

Copyright © 2017 Matthew Thomas Seufert

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

ZECHARIAH: SELECT PROBLEMS  
AND ALLUSIVE SOLUTIONS

---

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
the Faculty of  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
Matthew Thomas Seufert  
December 2017

**APPROVAL SHEET**

**ZECHARIAH: SELECT PROBLEMS  
AND ALLUSIVE SOLUTIONS**

Matthew Thomas Seufert

Read and Approved by:

---

Duane A. Garrett (Chair)

---

Russell T. Fuller

---

Peter J. Gentry

Date\_\_\_\_\_

To my loving and supportive wife, Athena.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
PREFACE.....	ix
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
History of Research on Zechariah’s Allusions.....	2
Chapters 1-8.....	2
Chapters 9-14.....	9
Whole Book.....	15
Method.....	18
2. ZECHARIAH 1:3 AND THE FORMER PROPHETS.....	21
Introducing the Problem.....	21
One Suggestion.....	21
“And You Shall Say to Them”.....	23
Other Suggestions.....	25
Two Allusive Approaches: Stead and Petitjean.....	26
Zechariah 1:1-6 and the Former Prophets.....	28
Stead and Single Texts.....	36
Petitjean and a Stereotypical Phrase.....	42
Conclusions.....	44
3. ZECHARIAH 1:11C, ISAIAH 14:7, AND JEREMIAH.....	46

Chapter	Page
Zechariah 1:11c: Text and Context .....	46
Al Wolters' Interpretation of Zechariah 1:11c .....	47
Contextual Incompatibility .....	49
Zechariah's Freedom: Two Clear Examples .....	53
Zechariah's Use of Isaiah 14:7 .....	57
Jeremiah 30:10 and 46:27 .....	60
A Note on Method .....	62
Other Interpretations and Conclusion .....	64
<b>4. ZECHARIAH 5:5-11, JEREMIAH 3, AND EZEKIEL 8 .....</b>	<b>67</b>
Zechariah 5:5-11 .....	67
Scholarship on the Ephah .....	68
My Proposal .....	69
Form Change and Lexical Links .....	69
Contextual Compatibility .....	70
Zechariah 1-8 and Jeremiah .....	72
The House in Shinar .....	73
Conclusion on Jeremiah 3 .....	74
Ezekiel 8 .....	75
Methodological Conclusions .....	80
<b>5. ZECHARIAH 11 AND ALLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>82</b>
A Scholarly Consensus .....	83
History of Proposals .....	84
Jeremiah 25, Ezekiel 34 and 37 .....	89
Jeremiah 25 and Zechariah 11:1-3 .....	89
Ezekiel 37:15-28 and Zechariah 11:4-16 .....	97
Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11 .....	101

Chapter	Page
David's King: Presently Absent.....	105
Lesser-noted Allusions.....	107
Judges 9 .....	107
Jeremiah 12-13 and Ezekiel.....	110
My Covenant with All the Peoples .....	114
Summary and Conclusions.....	131
6. CONCLUSIONS .....	134
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	140

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
ANEM	Ancient Near Eastern Monographs
ANES	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i>
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
<i>BKAT</i>	<i>Biblischer Kommentar zum Altes Testament</i>
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
<i>BZAW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>Did</i>	<i>Didaskalia</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>The Heythrop Journal</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IECOT	International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament



<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JHebS</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
J-M	Joüion and Muraoka
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
LHBOTS	The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
NAC	New American Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible
OTG	Old Testament Guides
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WMANT</i>	<i>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

## PREFACE

Throughout the years, many individuals have supported and encouraged me in the process of this dissertation. My advisor, Dr. Duane Garrett, has offered continual guidance and much-needed criticism. It would be nowhere near what it is without his help, and I am extremely grateful to have learned from him both in his feedback and seminars. I would also like to thank all those who would ask me about my topic and progress, especially my parents, Mike, Dan, and many of the people at the Reformed Baptist Church of Louisville; their interest and kindness encouraged me greatly along the way. A special thanks to Derek for his sustained expressed interest, encouragement, and willingness to edit large parts of the project. Finally, my wife, Athena, who is as ready as I am to have completed this, has labored and walked with me the entire way. I am very thankful for all of her help, in this and in all of life.

Matthew Seufert

Louisville, Kentucky

December 2017

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Zechariah is an extremely difficult book. Despite an extensive and growing corpus of Zecharian studies, much remains obscure. Nevertheless, a recent development in biblical studies, the detection and analysis of inner-biblical allusion, holds the promise of disclosing the meaning of some of the book's most cryptic texts.

Scholarship has applied this interpretational key to the book of Zechariah to varying degrees across its two halves (Zech 1-8 and 9-14), with the latter half receiving much greater attention for a much longer period of time than the former. These studies are detailed below, and my work means to build upon theirs and further affirm the claim that Zechariah's prophecy is thoroughly allusive.

The lack of any single interpretive key is a standing difficulty in interpreting Zechariah's perplexing texts—roving horsemen, four horns and four craftsmen, a menorah with two olive trees, a flying scroll, and an ephah with a woman inside (to name but a few). The various texts are often interpreted as though the prophet had no single, governing idea behind his work. Thus, scholars make the best sense they can of each text, but they often do this without reference to any strategy that guides the peculiar imagery and language of the book. This study suggests that Zechariah, coming late in the history of Old Testament Israel, is making significant use of allusion to prior biblical texts, and that recognizing his use of allusion provides a coherent and consistent basis for interpreting the book. I cannot address every problem of Zechariah within this dissertation, but I will seek to demonstrate through selected examples that *this allusive model allows for a uniform and compelling approach to the interpretation of Zechariah.*

A subsidiary purpose of this study is to encourage a refinement of the approach

to interpreting Zechariah's allusions. As will be seen, scholars have noted allusions, and given misinterpretations of them, based on an underdeveloped understanding of Zechariah's method. This is partially due to the recentness of thorough allusion studies on Zechariah. I hope to begin to correct this and highlight the importance of an approach that is sensitive to the book's allusive methods.

The following contains a summary of the previous allusion studies on Zechariah and an enumeration of my method.

### **History of Research on Zechariah's Allusions**

The majority of allusion studies on Zechariah have followed the split of the book. Accordingly, there are those on Zechariah 1-8, Zechariah 9-14, and the whole book. I lay out each in its turn. Throughout the summaries, I include various authors' discussion of method, both their own method for identifying allusions within Zechariah and their observations on Zechariah's method in incorporating other texts. Both methods factor into the interpretations I offer in this study, and my own uses of them are discussed in their appropriate place.

### **Chapters 1-8**

Michael Stead's relatively recent monograph, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, convincingly demonstrates a heavy reliance of these chapters' visions and oracles on previous texts, especially prophetic texts. An example of how committed he is to a thoroughgoing intertextual approach is his treatment of Zechariah 1:3a. The verse is "grammatically odd."<sup>1</sup> While almost all commentators render אַלְהֵם וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם with "and you shall say to them," אָמַרְתָּ follows a perfect (קִצְוִי) and so seemingly should be translated as a past, "and you said to them;" but this past rendering makes no sense in its context. A

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, LHBOTS 506 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 76.

typical approach might emend the text, translate as an imperatival imperfect despite the preceding perfect, or settle for a less than satisfactory interpretation which accepts a past rendering of the verb. In keeping with his overall intertextual approach, though, Stead employs “Riffaterre’s conception of an *ungrammaticality*,” which is “an awkward grammatical construction in one text which points the reader to another text,” and suggests “that Zech 1:3 is grammatically odd because it is a quotation of Ezek 2:4.”<sup>2</sup> Stead’s reading of Zechariah 1-8, as exemplified here, is based on his understanding that the early verses of the book “‘hook’ Zech 1-8 into the prophetic thoughtworld”<sup>3</sup> and the abundant allusions in chapters 1 and 2 effectively “position the message of Zech 1-8 in the context of the words of the ‘former prophets.’”<sup>4</sup> His study aims “to examine the nature, extent and effect of these allusions in Zech 1-8.”<sup>5</sup>

Stead utilizes a self-created computer search engine (*BibleCrawler*) for detecting allusions throughout Zechariah 1-8 that is specifically tailored to Zechariah’s method of using other texts, a method he comes up with by analyzing five places of uncontroversial allusion.<sup>6</sup> After concluding that Zechariah alludes to other sources by using synonyms and cognates, and often combines sources, he developed a search engine that would account for this and is more flexible than other computer concordances, which are limited to searching for common words, a problem he sees with Risto Nurmela’s method (see below).<sup>7</sup> Stead summarizes his own methodological approach, “Like *tradition history* approaches, it [his method] goes beyond the word-search in order to

---

<sup>2</sup>Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 77-78.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, 81 (italics original).

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 30-37.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, 29-30.

recognize ‘thematic allusions’; like *intertextual* approaches, it seeks to be sensitive to the literary effect of textual re-use in its various forms; like recent *inner-biblical* approaches, it focuses on ‘objective’ results that can be quantified and analyzed.”<sup>8</sup>

Stead’s work uses intertextuality to bridge “gaps” in the text. When he comes to a point in his interpretation of a vision or oracle where Zechariah 1-8, its historical context, and all the tools of traditional exegesis do not offer an adequate explanation of the material, he turns to a search for enlightening allusions.<sup>9</sup>

Stead spends a fair amount of time with Zechariah’s specific methods of allusion, which include sustained allusion, composite metaphor, and slight variations of the source text (e.g., using synonymous words rather than quoting verbatim).

Mark Boda and Michael Floyd have recently edited a handful of essays compiled under the title *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*. Eight of the essays specifically treat Zechariah 1-8, or a part thereof, and its links with other texts, either noting parallels on a broad level (e.g., D. Nathan Phinney’s essay on Ezekiel and Zechariah’s shared autobiographical nature;<sup>10</sup> Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer’s essay on Ezekiel’s cherubim and Zechariah’s patrolling horsemen;<sup>11</sup> Dominic Rudman’s essay on the presence and background of “the satan” in Zech 3),<sup>12</sup> or explaining specific texts in light of intertextual connections (e.g., Zech 1:8-

---

<sup>8</sup>Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 39.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>10</sup>D. Nathan Phinney, “Life Writing in Ezekiel and First Zechariah,” in *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, ed. Mark Boda and Michael Floyd, LHBOTS 475 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 83-103.

<sup>11</sup>Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, “Zechariah’s Spies and Ezekiel’s Cherubim,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 104-27. She further compares the two books’ similarity with Job’s “Satan” (Ezek 28:14 and Zech 3:1-2) and the similar disposition towards the high priest in Ezek 28:11-19 and Zech 3.

<sup>12</sup>Dominic Rudman, “Zechariah and the Satan Tradition in the Hebrew Bible,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 191-209.

15 and 5:1-11 [Delkurt],<sup>13</sup> Zech 1-2 [Stead],<sup>14</sup> Zech 1:11 [Wolters],<sup>15</sup> Zech 2:10-17 [Boda],<sup>16</sup> Zech 5:5-11 [Schnocks]<sup>17</sup>). The book as a whole demonstrates well the recent fruitfulness of allusive inquiry into chapters 1-8, a method that up until more recently scholars have applied extensively only to chapters 9-14.

A few earlier works treat, in whole or in part, allusions in chapters 1-8. Mark Cameron Love's *The Evasive Text: Zechariah 1-8 and the Frustrated Reader* is unique among them. Love "work[s] within the epistemological grounds of reader-response criticism, which believes intentions are impossible to discover in texts," though he does "recognize that readers still postulate intentions for authors and texts."<sup>18</sup> He views Zechariah 1-8 as "a pastiche which has drawn on many textual traditions in its composition,"<sup>19</sup> but he sees virtually no end to the possibilities of source texts and thus no controlling interpretive lens for any given Zecharian text. Though "the text assumes the reader is familiar with the prophetic corpus and that the reader interprets the prophetic corpus the same way it does,"<sup>20</sup> "the reader is assaulted with a barrage of polyvalent symbols which disharmoniously echo the cacophonous voices of the prophetic precursors

---

<sup>13</sup>Holger Delkurt, "Sin and Atonement in Zechariah's Night Visions," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 235-51.

<sup>14</sup>Michael R. Stead, "Sustained Allusion in Zechariah 1-2," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 144-70. Stead's essay is unique in that it highlights Zechariah's *method* of incorporating other texts into his message. The material here can for the most part also be found in his dissertation.

<sup>15</sup>Al Wolters, "'The Whole Earth Remains at Peace' (Zechariah 1:11): The Problem and an Intertextual Clue," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 128-43.

<sup>16</sup>Mark J. Boda, "Hoy, Hoy: The Prophetic Origins of the Babylonian Tradition in Zechariah 2:10-17," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 171-90.

<sup>17</sup>Johannes Schnocks, "An Ephah between Earth and Heaven: Reading Zechariah 5:5-11," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 252-70. See also Johannes Schnocks, "Eine intertextuelle Verbindung zwischen Ezechiels Eifersuchtsbild und Sacharjas Frau im Efa," *BN* 84 (1996): 59-63.

<sup>18</sup>Mark C. Love, *The Evasive Text: Zechariah 1-8 and the Frustrated Reader*, JSOTSup 296 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 15.

<sup>19</sup>Love, *The Evasive Text*, 204.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 141.

. . . and defy explanations given for them. The *mysterium* surrounding them is never dissipated.”<sup>21</sup>

Even when Love does find a single source text, as he does for Zechariah 3:2 with Amos 4:11, the source text, as well as the other elements of Zechariah’s text (in the case of Zechariah 3:2 this includes Yahweh’s rebuke, election, and the Satan), recall an almost endless web of additional texts (e.g., Genesis, Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel) which shape the reading of Zechariah in very different ways. “New possibilities are constantly being constructed, but none of them offer themselves as obvious interpretations of Zech. 3.2.”<sup>22</sup>

Whereas other Zecharian allusive studies seek objective criteria to establish limits for possible allusions, Love employs a free association method, resulting in a ceaseless pursuit through the Hebrew Bible for an evasive text. While I disagree with Love’s overall approach, he does often incorporate standard methods in his chase for texts and pays close attention to the way the source-text informs Zechariah.

Janet E. Tollington’s monograph *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8* is “a study of the ways in which [Hag and Zech 1-8] represent a continuation of, or divergence from, classical prophetic traditions and ideas.”<sup>23</sup> Tollington, rather than going through the material verse by verse, examines specific elements within Zechariah 1-8 (and Hag) and their overall continuity with the classical prophets and early Israelite theology. She discusses such things as prophetic authority, the prophet’s reception and delivery of the words of the Lord, the angelic interpreter, the Satan, the divine council, leadership, messianism, judgment, and the nations.

Often Tollington notes the similarity of Zechariah’s material with the broader

---

<sup>21</sup>Love, *The Evasive Text*, 144.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 205.

<sup>23</sup>Janet E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, JSOTSup 150 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 11.



prophetic tradition, rather than identifying a single text. So, for example, “Zechariah 8.20-22 and 23, in their present formulation, are not directly dependent upon any other prophecies; but internally there are indications that they are drawing on the concepts and motifs which are found elsewhere in the prophetic corpus.”<sup>24</sup> Though this conclusion is more frequent for her, at times she also specifies individual texts (e.g., Zech 3:2 / Amos 4:11).<sup>25</sup> She concludes that Zechariah is “a true prophet in the classical tradition” but also “an innovator in respect of his style and the content of his prophecies.”<sup>26</sup>

Since Tollington deals more with themes and ideas, her method of identifying prophetic precursors is less vocabulary-based than many of the other studies reviewed here. In that sense, she adds a fresh perspective to this review of scholars. When she does undertake identifying a specific underlying text, the factors of exclusivity (i.e., whether a word or idea appears infrequently) and contextual compatibility (i.e., whether the contexts of the supposed source text and Zechariah match) play a part in her conclusions. As her study is content to conclude that Zechariah often broadly draws on the prophetic tradition, she gives little to no attention to the question of his method of incorporation.

A couple of relevant studies limit their focus to the night visions of Zechariah 1-8. These are not wholly devoted to the search for allusions, but they are set apart from typical works by the amount of space they allot to allusive considerations. Christian Jeremias’ book *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja* summarizes its allusion findings with respect to Zechariah’s night visions: “Unverkennbar ist in vielen Einzelzügen (in der Formulierung, inhaltlich, im Bildmaterial, in Vorstellungen) eine starke Beziehung zu den älteren Propheten und ihren Visionen bis hin zu Amos, am meisten zu Deuterocesaja und zum Ezechielbuch.”<sup>27</sup> Delkurt’s *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte: Zur Aufnahme und*

---

<sup>24</sup>Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 238.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 154-55.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 248.

<sup>27</sup>Christian Jeremias, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja*, FRLANT 117 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck

*Abwandlung prophetischer Traditionen* builds on Jeremias and seeks to explain each of Zechariah's visions, giving each its own section for allusive considerations. Delkurt concludes that the visions are closest to Deutero-Isaiah in terms of content,<sup>28</sup> closest to Ezekiel (especially chaps. 1-3, 8-11, and 40-48) in vocabulary,<sup>29</sup> and incorporate Isaiah 1-39 (especially chap. 6) a number of times.<sup>30</sup> He notes further connections with Exodus, 1 Kings, Jeremiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Habakkuk.

Delkurt concedes that often it is impossible to identify a particular source for Zechariah, as his ideas occur throughout the prophetic tradition.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, "Bei Verwendung von eher seltenen Termini oder Vorstellungen läßt sich . . . auch genauer feststellen, auf welchen seiner Vorgänger Sacharja im einzelnen anspielt."<sup>32</sup> In addition to rare terms and ideas, he frequently takes into account the interpretational import of the source text and gives consideration to Zechariah's specific use of his predecessors (i.e., reversal, resumption/reapplication, etc.).<sup>33</sup>

In addition to the specialized allusive studies, Albert Petitjean's *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie: Un programme du restauration pour la communauté juive après l'exil*, along with the commentaries of W. A. M. Beuken, David Petersen, Eric and Carol Meyers, and Robert Hanhart, more so than other commentaries (Petitjean's work is essentially a commentary on the oracles), give considerable space to allusions.<sup>34</sup>

---

& Ruprecht, 1977), 228.

<sup>28</sup>Holger Delkurt, *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte: Zur Aufnahme und Abwandlung prophetischer Traditionen*, BZAW 302 (New York: de Gruyter, 2000), 321.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 322.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., 322-23.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., 101, 324.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 82.

<sup>33</sup>Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer came out with a study of the allusions within Zechariah's vision reports near the close of this dissertation. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, *Zechariah's Vision Report and its Earliest Interpreters: A Redactional-critical Study of Zechariah 1-8*, LHBOTS 626 (New York: T&T Clark, 2016).

<sup>34</sup>Albert Petitjean, *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie: Un programme du restauration pour la communauté juive après l'exil* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969); W. A. M. Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8*:

## Chapters 9-14

Bernhard Stade's 1881 work is the first to offer an in-depth study of the contact between Zechariah 9-14 and other prophetic material. He conducted his search in order to date the material of Zechariah 9-14 and concluded "dass wir in Za. c. 9–14 ein nachexilisches Product, ein Buch jünger als Joel vor uns haben."<sup>35</sup> Many of the following works are based on Stade's, which largely draws connections between these chapters and the Major Prophets. His particular connections are often taken up by the studies summarized below.

Paul Lamarche's *Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure Littéraire et Messianisme*, while not completely occupied with allusive inquiries, makes some links (e.g., Zech 9:9/Zeph 3:12; Zech 9:17b/Deut 11:13-15; Zech 11:1-3/Jer 25:34-38; Zech 11:4-17/Ezek 34 and 37; Zech 11:15-17/Jer 22-23; Zech 13:1/Ezek 36:23-28; Zech 13:7/Isa 53:10) and specifically examines whether or not chapters 9-14 borrow from "Deutero-Isaiah," and also, if Zechariah's pierced shepherd depends on Isaiah's Suffering Servant.<sup>36</sup>

After examining the parallels and differences between the Servant poems and Zechariah's sections on the shepherd-king (Isa 42:1ff./Zech 9:9-10; Isa 49:1ff./Zech 11:4-14; Isa 50:4ff./Zech 12:10-13:1; Isa 52:13-53:12/Zech 13:7-9), Lamarche concludes, "C'est donc très librement et selon ses perspectives propres que le Deutéro-Zacharie a sans doute utilize Is 40-55."<sup>37</sup> With respect to Zechariah 12:10, the text of the pierced shepherd, he thinks the use of the same idea found in Isaiah 53:5, "d'une transfixion de

---

*Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Frühnachexilischen Prophetie*, (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Comp., 1967); David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984); Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, AB 25B (New York: Doubleday, 1987); Robert Hanhart, *Sacharja 1-8*, BKAT 15 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998).

<sup>35</sup>Bernhard Stade, "Deuterozacharja: Eine kritische Studie," ZAW 1 (1881): 96.

<sup>36</sup>Paul Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure Littéraire et Messianism* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961), 124-47.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, 147.

l'envoyé de Yahweh," establishes a probable borrowing despite "des mots différents."<sup>38</sup> And it is "à bon droit que beaucoup d'exégètes . . . font appel à Is 53 pour identifier le mystérieux Transpercé de Zach 12,10."<sup>39</sup>

Lamarche does not affirmatively answer the question of the dependence of Zechariah's pierced shepherd on Isaiah's Suffering Servant until he compares elements of structure, theme, idea, vocabulary and exclusivity. He also considers the number of overall possible connections between Deutero-Zechariah and -Isaiah and each connection's interpretational significance; that is, does the source text shed light on an understanding of Zechariah? Lamarche's comprehensive method, in my eyes, is exemplary and strongly influences my identification of allusions throughout this study. Further, his overall evaluation of Zechariah's method of allusion is notable, "L'utilisation des écrivains antérieurs n'est jamais ici imitation servile, mais plutôt chez un esprit qui a longtemps baigné dans la lecture des prophètes le désir de s'insérer dans la tradition prophétique, d'assumer et de développer les révélations précédentes pour les porter à leur plus haut point."<sup>40</sup>

Rex Mason's 1973 dissertation "The Use of Earlier Biblical Material in Zechariah 9-14: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis" recently published as part of the compiled work *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*, aims "to examine the use of earlier biblical material in Deutero-Zechariah in the attempt to see what principles of exegesis, if any, can be detected in such use."<sup>41</sup> He finds in these chapters "considerable dependence upon earlier biblical material, particularly, although

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 137.

<sup>39</sup>Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV*, 147.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., 154-55.

<sup>41</sup>Rex Mason, "The Use of Earlier Biblical Material in Zechariah 9-14: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis," in *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, JSOTSup 370 (New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 4.

not exclusively, upon the major prophetic collections.”<sup>42</sup>

Mason is at times content to locate the ideas or phrases of Zechariah 9-14 within a more general “stream of tradition” without locating a single source (so, e.g., Zech 13:7, 8ff.).<sup>43</sup> He also occasionally raises the question of whether both places are making use of a third source (so, e.g., Zech 12ff. and Ezek 28ff.).<sup>44</sup> When he does identify a particular source he employs many of the methods already discussed, including exclusivity, vocabulary, theme, idea, structure, and interpretive usefulness.

Particularly helpful is Mason’s attention to Zechariah’s exegetical method. A general observation of his, like Lamarche’s, is Zechariah 9-14’s “fluid and free adaptation of earlier material.”<sup>45</sup> These chapters do not often employ word for word quotation of previous material, but they do often incorporate it for their own purposes. So, for example, Mason notes places where previous prophecies, while their main emphasis is kept, are slightly modified (so, e.g., Zech 9:7 and Amos 1:6-9ff.)<sup>46</sup> or even reversed altogether (so, e.g., Zech 10:3-12 and Jer 10:17-22).<sup>47</sup> Another method he identifies is “allusive word-play,” “where the use of a phrase or term may serve to recall a whole prophetic theme.”<sup>48</sup>

Raymond F. Person’s monograph, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School*, contends that “the Deuteronomistic school was responsible for the canonical form of Zech with the addition of II Zech (chs. 9-14) to I Zech (chs. 1-8).”<sup>49</sup> In order to

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., 201.

<sup>43</sup>Mason, “The Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 118, 129.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 136.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 202.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 19-20.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 73-75.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>Raymond F. Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School*, JSOTSup 167

establish his thesis he examines the Deuteronomic (including Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History, and Jeremiah) language and thought present in Zechariah 9-14, mainly focusing on those words and ideas exclusively or primarily located in these two sources.<sup>50</sup> He also calls attention to various passages (i.e., Deut 13:2-12; 28; Jer 14:1-15:4; 23:1-8; 25:15-29, 34-38; 30-31) “which significantly parallel II Zech.” By “significant” he means those passages that have “a concentration of phrases, themes and/or images that are closely related to II Zech, but [he] does *not* necessarily mean that these passages are the *sole* source of influence for II Zech.”<sup>51</sup> The criterion of exclusivity, whether in word or idea, is pervasive in Person’s method for identifying allusions.

In *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah: A Study of the Formation of a Mantological Wisdom Anthology*, Katrina Larkin searches chapters 9-14 for examples of mantological exegesis, which she defines, referencing Michael Fishbane, as “all those kinds of exegesis found within Scripture which are designed to solve cognitive problems and to explicate what is obscure or hidden.”<sup>52</sup> It is a “decoding operation” applied to dreams, visions, omens, and “certain oracles . . . whose meaning was originally self-explanatory, but which in course of time came to be seen as problematic or obscure, and thus became a candidate for decoding as well.”<sup>53</sup>

For instance, Larkin thinks Isaiah 17’s prophecy of doom against Ephraim and Damascus “could have been troubling to a post-exilic writer such as Zechariah who was deeply concerned with the restoration” of Ephraim “and could have prompted him to

---

(Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 13.

<sup>50</sup>Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School*, 84-104, 118-38.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, 105 (italics original).

<sup>52</sup>Katrina Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah: A Study of the Formation of a Mantological Wisdom Anthology*, CBET 6 (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994), 31.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*

undertake an important piece of mantalogical exegesis.”<sup>54</sup> Zechariah 9:1, then, now recalls Isaiah 17 (esp. vv. 1 and 7) in order to announce the restoration of Damascus and all the tribes of Israel (including Ephraim).

Nicholas Ho Fai Tai’s book *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung in Sacharja 9-14: Traditions- und kompositionsgeschichtliche Studien* is one of the more extensive studies on Zechariah’s allusions in chapters 9-14. He thoroughly examines every pericope for corresponding links with previous material and establishes connections based on overlapping vocabulary, theme, structure, motif, and surrounding context. He also takes into consideration exclusivity, interpretational significance, and multiple occurrences of a given text. The most prominent sources identified by Ho Fai Tai are Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, and various Psalms. Additional sources include Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah.

He often adduces more than one text for a given section. So, for example, Jeremiah 5:18-25, 14:13-16, and Deuteronomy 11:10-17 all lie behind Zechariah 10:1-2.<sup>55</sup> Ho Fai Tai further notes sustained allusion (i.e., the extension of a single source over a large portion of material in Zechariah) and modification and implementation of previous prophecies in chapters 9-14.

The lengthy article of Matthias Delcor, “Les sources du Deutéro-Zacharie et ses procédés d’emprunt,” in the first place “voudrait tenter de discerner les sources littéraires qui ont influencé [Deutero-Zechariah] de façon consciente ou inconsciente.”<sup>56</sup> He considers Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Trito-Isaiah, Job, Malachi, Joel, and 1 and 2 Chronicles,

---

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 58.

<sup>55</sup>Nicholas Ho Fai Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung in Sacharja 9-14: Traditions- und kompositionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Stuttgart, Germany: Calwer Verlag, 1996), 77-83.

<sup>56</sup>M. Delcor, “Les sources du Deutéro-Zacharie et ses procédés d’emprunt,” *RB* 59 (1952): 385.

basing links upon “contacts de pensée et de vocabulaire.”<sup>57</sup>

After identifying numerous connections between these books and Deutero-Zechariah, the article seeks “examiner ses procédés d’emprunt.”<sup>58</sup> Delcor identifies several methods incorporated by Deutero-Zechariah in the implementation of his sources: he loves to summarize his sources (e.g., Zech 11:3/Jer 25:36), he applies the sense of his predecessors to a different object (e.g., Zech 9:9/Zeph 3:14), he uses old metaphors with new meanings, sometimes contrary to their original (e.g., Zech 10:8/Isa 5:26; 7:18), he applies the metaphor or original sense to the same object (he does this most often; e.g. Zech 9:16/Isa 62:3; Zech 11:2/Ezek 31:1-8), and he combines sources (e.g., Zech 11:2-3/Jer 25:36 and Ezek 31; 19:3).<sup>59</sup> As a more general observation he notes that the author of Zechariah 9-14 “n’est pas l’esclave d’un texte: s’il en prend l’esprit, il saura en abandonner la lettre.”<sup>60</sup>

As with chapters 1-8, certain commentaries on chapters 9-14 give significant space to allusive considerations: Meyers and Meyers, Petersen, Ina Willi-Plein, and Magne Saebø.<sup>61</sup> Additionally, several allusive studies are occupied with smaller units of chapters 9-14. Suk Yee Lee offers an intertextual analysis of Zechariah 9-10, Hanns-Martin Lutz of Zechariah 12:1-8 and 14:1-5, and Konrad Schaeffer of Zechariah 14.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.

<sup>58</sup>Delcor, “Les sources,” 407.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., 407-08.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., 408.

<sup>61</sup>Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, AB 25C (New York: Doubleday, 1993); David L. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995); Magne Saebø, *Sacharja 9-14: Untersuchungen von Text und Form* (Wageningen, Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969); Ina Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende: Untersuchungen zu Sacharja 9-14* (Köln: Verlag, 1974).

<sup>62</sup>Suk Yee Lee, *An Intertextual Analysis of Zechariah 9-10: The Earlier Restoration Expectations of Second Zechariah*, LHBOTS 599 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); Hanns-Martin Lutz, *Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Völker: Zur Vorgeschichte von Sach. 12, 1-8 und 14, 1-5*, WMANT 27 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1968); Konrad Schaeffer, “Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion,” *CBQ* 57 (1995): 66-91.



## Whole Book

Risto Nurmela's *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1-8 and 9-14* searches for allusions to the Major Prophets, Minor Prophets, Deuteronomistic work, Psalms, and 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah. The bulk of his work is devoted to the Major Prophets (pp. 39-170), while the final part addresses internal connections between the two halves (1-8 and 9-14) and the remaining books listed above (pp. 171-232).

Nurmela faults previous studies (e.g., Stade, Delcor, Lamarche, Mason, Willi-Plein, Person, and Larkin) for not giving “a method for screening the *verbal* points of contact between Zc 9–14 and other Old testament books.”<sup>63</sup> He is concerned to minimize the subjectivity involved with identifying allusions and so begins his search with “words and phrases which occur exclusively or predominately in one of the main parts of Zechariah and one other Old Testament book, or phrases in one of the main parts of Zechariah and another book connected by a strong resemblance.”<sup>64</sup> He does not “regard similarities of, for instance, structure . . . or common themes . . . as significant indicators, although they can offer further corroboration to the observations based on vocabulary.”<sup>65</sup>

While shared vocabulary is his starting point, it does not constitute an allusion by itself. He critiques Larkin's method for resting “too heavily upon single words with too little attention paid to the contexts of these lexical links”<sup>66</sup> and at times he denies dependence even when an overlap in rare vocabulary exists. For instance, Zechariah 3:2's *אוד מצל מאש* is a rare expression occurring again only in Amos 4:11, *כאוד מצל משרפה*, but Nurmela concludes that since the contexts are “quite different” Zechariah “may

---

<sup>63</sup>Risto Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1-8 and 9-14* (Turku, Finland: Abo Akademi University, 1996), 1 (italics original).

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>65</sup>Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 2.

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, 11.

simply [be using] an expression which was in current use in Ancient Israel.”<sup>67</sup>

Nurmela evaluates each allusion as “Sure,” “Probable,” or “Possible” based on his criteria of “exclusive verbal similarities” (i.e., only occurring in Zechariah and one other book), “verbal similarities” (i.e., occurring in Zechariah and another book but also elsewhere in the OT), “synonymic similarities” and “thematic similarities.”<sup>68</sup> Further, he classifies the character of each allusion, whether it is “concordant” with the alluded to passage, “confirms the fulfillment of a message of judgment,” “proclaims the fulfillment of an oracle of salvation,” “reverses a message of judgment,” or is a “polemic against the passage alluded to.”<sup>69</sup>

Heiko Wenzel’s recently published dissertation *Reading Zechariah with Zechariah 1:1-6 as the Introduction to the Entire Book* argues for a unified reading of Zechariah. He devotes the majority of his book to seven intertextual case studies which span Zechariah: Zechariah 2:10-11 (Jer 51:6) and Zechariah 2:15-16 (Isa 14:1), Zechariah 3:6-7 (2 Kgs 3:14), Zechariah 6:15 (Deut 28:1, 15), Zechariah 7:11-12 (Isa 6:10 and Jer 17:1), Zechariah 9:11 (Exod 24:8) and Zechariah 10:1 (Deut 11:14-15), Zechariah 11:4-17, and Zechariah 14:9 (Deut 6:4). He also spends a fair amount of space discussing the introductory verses (1:1-6) and their relation to the “former prophets,” especially Jeremiah.<sup>70</sup> The seven case studies seek to demonstrate “that the call of Zechariah 1:3-4 sounds through the entire book.”<sup>71</sup>

Wenzel’s study gives extensive attention to the contexts of the alluded to texts

---

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., 27-28.

<sup>68</sup>Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 28.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., 36.

<sup>70</sup>Heiko Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah with Zechariah 1:1-6 as the Introduction to the Entire Book*, CBET 59 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011), 59-85.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., back cover.

in order to determine “the purpose or result of the reference for Zechariah’s argument.”<sup>72</sup> In establishing the reference texts he utilizes both exclusivity of language/syntax and broader contextual correspondence. For instance, in identifying a reference text for Zechariah 1:4 he “looks for the imperative plural masculine of שׁוּב” and finds Jeremiah 18:11, 25:5, 35:15 and 2 Kings 17:13.<sup>73</sup> He then compares the nearer contexts of these verses and excludes Jeremiah 18:11, because it alone among these four does not reference the “ancestors” or “the previous prophets who are identified as Yahweh’s servants.”<sup>74</sup> He concludes that Jeremiah 25:5 “is the primary reference because it is the only other place where a noun from the root עָלַל is qualified by רָע.”<sup>75</sup> Finally, he observes that the summarizing function of Jeremiah 25 in the context of the book of Jeremiah corroborates this conclusion, since “Zechariah 1:4 is not a summary or a culmination. . . . Zechariah 1:4 rather draws on the summary in Jeremiah 25.”<sup>76</sup> He consistently applies this method to the seven case studies of his work and draws conclusions on the implications the source texts have for understanding Zechariah’s message to his present-day audience.

Edgar Conrad’s short commentary on Zechariah is unique. His “strategies for interpreting the book emphasize literary rather than historical context.”<sup>77</sup> Also, he is “interested in reading Zechariah in the larger literary context of the twelve Minor Prophets and in the larger world of the textuality of the Hebrew Bible.”<sup>78</sup> Zechariah’s “former prophets” (see, e.g., Zech 1:4) are a reference to Hosea through Zephaniah. “If the Twelve is seen as a literary collage, it is appealing to interpret references to the

---

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., 48.

<sup>73</sup>Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah*, 62.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., 63.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., 63-64.

<sup>77</sup>Edgar W. Conrad, *Zechariah* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 7.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid.

former prophets as pointing to the prophets who appear earlier in the book, that is, Hosea through Zephaniah.”<sup>79</sup>

Rounding all of this out, the commentaries of Al Wolters and Mark Boda on the whole book are thoroughly allusive in their interpretive approach.<sup>80</sup>

### **Method**

Before I lay out the method of this study, I want to mention briefly the issues of source priority, the method for identifying an allusion within Zechariah, and Zechariah’s method in alluding to other texts.

First, the issue of allusion raises the question of the material Zechariah had available at the time he composed his work. The problem is somewhat eased by the lateness of Zechariah. Chapters 1-8 are unanimously regarded as properly dated by the superscriptions at 1:1, 7 and 7:1, just before the reconstruction of the temple in 515. Scholars assign chapters 9-14 to an even later date, either the late Persian or early Greek period, though the Persian has recently gained wider acceptance. Given this, along with the uncertainty of dating for many Old Testament books and the relative certainty of allusions in both halves of Zechariah, scholars often argue for or assume earlier dates for certain books or parts of books (e.g., Stead, Delkurt, Schaeffer), or they adopt a synchronic approach, which makes the dates irrelevant (e.g., Nurmela and Conrad). Basically, Zechariah’s allusions are allowed free reign and at times are decisive for determining if certain portions of other books already have come into existence. For example, Delkurt notes a sure incorporation of Amos 4:11, which he thinks is redactional,

---

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., 27.

<sup>80</sup>Al Wolters, *Zechariah* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014). Mark Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016). Mark Boda also now has a study of Zechariah’s use of biblical traditions that was published towards the finalization of this dissertation. It is essentially a compilation of various articles and essays that had been previously published. Mark Boda, *Exploring Zechariah: Volume 2—The Development and Role of Biblical Traditions in Zechariah*, ANEM 17 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2017).

into Zechariah 3:2. He concludes, therefore, that Zechariah must have known an advanced form of the book of Amos.<sup>81</sup> Similarly, Stead's observations prompted him to reevaluate the dating of much material upon which Zechariah is dependent.<sup>82</sup> In conversing with Odil Steck's redactional theory for Isaiah 54, for instance, Stead sees a sustained allusion to Isaiah 54 in Zechariah 1-2 and thus highly doubts Steck's theory of Isaiah 54's composition over a long period of time post-Zechariah.<sup>83</sup> Janet Tollington is a notable exception to this tendency. She is very reserved in concluding that Zechariah was literarily dependent on a given text, often hesitating because of an uncertainty with regard to the date of the source text. I, however, follow the majority in giving temporal priority to Zechariah's allusive sources.

The second issue is that of establishing an allusion. In determining a valid allusion, the main authenticating factor of this study is the ability of the allusion to unlock the meaning of a passage. In the quest for objectivity in identifying authentic allusions, this factor is especially relevant. If an obscure text, or piece of a text, has not been satisfactorily understood and remains wholly or partly in the dark, an allusion that sheds light on it, allowing for a fuller understanding of the previously obscure text, is almost certainly valid. Of course, this cannot be the only criterion, and in making the case for a legitimate allusion I adduce lexical, thematic, exclusivity, and contextual factors to support it. In addition to these, one of the more weightier considerations for this study is whether or not Zechariah uses that source elsewhere in his prophecy. If it is certain or even probable that he does, it is much more likely that he is drawing upon it again.

The significance of exclusive or rare overlapping terms and/or ideas in making an allusion more credible is evident to all. Shared themes and contexts is another

---

<sup>81</sup>Delkurt, *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte*, 323.

<sup>82</sup>Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 55-73.

<sup>83</sup>*Ibid.*, 68.

important consideration in this respect. Contrary to Nurmela, though, I do not think it is necessary for the contexts to match perfectly, only that the source's context is capable of interacting with Zechariah's text in a meaningful and believable way. This caveat aligns with the conclusion, drawn by not a few, that Zechariah is not enslaved to the original but incorporates it creatively. The key word here, in keeping with the concern for controlled and objective results, is meaningful. Freeness does not equal free-for-all, nor does it commend Love's endless pursuit. All of these factors taken together, along with the limits placed upon possible interpretations by Zechariah's book and context, work in favor of objective results, and when an interpretation is not certain even after all of these things are considered, the interpreter should offer the solution in tentative terms.

Finally, there is the issue of Zechariah's method in making allusions. Stead, Nurmela, Mason, Delcor, Ho Fai Tai, Delkurt, and Lamarche note various techniques at work in Zechariah's prophecy. Their research has concluded that Zechariah uses wordplay, reverses his predecessors, applies the original prophecy to a different object, applies it to the same object, utilizes the same source multiple times, sustains an allusion, combines sources, replaces parts of the original with synonyms and cognates, slightly modifies his source, reinterprets his source, and freely uses his source. Sensitivity to Zechariah's method can aid in the interpretation of the passage and is important for keeping interpretive options open. The concluding chapter offers a categorization of Zechariah's methods based on the results of this study.

The main chapters take up four separate "problem texts" within the book of Zechariah (1:3, 1:11, 5:5-11, and chapter 11). Each chapter contains a statement of the problem and offers a new interpretation in light of allusions. The chapters have several common goals: (1) to affirm the propriety of interpreting Zechariah via allusion, (2) to exhibit and examine Zechariah's methodology, (3) to show the usefulness of an awareness of Zechariah's methodology in identifying and interpreting allusions, and (4) to offer a new, allusive solution to a perplexing text.

## CHAPTER 2

### ZECHARIAH 1:3 AND THE FORMER PROPHETS

#### Introducing the Problem

Several issues confront the interpreter of Zechariah's introduction (1:1-6). Among them is the syntactical problem created by the verbs of verses 2 and 3. Verse 2 uses a perfect verb, קָצַף יהוה על־אבותיכם קָצַף ("The Lord was exceedingly angry with your fathers"). Verse 3 follows this with וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם. Typical Hebrew syntax requires the translation "and you said to them," as the perfect verb + *waw* (וְאָמַרְתָּ) immediately follows a perfect verb (קָצַף). The problem is that the context disallows the past rendering of אָמַר and, instead, requires the imperatival translation "and you shall say to them." This is so because of the remainder of verse 3, which is the content of the message that Zechariah is commanded to proclaim to the people, "Thus says the Lord of hosts, 'Return to me' declares the Lord of hosts, 'And I will return to you' says the Lord of hosts." How then is the tension to be resolved?

#### One Suggestion

Thomas McComiskey appeals to 1 Kings 2:6 in order to relieve the tension. He concludes that "the perfective וְאָמַרְתָּ with affixed ו does not appear to sustain a syntactical relationship with קָצַף (was angry), for it functions as an imperative here . . . and does not require a preceding verb."<sup>1</sup> The relationship of the perfect + ו at the beginning of Zechariah 1:3 to verse 2, as well as 1 Kings 2:6 to 1 Kings 2:5, an example McComiskey cites in support of his proposal, is "to command an action in view of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas McComiskey, *Zechariah* in vol. 3 of *The Minor Prophets*, ed. Thomas McComiskey (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), 1029.

preceding observation.”<sup>2</sup> First Kings 2:5 records the words of David to Solomon concerning Joab’s murders, and in 1 Kings 2:6, in light of this, David commands Solomon to act according to wisdom (וְעָשִׂיתָ כְּחָכְמָתָדָ) and to not let Joab die in peace. Similarly, notes McComiskey, “The command to speak to the people [in Zech 1:3] is a consequence of the previous affirmation of Yahweh’s anger [in Zech 1:2].”<sup>3</sup> That is, in light of the fact that “the Lord was exceedingly angry with your fathers” (1:2), “you shall say to them” (1:3).

Both sets of texts certainly share this connection, but from a syntactical point of view, that the perfect of Zechariah 1:3 “does not require a preceding verb” in order to be read as an imperative is questionable, as is the appeal to 1 Kings 2:6 for support of this.

The beginning of 1 Kings 2 recounts David’s admonitions to Solomon before his death. Verses 1b-3a read, “David commanded Solomon his son saying, ‘I am going the way of all the earth, but you be strong! And be a man and keep the charge of the Lord your God! [אָנֹכִי הַלֵּךְ בְּדַרְךְ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ וְחִזְקָתָ וְהָיִיתָ לְאִישׁ וְשָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת־מִשְׁמַרְתּוֹ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ].” Each of the three perfects + ו (וְחִזְקָתָ, וְהָיִיתָ, and וְשָׁמַרְתָּ) follows a personal pronoun + participle (אָנֹכִי הַלֵּךְ). These are instances closely related to “w-qatalti continuing a participle with future meaning.”<sup>4</sup> For example, Genesis 6:17 can be translated, “Behold, I am about to bring (הִנְנִי מְבִיא) the flood . . . but I will establish (וְהִקִּמֹתִי) my covenant.” In 1 Kings 2, instead of a purely future orientation (i.e., “and you will be strong,” etc.), an imperatival force is added by the context, “David commanded Solomon his son, saying...” (v. 1). This also occurs in Ezekiel 2:4: “I am about to send [אֲנִי שׁוֹלְחַ] you to them, and you shall say to them [וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם], ‘Thus says the Lord God.’” The force of

---

<sup>2</sup>McComiskey, *Zechariah*, 1029.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>J-M §119n.



the perfect אָמַר + ו clearly goes beyond a future meaning, and its imperatival force, as with 1 Kings, is gained from the context.

Rather than 1 Kings 2:6 being an example of a syntactically independent imperatival perfect + ו following a description of circumstances, as McComiskey alleges, it is better understood as syntactically dependent upon the participle + pronoun that comes in verse 2, which construction gains its imperatival force from the context set by verse 1. Verse 6 resumes the string of commands started in verses 2 and 3. The interlude of verses 4-5 does not preclude the syntactical relationship of verse 6 with verse 3, which itself is dependent upon verse 2, as this phenomenon is observable elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures (e.g., Num 18:30; Jer 7:27-8; 13:12; 19:11).

In short, the perfect + ו of 1 Kings 2:6 is not syntactically independent and thus does not aid in easing the tension present in Zechariah 1:3a.

### **“And You Shall Say to Them”**

Corroborating this conclusion is an investigation of “and you shall say to them” throughout the Hebrew Bible. Never is it syntactically independent. Instead, it always receives its imperatival force from preceding constructions.

The form that occurs in Zechariah is וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם. This form occurs 23 other times. It most frequently appears in Leviticus (9x) and Numbers (11x) and once each in Genesis, Exodus, and Ezekiel.<sup>5</sup> In every occurrence but one (Gen 44:4), these words are spoken by God to his messenger, whether Moses (21x) or Ezekiel (1x), commanding him to speak.<sup>6</sup>

These words are always preceded by either an imperative (21x) or an imperfect

---

<sup>5</sup>Gen 44:4; Exod 3:16; Ezek 20:3; Lev 1:2; 18:2; 19:2; 21:1; 22:18; 23:2, 10; 25:2; 27:2; Num 5:12; 6:2; 15:2, 18, 38; 18:26, 30; 28:2; 33:51; 34:2; 35:10.

<sup>6</sup>In Gen 44:4, Joseph commands his servant to pursue his brothers and then to speak to them, “Follow after the men . . . and you shall say to them.”

(2x) and depend upon these for the imperatival thrust, as in Leviticus 1:2, דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם. Other preceding imperatives include הֲלַךְ (Exod 3:16), אָמַר (Lev 21:1), and צוּה (Num 28:2; 34:2). Numbers 18:26 has וְאֶל־הַלְוִיִּם תְּדַבֵּר וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם, a leading imperfect which the וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם in Numbers 18:30 also depends upon.

In addition to the short form of this phrase as found in Zechariah, the elongated form, וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם, occurs 30 times.<sup>7</sup> All but one of the instances (Lev 17:2) are in Jeremiah (18x) and Ezekiel (11x), and each time the words are spoken by God commanding his prophets, Moses, Jeremiah, or Ezekiel, to speak.

As with the shortened form, the imperatival nature of the elongated form depends upon something preceding it. With this form, several different constructions are involved. The main one is “you shall say” following an imperative, whether נָבֵא, דָּבַר, הֲלַךְ, מָשַׁל, or יָדַע. Twice it follows an infinitive absolute used as an imperative (Jer 17:20; 19:11), and a handful of times it follows an imperfect, either by itself (e.g., Jer 14:17) or coupled with a temporal כִּי (e.g., Jer 5:19; 15:2). Finally, it appears once after a pronoun + a participle in Ezekiel 2:4 (for discussion of this construction see above).

In 52 of the 53 occurrences of this phrase outside of Zechariah (counting both the short and long forms), God is commanding one of his prophets to speak (Gen 44:4 is the exception). In every instance, the phrase is syntactically dependent for its force as a command.

In the case of Zechariah 1:3, however, none of the noted headers exist. Both Zechariah 1:1 and 1:2 lack an imperative, infinitive absolute, imperfect, and participle. As already mentioned, Zechariah 1:2 has a perfect verb as part of the prophet’s words to his audience, and verse 1, as the heading of this introductory section (Zech 1:1-6), contains a perfect verb and an infinitive construct, none of which can be responsible for

---

<sup>7</sup>Lev 17:2; Jer 5:19; 7:28; 8:4; 11:3; 13:12, 13; 14:17; 15:2; 16:11; 17:20; 19:11; 23:33; 25:27, 28, 30; 26:4; 38:26; 43:10; Ezek 2:4; 3:11, 27; 14:4; 20:5, 27; 24:3; 33:2; 34:2; 37:4; 37:12.

translating the beginning of verse 3 as a command.

The flow of the two verses into verse 3 is as follows: “In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, the word of the Lord came [הָיָה] to the prophet Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, son of Iddo, saying [לְאָמַר], ‘The Lord was very angry [קָצַף] with your fathers.’ And you shall say to them [וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם], ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts...’”

In addition to the contextual-syntactical tension, this verse has an additional problem. The pronoun of “you shall say to them” is unidentified in the text. The “them” of verse 3 has as its antecedent the “fathers” of verse 2, but it is obvious from the context that “them” must refer to Zechariah’s audience. I reintroduce this issue later. For now, how is it that “and you shall say to them” should be translated as a command without being dependent upon a controlling antecedent?

### Other Suggestions

Michael Floyd opts for a perfect habitual reading: “Yahweh was very angry with your forebears, and you [repeatedly] said to them . . . ,” since “on the purely grammatical level it would be necessary for this form [וְאָמַרְתָּ] to stand in sequential relationship to an imperfect or a command of some sort, in order for it to be a consecutive perfect.”<sup>8</sup> For Floyd, the lack of an antecedent disallows everything but a past reading. Again, though, as Mitchell notes, an imperatival reading is “the only way in which the present text can well be rendered.”<sup>9</sup>

Mitchell’s suggestion is that “the text here lacks several words, which must be supplied to make it completely intelligible. . . . There must have been at least one preceding verb having the sense of *speak*.”<sup>10</sup> Somehow, this word fell out. The original

---

<sup>8</sup>Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets Part 2*, FOTL 22 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 318.

<sup>9</sup>H. G. Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah*, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912), 110.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 110 (italics original).

reading would thus have been, “*Preach (cry) to the remnant of this people and say to them.*”<sup>11</sup> Similarly, K. Budde writes, “V. 3 entbehrt nun vollends für וואמרת אלהם jeder Anknüpfung . . . Vor וואמרת würde ein לך genügen oder besser קרא . . . Aber da einmal vor וואמרת sicher eine Lücke besteht, in die jetzt v. 2 irrig eingefügt ist.”<sup>12</sup> Friedrich Horst also supposes “daß [verse] 2 ursprünglichen Text verdrängt hat, und zwar eine Auftragserteilung, hin zu gehen zu einem näher bezeichneten Personenkreis und dort zu sprechen.”<sup>13</sup> Like Mitchell and Budde, he thinks that הָלוֹךְ, as a part of the original mission assignment, has fallen out and that וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלֵהֶם depended upon it.<sup>14</sup>

Myers and Myers also suggest something has dropped out. “Verse 2 . . . would make better sense were it the command given by an angel to Zechariah and not the direct words of Yahweh. . . . We might even speculate that an angelic speaker was once specified in the text.”<sup>15</sup>

Each of the previous suggestions (Floyd excepted) opts for a hypothetical text to ease the tension. The problem is that no such text has come down to us. In lieu of these hypothetical reconstructions, two scholars, Albert Petitjean and Michael Stead, suggest that the solution to the apparent problem of the phrase וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלֵהֶם is a reliance of Zechariah on previous prophets. The specifics of their suggestions, though, differ greatly.

### **Two Allusive Approaches: Stead and Petitjean**

In order to address the problem of verse 3 Michael Stead appeals to Michael Riffaterre’s conception of ungrammaticality. “Clearly, parts of Zech 1:2-3 are

---

<sup>11</sup>Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah*, 110 (italics original).

<sup>12</sup>K. Budde, “Zum Text der drei letzten kleinen Propheten,” *ZAW* 26 (1906): 5.

<sup>13</sup>Friedrich Horst, *Die zwölf Kleinen Propheten: Nahum bis Malachi* (Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), 217.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>15</sup>Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, AB 25B (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 102.

grammatically awkward. But perhaps this is deliberately so, because the phrases in question are allusions to other texts . . . that is, Zech 1:3 is ‘ungrammatical’ because it is a quote.”<sup>16</sup>

Stead identifies Ezekiel 2:4 as the quoted text and bases this, in part, on the present context of Zechariah’s mention of Yahweh’s “wrath against the fathers.” In light of this, “the closest semantic parallel to Zech 1:3 occurs in Ezek 2:3-4, which is addressed to ‘they and their fathers,’ and in which the prophet is told ‘You say to them, thus says Lord Yahweh’ [וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה].”<sup>17</sup> The other support he uses for identifying this text in Ezekiel is the similar phraseology. Zechariah 1:3 has וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. Stead notes that the phrase in Ezekiel “fits grammatically—the antecedent of אֲלֵיהֶם is defined, and the perfect וְאָמַרְתָּ, which follows a participle, has imperatival force.”<sup>18</sup> And thus Ezekiel’s text and context solve the problems posed by Zechariah 1:3.

Albert Petitjean’s proposal differs in an important respect from Stead’s. Instead of identifying a single text as the explanation for the grammatical problem, he thinks that “on peut raisonnablement supposer, en raison des nombreuses attestations de l’expression *w<sup>e</sup>’āmartā* *’aléhèm (kōh ’āmar YHWH)* en *Jérémie* et en *’Ezéchiël*, que ces mots se présentaient à Zacharie sous la forme d’une expression en quelque sorte stéréotypée marquant l’envoi en mission prophétique.”<sup>19</sup> Based on the frequency and uniformity of this expression in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, it was taken over by Zechariah as “stereotypical.” This explains its seemingly awkward placement in this text and its

---

<sup>16</sup>Michael Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, LHBOTS 506 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 77.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., 77-78.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., 78.

<sup>19</sup>Albert Petitjean, *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie: Un programme de restauration pour la communauté juive après l’exil* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), 28.

syntactical independence. As Petitjean writes, “Il n’est pas nécessaire d’ajouter, au début du verset 3, un verbe au mode impératif, auquel se rattacherait *w<sup>e</sup> āmartā*.”<sup>20</sup>

The proposals of Stead and Petitjean have several things in their favor. Contra those who propose a hypothetical reconstruction, both deal with the text as it has come down to us. Both views also embrace the imperatival reading, which is the only reading allowed by the context (*pace* Floyd). Lastly, relying on previous prophets to solve this problem emerges quite naturally from the recognition of prophetic language used throughout Zechariah’s introductory verses (1:1-6).

### **Zechariah 1:1-6 and the Former Prophets**

It is the purpose of this section to undergird Stead and Petitjean’s general agreement in looking to the former prophets to solve the problem presented by 1:3. Quite simply, if Zechariah’s introduction shows clear signs of pulling from the earlier prophetic stream, it is more likely that the beginning of 1:3 has done the same thing. Specifically, as shown above, *וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם* (or *אֲלֵיהֶם*) occurs only in the Pentateuch (23x), Jeremiah (18x), and Ezekiel (12x). Therefore, the presence of Jeremian, Ezekelian, and Pentateuchal language within the introductory verses of Zechariah is especially supportive of this proposal.

The most compelling support for this is the quotation of the former prophets (הַנְּבִיאִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים) in verse 4: “Do not be like your fathers, to whom the former prophets cried out saying, ‘Thus says the Lord of Hosts [כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת], Return from your evil ways and your evil deeds [שׁוּבוּ נָא מִדְרֹכֵיכֶם הָרָעִים וּמִמַּעַלְלֵיכֶם הָרָעִים].’ But they did not listen or pay attention to me, declares the Lord [וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ וְלֹא הִקְשִׁיבוּ אֵלַי נְאֻם־יְהוָה].”

It is self-evident that Zechariah is here quoting/summarizing the message of the former prophets, though interpreters are divided on the issue of to which prophet or

---

<sup>20</sup>Petitjean, *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie*, 29.

prophets he is referring. Some say Jeremiah 25:5a, 7a (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וּמָרַעַ) (וְלֹא־שָׁמַעְתֶּם אֵלַי נְאֻם־יְהוָה, מְעַלְלֵיכֶם) is the primary reference text.<sup>21</sup> They also allow the possibility that texts such as Jeremiah 18:11 (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ דְרָכֵיכֶם) (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ מְעַלְלֵיכֶם), 35:15 (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ מְעַלְלֵיכֶם), and Ezekiel 33:11 (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ מְעַלְלֵיכֶם) may also be in view.<sup>22</sup> Similar language is present elsewhere in Ezekiel, as in 14:6 (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ מְעַלְלֵיכֶם) (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ מְעַלְלֵיכֶם), and 18:30 (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ מְעַלְלֵיכֶם) (שובו־נָא אִישׁ מְדַרְכוּ הָרָעָה וְהִיטִיבוּ מְעַלְלֵיכֶם).

Stead observes, “In Jeremiah (and Ezekiel too, for that matter), the imperative [of שׁוּבוּ] always has the sense of ‘Turn *from*’ rather than ‘Return *to*.’”<sup>23</sup> Despite the fact that שׁוּבוּ־נָא (or שׁוּבוּ־נָא) is only used by Zechariah 1:4 and Jeremiah 18:11, 25:5, and 35:15, it is this “turn from [some evil act]” language that makes Ezekiel stand alongside of Jeremiah as a likely candidate of Zechariah’s reference.

In favor of a combination of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Zechariah labels this quotation as from the former prophets (הַנְּבִיאִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים), plural, and thus it appears inappropriate to limit the source to a single prophet. “One may infer that the author of Zech. 1:4 has viewed such texts as Jer. 11:18; 25:5; 35:15; Ezek 33:11 as typical of pre-586 prophetic language and has appropriated it as the sort of things such prophets said.”<sup>24</sup> Against this notion of multiple prophets/sources, Michael Stead and Heiko Wenzel both point out that Jeremiah 25 is itself a summary of former prophets, which gives Zechariah

---

<sup>21</sup>E.g., Heiko Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah with Zechariah 1:1-6 as the Introduction to the Entire Book*, CBET 59 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011), 63; Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 31-32; Robert Hanhart, *Sacharja 1-8*, BKAT 15 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998), 24; Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah*, 111.

<sup>22</sup>See, e.g., Joyce G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, TOTC (London: Tyndale Press, 1972), 95; David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 132-33; W. A. M. Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8: Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Frühnachexilischen Prophetie*, (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Comp., 1967), 98.

<sup>23</sup>Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 79 (italics original).

<sup>24</sup>Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 132-33.

the ability to reference a single text and simultaneously invoke multiple prophets.<sup>25</sup> In any case, the language is clearly Jeremian (לֹא שָׁמַע + מַעַלְל + דָּרָךְ + רַע + מִן + שׁוּבוּ נָא) and perhaps means to include Ezekiel as well.<sup>26</sup>

Other considerations point to Jeremiah. First is the very beginning of the former prophets' quoted speech in Zechariah 1:4, כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת (cf. Zech 1:3). As a part of 1:4's quoted speech, we should expect to find this phrase in the writings of earlier prophets. Excluding Haggai, Malachi, and 2 Chronicles, writings that either postdate Zechariah or are of the same period, the phrase occurs once in 1 Samuel 15:2, once in 2 Samuel 7:8, and 50 times in Jeremiah.

Another consideration is the combination of the terms דָּרָךְ and מַעַלְל, which occurs in both Zechariah 1:4 and 6 to describe the fathers' "evil ways and evil deeds."<sup>27</sup> Jeremiah combines these terms multiple times (cf. 4:18; 7:3, 5; 17:10; 18:11; 23:22; 25:5; 26:3, 13; 32:19; 35:15), and they are paired elsewhere only four times.<sup>28</sup> To this observation Théophane Chary adds, "Il est remarquable que ce couple . . . constitue quasiment un monopole de Jérémie . . . et que chaque fois il est au centre d'un appel à la conversion, d'une prédication morale." Both the like terms and like contexts support a Jeremian reference here. "Zacharie se place donc franchement dans le sillage de ce grand maître et répercute son message pour l'heure présente."<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 32; Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah*, 63-79.

<sup>26</sup>The closest parallel outside of Jer and Ezek is 2 Kgs 17:13 (שׁוּבוּ מִדְרָכֵיכֶם הָרָעִים). This verse also mentions "your fathers" and "my servants the prophets," both mentioned in Zechariah's introductory verses, and summarizes the message of every prophet and seer as "return from your evil ways and keep my statutes and commandments." Cf. Marvin Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 2:572. Sweeney, commenting on Zech 1:4, says, "Such language is characteristic of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer 15:7; 18:8, 11; 25:5; 26:3; 35:15; 36:3, 7; 44:5; 23:14, 22) and the Deuteronomistic historical work (1 Kgs 8:35; 13:33; 2 Kgs 17:13), with which Jeremiah is frequently associated."

<sup>27</sup>The MT of Zech 1:4 has both מַעַלְל (qere) and מַעַלִּיל (ketiv). 1:6 has מַעַלְל only.

<sup>28</sup>Judg 2:19, Hos 4:9 and 12:3, and Ezek 36:31.

<sup>29</sup>Théophane Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), 54.



These two considerations (the multiple occurrences of this couple and “thus says the Lord of hosts” 50 times in Jeremiah) seem to solidify the view that the texts of Jeremiah, perhaps especially 25:5, 7, are Zechariah 1:4’s primary references (כה אָמַר יְהוָה) (כה אָמַר יְהוָה begins Jeremiah 25:8), although this does not necessarily exclude Ezekiel.<sup>30</sup>

Besides the direct quote of the former prophets, additional places of overlap exist within Zechariah’s introduction. 1:1, בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַשָּׁנָה שְׁתַּיִם לְדַרְיוֹשׁ הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָה, along with an individual component of it, הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָה, are also common in prophetic writings.

וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי and variations of it (e.g., וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי) are abundantly used by earlier writers. The single Pentateuchal occurrence is Genesis 15:1, הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי. It also shows up a handful of times in the Former Prophets and the Writings (cf. 1 Sam 15:10; 2 Sam 7:4; 24:11; 1 Kgs 13:20; 16:1; 17:2, 8; 21:17, 28; 18:1, 31; 2 Kgs 20:4; 1 Chr 22:8; 2 Chr 11:2; 12:7). Interestingly, the overwhelming majority of instances are in the Latter Prophets (cf. Hos 1:1; Joel 1:1; Jonah 1:1; 3:1; Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1; Hag 2:10, 20), especially Jeremiah (29x) and Ezekiel (50x).<sup>31</sup>

While the presence of this phrase at the beginning of numerous prophetic writings seems to detract from the notion that Zechariah is particularly evoking the language of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the multiple reoccurrences of the phrase in Zechariah (see 1:1, 7; 4:6, 8; 6:9; 7:1, 4, 8; 8:1, 18), Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, something lacking in the other writings, argues in favor of it. Even if Jeremiah and Ezekiel are not the sole precursors, the language is clearly evocative of the earlier prophetic stream.

The same is true of the full formulation of Zechariah 1:1: “In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, the word of the Lord came to Zechariah the prophet, the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo.” The specification of the month and the year (and the day

---

<sup>30</sup>*Pace* Beuken. See Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8*, 98.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Petitjean, *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie*, 7; Hanhart, *Sacharja 1-8*, 22.

in Zech 1:7 and 7:1) distinguishes this opening from the general timeframe or lack of timeframe of other prophetic books. So, for example, Isaiah 1:1, “The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah . . .”; Hosea 1:1, “The word of the Lord that came to Hosea, the son of Beeri, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel . . .”; And Joel 1:1, “The word of the Lord that came to Joel, the son of Pethuel” (cf. Amos 1:1; Obad 1:1; Jonah 1:1; Mic 1:1; Nah 1:1; Hab 1:1; Zeph 1:1; Mal 1:1). It is Ezekiel and Jeremiah whose mold Zechariah most closely fits.

Ezekiel specifies the date of the reception of the word of the Lord on numerous occasions. For example, 20:1-2, “In the seventh year [of our exile], in the fifth month, on the tenth day of the month, certain of the elders of Israel came to inquire of the Lord and sat before me. And the word of the Lord came to me”; 24:1, “In the ninth year [of our exile], in the tenth month, on the tenth day of the month, the word of the Lord came to me” (cf. 26:1; 29:1, 17; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1, 17; 33:21-23; 40:1).

Moreover, the opening of Ezekiel’s book (1:1-3) shares many features with that of Zechariah’s: “In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month . . . (it was the fifth year of the exile of King Jehoiachin), the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel the priest, the son of Buzi.” Both include a specified date for the word, mention of a king, and “the word of the Lord came to” followed by the recipient (Zechariah/Ezekiel), the recipient’s office (prophet/priest), and the recipient’s lineage.<sup>32</sup>

Jeremiah also shares a peculiar feature with Zechariah 1:1, as he dates the reception of his word by the reign of a foreign king. Though these are not the only two

---

<sup>32</sup>Cf. Ellen F. Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel’s Prophecy*, JSOTSup 78 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 150n27. Davis, commenting on the date formulations of Ezekiel, writes, “That such a dating system was recognized as a mark of authenticity in prophetic speech is indicated by its imitation in Haggai and Zechariah.”

writings to do this (cf. Hag 1:1; 1:15; 2:10), its occurrence in Jeremiah 25:1 makes it noteworthy. It reads, “The word which came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah (that was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon).”

I noted above that Zechariah 1:4 is very close to Jeremiah 25:5, 7. Further, both Zechariah 1:12 and Jeremiah 25:11 reference the “seventy years” of the Lord’s anger with Jerusalem and Judah’s cities. In light of this, Zechariah 1:1 likely stands in line with Jeremiah 25:1, the first prophetic writing to key the reception of the word of the Lord to a foreign king’s reign. The first year of Nebuchadnezzar is mentioned here, and the only other specified year of Nebuchadnezzar, his nineteenth year, the year of the temple’s destruction, is mentioned in Jeremiah 52:12. Other specific date formulas are present throughout Jeremiah and serve to mark major events in the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. 39:1-2; 52:4). Byron Curtis has argued that with the dates of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 “in imitation of and counterbalance to the date forms of Jeremiah that memorialized the temple’s loss, we find the returned community’s eschatological and imminent expectation of the end of seventy years’ chastisement.”<sup>33</sup> In short, Jeremiah’s dates marked judgment and temple destruction, Zechariah’s, imminent restoration and reconstruction.<sup>34</sup>

In light of the affinity of certain features of Zechariah 1:1 with Ezekiel, and others with Jeremiah, it is best to view both as influential precursors that helped shape Zechariah’s opening.

The language of “my servants the prophets,” found in Zechariah 1:6, is also

---

<sup>33</sup>Byron G. Curtis, “Eschatological Expectation and the Date Formulae in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8” (paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature, November, 1992), 17. Curtis along with several others (e.g., Meyers and Meyers) see Haggai and Zech 1-8 as a composite writing, to which Zech 9-14 was later added.

<sup>34</sup>The year + month (+day) dating also accompanies the erection of the tabernacle in Exod 40:17, the beginning of temple construction in 1 Kgs 6:1, and the completion of the temple in 1 Kgs 6:38. Ezra 3:8 also dates the appointment of the Levites to oversee the reconstruction of the temple.

reminiscent of Jeremiah (7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19; 35:15; 44:4; cf. Dan 9:2, 6, 9).<sup>35</sup> And the form אָבוֹתֵיכֶם (“your fathers”; Zech 1:2, 4, and 5) appears most frequently in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Joshua (11x, 5x, and 6x respectively).<sup>36</sup>

Another observational support is the repeat of formulaic phrases like “says the Lord of Hosts” and “declares the Lord of Hosts.” Verse 3 repeats these three times:

וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת שׁוּבוּ אֵלַי נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וְאָשׁוּב אֲלֵיכֶם אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת.

“There are more formulaic words [12] than there are words in the oracle itself [4].”<sup>37</sup> It is

possible that the LXX deemed the repetition superfluous, as it excises several of Zechariah’s repetitive words: καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με καὶ ἐπιστραφήσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς λέγει κύριος. It seems likely, though, that the repeated phraseology is intentional. It has the purpose of placing this prophecy firmly in line with the prophetic tradition. As Al Wolters writes, “The frequent use of these standard prophetic formulas in Zechariah is further evidence that the prophet saw himself as standing in continuity with the tradition of preexilic prophecy.”<sup>38</sup> This hypothesis finds support in the occurrence of אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת and אֲנִי-יְהוָה within the quoted portion of the former prophets in verse 4.

Lastly, commentators have noted that Zechariah 1:6a, “Surely my words and my statutes (דְּבַרֵי וְחֻקֵי) which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not overtake (הֲשִׁיגוּ) your fathers?” is very close to Deuteronomy 28:15 and 45, “But if you

---

<sup>35</sup>It also occurs a handful of times in 2 Kgs (9:7; 17:13, 23; 21:10; 24:2) and once in Ezek 38:17, Amos 3:7, and Ezra 9:11. Cf. Martin Hallaschka, *Haggai und Sacharja 1-8: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, BZAW 411 (Berlin: De Gruyter), 145. “Die Bezeichnung der Propheten als עבדי הנביאים ist wiederum dtr Sprachgebrauch entlehnt und verweist wie Sach 1,4 ebenfalls besonders auf das Jeremia-Buch.”

<sup>36</sup>Other occurrences include Exod 3:13, 1 Sam (2x), 2 Chr (2x), Ps 95:9, Isa 65:7, and Hos 9:10.

<sup>37</sup>Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 130. Petersen counts ten formulaic words, but he apparently excludes אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת from consideration. I am unsure why.

<sup>38</sup>Al Wolters, *Zechariah* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014), 36. See pp. 36-38 for the statistics of these formulaic phrases throughout Zechariah, which he calls “Yahweh-revelation formulas.”

will not obey the voice of the Lord your God or be careful to do all his commandments and statutes (אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתָיו וְחֻקֹּתָיו) that I command you today, then all these curses . . . shall overtake you (הַשִּׁיגוּךְ),” and “All these curses . . . shall overtake you (הַשִּׁיגוּךְ) till you are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God, to keep his commandments and statutes (מִצְוֹתָיו וְחֻקֹּתָיו) that he commanded you.”<sup>39</sup> Each of these places contains talk of disobedience (see Zech 1:4), commandments/words and statutes (חֻק and דְּבַר/מִצְוָה), and overtaking (נִשְׁגָּח) those who will be or have been disobedient.<sup>40</sup>

Every verse of Zechariah 1:1-6 contains an echo of the past. Taken together, the number of prophetic reminiscences in the span of these six short verses is quite remarkable: the mention of the former prophets and the quote in 1:4; כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in 1:3 and 1:4 and 50 times in Jeremiah; the combination of דָּרַךְ and מַעַלְלֵי used to describe evil ways and deeds in 1:4 and 1:6 and its multiple occurrences in Jeremiah (11x); Zechariah 1:1’s opening cast in the mold of Ezekiel’s and sharing of features specific to Ezekiel and Jeremiah; the presence of הִזְיָה דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֵל (or a variation of it) in 1:1 and superabundantly in Jeremiah (50x) and Ezekiel (29x); the language of “my servants the prophets” in 1:6 reminiscent of Jeremiah; the form אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם in 1:2, 1:4, and 1:5 consonant with that found mainly in Jeremiah and Ezekiel; the inordinate amount of formulaic expressions; and finally, 1:6’s recalling of Deuteronomy 28. These introductory verses are “well aware of the legacy of classical prophecy,”<sup>41</sup> “a pastiche of

---

<sup>39</sup>See, e.g., Hanhart, *Sacharja 1-8*, 32; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 96; Petitjean, *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie*, 47; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, KAT 13, no. 4 (Gütersloh, Germany: Mohn, 1976), 70; Risto Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1-8 and 9-14* (Turku, Finland: Abo Akademi University, 1996), 187-88.

<sup>40</sup>The verb נִשְׁגָּח coupled with curses or words and commandments overtaking people for disobedience is peculiar to Zech 1:6 and Deut 28. Deut 28:2 similarly speaks of blessings that will overtake an obedient people.

<sup>41</sup>Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 101.

typical prophetic materials.”<sup>42</sup>

With the language of the former prophets featuring so prominently in Zechariah 1:1-6, it is most appropriate, with Stead and Petitjean, to look to the former prophets in order to solve the problem of וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם at the beginning of 1:3. But what approach best explains it? Does Zechariah 1:3a intend to invoke a specific text, as Stead suggests? Should we, with Petitjean, think of this as an expression that had been stereotyped by Jeremiah and Ezekiel and freely used by Zechariah? Or is there another available option?

### **Stead and Single Texts**

As noted, Michael Stead identifies a single text, Ezekiel 2:4, as Zechariah 1:3a’s point of allusion. His conclusion rests on several factors. First, the places share similar phraseology: וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in Zechariah 1:3 and, in Ezekiel 2:4, וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה. Second, “In the present context of Yahweh’s ‘wrath against the fathers,’ the closest semantic parallel to Zech 1:3 occurs in Ezek 2:3-4, which is addressed to ‘they and their fathers.’”<sup>43</sup> And last, “In Ezek 2:4, this phrase fits grammatically, the antecedent of אֲלֵיהֶם is defined, and the perfect וְאָמַרְתָּ, which follows a participle, has imperatival force.”<sup>44</sup>

Regarding this last point, the same can be said of each of the remaining 52 occurrences of וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם (or אֲלֵיהֶם) outside of Zechariah. In every case the antecedent of אֲלֵיהֶם/אֲלֵיהֶם is defined by the broader context and the perfect picks up the imperatival force “you shall say” from a preceding construction. Stead’s first point about Ezek 2:4’s similar phrase is likewise unremarkable. As he himself points out, similar phrases abound

---

<sup>42</sup>Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 135.

<sup>43</sup>Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 77-78.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, 78.

in Jeremiah and Ezekiel (cf. Ezek 3:11, 27; 14:4; 20:3, 5, 27; 24:3; 37:12; Jer 8:4; 11:3; 13:13; 15:2; 26:4), including several places of exact correspondence (Jer 19:11; 25:27, 28; 43:10).<sup>45</sup> The remaining consideration, that Ezek 2:4 is the “closest semantic parallel” to Zechariah 1:3, based on the correspondence of “wrath against the fathers” and “they and their fathers,” is also open to question.

In light of this, with the remainder of this section I wish to explore Jeremiah and Ezekiel for other possible single intertexts for Zechariah 1:3. The similar phraseology present in numerous texts and the ability to ease the grammatical tension of Zechariah builds the foundation for a supposed allusion. In order to attempt to single out one text among the many options, I search for additional support for the allusion with overlap in theme, topic, and vocabulary.

Based on the findings of the previous section, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are more likely candidates for a single text than the Pentateuch (the only three books with the phrase “and you shall say to them”). Additionally, while there are numerous occurrences of **וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם** in Leviticus and Numbers, and one occurrence each in Genesis and Exodus, none of these is followed by **כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת** or a variation of it. Jeremiah and Ezekiel offer several such places.

Four verses in Jeremiah offer the closest parallel to the extended beginning of Zechariah 1:3. Jeremiah 19:11, 25:27, 28, and 43:10 all begin with **וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם כֹּה-אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת**.<sup>46</sup> Jeremiah 43:10 lacks additional parallels with Zechariah 1:1-6. A few verses after Jeremiah 19:11, 19:15 makes mention of the people’s failure to hear the words of the Lord (**לִבְלֹתִי שְׁמוֹעַ אֶת-דְּבָרֵי**); cf. Zech 1:4 and 6), but nothing further meriting notice. The surrounding verses of Jeremiah 25:27 and 28, however, have several very

---

<sup>45</sup>The only variation is between the long and short form of **אֲלֵהֶם**. Zechariah has the short form.

<sup>46</sup>The only difference with Zechariah is the long form of **אֲלֵיהֶם**. Also, in Jer 25:27 and 43:10, the title for God is extended beyond “Lord of Hosts” to include **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**.

close parallels to 1:1-6.

As noted above, 1:4 possibly quotes 25:5 and 7. 25:1 dates the word which came to Jeremiah with reference to Nebuchadnezzar's first year (cf. Zech 1:1). The seventy years occurs in 25:11 (cf. Zech 1:12). Jeremiah 25:4 has "*you have neither listened nor inclined your ears to hear, although the Lord persistently sent to you all his servants the prophets*" (cf. Zech 1:4, 6), and 25:7 speaks of provoking the Lord to anger (cf. Zech 1:2, "The Lord was very angry with your fathers"). It is also noteworthy that the extended beginning of Zechariah 1:3 appears here twice in the span of two verses (25:27 and 28).

However, a couple of factors make it doubtful that Zechariah specifically alludes to these verses. Starting in verse 15 of Jeremiah 25 the chapter shifts its focus from Judah and Jerusalem to the Lord's anger against the nations. The nations are the referent of "them" in the "to them" of verses 27 and 28, and in Zechariah 1:3 the referent is clearly Israel. Though this is not impossible to reconcile with Zechariah's method of employing previous prophets, a natural explanation for the change here is not readily available. In sum, while the first part of Jeremiah 25 has many close affinities with the early verses of Zechariah, the latter part, in which verses 27 and 28 occur, does not. I conclude that Zechariah 1:3 is not alluding to Jeremiah 25:27-28, which leads to further investigation.

There are three variations of כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת following וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם in Jeremiah and Ezekiel: כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה (Jer 8:4; 13:13; 15:2; 26:4), כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Jer 11:3), and כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה (Ezek 3:11, 27; 14:4; 20:3, 5, 27; 24:3; 37:12).

Jeremiah 8:4 and its context offer very close parallels to Zechariah 1:1-6. Jeremiah 8:4-5 reads, "And you shall say to them, Thus says the Lord: When men fall, do they not rise again? If one turns away, does he not return (אִם־יָשׁוּב וְלֹא יָשׁוּב)? Why has this people, Jerusalem, turned away (שׁוֹבְבָה) with perpetual turning (מְשַׁבָּה)? They hold fast to deceit; they refuse to return (לֹא־יָשׁוּב)." To begin with, the "them" of "to them" is



clearly defined in Jeremiah as the present generation of Israelites to whom Jeremiah is to speak. More importantly, turning to God is the topic of Zechariah 1:3: “And you shall say to them, ‘Thus says the Lord of Hosts: Return (שׁוּבוּ) to me, says the Lord of Hosts, and I will return (אֲשׁוּבָה) to you.’” Zechariah 1:4 also recounts the prophets’ message to the fathers to *turn* from their ways and the fathers’ failure to listen. Returning, or a failure to do so, is central in both places.

Further correspondences occur in the broader context. Jeremiah 7:25-27, part of the same section as 8:4, reads,

From the day that your fathers came out of the land of Egypt to this day, I have persistently sent all my servants the prophets to them, day after day. Yet they did not listen or incline their ear, but stiffened their neck. They did worse than their fathers. So you shall speak all these words to them, but they will not listen to you. You shall call to them, but they will not answer you.

These verses contain the shared language of “your fathers,” “my servants the prophets” (cf. Zech 1:6), and “they did not/will not listen.” Jeremiah is summarizing the prophets’ mission and the constant disobedience of the people in spite of it, like Zechariah 1:4. Jeremiah’s “generation of [God’s] wrath” (Jer 7:29) is the “fathers” of Zechariah’s generation against whom the Lord was very angry (Zech 1:2). Jeremiah 7:27 says “they will not listen” to God’s words, and Zechariah 1:4 reflects back on this: “they did not listen.” All in all, the main topics covered in Zechariah 1:1-6, the Lord’s anger with the fathers, turn/return, disobedience, and the prophets, each appear in the context of Jeremiah 8:4.

In addition to these considerations, the context also offers an answer to the question of Zechariah 1:5a, “Your fathers, where are they?” Commentators commonly deduce two answers based on Zechariah’s context and a general knowledge of Israel’s history: They are dead, or, they are in exile.<sup>47</sup> Jeremiah 8:4’s context offers a more

---

<sup>47</sup>So, e.g., Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah*, 112; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 95; Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, 69; Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 133; Sweeney, *The Minor Prophets*, 2:572; Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, 95.

specific answer: They are nowhere to be found, because God’s wrath has made them “food for the birds of the air, and for the beasts of the earth,” (Jer 7:33) and “dung on the surface of the ground” (Jer 8:2).

Regarding whether Jeremiah 8:4 is Zechariah 1:3a’s single text of allusion, these collective considerations are inconclusive. There are, though, enough notable parallels between the two texts to undermine the notability of Ezekiel 2:4, which is proposed by Stead on even less evidence.

As for the remaining texts with similar beginnings, the majority share only a couple of touching points with Zechariah 1:1-6. For Jeremiah 13:13: “they would not listen” (13:11; cf. Zech 1:4); “fathers and sons together . . . I will not pity . . . that I should not destroy them” (13:14); an answer to the whereabouts of the fathers. For Jeremiah 15:2: “they did not turn from their ways” (15:7; cf. Zech 1:4); an answer to the question of 1:5a, “I will appoint over them four kinds of destroyers, declares the Lord: the sword to kill, the dogs to tear, and the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth to devour and destroy” (15:3). For Jeremiah 26:4: “it may be they will listen and every one turn from his evil way” (26:3; cf. Zech 1:4); “my servants the prophets” (26:5; cf. Zech 1:6). For Ezekiel 3:11: “the house of Israel will not be willing to listen to you, because they are not willing to listen to me” (3:7; cf. Zech 1:4).

Jeremiah 11:3 has more than a few parallels. The “them” in “to them” is clearly defined as the “men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem” (11:2). The context contains “your fathers” (11:4, 5, 7; cf. Zech 1:2, 5), “they did not listen” (11:8; cf. Zech 1:4), and “they have turned [שוב] to the iniquities of their forefathers (אָבוֹתָם הִרְאִשְׁנִים)” (11:10; cf. Zech 1:4, which includes the language of turning and an interesting parallel with הִנְבִּיאִים הִרְאִשְׁנִים).

Further, the specific way in which the prophets call for repentance is identical. Jeremiah 11 recalls the covenant the Lord made with the fathers when he brought them out of Egypt. It does this to set them forth as an example of what is going to happen to

the present generation if they do not obey the covenant: “cursed be the man who does not hear the words of this covenant” (Jer 11:3); “they [the fathers] did not obey . . . therefore I brought upon them all the words of this covenant” (Jer 11:8). In the same way, Zechariah sets forth the judgment of the previous generation as an example to warn the present generation to return: “Do not be like your fathers” (1:4a). He also uses the language of the covenant curses, as found in Deuteronomy 28, to describe what happened to them: “My words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not overtake your fathers?” (1:6a). Zechariah looks back on and affirms Jeremiah’s predicted disasters (cf. Jer 11:10-11).

As with Jeremiah 8:4, Jeremiah 11:3 and its context offer some very close correspondences with Zechariah 1:3 and its introduction. If this were the only place within the prophets with this much substantial overlap, a good argument could be made for a single intertext. The problem is that Jeremiah itself offers viable competing options. The correlations peculiar to Jeremiah 8:4 undermine the strength of the parallels here to conclude without hesitation the reliance of Zechariah upon Jeremiah 11:3.

The remaining texts in Ezekiel contain less overlap than Jeremiah 8 and 11. Other than the topic of turning (שוב) sandwiched between the extended phrase’s appearances in Ezekiel 3:11 and 3:27 (3:18-21), no other parallels stand out. Ezekiel 14:4 is noteworthy because 14:6 contains the call for the people to **שובו וְהָשִׁיבוּ מֵעַל גְּלוּלֵיכֶם** **שובו וְהָשִׁיבוּ מֵעַל גְּלוּלֵיכֶם**, which is similar to that in Zechariah 1:4, **שובו נָא מִדְּרָכֵיכֶם**, **שובו נָא מִדְּרָכֵיכֶם**, **וּמֵעַל לֵילֵיכֶם הָרָעִים**. Ezekiel 20 repeats the phrase under examination (“and you shall say to them, thus says the Lord God”) three times (20:3, 5, and 27), and it has a couple of other connections: 20:1 includes the specifics of year, month, and day (cf. Zech 1:1), and the bulk of the chapter stories the “abominations of the fathers” (Ezek 20:4) and the ensuing punishments with an appeal for Ezekiel’s audience to listen (cf. Zech 1:3-6). Aside from the specific date of Ezekiel 24:1, 24:3 offers nothing further, and Ezekiel 37:12 offers nothing.

This completes the exploration of the places in Jeremiah and Ezekiel that include a phrase similar to Zechariah's "And you shall say to them, thus says the Lord of Hosts." Jeremiah 8:4 and 11:3 are both attractive options as single intertexts, even more so than Ezekiel 2:4, but both also seem to mutually undermine the other, as do the multiple like phrases in contexts where there is at least some additional overlap. This pervasiveness of shared prophetic language, even evident when exploring select portions in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, leaves room for a different allusive approach in solving the problem of Zechariah 1:3.

### **Petitjean and a Stereotypical Phrase**

Albert Petitjean supposes that "Zacharie emploie *w'āmartā* *'aléhèm* comme une expression stéréotypée."<sup>48</sup> He bases this on the number of attestations of the phrase within Jeremiah and Ezekiel.<sup>49</sup> If the phrase presented itself to Zechariah as stereotypical, then neither a preceding imperative nor an explicit referent for "them" is needed. The uniformity of the abundant occurrences in Jeremiah and Ezekiel overrides the grammatical discrepancies. This line of thinking is preferable to that which seeks to find a single text for various reasons.

One, as exhibited above, no single text stands out among the others. The fact that numerous texts present themselves as plausible referents discourages pinpointing only one. Another reason, as also shown above, is the common use, rather than the particular use, of the previous prophets in this introductory section of Zechariah. That is, the majority of the reminiscences present in these six verses do not point to a single text but rather to the prophetic pool more generally, with Jeremiah and Ezekiel holding the prominent positions. Even in the quoted portion of Zechariah 1:4 several places of

---

<sup>48</sup>Petitjean, *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie*, 28.

<sup>49</sup>He further notes the presence of the extended form of the phrase, "And you shall say to them, thus says YHWH," throughout both prophets. (Ibid).

potential dependence within multiple sources exist. It therefore seems most natural that **וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם** recalls the plentitude of occurrences throughout earlier prophets.

In this way, I partially agree with Stead and wish to say more than Petitjean. Petitjean's label "stereotypical" does not leave room for an allusive function, and though Stead thinks that the "ungrammaticality" was intentional, recalling another text, I think the ellipsis was meant to signal his indebtedness to the multiple prophetic precursors who had, each one, given the full version of his now-abbreviated phrase.

Everything in Zechariah 1:1-6 works together to point Zechariah's current generation back to the earlier prophets and to set the trajectory for the rest of his book. Zechariah 1:3a is no exception. It seems undeniable that Zechariah would have been aware that the phrase "and you shall say to them" always follows something that clearly imperativizes it and that it is always in a context where the referent is specified. By deciding to exclude these things, he subtly yet forcefully highlights the extent of his appeal to the earlier prophets. The phrase, then, is elliptical and allusive. As such, it points to another body of texts and draws attention, at a micro-level, to their importance for filling out Zechariah's prophecy, working side by side with the rest of the introduction to underline its indebtedness to them.

I also want to mention the possibility, or what I think is a probability, that Jeremiah and Ezekiel are not solely responsible for Zechariah's use of this phrase.<sup>50</sup> As noted, it also appears 23 times in the Pentateuch. Interestingly, the Pentateuch is responsible for all but one of the uses of the short form of **אֲלֵהֶם**, the form of Zechariah (cf. Ezek 20:3). Jeremiah and Ezekiel almost exclusively represent the long form, **אֲלֵיהֶם**. Outside of Zechariah, 22 of the 23 short forms are in the Pentateuch, and 29 of the 30 long forms are in Jeremiah and Ezekiel (cf. Lev 17:2). His use of the short form, then, aligns more closely with the Pentateuch than Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Though far from

---

<sup>50</sup>Petitjean mentions only these two prophets in his discussion of Zech 1:3.

certain, perhaps the move was made intentionally in order to encompass all of them.<sup>51</sup> In addition to this, the Pentateuchal occurrences more uniformly and formulaically identify the referents of “them,” and thus appear as stronger candidates for the necessary filling out of Zechariah. Again and again, and comprising the bulk of instances present in the Pentateuch, it reads, *דְּבַר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם* (cf. Lev 1:2; 18:2; 23:2, 10; 25:2; 27:2; Num 5:12; 6:2; 15:2, 18, 38; 33:51; 35:10). Leviticus 19:2 has a minor insertion, *אֶל-כָּל-עַדְת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל*. Leviticus 17:2 and 22:18 have a larger insertion, *אֶל-אֲהָרֹן וְאֶל-בְּנָיו*, and Numbers 28:2 and 34:2 slightly vary this, *וְאֶל כָּל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם*.<sup>52</sup> The uniform formula makes these texts a perfectly suitable backdrop that provides the missing components of Zechariah’s text: the imperative and referent.<sup>53</sup> In colloquial terms, if Zechariah 1:3a is a hand, the formula of Leviticus and Numbers fits like a glove.

### Conclusions

Several conclusions flow from this chapter. First, when answering the question of whose proposal, whether Stead’s or Petitjean’s, is more accurate, Zechariah’s own methodology proves valuable. In Zechariah’s introduction, the number of general allusions is abundant, and it appears that he only has a specific text in mind once (i.e.,

---

<sup>51</sup>In this line of thought, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are encompassed by what follows “and you shall say to them” (i.e., “Thus says the Lord of Hosts”), a phrase that is absent in the Pentateuchal occurrences.

<sup>52</sup>The five other Pentateuchal texts are addressed to Joseph’s brothers (Gen 44:4), “the elders of Israel” (Exod 3:16), “the priests, the sons of Aaron” (Lev 21:1), and “the Levites” (Num 18:26, 30).

<sup>53</sup>Jeremiah and Ezekiel are much more variegated when it comes to identifying the referent for “them.” Even when the referent is explicit in a way similar to Leviticus and Numbers (cf. Jer 11:3; 26:4; Ezek 3:11; 20:5, 27; 24:3; 33:2; 34:2; 37:4, 12), the variation is much greater, including the men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem, all the cities of Judah who come to worship, the exiles, the elders of Israel, the house of Israel, the shepherds of Israel, and the bones of Israel. In the non-explicit cases, where the addressee is not fronted in the way found in Leviticus and Numbers, but only gleaned from the context, the referents include the nations, elders, officials, priests, prophets, and the people of Judah/Israel (see Jer 5:19; 7:28; 8:4; 13:12, 13; 14:17; 15:2; 16:11; 17:20; 19:11; 23:33; 25:27, 28, 30; 38:26; 43:9; Ezek 2:4; 3:27; 14:4). Of course, since it is most often in some way referring to the sons of Israel, it is not necessary to exclude Ezekiel and Jeremiah, but Leviticus and Numbers do provide more consistent and refined texts against which Zechariah better reads.

Deut 28 in 1:6). We could term this method “broad.” It is a broad allusion to the earlier prophets that resists confinement to a specific text. The realization and appreciation of Zechariah’s inclination to do this in the introduction should guard against the tendency to settle on one text without proper warrant both here and throughout the remainder of the prophet’s book.

Second, this chapter shows the potential value of a broad allusion in making sense of a text. The collective agreement of the occurrences of “and you shall say to them,” always including both an imperatival precursor and a clear referent, provides the necessary background for understanding Zechariah’s seemingly uncomfortable text. Since this is so, the search for one particular text is unneeded, and, as was shown, ends with multiple competing options each undermining the validity of the others.

Finally, like any good introduction, Zechariah’s sets the tone for the remainder of his book. It firmly entrenches it in the past, and the prophetic voices, as here, continue to shed light on what is dark and add fullness to what is abbreviated. The following chapters intend to manifest this more fully.

## CHAPTER 3

### ZECHARIAH 1:11C, ISAIAH 14:7, AND JEREMIAH

The previous chapter argued for a broad allusion to the former prophets by Zechariah 1:3 and cautioned against asserting a specific text because of Zechariah's inclination towards the prophetic stream as a whole, especially in the introductory verses. Though this chapter deals with specific texts, in light of the previous chapter's findings it argues for the probability that multiple specific texts underlie Zechariah 1:11c. In affirming these, I follow the methodological principles for identifying a particular allusion as laid out in chapter 2: exclusivity (i.e., are the words and/or ideas shared by only a few places), vocabulary overlap, context, multiple allusions to the same context, and interpretational significance. With this chapter I am seeking to do two main things: (1) offer a new interpretation of Al Wolters' proposed allusion of Zechariah 1:11c to Isaiah 14:7, one which is sensitive to Zechariah's context and Zechariah's method of employing earlier prophets, and (2) establish two additional texts to which Zechariah is alluding: Jeremiah 30:10 and 46:27.

#### **Zechariah 1:11c: Text and Context**

Zechariah 1:11 is part of Zechariah's first vision (Zech 1:7-17), which is dated to the second year of Darius (Zech 1:7). In it Zechariah sees "a man riding on a red horse . . . standing among the myrtle trees in the depth and behind him . . . red, sorrel, and white horses" (1:8). "These are they whom the Lord has sent to patrol the earth" (1:10). The report of their patrol is the subject of this chapter: כָּל־הָאָרֶץ יִשְׁבֹּת וְשָׁקֶטָה (1:11c).

Immediately following this report, the angel of the Lord cries out to the Lord, "How long [עַד־מָתַי] will you not have mercy [לֹא־תִרְחַם] on Jerusalem and the cities of



Judah, with whom you have been indignant these seventy years?” (1:12). The remainder of the vision is the Lord’s response to this question (vv. 13-17). He responds with “good words, comforting words” (v. 13), by which the Lord expresses his jealousy for Zion and Jerusalem (v. 14) and his anger with “the nations that are at ease [הַשְּׂאֲנָנִים]” (v. 15). He promises that his “house shall be built in . . . and the measuring line shall be stretched out over Jerusalem [וְנִטְּהָ עַל-יְרוּשָׁלַם]” (v. 16), and that he will “again comfort Zion and again choose Jerusalem [וְנִבְחַר עוֹד בְּיְרוּשָׁלַם]” (v. 17).

These verses mainly entail three interconnected parts: the report of the patrolling horsemen, the angel’s lamenting question, and the Lord’s favorable response, which includes both anger towards the restful nations and restoration for Jerusalem. Any interpretation of Zechariah 1:11c’s report must accord well with the additional parts.

### **Al Wolters’ Interpretation of Zechariah 1:11c**

Again, the horseman’s report is that כָּל-הָאָרֶץ יְשֻׁבָה וְשָׁקֵטָה. Wolters poses the question, “In what sense was there peace in the world at the time of Zechariah’s vision?”<sup>1</sup>

The vision is dated to “the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month, which is the month of Shebat, in the second year of Darius” (1:7). “Commentators are agreed that the Persian date of the vision corresponds to February 15, 519 B.C.E.”<sup>2</sup> Based on this precise date, Wolters proceeds to describe the great unrest in the world at the time, “both politically and spiritually.”<sup>3</sup> Politically, “great upheavals [caused by the Scythians and Elamites] . . . were threatening the Persian Empire.”<sup>4</sup> Spiritually, it was “the time of

---

<sup>1</sup>Al Wolters, “‘The Whole Earth Remains at Peace’ (Zechariah 1:11): The Problem and an Intertextual Clue,” in *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, ed. Mark Boda and Michael Floyd, LHBOTS 475 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 129.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. Wolters notes the possibility that it may be February 14.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 131. For his full discussion, see pp. 129-31.

<sup>4</sup>Wolters, “The Whole Earth Remains at Peace,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 130.

Confucius and Lao-Tze in China, Buddha in India, Zarathustra in Persia, Jeremiah and the other sixth-century prophets in Israel, and the Presocratic philosophers in Greece.”<sup>5</sup> In light of the then current turmoil, Wolters draws the conclusion that “no direct connection” exists between Zechariah’s report and the circumstances of the day.<sup>6</sup>

Instead, he proposes reading the report “as an allusion to Isa 14:7.”<sup>7</sup> Zechariah 1:11c, כְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ יִשְׁבֹּת וְשָׁקֵט, alludes to Isaiah 14:7a, נָחָה שָׁקֵטָה כְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ. He adduces several considerations in favor of this: (1) the grammar of the texts, with כְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ as the subject of twin verbs (perfects in Isaiah and participles in Zechariah), (2) the vocabulary of the texts, with שָׁקֵט used as the second verb and the first verbs, נוּחַ and יָשַׁב, being synonyms, (3) the presence of intertextuality in Zechariah, (4) a clear echo of Isa 14:1a (“the Lord will have compassion on Jacob and will again choose Israel”) in Zechariah 1:17c (“the Lord will again comfort Zion and again choose Jerusalem”) especially the phrase וַיִּבְחַר עוֹד בִּירוּשָׁלַם at the end of each, “that particular sequence of verb, adverb and preposition occurs only here in the MT,”<sup>8</sup> and (5) apparent allusions to Isaiah 14 elsewhere in Zechariah’s visions; Zech 2:13 (Eng. 2:9) / Isa 14:2 (“they shall become plunder for their own slaves”/“the house of Israel will possess the nations as male and female slaves”) and Zech 2:15 (Eng. 2:11) / Isa 14:1 (“Many nations shall join themselves [וַיִּגְלוּ] to the Lord on that day, and shall be my people” / “aliens will join them [וַיִּגְלוּ] and attach themselves to the house of Jacob”).

In addition to these arguments, it is notable that these are the only two texts in

---

<sup>5</sup>Wolters, “The Whole Earth Remains at Peace,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 131.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 134.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 137. See also Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, *Zechariah’s Vision Report and its Earliest Interpreters: A Redaction-critical Study of Zechariah 1-8* LHBOTS 626 (New York: T&T Clark, 2016), 50. Tiemeyer calls it a “plausible textual allusion.”

<sup>8</sup>Wolters, “The Whole Earth Remains at Peace,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 138.

the Hebrew Bible where כָּל־הָאָרֶץ is the subject of the verb שָׁקַט. Contextual and interpretational factors also influence my shared conclusion that this is a specific allusion to Isaiah, but I discuss these later. For now, I present Wolters' interpretation of Zechariah in light of this allusion.

Wolters understands the peace of all the earth to be the happy consequence of Babylon's fall. "The context [of Isa 14] is a taunt-song against the king of Babylon, and [there] the 'peace' of the whole earth refers to relief from oppression at the hands of the king of Babylon."<sup>9</sup> In Zechariah's day, the "condition in which the earth now finds itself is one of exuberant joy at the demise of the despotic king of Babylon."<sup>10</sup> "The situation of the world was one of freedom from Babylonian oppression."<sup>11</sup> The angel's announcement in Zechariah's vision, then, is a joyful one expressing the freedom that the whole earth, including Jerusalem, now enjoys.

In this interpretation, the meaning of the phrase in Isaiah 14:7 is wholly transferred to Zechariah 1:11c. The remainder of the vision, however, does not fit well with this.

### **Contextual Incompatibility**

Two considerations are decisively against the interpretation offered by Wolters. First, the immediate response of the angel (Zech 1:12) to the report of the earth's peace (Zech 1:11c) is a response of lament: "And the angel of the Lord answered and said, 'O Lord of Hosts, how long (עַד־מָתַי) will you not have mercy on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, with which you have been angry these seventy years?'" As Wilhelm Rudolph comments, "Ist dieses über den Tempelplatz hallende >>Friede auf Erden<< aus

---

<sup>9</sup>Al Wolters, *Zechariah* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014), 61.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Wolters, "The Whole Earth Remains at Peace," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 140.

Engelmund nicht eine frohe Botschaft? Offenbar nicht, denn die Reaktion darauf ist: Klage (12)!<sup>12</sup>

If the report referred to the good news that Babylon has been defeated and all the earth is enjoying the peace of her downfall, why would the angel respond in this way?

Wolters attributes the complaint to discord between the world-situation and that of the Jews in Jerusalem: “The Jews themselves were part of the world which now enjoyed post-Babylonian liberty, they were part of ‘the whole earth’ which was ‘at rest and quiet,’ and yet their immediate condition was pitiful.”<sup>13</sup> This seems like a roundabout way of addressing the relationship between the report and the complaint that immediately follows. Since no trace of a positive response to the report occurs anywhere in Zechariah’s vision, it is hard to accept Wolters’ view that the report of the horseman was actually good news. “Ruhe und Stille sind hier bestimmt keine positive Eigenschaften.”<sup>14</sup>

Another consideration works against Wolters’ interpretation. Verse 15 describes the Lord’s anger with “the nations that are at ease” (הַגּוֹיִם הַשְּׂאֲנָנִים), thus drawing a distinction between Jerusalem and the surrounding nations and excluding the former from “all the earth” that is resting quietly. This strongly intimates that the lamentable situation is that the nations are at peace and not Jerusalem.

For Wolters’ interpretation to stand, a distinction must be made between verse 11c’s כָּל־הָאָרֶץ יִשְׁבֵּת וְשָׁקֶטָה and verse 15’s הַגּוֹיִם הַשְּׂאֲנָנִים, a distinction which Wolters does in fact make: “We must . . . distinguish carefully between what is said in 1:15 about ‘the nations,’ meaning by this the oppressors of Israel, and what is said in 1:11 about ‘the

---

<sup>12</sup>Wilhelm Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, KAT 13, no. 4 (Gütersloh, Germany: Mohn, 1976), 77.

<sup>13</sup>Wolters, “The Whole Earth Remains at Peace,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 142. Similarly, Holger Delkurt, *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte: Zur Aufnahme und Abwandlung prophetischer Traditionen*, BZAW 302 (New York: de Gruyter, 2000), 55-56.

<sup>14</sup>W. A. M. Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8: Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Frühnachexilischen Prophetie* (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Comp., 1967), 241.

whole world,' meaning by this the peoples who had themselves suffered oppression [including Israel].”<sup>15</sup>

He bases this upon his reading of the word **הַשְׁאֲנִימִים**, which he distinguishes from **טָקֵט**. He writes, “The former unlike the latter often has a negative connotation, implying complacency, insolence, and pride.”<sup>16</sup> For this sense of the word he appeals to Amos 6:1, Isaiah 37:29, and Psalm 123:4. Elsewhere, however, Wolters himself concedes to places of overlap between the two words. He cites Jeremiah 30:10 as one example: “Jacob shall return and have quiet (**וַיִּשְׁקֵט**) and ease (**וַיִּשְׁאֲנֶה**).” Jeremiah 46:27 is identical, and Jeremiah 48:11 also associates the two words, “Moab has been at ease (**וַיִּשְׁאֲנֶה**) from his youth and he is quiet (**וַיִּשְׁקֵט**).”<sup>17</sup>

In several other places the root **שָׁן** carries this positive connotation. “My people will abide in a peaceful habitation (**בְּנִיחָה שְׁלוֹמָה**), in secure dwellings, and in quiet resting places (**וּבְמִנוּחַת שְׁאֲנִינֹת**)” (Isa 32:18; cf. Isa 32:9 and 11). “Your eyes will see Jerusalem, a peaceful habitation (**נִיחָה שְׁאֲנִינָה**), an immovable tent, whose stakes will never be plucked up, nor will any of its cords be broken” (Isa 33:20).

The adjectival form occurs nine times outside of Zechariah 1:15. Six times it unambiguously means peace or ease (Job 12:5, Isa 32:9, 11, 18; 33:20; Amos 6:1).<sup>18</sup> Another occurrence, Psalm 123:4, does not have enough context to determine the precise meaning, and the remaining two texts in which the adjective is found, 2 Kings 19:28 and

---

<sup>15</sup>Wolters, “The Whole Earth Remains at Peace,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 142-43.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, 142.

<sup>17</sup>The following part of this verse is obscure, but the pairing of these two words is the only thing of import here.

<sup>18</sup>Wolters cites Amos 6:1 as an example of the word meaning “complacency, insolence, and pride.” This, however, is a woe oracle spoken to those at ease (**הַשְׁאֲנִימִים**) in Zion (v. 1), who “lie on beds of ivory and stretch themselves out on their couches, and eat lambs from the flock and calves from the midst of the stall, who sing idle songs to the sound of the harp and like David invent for themselves instruments of music, who drink wine in bowls and anoint themselves with the finest oils” (vv. 4-6). This description, though certainly tied to insolence, perfectly describes people who are enjoying ease/peace.

Isaiah 37:29, are identical and appear to use the word in the sense proposed by Wolters.<sup>19</sup>

Though at times the root  $\text{נאש}$  is used for “peace/ease” with the negative connotation of “complacent” or “insolent,” the Isaiah/Kings occurrence is the only case where the idea of peace/ease seems to be absent. This is important because Wolters’ proposal depends upon severing the notion of peace/ease from  $\text{נאש}$ , leaving only “the negative connotation . . . operative in Zech 1:15.”<sup>20</sup> If only the negative connotation is operative, and the idea of peace/ease is missing, then it would be possible to distinguish between the whole earth at rest (v. 11) and the nations who are insolent (v. 15). However, the overwhelming majority of texts in which  $\text{נאש}$  is present argues strongly against this. Zechariah 1:15’s use may include these negative connotations, but not to the exclusion of the word’s primary meaning.

This being the case, it would be impossible to argue that “the nations at ease (הַגּוֹיִם הַשְּׂאֲנִיִּים)” in Zechariah 1:15 refers to something other than “all the earth [which is] at rest and peaceful (כָּל-הָאָרֶץ יִשְׁבֵּת וְשָׁקֶטָה)” in Zechariah 1:11. The former must be a clarification and explication of the latter. “All the earth” refers to “the nations” and does not include Jerusalem.

The interpretation of Wolters cannot withstand the close relation of these two verses. If the peace of all the earth is the result of the Lord’s promised salvation from oppression for all the earth, as his reading of Isaiah’s prophecy into Zechariah would have it, then it would be very strange for the Lord to be angry with this ease. This problem joined with the curious absence of any rejoicing over the pronouncement of peace, and moreover, the presence of a lament, opens the gateway for an alternative interpretation of Zechariah’s use of Isaiah, one that is sensitive both to the context of the

---

<sup>19</sup>Its verbal form always means to be at ease (Job 3:18; Prov 1:33; Jer 30:10; 46:27; and 48:11).

<sup>20</sup>Wolters, “The Whole Earth Remains at Peace,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 142.

surrounding verses and Zechariah's method of allusion present elsewhere in his book.

### **Zechariah's Freedom: Two Clear Examples**

For all of the reasons listed above (see p. 48), along with other considerations (see below), I agree that Zechariah is here alluding to Isaiah's prophecy. As seen immediately above, however, the context of Zechariah 1:11c disallows a total transfer of the meaning of Isaiah's oracle. Along these lines, others have recognized that Zechariah does not slavishly follow his predecessors when alluding to them.<sup>21</sup> As Lamarche comments, "L'utilisation des écrivains antérieurs n'est jamais ici imitation servile."<sup>22</sup>

This section displays the freedom of Zechariah's incorporation of anterior writers. By detailing two clear and pertinent examples, I hope to justify both the use of Isaiah 14:7 by Zechariah 1:11c and my interpretation of this use, which I set out afterwards.

One clear example of freedom in allusion is Zechariah 10's use of Isaiah.

Zechariah 10:8-11 reads,

I will whistle for them and gather them, for I have redeemed them. And they will be as many as they were. Though I scattered them among peoples and in distant places, they will remember me, and they will live with their children and return. I will bring them back from the land of Egypt and from Assyria I will gather them, and to the land of Gilead and Lebanon I will bring them until there is no room found for them. He shall pass through the sea of troubles and strike down the waves of the sea, and all the depths of the Nile shall be dried up. The pride of Assyria shall be laid low, and the scepter of Egypt shall depart.

Here, Zechariah speaks of a time when the Lord will whistle for his people to gather them in from their exile to Egypt and Assyria, and when Egypt and Assyria will no longer hold their positions of exaltation.

Isaiah 5:26 and 7:18 also include the language of whistling (שרק is used by

---

<sup>21</sup>See chap. 1, pp. 10-12, 14, 19-20.

<sup>22</sup>Paul Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure Littéraire et Messianism* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961), 154. Lamarche's quote refers only to Zech 9-14.

both Zechariah and Isaiah). Isaiah 5:25b-26 reads, “[The Lord’s] anger has not turned away, and his hand is stretched out still. He will raise a signal for distant nations, and he will whistle for them from the ends of the earth. And behold, quickly, speedily they come.” Isaiah 7:17-18, “The Lord will bring upon you and upon your people and upon your father’s house such days as have not come since the day that Ephraim departed from Judah. . . . In that day, the Lord will whistle for the fly that is at the end of the streams of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria.” In both cases the Lord whistles for nations to come and destroy Israel. Egypt and Assyria are specified in Isaiah 7.

Five considerations favor concluding that Zechariah is here alluding to Isaiah. The first and most general is the permeating presence of allusion in Zechariah (see chapters 1 and 2 above).

The second and most compelling consideration is the rarity of the verb שָׁרַק, both of its occurrence and of its particular use here. The verb only appears 12 times in the Hebrew Bible. Outside of Isaiah and Zechariah it never means “to whistle” in the sense of calling someone. Rather, it means “to hiss” and is used to describe the reaction elicited by a cursed and desolated nation. So, Jeremiah 19:8, “And I will make this city a horror, a thing to be hissed at (וְלִשְׂרָקָה). Everyone who passes by it will be horrified and will hiss (וְיִשְׂרָק) because of all its wounds.” This is the verb’s sense in every place but Isaiah and Zechariah (cf. 1 Kgs 9:8; Job 27:23; Jer 49:17; 50:13; Lam 2:15, 16; Ezek 27:36; Zeph 2:15). Additionally, the noun, שָׂרָקָה, means “hissing” in eight of its nine occurrences and is used in the same context, as also illustrated by Jeremiah 19:8 (cf. 2 Chr 29:8; Jer 18:16; 25:9, 18; 29:18; 51:37; Mic 6:16).<sup>23</sup> Zechariah’s uncommon use of the verb, to indicate whistling for someone instead of hissing at someone/something, makes “on pense immédiatement à Es 5,26; 7,18.”<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>The exception is Judg 5:16, which speaks of listening for the “whistling” or “piping” (RSV) of flocks: לִשְׁמֹעַ שָׂרָקוֹת עֹדְרִים.

<sup>24</sup>André Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14 in Commentaire de l’Ancien Testament*, XIc (Paris:



Further, Nicholas Ho Fai Tai points out that “mit der Präposition ל ist es nur noch in Jes 5,26 und 7,18 belegt, wo Jahwe auch das Subjekt ist.”<sup>25</sup> Yahweh whistles for distant nations to destroy Israel (Isa 5:26), for the fly in Egypt and the bee in Assyria, likewise to destroy Israel (Isa 7:18), and for his people to return from Egypt and Assyria for blessing (Zech 10:8). In no other text in the Hebrew Bible is Yahweh the subject of this verb. Zechariah 10:8 paints a “sehr menschliche Bild vom »Pfeifen« Jahwes,” vividly bringing to mind the earlier Isaianic texts.<sup>26</sup> “Somit beruht das Verb in Sach 10,8a direkt auf dem Jesajabuch.”<sup>27</sup>

Third, “In Is 5 God threatens to raise a banner for the nations faraway (מרחוק) and to call upon (שרק) them, whereas according to Zc 10,9 the Israelites will remember God in distant places (במרחקים).”<sup>28</sup>

The presence of Egypt and Assyria in both texts is the fourth consideration in support of utilization. The fifth and final, supplementing the fourth, is the reversal involving the people of God and their relationship with these nations. In Isaiah, Yahweh whistles for Egypt and Assyria to come and judge his people. In Zechariah, Yahweh whistles for his people to return from them for blessing. If this is intentional reversal, the use of the verb שרק is surely ironic. Instead of signaling desolation and curse, as it almost exclusively does, it initiates a return to blessing. Zechariah’s use of the verb presents in miniature his reversal of Isaiah’s prophecy.

---

Delachaux & Niestlé, 1981), 167.

<sup>25</sup>Nicholas Ho Fai Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung in Sacharja 9-14: Traditions- und kompositionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Stuttgart, Germany: Calwer Verlag, 1996), 95. See also pp. 102-3, and Risto Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1-8 and 9-14* (Turku, Finland: Abo Akademi University, 1996), 129; Magne Saebø, *Sacharja 9-14: Untersuchungen von Text und Form* (Wageningen, Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 217n1.

<sup>26</sup>Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, 197. Rudolph references both of Isaiah’s texts in this connection.

<sup>27</sup>Ho Fai Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung in Sacharja 9-14*, 95.

<sup>28</sup>Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 130.

For all of these reasons, “A *sure allusion* to Is 5,26; 7,18 can thus be registered in Zc 10,8-10.”<sup>29</sup> “Zach réemploie [Isaiah] en sens contraire.”<sup>30</sup>

Another well-noted example of Zechariah’s freedom in utilizing earlier prophets comes from Zechariah 12:4.<sup>31</sup> “In that day, declares the Lord, I will strike every horse with confusion (בַּתְּמָהוֹן), and its rider with madness (בְּשִׁגְעוֹן). But for the sake of the house of Judah I will keep my eyes open, when I strike every horse of the peoples with blindness (בְּעִוְרוֹן).” Only one other place in the Hebrew Bible combines these three extremely rare words in a single verse, Deuteronomy 28:28. “The Lord will strike you with madness (בְּשִׁגְעוֹן), and with blindness (וּבְעִוְרוֹן), and with confusion of mind (וּבַתְּמָהוֹן).” Two of the words (עִוְרוֹן and תְּמָהוֹן) occur only here, and the other (שִׁגְעוֹן) appears in one other text (2 Kgs 9:20). Moreover, in each case it is the Lord (יהוה) who strikes (נָחַת) with blindness, confusion, and madness.

The contexts are also alike. Deuteronomy 28:28 sits in the midst of a series of curses with which the Lord will strike Israel if she disobeys the terms of the covenant. This specific curse is given in the context of Israel’s defeat at the hand of her enemies, she shall “go out one way against them and flee seven ways before them” (28:25). Zechariah, in “a kind of reversal of judgment,”<sup>32</sup> applies these curses to “the peoples” who have gathered to fight against Jerusalem (12:2-3).

Theologically, it is interesting that in the opening verse of this chapter

---

<sup>29</sup>Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 130 (italics original). Cf. Marvin Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 2:673-74; Katrina Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah: A Study of the Formation of a Mantological Wisdom Anthology*, CBET 6 (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994), 98. Larkin only allows for a “possible” allusion.

<sup>30</sup>Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 167.

<sup>31</sup>See, e.g., Ho Fai Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 162, 164, 171-72; Mark Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 703.

<sup>32</sup>Rex Mason, “The Use of Earlier Biblical Material in Zechariah 9-14: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis,” in *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, JSOTSup 370 (New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 149.

Zechariah designates Yahweh as the one “who stretched out the heavens, founded the earth, and formed the spirit of man within him” (12:1), and so his rule, and seemingly by consequence his covenant and its curses, is over all the nations, not merely over Israel. Irrespective of the theological considerations, however, it is clear that Zechariah applies Israel’s curses of Deuteronomy to all of the nations. It is important, then, to recognize that one of the specific freedoms of Zechariah’s allusive methodology is the application of what was originally applied to Israel to the peoples of the earth.

A recognition and consideration of Zechariah’s freedom, exhibited in both reversal (from judgment against Israel to blessing for them) and a change in recipients of the curses (from Israel to the nations), within Zechariah opens up new possibilities for assessing Zechariah 1:11’s use of Isaiah. A concordant use of Isaiah 14:7 by Zechariah 1:11, as suggested by Wolters, is not the only available option.

### **Zechariah’s Use of Isaiah 14:7**

To summarize the main points thus far, the news that “all the earth is at rest and quiet” in Zechariah 1:11 is not good news for Zechariah’s audience, as evidenced by the ensuing lament of Zechariah 1:12. This phrase alludes to Isaiah 14:7, and it does not necessarily need to be read in the way Isaiah uses it, that is, positively. Instead, if the context is allowed its due weight, the phrase cannot be positive.

I suggest that Zechariah is here recalling Isaiah for rhetorical effect. A message of salvation that should have resulted in rejoicing is instead recalled and applied to a different object, the nations, with the opposite result, lamenting.<sup>33</sup> The original intent of

---

<sup>33</sup>Mark Boda, whose commentary came out near the completion of this chapter, comes to the same conclusions in affirming Isa 14:7 as a source text and disagreeing with Wolters’ interpretation of it. Boda writes, “There is a striking difference between 1:11-12 and its prophetic source in Isa 14. Whereas the peaceful dwelling of ‘all the earth’ in Isa. 14:7 prompts ‘shouts of joy,’ the peaceful dwelling in Zech. 1:11 prompts ‘lament’ to Yahweh in 1:12.” He does not include the Jeremian texts as sources and differs with me by concluding that the report is still meant to be a commentary on Darius (see below for the Jeremian texts and my view on this report’s relation to Darius). “The shaky transition between Cyrus’s son Cambyses and Cambyses’s general Darius in the years just preceding the vision report may have raised expectations that the full restoration of Judah would finally be realized. However, the report of the spies

Isaiah's message heightens the despair effected by Zechariah's use of the phrase in this context. By incorporating an allusion, the report of Zechariah's messengers not only describes the ease of the surrounding nations, from which Jerusalem is excluded, but it also brings to mind the promised peace of the Lord through Isaiah that at this time is yet to be.

This proposal of reversal becomes stronger by comparing the response of the angel with the response recorded in Isaiah. In Isaiah's prophecy, *נְחָה שְׁקֵטָה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ*, and the response is that *פָּצְחוּ רְנָה*. In Zechariah's, *כָּל־הָאָרֶץ יִשְׁבֵּת וְשָׁקֵט*, and the angel responds with *עַד־מָתַי*, "a familiar introduction to prayers that lament intolerable circumstances and express yearning for relief."<sup>34</sup> The lament replaces the song of joy as the promised blessing of Isaiah is suspended and the words of peace that rightly belonged to the people of God are used to describe the nations that are at ease.<sup>35</sup> Essentially, the report that "all the earth is at peace" means that God has not yet done for Jerusalem what he said he would do. Ironically, it is the nations who are enjoying peace and ease.

The peace of Zechariah's day did not meet the expectation of peace described in Isaiah's. Even if "Darius has quelled the revolts across the Persian Empire that greeted his succession for the throne" (though see below), this was not the peaceful state for

---

reveals that the status quo has been reinstated." Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 133.

<sup>34</sup>Meredith Kline, *Glory in Our Midst: A Biblical-theological Reading of Zechariah's Night Visions* (Overland Park, KS: Two Age Press, 2001), 38. See also David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 146. E.g., Pss. 6:4; 13:3; 79:5; 80:5; 90:13.

<sup>35</sup>Kline comments, "What had been promised to God's people as distinctly their blessed future was being enjoyed instead by the other nations." Interestingly, Kline cites Isa 14:7, Jer 30:10 and 46:27 before making this comment, but he is not making the case for an allusion. His full interpretation of the report goes on to include more than what is argued for here. Kline, *Glory in Our Midst*, 32-33. Michael Stead makes a similar comment, "After their [Israel's] punishment, it should be Yahweh's people who enjoy peace and security, and the nations should have been overthrown. The exile is apparently over, but the promised age of peace and security has not materialized for God's people. . . . It is still 'all the earth' which enjoys this peace instead." Stead also mentions all three texts, among others. He thinks Zech 1:11 is a "general allusion to the prophetic expectation of reversal." Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, LHBOTS 506 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 91. Stead also argues for an allusion to Ezek 38:11-12, where Gog plans to attack Israel who is inhabited and at rest. "In a great reversal, it is now Yahweh who will rouse himself and attack, and do to 'Gog' what 'Gog' had done to Israel." Ibid., 91-92. Tiemeyer thinks Ezekiel alludes to Zechariah. Tiemeyer, *Zechariah's Vision Report*, 50-51.

which Israel longed.<sup>36</sup> In fact, according well with this proposed interpretation, the rule of Darius over the Jews was the opposite of the promise the Lord had made through Isaiah: “And the peoples will take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel will possess them in the Lord’s land as male and female slaves. They will take captive those who were their captors, and rule over those who oppressed them” (Isa 14:2). This description marks a day described by Isaiah (14:3) as a day in which the Lord will have given rest to Israel (וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יְהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל). Even though they are back in their land, as Isaiah promised, they are not ruling over anyone, which indicates that the fullness of the blessings is yet to come.

It is the greater expectation of Isaiah, spelled out more fully in the phrase “all the earth is at peace and at rest,” which sets the stage for Zechariah’s report and accounts for the response of lament. With an inexact use of Isaiah’s phrase Zechariah can simultaneously elicit feelings of sorrow and nudge his hearers in the direction of great hope in what the Lord has yet to do. Though the initial response is lament, the vision ends with a reiteration of Isaiah’s hope, “My cities shall again overflow with prosperity, and the Lord will again comfort Zion and again choose Jerusalem” (Zech 1:17; cf. Isa 14:1). These words reaffirm Isaiah’s promise that Israel will one day prosper and be at peace because of Yahweh’s intervention on her behalf. The prophet Jeremiah speaks of this peace in very similar terms.

---

<sup>36</sup>Andrew Hill, *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, TOTC 28 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012), 133. Most commentators hold that the peace of all the earth is a reference to the peaceful situation brought about by the victories and rule of Darius. So, e.g., Eugene H. Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Exegetical Commentary* (Richardson, TX: Biblical Studies Press, 2003), 95n7; Samuel Amsler, *Aggée, Zacharie 1-8*, Commentaire de l’Ancien Testament Xlc (Paris: Delachaux & Niesté, 1981), 63; Théophane Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), 61; Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, AB 25B (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 130; John Calvin, *Zechariah and Malachi*, in vol. 5 of *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950), 34n1; Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 132-33; Martin Hallaschka, *Haggai und Sacharja 1-8: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, BZAW 411 (Berlin: De Gruyter), 299; Friedrich Horst, *Die zwölf Kleinen Propheten: Nahum bis Malachi* (Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), 221; Thomas McComiskey, *Zechariah*, in vol. 3 of *The Minor Prophets*, ed. Thomas McComiskey (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), 1038; Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, 2:578; Henning Graf Reventlow, *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja, und Maleachi* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 42.

### Jeremiah 30:10 and 46:27

Since we know that Zechariah is inclined towards the prophetic stream as a whole, and not necessarily a single text, it is natural to explore elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible for possible allusions, even when a specific allusion has been identified. This exploration leads to Jeremiah 30:10 and 46:27, which are almost identical.<sup>37</sup>

In this case, the two Jeremian texts stand out together with Isaiah as promises that make Zechariah's report especially lamentable. The texts read, "I will save you from far away, and your offspring from the land of their captivity. Jacob shall return and shall be at peace (טִשָּׁקֵט) and at rest (יִשְׁאָט) and there will be none who terrifies him."

Five considerations, taken together, favor the conclusion that Zechariah had these texts in mind during this section of his prophecy. The first and most general, again, is his thoroughly allusive book. The second is the presence of the roots טִשָּׁקֵט and יִשְׁאָט. Both places in Jeremiah have both, as does Zechariah. In Zechariah, "all the earth" is at rest (טִשָּׁקֵט; 1:11) and "the nations" are at ease (יִשְׁאָט; 1:15). The third consideration depends upon the correctness of the interpretation offered above concerning Isaiah's prophecy. If in fact the phrase "all the earth is at rest and quiet" was meant to evoke a sense of jealousy and longing because the described state of peace and serenity was properly the possession of God's people, then Jeremiah's texts work alongside of Isaiah's. Jeremiah too had promised peace and quiet for the people of God after their return from Babylonian exile, and so the message describing the nations in those terms would have been especially lamentable. The fourth is the heavy reliance of Zechariah upon other portions of Jeremiah 30-33.<sup>38</sup> The fifth and final consideration is that the surrounding verses of Jeremiah 30:10 and 46:27 fit nicely with Zechariah's vision when read in light of Isaiah's oracle.

---

<sup>37</sup>The only difference is the presence of נְאֻם־יְהוָה in Jer 30:10.

<sup>38</sup>See especially Elie Assis, "Zechariah 8 and its Allusions to Jeremiah 30-33 and Deutero-Isaiah," *JHebS* 11 (2011): 2-21. See also the literature cited therein.

Jeremiah 30 makes many promises. One of them had been fulfilled, at least partially, in the time of Zechariah, but others had not. The Lord had promised, “I will bring them back to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall take possession of it” (Jer 30:3). The people were back in the land in Zechariah’s time (however, see Zech 2:6-7/10-11 MT), but it was not solely their possession. Darius, a foreign king, ruled over the people of Israel, and the land belonged to him (cf. Zech 1:1, 7; 7:1). This is contrary to what the Lord had promised through Jeremiah: “It shall come to pass in that day . . . I will break his yoke from off your neck, and I will burst your bonds, and *foreigners shall no more make a servant of him*” (Jer 30:8). Immediately following this comes the promise that “they shall serve the Lord their God and David their king, whom I will raise up for them” (Jer 30:9). It was not only a return to the land that Israel was promised but possession of it, and a king “of themselves” and “from their midst” (Jer 20:21) to rule over them. As it stood, a foreign nation had possession of their land, and they served a foreign king. The heading of this vision, “On the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month, which is the month of Shebat, *in the second year of Darius*” (Zechariah 1:7), brings this aspect of the lamentable situation into focus.

Additional notable places of correspondence exist between these sections of the two prophets. In Jeremiah 30:10-11 and 46:27-28 the Lord promises to give “quiet and ease to Jacob” and to make “a full end of all the nations” to which he has driven them. Zechariah, though, has all the earth/the nations at rest and at peace, quite the opposite of complete destruction. Peripherally, both also speak of God’s anger with Israel enacted through the nations (cf. Jer 30:11-16; 46:28; Zech 1:15), and further, Jeremiah 30:11 and 46:28 express the justness of God’s punishment (טַחֲשֵׁב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל; ESV translates, “I will discipline you in just measure”), while Zechariah comments that the nations went beyond the punishment of the Lord (Zech 1:15).

Again, most of these considerations support the reversal at work in Zechariah’s

allusion to Isaiah in its description of the nations.<sup>39</sup> It is this aspect, along with the particular vocabulary used to express it, that makes Jeremiah's texts suitable allusions.

In all, the essential function of the allusions to Isaiah and Jeremiah is to remind the hearers of Israel's promises by describing the current world-situation in like language. The nations were quiet and at rest, but Israel should have been at rest and the nations should have been destroyed. It was a king from the nations who was ruling, but it should have been one from Israel, a king like David. This causes the angel to cry out to the Lord, when Israel should have been rejoicing, and the Lord responds with something very close to the promise for which the angel longed: "The Lord will again comfort Zion and again choose Jerusalem" (Zech 1:17; cf. Isa 14:1, "The Lord will have compassion on Jacob and will again choose Israel"). According to Zechariah, in spite of the current conditions these promises have not been forgotten; the Lord will yet comfort his people.

It would be hard to conclude with certainty that Zechariah meant to evoke the promises of Jeremiah with his report of the messengers and subsequent description of "the nations at ease," but it would likewise be hard to ignore how well these texts fit as a background to his vision and to conclude that they were not at all operating in this capacity. Zechariah 1:11 surely alludes to Isaiah 14. This conclusion makes it easier to accept the allusions to Jeremiah, as it casts the mold for the allusive method present within this vision into which Jeremiah's texts neatly fit. The evidence strongly favors allusions to Jeremiah's texts along with Isaiah's.

### **A Note on Method**

The previous chapter distinguished between a broad allusion to the former prophets and a specific allusion to a single text. In the case of Zechariah 1:11c, both

---

<sup>39</sup>The language of the report is also used later in Zechariah to describe what Jerusalem had formerly enjoyed. Zech 7:7 speaks of a time *בְּהֵיטֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם יֹשְׁבֵת וְשָׁלוֹה*. This observation goes against Wolters' contention that the report applies to Israel's current situation and supports my interpretation quite well.



allusive methods are present. That is, he specifically had Isaiah's phrase in mind, but he also relied on the existence of Jeremiah's texts, and so, in a sense, alluded to the broader prophetic stream. However, the sense is different than what was seen in the first chapter, where there were so many instances of the phrase "and you shall say to them" that the particular texts were swallowed up by the overwhelming amount of common appearances. Here, the appeal to the general stream is more specific, since specific texts can be located by virtue of there being no other available options. His allusion, then, can be both specific and broad. It is the latter because it encompasses more than a single text, and it is the former in that it has definite identifiable texts to which it appeals.

Another aspect of Zechariah's method of allusion worthy of note is the capability he has to appeal to more than one prophet in the span of a few verses. Actually, if the above conclusions are correct, he can allude to more than one prophet in a single verse. Although the vocabulary of verse 15, "the nations at ease," combined with verse 11, "all the earth is at rest and quiet," rather than verse 11 alone, is the stronger consideration when evaluating the appropriateness of Jeremiah's texts as background, the observation stands. This method of incorporating multiple sources was also evident in chapter 2 and reappears in the next.

Finally, *pace* Wolters, Zechariah is not here enslaved to the original meaning of his source texts. He showcases a freedom of allusion whereby he interacts with and depends upon but does not merely reiterate the original. He reemploys the language to recall the context and then utilizes them for his own purposes, manipulating his predecessor in certain constrained ways so that source text and context work together with his own time and place to create something new while maintaining something old. He clearly understood the original meaning and kept it in mind, but he did not wholly transfer this into his own text; rather, he relied upon it in order to evoke a response by playing with the audience's expectation of a better message that had been promised beforehand. The better message was given by Isaiah, and though he reaffirms the coming

of this reality after verse 11 (in Zech 1:17), he does not do so at first, since the circumstances of the day were quite contrary to the initial promises of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

Having briefly discussed Zechariah's method of allusion, I conclude this chapter with a restatement of my interpretation and how it agrees with and differs from others.

### Other Interpretations and Conclusion

Again, what exactly is the report of Zechariah 1:11: כָּל־הָאָרֶץ יְשֻׁבַת וְשָׁקֶטָה, meant to convey? In light of the proposed allusions, it means that God has not yet given Israel its promised peace by destroying the nations. In other words, the report says, "All the nations, who are doomed to be destroyed, are enjoying peace and rest, the fullness of which was promised to Israel by the Lord through Isaiah and Jeremiah."

This interpretation raises the question of the appropriateness of the main interpretation of this phrase. As rehearsed above, the main interpretation understands the report to refer to the success of Darius and the peace that was being enjoyed by his empire, referred to here as "all the earth." It is seemingly a difficult case to make that the report ought to be severed from the historical circumstances of the day, especially given the precise date offered at the outset of the vision (1:7), but others have noticed the impropriety of this description for that exact moment in history. As H. G. Mitchell writes, "It is not probable that the adversaries of Darius were all subdued, and the Persian empire reduced to a state of complete tranquility, by the month of February, 519 B.C."<sup>40</sup> The

---

<sup>40</sup>H. G. Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah*, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), 121. See also Wolters, "The Whole Earth Remains at Peace," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 132-33; Robert Hanhart, *Sacharja 1-8*, BKAT 15 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998), 68; George L. Klein, *Zechariah*, NAC 21B (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2008), 100-101. Mitchell regards "the vision as a picture of the past . . . of the period of Exile" (Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah*, 122). Likewise, Albin van Hoonacker writes, "Ici c'est aux derniers temps de l'empire babylonien que se trouve fixé le point de vue de la vision" (Albin van Hoonacker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes* (Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1908), 594).

combination of this with an alternative explanation for the relevance of the precise dating by a foreign king (see chapter 2, p. 33) makes a correlation between the report and the events of the day unnecessary. I conclude, therefore, that the report is not meant as a commentary on Darius' reign, only as an allusion to Isaiah and Jeremiah.<sup>41</sup>

While my interpretation belies the most popular interpretation, it intersects with another proposal. One of the alternative views is that this report recollects the predictions of Haggai.<sup>42</sup> "Yet once more, in a little while, I [the Lord] will shake the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land. And I will shake all the nations" (Hag 2:6-7). "I am about to shake the heavens and the earth, and to overthrow the throne of kingdoms. I am about to destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the nations, and overthrow the chariots and their riders" (Hag 2:21-22). The peace reported in Zechariah, "a peace doomed to be shattered,"<sup>43</sup> implies the delay of Haggai's hoped-for shaking.

The general notion corresponds well with what Isaiah and Jeremiah have to say about making a full end of the nations, and so I accept that the report invokes this idea, but the above interpretation insists that the idea is present via Jeremiah and Isaiah rather than in conversation with Haggai.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>While an allusion does not *necessarily* exclude a reference to historical circumstances, I prefer this reading because of its neatness and simplicity.

<sup>42</sup>See, e.g., Christian Jeremias, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja*, FRLANT 117 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 30. It should be noted that these two views are not mutually exclusive. For example, Rudolph refers the peace of all the earth in verse 11 to the quelling of the rebellions by Darius and thinks that the reason for the lament of v. 12 in response to this report is that the kingdom of God would not be brought about except by Haggai's shaking. Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, 77-78. Also, Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie*, 61; Reventlow, *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja, und Maleachi*, 42; Horst, *Die zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, 221.

<sup>43</sup>Joyce G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, TOTC (London: Tyndale Press, 1972), 102.

<sup>44</sup>For a convincing refutation of the Haggai view, see Wolters, "The Whole Earth Remains at Peace," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 136. David L. Petersen's interpretation, that the report refers to "cosmic peace, both of the deity and the world," highlights the idea of the delay of the Lord's judgment as well. "All the world, including the divine dwelling and its surroundings, is restful." But the people of the Lord are looking for him to "act as a divine warrior" (Petersen, *Zechariah 1-8*, 145-46). See also Klein, *Zechariah*, 101. Beuken, too, interprets the peace as the absence of judgment. "Ruhe und Stille sind hier bestimmt keine positive Eigenschaften. Sie stehen hier für das Fehlen jener Bewegtheit, die Gottes Eingreifen zugunsten Israels begleitet. Israels überwältiger sind völlig in Ruhe. Nichts weist darauf hin, daß ihrer Herrschaft bald ein Ende gemacht werde. Dieser Bericht über die Inspektionsreise bildet für den

To conclude, Zechariah's freedom of allusion allows him to apply the promise-language of Isaiah and Jeremiah to the nations, to the exclusion of Israel. He is not bound to a simple reiteration of the earlier prophets' message; the presence of this freedom elsewhere in Zechariah lends support to the interpreter's flexibility in determining the precise import of the allusion. As with the last chapter, sensitivity to Zechariah's method proves invaluable in assessing each individual allusion; this also appears in the next chapter, as Zechariah combines allusions to Jeremiah and Ezekiel in his vision of the woman in an ephah.

---

Engel den Anlaß, eine Klage gegen Gott zu erheben" (Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8*, 241).

## CHAPTER 4

### ZECHARIAH 5:5-11, JEREMIAH 3, AND EZEKIEL 8

The vision of Zechariah 5:5-11 is in contention for the most curious and perplexing of the prophet's book. It is filled with strange images and actions and has prompted numerous proposals and interpretations. The basic point of the vision seems clear: wickedness is removed from the land; but scholars debate the import of the specific components, as very little in the vision itself explains them. This chapter seeks to explain two individual components of the vision, the ephah and the identity of the woman, in light of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and, of course, the vision itself.

#### **Zechariah 5:5-11**

Zechariah 5:5-11 is composed of a dialogue between an interpreting angel and the prophet concerning several peculiar images. Zechariah sees an ephah going forth הַיּוֹצֵאת (הַאֵיפָה; 5:6), a leaden cover lifted from the ephah that reveals a woman sitting therein (5:7), the woman thrust back into the basket and the leaden stone thrust over it (5:8), and two women with the wings of a stork carrying the ephah away (5:9).

The interpreting angel only gives three statements of explanation for these things. He explains the ephah going forth as “their iniquity in all the land” (5:6) and the woman as “wickedness” (5:8). In response to the prophet's question concerning the destination of the ephah (5:10), the angel says that a house will be built for it in the land of Shinar and it will be established there and set to rest on its base (5:11).

Among the many questions that arise is: Why is there a woman sitting in a standard measuring unit?

## Scholarship on the Ephah

In searching the literature, there are multiple available options regarding the significance of the ephah: a common container,<sup>1</sup> a symbol of unjust action,<sup>2</sup> an edifice of a pagan deity,<sup>3</sup> a *double entendre* referring to a standard measure and an idolatrous cult room,<sup>4</sup> a coffin,<sup>5</sup> a symbol for sin in general and idolatry in particular,<sup>6</sup> a prison,<sup>7</sup> a lead-lined container to dispose of evil,<sup>8</sup> and a magic bottle.<sup>9</sup> No single proposal has enjoyed widespread acceptance.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Vulgate; H. G. Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912), 172; T. Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie, Malachie* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), 101.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Targum; Rashi; Joyce G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, TOTC 28 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1972), 136; Holger Delkurt, *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte: Zur Aufnahme und Abwandlung prophetischer Traditionen* (New York: de Gruyter, 2000), 249-53; David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1984), 255-56.

<sup>3</sup>S. Marenof, "Note Concerning the Meaning of the Word "Ephah," Zechariah 5:5-11," *AJSLL* 48 (1931-32): 264-67.

<sup>4</sup>Carol L. and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, AB 25B (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 295-97.

<sup>5</sup>Diana Edelman, "Proving Yahweh Killed His Wife (Zechariah 5:5-11)," *BibInt* 11 (2003): 337.

<sup>6</sup>Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, LHBOTS 506 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 204-07. The Amos 8 links upon which Stead's conclusion is based are not strong (i.e., the unjust ephah is not explicit in Zechariah, the presence of a symbolic basket is not peculiar to Amos and Zechariah [as Stead points out; cf. Jer 24; 25:15; Ezek 24], and the shared pun on the name of a goddess is questionable). Additionally, the unjust ephah is not the only part of Israel's "economic exploitation" (as Stead terms it) in Amos. They were also buying the poor. To say the ephah represents all economic exploitation, and thus is parallel to Amos, is a stretch. Further, the woman in the basket takes center stage in Zechariah's vision, but idolatry is only mentioned in a single verse in Amos, the last verse of the chapter (8:14).

<sup>7</sup>M. Delcor, "La Vision de la Femme dans l'Epha de Zach, 5:5-11 à la Lumière de la Littérature Hittite," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 187 (1975): 142.

<sup>8</sup>D. P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 273. The positions of Wright, Delcor (prison), and Edelman (coffin), as Stead notes, "can be readily discounted, in that they are based on (sometimes highly tenuous) parallels with extra-biblical material which are not supported by any parallels in the biblical corpus" (Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 205).

<sup>9</sup>Ernst Sellin and Karl Marti. Cited by Delcor, "La vision de la Femme," 138. Delcor quickly dismisses both views on account of lack of evidence.

<sup>10</sup>Jeremias rightly critiques Marenof's suggestion, "S. Marenofs Deutung . . . kommt – abgesehen von der Problematik seines Versuchs der sprachlichen Ableitung von dem sumerischen Namen

## My Proposal

In line with an allusive approach, this chapter proposes that the use of the ephah by Zechariah is an allusion to Jeremiah 3:2. The significance of Zechariah's **הָאֵיפָה** is in its ability to recall the **אֵיפָה** of Jeremiah and to localize the pervasive harlotry recounted by the earlier prophet for the purpose of its convenient removal from the land.

### Form Change and Lexical Links

The first hint in this direction is the opening of Zechariah's vision. As commentators often notice, it is the only one to open with a command. The typical introductory description has Zechariah active, **וְאָשָׂא אֶת-עֵינָיו וְאָרָא** (2:1; cf. 2:5; 5:1, 9; 6:1). Here (5:5), however, he is commanded **שָׂא נָא עֵינֶיךָ וְרָא מָה הַיּוֹצֵאת הַזֹּאת**. An explanation is rarely offered for this shift, but could be the move was made, at least in part, to recall Jeremiah.<sup>11</sup> Jeremiah 3:2 begins similarly, **שְׂאֵי-עֵינֶיךָ עַל-שָׂפָיִם וְרָא אֵיפָה**. The change in the gender of the imperatives is accounted for by the different addressee (Zechariah vs. Israel/Judah personified as a woman; cf. Zech 6:15 and Deut 28:1, which sees a shift from singular [Deut] to plural [Zech]). Jeremiah 3:2 shares **נָשָׂא**, **עֵין**, and **רָא** with Zechariah's opening, and **אֵיפָה** both parallels **מָה** ("lift your eyes and see *where*" // "lift your eyes and see *what*") and connects with the **הָאֵיפָה** of the next verse.

Jeremiah continues, "Where have you not been ravished? By the roads you sat for them like an Arab in the wilderness. You have polluted the land with your vile whoredom." Jeremiah's **אֵיפָה** refers to all the places of Judah's whoredom. She whored everywhere (**אֵיפָה לֹא שָׁגְלָה**). Interestingly, paralleling the thought of Judah's omnipresent adultery in Jeremiah (cf. Jer 23:10; "the land is full of adulterers"), the interpreting angel

---

E-pa einer Zikkurat in Lagasch – in Schwierigkeiten mit dem Visionbild selbst: das Epha hat einen Deckel, der die Frau offensichtlich gegen ihren Willen darin festhält" Christian Jeremias, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja*, FRLANT 117 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 200n22.

<sup>11</sup>Johannes Schnocks has called attention to several links between this vision and Ezek 8. See Johannes Schnocks, "Eine intertextuelle Verbindung zwischen Ezechiels Eifersuchtsbild und Sacharjas Frau im Efa," *BN* 84 (1996): 61-62. For further discussion, see below.

identifies the ephah (האיפה) with “their iniquity in *all* the land” (בכל־הארץ זאת עונם).<sup>12</sup> Each word (האיפה and איפה) signifies the locale of the adulteresses throughout the land. Zechariah’s האיפה is Jeremiah’s איפה concretized and contained. It is the intentional localization of the place of harlots for the purpose of convenient removal.

Additional parallels offer support of this. Jeremiah 3 personifies Israel/Judah as Yahweh’s unfaithful wife.<sup>13</sup> “You have played the whore with many lovers” (Jer 3:1). As such, she has sat (ישבת) by the roads waiting to be ravished (Jer 3:2). “The roads” expound the where (איפה) of the same verse and, so it can be rightly said that in Jeremiah a woman (faithless Judah) is sitting in איפה, like Zechariah’s woman sitting (ישבת) in האיפה (Zech 5:7). Further, the angel casts (שלך) the woman into the basket (v. 8), and in Jeremiah Yahweh is compared to a man who divorces (שלח) his wife (Jer 3:1, 8).<sup>14</sup> ארץ and עון complete the list of lexical links. Jeremiah’s *land* (Jer 3:1, 2, and 9) is polluted by Judah’s *iniquity* (Jer 3:13), and Zechariah’s *iniquity* is in all the *land* (Zech 5:6). The full list of significant lexical links is: איפה/האיפה, נשא, עין, ראה, ישב, שלח/שלך, ארץ, and עון.

### Contextual Compatibility

In addition to the notable lexical links, the broader contexts are perfectly compatible. Jeremiah 3 is entirely occupied with (1) Judah/Israel as Yahweh’s unfaithful wife who will be (2) removed from Zion (3) to the land of the north, Babylon (Jer 3:12, 14, 18). Zechariah’s vision is likewise concerned with 1) a woman who is identified as wickedness, 2) removed from the land, and 3) relocated to Shinar, an ancient name for the land of Babel’s kingdom (Gen 10:10). The suggestions for this woman abound:

---

<sup>12</sup>Reading עון instead of MT’s עין with the majority of commentators and the LXX and Syriac. The ephah is a stand-in for its contents, the woman who is wickedness. See n. 28.

<sup>13</sup>The chapter speaks of both Israel (the northern kingdom) and Judah. Both have been unfaithful.

<sup>14</sup>I also note the use of שלך with the lead cover, which is without parallel in Jer 3.



Asherah, Eve, the Samaritans, Jerusalem, the prophetic prostitute, Ezekiel's menstruating woman metaphor, an image for idolatry, foreign Babylonian women, Anat, Astarte, Ishtar, and ritual impurity.<sup>15</sup>

Interpreting Zechariah's woman in light of Jeremiah 3, and especially the above-noted parallels with *ישב* and *שלח/שלך*, supports the proposal to identify this woman with prostitute-Judah/Israel/Jerusalem,<sup>16</sup> an identification which has a long pedigree in the Hebrew Scriptures (Ezek 16 and 23; Hos 2; Lam; Isa 50 and 54; Jer 3).<sup>17</sup>

A reading of 5:5-11 in relation to 5:1-4 (the vision of the flying scroll) simultaneously helps to undergird this identification while undermining most of the previous proposals.<sup>18</sup> Michael Floyd's literary reading of 5:5-11 calls attention to the similarities with 5:1-4: the scroll flies and the ephah is flown (5:2; 5:9), a discrepancy in size with both objects, and the language of "all the land/earth" (5:3; 5:6) and "goes forth" (5:3; 5:5, 6, and 9) is present.<sup>19</sup> Additionally, in 5:4 the curse completely destroys the house of the thief and the one who swears falsely, which finds a counterpart in the building of a house for the woman in 5:11. These parallels invite us to read 5:5-11 in close conjunction with 5:1-4 and identify the woman rather closely with the covenant breakers of the preceding vision. Contrary to a typical reading that sees here the gracious

---

<sup>15</sup>The bulk of this list is often rehearsed. So, e.g., Edelman, "Yahweh Killed," 336-37; Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 202-3. For "the Samaritans," see Elie Assis, "Zechariah's Vision of the Ephah (Zech. 5:5-11)," *VT* 60 (2010): 15-32.

<sup>16</sup>So, e.g., Edgar W. Conrad, *Zechariah* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 119-20; Margaret Barker, "The Evil in Zechariah," *HeyJ* 19 (1978): 24.

<sup>17</sup>So, Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 173-74; Conrad, *Zechariah*, 119-20; Barker, "The Evil in Zechariah," 24. In the Jeremiah text it is Judah who takes center stage, but for Zechariah's vision the precise identification of the prostitute (whether Israel, Judah, or Jerusalem) is not important, only the association with an unfaithful wife is.

<sup>18</sup>Many have noted the closeness of these two visions. So, e.g., Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie*, 98.

<sup>19</sup>Michael Floyd, "The Evil in the Ephah: Reading Zechariah 5:5-11 in its Literary Context," *CBQ* 58 (1996): 53-54. He also says both objects command respect, but this is too impressionistic.

removal of guilt/evil and/or false deities,<sup>20</sup> the woman can plausibly be, and even should be, identified with Yahweh's unfaithful wife, Israel, the covenant breaker *par excellence*.<sup>21</sup>

### **Zechariah 1-8 and Jeremiah**

Along with the compatibility of the women and the contexts of the two passages, Zechariah's extensive use of Jeremiah makes it more likely that **הַאִיפָה** recalls **אִיפָה**. The previous two chapters demonstrate this. In addition, a few of the more prominent examples include: the "seventy years" of Zechariah 1:12 and 7:5 (cf. Jer 25:11-12; 29:10); Zechariah 2:10-11's call to flee from the north (cf. Jer 50-51, esp. 51:6);<sup>22</sup> Zechariah 3:8 and 6:12's use of **צַמַּח** (cf. Jer 23:5; 33:15); and sustained allusion in Zechariah 7:7-14 to Jeremiah 7 and in Zechariah 8 to Jeremiah 30-33.<sup>23</sup> Zechariah extensively incorporates the words of Jeremiah, making his use here of Jeremiah 3 much more probable. Of Zechariah 1:4 Chary writes, "Il semble donc bien que par << anciens prophètes >>, Zacharie entend avant tout Jérémie."<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>So, e.g., Johannes Schnocks, "An Ephah between Earth and Heaven," in *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, ed. Mark Boda and Michael Floyd, LHBOTS 475 (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 268; Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 137-38; Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 175; Michael Floyd, *Minor Prophets Part 2*, FOTL 22 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 396; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 313-15.

<sup>21</sup>The goddess suggestions fail to reckon with this correlation. Additionally, Schnocks writes, "Given the total lack of archaeological evidence of a post-exilic veneration of a goddess in Judah, the most important evidence for its existence would then be Zech 5:5-11 itself" (Schnocks, "An Ephah between Earth and Heaven," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 267).

<sup>22</sup>See, e.g., Mark J. Boda, "Hoy, Hoy: The Prophetic Origins of the Babylonian Tradition in Zechariah 2:10-17," in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 174-75; Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 113.

<sup>23</sup>See Stead, *Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, 231-36, 241-43; Ellie Assis, "Zechariah 8 and Its Allusions to Jeremiah 30-33 and Deutero-Isaiah," *JHebS* 11 (2011): 1-21. Several parallels in thought also exist between Jer 3 and Zech 1-8: a return to Yahweh from evil (at times with the specific language of "return to me"; Jer 3:1, 7, 10, 22; Zech 1:3); the Lord's mercy overtaking his anger (Jer 3:5, 12; Zech 1:14-16); return of the people to Zion (Jer 3:14; Zech 2:7) from the north (Jer 3:18; Zech 2:6); increase of the people in the land (Jer 3:16; Zech 2:8); and a gathering of the nations to Jerusalem (Jer 3:17; Zech 8:20-23).

<sup>24</sup>Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie*, 54-55. For the further permeation of Jeremiah's language in Zech 1-

## The House in Shinar

Before arguing for a combination of Ezekiel 8 with Jeremiah 3 within this vision, I want to offer a brief suggestion for how this interpretation fits with the end of the vision, the building of a house in Shinar. In a recent article (2010), Elie Assis argues that “the vision foresees [the Samaritans’, who are identified with “wickedness”] return to their original homeland in Babylon, where their temple will be erected.”<sup>25</sup> In his view, this is the only interpretation capable of resolving the tension of the “positive” (a word he repeatedly emphasizes) ending of the vision, and he faults all previous interpretations for their inability to do this.

The vision ends with the angel explaining to Zechariah the destination of the ephah. The stork-winged women are taking it “to the land of Shinar, to build a house for it. And when this is prepared, they will set the basket there on its base” (Zech 5:11). First, as seen, the building of the house is not explicitly positive. As the vision makes no mention of destruction, it is not the worst possible fate, but it is not necessarily positive.

The closest view to mine that Assis interacts with is Joseph Kara’s, who sees here the banishment of transgressors to Babylon. He objects to this because “even though the transgressors’ banishment from Judah is a possible punishment, it is not clear why they should have a permanent house built for them in Babylon.”<sup>26</sup> This does seem strange, but it is quite possible to read the ending negatively.

Johannes Schnocks, in writing of an alternative to a goddess having a temple built for her in Shinar, mentions the excavations of the palace of Nebuchadnezzar II where Koldewey uncovered various monuments. He thinks, “They most probably are booty from subjected territories, which had been stood up in a kind of castle museum to

---

8, see especially the works of Stead, Nurmela, and Wenzel.

<sup>25</sup>Assis, “Zechariah’s Vision,” 31.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 18.

demonstrate the power of the Babylonian kings. . . . It is quite probable that in early post-exilic times the existence of such institutions was known in Jerusalem.”<sup>27</sup> This provides a valid available option for interpreting the vision’s end: Zechariah does not envision a happy ending for the woman, Israel; he expects her to become a museum piece in Shinar, plunder for her enemies (cf. Zech 2:12; Dan 1:1-2). Recalling the destruction of the covenant breakers’ houses in the vision of 5:1-4, those who sin against the Lord can expect to have their houses in the land destroyed and new ones built for them in a land of exile.

### Conclusion on Jeremiah 3

Taken collectively, the pervasive presence of Jeremiah in Zechariah, the consonance of contexts wherein **האיפה** and **איפה** are found, the change in formula to open Zechariah’s vision, and the list of lexical connections between passages offers an attractive suggestion that the significance of **האיפה** is in its ability to recall Jeremiah 3:2’s **איפה**.<sup>28</sup> The ephah is holding Yahweh’s unfaithful wife who acted as a prostitute in all the land, and it transports her to the land of Shinar. The function of the vision, then, like the one of 5:1-4, would serve as a warning for its recipients whom the Lord commands in Zechariah 1:3-4a: “Return to me, says the Lord of hosts, and I will return to you, says the Lord of hosts. Be not like your fathers.” As in the past, so in the future, neither liars,

---

<sup>27</sup>Schnocks, “An Ephah between Earth and Heaven,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 267.

<sup>28</sup>Reading the ephah as a symbol of Israel’s sin of dealing with false measures (see note 2 of this chapter) does not fit well with the remainder of the vision. The seemingly impossible squaring of the unjust ephah with the woman sitting therein makes this interpretation unlikely and has given rise to the more generic translation “basket” (so, e.g., NRSV; ESV). It also rests largely on the supposed identification of the ephah with “their iniquity” in v. 6b. This identification is not necessary. An instructive parallel for how we are to understand the statement “this is their iniquity” is “this is the curse” (Zech 5:3). In both cases, Zechariah sees the object (the ephah and the scroll), and the object is explained: **זאת האלה** and **זאת עונם**. A common interpretation of the scroll sees it as containing writing that leads to the curse (either the Decalogue or the curses of Deuteronomy), such that “this is the curse” is not rigidly applied to the scroll, but is interpreted in light of the rest of the vision. This instructs how we are to understand “their iniquity” in relation to the ephah. The remainder of the vision, and particularly the woman who is inside of it, informs “this is their iniquity.”

perjurers, nor an adulterous people will inhabit the land.

Interpreting the vision through the lens of Jeremiah 3 offers an explanation for both the ephah and the woman that accords well with the previous vision and the ending of this one, but as Johannes Schnocks has demonstrated, Zechariah also here alludes to Ezekiel 8.

### Ezekiel 8

As has already been seen, Zechariah does not always limit himself to a single text or prophet when making an allusion. That appears to be the case here. Schnocks argues for “eine Beziehung zwischen den beiden Visionsberichten Ez 8, 1-6 und Sach 5,5-11.”<sup>29</sup> He draws several general connections. “They both are prophetic visions, there is a connection with the temple of Jerusalem, and the visions both deal with misconduct.”<sup>30</sup> He also highlights several overlapping phrases. וַיִּבֶן הָאָרֶץ וַיִּבֶן הַשָּׁמַיִם occurs in Ezek 8:3b and Zech 5:9. “Wörtlich nur noch in 1Chr 21,16; in umgekehrter Reihenfolge in 2Sam 18,9.”<sup>31</sup> A variation of Zechariah 5:5’s opening command discussed above with Jeremiah 3, וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵי שָׂא נָא עֵינַיךָ וְרֵא, is also in Ezekiel 8:5, וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵי שָׂא נָא עֵינַיךָ וְרֵא. <sup>32</sup> “Even though the pairing of נשא and עין is quite common, the request (וראה) עֵינַיךָ שָׂא נָא appears only four times in the Hebrew Bible.”<sup>33</sup> Ezekiel

---

<sup>29</sup>Schnocks, “Eine intertextuelle Verbindung,” 59.

<sup>30</sup>Schnocks, “An Ephah between Earth and Heaven,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 265. The connection with the temple of Jerusalem is not clear.

<sup>31</sup>Schnocks, “Eine intertextuelle Verbindung,” 61n12.

<sup>32</sup>While Jeremiah lacks נא, Zechariah’s introduction (“and he said to me”), and response (“and I lifted my eyes... and behold”), all of which Ezekiel has (see immediately below), it has ראה, which the Ezekiel text lacks. The combination of the three terms “lift,” “eyes,” and “see” in the form of a command does occur elsewhere (cf. Gen 13:14; 31:12; Deut 3:27; Isa 40:26; 49:18; 60:4; Jer 13:20), but the context of Jer 3:2, an interrogative directly following ראה (also in Isa 40:26; מי), the correspondence of איפה with האיפה, and Zechariah’s propensity to reference Jeremiah, make the Jeremiah occurrence stand out alongside of the Ezekiel occurrence.

<sup>33</sup>Schnocks, “An Ephah between Earth and Heaven,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 264. See also Gen 13:14 and 31:12.

responds with *וְאֵשָׁא עֵינַי דְּרָדָּךְ צְפוּנָה וְהִנֵּה*, which corresponds with Zechariah 5:9's *וְאֵשָׁא* *וְהִנֵּה*. Finally, he connects the *רוּחַ* that lifted Ezekiel “between earth and heaven” with the *רוּחַ* in the wings of the women carrying the ephah “between earth and heaven.”<sup>34</sup>

Schnocks’ conclusion concerning the interpretive import of this allusion for Zechariah’s vision is much different than my own. Both are determined by the identification of the woman, or “wickedness,” within Zechariah’s vision. Schnocks takes the view that it refers to the guilt of Israel and therefore reads the end of the vision as a gracious act of God to remove wickedness from the land. Ezekiel’s context (chapters 8 and 9), on the other hand, recounts the pending punishment of God for the abominations committed by Israel. According to Schnocks, “Die beiden Geschichten auch inhaltlich . . . sie völlig verschieden verlaufen.”<sup>35</sup> Zechariah 5:5-11 provides “eine innerbiblische Antwort auf Ez 8,1-6.”<sup>36</sup>

In the first place, nothing prohibits the interpretation offered by Schnocks. His proposal actually fits well with the findings of the previous chapter, in that Zechariah can freely employ his predecessors and is not bound to a simple reiteration of what they said. A reversal of sorts, the expulsion of sin from the land into exile versus the expulsion/destruction of Israel from the land, is well within the scope of Zechariah’s allusive methodology. For a number of reasons, though, another reading is preferable. The idea of “the sending of *רשעה* [i.e., the sins of Israel] into exile” would be peculiar to this text in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>37</sup> And though this reading correlates really well with parts of Zechariah 3, a vision that sees the removal of Joshua the high priest’s filthy garments

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., 265; Schnocks, “Eine intertextuelle Verbindung,” 61. He also notes the occurrence of the terms *שָׁמ* and *שָׁב*. Both occur in Ezek 8:4, the former in Zech 5:7 and the latter in Zech 5:11. (Ibid., 61-62).

<sup>35</sup>Schnocks, “Eine intertextuelle Verbindung,” 62.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 63.

<sup>37</sup>Schnocks, “An Ephah between Earth and Heaven,” in Boda and Floyd, *Tradition in Transition*, 268.

from him and speaks of a day when the Lord will remove the iniquity of the land in a single day (Zech 3:4, 9), it does not correlate well with the vision immediately preceding it, which, as noted above, has multiple features closely tying it to Zechariah 5:5-11. Both of these visions, it would seem, warn of the judgment for covenant breakers. This is perhaps the strongest consideration against Schnocks' proposal. Finally, accepting an allusion to the Jeremiah text, which is the only one capable of offering a plausible explanation for both the ephah and the woman sitting within, only permits a judgmental reading of the vision, which agrees with Ezekiel.

My own view is that Zechariah is here recalling the language of Ezekiel, and with that his context, as a warning to his hearers. He is not reversing Ezekiel's message but reapplying it. Ezekiel and Jeremiah work in tandem to underscore the gravity of the warning/threat intended by Zechariah's vision. If Israel does not forsake its evil and return to the Lord, as she did not do in the days of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, he will remove her to the land of Shinar, as he did in the days of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

A similar warning was issued by the previous vision. The flying scroll depicts "the curse that goes out over the whole face of the land," which "shall enter the house of the thief, and the house of him who swears falsely by my name. And it shall remain in his house and consume it, both timber and stones" (Zech 5:3-4). The scroll, with writing on both sides (5:3), recalls Ezekiel's scroll with writing on both sides (Ezek 2:9ff.), and perhaps the scroll of Jeremiah also (cf. Jer 36:1ff.).<sup>38</sup> Outside of Psalm 40:7 [v. 8; MT], מְגִלָּה (scroll) occurs only in these three books. Words of dirges, moaning and lamentation fill Ezekiel's scroll (Ezek 2:10), apparently what will come upon Israel if she fails to repent. They are meant to deter her from her current course of sin, even though continued disobedience is a foregone conclusion (Ezek 3:5-7, 11). He eats the scroll, digests the

---

<sup>38</sup>See Rex Mason, *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 57.

words, and then speaks them to Israel (Ezek 3:1-4).

The words of Jeremiah's scroll likewise contain the Lord's words of judgment "against Israel and Judah" (and the nations also; Jer 36:2) and are spoken in order "that the house of Judah will hear all the disaster that I intend to do to them, so that each may turn from his evil way" (Jer 36:3). In general, then, the three prophets have the threat of judgment written on scrolls with the express intent of turning sinners to repentance.

Zechariah and Ezekiel share the unique feature of the scroll with writing on both sides.

In Zechariah 5:1-4, the scroll takes on a life of its own, entering the houses of the thief and false-swearer and consuming both timber and stones (Zech 5:4). This personification is reminiscent of the curses of Deuteronomy's covenant overtaking the previous generation when they failed to turn from their evil ways and deeds (Zech 1:6; see chap. 2, pp. 34-35). If this is a legitimate and intentional connection, then it is likely that Zechariah's language recollects another text referring to the written words of the covenant at Sinai, Exodus 32:15.

Zechariah does not imitate the vocabulary of Ezekiel to express the shared idea of the scroll (מְגִלָּה) containing writing on both sides. Ezekiel's scroll has writing on the front and the back (וְהָיָא כְּתוּבָה פָּנִים וְאַחֲוֹר), while Zechariah uses the idiomatic מְזָה וּמְזָה (cf. Exod 26:13; Josh 8:33; 1 Kgs 10:19, 20; Ezek 45:7) to express the idea of "one side and the other side." Exodus 32:15 has this too. The exact phraseology of Zechariah 5:3b is כָּל־הַגִּבּ מְזָה כְּמֹזָה נִקְהָ וְכָל־הַנְּשָׁבַע מְזָה כְּמֹזָה נִקְהָ. The phrase is notoriously difficult.<sup>39</sup> Al Wolters comments that the expression does not mean "on the one side . . . on the other side" and appeal should not be made to Exodus 32:15. He writes, "The Hebrew there [in Exodus] is different (מֹזָה וּמְזָה written together, rather than as the correlative pair . . . מֹזָה . . . מְזָה), and the Zechariah text contains no reference to writing." In response to

---

<sup>39</sup>For an extended discussion, see Al Wolters, *Zechariah* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014), 158-60.



this, Numbers 22:24, Joshua 8:22, 1 Samuel 14:4 and 17:3 are all examples where the double *מְזֵה* is also separate and clearly means “on the one side . . . on the other side.” First Samuel 17:3 reads, “And the Philistines were standing on one side of the mountain and Israel was standing on the other side of the mountain, and a valley was between them” (וּפְלִשְׁתִּים עַמְדִים אֶל־הַהָר מְזֵה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עַמְדִים אֶל־הַהָר מְזֵה וְהַגַּיָּא בֵּינֵיהֶם). To Wolters’ second point, it is more likely that Zechariah’s scroll has writing than that it is blank. What significance would a blank scroll have?

As a backdrop to Zechariah’s vision, Exodus 32:15 records Moses coming down the mountain with the two tablets of the Law in his hand, “written on both sides, on one side and the other” (לְחַת כְּתָבִים מְשֻׁנֵי עֵבְרִיהֶם מְזֵה וּמְזֵה הֵם כְּתָבִים). If Zechariah intends to invoke the Law here, along with Ezekiel (and possibly Jeremiah), he does so by way of sharing certain vocabularic features with both. The “scroll” with the latter and the idiom with the former. Further, on verse 3a, “This is the curse going out over the whole land,” Wolters comments, “No doubt this is primarily a reference to the covenant curses listed in Deut 27:11-26, 28:15-68, and elsewhere.”

The message, then, is crystal clear: those who break the covenant of the Lord will not dwell in the land, as the curses will again come to life and consume the houses of its transgressors (cf. Zech 1:6; Deut 28:15, 45). *Pace* Schnocks, the following vision, 5:5-11, continues the narration. Not only will the transgressors’ houses be destroyed, but they will have a new house built for them in Shinar (5:11). It is not a gracious removal of sin and wickedness from the land, but rather another iteration of Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Moses’ warnings that apart from repentance, turning from evil ways and deeds to the Lord, the curses annexed to the Law will go forth, overtake, and destroy (cf. Zech 1:2-6).

The two distinct but closely related visions of Zechariah 5 incorporate the language of the former prophets to recall their warnings and to reiterate vividly the introductory message of the book: return to me or die.

## Methodological Conclusions

If the above arguments are correct, several conclusions concerning Zechariah's allusive methodology follow. Most generally and perhaps most obviously, the contexts of the alluded-to texts are indispensable for interpretation. The obscure components of Zechariah's text, particularly the identification of the woman and why she is sitting in an ephah, were only clarified via the context of Jeremiah 3. The context of Ezekiel, which recounts God's future punishment for Israel's abominations, also showed itself to be significant. Zechariah could appeal to both prophets as a warning because they shared the same message that he was intent on conveying: iniquity leads to exile.

In addition, as already noted a number of times, Zechariah has a tendency to combine sources. In chapter 2, it was shown that he broadly alluded to Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Pentateuch in the span of several verses; in chapter 3, he alludes to both Isaiah and Jeremiah; here, he alludes to Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Law. At this point it should be clear that identifying a single text as an allusive source does not exclude the identification of another, even within the span of a single verse. Consider for example:

Zechariah 5:5: וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי שָׂא נָא עֵינֶיךָ וּרְאֵה מָה

Jeremiah 3:2: שְׂאֵי-עֵינֶיךָ עַל-שָׁפְיִים וּרְאֵי אֵיפֹה

Ezekiel 8:5: וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי בֶּן-אָדָם שָׂא-נָא עֵינֶיךָ

Zechariah 5:5 is composed of a part unique to Jeremiah ("see what" / "see where"), a part unique to Ezekiel ("and he said to me . . . please"), and a part shared by both ("lift your eyes"). Zechariah also excludes portions of both ("upon the heights" [Jer] and "son of man" [Ezek]).

Furthermore, in this vision there were additional signs of the freedom Zechariah has in making allusions. In the opening command of his vision (Zech 5:5), he changes the imperatives from feminine singular (Jer 3:2) to masculine singular to suit his own context. He also uses a homographic/homophonic pun on *האיפה* in order to recall the message of Jeremiah 3, simultaneously providing himself with a useful object capable of

transporting sinful Israel out of the land.

Finally, Zechariah here wholly transfers the message of his predecessors.

While chapter 3 exhibited his reversal of the messages of Isaiah and Jeremiah to describe the current situation of the nations at rest, this chapter shows that at times he means only to reapply the message of the former prophets to his own generation.

## CHAPTER 5

### ZECHARIAH 11 AND ALLUSIONS

I stated at the outset of this project that scholars have given far greater attention to the allusions of the latter part of Zechariah (chaps. 9-14) than to those of the former (chaps. 1-8). That will become very clear in this chapter, as many scholars have proposed many allusions for Zechariah 11. Though the number of proposed allusions has been great, the extent to which these allusions have colored the interpretation of this difficult chapter is far less. Over and over again throughout the literature scholars claim an allusion to a specific text with little to no comment on the impact of the source text, and especially its context, upon Zechariah 11. This will be one of the main emphases and contributions of this chapter: a focus on contextual considerations for the various allusions and their potential import for the interpretation of Zechariah 11.

An additional contribution will be to focus almost exclusively on the allusions of Zechariah 11 and their interpretational significance. This chapter, almost certainly more so than any of Zechariah's others, has been the object of very close scrutiny amongst commentators. A large part of the discussion, however, has been occupied with answering many of the same questions: What is the historical identity, if any, of the three shepherds? The first or good shepherd? The worthless shepherd? The sheep traders? Does the chapter refer to the past, present, or future? To what genre does this chapter (especially vv. 4-17) belong? Did the prophet actually perform these acts? Do verses 1-3 pronounce judgment on the leaders of the nations or Israel? Are they the conclusion of chapter 10, introduction of 11, both, or neither? In verses 7 and 11 should we read "surely/particularly the afflicted of the flock" based on the MT (לְכֹן עֲנִי הַצֹּאֵן) or divide the letters of the MT differently and read "by/for the merchants/Canaanites of the flock"

based loosely on the LXX (οἱ Χαναανῆται and εἰς τὴν Χαναανῆται)?<sup>1</sup> In verse 13 should we read “to the potter,” following the MT (אֶל-הַיּוֹצֵר), or “to the treasury,” following the Peshitta, both of which seem to be picked up by Matthew’s Gospel (Matt 27:3-7)? Is the span of “one month” in verse 8 in which the three shepherds are destroyed to be taken literally? Are the 30 shekels a large sum, an insultingly low sum, or a fair sum? What does it mean that they are thrown to the potter or treasury? To what covenant does “my covenant which I had made with all the peoples” in verse 10 refer? Do “all the peoples” of the same verse refer to Israel or the nations?

The answers to these questions take up the bulk of the literature on Zechariah 11, and with good reason.<sup>2</sup> While I do offer my own answers to some of these questions in what follows, some new and some not, I intentionally avoid prolonged discussion in order to focus on the allusions, and especially their contexts, and their specific contribution to the interpretation of Zechariah 11. Any answer I provide to the above questions is thoroughly allusion-based and is offered insofar as it fits in with the main priority of the chapter.

Finally, I do offer, defend, and explore a couple of mostly overlooked allusions and give attention, as in the previous chapters, to Zechariah’s specific methodology.

### **A Scholarly Consensus**

Didymus the Blind begins his comments on Zechariah 11 with an idea echoed throughout the literature. “Words that make announcements in a hidden manner are riddles. The text of the prophet before us, for example, is phrased in the manner of a

---

<sup>1</sup>This is complicated by the LXX’s inexact correspondence with the re-division of the MT. Theodore of Mopsuestia and Didymus the Blind, whose commentaries were based on the LXX, mention both the land of Canaan and the Canaanites in reference to these verses. See Didymus the Blind, *Commentary on Zechariah*, trans. Robert C. Hill, *The Fathers of the Church* 111 (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 2006), 264, 272; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, trans. Robert C. Hill, *The Fathers of the Church* 108 (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 2004), 379, 381.

<sup>2</sup>For discussion of these questions, refer to any extended commentary written in the last 100 years.

riddle and proposes an obscure teaching.”<sup>3</sup> “Scholars regularly name this passage as one of the most difficult in the book.”<sup>4</sup> As James Nogalski comments, “To interpret the shepherd narrative in 11:4-17 is in many respects – to paraphrase Winston Churchill – *to interpret an enigma wrapped in a riddle.*”<sup>5</sup> Eugene Merrill says “Chapter 11 is clearly one of the most difficult in all the book.”<sup>6</sup> Carol Stuhlmueller goes further and places it “among the most obscure passages in the OT.”<sup>7</sup> S. R. Driver goes furthest and gives it the title of “the most enigmatic [passage] in the Old Testament.”<sup>8</sup>

The chapter’s difficulty, recited throughout the ages, makes it a prime candidate for a somewhat fresh view of the whole. My attempt at this comes through the lens of allusion.

### History of Proposals

Scholars have proposed numerous possible allusions for Zechariah 11. While not all of them are agreed upon by all, and some proposals are tentative, the cumulative

---

<sup>3</sup>Didymus the Blind, *Commentary on Zechariah*, 253.

<sup>4</sup>John Goldingay and Pamela Scalise, *Minor Prophets II* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009), 290.

<sup>5</sup>James Nogalski, *The Book of the Twelve: Micah-Malachi* (Macon GA: Smyth and Helwys Publishing, 2011), 939 (italics original).

<sup>6</sup>Eugene Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Exegetical Commentary* (Richardson, TX: Biblical Studies Foundation, 2003), 249.

<sup>7</sup>Carroll Stuhlmueller, *Haggai and Zechariah: Rebuilding with Hope* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 139.

<sup>8</sup>S. R. Driver, *The Minor Prophets*, 2 volumes (New York: Henry Frowde, 1906), 2:253. For similar comments, see Ernst Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch* (Leipzig: A. Deicherische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922), 510; Al Wolters, *Zechariah* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014), 357; Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, AB 25C (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 253, 293; Rex Mason, “The Use of Earlier Biblical Material in Zechariah 9-14: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis,” in *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, JSOTSup 370 (New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 93; Douglas R. Jones, “A Fresh Interpretation of Zechariah 9-11,” *VT* 12 (1962): 250; Paul Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, IECOT (Stuttgart, Germany: W. Kohlhammer, 2012), 92; George L. Klein, *Zechariah*, NAC 21B (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2008), 311.

list of potential allusions is quite extensive. For verses 1-3: Judges 9;<sup>9</sup> Isaiah 2:12-17,<sup>10</sup> 10:34,<sup>11</sup> 14:8,<sup>12</sup> 23:14,<sup>13</sup> 32:19;<sup>14</sup> Jeremiah 12:5,<sup>15</sup> 22:6, 20-23,<sup>16</sup> 25:15-29,<sup>17</sup> 25:34-38,<sup>18</sup> 32:8b,<sup>19</sup> 48:32,<sup>20</sup> 49:19 and 50:44;<sup>21</sup> Ezekiel 27:5-6,<sup>22</sup> 31:3ff.;<sup>23</sup> Amos 1:2, 4, 7, 10,<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 349, 351-52; Bernhard Stade, “Deuterozacharja: Eine kritische Studie,” ZAW 1 (1881): 68-70; Katrina Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah: A Study of the Formation of a Mantological Wisdom Anthology*, CBET 6 (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994), 101; Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 78; Ina Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende: Untersuchungen zu Sacharja 9-14* (Köln: Verlag, 1974), 73.

<sup>10</sup>Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah*, 101; Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 88; Risto Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1-8 and 9-14* (Turku, Finland: Abo Akademi University, 1996), 132-33. Nurmela sees here a “possible allusion.”

<sup>11</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 353; Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 88; Mark Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 645; Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende*, 75.

<sup>12</sup>Karl Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton* (Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904), 437.

<sup>13</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 354.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 353; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 246.

<sup>15</sup>Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 89; Stuhlmüller, *Haggai and Zechariah*, 132.

<sup>16</sup>Albin van Hoonacker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1908), 674-75; Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 639, 642, 644n37; Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 508.

<sup>17</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 350.

<sup>18</sup>Almost all commentators. So, e.g., Magne Saebø, *Sacharja 9-14: Untersuchungen von Text und Form* (Wageningen, Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 229; Joyce G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, TOTC (London: Tyndale Press, 1972), 192; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, KAT 13, no. 4 (Gütersloh, Germany: Mohn, 1976), 199-200; Elizabeth Achtemeier, *Nahum-Malachi* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1988), 156; Goldingay and Scalise, *Minor Prophets II*, 289; David L. Petersen, “Zechariah 9-14: Methodological Reflections,” in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing Out the Treasure*, 215; Paul Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure Littéraire et Messianism* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961), 59; Jones, “A Fresh Interpretation,” 251; Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, 437.

<sup>19</sup>Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, 208n18.

<sup>20</sup>Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 245.

<sup>21</sup>Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 89; Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 643n35.

<sup>22</sup>Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1984), 267.

<sup>23</sup>H. G. Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah*, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912), 297.

<sup>24</sup>Julia M. O’Brien, *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, AOTC (Nashville: Abingdon, 2004), 249.

3:8;<sup>25</sup> and Psalm 24:7-10.<sup>26</sup> For verses 4-14: covenant God established with the descendants of Jacob;<sup>27</sup> Genesis 9:8-17;<sup>28</sup> Leviticus 27:1-8;<sup>29</sup> Numbers 21:4;<sup>30</sup> Isaiah 2:2-4,<sup>31</sup> 9:19-20,<sup>32</sup> 41:2 and 42:4,<sup>33</sup> 42:6,<sup>34</sup> 43:4,<sup>35</sup> 44:21-28,<sup>36</sup> 45:9,<sup>37</sup> 49:4, 6b,<sup>38</sup> 49:8,<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Stuhlmüller, *Haggai and Zechariah*, 132.

<sup>26</sup>Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 335. Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 239.

<sup>27</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 377.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 387.

<sup>30</sup>André Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, in *Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament*, XIc (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1981), 177.

<sup>31</sup>Marvin Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 2:679, 680-82.

<sup>32</sup>Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 308.

<sup>33</sup>Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, 2:683.

<sup>34</sup>Robert L. Foster, "Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization: A Fresh Look at Zechariah 11:4-17," *JBL* 126 (2007): 748-49.

<sup>35</sup>Michael Stead, "The Three Shepherds: Reading Zechariah in the Light of Jeremiah 11," in *A God of Faithfulness: Essays in Honour of J. Gordon McConville on his 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, ed. Jamie A. Grant, Alison Lo, and Gordon J. Wenham (New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2011), 160.

<sup>36</sup>Foster, "Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization," 752.

<sup>37</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 385.

<sup>38</sup>Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 173; Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV*, 143, 147; Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 515.

<sup>39</sup>Foster, "Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization," 748-49.



50:4ff.,<sup>40</sup> 53:6, 9,<sup>41</sup> 56:9-11,<sup>42</sup> Jeremiah 5:27,<sup>43</sup> 12:3,<sup>44</sup> 13:14 and 21:7,<sup>45</sup> 14:11 and 20:9,<sup>46</sup> 14:19, 15:2, and 19:9,<sup>47</sup> 15:6,<sup>48</sup> 18:1-11,<sup>49</sup> 19,<sup>50</sup> 22:9,<sup>51</sup> 23:1-8,<sup>52</sup> 32:8,<sup>53</sup> 38:6,<sup>54</sup> 50:7;<sup>55</sup> Ezekiel 5:11, 7:4, 9:5, 10,<sup>56</sup> 7:19-20,<sup>57</sup> 19:3,<sup>58</sup> 22:17-22,<sup>59</sup> 34:12, 20-21,<sup>60</sup> 34:23, 25,<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 512.

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*, 143, 145, 147.

<sup>42</sup>Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 342.

<sup>43</sup>Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 256.

<sup>44</sup>Rex Mason, *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 105; Wolters, *Zechariah*, 362; Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 660.

<sup>45</sup>Andrew Hill, *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, TOTC 28 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012), 231.

<sup>46</sup>Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 515.

<sup>47</sup>Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 177; Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 258. Merrill mentions only 19:9. M. Delcor, "Les sources du Deutéro-Zacharie et ses procédés d'emprunt," *RB* 59 (1952): 387. Delcor mentions 14:19 and 15:2.

<sup>48</sup>Stead, "The Three Shepherds," 154.

<sup>49</sup>van Hoonacker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*, 677; Wolters, *Zechariah*, 383, 385.

<sup>50</sup>Klein, *Zechariah*, 340.

<sup>51</sup>van Hoonacker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*, 675.

<sup>52</sup>Saebø, *Sacharja 9-14*, 229; Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 173; van Hoonacker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*, 675; Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, 2:677; Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 485.

<sup>53</sup>Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 515.

<sup>54</sup>Eibert Tigchelaar, "Some Observations on the Relationship between Zechariah 9-11 and Jeremiah," in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 268.

<sup>55</sup>Delcor, "Les sources," 387.

<sup>56</sup>Hill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 231.

<sup>57</sup>Delcor, "Les sources," 410.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*, 408.

<sup>59</sup>Mason, *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, 109.

<sup>60</sup>Delcor, "Les sources," 386; Barry G Webb, *The Message of Zechariah* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2003), 149n139.

<sup>61</sup>Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 173; Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 271.

37:15-28;<sup>62</sup> Hosea 2:18 (2:20),<sup>63</sup> 11-12,<sup>64</sup> 12:7ff.;<sup>65</sup> and Song of Songs 7:7.<sup>66</sup> For verses 15-17: 1 Kings 13,<sup>67</sup> Jeremiah 22:13-19 and 36:20,<sup>68</sup> 23:1-4,<sup>69</sup> 50:35-38;<sup>70</sup> Ezekiel 17:19ff.,<sup>71</sup> 21:14-22,<sup>72</sup> 21:30,<sup>73</sup> 30:21,<sup>74</sup> 34:1-21;<sup>75</sup> and Hosea 3:1-5.<sup>76</sup>

Two things in particular become apparent from this list. The first is that Zechariah 11 continues in the pattern set by the introductory verses of this book. Even if some of the suggested allusions are invalid, and some certainly are, the history of interpretation has demonstrated that the language of the former prophets is certainly present throughout the chapter. The second thing that becomes apparent is that an

---

<sup>62</sup>Almost all commentators. So, e.g., Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 257; Friedrich Horst, *Die zwölf Kleinen Propheten: Nahum bis Malachi* (Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), 253; Heiko Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah with Zechariah 1:1-6 as the Introduction to the Entire Book*, CBET 59 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011), 232-34; Delcor, "Les sources," 386; Stead, "The Three Shepherds," in Grant, Lo, and Wenham, *A God of Faithfulness*, 158; Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 511-12.

<sup>63</sup>Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 176.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, 173, 177.

<sup>65</sup>Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende*, 80; Mason, "The Use of Earlier Biblical Material," in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 103; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 256.

<sup>66</sup>Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 176.

<sup>67</sup>Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 289-90, 292.

<sup>68</sup>Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 512.

<sup>69</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 398; Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 678; Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 337.

<sup>70</sup>Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah*, 137; Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 316; Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 678; Tigchelaar, "Some Observations," in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 267.

<sup>71</sup>Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 512.

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.*, 517.

<sup>73</sup>Delcor, "Les sources," 386; Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 512.

<sup>74</sup>Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 316; Mason, "The Use of Earlier Biblical Material," in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 116.

<sup>75</sup>Almost all commentators. So, e.g., Théopane Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), 184, 193; Horst, *Die zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, 253; Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 271; Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende*, 81; Driver, *The Minor Prophets*, 2:260; Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, 442. Some limit it to vv. 1-10 or 1-16.

<sup>76</sup>Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende*, 81.

exploration of the allusions within this chapter, including their context and interpretational significance, is worthy of its own focused and detailed treatment. I cannot address each and every proposed allusion, and I do not intend to do so. Rather, in what follows, I focus on the most compelling and offer an analysis of their overall impact.

My method has been first, to examine the texts and contexts of the most-noted allusions (Jer 25:34-38; Ezek 34 and 37:15-28), anchoring this chapter in the earlier prophets and taking special care to note Zechariah's methodology in utilizing their texts. Second, I have done the same with less frequently suggested, but still compelling, allusions. Throughout, I have sought to offer answers to some of the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter in light of the earlier prophets. The following demonstrates that Zechariah 11 consistently and repeatedly reverses the hope of the former prophets and reiterates their message of judgment.

### **Jeremiah 25, Ezekiel 34 and 37**

As shown by the footnotes above, almost all scholars accept these texts (more specifically, Jer 25:34-38 and Ezek 34:1-21 and 37:15-28) as valid allusions. Therefore, diverging from the practice of the previous chapters, I do not give an extended justification of these allusions. Instead, building upon this, my focus will be on the message and context of these texts and their impact on Zechariah 11. The section will also serve to build a framework within which Zechariah's use of other less-noted allusions will fit.

### **Jeremiah 25 and Zechariah 11:1-3**

All of Jeremiah 25 is subsumed under verse 1 as the "word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah (that was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon)." It is addressed to "all the people of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (v. 2).

The ensuing verses pronounce the coming judgment of the Lord through

Nebuchadnezzar because of the people’s disobedience in spite of the Lord’s constant warnings via his prophets (vv. 3-14).<sup>77</sup> Not only Judah and Jerusalem but the nations, specifically their kings and officials (see vv. 15-26a, 29, 31-33), will serve Nebuchadnezzar for 70 years (v. 11), after which point Nebuchadnezzar himself will be punished (v. 26b). The prophecy pictures the Lord as roaring (גאָץ [3x]) against his dwelling place (עַל-גַּוְוָהוּ) and all the inhabitants of the earth (v. 30).

The final five verses of the chapter (vv. 34-38) share the points of contact with Zechariah 11 that commentators often identify. Jeremiah 25:34-38 reads,

Wail, O shepherds! Cry out and roll in the dust, O lords of the flock! For your days for slaughter and your dispersion are complete, and you shall fall like a choice vessel. It will perish, the place of refuge for the shepherds, an escape for the lords of the flock. The sound of the crying of the shepherds, the wailing of the lords of the flock, for the Lord has destroyed their pasturage. The habitations of peace will be silent because of the fierce anger of the Lord.<sup>78</sup> Like a lion he has forsaken his lair, for their land has become a waste because of the wrath of the oppressor, and because of his fierce anger.

The portion of comparison is Zechariah 11:2-3. For context, verse one begins, “Open your doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour your cedars.” Verses 2-3 then read, “Wail, O cypress, for the cedar has fallen; the mighty ones have been destroyed. Wail, O oaks of Bashan, for the dense forest has come down. The sound of the wailing of the shepherds, for their glory has been destroyed. The sound of the roaring of the lions, for the pride of the Jordan has been destroyed.”

The most prominent parallel between the two sections is Zechariah 11:3a and Jeremiah 25:26:

Zechariah 11:3a: קוֹל יִלְלַת הָרְעִים כִּי שִׁדְדָה אֲדַרְתָּם

---

<sup>77</sup>For the use of Jer 25:5a and 7a by Zech 1:4, see chap. 2, p. 29.

<sup>78</sup>This translation retains the meaning of the verb דָּמָם, to be silent. ESV renders the verse “the peaceful folds are devastated.” NIV, “The peaceful meadows will be laid waste.” The verb does not have this meaning elsewhere. It appears that this verse is appealing back to Jer 25:10, which speaks of the Lord’s punishment as banishing from the land “the sound of exaltation and the sound of rejoicing, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride.” Here, then, the result of this banishment is described as the silence of the sounds regularly heard in the formerly peaceful land.

Jeremiah 25:36: קול צַעֲקַת הָרְעִים וַיִּלְלֵת אֲדִירֵי הַצֹּאן כִּי שָׁדַד יְהוָה אֶת־מְרֻעֵיהֶם

Zechariah combines the synonymous lines of Jeremiah (“the sound of the crying of the shepherds” and “the wailing of the lords of the flock”) borrowing a term from each line (“shepherds” and “wailing”) to form one new line (“the sound of the wailing of the shepherds”). The combination of terms to abbreviate evidenced here is also evident in the prophet’s use of Isaiah 42.<sup>79</sup>

Zechariah 11:3a attributes the wailing of the shepherds to the destruction of “their glory” without further identification. In Jeremiah 25:36, their wailing is the result of the Lord having destroyed “their pasturage.” A one-to-one identification yields that the shepherds wail in Zechariah because their pasturage has been destroyed.<sup>80</sup> Perhaps this exegetes Zechariah’s text, but it is more likely that Zechariah freely changes his source text, dropping the initial referent.

Another possible ray of light from Jeremiah illuminates the agent of destruction who remains in the shadows in these first three verses of Zechariah. The verb שָׁדַד occurs three times in the passive in verses 2 and 3 of Zechariah 11. “The glorious ones have been destroyed (שָׁדַדוּ)” (v. 2). “Their glory has been destroyed (הַשָּׁדַדָּה)” (verse 3a). “The pride of the Jordan has been destroyed (שָׁדַד)” (v. 3b). The shepherds’ wailing in Jeremiah 25:36b is explicitly said to be a result of the Lord’s punishment. “The Lord has destroyed (שָׁדַד) their pasturage.” Without any other indications to the contrary, and looking ahead to verses 4-17 of Zechariah 11 for confirmation, it is almost certain that the Lord is Zechariah’s unnamed agent of destruction. He has destroyed or will destroy the glorious ones, the shepherds’ glory, and the pride of the Jordan. Again, an earlier prophet here fills in the blank of Zechariah’s prophecy.

---

<sup>79</sup>See below. This of course assumes the validity of both allusions.

<sup>80</sup>*Pace* Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, 199. He appeals to Jer 25:34-36 and thinks “their glory” references “their flock.” Michael Floyd refers “their glory” to “their flock and their pasturage.” Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets Part 2*, FOTL 22 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 482.

Jeremiah's text shares the language of the "mighty ones" (אֲדִירִים) of Zechariah 11:2, "Wail, O cypress, for the cedar has fallen, *the mighty ones* have been destroyed." It occurs here as a substantive adjective and remains open to interpretation. The ESV interprets it as "the glorious trees" and the NIV similarly as "the stately trees." In Jeremiah 25:34, 35, and 36, however, the same adjective occurs, and each time it parallels "shepherds." 25:34, "Wail, O shepherds! Cry out and roll in the dust, O lords of the flock (אֲדִירֵי הַצֹּאן)." 25:35, "It will perish, the place of refuge for the shepherds, an escape for the lords of the flock (מְאַדִּירֵי הַצֹּאן)." 25:36, "The sound of the crying of the shepherds, of the wailing of the lords of the flock (אֲדִירֵי הַצֹּאן)." Again, it appears that Zechariah has utilized his pre-text's language while dropping its precise referent.

As somewhat of an aside, Isaiah 14:8 offers another interesting possibility for an allusion. There, instead of the wailing of the cypress as here, the cypresses (בְּרוֹשִׁים) and cedars of Lebanon rejoice;<sup>81</sup> "wie Cypressen und Cedern in Jes 14 8 zusammen sich freuen, sollten sie auch zusammen weinen."<sup>82</sup>

The occasion of the trees' joy in Isaiah 14:8 is the fall of the king of Babylon, which leaves the whole earth quiet and at rest (Isa 14:7; cf. chap. 3). They exclaim, "Since you [king of Babylon] were laid low, no woodcutter comes up against us." Conversely, in Zechariah 11:2, the cypress and oaks of Bashan *wail* because "the cedar has fallen; the glorious ones have been destroyed . . . the thick forest has been felled." Not only is there a reversal from rejoicing to wailing, but there is a perfect reversal of the cause for each. Isaiah's trees rejoice because they are standing and Zechariah's wail because they are cut down.

The destruction of the trees in Zechariah 11:2 indicates that the destructive force previously embodied in the king of Babylon has not been fully vanquished. If it had

---

<sup>81</sup>See Zech 11:1, "Open your doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour your cedars!"

<sup>82</sup>Marti, *Das Dodekapropheten*, 437.

been, the cedars, as in Isaiah 14:8, would rejoice. Instead, the shepherds' ruin, which, as Jeremiah 25 explains, was also caused by the king of Babylon, signals to the trees that peace does not yet reign. Instead then, they wail. The recollection of both Jeremiah 25 and Isaiah 14 by Zechariah does two very compatible things. It reapplies the predicted judgment of Jeremiah and reverses the predicted joy and peace of Isaiah.<sup>83</sup>

This leads to one of the main questions scholarship has sought to answer within this chapter. Against whom is the judgment of Zechariah 11:1-3? Who are the shepherds of verse 3's "The sound of the wailing of the shepherds?" Commentators disagree as to their identity. Most identify them as either the rulers of the nations<sup>84</sup> or the rulers of the Lord's people.<sup>85</sup> If read with Jeremiah 25 as the main background, the answer would be that they are both. As rehearsed above, the judgment of God extends well beyond his people in Jeremiah 25. The catalyst for judgment is the people's disobedience (see Jer 25:3-14), but the cup of wrath is given to the kings and officials of Jerusalem and Judah and to "all the kings . . . on the face of the earth" (Jer 25:26; see vv. 15-27). The prophecy culminates in universal condemnation. "The Lord has an indictment against the nations; he is entering into judgment with all flesh. . . . Behold, disaster is going forth from nation to nation, and a great tempest is stirring from the farthest parts of the earth" (Jer 25:31-32). The shepherds of verses 34ff., therefore, in agreement with Jeremiah 25, are the kings of all the nations, including the nation of the Lord.

The geographical movement of these first three verses of Zechariah likewise

---

<sup>83</sup>The terminological overlap (cypresses, cedars of Lebanon), reversals (from rejoicing to wailing and from trees standing securely to falling), interpretational significance, and similarity with Jer 25 (occupation with the king of Babylon; a text Zech 11 clearly references), make Isa 14:8 a very good candidate for an allusion.

<sup>84</sup>So, e.g., Marti, *Das Dodekapropheten*, 437; Jones, "A Fresh Interpretation," 251; Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV*, 59; Nogalski, *Book of the Twelve*, 921-22; Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, 204; Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, 2:677; Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 295.

<sup>85</sup>So, e.g., Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 334-35; Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 267; C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *The Minor Prophets*, trans. J. Martin (repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 355.

undergird the universality of the pronounced judgment. As Al Wolters writes,

The movement is from the renowned faraway cedars of Lebanon, which can easily be seen as symbolic of the proud and arrogant nations to the north, to the familiar tamarisks and oleanders of the lower Jordan. . . . It is not until the final word of this finely crafted pericope that it becomes unmistakably clear that the judgment that is threatened is not only directed at foreign nations, but also against Israel itself.<sup>86</sup>

This conclusion agrees with the dispute among scholars over whether this small unit of Zechariah 11 (vv. 1-3) is meant to be the conclusion of chapter 10 or the introduction of 11:4-17.<sup>87</sup> The dispute arises because the unit is “tightly related to its surroundings.”<sup>88</sup> “Evidence for either position can be adduced, since these verses contain catchwords which connect it with both the preceding and following sections.”<sup>89</sup> The interpretation of Zechariah 11:1-3 via Jeremiah 25 also connects it with both what precedes and follows.<sup>90</sup>

At the end of chapter 10 the Lord promises that the “pride of Assyria shall be laid low, and the scepter of Egypt shall depart” (10:11), which is a judgment against the shepherds of the nations. In the remainder of chapter 11, the Lord judges the shepherds of his own people (see vv. 4, 7-8, 15-17; see also Zech 10:2-3). As in Jeremiah 25, judgment falls on the shepherds of all the nations, Israel included.

An allusive reading of Zechariah 11:1-3 offers support for both sides of both debates present in the literature on this short section. It pronounces judgment on the

---

<sup>86</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 347.

<sup>87</sup>For the unit as conclusion, see, e.g., Peter Ackroyd, “Zechariah,” in *PCB*, ed. Matthew Black (London: Nelson and Sons, 1962), 653; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 375; Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie*, 183; Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV*, 59. As introduction, see, e.g., Stade, “Deuterozacharja,” 68-70; Klein, *Zechariah*, 311; Achtemeier, *Nahum-Malachi*, 156; Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, 2:675; Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 334. Rudolph says it is “zunächst eine Einheit für sich.” Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*, 199.

<sup>88</sup>Michael Floyd, *Minor Prophets Part II*, 2:481. For the arguments of both views, see Lacocque, *Zacharie 9-14*, 170; Wolters, *Zechariah*, 347-48; Hill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 226; Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah*, 103; Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 78; Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV*, 58-59, 61-63.

<sup>89</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 348.

<sup>90</sup>This position is supported by those who have claimed this section as a “literary hinge” or “redactional bridge” between chap. 10 and 11:4-17. See respectively Hill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 226; Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 79. See also Klein, *Zechariah*, 311; Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah*, 104; Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende*, 52.



shepherds of the nations, and the shepherds of the Lord's people. It concludes chapter 10 and it introduces chapter 11.

To summarize the interpretative conclusions drawn thus far, we have seen that the backdrop of Jeremiah 25 fills out the picture of Zechariah 11:1-3. It identifies the unnamed agent of destruction as the Lord and the shepherds as the kings and officials of every nation. It labels the unit as both a fitting conclusion and introduction, and, through its mutual connection with Isaiah 14:8, gives the specific reason for the wailing of the trees and shepherds: the destructive force previously embodied in Babylon has not yet met its final fate. In other words, the Lord's use of an agent of destruction to repay disobedience is still active. Judgment remains for all, including Israel, and the world peace of Isaiah is reversed, or at least suspended.

Another notable parallel between these two texts deserves discussion.

Zechariah 11:3b reads, קול שאגת כפירים בי שדד גאון הירדן. Here the lions (plural) roar because of the destruction of the גאון הירדן. Jeremiah 25 has two verses with similar imagery. Jeremiah 25:38 has, עזב ככפיר סבו ביהיתה ארצם לשמה, and Jeremiah 25:30 reads, יהוה ממרומים ישאג וממעון קדשו יתן קולו שאג ישאג על-גנהו. Verse 30 clearly identifies the Lord as roaring. Verse 38 appears to say that it is the Lord who has left his lair, and this because "their land has become a desolation."

The first point of similarity is the presence of roaring (שאג). The Lord roars against his dwelling place/flock in Jeremiah and the lions roar in Zechariah because their dwelling place has been destroyed. If there is intentional interplay here, Zechariah freely and artfully reemploys the imagery while keeping in touch with the original.

Zechariah altogether departs from Jeremiah's identification of the lion as the Lord. Zechariah's lions are part of the group (with the shepherds and trees) that mourns. Interestingly, though, he retains a portion of Jeremiah's description involving the lion. The Lord, like a lion, leaves his lair "because their land has become a desolation" (Jer 25:38). The lions roar in Zechariah "because the pride of the Jordan has been destroyed"

(Zech 11:3). In both cases the ruin of territory causes the lion/lions to do something, albeit something different. The significance of the differences is hard to pin down. It seems right to conclude that though the elements (lions, roaring, desolation of land) and theme (judgment) are the same, Zechariah has incorporated them into his own text with a degree of freedom while maintaining contact with the former text.<sup>91</sup> With Jones and others we can say that “he is creative, not imitative.”<sup>92</sup>

The final, and perhaps most illuminating point regarding the contact of these two texts and the significance of the context of Jeremiah 25:34-38 is the explanation Jeremiah provides for the judgment of Zechariah 11:1-3. This explanation is wholly lacking in Zechariah. Scholars have often noticed the disparity between chapters 9-10, which are filled with hope and promise, and chapter 11, which is almost entirely pessimistic.<sup>93</sup>

Zechariah provides no immediate explanation for the shift, but Jeremiah’s context does. There, the judgment comes because the people “have neither listened nor inclined [their] ears to hear, although the Lord persistently sent to [them] all his servants the prophets” (Jer 25:4). The message of these prophets, and of Jeremiah, was reiterated by Zechariah in the introduction to his book, “Turn now, every one of you, from his evil way and from the evil of your deeds. . . . Do not go after other gods to serve and worship them” (Jer 25:5a, 6a; cf. Zech 1:4; see chapter 2 for discussion). The surrounding context of Zechariah 11:1-3 speaks both of the rejection of the Lord’s shepherd/prophet (see Zech 11:7-13) and serving other gods (see Zech 10:2). These texts (Zech 1:4; Jer 25:4-7; Zech 10:2 and 11:7-13) work together to paint a robust picture of the occasion for Zechariah’s abrupt shift to judgment. It is a shift in perspective from the future to the present. The

---

<sup>91</sup>For another discussion of the similarities and differences, see David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1984), 94.

<sup>92</sup>Jones, “A Fresh Interpretation,” 251.

<sup>93</sup>Zech 11:17 judges the worthless shepherd and offers the only hope of the chapter.

present generation has not returned to the Lord, has not listened to his prophet, and will therefore experience desolation and mourning. This is in stark contrast to the future picture painted by the end of Zechariah 10, when the Lord, in a second-Exodus event, will take it upon himself to return the people from the many nations to which they were scattered (vv. 8-11) and “will make them strong in the Lord” so that “they shall walk in his name” (v. 12).

To conclude, the text and context of Jeremiah 25:34-38 supply missing identifications for Zechariah’s abbreviated text (the Lord as unnamed agent of destruction; the shepherds as those of all nations) and provide the background against which Zechariah’s text reads well (refusal of the people to heed the prophets; destructive force of Babylon active again). In addition, this reading supports viewing these three verses as a hinge connecting the end of 10 and 11. Finally, a comparison of the two texts showcases well the freedom with which Zechariah, at times, utilizes his sources.

### **Ezekiel 37:15-28 and Zechariah 11:4-16**

Ezekiel 37:15 begins a new section of chapter 37 with the introductory words, “the word of the Lord came to me.” This sets it apart from the well-known vision of the dry bones, which takes up the first part of the chapter (Ezek 37:1-14). The small section ends in verse 28 and is clearly distinct from the following prophecies against Gog (chaps. 38-39).

In these verses, Ezekiel performs a symbolic action. The Lord commands him to take (לָקַח) two sticks (הָעֵצִים) and to write upon each of them. On one of the sticks he is to write לְיוֹסֵף עֵץ אֶפְרַיִם וְכָל-בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל חִבְרוּ, and on the other לְיְהוֹדָה וּלְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל חִבְרוּ (v. 16). He then commands him to join them together so that they are one (v. 17). An explanation of the action follows,

I will take the people of Israel from the nations among which they have gone, and will gather them from all around, and bring them to their own land. And I will make them one nation in the land, on the mountains of Israel. And one king shall be king over them all, and they shall be no longer two nations, and they shall no longer be

divided into two kingdoms. . . . My servant David shall be king over them, and they shall all have one shepherd. They shall walk in my rules and be careful to obey my statutes. (Ezek 37:21-22, 24)

The two nations of Israel's history shall become one and the division that has plagued the nation since the days after Solomon will no longer remain. There will be one king, one shepherd, over one obedient nation.

Zechariah 11 is strongly reminiscent of this account. Zechariah, in response to the command of the Lord to shepherd the flock (11:4), takes (לְקַח) two staffs (מַקְלָיִם) and names them נְעָם and חֲבֵלִים (11:7). Instead of joining the sticks together, as in Ezekiel, he breaks each of them. The breaking of the first staff symbolizes the breaking of the covenant with all the peoples (11:10; on which see below). The breaking of the second staff symbolizes the breaking of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel (11:14).

“Damit wird nun auch einfach die Verheißung von Ez 37, 19ff. umgedreht.”<sup>94</sup>

Ezekiel speaks of one people with one shepherd. In Zechariah, the brotherhood is broken and the Lord's appointed shepherd, after a mutual detestation between him and his flock (11:8), leaves off being their shepherd. “I will not shepherd you” (11:9). In his place, the Lord appoints a worthless shepherd who is the antithesis of the promised Davidic shepherd (11:15-16; see below). Zechariah reverses the promises of the one good shepherd and the one united people.

While these two passages share substantial material, there are noticeable differences, including different terms used for the sticks, naming the sticks instead of writing the names upon them, and using *Joseph* and *Judah* to refer to the two kingdoms in Ezekiel and *Israel* and *Judah* in Zechariah.<sup>95</sup> These changes are well within the boundaries of Zechariah's creative allusive methodology, and the major parallels are more than enough to legitimize the allusion in spite of these minor differences. While the

---

<sup>94</sup>Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 516.

<sup>95</sup>Israel is also named in both cases in Ezekiel. The sticks symbolize Joseph and Judah and the members of Israel associated with them.

specific reasons for the change in terminology and change from “writing” to “calling” are unclear, it is possible that others of the earlier prophets prompted the change from *Joseph* and Judah, as used in Ezekiel, to *Israel* and Judah, as used in Zechariah.

The change is even more interesting given the use of Joseph and Judah alongside of one another in Zechariah’s previous chapter, “I will strengthen the house of Judah, and I will save the house of Joseph. I will bring them back because I have compassion on them” (Zech 10:6).<sup>96</sup> The promises of the return of Joseph and Judah to the land (see Ezek 37:21-22, 25-26; Zech 10:6, 8-10), the blessing of their children in the land (Ezek 37:25; Zech 10:7, 9), a multiplication of the people (Ezek 37:26; Zech 10:8), and an ingathering from all over (Ezek 37:21; Zech 10:9-10) are promised by both prophecies. Zechariah’s apparent intimate familiarity with Ezekiel 37:15-28 and use of its identical elements and themes in the preceding chapter make the change in Zechariah 11 from *Joseph* to *Israel* even more interesting. Why the change?

It seems likely that he is in conversation with more than one prophet here. More than a few passages in the latter prophets speak of the promise to bring the people of *Israel* and Judah back to the land. “He will raise a signal for the nations and will assemble the banished of Israel, and gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth” (Isa 11:12). “For behold, days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will restore the fortunes of my people, Israel and Judah, says the Lord, and I will bring them back to the land that I gave to their forefathers, and they shall take possession of it” (Jer 30:3; See also Jer 12:14-15; 23:6; 31:27; 33:7). A more direct dialogue partner for the breaking of the brotherhood of *Israel* and Judah in Zechariah 11 is Jeremiah 3:18. “In those days the house of Judah shall join the house of Israel, and together they shall come

---

<sup>96</sup>In fact, Zech 10 and Ezek 37 are the only places in the latter prophets where Joseph and Judah appear together. That they appear in the exact same context, proclaiming many of the same promises, together with the fact that Zech 11 certainly alludes to Ezek 37, argues strongly for a sustained allusion to Ezek 37 in Zech 10 and 11.

from the land of the north to the land that I gave your fathers for a heritage.”<sup>97</sup> Hosea 1:11 (2:2 MT) also underlines the unity aspect that Zechariah 11 undoes, “And the children of Israel and the children of Judah shall be gathered together, and they shall appoint for themselves one head.” By pairing *Israel* instead of *Joseph* with Judah, Zechariah’s stick-breaking of 11:11 reverses not only Ezekiel but also others of the prophetic past who spoke of a reunification of the divided nation. Instead of the promised unity coming to fruition during the time of this prophecy, he here breaks the staff in order “to break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel” (Zech 11:11b). It is a full reversal, a literal breaking, of the previous promise.

As has been the case before, Zechariah is in dialogue with the prophetic stream as a whole. Even when he is clearly alluding to a single prophetic passage (i.e., Ezek 37:15-28) he has the propensity to interact with a host of prophetic voices. In this case, that interaction comes via a name change, from *Joseph*, as Ezekiel and Zechariah 10 have it, to *Israel*, as other prophets have it. Since other major elements had already firmly rooted his prophecy in Ezekiel, he could freely opt for the name change in order to interact with other prophetic promises. By reversing these promises, Zechariah expressly indicates to his then-current audience that theirs is not the time for the promises to be realized, something that Zechariah 1:11 also communicated (see chapter 3).

To briefly conclude this section, “The original message is being inverted and the meaning of the action [now] is to announce judgment.”<sup>98</sup> As with Isaiah 14:8, Zechariah reverses the promises of Ezekiel and other former prophets, promises of a united people with a single king, exchanging those promises for a message of judgment expressed in a divided people with a worthless shepherd (see next section).

---

<sup>97</sup>For Zechariah’s use of Jer 3 in Zech 5:5-11, see chap. 4.

<sup>98</sup>Mason, “The Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 107.

## **Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11**

Like Jeremiah 25 and Ezekiel 37, it is commonplace to link Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11.<sup>99</sup> Ezekiel 34:1 begins a new oracle with the heading, וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר. The oracle extends the length of the chapter and is bookended with the same theme as Zechariah 11, the theme of sheep and shepherds. Ezekiel 34:2-10 is directed against “the shepherds of Israel” (verse 2). These shepherds feed themselves instead of the sheep and are worse than worthless, intentionally harming the sheep rather than working for their good (see vv. 3-10). The oracle ends speaking of the Lord as the shepherd of the people of Israel, “the human sheep of [his] pasture” (Ezek 34:31b). The verses in between (Ezek 34:11-30) recount the Lord’s promises in light of the worthlessness of Israel’s shepherds. “I myself will be the shepherd of my sheep” (Ezek 34:15a; cf. 34:11b, 20b, 22a, 25, 28a) and “I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them” (Ezek 34:23a).

Zechariah 11 is likewise concerned with sheep and shepherds. The shepherds appear in this text as early as verse 3, where they are wailing because their glory is ruined, and consistently throughout (see verses 4, 5, 7-9, 15-16), all the way to the end with a pronouncement of woe against “my worthless shepherd” (Zech 11:17).

Aside from the shared general topic of shepherds and sheep, several more specific points of contact are apparent between Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11. These corresponding points further showcase the reversal at work in Zechariah’s use of the earlier prophets.

In Zechariah 11:16 the Lord says, “Behold, I am raising up a shepherd in the land.” The introduction to this shepherd, הַנֶּהָאֲנֹכִי מִקִּים רֶעָה בְּאֶרֶץ, especially in light of how he is more fully and terribly described in the following verses, converses with and directly opposes a promise of Ezekiel’s. Ezekiel 34:23 begins, וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר

---

<sup>99</sup>See references towards the beginning of this chapter.

וְרָעָה אֶתְהֶן. This shepherd, contrary to Zechariah's, "shall feed them," and will be the Lord's agent of blessing to his people (see vv. 24-31).

Moreover, and strengthening the conclusion that intentional interaction exists between these proclamations of the two prophets, Ezekiel's description of the actions of the worthless shepherds, and his description of what the Lord would do in the future as shepherd of his people, as many commentators have noted, substantially overlaps with Zechariah's description of the worthless shepherd in Zechariah 11:16. Ezekiel poses the rhetorical question, "Should not shepherds feed the sheep?" He continues with his description of Israel's shepherds,

You eat (תֹּאכְלוּ) the fat, you clothe yourselves with the wool, and you slaughter the fat one (הַבְּרִיאָה), but you do not feed the sheep. The weak you have not strengthened. The sick you have not healed (לֹא־רִפְּאתֶם), and the broken (וְלֹנְשָׁבֶרֶת) you have not bound up. The strayed you have not brought back. The lost you have not sought (לֹא בִקְשֶׁתֶם). Instead, with violence and with harshness you have ruled them. (Ezek 34:3-4)

Later in the passage, the Lord promises to do for Israel what its shepherds had failed to do, "The lost I will seek (אֶבְקֹשׁ). The strayed I will bring back, and the broken (וְלֹנְשָׁבֶרֶת) I will bind up. The weak I will strengthen" (Ezek 34:16). Ezekiel's generation suffered the rule of ruthless and faithless leaders, which led to their dispersion among the nations. In the face of this reality, the great promise was that the Lord would take up the shepherd's staff and rule over a reunited nation in the land through a David-like figure. Zechariah's generation undoubtedly expected that this promise belonged to them. The bitterness of the words of Zechariah 11:16 is in the mixture of part of Ezekiel's hoped-for promise, that the Lord would raise up a good shepherd for them, with the descriptors used for the worthless leaders. Zechariah 11:16 reads, "Those being destroyed he will not attend. The young he will not seek (לֹא־יִבְקֹשׁ), and the broken (וְהַנִּשְׁבָּרֵת) he will not heal (יִרְפֵּא לֹא). The healthy he will not sustain. Instead, the flesh of the fat (הַבְּרִיאָה) he will eat (יֹאכְלֵ) and their hoofs he will tear off."<sup>100</sup> "Behold, I am raising up a shepherd in the

---

<sup>100</sup>The somewhat uncomfortable English, with the description of the sheep coming first and the



land...” who will be exactly like the ruthless shepherds of Ezekiel’s day. He will not be the good shepherd who was promised to you, and you will again suffer under oppressive rule.<sup>101</sup>

Zechariah here completely reverses the promise of Ezekiel and indicates that the people will return to their pre-exilic condition under a leader who does not care for them as the Lord had promised to care for them. Zechariah’s reuse of Ezekiel 34, then, contains both reversal and reapplication of judgment. The realization of Ezekiel’s promise is not for the current generation to experience. Their disobedience, as that of earlier generations, has resulted in the Lord’s anger and judgment (cf. Zech 1:4-6), expressed here in terms of Ezekiel.

The pronouncement of woe upon the worthless shepherd in Zechariah’s day (הוֹי רֹעֵי הָאֲלִיל) is also reminiscent of Ezekiel 34. The agent of judgment, the worthless shepherd, will himself be on the receiving end of the Lord’s judgment, as pronounced in 11:17, “Woe to the worthless shepherd, who deserts the flock! May the sword strike his arm and right eye! Let his arm be wholly withered, his right eye utterly blinded.” Ezekiel 34:2 reads, “Woe to the shepherds of Israel (הוֹי רֹעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), who have been feeding themselves!” The end of Zechariah 11, working together with the surrounding oracles, essentially resets the circumstances of Ezekiel’s day. The people faced the judgment of ruthless rulers, which led to their scattering (Ezek 34:5-6; Zech 10:9), eventual judgment of the leaders, and the expectation of the return of the people (Ezek 34:11-16; Zech 10:6, 10-11) and coming faithful king who himself would rule over them (Ezek 34:15, 23-24; Zech 9:9 [cf. Zech 2:10]; 14:9). Thus, although Zechariah here reverses Ezekiel, he also reiterates the doom of the worthless shepherd (within the immediate passage) and the

---

action/inaction of the shepherd second, reflects the word order of Zechariah’s Hebrew, which is also the order of Ezekiel’s; this furnishes the comparison of these two prophetic texts with yet another point of contact.

<sup>101</sup>This is similar to the phenomenon seen in the use of Isa 14 by Zech 1:11 (see chap. 3).

promises of peace and security (within the surrounding passages), which both redirect hope to the future. This is similar to the pattern of reversal and reiteration at work in Zechariah's first night vision (see chap. 3).

Heiko Wenzel, writing against Katrina Larkin's supposition that Zechariah tried to offer an explanation for the failed prophecy of Ezekiel, says, "The previous ten chapters [Zech 1-10], however, implicitly acknowledge that previous prophecies have not been fulfilled yet either. . . . They have pointed to . . . an intervening time period before the complete fulfillment."<sup>102</sup> As Wenzel explains, Zechariah points his audience to an additional period of waiting. The promises are not for the current day, as the returnees would have supposed, but that does not mean they have failed. Though there is reversal and judgment, there is also a reiteration of hope in the words of the earlier prophets. While Zechariah's prophecy may explain why the earlier promises were not realized in his day, namely, the disobedience of the people and failure of the leaders, he does not completely nullify their validity. Rather, he points again to the future.

To compress the findings of the comparison between Zechariah 11 and its three most often observed pre-texts (Jer 25, Ezek 34 and Ezek 37), and what can be concluded about Zechariah 11 from this comparison, the prophet either reiterates the judgment of his predecessors or he reverses their promises. In one instance, that of the pronouncement of woe upon the worthless shepherd, the reiteration of judgment is a positive indication that the punishment of the people will not be the final word. As for the other interactions with earlier prophecies, the picture is quite bleak. The hopes of the then-current generation are dashed, as prophetic language is taken up in order to break promises or reapply judgments. These observations lay the groundwork to investigate other, less prominent, uses of the earlier prophetic stream in this chapter. Before I discuss these other allusions, I want to call attention to a recurring figure within the main source-

---

<sup>102</sup>Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah*, 237.

texts of Zechariah 11, the promised Davidic king.

### **David's King: Presently Absent**

It is at the very least worthwhile to note that of the three most prominent alluded to sources of Zechariah 11, the promise of a king is present in two of them, and is intimately tied to the third. Ezekiel 34:23 reads, “And I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them.” Ezekiel 37:24 similarly reads, “My servant David shall be king over them, and they shall all have one shepherd. They shall walk in my rules and be careful to obey my statutes.” Jeremiah 25 does not contain any reference to a Davidic king, as it is occupied entirely with the judgment against “the shepherds . . . the lords of the flock” (Jer 25:35). Jeremiah 23, on the other hand, which begins the pronouncement of judgment that continues in chapter 25, “Woe to the shepherds (הוי רעים) who destroy and scatter the sheep” (Jer 23:1; see above on Ezek 34:2 and Zech 11:17),<sup>103</sup> does promise David's king. “Behold, the days are coming . . . when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely” (Jer 23:5; cf. Jer 33:14-18; Zech 3:8; 6:12).

This observation lends itself to certain potential conclusions. The first is that Zechariah has the broader context in mind when he alludes to particular texts. In this case, he is able to highlight the root of the people's problem, the absence of the Davidic king, by leaving him out of his picture in Zechariah 11. Since Zechariah here recalls three texts that are accompanied by the promise of the king's coming, the intentional non-mention would seemingly say something to the audience. Even though the prophet does not employ the specific verses wherein mention is made of David's king, he creates a king-shaped hole by his employment of the surrounding topics and terminology in the

---

<sup>103</sup>The texts of Jer 23:1, Ezek 34:2, and Zech 11:17 are the only three in the Hebrew Bible that pronounce “Woe” upon “shepherds.” On others who have noted an allusion to Jer 23 in Zech 11, see references towards the beginning of this chapter.

relevant texts of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. This is especially convincing in light of the dynamic between the worthless shepherds and the good king, who is the solution to the sheep's problem, in Ezekiel 34, and Zechariah's reinstatement of the worthless shepherd. In this way, he is able to evoke the prophecies of the good king and his future coming without explicitly mentioning them. The king's noticeable absence, then, ironically, gives him a certain presence.

Second, the observation that the king is present through absence in Zechariah 11 threads together earlier and later parts of the prophecy, as Zechariah elsewhere presents the king's arrival as the solution to the problem of the people. The cyclical distress of the people, hinted at by Zechariah 1:4, "Do not be like your fathers," (cf. Zech 7:7-14) would only come to an end when the king came. As early as Zechariah 3:8 there appears to be interplay between Zechariah's prophecy and Jeremiah's promise of the Branch (צמח)/king (see Jer 23:5; 33:14-18). "Behold, I will bring my servant the Branch." Again, in Zechariah 6:12-13, "Behold, the man whose name is the Branch. . . . It is he who shall build the temple of the Lord and shall bear royal honor, and shall sit and rule on his throne."<sup>104</sup> Most explicitly, Zechariah 9:9 reads, "Behold, your king is coming to you! Righteous and having salvation is he." And Zechariah 14:9 speaks of the day when, "the Lord will be king over all the earth." These promises, coupled with the dire situation of Zechariah 11, a people who suffers and will suffer at the hands of worthless shepherds/a worthless shepherd, work together to present the absent king as much-needed and still hoped-for in the renowned shepherd-narrative. Zechariah 11 presents a problem whose solution lies in the source texts' contexts, and this is corroborated by other places within Zechariah that directly speak of the king's coming.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup>For a thorough discussion of these texts, and a defense that they are Messianic, contrary to a popular view that the "Branch" refers to Zerubbabel, see Walter Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Post-Exilic Period* (New York: T&T Clark, 2000); Anthony R. Petterson, *Behold Your King: The Hope for the House of David in the Book of Zechariah* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009).

<sup>105</sup>Cf. David Kimchi, *Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary upon the Prophecies of Zechariah*,

Another consideration in favor of this line of thinking is the lesser-noted allusion to Judges 9 in Zechariah 11.<sup>106</sup> Zechariah 11 opens with the line, “Open your doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour your cedars (וְתֹאכַל אֵשׁ בְּאַרְזֵיךָ)!” As Wolters notes, Judges 9 is “the only other place in the Hebrew Bible where there is mention of fire consuming the cedars of Lebanon.”<sup>107</sup> Judges 9:15, a verse in the midst of Jotham’s fable concerning Abimelech’s recent illegitimate appointment as king, reads, “If in good faith you are anointing me king over you, then come and take refuge in my shade, but if not, let fire (אֵשׁ) come out of the bramble and devour the cedars of Lebanon (וְתֹאכַל אֶת-הָאַרְזֵי הַלְּבָנוֹן).” Several verses later (v. 20), Jotham identifies the cedars of Lebanon with “the leaders of Shechem and Beth-millo.” In both cases, the consumption of Lebanon’s cedars, the leaders, is the result of the lack of a legitimate king. The closing line of Zechariah 11 could well have restated the concluding remark of the book of Judges, “in those days there was no king in Israel.” Or, as Zechariah has it nearby, “The people are afflicted because there is no shepherd” (Zech 10:2).

### Lesser-noted Allusions

In addition to the three oft-noted allusions to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, other lesser-noted allusions within Zechariah 11 appear valid, as they fit into the molds of reversal and restatement of judgment. It is the purpose of this section to set forth those allusions, demonstrate their validity, and explore their surrounding contexts for overlooked parallels that may aid in understanding Zechariah 11.

### Judges 9

The thematic and peculiar lexical parallels between the texts of Zechariah 11

---

trans. A. M’Caul (repr., London: Paternoster Row, 1837), 142-43.

<sup>106</sup>See, among others, Wolters, *Zechariah*, 351-52.

<sup>107</sup>*Ibid.*, 351.

and Judges 9 were discussed above, and these are the ones that have been noticed and commented on by others.

Upon further investigation, Judges 9 yields an intriguing parallel to the infamous thirty pieces of silver.<sup>108</sup> The prophet Zechariah receives instruction to “become shepherd of the flock doomed to slaughter” (Zech 11:4), and he becomes their shepherd (11:7a). He recounts, “But I became impatient with them, and they also detested me” (11:8b). This leads to a request by the shepherd for his wages (11:12a), which come to him in the amount of thirty pieces of silver (שְׁלֹשִׁים כֶּסֶף; 11:12b). The transaction finalizes the relationship between the two parties and leads ultimately to the appearance of the worthless shepherd who “devours the flesh of the fat ones, tearing off even their hoofs” (11:15-16).

In Judges 9, when the leaders of Shechem find it favorable for Abimelech to rule over them as king they give him “seventy pieces of silver (שִׁבְעֵים כֶּסֶף) . . . with which Abimelech hired worthless and reckless men who followed after him” (9:4). “And he went . . . and killed his brothers . . . seventy men” (9:5).

In Zechariah, the payment of silver comes at the end of the prophet’s tenure as the shepherd of the flock, a prophet who was commissioned by the Lord to be a shepherd. In Judges, it comes at the beginning of Abimelech’s reign as king, a king who had no commission and procured the office by illicit means. The one payment disposes of a good leader, while the other installs a wicked one. This is not the reversal of prophetic promises as before, but another sort of reversal is at work here in the elements of disposal and installation and good and evil.

Further, after the initial difference, the absence versus the presence of a leader, the payments both initiate the same course of events, generally considered. Each payment

---

<sup>108</sup>The parallel by itself is a stretch, but when considered alongside of the common peculiar phrase, it becomes more plausible.

results in the activity of worthless men who kill and devour. In Judges, the silver is more directly linked with the worthless men than in Zechariah, and so too the killing, but the parallels remain.

It is also possible, though admittedly unlikely, that this sheds light on the debated question of interpreting whether thirty is a low amount or a fair amount for the prophet's service as shepherd. Upon receiving the payment, the Lord instructs the prophet to throw the money to the potter, and refers to it as "the glorious price which I was priced by them" (Zech 11:13a). This verse is surely ironical, and seemingly indicates that the amount was too little. The prophet should have been paid more. Joyce Baldwin, however, drawing upon Nehemiah 5:15, which records that the forty shekels in tax per year exacted by the Persian governors was burdensome, and Exodus 21:32, which records that thirty shekels was the price for the life of a slave, valuing human life highly, thinks, "This was no mean sum."<sup>109</sup>

If the "seventy of silver" can in any way be connected to a payment received by Abimelech to rule, then the "thirty of silver" is perhaps indeed meant to be viewed as a mean sum.<sup>110</sup> In any case, the forgoing observations on the interpretive impact of Judges 9 are suggestive rather than conclusive. They do, though, showcase once again the potential fruitfulness of mining the contexts of the source-texts in order to illuminate the dark places of Zechariah. Even if the interpretive options provided by the source-texts' contexts are not entirely persuasive, they do supply options.

---

<sup>109</sup>Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, 198-99.

<sup>110</sup>The connection is not all that neat in the Judges narrative, as the seventy likely relates to the number of men who were killed. Perhaps, then, Abimelech received one for every man's life, in which case there would be a disconnect between his ruling and his reception of the payment. It is also unclear in Zechariah if this shepherd was set up as a royal ruler, since only the term shepherd is used. Though it clearly indicates a leadership position, there is not a one-to-one connection between Abimelech as king and Zechariah as shepherd, and so it may be improper to compare the amount of silver that each received.

## Jeremiah 12-13 and Ezekiel

Other general prophetic precursors also appear to be operative in Zechariah 11. The first part of Zechariah 11:6 reads, “I will no longer have pity (לֹא אֶחַמּוֹל) on the inhabitants of the land, declares the Lord. Behold, I will cause each of them to fall into the hand of his neighbor, and each into the hand of his king.” The first-person form of חַמַּל occurs only six other times in the Hebrew Bible. The Lord is the subject of the verb in all other instances, and in each instance, as in Zechariah, the verb is negated by the particle לֹא (Jer 13:14; Ezek 5:11; 7:4, 9; 8:18; 9:10).

This is likely another example where Zechariah 11 restates the judgment of the earlier prophets. Jeremiah 13:14 reads, “And I will dash them, each man against his brother, fathers and sons together, declares the Lord. I will not pity (לֹא אֶחַמּוֹל) or spare or have compassion from destroying them.” The Lord gives his reason for this in Jeremiah 13:10, “This evil people, who refuse to hear my words . . . stubbornly follow their own heart and have gone after other gods to serve them and worship them.” All five texts of Ezekiel are very similar to one another. Ezekiel 5:11 reads, “Because you have defiled my sanctuary with all your detestable things and with all your abominations, therefore I will withdraw. My eye will not spare, and I will not pity (וְלֹא אֶחַמּוֹל).” Ezekiel 7:4, 7:9, and 8:17-18 also mention the peoples’ “abominations.” 8:17 adds that they “fill the land with violence” and Ezekiel 9:9-10 picks this up: “The land is full of blood, and the city full of injustice. . . . my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity (וְלֹא אֶחַמּוֹל), I will bring their deeds upon their heads.” The prevalence of false worship, violence and injustice, in short, disobedience, leads to the condemnation that the Lord will no longer pity the inhabitants of the land.

In Zechariah’s day, the situation was comparable. Zechariah 10:2-3 reads, “For the household gods (הַתְּרַפִּים) speak deceit, the diviners see visions of falsehood and speak empty dreams and comfort with a vain thing, therefore the people wander like sheep.” The idolatry of the people led to the scattering of the flock. Supporting the allusion, the



context of Jeremiah 13 references the people as “the Lord’s flock [that] has been taken captive” (Jer 13:17) the “beautiful flock” (Jer 13:20). The injustice and violence of Ezekiel’s verses are likewise present in Zechariah, “Those who buy them slaughter them and go unpunished, and those who sell them say, ‘Blessed be the Lord, I have become rich,’ and their own shepherds have no pity on them. For I will no longer have pity” (Zech 11:5-6a). The same vices produced the same results.

These allusions to previous judgments recall the introduction to the book and its call, “Return to me, and I will return to you. . . . Do not be like your fathers, to whom the former prophets cried out . . . ‘Return from your evil ways and deeds.’ But they did not hear or pay attention to me” (Zech 1:3-4). “My words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not overtake your fathers?” (Zech 1:6a). These introductory verses issue a call to its readers/hearers with the implicit threat that the same fate awaits them if they follow in their fathers’ steps. This provides interpretive value that lends its hand in legitimizing these allusions in Zechariah 11, as they communicate that Zechariah’s audience did not heed his call to reform, and the consequences of their actions, the actions that imitated those of earlier generations, will now imitate that of earlier generations, “Again, I will not have pity on them.”<sup>111</sup>

Zechariah 11:6 ends with, “I will not deliver from their hand (וְלֹא אֶצִּיל מִיָּדָם).” Ezekiel 34:10, 12, and 27 use similar language. For example, Ezekiel 34:27 reads, “And they shall know that I am the Lord, when I break the bars of their yoke and have delivered them from the hand (וְהִצַּלְתִּים מִיַּד הָעֹבְדִים בָּהֶם) of those who enslaved them.” Three times the Lord promises through Ezekiel, “I will deliver,” which he reverses by Zechariah, “I will not deliver.”

---

<sup>111</sup>For a monographic defense of the idea that the introductory verses govern the whole book, see Wenzel, *Reading Zechariah*. It is also worthwhile to note that it was common among earlier interpreters to suppose that Zechariah wrote his later chapters when he was older, giving time for the hopes of the community to be dashed and moral failure to set in.

If לֹא אֲצִיל at the end of Zechariah 11:6 is meant to evoke Ezekiel's promise by reversing it, fitting well with Zechariah's clear reversal of Ezekiel 34 elsewhere in this chapter, then it becomes even more likely that לֹא אֶחְמוֹל at the beginning of Zechariah 11:6 is meant to evoke Ezekiel's language of judgment by restating it.

This conclusion raises two questions. Is the text of Jeremiah 13:14, as the only text outside of Ezekiel containing the exact words לֹא אֶחְמוֹל, to be included among the source texts? And, is this an allusion to a single text or to multiple texts? That is, is it specific or broad? If it should be concluded that Jeremiah is to be included in the source texts, it would rule out a single text, but as with chapter 3, it may still be an allusion to multiple single texts, as the limited number of occurrences allows for the isolation and identification of the texts to which he is here alluding.

First then, is he here alluding to Jeremiah 13:14? Again, it reads, "And I will dash them one against another, fathers and sons together, declares the Lord. I will not pity, or spare, or have compassion from destroying them." Aside from לֹא אֶחְמוֹל, the two verses share in conveying the idea of conflict among the people, "I will dash them one against another (וְנִפְצְתִים אִישׁ אֶל-אָחִיו)," and "I will cause each of them to fall into the hand of his neighbor (אִישׁ בְּיַד-רֵעֵהוּ)" (Zech 11:6). As noted above, thematic overlap also exists between the two, as Jeremiah speaks of "the Lord's flock [that] has been taken captive" (Jer 13:17; cf. v. 20). Another consideration in support of a likely allusion is the presence of two rare phrases in Jeremiah 12 that appear in Zechariah 11. They are, "the flock of slaughter," כְּצֹאן לְטַבַּח in Jeremiah 12:3 and אֶת-צֹאן הַהֲרָגָה in Zechariah 11:4, and "the thicket of the Jordan," בְּגֵאוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן in Jeremiah 12:5 and גֵּאוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן in Zechariah 11:3. The former phrase finds close parallel elsewhere only in Psalm 44:12, כְּצֹאן מֵאֲכָל, and Isaiah 53:7, כְּשֶׂה לְטַבַּח. In Jeremiah 12:3, the term for slaughter is different than that of Zechariah, טַבַּח instead of הֲרָגָה, but exact lexical use is not necessary for a legitimate allusion in Zechariah, and even if it was, Jeremiah's verse concludes with Zechariah's term, "Pull them out like sheep for the slaughter, and set

them apart for the day of slaughter (לְיוֹם הַרְגָה).” הַרְגָה is a very rare term, occurring in only Zechariah (in 11:4 and 11:7) and Jeremiah (in 7:32, 12:3, and 19:6).<sup>112</sup> If Zechariah intentionally used Jeremiah 12, he has altered the phrase while managing to maintain the vocabulary of his predecessor. The latter phrase, “thicket of the Jordan,” is peculiar to Zechariah 11:3, Jeremiah 12:5, 49:19 and 50:44. The thought would be that if Zechariah was swimming in the waters of Jeremiah 12, as evidenced by his use of these two rare phrases, it is more likely that, being so close by, he could have easily dipped in those of Jeremiah 13.

It is a difficult question to answer definitively, whether Zechariah had Jeremiah 13 in mind for his proclamation that the Lord would no longer have compassion. It is also interesting to wonder if that is the right question to ask. Did the person who wrote Zechariah 11 have the scrolls of Jeremiah and Ezekiel opened up before him as he wrote, taking this word or phrase from one place and that word or phrase from another, leaving for his readers/hearers marks on a trail to follow to his original place of departure in an earlier prophet? Were the specific words and contexts all contained in his mind, so that practically this would amount to the same thing? This has been the underlying assumption of most of what I have written. The difficult part in assessing an intentional use of Jeremiah 13 is how familiar it must have been for anyone acquainted with Ezekiel to hear that the Lord would not have compassion. This being the case, perhaps he did not intend to lead his audience to Jeremiah 13 by his use of the words, “I will not have compassion.” That he apparently used Jeremiah 12 in this same context is, to my mind, the strongest consideration in favor of an intentional use of Jeremiah 13, but it is not decisive, since it is not clear that Jeremiah 13 adds anything to Zechariah’s interpretation beyond what Ezekiel’s texts add: a reapplication of the precise judgment of the former prophets in light of imitative disobedience.

---

<sup>112</sup>Jer 7:32 and 19:6 speak of the “Valley of Slaughter,” גֵּיא הַהַרְגָה.

This same line of thinking can be applied to the question of whether Zechariah is making a specific or broad allusion. Not one of the Ezekiel texts in which לֹא אֶחְמֹל or לֹא אֶחְמַל appear (Ezek 5:11; 7:4, 9; 8:18; 9:10) is notable for what it adds to the interpretation of Zechariah 11 beyond this general observation, that as the opening of the book called for repentance in the words of the earlier prophets, it is now applying judgment in the words of the earlier prophets, with the further implication, as noted above, that the people have emulated the disobedience of their fathers. It would therefore be impossible to single out one text as the one to which Zechariah is alluding. Here again, then, as in chapter 2, Zechariah is making a broad allusion to the former prophets. In chapter 3 it was observed that an allusion could be thought of as both broad and specific, in the sense that even if he does not have an individual text in mind, categorizing it as broad, there may only be a few available options for source texts, making it somewhat specific. In this case, it seems more fitting to label the allusion as broad, since more than a couple of existing pre-texts contain Zechariah's phrase.

### **My Covenant with All the Peoples**

No part of a verse fits more neatly into the mold of reversal than Zechariah 11:10b. The verse follows the well-famed actions of the prophet in the shepherd-narrative, becoming shepherd of the flock (11:7), destroying three shepherds (11:8), and refusing to continue the work as the shepherd (11:9). Upon forsaking his office, he breaks his staff “Favor (אֶת־נַעַם),” (11:10a) אֶת־כָּל־הָעַמִּים אֲשֶׁר כָּרַתִּי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אֲשֶׁר לָהֶפִיר (11:10b).

The breaking of the staff, as seen above, is a reversal of Ezekiel's stick-joining, which, Zechariah explains, is symbolic of breaking the covenant that had been made with “all the peoples.” This certainly must refer to a covenant that the Lord, Yahweh, had made with all the peoples, even though Zechariah does not transition from the prophet as subject of the stick-taking and -breaking, “I took my staff Favor and I broke it,” and the reference to “my covenant.” If it is not the Lord's covenant, it would be a covenant that

the prophet himself had made with all the peoples, which seems highly unlikely. The verses give the impression that it is the Lord who was the shepherd, as the prophet's actions are indistinguishable from his, "I (the prophet) broke my (the prophet's) staff, to break my (the Lord's) covenant." As F. Horst writes, "Aus 10b ist aber zu erkenne, dass dieser Hirt in göttlicher Legitimation und Vollmacht handelt."<sup>113</sup> "This interpretive comment ['to break my covenant'] demonstrates the close tie between the prophet and YHWH, already established in v. 4, as the prophet's actions and words become 'an event of God.'<sup>114</sup> In short, a covenant that the Lord had previously made is now broken. The question that has proved difficult to answer is: to what covenant does this refer?

Scholars have regularly looked to the earlier prophets for an answer to this question. No other reference to a covenant occurs within the shepherd-narrative, and the only other occurrence of בְּרִית within Zechariah is in Zechariah 9:11, "by/because of the blood of your [the people's] covenant (בְּדַם-בְּרִיתֶךָ) I have sent your prisoners from the waterless pit," which is itself understood to refer to a covenant spoken of by the former prophets. Zechariah never records that either he or the Lord had recently made a covenant with all the peoples.<sup>115</sup> This being the case, there have been several proposed texts to which לְהַפִּיר אֶת-בְּרִיתִי אֲשֶׁר כָּרַתִּי אֶת-כָּל-הָעַמִּים refers.<sup>116</sup>

The final words of this verse, "all the peoples," have been determinative for the proposals. First, some think that Zechariah is here referring to the Noahic covenant in Genesis 9:8-17. There God says, "I am establishing my covenant (אֶת-בְּרִיתִי) with you and

---

<sup>113</sup>Cited approvingly by Rex Mason in Mason, "The Use of Earlier Biblical Material," in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 108.

<sup>114</sup>Foster, "Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization," 746-47.

<sup>115</sup>See, contrarily, Boda, "This covenant had been made between the prophet-shepherd and *all the peoples*. . . . Most likely the *peoples* in view here are the nations, referring to the sellers and buyers who had employed the prophet-shepherd (along with his three shepherd foes) to care for the flock and enable their abuse of the sheep." Boda, *Zechariah*, 668 (italics original).

<sup>116</sup>See above for references to the following proposals.

your offspring after you, and with every living creature that is with you. . . . I establish my covenant (אֶת-בְּרִיתִי) with you, that never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of the flood” (Gen 9:9-11). That the covenant is not solely with Israel, but with Noah and all his offspring, or “all flesh that is on the earth” (Gen 9:16), and that it is referred to as “my covenant” three times (see also Gen 9:15), work in favor of this suggestion. But what would it look like if God broke the covenant he made with Noah? And, is this what Zechariah had in mind?

The result of breaking the Noahic covenant would be the destruction of all flesh. The context of Zechariah 11:10, however, outside of the reference to “all peoples,” does not explicitly contain the language needed to indicate the universality of destruction demanded by the supposed pre-text. As Wolters writes, “It is clear from the context that the breaking of the first staff symbolizes a judgment, not on the nations of the world in general, but on the one covenant nation represented by the flock.”<sup>117</sup> The shepherd is dealing with a particular people, and the absence of additional supportive material makes it unlikely that his focus in verse 10 is on the entire world.

Tempering this conclusion is the undoubted interaction of Zechariah 11:1-3 with Jeremiah 25 (see above), a text that clearly does indicate the world’s judgment, “I am summoning a sword against all the inhabitants of the earth. . . . Those pierced by the Lord on that day shall extend from one end of the earth to the other. . . . Wail, you shepherds” (Jer 25:29, 33-34). Since the beginning of chapter 11 does indicate universal destruction via Jeremiah 25, it is far from impossible to square the context with Noah’s covenant, especially given the difficulty of explaining why the plural and all inclusive אֶת-כָּל-הָעַמִּים would be used in reference to the covenant people alone. An allusion in Zechariah 11:10 to universal judgment becomes even more plausible given the broader context beyond Zechariah 11.

---

<sup>117</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 377.

Most immediately, Zechariah 12:2 reads, “Behold, I am going to make Jerusalem a cup of staggering to all the surrounding peoples (לְכָל־הָעַמִּים קָבִיב).” Verse 3 continues, “I will make Jerusalem a heavy stone for all the peoples (לְכָל־הָעַמִּים), all who lift it will surely be cut, and all the nations of the earth (כָּל־גּוֹיֵי הָאָרֶץ) shall be gathered against her.” Further, the exact construction of Zechariah 11:10, אֶת־כָּל־הָעַמִּים, occurs in Zechariah 12:6 and, along with the verses above, refers to the nations of the earth. It reads, “The clans of Judah . . . shall devour to the right and to the left all the surrounding peoples (אֶת־כָּל־הָעַמִּים קָבִיב).” Additionally, Zechariah 14:12, the only other place within the book containing אֶת־כָּל־הָעַמִּים exactly, reads, “And this shall be the plague with which the Lord will strike all the peoples that wage war against Jerusalem.”<sup>118</sup> The reference is again to all the nations (cf. Zech 14:2-3).

If these verses should influence the exegesis of “all the peoples” of Zechariah 11:10, which would be difficult to dispute considering a variation of “all peoples” occurs three times in such close proximity and once more a few chapters later; if they should influence the exegesis, then 11:10 would communicate the idea of judgment upon the inhabitants of the earth. This conclusion reopens the possibility that Zechariah is alluding to and breaking the covenant of Noah’s day. That covenant’s breaking would result in the judgment of the whole earth.

None of this proves that the prophet here alludes to the Noahic covenant, but it does give a response to the objection that the context has only judgment upon the covenant people in view, to the exclusion of the nations. It is precisely to the nations of the earth which “all the peoples” refers in the broader context.

Unfortunately, the immediate context of Zechariah 11:10 itself gives little clear help in determining what is meant by breaking “my covenant” with “all the peoples,”

---

<sup>118</sup>The exact construction of Zech 11:10 occurs in these three places of Zechariah (11:10; 12:6; and 14:12) and elsewhere in Deut 7:16 and Josh 24:18, both of which refer to the peoples Israel is to destroy.

especially if we are to conclude that “all the peoples” equals “all the nations.” Verse 11 follows with, “And it [my covenant] was broken in that day, and those who were watching me [“the sheep traders” or “the afflicted of the flock”]<sup>119</sup> knew that it was the word of the Lord.” Verses 13-14, the last of the verses to comment upon the breaking of the first staff (verse 15 recounts the breaking of the second), record the payment of those watching the prophet and the prophet’s casting of the money “to the house of the Lord, to the potter.” It is difficult to reconcile all of this with an interpretation of “all the peoples” as “all the nations,” because these verses appear to indicate that the covenant’s dissolution effects, or at least is very closely related to, the severing of the relationship of the prophet-shepherd over the people-sheep. Unless the prophet’s shepherding extended to “all the surrounding nations,” which is doubtful, a tension exists between breaking a covenant with “all the peoples,” understood as all the nations, and the prophet’s severance pay from his own people, which is closely related to the covenant’s severing. Why the close link between the end of the shepherd-sheep relationship and the breaking of the covenant with the nations?

Leaving behind this tension for the moment, another proposed source-text is Hosea 2:18, “And I will make for them a covenant on that day with the beasts of the field, the birds of the heavens, and the creeping things of the ground. And I will abolish the bow, the sword, and war from the land and make you lie down in safety.” The Lord would make this covenant, it is said, “that no harm should happen to his people.”<sup>120</sup> To break the covenant, then, would be to place the people in the way of harm once again. This does fit contextually at the broad level, but the specifics do not match. Zechariah makes no mention of beasts, birds, creeping things, the bow or war.<sup>121</sup> The sword occurs

---

<sup>119</sup>See above on the list of interpretive difficulties in this chapter.

<sup>120</sup>John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets: Zechariah and Malachi*, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950), 320.

<sup>121</sup>Though Zech 11:16 does depict the foolish shepherd as beastlike: he devours the flesh.



in Zechariah 11:17, “may a sword strike his arm and his right eye,” but its target is the worthless shepherd, not the people. Further, as others have said, the covenant in Hosea is with non-persons, whereas in Zechariah it is with “all the peoples.”<sup>122</sup> “The comparison is not suitable.”<sup>123</sup>

Others have concluded that the covenant of Zechariah 11:10 refers to the covenant God made with Abraham. John Calvin cites Genesis 17:6, “Nations from thee shall be born,” in order to explain the appropriateness of using “all the peoples” for Israel.<sup>124</sup> “The ten tribes were as so many nations among whom God reigned.” “The real meaning then [of Zech 11:10] seems to be, that God testified that he would no longer be the leader of that people; for when order was trodden under foot, the covenant of God was made void.”<sup>125</sup> In this case, the plural refers to the tribes of Israel. As Al Wolters writes, “the passage . . . refers to the covenant which God had established with the descendants of Jacob, the covenant which is at the heart of OT theology.”<sup>126</sup>

Most often, though, **עַם** rather than **עַמִּים** is used when speaking of Israel. For example, “I will take you for myself for a people (**עַמִּי**), and I will be your God” (Exod 6:7). The latter, **עַמִּים**, is typically used in reference to the nations. So, for example, Psalm 33:10, “The Lord nullifies the counsel of the nations; He frustrates the plans of the peoples.” In defense of Calvin’s interpretation, on the other hand, there have been plausible suggestions defending the identification of **עַמִּים** with Israel.

Al Wolters lists several suggestions in support of this identification. His own is that this is one of several examples in Zechariah of the “enclitic *mem*.”<sup>127</sup> “In the present

---

<sup>122</sup>See, e.g., Wolters, *Zechariah*, 377.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid.

<sup>124</sup>Calvin, *Twelve Minor Prophets*, 320.

<sup>125</sup>Ibid., 321.

<sup>126</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 377.

<sup>127</sup>Wolters, *Zechariah*, 377. He also supposes that this phenomenon occurs in 1:13; 5:6; 9:6;

case [of Zech 11:10] the postulated enclitic *mem* does not occur at the end of a construct plural, but at the end of an originally singular noun (עַמִּים), which the Massoretes misconstrued as a plural.” Therefore, “all the *people*” naturally identifies with the one people of God. Another suggestion, which, *pace* Wolters, maintains the plural reading of עַמִּים, is that “peoples” refers to the “Jewish colonies scattered among the nations.”<sup>128</sup> Finally, “[Paul] Redditt has argued that עַמִּים itself can bear a singular sense, appealing to the idioms ‘to be gathered to one’s people (עַמִּים)’ and ‘to be cut off from one’s people (עַמִּים),’ as well as passages like 1 Kgs 22:28, and Job 36:20.”<sup>129</sup>

Each of these suggestions reconciles the use of the plural, or “originally singular” in the case of Wolters, noun to refer to a single people group. A major problem with this, again, is the use of the exact construction אֶת-כָּל-הָעַמִּים, or a slight variation of it, multiple times in the following chapter, and once in Zechariah 14, to refer unambiguously to the nations. Coupling this with the fact that “peoples” is mostly synonymous with “nations” in the Hebrew Bible, it would be hard to conclude that Zechariah 11:10b refers to God’s covenant nation and not to the nations of the world. As much as the immediate context might seem to indicate otherwise, the Lord broke his covenant with all the nations.

This conclusion leads to an examination of other texts. Some say Zechariah had the covenant of Ezekiel 34:25 and 37:26 in mind.<sup>130</sup> Ezekiel 34:25 reads, “I will make with them a covenant of peace and banish wild beasts from the land, so that they may dwell securely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods.” Similarly, Ezekiel 37:26, “I will make a covenant of peace with them. It shall be an everlasting covenant with

---

11:7; and 14:5. Ibid., 64.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid., 377.

<sup>129</sup>For the idiom “to be gathered to one’s people,” see, e.g., Gen 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:33. For “to be cut off from one’s people,” see, e.g., Gen 17:14; Lev 7:20, 21, 25, 27.

<sup>130</sup>See, e.g., Paul Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 344-45.

them. And I will set them in their land and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in their midst forevermore.” The main consideration favoring an allusion to this covenant is that Zechariah clearly alludes to Ezekiel 34 and 37 in the immediate context (see above). Moreover, the stick that the prophet breaks in the first part of verse 10, to signify the breaking of the covenant in the second part, is a reversal of Ezekiel’s command to join the sticks in Ezekiel 34:16-21. It would naturally follow, then, that Zechariah breaks the covenant that Ezekiel promised.

It is also interesting to note, in light of the above conclusions regarding the identification of “all the peoples” with “all the nations,” Ezekiel’s mention of the nations in regard to the result of this covenant of peace. Ezekiel 37:27-28 says, “My dwelling place shall be with them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Then *the nations* will know that I am the Lord who sanctifies Israel, when my sanctuary is in their midst forevermore.” It is still unclear, however, how all of this would fit together.

To assume a legitimate allusion for the moment, Zechariah breaks Ezekiel’s covenant of peace that the Lord promised to make with Israel and nullifies the promised peace, security, and eternal presence of the Lord. The negation of these particulars is consonant with the picture of Zechariah 11. The Lord, presumably present in his house (11:13) and through the prophet, abandons the flock (11:8-9). This leaves the flock susceptible to having its flesh devoured and its hoofs torn off, a vivid reversal of Ezekiel’s promise in 34:28, “And they shall no more be a prey to the nations, nor shall the beasts of the land devour them. They shall dwell securely and none shall make them afraid.” However, in Ezekiel the covenant is clearly made with the chosen people, the flock of the Lord, and the nations are spoken of as outsiders who look on and see what the Lord has done. Is the mention of the nations looking on in Ezekiel 37:28 really enough to establish that this covenant was made with all the peoples? If so, Ezekiel’s covenant is an excellent candidate for Zechariah’s source-text: The Lord would not dwell with the people, and the people would not experience peace, safety, or the pride of being

the focal point of the nations. If not, there is yet another available option.

Robert Foster, borrowing Risto Nurmela's system of evaluating the likelihood of allusions, sees a "sure allusion" in Zechariah 11:10 to Isaiah 42:6 and 49:8.<sup>131</sup> Isaiah 42:6 reads, "I am the Lord. I have called you in righteousness. I will take you by the hand and keep you. I will give you as a covenant for the people (לְבְרִית עַם), a light for the nations." Isaiah 49:8, "Thus says the Lord, 'In a time of favor I have answered you; in a day of salvation I have helped you. I will keep you and give you as a covenant for the people (לְבְרִית עַם), to restore the land, to apportion the desolated inheritances.'" Foster comments, "Isa 42:6 and 49:8 are two prophecies that describe the Servant as 'a covenant to the people,' a combination of terms uniquely connecting these passages in the Hebrew Bible."<sup>132</sup> Connecting these passages with Zechariah, in addition to the terminology, he sees "a thematic parallel in the leadership role on behalf of the people, though again a reversal." The appointed Servant brings benefit while the shepherds of Zechariah's day bring harm.<sup>133</sup>

Having identified the allusion, Foster also gives space to contextual concerns. He describes, first, what it means that the Servant is a covenant to the people, "The vision of the Servant as a covenant to the nations means that the Servant facilitates the return of the exiles among the nations to the land of Israel." Second, he explains what it means for this covenant to be broken, "[It] means that YHWH reverses the promise to [continue to] bring the Jews back to their homeland from north, south, east, and west, from the ends of the earth."<sup>134</sup> In other words, the covenant promised a return and when Zechariah broke it the hope for a continued return was dashed.

---

<sup>131</sup>Al Wolters agrees with Foster's suggestion. Wolters, *Zechariah*, 377.

<sup>132</sup>Foster, "Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization," 748.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid., 749.

<sup>134</sup>Foster, "Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization," 749. Foster places the words "continue to" in brackets. I did not add them.

Judging by Foster's interpretation of the promise of the Isaianic covenant, "to bring the Jews back to their homeland," it is unclear how this would be a suitable backdrop for Zechariah's covenant with "all the peoples," understood as "all the nations."

This raises three separate but connected questions. Is Isaiah's covenant really with the Jews, as Foster supposes? Does Zechariah have this covenant in mind? And finally, if it is not and he does, what does it mean for the Lord to break the covenant with all the peoples in Zechariah 11:10b?

As for the first question, Isaiah's covenant is with both the Jews and the nations. As Foster himself points out regarding Isaiah 42:6, the Servant is given as "a covenant for the people, a light for the nations." Unexpectedly, he thinks that "עַם" obviously refers to more than one people, as it parallels גוֹיִם." This may be the case, but it is also quite possible that עַם refers to Israel alone. The covenant could still be with the nations in this scenario, and it seems likely that it is, in light of the benefits both parties (Israel and the nations) receive. Isaiah 49:6 points in this direction. It reads, "It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the preserved of Israel; I will make you as a light for the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth." "These shall come from afar, and behold, these from the north and from the west, and these from the land of Syene" (Isa 49:12). "Behold, I will lift my hand to the nations, and raise my signal to the peoples; and they shall bring your sons [O Zion] in their bosom, and your daughters shall be carried on their shoulders" (Isa 49:22). The immediately surrounding verses make it clear that the covenant is with Israel and the nations; the blessings are for both.

The second question, whether Zechariah here alludes to Isaiah, depends in part on how satisfactorily the third question, what it means for this covenant to be broken, can be answered in light of the allusion. That is, if Isaiah's texts and contexts shed light on Zechariah's text and simultaneously fit with his context, it is reasonable to suppose that Isaiah's covenant is Zechariah's covenant of reference. Before addressing this third

question, some independent considerations work in favor of affirmatively answering the second; Zechariah is here alluding to Isaiah.

First, these are the only texts with the coupling of **עם** and **ברית** in reference to a covenant between the Lord and all the nations.<sup>135</sup> Zechariah's plural, **העמים**, differs from Isaiah's singular, **עם**, but Isaiah's singular has the plural **גוים** in a parallel line and it is quite possible that the mergence of these two yielded Zechariah's choice, an adaptation not uniquely showcased here.<sup>136</sup>

At the broader level, as Foster points out, these two contexts share the theme of leadership. More specifically, further on, David is spoken of as “a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander for the peoples” (Isa 55:4), which is reminiscent of the Servant as a covenant/light for the people/nations. What David was the Servant would be, a light/covenant/witness for the nations. The lack of David's son, the awaited leader, is the problem of Zechariah 11.

The final independent consideration in favor of an allusion is the likely allusion to Isaiah 42 and its surrounding sections in Zechariah 12:1-2.<sup>137</sup> Zechariah 12:1 reads, “Thus declares the Lord, who stretched out the heavens and founded the earth (**נִטָּה שָׁמַיִם וַיִּסַּד אָרֶץ**) and formed the spirit of man (**רוּחַ-אָדָם**) within him.” The closest parallel, sharing the three elements of heaven, earth and the spirit of man, occurs in Isaiah 42:5, one verse before the mention of “covenant to the people.” It reads, “Thus says God, the Lord, who created the heavens and stretched them out (**הַשָּׁמַיִם וַנּוֹטִיהֶם**), who spread

---

<sup>135</sup>The many other texts that speak of a “covenant” between the Lord and the “people” refer to a covenant between the Lord and the people of Israel. E.g., Exod 24:7-8; 34:10; Num 18:19; Deut 29:1; Judg 2:20; 1 Kgs 19:10, 14; 2 Kgs 22:2-3; Jer 31:33;

<sup>136</sup>See above on his use of Jer 25, pp. 90ff.

<sup>137</sup>This assumes the legitimacy of the technique of “sustained allusion” that Michael Stead and others have noticed elsewhere within Zechariah (see chap. 1). That is, Zechariah has a tendency to allude to a certain prophet more than once across smaller (and larger) sections. This is apparent, for example, in his allusions to Isa 14 in Zech 1:11 and 11:2. For further discussion of Zechariah's techniques, see chap. 6 of this dissertation.

out the earth and what comes from it, who gives breath to the people on it, and spirit (וְרוּחַ) to those who walk in it.” Not many other texts speak of the Lord as the one who stretched out the heavens (נָטָה שָׁמַיִם). Outside of Isaiah’s multiple uses, there are only Job 9:8, Psalm 18:10, 104:2, and 144:5, and Jeremiah 10:12 and 51:15. Jeremiah’s two texts are identical to one another, “He made the earth by his power, established the world by his wisdom, and stretched out the heavens by his understanding,” and lack the element of man that is present in both Zechariah and Isaiah. The larger context of Isaiah has several places that contain all three elements. Isaiah 44:24, “Thus says the Lord . . . who formed you from the womb . . . I am the Lord who made all things, who stretched out the heavens (נָטָה שָׁמַיִם) by myself, who spread out the earth.” Isaiah 45:12, “I made the earth and I created man on it. My hands stretched out the heavens (נָטוּ שָׁמַיִם).” Finally, Isaiah 51:13, “The Lord, your maker, who stretched out the heavens and founded the earth (נָטָה שָׁמַיִם וַיְסִד אֲרֶץ).” Isaiah 51:13 is the only other verse in the Hebrew Bible to share this exact phrase with Zechariah 12:1.<sup>138</sup> Moreover, Isaiah 51:17ff. shares substantially with Zechariah 12:2, “Behold, I am about to make Jerusalem a cup of reeling (סִף־רַעֲלָה) to all the surrounding peoples.” Isaiah describes Jerusalem as the one who has drunk the cup of reeling (כּוֹס הַתְּרַעֲלָה; Isa 51:17) but who will have the cup of reeling (אֶת־כּוֹס הַתְּרַעֲלָה; Isa 51:22) taken from her hand and put into the hand of those causing her grief (Isa 51:23). Zechariah reiterates the hoped-for reversal promised by Isaiah to Jerusalem; the nations will be reeling instead of her.<sup>139</sup>

It seems, therefore, based on the rarity of נָטָה שָׁמַיִם, the concentration of it in Isaiah 42-51, the combination of the Lord as maker of heaven, earth, and man, and, more specifically in Isaiah 42:5 the spirit of man, the peculiarly shared “who stretched out the heavens and founded the earth,” and the pairing of reeling with Jerusalem, that Zechariah

---

<sup>138</sup>The only difference is the orthography of נָטָה.

<sup>139</sup>Thanks to Dr. Peter Gentry for the connection between Zechariah 12:2 and Isaiah 51:17ff.

12:1-2 is keyed into this larger context of Isaiah.<sup>140</sup> If this is so, an allusion to Isaiah 42:6 and 49:8 in Zechariah 11:10 is much more likely. This all fits quite well with Paul Lamarche's claim that "le Deutéro-Zacharie a sans doute utilize Is 40-55."<sup>141</sup>

Finally, then, if Isaiah's covenant is with the nations and Zechariah alludes to it, what does Zechariah 11:10b mean? That is, what would it mean to break Isaiah's covenant?

The answer to this question is quite difficult to ascertain, as the Servant portion of Isaiah has proven to be notoriously complex. Nevertheless, enough clear statements exist within Isaiah's prophecies to carve out some possible suggestions for the interpretation of Zechariah's covenant-breaking. The suggestions are tentative, but they are worth consideration.

If the main question raised by Zechariah 11:10 concerns the import of breaking the covenant, of significance are the benefits the nations would derive from this covenant. Alongside of this, how is it that they would receive these benefits? Lastly, why will they no longer benefit?

According to Isaiah, the nations would be incorporated into the people of God and would receive all the benefits Israel enjoyed as the Lord's people. They would receive justice and the law (42:1, 4; 51:4-5), freedom from blindness, darkness, and prison (42:7), the right to participate in the Lord's praises (42:12; cf. vv. 10-11), in worship (45:23), and in temple worship (56:7), salvation (45:22; 49:6), and an ingathering to Zion (49:22). To break the covenant, in short, would signify that the nations would remain in darkness. The light would not shine on them, the law and justice would not come to them, they would not be gathered to Zion, would not worship the

---

<sup>140</sup>For Zech 11:4-14 he sees connections with Isaiah 49:1ff. (see chap. 1).

<sup>141</sup>See p. 10 of this dissertation for the links Lamarche sees between Isaiah 40-55 and Zechariah 9-14.



Lord, and would not be saved. How, then, would these benefits be mediated to them?

It was shown above that in Zechariah a close relationship exists between breaking the covenant with the peoples and the shepherd's departure from office over the Jews. Why these two things should be related is unclear. Isaiah's backdrop, though, provides two potential ways to account for the relationship.

The first way depends on Israel herself acting in a mediatorial capacity between the Lord's benefits and the nations, and Isaiah depicts this role. It is well known that "servant" has several referents in Isaiah: Isaiah himself (20:3), Eliakim (22:20), David (37:35), Israel/Jacob (41:8-9; 42:19; 43:10; 44:1-2, 21; 45:4; 48:20; 49:3), messengers (44:26), and an unclear referent (42:1; 49:5-7; 50:10; 52:13; 53:11), often identified with the future Messiah in light of the New Testament.<sup>142</sup> Despite the variation, Israel/Jacob is most often and most unambiguously identified as the servant. For example, "But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen. . . . You are my servant. I have chosen you and not cast you off." (41:8-9). Regardless of the exact referent for 42:1 and 49:5-7, the servant texts that are most immediately connected with the covenant promise to give "*you* [the servant] as a covenant to the people," Israel, as the unambiguous servant of the Lord, was in the position to mediate benefits to the nations. How is it, though, that these benefits were to be mediated? And why, in Zechariah, would they no longer be mediated?

There are a couple of possibilities as to how Israel would mediate blessings to the nations. The Lord says of them several times, "you are my witnesses," (Isa 43:10, 12; 44:8). They are witnesses that there is no god, no savior, besides the Lord, and the idols of the peoples are worthless. Isaiah 43:11, "I myself am the Lord, and besides me there is no savior." The culmination of this is the call for all nations to turn to the Lord and be saved, "A righteous God and a Savior, there is none besides me. Turn to me and be

---

<sup>142</sup>Except for 50:10, which seems to be a reference to the prophet.

saved, all the ends of the earth! For I am God, and there is no other” (Isa 45:21-22). The idea is that if Israel would have been faithful witnesses, the blessings of salvation would come to the nations. One possibility, therefore, is that in Zechariah they fail to be faithful witnesses, are serving idols (see Zech 10:2) and therefore do not convey the blessings to the nations. The covenant with the peoples, instead, is broken.

Another possibility for their specific mediatorial function is their unique capacity to shine as lights by their obedience to the law for which the coastlands waited (Isa 42:4). Isaiah speaks of the nations as blind, prisoners in a dungeon, and those who sit in darkness (Isa 42:7). The servant was promised as “a light to the nations” (Isa 42:6). Fleshing this out, the Lord says, “I will lead the blind in a way that they do not know, in paths that they have not known I will guide them. I will turn the darkness before them into light” (Isa 42:16). Israel, as servant, should have been lighting the way as those among whom the Lord chose “to magnify his law and make it glorious” (Isa 42:21). Instead, Israel itself was blind. “Who is blind but my servant?” (Isa 42:19). “He sees many things, but does not observe them” (Isa 42:20). Israel had the law to lead them, but they were blind, and it was against the Lord, “in whose ways they would not walk, and whose law they would not obey” (Isa 42:24), that they sinned.

Furthermore, a reference to the Abrahamic covenant in Isaiah connects Israel’s obedience to the law to the blessing of nations. Isaiah 48:17-19 reads, “I am the Lord your God . . . who leads you in the way you should go. Oh that you had paid attention to my commandments! Then . . . your offspring would have been like the sand.” Genesis 22:17-18 reads, “I will multiply your offspring . . . as the sand that is on the seashore . . . and in your offspring shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because you have obeyed my voice.” Obedience to the commandments would lead to blessing for both Israel and all of the nations. If blessing for the nations depended upon the obedience of Israel, their disobedience, as portrayed in a failure to heed the words of the prophets, which reached a climax in the rejection of their own prophet-shepherd; their disobedience

would result in breaking the covenant with the nations.

The second way to understand the relationship between breaking the covenant with the peoples and the end of the shepherd-sheep relationship focuses on the role of the individual servant, as distinguished from Jacob/Israel, in bringing covenantal blessings to the nations. The individual servant is most clearly spoken of in Isaiah 49:6, “It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the preserved of Israel. I will make you as a light for the nations.” This future servant would bring salvation to both Israel and the nations. The connection with Zechariah 11 would depend upon Zechariah as a servant-type figure.<sup>143</sup> Ultimately, if the servant was the bridge between covenantal blessings and the nations, the people’s burning of the bridge, the rejection of their Lord-appointed leader, broke the covenant with the peoples.

It is relevant to the point that Zechariah 12 and 13 contain a couple of well-known verses applied by the New Testament writers to Christ. “When they look on me, on him whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him” (Zech 12:10; cf. John 19:37). “Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered” (Zech 13:7; cf. Matt 26:31; Mark 14:27). Additionally, Matthew teaches that the payment to finalize the relationship between the prophet-shepherd and the sheep as recorded in Zechariah 11:12-13 finds its fulfillment in the days of Christ (Matt 26:15; 27:3-10). This being the case, an interpretation that sees a link between Zechariah as a rejected leader and Isaiah’s Servant, who is also connected to the Messiah as a rejected leader (cf. Acts 8:32-33), agrees with the Gospel writers.

In each of these mediatorial scenarios, the covenantal blessings for the nations is dependent upon the obedience of Israel, either its obedience considered in itself or in its relation to its leader. Once Israel proves itself unfaithful, the shepherd forsakes the flock and the nations are left without their mediator. Thus, the covenant with the peoples

---

<sup>143</sup>The prophet Isaiah is also called the Lord’s servant (see Isa 20:3; 50:10).

is broken.

As complex as all of this is, it does resolve the earlier-stated tension between the relation of breaking a covenant with all the peoples, the nations, and Zechariah's departure from his office as shepherd of the sheep, the Jews. It provides an answer to the question of why the dealings of the prophet-shepherd with the Jews should impact the nations.

Finally, as an additional general support, this idea that Israel would be instrumental in bringing the nations to the Lord is present in Zechariah 8:23, "Thus says the Lord of hosts: In those days ten men from the nations of every tongue shall take hold of the robe of a Jew, saying, 'Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.'" Others have offered a similar interpretation of Zechariah 11:10b in light of this. Rex Mason writes, "No longer able to know the covenant relationship by which the [favor of the Lord] is mediated to them, their place in the divine purpose for all nations is lost also."<sup>144</sup> Katrina Larkin, naming several commentators who take this approach, sums up this view, "Thus the breaking of the staff of Grace reflects Israel's unfitness for the task of mediating Grace to the nations."<sup>145</sup>

Because of all of this, it is increasingly likely, when considered alongside of the lexical exclusivity claim and the allusion to Isaiah 42-51 by Zechariah 12:1, that Zechariah 11:10b alludes to Isaiah. Foster's claim of a *sure* allusion to Isaiah in Zechariah 11:10b may overstate the case, but it does make better sense of the data than other proposed allusions, whether the Noahic, Abrahamic, or Hosea's covenant. A strong case can also be made for Ezekiel's covenant, but that it is almost certainly not a "covenant with all the peoples" gives it far less credibility as referent-text.

---

<sup>144</sup>Mason, "The Use of Earlier Biblical Material," in Boda and Floyd, *Bringing out the Treasure*, 109-10.

<sup>145</sup>Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah*, 129. She names Westermann, Lacocque, and Stuhlmüller.

The other possibility, of course, is that this covenant made and broken with “all the peoples” does not allude to a previously-mentioned covenant within the Hebrew Bible. Other interpreters have opted to read this as an unknown covenant that the Lord had made with the nations to do no harm to Israel. Once broken, Israel would once again be susceptible to attack.

This non-allusive suggestion does read quite well against the backdrop of Zechariah 12:1ff., where the language of “all the peoples” is picked up again to describe the attack of the nations against Jerusalem. It is questionable, however, that this is a more plausible interpretation. For one, nothing in the immediate context hints at this at all. Second, that Isaiah presents a viable option for an allusion, one that provides a possible solution to the problem of this seemingly out of place reference to the nations in the midst of the shepherd-narrative, makes a non-allusive suggestion, especially one without any support in the immediate context, less persuasive. At the very least, the Isaiah allusion is conceivable, and perhaps deserves preference in light of Zechariah’s constant preoccupation with the prophetic stream.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

This chapter has sought to give coherence to the allusions of Zechariah 11. It has examined well-known and oft-rehearsed allusions, as well as lesser-noted allusions that gained believability in the light of how Zechariah utilized the more obvious ones. In all, Zechariah consistently employs the earlier prophets in order to reverse their messages of promise and blessing and to reiterate their pronouncements of judgment.

A main emphasis of the chapter was to explore the surrounding contexts of the specific allusion texts and to demonstrate the potential fruitfulness of this endeavor for understanding some of Zechariah’s obscurities. Especially the broader contexts of the alluded to texts within Jeremiah 25, Ezekiel 34 and 37, Judges 9 and Isaiah 42 and 49 had much to offer by way of interpretive help. This was true in terms of certain details (e.g.,

the Lord is the subject of the passive  $\text{דָּוַשׁ}$ , via Jeremiah 25; why Zechariah 11:14 uses *Judah* and *Israel*; the shepherds of verse 3 refer to the leaders of the nations and Israel) and broader thematic/theological issues (e.g., conflict and judgment existed among the people and leaders because the king like David had not yet come, via Jeremiah 23, Ezekiel 34 and 37, and Judges 9; Zechariah's audience did not heed the call to pay attention to the words of the prophets).

Finally, the chapter spent a good amount of space seeking to identify the reference-text of Zechariah 11:10b, "to break my covenant with all the peoples." The breaking of this covenant by Zechariah, first, embodied the principles of reversal and judgment at work throughout the chapter. Second, the texts of Isaiah 42:6 and 49:8, with the material that their larger contexts provided, allowed for an interpretation of Zechariah 11:10b that fit well with both its immediate and broader contexts, which made it a better candidate for a pre-text than any of the other previously proposed allusions.

That Zechariah reverses the promises of earlier prophets and reuses their language of judgment is evident, but why does he do this? It can only be conjectured, but the recycling of judgment, as stated earlier, makes good sense in light of the introductory call of the book to heed the words of the earlier prophets and not be like the previous generations, who were disobedient, prophesied against, and judged. Because Zechariah's generation emulated their disobedience, Zechariah emulates the judgment language. Nothing has changed. The people are stuck in a cycle of disobedience and judgment.

The reason for the reversal of the promises could also be connected to the opening of the book, which says, "Return to me, and I will return to you." The return of the Lord to the people, and, concomitantly, the realization of the promises and blessings, required obedience. In Zechariah, this is especially so of the leaders (see, e.g., Zech 3:7), but extends to all: "This shall come to pass, if you will diligently obey the voice of the

Lord” (Zech 6:15).<sup>146</sup> The reversal of the promises, then, indicates that the leaders and the people did nothing to bring about the Lord’s return. The solution, according to Zechariah, and the source-texts’ contexts of Zechariah 11, is the coming of David’s king, who would bring about the promised and long-awaited blessings and end the cycle.

As demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter, there are many other possible allusions to consider. I do not doubt that some are valid, and a thorough examination of the surrounding contexts of the remainder of the list set out at the start would certainly be worthwhile in an attempt to shed more light on this most difficult chapter.

---

<sup>146</sup>The “you” here is plural. It is likely that this verse is a conclusion to the first major part of Zechariah (1:1-6:15), and so “this” in “this shall come to pass” most likely refers to all of the blessings that have been spoken of up to this point.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSIONS

This study has sought to demonstrate the pervading influence of the earlier prophets upon the book of Zechariah. Given the overwhelming pervasiveness chronicled above, allusions do in fact provide interpreters with a consistent and compelling interpretive key for the book. They can and should, especially when faced with perplexing and obscure texts, regularly mine Zechariah's predecessors for help in discerning the meaning of the post-exilic prophet. This conclusion is based both on the number of detectable allusions throughout the book (of which only a small number have been treated) and, as importantly, on the ubiquity of the earlier prophets in Zechariah's introduction, which lays out the course followed by the remainder of the prophecy.

In addition to this, the study has given close attention to Zechariah's method in alluding to the former prophets. It has established that knowledge of Zechariah's method should influence the identification of valid allusions and aid in determining their interpretive import. Zechariah exercises great freedom in incorporating the earlier prophets. With few exceptions, he republishes neither their language nor their original message exactly; instead, he provides enough shared material to lead the readers/hearers back to the original source text and context, with which he ingeniously and freely interacts.

The following, compiled from the previous chapters, categorizes and describes Zechariah's methods and tendencies in making allusions. The legitimacy of the



categories, of course, rests upon the validity of the proposed allusions.<sup>1</sup>

The first category, *sustained allusion*, is borrowed from Michael Stead, who observes this technique's presence in Zechariah 1-8. Nicholas Ho Fai Tai also sees it in Zechariah 9-14. The definition is in the title: Zechariah will sustain an allusion to an individual source over the span of several verses, chapters, or even parts of the book. Stead has shorter sections in mind when he discusses this technique, but it is apparent over larger sections as well.<sup>2</sup>

In another strategy, Zechariah regularly blends multiple prophets in a single section of his, which can be described as *source-blend*. Stead, M. Delcor, and Nicholas Ho Fai Tai note this as well. Stead terms it "composite metaphor," which seems too restrictive a title. This method occurs in each of the chapters above.<sup>3</sup>

Less of a strategy and more of an inclination, Zechariah has *an affinity for Jeremiah and Ezekiel*. At least in Zechariah 1:1-6, 1:11, 5:5-11, and 11, Zechariah is quite fond of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Allusions to both are in chapters 2, 4, and 5, and an allusion to Jeremiah appears in chapter 3.

Occasionally, Zechariah changes a word out from his source text for a synonym. This *synonym replacement* is evident in several places: the change from הַעֲצִים, as it occurs in Ezekiel 37:20, to מְקִלוֹת in Zechariah 11:7;<sup>4</sup> the change from טְבֵּהָה to

---

<sup>1</sup>Compare the methods noted by Michael Stead, Paul Lamarche, Rex Mason, Nicholas Ho Fai Tai, and M. Delcor in ch. 1. The following footnotes direct the reader to see pages and chapters within this dissertation.

<sup>2</sup>See the use of Isa 14 in Zech 1:11c (Isa 14:7a), Zech 1:17c (Isa 14:1a), Zech 2:13/English 2:9 (Isa 14:2), Zech 2:15 (Eng. 2:11) (Isa 14:1), and Zech 11:2 (Isa 14:8). See pp. 48, 59, 91-92. See the use of Jer 25 in Zech 1:4 (Jer 25:4-7) and Zech 11:2-3 (Jer 25:34-38). See pp. 29, 89-95. See the use of Deut 28 in Zech 1:6a (Deut 28:15, 45) and Zech 12:4 (Deut 28:28). See pp. 35, 56-57. See also Zech 6:15 (Deut 28:1), which is not discussed above. See the use of Isa 42-51 in Zech 11:10b (Isa 42:6) and Zech 12:1-2 (Isa 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13; 51:17ff.). See pp. 123-27. See the use of Ezek 37 in Zech 10 and 11. See pp. 99-101.

<sup>3</sup>See, for examples, the blend of Isa 14:7 and Jer 30:10 and 46:27 in Zech 1:11 (see ch. 3) and that of Jer 3 and Ezek 8 in Zech 5:5-11 (see ch. 4). See also, and especially, ch. 1 on Zech 1:1-6, particularly pp. 29-36.

<sup>4</sup>See pp. 98-99.

הַהֲרָגָה in the phrases of Jeremiah 12:3, כְּצֹאן לְטִבְחָהּ, and Zechariah 11:4, אֶת-צֹאן הַהֲרָגָה;<sup>5</sup> and the use of יָשַׁב for Isaiah 14:7a's נִוָּח in Zechariah 1:11c.<sup>6</sup>

Words are not the only thing Zechariah freely modifies. He also, at times, employs a *gender and number change*, adjusting the original to fit his own context. Zechariah 5:5 alters both the feminine command and personal pronoun of Jeremiah 3:2 to masculine. In another example, Zechariah 6:15 pluralizes the singular “you” of Deuteronomy 28:1.<sup>7</sup>

In a few places, Zechariah utilizes words that play off of the sound, spelling, and/or meaning of the original: *paronomasia*. In Zechariah 5:6 he does this with his use of הָאֵיפָה, which plays off of Jeremiah 3:2's אֵיפָה. In the same vision שָׁלַח (Zech 5:8) interacts with שָׁלַח (Jer 3:1, 8).<sup>8</sup> In a final example, the use of שָׁרַק by Zechariah 10:8, which almost without exception is linked with judgment, as it is in Isaiah 5:26 and 7:18, initiates a return for blessing.<sup>9</sup>

He also plays off of the original statement of promises and judgments, with a *reversal* of both. This is especially apparent in Zechariah 11,<sup>10</sup> and occurs also in the use of Isaiah 5:26 and 7:18 by Zechariah 10:8-11.<sup>11</sup> Along similar lines, there is a *change in recipient* of the judgments and promises and an *unexpected use of promise-language*. As for the first of these, in Zechariah 1:11, the promised peace of Israel (Isa 14:7) is applied to the nations,<sup>12</sup> and in Zechariah 12:4, the curses for Israel (Deut 28:28) are applied to

---

<sup>5</sup>See pp. 113-14.

<sup>6</sup>See p. 49.

<sup>7</sup>For both examples, see p. 70.

<sup>8</sup>See pp. 70-71.

<sup>9</sup>See pp. 54-55.

<sup>10</sup>See ch. 5.

<sup>11</sup>See pp. 54-57.

<sup>12</sup>See ch. 3.

the nations.<sup>13</sup> As for the second, in two instances Zechariah recalls promises that were made to Israel, but he unexpectedly turns them undesirable. Zechariah 1:11 does this with its use of Isaiah 14:7,<sup>14</sup> and Zechariah 11:16 with Ezekiel 34:23.<sup>15</sup>

A more general observation, one that is in agreement with what scholars like Lamarche, Delcor, and Stead have seen, is that Zechariah exercises great *freedom* in his use of earlier sources. He is not constrained to replicate the exact meaning, words, or forms of his source-texts. This is evident throughout the pages above, and particular manifestations of this freedom are spelled out by many of the above strategies (e.g., number and gender change, recipient change, reversal). Another clear example of this is his use of Jeremiah 25 in Zechariah 11.<sup>16</sup>

In an *assumption of absent elements*, Zechariah drops certain features from his source-texts and their contexts while operating as if they are present. This is most clearly seen in Zechariah 1:3, “and you shall say to them,” where the command and recipients are dropped from the stock phrase “Speak to the sons of Israel, and you shall say to them.”<sup>17</sup> It is also evident in Zechariah 11 and its use of Jeremiah 25 (and 23), Ezekiel 34 and 37. The promised Davidic king occurs in each of these sources, but Zechariah 11 only interacts with the verses that surround the promise of his coming.<sup>18</sup> This category encompasses any time the larger context of the alluded-to text explains any of the details of Zechariah’s prophecy, which is quite often (e.g., the woman of Zechariah 5:5-11 is Israel based on Jeremiah 3).<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>See pp. 57-58.

<sup>14</sup>See ch. 3.

<sup>15</sup>See pp. 102-4.

<sup>16</sup>See pp. 90-98.

<sup>17</sup>See ch. 2.

<sup>18</sup>See pp. 106-8.

<sup>19</sup>See pp. 71-73.

Zechariah also will compress his sources. Delcor has also recorded this *source-compression*. Zechariah 11:3a shortens Jeremiah 25:26.<sup>20</sup> Zechariah 11:10b combines and abbreviates Isaiah 42:6b,<sup>21</sup> and Zechariah 1:3 cuts the prophetic stock phrase to “and you shall say to them.”<sup>22</sup>

Finally, sometimes Zechariah makes a *specific allusion*, sometimes a *broad allusion*, and sometimes a *specific and broad allusion*. In the majority of cases, as is evident in every chapter, he alludes to a single, specific text (e.g., his use of Isaiah 14:7 in Zechariah 1:11).<sup>23</sup> As shown in the introductory verses of his book (Zechariah 1:1-6), and elsewhere (see pp. 111-15 above), he will also allude to the broader prophetic stream without an individual text in mind.<sup>24</sup> Mixing both strategies, he can, with a single word or phrase, allude to more than one specific text, as he does in Zechariah 1:11.<sup>25</sup>

The list adds up to this: sustained allusion, source-blend, an affinity for Jeremiah and Ezekiel, synonym replacement, gender and number change, paronomasia, reversal, change in recipient, unexpected use of promise-language, freedom, assumption of absent elements, source compression, specific allusions, broad allusions, and specific and broad allusions.

Knowing that Zechariah utilizes earlier sources in these ways gives the interpreter guidance both in determining whether an allusion is valid and how the allusion should color the interpretation of Zechariah’s message, if at all. This latter determination should comport well with all of the traditional exegetical considerations.

---

<sup>20</sup>See pp. 91-92.

<sup>21</sup>See p. 125.

<sup>22</sup>See ch. 2.

<sup>23</sup>See ch. 3.

<sup>24</sup>See ch. 2.

<sup>25</sup>See pp. 63-64.

Finally, the context of the pre-texts has been seen to factor into the interpretation of Zechariah's texts again and again. The contexts are useful in reaching the initial conclusion concerning valid allusions, as they often add additional parallel material between the two texts under investigation, and in shedding light on Zechariah's text and context. Interpreters by and large have neglected this aspect of Zechariah's allusions and have often been satisfied with simply identifying an allusion and moving on. It appears, however, that Zechariah had digested the texts and contexts of the pre-exilic prophets, and the interpreter can benefit greatly from exploring the surrounding places of the relevant texts in search of additional relevant material.

Quite fittingly, complex problems (the texts of Zechariah) require complex answers (the use of earlier prophets). It is clear that the book of Zechariah is a thoroughly allusive book, and its complexities can often be resolved only with recourse to allusions. Identifying an allusion, however, is only part of the solution. Zechariah's usage of these allusions is intricate, and it is not always a straightforward task to determine the specific import of the source-text. Helpfully, enough of the allusions and how Zechariah employs them is discernible, which gives a better picture of Zechariah's methodology and aids in the analysis of other potential allusions. The clearer this picture becomes, the easier it will be to assert allusions and interpretations with certainty.

Future studies should focus on determining the allusive methods and tendencies at work in the book and on an exploration of the neglected contexts of certain, probable, and possible allusions. There are undoubtedly many more problems to solve, many more allusions to be identified, and many more contexts of already-identified allusions to be searched. In all, an allusive approach, and especially a refined allusive approach, holds great promise for the interpretation of this elusive prophecy.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *Nahum-Malachi*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1988.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Book of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 3 (1952): 151-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Two Old Testament Historical Problems of the Early Persian Period." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 17 (1958): 13-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah." In *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, edited by Matthew Black, 646-55. London: Nelson and Sons, 1962.
- Anderson, Francis I. "Reading the Book of Zechariah: A Review Essay." *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 37 (2000): 229-40.
- Assis, Elie. "The Structure of Zechariah 8 and Its Meaning." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 12 (2012): 1-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah 8 and its Allusions to Jeremiah 30-33 and Deutero-Isaiah." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11 (2011): 2-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah 8 as Revision and Digest of Zechariah 1-7." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 10 (2010): 1-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah's Vision of the Ephah (Zech. 5:5-11)." *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 15-32.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. London: Tyndale Press, 1972.
- Barker, Margaret. "The Evil in Zechariah." *The Heythrop Journal* 19 (1978): 12-27.
- Beuken, W. A. M. *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8: Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Frühnachexilischen Prophetie*. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Comp., 1967.
- Boda, Mark J. *The Book of Zechariah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "From Fasts to Feasts: The Literary Function of Zechariah 7-8." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003): 390-407.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Terrifying the Horns: Persia and Babylon in Zechariah 1:7-6:15." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 67 (2005): 22-41.

- Boda, Mark J., and Michael H. Floyd, eds. *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplemental Series 370. New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 475. New York: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Butterworth, Mike. *Structure and the Book of Zechariah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 130. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets: Zechariah and Malachi*. Vol. 5. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.
- Chary, Théophile. *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Clark, David. "Discourse Structure in Zechariah 7.1-8.23." *The Bible Translator* 36 (1985): 328-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Discourse Structure in Zechariah 9-14: Skeleton or Phantom?" In *Issues in Bible Translation*, edited by P. C. Stine, 64-80. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Coggins, R. J. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Conrad, Edgar W. *Zechariah*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Cook, S. L. *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Craig, Kenneth M. "Interrogatives in Haggai-Zechariah: A Literary Thread?" In *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts*, edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House, 224-44. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Curtis, Byron G. "Eschatological Expectation and the Date Formulae in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature, November, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Davis, Ellen F. *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 78. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Delcor, M. "Les allusions a Alexandre le Grand dans Zach IX 1-8." *Vetus Testamentum* 1 (1951): 110-24.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les sources du Deutéro-Zacharie et ses procédés d'emprunt." *Revue Biblique* 59 (1952): 385-411.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Vision de la Femme dans l'Epha de Zach, 5:5-11 à la Lumière de la Littérature Hittite," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 187 (1975): 137-45.
- Delkurt, Holger. *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte: Zur Aufnahme und Abwandlung prophetischer Traditionen*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 302. New York: De Gruyter, 2000.
- Didymus the Blind. *Commentary on Zechariah*. Translated by Robert C. Hill. The Fathers of the Church 11. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2006.
- Edelman, Diana. "Proving Yahweh Killed His Wife (Zechariah 5:5-11)." *Biblical Interpretation* 11 (2003): 335-44.
- Finitsis, Antonio. *Visions and Eschatology: A Socio-historical Analysis of Zechariah 1-6*. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Floyd, Michael H. "The Evil in the Ephah: Reading Zechariah 5:5-11 in Its Literary Context." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996): 51-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Minor Prophets Part 2*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 22. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The מִשָּׁא as a Type of Prophetic Book." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 401-22.
- Foster, Robert L. "Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization: A Fresh Look at Zechariah 11:4-17," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007): 735-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Undoing the Future: The Theology of the Book of Zechariah." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 34 (2012): 59-72.
- Frolov, Serge. "Is the Narrator also among the Prophets? Reading Zechariah without Presuppositions." *Biblical Interpretation* 13 (2005): 13-40.
- Goldingay, John, and Pamela Scalise. *Minor Prophets II*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009.
- Hallaschka, Martin. *Haggai und Sacharja 1-8: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 411. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Sacharja 1-8*. Biblischer Kommentar zum Altes Testament 15. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Hill, Andrew E. "Dating Second Zechariah: A Linguistic Reexamination." *Hebrew Annual Review* 6 (1982): 105-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 28. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012.



- Ho Fai Tai, Nicholas. *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung in Sacharja 9-14: Traditions- und kompositionsgeschichtliche Studien*. Stuttgart, Germany: Calwer Verlag, 1996.
- Hoffman, Yair. "The Fasts in the Book of Zechariah and the Fashioning of National Remembrance." In *Judah & the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, edited by O. Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp, 169-218. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Horst, Friedrich. *Die zwölf Kleinen Propheten: Nahum bis Malachi*. Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964.
- Jeremias, Christian. *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 117. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- Jones, Douglas R. "A Fresh Interpretation of Zechariah 9-11." *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 241-59.
- Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. *The Minor Prophets*. Translated by J. Martin. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kimchi, David. *Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary upon the Prophecies of Zechariah*. Translated by A. M'Caul. Reprint, London: Paternoster-Row, 1837.
- Klein, George L. *Zechariah*. New American Commentary 21B. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2008.
- Kline, Meredith. *Glory in Our Midst: A Biblical-theological Reading of Zechariah's Night Visions*. Overland Park, KS: Two Age Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Structure of the Book of Zechariah." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 34 (1991): 179-93.
- Kraeling, E. "The Historical Situation in Zechariah 9:1-10." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 41 (1924): 24-33.
- Lamarche, Paul. *Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure Littéraire et Messianism*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961.
- Larkin, Katrina. *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah: A Study of the Formation of a Mantological Wisdom Anthology*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 6. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994.
- Lee, Suk Yee. *An Intertextual Analysis of Zechariah 9-10: The Earlier Restoration Expectations of Second Zechariah*. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 599. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Love, Mark C. *The Evasive Text: Zechariah 1-8 and the Frustrated Reader*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 296. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Lutz, Hanns-Martin. *Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Völker: Zur Vorgeschichte von Sach. 12, 1-8, und 14, 1-5*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 27. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1968.

- Malamat, Abraham. "The Historical Setting of Two Biblical Prophecies on the Nations." *Israel Exploration Journal* 1 (1950-51): 149-59.
- Marti, Karl. *Das Dodekapropheton*. Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904.
- Mason, Rex. *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophets of Restoration." In *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter Ackroyd*, edited by R. Coggins, A. Phillips, and M. Knibb, 140-55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Relation of Zechariah 9-14 to Proto-Zechariah." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 227-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Echoes of the Preaching in the Second Temple? Tradition Elements in Zechariah 1-8." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 96 (1984): 221-35.
- McComiskey, Thomas. *Zechariah*. In vol. 3 of *The Minor Prophets*. Edited by Thomas McComiskey, 1003-243. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Exegetical Commentary*. Richardson, TX: Biblical Studies Press, 2003.
- Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. *Zechariah 1-8*. Anchor Bible 25B. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Zechariah 9-14*. Anchor Bible 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Mitchell, H. G. *Haggai, Zechariah*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.
- Monro, W. D. "Why Dissect Zechariah?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 10 (1938): 45-55.
- Moseman, R. David. "The Date Formulae in the Book of Zechariah: An Important Key for Interpreting Zechariah." *Review and Expositor* 106 (2009): 575-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reading the Two Zechariah's as One." *Review and Expositor* 97 (2000): 487-98.
- Nogalski, James D. *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 217. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 218. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993.
- North, Robert. *Prophecy to Apocalyptic via Zechariah*. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Nurmela, Risto. *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1-8 and 9-14*. Turku, Finland: Abo Akademi University, 1996.
- O'Brien, Julia M. *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2004.

- Otzen, Benedikt. *Studien über Deuteriosacharja*. Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1964.
- Parunak, H. Van Dyke. *Linguistic Density Plots in Zechariah*. Wooster, OH: Biblical Research Associates, 1979.
- Person, Raymond F. *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 167. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Petersen, David L. *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Zechariah 9-14*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah 9-14: Methodological Reflections." In *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*, edited by Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, 210-24. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 370. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Petitjean, Albert. *Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie: Un programme de restauration pour la communauté juive après l'exil*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969.
- Pierce, R. W. "Literary Connectors and a Haggai/Zechariah/Malachi Corpus." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27 (1984): 277-89.
- Portnoy, S. L., and D. L. Peterson. "Biblical Texts and Statistical Analysis: Zechariah and Beyond." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 11-21.
- Pyper, Hugh S. "Reading in the Dark: Zechariah, Daniel and the Difficulty of Scripture." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29 (2005): 485-504.
- Redditt, Paul L. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. New Century Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Nehemiah's First Mission and the Date of Zechariah 9-14." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994): 664-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Zechariah 9-14*. International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament. Stuttgart, Germany: W. Kohlhammer, 2012.
- Radday, Y. T., and M. A. Pollatschek. "Vocabulary Richness in Post-Exilic Prophetic Books." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92 (1980): 333-46.
- Radday, Y. T., and D. Wickmann. "The Unity of Zechariah Examined in the Light of Statistical Linguistics." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87 (1975): 30-55.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja, und Maleachi*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Haggai, Sacharja 1-8/9-14, Maleachi*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament 13, no. 4. Gütersloh, Germany: Mohn, 1976.

- Saebø, Magne. *Sacharja 9-14: Untersuchungen von Text und Form*. Wageningen, Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Schaefer, Konrad R. "Zechariah 14 and the Composition of the Book of Zechariah." *Revue biblique* 100 (1993): 368-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 66-91.
- Schellenberg, Angeline F. "One in the Bond of War: The Unity of Deutero-Zechariah." *Didaskalia* 12 (2001): 101-15.
- Schnocks, Johannes. "Eine intertextuelle Verbindung zwischen Ezechiels Eifersuchtsbild und Sacharjas Frau im Efa." *Biblische Notizen* 84 (1996), 59-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Ephah between Earth and Heaven: Reading Zechariah 5:5-11." In *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*. Edited by Mark Boda and Michael Floyd, 252-70. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies. New York: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Sellin, Ernst. *Zwölfprophetenbuch*. Leipzig: A. Deicherische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.
- Sinclair, Lawrence A. "Redaction of Zechariah 1-8." *Biblical Research* 20 (1975): 36-47.
- Smith, James L. *Chiasmus in the Post-Exile Prophets: Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*. Anchorage: White Stone Press, 2004.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah-Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word, 1984.
- Stade, Bernhard. "Deuterozacharja: Eine kritische Studie." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1 (1881): 1-96.
- Stead, Michael R. *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 506. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Three Shepherds: Reading Zechariah in the Light of Jeremiah 11." In *A God of Faithfulness: Essays in Honour of J. Gordon McConville on his 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Edited by Jamie A. Grant, Alison Lo, and Gordon J. Wenham. New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Stuhlmüller, Carroll. *Haggai and Zechariah: Rebuilding with Hope*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *The Twelve Prophets*. 2 vols. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah's Debate with Isaiah." In *The Changing Face of Form-Criticism for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, 335-50. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*. Translated by Robert C. Hill. The Fathers of the Church 108. Washington DC: CUA Press, 2004.
- Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia. *Zechariah's Vision Report and its Earliest Interpreters: A Redactional-critical Study of Zechariah 1-8*. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old

- Testament Studies 626. New York: T&T Clark, 2016.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*. New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Tollington, Janet E. *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 150. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- van Hoonacker, Albin. *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*. Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1908.
- Webb, Barry G. *The Message of Zechariah*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2003.
- Wenzel, Heiko. *Reading Zechariah with Zechariah 1:1-6 as the Introduction to the Entire Book*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 59. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011.
- Willi-Plein, Ina. *Prophetie am Ende: Untersuchungen zu Sacharja 9-14*. Köln: Verlag, 1974.
- Wolters, Albert M. *Zechariah*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014.
- Wright, D. P. *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

## ABSTRACT

### ZECHARIAH: SELECT PROBLEMS AND ALLUSIVE SOLUTIONS

Matthew Thomas Seufert, Ph.D.  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017  
Chair: Dr. Duane A. Garrett

This dissertation interprets four particularly perplexing Zecharian texts (1:3, 1:11, 5:5-11, and 11) in light of allusions to other texts in order to exhibit the usefulness of an allusive approach to the interpretation of the book of Zechariah. In addition to providing new interpretations to these select texts, it discusses the issue of Zechariah's method of allusion and the influence this should have both on the method of identifying allusions and interpreting them.

Chapter 1 gives a history of research on Zecharian allusion studies. Chapter 2 discusses the grammatical oddity of Zechariah 1:3a, "and you shall say to them," and proposes that Zechariah intentionally abbreviates a fuller phrase, subtly demonstrating his reliance upon his prophetic precursors who uniformly use the full version of the phrase. Chapter 3 examines Zechariah 1:11, "all the earth is at rest and at peace," and interacts with Al Wolters' proposed allusion to Isaiah 14:7, affirming but reinterpreting it. Chapter 4 interprets Zechariah 5:5-11 based largely on an allusion to Jeremiah 3, which provides a solution to the much-debated identification of the ephah and the woman sitting in it. Chapter 5 examines the prominent allusions of Zechariah 11. It demonstrates that Zechariah 11 regularly reverses the promises made by earlier prophets (especially Isaiah and Ezekiel) and restates their judgments. The chapter engages mostly with Jeremiah 25, Ezekiel 34 and 37, and Zechariah's phrase "to break my covenant with all the peoples" (Zech 11:10). Finally, chapter 6 categorizes the ways Zechariah utilizes his sources.

## VITA

Matthew Thomas Seufert

### EDUCATION

B.S., Psychology, Olivet Nazarene University, 2008

M.A., Biblical Studies, Westminster Seminary California, 2012

M.A., Theological Studies, Westminster Seminary California, 2012

### PUBLICATIONS

“Isaiah’s Herald.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 77 (2015): 219-36.

“Reading Isaiah 40:1-11 in Light of Isaiah 36-37.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 58 (2015): 269-81.

“Zechariah 5:5-11: Why an ephah?” *Vetus Testamentum* 65 (2015): 289-96.

“The Presence of Genesis in Ecclesiastes.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 78 (2016): 75-92.

“Zechariah 1:3a, Zechariah’s Introduction, and the Former Prophets.”

*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 128 (2016): 389-403.

“Zechariah 1.11’s Allusion to Isaiah and Jeremiah.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 42 (2017): 249-65.

### ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Online Teaching Assistant, Hebrew Syntax and Exegesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2016

Lecturer in Old Testament, Westminster Seminary California, Escondido, California, 2017

Upper School Theology Teacher, Rockbridge Academy, Millersville, Maryland, July 2016-