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**Elie Assis,**

**Zechariah 8 and its Allusions to Jeremiah 30–33 and Deutero-Isaiah**
INTRODUCTION
Elsewhere I have claimed that Zechariah 8 is a digest and revision of the oracles of the first seven chapters of the book, recapitulating the prophecies that the prophet had previously expressed, sometimes by the use of quotations and similar wording, and sometimes by condensing the concept without resorting linguistically to the original oracle.¹ In this article I will show that the first eight oracles of Zechariah 8 allude to Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption, Jeremiah 30–33² (one of which alludes to an oracle of rebuke by Jeremiah).³ The last two oracles of Zechariah 8 have no parallels in

Jeremiah, but have direct affinity with words of Second Isaiah.¹ After demonstrating the affinity between the oracles in Zechariah and those in Jeremiah, I shall attempt to determine the chronological order of the oracles. For purposes of convenience when writing the analogies I refer to Jeremiah as an earlier source to Zechariah, in accordance with the way the Masoretic Text orders these prophets. After examining various findings, I examine the question of the historical background of the sources.

AFFINITIES BETWEEN ZECHARIAH 8:2–19 AND JEREMIAH

The first of the ten oracles, Zech 8:2, is concerned with God’s jealousy for Jerusalem. In accordance with similar content in Zech 1:14–15 it refers to God’s wrath on the nations who have harmed Judah.⁵

I am jealous for Zion with great jealousy, and I am jealous for her with great wrath.

---


And in 1:14–15 the prophet says:

I am very jealous for Jerusalem and for Zion. And I am extremely angry with the nations that are at ease; for while I was only a little angry, they made the disaster worse.

These words of Zechariah are very similar to the words of consolation of Jeremiah in 32:37, except that in Jeremiah, God’s wrath was on Judah:

I am going to gather them from all the lands to which I drove them in my anger and my wrath and in great indignation; I will bring them back to this place, and I will settle them in safety.6

The second oracle, in Zech 8:3 describes the return of God to Jerusalem, that is also called “the mountain of the Lord of hosts,” “the city of truth,” and “the holy mountain.”

I will return to Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; Jerusalem shall be called the faithful city, and the mountain of the Lord of hosts shall be called the holy mountain.

These epithets for Jerusalem that come in the context of the return to the holy city are similar to those used for Jerusalem in Jer 31:22 [ET 31:23]:

Once more they shall use these words in the land of Judah and in its towns when I return their fortunes: “The Lord bless you, O abode of righteousness, O holy mountain”7

While the Zechariah source talks of the return of God to Jerusalem, Jeremiah talks of the return of the people by God.

---

6 In no prophetic book beside Jeremiah and Zechariah, is the term used. Beside the occurrences above, it appears in Jer 21:5; Zech 1:15; 7:12. Outside the prophetic literature it occurs twice, in Deut 29:27; 2 Kgs 3:27.

7 For this analogy see also Stead, The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 241. Besides the two sources mentioned above, the expression only in Dan 9:20.
The third oracle in Zech 8:4–5 prophesies the quality of life of the residents of Jerusalem:

Thus says the Lord of hosts: Old men and old women shall again sit in the streets of Jerusalem, each with staff in hand because of their great age. And the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in its streets.

In this description there are a number of motifs taken from Jer 30:18–19

Thus says the Lord: I am going to restore the fortunes of the tents of Jacob, and have compassion on his dwellings; the city shall be rebuilt upon its mound, and the citadel set on its rightful site. Out of them shall come thanksgiving, and the sound of merrymakers (משחקים). I will make them many, and they shall not be few; I will make them honored, and they shall not be disdained.8

This description also talks about the return of Judah to Jerusalem from captivity and the quality of life in the city which is expressed in terms of the number of the city’s citizens, as well as the life of gladness. The rare expression of people “making merry” (משחקים) also appears in Jer 31:3 [ET 31:4]:

Again I will build you, and you shall be built, O virgin Israel! Again you shall take your tambourines, and go forth in the dance of the merrymakers (משחקים).9

The fourth oracle of Zechariah, in 8:6 also relates to the oracles of redemption in Jeremiah:

8 For this analogy, see Mason, The Books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 69.

9 The use of the word משחקים in this form is unique to Jeremiah and Zechariah. It appears also in Jer 15:17. In a different meaning and in the singular form the word is used in Hab 1:10.
Thus says the Lord of hosts: Even though it seems impossible to the remnant of this people in these days, should it also seem impossible to me, says the Lord of hosts?

Most commentators interpret this verse as a rhetorical question whose meaning is that nothing is too hard for God to do, including the redemption of the people—similar to what is said in Jer 32:17:

ואحسبאת ביהו את משפט אשמה ואת ראית הכהנים הכהנים

ובוורמה המצויה לא יקרה לך_bindings

Ah Lord God! It is you who made the heavens and the earth by your great power and by your outstretched arm! Nothing is impossible for you.

See also Jer 32:27:

נה אתי יהו אלהיך כל יבשה להممך יקרה לך_bindings

See, I am the Lord, the God of all flesh; is anything impossible for me?°

The fifth oracle, Zech 8:7–8, is concerned with the ingathering of the exiles to Jerusalem, which follows the description in the second oracle of the entry of God there. With the return of God and the people to Jerusalem (in 8:7) the fifth oracle talks of the renewal of the covenantal relationship between God and the people in 8:8. The concept behind this oracle and its wording is based on Jeremiah’s prophecy of redemption, Jer 32:37–38.°

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zechariah 8:7–8</th>
<th>Jeremiah 32:37–38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כנני מושיע אתי לאמו</td>
<td>והנה ממקצתผม</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תפארם מורדיים נבוי</td>
<td>הקאר נהמר והולדים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והעם</td>
<td>הנכרים בורא יבשה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זוהי ילב יאיא שתה</td>
<td>והנה ילב יאיא שתה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לאלים</td>
<td>לאלים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

° The connection between these sources was indicated by Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 78–79.
°° This is the conclusion of Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 80.
7 I will save my people from the east country and from the west country;

37 See, I am going to gather them from all the lands to which I drove them in my anger and my wrath and in great indignation;

8 and I will bring them to live in Jerusalem.

I will bring them back to this place, and I will settle them in safety.

They shall be my people and I will be their God, in faithfulness and in righteousness.

38 They shall be my people, and I will be their God.

The word faithfulness in the context of the concept of the return to Zion appears also in Jer 32:41:

אֶשֶׁר יְהָשֵׁי לָֽהָֽם לָֽהָֽם אָתָֽם וּמְשַׁשְּתֵּי הבַּֽאֲרָֽךְ הָאָתָֽם בַּכָּל לְבָֽם

I will rejoice in doing good to them, and I will plant them in this land in faithfulness, with all my heart and all my soul.

The phase “They shall be my people, and I will be their God” appears twice more in the redemption chapters of Jeremiah to express the renewal of the covenantal relationship between the people and God, 30:22; and 30:25.

The sixth oracle in 8:9–13 is concerned with the economic bounty of the people after the establishment of the Temple. Jeremiah also concerns himself with the abundance of the crop, though he does not connect it with the building of the Temple, Jer 31:4, 11, 13. Below I will relate to the difference between the two sources.

The wording of the opening of the seventh oracle, Zech 8:14–17 is taken from Jer 32:37–42 as shown by the following table:\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
7 I will save my people from the east country and from the west country; & 37 See, I am going to gather them from all the lands to which I drove them in my anger and my wrath and in great indignation; \\
8 and I will bring them to live in Jerusalem. & I will bring them back to this place, and I will settle them in safety. \\
They shall be my people and I will be their God, in faithfulness and in righteousness. & 38 They shall be my people, and I will be their God. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{12} On this analogy see Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 84–86.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zechariah 8:14–15</th>
<th>Jeremiah 32:37–42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 32:37–42</td>
<td>Zechariah 8:14–15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zechariah 8:14–15</th>
<th>Jeremiah 32:37–42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For thus says the Lord of hosts:</td>
<td>42 For thus says the Lord:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just as I purposed to bring disaster upon you, when your ancestors provoked me to wrath, and I did not relent, says the Lord of hosts, so again I have purposed in these days to do good to Jerusalem and to the house of Judah; do not be afraid.</td>
<td>Just as I have brought all this great disaster upon this people, so I will bring upon them all the good fortune that I now promise them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zechariah 8:14–15</th>
<th>Jeremiah 32:37–42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 and I will put the fear of me in their hearts, so that they may not turn from me.</td>
<td>41 I will rejoice in doing good to them, and I will plant them in this land in faithfulness, with all my heart and all my soul.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The seventh oracle in Zechariah 8 is an oracle with a promise for the future. This is the only oracle in which a condition appears that good will befall the people if one behaves well toward his fellow man, though the condition also hints at its opposite – that if one does not behave well towards others, evil, and perhaps catastrophe, will befall the people. Therefore, it is reasonable to look for a parallel for this oracle outside of the collection of Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption. The seventh oracle in Zech 8:14–17 is based on the oracle of rebuke in Jer 9:1–7 [ET 9:3–8]. The subject of both oracles is the speaking of truth between man and his fellow and the avoidance of deceit and lies. The words “truth” and “lies” are keywords in both oracles, and in both the word “peace” occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>פָּעַל הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>קֶשֶׁתָם שָׁקָר לָא לִאָמָּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דֶּברְךָ אֶתִּי אַשֶּׁר רָעֹתָ</td>
<td>קֶשֶׁתָם שָׁקָר לָא לִאָמָּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָמַת וּמֵשֶׁפֶט שָׁלָּם שָפָּטָ</td>
<td>תָּרֹעִים:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והָשִּׁבֶנֶם לֶאֶל בָּשָׂר</td>
<td>והָשִּׁבֶנֶם לֶאֶל בָּשָׂר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָשִּׁבֶנֶם לֶאֶל בָּשָׂר</td>
<td>הָשִּׁבֶנֶם לֶאֶל בָּשָׂר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
<td>יָשָׁר הַתָּכֹבֵדֵי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁנֹשֵׁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are the things that you shall do:

Speak the truth to one another, render in your gates judgments that are true and make for peace, do not devise evil in your hearts against one another, and love no false oath;

They bend their tongues like bows; they have grown strong in the land for falsehood, and not for truth; for they proceed from evil to evil, and they do not know me, says the Lord.

Beware of your neighbors, and put no trust in any of your kin; for all your kin are supplanters, and every neighbor goes around like a slanderer.

They all deceive their neighbors, and no one speaks the truth; they have taught their tongues to speak lies; they commit iniquity and are too weary to repent.

Their tongue is a deadly arrow; it speaks deceit through the mouth.

They all speak friendly words to their neighbors, but inwardly are planning to lay an ambush.

for all these are things that I hate, says the Lord.
In the eighth oracle, (8:19) the prophet prophesies that the fast days on which the people mourned the destruction of the Temple will become days of joy and gladness.

Thus says the Lord of hosts: The fast of the fourth month, and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth, shall be seasons of joy and gladness, and cheerful festivals for the house of Judah: therefore love truth and peace.

Jeremiah, of course, could not speak about these fast days before the Temple was destroyed, and therefore there is no parallel oracle. Nevertheless Zechariah’s vocabulary and promise that eventually there would be gladness are based on Jer 31:12:

Then shall the young women rejoice in the dance, and the young men and the old shall be merry. I will turn their mourning into joy, I will comfort them, and give them gladness for sorrow.

A further parallel oracle can be found in Jer 33:11

The voice of joy, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride, the voice of them that shall say, Praise the LORD of hosts: for the Lord is good…

**Parallel between Zechariah 8:20–23 and Deutero-Isaiah**

The two last oracles in this group, the ninth and the tenth, 8:20–22 and 8:23 are concerned with the gentiles accompanying the Jews on their journey to Jerusalem in order to call on the Lord and implore His favor. These oracles emphasize the recognition by the gentiles of the Jews as the people of the Lord and the Lord as God, and Jerusalem as the place where God dwells. There is no parallel or similarity between these two oracles and the various prophecies of redemption in the Book of Jeremiah or anywhere else in the Book.
However this subject is found in the words of the anonymous prophet whose prophecies appear in Isaiah 40–66.\textsuperscript{13} Isa 56:3 and 56:8 describe, as does Zechariah, the gentiles who accompany the Jews on their return to Jerusalem. The oracle in Isaiah promises these gentiles that they will be welcome in the House of God, that the Lord will make them glad, and their sacrifices and their prayers will be acceptable before God.\textsuperscript{14} This source refers to the gentiles attaching themselves to the Temple and community of God. The city of Jerusalem, which is mentioned explicitly as the destination of gentiles in Zechariah, is not mentioned in Isa 56:8 but is explicit in Isa 66:18–21. This source describes the coming of the gentiles to assemble on the Holy Mountain so as to see the Glory of the Lord in Jerusalem. A description of gentiles coming to the Temple in Jerusalem is also found in Isa 60:10–14 though the emphasis here is on their coming to serve in the Temple in Jerusalem. The gentiles’ recognition of and prayers to God, which occur at the end of Zechariah 8, are also found in Isa 45:14. A similar idea is found in Isa 2:1–4,\textsuperscript{15} and duplicated in Mic 4:1–3.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} See above n. 4


\textsuperscript{15} Mitchell, Haggai, Zechariah, 216. See also Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 87–90; H. G. M. Williamson, Isaiah 1–27 (ICC; London and New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 177. However it is a matter of dispute if the passages in Isa 2:1–4 and Mic 4:1–4 are original. On the question of the date of this prophecy, see the survey in: H. G. M. Williamson, Isaiah 1–27, 174–179. It is assumed by many that these passages are post-exilic. See A. Weiser, Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten, 1 (ATD, 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1967), 263. Gray, emphasizes, that the allusion of Zech 8:20–22, to Isaiah 2 proves that the date of Isaiah 2 is not later than 520 BCE. See G. B. Gray, The Book of Isaiah (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912), 44. Hillers believes that the prophecy was written in the 8th century, see Hillers, Micaiah, 53. For the origin of the Zion tradition in the Davidic-Solomonic period, see J. J. M. Roberts, “The Davidic Origen of the Zion Tradition”, JBL. 92 (1973), 329–344. For Jerusalem as a pilgrimage site for all nations see H. Wildberger, “Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion”, VT 7 (1957), 62–81.

\textsuperscript{16} For the relationship between Isa 2:2–4 and Mic 4:1–4, see H. Wildberger, Jesaja (BKAT, 10/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980), 78–80. D. R. Hillers, Micaiah (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 51–53. Sweeney has claimed that the text in Zechariah is a citation of the Mican source, and deliberately differs from Isa 2:2–4. M. A. Sweeney, Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature,
EVALUATION OF THE FINDINGS

We have seen, then, that the first eight oracles in Zech 8:2–19, are based on the ideas and vocabulary of Jeremiah, while the last two oracles, vv 20–23, have no parallel in Jeremiah, but correspond to oracles of the anonymous prophet in Isaiah 40–66.

The date of the prophecies of redemption in Jeremiah 30–33, is disputed among scholars.17 It is not possible within the framework of this paper to review the vast amount of research that has been conducted on these chapters, but it can be stated that the prevalent opinion is that they were written after the events of 586 BCE, and not by Jeremiah himself.18 In the opinion of Carroll, for instance, it is hard to suppose that Jeremiah, who prophesied the complete destruction of the city, could make such a complete volte-face and also prophesy the redemption of the people and the city of Jerusalem.19 However, I do not see why one prophet should not speak both of the destruction of the Temple on account of sins being committed at the present, while also prophesying redemption in the future, believing the destruction to be of a temporary nature.20 It may be assumed that the prophet did not intend to prophesy the total destruction of the people, but rather a temporary destruction. It is also possible that Jeremiah himself authored these prophecies of redemption after the destruction. Some scholars hold that the affinity between these chapters and the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah, is further reason for a late dating of Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption.21 Other scholars are of the opinion that Deutero-Isaiah is later than the Book of Jeremiah and quotes from it.22 I will demonstrate how the affinity between Zechariah 8 and

---

19 R. Carroll, The Book of Jeremiah, A Commentary (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1986), 569. Carroll is of the opinion that the oracles in Jer 30–33 were composed by anonymous writers from the exilic or postexilic times. See Carroll, Jeremiah, 569. For the various opinions as to the time of Jeremiah 30–33, see McKane, Jeremiah, clvii–clxiv.
22 See e.g. Driver, Introduction; J. R. Lundbom, Jeremiah 21–36, (AB, 21B; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 390; J. A. Thompson, The Book of Jeremiah (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans), 557. This possibility
Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption supports the assumption that Deutero-Isaiah refers to material in Jeremiah, and that in the discussions on the dating of Jeremiah 30–33 scholars did not take into account their affinity with Zechariah 8.23

In order to understand the way Zechariah 8 uses Jeremiah’s work it is necessary also to examine what topics of redemption in Jeremiah are absent in Zechariah. Another issue to be addressed is the idea behind the affinities between the universal prophecies in Zech 8:20–23 and their parallels in Second Isaiah. Can the absence of prophecies of this type in Jeremiah be explained?

The dependence of Zechariah on the pre-exilic prophets stems first and foremost from the fact that Zechariah wanted to impress on his audience the message that he is continuing in the steps of the classical prophets, which he refers to as “the Former Prophets.”24 Zechariah’s perception that he was continuing in the path of the Former Prophets is mentioned explicitly in 1:4–6 and 7:4–14. Four times in these verses Zechariah refers to the prophets who preceded him, and each time summarizes their rebukes and directs similar rebukes to the people of his own generation, together with a veiled threat that if they copy the behavior of their ancestors their fate is likely to be similar to theirs. So as to strengthen this assertion, Zechariah uses, throughout his prophecies, the messages used by the Former Prophets together with their style and even direct quotations from their words. Indeed, the continuity created between Zechariah and Jeremiah leads Boda to the conclusion that Zechariah is a ‘Second Jeremiah’.25 Apart from this, Zechariah wanted to convey to his audience that Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption were in the process of fulfillment.26

A further dimension can be added to this concept. Jeremiah is primarily identified as a prophet of doom, whose prophecies of woe and calamity were fulfilled. To this same prophet were also ascribed prophecies of redemption. Zechariah’s allusions to Jeremiah were also designed to strengthen the belief of his audience in

---

24 See also A. Petitjean, Les oracles du Proto-Zacharie, 441. For analogies between Zechariah and pre-exilic prophecy see Nurmiela, Prophets in Dialogue, 39–103; Stead, The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 2–6.
26 On this subject see Stead, The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8, 261–262.
his own prophecies of redemption. Zechariah uses the latent claim that if Jeremiah’s prophecies of woe were fulfilled, now it must also be believed that his prophecies of redemption will also come to pass. Therefore, Zechariah, the majority of whose prophecies are prophecies of redemption, is seeking to assure the trustworthiness of his words by basing them on those of Jeremiah. The need to reinforce the credibility of the words of the prophet stems primarily from the fact that the strong expectations of the people had not been realized (indeed there is evidence that Zechariah had to prove his credibility, see Zech 2:13, 15; 4:9; 6:15). It should be noted that Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption are prophecies of the future. In a similar way Zechariah’s prophecies are also prophecies of the future. In this way the prophet seeks to establish that although Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption have not yet been realized, they have not changed, and their fulfillment in the future should still be anticipated, in Zechariah’s new wording.

Despite Zechariah’s attempt to present himself as Jeremiah’s successor and his prophecies as having a similar import to those of Jeremiah, it is evident that there are significant differences between the two prophets. These are the result of different historical circumstances.

The first difference is between the attitude of Zechariah to prosperity in the sixth oracle of chapter 8 vv 9–13 as opposed to the parallels of this oracle in Jer 31:4,11. It can be seen here that although Zechariah draws from Jeremiah’s prophecy he updates it. Prior to the Destruction no prophet had made prosperity dependent on the building of the Temple, but rather on the performance of God’s commandments. Haggai is the first prophet to make the connection between economic prosperity and the building of the Temple; Zechariah here is following his example. These prophets made economic prosperity dependent on the building of the Temple in order to strengthen its status that was being undermined by the people. This is a good example of how the prophet worked: he hinted at the words of Jeremiah, but changed them and added to them to fit the circumstances of his times. If Jeremiah’s prophecies

---

of redemption were composed after the exile it might well be possible to find a similar connection between economic prosperity and the reconstruction that we find in Haggai and Zechariah. Such a connection exists also in Ezek 47:12.

A much more significant subject that differentiates between Jeremiah and Zechariah is their treatment of the Davidic monarchy. In Jer 30:9 there is a clear and explicit promise that the monarchy will be renewed: “But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up for them.” The renewal of the monarchy is not referred to in this way in Zechariah 1–8, and especially in chapter 8, which summarizes the oracles of the previous chapters.

Jeremiah 33:15–17 also refers to the return of the Davidic monarchy: “In those days, and at that time, will I cause a righteous Branch to spring forth for David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem will dwell securely; and this is the name by which it will be called: ‘the Lord is our righteousness’. For thus says the Lord: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel.” Zech 3:8 also makes reference to ‘the Branch of David’: “Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, you and your friends who sit before you; for they are men of good omen: behold, I will bring forth My servant the Branch.” It is also cited in Zech 6:12–13: “and say to him, ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts, Behold, a man whose name is the Branch, for he shall grow up in his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord. It is he who shall build the temple of the Lord, and shall bear the royal honour, and shall sit and rule upon his throne. And there shall be a priest by his throne, and peaceful understanding shall be between them both.”

Some scholars are of the opinion that the “Branch” in Zechariah is not Zerubbabel. The prevalent view is that these oracles reflect Zechariah’s understanding that Zerubbabel is a descendant of David who will fulfil the prophecies of the earlier prophets, in particular those of Jeremiah, and will sit on the Davidic throne.

---

28 Baker believes that Zemah refers to Joshua the high priest. M. Baker, “The Two Figures in Zechariah,” Heyj 18 (1977), 38–46. Bie believes that Zemah refers to an eschatological Messiah, see M. Bie, Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja: Eine Auslegung von Sacharja 1–6 (Biblische Studien, 42; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), 38. Rudolph believes that Zechariah at first thought that Zerubbabel was to take the throne, but when Zechariah realized Zerubbabel’s failure he thought that one of his descendents would fulfil the expectations of the renewal of the line of David. See Rudolph, Haggai-Sacharja 1–8, 130–131. According to Tollington and Rose “Zemah” is not identified with Zerubbabel, but a future figure, see Tollington, Tradition and Innovation, 144–145, 172; Rose, Zemah and Zerubbabel, 248–249.

Although I agree with the opinion of many scholars who hold that the “Branch” is Zerubbabel, nowhere does Zechariah speak explicitly of the restoration of the House of David. Nowhere in the Book of Zechariah and not even in the Book of Haggai is Zerubbabel called “king.” Although Haggai prophesies about Zerubbabel he does not mention that he is a descendant of David, and does not speak explicitly of the monarchy (Hag 2:20–23).30 Admittedly Zechariah uses royal vocabulary, as Boda has convincingly demonstrated.31 I accept the opinion that Zechariah speaks about Zerubbabel sitting on the royal throne, 6:12–13: “Thus says the Lord of hosts: Here is a man whose name is Branch: for he shall branch out in his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord. It is he that shall build the temple of the Lord; he shall bear royal honor, and shall sit and rule on his throne. There shall be a priest by his throne, with peaceful understanding between the two of them.”32 However, his position as king is weakened not only because kingship is not specifically mentioned, but also because, for the first time in biblical literature, a priest will sit on a throne beside the king.33 Moreover, the main royal task mentioned is the future building of the temple.34

---

30 See also, W. H. Rose, Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period (JSOTSup, 304; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000, 249–250).
33 Mitchell, Haggai, Zechariah, 188.
34 Mason is right when he comments that Zerubbabel is called to build the temple like David and Solomon. Mason, Preaching the Tradition, 209–210.
One may argue that these prophets refrained from speaking explicitly about the Davidic kingship as long as Judea was a weak province under the rule of the Persian monarchy. However, this cannot explain why Haggai or Zechariah do not mention any affinity between Zerubbabel and David, or refer to him specifically as a scion of the House of David.\(^{35}\)

In view of the explicit mention by Jeremiah of the ‘Branch’ as a descendant of David, who will sit on his throne, and in view of the many affinities between Zechariah and Jeremiah, the contrast between the two on this subject is significant.

The difference in the way Zechariah and Jeremiah relate to the Davidic monarchy is based on the different circumstances in the two periods in which these two prophets functioned. If we accept the assumption that Jeremiah prophesied about ‘the Branch of David’ prior to the exilic period, but after he had prophesied the devastation of the country and the fall of the Davidic monarchy, it can be understood why he also prophesied the renewal of the monarchy as part of the future redemption. However, it would seem that by the days of Zechariah, the hope that the monarchy would be restored was recognized as being unrealistic, and so in Zechariah 1–6, the prophet speaks of ‘the Branch’ but does not reiterate Jeremiah’s prophecy of the restoration of the monarchy, nor is there a mention of David.\(^{36}\)

\(^{35}\) See also Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 144; See also Miller and Hayes who note “If Zerubbabel had been a member of the Davidic family line, it seems almost unbelievable that neither Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, nor Zechariah noted this”. In their opinion Zerubbabel was not from the line of David, but was regarded so only by the Chronicler, in order to maintain continuity of the Davidic leadership. Cf. J. M. Miller and J. H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (London: SCM Press, 1986), 456. I think that he was a descendent of David; however, indeed these sources do not indicate that in line with the realization that he will not be a monarchic ruler. See also K. E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (*SBLJIL*, 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 46–53.

\(^{36}\) Many scholars make the claim that Zechariah initially predicted Zerubbabel to be the heir of the Davidic kingship, but after this hope was disappointed, Zechariah abandoned this idea and replaced it by other more realistic hopes. Some think that priesthood was perceived as the royal Messiah. See, for instance, J. Wellhausen, *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah* (3rd ed., London: A. & C. Black, 1891) 129. Against the understanding that the hope for the renewal of the house of David was transferred to priesthood, see recently A. R. Petterson, *Behold Your King: The Hope for the House of David in the Book of Zechariah* (*LHBOTS*, 513; New York and London: T & T Clark, 2009), 46–62. In his opinion, looking at the book of Zechariah in its final form demonstrates the Messianic hope though a Davidic king. See the conclusion of the book, pp. 246–252. Carroll points out that Zechariah 1–8 demonstrates the failure of Zerubbabel, and that Zechariah 9–14 was added later in order demonstrate the
was composed later than Zechariah 1–7, when Zerubbabel had already disappeared from the scene. In chapter 8, that repeats some main ideas of chapters 1–7, even the notion of the return of ‘the Branch’ is not found.

This discussion also has implications for dating Jeremiah 33:14–26. It is more difficult for those scholars who date these verses as late as the post-exilic period to explain a prophecy of the restoration of the Davidic monarchy at a time when this seems far beyond the realm of possibility.  

As we have seen many scholars are of the opinion that at first Zechariah thought that Zerubbabel would be king and would sit on the throne of David, and later, when this hope failed to materialize, the oracles of Zechariah were rewritten. If this is indeed the case, it is necessary to ask how was it that in the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah exactly the opposite had taken place, and an extra oracle, on the renewal of David’s monarchy, was actually added to it. This all leads to the conclusion that these verses of Jeremiah were in fact written prior to the events of 586 BCE, and by Jeremiah himself.

We can now offer an explanation why Jer 33:14–26 is absent from the Septuagint. In the same way that many scholars claim that Zechariah was rewritten once it became clear that Zerubbabel was not ‘the Branch’ of the House of David and would not sit on David’s throne, one can understand the change that took place in the Hebrew vorlage of the Septuagint to Jeremiah 33. Assuming that the wording of the Masoretic Text was composed prior to 586


37 For those who consider 33:14–26, as a postexilic addition see C. H. Cornill, Das Buch Jeremia (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1905), 359; Volz, Der Prophet Jeremia (KAT, 10; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1928), 314–316; W. Rudolph, Jeremia (HAT; Tübingen: Mohr, 1968), 217; Holladay, Jeremia, vol. 2, 228–230; Carroll, Jeremia, 637. The claim that Jer 33:14–26 is post-exilic is problematic, as this text is so explicit about the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. In an extensive treatment, Mark Leuchter finds arguments for a composition prior to the 586 BCE events, and even for Jeremianic authorship. However he also points to some later signs in the text, especially in vv 19–22. He thus suggests a more complicated process of composition. See M. Leuchter, The Polemics of Exile in Jeremiah 26–45 (Cambridge: University Press, 2008), 72–81.

BCE, it is understood that the promise concerning the royal House of David is to be found in it. If indeed we accept that the Septuagint came subsequently, the translator (or the author of the Hebrew *vorlage* of the Septuagint) erased the prophecy concerning the House of David, thereby also reducing the emphasis on the House of David in the oracles of Zechariah.

I have now touched on the central idea that appears in Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption that is absent from Zechariah 8. On the other hand it is evident that in Zechariah 8 there is another basic idea which has no parallel in Jeremiah. All of the first eight oracles are based on parallel oracles in Jeremiah 30–33. However, as we have said, the ninth and tenth oracles in Zechariah 8, talk about gentiles joining the Jews in their pilgrimage to Jerusalem, with the intention of beseeching the Lord there, and recognizing the Judeans as the people of God. There is no mention whatsoever in Jeremiah of these concepts that are parallels of oracles in Second Isaiah. The subject of the mixing of Jews and gentiles, whether with a positive or a negative connotation, begins specifically in the exilic and post-exilic literature. In the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Malachi we find opposition to inter-marriage (Ezra 9–10; Neh 9:1–3; 10:28; 13; Mal 2:10–16). In Second Isaiah, and in Zechariah, we find, on the other hand, a positive attitude to the mingling of Jews with gentiles. Both the positive and negative aspects are the result of the mixing of Jews among gentiles in exile after the events of 586 BCE. As a consequence the prophets and the leaders of the people were obliged to turn their attention to this matter. The prophets were aware of the latent problem of the negative influence of gentiles on Jews through inter-marriage, but we also find that in this assimilation there were those who saw the realization of the ideal of the propagation of the name of God among the gentile nations. Living in the reality of his time Zechariah struggled with this problem, but found no relevant material in the work of Jeremiah from which he quotes a great deal, and so he adopted the universal stance from Second Isaiah. It is evident that Zechariah used his sources in a sophisticated way, adjusting the words of his predecessors to the circumstances of the period in which he lived.

Returning now to Jeremiah, we can perhaps understand why his prophecies of redemption contain no universal orientation. If Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption were created during the exilic or post-exilic periods, as many scholars hold (see above), we might have expected to see the sort of universal approach that we find in...

---

39 The difference between the universalistic attitude during the first temple period as an utopian ambition versus the universalistic approach as a realistic one during the restoration period see M. Weinfeld, “Universalistic and Particularistic Trends During the Exile and Restoration,” M. Weinfeld, *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, London and (New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 251–266.
Second Isaiah and Zechariah. Or we might have expected to see the opposite approach, such as we find in Ezra and Nehemiah. But it is difficult to understand why the subject finds no expression in Jeremiah if his prophecies were created after 586 BCE. But if we accept the position that the tidings of redemption belong to the period prior to the Destruction, it becomes understandable, since Jeremiah never experienced the mingling of the Jews among the gentiles in the exile, with its ramifications, and so he never needed to make any sort of pronouncement on this subject.

We can therefore conclude that Zechariah 8 borrowed heavily from Jeremiah 30–33, though Zechariah adjusted the words of his predecessor and updated them to fit the period in which he lived. And so the tone of the renewal of the Davidic monarchy, which is a key subject in Jeremiah’s prophecies of redemption, is expressed in a more subtle way, in all probability because it seemed to be very removed from the new reality. On the other hand, Zechariah had to relate to the subject of the influence of the Jews on the gentiles, or vice versa, as indeed Second Isaiah did, though this subject was beyond Jeremiah’s vision in the pre-exilic period.40

---

40 I thank Michael Avioz, Mark Boda, and Rimon Kasher for reading this article and for their valuable comments.