yahweh’s
and to look for God’s salvation (Ps 72:4). Submission and trust are the keys to the
continuous prosperity of the human king. The cosmic dominion is possible only when

118 Tai, Prophetic als Schriftauslegung, 50; Duguid, “Messianic Themes,” 267.
the royal figure acknowledges that his reign is actually the reign of Yahweh and his power is in fact derived from the sovereignty of the Lord.¹¹⁹

**The Purpose of Alluding to Davidic Dynasty Tradition**

In Zech 9:9–10, Ps 72 is the material most alluded to, used to shape the reading of the host text, particularly the attributes and the mission of the coming king. The postscript of the Psalm suggests that it should be read as a prayer of David for his son and successor, portraying David’s attempt to transfer the blessings of his covenant with Yahweh to his descendants through a series of petitions on behalf of the king.¹²⁰ With this intertextual insight, the Davidic dynasty tradition is surely called to mind.¹²¹

Apparently, Zech 9:9–10 projects a moment of great exuberance, envisioning a new kingdom ruled by a new David characterized by peacefulness, righteousness and humble submission. The new ruler is one who is faithful to the covenant and reliant on Yahweh for salvation. Under his reign, the whole world will be restored with peace and prosperity. Thus all the hopes of David in Ps 72 could be realized.

---

¹²⁰ Wilson, “Use of Royal Psalms,” 5.
¹²¹ Reading in light of the intertextual backdrop, we do not agree with Pomykala’s argument: “It should be observed, however, that Zech 9:9 makes no mention of a Davidic king”; Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 125. Hanson argues that Second Zechariah reflects the struggle between the visionaries and the hierocrates, to which the Davidic government associated. With this background, he concluded that “if the governors of the part of the fifth century which concerns this study were in fact Davidic, the total absence of a Davidic messianism in the eschatology of the visionary tradition of this period becomes understandable”; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 350, n 39. However, Hanson’s thesis which lies on the assumption of two conflicting parties has met with a lot of challenges, e.g., Larkin, *Eschatology*; Cook, *Prophecy & Apocalypticism*; Carroll, “Twilight of Prophecy,” 3–35.

Jones views Zech 9:9–10 as recounting the story of David and Absalom in 2 Sam 15–19; Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 256–58. However, Larkin contends that this kind of over-emphasis on the Davidic-historical links should be resisted; Larkin, *Eschatology*, 76.
What is the purpose of evoking the Davidic dynasty tradition, particularly through all these significant allusions to Ps 72 and Mic 4? Does Zech 9:9–10 intend to heighten the Davidic hope, reinforcing the reestablishment of the Davidic kingdom as argued by numerous scholars? Though this interpretation is a possibility, the contention of Mason is worthy of consideration: “How is it that so much emphasis is given to a Messianic figure here, but scarcely elsewhere in Deutero-Zechariah?” This is particularly true as the Davidic royal tradition seems to have faded away immediately in the rest of the chapter (9:11–17).

If Zech 9 arose in the period soon after the completion of the temple (cf. Zech 9:8) in ca. 515–510 B.C., then it is possible that the depiction in vv. 9–10 captured a moment when there was heightened hope for the house of David with Zerubbabel as the reigning member. The writer may have grasped this opportunity to raise the Davidic

---

122 On the contrary, Meyers and Meyers believe that the messianism of Zech 9–14 is muted on account of the sensitivity of the political situation that the restoration community now found themselves in; Meyers and Meyers, “Future Fortunes,” 207–22; Meyers, “Messianism in First and Second Zechariah,” 127–42.
123 E.g., Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 222; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 415–16; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 465–66; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 172; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 276; Petterson, Behold Your King, 135; Laubscher, “King’s Humbleness,” 130.
124 Mason continues to argue: “The only possible Messianic references are to be found in 10.4, which, however, as will be argued, seems to be more the promise of a general provision of adequate leadership to replace the unworthy ones than to a Messianic figure specifically of the Davidic line; 11.4, which there is no reason to believe is Messianic; 12.7ff., which we shall suggest, if it envisages a Davidic leadership, sees it as only of a very limited kind; and 12.10, which cannot be taken as Messianic in any recognized sense. Chapters 13–14 have no possible reference to a Messianic figure. Why then is this special variant of the coming of Yahweh to his people tradition, apparently so strongly stressed here?” Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 34. Cf. the opposite view of Petterson, Behold Your King, 129–245.
125 E.g., Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 44; Tai, Prophetic als Schriftauslegung, 71.
126 See “Date of Composition” in CHAPTER TWO.
127 See “Leadership in Yehud” in CHAPTER TWO.
expectation, reminding the depressed community of Yahweh’s promise in the mist of hardship. 128

However, if the rebuilding project is to be understood within its political atmosphere, then the Zecharian poem may have been designed to convey another message. The reconstruction of the temple was sponsored by the Persian empire, with local officials, whether priest or lay, holding little or no real power. 129 The Judean government, including the imperial appointed governor, Zerubbabel, and the scribal circle, could only cooperate with the Persian ruling elite, hoping that the royal support would bring forth the restoration of Israel. In this context, Zech 9:9–10 is probably a polemic against this false hope, urging the audience, particularly its leaders, including the house of David, to trust Yahweh rather than any human power (cf. Zech 4:6b). The emphasis on the attributes of the coming king, particularly the summons of the notion of charismatic leadership of the premonarchial period, all point in this direction. In this light, we argue that the Zecharian poem serves as an admonition, reminding the audience that their king will be installed by and will rule for Yahweh instead of the Persians, and that the new kingdom will transcend the tiny domain of Yehud and exceed even the realm of Persia to include all nations. However, all these could only be accomplished by the deed of Yahweh, not relying on any human might or power (Zech 9:10a–b; cf. 4:6b). 130

The audience is exhorted to rejoice not only because they are going to have a Davidic king, but also because ideal leadership will be installed for them in the new era. This is the most important blessing brought forth when Yahweh takes up residence on

128 See “Historical Setting” in CHAPTER TWO.
129 See “Emergence of a Theocracy?” in CHAPTER TWO.
130 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 425.
his throne in Zion (Zech 9:8). The identity of the king is not elaborated as it is not the focus. The main thrust is the attributes of the coming one. Thus, instead of arguing for a robust messianism, we believe that Zech 9:9–10 aims to present a correct perspective of the Davidic hope to its audience. The poet educates the readers that, only with these qualities, would the anointed king of Yahweh be able to effect ζητητήσεως για τον εαυτό του for the nations. This description of a royal figure is carefully nuanced not only to keep Davidic hope alive and to avoid political triumphalism, but also to project a model of the ideal king, a rhetorical tactic that draws on the tradition of kingship in Israel and is essential in the socio-political context of the text.¹³¹

The rest of Zech 9–14 revolves around the theme of ideal kingship presented in Zech 9:9–10. On the one hand, the corpus reinforces the idea that Yahweh is the sovereign king who is the only source of leadership (e.g. Zech 10:3b–5)¹³² and salvation (e.g. Zech 10:6–12).¹³³ On the other hand, the text reminds the audience repeatedly that all human leaders are accountable to Yahweh who, as the divine king, will judge his appointed ones (e.g. Zech 10:3a; 11:1–3, 17).¹³⁴

The overall flow of the shepherd materials (Zech 10:1–3a; 11:1–3, 17; 13:7–9) depicts the progressive downfall of the ruling class in Yehud, possibly including

¹³² See CHAPTER SIX.
¹³³ See CHAPTER SEVEN.
¹³⁴ Zechariah 11:1–3 is a coherent unit announcing judgment on the present leadership, thus drawing our attention back to 10:2–3 and setting the stage for the foreboding prediction of leadership and the people in 11:4–16. The Lebanon cedar and cypresses, the oaks of Bashan, and the thickets of the Jordan are frequently employed in prophetic literature to express the majesty and power of rulers. In Zechariah, the word ζητητήσεως symbolizes the leadership within the nation. Thus, this unit is announcing the coming divine judgment on the unsatisfactory leadership mentioned in 10:2–3. Boda argues: “The reaction of the trees and shepherds within Israel’s territory probably indicates that this message is directed also against domestic leadership, who operate under the authority of the Persian emperor and contribute to Zerubbabel’s demise. Their positions will be threatened by God’s coming judgment”; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 461.
Zerubbabel's son-in-law, after Zerubbabel's tenure.\(^{135}\) It might reflect a crisis in Davidic leadership in a time with high monarchical expectation.\(^{136}\) By contrasting the ideal king who brings peace and prosperity, Zech 10–13 stresses the calamity which resulted from a failure of leadership (e.g. Zech 10:1–2; 11:4–16) which Yahweh will surely address (Zech 12–13).\(^{137}\) The failure of the leadership in Zech 11 has prompted some to conclude that the promise of the Davidic king in Zech 9:9 is no longer operative as evidenced in Zech 14:9 in which Yahweh rules directly.\(^{138}\) However, this suggestion does not take into account consistent echoes of the Davidic tradition from earlier materials and explicit references to the house of David in Zech 10–13. Boda is probably right that these echoes and references "remind the people of God’s enduring hope for the Davidic line while at the same time reminding them of God’s willingness to discipline the line."\(^{139}\)

Zechariah 12:1 asserts that the creator God has the ability to carry out a cosmos-wide transformation of the world so that universal recognition of Yahweh in Zion will be achieved (14:16–21). While Zech 12:3–8 depicts divine triumph, Zech 12:9–13:1 embraces divine cleansing. Notice that the phrase רְאֵה הָדוֹר, drawing on the Davidic tradition, only appears in these two sections which focus on the truth that, in


\(^{136}\) Meyers contends: “Still, a woman [Shelomith] was chosen over two viable male candidates, and such a decision indicates first that monarchist feelings were running high although realistically focused on the future, and second, that appointing or arranging through marriage a Davidic co-regent for the governor would somehow be a constructive way of dealing with the royal family”; Meyers, “Messianism in First and Second Zechariah,” 131. See “Leadership in Yehud” in CHAPTER TWO.

\(^{137}\) Zechariah 11:4–16 begins with the phrase רְאֵה הָדוֹר which sets the stage for its interpretation. The noun רְאֵה, besides in 11:4 and 11:7, only occurs in Jer 7:32; 12:3; 19:6 in the context of divine judgment. Thus, the prophetic sign-acts represent God’s judgment plan for the flock (דֵּד in 11:4; לַעֲשׂוֹת in 11:6) subsequent to the horrible announcement of judgment to the leadership in 11:1–3.

\(^{138}\) Cf. Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 144–45.

God's restoration plan, spiritual renewal is the prerequisite to God's promised victory. Through the cleansing process, the royal families (12:10, 12; 13:1) together with other leaders, will be refined so that they might become channels of divine blessings. After the refinement, the goal of Yahweh's restoration plan will be realized—all humankind drawing together into the presence of the universal sovereign Lord (Zech 14:16; cf. 8:20–23; Isa 2:2–4; 42:6; 49:6).

**Summary (Zech 9:9–10)**

**Source Text**

In Zech 9:9–10, five intertexts are detected (see Table 6 below), of which Mic 4–5 and Ps 72 (no. 2, 4, 5) are the most common materials, both related to the Davidic Dynasty tradition. The Micah text (no. 2) is summoned to express the reversal of fortune in a new age, whereas the Psalm (no. 5) is recalled to explicate the key to the success of a royal figure. The Genesis text (no. 3) is evoked to relate the audience to pre-monarchic charismatic leadership, nuancing the importance of the humble submission of an ideal king.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zech 9:9–10</th>
<th>Intertext</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:9a–c</td>
<td>Zech 2:14 [2:10]</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:9a–c</td>
<td>Mic 4:8–9</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

140 This motif is further supported when the phrase רָׁשָׁהוּ מִן שָׁם mainly appears in the divine cleansing passage. The phrase רָׁשָׁהוּ מִן שָׁם appears 5 times in Second Zechariah: 12:7, 8, 10, 12, 13:1.

141 In the cleansing process, all leaders include the royal and the priestly families (12:12–13), the prophetic institution (13:2–6) and other leaders in general (13:7–9) will be purged.

142 Tollington states that "all the prophetic books of the Old Testament display awareness that Israel's ultimate destiny is connected to its relationship with the other nations around it, and that Yahweh's relationship to these nations is another factor which has a bearing on Israel"; Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 216.
The advent of Yahweh to Zion (Zech 9:1–8) brings forth a host of blessings to his people, of which the restoration of an ideal kingship is the leading one (9:9–10). At the beginning of the poem, the sermonic oracle in Zech 2 is summoned to exhort the audience to rejoice as well as to respond to Yahweh’s act since the redemptive drama has been unfolded as promised in the earlier prophets. By leveraging Mic 4–5, the identity of the coming royal figure becomes explicit—a Davidic king, who will rule together with Yahweh as his vice-regent. This new kingdom will extend to the end of the earth.

However, the representation of the royal figure in the Zecharian poem is quite different from the notion of an ideal king in the Davidic tradition. In order to explicate this new perspective of kingship, Ps 72 is recalled but modified. The juxtaposition of two contradictory ideas helps to sharpen the focus of the host text, thus, creating an impact for the readers. With this intertextual insight, an ideal king will be one who has right relationship with Yahweh, longing for the justice of the Lord, and waiting for the salvation of the deity. The Genesis material is evoked to further stress the importance of submission and trust which are the keys to the continuous prosperity of the royal figure. The cosmic dominion of the human king is only possible when the vice-regent realizes that his reign actually belongs to Yahweh and his power in fact stems from the sovereignty of the Lord.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:9f</td>
<td>Gen 49:11</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:10a–b</td>
<td>Mic 5:9 [5:10]</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:9–10</td>
<td>Ps 72 (sustained)</td>
<td>exegesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refer to “The Nature of Textual Relationships” (Chapter One)

Table 6: Intertexts of Zech 9:9–10

Intertextual Reading
CHAPTER FIVE
THE RESTORATION OF AN IDEAL PEOPLE:
AN INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF ZECHARIAH 9:11–17

Introduction

The advent of Yahweh (Zech 9:1–8) will bring forth a host of blessings in the new era. Not only will the Lord give to Zion an ideal king (9:9–10), the deity will also restore to the city an ideal people (9:11–17). However, many scholars regard Zech 9:11–17 as a difficult passage, “distorted by errors and glosses,” with an irregular structure. The question of who is being addressed has prompted a lot of discussion. The lack of specification has made it difficult to identify the “prisoners” who are exhorted to return (v. 12). Otzen believes that the oracle speaks to the exiles of the northern kingdom of 734 and 722 B.C. as the address to Zion is akin to that found in Mic 4–5, where the return of the northern exiles to Zion is announced: “Können nicht die Exulanten des Nordreiches von 734 und 722 »Gefangene Zions« genannt werden? Das ist keineswegs unwahrscheinlich.” Mason argues for the Babylonian exiles: “The general theme of return from captivity does seem to recall the promises of Second Isaiah and therefore to have had the Babylonian exile particularly in mind.” Mitchell opts for the exiles of the Greek period based on the historical allusions in the corpus, especially the word in Zech 9:13b: “The prisoners in question are the Jews still in exile. The Persian as well as

1 E.g., Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 282.
4 Translated as: “Could the exiles of the northern kingdom of 734 and 722 not be called as ‘prisoners of Zion’? That is by no means improbable”; Otzen, Studien über Deuterosacharja, 127–28.
the Babylonian empire has been overthrown, yet many of the children of Sion remain scattered in other countries.\(^6\)

Amidst these controversial hypotheses, we argue that the nuance of the Zecharian text will become clear when it is read in light of its intertexts. In the following, we will analyze the text, identify its sources, and suggest any possible impact that such an intertextual reading might make upon our understanding of the passage. In terms of content, Zech 9:11–17 can be seen as a drama that opens with an invitation to return (vv. 11–12), continues with an account of military victory (vv. 13–15b), then culminates at a scene of rejoicing and prosperity (vv. 15c–17).\(^7\) Grammatically, these seven verses can be divided into three parts: (1) the invitation to return (vv. 11–13), with Yahweh in the first person and the people mainly in the second-person feminine singular; (2) the war of liberation (vv. 14–16), with Yahweh in third person, addressed as הוהי (v. 14a), ויהיה (v. 14c), והיה (v. 15a), והיה (v. 16a), and the people in the third-person masculine plural; and (3) the prosperity of the people (v. 17), with the emphatic ט (cf. Gen 18:20; Job 12:2) indicating a shift in perspective within the oracle.\(^8\) Our investigation of the pericope will follow the latter structure.

**The Invitation to Return (Zech 9:11–13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:11–13</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11a Even you! Because of the blood of the covenant with you,</td>
<td>11a יִבְרַעַת הקֶסֶבָּרִיתָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b I have set your prisoners free from the pit, in which there was no water.</td>
<td>11b שבָּלָא אַפְּרָיקֹרָא מַמְרָד אָמְרָא בָּל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^8\) *HALOT*, 470.
Zechariah 9:11–13 is a first person divine speech, continuing from 9:8, and addressing, first, an unspecified second person feminine singular (אָזֶה, 9:11a), and then, “prisoners of the hope” (אָסִירֵי הָהוֹדֵד, 9:12a) and “Sons of Zion” (צִיּוֹン בֵּית, 9:13b). Before we proceed, we have to investigate who is the recipient of the oracle. A close reading of Zech 9:11–13 reveals that the 2fs emphatic אָזֶה in 9:11a refers to the Daughter Zion (=Jerusalem) of 9:9, linked by נָעַ. The same construction can be found in 9:7, with נָעַ pointing back to the previous subject being addressed. The opening אָזֶה serves as an antecedent for four subsequent 2fs suffixes: (1) אָסִירֵי הָהוֹדֵד (9:11a)—the covenant with Zion; (2) אָסִירֵי הָהוֹדֵד (9:11b)—the אָסִיר of the personified city; (3) מְשָׁפֵךְ הַיְוָה (9:12b)—double restoration to Zion; and (4) צִיּוֹנ בֵּית (9:13b)—the sons of Zion. The noun אָסִיר in 9:11b and 9:12a most likely functions as a catchword, linking the two verses together. If so, the imagery אָסִירֵי הָהוֹדֵד in v. 12a points to the אָסִיר of Zion who have been set free by Yahweh in v. 11b. While 9:11 depicts the saving deed of the Lord, 9:12 invites the liberated to respond to Yahweh’s restoration:

---

9 This connection is a general consensus among present scholarship, e.g., Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 419; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 470; Larkin, Eschatology, 78; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 114; Moseman, “Interpreting the Dissonance and Unity,” 139; Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 223; O’Brien, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 240; Petterson, Behold Your King, 143; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 664–65; Tai, Prophetie als Schriflauslegung, 52; Webb, Message of Zechariah, 133; Woodcock, “Forms and Functions,” 172.
However this identification of the addressee seems to create a tension with the exhortation נֶאֱמָרָי in Zech 9:12a. In order to understand the tension, we have to clarify the meaning of נֶאֱמָרָי. The noun נֶאֱמָרָי is a hapax legomenon and many exegetes have been reluctant to accept it in its existing form, suggesting various emendations. BHS suggests emending the clause to נֶאֱמָרָי, whereas Mitchell rejects the noun as a gloss. Since all the versions agree on its meaning as “stronghold” and its cognate verbal form נֶאֱמָרָי is used in Isa 22:10 to connote “fortify,” Meyers and Meyers argue that נֶאֱמָרָי refers to “the idea of the exiles returning to their homeland to occupy a ‘fortress’ or ‘stronghold,’ a term that would characterize Jerusalem and Yehud in the mid-fifth century when the Persian government erected a whole string of fortresses in its western provinces to guard against Greek expansion.” If so, then one might ask why the more common term נֶאֱמָרוּ is not used. Most likely, the strange word נֶאֱמָרָי is used instead of נֶאֱמָרוּ in order to provide an alliterative play on the noun נֶאֱמָרָי. Because of this wordplay, Petersen claims that “the stronghold is not to be construed as some structure in Jerusalem, but as Zion נֶאֱמָרָי itself.” We agree with Petersen’s suggestion that נֶאֱמָרָי refers to Zion itself, however, we further argue that this alliterative play is not only on נֶאֱמָרָי but also on נֶאֱמָרָי. Thus, the sound connection in v. 12a may also link the verse to 9:9, where נֶאֱמָרָי rejoices because of the inauguration of her restoration due to the advent of Yahweh (9:1–8). The alliterative play brings the

---

10 Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 279, 283. Cf. BHS.
13 The word נֶאֱמָרָי appears 37 times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 13:19; 32:17, 36; Josh 10:20; 19:29, 35; 1 Sam 6:18; 2 Sam 24:7; 2 Kgs 3:19; 8:12; 10:2; 17:9; 18:8; 2 Chr 17:19; Pss 89:41; 108:11; Isa 17:3; 25:12; 34:13; Jer 1:18; 4:5; 5:17; 6:27; 8:14; 34:7; 48:18; Lam 2:2, 5; Dan 11:15, 24, 39; Hos 10:14; Amos 5:9; Mic 5:10; Nah 3:12, 14; Hab 1:10.
14 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 55, 61.
audience back to the beginning of the chapter, reminding them of Yahweh’s enthronement in Zion which becomes the dwelling place of the divine king (9:8; cf. 2:14 [2:10]).

The word יְשַׁלְחֵנִי, which generally means turn or return, plays an important role in the rhetoric of exilic and postexilic prophetic literature, denoting a sense of returning to the Levant, the homeland of the Israelites, e.g., Isa 51:11 and Neh 7:6.15 Thus, the exhortation יְשַׁלְחֵנִי in Zech 9:12a most likely connotes a sense of returning to Zion. Since the phrase יְשַׁלְחֵנִי is in v. 12a refers to the prisoners of Zion (אֶפֶר הַלַּבְּשֵׂרִים) in v. 11 (see discussion above), Petersen claims that “those being addressed [in Zech 9:12a] are already in Syria-Palestine.”16 Thus, it is meaningless to exhort יְשַׁלְחֵנִי to return to Zion (אֶפֶר הַלַּבְּשֵׂרִים). In view of this, he contends that the imperative יְשַׁלְחֵנִי here “works in a figurative sense, that of repentance rather than that of physical movement.”17 However, this understanding of יְשַׁלְחֵנִי is not correct as the personified אֶפֶר הַלַּבְּשֵׂרִים always exhibits fluid associations. The epithet may refer to the city Zion/Jerusalem (Isa 2:3) or extend to the people of Israel (Isa 51:16) whether they are in Jerusalem or not (cf. Zech 2:10–11 [2:6–7]).18 Thus, יְשַׁלְחֵנִי may be an invitation, exhorting a specific group of Yahweh’s people—the prisoners of the hope (אֶפֶר הַלַּבְּשֵׂרִים, v. 12a), who were still scattered

15 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 61.
16 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 61.
17 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 61.
18 Dobbs-Allsopp states: “This kind of fluidity of reference is traceable within the biblical traditions themselves. For example, within the Zion tradition, talk of Zion moves to talk of Jerusalem and even to the whole land of Israel and Judah quite easily, with no apparent distinction intended. The name Zion itself ... exhibits especially fluid associations. Originally, it probably was a designation for Jebusite Jerusalem, which David is said to have conquered (2 Sam 5:7; 1 Kgs 8:1). It then becomes a specific designation for the Temple Mount (Pss 48:2, 11; 78:68–69; Isa 31:4; Joel 3:17, 21) ... And eventually, through synecdoche, Zion becomes a designation for the whole of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 19:31; Isa 2:3; 30:19) and, in Lamentations, through the cohering force of the personification and genre associations, even Judah”; Dobbs-Allsopp, Lamentations, 52–53. Cf. Dearman, “Daughter Zion,” 144–59.
in other countries to return to Zion, the dwelling place of the Lord.19 This argument is supported by the subsequent word נגף (9:12a) which is used several times in connection with return from captivity, e.g., Hos 2:17 [2:15]; Jer 31:17.20

Prisoners of the Hope (Zech 9:11–12)

How are the dispersed exiles represented in Zech 9:11–12? (1) They are depicted as prisoners (עַרְרֵךְ) who have been set free from a pit (רֵים, 9:11b), in which there is no water (נְחָלָה, 9:11b), because of the blood of the covenant with Zion (רְאֵשׁ, 9:11a). (2) After the liberation, they are designated as prisoners of the hope (שַׂרְרֵךְ, 9:12a) who are exhorted to return to the stronghold, Zion, (רָכַב, 9:12ae) with the divine promise of double (רְאֵשׁ, 9:12b) restoration.

In Zech 9:11b, the misery and grief of the exilic community is represented by the prison imagery. The noun עַרְרֵךְ is used mainly in poetic contexts, mostly referring to Yahweh’s mercy to those who suffer as prisoners (cf. Pss 68:7 [68:6]; 79:11; 102:21 [102:20]).21 Apart from those poetic occurrences, the term עַרְרֵךְ occurs also in the Joseph story (Gen 39:20, 22) and the Samson account (Judg 16:21, 25). Mason claims that the theme of the restoration of the captives in the Zecharian oracle alludes to the tradition of Second Isaiah.22 The motif of “setting free” (9:11b) recalls the idea in Isa 42:7: “To

19 Holladay contends that the וש in Zech 9:12a denotes physical movement; Holladay, “Root šûbh,” 62.
open blind eyes, to bring out prisoners (ְנָתֵל; cf. וְנָתֵל of Zech 9:11b–12a) from the
dungeon and those who dwell in darkness from the prison," whereas the promise of
“restore double” (9:12b) reactivates the concept in Isa 61:7 which itself echoes the
statement of Isa 40:2: “Speak kindly to Jerusalem; and call out to her, that her warfare
has ended, that her iniquity has been removed, that she has received of the LORD’s hand
double (כּּבָּד; cf. כּּבָּד of Zech 9:12b) for all her sins.” Based on these echoes, he
argues that the רְפָאִים in Zech 9:11–12 should refer to the Babylonian exile. There is
certainly a correspondence in the idea expressed in these texts, however, Mason’s
connection of the Zecharian oracle to the Isaianic tradition, particularly Second Isaiah, is
weak since “liberty” and “restoration” are general motifs which can be seen in numerous
places in other canonical books, e.g., Exodus, and particularly prophetic literature, e.g.,
importantly, the verbal parallel as such does not show convincing evidence for literary
dependence.

The helplessness and pain of the “prisoners” are represented by a metaphor—the
pit (יחֵר, Zech 9:11b) as dungeon. The pit is described as יְהֵס יָכָּת (Zech 9:11b), a phrase
generally regarded as a gloss, though without any textual evidence. Instead of
assuming it is redundant, we argue that the seemingly excessive phrase was composed as
a catchword, functioning to direct the readers to its intertext. With this explanatory tag
(יחֵר), most scholars claim that Zech 9:11b alludes to the Joseph story (Gen 37:24)

---

25 E.g., Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 298; Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 92; Mitchell,
et al., Zechariah, 282. Cf. BHS which regards it as a later addition.
and/or the Jeremiah narrative (Jer 38:6), the other two places where “with no water in it” occurs.26

Genesis 37:24
and they took him and threw him into the pit. Now the pit (הָבַת) was empty, without any water in it (אֲרֵי מֵי).

Jeremiah 38:6
Then they took Jeremiah and cast him into the cistern (בָּהַר) of Malchijah the king’s son, which was in the court of the guardhouse; and they let Jeremiah down with ropes. Now in the cistern there was no water (יִשְׁבָּהוּ אֲרֵי מֵי) but only mud, and Jeremiah sank into the mud.

Person argues that the Zecharian text alludes to the Jeremianic text: “Although this image is also found in Genesis, the close dependence on Jer elsewhere [probably referring to the subsequent chapters of II Zech] lends support to the probability that Jer 38:6 influenced Zech 9:11.”27 Instead of opting for one intertext, Mason prefers a thematic allusion to both of them. He suggests that the adoption of these two texts might be designed to evoke the idea of divine protection and deliverance for those who were faithful to Yahweh.28 However, we argue that the Joseph tradition is the one which is specifically alluded to for the following reasons: (1) the Genesis passage has more shared words (אֲרֵי מֵי) than the Jeremianic one (יִשְׁבָּהוּ אֲרֵי מֵי); (2) the noun (אָרֵי מֵי) (Gen 39:20, qere) and its verbal form (יִשְׁבַּה, 40:3) relating to Joseph are also found in the narrative; (3) the associated verb יָשָׁב, with Yahweh as subject denoting a sense of setting free, which appears prominently in the exodus account (Exod 5:1; cf. 7:16, 26; 8:16, etc.), ties closely to the Joseph story, a narrative recounting the event which leads

27 Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 118.
the whole family of Israel going down to Egypt (Gen 46); and (4) the mention of Ephraim (v. 13a), a son of Joseph, also serves as a connection. In view of these remarkable correspondences, we register Gen 37:24 as an intertext of Zech 9:11b, with אֶלְּכֵם בְּרֹאֶה אֲבֹר as markers.

**Allusion to Gen 37:24.** Genesis 37:24 is embedded within the Joseph narrative (Gen 37:2–50:26) which is headed by a title: “These are the records of the generations of Jacob” (נֵכֶדֶג הַנָּכָר; 37:2). With this title in mind, the focus of the narrative is not simply on Joseph, but all the sons of Jacob. The broader interest is obvious in the deathbed testament of Jacob in Gen 49 where the patriarch blesses his twelve sons who are to make up the nation of Israel.30

Our intertext lies within a pericope (Gen 37:2–36) narrating the downturn of Joseph who was sold as slave into Egypt due to the rivalry of brothers. The threefold clause, “they hated him” (אֹהַבּוּ אֹתוֹ; 37:4; cf. v. 5, 8), which culminates in v. 11, “his brothers were jealous of him,” sets the tone of the whole story.31

Although Joseph was sold as slave (37:36) and confined as prisoner (39:20), he was finally exalted as the ruler of Egypt (Gen 41:40). The narrator tells us that the real cause of his success is “The Lord was with Joseph” (Gen 39:2; cf. 39:3, 21, 23). Yahweh has a plan for Joseph and God works it out behind the scene: “…you meant evil against me, but God meant it for good in order to bring about this present result, to preserve many people alive” (Gen 50:20; cf. 45:5, 7–8). The story is an account of divine

---

29 Cf. “Allusion to Gen 49:11” in CHAPTER FOUR.
30 Longacre regards this second last chapter as “the peak” of the final תְּלֵה הַנָּכָר as well as of the whole book of Genesis: “We have a glimpse of the embryonic nation—with the Judah and Joseph tribes destined to have preeminence in the south and north respectively”; Longacre, Joseph, 51. Hence, within the Joseph story, it is not surprising to see one entire chapter devoted to Judah (Gen 38) and the leading actors in chs. 42–46 are both Judah and Joseph. Cf. Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 345.
providence. The narrative teaches that the ways of the Lord are reliable and the purposes of the deity will come to fruition.\textsuperscript{32}

By alluding to Gen 37:24, the downturn in the fortune of Joseph in the first unit of the Joseph narrative (Gen 37:2–36) is recalled. The phrase דא דא (Zech 9:11b) reminds the readers that the dearest son of their forefather was thrown into a waterless pit and then was sold into Egypt as a slave. The noun דא (Zech 9:11b) further brings to mind the misery of the slave Joseph who was put into prison without justified cause. The plight of the young boy was due to the rivalry of the brothers which led to the misery of the whole family. However, the immediate context of the Zecharian text provides an idea of the reversal of the adverse fate of the prisoner. The piel of דא (v. 11b) evokes the idea that Yahweh has set his captive free from the house of slavery (cf. Exod 5:1). The hiphil of דא (v. 12b) enkindles the expectation for restoration in which the Lord promises to restore double to the released. With this context in mind, we suggest that the Zecharian text intends to recall the misfortune of Joseph but to reverse it in order to nuance the salvific act of Yahweh in v. 11b. Yahweh delivered the prisoners of Zion as he did for Joseph in the past.

Besides this, the rest of the Joseph story is also summoned as a backdrop which highlights the divine will of salvation. The context of the source reminds the readers of Yahweh's good intention for his people, all Israel. Just as God used the delivered Joseph as a vehicle to save his other family members so the deity will use the restored Judah as an instrument to deliver Ephraim (see discussion of v. 13 below). This broader interest of the Joseph narrative (Gen 37:2–50:26) reminds the readers in Yehud of their

responsibility to their exilic brothers who are also the subject of Yahweh's good intention. The intertext urges the audience to believe that in the contingencies of history, the purposes of God are at work for the benefit of his people, including their dispersed brothers.

By evoking the Joseph tradition, the alluded text may provide some cues about the identity of the "prisoners." When the scattered exiles are called to return to Zion (Zech 9:12a), the northern tribes, usually designated as Ephraim, one of the sons of Joseph, might be particularly in mind. The fact that the return of the northerners is the centre of focus in the second half of Zech 10 may lend support to this argument. If so, then the intertextual reading may aim at summoning the Yehudites (1) to have pity on the plight of their northern brothers who were still in exile; (2) to avoid the rivalry of brothers which has caused the misery of Israel in the past; (3) to understand the decisive will of Yahweh in the restoration of all Israel; and (4) to respond positively to the redemptive drama inaugurated by the Lord (cf. Zech 9:13). In this light, the prophecy here envisions again the unity of the tribes which has been evoked repeatedly in Zech 9: (1) the inheritance of the restored land by the twelve tribes (vv. 1–8); and (2) a united nation under a Davidic vice-regent (vv. 9–10).

Why did Yahweh set the אַרְסָרָה free? Did they deserve the salvation of Yahweh? The text asserts that the אַרְסָרָה were liberated because of לְאִם כֹּל לְאִם (Zech 9:11a), emphasizing the allegiance of Yahweh towards his covenant. The blood of the covenant refers to the blood of the sacrifices with which the covenant was sealed. When

---

33 Cf. "Allusion to Ezek 47:13–20" in CHAPTER THREE.
34 Cf. CHAPTER FOUR. See also Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 426–27.
35 Apart from Zech 9:11a, the exact form לְאִם כֹּל לְאִם is also attested in Ezek 16:61 but there it is used with different sense.
did the ceremony occur? Mitchell claims that “the writer had in mind the original covenant between Yahweh and Abraham in Gn. 15:9–21.” Horst sees it as a reference to the continuous offerings in Jerusalem which were effective for the Jews of the Dispersion. However, the phrase נמְצָא שֲנֵי occurs elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible only in Exod 24:8. In view of this exclusive verbal parallel, we argue that the Zecharian text alludes to the covenant-making instance in the Sinai tradition with נמְצָא שֲנֵי as an intertextual pointer. Based on this, we register Exod 24:8 as an intertext of Zech 9:11a.

Exodus 24:8
So Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, “Behold the blood of the covenant (נְמָצָא שְנֵי), which the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words.

Allusion to Exod 24:8. Exodus 24:8 lies within the concluding chapter (Exod 24) of the Sinai narrative (Exod 19–24). The narrative opens with the theophany of Yahweh at Sinai (19:16–25) after the preparation of the Israelites (19:1–15). It continues with the granting of the Decalogue (20:1–21) and the Book of the Covenant (20:22–23:33), setting forth the principles guiding Israel’s relationship with the deity as well as with one another. The narrative then culminates at ch. 24 where Yahweh makes his covenant with his people.

The Sinai narrative (Exod 19–24) in its final form is a well-crafted unity, with the closing chapter echoing the opening one. Exodus 24 recounts the sealing of the covenant between the deity and the Israelites, an event which has been set in motion in ch. 19.

---

36 Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 278.
37 Horst, Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, 249.
38 A number of scholars have noted this allusion, e.g., Willi-Plein, Prophetic am Ende, 81–82; Larkin, Eschatology, 83; Rudolph, Sacharia 9–14, 186; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 419; Wenzel, Reading Zechariah, 216.
39 Durham, Exodus, 256–348.
Childs argues that “the repetition by the people of the same response (19.8 and 24.3, 7) marks the beginning and end of one great covenant event.” Sprinkle shares this view and sees these six chapters as a chiasmus, with Yahweh offering the covenant in ch. 19 and the people accepting the covenant in ch. 24. In view of this, Nicholson contends that the blood rite in Exod 24 fulfils what has been anticipated at the beginning of the narrative, that is, Israel became a people for the Lord—a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (19:3b–6).

Exodus 24 can be divided into three sections: (1) the covenant ritual (vv. 3–8); (2) the covenant meal (vv. 1–2, 9–11); and (3) the receipt of the stone tablets (vv. 12–18). Our intertext (Exod 24:8) is embedded within the first section (24:3–8), a unit focusing on the covenant-making ritual at Sinai. The covenant was made with all Israel, symbolized by the twelve pillars for the twelve tribes of Israel (v. 4). The assent of the people to the terms of the covenant in “one voice” (τὸ ἤματος) reinforces the sense of the unity of the tribes in the ceremony (v. 3). The formal entry into covenant with Yahweh includes the sprinkling of blood which has been drained from the slain sacrifices. The slaughter of the animals not only functions to provide blood for the ritual, but also serves

40 Childs, Exodus, 502–503.
41 See Sprinkle’s chiastic structure of Exod 19–24: A—Narrative, the Covenant offered (ch. 19); B—General regulations, the Decalogue (20:1–17); C—Narrative, people’s fear of God (20:18–21); B’—Specific regulations (20:22–23:33); A’—Narrative, the Covenant consummated (ch. 24); Sprinkle, Book of the Covenant, 27; cf. pp. 17–34.
44 The twelve pillars probably serve a dual purpose: (1) they may represent the twelve tribes of Israel as the second party to the covenant; (2) they may function as memorial stones to commemorate the occasion; Hilber, “Theology of Worship,” 181.
45 Hendel argues: “The coming together of the tribes is a precondition of the covenant with Yahweh...the sacrificial ceremony has a social as well as a sacramal function”; Hendel, “Sacrifice as a Cultural System,” 376–77.
to pre-enact the fate of the covenant violator (cf. Jer 34:12–22). Before the covenant was sealed, Moses took the book of the covenant (תֵּJacobן הרָכַב) and read it solemnly to the people who then swore: "all that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient" (24:7; cf. 19:8; 24:3). With Israel’s pledge of accepting the words of Yahweh, the blood ceremony completes the covenant by consecrating Yahweh’s people as God’s holy possession. The ratification of the covenant affirms the election of the Israelites (cf. 19:3b–8), who now enter into servitude to the Lord.

The covenant-making ritual (Exod 24:3–8) of the Sinai narrative is summoned as an analogy to nuance the liberation act of Yahweh in Zech 9:11. By recalling the ceremony in Sinai, the readers re-enact in their minds the drama leading up to the event establishing Israel as a holy people for Yahweh. On the one hand, the scene calls to mind how Yahweh delivered their forefathers from slavery in Egypt and created them as his holy possession (Exod 19:4). On the other hand, the scene also reminds the audience of the oath of obedience and the consequence of violating it. Despite the fact that Israel had failed to meet the demands of the Sinai tradition, Yahweh did not give up his holy possession. The allusion is summoned to stress the fidelity of the Lord to his people—Yahweh will set them free as he did in the first exodus (cf. Zech 9:11b). The intertextual reading emphasizes that the failure of Israel will not hinder the actualization of the divine restoration intended for his people. At the same time, the intertextual backdrop calls for a faithful response to Yahweh’s promised salvation.

---

46 Propp, Exodus 19–40, 308.
In Zech 9:12a, the oracle invites the liberated to return to Zion (cf. לֵשָׁנוֹת), the abode of the divine king. One of the motivations behind such a return is the promise of Yahweh—ַּכָּל גְּבָרָה מֶשֶׁת (Zech 9:12b). The word מֶשֶׁת is obscure and has given rise to different interpretations.⁵⁰ Petersen takes the connotation of “second” for the word, rendering the clause ַכָּל גְּבָרָה מֶשֶׁת as “I will return again to you.”⁵¹ Though מֶשֶׁת can be translated as second, an accusative “double” fits better with the hiphil of בֵּרָשׁ which is followed by the preposition ב and a suffixed pronoun, with the meaning of “to bring back, give back, restore, recompense” rather than “to return.”⁵² Boda relates מֶשֶׁת to the “practice of double blessing” reflected in “the custom of rewarding the firstborn of a family with a double inheritance.”⁵³ However, the typical language for such an expression is יִשְׂרֵאֵל (Deut 21:17; cf. 2 Kgs 2:9) rather than מֶשֶׁת.⁵⁴ Redditt links Yahweh’s promise ַכָּל גְּבָרָה מֶשֶׁת to the idea of doubling the population of Zion as reflected in Neh 11:1–2.⁵⁵ Though the size of population is a concern of Persian Yehud, such a concern is not reflected in Second Zechariah where Yahweh even cuts off two thirds of her population through a refining process (Zech 13:8–9). Based on the notion of the non-punitive nature of imprisonment, Meyers and Meyers argue that those in exile in the Persian period were innocent as they were not the earlier generations who had been sent into exile due to their sins. Therefore, the restoration to Zion should include “some recompense for the undeserved suffering involved in the condition of exile.”⁵⁶

---

⁵⁰ For the obscurity of מֶשֶׁת, see Tsevat, “Hebrew Slave,” 587–95.
⁵¹ Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 54.
⁵² HALOT, 1432–33; BDB, 998–99.
⁵³ Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 420.
⁵⁴ Arnold, Genesis, 376.
⁵⁵ Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 115–16.
⁵⁶ Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 145. Meyers and Meyers follow the conception of the nonpunitive nature of imprisonment suggested by Smith. Smith argues that prisons as a means of formal
the imagery of imprisonment does not connote a punitive dimension, it does not mean that all those being held in custody are not guilty after their cases have been adjudicated, e.g., the Sabbath-breaker in Num 15:32–36. In addition, the Zecharian oracle does not reflect any sense of compensation for the unjustified suffering of the exiles. Thus, we do not agree with their argument which suggests that מְדֻבָּד here confers a connotation of compensation due to indebtedness, a notion typically expressed as שָׁכַר (cf. Exod 22:6 [22:7], 8 [9]) in the Hebrew Bible. With the theme of liberation and the word מְדֻבָּד, a number of scholars argue that the Zecharian text alludes to Isa 61:1–7 where the qal passive participle of מְדֻבָּד also occurs in 61:1: “Instead of your shame, a double (והם), and instead of humiliation, they will shout for joy over their portion. Therefore they will possess a double (והם) in their land. Everlasting joy will be theirs” (Isa 61:7, translation mine).⁵⁷

Isaiah 61:1–7 is probably the voice of one of the “Servants of Yahweh,” who was commissioned to bring good news to various groups of the afflicted—to heal the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom (והם ... כָּל) to the captives and liberty to the prisoners (והם, v. 1; cf. והם of Zech 9:11b, 12a).⁵⁸ The expression והם is a technical term for the solemn proclamation of the seventh-year release to the Hebrew

punishment were not part of the judicial system of ancient Israel, although people could be held in custody until their cases were adjudicated (as Num 15:34; 1 Kgs 22:27). He claims that prisons “are never mentioned in the legal corpus of the Pentateuch, and... prisons as an institution are not even hinted at during the monarchical era... It is significant that most hero types of the exilic period—Joseph, Jehoiachin, Daniel, and the Servant—suffer imprisonment ‘innocently’ and are eventually delivered”; Smith, Religion of the Landless, 173, cf. 171–74; Petterson, Behold Your King, 144.


⁵⁸ For the discussion about the identity of the speaker and the delimitation of this pericope, see Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 56–66, 220–22.
slaves who had served their masters for six years. The masters have to set the fellow-slaves free and remit all their outstanding debts (Exod 21:2; Deut 15:12–18; Jer 34:8–22; cf. Lev 25:10). The “favourable year of the Lord” (יִשְׁלֹחֵן והָלָה, v. 2) most likely relates to this social institution. At the year of remission, all the present adverse situations will be reversed, turning mourning into exultation (v. 3). The restorers will rebuild the ancient ruins, raising up the former devastations (61:4). The relationship with the nations will be reversed, with foreigners functioning as servants for the Israelites (v. 5), whereas the restored are honoured as priests of the Lord (v. 6). The pericope ends with another reversal—a “double” possession (יִשְׁלֹחֵן) in their land instead of shame and humiliation (v. 7).

Scholars generally agree that the motif of יִשְׁלֹחֵן in Isa 61:7 alludes to the theme of double punishment in 40:2: “Speak kindly to Jerusalem; and call out to her, that her warfare has ended, that her iniquity has been removed, that she has received of the LORD’s hand double (יִשְׁלֹחֵן) for all her sins.” Isaiah 40:1–2 is a divine speech of comfort based on the covenant relationship between Israel and Yahweh (Isa 40:1). At the dawn of a new era, the deity summons the prophet to speak kindly to Jerusalem, telling

59 The expression יִשְׁלֹחֵן ... לְרָדָה occurs six times in the Hebrew Bible: Lev 25:10; Isa 61:1; Jer 34:8, 15, 17.

60 Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 56–66, 225; Childs, Isaiah, 505; Brueggemann, Isaiah 40–66, 214.


62 The motif of repaying double for the sin of the Israelites can be found in Isa 40:2 (יִשְׁלֹחֵן) and Jer 16:18 (יִשְׁלֹחֵן). Though the Jeremian text employs the exact word יִשְׁלֹחֵן, scholars generally argue that Third Isaiah echoes Second Isaiah: (1) the oracle opens with the words “the spirit of the Lord is upon him” (61:1) which is also used to describe the Servant in Second Isaiah (42:1); (2) the mission of liberation in 61:1 is similar to that of the Servant in 42:7; and (3) the word יִשְׁלֹחֵן in 61:2 functions as a catchword to bring the audience back to the beginning of Second Isaiah (40:1) where the theme of comfort is prominent (the word יִשְׁלֹחֵן appears 9 times in Second Isaiah: Isa 40:1, 24; 49:13; 51:3, 12, 19; 52:9; 54:11). Cf. Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 56–66, 226; Brueggemann, Isaiah 40–66, 216; Hanson, Isaiah 40–66, 225; Larkin, Eschatology, 81; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 47.
her that she had received a “double” (খণ্ডন) portion that atoned for all her sins. The focal point is that the debt has been fully repaid and settled. It may be that Isa 61:1–7 speaks of a deliberate reversal of an earlier “double” judgment in the Isaianic circle by a promise of “double” restoration. It seems that the incredible blessing in the Isa 61:1–7 is recalled to serve as a motivation, inducing the readers to respond:

Does Zech 9:12b allude to Isa 61:7, with the word יִשְׂמַע and the motif of liberation as linking points? Since the lexeme יִשְׂמַע is not a distinctive word and the theme of liberation is not rare in the Hebrew Bible, as discussed above, we have to examine closely the possible candidate in order to determine whether a genuine intertextual connection exists between the two texts or whether they just share a common theme. The noun יִשְׂמַע appears 35 times in the Hebrew Bible, basically with two types of meaning: (1) second; and (2) double. Within these 35 occurrences, 11 of them carry a connotation of double: Gen 43:12, 15; Exod 16:5, 22; Deut 15:18; Job 42:10; Isa 61:7x; Jer 16:18; 17:18; Zech 9:12. Among these 11 appearances, four of them are attested in the context of liberation: Deut 15:18; Isa 61:7x; Zech 9:12. Thus the possible intertext for the

---

63 The idea of receiving “double” for all its transgressions is ambiguous. Von Rad argues that the words יִשְׂמַע and יִשְׂמַע should not be viewed as “double,” but rather as “equivalent,” emphasizing that a claim is met correspondingly; von Rad, “טעם,” 80–82. Cf. Tsevat, “Hebrew Slave,” 587–95; Nelson, Deuteronomy, 190. Tai uses the “equivalent” interpretation for Isa 61:8: “For I, the Lord, love justice, I hate robbery in the burnt offering, and I will faithfully give them their recompense (קניא) and make an everlasting covenant with them”; see Tai, Prophete als Schriftauslegung, 64. For a contrasting view, see Christensen, Deuteronomy 1:1–21:9, 321. There are different interpretations of קניא, but all basically stress the idea that the debt is fully settled. See discussion in Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 52–53. Cf. Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40–55, 181.

64 The lexeme יִשְׂמַע appears 35 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 41:43; 43:12, 15; Exod 16:5, 22; Deut 15:18; 17:18; Josh 8:32; 1 Sam 8:2; 15:9; 17:13; 23:17; 2 Sam 3:3; 2 Kgs 22:14; 23:4; 25:18; 1 Chr 5:12; 15:18; 16:5; 2 Chr 28:7; 31:12; 34:22; 35:24; Ezra 1:10; Neh 11:9, 17; Esth 10:3; Job 42:10; Isa 61:7x; Jer 16:18; 17:18; 52:24; Zeph 1:10; Zech 9:12.

65 Among these 11 appearances, two are attested in the Joseph narrative (Gen 43:12, 15), two occur in the wilderness account (Exod 16:5, 22); four appear in the context of liberation (Deut 15:18; Isa 61:7x; Zech 9:12); one relates to restoration after suffering (Job 42:10); and two link to the idea of double
Zecharian text may be either Deut 15:18 or Isa 61:7. In terms of lexical connection, the characteristic language for liberation in the Isaianic text is לָמוּד, whereas that in the Deuteronomic text is the piel of תָּשָׁל which also occurs in Zech 9:11b to express its motif of liberation. The Isaianic text announces good news to various groups of the afflicted people, of which the prisoners (לֹא־אָדָם, qal participle of אָדָם) are just one group. Since the noun אָדָם in Zech 9:11b has served as an intertextual marker relating the Zecharian text to the Joseph narrative, the function of it as a linking point to the Isaianic text here is thus weakened.

For thematic connection, the Isaianic text embraces a message of reversal of fortune, with a double possession of the land (מַמָּשֶׁהָ יְרוּשָׁלַיִם) replacing the present humiliation of the people. The tie of תָּשָׁל to the land and its function in the reversal of fate are not explicit in the Zecharian text, though it may be implied. The Deuteronomic text focuses explicitly on the emancipation of slaves. Could the manumission of slaves also be a theme in Zech 9:11–12? The use of תָּשָׁל in piel and the allusion to Gen 37:24 suggest an affirmative answer to this question: (1) תָּשָׁל in piel appears 267 times in the Hebrew Bible, connoting a sense of setting free; among such uses of תָּשָׁל, most prominent are passages relating to the release of slaves, e.g., those in the narrative of the exodus (cf. Exod 5:1; 7:16, 26, 8:16) and in the accounts of freeing slaves (cf. Deut 15:12, 13\textsuperscript{202}, 18; Jer 34:9, 10\textsuperscript{202}, 11, 14\textsuperscript{202}, 16); and (2) The immediate context of Gen 37:24 narrates that Joseph was sold into Egypt as a slave in vv. 25–28. With this intertextual backdrop, the divine action of setting the prisoners free from the waterless pit (ב גָּפֶה) in Zech 9:11b most likely evokes an image of freeing the young Joseph punishment (Jer 16:18; 17:18).
from slavery. Based on the above, we suggest that Deut 15:18 has more impressive connections, both lexically and thematically, with the Zecharian text than the Isaianic one. Thus, we register Deut 15:18 as an intertext of Zech 9:12b, with חספ in piel and חספ as markers.66

Deuteronomy 15:18
It shall not seem hard to you when you set him free (חרם), for he has given you six years with double ( الثن) the service of a hired man; so the LORD your God will bless you in whatever you do.

Allusion to Deut 15:18. Deuteronomy 15:18 is embedded within a pericope (15:12–18) outlining the instructions for the manumission of the Hebrew slaves in the seventh year: (1) set the Hebrew slaves free after six years of servitude (v. 12–14); and (2) make provision for voluntary permanent servitude (v. 16–17). The command is based on two motivations, one looking to the past (v. 15) and one to the present (v. 18). In v. 15, the text appeals to the Israelites’ memory of enslavement in Egypt (v. 15), from which Yahweh has redeemed them. In v. 18, the noun חספ is introduced to induce the slave owner to observe the law—the master will lose nothing financially as the slave has given twice the service that a hired man would have performed for the same cost (15:18).67

Deuteronomy 15:18 is alluded to in order to nuance the liberation of Yahweh in the Zecharian text (9:11–12). By analogy, the release of the captives in the alluding text is an act of slave manumission. The restoration age is an era of remission, in which not only the enslaved will be released but also the outstanding debts will be forgiven, anticipating a reversal of fortune.

66 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 63–65.
However, when we compare the host text with the source one, we find that the antecedent is recalled but also revised in order to create a new tone. In the source, it is the human owner who sets the slaves free, whereas in the host, it is the deity who sets the captive free. In addition, the use of יִגְדֵּשׁ in both passages is also different. In the alluded text, יִגְדֵּשׁ is the benefit provided by the slave to the master in order to offset the debt. Without it, the liberation will not be possible. In the alluding text, יִגְדֵּשׁ is the gift promised by the Lord to the emancipated who will return to Zion. The יִגְדֵּשׁ which plays a pivotal role in the antecedent now becomes a divine present given to the liberated slave.

When Yahweh declares the emancipation of the prisoners in v. 11b, it implies that the Lord is the master as well as the liberator of the released. As the master, the deity has the authority to set his slaves free without requiring any compensation. As the liberator, the Lord could even promise to restore יִגְדֵּשׁ to the released. With this divine gift, the liberation is totally guaranteed since יִגְדֵּשׁ plays a pivotal role in the completion of the slave manumission, thus anticipating a new life ahead.68

Sons of Zion (Zech 9:13)

In Zech 9:13, the causal ה links this verse to the previous one, functioning as another motivation urging the released prisoners (v. 11b) to return to Zion (v. 12a). The poet describes Yahweh as a divine warrior, with four first-person verbs depicting a series of actions by the Lord—(1) יַעֲשֶׂה (v. 13aa); (2) יְנַשֶּׁר (v. 13af3); (3) יִשְׁפְּרֵר (v. 13b);

68 Tai, Prophétie als Schriftauslegung, 64–65.
(4) נָפָר (v. 13c). The verbal sketch concerns preparations for war, which belong to the future but which have already begun.⁶⁹

The preparation starts with נָפָר לֶא יְהוָה נֲפָר אֲשֵׁר מָלַא (Zech 9:13a). This clause appears awkward, particularly due to the absence of the word “arrow.” Some scholars try to make sense of it by adding words that are not in the Hebrew text: “I have bent Judah as my bow, I have made Ephraim its arrow.”⁷⁰ Meyers and Meyers contend that נֲפָר in v. 13a is a “pars pro toto for bow-and-arrow.”⁷¹ Comparing this verse to Akkadian literature, Paul argues that נֲפָר does double duty, serving as the object of נְפַר as well as of נָפָר: “For I have bent Judah, my bow; I have nocked Ephraim.”⁷² Paul’s argument is sensible, especially with נֲפָר occupying “a central, pivotal position” in the two lines (9:13aa and 9:13af).⁷³

However, the main interpretative challenge of Zech 9:13a lies with the verb נָפָר which is never used to depict an action of nocking the bow (cf. Ps 11:2). Apart from here, the נָפָר in piel appears in the Hebrew Bible in reference to archery only in 2 Kgs 9:24 where Jehu is the archer preparing his bow for shooting: נָפָר לְיָד יְהוּדָה אֲשֶׁר נְפַר וּלְיָד יְהוּדָה ("and Jehu filled his hand with the bow"). Jehu mounted his hand on the bow so that he could shoot Joram with the arrow. Thus, the bow is set as an instrument of war for Jehu since it is in his hand. If the נֲפָר in Zech 9:13a functions in both poetic lines, then it acts both as an accusative noun of נָפָר which does not need a preposition and an adverbial phrase of נָפָר which requires a prepositionב. Taking 2 Kgs 9:24 as a precedent for Zech 9:13af,

---

⁶⁹ Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 62.
⁷⁰ E.g., Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 296; Larkin, Eschatology, 77. Cf. NRS, NJB.
⁷¹ Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 146.
would mean that Ephraim is compared to the archer’s hand (עַל of 2 Kgs 9:24) on the
bow. If Judah is the bow (v. 13aa), then the tribe will be employed as an instrument of
war for Ephraim, who is identified as the hand of the archer, who is Yahweh in the
Zecharian text. In this view, Zech 9:13a may mean that Yahweh, the divine warrior, has
prepared Judah as a weapon which will fight for Ephraim.74

When read with Gen 37:24 as its intertextual backdrop, Zech 9:11–13 implies that
Ephraim, which stands for the northern kingdom, is the prisoner (יְנוּר) who has endured
the waterless pit (v. 11b). Yahweh expresses his concern for this specific group of
people, releasing them and exhorting them to return to Zion (v. 12a). The invitation is
based on two motivations: (1) the Lord is going to restore double to the inhabitants of
Zion (v. 12b); and (2) the deity intends to equip Judah, the returned tribe, as an
instrument of war for the deliverance of Ephraim, the exilic tribes (v. 13a). With these
nuances, vv. 11–13a conveys again a message which reveals the passion of Yahweh for
the return and unity of all Israel.75

In Zech 9:13b, a fully equipped Judah is designated as the sons of Zion, יְנוּר יִשְׂרָאֵל,
who are going to fight against the sons of Javan, יִשְׂרָאֵל. The designation יְנוּר יִשְׂרָאֵל is rare in
the Hebrew Bible, especially when compared with יְנוּר כֹּל.76 Apart from Zech 9:13b, the
phrase יְנוּר יִשְׂרָאֵל only appears in three other instances in the Hebrew Bible: Joel 2:23; Ps
149:2; and Lam 4:2. In Joel 2:23, the prophet announces the reversal of Yahweh’s curse
on the land. Because of this revival of fertility, the pastures grow green again; the fig
trees and vines yield fruit; the vats overflow with the new wine and oil; and there is

---

74 Boda, Zechariah, forthcoming.
75 See “Allusion to Gen 37:24” above.
76 See “The Identity of the Coming King” and footnotes thereto in CHAPTER FOUR.
adequate rain once more (vv. 23–24). The sons of Zion ( Throne) are exhorted to rejoice for these abundant blessings in the Lord. In Ps 149:2, the psalmist exhorts the sons of Zion ( Throne) to rejoice because Yahweh beautifies them, the afflicted, with salvation (149:4). Similar to Joel, the turn of fortunes is the reason to sing with joy to the deity.\textsuperscript{77}

In Lam 4:2, the epithet \textit{ כנ} is used to represent the glorious past of the inhabitants as a vivid contrast against the designation \textit{ כנ} (4:22) which stands for the gloomy present of the city. The verse associates \textit{ כנ} (the past) with fine gold, whereas \textit{ כנ} (the present) with earthen jars. The downfall of Zion is due to the fierce anger of Yahweh (4:11) poured out upon the sinful daughter (4:6). From the above analysis, we notice that the epithet \textit{ כנ} is generally used in a positive sense, denoting a people blessed by the deity. The well-being of Zion is connected with the restoration of Yahweh.

The use of \textit{ כנ} in Zech 9:13b for Judah not only contrasts with \textit{ כנ} in Zech 9:9a, but also reminds the readers how their fortunes have been reversed by the Lord.

The battle between \textit{ כנ} and \textit{ כנ} is prompted (Temple) by Yahweh who has equipped Zion to participate in the war (Zech 9:13b). What is the intention of the Lord initiating this fight? The phrase \textit{ כנ} is problematic as it seems to destroy the symmetry of the couplet. Some scholars suggest that it is a gloss and should be deleted, though without any textual support.\textsuperscript{78} Others view the word \textit{ כנ} as explicit evidence supporting the origin of Second Zechariah in the Greek period, claiming that the Greeks were the imperial power ruling over the Jews at the time of composition.\textsuperscript{79} However, the mention

\textsuperscript{77} Psalm 149 is generally regarded as a post-exilic work. It is usually deemed as one of the appendixes to the final collection of the Psalter with some conscious balancing with Ps 2; however, it does not mean that it was not composed in a time earlier than its collection; Gerstenberger, \textit{Psalms, Part 2}, 456.

\textsuperscript{78} E.g., Hanson, \textit{Dawn of Apocalyptic}, 289; Mitchell, et al., \textit{Zechariah}, 279, 284. Cf. BHS.

\textsuperscript{79} See “Date of Composition” in \textit{CHAPTER TWO}. 
of "here does not necessarily require a date after Alexander as this word has already appeared in earlier texts, e.g., Ezek 27:13; Gen 10:2, 4. Those who argue for the Persian date of the corpus contend that the mention of Greece as the enemy is quite appropriate as the Greeks and the Persians were locked in a historic struggle for control of the eastern Mediterranean and the Levantine land mass in the mid-fifth century B.C. If so, we would question why only the Greeks were presented as an object of judgment and not the Persians who were the actual overlord dominating the people of Yehud.

Moseman asserts that “the ancient Israelites would more likely have perceived them [the Greeks] as potential liberators.” Curtis argues that “the sons of Yavan represent the powers of evil, whom Yahweh will defeat on the great eschatological day.” However, evidence of this evil image of is neither found in any biblical text nor in any historical account of Greece during the Persian period. Among its 11 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, is never an object of rebuke. Even in Joel 4:4–7 [3:4–7], it is the Phoenicians and the Philistines being condemned rather than who bought the Israelites as slaves.

In fact, the Hebrew Bible provides no particular reason for to be the target of Yahweh’s wrath.

Why are singed out as the object of judgment in Zech 9:13b? Since Second Zechariah is notable for its re-use of earlier materials, we suggest examining its use in earlier traditions. Most likely, the obscure is employed here in order to alert the audience to the intertextual dimension at play. In the Hebrew Bible, the term occurs

---

81 Moseman, “Interpreting the Dissonance and Unity,” 156.
82 Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 181, cf. 173–81.
83 The 11 occurrences of are: Gen 10:2, 4/1 Chr 1:5, 7; Isa 66:19; Ezek 27:13, 19; Dan 8:21; 10:20; 11:2; Zech 9:13.
only in the table of nations (Gen 10:4//1 Chr 1:7). Also, the hypothetical form לְיַעַר in Joel 4:6 [3:6] is rendered as Greek, a verse portraying the slave trade of גַּם יִשְׂרָאֵל. 85

Genesis 10:4–5
4 The sons of Javan (גָּנְבִּים) were Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim.
5 From these the coastlands of the nations (אֲרֵסֵי) were separated into their lands, every one according to his language, according to their families, into their nations.

6 and sold the sons of Judah and Jerusalem (גָּזֹז) to the Greeks (גַּם יִשְׂרָאֵל) in order to remove them far from their territory;
7 behold, I am going to arouse (זֶרֶקְטָן; cf. Zech 9:13b) them from the place where you have sold them, and return your recompense on your head.

In Genesis, גָּנְבִּים are described as the ancestor of the “coastlands of the nations” (גָּנְבִּים, 10:5). The descendant of גָּנְבִּים becomes symbolically one of the places representing those far distant coastlands (אֲרֵסֵי) in which their people have neither heard Yahweh’s fame nor seen his glory (Isa 66:19). In Joel, the Phoenicians and the Philistines are accused of having sold the Judeans as slaves to the Greeks (גַּם יִשְׂרָאֵל), in a place far away from their own country (Joel 4:6 [3:6]; cf. Ezek 27:13). As punishment, Yahweh will arouse (זֶרֶקְטָן) the Jewish slaves (גָּזֹז) and turn the tables on their sellers (4:7 [3:7]). These texts project an image of גָּנְבִּים as those who are far away from the restored homeland, Zion, and in these far off coastlands, some Judeans were enslaved just like prisoners.

Would there have been any specific intertext in mind when the poet evoked this tradition? We suggest Joel 4:6–7 [3:6–7] as it demonstrates an impressive verbal parallel

85 HALOT, 403; Gesenius and Tregelles, Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, 342–43.
86 Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 248.

Allusion to Joel 4:6–7 [3:6–7]. The book of Joel is a relatively well organized prophetic work, with a logical progression from woe to weal: (1) divine judgment against Judah and her response (1:1–2:17); (2) divine restoration for Judah and the outpouring of the spirit (2:18–3:5 [2:18–32]); and (3) divine judgment against Israel’s enemies (4:1–21 [3:1–21]).

Our intertext lies within the first part (vv. 1–8) of the third section (4:1–21 [3:1–21]) where specific nations are judged for their offense committed during the deportation(s) of Yahweh’s people, Israel (vv. 2b–3): (1) the exile of the Israelites (גּוֹז, “scatter,” cf. Jer 50:17); (2) the capture of Israel’s land; and (3) the sale of the captured as slaves (כָּמִית, “cast lots,” cf. Nah 3:10; Obad 1:11).\textsuperscript{87} Verses 4–8, which are linked to vv. 1–3 by כ, concern particularly the war crimes of the Phoenicians and the Philistines: (1) the plunder of the Jerusalem temple (v. 5; cf. 2 Kgs 24:13; 25:13–15; Jer 52:17–19); and (2) the sale of the captured Judeans as slaves to the Greeks (v. 6; cf. Ezek 27:13; Amos 1:6, 9). Yahweh will bring his exiled people back (v. 7) and sell the slave-traders as slaves (v. 8).\textsuperscript{88}

The poet recalls the Joel text in order to assimilate the image of כְּּיָּבָר from the antecedent text to nuance the battle between כְּּיָּבָר and כְּּיָּבָר. In Joel, כְּּיָּבָר are not the ones rebuked by Yahweh but the ones keeping the Jewish slaves far from their land. Most likely, the focus of the connection is on the slave-captives who have not yet

\textsuperscript{87} The clause כְּּיָּבָר appears 3 times in the Hebrew Bible: Joel 4:3; Obad 1:11; Nah 3:10.

\textsuperscript{88} The analysis of Joel above draws on the works of Stuart, Hosea-Jonah, 262–71; Crenshaw, Joel, 172–86; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets I, 176–80, unless noted otherwise.
returned to Zion where Yahweh inaugurates his restoration program (Zech 9:8). The high expectation about the return of the dispersed exiles to the city supports this suggestion (cf. Zech 9:12). The restored נֶעָרִים are used to accomplish this divine purpose.

However, there are some differences between the source text and the host text. In the source text, Yahweh arouses the Jewish slaves in Greece to punish the slave-sellers who caused the captivity of the Judeans, whereas in the host, the Lord arouses נֶעָרִים in Yehud to fight against the Greeks who hold the captives away from their homeland. The divine agent shifts from the Jewish slaves in the earlier text to נֶעָרִים in the later one. This might explain the motive behind v. 13a where Judah, the returned, is prepared as an instrument of war for Ephraim, the exiles. The object of divine wrath also changes from the slave-sellers in the old text to the Greeks in the new one. The missions in both texts are also altered, from punishing the slave-sellers in the alluded text to delivering the slave-captives in the alluding text. With these intertextual insights, the goal of the battle with נֶעָרִים is clear. On the one hand, Yahweh aims to prepare the restored נֶעָרִים as his instrument of war for their exilic brothers. On the other hand, by subduing נֶעָרִים, נֶעָרִים could set the slave-captives free so that the released slaves may act as agents of punishment against the slave-sellers (cf. Joel 4:7 [3:7]). In this way, both the נֶעָרִים and the released slaves could serve as agents of Yahweh though with different missions. Finally, both the slave-sellers and slave-buyer will be punished for their crimes, as Yahweh’s justice is dispensed in the coastlands (סִלָּה; cf. Isa 42:4; see below: “Allusion to Isa 49:2”).

In Zech 9:13, the preparation of Judah as an instrument of war includes bending her as a bow (שָׁמַר...רֶם; v. 13a) and setting her as a sword (מַעֲשֵׂר...סִי; v. 13c). The
imagery of bending a bow by Yahweh is not uncommon in the Hebrew Bible: Ps 7:13 [7:12]; Lam 2:4; 3:12; Zech 9:13a, however, the picture of setting someone as a sword by the deity is rare. Apart from Zech 9:13c, it occurs only in Isa 49:2 where the Servant of Yahweh is made figuratively as the powerful sword of the Lord. Based on the exclusive lexical parallel (שָׁלַל, נָעָר) and striking thematic correspondence, we register Isa 49:2 as an intertext of Zech 9:13c.

Isaiah 49:2
He has made (שָׁלַל) My mouth like a sharp sword (כָּפָר),
In the shadow of His hand He has concealed Me;
And He has also made Me a select arrow (כְּפָר, cf. 앞 of 9:14b),
He has hidden Me in His quiver.

Allusion to Isa 49:2. Isaiah 49:2 is embedded within a Servant Song (49:1–6), narrating the commission of the Servant of Yahweh. The Song begins with a court speech (cf. 41:1), summoning the islands (שָׁם; cf. Gen 10:5) and the peoples afar (פָּרָה; cf. 앞 of Isa 66:19) to pay attention to the testimony of the Servant who was called from the womb by the Lord (49:1). The Servant is identified as Israel, in whom Yahweh will display his glory (49:3). The mission of the Servant is to raise up...
the tribes of Jacob and to bring salvation to the ends of the earth (49:5–6). Though the Servant may sometimes feel discouraged, he relies firmly on Yahweh for his vindication and reward (49:4). Because of the labor of the Servant, islands and peoples afar can hear the word of Yahweh (49:1).

In order to achieve this mission, Yahweh has prepared his Servant as weapons by setting his mouth as a sharp sword, ready to be drawn, and making him into a polished arrow, ready to be shot (49:2a, c).96 Yahweh, the divine warrior, has laid his hand on his weapons, using them to accomplish his will.97

The confrontational nature of the assigned task not only makes the Servant feel distressed (Isa 49:4; cf. 50:6), but also makes the protection of the Lord a must (49:2b, d). The word “shadow” (ךָּז) usually carries a positive nuance, connoting protection rather than danger of darkness (49:2b; cf. Isa 4:6; 25:4, 5; 34:15). Yahweh protects his Servant by hiding (ןָּח, נָּחַר) him away from danger (49:2b, d; cf. Josh 6:17; 1 Kgs 18:4; 2 Kgs 6:29).98

---

96 The word “mouth” (וג) could be a weapon: “He will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth (וג), and with the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked” (Isa 11:4; cf. Ps 57:5 [57:4]; Prov 5:3–4).

97 Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 307. The military image of the Servant in Isa 49 seems to be inconsistent with the peaceful impression of the figure in Isa 42:1–4: “A bruised reed he will not break and a dimly burning wick he will not extinguish; he will faithfully bring forth justice” (v. 3). However, Boda reminds us that the character of the Servant is “progressively revealed” throughout Second Isaiah where the Servant is expected to dispense justice with compassion in Isa 42 as well as to release the “exilic Israel from bondage in the land of their captivity” as stated in 49:6: “to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved ones of Israel.” This “hope-for release” (49:6; cf. 52:11–12) is preceded by the military victory of Yahweh announced in 52:7–10 where the good news of “Your God reigns!” and “He has redeemed Jerusalem!” are backed up by the divine triumph in battle: “The Lord has bared his holy arm in the sight of all the nations” (v. 10). The military language, which continues to appear in the depiction of the suffering Servant: “He will be high and lifted up and greatly exalted” (52:13) and “He will divide the booty with the strong” (53:12), is not a surprise as the Servant “has been included all along the way as integral to this redemption and salvation” by being as Yahweh’s instrument of war (49:2); Boda, “Walking in the Light of Yahweh,” 72–73.

In both texts, Yahweh’s people (שֶׁפֶרְאָה/ the Servant=Israel) are equipped as weapons (bow/sword, Zech 9:13a, c; sword/arrow, Isa 49:2a, c) of Yahweh in order to carry out the task assigned by the Lord (Zech 9:13a–b; Isa 49:5–6). Besides divine preparation, divine protection is also a theme in both passages (Zech 9:15a; Isa 49:2b, d). The military nature of the mission appears in both pericopes where Yahweh as the divine warrior subdues the enemy with his weapons (Zech 9:13b; Isa 49:2). However, the purpose of the military activity which is not clear in the Zecharian text is explicit in the Isaianic one. The triumph of Yahweh aims at releasing exilic Israel from bondage as well as bringing forth witnesses to the nations, even to those לא爿דז cuent y איסר (Issa 49:6; cf. 49:1). Hence, by recalling Isa 49:2, the antecedent adds an additional nuance to the obscure battle between שֶׁפֶרְאָה and קָרָב, illuminating the motivation behind the divine action of prompting the fight (Zech 9:13b).

Reading Zech 9:13 together with its intertexts (Joel 4:6–7 [3:6–7]; Isa 49:2), the goal of the battle with שֶׁפֶרְאָה in the host text is clear. The war serves dual purposes: (1) By subduing קָרָב, the renewed שֶׁפֶרְאָה could set the slave-captives free, even at a far distance (cf. Joel 4:7 [3:7]; Isa 49:6); and (2) By using the restored קָרָב as an instrument, the redemptive might of Yahweh will be witnessed to the people far away who do not know the Lord (Issa 49:6; cf. Issa 66:19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The War of Liberation (Zech 9:14–16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation of Zechariah 9:14–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a Then the Lord will appear over them,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b and his arrow will go forth as lightning;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*99 We see the relationship between קָרָב and קָרָב as appositional rather than genitive.
14c then the Lord God will blow the horn,  
14d and march forth in the whirlwinds of the south.  
15a The Lord of hosts will defend them,  
15b so that they will eat and will subdue stones of a sling,  
15c then they will drink, will roar as wine,  
15d then they will be filled like the bowl, as [the ones at] the corners of the altar.  
16a Then the Lord their God will deliver them, in that day, as a flock, his people,99  
16b so that stones of a crown shine upon his land.

Zechariah 9:14–16 shifts to a prophetic announcement, speaking of Yahweh in the third person. These verses recount the theophany of Yahweh who appears to defend and deliver victoriously an unspecified third person plural “them” (9:14a, 15a, 16a). Though the shift to the third person account of Yahweh signifies the beginning of another subunit, the present oracle is still bound to the preceding one by the linking image of the weapons of Yahweh, with יָד in 9:14b joining nicely to יָד in 9:13a. With this connection, the unspecified third person plural “them” in 9:14a, 9:15a, and 9:16a must refer back to the sons of Zion who are aroused to fight against the sons of Javan (9:13b).100 Hence, the present pericope depicts the battle between מִלְחָמָה (9:14b) and מִלְחָמָה (9:13b) which has been announced by Yahweh in v. 13.

The language in Zech 9:14 is drawn from traditional formulations of the appearance and activity of the divine warrior, which was known throughout the ancient Near East and prevalent in Israelite literature (cf. Exod 19:16–19; Deut 33:2; Judg 5:4; 2

100 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 421.
The divine warrior imagery in v. 14 brings the readers back to the Yahweh war setting in 9:1–8. However, there is one difference between the two texts—the participation of the community. Unlike the earlier text, God’s people in 9:14–16 play a role in the battle, even though it is a minor one (see below).

The poet begins with נַעֲרָה הַיָּהָウェֹה (Zech 9:14a), drawing on the language of theophany to convey the idea of Yahweh’s presence. The divine intervention is crucial to the triumph of the restored community. By adopting various theophanic images, the Lord’s march is represented as an approaching storm in which lightning is seen as God’s arrows and thunder as his trumpet. One unusual element is employed to describe this theophany—םָתִית נַעֲרָה הַיָּהָウェֹה (9:14c). Though the trumpet-thunder simile is common in the theophanic passages (cf. Exod 19:16, 19; 20:18), there is no other instance in the Hebrew Bible where Yahweh sounds the נַעֲרָה. A נַעֲרָה is different from a נָשַׁב (trumpet, cf. Num 10:2–10) though sometimes they are used together as a parallel (cf. Hos 5:8).

The instrument נַעֲרָה is mentioned constantly in the earlier literature, mostly in

---

101 The theme of the divine warrior may be traced back to mythological roots. In the Baal cycle, the Ugaritic people portrayed their god Baal as a warrior who battled Yamm in order to establish his kingship and receive a sanctuary on Zaphon. The result of these victories was renewed fertility in the land. A similar story is also told in Mesopotamia, depicting Marduk’s war against Tiamat. Cf. Schellenberg, “One in the Bond of War,” 101–15; Cross, “Song of the Sea,” 1–25; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 299–315, 322; Kang, Divine War; Lind, Yahweh is a Warrior; Longman, “Psalm 98,” 267–74; Longman and Reid, God Is a Warrior; Miller, Divine Warrior.

102 There are 72 occurrences of נַעֲרָה in the Hebrew Bible: Exod 19:16, 19; 20:18; Lev 25:9; Josh 6:4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 16, 20; Judg 3:27, 6:34; 7:8, 16, 18, 20; 1 Sam 13:3, 15, 18; 18:16, 20:1, 22; 2 Kings 9:13; 1 Chr 15:28, 15:14; Neh 4:12, 14; Job 39:24, 25; Ps 47:6; 81:4; 98:6; 150:3; Isa 18:3; 27:13; 58:1; Jer 4:5, 19, 21, 6:1, 17; 42:14; 51:27; Ezek 33:3, 4, 5, 6; Hos 5:8; 8:1; Joel 2:1, 15; Amos 2:2, 3:6; Zeph 1:16; Zech 9:14.

The clause נַעֲרָה נַעֲרָה appears 36 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 6:4, 8, 9, 13, 16, 20; Judg 3:27, 6:34; 7:18, 19, 20, 22; 1 Sam 13:3; 2 Sam 2:28; 18:16, 20:1, 22; 1 Kings 13:4, 19; 2 Kings 9:13; Neh 4:12; Ps 81:4; Isa 18:3; Jer 4:5; 6:1; 51:27; Ezek 33:3, 6; Hos 5:8; Joel 2:1; Zech 9:14. The greatest concentration of the clause נַעֲרָה נַעֲרָה occurs in the Jericho narrative (Josh 6) and the Gideon story (Judg
military contexts. When used together with הַר, it functions either as an instrument for calling a military group to arms (cf. Judg 3:27; 6:34) or for signalling troops during battles (cf. 2 Sam 2:28; 18:16). The use of נָעַרְנָה here denotes that the restored community is summoned to fight together with the divine warrior, though without sophisticated weapons (cf. Zech 9:10a–b). They are drawn into the battle, not only as passive weaponry but also as an active army under the command of their Lord, the divine warrior.

Protected (יהוי) by Yahweh (Zech 9:15a), the sons of Zion will subdue sling stones (Zech 9:15b). Although the imagery of Yahweh’s protection of his people is common in the Hebrew Bible, the lexical choice here is special. Apart from the Zecharian texts (9:15; 12:8), the root נ is only found 6 times elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, all with Yahweh as subject and Jerusalem as object, depicting God’s protection of the holy city. Because of this close relationship between נ and Jerusalem, Meyers and Meyers argue that the masculine plural נְבִיאָה in 9:14a and 9:15a “probably… goes all the way back to verse 1,” referring to נבִיאָה (נְבִיאָה: מִפָּה), with Jerusalem representing all Israel. We agree with Meyers and Meyers that the connection to the tradition of divine protection of Zion is clear here, nevertheless, we are hesitant to accept their proposal of having the construct נְבִיאָה as the antecedent of נבִיאָה, as they are too far apart with numerous other possibilities in between. Besides recalling the notion of divine protection of Zion, it is important to ask whether there was any specific text in mind when the poet evoked

6–7), both in a Yahweh war setting.

103 HALOT, 1448; BDB, 348, 1051.
105 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 152.
this motif. Apart from Zech 9:15; 12:8, the root נל appears 6 other times in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Kgs 19:34//Isa 37:35; 2 Kgs 20:6//Isa 38:6; Isa 31:5. The passages in 2 Kings and its parallels are divine oracles, with the root נל inflected in the same form—יי, whereas Isa 31:5 is a prophetic comment, same as Zech 9:15a, with נל inflected as נל and נל. Besides having the same verbal form (נל), Isa 31:5 also shares a subject with the same form as that in the Zecharian text—יי יי הוהי. Thus, Isa 31:5 demonstrates a closer lexical similarity with Zech 9:15a, with נל יי הוהי in the former and נל יי הוהי in the latter. Based on this lexical parallel, we register Isa 31:5 as an intertext of Zech 9:15a.

Isaiah 31:5
Like flying birds so the LORD of hosts will protect Jerusalem. He will protect and deliver it; He will pass over and rescue it.

Allusion to Isa 31:5. Isaiah 31:5 is part of a woe oracle (31:1–9), with the Assyrians attacking Hezekiah and Jerusalem during the period 705–701 as its historical background. The pericope opens with a rebuke, criticizing those who are inclined to depend on Egypt to gain independence from Assyria: “Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses, and trust in chariots” (31:1a). The political leaders prefer dependence on human alliances to dependence on God. In this critical moment of threat, the prophet stresses the assurance of divine protection, reminding the people to

---

106 The construct נל יי הוהי is not common in the first oracle of Second Zechariah. It appears only in Zech 9:15 and 10:3.
107 Based on the similarity, Nurmeila concludes that “there are thus sure allusions to Is 31,5 in Ze 9,15 and 12,8.” Also see his work which offers a detailed analysis of the similarities between Isa 31:5 and Zech 9:15a; Nurmeila, Prophets in Dialogue, 110–13. Cf. Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 57.
108 Isaiah 31:1–9 is an obscure text, however, most commentators favor the period 705–701 as its historical background, relating the text to the miraculous delivery of Hezekiah and Jerusalem, which is the same backdrop for the other possible intertexts: 2 Kgs 19:34//Isa 37:35; 2 Kgs 20:6//Isa 38:6; Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1–39, 411; Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 407.
trust the Lord and to seek him in times of distress (31:5). The pericope culminates in vv. 8–9, announcing the fall of Assyria: “And the Assyrian will fall by a sword not of man, and a sword not of man [human] will devour him. So he will not escape the sword, and his young men will become forced laborers” (v. 8).109

The appropriation of יַשְׁלַךְ in Zech 9:15a is due to the obvious significance of the verb in the biblical tradition, particularly in Isa 31:1–9 whose historical backdrop informs us that Yahweh has kept his promise by delivering Jerusalem miraculously from the Assyrian threat. By recalling Isa 31:5, the prophet restates and reapplys the message of the source, prompting the readers to rely on the Lord in carrying out the mission of the deity. The יַשְׁלַךְ can win the battle only if they have confidence in Yahweh.

With the defense of Yahweh, Zech 9:15b envisions a picture of military victory. However, the clause יִשָּׂרֶץ אַבְרָהָם מִשְׁלָנָה is obscure and has been challenging for scholars. The reason is that יִשָּׂרֶץ appears 14 times in the Hebrew Bible, mainly with humans as its object (cf. Jer 34:16).110 Some scholars accept the proposed emendation יִשָּׂרֶץ מִשְׁלָה, i.e., “sons of the sling,” or simply assume that “sling stones” is a synecdoche for “slingers of the stones.”111 However, in all other occurrences of יִשָּׂרֶץ, the phrase refers to weaponry, whereas the noun “slingers” does not appear elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.112 In view of this, Meyers and Meyers suggest that יִשָּׂרֶץ here, “as part of

110 The root יִשָּׂרֶץ appears 14 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 1:28; Num 32:22, 29; Josh 18:1; 2 Sam 8:11; 1 Chr 22:18; 2 Chr 28:10; Neh 5:5; Esth 7:8; Jer 34:11, 16; Mic 7:19; Zech 9:15. A few usages are attested with the land as the object of the verb (cf. Josh 18:1; 1 Chr 22:18), referring to the subjection of the inhabitants of the land.
111 E.g., Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 667; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 65; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 117. Cf. NRS; BHS.
112 Apart from Zech 9:15b, this phrase only appears in Job 41:20 [41:28] (יִשָּׂרֶץ) and 2 Chr 26:14 (יִשָּׂרֶץ).
Yahweh’s weaponry [cf. יִשְׂרָאֵל of 9:13a; יִשְׂרָאֵל of 9:13c], must surely also be equated with Zion.” Thus Yahweh uses Zion (i.e., sling stones) to subdue the enemies. However, the subject of צִיבִי and צִיבִי is the restored people rather than the deity himself. Among the 14 usages of צִיבִי, there is one exception in Mic 7:19 where an inanimate object is attested, apart from Zech 9:15b. In the Micah text, Yahweh will tread the iniquities (הָיוֹת וּמִשְׁתָּחֲתוֹ) which are presented as a personified enemy of the Lord. This personification may be applied to צִיבִי in the Zecharian text. The representation means that the “stones of a sling” (אָבִּיַּגְוָה) in v. 15b is parallel to the “stones of a crown” (אָבִּיַּגְוָה) in v. 16b (see discussion below).

In Zech 9:15c–d, the text portrays a celebration of triumph in battle through images drawn from drinking and sacrifice. However, the Hebrew text of this verse presents a lot of interpretative difficulties. As Mason states, “so many interpretations of v. 15 have been offered that it is difficult to be confident of any of them.” In order to solve the problems, we need to investigate the meanings of the following metaphors which have been used to describe the restored people after gaining victory in battle:

(1) יְסַלָּה כְּמֹקַם קְנֵי הָיוֹת כְּמוֹ בֵּית (1)

The verb יָכֶם in Zech 9:15c is problematic when read in context, particularly without יְכָּה and has evoked a number of suggestions. Some scholars, based on a few

114 Meyers and Meyers argue that “sling stones” (אָבִּיַּגְוָה) and “gemstones of a crown” (אָבִּיַּגְוָה) constitute a double use of “stones,” functioning as a wordplay on “sons” which appears twice in 9:13b and on “daughters” which occurs twice in 9:9a; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 154.
115 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 422.
116 Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 57. The discussion about the confusion in the ancient versions over Zech 9:15 can be found in Jansma’s work; Jansma, Inquiry, 76–78.
battle-scene passages (e.g., Ezek 39:17–20; Jer 46:10), emend שַׁלַּח to שַׁלְחָנִי, contending that the revised clause “then they will drink blood as wine” represents a bloody-banquet after triumph of war. However, the subjects in these battle-scene texts are never God’s people, rather birds and beasts in Ezek 39 and the sword in Jer 46, with the focus on the severity of the fight. Dissatisfied with the bloody-banquet interpretation, Petersen appeals to the same rationale but with a different claim. He argues that “the imagery is not that of a banquet... but of devouring sword... The sword-people [Zion] will drink the blood of the stone slingers [Yawan] as if it were wine, that is, in copious amounts.”

Then, according to Petersen, the ritual-similes in the final two lines of v. 15 are used to describe “the vast amounts of blood that will be spilled” from the slain מַכָּה.

However, without resort to emendation, we may perceive that שָׁמַע is used to depict the noise of the drunken revelers (cf. Prov 20:1). The phrase מַכָּה מְדֻבָּכִים which modifies the verb שָׁמַע is not attested elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, apart from Zech 10:7 where the heart of Ephraim will be glad as wine (כַּלַּח). Thus, Zech 9:15c may portray that, after gaining victory (9:15b), the restored community celebrates with heavy drinking and joyful roaring in a cultic-related context.

In Zech 9:15d, the oracle continues to describe the restored community which will be filled מְכוֹנָה מְדוֹחָה מְדֻבָּק. The similes מְדוֹחָה and מְדוֹחָה together with the word מְכֹנָה seem to be drawn from the world of ritual activity relating to sacrifice. Hence, some scholars suggest that the cultic imagery might refer to the basins as receptacles for blood gathered

---

119 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 65.
120 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 65.
121 Cf. Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 422; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 667; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 154–55; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 117.
from sacrifices to be sprinkled on the "corners" of the outer altar (cf. Exod 24:6; 27:2; 38:2). Hanson, based on the Ugaritic Baal myth, contends that v. 15 represents "a bloody sacrifice-banquet." He claims:

We are dealing with a rite de passage, where the victory alone does not restore the fertility of the earth; necessary in addition is a bloody sacrifice of the enemy's warriors, whereby the shedding of their blood has the effect of releasing the earth's fertility which had been suppressed during the enemy's reign. However, we find no evidence in the Hebrew Bible for such a biblical rite as argued by Hanson. Even in his analysis of the so-called "divine warrior hymns," Hanson cannot provide any support of the element of sacrifice-banquet in the Hebrew Bible.

Schellenberg modifies Hanson's thesis by stating that "the masoretic celebration seems more in keeping with biblical victory feasts (Isa 25:6)." The problem with Schellenberg's suggestion is that the nature of the banquet in the Isaianic text is quite different from that of the Zecharian one: it is not a sacrifice-banquet celebrating the victory of God's people in a Yahweh war setting, but rather a banquet for all the nations held by the Lord on Mt. Zion (Isa 25:6–8) after Yahweh's judgment of the entire earth (Isa 24:1) and his establishment of a new world order (Isa 24–27), representing the blessings of the deity on all people. Thus the celebration in the Zecharian text after

---

122 E.g., Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 280; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 667; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 422; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 322.
123 Hanson traces and analyzes the pattern of the divine warrior hymns in the Hebrew Bible, including, Exod 15; Song of Deborah (Judg 5); Pss 2; 9; 24; 29; 46; 47; 48; 65; 68; 76; 77; 89; 97; 98; 104; 106; 110; Isa 11:1–9, and concludes with a table (p. 308) indicating that, in contrast to the Ugaritic Baal cycle and the Enûma elîš, the element of "Banquet" is absent in the biblical material. Then he uses Isa 34:5–7 and Isa 25:6–8 to support his argument of the existence of the sacrifice-banquet (p. 313); Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 300–313. However, Isa 34:5–7 focuses on the image of Yahweh's sword drenched in blood, denoting the thoroughgoing destruction of Edom. Nothing is said about a sacrificial meal that was meant to be a joyful occasion. Cf. Seitz, Isaiah 1–39, 236–27; Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 437–39; Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1–39, 452. For Isa 25:6–8, see the discussion on Schellenberg's argument below.
124 Schellenberg, "One in the Bond of War," 108.
125 Seitz, Isaiah 1–39, 185–92; Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 311–24, 334;
the victory of the people is not part of this kind of banquet. Rather it is composed to deliver another message.

Before we proceed, we have to examine the Hebrew text (כְּפַרְמִים כַּפְּרָמִים) in more detail. The construction of the clause with כְּפַרְמִים following אֲשֶׁר is clumsy and some scholars tend to delete either כְּפַרְמִים or אֲשֶׁר from the “overloaded” phrase. However, emendation is not necessary as the awkward structure may be designed to alert the audience to the intertextual dimension at play. The noun כְּפַרְמִים most likely is a “late equivalent” or “a loan-word from Aramaic” of כְּפַרְמִים. Thus, כְּפַרְמִים may refer to the four corners of the bronze altar (Exod 27:1–2). Then the clause כְּפַרְמִים כַּפְּרָמִים may be translated as “like the bowl, as [the ones at] the corners of the altar.” Now, the interpretative problem lies with the singular, specific כְּפַרְמִים, particularly when it is used in a cultic-related context.

The triumphant community “will be filled like the bowl” (כְּפַרְמִים כְּפַרְמִים; Zech 9:15dz). The word כְּפַרְמִים appears 32 times in the Hebrew Bible, mostly in plural form and referring to the bronze basins before the outer altar (cf. Exod 27:3; 38:3; Num 4:14), but without specifying its function. Thus the suggestion that these basins were used for

---

127 Mitchell argues that כְּפַרְמִים is an interpolation of the “overloaded” phrase; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 285. On the other hand, Hanson suggests deleting כְּפַרְמִים from the clause; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 296; cf. translator of OG-Zechariah, BHS.

128 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 155. Cf. HALOT, 266; BHS, 265. The phrase כְּפַרְמִים appears also in Ps 144:12 where the daughters are depicted as corners of the pillars of a building.


130 The word כְּפַרְמִים is also used to designate: (1) the golden basins probably associated with the golden table in the First Temple (1 Kgs 7:50; cf. 1 Chr 28:17); (2) the 50 golden basins contributed to the Second Temple (Neh 7:69 [7:70]); and (3) the silver basins offered for the dedication of the altar (cf. Num 7:10–13). However, neither the Tabernacle nor Temple texts specify what כְּפַרְמִים associated with the altar was used for. The 32 occurrences of כְּפַרְמִים are: Exod 27:3; 38:3; Num 4:14; 7:13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 84, 85; 1 Kgs 7:40, 45, 50; 2 Kgs 12:14; 25:15; 1 Chr 28:17; 2 Chr 4:8, 11, 22; Neh 7:69; Jer 52:18, 19; Amos 6:6; Zech 9:15; 14:20.
collecting blood during cultic ceremonies is only speculation,\textsuperscript{131} though this is possible based on the meaning of its cognate verbal form פֶלֶך.\textsuperscript{132} The singular פֶלֶך here is odd, probably prompting its rendering as a plural in the LXX.\textsuperscript{133} Apart from Zech 9:15d, the singular פֶלֶך is attested exclusively in Num 7 where the twelve tribal leaders brought their offerings to the Tabernacle for the dedication of the outer altar (ןוֹסֵף, Num 7:10–11, 84–88). It is only in Num 7 where the usage of the basins has been specified. Besides the singular פֶלֶך, the word אֶלְכֶם also occurs there as a linking point. In the Hebrew Bible, the common appearance of פֶלֶך and אֶלְכֶם is attested only in Num 7, apart from Zech 9:15.

Based on this lexical parallel, we register Num 7:13 as an intertext of Zech 9:15d, with פֶלֶך, אֶלְכֶם as catchwords.

Numbers 7:13
and his offering was one silver dish whose weight was one hundred and thirty shekels, one silver bowl (ךְָּנָּם) of seventy shekels, according to the shekel of the sanctuary, both of them full (ךְָּנָּם) of fine flour mixed with oil for a grain offering (cf. 7:19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79).

Allusion to Num 7:13. Numbers 7:13 lies within a pericope (7:1–88) where the twelve tribal leaders took the initiative to make gifts for the consecration of the tabernacle (v. 1), an event linking the pericope to Exod 40 where the tent of meeting was assembled with the glory of the Lord filling it (Exod 40:34–35; cf. 40:9–11; Lev 8:10–11). There are two groups of offerings brought to the Lord: (1) gifts for the transportation needs of the Levites—six wagons and twelve oxen (vv. 2–9); (2) gifts for the dedication of the tabernacle—utensils and sacrifices for various offerings (vv. 10–88).


\textsuperscript{132} BHS, 284.

\textsuperscript{133} Cf. Jansma, \textit{Inquiry}, 77.
The account in Num 7 marks the initiation of the sacrificial cult in ancient Israel in Sinai (cf. נַעֲרָא in vv. 10, 11, 84, 88).

The second group of offerings was presented for the dedication of the outer altar (vv. 10–11) as part of the celebration (cf. 1 Kgs 8:63; 2 Chr 7:5–9). Each tribal leader brought willingly an identical offering which covers the needs of various sacrifices at the celebration (vv. 12–83). The narration ends with a summary of the grand total of gifts (vv. 84–88), underscoring the abundance of the offerings which exceed considerably the number of sacrifices used in Lev 8–9. These offerings were brought forward on successive days, beginning with the tribe of Judah (v. 12). The account emphasizes that the participation of each tribe is equal and no tribe could play a greater role than the others. The gifts represent the commitment of the whole community and their generous support to the sanctuary where God’s presence abides (Exod 29:45–46).134

Besides verbal similarity, the two texts also exhibit other correspondences, with both texts relating to the altar and conveying a joyful mood. In the Zecharian text the people are compared to ☒ at the corners of the altar when they celebrate their victory, whereas in Numbers the community, represented by their leaders, offered the ☒ for the dedication of the altar when they celebrated the consecration of the tabernacle. The basins of the tribal offerings were filled (קָטַן) with fine flour mixed with oil for a grain offering. Based on this picture, Meyers and Meyers suggest that the text underscores Yahweh’s providence: “The comparison of the people to sacral vessels, which presumably will be regularly filled, suggests that those about to be rescued...will

134 The analysis of Num 7 draws on the works of Budd, Numbers, 78–84; Levine, Numbers 1–20, 247–66; Davies, Numbers, 70–74; Knierim and Coats, Numbers, 97–104.
be safe and, moreover, assured of sustenance.” However, we have to question the assumption that the basins “will be regularly filled.” Without a satisfactory answer, the suggestion of Meyers and Meyers cannot stand. As discussed above, Num 7 focuses on the initiation of the community (vv. 2–3, 10), stressing the contribution of every tribe at the ceremony. In this view, we argue that the emphasis of the intertext is not on divine providence but rather on the dedication of the people, represented by the various types of offerings brought forth by their leaders.

In the host text, the comparison of the community to הנני projects an image that the people are just like these basins in the source text, full of fine flour to be presented to the Lord as a grain offering (שהם). The noun הנני means gift or present, conveying an expression of respect (cf. 2 Kgs 8:8), thanksgiving (cf. Ps 96:8), tribute (cf. 1 Kgs 5:1), and homage (cf. Gen 32:19 [32:18]). As a sacrificial offering, it denotes the sacrifice of homage, expressing thanks and loyalty to the deity. Leviticus 2:13 states that every grain offering should be seasoned with salt so that the salt of covenant (กะב והלמ) of God shall not be lacking from it (cf. Num 18:19; 2 Chr 13:5). The term והלמ possibly links to the preservative quality of salt and to the role of salt in meals related to covenant agreements (cf. Gen 26:30; 31:54), thus stressing the perpetual binding of the covenant between the Lord and the offerers.

The antecedent nuances by analogy the celebration of הנני after their victory. By recalling Num 7:13, Zech 9:15 projects the image of a revived community expressing thanks and loyalty to Yahweh in return for the Lord’s salvation. In light of these intertextual insights, Zech 9:15 envisages not only victory over enemies (9:15a–b), but

---

135 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 155.
136 HALOT, 601.
also the spiritual renewal of the people (9:15c–d), stressing the response of the community to the marvelous deeds of the Lord. However, the strong emphasis on the participation of all the tribes in the momentous event in the source reminds the readers to pay special regard to their exilic brothers who are still scattered outside the land.

Sustained Allusion to Exod 24:3–11. In Zech 9:15, the verbs לְָּבָא and נָּשָׁה with the Israelites as subject used in a cultic context may recall for the readers Exod 24:11 where the leaders of Yahweh’s people ate and drank in a covenant meal (vv. 9–11).137 Though the pair of לְָּבָא and נָּשָׁה is very common in the Hebrew Bible, the multiple scattered references to Exod 24:3–11 makes a cumulative case for a sustained allusion in Zech 11–15 to the chapter with the following verbal parallels:138

24:6 Moses took half of the blood and put it in basins, and the other half of the blood he sprinkled (לְָּבָא; cf. בְּלַעֲנָה of Zech 9:15d) on the altar (נָּשָׁה; cf. Zech 9:15d).

24:8 So Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, “Behold the blood of the covenant (נָּשָׁה לְָּבָא; cf. Zech 9:11a), which the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words.”

24:10 and they saw (לְָּבָא; cf. Zech 9:14a) the God of Israel; and under His feet there appeared to be a pavement of sapphire, as clear as the sky itself.

24:11 Yet He did not stretch out His hand against the nobles of the sons of Israel (לְָּבָא נָּשָׁה; cf. Zech 9:13b); and they saw God, and they ate and drank (לְָּבָא נָּשָׁה; cf. Zech 9:15b, c).

137 Childs, Exodus, 507; Bruckner, Exodus, 169; Durham, Exodus, 345; Noth, Exodus, 19; Beyerlin, Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, 33, 37; Propp, Exodus 19–40, 297. However, some scholars argue that Exod 24:9–11 is not a covenant meal; e.g., Nicholson, “Exodus 24:9–11,” 86–97; Dozeman, God on the Mountain, 113–16.

138 Tai also registers this allusion; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 61. Cf. Stead, “Sustained Allusion,” 144–70.

The pair of נָּשָׁה and לְָּבָא is very common in the Hebrew Bible and it is attested 108 times in the Hebrew Bible. However, the common appearance of נָּשָׁה in qal plural and לְָּבָא in qal plural occurs only 38 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 24:54; 26:30; Exod 24:11; Deut 2:6; 29:5; 32:38; Judg 9:27; 19:4, 6, 21; 1 Sam 30:16; 1 Kgs 1:25; 4:20; 2 Kgs 6:22, 23; 7:8; 18:31; 1 Chr 12:40; 29:22; Neh 8:10; Esth 4:16; Job 1:13, 18; Song 5:1; Isa 36:16; 62:9; 65:13; Ezek 4:16; 12:19; 25:4; 39:17, 18, 19; Dan 1:12; Amos 9:14; Zech 7:6136; 9:15.
Besides lexical correspondences, we notice that the motif of covenant-making in Exod 24:3–11 forms the backdrop for this chapter—The Restoration of an Ideal People (Zech 9:11–17). At the beginning of the Zecharian text, the phrase ותיכם (v. 11a), which serves as the motivation for the divine liberation of the captives, alludes to the covenant-making ritual in Sinai (Exod 24:3–8). In Zech 9:14, Yahweh appears (יְהוָה) over מִן, an event that functions as a crucial factor in the triumph of the war of liberation, echoing the theophanic scene in the exodus account where the leaders of the Israelites saw (יְהוָה) the God of Israel (Exod 24:10), an essential element for the sealing of the Sinai covenant, though the purpose of the theophany is different. The image of eating and drinking at the cultic-related celebration in Zech 9:15 recalls the covenant meal of the leaders who ate and drank before the Lord (Exod 24:11), though the setting is different.

In Exod 24, the ratification of the covenant is depicted in two different accounts of the same event: (1) it was solemnized at the foot of the mountain by means of blood-rite (24:3–8); and (2) it was sealed on the top of the mountain by means of a covenant meal (24:9–11). The two momentous events in the final form of the chapter are both regarded as the final stage of the covenant ceremony. The juxtaposition of these two events helps to create an impact, stressing the completion of the covenant. The double-sealing of the covenant conveys a message that the intended bonding between the two parties is firmly secured.

---

139 See “Allusion to Exod 24:8” above.
141 Plastaras, God of Exodus, 230–35.
During the covenant meal (Exod 24:11), the representatives of Israel celebrated the communion by consuming sacrifices of peace offerings (Exod 24:5) on the mountain where they enjoyed the presence of Yahweh (24:9–11). Propp argues that “to eat and drink before someone is to acknowledge his authority and beneficence” (1 Kgs 1:25; cf. Jer 52:33; Ezek 44:3). If so, then the covenant meal may connote not only the completion of the covenant but also the submission of the people.

The covenant motif introduced into the latter part of Zech 9 through the allusion to Exod 24:8 in v. 11a continues in the Zecharian text when appears in v. 16a. The phrase looks redundant and is often deleted though without any textual evidence. Meyers and Meyers argue that this “expanded” designation of Yahweh is well attested in the book of Zechariah, e.g., in 6:15b and in 9:14c, hence indicating continuity of style. However, the claim of Yahweh as and the community as surely invokes the language of covenant relationship (cf. Deut 7:6; 14:2) which serves to bring the audience back to the Sinai covenant (Exod 19–24) as well as to the beginning of this unit: (Zech 9:11a; cf. Exod 24:8).

The claim in v. 16a reinforces once again why Yahweh will save his people—the Lord remembers the covenant with them. The covenant motif culminates at Zech 9:17 where the covenantal blessing relating to the bounty of the land is depicted (Deut 7:13; 28:51; Hos 2:23–25 [2:21–23]).

---

142 Propp, Exodus 19–40, 297. Propp’s argument is in contrast to Durham’s suggestion which argues that the eating and drinking of the leaders upon the mountain reinforces their self-confidence and undergirds their authority for the tasks of leadership; Durham, Exodus, 345.

143 E.g., Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 296. LXX also opts for omitting the phrase; see Jansma, Inquiry, 78.


145 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 66.
In view of these correspondences, we contend that the covenant motif in Exod 24 is recalled as a backdrop for Yahweh’s restoration program for his people in Zech 9:11–17. By reading this intertextually, the motivation behind the divine acts of setting the slave-captives free and of fighting for his people is fully revealed. The Lord is faithful to the covenant that he has made with his people. His fidelity towards his holy possession will not be affected by any circumstances. Even the failure of his people will not hinder the good will the Lord intended for them.

Zechariah 9:16a serves as a concluding remark for what Yahweh has done for his people in vv. 14–15. The phrase which is in the middle of the line most likely refers to the day of battle depicted in the previous two verses.\(^{146}\) The summary emphasizes the covenant fidelity of Yahweh as the foundation for the divine salvation (see discussion above).

The people of Yahweh are compared to אֹמֶן, a simile well attested in the Hebrew Bible (cf. 2 Sam 24:17; Jer 23:2; Ezek 34:22, 31). Israel as Yahweh’s flock also calls forth another familiar image—the Lord as their shepherd, resonating also with many biblical texts (cf. Gen 48:15; Isa 40:10–11; Ezek 34:15). By evoking this figurative world, the picture of Yahweh as a shepherd leading his people as a flock is vividly placed into the mind of the audience: אָמַם (Pss 78:52; cf. Pss 23; 77:21 [77:20]; 80:2 [80:1]). This imagistic connection not only stresses the protection and guidance of the Lord for his people but also underlines the obedience and reliance of the flock on the shepherd, hence, foreshadowing the right relationship between the two covenantal partners.

\(^{146}\) Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 422.
In Zech 9:16b, the imagery shifts abruptly from the pastoral scene (תפסות) to beautiful gemstones (יהבורי), a metaphor portraying the people of Yahweh as דליתום. By taking ר as a conjunction of result, v. 16b expresses the consequence of Yahweh’s action in the previous line—the deliverance of the Lord will make the people like עדותיו. The expression יבורי is literally rendered as “stones of a crown,” projecting a picture leading on to the thought of the community as precious stones in a crown, focussing on the resultant splendour and beauty of the revived people.

This image of the renewed people prompts many scholars to search for its source using the word “crown” as a catchword. Mason relates the Zecharian text to Isa 62:3 where the restored people will become “a crown (יהבורי) of beauty in the hand of the Lord” and 62:10 where the exiles are instructed to “lift up a standard (וי) over the peoples.” With this connection, he argues: “It is just possible that the two points are recalled in the MT of Zech 9:16. The people whom God restores will be like precious stones in his crown, that is, tributes and witnesses to his sovereignty over all other gods and nations, and, as such, will serve as Yahweh’s standard by which peoples of all nations shall be guided to Jerusalem to seek him in his land.”

There are certainly some correspondences in the ideas expressed in these texts, particularly the notion of having the restored community compared to a beautiful crown, however, the lexical similarity as such does not provide sufficient evidence for literary dependence. Probably, both texts took their shape in a similar context, sharing the same restoration theme and

---

147 Petersen contends that the two images (תפסות, יבורי) are related: “the motif of crown jewels elaborates the notion of sheep as flock...[which] can in turn be viewed as numerous jewels on a crown, jewels that bedeck the landscape”; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 66. Cf. Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 281.

148 Arnold and Choi, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 150.

149 Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 58–59. Nurmela registers Isa 62:3, 10 as a “possible allusion” in Zec 9:16, however, with the remark: “there is only a remote verbal similarity between Zc 9,16 (MT) and Is 62,10”; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 113–14.
language. Meyers and Meyers contend that “the image of Israel as a crown” has probably been influenced by Isa 62:3, “but surely the most direct source of crown imagery would be Zech 6:11 and 6:14, where two crowns (ךָּרָבָּשׁ) are prepared, one for Joshua and the other set aside for the future royal descendant of David.” The interpretative problem of all these suggestions is that the Hebrew word used there for “crown” is כָּרָבָּשׁ instead of כָּרָב. Both כָּרָבָּשׁ and כָּרָב are not rare words. The noun כָּרָבָּשׁ occurs 23 times in the Hebrew Bible, mainly used figuratively as a crown of honour (cf. Job 19:9; Prov 12:4, Lam 5:16) or a crown of splendour (cf. Jer 13:18; Ezek 16:12; 21:31). The noun כָּרָב is attested 25 times in the Hebrew Bible, mostly used as a sign of consecration, either for the king, the high priest, or the Nazirite. The divergent results may indicate that the use of the common word “crown” as a catchword to identify its source is inadequate.

The verb כָּרָבָּשׁ is a hithpolel feminine plural of כָּרָב (or possibly כָּר), but its meaning is obscure. Some scholars relate it to the noun כ (standard, ensign), rendered as raised up or displayed as ensign. Thus Zech 9:16b could be rendered as “so that stones of a crown will be displayed over his land.” Other scholars derive its meaning from the root כָּרָב, “to sparkle” or “to shine.” Thus Zech 9:16b could be rendered as “so that stones of a crown shine above his land.” The latter connotation of having a crown shining above appears also in Ps 132:18 where Yahweh will humiliate David’s

150 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 158.
151 The 23 occurrences of כָּרָבָּשׁ are: 2 Sam 12:30//1 Chr 20:2; Esth 8:15; Job 19:9; 31:36; Ps 21:4 [21:3]; Prov 4:9; 12:4; 14:24; 16:31; 17:6; Song 3:11; Isa 28:1, 3, 5; 62:3; Jer 13:18; Lam 5:16; Ezek 16:12; 21:31 [21:26]; 23:42; Zech 6:11, 14.
152 The 25 appearances of כָּר are: Exod 29:6; 39:30; Lev 8:9; 21:12; Num 6:4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 1225, 13, 1825, 19, 2125; 2 Sam 1:10; 2 Kgs 11:12//2 Chr 23:11; Ps 89:40; 132:18; Prov 27:24; Jer 7:29; Zech 9:16.
enemies with the king’s crown (יָאוֹן) shining (יָהָי) upon him. Though it is hard to argue for literary dependence since the lexical similarity is not significant, the parallel construction in Ps 132:18—the crown shining above versus the defeat of the enemy—may illuminate our understanding of the Zecharian text. By taking Ps 132:18 as a reference, the stones (בְּגֻקְךָ) of a crown (cf. Isa 62:3 where the “crown” is a epithet of יָאוֹן) shining above in Zech 9:16b may denote the defeat of the enemy, i.e., יִשְׂרָאֵל (9:15b), with the word בְּגֻקְךָ in both lines as a catchword. Thus, in Zech 9:16, Yahweh will not only deliver his people as a flock, but also make them triumphant before the foe.

The verb יָאָל is rare and it occurs exclusively in Ps 60:6 [60:4], apart from Zech 9:16b.156 Besides יָאָל in hithpolel, the verb יָשִׁף in hiphil is also attested in Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5]. In the Hebrew Bible, the common appearance of יָאָל and יָשִׁף is attested exclusively in Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5] and Zech 9:16a–b. The lexical correspondence is impressive, however, whether or not the Zecharian text alludes to the Psalm depends on the origin of Ps 60. Duhm argues for a Maccabean date of Ps 60 based on the historical reference to the conquest of Edom (cf. 60:8), whereas Dahood opts for a Davidic origin as reflected in the superscription.158 However, most scholars prefer to accept an early Persian dating of the Psalm due to its close connection with Isa 63:1–6. Ogden argues: “On the basis of several rhetorical features, principally in the corresponding use of terminology and themes, it is possible to theorize that Isa 63:1–6 is a prophetic response to the lament ceremony in which Ps 60 was sung to seek God’s vengeance

---

155 See the discussion of יָאָל above. Cf. Tai, Prophe tie als Schriftauslegung, 70–71.
156 The root יָאָל appears 3 times in the Hebrew Bible, with its occurrence in Ps 60:6 [60:4] and Zech 9:16b in the stem of hithpolel and in Isa 10:18 in the stem of qal. However, when יָאָל appears in Isa 10:18, it refers to being sick (יָאָל).
upon a treacherous neighbor.”

If so, Ps 60 should be dated earlier than Isa 63. In view of this, we register Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5] as an intertext of Zech 9:16.

Psalm 60:6–7 [60:4–5] (translation mine)

6 Give a banner to those who fear you, so it may be displayed in front of the bowmen,

7 In order that your beloved may be delivered, save with your right hand and answer us!

Allusion to Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5]. Psalm 60 is a lament concerning an impending battle against Edom (v. 11 [9]), with a recent devastating defeat as its background (vv. 1–5 [1–3], 12 [10]). The content of the psalm can be divided into three sections: (1) The first section (vv. 1–7 [1–5]) is a complaint culminating in a call, demanding God to answer his people; (2) The second section (vv. 8–11 [6–9]) is a response to the previous call, affirming God’s on-going commitment to Israel; and (3) the third section (vv. 12–14 [10–12]) begins with two negative questions, grumbling that God has truly rejected his people, and ends with a faith statement, confessing that God’s power will make them victorious.

---

159 Ogden, “Psalm 60,” 93. Cf. Tate, Psalms 51–100, 104.

160 The translation of הַנְּבִיָּה with an imperative sense here follows the works of Dahood, Psalms II, 79; Oesterley, Psalms, 298; Ogden, “Psalm 60,” 86.

Many scholars agree that הַנְּבִיָּה conveys a positive sense in a military context, denoting a sense of setting out a banner to rally the forces to victory. Thus the first line of Ps 60:6, הַנְּבִיָּה הָנְּבִיָּה, implies that Yahweh has already given support to the petitioners. However, this positive reading creates a tension with: (1) the second line of the same verse if הָנְּבִיָּה is understood as deriving from הִנָּה, conveying a sense of fleeing in front of the bow; (2) the thought of the preceding and following verses where a negative picture is projected. So some scholars read הַנְּבִיָּה with a precative or imperative sense, implying a plead for triumph, e.g., Dahood, Psalms II, 79; Oesterley, Psalms, 298; Ogden, “Psalm 60,” 86. Others read הַנְּבִיָּה with an ironical sense, denoting that God has set up a banner not to rally the troops for victory but to summon them to flee (cf. Jer 4:6) when the arrows are directed at them, e.g., Goldingay, Psalms 42–89, 228; Barnes, Psalms, 282; Taylor, “Psalms,” 314; Broyles, Psalms, 253; Tate, Psalms 51–100, 105.

161 The word הָנְּבִיָּה means “bow.” Here we understand it as a personified enemy, similar to the case of “slingstones” in Zech 9:15b.

162 For the analysis of the structure of Ps 60, see Ogden, “Psalm 60,” 83–85.
Our intertext lies within the first section which opens with a series of complaints, culminated in v. 5 [3]: “You have made your people experience hardship; you have given us wine (םִּכַּל cf. Zech 9:15c) to drink (ﬠַלְׁפָּה; cf. הָכָל of Zech 9:15c) that makes us stagger.” The reason for their distress is Yahweh’s abandonment: “You have rejected us” (רָעִית; v. 3 [1]; cf. Zech 10:6b). Amid their complaints are two petitions: (1) O, return to us (נָשְׁבוּ נְשׁוֹבָה; v. 3 [1]) and (2) O, heal its breaches (נָשָׁב נְשָׁבָה; v. 4 [2]). The section closes with another series of petitions, pleading God to give them a banner (v. 6 [4]), to save them with his right hand, and to answer their pleadings (v. 7 [5]). In order to add motivation to their appeals, they remind God that the petitioner are “your beloved ones” (דַּגָּד דָּגָד; v. 7a [5a]), a designation that echoes the epithet “those who fear you” (דַּגָּד לֵּבֶן) in v. 6a [4a].

In v. 6 [4], the afflicted people ask God to give them a ג, so that they can display it in front of the bowmen, their enemies. Based on the striking similarities between Ps 60 and Ps 20, Dahood argues that ג here in a military context should be rendered as “banner” rather than “refuge” (cf. Jer 4:6), denoting a sense of rallying for triumph (רָעִית; Ps 20:6 [20:5]; cf. Jer 50:2). This positive sense of ג is also attested in Exod 17:15 where Moses declared that Yahweh is the banner (ג) of his people after a triumphant deliverance. The subsequent infinitive חֲלָקַנְּשָׁהּ may be intended as wordplay with ג, connoting a similar sense of an announcement of victory. Based on the above discussion, Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5] may be a petition of the distressful community, appealing for God’s intervention—to grant them victory and deliver them in front of their enemies.

164 Goldingay, Psalms 42–89, 228.
Besides verbal similarity, both texts are in a warlike context, with Yahweh’s intervention as a crucial element for victory. However, there are also differences between the two passages. In the source, Israel is in a plight which is compared to the wine of staggering (Ps 60:5 [60:3]), whereas in the host, Yahweh’s people are in a celebration which is expressed as drinking and roaring with wine (Zech 9:15c). In the alluded text, Israel pleads with God to give them a banner for displaying before their enemies (Ps 60:6 [60:4]), whereas in the alluding text, Yahweh’s people enjoy victory, like a crown shining above the land (Zech 9:16b). The salvation requested in Ps 60:7 [60:5] finds its fulfillment in Zech 9:16a where Yahweh will deliver his people as a flock. Psalm 60 is summoned but reversed, shifting from appealing for salvation in the source to celebrating for victory in the host. The antecedent is recalled to nuance the deliverance of the Lord—Yahweh is faithful to Israel, as declared in the second section of Ps 60, even though his people are not aware of it.

**The Prosperity of the People (Zech 9:17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17a Look! How great is his goodness and how great is his beauty!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b Grain will make young men flourish, and new wine, virgins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zechariah 9:17 is the concluding climax of the promised restoration in chapter 9. The verse shifts from martial language to a joyful description of the beneficent effects for land and people in the new age. The exclamation (Zech 9:17a) announces the dawn of a new age of prosperity. It may be seen as a response to the aforementioned scene
(9:16), but most likely, it serves as an introduction to the climactic blessings (9:17b).\textsuperscript{165}

This is particularly true when the opening יִרְאֶה, which make the חֶלֶלֶל and the אֲדוֹן flourish. Though the two commodities יִרְאֶה and חֶלֶלֶל are generally used together (cf. Gen 27:28, 37; Num 7:13; Neh 5:11),\textsuperscript{167} their appearances jointly with יִרְאֶה and חֶלֶלֶל are not common.\textsuperscript{168} Apart from Zech 9:17b, there is only one other instance where these four words occur simultaneously with a similar nuance: Jer 31:12–13. Besides יִרְאֶה, חֶלֶלֶל, and אֲדוֹן, the noun יִרְאֶה also occurs in the Jeremianic text as a catchword.\textsuperscript{169}

Based on this striking lexical similarity, we register Jer 31:12–13 as an intertext of Zech 9:17b.\textsuperscript{170}

Jeremiah 31:12-13

12 “They will come and shout for joy on the height of Zion,
And they will be radiant over the bounty (ם) of the LORD—
Over the grain (םי) and the new wine (םי) and the oil,
And over the young of the flock and the herd;
And their life will be like a watered garden,
And they will never languish again.

13 “Then the virgin (םי) will rejoice in the dance,

\textsuperscript{165} The pronominal suffixes on יִרְאֶה and חֶלֶלֶל are masculine singular, hence, they could (1) refer to the יִרְאֶה and חֶלֶלֶל, describing how good and beautiful the day of Yahweh will be; (2) serve as collective suffixes pointing to the יִרְאֶה who has been victoriously delivered; (3) point forward to the abundant fertility in v. 17b; and/or (4) address Yahweh himself, proclaiming the marvelous deed of the Lord for his people.

\textsuperscript{166} HALOT, 470.


\textsuperscript{168} The common appearance of יִרְאֶה, חֶלֶלֶל, יִרְאֶה, and חֶלֶלֶל in Isa 62:5–8 occurs in Isa 62:5–8; Jer 31:12–13; Zech 9:17. However, the usages of יִרְאֶה, חֶלֶלֶל, and חֶלֶלֶל in Isa 62:5–8 are different from those in Zech 9:17.


\textsuperscript{170} Tai also discerns this intertext; Tai, Prophetic als Schriptauslegung, 69.
And the young men (םיהו) and the old, together,
For I will turn their mourning into joy
And will comfort them and give them joy for their sorrow.

Allusion to Jer 31:12–13. Jeremiah 31:12–13 lies within the Little Book of
Consolation (Jer 30:1–31:40 [LXX 37:1–38:40]; cf. ויהי, 30:2) which “stands as a
refuge amid the storm of divine wrath that blows through the rest of the book of
Jeremiah.” Carroll comments: “Yahweh’s love for his people will bring them back
from afar and set them up in their own land … [This] is quite foreign to the spirit of
Jeremiah ... There Yahweh’s hatred of his people, his fierce wrath and his overwhelming
determination to destroy them for ever is the opposite of the love, compassion and
tenderness which breathe through 30–31.” The content of Jer 30–31 focuses on the
relationship between the present misery, impending danger, and future restoration of the
community. The corpus acknowledges repeatedly the agony and pain of the people (cf.
30:5–7, 15), yet it also offers hope by explicating that their wounds and their healing are
all bound up in Yahweh’s merciful will (cf. 30:18; 31:20). The God who has plucked up
and torn down is the same God who will build and plant (31:28). The theological
dilemma of how Yahweh could announce both judgment and salvation for his people is
expounded in terms of covenant and election. Yahweh’s commitment to the community

171 There are three more intertexts detected in Jer 30–31; see “Allusion to Jer 30:21” in CHAPTER
SIX, “Allusion to Jer 31:10–11” and “Allusion to Jer 31:18–20” in CHAPTER SEVEN.
Some scholars regard Jer 30–33 as the “Book of Comfort” or the “Book of Consolation,” whereas
others treat Jer 30–31 as such. For the former opinion, see, e.g., Lundbom, Jeremiah, 47; Yates, “New
Exodus,” 2; Rata, Covenant Motif. For the latter position, see, e.g., Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 148; Keown et
al., Jeremiah 26–52, 82. Lundbom argues that the original collection of the Book is Jer 30–31 which was
later expanded to include chapters 32–33; Lundbom, Jeremiah, 52. In this work, we follow the designation

172 Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 83.

173 Carroll, Jeremiah, 569–70. Hobbs writes: “A possible exception to the overtly pessimistic nature
of 26–36 is the section 30–33. This may be explained as a later collection…But the reason for the present
context of 30–33 still remains something of a mystery”; Hobbs, “Composition,” 268. Cf. Rofé,
is sealed not once but threefold by the covenant formula: “You shall be my people, and I will be your God” (30:22; cf. 31:1b, 33). The Lord’s unceasing fidelity to his people ensures that the community has a new beginning after discipline. The Little Book of Consolation as a whole emphasizes that it is Yahweh’s everlasting love which extends the deity’s covenant even beyond his people’s covenant breaking into their present misery to assure a possible future (31:3).174

Many scholars agree that the core materials (Jer 30:5–7, 12–15; 31:2–6 + 9b, 15–22) of Jer 30–31 come from Jeremiah’s own preaching.175 These materials share an orientation toward the northern exiles, designated as Ephraim (31:6, 9, 18, 20). The suffering of the exiles had come from Yahweh as a result of their sin (30:14–15), however, out of divine compassion (31:20) and with their repentance (31:18–19) comes a promise of return to the land (31:17). The later edition of the Book (e.g., 30:1–3, 10–11, 16–17; 31:7–9a, 27–28, 31–34) assigns a new audience and a new function to the core passages that had been circulated in the past. In the final collection, oracles addressed to northerners frequently stand alongside sayings about southerners, indicating that not only the restoration of the northern people but also the reunion of all Israel, both Judah and Ephraim, is part of Yahweh’s plan (cf. 30:3; 31:1, 27, 31).

174 Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 83–84, 110.
175 According to Holladay, Jeremiah composed a seven-strophe recension for an audience in the former northern kingdom, most likely at the time of Josiah (2 Kgs 23:15–22; cf. 2 Chr 34:6–7): (1) 30:5–7; (2) 30:12–15; (3) 30:18–21 + 31:1αβγδ; (4) 31:2–6 + 9b; (5) 31:15–17; (6) 31:18–20; and (7) 31:21–22. By 588/587, just before the fall of Jerusalem, Jeremiah expanded his earlier address to the north to address his audience in the south, adding 30:10–11, 16–17; 31:7–9a. When he was in custody (Jer 32:2; 37:21), Jeremiah wrote all his works in a scroll, adding the framing passages 30:1–3 and 31:27–28, with the proclamation of the new covenant (31:31–34) as the terminus ad quem, ca. Sept/Oct of 587. Subsequent editorial work on Jeremiah’s address to the south continued both at the time of the return from exile (30:8–9; 31:10–14; 23–26) and in the mid-fifth century B.C. (31:29–30, 35–40); Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 156–67. Cf. Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 84–87; Unterman, From Repentance to Redemption.
Jeremiah 31:12–13 is embedded within 31:7–14 which continues to spell out what the restoration of Israel will be, with moving and memorable word-pictures. The unit includes two stanzas: (1) return from afar (31:7–9) and (2) filled to satiety (31:10–14). According to Holladay, Jer 31:7–9 is Jeremiah’s expansion on his earlier address to the north, composed just before the fall of Jerusalem, whereas Jer 31:10–14 is an early post-exilic editorial expansion on Jeremiah’s address to the south.

The first stanza begins with an exhortation to speak (תָּהְדֹּא), inviting the addressee to ask for salvation from Yahweh: “O Lord, save (יְשָׁהָה; cf. יְשָׁהָה of Zech 9:16a) your people, the remnant of Israel” (31:7b). As supplication, the imperative יְשָׁהָה indicates that renewal is not yet as it has been proclaimed (cf. 31:2–6); nevertheless, it is a cry of confidence in both the power of Yahweh and his faithfulness to his promise. A first-person divine speech responds to the petition, promising a regathering of the exiles from the north and also from the remote parts of the earth (31:8a). The return is absolutely guaranteed as the path (תָּהְדֹּא) is so straight (יֵשָׁהְ) due to divine provision that even the most vulnerable travelers, e.g., the blind, the lame, women who are pregnant or giving birth, will walk (יָלְדוּ) safely and will not stumble (יָלְדוּ) in it (31:8b–9b). The faithfulness of the Lord makes possible a great homecoming procession of those valued by God whom the nations have devalued.

177 Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 162.
178 Some follow the rendering of the LXX, emending the imperative יְשָׁהָה to a perfect in order to express more clearly the present joy called for by the opening imperatives: “The Lord has saved his people, the remnant of Israel.” See, e.g., Carroll, Jeremiah, 590; McKane, Jeremiah 26–52, 787; Longman, Jeremiah, 224. Brueggemann suggests: “The substance of the proposed speech of Israel is either an imperative seeking God’s rescue, or it is a declaration, celebrating it. Perhaps the verb intends to point in both directions, as imperative and as celebrative declaration”; Brueggemann, Jeremiah 26–52, 61.
In Jer 31:9c Yahweh declares that he, as father, will bring home his firstborn son, Ephraim (31:9c). The mention of Ephraim as Yahweh’s son in v. 9c may link the weeping (כז) and supplication (מThanOr) in v. 9a to the next pericope where Ephraim, the dear son of Yahweh, grieves for his past misdeeds and prays for his return (vv. 18–19). If weeping and supplication indicate remorse and seeking of God, then the straight path of Yahweh could be understood both concretely and figuratively. If so, the poem might intend to echo Hos 14:10 where the righteous will walk (קד) securely in Yahweh’s straight ways (שֵׁרוֹת יְהוָה), whereas the sinners will stumble (לְשֵׁם) in them (cf. Jer 6:15; 8:12). With this intertextual insight, the promised return of the diaspora might mean a return to the homeland as well as a turning to the Lord.

The second stanza opens with another command to speak (אמרו), summoning the nations to announce the coming salvation to the distant lands (כַּאֲשֶׁר נִמְצָאֵם): “He who scattered Israel will gather him and keep him as a shepherd keeps his flock” (קרותא רבעי, 31:10b; cf. מצא אֲשֶׁר of Zech 9:16a). The homecoming for Yahweh’s people is firmly resolved as the good shepherd is going to seek and save the lost ones. The motivation behind Yahweh’s restoration is that he has ransomed (רッド) Jacob (31:11). The qal of רד which appears 55 times in the Hebrew Bible is the language of exodus, denoting the act of rescuing one from a fate which would lead to slavery (cf. Deut 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 24:18).

In vv. 12–14, the poet continues to envision the hyperbole scene of the joyous return, with all the exiles arriving home altogether in one notable event, in a procession

---

180 In the Hebrew Bible, besides Jer 31:9, כז and מ ثنappear together only in Jer 3:21 where repentance and entreaty are recounted (cf. Hos 12:5). Cf. Craigie et al., Jeremiah I–25, 64.
181 Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 113; Bozak, Life Anew, 85.
led by the deity. The rhetoric of the poem moves beyond salvific language to creation, focusing on the fertility of the land and of the people. Yahweh will prepare a great feast for the ransomed (31:11) who are brought back to Zion (31:12a). Virgins, young men, and the elders will join together in the dance (cf. 31:4), turning sorrow into joy (31:13). Not only do the returnees enjoy the bounty of life, but also the priests rejoice in the abundance of sacrifices (תְּפִלְיוֹת, 31:14a). The pericope concludes with a summary promise: “my people will be satisfied with my goodness” (תְּפִלְיוֹת, 31:14b; cf. לתה לֹֽא of 3:12; cf. of Zech 9:17a).¹⁸⁴

Besides shared words, there are thematic parallels between the two texts and their immediate contexts, though some of them are used somewhat differently. These motifs in the Jeremianic text can be divided broadly into two catalogues: (1) homecoming; and (2) prosperity.

Homecoming

(1) The shepherd-flock motif (Jer 31:10b; Zech 9:16a)—In the source, the motif is related to the exile and the subsequent gathering and return, whereas in the host, the motif is linked to the deliverance of Yahweh to his flock.

(2) The liberation of the captives (Jer 31:11; Zech 9:11)—In the alluded text, the ransom is for Jacob, whereas in the alluding text, the release is for the prisoners.

(3) The homecoming motif (Jer 31:12a; Zech 9:12a)—In the earlier text, the return to Zion is envisioned, whereas in the later text, the return is a summons only.

¹⁸⁴ The analysis of Jer 31:7–14 draws on the works of Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 184–86; Carroll, Jeremiah, 590–95; Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 110–16; Bozak, Life Anew, 81–91; Brueggemann, Jeremiah 26–52, 61–63, unless noted otherwise.
Prosperity

(1) The bounty of the land (Jer 31:12a; Zech 9:17b)—The fertility of the land is stressed in both texts, though it is elaborated much more in Jeremiah.

(2) The renewed joyfulness of the people (Jer 31:13a; Zech 9:17a)—Rejoicing is the mood in both pericopes, however the Jeremianic text adds another nuance of reversal of fortune (v. 13b).

(3) The זֶה of Yahweh (Jer 31:14b; Zech 9:17aa)—The people in both passages experience the goodness of Yahweh, though the זֶה in the Zecharian text is not related explicitly to the Lord.

All these themes in the Jeremianic text are recalled in Zech 9:17 and its context in order to envisage the incredible blessings of the Lord in the restoration age. According to the source, the prosperity envisioned will be realized only when the exiles return to Zion (Jer 31:12a). The motifs of homecoming and prosperity are tied together in the alluded text. However, in the alluding text, it seems that only the latter motif is emphasized (v. 17b). Would the host text also recall the motif of homecoming?

Some scholars argue that Zech 9:17 is an addition to the oracle which originally closes at v. 16. The reason behind this argument is that the form and content of v. 17 are inconsistent with the previous ones. Moreover, Yahweh who is so prominent in the redemptive drama depicted in vv. 1–16 is absent in v. 17. It is true that the setting of the final verse is quite different from those that precede. The emphatic "זֶה seems to indicate a shift in perspective too. This phenomenon of the host may allow us to make an assumption based on its source—the final verse envisages the climax of the restoration

---

185 E.g., Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 282.
which depicts a scene where the released have returned to Zion together with the sons of Zion after the war of liberation. If so, then the amazing blessings of the land and the awesome prosperity of the people depicted in v. 17b will be for all those who have returned to Zion, echoing what is promised in v. 12b—לָאָם אֵשֶׁת אֶこれらּ יָשָׁבוּ. In this light, the elaborated prosperity of the returnees in the source not only serves as a climax concluding the restoration program in Zech 9, but also acts as a motivation exhorting the northern exiles to return home (cf. Zech 9:12a). The latter function of the intertext—homecoming—links Zech 9 to Zech 10.

**Summary (Zech 9:11–17)**

**Source Text**

In Zech 9:11–17, ten intertexts are detected (see Table 7 below), of which the two in Exod 24 (no. 1, 8) are the most prominent ones. The covenant motif of Exod 24 not only serves as a supplement to Zech 9:11a, but also functions as a backdrop to the whole unit (Zech 9:11–16). Four out of the ten antecedents link to slavery: (1) Exod 24:8—a ceremony transforms Israel from slavery in Egypt to holy possession of the Lord; (2) Gen 37:24—Joseph was sold as a slave after being thrown into a waterless pit; (3) Deut 15:18—instructions relates to the manumission of the Hebrew slaves in the seventh year; and (4) Joel 4:6–7 [3:6–7]—captured Judeans were sold as slaves to the Greeks. All these four allusions are recalled to nuance the liberation act of Yahweh (Zech 9:11–13). Three earlier materials are summoned to illuminate the different stages of the war with

---

186 This is probable especially when Jer 31:10–11 is recalled in Zech 10:8a to nuance the restoration of Ephraim; see “Allusion to Jer 31:10–11” in CHAPTER SEVEN.
Javan: (1) Isa 49:2—the preparation of Yahweh’s people as an instrument of war; (2) Isa 31:5—the defense of the deity for the sons of Zion during the battle; and (3) Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5]—the triumphant deliverance of the Lord leading to the final victory of Yahweh’s people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zech 9:11–17</th>
<th>Intertext</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:11a</td>
<td>Exod 24:8</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:11b</td>
<td>Gen 37:24</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:12b</td>
<td>Deut 15:18</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:13c</td>
<td>Isa 49:2</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9:15a</td>
<td>Isa 31:5</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:15d</td>
<td>Num 7:13</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9:11–15</td>
<td>Exod 24:3–11 (sustained)</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9:16</td>
<td>Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5]</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9:17b</td>
<td>Jer 31:12–13</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refer to “The Nature of Textual Relationships” (Chapter One)

Table 7: Intertexts of Zech 9:11–17

Intertextual Reading

The advent of Yahweh (Zech 9:1–8) will bring forth a host of blessings in the new era, of which the restoration of an ideal people is one of them (9:11–17). The transformation of the people begins with the divine invitation to return to Zion (v. 12a). The intertextual marker רָבָּה שֵׁם חָיָיו (v. 11b; cf. Gen 37:24) reveals that the concern of the Lord is for the northern exiles. In order to make the return possible, Yahweh has set the prisoners free (v. 11b). The liberation is compared to the manumission of the slaves through the catchword נָהָרִים (v. 12b; cf. Deut 15:18). The divine remission not only releases the enslaved ones but also forgives the outstanding debts. Adding motivation to the invitation are the two promises of Yahweh: (1) to restore double to the inhabitants of
The restored sons of Zion will be equipped as weapons of Yahweh in order to carry out the divine mission—battle with the sons of Javan (v. 13b). By leveraging earlier materials, the goal of the war is made explicit: (1) to release the slave-captives of Israel (cf. Joel 4:6–7 [3:6–7]) and (2) to witness the redemptive might of Yahweh (cf. Isa 49:2). During the war of liberation, Yahweh will appear (v. 14) and defend the sons of Zion (v. 15a) as he did for Jerusalem in the past (cf. Isa 31:5). The victorious deliverance of the Lord (v. 16a) not only enables his people to subdue their enemies (v. 15b) but also leads them to final victory (v. 16b; cf. Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5]).

In contrast to Zech 9:1–8, the present pericope depicts Yahweh’s people being drawn into the battle of liberation, at first as passive weaponry (v. 13a, c), then as an active army (v. 15a, b) under the command of their Lord (v. 14c). This participation of the people will enrich their experience of the marvelous deeds of the deity. After gaining victory, the sons of Zion not only celebrate gladly with heavy drinking and joyful shouts (v. 15c–d) but also express thanks and loyalty to Yahweh for God’s salvation (cf. Num 7:13).

By alluding to Jer 31:12–13, the climax of the restoration envisions the return of the exiles together with the sons of Zion. The renewed community will exclaim with astonishment the goodness of the Lord (v. 17a). The incredible blessings include the bounty of the land which will make the next generation flourish (v. 17b). At that time, Yahweh’s promise of restoring double to Zion will be fulfilled.

The restoration of an ideal people involves a series of divine actions, from liberating the prisoners and inviting them to return to fighting for his people and
delivering them from danger. All these salvific acts are possible only because of
Yahweh’s allegiance to his covenant (v. 11a). The covenant motif in Exod 24:3–11 is
summoned in v. 11a and then in v. 15 to nuance the fidelity of the Lord towards his holy
possession. This intertextual reading emphasizes that even the failure of Israel will not
hinder the actualization of the divine restoration intended for his people.
CHAPTER SIX
THE TRANSFORMATION OF JUDAH:
AN INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF ZECHARIAH 10:1–5

Introduction

At the beginning of chapter 10, there is an abrupt transition from a promise of restoration to an oracle of denunciation, with the imperative חָשַׁב serving as an opening marker and וַיהָ לָמוּז as a closing one. As mentioned above, we consider all of Zech 10 as one unit despite the fact that we divide our research on it into two separate chapters due to the length of our discussion.¹ The present chapter examines the transformation of Judah (vv. 1–5), whereas the next one investigates the restoration of Ephraim (vv. 6–12). The arbitrary delineation here is based on the piel of יַכַּב in v. 6a and v. 12a which represents a striking inclusio, binding vv. 6–12 together as a thought unit.² However, vv. 6–12 is linked to vv. 1–5 through the phrase וַיהָ לָמוּז in v. 6a and v. 3b. Moreover, the absence of any convincing form-critical marker precludes us from treating these seven verses as a separate section.³

For the sake of discussion, we divide Zech 10:1–5 into two pericopes: (1) Yahweh as the source of salvation (vv. 1–2) and (2) Yahweh as the source of leadership (vv. 3–5),⁴ with the former diagnosing the problem of Judah and the latter providing a solution to the undesirable situation. This division is arbitrary as the two sections are tied together by the qal participle of יִבְשָׁם (v. 2c; 3a), though the word is used in a different form.

¹ See “Discourse Structure” in INTRODUCTION.
² The piel of יַכַּב occurs only 3 times in the Hebrew Bible: Eccl 10:10; Zech 10:6, 12.
³ Butterworth, Structure, 76.
⁴ The masoretic מ at the end of Zech 10:2 seems to recognize this division as well.
way (see discussion below). Some scholars argue that the change of speech from first to third person and the change of theme from judgment to salvation constitute a syntactical break between v. 3a and v. 3b. However, the clausal ריחא in v. 3b binds the two lines together, with ריחא as catchword, though used in an opposite sense. The theme of shepherd and flock (שורי/רעה) in v. 3a and v. 3b also acts as a linking point.

Yahweh as the Source of Salvation (Zech 10:1–2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 10:1–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a Ask from Yahweh rain in a time of spring rain —Yahweh makes thunderbolts. | שאלו מיהוה גשם בחש יפלבוד
| 1b And shower rain he gives to them —to each, the herb in the field. | לאהש גשם כל ילהמ
| 2a For the teraphim have spoken deception, and the diviners have envisioned falsehood —worthless dreams they speak, empty consolations they give. | ובתרפים אמרו חינה ותנורא ע前に והדのではないים קצwards העירHV
| 2c Therefore, they have set out just like a flock, they are afflicted for there is no shepherd. | ועלם נושש יש לבראש

Zechariah 10:1–2 which depicts the problem of Judah (cf. v. 3b) is labeled by Horst as “Mahnspruch.” The clausal ריחא in v. 2a ties the two verses together into a thought unit that contrasts Yahweh with other sources of help in a time of distress. The opening particle ריחא in v. 2c functions as a concluding summary of what has been discussed in the first two verses.

---

5 Due to the different usage of ריחא in Zech 10:2c and 3a, Butterworth regards the word ריחא as a “secondary catchword continuation”; Butterworth, Structure, 75.
6 E.g., Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 96; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 118.
7 Horst sees Zech 10:1–2 as an “admonition”; Horst, Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, 249.
8 Butterworth, Structure, 75.
The oracle begins with בַל נִעֲשֵׂה (Zech 10:1a). The 2mp qal imperative of בַל נִעֲשֵׂה (ם עֲשָׂי, 10:1a) has often frustrated exegetes since it does not conform to the following 3mp suffixed pronoun (ם הל, 10:1b). In order to solve the tension, some point the imperative as a third person perfect,⁹ whereas others read the pronoun as 2mp לֶךְ “to you”¹⁰ or לֶךְ “bread.”¹¹ Without resorting to emendation, Tromp proposes to read לֶךְ-ב as “a quotation of Yahweh’s answer according to the teraphim and קְפֹרָה.”¹² However, this is a mere conjecture without any evidence in the text. We suggest that this inconsistency could be solved if we understand the opening summons as directed to the leaders of the community and the subsequent לֶךְ to all the people.¹³ This reading is in line with the pictures generally portrayed in the Hebrew Bible where the leadership had to take action on behalf of the people in a time of national disaster (cf. Isa 37:1–4).

The exhortation to request rain from Yahweh instead of לָטֵן קָרָא and לָטֵן קָרָא is obscure. Scholars try to make sense of it by reading much into the poem. By using Third Isaiah as its type, Hanson claims that the present pericope is an attack of the visionary party against the Davidic governor and his officials (shepherds and he-goats of v. 3a) who turned the worship of Yahweh into “defiled cult,” resulting in a democratization of the nation’s offices.¹⁴ There are undoubtedly recurrent images and motifs in the unit that relate thematically to Third Isaiah, however, there is insufficient evidence in the Zecharian text to support his typological reading.¹⁵ Believing that all of Zech 10 is

---

⁹ E.g., Jansma, Inquiry, 81; Otzen, Studien uber Deuterosacharja, 247; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 69.
¹⁰ E.g., Marti, Dodekapropheton, 433.
¹¹ E.g., Duhm, “Anmerkungen,” 191.
¹² Tromp, “Bad Divination,” 47.
¹³ Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 438.
¹⁴ Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 329–31.
¹⁵ See Carroll’s comment on Hanson’s typological reading; Carroll, “Twilight of Prophecy,” 3–35.
addressing the dispersed northerners who still “used traditional patterns of popular prophetic activity [םְפֹתַיִם וְעֵדַיִם] to cope with the exigencies of life on foreign soil,” Meyers and Meyers argue that the prophet exhorted them to “seek Yahweh directly” instead of relying on “false prophetic intermediaries.”16 The problem with this reading is that the meaning of certain elements of the text has to be twisted in order to give this sense, e.g., the spiritualization of the concrete situation of petitioning for rain (10:1a) as “[Yahweh is] the source of the most fundamental aspects of existence” because the meteorological and agricultural conditions of the verse are apparently related to the Levant rather than the exilic locale of the northerners.17 We agree that some parts of Zech 10 do address the dispersed northerners as the surface audience, however, it does not necessarily mean that every verse of the chapter is related to them.

Despite its obscurity, the structure of the oracle is straightforward. It begins with an exhortation: ישאלו יְהֹוָה עֹלֶה (Zech 10:1a). Then it supplies two motivations for the command: (1) a positive exhortation—for Yahweh is the giver of rain (10:1aβ); and (2) a negative admonishment—for קָרָאתִים and כוֹכֹכִים were telling lies (10:2a–b). The audience is told that if they cling to Yahweh, they will experience covenant blessings (זֶה חַד בְּשׁוֹם, 10:1b; cf. מָשִׁים וְמָשְׂדְהוּ of Lev 26:4). If they choose קָרָאתִים and כוֹכֹכִים, they will suffer as a shepherdless flock (10:2c).

The Petition for Rain: Positive Exhortation (Zech 10:1)

The discourse opens with a command, urging the community to seek timely rains from Yahweh (Zech 10:1a). The reason behind this appeal is that Yahweh is the real

---

source of water—he is the lightning-maker (Zech 10:1a). The noun נַעַר appears 38 times in the Hebrew Bible, generally endorsing the notion that Yahweh is the author of rain (cf. 1 Kgs 18:1; Job 5:10; Ps 135:7). The timely נַעַר is of critical importance for the proper early development of crops and thus necessary for agricultural fertility. The technical language used here demonstrates that the audience understood Yahweh to be the giver of rain which serves as a symbol of life-subsistence.

The urgent pastoral entreaty might reflect a situation of drought. The exhortation is particularly vivid for the audience who resided in the Levant. Ancient Israel practised agriculture based on a cropping pattern sensitively geared to climatic conditions. The success of their harvest depended on seasonal rain rather than on water from other sources. The precarious supply of rain in the Levant resulted in periodic droughts which were detrimental to the life of the people who needed rain for farming. In ancient Israel, the way in which “the granting or withholding of rain” is equated with “God’s blessing or curse” in the Hebrew Bible made the Israelites interpret droughts as an outworking of divine wrath (cf. Hag 1:5–11). This notion is fully expressed in Deut 11:13–17, a classic biblical statement about the sending of specific rains by the deity at their appointed times.

18 The translation here follows the accentuation of the MT, which places the major disjunctive accent יָתָנָה under the plural noun נַעַר which appears only 3 times in the Hebrew Bible: Job 28:26; 38:25; Zech 10:1.

19 The occurrences of the noun נַעַר are: Exod 9:33, 34; Deut 11:11, 14, 17; 28:12, 24; 32:2; 1 Sam 12:17, 18, 2 Sam 1:21; 23:4; 1 Kgs 8:35, 36; 17:1; 18:1; 2 Chr 6:26, 27; 7:13; Job 5:10; 28:26; 29:23; 36:27; 37:6, 26, 28; Pss 72:6; 135:7; 147:8; Prov 26:1; 28:3; Isa 4:6; 5:6; 30:23; Jer 10:13; 51:16; Zech 10:1.

20 The noun נַעַר נַעַר appears only 8 times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 11:14; Job 29:23; Prov 16:15; Jer 3:3; 5:24; Hos 6:3; Joel 2:23; Zech 10:1.


22 King and Stager, Life in Biblical Israel, 122–29; Hopkins, Highlands of Canaan, 84–108; Borowski, Agriculture.

Deuteronomy 11:13-17

13 "It shall come about, if you listen obediently to my commandments which I am commanding you today, to love the LORD your God and to serve Him with all your heart and all your soul,

14 that He will give (ןָדַד) the rain (םֶשֶׁר) for your land in its season (םֶשֶׁר), the early and late rain (ַּוֶּלָּכֶשֶׁר), that you may gather in your grain (ןָדַד), cf. Zech 9:17b) and your new wine (שָׂכִי, cf. Zech 9:17b) and your oil.

15 "He will give (ןָדַד) grass in your fields (שֶׁשֶׁב שָׁבְעָה) for your cattle, and you will eat and be satisfied.

16 "Beware that your hearts are not deceived, and that you do not turn away and serve other gods and worship them.

17 "Or the anger of the LORD will be kindled against you, and He will shut up the heavens so that there will be no rain (םֶשֶׁר) and the ground will not yield its fruit; and you will perish quickly from the good land which the LORD is giving (ןָדַד) you.

The verbal similarities between Zech 10:1 and Deut 11:13–17 are remarkable, with שֶׁשֶׁב שָׁבְעָה as catchwords binding the two corpora together. The connection is particularly clear as the construct chain שֶׁשֶׁב שָׁבְעָה with the preposition ב before שֶׁב only occurs in these two passages. The notion of Yahweh as the giver of timely שֶׁב, including שֶׁשֶׁב שָׁבְעָה is also attested (Deut 11:14a). Because of this divine gift, the people could enjoy agricultural fertility (11:14b). Though the consequence of the granting of timely rain (11:14b) is not made explicit in Zech 10:1, at least two elements of it—annis והנהו—appear in 9:17b, providing a link to the previous chapter. Based on this remarkable similarity, we register Deut 11:13–17 as an intertext of Zech 10:1.

However, some scholars are reticent to register this allusion based on the fact that passages with similar language denoting Yahweh as the giver of rain are common in the

---


25 This intertextuality is also discerned by other scholars, e.g., Mason, "Use of Earlier Biblical Material," 66; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 79–82; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 71.
Hebrew Bible (cf. Job 38:25–8; Jer 5:24; Hos 6:3; Joel 2:23).  This observation is true, however, the resemblance between Zech 10:1 and Deut 11:13–17 is much more striking than any other possible intertext, e.g., Jer 5:24, an intertext proposed by Tai, a passage with significant verbal parallels: “They do not say in their heart, ‘Let us now fear the Lord our God, who gives (תָּנָה) rain (שת) in its season (שתי), both the autumn rain and the spring rain (שת), who keeps for us the appointed weeks of the harvest,” but still not as close as the Deuteronomic one. Larkin chooses Jer 14 as the intertext of Zech 10:1–2 and suggests that the Jeremianic text is dependent on Deut 11:13–17 which only provides “an anthologizing principle for the construction” of the Zecharian hymn. Though we agree that Jer 14 is one of the intertexts (see below), the appearance of some unique connections (e.g., פתרון, קדש) between Zech 10:1–2 and Deut 11:13–17 independent of Jer 14 suggests that the Zecharian text most likely also alludes to the Deuteronomic one, even if the Jeremianic text is dominant.

Allusion to Deut 11:13–17. Deuteronomy presents itself as a farewell discourse delivered by Moses in the land of Moab, just before his death and immediately prior to Israel’s invasion of Canaan. The language of motivation permeates the speeches. Moses begins his address with a historical review (Deut 1–3, 5), functioning as a parenetic introduction. He prefaces the law itself with admonitions, warnings, and encouragements in order to inspire attentive obedience (Deut 4, 6–11). Then he promulgates a

---

27 Tai has registered both Deut 11:13–17 and Jer 5:24 as intertexts for Zech 10:1–2; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 77–82. However, Tigchelaar questions about the connection between Jer 5:24 and Zech 10:1; Tigchelaar, “Some Observations,” 261.
28 Larkin, Eschatology, 88–89.
wide-ranging law code (Deut 12–26) which demands exclusive loyalty to Yahweh and seeks to shape Israel as a just and humane society.  

Our intertext is embedded within a pericope (11:10–25) focusing on the promised land, with רָאָה in v. 10 forming an inclusion with פרָעָה in v. 25. The beginning of the unit emphasizes that the land that Yahweh is going to give to Israel is a land of special divine providence (vv. 10, 12), a land that drinks waters from the rain of heaven—לְמָשְׂרָהּ נָבָעָה נָבָעָה (v. 11). Such is the land that the Israelites are about to possess, however, the subsequent section (vv. 13–25) reminds them that their continued possession of this good land is contingent on their obedience to Yahweh.

Deuteronomy 11:13–25 can be divided into three sections. The first and the third sections are two motivational pericopes (vv. 13–17, 22–25), each employing conditional rhetoric—if the people obey the commandment of Yahweh, then the Lord will grant them prosperity in the land (vv. 13, 22). The middle section (vv. 18–21) instructs the Israelites to keep Yahweh’s word in their hearts by all means so that they and their children may live long on the promised land.

Deuteronomy 11:13–17 begins with a protasis, שאפשם חזון אַלִּים אָבָא, which modifies the promise of 11:10–12 into a conditional blessing and curse (11:13). Obedience leads to abundant rainfall and good harvest which are seen as signs of divine blessing (11:14–15), whereas disobedience results in drought and poor yield which are regarded as marks of divine curse (11:16–17). The stark contrast reminds the people of their need to make the right choice. On the one hand, the text affirms that Yahweh is the author of rain, on the other hand, it insists that showers will only bless those who choose

---

31 Christensen, Deuteronomy 1:1–21:9, 210–11.
to love the Lord and to serve him with all their heart and all their soul (11:13; cf. 11:26–28). 32

Besides verbal and thematic parallels, we find that there is also formal correspondence between Deut 11:13–17 and Zech 10:1–2, with both texts connecting to the previous units relating to the land: 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ Promised with the good land (vv. 10–12)</td>
<td>~ Promised with the bounty of the land (9:17b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Condition: obey Yahweh (v. 13)</td>
<td>~ Condition: ask from Yahweh (v. 1a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Blessing: rain and yield* (vv. 14–15)</td>
<td>~ Blessing: rain and yield* (v. 1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Warning: unfaithful to Yahweh (v. 16)</td>
<td>~ Warning: unfaithful to Yahweh (v. 2a–b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Consequence of disobedience (v. 17)</td>
<td>~ Consequence of disobedience (v. 2c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note: the yield of הָנָה and שָׁרוֹן in Deut 11:14 appears in Zech 9:17b

What is the intention of alluding to Deuteronomy? Since the shared words mainly lie within the apodosis of the promised blessing (Deut 11:14–15), the antecedent is recalled to affirm the notion that Yahweh is the author of rain, the source of fertility (cf. Zech 10:1b). The Lord is the one who takes care of the land so that his people will enjoy the abundant harvest and be satisfied. However, by alluding to the source, the conditional nature of the text is also evoked as a backdrop to the promised prosperity in Zech 10:1b—the blessing of Yahweh on his people is not an unconditional promise, but rather comes as the result of obedience to the word of the Lord (cf. Deut 11:13). The condition imported from Deuteronomy reminds the readers of the crucial factor affecting their petition—faithfulness to the Lord. The confession that Yahweh, not idols, is the only one who produces rain identifies the community as loyal to the deity (Jer 14:22; cf.

---

33 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 80.
This exclusive loyalty, thus obedience and trust, is a prerequisite for the fulfillment of the promised salvation.

The formal correspondence between Deut 11:13–17 and Zech 10:1–2 might also link the opening exhortation (Zech 10:1) to the concluding summary of Zech 9 where the bounty of the land is promised (cf. 9:17). Before the Jewish youth could enjoy the plenteous fruit of the land, there must be ample and timely rainfall. By alluding to Deut 11:13–17, Zech 10:1 sets forth the conditions that will produce the promised fertility described at the end of the last chapter. If so, then the people may have been assigned a role in the actualization of the future restoration.

The Petition for Rain: Negative Admonishment (Zech 10:1–2)

The people were admonished to ask rain from Yahweh rather than from גמליא and תושב for the latter figures were telling lies (Zech 10:2a–b). With the appearance of גמליא, most scholars argue that the purpose of the admonishment is to rebuke the idolatrous activities of the community.34 This understanding of גמליא generally affects their interpretation of the text and their choices of the intertext. For example, Nurmela chooses Jer 10:13–15 (=51:16–18) as one of the intertexts of Zech 10:1–2 rather than Deut 11:13–17, even though the latter one has more shared lexical features. The reason behind this is that “the admonishing character of the contrast made between Yahweh and the idols is also common to the passages [Jer 10:13–15 (=51:16–18)].”35 Nurmela’s concern for the selection of this intertext is not without merit as passages with similar

34 E.g., Smith, Micah–Malachi, 261; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 118; Webb, Message of Zechariah, 138; Achtemeier, Nahum–Malachi, 155; O’Brien, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 245; Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 171; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 187.
35 Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 116.
vocabulary comprising the motif of rain and the motif of illegitimate religious practices are not rare in the Hebrew Bible, cf. Ezek 13 and Jer 14.

Of all those possible intertexts, nearly all scholars register Jer 14:1–15:4, a collection of oracles headed “Concerning the Drought” (14:1), as the source of Zech 10:1–2. The similarities between these two texts are striking with the following parallels: (1) the motif of a drought (Zech 10:1α; Jer 14:1–6); (2) petitions to the divine (Zech 10:1α; Jer 14:7–9, 19–22); (3) Yahweh as the sole giver of rain (Zech 10:1β; Jer 14:22); and (4) a dispute over illegitimate religious practices (Zech 10:2; Jer 14:14). Besides the above, both texts are further bound together with significant verbal resemblance: נָּשַׁ, בֶּןָ, הָבָלָ, בְּשֵׂ, סֵ, סְ, עְשֵׁ, שֶׁרֶ, לָמָ, רָ, רֶ. Based on all these similarities, we register Jer 14:1–15:4 as an intertext of Zech 10:1–2.

Jeremiah 14:1, 4–6, 14, 18, 22
1 That which came as the word of the Lord (יהיה) to Jeremiah in regard to (תְּ) the drought:
4 “Because the ground is cracked, For there has been no rain (בַּ) on the land;
The farmers have been put to shame, They have covered their heads.
5 “For even the doe in the field (כּ) has given birth only to abandon her young, Because there is no grass.
6 “The wild donkeys stand on the bare heights; They pant for air like jackals, Their eyes fail For there is no vegetation (לָשׁ).
14 Then the LORD said to me, “The prophets are prophesying falsehood (לָנָ) in My name. I have neither sent them nor commanded them nor spoken (רַכָּ) to

---


37 Stade argues that Zech 10:2 is dependent on 1 Sam 15:23 where כּ and בַּ also appear; Stade, “Deuterocanonical 1,” 58–60. However the linking together of כּ and בַּ is not a very remarkable feature as it also occurs in Ezek 21:26 [21:21]. As the similarity to Jeremiah is much stronger, the connection between Zechariah and Jeremiah is to be preferred.
them; they are prophesying to you a false vision (יבש עָומָד), divination (אֲפֵר),
futility and the deception of their own minds.

18 'If I go out to the country (הָעָר), Behold, those slain with the sword! Or if I
enter the city, Behold, diseases of famine! For both prophet and priest Have
gone roving about in the land that they do not know.' ”

22 Are there any among the idols (עַלְמָי) of the nations who give rain (שָׁמַר)? Or
can the heavens grant (תִּהְיוּ) showers? Is it not You, O Lord our God?
Therefore we hope in You, For You are the one who has done (NavItem) all these
things.

Allusion to Jer 14:1–15:4. Jeremiah 14:1–15:4 is a highly structured discourse,
headed with the superscription “Concerning the Drought” (14:1). It consists of two
parallel lament-response poems (14:1–10; 14:17–15:4) with a prophet-divine dialogue in
between (14:11–16). The first lament-response hymn begins with a prophetic description
of a drought and its threat to the crops (14:2–6), followed by a communal lament
confessing their sins and pleading for divine mercy (14:7–9), then concluding with a
divine response announcing the inevitable judgment (14:10). The second
lament-response hymn opens with an expression of grief depicting the intensity of the
calamity of war (14:17–18), followed by a communal confession of their sins and their
mourning over the overwhelming catastrophe (14:19–22), then concluding with another
divine response restating the punitive will of the Lord (15:1–4). Though the first lament
generally concerns a drought and the second lament basically relates to the ravages of
war, the materials cannot easily be separated on a thematic basis as the theme of war can
be found in 14:12–13 and the theme of drought in 14:22. 39

---

38 The superscription in 14:1 signals the beginning of a new unit, however, it is less clear where that
unit ends. Some scholars extend the passage to include 15:5–9, e.g., Clements, Jeremiah, 89; Holladay,
Jeremiah 1, 419; Fretheim, Jeremiah, 217; Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 195. We follow Kessler and end
the unit at 15:4; Kessler, “Drought,” 503.

39 Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 200; Carroll, Jeremiah, 307.
Sandwiched between the two lament-response poems is the prose report of a dialogue between Yahweh and his prophet (14:11–16) which forms the centre of the discourse. The prophet-divine dialogue begins with a private oracle (14:11–12) which declares the divine prohibition of intercession together with the complete rejection of the laments. The word נַעַמָּ in v. 13 signals another lament, portraying the extreme distress of the prophet due to the problem of false prophets: “Look, the prophets are telling them, ‘You will not see the sword nor will you have famine, but I will give you lasting peace in this place.’” The thrust of the prophet-divine dialogue is contained in Yahweh’s answer (14:14–16) which denies the legitimation of the false prophets whose words are characterized as נַעַמָּ (14:14). The false prophets are prophesying out of their own minds rather than from Yahweh. The falsehood of their prophecy brings about the subsequent doom oracle which not only speaks against the false prophets but also the people to whom they are prophesying (14:15–16).

Jeremiah 14:1–15:4 is fundamentally dialogical in character which together with the communal laments is said to reflect a Temple liturgy recited at a fast called in response to a drought (14:1; cf. 14:12). Boda suggests that Jer 14:17–21 “is a liturgy from the time of siege which has been incorporated into a larger liturgy for a time of

---

40 Note that the private oracle starts with a new messenger formula: אֱלֹהִים נַעַמָּ (14:11).
41 Note that Yahweh’s answer opens with another messenger formula: אֱלֹהִים נַעַמָּ (14:14).
43 Boda suggests that “Jeremiah was involved in communal ceremonies in which he would receive an oracle from Yahweh in response to communal lament.” Thus the prophet-divine dialogue could be viewed as a prophetic approach to Yahweh asking for a divine answer which is judgment (14:15–16); Boda, “From Complaint to Contrition,” 192.

The liturgical character of the text is supported by a number of scholars, e.g., Fretheim, Jeremiah, 217; Carroll, Jeremiah, 306; Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 205; Lundbom, Jeremiah 1–20, 692. However, Jones disagrees with this view: “None of these is explicable as liturgy. They are explicable as Jeremiah’s intervention in a liturgy”; Jones, Jeremiah, 204.
drought.” As a result, Jer 14:1–15:4 is a unified liturgy from the time of a drought which serves as a sign of a greater calamity that lies in the future, that is, death and deportation (14:12; cf. 21:7–10). If so, then the liturgy of the drought (14:1–15:4) must come from a period later than the liturgy of the siege (14:17–21). Since 14:2–6 seems to reflect a period prior to the fall of Jerusalem, the depiction of the drought would be more appropriate to the period of Zedekiah’s reign when the people had experienced a situation of siege under Jehoiachin. However, Kessler reminds us that the final form of Jer 14:1–15:4 when read within its literary context should be regarded as a sermon addressed to the exilic Jewish community with the intention of persuading “the hearers that Yahweh was right in meting out such severe punishments (theodicy).”

Jeremiah 14:1–15:4 as a whole deals with the prophet and his role in the Judean community, revolving around the common understanding that it was an essential part of a prophet’s duty to intercede on behalf of his people in order to bring about salvation in the time of distress (cf. Deut 9:25–29). When the prophet of Yahweh pleads for God’s

---

44 Boda, “From Complaint to Contrition,” 194. In contrast to Lundbom who argues that the lament related to siege is later than the one related to the drought; Lundbom, Jeremiah 1–20, 714. Boda’s suggestion seems to be more likely as the final piece is now headed with the superscription “Concerning the Drought” which governs the reading of the whole passage.


46 Nobles, servants, and farmers (14:3–4) are depicted with no sign of social disorder caused by the fall of Jerusalem, e.g., Jer 27:20; 39:6 which emphasize the death of the nobles and Jer 31:24 which implies the absence of farmers; Boda, “From Complaint to Contrition,” 195.

47 Boda, “From Complaint to Contrition,” 195. Cf. Craigie et al. who suggest a date for the judgment of sword and famine against Jerusalem (Jer 14:17–21) in the reign of Jehoiachin, ca. 597 B.C.: “The passage as a whole seems to picture a time after invasion but before the final deportation”; Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 200, 203. Holladay claims that the date that gave rise to this counter-liturgy was 601; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 427.

48 Kessler identifies a series of sermons within the wider context of Jer 14:1–15:4: (1) Sermon on repentance (Jer 7–9); (2) Sermon on idolatry (Jer 10); (3) Sermon on the broken covenant (Jer 11–12); (4) Sermon on the imminent exile (Jer 13); (5) Sermon: From drought toward exile (Jer 14–15); (6) Sermon: No immediate future (Jer 16–17); and (7) Sermon: The potter’s prerogative (Jer 18–20); Kessler, “Drought,” 520.
mercy on his people, the community normally expects the deity to answer with words of deliverance (cf. Jer 21:2; 37:3; 42:2, 4, 20). The communal laments (14:7–9, 19–22) used by Jeremiah are usually uttered on behalf of the people by a cultic intercessor, a prophet, or priest, as a vehicle of hope. What is striking here is that, after lament and confession of sin, the divine answer is not the expected word of salvation but a threat of judgment (14:10; 15:2). The deity takes even further initiative prohibiting Jeremiah from praying for the welfare of the people (14:11; 15:1) as their failure to live up to their covenant obligations have rendered intercession irrelevant (14:10; cf. Jer 13). Once the divine conversation is closed, the Israelites have reached the edge of God’s graciousness. Instead of blessings, they will only have covenant curses: sword, famine, pestilence (14:12; cf. Deut 28:15–48). This implies that Judah must be punished for her sin and divine favor will only be restored after her iniquity has been fully repaid (cf. Isa 40:2).

The unrelenting doom would imply that Jeremiah was a failed prophet because he could not spare the people from future destruction by interceding for them. Instead of blessing, the prophet must announce the coming judgment which cannot be averted. On

---

49 See the discussion in Boda, “From Complaint to Contrition,” 192.

50 Boda traces the prayer ministry of Jeremiah in Jer 7:16; 11:14; 14:11 and concludes that this ministry of the prophet occurs in a public setting: “This evidence strongly suggests that Jeremiah participated on several occasions in communal ceremonies in which laments were uttered”; Boda, “From Complaint to Contrition,” 191.

51 Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 205; Jones, Jeremiah, 208; Carroll, Jeremiah, 319; Brueggemann, Jeremiah, 136; Kessler, “Drought,” 519.

52 Carroll argues: “The oracle of salvation, so typical of the divine response to the lament, is conspicuously absent from this composition and its lack demonstrates that the purpose of the section is to construct an explanatory schema for the fate of Jerusalem and the people”; Carroll, Jeremiah, 319. The only other case where a popular lament is followed by an oracle of doom instead of hope is in Hos 6:1–3, 4–6; Kessler, “Drought,” 519.

53 Jeremiah’s role as intercessor is emphasized throughout the book, e.g., Jer 7:16; 11:14; 14:11; 37:3; 42:2, 4, 20. However, Jeremiah is told repeatedly that he must not continue to intercede on behalf of such a sinful people. This only underscores the fact that intercessory prayer was a vital part of Jeremiah’s ministry. Cf. Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 205.
the contrary, the false prophets of Jeremiah’s day also petitioned on behalf of the people and promised them freedom from war and peace as a result of their intercession (14:13). Because of this comforting message, the people were misled and failed to grasp what was really happening: “Your prophets have seen for you false and foolish visions; and they have not exposed your iniquity so as to restore you from captivity, but they have seen for you false and misleading oracles” (Lam 2:14; cf. Jer 23:9–40). Jeremiah had to transform the expected and uniform prophetic assurances into warnings and predictions of judgment. The prophet as a spokesperson of God must speak the word of Yahweh even though this will be painful for the people to hear (cf. 14:1). The prophetic word originating from Yahweh must obey the will of God.  

What is the purpose of recalling this antecedent? Redditt views כָּנָף as idols and thus claims that the prophet reused this tradition because Jer 14:22 “emphasized the power of God to do things other gods or people cannot.” Mitchell also states that the “doctrine” taught in the Zecharian poem echoes the “rhetorical question” of Jer 14:22: “Are there any among the idols of the nations who give rain?” Mason probably gets the proper focus of Jer 14:1–15:4 and asks the right question: “But here it is important to note that the Jeremiah/Deuteronomist tradition which appears to be re-interpreted and re-applied is one in which polemic against the wrong leadership and direction of false prophets is strongly to the fore. Has this element also been taken up in Zech 10:1f?” As other scholars, Mason wrestles with the meaning of כָּנָף, which he sees as idols,  

---

54 Clements, Jeremiah, 89–96.  
55 Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 118.  
56 Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 286.  
58 The idea of having the כָּנָף as representations of household deities has been generally accepted among scholars. Thus, the presence of the word כָּנָף in Zech 10:2a leads scholars to associate the
but which are at odds with the Jeremianic intertext where the shared words are largely drawn from v. 14.

This onesided interpretation favouring idolatry over false prophecy is not necessary. First, the word כְּלָיָם appears only fifteen times in the Hebrew Bible, yet there is still no consensus on what כְּלָיָם are, as Schmidt comments: “What the Teraphim represented is anyone’s guess.” Second, the combination of prophets and idols as the problem of Yahweh’s people is not odd in the Hebrew Bible, e.g., Deut 13:2–6 [13:1–5] where the people are warned not to follow those prophets and dreamers (כְּלָיָם) who tempt them to worship other gods. The same linkage between idolatry and false prophecy is also evidenced in Zech 13:2–6 where the idols will be cut off and the

prophets will be removed.\textsuperscript{61} Third, the terms used in 10:2a–b are generally related to false prophets. For example: (1) The qal participle of \textit{cop}\textsuperscript{62} is commonly associated with false prophecy in prophetic literature (cf. Mic 3:5–11; Jer 29:8; Ezek 13:9; 22:28), especially in Mic 3:7 where the term refers to false prophets; (2) the use of \textit{$n$} in Zech 10:2 may have been influenced by Jer 23:25–32 where the connection between the interpretation of dreams and false prophets is made explicit: "The prophet who has a dream may relate \textit{his} dream, but let him who has my word speak my word in truth" (Jer 23:28a); and (3) From the exilic period, \textit{lt-t} was used commonly in connection with qualifying prophetic phenomena that were to be rejected, particularly when it is used together with \textit{nn} to contrast the authentic words of the prophets (cf. Ezek 13:4–9). In view of the above, we may conclude that the main concern of Zech 10:1–2 is probably over illegitimate religious practices, most likely relating to idolatry and false prophets (cf. Zech 13:2–6), both of which can be found in the Jeremianic intertexts.

When reading Zech 10:1–2 together with this Jeremianic sermon, what additional depth of meaning can we perceive for the Zecharian text? After proclaiming the great blessing in Zech 9:16–17, the prophet of Zech 9–14 expresses a pastoral concern for the


\textsuperscript{62} The qal participle of \textit{cop} appears 12 times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 18:10, 14; Josh 13:22; 1 Sam 6:2; Isa 3:2; 44:25; Jer 27:9; 29:8; Ezek 13:9; 22:28; Mic 3:7; Zech 10:2. The root \textit{cop} is never used in association with priests; Redditt, "Israel's Shepherds," 639.

\textsuperscript{63} In prophetic literature, the noun \textit{nn} only appears in Isa 29:7; Jer 23:27, 28\textsuperscript{2x}, 32; 27:9; 29:8; Dan 1:17; 2:1, 2, 3; Joel 3:1 [2:28]; Zech 10:2. Cf. Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 121; Carroll, Jeremiah, 473.

community. By alluding to Jer 14:1–15:4, the Mahnspruch, which represents the
prophet’s diagnosis of the contemporary condition of the community, serves as an urgent
call soliciting the people to make a proper response in time—return to Yahweh and obey
his word. In order to do so, both the backdrop of the Jeremianic passage (i.e., drought)
and the thrust of the antecedent (i.e., false prophets) are recalled for the readers. The
material evoked for the former theme lies mainly in Jer 14:22, whereas that for the latter
one in Jer 14:14.

When the leaders, 65 representing the community, were busy dealing with the
disaster of the drought, the prophet admonished them to seek Yahweh (shafta מֶׁהָרָה),
probably through the true prophet (cf. נָשִּׁית אֲדֹנֵי הָאָדָם, Isa 7:11), 66 as God is the sole
source of rain, a symbol of subsistence of life. The opening verse (Zech 10:1a) serves as
a reply to the rhetorical question in Jer 14:22a: “Are there any among the idols of the

---

65 See discussion above.
66 The technical termshafta in Zech 10:1a overlaps somewhat with נָשִּׁית, connoting a sense of
consulting a deity in a cultic context (Isa 65:1). When נָשִּׁית is used in a prophetic or priestly inquiry of God
or idols, it is usually followed by a preposition מ introducing the object of inquiry (HALOT, 1372; cf. Judg
1:1; 20:18; Hos 4:12; Ezek 21:26 [21:21]; 1 Chr 10:13). However, Zech 10:1 does not appear to have this
kind of divinatory inquiry in mind. The construction ofshafta with מ generally denotes a request/demand for
something specific, e.g., Exod 12:35; Josh 15:18; 1 Kgs 2:20; Ezra 8:22; Neh 13:6; cf. HALOT, 1373.
The qal imperative ofshafta appears 24 times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 4:32; 32:7; Judg 18:5; 1 Sam
17:56; 25:8; 1 Kgs 2:20, 22; 3:5; 2 Kgs 2:9; 4:3; 2 Chr 1:7; Job 8:8; 12:7; Pss 2:8; 122:6; Isa 7:1122; 45:11;
Jer 6:16; 18:13; 30:6; 48:19; Hag 2:11; Zech 10:1. Of the 24 occurrences ofshafta in qal imperative, the
construction with the imperativeshafta followed by מ and מ is only attested in Isa 7:11 and Zech 10:1.
Probably, we can nuanceshafta משָּׁה in Zech 10:1 by referencing Isa 7:11, where Ahaz was told to ask for a
sign from Yahweh (shafta מֶׁהָרָה נָשִּׁית) in a time of threat, most likely through the prophet Isaiah (The
oracle of the Immanuel sign appears in Isa 7:10–25 where Yahweh seems to be the speaker [7:10].
However, the combination of 1st-person perspective with 3rd-person references to Yahweh throughout the
so-called Yahweh speeches [7:11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20] demonstrates that Isaiah is speaking on Yahweh’s
behalf; cf. Sweeney, Isaiah 1-39, 146).
In light of Isa 7:11, the constructionshafta מ in Zech 10:1a may signify the leaders’
tercession to the deity, probably through the prophet, in a time of disaster, similar to the case of Ahaz. In
this view, to ask from Yahweh (shafta מֶׁהָרָה) something does not necessarily mean that the summons in v. 1
is a “critique of the modes of contacting divinity” as Meyers and Meyers contend: “It is noteworthy that
the exhortation is to address Yahweh directly. There is no notion of intermediaries”; Meyers and Meyers,
Zechariah 9–14, 180.
nations who give rain? Or can the heavens grant showers?” The purpose of the connection is to arouse the community to embrace the same kind of trust confessed in Jer 14:22b: “Therefore we hope in you! For you are the one who has done all these things.” This allusion works together with the other intertext, Deut 11:13-17, affirming Yahweh as the sole source of salvation in time of distress and foregrounding the importance of the covenantal fidelity of the people in the fulfillment of the promised abundance.

However, the prophet-divine dialogue of the source (Jer 14:11-16) reminds the people that the present disaster of drought is only a sign pointing towards a greater calamity that lies in the imminent future (cf. v. 12). They were already in a desperate state in which divine judgment will be inevitable in order to purge their sin (v. 11; cf. Zech 12:1-13:6). The unrelenting note of judgment on the Jeremianic audience who had failed to make an appropriate response in time serves as an alarm for the Zecharian readers, summoning them to make a wise choice at the present moment.

The major problem within the community is the internal threat of corrupt leadership who, probably, resorted to false prophecy connected with idolatry (cf. Zech 13:2-3). The thrust of the Jeremianic source is evoked in order to apply the same polemic against the false teaching of those who were meant to be Yahweh’s spokespersons. Jeremiah 14:14 is summoned to support the accusation in Zech 10:2 in which the leaders were admonished not to side with the false prophets whose messages originate from their own mind rather than Yahweh. The worthless and empty counsel of the deceptive diviners had caused the people to turn away from the true prophet and thus Yahweh’s word, resulting in a lack of divine direction in a time of plight. The prophet
warns the leaders, thus the people, not to fail as their forefathers did, encouraging them to return to the true source of salvation, that is, Yahweh himself.

What will be the consequence if the audience adheres to the guidance of the false prophets? Zechariah 10:2 tells us that the messages of כָּרוֹם and כָּלָּמָה have produced two effects: (1) the people felt relieved (כָּלָּמָה, 10:2b) because of the comforting messages;67 and (2) the people suffered as a flock without shepherd (כָּרוֹם ... אֶרֶץ, 10:2c) for the misguidance of the empty consolations. The identity of the אֶרֶץ in 10:2c has aroused great attention. Scholars generally want to make sense of it by relating it to אֶרֶץ in 10:3a. Based on Isa 44:28 and 45:1, Sweeney contends that the corrupt shepherd who had scattered the people must be the Persian monarchs who had failed to carry out Yahweh’s purpose in reestablishing the deity’s dominion over the entire world.68 Petterson argues that the shepherd in 10:2c refers to the previous kings of Israel who had been removed by Yahweh in the past.69 However, the expression כָּרוֹם ... אֶרֶץ is a simile commonly used in the Hebrew Bible to stress the plight of the people who suffer due to the lack of true guidance. Apart from here, the idiom occurs three other times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 27:17; 1 Kgs 22:17//2 Chr 18:16; Ezek 34: 8.70

67 Floyd understands the oracular inquiry as a concern about the time when the spring rains will come; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 472. However, that is unlikely to have been the inquiry as everybody knew at what time the spring rains were supposed to come, unless they are overdue. Most likely, כָּרוֹם ... אֶרֶץ have given the inquirers a comforting message—the rains would come in their season.
68 Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 669.
69 Petterson argues: “...the people’s present lack of a shepherd was Yahweh’s judgment on the failure of the kings of Israel and Judah...it is clear that the shepherd which the people lacked in 10:2 was a king of their own”; Petterson, Behold Your King, 155.
70 The intertextual analysis of the imagery of כָּרוֹם ... אֶרֶץ will be discussed below.
In Num 27:17, it is the death of Moses that will make the congregation lose its leadership. In 1 Kgs 22:17//2 Chr 18:16, it is the death of king Ahab which will result in all Israel scattered on the mountains. In Ezek 34:8, it is bad leadership which cannot provide proper guidance that makes the people become a prey just like a flock without a shepherd. Apart from here, the verb פָּעַל together with the simile כָּפָר appears also in Ps 78:52 where the people were led safely because Yahweh was their shepherd. Therefore, the phrase כָּפָר...אֵל רְוֹדֵה is a conclusion to the foregoing material, expressing in figurative language, the plight of the people which has resulted from the misguidance of the leaders who resorted to false prophecy during a time of adversity (10:2a–b). The people had no proper leadership to lead them in the proper direction and therefore they were on a path to destruction. Since the formulation כָּפָר...אֵל רְוֹדֵה in v. 2c is a simile used to express the miseries of the people, we are reluctant to identify the כָּפָר here with someone in the real world.

---

71 Larkin argues that the imagery of כָּפָר...אֵל רְוֹדֵה in Zech 10:2c “may allude to a tradition from Num 27:16–17” in which Moses prays for a successor; Larkin, Eschatology, 90. Here, Moses himself could be seen as the shepherd of his flock (cf. Isa 63:11). Moses was, in Deuteronomic eyes, the prototype of the true prophet, to be contrasted with false prophets (Deut 18:15–22). If it is correct, then this phrase further indicates the concerns about false prophets as those expressed in Jer 14:14 and Deut 18.

72 Person argues that the imagery of כָּפָר...אֵל רְוֹדֵה in Zech 10:2c may “draw from 1 Kgs 22:13–23, where the prophet Micaiah prophesies the death of king Ahab against the empty consolation of the false prophets (22:13); Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 120. If it is correct, then this phrase further denotes the concerns about false prophets which are expressed in Jer 14:14.

73 The Ezekiel oracle undoubtedly includes references to various kinds of Judean leaders, all of whom are targeted one by one in Ezek 22:23–28, particularly the prophets who were rebuked twice in vv. 25 and 28; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 187–88. If this is correct, then this phrase further denotes the concerns about false prophets expressed in Jer 14:14.

74 The same adverse consequence can be found when the people listened to the false prophets, e.g., in Jer 14:13–16; 23:32; Ezek 13:9–11.

75 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 72; Tromp, “Bad Divination,” 49.
This segment (Zech 10:3–5) continues to focus on the restoration of the house of Judah (10:3b), the faithful remnant in the Persian province of Yehud. The portrayal of the frustrating leadership situation of the community in 10:1–2 serves as the backdrop for reading the present oracle. After diagnosing the afflictions of the people, the oracle turns to the solution of the problem. The emphasis shifts from the aimless sheep to the faulty נְיוֹרָיו and מָרֵדֵי, with a first-person divine speech accusing them of leading the people astray (10:3a). The third-person prophetic comments in vv. 3b–5 serve as an elaboration further expounding the divine judgment announced in 10:3a. The prophetic speech includes the renewal of the people (10:3b) and the renewal of their leaders (10:4), with 10:5 portraying the climax of this transformation.
The Condemnation of the Leadership (Zech 10:3a)

The divine reproach bursts out abruptly, forcibly condemning צַוְּדָקָה יִרְצֹה חַרְצֹו הָאֵבָה. The qal participle of צַוְּדָקָה is a frequently used term, occurring nearly 100 times in the Hebrew Bible. As pastoralism was a central part of Israel’s subsistence economy, the word צַוְּדָקָה became a common metaphor for leadership. 76 Yahweh is seen as the divine shepherd-king of Israel, providing guidance and protection to his flock (cf. Ps 23; Isa 40:11). Shepherd imagery is also applied to human rulers, whether royal or nonroyal, both of Israel (e.g., David and Moses; cf. 2 Sam 5:2; Isa 63:11) and of foreign nations (e.g., Cyrus and leaders of foreign armies; cf. Isa 44:28; Jer 6:3). Ultimately it became a metaphor for future ideal leaders of Israel (cf. Ezek 34:23; Mic 5:3 [5:4]). The context here in Zech 10 is negative and thus צוֹדָקָה denotes faulty leaders. In prophetic literature, it is not uncommon to use this designation to denounce unworthy leaders of Israel (cf. Isa 56:11; Jer 2:8; Ezek 34:2).

The adversative sense of the opening line carries over to the next bicolon, placing blame also on צָרָת צָרָת. The noun צָרָת occurs 29 times in the Hebrew Bible, only attested in plural form. It mainly denotes male goats, particularly those used in sacrificial offerings, with only four usages representing leadership. 77 The behavior of an צָרָת as an animal within a herd of goats is reflected in Jer 50:8 where צָרָת צָרָת are the ones that lead

---

76 The image of the shepherd and his flock is common in the literature of the ancient Near East in descriptions of the relationship between a king and his people. In an Egyptian text prior to 2000 B.C., a god-king delivers Egypt as a herdsman of all men [humans] (ANET, 443). Also Hammurabi claims that he is a shepherd of his people (ANET, 164). Golding, “Shepherding 1,” 18–28; Golding, “Shepherding 2,” 158–75; Ryken et al., Biblical Imagery, 782–85; Thomson, “Shepherd-Ruler,” 406–18.

77 The noun צָרָת appears 29 times in the Hebrew Bible, with 25 occurrences either denoting the animal male goats, mainly as sacrificial victims (Gen 31:10, 12; Num 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 88; Deut 32:14; Pss 50:9, 13; 66:15; Prov 27:26; Isa 1:11; Ezek 27:21) or used figuratively of princes and people for Yahweh’s eschatological slaughter/sacrificial (Isa 34:6; Jer 51:40; Ezek 39:18). In the remaining instances the word is used to represent leadership (Isa 14:9; Jer 50:8; Ezek 34:17; Zech 10:3).
the flock. Hence, the function of כְּנֵים within a herd underlies the metaphoric use of the term for human leadership.

The majority of scholars view כְּנֵים and כְּנָעָנים as operating in parallel and regard them as the contemporary leadership caste of the audience. The dispute among them generally revolves around the identity of these leaders. Based on Ezek 37:24 where the shepherd is David, Hanson argues that the plural shepherds in Zech 10:3 refer specifically to the Davidic governor and his officials in the post-exilic period. However, the Ezekiel reference in chapter 37 more likely looks to the prospect of a future Davidic restoration rather than to the Davidic government in the late sixth century. Petterson contends that כְּנָעָנים and כְּנֵים in 10:3a refer to foreign kings who oppressed Yahweh’s people; he claims: “Given the way that ‘he-goats’ refers exclusively to foreign kings elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, ... it seems best to understand these two terms in 10:3 as ... foreign kings.” Though several passages with the noun כְּנָעָן are connected with foreign rulers, the term is also used to denote the leaders of the Israelites, e.g., Ezek

---


Meyers and Meyers see כְּנֵים and כְּנָעָנים as referring to two tiers of human leadership; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 196, 233; cf. Meyers and Meyers, “Future Fortunes,” 213. Duguid argues: “These two groups seem to represent different levels of leadership ... then, the prophet seems to be addressing a message of judgment to all levels of leadership, both ‘the shepherds’ and ‘the he-goats’”; Duguid, “Messianic Themes,” 270.

79 Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 329–31. Similarly, Leske argues that the corrupt “shepherds” probably included the Zadokite priesthood and Davidic descendants; Leske, “Context and Meaning,” 673.


Tai, based on the textual correspondences (כְּנָעָן in Jer 25:34; כְּנֵים in Jer 25:37) between Zech 10:3a and Jer 25:32–38, argues in a similar but slightly different direction, suggesting that כְּנָעָנים and כְּנֵים in Zech 10 refer to the leaders of Judah as well as the nations; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 88.
Moreover, the verb חֲרָה which appears 93 times in the Hebrew Bible is never used to express Yahweh’s anger towards foreign leaders. The divine anger is almost always kindled against the Israelites, with only two exceptions depicting the cosmic manifestations of Yahweh’s anger against the enemies, including nations as a whole (2 Sam 22:8//Ps 18:8 [18:7]; Hab 3:8). The lexical choice might imply that the leadership here is unlikely to be understood as representing foreign rulers. Grounded on the language in Zech 10:6–7 specifying Joseph and Ephraim and in 10:10–11 signifying a wide dispersion, Meyers and Meyers contend that the condemnation of leadership in 10:3a is directed toward “the diaspora leadership,” namely, the rulers of the dispersed northerners who “have not used the full potential of their positions to encourage those still in exile to return to the land of Israel, to the province of Yehud.”

The problem with this interpretation lies in v. 3b where the causal נַעֲשֶׂה spells out the reason for Yahweh’s judgment against the inappropriate leadership—he cares for his afflicted flock (cf. 10:2c), namely, the house of Judah (יָשָׁר). The immediate focus of the text is on the interest of Judah rather than that of the dispersed northern exiles.

In searching for the identity of כֵּדֵי and כֵּיָּמִים, Mason’s suggestion is worth considering: “The promise to substitute the false leadership by that of divine appointment [in Zech 10:3–11:3] owes much in its terminology and ideas to the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.” As the earlier prophets, particularly Jeremiah and Ezekiel, often attack bitterly the leaders of their day whom they designate as כֵּדֵי and כֵּיָּמִים (cf. Jer 2:8; Ezek 34:17), which include primarily kings but also other positions of

---

81 Greenberg, Ezekiel 21–37, 705; Allen, Ezekiel 20–48, 164; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 473; Hals, Ezekiel, 253; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 214.
83 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 197.
responsibility, it is reasonable to assume that כהים here refer to the faulty leaders of the present community in Yehud, whether they were officials in the political, economic, or religious circles. 

The Renewal of the People (Zech 10:3b)

Yahweh promises not only to punish (כם) the corrupt leadership (Zech 10:3a) but also to care (כם) for his people (10:3b). Through his condemnation of the faulty leaders, the deity shows his intention to shepherd his flock (ךכםך) which is identified explicitly as בתי כהים (10:3b), the Jewish community in Yehud. Under this divine care, the community will be transformed dramatically from an aimless and defenseless “flock” (10:2c) into a splendid and mighty “horse” (ךכםך, 10:3b). By taking the antecedent of the 3ms suffixes of כהים as בתי כהים, not בתי יהודה which is referred to as אוסף, Judah is pictured as Yahweh’s majestic steed on which the divine warrior rides into battle (ךכםך, cf. 10:5a).

Rudman argues that the horse-metaphor of כהים alludes to Job 39:19–25, with מלך Hương (39:19), מלך (39:20), מלך (39:25) as catchwords. In Job 39, these three words

---

85 The connection to Ezekiel and Jeremiah will be discussed at the end of the chapter.
86 The noun כהים appears 38 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 29:28; 3:12; 30:40; 32:17; 20; Judg 5:16; 1 Sam 17:34; 2 Chr 32:28; Job 24:2; Ps 78:52; Prov 27:23; Song 1:7; 4:1, 2; 6:5, 6; Isa 17:2; 32:14; 40:11; Jer 6:3; 13:17, 20; 31:10, 24; 51:23; Ezek 34:12; Joel 1:18; Mic 2:12; 5:7; Zeph 2:14; Zech 10:3; Mal 1:14.
87 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 440.
88 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 440; Merrill, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 272. Though Yahweh is generally depicted as riding on clouds (cf. Ps 104:3) or cherubim (cf. 1 Sam 4:4), the imagery of Yahweh mounted on a horse (ךכםך) is reflected in Hab 3:8 (cf. 3:15).
89 The noun כהים appears 137 times in the Hebrew Bible.
91 The noun מלך appears 319 times in the Hebrew Bible.
are used to depict Yahweh’s mighty war steed which is excited by the sound of the battle.\textsuperscript{92}

\begin{quote}

\textbf{Job 39:19–25}

19 "Do you give the horse (םות) his might? Do you clothe his neck with a mane?

20 "Do you make him leap like the locust? His majestic (תוחו) snorting is terrible.

21 "He paws in the valley, and rejoices in his strength; he goes out to meet the weapons.

22 "He laughs at fear and is not dismayed; and he does not turn back from the sword.

23 "The quiver rattles against him, the flashing spear and javelin.

24 "With shaking and rage he races over the ground, and he does not stand still at the voice of the trumpet.

25 "As often as the trumpet sounds he says, 'Aha!' And he scents the battle (ע""ש) from afar, And the thunder of the captains and the war cry.
\end{quote}

Though the conjoined occurrence of בָּאָשׁ and הָעֵדָע is common (cf. Deut 20:1; 1 Kgs 22:4; 11 Kgs 3:7; Prov 21:31) and the noun חוחו is not rare in the book of Job (cf. Job 37:22; 40:10), their appearances together in one pericope describing the majestic horse created by Yahweh are striking. In addition, these are the only two instances in the Hebrew Bible where חוחו is employed to portray a horse. Whether Zech 10:3b recalls the majestic creature in Job for its audience is hard to say as we are unable to determine the direction of influence. The origin of the book of Job is controversial with conclusions ranging from the patriarchal period to the Persian era.\textsuperscript{93} In view of this, we may suggest that a

\textsuperscript{92} Rudman, “Warhorse,” 163–68.

\textsuperscript{93} Pope, \textit{Job}, xxx. Clines claims: "The author has so convincingly located his narrative in the patriarchal world that there are no clear contemporary allusions of any kind to the period contemporary with the author"; Clines, \textit{Job 1–20}, lvii. Schifferdecker argues: “There is no consensus about the dating of Job. ... This wide variety of opinions concerning the origins of Job ... is the result of a distinct lack of clues in the book as to its date. There are no historical ‘markers’ in the book ... The language of Job likewise makes it difficult to assign a particular date to the book. The Hebrew of the poetic core of the book is full of words that appear nowhere else in the Bible. ... Based on linguistic features alone the, scholars have not reached a consensus concerning the date of the book of Job”; Schifferdecker, \textit{Whirlwind},
general simile rather than a specific allusion is used here to depict the thoroughgoing nature of the change in Judah's fortunes.

The Renewal of the Leaders (Zech 10:4)

Verse 4 contains the following series of elements—יהו, יִשְׂרָאֵל, סֹבֶל, אֱלֹהִים. The first element יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs 30 times in the Hebrew Bible, with its most frequently attested meaning as "corner," mainly relating to an architectural designation (cf. Exod 27:2; 1 Kgs 7:34; Job 1:19). It is used as a metaphor for leadership in Judg 20:2; 1 Sam 14:38; and Isa 19:13. Mason suggests that in Ps 118:22, יִשָּׂרָאֵל provides a wordplay on "stone"—the stone that the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone (יהו סֹבֶל), that is, the king. If this is true, then the figurative use of יִשָּׂרָאֵל might carry some sort of royal nuance. Despite this, the corner of a structure used figuratively can signify leadership which provides essential support for the group being led similar to the corner which serves as the foundation of a building's superstructure.

---


94 The noun יִשָּׂרָאֵל occurs 30 times in the Hebrew Bible: Exod 27:2; 38:2; Judg 20:2; 1 Sam 14:38; 1 Kgs 7:34; 2 Kgs 14:13; 2 Chr 26:9, 15; 2 Chr 28:24; Neh 3:24, 31, 32; Job 1:19; 38:6; Ps 118:22; Prov 7:8, 12; 21:9; 25:24; Isa 19:13; 28:16; Jer 31:38, 40; 51:26; Ezek 43:20; 45:19; Zeph 1:16; 3:6; Zech 10:4; 14:10. The rendering "corner" is preferable as sometimes יִשָּׂרָאֵל is conjoined with יָד to confer the meaning of "cornerstone," e.g., Job 38:6; Jer 51:26.

95 Mason contends: "The similarity of vocabulary and thought [of Ps 118] to Zech 9.9f. is striking. Nowhere in this psalm is the speaker identified explicitly with the king. But of whom else would the words of v. 22 have any significance? Indeed, not only does v. 22 seem to imply the king, but vv. 10ff. can hardly refer to anyone else. That it is the king speaking in the individual passages in this liturgical celebration has been widely acknowledged...It is of interest that an identification of the 'stone' in Ps 118.22 with the Messiah is attested in the writings of later Judaism...The Targum on Zech 10.4 also interprets it of the Messiah, and of course, Christian interpretation of it in this sense is well attested in the New Testament"; Mason, "Use of Earlier Biblical Material," 79–80.

The second component יַעֲדֵם, which appears only 24 times in the Hebrew Bible, continues the architectural imagery of יִפּוּך. Its basic connotation is a “tent peg” which is used to secure a tent to the ground and thus lends stability to its structure (cf. Exod 39:40; Isa 54:2). The term is also used for a wall peg driven into a firm place from which heavy items could be hung (Isa 22:23–25; cf. Ezek 15:3). In the Isaianic text, יַעֲדֵם is used metaphorically for leadership as Eliakim is likened to a “peg” on which is hung the honor of his father’s house (Isa 22:23). Some scholars suggest that the language of Eliakim’s investiture (v. 21) together with the divine promise of placing on his shoulder “the key of the house of David” (v. 22) may provide יַעֲדֵם in the Zecharian text with a royal association. In any case, the sense of providing mooring and security for the object that a יַעֲדֵם holds is similar to that of יִפּוּך, thus alluding to leadership roles in a community.

The third element יָשִׁפָּה יִפּוּך used as a construct chain only appears here and in Zech 9:10 where the disarmament of Yahweh’s people is announced in a divine speech. Because of this removal of weaponry, Tai argues that the phrase here should connote a negative sense. However, this term can also carry a positive notion as the image of a war bow יָשִׁפָּה is also alluded to in 9:13 where Yahweh says that he has bent Judah as his bow with which he has filled Ephraim. The phrase יָשִׁפָּה יִפּוּך as a kind of weapon has a straightforward military meaning, conferring an idea of power and strength. Meyers and

---

97 The noun יַעֲדֵם appears 24 times in the Hebrew Bible: Exod 27:19x2; 35:18x2; 38:20, 31x2; 39:40; Num 3:37; 4:32; Deut 23:14; Judg 4:21x2, 22; 5:26; 16:14x2; Ezra 9:8; Isa 22:23, 25; 33:20; 54:2; Ezek 15:3; Zech 10:4.
99 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 91.
Meyers state that the use of this term here might allude to the future political independence of Judah when the restored people would have its own military force.  

This is a possible interpretation, however, we may ask why נְפָפ rather than other more common weapons, e.g., כֹּר, is used to signify the situation. Mason suggests that the Egyptian kings sometime bore the title of “He who repels the Nine Bows” where the “Bows” were kings hostile to Egypt. If so, then the term “Bow” might be a royal designation and thus כְּפֶפ could be symbolic of royal power. Though כְּפֶפ is the one with the least connection to leadership among other symbols, military leadership of some sort could probably be suggested by the parallel construction of the verse, in which כְּפֶפ parallels other metaphors of leadership. Hence, כְּפֶפ might pertain to a leader’s military strength which is important for the victory of the community in battle.

The last item שָנ, whose root is attested 23 times in the Hebrew Bible, confers the meaning of “one exerting power.” This participle which also occurs in Zech 9:8 usually carries negative connotations, depicting the oppressive actions of foreigners against Israel (e.g., Exod 5:6, 10), as well as those of the rich against the poor (e.g., Deut 15:3; Isa 58:3). Based on its use in 9:8, Tai argues that שָנ should refer to inappropriate leadership. However, this term is also used positively in Isa 60:17, depicting overseers with just rule. Since the overall context in v. 4 is positive, שָנ here should be

101 The noun נְפָפ appears 76 times in the Hebrew Bible.
102 The noun כֹּר appears 413 times in the Hebrew Bible.
104 The 23 occurrences of שָנ are: Exod 3:7; 5:6, 10, 13, 14; Deut 15:2, 3; 1 Sam 13:6; 14:24; 2 Kgs 23:35; Job 3:18; 39:7; Isa 3:5, 12; 9:3; 14:2, 4; 53:7; 58:3; 60:17; Dan 11:20; Zech 9:8; 10:4.
105 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 91.
viewed as a good ruler. The phrase כֶּלֶחְתַּעַת at the end of the line can be seen as a summary of the three images introduced above—לָיְרָה, עֵצָה, כַּנְעַה. The final adverb כָּרִיך describes a concerted effort by several participants (cf. Jer 31:8), denoting that all the leaders symbolized here will work in unity. Thus כֶּלֶחְתַּעַת could be understood as a conclusive remark of the previous metaphors collectively, with the finite verb כָּרִיך applying to each of them.

Zechariah 10:4 piles up a number of leadership metaphors with the four appearances of מי emphasizing the source of each of them. The Hebrew word מְמַנֶּת simply reads “from him.” However, it is uncertain whether the antecedent of the preposition is מי כַּנְעַה or בָּה יְהוָה. A number of scholars render it as “from them,” suggesting a reference to יְהוָה כַּנְעַה (10:3b). However, both the syntax (the reference of מי כַּנְעַה as בָּה יְהוָה) and the context (the stress on God’s activity) of the text favor Yahweh as the antecedent of מי. In view of this, we take מי כַּנְעַה as the antecedent of the preposition suffix, similar to those of מי כַּנְעַה and מי כַּנְעַה. By doing so, each unit of v. 4 identifies Yahweh as the source of leadership. The deity will provide new leaders to replace the corrupt ones (cf. 10:1–2). Hence, the divine intervention in v. 3 will not only bring forth the transformation of the community (10:3b), but also the renewal of their

---

106 We follow the MT by keeping the adverb כָּרִיך at the end of v. 4 instead of transferring it to the beginning of v. 5. Contra Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 98; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 326; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 70; Larkin, Eschatology, 91. Cf. Jansma, Inquiry, 84–85.

107 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 442; Petterson, Behold Your King, 162.

108 E.g., Leske, “Context and Meaning,” 673; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 199; Smith, Micah-Malachi, 264; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 324; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 68; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 671; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 78, 84; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 289; Larkin, Eschatology, 91; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 189; Webb, Message of Zechariah, 140; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 91; Otzen, Studien über Deuterosacharja, 142–43; Stuhlmüller, Rebuilding with Hope, 130; Dentan, “Zechariah 9–14,” 1099; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 477. Also see the translation in NAU, NRS, NIV, CJB.


110 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 441.
leadership (10:4). Both the community and the leaders will be transformed into a powerful fighting force (vv. 3b; 4a).

Apart from Zech 10:4b, the construction which uses both the suffixed יָד denoting the source of future leader(s) and the verb יָשֶׁר relating to the coming forth of that figure(s) can be found on three other occasions. In 2 Sam 7:12, this construction is used together to depict the divine promise of raising up a king who will come forth from the Davidic line: “When your days are complete and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your descendant after you, who will come forth (יָשֶׁר) from you הָעָם), and I will establish his kingdom.” In Isa 11:1, the construction is employed in a prophetic oracle promising that a shoot will come forth from the stem of Jesse: “Then a shoot will spring (הַשָּׁלֹם) from the stem (בעש), and a branch from his roots will bear fruit.” In Jer 30:21, the construction is used in a salvation oracle announcing that the future ruler of the restored community will come forth from Jacob, that is from their own people, rather than out of foreign nations: “‘His majestic one shall be from him הָעָם), and his ruler shall come forth (יָשֶׁר) from his midst; and I will bring him near and he shall approach me; for who would dare to risk his life to approach me?’ declares the LORD” (Jer 30:21, translation mine). Among these three occurrences, the Jeremianic one has a more impressive lexical correspondence in that both words are used in the same form as the Zecharian text. Based on this, we register Jer 30:21 as an intertext of Zech 10:4b.

In addition, Jer 30:21 is embedded within the Little Book of Consolation (Jer

---

111 Apart from Jer 30:21 and Zech 10:4, the common appearance of יחיא and יָשֶׁר can also be found in Hab 1:7 where justice and authority come forth (יָשֶׁר) from (יחיא) the Chaldeans.

112 Some scholars also detect this connection, e.g., Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 125–28; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 84; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 289; Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 121–22.
30:1–31:40 [LXX 37:1–38:40]) which is evoked three other times in Zech 9–10. The recurrent allusion to the same pericope contributes to the density of the shared features, thus supporting our argument of literary dependence.

Allusion to Jer 30:21. Jeremiah 30:21 is embedded within a poem (30:18–31:1), which is part of the Little Book of Consolation. The introductory formula בֶּן יָהּוָה in 30:18 and 31:2 defines the boundaries of the unit. The pericope can be divided into two stanzas: 30:18–22 and 30:23–31:1, each opens with a particle ויָהּוָה (vv. 18, 23) and closes with a covenant formula (30:22; 31:1). The former stanza presents the positive deeds of Yahweh, whereas the latter one recounts the negative acts of the Lord. However, the verbs יָשָׁב (vv. 18, 24) and גָּאֹל (vv. 19, 21, 23) bind the two parts of the poem together, with salvation being announced in the midst of judgment.

Our intertext lies within the first stanza (Jer 30:18–22) which begins with a divine promise, announcing the salvation of Jacob (v. 18). Based on his compassion, Yahweh will transform the fortunes of his people, rebuilding their city on its ruins and their palace on its proper place. In vv. 19–20, the people will celebrate with thanks because the Lord will restore them to their former glory and will punish their oppressors. Instead of being dominated by foreign authorities, their noble (אַראֵר) will come forth from the line of Jacob and their ruler (מֶלֶךְ) will go out from his own people. As a

---

113 For other allusions to the Little Book of Consolation in Zech 9–10, see “Allusion to Jer 31:12–13” in CHAPTER FIVE.
114 For the analysis of the Little Book of Consolation (Jer 30:1–31:40 [LXX 37:1–38:40]), see “Allusion to Jer 31:12–13” in CHAPTER FIVE.
115 Bozak, Life Anew, 22.
116 Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 103.
117 According to Holladay, Jer 30:18–21 is part of the recension directed towards the north, composed by the prophet Jeremiah probably at the time of Josiah; Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 156–59.
result, Yahweh’s people will no longer be enslaved by aliens.\textsuperscript{118} This new ruler will enjoy a good relationship with the deity: \( נָחַ֥ת נְבֵּיאָ֫ה אֵל \) (‘I will bring him near and he shall approach me’).\textsuperscript{119} The niphal of \( שָׁמַ֣יִם \) does not necessarily refer to a ‘cultic figure’ with a priestly function.\textsuperscript{120} Rather, \( שָׁמַ֣יִם \) can be connected to a ‘religio-social reality’ similar to the role of Josiah in 2 Kgs 23:3 where the king made a covenant before the Lord on behalf of his people.\textsuperscript{121} This renewal of relationship between the divine and human is summed up in the closing verse: ‘You shall be my people, and I will be your God’ (v. 22).

The identity of the ruler is not specified, however, the word \( מַכְּרַ֨בָּה \) resembles Deut 17:15 where the ideal king is identified as one from among his countrymen (\( מַכְּרַ֨בָּה אָ֫וַצָּה \)). Also, the participle \( מְשַׁל \) which parallels \( אָֽוַצָּה \) denotes ‘a person of authority and lordship, whose rank is close to that of’ a king.\textsuperscript{122} Thus, the expression \( מְשַׁלְּכֶם מַכְּרַ֨בָּה \) might add a royal connotation to the verse, though the word \( מַלֵּךְ \) is absent.\textsuperscript{123}

The restoration theme of the Jeremianic text is recalled in order to nuance by analogy the divine promise of new leadership for Yahweh’s people in Zech 10:4. In both texts, the Lord will raise up good leader(s) within the community to replace the faulty ones. By reading this intertextually, we conclude that the God-given leaders in the host will be ones who have a good relationship with the Lord and probably will assume a

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Reference} & \\
\hline
\textsuperscript{118} Carroll, 	extit{Jeremiah}, 583–84; Bozak, 	extit{Life Anew}, 59–66; Keown et al., 	extit{Jeremiah 26–52}, 103–104. & \\
\hline
\textsuperscript{119} Bozak, 	extit{Life Anew}, 64. & \\
\hline
\textsuperscript{120} Contra Carroll, 	extit{Jeremiah}, 583. & \\
\hline
\textsuperscript{121} Bozak argues: ‘Moses in his role of intercessor draws near to Yhwh (ng§ Ex 20:21; 24:2) much as the people draw near to him to receive his message (Ex 34:32); yet Moses’ role is not specifically priestly or cultic”’; Bozak, 	extit{Life Anew}, 64. & \\
\hline
\textsuperscript{122} Bozak, 	extit{Life Anew}, 63. Cf. Gross, “אָֽוַצָּה,” 69. & \\
\hline
\textsuperscript{123} Holladay translates the last line of Jer 30:18 אַשֶּׁר יְהֹוָ֥ה יִהְיֶ֖ה as “a citadel shall be enthroned on (the basis of) its legitimacy” and relates the words אִֽיָּר and יְהֹוָ֥ה in v. 21 to the king; Holladay, 	extit{Jeremiah 2}, 177, 79. Cf. Keown et al., 	extit{Jeremiah 26–52}, 103; Allen, 	extit{Jeremiah}, 339. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
mediatorial role of leading the people close to the deity. The identity of the future leadership in both texts is not explicit, however, the lexical choice in them most likely carries some royal association. This is particularly true if we also consider the other two instances (2 Sam 7:12; Isa 11:1) where the suffixed ṣ and the verb šw appear together in similar contexts. Despite extensive parallels, there are two differences between the alluded and the alluding texts: (1) The source text focuses on one single ruler, whereas the host text speaks of many ones;\(^\text{124}\) and (2) The Jeremianic text emphasizes that the future ruler comes forth from his own people, whereas the Zecharian one stresses that the renewed leaders go out from Yahweh himself, with the host text highlighting the ultimate source of leadership. Nevertheless, these distinctions will not affect the main focus of the texts, namely, Yahweh will restore faithful leadership for his people in the restoration era.

The identity of the transformed leadership has aroused great speculation. Meyers and Meyers contend that the leadership symbolized by these components relates to “the royal leader, an eschatological Davidide.” They claim that the association with “royal messianism” is appropriate as this leader will emerge from Judah.\(^\text{125}\) From our preceding discussion, we agree that the new leadership from Yahweh most likely includes the royal circle. However, the metaphors of Zech 10:4 envisage a plurality of leadership rather than a single figure as in Zech 9:9–10, thus undermining the messianic

\(^{124}\) Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 126, 128.

interpretation. On the contrary, Leske argues that it is the house of Judah who “will become the instruments of God’s reign over the nations” by supplying the leaders as cornerstone, tent-peg, and battle-bow (10:4), envisioning democratization of kingship. It is true that the new leaders will arise from Judah; however, we should not tie this phenomenon to the concept of democratization of kingship. In 10:4 the emphasis is on Yahweh who will replace those corrupt leaders with good ones in order to deliver his people, Judah, from their affliction (10:2c). When read in context, the metaphors represent the rise of a multiplicity of leaders to address the need of the people rather than the community replacing the king.

The Climax of the Renewal (Zech 10:5)

Verse 5 continues to picture the restoration of Judah, with a prophetic comment describing an unspecified third-person plural (יְהַלְגָּדְתָּם, 10:5a) who will be transformed קֹדֵמָם. Because קֹדֵמָם which occurs here also appears in 10:3b where Judah is referred to as יְהַלְגָּדְתָּם, many scholars argue that it is the restored people, that is the house of Judah, who will fight as קֹדֵמָם. We agree that קֹדֵמָם may serve as a catchword, linking v. 3 and v. 5 together. The lexical choice reminds us that the renewed people will join the battle as warriors. However, the word קֹדֵמָם also occurs in v. 4 where the military strength of the future leaders is depicted, allowing us to conclude that the

126 Petterson, Behold Your King, 163–66; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 442–43.
127 Leske, “Context and Meaning,” 673, 677. Scholars advocating this line of interpretation include, e.g., Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 100; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 331; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 119–120; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 74.
128 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 443; Petterson, Behold Your King, 163–66.
129 The plural form (יִכְּלֶגֶדְתָּם) only appears here and in Joel 2:7. The singular form (יִכְּלֶגֶד) which occurs in Isa 42:13; Jer 14:9; 20:11; 50:9; Pss 19:6; 78:65; Job 16:14 mostly is used to describe Yahweh (Isa 42:13; Jer 14:9; 20:11; 78:65; cf. Zeph 3:17).
130 Those scholars who argue that יִכְּלֶגֶד refers to the house of Judah support this view. See above.
God-given leaders will also participate in the battle, directing the people to fight against the oppressors.131

In this view, the new leaders together with the renewed Judeans will be like נביאים, a term which often refers to skilled warriors (e.g., Josh 10:2, 7).132 The image of trampling (טב; cf. Isa 14:25; 63:6)133 in the muddy streets (밖에 צחשב, cf. 2 Sam 22:43; Mic 7:10)134 in time of war connotes a sense of triumphant military conquest (10:5a). The term is so powerful that they will not only subdue their foes but also humiliate (תן; cf. Pss 44:8 [44:7]; 53:5) the strongest opposing forces, the cavalry (10:5b). The victory of the נביאים is linked to the presence of Yahweh: ב יד יהוה כحسب (10:5b; cf. Josh 10:12, 42).

The success of the future leadership and the transformed community rests completely with the Lord.

The turn of fortune for the community rests totally upon Yahweh's visitation (웍, Zech 10:3). The verb יスペ is common and appears more than 300 times in the Hebrew Bible, basically conferring a sense of paying attention to or making a careful inspection, either for ill or good.135 It can mean "to punish" in a negative sense (cf. Isa 24:21; Jer 6:15) and "to care" in a positive one (cf. Exod 4:31; Ps 80:15 [80:14]), depending on the context of the text. In v. 3, the double appearance of יスペ denoting both senses is strikingly similar to that in Jer 23:2, a text embedded within Jer 23:1-4 which announces the judgment of Yahweh on the shepherds with the promise of salvation to the flock.

---

131 The noun נביאים is the only word which appears three times in Zech 10:3–5.
132 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 442.
133 The verb טב occurs 12 times in the Hebrew Bible: Pss 44:6; 60:14; 108:14; Prov 27:7; Isa 14:19, 25; 63:6, 18; Jer 12:10; Ezek 16:6, 22; Zech 10:5.
134 The noun כב appears 13 times in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Sam 22:43; Job 41:22; Pss 18:43; 40:3; 69:15; Isa 41:25; 57:20; Jer 38:6; Mic 7:10; Nah 3:14; Zech 9:3; 10:5. The construct chain with כב and כב occurs in 2 Sam 22:43; Pss 18:43; Mic 7:10; Zech 9:3; 10:5.
135 HALOT, 956; BDB, 823.
Besides the distinctive construction of כֹּכַב, there are other lexical similarities between the two texts and their literary contexts: כֶּבֶן, רַבָּה, זֶבַח, and the characteristic pair of פֶּרֶשׁ in piel 136 and בָּשָׂט in hiphil. 137 Based on this, we register Jer 23:1–4 as an intertext of Zech 10:2c–5. 138

Jeremiah 23:1–4
1 “Woe to the shepherds (סֵפֶר) who are destroying and scattering the sheep (יָדַע, cf. יָדַע of Zech 10:2c) of My pasture!” declares the LORD (יְהוָֹה, cf. Zech 10:12b).
2 Therefore thus says the LORD God of Israel concerning the shepherds (כֹּכַב) who are tending (כַּהַנָּם) My people: “You have scattered My flock (יָדַע, cf. יָדַע of Zech 10:2c) and driven them away, and have not attended to them (כֶּבֶן וְכֶבֶן לֹא). Behold, I am about to attend to you (כֶּבֶן לֹא), for the evil of your deeds,” declares the LORD (יְהוָֹה, cf. Zech 10:12b).
3 “Then I Myself will gather (כָּבָּד;) the remnant of My flock (יָדַע, cf. Zech 10:8a, 10a) out of all the countries where I have driven them and bring them back (כָּבָּד;) to their pasture, and they will be fruitful and multiply (כָּבָּד;) declares the LORD (יְהוָֹה, cf. Zech 10:12b).
4 “I will also raise up shepherds (כֹּכַב;) over them and they will tend them (כַּהַנָּם;) and they will not be afraid any longer, nor be terrified, nor will any be missing (כֶּבֶן),” declares the LORD (יְהוָֹה, cf. Zech 10:12b).

136 The piel of כֹּכַב appears 49 times in the Hebrew Bible within which its appearance in the first person singular with Yahweh as subject and Israelites as object, denoting a sense of Yahweh gathering his people to the land, only occurs in Neh 1:9; Isa 43:5; 54:7; 56:8; Jer 23:3; 29:14; 31:8; 32:27; Ezek 11:17; 20:41; 28:25; 34:13; 36:24; 37:21; 39:27; Mic 2:12; Zeph 3:20; Zech 10:8, 10.

137 Though the hiphil of בָּשָׂט appears around 100 times in prophetic literature, its appearance in the first-person singular with Yahweh as subject and Israelites as object, denoting a sense of Yahweh bringing back his people to their land, only occurs in Jer 12:15; 16:15; 23:3; 24:6; 28:4; 29:10, 14; 30:3; 32:37; Zech 10:10. If our suggested reading of בָּשָׂט is preferred (see next chapter), then Zech 10:6 is added to these occurrences. Among all these passages, only Jer 23:3; 29:14; 32:37 and Zech 10:10 conjoin with the piel כֻּבֶּשׁ in the first-person singular with Yahweh as subject and Israel as object. Cf. Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 120.

138 Many scholars have noted the connections between Jer 23:1–3/4 and Zech 10; e.g., Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 196; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 100–103; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 120–25; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 669; Boda and Porter, “Literature to the Third Degree, 225; Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 195; O’Brien, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 245.

139 For the discussion of בָּשָׂט in 10:6b, see CHAPTER SEVEN.
Allusion to Jer 23:1–4. Jeremiah 23:1–4 is embedded within a lengthy collection (Jer 21:11–23:8) which consists of many short oracles. The whole collection can be divided into two main sections: the oracles of doom (21:11–22:30) and the oracles of salvation (23:1–8) with 23:1–4 as a transition. However, the two sections are linked together with some verbal parallels, e.g.: (1) speech in 22:13, 18 and 23:1; (2) in 21:12; 22:2, 4, 30 and 23:5; (3) the demand of and in 22:3, 15 and 23:5; (4) as a metaphor for kings in 22:22 and 23:1, 2, 4; and (5) successive use of in 22:22 and 23:2, 4. The introductory phrase in 21:11 not only sets off this unit but also places up front the main issue of the entire collection.

The first section (Jer 21:11–22:30) is a series of doom oracles condemning mostly the last kings of Judah. It spells out the covenant responsibilities of the kings (cf. 22:1–5, 15) and announces the coming judgment against them because of their misdeeds (cf. 22:13–23). As the kings do not keep the demands of the covenant, they will be excluded from the promise of the Davidic covenant and the present royal house will collapse with no hope for restoration (22:30). The demise of the royal house will result in the destruction of the royal city (cf. 22:8–9) and the exile of the people (cf. 22:10).

---

140 The extent of the unit is debated among scholars. Some suggest the unit extends through v. 8; e.g., Brueggemann, Jeremiah, 205; Jones, Jeremiah, 296; Longman, Jeremiah, 159; Fretheim, Jeremiah, 324; Kuyvenhoven, "Jeremiah 23:1–8," 3; Klein, "Jeremiah," 167. Others propose the unit includes only vv. 1–4, e.g., Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 324; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 613; Carroll, Jeremiah, 443. The position in this dissertation is similar to the latter view which concludes that Jer 23:1–8 consists of three separate but interrelated oracles addressing the crisis resulting from the demise of the royal house and the catastrophe of the exile.

141 Some attach Jer 21:1–10 (oracles against Zedekiah and the fate of Jerusalem) as a preface to the collection of the royal house of Judah (Jer 21:11–23:8), e.g., Carroll, Jeremiah, 404.


143 A similar transition word in Jer 23:9 marks off this unit. Cf. Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 290–333.


blame of the post-Josianic kings in the doom oracles probably reflects the historical perspective of the closing decade of Judah prior to the deportation of the southerners.  

The second section (Jer 23:1–8) consists of three salvation oracles (23:1–4, 5–6, 7–8) promising deliverance to the people of Judah who are going into exile. It serves as a climax of and a response to previous oracles of doom (Jer 21:11–22:30), offering the addressee a message of hope. However, this hope is only realized in a future time after the judgment of deportation prophesied in the doom oracles of the collection.

The first salvation oracle (Jer 23:1–4) includes two parts, with vv. 1–2 focusing on the divine reproach to the bad shepherds and vv. 3–4 on the divine care for the scattered sheep. The pericope begins with the word “woe” (הוֹז, 23:1; cf. 22:13) which only extends through v. 1 where the shepherds (רעים) are accused of destroying and scattering Yahweh’s sheep. The plural רעים in Jer 23:1 could be a reference to the leaders of Judah, however, when read in light of the context, particularly the next pericope, the metaphor most likely signifies the kings and the royal court. The transition word לֶבֶן in v. 2 switches the attention to Yahweh’s call to account, with the divine judgment against the רעים announced in a first-person speech. The improper discharge of responsibilities (i.e., not caring for the sheep; שָׁפָרָת אֵלֵי אֵלִים) of the רעים incurs punishment from the deity (והי אָדָם שָׁפָרָת לֵעָלָם) which signals the beginning of salvation to the remnant. Despite the fact that the failure of the רעים had caused the scattering of the flock

---

146 Most scholars share this view, e.g., Carroll, Jeremiah, 435; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 610; Longman, Jeremiah, 155.
148 In Jeremiah, רעים is commonly used as a metaphor to denote all kinds of leaders, including priests, kings and prophets of Israel (cf. Jer 2:8; 3:15; 10:21) and of foreign nations (cf. 12:10). See the discussion in Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 70–75.
149 Carroll, Jeremiah, 435; Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1–25, 326.
(23:2), Yahweh claims that he is the one who has thrust his flock into diverse lands (23:3) because of the sins of the leaders (22:13–19) and also of the people (22:9), a reason supplied in the context.\(^{150}\)

In vv. 3–4 the discourse shifts abruptly with the first-person divine saying moving beyond the judgment of the יִהְיוּדֵי יְבֵשֶׁת to the deliverance of the יִהְיוֹדֵי יְבֵשֶׁת.\(^{151}\) The tone is entirely positive, focusing on what Yahweh is going to do for the remnant of his people. A series of gracious actions are promised to the sheep who will be scattered: (1) Yahweh will gather (אֲשַׁפֵּר) the remnant of his flock out of all the countries; (2) he will bring them back (יָדְגְּבִּיהוּ) to their homeland; (3) where they will become fruitful and multiply (יְהַבֵּר נֶבֶר); and finally (4) the deity will install good leaders (יְהַקָּמֹת סְלָמִים וְרֵעוּתָם) to take care of the regathered flock. After this salvation process, the people will neither fear (יְכַפֵּר) nor be dismayed (לֹא יִכָּמֵר) any longer (23:4). The typical formula לֹא יִכָּמֵר...לֹא יְכַפֵּר appears 14 times in the Hebrew Bible, mostly due to Yahweh’s presence with the ones addressed (cf. Deut 31:8; 1 Chr 28:20).\(^{152}\)

After the general promise of a new caste of faithful leadership in Jer 23:4, the next salvation oracle (23:5–6//33:14–16) picks up the same theme but confines it to a particular king, a rightful descendant of David, with the verb יְהַקָּמֹת joining the two sections together. The raising-up of a Davidic scion here might serve as a reversal of the covenant curse in 22:30. In contrast to the condemned ones (21:11–22:30), this new king will fulfill the covenant requirement expected of a royal figure: וְנָעַשׂ הַמֶּשֶׁה עַצְמָהּ בֵּאֵרִים (23:5; cf. 22:3, 15). Under his reign, the people, both Judah and Israel, will be liberated,


\(^{151}\) Contra Carroll, who argues that v. 3 is an interpolation from Ezek 34 as it “interrupts the flow of imagery about leadership” which is the main point of vv. 1–4; Carroll, Jeremiah, 444.

\(^{152}\) The typical formula לֹא יִכָּמֵר...לֹא יְכַפֵּר appears 14 times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 1:21; 31:8; Josh 8:1; 10:25; 1 Chr 22:13; 28:20; 2 Chr 20:15, 17, 32:7; Jer 23:4; 30:10; 46:27; Ezek 2:6; 3:9.
and will return and dwell securely in the land (23:6). The parallelism of יְשָׁרֵא in 23:6 suggests that Jeremiah’s old dream of the reunion of north and south (3:18) is still alive.\(^{153}\)

The adverb כל, the temporal clause והימים, and the messenger formula in v. 7 all serve to link the third salvation oracle (Jer 23:7–8//16:14–15) to the previous one (23:5–6), with the former emphasizing the return from deportation and the latter stressing the rule of the future Davidic king. The return motif here might be treated as a reversal of the curse in 22:27. This final unit (23:7–8), like the two previous ones, has a positive message of what will come after the judgment of exile—return to their homeland. In the second exodus, not only those deported to Babylon but also those scattered to all the countries will be brought back by the Lord (23:8). If that were to happen it would surpass the original exodus and even eclipse it because it would be a much broader exodus. The hyperbolic expression (23:8) in the form of a change of oath pattern of the returnees functions to contrast Yahweh’s earlier rescue with the latter one to come, envisaging a grand return of all exiles wherever they were.\(^{154}\) This last salvation oracle echoes Jer 23:3 not only in terms of theme, but also in terms of a verbal parallel: מְסַלָּל מִלְחַמְתּוֹ אַשְׁרֵי נַחֲלֵי יְשָׁרֵא (23:8b); cf. מְסַלָּל מִלְחַמְתּוֹ אַשְׁרֵי נַחֲלֵי יְשָׁרֵא of 23:3.

The similarities between Zech 10:2c–5 and Jer 23:1–4 are remarkable, with both verbal linkages and thematic connections binding the two texts together:

1. The use of the shepherd-flock motif—both passages include a rebuke against faulty shepherds (שָׁפִיר, רַע of Zech 10:3a) and a salvation oracle to

\(^{153}\) The reading of Jer 33:16 is Judah and Jerusalem rather than Judah and Israel suggests that the later generation might envisage a restoration of the south alone. Cf. Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 619.

\(^{154}\) Carroll, Jeremiah, 448; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 622–23.
the flock (Jer 23:3; Zech 10:3b) which is referred to as Yahweh's herd (אָבְרֶם of Jer 23:2, 3; אָבְרֶם of Zech 10:2c; שִׂיחַ of 10:3b).

(2) The double use of יִכְגָּר—the verb יִכְגָּר is used twice in each text (Jer 23:2; Zech 10:3) to denote the meaning of care for (אָבְרֶם) and punishment to (אָבְרֶם). Despite the numerous occurrences of the verb, this is the only other place in the Hebrew Bible where יִכְגָּר is also used in both senses with the same context as that of Zech 10:3. 155

(3) The theme of Yahweh as the source of good leadership—after the judgment of the faulty leadership, Yahweh promises to raise up good leaders for the people (Jer 23:4; Zech 10:4–5).

(4) The motif of Yahweh’s presence—the presence of the Lord which is vital to the success of the restored community is reflected in both texts: לְאִמָּיוֹת שָׁם וְאֶלֶּיהָ (Jer 23:4); והי הָאָלֶתֶּם (Zech 10:5b).

In addition, Jer 23:1–4 also contains connections with the wider context of Zech 10:2c–5:

(1) The theme of Yahweh gathering (אָבְרֶם, Jer 23:3; Zech 10:8a, 10a) the scattered sheep and bringing them back (אָבְרֶם, Jer 23:3; Zech 10:6b, 10a) is strong in both passages with כֹּבֵן and שֶׁב as catchwords.

(2) The motif of Yahweh dispersing his people among other nations appears in both texts (אֲחָסֵן הָעַלֶּם of Jer 23:3; אֲחָסֵן הָעַלֶּם of Zech 10:9a).

(3) The promise of posterity, with the expression אֵלֶּה וְיִרְבּוּ אֶלֶּה in Jer 23:3, resembles the clause יוֹרָד אֶלֶּה רֹד in Zech 10:8a.

156 For the reading of אֲחָסֵן הָעַלֶּם in Zech 10:6b, see CHAPTER SEVEN.
(4) The presence of the messenger formula נֵאמָּה, signifying the divine source of the message is found in both passages (Jer 23:1, 2, 4; Zech 10:12b).

Nevertheless, when we scrutinize the reuse of Jer 23:1–4 in Zech 10, we notice that some elements in the source text have been altered in order to produce a different picture in the new context:

(1) The use of the verb יָדַעְתָּ is modified. In Jer 23:2 Yahweh blames the shepherds for not having taken care of the sheep (שְׁפַרְתָּ הַיָּרָה) and threatens to call them to account (שְׁפַרְתָּ הַיָּרָה), whereas in Zech 10:3 Yahweh threatens to call the he-goats to account (יֵשָׁע לְךָ מַעֲשֵׂי הָעָם) for the deity has taken care of his flock (קְפִּרְתָּ הַמַּעֲשֶׂה). The prophet in Zechariah draws on the שְׁפַרְתָּ-language from the source text but changes it so that the emphasis shifts from the responsibility of the shepherds to the personal care of the Lord, foregrounding not only the salvific intent of the deity but also the prominent theme of Yahweh as the good shepherd of his flock. The motif of Yahweh as the good shepherd is pivotal for understanding the rest of the chapter.

(2) The promise of the restoration of the flock is updated. The scattered sheep in the source text will be gathered (קְפִּרְתָּ הַמַּעֲשֶׂה) and brought back (זְרַע הַשָּׁבָע) by Yahweh with a result of fruitfulness in the land, whereas the afflicted flock in the host text will be transformed into a majestic horse of Yahweh ready for battle (Zech 10:3b). The change reflects the current state of the audience, the house of Judah. In the Jeremianic text, the Judeans were going to face exile. The promise of gathering, returning, and multiplying matches well their future needs, thus giving them hope. On the other hand, the Yehudites in Zech 10 had already been gathered and brought back home by the Lord. What they mostly needed at the moment was the strength
and power that could help them to cope with their daily struggle in the land (cf. Ezra 4:7–23). The intertext thus is updated in order to continue to provoke hope in a new context.

(3) The salvation oracle is not only updated but also reapplied. In the host text, the promise of gathering ( множ, 10:8a, 10:8b), returning ( ישראל, 10:6b, 10a), and multiplying (ރئ, 10:8b) is now applied to the northern deportees. By doing so, the dispersed northerners are also considered the sheep of Yahweh, on a par with Judah ( נצו, Zech 10:3b), as all these divine acts are promised to Yahweh’s flock ( צע) in Jer 23:3. This practice of reapplication is common in Zech 10 as the transformation of Ephraim always echoes the language of the renewal of Judah: (1) the term נבשנים, used to depict the restored southerners including their newly appointed leaders (10:5a), is appropriated in 10:7a (נכי) to describe the redeemed northerners; and (2) the verb בָּדֶה, employed to portray the divine empowerment of Judah (10:6a), is adopted to delineate that of Ephraim (10:12a). This resignification is significant as it not only spells out God’s salvific will for the northerners but also reminds the audience of an important element in Yahweh’s restoration plan—to regather and reunite all his people as one flock under one shepherd. This motif is further intensified when we read the Zecharian oracle in light of its intertextual literary context where (1) a new Davidic king will be installed to rule over the united monarchy with justice and righteousness (Jer 23:5–6); and (2) a grand return of all exiles from all the lands is hyperbolically envisaged (Jer 23:7–8). The theme of unity has been evoked repeatedly in Zech 9, e.g., vv. 9–10.

---

157 See “Historical Setting” in CHAPTER TWO.
(4) The effect of the divine appointment is widened. In Jeremiah the sheep in the source text will be saved and secure (Jer 23:4) with proper tending of the newly raised shepherds. Whereas in Zechariah new leadership will be raised not only to provide security (10:4), but also to lead the empowered Judeans to fight in battle (Zech 10:5). The military language is strong in Zech 10:3–5 but absent in Jer 23:1–4. What might be the intention of extending the effect of the installation of new leaders? As we have argued in the previous chapter Yahweh intends to prepare Judah as a weapon fighting for Ephraim (Zech 9:13). Thus the extension of the effect here fits well our suggestion that the restored Judeans under effective leadership are to be instrumental in securing the return of the rest of Israel (10:6–12). The military aspect of the text reflects the redemptive role of the revived Judah who will battle against great powers in order to free the captives.¹⁵⁸

(5) The impact of the alluded literary context is enlisted. The whole restoration process depicted in Jer 23 includes three stages—the rectification of the frustrated leadership situation (23:1–4) is followed by the coming of a Davidic king (23:5–6) and a grand return of all exiles to the land (23:7–8). By staying at the first stage of the restoration, Zech 10:3–5 leaves the readers in a state of suspense, forcing them to look for the rest of the restoration—the promise of the righteous rule of a Davidic king (23:5–6) and the vision of the return of the north and of the south to the land (23:7–8). The former links the audience back to Zech 9:9–10 where a Davidic king with elaborate attributes is envisioned. The latter forms the core of Zech 10:6–12 where the return of the northerners is expected. By taking the alluded literary context as an

intertextual backdrop, the text reminds the Zecharian readers that they should participate in the salvation of their dispersed brothers so that the full restoration anticipated in Jer 23 will be completely realized after the remaining exiles have returned to the land as envisioned in Jer 23:7-8.

Besides Jer 23:1-4, the shepherd-flock motif, with Yahweh rebuking the corrupt shepherds and promising salvation to his flock, is also strong in Ezek 34 where the word נָזִיר is attested too. Of the four instances where the word נָזִיר is used to refer to leadership (Isa 14:9; Jer 50:8; Ezek 34:17; Zech 10:3), Ezek 34:17 exhibits the closest affinity with Zech 10:3, in which the נָזִיר in both passages refer to the leaders of the Israelites. Besides the word נָזִיר, there are other shared words/phrases between the two texts and their literary contexts: רַעַה (Ezek 34:2, etc.; Zech 10:2c, 3a), תּוֹרָה (Ezek 34:12; Zech 10:3b), and רַעַה (Ezek 34:8; Zech 10:2c). Based on the above, we register Ezek 34:1-22 as an intertext of Zech 10:2c-3, with תּוֹרָה, רַעַה, and רַעַה as markers.

Ezekiel 34:2, 8, 12, 17

2 “Son of man [human], prophesy against the shepherds of Israel (ים). Prophesy and say to those shepherds (ים), ‘Thus says the Lord God, “Woe, shepherds of Israel (ים) who have been feeding themselves! Should not the shepherds (ים) feed the flock (ים)?

8 “As I live,” declares the Lord God, “surely because My flock (ים) has become a prey, My flock (ים) has even become food for all the beasts of the field for lack of a shepherd (ים), and My shepherds (ים) did not search for My flock (ים), but rather the shepherds (ים) fed themselves and did not feed My flock (ים);

12 “As a shepherd (ים) cares for his herd (ימים) in the day when he is among

---

159 In Isa 14:9 the word נָזִיר refers to all the leaders of the earth, whereas in Jer 50:8 it is used as a metaphor.
his scattered sheep (נְפֶרְדֵּד), so I will care for My sheep (נְפֶרְדֵּד) and will deliver them from all the places to which they were scattered on a cloudy and gloomy day.

17 “As for you, My flock (נְפֶרְדֵּד), thus says the Lord GOD, ‘Behold, I will judge between one sheep and another, between the rams and the male goats (נְפֶרְדֵּדִים).

Allusion to Ezek 34:1–22. Ezekiel 34 is a literary unit, opening with a message reception formula: יְהֹוָה דָּבָר הָאֵל לָאָמָר, which next occurs in 35:1. The chapter as a whole is both an oracle of judgment and an oracle of salvation. It can be divided into four units. The first one (vv. 1–16) begins with a severe condemnation of the shepherds who only profited from their positions without exercising proper responsibility (vv. 2–4). As a result, the flock was scattered and became a prey for lack of a shepherd (vv. 5, 8). Yahweh promises to deliver his flock and shepherd his sheep personally (vv. 10–16). The second one (vv. 17–22) shifts the focus to the flock (נְפֶרְדֵּד). Not only will the shepherds be judged but also the flock, distinguishing between the fat sheep and the lean ones. The third one (vv. 23–24) envisions Yahweh’s appointment of a human shepherd, David, to tend his flock, though the deity is mentioned as the shepherd of the flock (cf. vv. 10–16). The fourth one (vv. 25–31) ends with a vision of an idyllic future, with the restored people living in peace and prosperity.¹⁶¹

As the words/phrases which are shared by both texts appear up to Ezek 34:17, it is most likely that the Zecharian text intends to recall for the readers the first two units of Ezek 34, where the shepherd-flock motif is developed at great length. The Ezekielian source is summoned as a supplement to the host, particularly to nuance the affliction of the sheep for lack of proper leadership (34:1–10; cf. Zech 10:2c) and the determination of Yahweh to be the good shepherd of his flock (34:11–16; cf. Zech 10:3).

However, the motif of gathering and return (cf. Zech 10:6, 8, 10) and the promise of Yahweh raising-up good leaders (cf. Zech 10:4) for the restored community in the Zecharian text are dependent on the Jeremianic source rather than the Ezekielian one. Although פִּסַּח in piel (Ezek 34:13; cf. Zech 10:8a, 10a) and רָשַׁב in hiphil (Ezek 34:4, 16; cf. Zech 10:6b, 10a) are also attested in Ezekiel 34, the motif of gathering the dispersed exiles and returning them to the land in Zech 10 demonstrates a literary connection to Jeremiah. For Jeremiah the stereotypical language of gathering and return is פִּסַּח and רָשַׁב (cf. Jer 23:3; 29:14; 32:37), whereas in Ezekiel the stereotypical formula is פִּסַּח with רָשַׁב and/or מַעֲבַר, with the last term echoing the Exodus traditions (cf. Ezek 20:34–35, 41–42; 34:13; 36:24; 37:21). Regarding the theme of the raising-up of good human leaders for the restored community after the judgment of the shepherds, Zech 10:4 shows close affinity with Jeremiah too. In Jer 23:4 human shepherds will be raised up by the divine to tend the regathered flock (ךָ֥חֲצֶהוּ שָׁלַ֣וּ הָעָ֣ם וּרְאֵ֥הוּ, Jer 23:4), whereas in Ezek 34:23 only one shepherd, i.e., David, is envisioned (ךָ֥חֲצֶהוּ שָׁלַ֣וּ הָעָ֣ם וּרְאֵ֥הוּ, Ezek 34:23). Thus, both Jer 23 and Ezek 34 are summoned to nuance the host text, however, the former source is alluded to more than the latter one, so that the Jeremianic source acts as a backdrop for the majority of Zech 10, whereas the Ezekielian one only serves as a supplement to Zech 10:2c–3.

162 See above.
Summary (Zech 10:1–5)

Source Text

In Zech 10:1–5, five intertexts are detected (see Table 8 below), of which three (no. 2, 3, 5) are recalled from the book of Jeremiah. Among these Jeremianic antecedents, two of them (no. 2, 5) constitute significant allusions, with Jer 14:1–15:4 serving as the backdrop of Zech 10:1–2 and Jer 23:1–4 acting as the backbone of Zech 10:3–5. They are evoked to nuance the transformation of Judah, particularly relating to the issue of improper leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zech 10:1–5</th>
<th>Intertext</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>Deut 11:13–17</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:1–2</td>
<td>Jer 14:1–15:4</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10:4b</td>
<td>Jer 30:21</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:2c–3</td>
<td>Ezek 34:1–22</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10:2c–5</td>
<td>Jer 23:1–4</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refer to “The Nature of Textual Relationships” (Chapter One)

Table 8: Intertexts of Zech 10:1–5

Intertextual Reading

The opening Mahnspruch (Zech 10:1–2) represents the prophet’s diagnosis of the contemporary problem of Judah. When the leaders were busy dealing with the disaster of the drought, the prophet admonished them to ask for rain from Yahweh as he is the sole source of salvation. In order to add motivation to the exhortation, Deut 11:13–17 is recalled for the readers, reminding them that Yahweh is the author of rain, the source of fertility. By evoking this Deuteronomic source, the conditional nature of the antecedent
is also imported into the host to nuance the promised prosperity, both in Zech 10:1b and Zech 9:17b, stressing that exclusive loyalty to the deity is a prerequisite for the fulfillment of future restoration.

However, the major problem within the community is the internal threat of corrupt leadership who sided with false prophets. The Jeremianic source (Jer 14:1–15:4) is summoned to sharpen the accusation in v. 2, serving as a polemic against the empty counsel of the deceptive diviners. The unrelenting judgment in the alluded text functions as an alarm, warning the leaders that divine punishment will be inevitable.

Zechariah 10:3–5 serves as the solution to the problem diagnosed in the previous pericope (10:1–2). Ezekiel 34:1–22 is summoned to nuance the affliction of the flock resulting from improper direction. The frustrating leadership situation will be rectified when Yahweh visits his flock (v. 3). The punishment of the bad leaders signals the beginning of salvation for the people. At that time the house of Judah will be transformed into Yahweh’s majestic horse (v. 3b), whereas the unworthy leadership will be replaced by a God-given one (v. 4). By reading this together with Jer 30:21, the good leaders would be ones who have a good relationship with the Lord and who would lead the people close to the deity. Though the identity of the כְּלֵי הָדוֹר in the Zecharian text is not explicit, the metaphors most likely signify the kings and the royal court when read in light of the intertexts and their contexts (Jer 23:1–4; 30:21). The rebuke of the false prophets in 10:1–2 and the reproach of the royal caste in 10:3–5 match well the divine cleansing in 12:10–13:6 where the house of David (13:1) and the pseudo-prophets (13:2–6) are singled out for purification. Finally, both the renewed community and the newly raised leaders will become powerful military forces, ready to fight in battle as
mighty warriors (v. 5a). The transformed Judeans under this new leadership will subdue their foes due to the presence of Yahweh with them (v. 5b).

In order to nuance the restoration of Judah, Jer 23:1–4 is recalled as an intertextual backdrop for Zech 10:2c–5. In both texts, the divine visitation marks the inauguration of the salvific process. However, by deviating from the source, the host text provides another picture for the readers. The promise of gathering, returning and multiplying in the alluded text is now reapplied to the northern exiles in the alluding text, making Ephraim on par with Judah as the flock of the Lord. The sheep in the source will be saved and secure, whereas the flock in the host will become a majestic horse of Yahweh. The military language in the Zecharian text but absent in the Jeremianic one echoes well the divine intention of preparing Judah to be an instrument of war for the return of the rest of Israel (10:6–12; cf. 9:13). By remaining at the first stage of the restoration process depicted in Jer 23:1–8, the suspense prompts the readers to participate in the salvation of their dispersed brothers so that the whole restoration envisioned in Jeremiah will be realized.
CHAPTER SEVEN
THE RESTORATION OF EPHRAIM:
AN INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF ZECHARIAH 10:6–12

Introduction

After examining the transformation of Judah (Zech 10:1–5) in the previous chapter, this chapter will analyze the restoration of Ephraim (Zech 10:6–12). For Judah, the main problem is the corrupt leaders who will be replaced with God-given ones. In the end, the Judeans together with their leaders will be turned into a military force, fighting victoriously as warriors (v. 5). For Ephraim, the main concern is the return of the exiles who will be gathered, brought back, and become numerous (vv. 6–11). Finally, the Ephraimites will be strengthened so that they can walk in Yahweh’s name (v. 12).

For the investigation of the restoration of Ephraim, we will discuss the intertextual connections of the text under three topics: (1) the salvific plan for Ephraim (10:6–7); (2) the gathering and return of Ephraim (10:8–11); and (3) the climax of the renewal (10:12).

Salvific Plan for Ephraim (Zech 10:6–7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 10:6–7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a Then I will strengthen the house of Judah, and the house of Joseph I will deliver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b Then I will bring them back for I had compassion on them, and they will be as if I had not rejected them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c For I am Yahweh their God, and I will answer them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zechariah 10:6 marks the transition in the chapter from the transformation of Judah (10:3–5) to the restoration of Joseph (10:6aβ–12), with a shift from a third-person prophetic comment to a first-person divine speech, spelling out the salvific will of Yahweh. The transformation of the house of Judah is summed up quickly at the outset of v. 6, using a verb that echoes the noun זכר in v. 5a. Then the focus of the rest of the chapter turns immediately to the house of Joseph (דם זכר), which is subsequently addressed by a series of words (verbs and nouns) with third-person plural suffixes. The construction of v. 6 links the strengthening of Judah (v. 6α; cf. 3b, 5) to the deliverance of Joseph (v. 6β; cf. 6b–12), assigning a role to the southerners in securing the return of the northerners from distant lands (cf. 9:13). The gracious actions of Yahweh towards Judah are only part of his restoration scheme which aims at a glorious and triumphant future for reunited Israel.

The phrase סובב זכר refers to those tribes from the northern kingdom (cf. Amos 5:6) who were taken into exile when Samaria, their capital, fell to the Assyrians in 722 B.C. Yahweh here promises to deliver (משחר) this community from their present

---

1 The verb ברך appears 25 times in the Hebrew Bible, among which the piel form of the verb only occurs in Ecc 10:10; Zech 10:6, 12. The other occurrences of the verb are Gen 7:18, 19, 20, 24; 49:26; Exod 17:11; 1 Sam 2:9; 2 Sam 1:23; 11:23; 1 Chr 5:2; Job 15:25; 21:7; 36:9; Pss 12:5; 65:4; 103:11; 117:2; Isa 42:13; Jer 9:2; Lam 1:16; Dan 9:27.
2 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 235; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 443. Cf. “Sons of Zion” in CHAPTER FIVE.
4 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 207; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 443.
adversity and bring them back (וְחָבָרָם). The mention of יִשְׂרָאֵל is rare in late biblical literature, particularly in the post-exilic prophetic books. The use of this epithet might indicate a strategy to link the present deliverance of the northerners to the previous salvation oracle: נַעֲמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶבֶר אֵין בְּשִֽׁמְךָ (Zech 9:11b) where the Joseph narrative is evoked, reminding the audience of the divine invitation to return to the northern exiles in Zech 9:12. However, the syntactical juxtaposition of the house of Judah with the house of Joseph in the central part of 10:6a signifies that all Israel, both Judah and Joseph, is in the redemptive plan of the deity. In addition, the phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל also functions as an intertextual marker for v. 10b, as discussed below.

The verb וְחָבָרָם in Zech 10:6b looks strange, thus Sæbø calls it “die unmögliche Verbform.” Jansma suggests that וְחָבָרָם might be a conflation of two readings: (a) וְחָבָרָם which appears also in Zech 10:10a and is supported by the Peshitta, and the Vulgate; (b) וְחָבָרָם which is reflected in καὶ κατοικῶν ἀντεύσθη in the LXX. Based on the line: וְחָבָרָם (10:6b), Sæbø argues that the original reading was וְחָבָרָם as, he explains, יִשְׂרָאֵל implies that “sie werden im Lande wohnen können.” However, the connotation of bringing the people back to the land suggested by וְחָבָרָם could also

---

5 For the restoration of the northern kingdom, see Greenwood, “Northern Kingdom,” 376–85.
6 See “Prisoners of the Hope” in CHAPTER FIVE.
7 Translated as: “The impossible verbal form”; Sæbø, Sacharja 9–14, 66.
8 The verb וְחָבָרָם is a 1cs hiphil perfect of וָשִֽׁבָּר with 3mp suffix and consec 1, rendered as “then I will bring them back.”
9 The verb וְחָבָרָם is a 1cs hiphil perfect of וָשִֽׁבָּר with 3mp suffix and consec 1, rendered as “then I will settle them.”
10 Jansma suggests: “It is possible that M. has a conflate text in order to continue two traditions one of which is supported by G, whilst the other one is the base of the renderings of S. and V”; Jansma, Inquiry, 87.
11 Translated as: “They will be able to live in the land”; Sæbø, Sacharja 9–14, 66–67.
work in harmony with the idea of סuyển לא לָוִיתִים since exile denotes divine rejection. In addition, if the hiphil of כִּבֵץ is to be used, it would usually be followed by a phrase qualifying how or where they were to dwell, e.g., Ps 4:9 [4:8]; Isa 54:3; 1 Sam 12:8; Zech 9:6; 12:6. The omission of that qualification makes it likely that it was the hiphil of כִּבֵץ which was intended to be used. Although verbs with the root of either כִּבֵץ or כִּבֵץ occur frequently in Zech 9–14, the former reading is more appropriate to the immediate context of Zech 10:6–12 which embraces the theme of return of Yahweh’s people, evidenced especially in the double use of קִבֵץ (10:8a, 10a) and כִּבֵץ (10:9b, 10a).

The reading in the LXX might involve graphic confusion and/or transposition of certain consonants. In view of the above, we opt for the reading כִּבֵץ כִּבֵץ. If our suggested reading of כִּבֵץ כִּבֵץ is preferred, then the first two verbs in Zech 10:6b would be כִּבֵץ כִּבֵץ and כִּבֵץ כִּבֵץ, which appear exactly in Jer 12:15 with the same forms and connotations. Based on this similarity, Tigchelaar suggests that Zech 10:6b

12 See discussion below.
13 Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 300.
14 In Second Zechariah, verbs with root of כִּבֵץ occur in Zech 9:8, 12x; 10:6, 9, 10; 13:7; and verbs with root of כִּבֵץ occur in Zech 9:5, 6; 12:6; 14:10, 11x.

Meyers and Meyers assert: “The similarity of the two roots involved, and the complementarity of their meanings (‘to bring back’ the exiles implies God’s concomitant intention ‘to resettle’ them in their homeland), no doubt underlie the confusion”; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 209.

Larkin states that “the mixture is deliberate” in order to capture both senses of כִּבֵץ and כִּבֵץ; Larkin, Eschatology, 92. Likewise, Lacocque regards כִּבֵץ כִּבֵץ as a hybrid form which combines the hiphil forms of כִּבֵץ and כִּבֵץ; Lacocque, “Zacharie 9–14,” 166. Cf. Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, 100; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 93.

16 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 93.


The piel of כִּבֵץ with Yahweh as subject and his people as object denoting a sense of Yahweh
links to Jer 12:15: “And it will come about that after I have uprooted them, I will again have compassion (חַדְשֵׁי) on them; and I will bring them back (חַדְשֵׁי), each one to his inheritance and each one to his land.”¹⁷ This looks appealing since both passages depict the restoration of Yahweh’s people after exile and emphasize the compassion of the Lord as the motivation for the divine promise of homecoming of the exiles. However, since there is uncertainty about the reading of חַדְשֵׁי, we are reluctant to use the word as a catchword arguing for literary dependence. In addition, the common appearance of חַדְשֵׁי in piel and חַדְשֵׁי in hiphil denoting a similar sense is not rare in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Jer 42:12; Ezek 39:25).

In the Zecharian text, Yahweh’s restorative act (חַדְשֵׁי in hiphil; 10:6b) is grounded on a double foundation: (1) his compassion (חַדְשֵׁי, 10:6b) and (2) his covenant (חַדְשֵׁי, 10:6c). The deity will restore the community because of his deep affection for them as his people (cf. Deut 30:3). His character of compassion (Exod 33:19) expressed through his commitment to covenant (Lev 26:44–45; cf. Exod 20:2; 29:46) forms the basis of this liberation.¹⁸

Because of his compassion (חַדְשֵׁי, 10:6b), Yahweh will restore the dispersed northerners to their former state: חַדְשֵׁי (10:6b). The verb חַדְשֵׁי here with Yahweh as subject and Israelites as object to denote the deity’s rejection of his people is odd.¹⁹

¹⁸ Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 444.
Out of its 16 appearances in the Hebrew Bible, none is used in this way in prophetic literature where the more common verb for Yahweh’s rejection is יָרַע (Isa 41:9; Jer 2:37; 6:30; 7:29; 14:19; 31:37; 33:24, 26; Hos 9:17; Amos 5:21). The verb יָרַע is attested predominantly in the Psalter, mainly denoting the defeat of the Israelites in battle as a result of Yahweh’s rejection (cf. Pss 44:10 [44:9]; 60:12 [60:10]; 108:12 [108:11]); it is particularly used in relationship to the deportations (cf. Ps 74:1; Lam 2:7; 3:31). The application of the concept of divine rejection to the exiled Israelites implies that their undesirable status of landlessness and oppression was due to Yahweh’s punishment on their sin rather than the ability of the foreign nations to exert power. The particles יָרַע indicates that Yahweh has rejected his people, probably referring to the exiles too (cf. Zech 10:8a, 9a). The use of this uncommon יָרַע here might indicate an allusion to Lam 3:31–33 where יָרַע with the same sense is found; it also is the only other place in which יָרַע appears together with יָרַע. Based on the impressive verbal parallels (יָרַע יָרַע, יָרַע יָרַע) and the same sense of the words being used within the context of exile, we register Lam 3:31–33 as an intertext of Zech 10:6b.

**Lamentations 3:31-33**

31 For the Lord will not reject (יָרַע יָרַע) forever,
32 For if He causes grief, then He will have compassion (כָּל) according to His abundant lovingkindness.
33 For he does not afflict (יָרַע, cf. Zech 10:2c) willingly or grieve the sons of men.

**Allusion to Lam 3:31–33.** The fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. “marks the great watershed in Judean history” and most of the literature of the Bible after that event “bears the peculiar ideological-theological stamp” of the post-destruction community. Lamentations is one of these “compelling testaments” which witnesses to the “unique
timbre of the Palestinian voice" that had endured the cruelty of the catastrophe. The people left behind mourned for the loss of their beloved ones, either through death or deportations. They were forced to live under foreign domination and to struggle with the aftermath of the disaster. “Out of the ashes and ruins of Jerusalem,” the howls of the community testify to the “horror and pain of human suffering” as a reality of life.20

In Lam 3, the speaker בָּשֶׂר (v. 1; cf. נֶצֶר in Zech 10:7a) is the personified voice of a person who cries out in his affliction to a God who seems not to respond (v. 8) and struggles to make sense of the awful tragedy that has befallen him (vv. 18–20). In the midst of despair, the בָּשֶׂר recalls for himself “this” (なん, v. 21), which refers both retrospectively, back to the suffering (3:1–18), and prospectively, forward to Yahweh’s צַדְּקָנוּ and חָכְמִי (3:22–23). Because of “this,” the speaker declares that he will wait for (יִרְצֶה) the Lord even though he was in distress: “The Lord is my portion,’ says my soul, ‘Therefore I have hope (יַעֲדֵה) in him’” (3:24, cf. 3:21, 25, 26). This confession is clearly rooted in Yahweh’s gracious character, appealing to the covenant loyalties of the deity (cf. Exod 34:6). Based on this acknowledgment, the בָּשֶׂר proclaims that Yahweh will eventually help those who wait for (יַעֲדֵה) his salvation (3:25–26). He asserts that Yahweh will not reject his people forever, but will have compassion on the afflicted (3:31–33). The lament reaches its climax in vv. 40–41 which serve as an exhortation to the suffering community: “Let us examine and probe our ways, and let us return (זָכָה) to the Lord. We lift up our heart and hands toward God in heaven.” The rest of Lam 3 takes

20 Dobbs-Allsopp, Lamentations, 1–3. Though Gerstenberger is right that Lamentations is a liturgical text that could be used for other moments of corporate suffering, the traditional view that the book was written in the aftermath of the destruction of 587 B.C. seems a sound one, particularly with the mention of the Edomites in Lam 4:21–22 (cf. Ps 137); Longman, Jeremiah, 329–30. Cf. Gerstenberger, Psalms, Part 2, 473–74.
on the character of the prayer lament: complaint (vv. 42–47), expression of grief (vv. 48–51), and extended appeal to Yahweh for help (vv. 52–66). 21

Besides verbal connections, there are thematic correspondences between the two texts. Both passages (1) appeal to the compassionate character of the Lord as the basis for their restoration; (2) denote that exile is the result of divine rejection; and (3) affirm that the rejection from Yahweh will not be forever. Nevertheless, when we scrutinize the reuse of the intertext in Zech 10, we notice that there are some differences between the two texts. In Lam 3 it is the afflicted who proclaim a faith statement in the course of inquiring into suffering, whereas in Zech 10 it is the deity who promises to restore the afflicted to their former state based on his compassion on them. The divine speech in the latter text acts as a response (cf. בּה in Zech 10:6c) to the confession of the exilic community who returned to Yahweh (cf. וּבָרָב in Lam 3:40). The hope in the source text finds its realization in the host text. 22

Because of his covenant commitment (כֵן אִישׁ יְהֹוָה אֲלָדוֹתָה, 10:6c), Yahweh promises to answer (יִשְׁמַע) an assumed cry from the exilic northerners. According to BHS, the line בּּּּּּּּּּּּ (10:6c) is probabiliter additum. Some scholars deem the clause as a gloss for it disrupts the parallelism of the preceding two lines (10:6a–b). 23 However, this inconsistency alerts the readers to an intertextual dimension at work. Based on this perception, Willi-Plein contends that the covenant formula כֵן אִישׁ יְהֹוָה אֲלָדוֹתָה (10:6c) draws on Ezek 34:29–30 where the same clause appears: "Then they will know that I, the Lord their God (כֵן אִישׁ יְהֹוָה), am with them, and that they, the house of Israel, 21

22 This intertextual insight will be discussed below.
are my people,' declares the Lord God” (34:30). However, we are reluctant to register this allusion as (1) the exact formula occurs not only in Ezek 34:30 and Zech 10:6c, but also in Exod 29:46; Lev 26:44; Ezek 28:26; 39:22, 28; and (2) the usage of the formula is different in both texts—in Zech 10:6c it is used as a cause introducing the motivation of Yahweh’s restoration with צי denoting the reason, whereas in Ezek 34:30 it is used as a consequence resulting from Yahweh’s restoration with צי expressing the result.

On the other hand, Mason suggests that Zech 10:6c might allude to Isa 41:17:

“The afflicted and needy are seeking water, but there is none, And their tongue is parched with thirst; I, the LORD, will answer them Myself (אני יהוה אלהים), As the God of Israel (אני יהוה אלוהים) I will not forsake them (לא אנט(sem) cf. Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 85. Cf. Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 210.

T'ai claims that the whole line צי in Zech 10:6c is so strongly reminiscent of Isa 41:17 (אני יהוה אלהים) that the latter probably is a “Zitat” in the former.26 At first glance this suggestion looks appealing. However, when we scrutinize the syntactical status of these words, we find that their functions are quite different. In the Zecharian text, צי is a nominal clause introducing one of the motivations for the divine restoration in v. 6b, whereas in the Isaianic text, צי is the subject of צי in an emphatic construction, a formulation which is not uncommon in the Hebrew Bible (cf.

---

24 Willi-Plein, Prophetic am Ende, 72–73.
26 “Zitat” is translated as “quotation”; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 94.
of Ezek 14:4; אֵלֶּה הֵעָמָדות of Ezek 14:7). Based on this, we are reluctant to register this intertext.27

In Zech 10:7, the text reverts to third-person prophetic comment, with Ephraim, which stands collectively for the whole exiled northerners (cf. Isa 7:8, 9, 17), now coming to the forefront: יִהלָה הַכּוֹנָה אֱלֹהִים (Zech 10:7a). Because of Yahweh’s response (v. 6c), Ephraim will be חָזְק, a phrase mostly used to describe Yahweh (Isa 42:13; Jer 14:9; 20:11; Ps 78:65).28 It is applied to the Lord in Ps 78:65 where the rejection of Ephraim has been announced (Ps 78:67; cf. vv. 59–64): “Then the Lord awoke as if from sleep, like a warrior (כּוֹנָה) overcome by wine.” Petterson claims that the Zecharian text serves to reverse the divine judgment on the northern people: “In Ps 78, the coming of a Davidic king will not only see the house of Judah being saved, but will also see the salvation of the house of Joseph…Psalm 78 provides an important perspective on the relationship between the house of Judah and the house of Joseph that features in Zech 10.”29 There is certainly a correspondence in the idea expressed in both texts, however, it is not possible to claim a literary dependence due to the lack of impressive verbal link, apart from some common names, e.g., אֱלֹהִים, יִהלָה.

The mention of Ephraim in Zech 10:7 provides a clue for the audience to appreciate the second motivation of Yahweh’s salvific act in v. 6. The transformation of Ephraim in v. 7 is a consequence of Yahweh’s response (חָזְק, v. 6c), probably, to an

27 For the discussion regarding the use of אֵלֶּה הֵעָמָדות and אֱלֹהִים as intertextual markers, see “Allusion to Jer 31:18–20” and “Allusion to Hos 2:23–25 [2:21–23]” below.
28 See “The Climax of the Renewal” and the footnotes thereto in CHAPTER SIX.
29 Petterson, Behold Your King, 159–60.
assumed petition, recalling for the readers Ephraim’s prayer of repentance in Jer 31:18–20.\(^{30}\)

**Jeremiah 31:18–20**

18 “I have surely heard Ephraim (עפרים) grieving, ‘You have chastised me, and I was chastised, like an untrained calf; bring me back (כָּבָד בָּשָׁם) that I may be restored (כָּבָד בָּשָׁם) for You are the LORD my God (לֹֽא יְהוָֽה);’ cf. Zech 10:6b, 10a) that I may be restored (כָּבָד בָּשָׁם) for You are the LORD my God (לֹֽא יְהוָֽה);”

19 “For after I turned back (כָּבָד בָּשָׁם) I repented; and after I was instructed, I smote on my thigh; I was ashamed and also humiliated because I bore the reproach of my youth.”

20 “Is Ephraim (עפרים) My dear son (בָּשָׁם)? Is he a delightful child? Indeed, as often as I have spoken against him, I certainly still remember (כָּבָד בָּשָׁם) him; therefore My heart yearns for him; I will surely have mercy (כָּבָד בָּשָׁם) on him,” declares the LORD (לֹֽא יְהוָֽה);”

Jeremiah 31:18–20 is linked to Zech 10:6–7 not only by shared words: כָּבָד בָּשָׁם and אֶפְרָיִם, but also by the corresponding phrase יְהוָֽה as which is answered by the deity in Zech 10:6c as יְהוָֽה. Based on these similarities, we register Jer 31:18–20 as an intertext of Zech 10:6.

**Allusion to Jer 31:18–20.** Jeremiah 31:18–20 is embedded within a pericope (31:15–22), which is part of the Little Book of Consolation (Jer 30:1–31:40 [LXX 37:1–38:40]).\(^{31}\) This pericope, which is one of the core materials of the Little Book of Consolation, can be divided into three stanzas: (1) inconsolable Rachel (vv. 15–17); (2) Ephraim consoled (vv. 18–20); and (3) a new creation (vv. 21–22).\(^{32}\) However, the whole passage (31:15–22) is bound together by a repetition of key words, particularly

---

\(^{30}\) Larkin, *Eschatology*, 96.

\(^{31}\) See “Allusion to Jer 31:12–13” in CHAPTER FIVE.

the root שׂוּה which occurs in nearly every verse for a total of eight times: vv. 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, mostly denoting a return to the land. The poem progresses from the land empty of its people to Yahweh’s invitation for them to journey home with Ephraim’s repentance and Yahweh’s compassion as the core elements of the composition. The stanza shifts from an image of death to a promise of hope, turning sorrow into joy. The invitation of the Lord fulfills the promise made to Jacob in 30:10 and to Rachel in 31:16–17.

The first stanza begins with v. 15 which serves as a narrative introduction, identifying Rachel, who stands for the nation, as the addressee of Yahweh’s speech in vv. 16–17. While Rachel, the grandmother of Ephraim, mourns for the loss of her child, Ephraim (v. 15), the Lord responds to the disconsolate mother with a promise that there will be hope for return in the future (vv. 16–17).

The second stanza continues with Yahweh’s speech which recounts the repentance of Ephraim, portraying his posture of remorse and quoting his prayer of penitence (vv. 18–19). There is only one request in the prayer: שׂוּה with the ground of the petition: אֶלֶף אֲדַנָּאֵי יְהוָה (31:18b). The double שׂוּה in v. 18b can denote a geographical and/or a spiritual return, i.e., brought back to the land and/or back to Yahweh.33 Holladay comments that the שׂוּה in this verse can mean “return from exile” and “repent,” since it has no prepositional or adverbial phrase to make the sense explicit.34 However, Carroll argues that repentance is not a prerequisite of salvation in Jer 30–31: “The

34 Holladay considers the two instances of שׂוּה in v. 18b as examples of “discontinuous ambiguity,” i.e., an expression that has two possible interpretations, both of which fit the context; Holladay, “Root שׂוּה,” 56–58, 145.
reference to repentance is unusual in the cycle as all the images of salvation are of the
divine initiative irrespective of human response, so this extract from a confessional
lament is quite out of place in the cycle."³⁵ Though Carroll’s observation is right, Bozak
reminds us that these two aspects of יְשָׁפַת cannot be separated in v. 18 (also v. 21): “The
return to Yhwh is the basis for return to the land. The nation cannot have the land if she
does not have Yhwh.”³⁶ It is true that human response is not a prerequisite for salvation
in Jer 30–31, nevertheless, the repentance mentioned here could be seen as a natural
consequence when the sinners recognize their situation of disgrace and are aware of their
possibility to return after encountering the marvelous grace of the divine.³⁷ As Carroll
perceives, the repentance set within this poem “may be read as a transformed element in
the dialogic exchanges between Yahweh and community.”³⁸

In response to this confessional lament, Yahweh declares his determination to
show mercy to Ephraim, his delightful son (v. 20). The emphatic construction, which
frames the prayer of Ephraim, occurs once in v. 18a (שׁפַת יְשָׁפַת) and twice in v. 20b–c
(רחם אל usted, יבג אתינא), denoting the intensity of the Lord’s response. Yahweh’s love for
Ephraim is so strong that the child will encounter mercy in spite of his foolish
youthfulness. The compassion of the deity forms the basis for the restoration of the
people (31:20; cf. Hos 11:1–4, 8–9).³⁹

The third stanza depicts Yahweh’s answer to Ephraim, inviting faithless Israel to
return (שָׁפַת x2; v. 21), both spiritually and geographically, stressing a genuine

---
³⁵ Carroll, Jeremiah, 600.
³⁷ Bozak, Life Anew, 102.
³⁸ Carroll, Jeremiah, 600.
transformation. The prophetic comment in v. 22b announces the coming salvation which is expressed in the terse style of a proverb. The depths of divine love not only open up new possibilities for a renewed relationship between the deity and his people (30:22; 31:1b, 33; cf. v. 31–34) but also enable the new creation to spring up and to multiply (cf. Zech 10:8b).

Besides verbal parallels Jer 31:18–20 and Zech 10:6–7 are further connected with thematic correspondences. Both passages (1) depict Ephraim in a state of exile due to divine rejection (Zech 10:6b; Jer 31:18a; cf. Jer 30:15); (2) announce the intent of salvation in a first-person divine speech (Zech 10:6; Jer 31:20); and (3) appeal to the compassionate character and the covenantal commitment of the deity as a foundation of restoration (Zech 10:6b–c; Jer 31:20; cf. Jer 30:22; 31:1b, 33).

However, when we compare the source text with the host text, we find that the former one provides additional information, i.e., human response to the divine initiative, for our understanding of the latter one. The assumed petition of the Zecharian text is supplied by the Jeremianic one. The plea of Ephraim: יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשָּׁבוּתָם (Jer 31:18b), finds its answer in Yahweh’s reply: יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשָּׁבוּתָם... יְאַבֵּד (Zech 10:6bc).

40 Bozak argues that the clause יִשָּׁבוּתָם can indicate either the return from physical exile to the land or the turning back from a spiritual separation from Yahweh. The interpretation is based on one’s understanding of יִשָּׁבוּתָם: (1) the person(s) who must return from the exile; or (2) the seat of understanding and decision which must be directed to Yahweh; Bozak, Life Anew, 101. Cf. Boda, Severe Mercy, 248.

Anderson also argues that the יִשָּׁבוּתָם in v. 21b carries a double sense of returning home to the land and of returning home to covenant loyalty with Yahweh: “The summons to return involves a geographical movement: a movement away from captivity along the very route (marked with guideposts) of the journey into exile, and a movement toward her homeland, specifically ‘her cities’ (v 21). There is also the suggestion that coming home involves a return to a faithful relationship to Yahweh, for the Virgin/Daughter is address: יְאַבֵּד תַּכְתִּיס עַל יִשָּׁבֶת (‘O wandering daughter’). Thus she is asked, with double entendre, why she wanders to and from (דֵּמּוּד נֶגֹּר), both in the sense of getting lost on the homeward journey and in the sense of continuing in her faithless straying from the covenant relationship with Yahweh (v 22a);” Anderson, “A Stylistic Study of Jer 31:15–22,” 368.

The report of Ephraim’s prayer of repentance reveals the desire of the prodigal son to return which is an important element, though not a condition, in the future restoration hinted at in Zech 10:9a.  

As Zech 10:6, the two intertexts (Lam 3:31–33; Jer 31:18–20) concentrate on Yahweh’s compassionate character and his covenant commitment as a foundation for the salvation of his people, who were suffering because of the exile, which is understood as the discipline of the Lord. The host text portrays in detail the divine compulsion to deliver the afflicted from ruin, however, only the source texts supply the human response which fills in the gap, particularly the assumed cry in v. 6c. The impulse of the distressed community to return, both to the deity and to the land, in the antecedents serves as a dialogic exchange with the divine monologue in the Zecharian oracle. With this intertextual insight, the response of the people to the impending restoration is crucial, at least the remorse for past misdeeds, the regret for the present disgrace, and the hope for divine intervention (cf. Zech 10:9a). Without these elements, there will never be a genuine transformation. The vivid portrayal of the suffering and the penitence of the dispersed community might be intended to arouse the empathy of the readers, inviting them to identify with the deep attachment of the Lord to the scattered northerners. The intertextual experience enlists the audience to participate in Yahweh’s salvific acts for their exiled brother and prepares the readers to accept the penitent repatriates when they have returned to the land.

In Zech 10:7, the divine redemption of Ephraim will entail a turn in their fortunes—from a defeated and depressed people to a mighty and jubilant warrior (יהושע), a phrase also used to portray the restored Judeans (יהושע, 10:5a). The intertextual insight will be discussed below.
comparison of Ephraim to בהד יד not only highlights their vivid struggle (fight in battle) but also their successful result (victory in combat), with the rest of the verse elaborating on the attendant emotions. The northerners will rejoice greatly alongside a new generation (10:7b). They will express surprise when they see the marvelous deeds of the Lord. Their heart will rejoice (יֹהֵב) as daughter Zion does when her king is coming to her (9:9a). Mason suggests that the vision of a renewed Ephraim here is “a striking echo” of the idyllic picture of the restored Jerusalem in Zech 8:5: “and the streets of the city will be filled with boys and girls playing in its streets.” Though there might be a thematic connection between the two texts, the lack of verbal parallels makes us hesitant to register this intertextuality. In addition, this kind of text depicting the exultation of the restored people in a utopian context after the transformation of Yahweh is common in prophetic literature (cf. Isa 35; Jer 31:10–14; Zeph 3:14–17; Joel 2:21–25).

**Gathering and Return of Ephraim (Zech 10:8–11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 10:8–11</th>
<th>אַשְׁרֵי הָלָה לָהֶם הסבי</th>
<th>כְּמִמְיֹרִיתוֹ מַרְאוִי</th>
<th>יָדוֹ תָּרְבֹּה רַבָּה</th>
<th>זָאָהוֹת קַעֵמִים</th>
<th>גְּבוֹרַהוֹי יָפָה</th>
<th>יַתָּשְׁמָתוֹ מַרְאוּ מִעְרַי</th>
<th>מְאָמוֹרָה קָפִּסָּה</th>
<th>יַאֲלָאָרִים נַלְעָרָה מְעָנִי</th>
<th>אָבִיאָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a I will whistle to them, and I will gather them in, for I have ransomed them.</td>
<td>אַשְׁרֵי הָלָה לָהֶם הסבי</td>
<td>כְּמִמְיֹרִיתוֹ מַרְאוִי</td>
<td>יָדוֹ תָּרְבֹּה רַבָּה</td>
<td>זָאָהוֹת קַעֵמִים</td>
<td>גְּבוֹרַהוֹי יָפָה</td>
<td>יַתָּשְׁמָתוֹ מַרְאוּ מִעְרַי</td>
<td>מְאָמוֹרָה קָפִּסָּה</td>
<td>יַאֲלָאָרִים נַלְעָרָה מְעָנִי</td>
<td>אָבִיאָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b Then they will be numerous as they have been numerous.</td>
<td>נָרְבָה כָּמֶה רַבָּה</td>
<td>זָאָהוֹת קַעֵמִים</td>
<td>גְּבוֹרַהוֹי יָפָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a For I will sow them among the peoples, and in the distant places they will remember me.</td>
<td>זָאָהוֹת קַעֵמִים</td>
<td>גְּבוֹרַהוֹי יָפָה</td>
<td>יַתָּשְׁמָתוֹ מַרְאוּ מִעְרַי</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b Hence, they together with their sons may live and return.</td>
<td>יַתָּשְׁמָתוֹ מַרְאוּ מִעְרַי</td>
<td>מְאָמוֹרָה קָפִּסָּה</td>
<td>יַאֲלָאָרִים נַלְעָרָה מְעָנִי</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a Then I will bring them back from the land of Egypt, and from Assyria I will gather them in.</td>
<td>יַתָּשְׁמָתוֹ מַרְאוּ מִעְרַי</td>
<td>מְאָמוֹרָה קָפִּסָּה</td>
<td>יַאֲלָאָרִים נַלְעָרָה מְעָנִי</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b Then to the land of Gilead and of Lebanon I will cause them to come in,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 211.
for no [room] will be found for them.

11a Now he will pass through the sea, the distress, and he will strike the sea, the turbulence, so that all the depths of the Nile will dry up.

11b Then the pride of Assyria will be brought down, and the scepter of Egypt will depart.

The return of the northern exiles involves a series of divine actions (10:8a): פִּים, רוֹדִים, and וּדָשַׁיֵל, resulting in a prosperous state of the people expressed as כְּכַלְכֵל, כַּיּוֹם, and פְּנֵיהֶם at (10:8b).

The first salvific act of Yahweh is פִּים. The sense of the verb used here is drawn probably from pastoral imagery as God makes the sound that a shepherd would make on a pipe in order to gather in scattered flocks (cf. Judg 5:16), underscoring that Yahweh is the divine shepherd of the dispersed exiles. However the choice of פִּים to unfold the redemptive act is dramatic. Of its 12 appearances in the Hebrew Bible, all but this one have a strong negative or derisive connotation. Within all these usages, only in Isa 5:26; 7:18; and Zech 10:8 is פִּים conjoined with ב, only in these three instances is פִּים used to denote a signal for someone by whistling, and only in these three texts is the subject of the verb Yahweh.

Isaiah 5:26
He will also lift up a standard to the distant (רַעַב, cf. רַעַב in Zech 10:9a) nation, and will whistle (נִשְׁמָה) for it from the ends of the earth; and behold, it will come with speed swiftly.

---

45 Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 291; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 121.
47 The noun יִשְׂרָאֵל has caused much trouble for commentators since its first reference is plural while its second and third, יִשְׂרָאֵל and יִשְׂרָאֵל, are singular. Here we adopt the translation of NASV, rendering it as singular, a suggested emendation following Jer 5:15, dividing the letters differently to read יִשְׂרָאֵל "to a nation from afar"; Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 64.
Isaiah 7:18
In that day (בונת רוחה) the LORD will whistle ( ALOG) for the fly that is in the remotest part of the rivers (אר in Zech 10:11a) of Egypt (ארץ; cf. Zech 10:10a) and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria (ארץ; cf. Zech 10:10a).

Besides the verbal parallel א.Log, there are some other correspondences among these texts:

(1) In Isa 5:26 Yahweh will call upon the distant (א.Log) nation who will come quickly to punish the Israelites (5:26b–30; cf. 5:25). According to Zech 10:9a, the dispersed Israelites will remember Yahweh in distant places (פ ZIP). Hence, in Isa 5 the nation is summoned by God from a distance, whereas in Zech 10 the Israelites are called upon by the deity from places afar. Both objects of א.Log received Yahweh’s audible signal from far away.

(2) In Isa 7:18 Yahweh signals the flies from Egypt (ארץ), and the bees from Assyria (ארץ) to attack Judah (cf. 7:17). According to Zech 10:10a the Lord will gather the exiles from these two countries (ארץ; cf. 10:10a). Hence, in Isa 7 Yahweh summons the armies from Egypt and Assyria to invade Judah, whereas in Zech 10 the deity signals the exiled people from the same nations to return home.

Nurmela registers these two Isaianic texts as a sure allusion. However, Tai does not agree with this registration and contends: “Einerseits gibt DtSach die Vorstellung der Kriegsmannschaft von Jesaja nicht auf. Andererseits hebt DtSach mehr den freudigen Aspekt der Heimkehr Efraims hervor.” Tai is right that the military motif of the Isaianic texts is absent in Zech 10:8a which is an oracle of salvation rather than of doom.

49 Translated as: “On the one hand, II Zech does not have the military motif of Isaiah. On the other hand, II Zech emphasizes more on the joyful aspect of the homecoming of Ephraim”; Tai, Prophetic als Schriftauslegung, 103.
However we should notice that the antecedents could be used differently in the new context of the later text, not only being affirmed but also transformed or even reversed. Based on the impressive similarities, we register Isa 5:26 and 7:18 as intertexts of Zech 10:8a.

Allusions to Isa 5:26 & 7:18. Isaiah 5:26 lies within an oracle of doom (5:25–30), announcing judgment against Yahweh’s people. Because of their sin (5:1–24), Yahweh will summon (רָשָׁם) an unnamed nation which will come quickly from a far distance (בָּצְלֵים לָאָרָכְם אַזָּא מַעְרָה יְדֹר נְעָרִית) to punish Israel (5:26). However, because of the line ("For all this his anger is not spent, but his hand is still stretched out," 5:25; cf. 9:11[12], 16[17], 20[21]; 10:4), many scholars argue that 5:25–30 is originally part of the “refrain poem” about the outstretched hand of Yahweh beginning from 9:7[8]. In this reconstruction, Isa 5:25–30 envisages the Assyrians as the destroyers of the Aramaean kingdom and the northern kingdom of Israel (cf. 9:7[8]–11[12]). Within this context, Isa 5:26 contends that Yahweh controls and directs all historical events, particularly the downfall and exile of the northern kingdom. His signal (וּרְשַׁם) inaugurates the whole

---


52 Since Isa 5:1–7 is a condemnation of Judah, Williamson argues that the final form of Isa 5:25–30 should be read synchronically as an anticipation of “the Babylonian defeat”; Williamson, Isaiah I–5, 400. For Williamson, “Israel” in Isa 5:7 is “the people of God as a whole,” which he further defines more specifically as the people of Judah; Williamson, Isaiah I–5, 342.

However, Brueggemann reminds us that the characteristic refrain which is repeated five times within the pericope (Isa 5–10) should also alert the readers to relate this Isaianic poem to the Assyrian conquest of the northern kingdom, the setting of the “refrain poem” (cf. Isa 10:5). Hence, the unnamed
judgment process, with the enemy nation advancing swiftly from afar to annihilate Israel.

Isaiah 7:18 is embedded within an account concerning Yahweh’s judgment against Judah because of Ahaz’s lack of faith (Isa 7:1–25). The narrative begins with a chronological formula that relates the unit to the reign of Ahaz during the Syro-Ephraimite War (7:1). The first part of the discourse is a dialogue between Yahweh/Isaiah and Ahaz (7:1–17), with v. 17 as an announcement of crisis relating to Assyrian invasion, a watershed event in the history of Judah. The announcement is followed by four independent oracles of doom (7:18–25) providing further specifics about the disaster spelt out in 7:17. At the outset of the doom oracles, the verb כִּבְשֵׁה is used in v. 18 to signify that Yahweh is the source of the impending catastrophe, emphasizing that the coming powers are being sent by the deity as agents of judgment.

When we compare the source texts with the host one, we discover that they have different emphases. In Isaiah Yahweh whistles in order to call the nations against his people, both the north (cf. Isa 5:25) and the south (cf. Isa 7:17), whereas in Zechariah the deity does it in order to call the Ephraimites home from their exile (Zech 10:8a). The context of the former texts is impending devastation, whereas that of the latter one is imminent salvation. Hence, the judgment of an earlier prophet is reversed in Zechariah. For the southerners, Yahweh has already turned their fortunes, whereas for the

“distant nation” which is the instrument of Yahweh could be Assyria who will destroy the northern kingdom or Babylon who will defeat the southern kingdom; Brueggemann, Isaiah 1–39, 56.

53 Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 145–48; Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1–39, 235–36. However, some scholars view that Isa 7:18–25 contains material that is principally judgmental, but with some parts being arguably positive in tone, e.g., some elements in vv. 21–22, e.g., Seitz, Isaiah 1–39, 79; Wildberger, Isaiah 1–12, 321–29. The four originally distinct oracles are linked together by the redactional formulas מִלְיַחְתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל (7:18, 21, 23) and מֵאִי מֵאִי יִשְׂרָאֵל (7:20).

54 The figurative use of כִּבְשֵׁה for war can be found in Deut 1:44 and Ps 118:12. So the bee-metaphor fits the warring Assyrian armies. Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 106–10.
northerners, the same reversal is going to apply to them (Zech 10:8). Ironically, the sons of Zion are to be instrumental in securing the return of their northern brothers (cf. Zech 9:13), though Judah was the victim in the Syro-Ephraimite War, a historical backdrop of both intertexts.

There is one common element among these texts, that is, Yahweh is the one who controls and directs all events. In the sources, both the north and the south got their just dues, with Ephraim being punished for invading Judah (Isa 5:25–30) and Judah being chastised for lack of faith (Isa 7:1–25). In the host text, both of them are promised the deliverance of Yahweh, though in different order (Zech 10:6a, 8). With this intertextual dimension, the Zecharian audience gains insight, recognizing that both destruction and restoration are in the hands of Yahweh who shapes the course of world history. Since Ephraim has received her retribution as announced in Isa 5:25–30, Judah should forgive their northern brothers by extending Yahweh’s salvation to them. When the southerners carry out their divine mission of securing the return of their scattered brothers, they should trust the Lord so that they will not fail as their forefathers did (Isa 7:1–25).

In Zech 10:8a, the piel of וִקֵם继续 the pastoral imagery projected by נָתַן יָרָא. The verb וִקֵם is frequently used of God as one who gathers the people as his flock: “I will gather the remnant of my flock” (Jer 23:3a; cf. Mic 2:12; Jer 31:10). Yahweh’s whistling to the northern exiles results in their being gathered. All these salvific acts of

55 The piel of וִקֵם appears 49 times in the Hebrew Bible, within which its appearance in the first person singular with Yahweh as subject and the Israelites as object, denoting a sense of Yahweh gathering his people to the land, only occurs in Neh 1:9; Isa 43:5; 54:7; 56:8; Jer 23:3; 29:14; 31:8; 32:27; Ezek 11:17; 20:41; 28:25; 34:13; 36:24; 37:21; 39:27; Mic 2:12; Zeph 3:19, 20; Zech 10:8, 10.
56 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 214.
57 Widengren claims that, in contrast to Mesopotamia, in Israel, “it was Yahweh, God of Israel, who would act as the ingatherer of the dispersed members of the people”; Widengren, “Yahweh’s Gathering,” 238.
the Lord rest completely on the deity’s prior redemption of his people: יִשְׂרָאֵל, making it possible for them to return. The clause יִשְׂרָאֵל is usually regarded as a gloss, being deleted on account of the meter, similar to the case of יִשְׂרָאֵל (10:6c). However, we argue that the obscure יִשְׂרָאֵל is laid here as a marker, guiding the readers to recognize an intertextual reading.

The qal of יִשְׂרָאֵל \textsuperscript{59} appears 55 times in the Hebrew Bible, mainly related to the exodus in the past (cf. Deut 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 24:18). Among these occurrences, its appearance with Yahweh as subject and the Israelites as object, denoting a promise of divine redemption, only occurs in Isa 35:10=51:11; Jer 31:11; Zech 10:8. Based on these attestations, Mason suggests that יִשְׂרָאֵל in Zech 10:8 alludes to the idea of second exodus found in Isa 51:11, which follows a reference to the exodus in terms of Yahweh’s victory over Rahab in the drying up of the waters (Isa 51:9–10), a notion echoing Zech 10:11a: “...and he will strike the waving sea, so that all the depths (מַשְׂרִים) of the Nile will dry up (רַבְגַּי).” Mason’s argument is followed by Mendecki.\footnote{Mendecki, “Deuterojesajanischer,” 340–41.}

\begin{verbatim}
Isaiah 51:9–11
9 Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the LORD; awake as in the days of old, the generations of long ago. Was it not You who cut Rahab in pieces, who pierced the dragon?
10 Was it not You who dried up (מַשְׂרִים) the sea, the waters of the great deep (רַבְגַּי); who made the depths of the sea (מַשְׂרִים) a pathway for the redeemed (יִשְׂרָאֵל) to cross over?
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{E.g., Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 301. Cf. BHS.}

\footnote{The qal of יִשְׂרָאֵל appears 55 times in the Hebrew Bible: Exod 13:13\textsuperscript{3x}, 15; 34:20\textsuperscript{3x}; Lev 27:27; Num 3:49; 18:15\textsuperscript{3x}, 18:16\textsuperscript{3x}, 17; Deut 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 15:15; 21:8; 24:18; 1 Sam 14:45; 2 Sam 4:9; 7:23\textsuperscript{3x}; 1 Kgs 1:29; 1 Chr 17:21\textsuperscript{3x}; Neh 1:10; Job 5:20; 6:23; 33:28; Pss 25:22; 26:11; 31:6; 34:23; 44:27; 49:8\textsuperscript{2x}, 16; 55:19; 69:19; 71:23; 78:42; 119:134; 130:8; Isa 29:22; 35:10; 51:11; Jer 15:21; 31:11; Hos 7:13; 13:14; Mic 6:4; Zech 10:8.}

\footnote{Daube, Biblical Law, 39.}

\footnote{Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 87.}
11 So the ransomed (חזרה) of the Lord will return and come with joyful shouting (እגלי) to Zion, and everlasting joy (_xorן) will be on their heads. They will obtain gladness (ףפדפ) and joy (_xorן), and sorrow and sighing will flee away.

We agree that there are thematic parallels between the two passages, however, the lack of significant lexical connections prevents us from registering this allusion. The only shared word is חזרה which is a common word used in contexts employing the exodus motif. In addition, texts with this theme but different lexical stock are not rare in the Hebrew Bible, e.g., Isa 50:2: “...Is my hand so short that it cannot ransom (_xorן)? Or have I no power to deliver? Behold, I dry up (سورן) the sea (ם) with my rebuke, I make the rivers a wilderness. Their fish stink for lack of water and die of thirst.” The correspondences as such do not show convincing evidence for literary dependence. The similarities between them are probably due to their common context, sharing similar language and traditional background.

On the other hand, the qal of חזרה in Zech 10:8a is strikingly reminiscent of that in Jer 31:10–11 where the piel of כנפ also occurs with Yahweh as subject and Israelites as object. It is the only other place, apart from Zech 10:8a, where these two key verbs appear together with a shepherd-flock motif.⁶³ Based on this, we register Jer 31:10–11 as an intertext of Zech 10:8a with כנפ and חזרה as catchwords.⁶⁴

---

⁶³ The qal of חזרה and the piel of כנפ occur together also in Neh 1:9–10: “but if you return to Me and keep My commandments and do them, though those of you who have been scattered were in the most remote part of the heavens, I will gather them (חרまして) from there and will bring them to the place where I have chosen to cause My name to dwell.’ ‘They are Your servants and Your people whom You redeemed (חרまして) by Your great power and by Your strong hand.’” Since Nehemiah and Second Zechariah are contemporary, we will not consider this case.

Jeremiah 31:10-11

10 Hear the word of the LORD, O nations, and declare in the coastlands afar off (בְּנֵי חוֹדֶשׁ in Zech 10:9a), and say, “He who scattered Israel will gather (נָתַן) him and keep him as a shepherd (בֶּדֶא) keeps his flock (בֶּדֶא; cf. Zech 10:3b).”

11 For the LORD has ransomed (יְשַׁבֵּר יְהֹוָה) Jacob and redeemed him from the hand of him who was stronger than he.

Allusion to Jer 31:10-11. Jeremiah 31:10–11 is embedded within 31:7–14, which is part of the Little Book of Consolation (Jer 30–31).⁶⁵ The pericope (31:7–14) is a promissory oracle which asserts with exuberance the well-being, joy, and abundance that Yahweh will provide to the restored community. It includes two stanzas: (1) return from afar (31:7–9)⁶⁶ and (2) filled to satiety (31:10–14).⁶⁷

After the salvation and ingathering of the remnant (Jer 31:7–9), the Lord promises to keep Israel as a shepherd keeps his flock (31:10). The fate of the dispersed Israelites will be reversed from curses to blessings. The motivation behind this salvific act is אֱלֹהִים (31:11a), just as Yahweh rescued Israel from Egypt. The noun בָּשָׂר (v. 9c; cf. Exod 4:22) and the verb הָרָב לֵבָר suggest a link to the Exodus motif, a theme concerning a people especially valued and beloved by God who has delivered them from the house of slavery with a powerful hand (בָּשָׂר, Exod 13:14–16; cf. מַצָּרוֹן מָשָׁר, Jer 31:11). The ransom of Yahweh is the basis for the promised restoration.

The poet continues to envision the hyperbolic scene of the joyous return, with all the exiles arriving home together in a procession led by the deity. The returnees will

⁶⁵ See “Allusion to Jer 31:12–13” in CHAPTER FIVE.
⁶⁶ See “Allusion to Jer 31:12–13” in CHAPTER FIVE.
⁶⁷ Bozak, Life Anew, 81–91. According to Holladay, Jer 31:10–14 is one of the editorial expansions on Jeremiah’s recension directed to the south, inserted to Jer 30–31 during the early post-exilic period; Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 162.
enjoy the bounty of life, with the youths and the elders joining together in the dance (cf. 31:4), turning mourning into joy (נשף, Jer 31:13; cf. Zech 10:7).68

Besides verbal linkages, there are some thematic parallels between the two texts. Both passages (1) affirm that the divine ransom (מלחמה) is the basis of the regathering (רחב) of the exiles; (2) are oracles of salvation, with the host text expressing in a first-person divine saying, whereas the source text proclaiming in a third-person prophetic speech; and (3) are set within a context of exuberant joy (Zech 10:7; Jer 31:12a, 13) and abundant fertility (Zech 10:8b; Jer 31:12, 14) as a consequence of the coming restoration.

When we scrutinize the intertextuality, we find that the same pericope (Jer 31:7-14), which has been evoked for the readers when Jer 31:12-13 functions as the antecedent of Zech 9:17, is now recalled again when Jer 31:10-11 acts as the source text of Zech 10:8a. The jubilation and prosperity promised to all returnees in Zech 9:17 (cf. Jer 31:12-13) is now applied to the northerners (Zech 10:8a) who will become the flock of Yahweh (נפש of Jer 31:10), just as Judah (נפש of Zech 10:3b). Though the southern exiles had returned to Zion for quite a time, the envisioned abundance (Zech 9:17; cf. Jer 31:12-13) is not yet realized in Yehud. The intertextual reading here could provide insight, enabling the readers to recognize the importance and relevance of the return of the northern diaspora (Zech 10:8a; cf. Jer 31:10-11) which serves as a prerequisite of the culminated restoration of all Israel (Zech 9:17; cf. Jer 31:12-13). The envisioned joy and fertility would only be achieved after the return of their northern brothers.

---

68 The analysis of Jer 31:7-14 draws on the works of Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 184-86; Carroll, Jeremiah, 590-95; Keown et al., Jeremiah 26-52, 110-16; Bozak, Life Anew, 81-91; Brueggemann, Jeremiah 26-52, 61-63, unless noted otherwise.
In Zech 10:9, the opening verb אֲחַלֶּם has presented great difficulty for interpreters since its occurrence together with the phrase אֲשַׁמֵּש seems to denote a sense of “scattering” the Israelites “among the peoples,” apparently relating to the deportation of the northerners. Based on this, most scholars contend that if one interprets the imperfect דַע as referring to the present or future time, the verse would seem to contradict the preceding promises. Thus many of them re-point אֲחַלֶּם as an imperfect consecutive and interpret the clause either as a concessive one: “though I sowed them among the peoples” or as a conditional one: “Als Ik hen uitzaai onder de volken.” However, this alteration of אֲחַלֶּם causes problem for the interpretation of Zech 10:9b: אֲשַׁמֵּש where the idea that the exiles themselves will stay alive and return is not realistic unless one opts for an early exilic dating of the text.

More problematic is that דַע does not appear to be used elsewhere in a sense of “scattering” Yahweh’s people, that is, the exile. Rather the verb אֲחַלֶּם is the one regularly used for this signification (cf. Jer 15:7; Jer 31:10; Ezek 6:8; 20:23; 22:15; 36:19). Some scholars find it hard to believe that the prophet would speak of Yahweh “sowing” Israel “among the peoples,” thus emending אֲשַׁמֵּש to אֲחַלֶּם. Mason argues for this option and

---

69 It is so difficult that Horst just omits the verb אֲחַלֶּם; Horst, Zwolf Kleinen Propheten, 250.
70 E.g., Mitchell, who states: “This word, as pointed, contradicts the promise of the preceding verse”; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 301.
71 E.g., Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 216; Larkin, Eschatology, 91.
72 Translated as “If I sow them among the nations”; Van der Woude, Zacharia, 197. Cf. Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, 101.
73 Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, 102. In order to solve this tension, some scholars, e.g., Petersen and Hanson, delete דַע: “Their children will survive and return” while others, e.g., Meyers and Meyers, Smith, and Curtis, change the verb to a piel: “They will give life to their children and they will return.” Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 69; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 326–27; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 179; Smith, Micah-Malachi, 263; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 190.
74 E.g., Wellhausen, Die Kleinen Propheten, 192; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 69, 76; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 301; Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomical School, 115; Dentan, “Zechariah 9–14,” 1100. Cf. BHS.
suggests that the emended text is a possible echo of Zech 2:4 [1:21] where the craftsmen have come “to throw down the horns of the nations who have lifted up their horns against the land of Judah in order to scatter it (נָעִיר)”. He claims: “it is possible that this promise of deliverance by the defeat of the nations who have held them captive is being recalled here.” Even if we accept the proposed emendation, the verbal correspondence as such still is not convincing evidence for literary dependence.

Without resorting to emendation, Meyers and Meyers contend that the verb יָד is an agricultural term involving the idea that the seed distributed by the process of sowing will take root when it falls, i.e., be planted and grow (cf. Hag 1:6). In their opinion this meaning suits well metaphorically the experience of the dispersed northerners whose long exile resulted in deep roots in their respective locales. Though their suggestion looks logical with our common sense, we cannot find any figurative use of יָד with this nuance in the Hebrew Bible. Usually, the יָד-metaphor is employed to indicate the relationship between act and consequence—seed sown and plants reaped. The consequences may be positive or negative, depending on the tenor that the vehicle יָד represents. For example, in Hos 10:12 the people are urged to sow righteousness and thus to reap steadfast love, whereas in Hos 8:7 the people are charged with sowing the wind and thus reaping the whirlwind (cf. Prov 22:8). This interconnection between act and consequence is especially vivid in the Yahweh-יָד metaphor.

---
77 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 216.
78 Dearman, Hosea, 95–96.
Though יד appears 56 times in the Hebrew Bible, its occurrence with Yahweh as subject only occurs in Hos 2:25 and Jer 31:27, apart from Zech 10:9a.

23 “It will come about in that day that I will respond (ֶלֵבָנָן, v. 23 [21]; cf. יָשָׂעָה in Zech 10:6c),” declares the LORD. “I will respond (ֶלֵבָנָן) to the heavens, and they will respond (ֶלֶךֶם) to the earth,

24 And the earth will respond (ֶלֶךֶם) to the grain, to the new wine and to the oil, And they will respond (ֶלֶךֶם) to Jezeel (יֵצֶרֶל).

25 “I will sow her (יִשְׂדָה) for Myself in the land. I will also have compassion (נָחַמְתִּי) on her who had not obtained compassion, And I will say to those who were not My people, ‘You are My people!’ And they will say, ‘You are my God!’ ”

The יד saying in Hos 2:23 [2:21] introduces the divine process by which the blessings of a fertile land will come again to Yahweh’s people. The divine response (ֶלֵבָנָן) sets in motion a chain reaction which runs through all the stages in the fertility cycle: deity—heavens—earth—grain, new wine, oil—יֵצֶרֶל (2:23–24 [2:21–22]). Verse 25a [23a]—יֵצֶרֶל—is linked to the preceding verses with יד as a catchword, stressing that Yahweh is the source of fertility. The people will enjoy agricultural prosperity based on the sowing of the deity. Hence, the Yahweh-יד metaphor in Hos 2:25 [2:23] confers a sense that when the Lord sows, the harvest is sure to be abundant.


80 Scholars generally agree that the 3fs suffixed pronoun of יד refers to Gomer/Israel. Even though יד is closely connected with יד, the suffixed pronoun probably still signifies Israel, based upon the assonantal qualities of יד (sounds like יד) and the symbolic significance of the name in the context of the marriage between Hosea/Yahweh and Gomer/Israel. Cf. Stuart, Hosea-Jonah, 61; Dearman, Hosea, 131; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets I, 36–37; Mays, Hosea, 53.
Jeremiah 31:27-28

27 “Behold, days are coming,” declares the LORD, “when I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man and with the seed of beast.

28 “As I have watched over them to pluck up, to break down, to overthrow, to destroy and to bring disaster, so I will watch over them to build and to plant,” declares the LORD.

The salvation oracle in Jer 31:27–28 begins with a promise that will reverse past judgments—from plucking up and breaking down to building and planting (31:28; cf. 1:10). In Jer 7:20 and 21:6, judgment and death extending to humans and even animals were announced, but both populations will be restored in 31:27–28. The noun רשות is also a significant word in the divine pledge made to the Israelite ancestors that they would have innumerable descendants: “I will make your descendants as the dust of the earth, so that if anyone can number the dust of the earth, then your descendants can also be numbered” (Gen 13:16; cf. Gen 12:7; 22:17; 28:14; 35:12). Thus the implication of רשות language also points beyond the present generation to the coming ones.

The majority of scholars agree that the Yahweh- WHATSOEVER metaphor in v. 27 alludes to Hos 2:25 [2:23], in which Yahweh’s “sowing” will inaugurate the process which will bring fertility.81

Based on these Yahweh-SOEVER texts, we conclude that this figure of speech as used in passages of salvation to convey hope for sowing implies a harvest.82 The emphasis of the verb WHATSOEVER is not on the act of dispersing the seed, but rather on the aspect of flourishing. It is appropriated in a positive sense to denote that the sowing of the deity

---

81 Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 129; Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 196; Carroll, Jeremiah, 608; Rata, Covenant Motif, 32, 40, 45.
82 Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 176; Floyd, Minor Prophets 2, 478.
will lead to the fruitfulness of the people. Thus the Yahweh-trad metaphor would be thought of primarily in terms of prosperity with sowing as the beginning of the whole flourishing process.

The Yahweh-trad metaphor is constructed with in Zech 10:9a. The phrase denotes the location of exile (cf. Deut 4:27; cf. Neh 1:8), which is described as far distant places (םירוקמ) in the next line. In light of the Yahweh-trad passages, we can assume that the consequence of being sown in the Zecharian text is the multiplication of the people in their locale of exile. By understanding the of as a causal one, we can render Zech 10:9a as “For I will sow them among the peoples, and in the distant places they will remember me.” The divine promise of sowing (10:9a) is the inauguration of the whole restoration process which culminates in the multiplication of Ephraim (10:8b). This interpretation fits well with the preceding promise: (10:8b), and with the following reference to the next generation: (10:9b). In addition, this explication can solve the tension presented by the last line of this verse: . The subject of the verbs (שבר, שבר) is not the original exiles deported a long time ago but the existing dispersed northerners and their posterity.

It is important to ask whether there was any specific intertext in mind when the prophet evoked the Yahweh-trad tradition. Jeremiah 31:27–28 is part of the Little Book of Consolation which has been alluded to four times already, however, these two verses are embedded within a new pericope (Jer 31:23–40) which does not have any lexical

---

85 Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, 102.
86 See “Allusion to Jer 31:12–13” in CHAPTER FIVE.
connection to Zech 10:9a and its context (10:6–12), apart from the word יְהוָ֣ה. On the other hand, the Hosea text shows convincing evidence for literary dependence with impressive verbal parallels. In addition, the qal of צָרַֽעַת, the qal of עָנָה, and the piel of רָם also appear as catchwords, linking the Hosea text to Zech 10:9a and its context, especially v. 6b–c. All these shared words in Hos 2 and Zech 10 are used in the same sense with Yahweh as subject and the Israelites as object. Also, Hos 2:23–25 [2:21–23] is embedded within a section (2:18–2:25 [2:16–23]) which will be recalled again when 2:18–19 [2:16–17] functions as an intertext of Zech 13:2 with substantial verbal parallels: אָלַיְהוּדְרוּ שֵׁד; נַעֲשֶׂה נִשָּׁה נָאֲשָׁה כָּהֵן. In view of this, we register Hos 2:23–25 [2:21–23] as an intertext of Zech 10:9a.


The names of Hosea’s children are skillfully woven into the end of the passage to form its climax (Hos 2:25 [2:23]). These names are used as vehicles for the

---

88 For the discussion regarding צָרַֽעַת (Zech 10:6c) as an intertextual marker, see discussion above.
89 A number of scholars agree that Hos 2:18–19 [2:16–17] is one of the intertexts of Zech 13:2, with אָלַיְהוּדְרוּ שֵׁד; נַעֲשֶׂה נִשָּׁה כָּהֵן as markers. See, e.g., Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 209–12; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 182–84; Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, 129.
90 Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 673; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 105–106.
transformation of the messages once conveyed by their connotations. In the process of renewal, Yahweh will respond (וַיְגַדֵּה, v. 23 [21]; cf. מַגֵּד in Zech 10:6c) in a beneficent manner for the benefit of Israel. The pivotal agent of the various responses is “Jezreel” (זְרֵעי, v. 24 [22]). No longer is זְרֵעי a sign for doom, as it was for the Jehu dynasty (1:4). It is now a glorious name, full of its basic sense: “God sows,” envisaging the covenant blessing of agricultural bounty (cf. כּוֹר, v. 25a [23a]). However, the divine sowing is the first stage of the restoration process. The seed which is shown will take root, grow, and be harvested. The pun of כּוֹר in v. 25a [23a] signals the inauguration of the restoration process which will reach its climax when the relationship between the deity and his people is fully restored. Thus, besides the renewal of fertility, Yahweh will also reconstitute Israel’s relation with him. He will restore compassion to נֹעַד אֵל and peoplehood to נֶפֶשׁ אֹמֵם (v. 25b–c [23b–c]). At the climax, the restored Israel will respond to the Lord: יִגְדֵּה (v. 25d [23d]), signifying their confession to the covenant relationship. 91

Besides shared words, there is a striking thematic parallel between the two texts. Both passages are expressed using a first-person divine oracle, stressing the promise of Yahweh sowing his people as an inauguration of the transformation process, which will culminate not only in the renewal of fertility (Hos 2:24 [2:22]; Zech 10:8b) but also in the revival of relationship (Hos 2:25d [2:23d]; Zech 10:9aג). The emphasis of the fully restored relationship between the deity and his people prepares the readers of the host text to appreciate the following line: “and in the distant places they will remember me” (Zech 10:9aג).

91 This analysis draws on the works of Stuart, Hosea-Jonah, 61; Dearman, Hosea, 131; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 1, 36–37; Mays, Hosea, 53.
Despite these similarities, there is one difference between the two Yahweh- LORD passages. In Hosea Yahweh will sow his people חַדְרָה, whereas in Zechariah the deity will sow the diaspora תְּנֵסַה. Though both texts embrace the same motif—Yahweh sows his people resulting in prosperity—the difference in locality marks an additional nuance to the host text: not only will Yahweh bless his people in their own land but also in hostile countries. The omnipotence of the Lord will ensure the possibility of return of the scattered northerners. The intertextual reading enables the audience to gain insight and be aware of this connotation.

In Zech 10:9ab, when the diaspora will multiply among other peoples and in remote places (וּבָאוֹתָם), they will begin to remember Yahweh: זֶרֶק. Because of this remembering, the dispersed northerners together with their children will live (חייך) and return (אלים) to their homeland (10:9b). The jubilation of the next generation in v. 7b is now comprehensible. The use of חייך and אלים together is typical in Ezekiel (cf. Ezek 18:23; 33:11), however, there it is used in a different way—the return to Yahweh as a condition for remaining alive (cf. Deut 30:19). In Zech 10:9b, אלים denotes physical movement95 and חייך together with אלים are the outcome of the people’s remembering of the Lord.

In the Hebrew Bible remembering (זɅר) the Lord is more than just recalling Yahweh’s past deeds to mind (cf. Deut 5:15; Isa 63:11) but rather evoking affections within a covenantal context (cf. Gen 9:15–16; Jer 14:21; Ps 106:7). Remembering as a covenantal term is elaborated well in Deut 8:18–20 where it speaks of “remembering

---

92 The qal of זɅר is a common verb which appears 174 times in the Hebrew Bible.
93 We keep the difficult reading preserved in the MT: זɅר. Same as Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 193–94. See discussion above.
94 The qal of אלים appears together with the qal of אלים in Judg 15:19; 1 Kgs 17:22; Ezek 18:21, 23, 24, 28; 33:11, 12, 19; Zech. 10:9.
95 Holladay, “Root סbh,” 62.
and forgetting God in terms of covenant fidelity and infidelity.” Forgetting God means serving other gods (Deut 9:19; Isa 17:10), whereas remembering God indicates a turning to him (cf. Jonah 2:8–10). 96

The word נָשָׁה appears 18 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which only those occurrences in Jer 8:19 and Zech 10:9a refer to the diaspora. 97 Based on this, Person argues for a dependence of the latter text on the former one: “Behold, listen! The cry of the daughter of my people from a distant (דָּרָיָה) land: ‘Is the Lord not in Zion? Is her King not within her?’ ‘Why have they provoked me with their graven images, with foreign idols?’” (Jer 8:19). 98 There is certainly a correspondence in the idea expressed, however, the lexical similarity is not strong enough to prove an allusion, particularly when compared with Jer 51:50 where the motif of remembering Yahweh in the far distance occurs. In Jer 51:50 the exiles from afar were exhorted to remember Yahweh (הַמִּנְעֵת הַאָדָרוֹת), whereas in Zech 10:9a the Lord says that the exiles in the distance places remembered him (הַמִּנְעֵת יְהוָה). Based on this similarity, we register Jer 51:50 as an intertext of Zech 10:9a. 99

Jeremiah 51:50
You who have escaped the sword, Depart! Do not stay! Remember the LORD from afar (הַמִּנְעֵת יְהוָה in Zech 10:9a), And let Jerusalem come to your mind.

Allusion to Jer 51:50. Jeremiah 51:50 lies within the oracle against Babylon in 50:1–51:58 (cf. 50:1; 51:59–64) which forms the last part of the oracles against the

96 Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 444.
99 Tai argues that Zech 10:9a is a quotation of Jer 51:50; Tai, Prophétie als Schriftauslegung, 95.
nations (OAN) in the final form of MT Jeremiah. Two main interwoven themes dominate the lengthy section: (1) the coming judgment on Babylon (cf. 50:2–3) and (2) the restoration of Yahweh’s people to the land (cf. 50:4–5, 19–20). Though this oracle looks similar to other ones in the OAN in terms of genre, these two chapters represent a “counter-theme” in the book of Jeremiah. In 27:6–8, Babylon is seen as the servant of Yahweh who will put all nations, including Israel, under its power (cf. 51:7, 20–23). Obedience to Yahweh implies submission to the reign of Babylon. Towards the end of the book in its final form, Babylon dominates the politics of the period and becomes the “superpower par excellence.” Under the “Babylon-dominated world,” there is only one future, namely, the “Babylon-shaped future.” However, chapters 50–51 provide an unexpected twist, in which a nation from the north (50:3) will destroy the “foe from the north,” an epithet of Babylon (cf. 1:13–14). The oracle shifts the fate of the great empire which is now not the divine means of attack, but the object of Yahweh’s wrath, thereby transforming its role and position. By the end of the book of Jeremiah, trust in Yahweh does not equal submission to Babylon, for the empire now stands under divine judgment and will soon become a ruin. The oracle stresses that Babylon is not the

---

100 There are several interpretative issues in this oracle against Babylon, e.g., (1) the different location of the text in the MT and in the LXX; (2) the question of authenticity; (3) the question of consistency. In Jer 51:59–64, it seems to denote that this was the written oracle which Seraiah was ordered in 594 B.C. to carry to Babylon, to read, and to sink in the Euphrates. However, in the same period, Jeremiah preached against the rebellion of vassal states, including Judah, against Babylon (27:1–15). See Keown et al., Jeremiah 26–52, 357–59; McKane, Jeremiah 26–52, 1249–50; Carroll, Jeremiah, 751–59. Our discussion in this project follows the structure in the final form of the MT Jeremiah; cf. “The Definition of a Text” in CHAPTER ONE.

For the authentic and unauthentic material in Jer 50–51, see Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 402–411. Holladay regards 82 of the 104 verses in Jer 50–51 as authentic material from Jeremiah. He states that “the diction of 51:49–53 is appropriate to Jrm”; Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 408.

101 Carroll states that these themes are similar in Isa 40–55; Carroll, Jeremiah, 814.

102 Brueggemann, Jeremiah, 461–62.

"shaper of the future, not the perpetual power," but only a "pretender to power" who cannot endure the ultimate judgment of Yahweh.\textsuperscript{104}

After depicting the fall of Babylon (Jer 51:47–49), the text turns to the surviving Jews in the empire. Verse 50 is a summons to those Judean exiles who have escaped the destruction of Babylon, commanding them to flee from Babylon without dithering.\textsuperscript{105} A similar call can be found in v. 45a: "Come forth from her midst, my people." When Babylon is overthrown, the exiles are able to return home. However, this urging, which may relate to a geographical departure, is also an emotional one. The exiles may have already sided with Babylon, a dominate power of the era. In order to prepare them for their exodus, the prophet exhorts the people to īw Yahweh and to think of Jerusalem even though they were in far distant places.\textsuperscript{106}

The exhortation to remember in Jer 51 prompts the people settling in the foreign land to turn to Yahweh instead of siding with the empire and its idols (cf. 51:52).\textsuperscript{107} They should think of the holy city and of the abused temple, reminding themselves why they have become so humiliated. They should regret their past misdeeds which led to their present distress. Such memories trigger sadness as reflected in their confession: "We are ashamed because we have heard reproach; disgrace has covered our faces, for aliens have entered the holy places of the Lord’s house" (51:51; cf. Ps 137:1). However,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{104} Brueggemann, \textit{Jeremiah}, 462.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Lundbom argues: "The directive [of vv. 50–51] is rather to survivors of Nebuchadnezzar's attack on Jerusalem, perhaps in 597 B.C., telling them to get on their way into exile as instructed, and not to linger lest they meet up with new danger"; Lundbom, \textit{Jeremiah} 37–52, 487. However, this interpretation does not fit well with the preceding verses: "Indeed Babylon is to fall for the slain of Israel, as also for Babylon the slain of all the earth have fallen" (Jer 51:49, cf. 51:47–58).
\item \textsuperscript{106} Keown et al., \textit{Jeremiah} 26–52, 372; McKane, \textit{Jeremiah} 26–52, 1339–42; Carroll, \textit{Jeremiah}, 849–51; Holladay, \textit{Jeremiah} 2, 430–31; Brueggemann, \textit{Jeremiah}, 481–82.
\item \textsuperscript{107} Keown argues that to remember Yahweh "may be seen as a call to the many who had adopted Babylonian religion while in exile to readopt their former religion in light of the Lord’s impending deliverance"; Keown et al., \textit{Jeremiah} 26–52, 375.
\end{itemize}
at this crucial moment, "when memory is rekindled and pain is embraced, the healing work of the wounded begins." This imagination re-enacts for the oppressed marginals Yahweh’s involvement in history, his victory over oppressive regimes, and his reign on earth. It encourages thinking that it is Yahweh, not Nebuchadnezzar, who is the true king of the universe and it is the Lord, not Babylon’s idols, who is the real God of the cosmos. This kind of remembering prompts the exiles to trust Yahweh and enables them to disengage themselves from Babylon in order to return to their homeland.

The similarities between Zech 10:9a and Jer 51:50 are striking. Both texts (1) address the exiles settling in far distant places (בָּאָם, Zech 10:9a; בָּאָם, Jer 51:50); (2) focus on the topic of remembrance (רמּו) of these dispersed communities; and (3) stress the motif of remembering Yahweh as the key to the turn of fortune.

Though the two passages have impressive correspondences, they also demonstrate some difference. The sermon-like exhortation in Jer 51:50 is converted into a description of the piety of the diaspora in Zech 10:9a. Thus, Zech 10:9 projects an image that the northern exiles will obey the exhortation of the earlier prophet and will remember Yahweh in the remote areas after the Lord has sown them among other peoples. The positive portrayal of the northerners not only enlists the audience to accept the return of their penitent brothers, but also reveals the great expectations of the Lord for the renewal of his chastised people.

In Zech 10:10a, the diaspora will come home since Yahweh has promised to bring his people back from Egypt and Assyria. Since the dispersion of the northerners is

---

110 Meyers and Meyers suggest that the existence of northern Israelites in Egypt and Assyria, probably from the eighth century onward, seems certain on the basis of texts from the eighth-century
extensive, as set forth by the use of הָאָרָא and נְזֵבֵר (10:9a; cf. Isa 11:11–12; Jer 23:3),
the singling-out of these two nations (cf. 10:11b) as specific places of exile has
prompted much discussion. Mitchell contends that the references here are to the empires
of the Ptolemies and Seleucids, which are the ruling world power of the time. On the
other hand, Petersen argues that the selection of these two countries matches well the
geographic extent of the northerners in the Persian period, not only in Mesopotamia but
also in Egypt. These divergent suggestions prove that these attempts to pin-point the
oracle in historical events are precarious.

In the Hebrew Bible, Egypt and Assyria are seen as symbols of major threats to
Israel’s freedom, particularly in prophetic literature, with the former approaching from
the south and the latter from the north (Isa 10:24; 52:4; cf. Lam 5:6). Due to the
allusive nature of the text, it is important to ask whether there is any intertextual
dimension at play when these typical oppressors are recalled here. Since the pair of נֶעְרִים
and נְזֵבֵר also occurs in v. 11b, we will discuss the intertextual connection later.

In Zech 10:10b, Yahweh will bring the returnees to the territories of Gilead and of
Lebanon. Gilead sometimes refers to a limited part of Transjordan, however, it can also
designate all of the area (cf. Deut 3:12, 13; Josh 12:2–6), between the Sea of Galilee and

prophets, e.g., Isa 11:11; Hos 11:11; Mic 7:12. The major deportation of Israelites after the fall of Samaria
was clearly to Assyria rather than Egypt as not as evidenced as that of Assyria. However, Meyers and
Meyers argue: “Although Egypt is not specified in the 2 Kings passage or in contemporary Assyrian
documents chronicling the conquest and deportation of Samaria, it is possible that the vast rearrangements
of populations that the Assyrians practiced did involve the transfer of some Israelites to Egypt. Assyrans,
in fact, deported people both to and from Egypt. ... Thus, even though the evidence is indirect, it is quite
possible that resettlements by the Assyrians involved the movement of Israelites to Egypt”; Meyers and
Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 220 (italic mine).


112 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 76. Cf. O’Brien, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah,
Malachi, 246.

113 See “Date of Composition” in CHAPTER TWO.

the Dead Sea, which was inhabited by Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh (cf. Num 32:33). Lebanon refers to the mountain range which rises from the west of the Phoenician coast to a height of 8300 feet and which begins from the north of the Leontes River continuing northward for about a hundred miles. These two areas share similar geographical and historical features: they were (1) rugged and mountainous, each with a relatively narrow band of tableland; (2) densely forested, with insignificant settlement throughout the biblical period; (3) famed for their beauty and wealth of natural resources (Lebanon: Isa 60:13; Ezek 31:3; Gilead: Num 32:1-4; Jer 8:22; 50:19); (4) part of the Levantine territory but outside of Persian Yehud; and (5) not confined within the promised land as laid out in Gen 15:18-21; Num 34:2-12; Ezek 47:15-20.

The mention of Lebanon as one of the places of return (10:10b), however, has prompted much discussion among scholars. Numerous suggestions have been proposed in order to give a satisfactory account of the mention of Lebanon here. The problem begins with Jer 50:19 where Yahweh promises to bring his flock back to the land after the fall of Babylon: “And I will bring Israel back to his pasture and he will graze on Carmel and Bashan, and his desire will be satisfied in the hill country of Ephraim and Gilead.” The Jeremianic promise echoes the petition in Mic 7:14b: “Let them feed in Bashan and Gilead as in the days of old.” Because of these passages, Tai argues that the destination of return in Zech 10:10b should be Gilead and Bashan which belong to the former northerners. Mitchell follows the same line of interpretation and claims that

115 Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 222.
116 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 77; Butler, Joshua, 151.
118 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 97.
Lebanon “must be omitted” due to metrical reason.\footnote{Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 294. So is Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 327.} For him, Gilead in Zech 10 is used in the broader sense to include Bashan, that is, for the entire region east of the Jordan once occupied by the Israelites (cf. Josh 22:9; Judg 10:8; 20:1).\footnote{Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 294.}

Dissatisfied with the emendation, Meyers and Meyers contend that “the toponyms of Second Zechariah have been carefully selected. This instance is no exception.”\footnote{Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 223.} They argue that Lebanon was considered as marginal Israelite territory (cf. Josh 1:4) for most of it was not suitable for agricultural development. It would be settled by the northern returnees only when the heartland of Israel and Galilee were fully populated, a condition anticipated in the clause that follows: \( \text{נַחֲלָתָה} \ \text{נַחֲלָתָה} \ \text{נַחֲלָתָה} \ \text{נַחֲלָתָה}. \) They conclude: “Gilead and Lebanon as a pair are integral to the prophet’s concern for the full restoration of the Northern Kingdom.”\footnote{Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 223.} Though Gilead was apparently part of the Northern Kingdom when the Assyrian captured various western cities in his campaigns of 732 B.C. (cf. 2 Kgs 15:29), Lebanon as a whole remained external to Israelite domination even in the period of Davidic-Solomonic expansion (cf. 1 Kgs 5:20–23 [5:6–9]).\footnote{Petersen states that Lebanon refers to the mountainous area which is north of territory normally controlled by Israel”; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 77. O’Brien claims that Lebanon was outside of, though bordering on, the land of Israel; O’Brien, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 246. Redditt contends that Lebanon remained outside the territory of Israel, but bordered on it; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 122; Boda asserts that Lebanon was on the northern border of Israel; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 446. Contra Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 223.} Because of this, Mendecki suggests that these two geographical names are cited in order to underline how populous the future Israel will be, that is, her inhabitants will be so numerous that

\begin{itemize}
\item Most scholars agree that Lebanon belongs to Hiram’s territory rather than Solomon’s (1 Kgs 9:19//2 Chr 8:6); De Vries, 1 Kings, 133; Sweeney, I & II Kings, 143; Nelson, First and Second Kings, 64. However, it does indicate that a Lebanon district in southern Syria once represented the extreme northern extent of David’s conquests (2 Sam 8:6). Thus we may assume that part of the southern Lebanon was under Solomonic dominion. Cf. Dentan, “Zechariah 9–14,” 1101.
\end{itemize}
they will spill over into neighbouring regions. In this case, the text allocates more than the original land to the northerners. Many scholars follow this line of interpretation, contending that since Lebanon lies along the northern boundary of the land occupied by the northerners before exile, the site probably serves the function of accommodating the overflow. However, if the returnees needed more space for settlement, then it is important to ask why the mountainous Lebanon was allocated rather than other northern territories, e.g., the Phoenician cities or the Syrian areas.

Due to the allusive nature of the text, it may be profitable to investigate whether there is any intertextual dimension at play by employing these toponyms. Apart from Zech 10:10b, Gilead and Lebanon as a pair occur only in Jer 22:6: “For thus says the LORD concerning the house of the king of Judah: “You are like Gilead to Me, like the summit of Lebanon; Yet most assuredly I will make you like a wilderness, like cities which are not inhabited.” Based on this, Mason argues that the earlier judgment against the royal house in Jer 22 is to be reversed here: “the land and the returned community are to be rescued from desolation and made as Gilead and Lebanon in Yahweh’s sight again. The beauty and fertility of the land will be such, and perhaps even the character of the whole community so different from that of the old Judean kings, that it can be described as Gilead and Lebanon again.” The problem of Mason’s interpretation is that the two toponyms are not appropriated metaphorically in the Zecharian text as he suggested. They are used concretely as geographical places in which the returnees will be brought.

125 E.g., Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 446; Merrill, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 279; Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 176.
It may be helpful to explain the mention of Lebanon in v. 10b by reading the last two lines of v. 10b together. The reason for settling the repatriates in these two sites is implied in 10:10b: הָעָלָה הָעָלָה לָהּ. By taking the י as causal waw and reading it together with הָעָלָה הָעָלָה in v. 8b, the clause הָעָלָה הָעָלָה in Zech 10:10b can be rendered as “for no [room] will be found for them,” that means, there will not be enough space for the returnees to reside. Based upon this nuance, Mendecki argues that the Zecharian text is dependent on Isa 49:18–23: “Die beschriebene Größe der Sammlung, die so umfassend ist, daß es an Platz mangelt, erinnert an Jes 49,18–23.”127 It is true that both texts share the same connotation, that is, the restored people will be so exceedingly populous that the settlement site will not be big enough for them: “The place is too cramped for me, make room for me that I may live here” (Isa 49:20b). However, the lack of distinctive verbal similarity between the two texts precludes us from arguing for literary dependence. Probably, these two texts took their shape in a similar context, sharing the same traditional theme.

In the Hebrew Bible, the niphal of קָבָא following קָבָא and preceding a suffixed קב occurs elsewhere only in Josh 17:16. Besides the formulation קב קב קב, other words and phrase קב קב קב, and all כְּרָדַת כְּרָדַת כְּרָדַת all serve as catchwords, linking the two texts together. Thus we register Josh 17:16–18 as the intertext of Zech 10:10b.128

Joshua 17:16–18
16 The sons of Joseph said, “The hill country is not enough for us (כְּרָדַת כְּרָדַת כְּרָדַת), and all the Canaanites who live in the valley land have chariots of iron, both

127 Translated as: “The described size of the collection, which is so extensive that it is deficient in place, is reminiscent of Isa 49:18–23”; Mendecki, “Deuterojesajianischer,” 342.
128 A number of scholars have observed this connection; e.g., Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 222; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 222; Tai, Prophétiq als Schriftauslegung, 108.
those who are in Beth-shean and its towns and those who are in the valley of Jezreel.”

17 Joshua spoke to the house of Joseph (יהושע בֶּן יֵשׁוּעַ; cf. Zech 10:6a), to Ephraim (בֵּית אֲפַרְמָה; cf. Zech 10:7a) and Manasseh, saying, “You are a numerous (多い; cf. י铷, Zech 10:8b) people and have great power; you shall not have one lot only;

18 but the hill country shall be yours. For though it is a forest, you shall clear it, and to its farthest borders it shall be yours; for you shall drive out the Canaanites, even though they have chariots of iron and though they are strong.”

Allusion to Josh 17:16–18. Joshua 17:16–18 is embedded within a section of Joshua focused on the land distribution to the sons of Joseph, Ephraim (Josh 16) and Manasseh (Josh 17), with 17:14–18 as a concluding narrative concerning the driving out of the remaining Canaanites in the allotted inheritance. The narrative (17:14–18) is related in a dialogue style, connecting the increase in numbers of יִשְׂרָאֵל to the patriarchal blessing of fruitfulness (Gen 49:22–26; cf. יִשְׂרָאֵל of Gen 48:16). The Joseph tribe complained to Joshua that the allotted portion was not enough for them because they were numerous (多い) and the valley was occupied by the Canaanites who had chariots of iron (17:16). Joseph accepts the fact that יִשְׂרָאֵל is a great and blessed people who should have more than one lot (17:17). However, the gaining of the second lot is set forth in a challenge: (1) they must create a living space for themselves by clearing up the wooded hill country (17:18a; cf. 17:15); and (2) they have to drive out the Canaanites despite the great power of the enemy (17:18b).

The second part of the challenge set out by Joshua is a real problem for the Israelites according to their traditions (cf. Josh 13:13; 15:63; 16:10; 17:12; Judg 1:19, 21,

130 Butler, Joshua, 141–53;
Despite its difficulty, the removal of the Canaanites from the land is not an impossible task as Yahweh has pledged himself to fight for his people when he commands Joshua to divide the land to the tribes of Israel (Josh 13:7).

The command of land allocation in the book of Joshua (13:1–7) begins with a catalogue of regions which remain to be possessed (13:1–5), including: (1) the land of the Philistines and their southern allies (vv. 2–3); (2) the Phoenician coast (v. 4); and (3) the northern mountain country of Lebanon (v. 5). Then Yahweh promised to complete the conquest for his people despite the fact that their leader, Joshua, was too old to bring victory to them: “All the inhabitants of the hill country from Lebanon as far as Misrephoth-maim, all the Sidonians, I will drive them out from before the sons of Israel; only allot it to Israel for an inheritance as I have commanded you” (13:6).131 Misrephoth-maim which stands at the northern end of the Plain of Acco, is the traditional frontier city between Lebanon and Palestine (cf. Josh 11:8).132 Thus, Josh 13:6 describes the northern region, one of the areas not yet possessed when the land was distributed. Lebanon, which is highlighted in the promise in v. 6, is considered as part of the promised land only in the Moses-Joshua tradition (Deut 1:7; 3:25; 11:24; Josh 1:4; 13:5).133 With the leadership of Yahweh, the inhabitants of Lebanon will be driven out (Josh 13:6) even though the Israelites were unable to do so by themselves (cf. 13:5).

When reading the last two lines of Zech 10:10 in light of its intertextual backdrop, the land allotment of the Israelites in Joshua’s time was called to mind. In both texts (Zech 10:10b; Josh 17:16–18), the formulation יָשָׁבוּ הָאָרֶץ indicates that יָשָׁבוּ הָאָרֶץ is

131 Joshua 13:6a is generally regarded as “an incomprehensible addition” because it seems not to fit well with the context (cf. 13:1–5); Soggin, Joshua, 153; Boling, Joshua, 338.
132 Butler, Joshua, 128.
133 For the different concept of the promised land, see Kaufmann, Biblical Account, 46–54.
numerous (Zech 10:8b; Josh 17:17), resulted in a shortage of space for the people to reside. In the source, the problem arising from ב אֱלֹהִים could not be solved for the Israelites were incapable of driving out the Canaanites (Josh 17:18). In the host, the overflow of the population will be settled not only in Gilead but also in Lebanon, denoting that Yahweh will complete the conquest for the returnees as promised (cf. Josh 13:6).

Based on the above, the mention of Lebanon as one of the destinations of return in Zech 10:10b is intended to bring to the mind of the readers the promise of Yahweh in Josh 13:6. The intertextual reading reminds the audience that Yahweh will not only bring the northerners back to the land, but also fulfill his promise by including Lebanon as part of their future settlement. However, the realization of the promised land in the Moses-Joshua tradition will only be achieved after all Israel has returned home. In this instance, the full restoration of Yahweh’s people is still in progress.

**Sustained Allusion to Jer 23:1–4, 7–8.** As discussed before, the salvation oracle in Jer 23:1–4 is alluded to as an intertextual backdrop for the transformation of Judah (Zech 10:2c–5) as well as for the restoration of Ephraim (Zech 10:6, 8, 10). The pair of בָּשָׁה in hiphil and קָבִיב in piel is stereotypical language in Jeremiah for denoting the divine gathering of the dispersed exiles and the subsequent return of them to the land. In v. 10a, the pair בָּשָׁה and קָבִיב with the same connotations is used in order to recall for the readers Jer 23:1–4 (cf. v. 3), where the motif of multiplication (זָרַע וּרְזָע; cf. זָרַע of Zech 10:8a) also appears. However, by adding the hiphil of בָּשָׁה to the pair, all with Yahweh as subject and Israelites as object conferring a sense of Yahweh gathering and bringing

---

134 See “The Climax of the Renewal” in CHAPTER SIX.
135 Tigchelaar argues that “the structure of Zech 10:3a, 8–10 reflects the order of Jer 23:2–3, 7–8”; Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, 107.
back his people to the land, Zech 10:10 as a whole evokes for the audience not only Jer 23:1–4 but also Jer 23:7–8, where a broader exodus is envisaged with a grand return of all exiles (vv. 7–8).136

Jeremiah 23:7–8
7 “Therefore behold, the days are coming,” declares the LORD, “when they will no longer say, ‘As the LORD lives, who brought up the sons of Israel from the land of Egypt (אenen ליהב),’
8 but, ‘As the LORD lives, who brought up and led back (אנהב נב) the descendants of the household of Israel from the north land and from all the countries where I had driven them.’ Then they will live on their own soil.”

The second exodus envisioned in Zech 10 (cf. v.11), similar to that of Jer 23, will surpass the original one. Like the first exodus, the Lord will save and bless יוחנן so that they will be as numerous as they were before (בראש נב, Zech 10:8b; cf. Josh 17:17). Unlike the first exodus, the deity will complete the conquest for his people before they arrive the land (Zech 10:10b; cf. Josh 13:6). The intertextual backdrop (Josh 17:16–18; Jer 23:1–4, 7–8) of Zech 10:10 aims to endow the audience with a grand vision, exhorting them to trust Yahweh who will bring Israel a full restoration, one that will surpass any ones that they have experienced before. The intertextual reading also provokes thought of hope, enlisting the readers to translate the vision into reality as the lead of Yahweh will ensure victory for them (Josh 13:6). This exodus motif recalled here will be developed further in Zech 10:11a.

In Zech 10:11, the third-person prophetic comment breaks into the first-person divine saying in Zech 10:10. It seems that vv. 10 and 11 have different emphases, with the former one stressing the promise of return and abundance of the people and the latter

136 Lust argues that the only instance in Jeremiah where the return of the exiles is depicted as a new exodus occurs in Jer 23:7–8/16:14–15, employing typical language of exodus: חנעמ and נב; Lust, “Gathering and Return,” 133–35.
one focusing on the downfall of the hostile forces. Because of this, Tigchelaar comments: “whereas the preceding divine speech [in v. 10] focuses on the return of the exiles from Egypt and Assyria, the comment [in v. 11] digresses on the fall of these empires.”\textsuperscript{137} However the two verses are linked together by chiasmus—\textit{משיבים–משרathon} in v.10a and \textit{משרathon–משיבים} in v.11b—which bracket the corpus.\textsuperscript{138} This chiastic structure not only shows a close connection between these two verses but also forces us to interpret them in light of each other. Based on this, the traditional enemies, Egypt and Assyria, may be seen as barriers to return. The bringing down (\textit{ירד}) and the coming to an end (\textit{סיים}) of the hostile forces in v. 11 are a preparation for the gathering (\textit{פייק}) and return (\textit{שוב}) in v. 10. Thus v. 11 should not be seen as a digression. The dichotomy between these two emphases is not necessary, particularly in the final form of the corpus.

The deliverance of the northern tribes in v. 11a is compared to the Israelites’ exodus from Egypt, which is often portrayed, especially in poetry, in mythological terms as though the \textit{פֶּה–פָּרָע} and Pharaoh’s armies were monsters over whom Yahweh, the divine warrior, prevailed (cf. Exod 15:1b–18).\textsuperscript{139} The exodus motif of the verse is reflected by the lexical choice, particularly \textit{====, massa} and \textit{גָּבָה, גֵּש}. The verb \textit{נָדֵה, מְצַלֶּה} with Yahweh as subject and a watercourse as object denoting a sense of Yahweh conquering the primeval evil occurs mostly in relation to exodus: “I [Yahweh] will strike \textit{(mid)} the water that is in the Nile” (Exod 7:17; cf. 7:25; Isa 11:15).\textsuperscript{140} In Josh 2:10a, Rahab recounted the exodus event in which Yahweh had dried up \textit{(mid)} so that the Israelites could walk on

\textsuperscript{137} Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, 107.
\textsuperscript{138} Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 227; Larkin, Eschatology, 98.
\textsuperscript{139} Cross, “Song of the Sea,” 1–25; Cross, Canaanite Myth, 121–44; Miller, Divine Warrior, 113–17; Lind, Yahweh Is a Warrior, 46–60.
\textsuperscript{140} The hiphil of \textit{(mid} occurs 481 times in the Hebrew Bible, denoting a deadly blow or a military defeat, an assault that leads to the immediate or rapid demise of the object of the verb; Conrad, “\textit{mid},” 415–23.
dry land (cf. הנחל in Exod 14:16, 22, 29; 15:19). In Exod 15:4–5, Pharaoh and his armies drowned in the ים סוף when they were crossing the ים סוף (cf. Neh 9:11). The noun ים which appears 65 times in the Hebrew Bible mainly refers to the Nile of Egypt (cf. Exod 7:21; Amos 9:5).

The exodus imagery in 10:11a probably alludes to the motif of crossing the ים סוף but has been stretched beyond the tradition so that the sea is now equated with the Nile: הבשה על ים אד. Behind this imagery is likely the creation myths of conquering the תחנה ים יבש which is drawn on in order to emphasize that Yahweh is both the creator and the deliverer who conquers the hostile forces that held his people captive (cf. Ps 74:12–15).

For the exegesis of Zech 10:11, scholars generally have problems with the first line: יבש שבר (10:11a) where the antecedent of שבר in third masculine singular is not clear. Some adopt ים as the subject of שבר and render the clause as “distress shall come upon the sea” (cf. Ezek 5:17). If that is the case, then the feminine ים contrasts the masculine verbs (דיבר, דיבר), particularly that of the second line: ים פרשי, where ים heads the verb. Others follow the rendering of the LXX, changing the singular שבר into a plural form, thus allowing “them” (ם, 10:10b), that is, the repatriates, to be the

---

141 The hiphil of בוש appears 15 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 2:10; 4:23; 5:1; Ps 74:15; Isa 42:15; 44:27; Jer 10:14; 51:36; Ezek 17:24; 19:12; Joel 1:10, 12; Zech 10:11. Of these, its appearance with Yahweh as subject, denoting a sense of Yahweh drying up a watercourse, occurs in Josh 2:10; 4:23; 5:1; Ps 74:15; Isa 42:15; 44:27; Jer 51:36; Zech 10:11.

142 The noun ים appears 12 times in the Hebrew Bible: Exod 15:5; Neh 9:11; Job 41:23; Ps 68:23; 69:3, 16; 88:7; 107:24; Jonah 2:4; Mic 7:19; Zech 1:8; 10:11.

143 The noun ים can also denote ordinary stream, river or canal (cf. Isa 33:21).


antecedent. However, the one who will pass through (נהר) the distressful sea is also the one who will strike (נהר) the waving sea in the next line. This powerful figure probably is Yahweh rather than the people. Otzen is probably right that “der ganze Vers spielt auf die bekannten Vorstellungen von der Epiphanie Jahwes an. Jahwes und Israels Kampf gegen die Feinde wird als Jahwes Kampf mit dem Urmeer angesehen.”

Within this theophanic context, which parallels יבשת, should be understood as denoting a threatening sense with the deity passing through in judgment (cf. Amos 5:17) rather than merely travelling across a locale (cf. Josh 4:7). Hence, it is Yahweh who will pass through the sea which causes distress (cf. Isa 30:6), and it is he who will strike down the foe which generates turbulence (cf. Jer 5:22).

Apart from Zech 10:11a, the construction יבשת which occurs together with יבשת in hiphil and confers the same nuance, appears only in Exod 12:12 where Yahweh announces that he will appear to kill the firstborn in Egypt in order to set the captives free. Besides יבשת and יבשת, the construct chain יבשת and the self-identification formulation also serve as catchwords, linking the two texts together. Based on these correspondences, we register Exod 12:12–13 as an intertext of Zech 10:11a.

---

146 E.g., Wellhausen, Die Kleinen Propheten, 192; Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 326; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 294. Cf. BHS.
147 Translated as: “The entire line plays on the well-known concepts of the epiphany of Yahweh. Yahweh and Israel fight against the enemies would be viewed as Yahweh’s battle with the primordial sea”; Otzen, Studien über Deuterosacharja, 251. Cf. Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 109.
148 We keep the reading of the MT, treating יבשת and יבשת as in apposition, and do not change them to יבריחה יבריחה. Contra Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, 326; Mitchell, et al., Zechariah, 295; Dentan, “Zechariah 9–14,” 1101.
149 The qal of יבשת followed by יבשת occurs 64 times in the Hebrew Bible. Among these it appears with Yahweh as subject only in Exod 12:12; Amos 5:17; Zech 10:11.
150 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 110.
Exodus 12:12–13

12 For I will go through (ָּנָּאָר מֵאֵרְעֵי פַּרְנָסַּת; cf. Zech 10:10a) the land of Egypt (מַּיִּית הַפַּרְנָסַּת; cf. Zech 10:10a) on that night, and will strike down (קָרֵב בָּדְרִי) all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man [human] and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments—I am the LORD (יְהוָּה אֶרֶץ; cf. Zech 10:6c).

13 The blood shall be a sign for you on the houses where you live; and when I see the blood I will pass over you, and no plague will befall you to destroy you when I strike (שֶׁכֵּן) the land of Egypt (מַּיִּית הַפַּרְנָסַּת; cf. Zech 10:10a).

Allusion to Exod 12:12. Exodus 12:12 is embedded within a pericope recounting divine instruction on the observance of the Passover in Egypt (12:1–13).151 The ordinance is intended for the whole congregation (כֹּל תַּנּוּר הַשֶּׁם אֶלֶף) who will celebrate the festival together as a memorial feast to Yahweh throughout the generations (12:3, 14, 24–25). Situated within the narrative of the exodus, the pericope provides an etiology for the festival, linking it with the beginning of national freedom.152 Whatever its origins, the Passover in this text initiates the marking of time in relation to the memory of the past rather than to the seasonal changes of nature.153

The instruction is presented as a divine speech to Moses and Aaron. The decree begins with a prefatory note introducing a new cultic calendar which signifies a new historic epoch in the life of Israel (vv. 1–2). Then the components of the commemorative festival are set forth, starting with a detailed description of the meal to be eaten before the departure from Egypt (vv. 3–11). The blood of the animals is smeared on the doorposts and on the lintel of the Israelite dwellings in which they will eat the meal (v. 7). The blood marks the homes that the Lord will pass over when the firstborn plague is

151 The pericope could be extended to v. 20 as the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread is viewed as a single, seven-day feast in P. See Dozeman, *Exodus*, 262; Meyers, *Exodus*, 94. Since that part of the ritual does not affect our analysis of the intertext, we do not proceed beyond v. 13.

152 For the discussion about the relationship between the Passover and the exodus, see Childs, *Exodus*, 191–92.

153 For the discussion about the etiology of the Passover, see Dozeman, *Exodus*, 261.
brought upon the Egyptians (v. 13). The absence of blood on a doorframe would constitute a rejection of God’s offer of grace, protection, and lordship.

Exodus 12:12 provides an interpretation of the Passover meal in Egypt. On the night of death, Yahweh will engage in a cosmological battle against the hostile forces that hold his people captive. Three actions of the Lord in the verse signify warfare: (1) בָּכֵלַ֣ל אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם, חָצֵ֣ת אֶחְשָׁ֣א שֵׁםְךָ, (2) אַחֲרֵי מַשָּׁ֥מַר; and (3) יָדוֹחַ אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם. Yahweh’s judgment on the land of Egypt, its people, and its gods is presented as an epiphany, punctuated with his divine name: אָדָ֖ם. The self-introduction of Yahweh confirms the intention and ability of the Lord in deeds of salvation for the Israelites (cf. Exod 6:2–8) and in actions of punishment against their enemies (cf. Exod 6:11–13, 29; 7:5).

Besides verbal parallels, there are some thematic connections between the two texts. Both passages: (1) use the exodus as a backdrop to depict the divine deliverance of Israel; (2) focus on Yahweh’s assault against the hostile powers which hold people captive; (3) picture the divine intervention which removes the barriers to return to the land; and (4) employ בָּכֵלַ֣ל אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם as an assurance of the divine promise of salvation.

However, when we scrutinize the reuse of the intertext in Zech 10:11, we notice that there are two differences between these texts: (1) In Zech 10:11a Yahweh will pass through בָּכֵלַ֣ל אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם and strike בָּכֵלַ֣ל אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם, whereas in Exod 12:12 the Lord will pass through בָּכֵלַ֣ל אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם and strike בָּכֵלַ֣ל אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם. In the source text, the divine judgment will fall not only on the evil forces (בָּכֵלַ֣ל אֲמַרְךָ֗ מִצְרָֽיִם of Zech 10:11a) but also on those who side with them, that is, the Egyptians; and (2) The immediate context of the host.

---

154 This analysis draws on the works of Meyers, Exodus, 94–101; Dozeman, Exodus, 258–70; Bruckner, Exodus, 108–12; Cassuto, Exodus, 136–40.
155 Bruckner, Exodus, 108–12. The Hebrew term נַחֲרָ֖ה, as a verb, probably means “to protect” (cf. Exod 12:23; Isa 31:5); Meyers, Exodus, 97; Bruckner, Exodus, 112; Dozeman, Exodus, 269.
156 Dozeman, Exodus, 269.
text is the return of the northerners from afar, whereas the immediate context of the
source text is the observance of the Passover which remembers events in Egypt. The
antecedent focuses more on divine provision in the midst of judgment for the smeared
blood functions as a sign of divine grace and protection for those who would seek
Yahweh’s shelter by placing the blood accordingly. 157

As discussed above, the pair of תָּלִים and כַּלְלַים which appears in Zech 10:10a and
10:11b serves as a tie binding together the return of the people in v. 10 and the demise of
the empires in v. 11. In the Hebrew Bible, only 3 occurrences of the pair denote the
return of the Israelites from תָּלִים and כַּלְלַים after the exile: Isa 11:11; 27:13; Hos 11:11,
apart from Zech 10:10a. 158 Isaiah 11:11 announces Yahweh’s plan of acquiring his
people from a number of places: “Then it will happen on that day that the Lord will
again recover the second time with His hand the remnant of His people, who will remain,
from Assyria (כַּלְלַים), Egypt (תָּלִים), Pathros, Cush, Elam, Shinar, Hamath, and from the
islands of the sea.” Isaiah 27:13 promises the gathered Israelites the privilege of
worshipping Yahweh in Jerusalem: “It will come about also in that day that a great
trumpet will be blown, and those who were perishing in the land of Assyria (כַּלְלַים) and
who were scattered in the land of Egypt (תָּלִים) will come (שָׁאָר) and worship the Lord in
the holy mountain at Jerusalem.” Hosea 11:11 depicts the homecoming of Ephraim with
a bird-simile: “They will come trembling like birds from Egypt (קָנָם) and like doves

157 The intertextual impact will be discussed below.
158 Egypt and Assyria occur together in 23 verses in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 25:18; 2 Kgs 17:4;
11:5, 11; 12:2 [12:1]; Zech 10:10, 11. Micah 7:12 is not counted as the word שָׁאָר probably means siege or
fortress (cf. Mic 4:14). In addition, the meaning of Mic 7:12 is ambiguity, with two possible
interpretations: (1) the return of the Judean diaspora; or (2) the threat posted from Assyria and Egypt to
Jerusalem. For the former view, see Mays, Micah, 162; Smith, Micah-Malachi, 58. For the latter one, see
Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 411.
from the land of Assyria (גֵּרְשָׁנָי); and I will settle them in their houses, declares the Lord.” Tai argues that Hos 11:11 has a more impressive verbal parallel as also appears in Hos 11:8, apart from Zech 10:11a, the hiphil of חֶבְלָה with Yahweh as subject and a watercourse as object denoting a sense of God conquering the waters occurs only in Isa 11:15–16 where the pair of וְיהָנָא and is also attested. The pair of וְיהָנָא which brackets Zech 10:10–11 also serves the same function in Isa 11:11–16, a pericope depicting the restoration of the remnant of Yahweh’s people. Based on this correspondence, we register Isa 11:11–12, 15–16 as an intertext of Zech 10:10–11, with כַּפַּרָה+יָמָרָא כַּפַּר הָנָא כַּפַּרָה as catchwords.

Isaiah 11:11–12, 15–16

11 Then it will happen on that day that the Lord will again recover the second time with His hand the remnant of His people, who will remain, from Assyria (גֵּרְשָׁנָי; cf. Zech 10:10a), Egypt (מַעֲרַיִם; cf. Zech 10:10a), Pathros, Cush, Elam, Shinar, Hamath, and from the islands of the sea.

12 And He will lift up a standard for the nations And assemble the banished ones of Israel, And will gather (נָפַשׁ; cf. Zech 10:10a) the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

15 And the Lord will utterly destroy the tongue of the Sea of Egypt (רָבָן מַעֲרַיִם); and He will wave His hand over the River with His scorching wind; and He will strike it (נָשָׁף; cf. Zech 10:11a) into seven streams and make men [people] walk over dry-shod (נָשָׁף, cf. יָשָׁף of Zech 10:11a).

16 And there will be a highway from Assyria (גֵּרְשָׁנָי; cf. Zech 10:11a) for the remnant of His people who will be left, just as there was for Israel in the day that they came up out of the land of Egypt (מַעֲרַיִם; cf. Zech 10:10a).

Allusion to Isa 11:11–12, 15–16. Isaiah 11:11–12, 15–16 is embedded within a salvation oracle (11:11–16) which depicts the future deliverance of Israel reminiscent of

---

159 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 108.
the exodus from Egypt. However, within its broader context (10:5–12:6), the restoration of Israel in Isa 11 should be read in light of the woe oracle against Assyria in Isa 10 where the contrast between the Assyrian and Davidic monarchs is employed as one of the thematic connections binding the two chapters together. The pericope (11:11–16) can be divided into three sections: (1) the homecoming of the exiles (vv. 11–12); (2) the unification of the kingdom (vv. 13–14); and (3) the highway for the returnees (vv. 15–16).

The first section (11:11–12) opens with a verse which announces that, in that day, Yahweh will acquire יְהֹוָה (YHWH) again the remnant of his people (יִשְׂרָאֵל) from distant places, including Egypt and Assyria (11:11). The verb יְהֹוָה signifies ownership (cf. יְהֹוָה of 1:3). It is used to denote God's creation (Gen 14:19, 22; Deut 32:6) and Yahweh's redemption (Exod 15:16; Ps 74:2). With overtones of creation and redemption, the deity will act to bring back the exiles in a way parallel to the exodus, a way that is like his creation of a people for himself. The technical phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל, which denotes the remnant of Yahweh's people, appears only in Isa 11:11, 16; 28:5, mainly concerning the northern exiles (cf. Isa 28:1–14). This concern is reflected at the end of the pericope—the striking of the רַם (v. 15) and a highway from Assyria (v. 16), though Judah is also mentioned in the divine ingathering (v. 12). In line with this announcement, Yahweh will signal the

---

162 The pericope (Isa 11:11–16) opens with יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, signifying the beginning of a new unit; Wildberger, Isaiah 1–12, 486; Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 176; Childs, Isaiah, 104; Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 198.
163 Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 196–201. Cf. Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 154–55, which limits the corpus to Isa 10:24–12:6, but with the same argument as Sweeney, that is, reading the restoration of Israel in light of the demise of Assyria.
165 Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 178–79.
166 Sweeney argues that the focus on the return of the northerners might be due to the fact that the text stems from the period of King Josiah's reform which encourages the return of the northern kingdom to the Davidic dynasty; Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 203–11.
nations, indicating his intention to gather (יִקְּהֶן; cf. Zech 10:8a, 10a) the dispersed of Israel and Judah (11:12).

The third section (11:15–16) pictures Yahweh’s intervention to remove the barriers to returning. The phrase והושיע יִשְׂרָאֵל has no parallel in the Hebrew Bible, but probably refers to the רְשָׁע (cf. Exod 13:18; Num 14:25; Deut 1:40) which is referred to simply as יִשְׂרָאֵל (cf. Exod 14:2, 9; 15:4). The noun רְשָׁע usually refers to the Euphrates, particularly in light of its use of the definite article (cf. Gen 31:21; Exod 23:31; Deut 1:7; 11:24). The terms רֶשֶׁת, יָדוֹ, and חֹטֶל all indicate that these watercourses are deemed as hostile forces which the Lord is going to conquer. Yahweh’s striking (רוּר) of רֶשֶׁת will divide it into seven streams so that people can cross it on dry land (11:15). Reading within the broader context, the imagery of Yahweh-לו רָאָה not only parallels the crossing of the רָאָה when the Israelites went through it on dry land (Exod 14:16), but also points to the demise of the Assyrian monarch (cf. 10:12, 24–25, 33–34). As a climax, a highway will emerge so that the remnant can return home from exile in Assyria as in the exodus from Egypt (11:16a).

Sandwiched between the two sections relating to the return of the remnant is a segment (11:13–14) that envisions the full restoration of the remnant—the unification of the kingdom with the enmity between Judah (יוֹדֵעָה; cf. Zech 10:6a) and Ephraim (סְפֹרַמ; cf. Zech 10:7a) dying out (11:13). When unity is achieved, the resultant empire would

---

167 Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 179; Kaiser, Isaiah 1–12, 268.
168 Watts, Isaiah 1–33, 179; Kaiser, Isaiah 1–12, 268; Sweeney, Isaiah 1–39, 201.
have a glorious future with its sovereignty established over the former subject people in
the neighborhood (11:14).  

Besides shared words, there are thematic correspondences between the two texts. Both passages: (1) focus on the divine intervention of the impending return (Isa 11:11–12; Zech 10:10); and (2) depict the violent assault of Yahweh on hostile forces, represented by waters which will be dried up (Isa 11:15–16; Zech 10:11). In addition, the northern orientation of the source text fits well with the context of the host text where Ephraim is the subject of the return (cf. Zech 10:7a). However, when we scrutinize the reuse, we find that the emphasis on striking is different. In Zech 10:11 the striking leads to the demise of Assyria and Egypt, whereas in Isa 11:15–16 the striking creates a pathway from Assyria for the return. Based on this, Tigchelaar casts doubt on this connection. However, as discussed above, the restoration of Israel in the Isaianic text should be read in light of the demise of Assyria (cf. Isa 10:5–12:6) and the demise of the empires in Zech 10:11 is closely connected with the return of the people in Zech 10:10. The emphases of Isa 11:15–16 and Zech 10:11 are not exclusive but rather complementary, with the source clarifying the motivation for the divine attack of the empires in the host text.

What is the purpose of appropriating Exod 12:12 and Isa 11:11–12, 15–16 in Zech 10:10–11? The intertextual reading summons the readers to reflect upon their history and to learn from the past. On the one hand, the Exodus text affirms the determination and ability of the Lord to liberate his people and return them to the land as he did before. The Exodus antecedent recalls for the audience their past experience in which divine

---

provision was adequate for them even though Egypt looked like a huge monster in comparison to tiny Israel. The Isaianic text reinforces this message by exhorting the audience to cling to Yahweh’s promise (11:11–12), believing that the Lord will remove all barriers to returning and even prepare a highway from Assyria for the remnant of his people (11:15–16).

On the other hand, the centre part of the Isaianic text reminds the audience once again that the return of the northerners and the reunification of the people are crucial to the complete salvation of Israel (11:13–14). This theme of reconciliation between the north and the south has been evoked before when Gen 37:24 is recalled as an intertext of Zech 9:11b.\footnote{See “Allusion to Gen 37:24” in CHAPTER FIVE.} This idea is echoed in the Exodus text where the deity expects the whole congregation (ךֵלְיִמּוֹנָה שֶׁפֶר) to commemorate the memorial feast together, remembering the grace and protection of the Lord as a people. Finally, the intertextual backdrops prompt the audience not to side with any world power, whether it is Egypt (cf. Exod 12:12), Assyria (cf. Isa 11:15–16), or Babylon (cf. Jer 51:49–50)\footnote{See “Allusion to Jer 51:50” above.} in the past or, by analogy, Persia in the present, as all these earthly empires will stand under Yahweh’s Judgment (שם, Exod 12:12) and are not perpetual.

In Zech 10:11b, as a result of Yahweh’s attack, the pride (ﾉו) of Assyria will be brought down (יִכְפָּר) and the scepter (שׁעָטֵן) of Egypt will depart (כָּסַף). The downfall of the oppressors will result in liberation for the exiles. In prophetic literature, the hophal of דָּרֶךְ is used to confer a sense of divine judgment against foreign powers, e.g., Babylon in Isa 14:11, 15 and Egypt in Ezek 31:18.\footnote{Though the verb דָּרֶךְ appears 380 times in the Hebrew Bible, its occurrence in the hophal stem is only attested in Gen 39:1; Num 10:17; Isa 14:11, 15; Ezek 31:18; Zech 10:11.} Here, the verb is applied to denote the demise of

\footnote{© 2023 by J. G. Littman. Used by permission of Baker Publishing Group, copyright® 2023.}
another empire, namely, Assyria. For the removal of the scepter from Egypt, Sweeney argues that the Zecharian text draws upon Isa 10:24–27.¹⁷⁶

Isaiah 10:24–27
24 Therefore thus says the Lord GOD of hosts, “O My people who dwell in Zion, do not fear the Assyrian (עון) who strikes (מת) you with the rod (פאש) and lifts up his staff against you, the way Egypt (מצרים) did.
25 “For in a very little while My indignation against you will be spent and My anger will be directed to their destruction.”
26 The LORD of hosts will arouse a scourge against him like the slaughter of Midian at the rock of Oreb; and His staff will be over the sea and He will lift it up the way He did in Egypt.
27 So it will be in that day, that his burden will be removed (ריך) from your shoulders and his yoke from your neck, and the yoke will be broken because of fatness.

Though some distinctive words, especially עון and רך, do appear in both texts, their nuances and usages are totally different. In the Zecharian text, עון and רך are used together to depict the downfall of Egypt, whereas in the Isaianic text, עון is employed to refer to the striking rod of Assyria and רך is used to denote the removal of the Assyrian הרך. There is certainly a shared idea, however, the lexical correspondence is not impressive particularly when compared with Gen 49:10 where the exact forms of עון and רך occur exclusively with the same sense, apart from Zech 10:11b.¹⁷⁷ Due to the exclusive verbal parallels: עון and רך, which are the distinctive terms used to express one of the consequences of the divine striking in the verse, we register Gen 49:10 as an intertext of Zech 10:11b.

¹⁷⁶ Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 675.
¹⁷⁷ Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 99. The qal of רך appears 160 times in the Hebrew Bible. The common appearance of עון and רך occurs only in Gen 49:10 and Zech 10:11b.
Genesis 49:10
The scepter (אֶשֶׁר) shall not depart (יָכֹל) from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from his children; until tribute is brought to him, and to him shall be the obedience of the nations (translation mine).

Allusion to Gen 49:10. Genesis 49:10 is embedded within the farewell blessing of Jacob on Judah (Gen 49:8–12) which is part of the deathbed testament of the patriarch to his sons (Gen 49:3–27). The farewell blessing on Judah (Gen 49:8–12) envisages the glorious future of the tribe: (1) preeminence (v. 8); (2) lion-like strength (v.9); (3) long-lasting hegemony (v. 10);\(^{178}\) and (4) fertility (vv. 11–12).\(^{179}\)

The promise in Gen 49:10 particularly relates to the future leadership of Judah. From this verse alone, it is not obvious whether Judah is being promised a tribal leader or a national leader. However, the second opinion is more feasible because v. 8 seems to suggest that Judah will lead all the tribes. In addition, his kingdom will be a long lasting one because the phrase מִצְרָיִם רָבִּים probably refers to Judah’s descendents (cf. Deut 28:57), implying that the ruler’s staff will not depart from his children. Moreover, if מִצְרָיִם רָבִּים is reworked as מִצְרָיִם רָבִּים,\(^{180}\) then Gen 49:10b may mean that even foreign nations will bring tribute to the Judean monarch, implying a sense of submission.

\(^{178}\) For the interpretation of the phrase מִצְרָיִם רָבִּים, see below.

\(^{179}\) For detailed explanation, see “Allusion to Gen 49:11” in CHAPTER FOUR.

\(^{180}\) The phrase מִצְרָיִם רָבִּים only occurs in Gen 49:10 (מָצַר רְבָּעִים) and Deut 28:57 (מָצַר רְבָּעִים) where it refers to giving birth to a child (cf. Judg 5:27). Cf. Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 477; Sarna, Genesis, 336.

\(^{181}\) The Hebrew word מִצְרָיִם is obscure and has prompted a lot of discussion and suggested emendation. In order to be consistent with the context and introduce a minimum of emendation, the line מִצְרָיִם רָבִּים can be split and repointed to מִצְרָיִם רָבִּים (to him) מִצְרָיִם (is brought), and be rendered as “until tribute is brought to him.” This suggestion produces a good poetic line in parallel with the next one: “and to him, the obedience of the peoples.” The word מִצְרָיִם only appears in Pss 68:30 [68:29]; 76:12 [76:11]; Isa 18:7, portraying foreign nations bringing gifts of homage to Jerusalem. The noun מִצְרָיִם can mean foreign nations (cf. Zech 8:22). Thus, Gen 49:10e–d can confer a sense that tribute is brought by foreign nations to express their submission to the Judean king in Jerusalem. In addition, this proposal takes further the leadership promised to Judah in the previous two lines. Cf. Wenham, Genesis 16–50, 477–78; Sarna, Genesis, 337.
As a whole, Judah was blessed with long lasting hegemony over his brothers and also over other nations.

Besides lexical parallels, both texts use סב in a royal sense, denoting the future fortune of the monarchies. With the blessing of Yahweh, the Judean kingdom will be a long lasting one (Gen 49:10), in sharp contrast with the adverse fate of Egypt which will be brought down by the deity (Zech 10:11b). This idea is already hinted at in the previous allusion when Isa 11 is read within its broader context, though the empire to be destroyed is Assyria. In the restoration of Ephraim, Jacob’s blessing on Joseph for fruitfulness (Gen 49:22–26) is reflected in vv. 8 (ם ח וב יב) and 10 (ם ח וב יב; cf. “Allusion to Josh 17:16–18”), whereas his blessing on Judah for supremacy is evoked in v. 11 (ם ח וב יב). The intertextual backdrop affirms that Yahweh is the one who will honor his promises to his people, with the blessings of Joseph and Judah both in his mind.

The Climax of the Renewal (Zech 10:12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 10:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a Then I will strengthen them in Yahweh, so that in his name they will exercise dominion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b The utterance of Yahweh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נהרתש יְרוּחַּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֲשֶׂה יִהְיוּ לֵו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the theophany and the victory of Yahweh, Zech 10:12 brings closure to the section on the restoration of the northern exiles. The appearances of the phrases כַּלּה and לִפּוּם in a first-person speech cause the readers to ask who is the subject of the verse.

---

182 See “Allusion to Isa 11:11–12, 15–16” above.
183 In v. 12, it is difficult to determine to whom the divine speech is addressed. It may continue from the previous verses concerning Ephraim and thus point to the northerners. However, this verse can also be seen as the culmination of the whole chapter, denoting both Judah and Ephraim, as a united people who will be strengthened together in Yahweh’s name.
However, the content of the text makes Yahweh the only possible candidate who is able to strengthen the restored exiles (10:12a). Similar constructions can be found in Gen 18:13–14; Hos 1:7.

Verse 12 opens with a promise: נָבְרָי, a verb associated with military prowess (cf. Exod 17:11). The root נָבְרָי appears 4 times in Zech 10, with two occurrences relating to Judah (10:5a, 6a) and the other two to Ephraim (10:7a, 12a). The recurrent use of נָבְרָי stresses the fact that both the house of Judah and the house of Joseph will enjoy the same benefits promised by the deity—to be strengthened in the Lord. This strength will enable the restored people to walk in Yahweh’s name (כֹּשֶׁם יְהֹוָה).

The hithpael of נָבְרָי can be used of generic walking (cf. Gen 3:8) or of walking in relationship with Yahweh (cf. Gen 5:22; 6:9), however, it can be used of exerting control too (cf. Gen 13:17; Josh 18:4, 8). The hithpael of נָבְרָי appears prominently in First Zechariah (1:10, 11; 6:738), where the verb conjoins with the adverbial phrase יִהְיוּ, connoting a sense of exercising dominion over an area. This connotation can be implied in 10:12a as נָבְרָי is preceded by a reference to Yahweh’s strengthening (נָבְרָי) of the Israelites. The chiastic arrangement of v. 12a–נָבְרָי יִהְיוּ–נָבְרָי further reinforces this nuance. This suggestion also suits well the military sense introduced by the preceding verse. In view of this, נָבְרָי

---

184 The noun נָבְרָי occurs in 10:5a and 7a, whereas the verb נָבְרָי in piel form appears in 10:6a and 12a. In the Hebrew Bible, the piel of נָבְרָי only appears in Ecc 10:10; Zech 10:6, 12.
185 The hithpael of נָבְרָי appears 64 times in the Hebrew Bible, 10 of these in prophetic literature: Isa 38:3; Ezek 1:13; 19:6; 28:14; Zech 1:10, 11; 6:738; 10:12.
186 Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 177.
probably refers to the assertion of lordship in Yahweh’s authority. Hence, the conclusion of Zech 10 emphasizes the ultimate triumph of Yahweh and also his restored people.\footnote{Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 446; Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 282.}

In light of this imagery, Mason argues that “the whole verse recalls Isa 40:31: ‘but those who look to the Lord will win new strength [םיִּ֣בְשַׁ֔ר]...they will march on [בָּאֵ֖ו] and never grow faint.’”\footnote{Mason, *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*, 102.} Though there is a shared idea in both texts, the only shared word is אֲשֶׁ֖ר which is a common verb in the Hebrew Bible.\footnote{The verb אֲשֶׁר in various forms appears 1554 times in the Hebrew Bible.} The lack of verbal parallel as such precludes us from arguing for literary dependence.

Apart from Zech 10:12a, the use of אֲשֶׁ֖ר as an adverbial phrase modifying the verb אָנֹ֑נִים occurs only in Mic 4:5, though the stem of אָנֹ֑נִים is different, with a qal אָנֹ֑נִים in Micah and a hithpael אָנֹ֑נִים in Zechariah.\footnote{The common appearance of the noun אֲשֶׁ֖ר and the verb אֲנֹ֑נִים occurs 30 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 2:14; Num 32:42; Deut 26:2; Josh 2:1; Judg 1:10, 11, 17, 26; 1 Sam 17:13; 20:42; 2 Sam 6:2; 7:9, 23; 20:21; 2 Kgs 5:11; 1 Chr 17:8, 21; 2 Chr 26:8; Pss 83:5; 86:11; Eccl 6:4; Isa 50:10; 63:12; Jer 3:17; 7:12; Ezek 20:39; Amos 2:7; Mic 4:5\textsuperscript{24}; Zech 10:12. Of these, only in Mic 4:5 and Zech 10:12 are the two words used to nuance each other.} Based on this exclusive lexical similarity, we register Mic 4:5 as an intertext of Zech 10:12a, with the unique combination of אֲנֹ֑נִים and אֲשֶׁ֖ר as a linkage.\footnote{Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets* 2, 675; Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 103.} In addition, Mic 4:5 is embedded within a pericope (4:1–5:14 [5:15]) where two other intertexts have been identified before.\footnote{The two intertexts also detected in Mic 4:1–5:14 are: (1) Mic 4:8–9 is recalled in Zech 9:9a–c, see “The Identity of the Coming King” in CHAPTER FOUR; and (2) Mic 5:9 [5:10] is alluded to in Zech 9:10a–b, see “The Mission of the Coming King” in CHAPTER FOUR.} The recurrent allusion to the same pericope bolsters our argument of literary dependence.

**Micah 4:5**

Though all the peoples walk (אָנֹ֑נִים) each in the name (אֲשֶׁ֖ר) of his god, As for us, we will walk in the name of the Lord (אֲנֹ֑נִים אֲשֶׁ֖ר) our God forever and ever.
Allusion to Mic 4:5. Micah 4:5 is embedded within a larger context of 4:1–5:14 [5:15], with 4:1–5 as an opening oracle envisioning the future exaltation of Jerusalem and its temple. Many nations will make pilgrimages to Zion in order to learn the word of the Lord so that they may walk in his paths (v. 2). With Yahweh as king (cf. v. 7), a universal reign of peace among peoples will result, ushering in an ideal age (v. 3–4). Though this idyllic hope is not a present reality, the vision endows the audience of Micah with an expectation, prompting them to respond with a confession: “As for us, we will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever” (v. 5). 194

Though there are similarities between the source and the host, they also demonstrate some difference. In Micah it is the people who confess that they will walk in the name of the Lord despite the present adversity, whereas in Zechariah it is Yahweh who declares that the restored people will walk in his name after his strengthening. The confession of the people in the alluded text finds its realization in the alluding text, endorsing the deity as the source of strength. The affirmation in the source may also serve as the kind of reply expected by the divine in the host, reminding the people to respond faithfully to Yahweh’s salvific deeds. This dialogical nature between the earlier and the later texts seems to be a characteristic of Zech 10:6–12 where several intertexts are summoned to supply the human response to the divine initiative (cf. allusion to Lam 3:31–33; Jer 31:18–20). With this intertextual backdrop, the audience is exhorted to react positively to Yahweh’s coming restoration by trusting the Lord even though the present reality has some distance with the idealistic vision promised to them. Yahweh is the only one who can enable his people to experience the ultimate triumph.

193 For the analysis of Mic 4:1–5:14 [5:15], see “Allusion to Mic 4:8–9” in CHAPTER FOUR.
194 Smith, Micah-Malachi, 35–38; Andersen and Freedman, Micah, 392–413.
The formula הָזֵר אִשָּׁה (10:12b) at the end of the chapter serves as the closure marker denoting the end of this unit.195

Summary (Zech 10:6–12)

Source Text

In Zech 10:6–12, thirteen intertexts are detected (see Table 9 below), four (no. 2, 5, 7, 9) of which come from the book of Jeremiah. Among these Jeremianic antecedents, (1) two of them (no. 2, 5) come from the Little Book of Consolation (Jer 30–31) where two other passages have been recalled as intertexts of Zech 9:17b (cf. Jer 31:12–13) and 10:4b (cf. Jer 30:21); and (2) Jer 23:1–4, 7–8, which has been significantly alluded to in Zech 10:3–5, is evoked as an intertextual backdrop of the gathering and return of Ephraim (Zech 10:6, 8, 10).

The majority of scholars have noticed that there are many similarities between Zech 10 and Jeremiah.196 Tigchelaar, furthering the work of Willi-Plein, identifies 23 phraseological correspondences between the two corpora.197 He argues that “the clear correspondences with Jeremiah are found in the divine oracles [Zech 10:3a, 6, 8–10, and perhaps 12],” with most of the parallels are found either in Jer 23 or 31.198 This argument is basically true in that all the Jeremianic intertexts are found within the divine speech. However, if we examine other biblical literature rather than Jeremiah alone, we discover a number of exceptions. For example, we identify Hos 2:23–25 [2:21–23] as an

196 E.g., Willi-Plein, Prophetie am Ende, 72–73; Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 119–124.
intertext of Zech 10:9a rather than Jer 31:27 which is proposed by Tigchelaar. In addition, several non-Jeremianic intertexts are detected alongside with the Jeremianic ones in the divine oracles (cf. Isa 5:26; 7:18).\footnote{Cf. Tigchelaar, "Some Observations," 264.}

Besides the Jeremianic tradition, the farewell blessing of Jacob on Judah, especially Gen 49:10–11, has been reused not only in Zech 10:11b but also in 9:9f. Three Isaianic texts (no. 3, 4, 11) have been appropriated to signal the divine reversal of previous judgments (Zech 10:8a; cf. Isa 5:26; 7:18) and to explicate the divine assault on hostile forces (Zech 10:11a; cf. Isa 11:11–12, 15–16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zech 10:6–12</th>
<th>Intertext</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:6b</td>
<td>Lam 3:31–33</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>Jer 31:18–20</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10:8a</td>
<td>Isa 5:26</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:8a</td>
<td>Isa 7:18</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10:8a</td>
<td>Jer 31:10–11</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10:9a</td>
<td>Jer 51:50</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10:10b</td>
<td>Josh 17:16–18</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10:6, 8, 10</td>
<td>Jer 23:1–4, 7–8 (sustained)</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10:11a</td>
<td>Exod 12:12–13</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10:10–11</td>
<td>Isa 11:11–12, 15–16</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10:11b</td>
<td>Gen 49:10</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10:12a</td>
<td>Mic 4:5</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refer to "The Nature of Textual Relationships" (Chapter One)

Table 9: Intertexts of Zech 10:6–12
Intertextual Reading

The second half of Zech 10 envisions the deliverance of Ephraim. At the onset of the pericope, Yahweh announces his salvific plan for the northern exiles: עַדָּהָיָהוֹד (v. 6b). The restorative act of the deity is grounded on a double foundation: (1) עַדָּהָיָהוֹד (v. 6b) and (2) עַדָּהָיָהוֹד (v. 6c). The intertextual reading (cf. Lam 3:31–33; Jer 31:18–20) enriches the first-person speech in v. 6, transforming a divine monologue into a human-divine dialogue: (1) The confession of the suffering exiles: לא אֲלֵךְ לְעָשֵׂה אָדָם (Lam 3:31), gets its response in Yahweh’s promise: עַדָּהָיָהוֹד (Zech 10:6b); (2) The plea of Ephraim: עַדָּהָיָהוֹד עַדָּהָיָהוָה יְאָשֵׂר הֵן יְאָשֵׂר (Jer 31:18b), finds its answer in Yahweh’s reply: עַדָּהָיָהוֹד עַדָּהָיָהוָה... יִקְרָא כֵּנֶסֶת (Zech 10:6bc). All these renewal deeds are possible only because of God’s compassion on his people.

In Zech 10:8a, the return of the northerners involves a series of divine actions: χρήμα, κόπτον, and οὐδέ. By alluding to Isa 5:26 and 7:18, the first action (χρήμα) signals the reversal of the fate of the exilic community. This intertextual insight reveals that Yahweh is the one who controls all human events, with destruction and restoration both in the hands of the Lord. The subsequent regathering (κόπτον) rests completely on Yahweh’s prior redemption of his people: χρήμα, κόπτον, just as Yahweh had rescued Israel from Egypt. By recalling Jer 31:10–11, the same pericope (Jer 31:7–14), which has been evoked when Jer 31:12–13 functions as the antecedent of Zech 9:17, is now applied to Ephraim. The intertextual impact reminds the audience of the relevance of the return of their northern brothers (Jer 31:10–11) which serves as a prerequisite for the climactic restoration of all Israel (Jer 31:12–13). The envisioned joy and prosperity would only be achieved after the return of the south as well as the north.
In Zech 10:9a, the Yahweh’s sowing (זרתא) of the dispersed in their respective locale of exile will result in their multiplication (נישא, v. 8b). By alluding to Hos 2:23–25 [2:21–23], the divine sowing, which inaugurates the transformation process, not only leads to the renewal of fertility but also reconstitutes Israel’s relation with the Lord. The emphasis of the fully restored relationship between the deity and his people in the Hosea source prepares the audience of the Zecharian text to appreciate the following line: “and in the distant places they will remember me” (Zech 10:9aβ). By reading Zech 10:9aβ together with Jer 51:50, the sermon-like exhortation in the source is altered as a description of the piety of the diaspora in the host. The intertextual insight projects an image that the northern exiles will remember Yahweh in the distant areas. This positive portrayal not only encourages the audience to accept the return of their penitent brothers, but also reveals the expectations of Yahweh for the renewal of his chastised people.

If the last two lines of Zech 10:10 are read in light of their intertextual backdrop (Josh 17:16–18), the formulation אַלּוֹ נָא יְהֹוָה serves as a marker, bringing the readers to the land allotment event in Joshua’s time. The failure of the Israelites to drive out the Canaanites in the source is rectified in the host because Yahweh will include even Lebanon as part of their future settlement (cf. Josh 13:6). The second exodus envisioned in Zech 10:6–12 (cf. v.11) will surpass the original one (cf. Jer 23:7–8). Like the first exodus, Yahweh will bless נֹשֵׁא קְצִי so that they will be as numerous as they were before (וְהָלַךְ נָא אֲדֹנָי, Zech 10:8b; cf. Josh 17:17). Unlike the first exodus, the Lord will complete the conquest for his people before they arrive in the land (Zech 10:10b; cf. Josh 13:6). The intertextual backdrop (Josh 17:16–18; Jer 23:1–4, 7–8) of Zech 10:10 endows the
readers with a grand vision, summoning them to trust Yahweh who will bring Israel a full restoration, one that will surpass any ones that they have experienced before.

In Zech 10:10–11, by appropriating Exod 12:12–13 and Isa 11:11–12, 15–16, the intertextual reading invites the readers to learn from the past. On the one hand, the source texts affirm the determination of the deity to liberate his people as he did before (Exod 12:12–13), exhorting the audience to believe that Yahweh will remove all barriers to returning (Isa 11:11–12, 15–16). On the other hand, these intertexts remind the audience once again that the reunification of the north and the south are crucial to the complete salvation of Israel (Isa 11:13–14) for Yahweh expects the whole congregation of Israel (כָּל בֵּיתוֹ, שֵׁם יְהֹウェָה) to remember his grace and protection as a people (cf. Exod 12:3). Finally, the intertextual reading prompts the audience not to side with any world power, whether it is Egypt (cf. Exod 12:12), Assyria (cf. Isa 11:15–16), or Babylon (cf. Jer 51:49–50) in the past or, by analogy, Persia in the present, as all these earthly empires will be judged by Yahweh (יִשְׂרָאֵל, שֶׁאָלַי, Exod 12:12) and will not endure forever. This message is reinforced in Zech 10:11b when Gen 49:10 is recalled as an intertext. With the blessing of Yahweh, the Judean kingdom will be a long lasting one (Gen 49:10), in sharp contrast with the adverse fate of Egypt which will be brought down by the deity (Zech 10:11b). The conclusion of Zech 10 emphasizes the ultimate triumph of Yahweh and also his restored people (v. 12). The last intertext (Mic 4:5) serves as a final remark, prompting the readers to have confidence in Yahweh and his promised restoration.
CONCLUSION

Introduction

The majority of scholars agree that the main emphasis of Zech 9–14 is on Yahweh’s restoration of his people. This view is especially true when Zech 9:9–10 envisions the coming of a royal figure who will rule with universal peace and 14:16 expects cosmic worship of Yahweh who will reign as king in Jerusalem. Despite this assertion, few scholars, if any, have examined extensively the restoration expectations in Second Zechariah, apart from providing some general ideas. In view of this, this dissertation set out to fill in the gap by conducting an in-depth study of the ideas about future salvation in Second Zechariah in order to delineate the kind of restoration perspective embraced in this late biblical prophecy.¹

Second Zechariah is known for its obscurity. The enigmatic nature of the text and the complex web of allusions in the corpus demand that we conduct a thorough investigation rather than a brief treatment of the topic in Zech 9–14. However, this kind of meticulous research on these six chapters would generate a huge amount of material that would require more space than is available in this dissertation. Because of the length of discussion and the limited space of the project, we confined our scope of inquiry to the first two chapters of Zech 9–14.

Zechariah 9 and 10 is generally treated as a coherent section revealing the earliest aspiration of the restoration hope of Second Zechariah, with 11:4–16 transitioning the

¹ See INTRODUCTION.
readers from the first oracle (Zech 9–11) to the second one (Zech 12–14). By confining the scope of inquiry to the first two chapters of Zech 9–14, we admit that the restoration ideas depicted in this project are limited because they only reveal earlier expectations of these six chapters. Thus, this project intends to serve as a foundation for further studies, hoping that with further work a comprehensive depiction of the topic in the rest of Second Zechariah may be provided.

Nearly all scholars acknowledge and give prominence to the presence of intertextuality in Second Zechariah and this phenomenon has long been the subject of investigation, beginning with the groundbreaking work of Stade (1881–82) and extending to the subsequent inquiries tracing the dependence of Zech 9–14 on other books of the Hebrew Bible, including the studies of Delcor (1952), Lutz (1968), Mason (1973), Willi-Plein (1974), Schaefer (1992), Person (1993), Larkin (1994), Tai (1996), and Nurmela (1996). In view of the allusive character of the corpus, we argue that the meaning of Zech 9–10 is found between the lines as it dialogues with its sources. Due to the nature of the text, we offer an intertextual analysis of Zech 9–10 in order to trace the nature of the earlier restoration expectations in Second Zechariah. The approach in this project is literary, with its readings based on the final form of the biblical texts. This study of the final form is synchronic, in the sense that the restoration expectations reflected in the final form of Zech 9–10 were used to address the needs of the audience at the time when Second Zechariah reached its final stage.

In this project, we locate Second Zechariah in ca. 440 B.C., contending that the final form of Zech 9–10 leveraged earlier biblical material to express its view on

---

2 See INTRODUCTION.
3 See CHAPTER ONE.
restoration for the original readers in that time frame. The salvific hope envisioned in these two chapters served as a lens for the audience in Yehud to make sense of their troubled world in the early Persian period.  

The following chapter presents a synthesis of all the findings in our intertextual analysis of Zech 9–10. Two accounts will be offered. First, a report of how Zech 9–10 leverages earlier biblical material to express its vision of restoration is given as we intend to examine the restoration themes of these two chapters in light of their intertexts. Second, a summary of the nature of the restoration expectations in the corpus will be depicted according to different rubrics: (1) divine intervention, (2) new land, (3) new community, (4) new David, and (5) new leadership. Finally, some suggestions for future intertextual studies on Second Zechariah will be offered.

**Usage of the Source Text**

In Zech 9–10, forty-one intertexts are detected (see Table 10 below), affirming our assertion that Second Zechariah is a highly allusive text. The instances of literary dependence are spread evenly over these two chapters, with the greatest concentration of intertexts in Zech 9:9–10. The corpus never cites explicitly with marked quotations but usually employs allusions, sharing two or more literary features. The most extensive verbal parallel (דבכ עשרות יִעָּלֶה בְּצֵדָה וּכְפֵרָה) is found between Zech 9:10d and Ps 72:8, nevertheless, the view of a successful king embraced in the alluded text is significantly reinterpreted for the Zecharian readers in the alluding one. Most of the time (twenty-four), Zech 9–10 reuses freely the phrases and words of its antecedents.

---

4 See CHAPTER TWO.
5 See CHAPTER THREE to CHAPTER SEVEN.
6 See INTRODUCTION.
adapting but altering them to express its view on restoration in a new context (cf. Jer 23:1–4 in Zech 10:2c–5). The instance in which the sources are recalled but revised occurs more at the end of the corpus, with eleven cases found in Zech 10:6–12. This innovative variation of its source helps to provide a new perspective on the coming salvation for the audience. The corpus seldom argues against its predecessor, with only one occurrence where the alluding text attempts to take the place of the alluded one (cf. Deut 23:3 in Zech 9:6a, 7b–c). Several intertexts are summoned to supply a human response to a divine initiative, e.g., Lam 3:31–33; Jer 31:18–20. This dialogical nature between the earlier and the later texts seems to be a characteristic of the corpus.

Sometimes, Zech 9–10 incorporates materials from multiple sources, e.g., Isa 5:26 and 7:18 in Zech 10:8a, engaging all of them in conversation in order to expound its restoration hope. Sometimes, the corpus connects to another text by means of sustained allusion, in which several scattered parallels are found over a longer passage, e.g., Exod 24:3–11 in Zech 9:11–15; Jer 23:1–4, 7–8 in Zech 10:6, 8, 10. These creative patterns of dependence in Zech 9–10 coincide with Mason’s “allusive word-play”7 and affirm our suggestion that a broad field of inquiry, i.e., intertexuality, is necessary as the Zecharian text is reminiscent of another in multiple ways for various reasons.8

In expressing its vision of restoration, Zech 9–10 betrays close affinity with prophetic literature, with twenty-seven intertexts identified from the Latter Prophets (see Table 11 below). Apart from that, the corpus also alludes to the Pentateuch ten times to express its views on future salvation. There are only two intertexts identified in the Psalter, one in the book of Joshua and one in the book of Lamentations.

8 See “Evaluation of Approach” in CHAPTER ONE.
The Book of Jeremiah. In the Latter Prophets, the book of Jeremiah is the most common source of allusion, with ten antecedents found in the corpus. At the outset, Zech 9–10 adopts Jer 23:33–40 to signal the reversal of the prohibition of ἱδρυμα, asserting the renewal of prophecy among the people in a new era. However, the Zecharian text, by deviating from Jer 5:20–25, calls the readers to a faithful response—to see and fear—to the coming of the Lord. Similarly, Jer 14:1–15:4 is summoned in Zech 10:1–2 to warn the leaders that divine punishment will be inevitable. The major problem within the community is the internal threat of corrupt leadership who, probably, resorted to false prophecy connected with idolatry (cf. Zech 13:2–3). The prophet warns the leaders, and thus the people, not to fail as their forefathers did, encouraging them to return to the true source of salvation, that is, Yahweh himself.

Four intertexts are recalled from the Little Book of Consolation (Jer 30–31) to nuance Zech 9–10’s view on restoration as the corpus moves towards its end. Though the core materials of Jer 30–31 share an orientation toward the northern exiles, the later edition of the Book assigns a new audience and a new function to the core passages that had been circulated in the past. In the final form of the collection of Jer 30–31, oracles addressed to the northerners frequently stand alongside sayings about the southerners, indicating that not only the restoration of the northern people but also the reunion of all Israel is part of Yahweh’s plan (cf. 30:3; 31:1, 27, 31). This view of the final collection of Jer 30–31 is fully embraced in Zech 9–10. Jeremiah 31:12–13 and 31:10–11 are summoned in Zech 9:17b and 10:8a respectively as supplements to nuance the renewal of Yahweh’s people, with both Ephraim and Judah as the flock of the Lord. In addition, both intertexts are embedded within a pericope (Jer 31:7–14) which envisions all the returnees arriving home and enjoying the bounty of the land, binding the motifs of
homecoming and prosperity together. In view of this, the climax of the restoration for Yahweh’s people stresses the return of all Israel, with the renewed community rejoicing in the incredible blessings of the Lord in their homeland (cf. Zech 9:17). Jeremiah 30:21 and 31:18–20 are recalled but revised in Zech 10:4b and 10:6 respectively to express the vision of salvation in Zech 9–10. Reading together with the former intertext, Zech 10:4b anticipates the raising up of good leaders (cf. Jer 23:4) from their own people by Yahweh after the punishment of the faulty ones who, probably, resorted to false prophecy connected with idolatry in a time of distress (Zech 10:1–2; cf. Jer 14:1–15:4). The latter intertext reports the prayer of repentance of Ephraim, stressing the remorse of a prodigal son. This intertextual reading (Jer 31:18–20; cf. Lam 3:31–33) reveals that the human desire to return, both to the deity and to the land, is an important element in the future restoration.

A similar motif occurs also in Zech 10:9a where the sermon-like exhortation in Jer 51:50 is converted into a description of the piety of the diaspora, projecting an image that the northern exiles will remember Yahweh in the remote areas. The positive portrayal of the northerners reveals the great expectations of the Lord for the renewal of his chastised people in the restoration age. Without these faithful human responses, there will never be a genuine transformation (cf. Jer 5:20–25). Jeremiah 23 is alluded to twice again in Zech 10, being updated and reapplied in a new context to nuance the transformation of Judah (Zech 10:2c–5; cf. Jer 23:1–4) as well as the gathering and return of Ephraim (Zech 10:6, 8, 10; cf. Jer 23:1–4, 7–8). These intertexts not only address the frustrated leadership situation (Zech 10:2c–5; cf. Jer 23:1–4) but also envision a grand return of all exiles to the land, with the second exodus surpassing the original one (Jer 23:7–8 in Zech 10:10; cf. Josh 17:16–18).
The literary connection to Jeremiah is striking, with Jer 14; 23, and 30–31 as the material used most commonly to express the view of restoration in Zech 9–10. The number of allusions to Jeremiah increases towards the end of Zech 9–10 where the restoration for Judah and Ephraim is envisioned. The Zecharian corpus never argues with the Jeremianic sources. Most of the time, the alluding text alters some of the ideas in the alluded one to serve its own purpose in a new context (cf. Jer 5:20–25; 23:1–4), with a few recalled as supplements to the host text (cf. Jer 31:10–11, 31:12–13) and only one reversed to signal a new era (Jer 23:33–40).

The Jeremianic antecedents serve as a significant source for two of the restoration themes depicted below: (1) new community (cf. Jer 5:20–25; 23:1–4, 7–8; 31:10–11, 12–13, 18–20; 51:50); and (2) new leadership (cf. Jer 14:1–15:4; 23:1–4; 30:21). From the above analysis, we conclude that Jeremiah supplies the main ideas for the vision of the restoration of the new community in Zech 9–10, with most of the sources recalled but updated in a new context.

The Book of Isaiah. In contrast to Jeremiah, the literary influence of Isaiah is much less in Zech 9–10, with only six intertexts identified within the corpus. At the beginning, Isa 29:3 is recalled but reversed to explicate the inauguration of the new age. Instead of encamping to attack Jerusalem, the Lord comes to protect her inhabitants, denoting a reversal of fortune. Two other Isaianic intertexts are summoned as supplements to expound the obscure battle between יִרְשָׁדֶה and יִרְשֵׁד, with Isa 49:2 relating to the preparation of Judah as an instrument of war and Isa 31:5 linking to the defense of the deity for the sons of Zion during the battle. At the end of the corpus, Isa 5:26 and 7:18 are appropriated but reversed to signal the turn of fate in the restoration period. Instead of calling the nations to attack his people, Yahweh whistles in order to
call the Ephraimites home from their exile (Zech 10:8a). In Zech 10:10–11, another Isaianic text, 11:11–12, 15–16, is recalled to affirm the promise of the Lord in liberating his people and returning them to the land. The innovative variation of its source in Zech 10:10–11 delivers a distinctive message that the striking of the empires intends to prepare the way for the return.

The reuse of the Isaianic text is not as impressive as the Jeremianic ones, with the majority of intertexts coming from Isa 1–39. All the Isaianic intertexts carry a military sense, with Yahweh as subject, either against Israel (cf. Isa 5:26; 7:18; 29:3) or against the nations (cf. Isa 11:11–12, 15–16). Half of the intertexts are recalled but reversed to signal a turn of the fortune in a restoration era (Isa 5:26; 7:18; 29:3). Another half of the antecedents are summoned to nuance the protection of Yahweh (Isa 31:5; 49:2) and the restoration of the exiles (Isa 11:11–12, 15–16; 49:2). In the Zecharian context, the Isaianic intertexts are used to stress Yahweh’s control of all human events, including the coming deliverance of his people.

From the above analysis, we conclude that the Isaianic antecedents serve as an important source for two of the restoration themes depicted below: (1) divine intervention; and (2) new community, with the former one being the centre of focus in the reuse of the Isaianic texts.

The Book of Ezekiel. Contra Jeremiah, the reuse of Ezekiel decreases significantly after the beginning of Zech 9–10, with three out of four intertexts found in Zech 9:1–8 where the advent of Yahweh marks the inauguration of restoration. At the onset, by recalling Ezek 47:13–20 as a supplement, the return of Yahweh depicted in Zech 9:1b–2a represents his territorial claim to kingship, denoting his reign in the new era.
Yahweh will come to conquer the foreign cities, claiming his territories, and preparing the land for his people.

Associated with this vision is the creation of an ideal people, suitable to dwell in the promised homeland with Yahweh in their midst (cf. Ezek 43:1–7). Two other Ezekielian intertexts are summoned to nuance this view: (1) By deviating from the source text (Ezek 28:3–5), the Tyre passage (Zech 9:2b–4) declares that Yahweh’s salvation for his people will be worked out inexorably. However, the intertextual insight also reminds the readers to re-examine themselves in light of Tyre’s fate; (2) The typological correspondence established between Zech 9:6b–7a and Ezek 7:20–24 could serve as an archetype of Yahweh’s transformation program for humanity, including the audience of Second Zechariah, who must be purified before they could inherit the promised land (cf. Zech 10:1–3a; 11:1–3, 17; 12:10–13:9).

At the end of the corpus Ezek 34:1–22 is summoned as a supplement in Zech 10:2c–3 to nuance the affliction of the sheep for lack of proper leadership (34:1–10; cf. Zech 10:2c) and the determination of Yahweh to be the good shepherd of his flock (34:11–16; cf. Zech 10:3). However, this Ezekielian source is not used as extensively as the Jeremianic one (Jer 23:1–4) which is also recalled in the same host text to explicate the restoration of Judah.

Among these four Ezekielian intertexts, Ezek 47:13–20 is the most prominent one which is used as the backbone of Zech 9:1–8. The Zecharian text adheres closely to the view of Ezekiel on the restoration of land, with only one intertext (28:2–5) revised to stress the unrelenting determination of Yahweh’s salvific will. Ezekiel serves as an important source for two of the restoration themes depicted below: (1) new land (cf.
Ezek 47:13–20); and (2) new community (cf. Ezek 7:20–24; 28:2–5), with the former
one being the centre of focus in the reuse of the Ezekielian texts.

**The Book of the Twelve.** Seven intertexts are recalled from the Book of the
Twelve, with three out of seven coming from the book of Micah. Micah 4:1–5:14 is
evoked threefold to express the vision of restoration in Zech 9–10. Two of them are
alluded to in Zech 9:9–10, with Mic 4:8–9 envisaging the restoration of the Davidic rule
in the new age and Mic 5:9 [5:10] envisioning the divine purge of the audience (cf. Ezek
7:20–24 in Zech 9:6b–7a). Micah 4:5 is the last intertext of the corpus, recalled in Zech
10:12a to exhort the audience to react positively to Yahweh’s coming restoration even
though the present reality is distanced from the idealistic vision promised to them.

Two allusions to First Zechariah are detected (Zech 2:14 [2:10] in 9:9a–c; 7:14 in
9:8a), both of them relating to the reversal of fortune due to the advent of Yahweh (Zech
9:1–8), urging the audience to look for and respond immediately to the divine plan.
Hosea 2:25 [2:23] is alluded to in Zech 10:9a as a supplement to explicate the effect of
Yahweh’s sowing, which will culminate not only in the renewal of fertility (Hos 2:24
[2:22]; Zech 10:8b) but also in the revival of relationship (Hos 2:25d [2:23d]; Zech
of the battle between יז and יז—to release the slave-captives of Israel in a far
distant place.

Among these seven intertexts, Micah is the material most commonly alluded to,
used to nuance the restoration of the Davidic rule in the restoration age (cf. Mic 4:8–9).
The instances of literary dependence are spread evenly over Zech 9–10, with the greatest
concentration allusions in 9:9–10 (Mic 4:8–9; 5:9 [5:10]; Zech 2:14 [2:10]). The
Zecharian corpus adheres closely to the restoration hope found in the Twelve, with some
variations to the sources to express its idea in the new context (cf. Mic 4:5, 4:8–9), apart from Zech 7:14 where the desolation scene in the source is reversed to signal the inauguration of the new era.

From the above analysis, we conclude that the Twelve serves as an important source for two of the restoration themes depicted below: (1) new David (cf. Mic 4:8–9); and (2) new community (cf. Hos 2:25 [2:23]), with the former one being the centre of focus in the reuse of the texts in the Twelve.

The Pentateuch. Ten intertexts from the Pentateuch are identified, among which three antecedents are linked to slavery: (1) Exod 24:8—the ceremony which transformed Israel from being slaves in Egypt to being the holy possession of the Lord is brought into view in order to supplement the stress on the fidelity of Yahweh to his covenantal partner in Zech 9:11a; (2) Gen 37:24—the misfortune of Joseph being sold as a slave is recalled but reversed to signal the turn of fate in Zech 9:11b; and (3) Deut 15:18—the instructions relating to the manumission of the Hebrew slaves is summoned but revised to nuance the liberating act of Yahweh in Zech 9:12b. All these allusions, together with Joel 4:6–7 [3:6–7], are recalled to nuance the salvific deeds of Yahweh (Zech 9:11–13). By analogy, the release of the captives in the alluding text is an act of slave manumission. The restoration age is an era of remission, in which not only the enslaved will be released but also the outstanding debts will be forgiven, anticipating a turn of fate. The covenant motif in Exod 24:3–11 is evoked again in Zech 9:11–15 as a supplement, stressing the right relationship between the two covenantal parties. By reading the host text intertextually, the motivation behind the divine acts of setting the slave-captives free and of fighting for his people is fully revealed—Yahweh is faithful to the covenant that he has made with his people.
On the other hand, Num 7:13 is summoned in Zech 9:15d to supplement the presentation of the spiritual renewal of the people, stressing the faithful response of the community to the marvelous deeds of the Lord. Deut 11:13–17 is recalled in Zech 10:1 to affirm the notion that Yahweh is the author of rain, the source of fertility. However, by alluding to the source, the conditional nature of the text is also evoked as a backdrop to the prosperity promised in Zech 10:1b—the blessing of Yahweh on his people results from obedience to the word of the Lord (cf. Deut 11:13). This exclusive loyalty, thus obedience and trust, is a prerequisite to the fulfillment of the promised salvation.

Genesis 49:10 and Exod 12:12–13 are recalled but revised in Zech 10:11b and 10:11a respectively in order to speak to the future fortunes of the monarchies. With the blessing of Yahweh, the Judean kingdom will be a long lasting one (Gen 49:10), in sharp contrast to the adverse fate of Egypt which will be judged for siding with the evil forces (Exod 12:12; cf. Zech 10:11b). Genesis 49:11 is summoned as a supplement in Zech 9:9f to nuance the type of rule which will enjoy the blessing of the Lord. Only with firm reliance on Yahweh rather than earthly power will the king and his sons continue long in their kingdom (cf. Deut 17:15–20).

The only intertext, which is recalled but displaced in Zech 9–10, is Deut 23:3[23:2]. The host text (Zech 9:6a, 7b–c) leverages the earlier congregational act but repudiates it in order to provide a new perspective for the audience—to admit alien residents, impelling the readers to embrace a more inclusive attitude.

Among these ten intertexts, Gen 49 and Exod 24 are the most commonly used materials, with two sources from Gen 49 recalled in contrast to Exod 12:12–13 in order to describe the type of rule that will enjoy Yahweh’s blessing and two sources from Exod 24 summoned to expound the fidelity of Yahweh to his covenantal partner. However, the
faithful response of the community to the marvelous deeds of the Lord is also stressed in Num 7:13 and Deut 11:13–17.

The Pentateuchal intertexts are spread evenly over Zech 9–10, with the greatest concentration of allusions found in Zech 9:11–17 where the liberation and deliverance of an ideal people is depicted (cf. Gen 37:24). The Pentateuchal antecedents serve as an important source for two of the restoration themes depicted below: (1) new community (cf. Num 7:13); and (2) new David (cf. Gen 49:11), with the former one being the focus in the reuse of Pentateuchal texts.

The Psalter. In Zech 9–10 two Psalms are used to express its vision of restoration. Psalm 72 is summoned but revised in order to reinterpret the notion of an ideal king in the new age. With this intertextual insight, an ideal royal figure will be one who has right relationship with Yahweh, longing for the justice of the Lord and waiting for the salvation of the deity, in contrast to the Davidic Dynasty tradition in Ps 72. Psalm 60:6–7 [60:4–5] is summoned but revised, to nuance the deliverance of the Lord which leads to the final victory of Yahweh’s people.

Of these two intertexts, Ps 72 is the most commonly used material for nuancing the coming king in Zech 9:9–10. The sources are recalled but revised significantly to create a new tone in the Zecharian text. The allusions to the Psalter serve as an important source for the restoration theme depicted below—a new David (Ps 72).

In light of its appropriation of sources, we can conclude that Zech 9–10 displays close affinity with Jeremiah’s view on the restoration of the people (Zech 10) and the renewal of leadership (Zech 10:1–5), whereas the corpus adheres to Ezekiel’s perspective on the return of Yahweh and the restoration of the land (9:1–8). For the reinstitution of the Davidic dynasty, the Zecharian text adapts the aspirations of Mic 4–5,
affirming the reinstallation of a new David, though, at the same time, the host text
deviates from Ps 72, presenting another model of kingship. Nearly all intertexts affirm
the view that restoration is only inaugurated by Yahweh who controls and directs all
human events, however, the Isaianic intertexts focus mainly on this aspect, stressing that
the intervention of the Lord is the key to the reversal of fortune for his people. In
contrast to a number of scholars, this study demonstrates that there is no convincing
evidence for dependence between First Zechariah and Zech 9–10.9

---

9 Mason is one of the pioneers who investigates the relationship between the two parts of the book
of Zechariah. His article “The Relation of Zech 9–14 to Proto-Zechariah” focuses on the thematic
connections between Second Zechariah and First Zechariah. His findings are categorized into five
emphases: (1) the prominence of the Zion tradition; (2) the cleansing of the community; (3) universalism;
(4) the appeal to the earlier prophets; and (5) the provision of leadership as a sign of the new age. He
concludes that “a real line of continuing tradition runs from proto-to deutero-Zechariah”; Mason,
“Relation of Zech 9–14,” 238; cf. Mason, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 79; Mason, “Use of Earlier
Biblical Material,” 204. Mason’s conclusion is adopted by a number of scholars, e.g., Larkin, Eschatology,
26; Person, Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School, 23; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 27;

However, Mason’s argument is not without criticism. Leske comments that most of the common
elements suggested by Mason are just general concerns of the post-exilic community and do not give
evidence of dependence: “the universalism found in Zechariah 8 and Zechariah 14 come from the
common influence of Deutero-Isaiah rather than the dependence of one on the other”; Leske, “Context and
Meaning of Zechariah 9–9,” 664; cf. the concerns in Mason, “Relation of Zech 9–14,” 235–36; Pierce,
“Thematic Development,” 408.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zech 9-10</th>
<th>Intertext</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:1a</td>
<td>Jer 23:33–40</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:1b–2a</td>
<td>Ezek 47:13–20</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:2b–4</td>
<td>Ezek 28:2–5</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>Jer 5:20–25</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:6a, 7b–c</td>
<td>Deut 23:3 [23:2]</td>
<td>polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9:6b–7a</td>
<td>Ezek 7:20–24</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:8a</td>
<td>Isa 29:3</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9:8a</td>
<td>Zech 7:14</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9:9a–c</td>
<td>Mic 4:8–9</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9:9f</td>
<td>Gen 49:11</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9:10a–b</td>
<td>Mic 5:9 [5:10]</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9:9–10</td>
<td>Ps 72 (sustained)</td>
<td>exegesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9:11a</td>
<td>Exod 24:8</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9:11b</td>
<td>Gen 37:24</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9:12b</td>
<td>Deut 15:18</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9:13c</td>
<td>Isa 49:2</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9:15a</td>
<td>Isa 31:5</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9:15d</td>
<td>Num 7:13</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:11–15</td>
<td>Exod 24:3–11 (sustained)</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9:16</td>
<td>Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5]</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9:17b</td>
<td>Jer 31:12–13</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>Deut 11:13–17</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10:1–2</td>
<td>Jer 14:1–15:4</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10:4b</td>
<td>Jer 30:21</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10:2c–3</td>
<td>Ezek 34:1–22</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10:2c–5</td>
<td>Jer 23:1–4</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10:6b</td>
<td>Lam 3:31–33</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>Jer 31:18–20</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10:8a</td>
<td>Isa 5:26</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>10:8a</td>
<td>Isa 7:18</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>10:8a</td>
<td>Jer 31:10–11</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10:9a</td>
<td>Jer 51:50</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>10:10b</td>
<td>Josh 17:16–18</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>10:6, 8, 10</td>
<td>Jer 23:1–4, 7–8 (sustained)</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10:11a</td>
<td>Exod 12:12–13</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10:10–11</td>
<td>Isa 11:11–12, 15–16</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10:11b</td>
<td>Gen 49:10</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>10:12a</td>
<td>Mic 4:5</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Allusions in Zech 9–10 (arranged by host text)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gen 37:24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:11b R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:11b R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 49:10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 49:11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:9f S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exod 12:12–13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:11a S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:11a R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exod 24:8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exod 24:3–11 **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:11–15 S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Num 7:13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:15d S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deut 11:13–17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:1 S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deut 15:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:12b R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deut 23:3 [23:2]</td>
<td>9:6a, 7b–c P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Josh 17:16–18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:10b R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Isa 5:26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:8a R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 7:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:8a R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 11:11–12, 15–16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:10–11 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 29:3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:8a R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 31:5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:15a S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 49:2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:13c S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jer 5:20–25</td>
<td>9:5 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:1–2 S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 14:1–15:4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:2c–5 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 23:1–4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:6, 8, 10 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 23:1–4, 7–8 **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:6, 8, 10 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 23:33–40</td>
<td>9:1a R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 30:21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:4b R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 31:10–11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:8a S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 31:12–13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:17b S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 31:18–20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:6 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 51:50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:9a R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ezek 7:20–24</td>
<td>9:6b–7a S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ezek 28:2–5</td>
<td>9:2b–4 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ezek 34:1–22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:2c–3 S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ezek 47:13–20</td>
<td>9:1b–2a S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hos 2:23–25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:9a S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2:21–23]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joel 4:6–7 [3:6–7]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:13b R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mic 4:5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:12a R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mic 4:8–9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:9a–c R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mic 5:9 [5:10]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:10a–b S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zech 2:14 [2:10]</td>
<td>9:9a–c R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zech 7:14</td>
<td>9:8a R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ps 60:6–7 [60:4–5]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:16 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ps 72 **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9:9–10 E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lam 3:31–33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:6b R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** sustained allusion  S = supplement  R = revision  E = exegesis  P = polemic

Table 11: Allusions in Zech 9–10 (arranged by source text)
Restoration Themes

By dialoguing with earlier traditions, Zech 9–10 expresses its vision of restoration. The restoration envisioned in the corpus is multidimensional, with a more positive tone on the future than the rest of Second Zechariah. The various restoration aspects exhibited in the text will be reviewed according to the following rubrics.

Divine Intervention

Restoration is inaugurated by Yahweh, who breaks into Israel's history to provide the needed salvation (cf. Zech 9:1–8, 14–16; 10:3b, 6a, 10–11). The advent of Yahweh to the temple (Zech 9:1–8) marks the beginning of the new age, reversing the negative fortunes of the past (cf. Isa 29:3 and Zech 7:14 in Zech 9:8a). Salvation flows from Zion, not other Persian royal cities, when Yahweh takes up residence on his throne in Jerusalem.

However, the expected acts of salvation in Zech 9–10 are not entirely future events. The restoration is a process (cf. Hos 2:25 [2:23] in Zech 10:9a), instigated in the past (cf. 9:11b), continuing in the present (cf. 9:12b), and completed in the future (cf. 9:13b). Nevertheless, the corpus as a whole demonstrates a sense of strong expectation for the fulfillment of the old promises in the imminent rather than distant future (cf. 9:9c, 12b; 10:1). Yahweh, who ushers in the restoration, is the true ruler of the world. He is the one who controls all earthly empires and directs the course of human history, in the past, present, as well as future (cf. Zech 10:11 and its intertexts [Exod 12:12; Isa 11:15–16; Gen 49:10]).

The salvation process is envisioned as a second Exodus, which will surpass the original one, projecting a future brighter than the past (cf. Zech 10:10 and its intertexts
[Josh 17:16–18; Jer 23:7–8]). The deity will restore the land, renew the people, install
good leaders, and remove the hostile forces. All these restoration deeds are possible only
because of Yahweh’s compassion expressed through his commitment of covenant (Zech

New Land (Important Source: Ezekiel)

By adhering to the restoration program of Ezekiel (chs. 40–48), the conquest of
the foreign cities represents Yahweh’s territorial claim to kingship, denoting his reign in
the new era (cf. Ezek 47:13–20 in Zech 9:1b–2a). The restored land, which is much
larger than tiny Yehud, will become an ideal homeland of the renewed community, a
new people acknowledging the sovereignty of the Lord. In contrast to the present
socio-political situation, the presence of Yahweh will enable Israel to enjoy divine
protection from oppressive forces (cf. Zech 9:8) as well as the bounty of the land (cf. Jer

According to Ezek 47–48, the alluded context, three conditions must be met
before the community will fully realize the promise of land: (1) the land must be ready
to be inherited (cf. 47:13–20); (2) the aliens must be accepted (cf. 47:21–23); and (3) the
twelve tribes must exist (cf. 48:1–29). This perspective on the restoration of land,
particularly the last two conditions, lays the foundation for the next restoration aspect
concerning the new community in the new age.

New Community (Important Source: Jeremiah)

The restoration of Zech 9–10 includes not only the reclamation of the land, but
also the creation of an ideal people, suitable to dwell in the promised homeland with
Yahweh in their midst. By alluding to Jer 23 and 30–31, the new community includes Judah as well as Ephraim (cf. 9:13), an important theme stressed throughout the whole Zecharian corpus. In order to achieve this, Judah is used by Yahweh as an instrument for the return of Ephraim (cf. Isa 49:2 in Zech 9:13). This vision will satisfy the third condition laid out in Ezek 47–48—the existence of the twelve tribes (cf. 48:1–29).

During the restoration process, Yahweh’s people will be liberated from bondage (cf. Gen 37:24 in Zech 9:11b) and will return to Zion (cf. Zech 9:12a), with a divine promise of restoring double to them (cf. Deut 15:18 in Zech 9:12b). Instead of weakness, the restored people will enjoy ultimate triumph through the strengthening of the Lord (cf. Zech 10:6a, 12a). Instead of poverty, the returned people will celebrate with joy due to the incredible prosperity flowing from Yahweh’s renewed presence (cf. Jer 31:12–13 in Zech 9:17b).

Though restoration cannot be brought about by human effort, the intertextual insight of Zech 10:6 reveals that the faithful response of the people, after divine discipline (cf. Jer 31:18–20 and Lam 3:31–33 in Zech 10:6), is crucial to the fulfillment of the impending restoration (cf. Jer 51:50 in Zech 10:9a). The misconduct on the part of Yahweh’s people will affect the actualization of the promised salvation (cf. Jer 14:1–15:4 in 10:1–2). Also, the intertextual backdrop of 9:15 and 10:9a envisions the spiritual renewal of the people (cf. Num 7:13 in Zech 9:15d), emphasizing the fully restored relationship between the deity and his people.

In order to create an ideal people suitable to dwell in the restored land with Yahweh in their midst as king, the Lord will purify the audience so that they will be qualified to inherit the promised land. Two intertexts are recalled to nuance this divine
refinement (Ezek 7:20–24; Mic 5:9 [5:10]), advocating that the purging of the audience is a part of the restoration program of Yahweh (cf. Zech 12:10–13:9).

The new commonwealth envisioned in Zech 9–10 has a global dimension as Yahweh’s salvific act is not restricted to his chosen people alone. Instead of exclusivity (cf. Ezra 9–10; Neh 13:23–29), the corpus advocates the notion of inclusivity. The aliens, even former enemies, will be integrated respectfully into the covenant community after purification (Zech 9:5–7, 10c–d), united under a Davidic king who will reign with peace (Zech 9:9–10). This vision will satisfy the second condition laid out in Ezek 47–48—the acceptance of the aliens (cf. 47:21–23).

New David (Important Sources: Micah, Psalter)

By alluding to Mic 4–5, Zech 9:9–10 affirms that a new David will be reinstated in the new age. However, the image of this royal figure in the Zecharian poem is completely different from the notion of an ideal king in the Davidic tradition, particularly Ps 72. Instead of ruling with power and strength, a submissive vice-regent who has right relationship with Yahweh is presented as a model of ideal leadership.

Second Zechariah insists that the future king of the new commonwealth will be established by and rule for Yahweh, not the Persians. The cosmic dominion of the human king is only possible when the royal figure realizes that his reign actually belongs to Yahweh and his power in fact stems from the sovereignty of the Lord. The reliance of the vice-regent on Yahweh (9:10a–b) forms the foundation of his universal reign (9:10c–d).
New Leadership (Important Source: Jeremiah)


In light of the words chosen, the good leaders in Zech 10:4 most likely relate to the royal circle which will lead the transformed Judeans to fight victoriously in battle (Zech 10:5). By reading intertextually (cf. Jer 30:21), the God-given leaders in the host will be ones who have a good relationship with the Lord and probably will assume a mediatorial role of leading the people close to the deity.

The condemnation of the present leadership at the outset of Zech 10 is developed further in subsequent chapters of Second Zechariah (e.g., 11:1–3 and 11:17), culminating in Yahweh’s execution of judgment on the shepherd leaders in 13:7–9. To our surprise, there is no mention of priesthood in this depiction of restoration, a topic discussed extensively in First Zechariah (cf. Zech 3; 6:9–15).

Summary

Zechariah 9–10 attempts to offer hope to its readers from their Israelite heritage. The corpus envisions the return of Yahweh who inaugurates the new age, ushering in prosperity and blessing. The earlier restoration expectations of Second Zechariah anticipate the formation of an ideal remnant settling in an ideal homeland, with Yahweh as king and David as vice-regent, reigning in Zion. The new commonwealth is not only a
united society but also a cosmic one, with Judah, Ephraim, and the nations living together in peace.

Suggestions for Future Intertextual Studies

Although there have been a number of research projects examining the inner-biblical connections of Second Zechariah, nearly all of them focus on the diachronic dimension of the process, investigating how the corpus connects to its antecedent and on what biblical materials/traditions these six chapters depend. Most of these works put much effort on issues relating to textual connections on the formal level rather than strategic relations between texts. However, literary dependence is not a mere replication, amalgamating words and phrases from sources, but rather a creative process, transforming intertexts to accomplish the communicative purpose in the host, as found in this project. Based on this, we suggest that future intertextual studies of Zech 9–14 should pay more attention to the reason for dependence, noting whether the intertexts are affirmed (e.g., Ezek 7:20–24 in Zech 9:6b–7a), revised (e.g., Jer 23:1–4 in Zech 10:2c–5), or displaced (e.g., Deut 23:3 [23:2] in Zech 9:6a, 7b–c) to express the view of the alluding text.

Recent works on inner-biblical connections have moved to a new level by using intertextuality as a model of inquiry, with more critics affirming that meaning only exists in the interaction between a text and its intertexts. This phenomenon is affirmed in our

10 See CHAPTER ONE.
intertextual studies of Zech 9–10, e.g., the dialogue among Isa 5:26; 7:18, and Zech 10:8. With this perspective, future studies on the intertextuality of Second Zechariah should bring the various intertexts “between the lines” into focus, reflecting on their impact on the reading of the host text, and projecting any possible rhetorical effects that such connections might have created for the readers when they pick up those complex and intertwined allusions.¹³

This dissertation represents an attempt on this new level of intertextual studies. The project aims not only to read the Zecharian text in light of its intertexts but also to delineate the restoration themes in Zech 9–10 based on its dialogue with its complex web of allusions. In order to achieve this kind of reading, two more points should be noted. First, before examining how the intertexts shape our reading of the Zecharian text, we have to perform an in-depth investigation of both texts and their contexts, not only the host but also the source, in order to establish their respective meanings for analysis. Second, since the context of the host text performs an important role in guarding against subjectivity, we suggest all pericopes of the host text, even those passages without any literary dependence, should be examined as a whole to provide a better control for registering intertexts. Above all, our suggestions presuppose a well-defined methodology which is sensitive to the highly allusive character of Zech 9–14 and a willingness to dialogue with other scholarly works when registering an intertext.

---

¹³ Boda, “Reading Between the Lines,” 291.
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