

**THE ADVENT OF THE DIVINE KING:
AN INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF ZECHARIAH 9:1–8**

(Anna Suk Yee Lee)
(annalee1013@yahoo.com.hk)

4.1 Introduction

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

¹ For the work of Masing, see Masing, “Die Proklamation Des Tab’ Alsohnes,” 73–98. For the work of Otzen, see Otzen, *Studien über Deuterostacharja*.

² For the work of Stade, see Stade, “Deuterostacharja,” 1–96, 151–72 and 275–309. For the work of Sellin, see Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*.

³ Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 290.

⁴ Rudolph, *Sacharja 9–14*, 171–72.

Dissatisfied with the divergent results, recent scholars tend to relate Zech 9:1–8 with the Davidic traditions, claiming that the significance of these cities is that they were the traditional enemies of the old Davidic kingdom.⁵ Redditt contends that “Zechariah 9–14 opened with a chapter...depicting God’s recapturing the old Davidic empire (9:1–8)”⁶ whereas Petterson asserts that “The message of the oracle is...that Yahweh is coming to re-establish the kingdom promised to David.”⁷ We admit that the re-use of earlier traditions is a notable phenomenon in Second Zechariah and this line of enquiry can yield a better result than a historical-critical approach.⁸ However, not all the toponyms mentioned in the schema were once traditional enemies of Israel, such as Hadrach and Hamath; nor all of them had been included within the Davidic kingdom, such as Sidon and Tyre. Moreover, when Zech 9:1–8 was composed, all these regions, together with Israel, were under the Persian rule, posing no threat to post-exilic Yehud. If the text alluded to the greatest extent of the Davidic empire, or even a kingdom surpassing that of David, as Hanson argues,⁹ we would expect the land east of the Jordan to be mentioned, as Kaufmann states.¹⁰

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

⁶ Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*, 102.

⁷ Petterson, *Behold Your King*, 135.

⁸ See “Chapter Two: Methodological Consideration.”

⁹ Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 320. Cf. Nurmela argues: “The areas mentioned in 9,1–8 seem to correspond to the limits of David’s empire”; Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 196.

¹⁰ The work of Kaufmann reminds us that “in the Bible we find *five* different conceptions of the *Land of Israel*

If the depiction of the campaign neither matches any specific conquest of the past, nor does the passage allude to any Davidic traditions, then this raises the question of why the redactor composed this schema of toponyms at the beginning of the corpus. We contend that the significance of the place names and the military activities in this section can be understood in light of the intertexts of the passage. Based on this, the following will offer an intertextual analysis of Zech 9:1–8, investigating to what biblical materials the text alludes and what impact such intertextual insights might make upon the prophetic community. For the sake of discussion, we divide Zech 9:1–8 into three sections: (1) the **שִׁמְעָה** of Yahweh (Zech 9:1a); (2) the territorial claim of Yahweh (Zech 9:1b–7); and (3) the inauguration of the new age (Zech 9:8).

4.2 The **שִׁמְעָה** of Yahweh (Zech 9:1a)

Translation of Zechariah 9:1a ¹¹	
1a A maśśāʾ.	שִׁמְעָה 1a

Second Zechariah opens with a word **שִׁמְעָה**, which also appears in Zech 12:1, functioning both as a title and an introduction to the subsequent oracle, namely, Zech 9–11, and serving as the

corresponding to changes in the historical situation, viz: 1. The Land of Canaan, or the Land of the Patriarchs; 2. Moses' Land of Israel; 3. Joshua's Land of Israel; 4. The Land of the real Israelite Settlement; 5. The Kingdom of Israel. The first four conceptions are *ethnographic*, the fifth *imperialistic*." Kaufmann states that the ideal boundaries in Ezek 47 and Num 34 belong to the first conception with the extent of the land promised to Israel excluding the Transjordan. This ideal land was give by Yahweh to the Israelites as their home. However, there was discrepancy between the ancient promise and the actual settlement, he writes: "the ideal Land has boundaries...which conform neither to those of 'the settled area in Palestine' nor to those of David's or Solomon's kingdom" which included the Transjordan; Kaufmann, *Biblical Account*, 48–50.

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

reading key of the corpus. The *mahēppakh* under the ם might indicate a construct chain: “The maśśā’ of the word of Yahweh.”¹² Hanson adopts this rendering with a second יהוה added before בְּאֶרֶץ in order to adjust the metric structure in 9:1: “The oracle of Yahweh’s word: Yahweh is against Hadrach.”¹³ However, such an emendation does not have any support in the versions.¹⁴ Without a second יהוה, the understanding of מִשָּׂא דְּבַר־יְהוָה as a construct chain becomes less compelling.¹⁵ In view of this, we opt for an appositional relationship rather than a possessive one: “A maśśā’. The word of the Lord is against the land of Hadrach,” with מִשָּׂא as an overall heading for Zech 9–11 and דְּבַר־יְהוָה as a specific word-event for Zech 9:1–8.¹⁶

The construction מִשָּׂא דְּבַר־יְהוָה occurs exclusively in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1. Based on this, Nogalski argues that “the similarity of the superscriptions in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1 point toward a deliberate shaping on the part of a redactor.”¹⁷ However the uses of the formulation in the three places are quite different. In Zech 9:1, only the word מִשָּׂא serves as a superscription with the rest of the verse forming part of a poetic oracle.¹⁸ By contrast, both the

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

¹³ Hanson believes that the second יהוה is lost due to haplography; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 294–96.

¹⁴ Cf. Jansma, *Inquiry*, 59–62.

¹⁵ Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 90.

¹⁶ Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 26.

¹⁷ Nogalski, *Redactional Processes*, 217.

¹⁸ Contra Kashow who argues that both Zech 9 and 12 begin their oracles with the particle הנה (see table below); Kashow, “Canoncial Function,” unpublished.

	Zech 9:1–3	Zech 12:1
Heading	מִשָּׂא	מִשָּׂא
Subject	דְּבַר־יְהוָה	דְּבַר־יְהוָה

first half of Zech 12:1 (מִשָּׂא דְבַר־יְהוָה עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) and the whole of Mal 1:1 (דְבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּיד מְלֹאכִי) function as titles of the corpora, with על denoting Israel as the subject of the oracle in the former one (cf. Zeph 2:5; Mic 1:1) and אֶל implying Israel as the recipient of Yahweh's word in the latter one (cf. Hag 1:1). In view of this, Zech 9:1 might not have a literary dependence with Mal 1:1.¹⁹

The lexeme מִשָּׂא occurs 67 times in the Hebrew Bible, with 4 occasions referring to names of persons or regions (such as Gen 25:14), 35 times denoting the bearing of weighty objects or heavy responsibilities (such as Exod 23:5; Num 11:11), and 28 occasions depicting prophetic speech or writing.²⁰ Prior to the 1980's, the definition of מִשָּׂא as a reference to prophetic speech was largely dominated by etymological investigation. Most scholars have argued that the meaning of the word should be derived from the well-established sense of the lexeme מִשָּׂא, referring to something that is literally or figuratively burdensome, thus describing either a prophecy of doom or the hard responsibility of the prophet.²¹ However, a review of the various

Preposition + addressee	בְּאֶרֶץ חֲדָרָף וּרְמִשָּׁק... וְנִגְמֵי־חַמָּת... צַר וְצִדוֹן	עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
Elaboration about (i) Yahweh (ii) addressee	(i) כִּי לַיהוָה עֵין אָדָם וְכָל שְׂבָטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (ii) וַחֲבֹן צַר מְצוּר לָהּ... ; כִּי חֲכִמָּה מְאֹד	(i) נִאֲמַר־יְהוָה נִטָּה שָׁמַיִם וְיִסַּד אֶרֶץ וַיַּצַּר רוּחֵי־אָדָם בְּקִרְבּוֹ
Oracle begins with הִנֵּה	הִנֵּה אֶרְצִי יוֹרְשָׁנָה... (9:4)	הִנֵּה אֲנִכִּי שָׁם אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם... (12:2)

¹⁹ See discussion in Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 24–27.

²⁰ The 28 occasions depicting prophetic speech are: 2 Kgs 9:25; Isa 13:1; 14:28; 15:1; 17:1; 19:1; 21:1, 11, 13; 22:1; 23:1; 30:6; Jer 23:33 (x2), 34, 36 (x2), 38 (x3); Ezek 12:10; Nah 1:1; Hab 1:1; Zech 9:1; 12:1; Mal 1:1; Lam 2:14; 2 Chr 24:27. Cf. Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 338.

²¹ Cf. Boer, “An Inquiry,” 197–214.

prophetic passages in which the word נְאֻם appears establishes the fact that this word does not always introduce an ominous prophecy (such as Jer 23:38). Hence, using etymology to understand a word is not always helpful for understanding the meaning of it at a specific time.²²

In his doctoral work, Weis leveraged form-critical categories and presented a full definition of נְאֻם as a genre which is a form-critical tag used in the prophetic speech or text with “the intention to expound, on the basis of a particular revelation, the way YHWH’s action/intention will be manifested in human affairs—this to give instruction for the present or insight into the future.”²³ This innovative view of נְאֻם has been applied and developed by subsequent scholars, such as Floyd, Sweeney, and Woodcock.²⁴ However, the weakness of Weis’ thesis is that there are exceptions to patterns that he has highlighted for those נְאֻם texts.²⁵ The deviations may signal to Weis that he is not dealing with a unique form.²⁶ In addition, one may argue that a number of prophetic speech forms also express Yahweh’s intention, such as woe oracles and lawsuits, conveying God’s impending judgment. After reviewing all the נְאֻם texts, we conclude that this word can only be regarded as a general tag denoting prophetic revelation.²⁷ Thus we prefer to understand נְאֻם within its immediate context rather than as an overarching generic category.

²² Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 340.

²³ Weis, “Genre *Maššā*,” abstract.

²⁴ Floyd, *Minor Prophets 2*, 306; Floyd, “ נְאֻם (*Maššā*),” 401–22; Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets 2*, 656–57; Woodcock, “Forms and Functions,” 1–5.

²⁵ See the exceptions in Weis’ work; Weis, “Genre *Maššā*,” 212–13.

²⁶ Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 349.

²⁷ Oswalt, *Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*, 296.

The use of the word **נְשִׂא** alone as a title in Zech 9:1 is unique among those 28 occurrences depicting prophetic speech. Is there any significance to this opening **נְשִׂא** besides introducing the subsequent revelation? Boda suggests that the importance of **נְשִׂא** can be discerned through a closer look at the traditio-historical relationship between the book of Jeremiah and Second Zechariah. He claims that of all the tradition streams that have influenced Zech 9–14, the Jeremianic one is clearly the strongest.²⁸ When we scrutinize the book of Jeremiah, we discover that the greatest concentration of the term **נְשִׂא** as a reference to prophetic speech in the Hebrew Bible occurs in Jer 23:33–40, a passage within a larger literary context denouncing false prophets (Jer 23:9–40). When condemning the false prophets, Jer 23:9–40 gives a comprehensive explication of the word of Yahweh, particularly in v. 29, where the word of the Lord is a powerful weapon, like fire that burns straw or like a hammer that shatters rocks.²⁹ This connotation of the word of Yahweh suits well the nuance of the phrase **דְּבַר יְהוָה** used in Zech 9:1b when the subsequent **וְ** is translated with adversative sense.³⁰ Since other part of Jer 23 (vv.1–4, 7–8) is also alluded to in Zech 10,³¹ we suggest that the **נְשִׂא** in Zech 9:1 may have been influenced by Jer 23:33–40 though a literary dependence is probably not the case due to lack of convincing

²⁸ Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 350, 54. Cf. Boda, and Porter, “Literature to the Third Degree,” 215–54. See the subsequent allusions detected below.

²⁹ Tai suggests that the phrase **דְּבַר יְהוָה** in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1 should be understood with Jer 23:28–40 in mind; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 13.

³⁰ See discussion below.

³¹ See “7.3 Yahweh as the Source of Leadership” and “....ch. 8.”

verbal parallel. A close investigation of the source text might shed light on our understanding of the term נִשְׂא here.

Jeremiah 23:33–40 is embedded within a larger context which criticizes false prophets (23:9–40). The pericope (23:9–40) is headed with a superscription: לַנְּבִיאִים, with the root נבא or נביא occurring twenty-three times within it.³² The whole unit can be divided into six sections.³³ (1) The first section (23:9–12) opens with Jeremiah's heartbroken lament (v. 9), triggered by the strong judgment against prophet and priest who committed evils even in Yahweh's house (vv. 10–12); (2) The second section (23:13–15) is another accusation directed against the prophets, especially those of Jerusalem, who have done even worse than the prophets of Samaria (vv. 14–15); (3) The third section (23:16–22) is a clear attack on the false prophets who spoke peace out of their own mind rather than from Yahweh, leading to the demise of Judah,³⁴ (4) The fourth section (23:23–24) contains three rhetorical questions which serve as the basis for judgment against the false prophets whose wickedness cannot be hidden and whose punishment cannot be escaped from this unavoidable God; (5) The fifth section (23:25–32) accuses the ones who prophesy false dreams which make the people forget Yahweh; and (6) The last section (23:33–40)

³² The root נבא occurs in Jer 23:13, 16, 21, 25, 26, 32 and נביא appears in Jer 23:9, 11, 13, 14, 15 (2), 16, 21, 25, 26 (2), 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37.

³³ The depiction of these sections draws on the following works, unless noted otherwise; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 624–53; Craigie et al., *Jeremiah 1-25*, 334–55; Brueggemann, *Jeremiah 1-25*, 200–208; Longman, *Jeremiah*, 162–66; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 449–80.

³⁴ Some scholars, such as Holladay, separate 23:16–20 from 23:21–22 as the latter unit shifts to a first-person speech. Cf. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 633.

appears to be a play on the word *מִשָּׂא*.³⁵ It begins with a question-and-answer schema—whenever people ask for *מִשָּׂא יְהוָה*, tell them that there is no more *מִשָּׂא* from Yahweh for the Lord abandons them (v. 33).³⁶ Thus if anyone presumes to have a genuine *מִשָּׂא יְהוָה*, that person will be punished for giving false revelation (v. 34; cf. vv. 38–40). The people are forbidden to use the phrase *יְהוָה* *מִשָּׂא* as they have perverted Yahweh’s words by perceiving their own words as *מִשָּׂא יְהוָה* (v. 36).³⁷

Petersen contends that Jer 23:34–40 is a “deutero-prophetic” text, an exegetical piece with *מִשָּׂא יְהוָה* inserted later to “prohibit new oracles in the classical prophetic style” (23:34).³⁸ He links the expansion of these verses to the same period as Zech 13:2–6, both rejecting prophecy as a means of new revelation.³⁹ However, the curtailing of the prophetic process is not unusual in the earlier Jeremianic tradition, such as 14:1–15:4, where the prophet is told not to intercede for the

³⁵ McKane, W. “אֲשֵׁם,” 35–54. Cf. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 649–50; Brueggemann, *Jeremiah 1–25*, 207.

³⁶ Jeremiah 23:33 is a good example of the question-and-answer schema of type B delineated by Long; see Long, “Schemata,” 134–39.

³⁷ Boda and Porter argue: “this section describes a crisis over the use of *maššā’* among false prophets, prophets who claimed to have the *d’bar YHWH* when they were only speaking their own words”; Boda, and Porter, “Literature to the Third Degree,” 230. For the different interpretations of Jer 23:36, see Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 651–52; McKane, W. “אֲשֵׁם,” 35–54.

³⁸ Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy*, 33.

³⁹ Petersen argues that Zech 13:2–6 reflects the rejection of prophecy as a means of new revelation, similar to Jer 23:33–40; Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy*, 33–38. However, we argue that Zech 13:2–6 deals with false prophecy rather than rejection of prophecy, with 13:2–3 condemning specifically the idolatry prophets and 13:4–6 rebuking generally the deceptive prophets; Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 490–94. Carroll and Fretheim echo Petersen’s conclusion, but with additional concern. Carroll comments that the argument of relating Jer 23:34–40 to the period similar to Zech 13:2–6 “is quite likely, though not capable of demonstrable proof”; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 480. Fretheim claims that “most likely” Jer 23:33–40 “is concerned to make claims for the prophecy of Jeremiah ... especially with respect to its *burdensome* message of ‘gloom and doom,’ in the face of critical voices”; Fretheim, *Jeremiah*, 340. However, Jones argues that Jer 23:33–40 “must be the work of either Jeremiah himself or a prophet in the tradition”; Jones, *Jeremiah*, 315.

people.⁴⁰ If we read 23:34–40 within its larger literary context, we realize that the concern of the passage is not over the means of prophecy, contra Petersen, but rather over the source of prophecy—from human minds or from the Lord (23:16; cf. 25, 28, 30). The problem in Jeremiah’s time is that the reckless lies of those false prophets led the people astray (23:32), forgetting the name of Yahweh as their forefathers did (23:27). Jeremiah 23:33–40 speaks to a particular crisis of false prophecy at the end of the southern kingdom leading to the judgment of Yahweh upon the disobedient generation.⁴¹ In Jer 23, the term נִשְׁבָּע is only reserved for those authentic prophesies originated from Yahweh.

In the beginning of the corpus, Second Zechariah may intend to signal the reversal of the prohibition of נִשְׁבָּע in Jer 23, indicating the “renewal of prophecy along the lines of earlier prophecy.”⁴² The use of this lexeme may establish authority for the oracular material being introduced, endorsing the role of the prophet as the legitimate mediator of Yahweh in a new era. The נִשְׁבָּע, banned prior to the exile, was now available again in the midst of the prophetic community of Zech 9–14.

⁴⁰ See “5.2 Yahweh is the Source of Supply.”

⁴¹ Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 354. Cf. Boda, “From Complaint to Contrition,” 186-97.

⁴² Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 356.

4.3 The Territorial Claim of Yahweh (Zech 9:1b–7)

The opening of this pericope presents the audience with a number of enigmas. The lack of any verbs of motion in Zech 9:1b makes the translation difficult. Before we proceed, we have to determine the senses of ב and of מְנוּחָה, which are interrelated. Some scholars claim that ב is probably locative, denoting that the word of Yahweh was heard in these foreign lands.⁴³ However, the close parallel construction of Isa 9:7 with ב following דבר may argue for a hostile sense: “The Lord sends a message against Jacob (דְּבַר שְׁלַח אֶרְצִי בְּיַעֲקֹב), and it falls on Israel,” though ב needs not carry any such a connotation in all cases, such as Hos 1:2.⁴⁴

The word מְנוּחָה, assuming that the pronominal suffix connects to דְּבַר־יְהוָה, usually has a favorable sense in the Hebrew Bible, referring either the resting place of the chosen people, that is, the promised land (e.g. Deut 12:9), or the resting place of Yahweh, that is, the temple (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:56; Isa 66:1–2), thus supporting the locative connotation of ב.⁴⁵ However, there is a striking parallel to the use of the root נוח in Zech 6:8 in which Yahweh’s wrath finds rest when the northern country is subdued. In view of this correspondence, the word מְנוּחָה may refer to the

⁴³ Such as Larkin, *Eschatology*, 55; Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 244; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 90–93.

⁴⁴ Scholars supporting this view include, such as, Petterson, *Behold Your King*, 130; Pierce, “Literary Connectors,” 282; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 294.

⁴⁵ Such as Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 244; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 13–14; Floyd, *Minor Prophets* 2, 462. Similarly, Hanson opts for “throne dais” by comparing מְנוּחָה with נוח in the Ugaritic texts; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 297.

capture of Damascus, denoting that either God’s wrath is brought to rest or the city is included as part of the promised territory, namely, the resting place of the covenant community.⁴⁶

In Zech 9:1–8, the passage mostly adopts a hostile tone towards the nations with warlike image, particularly reflected in v. 8, where Yahweh encamps as a guard against any oppressor of his people.⁴⁷ In light of this, we choose the second connotations for both cases which are more in line with the overall sense of the passage. Hence, we take **ב** in **בְּאַרְץ** as adversative: “against the land of” and nuance **מְנוּחָה** as the capture of Damascus. With this understanding of **מְנוּחָה**, the phrase **דְּבַר-יְהוָה** in 9:1b could imply not only a word of judgment but also a word-event which leads to the downfall of the northern territories, though the divine attack is only mentioned explicitly from v. 4.

Based on the above assumption, the scene in Zech 9:1b–7 opens with the triumphant return of Yahweh, who marches down from north to south in the Levant, conquering some cities before reaching Jerusalem (v. 8). The areas being subdued can be divided into three groups: (1) the Syrian group (Zech 9:1b–2a); (2) the Phoenician group (Zech 9:2b–4); and (3) the Philistine group (Zech 9:5–7).⁴⁸ In the following, we will analysis Zech 9:1b–7 according to the geographical locations of the places. As the present scholarly views on this passage generally link

⁴⁶ Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 9–10.

⁴⁷ See “4.3 The Enthronement of Yahweh.”

⁴⁸ Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 162.

these toponyms to either the Davidic tradition or the promise land accounts, in our discussion below, a brief survey of each place, particularly relating to these traditions, will be sketched.

4.3.1 The Syrian Group (Zech 9:1b–2a)

Translation of Zechariah 9:1b–2a	
1b The word of the Lord is against the land of Hadrach, and Damascus, his resting place,	דְּבַר־יְהוָה בְּאַרְץ תְּדִרְךָ וּדְמִשְׁק מְנַחְתּוֹ 1b
1c For Yahweh’s eye is on humankind, as well as on all the tribes of Israel. ⁴⁹	כִּי לַיהוָה עֵין אָדָם וְכָל שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: 1c
2a and also Hamath, which borders on it,	וְגַם־חַמַּת תְּגַבֵּל־בָּהּ 2a

The three Syrian areas, Hadrach, Damascus, and Hamath, are all inland territories which locate in the east of Phoenicia. Hadrach, which only appears here in the Hebrew Bible, is the northernmost of the geographic entities mentioned in the schema, with Hamath on its south. Since the northern border of the Israelite lands at their fullest was the entrance of Hamath, Hadrach lay beyond the greatest extent of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom and was outside both

⁴⁹ The phrase in 9:1c is ambiguous, basically related to the translation of the construct chain עֵין אָדָם. Without resort to emendation, generally there are two major interpretations of the text. Some scholars opt for a subjective genitive: “For all humankind and all the tribes of Israel are looking towards Yahweh.” This translation focuses on the reaction of human being, denoting a sense of expectancy, waiting for Yahweh to take action, such as Webb, *Message of Zechariah*, 130. Others prefer an objective genitive with the preceding לְ as possessive: “For Yahweh’s eye is on humankind, as well as on all the tribes of Israel,” such as Petersen, *Prophetic Literature*, 39–40. This translation, supported by the LXX, stresses the work of Yahweh, implying a sense that Yahweh as the universal Lord is watching over every aspect of humankind, including his people, to whom God is going to visit. We choose the latter interpretation due to a similar universalistic overtone highlighting Yahweh’s global dominion is also found in Zech 12:1. Reading within context, the elaboration in the second מִשָּׁא serves to remind the readers to pay great attention to the coming cosmos-wide transformation of Yahweh, both for Israel and the nations. Another reason for choosing the latter interpretation is that its nuanced view matches the God’s eye-keeping watch motif at the end of this unit: בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה רְאִיתִי כִּי עָתָה רְאִיתִי (9:8b), with Yahweh’s עֵין bracketing the whole section (9:1–8). The transcendent character of Yahweh emphasized here also finds its echo in the first vision in Zech 1:7–17 where Yahweh has sent his hosts to patrol the earth. Scholars, such as Rudolph, have emended conjecturally to read אָרָם (Aram) instead of אָדָם (Adam); Rudolph, *Sacharja 9–14*, 167–68. For various emendation of Zech 9:1c, see discussion in Mason’s work; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 11–12.

the historical and ideal borders of the Israelite kingdom (Num 34:7–8; cf. Ezek 47:17). Information about Hadrach is scarce. It can be a city or a district. Since it appears together with דַּמָּשְׁק , most likely it represents an area rather than a city.⁵⁰ Its function here probably denotes that the divine warrior, Yahweh, is coming from the far north.

Damascus appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible.⁵¹ Being the capital of Aram during the 10th through 8th centuries B.C., it is well-known as a commercial centre in antiquity. The city had been a rival to Israel since the time of the Israelite settlement, constantly posing grave dangers to the territorial integrity of the tribal portions. Though it was not included in the ideal boundary of Israel (Num 34:1–12), it was once subdued and incorporated into the empire of David (2 Sam 8:5–6). Afterwards, it was lost under Solomon's reign when Rezon captured it and proclaimed himself king (1 Kgs 11:23–25). Damascus continued to pose a threat to the northern borders of Israel throughout the monarchy until the reign of Jeroboam II who probably established it as a vassal of Israel (2 Kgs 14:25, 28). Damascus was defeated by Tiglath-Pileser III in 732 B.C., came under Babylonian domination in 604 B.C., and was a provincial capital under Persian

⁵⁰ Hadrach appears in the inscription of Zakkur (ca. 800 B.C.), depicting the miraculous deliverance of Zakkur and his capital Hadrach from a siege by a coalition of kingdoms headed by Bar-Hadad, son of Hazael; Parker, *Stories in Scripture and Inscriptions*, 106–10, 134. Based on Neo-Assyrian texts, some scholars, such as Na'aman, relate Hadrach to Hatarikka, a Syrian region having been conquered by Tiglath-pileser in 738 B.C.; Na'aman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors I*, 147–49.

⁵¹ The noun דַּמָּשְׁק appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 14:15; 15:2; 2 Sam 8:5, 6; 1 Kgs 11:24 (x2); 15:18; 19:15; 20:34; 2 Kgs 5:12; 8:7, 9; 14:28; 16:9, 10 (x2), 11 (x2), 12; 2 Chr 16:2; 24:23; 28:5, 23; Song 7:5; Isa 7:8 (x2); 8:4; 10:9; 17:1 (x2), 3; Jer 49:23, 24, 27; Ezek 27:18; 47:16, 17, 18; 48:1; Amos 1:3, 5; 5:27; Zech 9:1.

rule.⁵² In the prophetic literature, oracles against Damascus occur in only in Isa 17:1–3; Jer 49:23–27; and Amos 1:3–5.

Hamath occurs 36 times in the Hebrew Bible.⁵³ It is a place bordering on Israel, with the phrase **בְּוַיֵּאמֶר הָמָת** (entrance of Hamath) being typically used in the Bible to denote a site on the northern boundary of the ideal territory (Num 34:7–8; Ezek 47:16–17, 20). It seems that Hamath was in good relationship with Israel during David’s reign (2 Sam 8:9–11) and was under Israelite control during Solomon’s rule (2 Chr 8:4). The city might have gained independence as Jeroboam II is said to have recovered Damascus and Hamath for Israel (2 Kgs 14:28). Hamath eventually threw off this control and reached its greatest power in the 8th century B.C. However, by 720 B.C., it was incorporated into the Assyrian empire. The Assyrian ravages were so serious that most of the city was abandoned with few settlements only during the Persian period.⁵⁴ In the prophetic literature, there is no oracle against Hamath.

Because of the common appearance of **דַּמְשֶׁק** and **מִשָּׁא**, Larkin suggests that Zech 9:1 contains a piece of mantological exegesis, alluding to Isa 17:1, 7: “The oracle concerning Damascus (**מִשָּׁא דַּמְשֶׁק**). ‘Behold, Damascus is about to be removed from being a city and will become a fallen ruin.... In that day man (**הָאָדָם**) will have regard for his Maker and his eyes (**וְעֵינָיו**)

⁵² Burns, *Damascus*, 10–26; Pitard, *Ancient Damascus*; Pitard, “Damascus,” 5–7.

⁵³ The noun **הָמָת** appears 36 times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 13:21; 34:8; Josh 13:5; Judg 3:3; 2 Sam 8:9; 1 Kgs 8:65; 2 Kgs 14:25, 28; 17:24, 30; 18:34; 19:13; 23:33; 25:21; 1 Chr 13:5; 18:3, 9; 2 Chr 7:8; 8:4; Isa 10:9; 11:11; 36:19; 37:13; Jer 39:5; 49:23; 52:9, 27; Ezek 47:16 (x2), 17, 20; 48:1 (x2); Amos 6:2, 14; Zech 9:2.

⁵⁴ Buhl, “Hamath,” 33–36.

will look to the Holy One of Israel (אֱלֹהֵינוּ).”⁵⁵ The Isaianic oracle (17:1–8) laments the destruction of Damascus (vv. 1–3) as well as Ephraim (vv. 4–6), events associated with the Syro-Ephraimite assault on Judah in 735–32 B.C. In verse 7–8, a proper attitude of the people will be developed after the catastrophic judgment—they will look for their Maker and turn away from idols.⁵⁶ The thrust of Larkin’s proposal ties to the interpretation of Zech 9:1c, that is, “the writer describes a day on which all eyes are turned to the Lord, and all the tribes of Israel (including the lost Ephraim) are restored together with Damascus.”⁵⁷ Another ground of her argument is based on the assumption that the Zecharian author has invested Damascus with mantological significance for the future of Israel, she contends: “I suggest that this yoking together of the fate of Ephraim with that of Damascus could have been troubling to a post-exilic writer such as Zechariah who was deeply concerned with the restoration of ‘the glory of the children of Israel’ (and specifically of Ephraim in 9:13 and 10:6–12...), and could have prompted him to undertake an important piece of mantological exegesis.”⁵⁸ However, we are reluctant to register this connection for the following reasons: (1) we do not agree with Larkin’s interpretation of Zech 9:1c (see above); and (2) we cannot find evidence in Zech 9:1–8 indicating how Damascus is so outstanding from other toponyms as she asserts.

⁵⁵ Larkin, *Eschatology*, 57.

⁵⁶ Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, 235–39; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 301–306; Seitz, *Isaiah 1–39*, 141–43.

⁵⁷ Larkin, *Eschatology*, 59.

⁵⁸ Larkin, *Eschatology*, 58–60. This assumption mainly draws on the evidences preserved in Qumran materials and in the works of Jones. Cf. Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 241–59.

With the demise of Damascus, Sweeney contends that Zech 9:1–2a represents the itinerary of the Assyrian monarch who defeated Damascus at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War (Isa 17:1–3).⁵⁹ The argument seems to be weak as the Isaianic text is a prophecy of doom concerning Damascus rather than an account of its invasion in 732–35 B.C. In addition, Hamath is listed third in the schema though it actually lies between Hadrach and Damascus, with the former on the north and the latter on the south.⁶⁰ If the list is viewed as the route of a military campaign, the itinerary may seem irregular. However, if we understand the schema as concerning the boundaries of the promised land envisioned by Ezekiel, then the existing sequence of places causes no difficulty, with Damascus relating to the eastern border and Hamath defining the northern extent of the tribal allotments (Ezek 47:17–18). Zechariah 9:1b–2a depends heavily on Ezek 47:13–20, with *שבטי ישראל*, *דמשק*, *חמת*, and *גבול/גבול* as catchwords:

Ezekiel 47:13–20

- 13 Thus says the Lord GOD, “This *shall be* the boundary (גבול) by which you shall divide the land for an inheritance among the twelve tribes of Israel (שבטי ישראל); Joseph *shall have* two portions.
- 14 “You shall divide it for an inheritance, each one equally with the other; for I swore to give it to your forefathers, and this land shall fall to you as an inheritance.
- 15 “This *shall be* the boundary (גבול) of the land: on the north side, from the Great Sea *by* the way of Hethlon, to the entrance of Zedad;
- 16 Hamath (חמת), Berothah, Sibram, which is between the border (גבול) of Damascus (דמשק) and the border (גבול) of Hamath (חמת); Hazer-hatticon, which is by the border (גבול) of Hauran.

⁵⁹ Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets* 2, 661.

⁶⁰ Aharoni, et al., *Macmillan Bible Atlas*, 115.

- 17 “The boundary (גְּבוּל) shall extend from the sea *to* Hazar-enan *at* the border (גְּבוּל) of Damascus (דְּמֶשֶׁק), and on the north toward the north is the border (גְּבוּל) of Hamath (חֲמַת). This is the north side.
- 18 “The east side, from between Hauran, Damascus (דְּמֶשֶׁק), Gilead and the land of Israel, *shall be* the Jordan; from the *north* border (גְּבוּל) to the eastern sea you shall measure. This is the east side.
- 19 “The south side toward the south *shall extend* from Tamar as far as the waters of Meribath-kadesh, to the brook *of Egypt and* to the Great Sea. This is the south side toward the south.
- 20 “The west side *shall be* the Great Sea, from the *south* border (גְּבוּל) to a point opposite Lebo-hamath (חֲמַת). This is the west side.

The phrase שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל appears 47 times in the Hebrew Bible.⁶¹ As a “territorial and political entity” arising in earliest Israel, the term שְׁבֵט did not fare well under the monarchy and became meaningless after the fall of the united kingdom. The Babylonian conquest further shattered “whatever modicum of reality may have been retained in the concept of a confederation of tribes.” Though the term שְׁבֵט appears with decreasing frequency, particularly in the later biblical texts, it never disappears. In the Persian period, it takes on new meaning, especially in construct with יִשְׂרָאֵל, “to represent the ideal of the people restored in their land.”⁶² This notion of שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs notably in the vision of the restored land in Ezek 47–48 (Ezek 47:13, 21, 22; 48:19, 29, 31). The city דְּמֶשֶׁק is not mentioned in the tribal allotment in Num 34:1–12 but named three times in the ideal boundary in Ezek 47:13–20. The place חֲמַת is stated once in the former

⁶¹ The phrase שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל appears 47 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 49:16, 28; Exod 24:4; Deut 29:20; 33:5; Josh 3:12; 12:7; 24:1; Judg 18:1; 20:2, 10, 12; 21:5, 8, 15; 1 Sam 2:28; 9:21; 10:20; 15:17; 2 Sam 5:1; 7:7; 15:2, 10; 19:10; 20:14; 24:2; 1 Kgs 8:16; 11:32; 14:21; 2 Kgs 21:7; 1 Chr 27:16, 22; 29:6; 2 Chr 6:5; 11:16; 12:13; 33:7; Ps 78:55; Ezek 37:19; 47:13, 21, 22; 48:19, 29, 31; Hos 5:9; Zech 9:1.

⁶² Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 95.

territory allocation (Num 34:8) while four times in the latter one (Ezek 47:16–17, 20). The direct lexical link between the two texts is strong. In addition, both the boundaries in Zechariah and Ezekiel are represented from north to south. Based on these similarities, we register Ezek 47:13–20 as an intertext of Zech 9:1b–2a.⁶³

Allusion to Ezek 47:13–20. The great temple vision (Ezek 40–48) ends with a theological geography, whose thrust is the divine presence (chs 47–48). The description of the ideal boundaries (47:13–20) is an introduction to the tribal allotment of the land (48:1–29), with vv. 21–23 concerning the inheritance for the resident aliens, an unprecedented concept going far beyond the Torah’s legislation (cf. Exod 23:9; Lev 19:10, 33–34; Deut 24:17–22). At the heart of the new commonwealth stands the temple which is the source of blessing for the land (47:1–12). Each tribe could enjoy equal stake in the new city where Yahweh is present within (48:30–35). Verse 14 lays down a premise that the division of the land is a divine fulfillment of the land promised to the forefathers.⁶⁴ However, in order to realize this promise, three conditions must be ready: (1) the land to be inherited (cf. 47:13–20); (2) the acceptance of the aliens (cf. 47:21–23); and (3) the existence of the twelve tribes (cf. 48:1–29).

⁶³ Tai has noted this connection, too; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 21.

⁶⁴ Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 271–87; Vawter and Hoppe, *Ezekiel*, 207–10; Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 329–42; Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 230–39; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 503–47.

By leveraging earlier materials, the advent of the divine warrior Yahweh presents a vision in which the deity inaugurates the claim of the promised land, thus satisfying the first condition. With this picture of the restored ideal land, Meyers claims that these eight verses aim at “restoring the historic homeland” of Israel.⁶⁵ Though the restoration of the ideal homeland does form one of the major motifs of Zech 9:1–8, we would query why the text about the promised land in Ezekiel rather than Numbers is alluded to.⁶⁶ Stevenson argues that the intention to define boundaries in Ezek 47 is to establish territories, asserting Yahweh’s territorial claim as the divine king of Israel. Yahweh is the only power holder and all others are power subjects in his territories.⁶⁷ She argues that the notion of divine kingship in Ezek 40–48 is apparent when the glory of Yahweh returns to the temple (הַבַּיִת; 43:4–5) where the Lord delivers his very first statement: “Son of man, *this is* the place of My throne and the place of the soles of My feet” (43:7a).⁶⁸ Thus, the primary purpose of the advent of Yahweh is not just to build a commonwealth in its own land, but to create a temple society with Yahweh in its midst as king.

The Ezekielian text stresses that the divine presence is the source of blessing for the new **ישראל**

⁶⁵ Meyers, “Foreign Places,” 165.

⁶⁶ The argument that Zech 9:1b–2a alludes to Ezek 47 rather than Num 34 is based on the fact that the boundaries in Zechariah and Ezekiel are represented from north to south whereas the borders in Numbers are described from south to north. In addition, the city דְּמִשְׁק is not mentioned in the tribal allotment in Num 34:1–12 but named three times in the ideal boundary in Ezek 47:13–20. Contra Schellenberg who argues that these toponyms are “within the ideal borders of the Promised Land (Numbers 34)”; Schellenberg, “One in the Bond of War,” 106.

⁶⁷ Stevenson points out that the lack of vertical dimensions in Ezek 40–48 indicates that the text is not a “temple blueprint” as many scholars argue, such as, Patton, “Ezekiel's Blueprint for the Temple of Jerusalem.” She contends that the corpus represents a vision of a temple society organized according to a new set of spatial rules, based on a spatial theology of holiness; Stevenson, *Vision of Transformation*, 4–7, 163.

⁶⁸ Stevenson, *Vision of Transformation*, 50–51. Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 509–16; Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 211.

שבטי (cf. Zech 9:8, 16–17). With these intertextual insights, the significance of the schema is that it portrays the territorial claim of Yahweh rather than his military campaign. The geography of the toponyms is important not only in circumscribing the ideal homeland but also in envisioning the restored Israel—a new people who will enjoy Yahweh’s presence, a new people who will acknowledge Yahweh’s kingship.

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

4.3.2 The Phoenician Group (Zech 9:2b–4)

Translation of Zechariah 9:2b–4	
2b Tyre and Sidon, though she was very wise.	2b צָר וְצִידֹן כִּי חֲכָמָה מְאֹד:
3a For Tyre built for herself a rampart,	3a וַתִּבֶן צָר מְצֹר לָהּ
3b and piled up silver as dust, and gold as mud of streets.	3b וַתַּצְבֵּר-כֶּסֶף כְּעֹפָר וְחָרוֹץ כְּטִיט חוֹצוֹת:
4a Look! The Lord will dispossess her, and	4a הִנֵּה אֲדֹנָי יְרוּשָׁנָה וְהִכָּה בָּיָם חִילָּהּ
throw her wealth in the sea,	4b וְהִיא בְּאֵשׁ תֵּאָכַל:
4b and she will be devoured by the fire.	

In contrast to the Syrian group, the Phoenician territory, represented by Sidon and Tyre, plays a different role in the biblical conception of the Israelite boundaries, in which Sidon⁶⁹ and

⁶⁹ The place name צִידֹן appears 20 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 10:19; 49:13; Josh 11:8; 19:28; Judg 1:31; 10:6; 18:28; 2 Sam 24:6; 1 Kgs 17:9; Isa 23:2, 4, 12; Jer 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; Ezek 27:8; 28:21, 22; Joel 4:4; Zech 9:2

Tyre⁷⁰ are not mentioned in any text of the promised land (Num 34:1–12; Ezek 47:15–20) but included in “the land that remains” (Josh 13:4–6). The tribal allotment of Asher is associated with Great Sidon and Old Tyre, though the extent of Asher’s actual control of these lands is questionable (Josh 19:27–29; Cf. Judg 1:31–32).⁷¹ Even in the period of Davidic-Solomonic expansion, the Phoenician coast remained external to Israelite domination. Solomon’s transfer of the twenty Galilean cities in Asher to Hiram definitely affects the territorial integrity of Israel (1 Kgs 9:11).⁷² The expectations of territorial restoration not only include Tyre and Sidon which are considered part of Israelite allotment but also all of Phoenicia which was included in Ezekiel’s prophecies—the western boundary is given as the Mediterranean coast as far north as a point “opposite Lebo-Hamath” (עַרְנֹכָה לְבוֹא הַחַמָּת; Ezek 47:20).

Although two Phoenician cities are mentioned, only the description of Tyre is elaborated upon (Zech 9:2bβ–4). We do not have much information about the relationship between Sidon and Israel besides some in the reign of Ahab.⁷³ In the biblical account, Sidon and Tyre are generally paired, rebuked with similar sinful deeds (cf. Jer 47:4; Joel 4:4 [3:4]). In the Persian

⁷⁰ The place name צַר appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 19:29; 2 Sam 5:11; 24:7; 1 Kgs 5:15; 7:13; 9:11, 12; 1 Chr 14:1; 2 Chr 2:2, 10; Ps 45:13; 83:8; 87:4; 89:44; Isa 23:1, 5, 8, 15 (x2), 17; Jer 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; Ezek 26:2, 3, 4, 7, 15; 27:2, 3 (x2), 8, 32; 28:2, 12; 29:18 (x2); Hos 9:13; Joel 4:4; Amos 1:9, 10; Zech 9:2, 3.

⁷¹ The term מְבִצְרֵי צַר (the fortified city of Tyre) in Josh 19:29 refers to Old Tyre on the mainland opposite the island Tyre; Katzenstein, *History of Tyre*, 65.

⁷² This transfer seems to be improbable by the Chronicler, thus reversing the action (2 Chr 8:2). See the discussion in Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 621.

⁷³ In 1 Kgs 16:31, there is an “Ethbaal king of Sidonians” who was the father of Jezebel, the wife of Ahab. From the work of Josephus, *Against Apion*, we know that Ethbaal is the king of Tyre whose reign marks the second golden age of the city. At that time, Tyre and Sidon became a political unit until 701 B.C.; Josephus, et al., *New Complete Works of Josephus*, 319. Cf. Edwards, “Tyre,” 688.

period, Sidon became an important administrative centre of the empire, with status surpassing that of Tyre.⁷⁴ On the other hand, Tyre is mentioned much more in the Hebrew Bible, especially in the Deuteronomic history. As a trade port lying in the heart of the seas, the city was famous for its great wealth, remarkable wisdom, and impregnable stronghold (Ezek 27:3; 28:3–5). Tyre was never stated as an enemy threatening Israel but rather as an economic alliance of the Israelite kingdom. In fact, the king of Tyre gave numerous assistance and materials for more than twenty years in the great building project of Davidic-Solomonic era (2 Sam 5:11; 1 Kgs 5:16–27; 9:10). After being besieged by Nebuchadnezzar for 13 years (ca. 585–572 B.C.), Tyre's power was totally exhausted. Later, it became part of the Persian empire, as a “powerful polity in the Levant, second only to Sidon.”⁷⁵

There are three awkward elements in Zech 9:2b–4: (1) Tyre is mentioned first although Sidon was more important in the Persian empire, and this results in a disrupted itinerary (Zech

⁷⁴ Eiselen states: “The statements of ancient classical writers make it plain that during this entire [Persian] period Sidon stood out as the most prominent city of Phoenicia... The Persian kings selected Sidon as their temporary residence, whenever their duties called them westward... In the war against the Greeks the eighty vessels of the Phoenicians were under the command of the king of the Sidonians, and in battle the Sidonians were the bravest and most courageous fighters in the Persian fleet”; Eiselen, *Sidon*, 61. Jigoulov supports this idea: “...by the time of Xerxes, the city of Sidon had emerged as the central and most powerful player on the Levantine coast in economic, political and maritime matters. Its citizens supplied manpower to many military operations of the Persians, for anything from quelling the Ionian revolt of 499 BCE to the operations against pro-Athenian Cypriot towns. Sidon remained as a satrapal capital city at least until the middle of the fourth century BCE”; Jigoulov, “Achaemenid Phoenicia,” 141; cf. Jigoulov, *Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia*, 166–67. Elayi claims that “Sidon was the leading Phoenician city in the Persian period”; Elayi, “Studies in Phoenician Geography,” 93–95; cf. Elayi, “Phoenician Cities,” 13–28. Katzenstein also supports this view: “...in the 6th century... Tyre lost preeminence to its twin city, Sidon”; Katzenstein, “Tyre,” 23. Cf. Schmitz, “Sidon (Place),” 17–18.

⁷⁵ Jigoulov, *Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia*, 142–43. Cf. Eiselen, *Sidon*, 63; Edwards, “Tyre,” 686–91.

9:2b);⁷⁶ (2) a singular verb *הִכְמָה* with a plural subject *צֵר וְצִידוֹן* is used (Zech 9:2b β); and (3) Tyre is singled out as Yahweh's foe being punished harshly even though she was never a threat to the existence of Israel (Zech 9:3–4).

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

The singular verb *הִכְמָה* with a plural subject *צֵר וְצִידוֹן* in Zech 9:2b β has aroused a lot of discussions. BHS suggests *צֵר* be emended to *צָמַר* whereas the LXX opts for a plural verb *ἐφρόνησαν*, retroverted as *חִכְמוּ* (they were wise). Similar to Otzen,⁷⁷ Petersen argues that Tyre and Sidon serve as “a shorthand reference to the Phoenician coast,” thus a singular verb fitting well the approach.⁷⁸ Though the uniform concept can be evidenced in the Hebrew Bible, the use of a singular verb with both cities as subject does not happen anywhere in the biblical books. Hanson proposes that we may perceive *צֵר* as a secondary intrusion into Zech 9:2b for (1) *צֵר* forms the heart of Zech 9:3, thus influencing the previous line; and (2) *צֵר וְצִידוֹן* are always mentioned together in the prophetic literature (e.g. Jer 47:4, Joel 4:4); and (3) *צֵר* is especially famous for her

⁷⁶ Similar to the case of Hamath, see our discussion above.

⁷⁷ Otzen argues that “das Wortpaar »Tyros und Sidon« wird als ein einheitlicher Begriff aufgefasst mit dem Verb im Singular”; Otzen, *Studien über Deuteriosacharja*, 237.

⁷⁸ Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14*, 45. Cf. Rudolph, *Sacharja 9–14*, 168; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 97.

wisdom in Ezek 28:3–5, thus conflation resulted.⁷⁹ Hence, from the text critical point of view, Hanson suggests that the best reading should be one that could reflect the announcement of judgment on Sidon in Zech 9:2b and on Tyre in Zech 9:3–4. However, contra to Hanson, Mason believes that Sidon should be secondary as she does not appear again in the text.⁸⁰ Amid these conflicting hypotheses, we suggest to read the irregularity as an intertextual marker, prompting the audience to find meaning from another text.⁸¹ When the readers consider the subject of the clause (הַכְּמָה מְאֹד), the textual problem in Zech 9:2b functions to direct them to Ezek 26–28, the only other passage where Tyre is portrayed as a very wise city, with הַכְּמָה appears in 27:8, 9; 28:3 and הַכְּמָה occurs in 28:4, 5, 7, 12, 17.

The single out of Tyre as Yahweh's foe in Zech 9:3–4 also serves as an intertextual clue, linking the audience to the earlier prophecies against the city. In the Hebrew Bible, oracles of judgement against Tyre are attested only in 4 occasions: Isa 23:1–14; Ezek 26:1–28:19; Amos 1:9–10 and Joel 4:4–8 [3:4–8]. Isaiah 23 summons to lament the demise of Tyre, a renowned commercial centre whose massive wealth and incredible power were once praised throughout the world. She was punished by Yahweh because of her pride and arrogance (23:9).⁸² The lengthy prophecy against Tyre in Ezekiel 26–28 asserts the fall of the strongly defended Tyre as she takes

⁷⁹ Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 298.

⁸⁰ Mason, "Use of Earlier Biblical Material," 17.

⁸¹ See "2.4 Intertextual Approach of This Project."

⁸² Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 403–38; Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 182–85; Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 300–309. The distinctive vocabularies shared with Zech 9:2–4 are: צָר, צִידוֹן, צָר, יָם.

pride in her great wisdom and excessive wealth.⁸³ The brief oracle in Amos announces the divine judgment on Tyre for her involvement in slave trade and her violation of brotherhood treaty.⁸⁴ In Joel, Tyre is accused of plundering the Judean assets and selling the Judean as slaves.⁸⁵ With the image of Tyre being destroyed by fire (Zech 9:4b), Smith argues that “the judgment on Tyre (v. 4) almost certainly is influenced by Amos 1:10.”⁸⁶ Though in Amos 1:10 Yahweh threatens to send fire upon the wall of Tyre: וְשָׁלַחְתִּי אֵשׁ בְּחֹמַת צַר וְאָכְלָהּ אֶרְמֹנֶיהָ, the oracle in Ezekiel has closer verbal similarities. Besides חכם, the punishment of having Tyre being consumed by fire (אֵשׁ...הִיא אֹכְלָתָהּ) is also attested in Ezek 28:18.

Many scholars have recognized the connection between Zech 9:2bβ–4 and Ezek 26–28, particularly 28:2–5, where צר, חכם, חיל, כסף, and חרוץ/זקב are attested as catchwords.⁸⁷ Despite the striking similarities, Petersen casts doubt on this allusion, contending that “one important motif in the Ezekiel Tyrian material, Tyre’s pride, is absent from vv. 3–4, whereas the basic point of Zechariah 9 involves the demise of a major Phoenician port for no apparent reason.”⁸⁸ The observation of Petersen is right, however, the word גאון does not appear in Ezek 26–28 where the

⁸³ See discussion below.

⁸⁴ Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, 312; Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets 2*, 208–209. The distinctive vocabularies shared with Zech 9:2–4 are: צר, אכל, אש.

⁸⁵ Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, 267–68; Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets 2*, 176–80; Crenshaw, *Joel*, 178–84. The distinctive vocabularies shared with Zech 9:2–4 are: צר, צידון, כסף.

⁸⁶ Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 253.

⁸⁷ Such as Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 17–19; Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 105–107; Stade, “Deuterosacharja,” 46–52; Sæbø, *Sacharja 9–14*, 148–49; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 25; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 98.

⁸⁸ Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14*, 49.

image of Tyre's pride is inferred by the description of the city. We argue that the intertextual parallel to Ezekiel intends to bring this important motif נָאוֹן into conversation in the schema, as we shall discuss.

Ezekiel 28:2-5

- 2 “Son of man, say to the leader of Tyre (צַר), ‘Thus says the Lord GOD,
 “Because your heart is lifted up
 And you have said, ‘I am a god,
 I sit in the seat of gods
 In the heart of the seas’;
 Yet you are a man and not God,
 Although you make your heart like the heart of God—
- 3 Behold, you are wiser than Daniel (חָכָם מִדָּנְיָאֵל);
 There is no secret that is a match for you.
- 4 “By your wisdom (בְּחָכְמָתְךָ) and understanding
 You have acquired riches (חֵיל) for yourself
 And have acquired gold (זָהָב) and silver (כֶּסֶף) for your treasures.
- 5 “By your great wisdom (בְּרֹב חָכְמָתְךָ), by your trade
 You have increased your riches (חֵילָךְ)
 And your heart is lifted up because of your riches (בְּחֵילָךְ).

The two texts demonstrate strong verbal and thematic parallels. In both passages, Tyre is depicted as very wise: חָכְמָה מְאֹד in Zech 9:2b and חָכָם מִדָּנְיָאֵל in Ezek 28:3 (cf. Ezek 28:4–5). In Zechariah, Tyre piled up numerous כֶּסֶף and חֵרֹוּץ (Zech 9:3), which she also acquired in Ezekiel (instead of חֵרֹוּץ the more common word זָהָב is used for gold in Ezek 28:4). The riches of Tyre are depicted as חֵיל in Zech 9:4 and Ezek 28:4–5. In addition, within the larger literary context of the Ezekielian passage, there are two more correspondences. Both texts depict the divine punishment of Tyre as (1) a destruction by fire: הָיָא בְּאֵשׁ תֵּאֶכְל in Zech 9:4 and הָיָא אֶכְלָתְךָ...אֵשׁ in Ezek 28:18; and

(2) having Tyre's wealth/rubble being thrown into a watercourse: *הִלְהָה בַּיָּם הַיְלֵה* in Zech 9:4 and *וְאֶבְנֵיךָ וְעֵצֶיךָ וְעַפְרֶיךָ בְּחוֹדַי מִיָּם יִשְׂמוּ* in Ezek 26:12.⁸⁹ In view of these resemblances, we register Ezek 28:2–5 as an intertext of Zech 9:2b–4.

Allusion to Ezek 28:2–5. The oracle against Tyre can be divided into two major sections: (1) the prophecies against Tyre (Ezek 26:1–21); and (2) the judgment against Tyre's king (Ezek 28:1–10), each followed by a lament, namely, 27:1–36 and 28:11–19 respectively. In the first section, Tyre is punished due to her mockery at the fall of Jerusalem (26:2), a reason linking the Tyre material with the tragedy of Israel. In the second section, the pride of the maritime giant will be brought down despite its remarkable wisdom and excessive wealth (28:2b–5).⁹⁰

The echoing and evoking of the oracle of Ezekiel against Tyre raises the question as to why the redactor is here using the material. After defining the intertext, Nurmela concludes that the similarities between Zech 9:2b–4 and Ezek 28:3–5 are “not very significant” with the reason that allusions to earlier prophets are typical of Second Zechariah.⁹¹ However, we do not agree with Nurmela's view on the nature of textual relationship.⁹² Mason guesses that probably the king of Tyre personifies the whole “spirit of proud independence, of confidence in the powers of her own wisdom and wealth, her strength and all alliances,” thus the traditional material is reused as a

⁸⁹ Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 105–107.

⁹⁰ Vawter and Hoppe, *Ezekiel*, 119–33; Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 167–88; Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 70–96. Cf. Corral, *Against Tyre*.

⁹¹ Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 107.

⁹² See “2.3.3 The Nature of Textual Relationships.”

warning to the inappropriate leadership within Israel.⁹³ Mason's observation, though hypothetical, is still possible, particularly when we consider the language of the subsequent lament (28:11–19). Zimmerli states that the fate of the king of Tyre “is narrated in terms of primeval man...this prevents the reader...from an overhasty withdrawal of himself from this event. In the pride and fall of the Prince of Tyre, there is repeated the story of ‘primeval man.’ This is ‘Everyman’s story’.”⁹⁴ If the representation of Tyre in the Ezekielian material is typical rather than historical, then the intertextual insights might provoke the readers to ascribe an image of “pride” to the Zecharian Tyre based on the impressive portrayal of the city in the antecedent text. Hence, one of the functions of this allusion to Ezekiel 26–28 is to rebuke all pride of humanity, setting the stage for the audience to dialogue with the subsequent material—the Philistine group (Zech 9:5–7).

However, the intertextual impact may be highlighted if we examine the strategic place of the prophecy against Tyre in Ezekiel. The oracle against Tyre (Ezek 26–28) is part of the collection of oracles against the nations in chapters 25–32, which lies between the judgment on Israel (Ezek 1–24) and the restoration of the people (Ezek 34–48). The function of the collection (Ezek 25–32) is to give historical events a “Yahweh-focused theological interpretation.”⁹⁵ The Ezekielian oracles against the nations not only affirm the sovereignty of Yahweh over all human

⁹³ Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 19–20. Cf. Rudolph, *Sacharja 9–14*, 172.

⁹⁴ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 95.

⁹⁵ Renz, *Rhetorical Function*, 93.

affairs but also signal the turn of fortune of Yahweh's people.⁹⁶ The judgment against Tyre prepares the ground for what is anticipated in 28:25–26, a passage at the heart of the whole collection, where Yahweh promises: “They will live in it [the land] securely, and they will build houses, plant vineyards and live securely when *I execute judgments* upon all who scorn them round about them” (28:26; italic mine).⁹⁷

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

The intertextual reading of the text stresses that the sovereign Yahweh is the author of all the human affairs, including the fate of Israel as well as those of the nations (cf. Zech 9:1c). While the previous oracle (Zech 9:1b–2a) heightens the hope for restoration within the prophetic community, the present oracle (Zech 9:2b–4) reinforces it—Yahweh will remove all obstacles by

⁹⁶ Vawter and Hoppe, *Ezekiel*, 119.

⁹⁷ Renz, *Rhetorical Function*, 94.

himself. However, alongside with this core message, the intertextual backdrop also alerts the readers to re-examine themselves in light of the fate of Tyre, preparing the audience for the next oracle (Zech 9:5–7).

4.3.3 The Philistine Group (Zech 9:5–7)

Translation of Zechariah 9:5–7	
5a Ashkelon will see and fear, Gaza will writhe with grief, also Ekron, for her hope came to ruin.	תִּרְא אַשְׁקְלוֹן וְתִירָא 5a וְעִזָּה וְתַחִיל מְאֹד וְעַקְרוֹן כִּי־הָבִישׁ מִבְּטָה
5b Then the king from Gaza will perish, and Ashkelon will not be inhabited.	וְאָבַד מֶלֶךְ מֵעִזָּה 5b וְאַשְׁקְלוֹן לֹא תִשָּׁב:
6a and a mongrel [race] will dwell in Ashdod.	וְיָשֵׁב מִמְזֵר בְּאַשְׁדּוֹד ⁹⁸ 6a
6b Now I will cut off the pride of the Philistines.	וְהִכַּרְתִּי גְאוֹן פְּלִשְׁתִּים: 6b
7a and I will take away his bloodshed violence from his mouth, and his detested things from among his teeth.	וְהִסַּרְתִּי דָמָיו מִפִּיו 7a וְשִׁקְצָיו מִבֵּין שִׁנָּיו ⁹⁹
7b Then he will be remained, even he, belonging to our God,	וְנִשְׁאַר גַּם־הוּא לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ 7b
7c and he shall be like a tribal chief in Judah, and Ekron, like a Jebusite.	וְהָיָה כְּאֵלֶף בִּיהוּדָה 7c וְעַקְרוֹן כִּיבוּסִי:

As Phoenicia, Philistia is one of the major geographical areas which formed part of “the land that yet remains” to be captured by the Israelites (Josh 13:2–3). The Philistine cities are in territory allotted to Judah and Dan (Josh 15:45–47; 19:43). As Dan was unable to acquire Ekron,

⁹⁸ The word וְיָשֵׁב can also be translated as “and he will rule.” Thus, the rendering would be “Then a bastard will rule in Ashdod.” However, this does not affect the interpretation of the verse, i.e., the destruction is very serious (see discussion below).

⁹⁹ The repetition (four times in six words) of the ם (pronominal suffix “his”) in Zech 9:7a functions to anticipate the emphatic “he” (גַּם־הוּא) in the next line. As these pronominal suffix link to the Philistines, thus those remained refer to the remnants of the Philistines; See Woodcock, “Forms and Functions,” 112–13. Meyers and Meyers share similar interpretation: “The leadership of the Philistines will be destroyed, yet here the singular Niphal of *š’r* refers to the survival of one individual Philistine leader”; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 115.

she was forced to move to the north and left Judah to contend with the Philistines about the occupation of Ekron (Judg 1:18–19).

The Philistines¹⁰⁰ dominated the Palestinian seacoast in the twelfth and eleventh centuries with their centre of power being a Pentapolis comprising Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron (cf. Josh 13:2–3). They had a reputation for being a strong military force with formidable fighters and iron weapons (1 Sam 13:19–21). In the Israelite history, the Philistines constantly posed grave threats to the chosen people, especially in the time of the Judges, as seen in the tales of the migration of the tribe of Dan who travelled North in their search for a safe refuge (Judg 18:1). It was in the time of David that the Philistines were being defeated, putting an end to the Pentapolis (2 Sam 5:17–25; 21:15–22). Many of these cities were either subdued or destroyed in the Assyrian and Babylonian periods.¹⁰¹

Ashkelon¹⁰² lies directly on the sea coast, in a strategic location on the Via Maris. She was an important Canaanite city long before becoming a part of Philistia and was the leading maritime power during the twelfth to tenth centuries. Though being destroyed by the Babylonians,

¹⁰⁰ The noun פְּלִשְׁתִּים appears 288 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which 17 times occurs in the prophetic literature: Isa 2:6; 9:11; 11:14; Jer 25:20; 47:1, 4 (x2); Ezek 16:27, 57; 25:15, 16; Amos 1:8; 6:2; 9:7; Obad 1:19; Zeph 2:5; Zech 9:6.

¹⁰¹ Ehrlich, *Philistines in Transition*. Cf. Katzenstein, “Philistines,” 326–28.

¹⁰² The place name אַשְׁקֶלֶן appears 12 times in the Hebrew Bible: Judg 1:18; 14:19; 1 Sam 6:17; 2 Sam 1:20; Jer 25:20; 47:5, 7; Amos 1:8; Zeph 2:4, 7; Zech 9:5 (x2).

Ashkelon once more became a flourishing seaport under the nominal control of Tyre during the Persian period.¹⁰³

Gaza¹⁰⁴ was a regional centre on the southernmost part on the Palestinian coast, with fertile lands and rich wells of sweet waters. She lies on the main highway between Africa and Asia, known as “the way of the land of the Philistines” in the Bible (Exod 13:17). During the rule of Darius, Gaza became a strong fortress town for the Persians, assisting in the crush of the Egyptian rebellions.¹⁰⁵

Ekron¹⁰⁶ is the northernmost of the Philistine group, situated on the west edge of the inner Coastal Plain, the natural and historical frontier zone that separated Philistia and Judah. She marks the southern boundary of Dan (Josh 19:43) and defines the northern border of Judah (Josh 15:11). After being destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in 603 B.C., she is not mentioned in any source until the Hellenistic period. The excavations of Ekron indicate that the city was abandoned until a small Roman settlement was built on the northern edge of the site.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ Jigoulov, *Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia*, 167; Laughlin, *Fifty Major Cities*, 33–42. Cf. Esse, “Ashkelon,” 487–90.

¹⁰⁴ The place name אַשְׁקֶלֶן appears 20 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 10:19; Deut 2:23; Josh 10:41; 11:22; 15:47; Judg 1:18; 6:4; 16:1, 21; 1 Sam 6:17; 1 Kgs 5:4; 2 Kgs 18:8; Jer 25:20; 47:1, 5; Amos 1:6, 7; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:5 (x2).

¹⁰⁵ Katzenstein, “Gaza,” 912–15.

¹⁰⁶ The place name עֶקְרוֹן appears 22 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 13:3; 15:11, 45, 46; 19:43; Judg 1:18; 1 Sam 5:10 (x2); 6:16, 17; 7:14; 17:52 (x2); 2 Kgs 1:2, 3, 6, 16; Jer 25:20; Amos 1:8; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:5, 7.

¹⁰⁷ We do not have much information about Ekron following her destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in 603 B.C. She reappears only in 1 Macc 10:89, in the *Antiquities* of Josephus, and in the work of Eusebius; Laughlin, *Fifty Major Cities*, 111–14. Cf. Dothan, “Ekron,” 415–22.

Ashdod¹⁰⁸ is a major urban centre, lying also on the Via Maris. She perhaps even surpasses Ashkelon in importance by the late premonarchic period as it was to Ashdod that the ark was transported after it was captured at Ebenezer (1 Sam 5:1–7). The city was first destroyed by Sargon II and then became a Babylonian province after Nebuchadnezzar’s conquest. The excavations of Ashdod indicate that a Persian occupation is well-represented there, with the city probably serving as an administrative centre.¹⁰⁹

In Zech 9:5–7, only four of the five cities of the Philistine league are mentioned, missing Gath¹¹⁰ which is also not named in other oracles against the Philistines: Jer 25:20, 47:1–7; Ezek 25:15–17; Amos 1:6–8, and Zeph 2:4–7 (see table below). The lack of mention of Gath might be due to the fact that the Philistine Pentapolis had become a Tetrapolis with Gath being included in Israel (2 Chron 11:5–12) or the city had a close relationship with David (1 Sam 27:1–28:2 cf. 2 Sam 6:10–11; 15:18–23).¹¹¹

	Jer 25:20	Jer 47:1–7	Ezek 25:15–17	Amos 1:6–8	Zeph 2:4–7	Zech 9:5–7
Place name mentioned (in sequence)	Philistines Ashkelon Gaza	Philistines Gaza Ashkelon	Philistines	Gaza Ashdod Ashkelon	Gaza Ashkelon Ashdod	Ashkelon Gaza Ekron

¹⁰⁸ The place name אַשְׁדּוֹד appears 17 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 11:22; 15:46, 47; 1 Sam 5:1, 5, 6, 7; 6:17; 2 Chr 26:6 (x2); Isa 20:1 (x2); Jer 25:20; Amos 1:8; 3:9; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:6.

¹⁰⁹ During the Persian period, Ashdod is only mentioned in a few sources, such as Neh 4:1–2, Jdt 2:28; Laughlin, *Fifty Major Cities*, 33–36. Cf. Dothan, “Ashdod,” 477–82.

¹¹⁰ The place name גַּת appears 33 in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 11:22; 1 Sam 5:8; 6:17; 7:14; 17:4, 23, 52; 21:11, 13; 27:2, 3, 4, 11; 2 Sam 1:20; 15:18; 21:20, 22; 1 Kgs 2:39 (x2), 40 (x2), 41; 2 Kgs 12:18; 1 Chr 7:21; 8:13; 18:1; 20:6, 8; 2 Chr 11:8; 26:6; Ps 56:1; Amos 6:2; Mic 1:10.

¹¹¹ Ehrlich, *Philistines in Transition*, 36–50. Cf. Seger, “Gath,” 908–909.

	Ekron Ashdod			Ekron Philistines	Ekron Philistines Ashkelon	Gaza Ashkelon Ashdod Philistines Ekron
Shared Vocabularies with Zech 9:5–7 (besides place name)	מֶלֶךְ וְנִשְׂאָר / שְׂאֲרִית	יֵשֶׁב כַּרְתַּת וְנִשְׂאָר / שְׂאֲרִית	אֲבָד כַּרְתַּת וְנִשְׂאָר / שְׂאֲרִית	אֲבָד יֵשֶׁב כַּרְתַּת וְנִשְׂאָר / שְׂאֲרִית	אֲבָד יְהוּדָה יֵשֶׁב וְנִשְׂאָר / שְׂאֲרִית	--

For the threat of judgment against the Philistines (Zech 9:5–7), echoes of earlier prophetic materials might be found. Person argues that Zech 9:5–6 is influenced by Jer 25:20, he argues: “The choice of the four Philistine cities and the order in which they are given suggests the influence of Jer 25:20. Of all the possible groupings of Philistine cities, only Jer 25:20 and Zech 9:5–6 have the following sequence of these four Philistine cities: Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, Ashdod.”¹¹² However, the order of the city-names in Zech 9:5–6 should be Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ashdod.

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

¹¹² Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School*, 118.

the Philistines (שְׂאֲרֵיית פְּלִשְׁתִּים) will perish (וְאָבְדוּ).”¹¹³ Besides the four city names, both אבד and כרת are used in Amos 1:7–8 as catchwords, though with different subjects: וְאָבְד מִלֶּךְ מֵעַזָּה/וְהִכְרַתִּי יוֹשְׁבֵי מַאֲשֶׁדִּי וְחֹמְרֵי שְׁבֵט מַאֲשֶׁקְלוֹן/וְאָבְדוּ שְׂאֲרֵיית פְּלִשְׁתִּים in Amos 1:8. The remnant of the Philistines is also depicted, but with different fates: וְנִשְׁאַר גִּם־הוּא לְאֵלֵהֶינּוּ in Zech 9:7 but וְאָבְדוּ שְׂאֲרֵיית פְּלִשְׁתִּים in Amos 1:8.

However, similar judgment oracle against these four cities appears also in Zeph 2:4–7 where not only שְׂאֲרֵיית but also אבד, ישב, and יהודה occur as linkage. Another oracle against the Philistines, without naming the four cities, is attested in Ezek 25:15–17, where similar verbal connections can also be evidenced: אבד, כרת, שְׂאֲרֵיית and פְּלִשְׁתִּים, all appearing in the same verse: “Therefore thus says the Lord GOD, “Behold, I will stretch out My hand against the Philistines (פְּלִשְׁתִּים), even cut off (וְהִכְרַתִּי) the Cherethites and destroy (וְהִאֲבַדְתִּי) the remnant of the seacoast (אֶת־שְׂאֲרֵיית חוֹף הַיָּם)” (Ezek 25:16). The same phenomenon can be found in Jer 47:1–7 where similar vocabularies (שב, כרת, ישב) are used in the oracle against Philistines. It seems that these lexical resemblances reflect a conventional biblical parlance, or at least language typical of judgment oracles against Philistines. In view of this, we are reticent to register Amos 1:7–8 as an intertext of Zech 9:5–7.¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 20; Mason, *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*, 85.

¹¹⁴ Nurmela arrives at similar conclusion: “an allusion to Am cannot be registered in Zc at this point”; Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 182.

In Zech 9:5a, the oracle against the Philistines starts with an abrupt scene, depicting the tremendous fear of the cities. It is probably the tragedy of Tyre in v. 4 has provoked this agitation. The demise of the Phoenician city signals that their hope is dashed: כִּי־הִבִּישׁ מִבְּטָה (Zech 9:5). The noun מִבְּטָה usually has a positive connotation, regarding something with expectation. Apart from here, מִבְּטָה appears only in Isa 20:5–6, where it denotes the vain hope of the Ashdodites who expected that their allies, the Egyptians or Ethiopians, would deliver them from the advancing armies of the Assyrians: “Then they will be dismayed and ashamed (וְבִשְׁתוּ) because of Cush their hope (מִבְּטָתָם) and Egypt their boast” (20:5; cf. 20:1–6). A similar situation might exist here in which the Philistine cities would expect Tyre, the prominent power of Phoenicia, to rescue them from the approaching divine warrior, Yahweh. Though the source of Ekron’s expectation of help is not directly specified, the close political tie between Ashkelon and Tyre may suggest that the Philistine cities would expect aids from this maritime stronghold.¹¹⁵

Ashkelon and Gaza will be horrified by the storming events in Phoenicia: וְעָזָה וְתַחֲוִיל מְאֹד (Zech 9:5a). Apart from here, the Qal forms of רָאָה, יָרָא, and חִיל appear only in Jer

¹¹⁵ The inscription of Eshmunazor II (KAI 14), dated to the last quarter of the sixth century B.C or the first half of the fifth century B.C., mentions that the Persian king gave some Palestinian coastal cities to Sidon/Tyre. Thus the Philistean cities might become colonies of the Phoenician powers; Jigoulov, *Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia*, 50–56. See discussion about Ashkelon above.

5:20–25 where Judah is condemned. Due to the exclusive shared vocabularies, we register Jer 5:20–25 as an intertext of Zech 9:5.¹¹⁶

Jeremiah 5:20-25

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

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

¹¹⁶ Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 26–30.

The divine questions in verse 22 are rhetorical ones, denouncing the Israelites who see (ראה) Yahweh's greatness but neither fear (ירא) nor tremble (חיל) before the sovereign Lord. The failure of the community leads to an inevitable judgment. Jeremiah 5 ends with an ominous question: “What will you do at the end of it [the land]” (וּמַה־תַּעֲשׂוּ לְאַחֲרֵיתֶיהָ) (v. 31)?¹¹⁷ Obviously, the passage intends to alert the community to learn a lesson before the end—to see and fear, so that a new future is possible.¹¹⁸

When we compare Zech 9:5 with its source, we notice that the alluding text has revised the alluded one: (1) the subject of the verbs changes from the Israelites to the Philistines; and (2) the rhetoric of the text shifts from condemning Yahweh's people who see but not fear to depicting the aliens who see and fear. The Philistines not only see the fall of Tyre but also fear the might of Yahweh. The innovative variation creates a sharp contrast between the two peoples, preparing the readers to understand the surprising twist of the oracle—the remnant of the Philistines (9:7b). The see and fear of the foreign people enables them to have a possible future.

In Zech 9:5b, the destruction of the Philistine cities begins. Gaza will lose her king and Ashkelon will be uninhabited. The clause וַיֵּשֶׁב מִמְזַר בְּאַשְׁדּוּדַיִר in Zech 9:6a offers a sense that the

¹¹⁷ The expression “at her end” (לְאַחֲרֵיתֶיהָ) in Jer 5:31 is ambiguous. Holladay suggests that the feminine possessive suffix refers to “the land” in v. 30, which is feminine; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 201.

¹¹⁸ Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 201; Craigie et al., *Jeremiah 1-25*, 93–96; Brueggemann, *Jeremiah 1–25*, 64–65; Allen, *Jeremiah*, 78–81.

destruction of the Ashdodites is so tremendous that מְזוּרָה¹¹⁹ can find room to live in the city without any objection. The outcast, מְזוּרָה, becomes part of the inhabitants of Philistia. Though the devastation is overwhelming, to the readers' surprise, this severe judgment of Yahweh intends to create a remnant for the Lord (Zech 9:7b–c). This concept is radical in that it not only reverses the adverse fate of the remnant of the Philistines announced in all the prophetic literature (Jer 25:20; 47:4–5; Ezek 25:16; Amos 1:8) but also admits the forbidden מְזוּרָה, who dwells in Ashdod, into the new commonwealth as this mongrel race is part of the remnant of the Philistines.

In Zech 9:7c, two similes are used to express this unprecedented tone about the remnant of the Philistines: (1) כְּאֶלֶף בֵּיהוּדָה; and (2) וְעֶקְרוֹן כִּיבוּסִי. These similes further astonish the audience by portraying how the resultant remnant will be integrated into the Judahite community. The first simile depicts that the remnant will be like a אֶלֶף in Judah. There are different views on the word אֶלֶף. On the one hand, Mason sees the term as referring to “intimate” or “tamed,” i.e., the remnant of the Philistines will “become the intimates of God’s people.”¹²⁰ On the other hand, Mitchell claims that this word appearing in the Zecharian texts (Zech 9:7c; 12:5–6) has a collective sense and clearly refers to a group or social unit, thus rendered as clan.¹²¹ Gottwald

¹¹⁹ The meaning of the Hebrew word מְזוּרָה is uncertain. By referencing to Deut 23:4 [3]), most translators render it as “illegitimate birth” (NAU), “illicit union” (NRS), or “half-breed” (NJB). It probably derives from the root מזר, connoting “be bad” or “corrupt”; HALOT, 595; BDB, 561. Cf. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 536; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 275.

¹²⁰ Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 22.

¹²¹ Mitchell was among the earliest exegetes to offer such a view; Mitchell, et al., *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 269. This view is followed by a number of scholars, such as, Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 116;

supports the latter view, contending that אֶלְוִי, as a social unit, is most appropriate in an archaizing poetic context of Zech 9:7.¹²² However, Wenham opposes to the rendering of אֶלְוִי as clan: “Though this translation is contextually possible, the fact that a similar term *ulp* is found with the meaning ‘leader’ at Ugarit...and its consistent translation by the versions as ‘leader’ make this interpretation unlikely.”¹²³ Instead, he proposes to render אֶלְוִי as “chief.”¹²⁴ Since all its 60 occurrences relate to Edom,¹²⁵ Wenham argues that אֶלְוִי is “an Edomite term.”¹²⁶ In view of this, we render אֶלְוִי as “tribal chief,” bearing in mind its relationship with Edom. With this connotation, the first simile projects an image that an alien remnant will be accepted with honour, like an Edomite tribal chief, among the Judahites. The second simile alludes to the Jebusites, with Ekron as the representative of the alien cities. Though the Jebusites were destined for destruction (cf. Exod 23:23), they were later absorbed into Israel after David established his capital in Jerusalem (2 Sam 5:6–10). Just as the Jebusites have a place within Yahweh’s people, so too the remnant will be incorporated into the restored community in the new age.

Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14*, 52; Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*, 113.

¹²² Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh*, 277–78.

¹²³ Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 338.

¹²⁴ Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 338.

¹²⁵ The noun אֶלְוִי appears 60 times in the Hebrew Bible. Besides the Zecharian texts (9:7; 12:5, 6), the other appearances of the word אֶלְוִי with the meaning of “tribal chief” include Gen 36:15 (x5), 16 (x4), 17 (x5), 18 (x4), 19, 21, 29 (x5), 30 (x5), 40 (x4), 41 (x3), 42 (x3), 43 (x3); Exod 15:15; 1 Chr 1:51 (x4), 52 (x3), 53 (x3), 54 (x3). All these occurrences relate to Edom.

¹²⁶ Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 338.

In order to assist the readers to digest the radical notion of accepting the alien remnant into their new commonwealth (Zech 9:7b–c), the poet recalls for the audience the word *מִמְזֵר* (9:6a). The noun *מִמְזֵר* is a rare word. Apart from here, it only appears in Deut 23:3 [23:2], a verse within a larger context (23:3–9 [23:2–8]) where certain kinds of people are prohibited from joining the assembly of Yahweh. Based on the exclusive lexical parallel as well as the similar concern about the admission of the alien people into the community, we register Deut 23:3 [23:2] as an intertext of Zech 9:6a, 7b–c.¹²⁷

Deuteronomy 23:2-8 (NASB95) [MT 23:3–9]

- 2 “No one of illegitimate birth (*מִמְזֵר*) shall enter the assembly of the LORD; none of his *descendants*, even to the tenth generation, shall enter the assembly of the LORD.
- 3 “No Ammonite or Moabite shall enter the assembly of the LORD; none of their *descendants*, even to the tenth generation, shall ever enter the assembly of the LORD, 4–6 because...
- 7 “You shall not detest an Edomite, for he is your brother; you shall not detest an Egyptian, because you were an alien in his land.
- 8 “The sons of the third generation who are born to them may enter the assembly of the LORD.

Allusion to Deut 23:3 [23:2]. Deuteronomy 23:3–9 [23:2–8] lays down the laws about the admission to the assembly of Yahweh (*קְהַל-יְהוָה*).¹²⁸ Nelson argues that the *קְהַל-יְהוָה* in Deuteronomy refers not only to the corporate worship as it “has been generalized into a synonym for the national community as a whole.”¹²⁹ The rationale behind this restriction in Deut 23:2–9

¹²⁷ Tai, *Prophetic als Schriftauslegung*, 30.

¹²⁸ The construct chain *קְהַל-יְהוָה* appears 10 times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 16:3; 20:4; Deut 23:2 [23:1], 3 [2] (x2), 4 [3] (x2), 9 [8]; 1 Chr 28:8; Mic 2:5.

¹²⁹ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 278. This argument is reasonable as *קְהַל-יְהוָה* is nuanced as “all Israel” in 1 Chr 28:8

[23:1–8] might suggest that “only those who are perfect physically and not the product of some unnatural union should be members of the covenant community in ancient Israel.”¹³⁰

The groups of people prohibited from entering the קהל־יהוה in Deut 23:3–9 [23:2–8] are: (1) the emasculated (v. 2 [1]); (2) the illegitimate birth (מִזְנוֹרָה) (v. 3 [2]); (3) the Ammonites and the Moabites (vv. 3–7 [2–6]); and (4) the Edomites and the Egyptian (vv. 8–9 [7–8]). All of them are not allowed to join the קהל־יהוה forever, except the last group of people, whose children of the third generation are qualify for inclusion (v. 9 [8]). The Edomites deserves a better treatment for their kinship with Israel (כִּי אֶחָיִךְ הוּא, v. 8[7]), a view stemming from the story of Esau and Jacob in Gen 25:21–26. Bartlett argues that the “Esau-Edom identification is well established by the fifth century B.C.”¹³¹ It is important that membership of the קהל־יהוה is not restricted to the

(cf. Num 16:3; 20:4).

¹³⁰ Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 537.

¹³¹ Edom is a nation lying on the South and East of the Dead Sea, with the King’s Highway passing through the eastern part of her territory (Num 20:17). The Edomites are represented in the Hebrew Bible as the descendants of Esau, the brother of Jacob (Gen 25:19–34; 27:27–29, 39–40; 36:1, 8, 9, 19, 43; Num 20:14–21; Deut 2:4, 8 23:8; Amos 1:11; Obad 10, 12; Mal 1:2–4; cf. 1 Chr 1:34–54). Bartlett dates Malachi to the early/mid-fifth century B.C., between Haggai/Zechariah and Ezra/Nehemiah. By referencing to Mal 1:2–5, he states that the “Esau-Edom identification is well established by the fifth century B.C.”; Bartlett, “Brotherhood of Edom,” 2.

In the United Kingdom, Saul successfully fought against the Edomites (1 Sam 14:47) and David subdued them as his servants (2 Sam 8:14). The subjection of Edom continued until she successfully revolted against the rule of Judah in the time of Jehoram (2 Kgs 8:20). There was continuing hostility of Edom towards Judah and the former was frequently rebuked in the prophetic texts for taking vengeance on the latter despite of their brotherly connection (Amos 1:11; Obad 1:12; cf. Joel 3:19; Ezek 25:12–14, 35:15). Edom became the vassal of Assyria, Babylon, and later Persia, with insignificant occupation. By the mid-fifth century B.C., Edom might have been ruined as stated in Mal 1:2–5. Bartlett states: “Edom had ceased to count for anything, as is shown by the absence of any reference to her in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. There is no certain evidence that the Persians took much thought for this mountainous region on the desert fringes of the Trans-Euphrates satrapy.” Bartlett, *Edom and the Edomites*, 174; Bartlett, “Rise and Fall,” 36–37. Myers suggests that Edom probably fell into Arab hands in the mid-fifth century B.C.; Myers, “Edom and Judah,” 386. However, Bartlett argues against Myers’ thesis; Bartlett, *Edom and the Edomites*, 161. Cf. Bartlett, “Edom,” 287–301.

Israelites alone, but also is open to other people, particularly the Edomites who is regarded as the brother of the Israelites.¹³²

The catchword מִמְּזַר is used in different ways in both texts. In Deut 23, מִמְּזַר is one of the outcasts excluded forever from the assembly of Yahweh whereas in Zech 9, מִמְּזַר is finally absorbed into the new community after being refined (Zech 9:6b–7a).¹³³ The host text leverages the earlier congregational act but reverses it in order to garner a new perspective for the audience—to admit the alien residents. In what manner would this previously prohibited people be integrated into the prophetic community? They should be accepted in a most inclusive way, כְּאֶלֶף בִּיהוּדָה and כִּיבוֹסֵי (Zech 9:7c). The noun אֶלֶף, as an Edomite term, recalls for the readers the legislation about the Edomites in Deut 23:8 [23:7] where these people are treated with favor based on brotherhood. The intertextual backdrop asserts that the remnants, even though they are gentiles,¹³⁴ just like the Edomites, who were once excluded from the assembly of Yahweh, are now accepted in the most respective way, as a tribal leader as well as a brother within Judah.¹³⁵

The juxtaposition of two contradictory ideas, of the alluding and the alluded, intends to create an impact, impelling the readers to embrace a more inclusive attitude. What is the purpose

¹³² McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 353.

¹³³ The refinement process will be discussed below.

¹³⁴ None of the Philistine cities mentioned in Zech 9:5–7 appear in the lists of Ezra-Nehemiah as cities in which Judeans dwelled. Thus, we may infer that Philistia was truly foreign in the mid-fifth century B.C. (cf. Neh 13:23–24).

¹³⁵ This connection is also noted in the work of Tai; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 30–32.

of nurturing this kind of attitude? There are two possible reasons: (1) to prepare the audience to inherit the land as promised in Ezek 47:13–20, an intertext of Zech 9:1b–2a, where a radical command concerning the inheritance for the resident aliens is followed (47:21–23): “You shall divide it [the land] by lot for an inheritance among yourselves and among the aliens who stay in your midst, who bring forth sons in your midst. And they shall be to you as the native-born among the sons of Israel; they shall be allotted an inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel” (v. 22);¹³⁶ and (2) to prepare the audience to accept unreservedly their scattered brothers, the northern exiles, so that they will participate wholeheartedly into their deliverance in order to restore the twelve tribes of Israel.¹³⁷ These two proposals satisfy the last two conditions of inheriting the promised land.¹³⁸

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

In Zech 9:6b–7a, the cleansing process involves the removal of three abominations from the Philistines: (1) נְאוֹן; (2) דְּמֵי מַפְיֹו; and (3) שְׂקָצִי מִבֵּין שְׁנָיו. The first charge against the Philistines is

¹³⁶ Larkin also discerns this connection but with no further elaboration; Larkin, *Eschatology*, 61.

¹³⁷ To save the northerners is the core message of the second half of Zech 10. See Chapter Eight.

¹³⁸ See “4.3.1 Syrian Group.”

their נָאוֹן, which is unusual as Philistia is not accused of arrogance in any prophetic oracles.¹³⁹

The noun נָאוֹן denoting human pride appears notably in Ezekiel (7:20, 24; 16:49, 56; 24:21; 30:6, 18; 32:12; 33:28).¹⁴⁰ The other charges relate to the words דָּמְיוֹ מִפִּי and שִׁקְצוּי מִבֵּין שִׁנָּיו. Based on

the vocabularies דָּם and שִׁקוּץ, many scholars link the detestations of the Philistines to cultic defilement and idolatrous practices (cf. Lev 7:21; 17:10–14; 19:26; Deut 12:16, 23; 29:16).¹⁴¹

The problem of this interpretation is that the word דָּם in the text is in plural form, against that in the Mosaic laws where דָּם, referring to eating blood, is always in singular and never occurs together with the word פָּה. The word דָּם in plural frequently denotes the shedding of blood, such as Gen 4:10–11.¹⁴² The figurative use of the word פָּה in the Hebrew Bible, such as רְשָׁעִים יִכְסֶה הַמֶּסֶה וְפִי (“but the mouth of the wicked conceals violence”) in Prov 10:6, supports our argument that

God intends to remove the bloodshed violence in 9:7a.¹⁴³ The plural דָּם with the meaning of

¹³⁹ The word נָאוֹן can have a positive nuance—majesty, excellence, glory (cf. Exod 15:7; Ps 47:5; Isa 2:10). However the נָאוֹן in Zech 9:6b connotes a negative sense of arrogance. It may refer to those materials that might cause either pride or arrogance, such as wealth, power. However, the verb הִכְרַתִּי usually indicates the cutting off of real things rather than ideas; thus נָאוֹן might be used here in both ways to represent abstract pride or wealth as well as the ruler amassing such aspects of power. Cf. Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 112.

¹⁴⁰ The noun נָאוֹן appears 49 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which 30 times denoting human arrogance: Lev 26:19; Job 35:12; Ps 59:13; Prov 8:13; 16:18; Isa 13:11, 19; 14:11; 16:6 (x2); 23:9; Jer 13:9 (x2); 48:29 (x2); Ezek 7:20, 24; 16:49, 56; 24:21; 30:6, 18; 32:12; 33:28; Hos 5:5; 7:10; Amos 6:8; Zeph 2:10; Zech 9:6; 10:11.

¹⁴¹ Such as Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*, 113; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 21; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 113; Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 413. However, Petersen claims that “explicit language of ritual and purification is not used” in the text; Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14*, 51.

¹⁴² HALOT, 225. BDB explains that the plural דָּמִים has a sense of “abundance, blood in quantity, hence sometimes of blood shed by rude violence”; BDB, 196. The plural of דָּם appears 73 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 4:10, 11; Exod 4:25, 26; 22:1, 2; Lev 12:4, 5, 7; 20:9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 27; Deut 19:10; 22:8; 1 Sam 25:26, 33; 2 Sam 1:16; 3:28; 16:7, 8 (x2); 21:1; 1 Kgs 2:5, 31, 33; 2 Kgs 9:7 (x2), 26 (x2); 1 Chr 22:8; 28:3; 2 Chr 24:25; Ps 5:7; 9:13; 26:9; 51:16; 55:24; 59:3; 106:38; 139:19; Prov 29:10; Isa 1:15; 4:4; 9:4; 26:21; 33:15; Ezek 7:23; 9:9; 16:6 (x3), 9, 36; 18:13; 22:2; 24:6, 9; Hos 1:4; 4:2 (x2); 12:15; Mic 3:10; 7:2; Nah 3:1; Hab 2:8, 12, 17; Zech 9:7.

¹⁴³ See other similar use of the word פָּה, such as Prov 4:24; 10:11; 11:9; 12:6; 18:7; 26:28.

bloodshed occurs prominently in Ezekiel (cf. 7:23; 9:9; 18:13; 22:2; 24:6, 9). The three abominations of the Philistines mentioned in Zech 9:6b–7a are attested exactly in Ezek 7:20–24.

Based on these striking lexical similarities and thematic parallels, we register Ezek 7:20–24 as an intertext of Zech 9:6b–7a, with גאון, דם, and שקיזיהם as catchwords.¹⁴⁴

Ezekiel 7:20-24

20 ‘They transformed the beauty of His ornaments into pride (גָּאוֹן), and they made the images of their abominations *and* their detestable things (שְׁקִיזִיּוֹתָם) with it; therefore I will make it an abhorrent thing to them.

21 ‘I will give it into the hands of the foreigners as plunder and to the wicked of the earth as spoil, and they will profane it.

22 ‘I will also turn my face from them, and they will profane My secret place; then robbers will enter and profane it.

23 ‘Make the chain, for the land is full of bloody crimes (דְּמָיִם) and the city is full of violence.

24 ‘Therefore, I will bring the worst of the nations, and they will possess their houses. I will also make the pride of the strong ones (גָּאוֹן עֲזִיזִים) cease, and their holy places will be profaned (וְנִחַלְתִּי מִקְדָּשֵׁיהֶם).

Allusion to Ezek 7:20–24. Ezekiel 7:20–24 is embedded within Ezek 7 which is the last oracle of judgment against Jerusalem before the departure of the glory of Yahweh in Ezek 10. The chapter expresses a strong sense of despair and a desperate situation of crisis: “An end! The end is coming” (קֵץ בָּא הַקֵּץ, 7:2; cf. vv. 3, 6). The קֵץ in Ezek 7 is not a warning but a sure extinction.¹⁴⁵

It announces the fall of the holy city as a result of the sins of God’s people, with verses 20–24 focusing on the profanation of the temple (7:24).¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴ Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 33.

¹⁴⁵ Vawter and Hoppe, *Ezekiel*, 56.

¹⁴⁶ Renz, *Rhetorical Function*, 69; Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, 97–113.

In the Ezekielian text, the primary sin of the Israelites relates to גָּאוֹן, appearing in 7:20 as גָּאוֹן and 7:24 as גָּאוֹן עֲזִים, forming an inclusio around 7:20–24. A glance through the use of the term גָּאוֹן in Ezekiel, we realize that the sources of the people’s pride include the temple (24:21), military force (30:6, 18), and economic prosperity (33:28; cf. 7:19). They depended on these worldly materials rather than Yahweh who will surely address the problems. The second sin connects to שְׂקִינֵיהֶם (7:20), a word appearing usually together with abomination (תוֹעֵבָה) in Ezekiel (cf. 5:11; 7:20; 11:18, 21). It relates to the images and idols on which the community relied, thus profaning the holy sanctuary (37:23). The third sin is דְּרִימִים (7:23), thus falling short of God’s expectations on their moral lives. Because the land was full of blood crimes and the city was full of violence, the people of Yahweh had to go into exile.¹⁴⁷

The prophet Ezekiel states clearly that, with all these sins, Yahweh’s people cannot inherit the promised land (33:25–26): “Therefore say to them, ‘Thus says the Lord GOD, “You eat *meat* with the blood *in it*, lift up your eyes to your idols as you shed blood. Should you then possess the land? You rely on your sword, you commit abominations and each of you defiles his neighbor’s wife. Should you then possess the land?”’ Despite the fact that these sinful people have to go into exile, the prophet comforts them with a promissory note: “... I [Yahweh] will deliver them from all their dwelling places in which they have sinned, and will cleanse them. And they will be My

¹⁴⁷ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 153–55; Block, *Ezekiel 1-24*, 264–68; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 211–14.

people, and I will be their God” (37:23). Ezekiel 37:23 ends with a covenant formula: לָהֶם לְאֱלֹהִים, emphasizing that the purpose of the judgment is to restore the covenantal relationship. Thus, the disaster that the Israelites were going to face was actually a process of refinement, allowed by Yahweh, aiming at creating a remnant with spiritual renewal.

The cleansing process of Yahweh’s people in Ezekiel is used as an analogy to the transformation of the Philistines. Similar to Ezek 7:20–24 where Yahweh has taken action to remove the sins of the Israelites, namely, גְּאֹזֶן, דְּמַיִם, and שְׂקִינְיָהֶם, in order to create a remnant suitable to possess the Land (cf. 33:25–26; 37:23), the Philistines must also be purified as such before they could be admitted into the assembly of Yahweh. Though the refining process will be severe, just like the complete uprooting of the cities as depicted in Zech 9:5–6a, after the purging campaign of Yahweh, a remnant suitable to inherit the ideal homeland will be restored (cf. Ezek 47:21–23). At that time, even Ekron who was so difficult to subdue will be absorbed into the transformed community, like the Jebusites of old, living among the Israelites (Zech 9:7cβ). Even the outcast מִמְצָר, like Edom, who had once been excluded from the covenantal blessings will become part of the new community, restoring the brotherhood of humankind (Zech 9:7cα).

The typological correspondence established between the host text and the source one could serve as an archetype of Yahweh’s transformation program for humanity, including the prophetic community of Second Zechariah, who must be purified before they could inherit the promised

land (cf. Zech 10:1–3a; 11:1–3, 17; 12:10–13:9).¹⁴⁸ By perceiving the divine refinement through the lens of this typical prophecy in Zech 9:5–7, the readers know that such transformation, though inconceivable, is completely possible in the hands of Yahweh.

At first glance, the Philistine material looks like one of the oracles against the nations in other prophetic literature, as Mason suggests.¹⁴⁹ It projects an impression that the Lord simply intends to remove this traditional enemy so that the prophetic community could possess the land. It is true that, at the surface level, the text does convey this message of salvation. However, the radical twist of the pericope invites the readers to understand the deeper meaning of the passage in light of its intertexts. By recalling, the original perception of the host text is enriched when the audience brings the source to bear on the alluding one. With the intertextual insights, Zech 9:5–7 is both promising and exhortative. The oracle summons the audience to have faithful response to Yahweh’s coming acts in the world. It urges the readers (1) to learn a lesson from the past—to see and fear—which is an important key for the divine transformation; and (2) to nurture an inclusive attitude towards their dispersed brothers—the northern exiles. In view of this, Yahweh’s purpose in this unit is not only to restore the homeland but also to renew the people so that they would be qualify to inherit the land.

¹⁴⁸ See subsequent discussions.

¹⁴⁹ Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 23. Cf. Larkin, *Eschatology*, 67.

4.4 The Inauguration of the New Age (Zech 9:8)

Translation of Zechariah 9:8	
8a Now I encamp at my house as a guard, without anyone who passes through and returns, and no more shall an oppressor traverse against them, 8b for now I have seen with my eyes.	8a וְחָנִיתִי לְבֵיתִי מִצָּבָה מֵעֶבֶר וּמִמְּשָׁב וְלֹא־יַעֲבֹר עָלֵיהֶם עוֹד נֹגֵשׁ 8b כִּי עַתָּה רָאִיתִי בְעֵינָי: ס

The last word יְבוּסִי (Jebusite) in Zech 9:7 connects the readers to Yahweh’s בַּיִת, which is in Jerusalem—the locus of verse 8. The word בַּיִת with Yahweh as subject is frequently used of the temple (cf. 2 Sam 7:5–6; 1 Kgs 7:12; 1 Chr 17:5), though it also refers to the earlier tent of worship on six occasions (Judg 18:31; 19:18; 1 Sam 1:7, 24; 2 Sam 12:20 and 1 Chr 9:23).¹⁵⁰ After capturing the territories, Yahweh marches down to his temple and takes up residence on his throne in Jerusalem (Zech 9:8).¹⁵¹ The divine return marks the inauguration of the new age, ushering in God’s decisive act of salvation.¹⁵²

Zechariah 9:8 represents a picture that Yahweh will return to Zion and encamp as a guard for his temple with the result that Jerusalem will be free from any oppressors. This idea leads some scholars to relate this verse to certain passages in Proto-Zechariah, particularly 1:16–17 and 2:8–9 [2:4–5], where the themes of divine return and divine protection appear.¹⁵³ For the latter

¹⁵⁰ I do not agree with Mitchell and Tai who argue that בַּיִת should refer to the people of Judah rather than the temple based on the subsequent plural עַלֵיהֶם; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 18; Mitchell, et al., *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 269.

¹⁵¹ Since the temple was built in Jerusalem (see Zech 1:16), therefore it is reasonable to suggest that Yahweh was marching towards Jerusalem. Moreover, from Zech 1:16–17 (“I will return to Jerusalem”) and 8:3 (“I will return to Zion”), we find that the term “Zion” and “Jerusalem” are used interchangeably in Zechariah (also see Zech 9:9).

¹⁵² Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 28.

¹⁵³ Similar connections are noted by some scholars, such as, Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 24–25;

passage, since there is no verbal parallel, we are reluctant to register it as an intertext. For the former one, Mason argues for a dependence with *בֵּית* and *עוֹד* as catchwords: “Therefore thus says the LORD, ‘I will return to Jerusalem with compassion; My house (*בֵּיתִי*) will be built in it,’ declares the Lord of hosts, ‘and a measuring line will be stretched over Jerusalem.’ ‘Again (*עוֹד*), proclaim, saying, “Thus says the LORD of hosts, ‘My cities will again (*עוֹד*) overflow with prosperity, and the LORD will again (*עוֹד*) comfort Zion and again (*עוֹד*) choose Jerusalem”’ (Zech 1:16–17).¹⁵⁴ However, the destination of the return is different—in Zech 1, Yahweh returns to Jerusalem where the temple will be built whereas in Zech 9, the Lord returns to the temple so that oppressive forces no longer (*לֹא...עוֹד*) traverse against his people. Besides thematic parallels, the lexical similarities between the two texts are not impressive enough to argue for a literary dependence. In view of this, we do not register Zech 1:16–17 as an intertext of 9:8.

Zechariah 9:8a depicts that the approaching divine warrior will encamp (*וְהִתְחַיֵּת*) around his house, as a protective shield guarding against any oppressor. Apart from here, the same verbal form *וְהִתְחַיֵּת* appears in the Hebrew Bible exclusively in Isa 29:3, where *מִצָּב* is also attested, a hophal participle of *נָצַב*, with *מִצָּבָה* probably as its feminine noun.¹⁵⁵ Both *מִצָּב* and *מִצָּבָה* are hapax legomena.

Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 119; Sæbø, *Sacharja 9–14*, 159.

¹⁵⁴ Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 25.

¹⁵⁵ HALOT, 620; BDB, 663; Gesenius and Tregelles, *Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, 500; Jansma, *Inquiry*, 69.

Isaiah 29:3

I will camp (וְהִנֵּיתִי) against you encircling you, and I will set siegeworks against you, and I will raise up battle towers (מִצְבָּה; cf. מִצְבָּה) against you.

In the Hebrew Bible, the qal of חנה occurs 143 times, basically attested in two meanings: (1) to encamp with non-military sense, such as the encampment of the Israelites during their wilderness journey (cf. Num 1:52); and (2) to encamp with military sense, such as the encampment of a troop during a military expedition (cf. 1 Sam 4:1).¹⁵⁶ Both Zech 9:8 and Isaiah 29:3 belong to the latter group with a warlike setting, but with a different emphasis—Isa 29:3 describes an act against Jerusalem whereas Zech 9:8 depicts the protection of God’s house. Though Ps 34:8 [34:7], which asserts that the angel of the Lord encamps (חָנָה) around those who fear Yahweh as a protection against their enemies, has a closer thematic parallel with the Zecharian text, the Isaianic one should be the right candidate due to the impressive similarities: (1) shared vocabularies (וְהִנֵּיתִי and מִצְבָּה vs. חָנָה in Ps 34:8 [34:7]); and (2) the same subject (Yahweh, not the angel of the Lord as in Ps 34:8 [34:7]). Based on these correspondences, we register Isa 29:3 as an intertext of Zech 9:8a.¹⁵⁷

Allusion to Isaiah 29:3. Isaiah 29:3 is embedded within a pericope (Isa 29:1–8) where Jerusalem’s destiny is announced.¹⁵⁸ The passage is divided into two sections: (1) a divine

¹⁵⁶ In the Hebrew Bible, the qal of חנה appears 143 times, of which 6 times occurs in the prophetic texts: Isa 29:1, 3; Jer 50:29; 52:4; Nah 3:17; Zech 9:8.

¹⁵⁷ Based on the exclusive verbal similarity (וְהִנֵּיתִי), Nurmela concludes that there is a “probable allusion” to Isa 29:3 in Zech 9:8; Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue*, 108–109. Cf. Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende*, 69; Larkin, *Eschatology*, 66; Rudolph, *Sacharja 9–14*, 175.

¹⁵⁸ The explanation here references to the following works, unless noted otherwise; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*,

judgment of Jerusalem (29:1–4) which is followed by (2) a sudden and unanticipated divine deliverance (29:5–8).¹⁵⁹ This depiction corresponds closely with the historical circumstance in which Jerusalem was under siege during the reign of Hezekiah, but experiencing a miraculous relief with the sudden retirement of the Assyrian army in 701 B.C.¹⁶⁰ The pericope asserts that Yahweh is the agent of assault as well as deliverance.

The first section begins with a woe, setting a tone of threat against Jerusalem who relies on her ritual observance rather than Yahweh (v. 1; cf. 1:11–15). The city will be besieged by Yahweh (v. 3) with her people suffering a humiliation as unto death (v. 4). The second section describes the divine deliverance of Jerusalem with Yahweh’s punishment falling on her foes, portrayed in the language of theophany (vv. 5–6). The simile in vv. 7–8 compares the assault of the hostile nations to a dream, asserting that, with Yahweh’s assistance, these threats will be “like a fantasy, as though it had never happened, as though it leaves no enduring effect.”¹⁶¹

The Isaianic text is not only recalled but also reversed in order to explicate the essence of the new age. By alluding to Isa 29:3, the Zecharian text opens a new vista for the audience, inviting them to view the advent of Yahweh through the lens of the earlier material. Instead of

389–402; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 373–86; Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, 378–83; Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 230–32.

¹⁵⁹ There are different scholarly views on the beginning of the section regarding the deliverance of Jerusalem. For example, Blenkinsopp suggests a start in v. 5, Brueggemann chooses v. 5d, whereas Sweeney opts for v. 7; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 389–402; Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 230–32; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 373–86.

¹⁶⁰ Scholars generally ascribe this passage to the Assyrian attack in 701 B.C.; such as, Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 389–402. However, Sweeney opposes to this linkage; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 382.

¹⁶¹ Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 232.

encamping to attack Jerusalem, the Lord comes to protect her inhabitants. With the assistance of Yahweh, God's people could experience the miraculous salvation of the deity as all oppressive forces will be insubstantial in front of the deity.

In the inauguration of the new epoch, not only is the judgment oracle in Isaiah reversed, but also the desolation scene in Zech 7:14 is revised. The phrase *מַעֲבֵר וּמֹשֵׁב* causes some trouble for scholars. Jansma regards it as redundant whereas Hanson deems it as an explanatory gloss, as does BHS.¹⁶² However, we argue that the obscure construction of Zech 9:8a serves as a marker, pointing the audience to its source. Apart from here, the explanatory phrase *מַעֲבֵר וּמֹשֵׁב* appears in exact verbal form only in Zech 7:14.¹⁶³ Based on the exclusive lexical parallel and the awkward construction of the phrase, we register Zech 7:14 as an intertext of Zech 9:8a.¹⁶⁴

Zechariah 7:14

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

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

¹⁶² Jansma, *Inquiry*, 69; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 298. Cf. Rudolph, *Sacharja 9–14*, 169.

¹⁶³ Besides Zech 7:14, the phrase *עָבַר שׁוֹב* in participle absolute also appears in Ezek 35:7, with both texts portraying the desolation of the land after Yahweh's punishment to Israel and Edom respectively.

¹⁶⁴ Meyers and Meyers believe that this is a quotation of Zech 7:14, emphasizing the contrast between the past; Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 119.

portraying Yahweh's blessings as well as ethical demands in the restoration when the Lord returns to Jerusalem.¹⁶⁵

Because of their disobedience, Yahweh chastised the former generation by scattering them among other nations, resulting in the complete desolation of the land (Zech 7:14). The harsh effects of the destruction of the land is expressed by the phrase *מְעַבְרֵי וַיִּשָּׁב*, referring to the absence of people crossing back and forth, probably due to: (1) depopulation caused by the exile; (2) reduction of productive activity due to deportation or military devastation; and (3) the absence of travelers owing to general insecurity resulting from the ruin.¹⁶⁶

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

4.5 Summary (Zech 9:1–8)

4.5.1 Source Text

¹⁶⁵ Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 353–64; cf. Boda, “From Fasts to Feasts,” 390–407.

¹⁶⁶ Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8*, 405.

In Zech 9:1–8, seven intertexts are detected (see table below), of which three (no. 1, 2, 5) are recalled from the book of Ezekiel. Among the three Ezekielian antecedents, the text of the ideal boundaries (no. 1) in the great temple vision (Ezek 40–48) serves as the backbone of the Zech 9:1–8. It is evoked as supplement in order to nuance the restoration program of the Zecharian text. In addition, one earlier prohibitions (no. 4) and two judgment oracles (no. 6, 7) are summoned and reversed to signal the inauguration of the new age.

No.	Zech 9:1–8	Intertext	Strategy*
1	9:1b–2a	Ezek 47:13–20	supplement
2	9:2b–4	Ezek 28:2–5	revision
3	9:5	Jer 5:20–25	revision
4	9:6a, 7b–c	Deut 23:3	revision
5	9:6b–7a	Ezek 7:20–24	supplement
6	9:8a	Isa 29:3	revision
7	9:8a	Zech 7:14	revision

* refers to “2.3.3 The Nature of Textual Relationships.”

4.5.2 Intertextual Reading

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

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

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

Associated with the first vision is the creation of an ideal people, suitable to dwell in the promised homeland with Yahweh in their midst (cf. Ezek 43:1–7). By using the rhetorical marker *וַיִּשְׁמַע* to introduce and structure the oracles, the corpus asserts that the word of Yahweh has revealed once again among the people. By appropriating the Jeremianic material (Jer 5:20–25), the source summons the people to have faithful response to the coming of the Lord. By deviating from the source text (Ezek 28:3–5), the Tyre passage (Zech 9:2b–4) declares that Yahweh’s salvation for his people will be worked out inexorably. However, the intertextual insights also reminds the readers to re-examine themselves in light of Tyre’s fate. By using the cleansing process of the Philistines (Zech 9:5–7) as an archetype, the corpus invites the audience to believe

that Yahweh can transform any situation in favor of the restoration (cf. Ezek 7:20–24). By reversing the earlier prohibition (Deut 23:3), the intertextual reading exhorts the readers to nurture an inclusive attitude towards their dispersed brothers, a requirement set forth in Ezek 47–48.

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