

dom is still expressed in *the personal line of David's descendants*, and is not simply absorbed in the temple and cult.⁴⁶ While the focus is on the *present* manifestation of Yahweh's kingdom, mediated through the Davidic covenant, this association introduces a new and potentially transcendent element into the tradition. It may be that this fact relativises the older political significance of the dynasty for the Chronicler, at the same time as giving rise to hopes of salvation focused on David's line. The writer does not develop this thought, for he is too much concerned to focus on the present state of his community, and to stress its continuity with the formative events of the pre-exilic past. Preeminently this means the Davidic covenant, which remains the basis of Israel's existence and its hope of restoration (*cf.* 2 Ch. 7:12-22). Nevertheless, it is a remarkable feature of the Chronicler's presentation that he introduced a connection which, centuries later in its own way, is central to New Testament christology, God's kingdom present through the Son of David. Is the association accidental, or was there a trajectory from the work which itself concludes the Hebrew Bible in its canonical order?⁴⁷

⁴⁶1 Ch. 17:14; 28:5; 29:23; 2 Ch. 9:8; 13:5. On the eternity of Yahweh's kingdom, *cf.* 1 Ch. 16:31; 29:11-12; 2 Ch. 20:6.

⁴⁷A fact reflected in Mt. 23:35; Lk. 11:51; *cf.* 2 Ch. 24:20ff.

CHAPTER 13

MESSIANIC THEMES IN ZECHARIAH 9-14

Iain Duguid

Summary

The book of Zechariah looks forward to the coming of the Messiah in terms borrowed and developed from earlier scriptural material. Its imagery was then further picked up and developed by the New Testament writers to affirm their conviction that these prophecies were fulfilled in Jesus. This article examines the prominent messianic themes in Zechariah 9-14 (the coming king, the good shepherd, the pierced Messiah), looking at how the prophet interacts with earlier Scriptures, and briefly exploring how these themes are taken up and reused in the New Testament.

I. Introduction

It is a recognisable feature of post-exilic prophecy that it does not stand alone but interacts extensively with other Scriptural material. This is not due to a lack of creativity on the part of the later prophets. Far from it; they were, in fact, often extremely creative in the reuse of earlier materials, sometimes transforming the literary genre of the original,¹ or reinterpreting earlier oracles to apply in a new way to the new situation. However, their creativity apparently operated largely within the boundaries of existing materials. These materials were recognized by them as authoritative yet also open to development and reapplication to new situations. Prophecy was not yet at an end.

This feature of post-exilic prophecy is very evident in Zechariah 9-14.² The oracles repeatedly refer back to already existing materials, with which they assume the reader's familiarity, and then proceed to develop them as the basis for new prophecies. The process is not dissimilar to the way in which Chronicles reuses earlier historical materials in a creative fashion.³ In this study, we shall examine the prominent messianic themes in Zechariah 9-14, looking at how the prophet interacts with earlier Scriptures, and briefly explore how these themes are taken up and reused in the New Testament.

II. The Coming King

Perhaps the best known passage in Zechariah 9-14 is the promise of the coming king in Zechariah 9:9, 10, where Zion is instructed to rejoice and Jerusalem to shout, because her king is coming to her riding on a donkey. The greatness expected for this coming king is one of world domination, as may be seen in the last two lines of v.10: 'His dominion will be from sea to sea, from the River to the ends of the earth.' This aspiration may originally have belonged to the royal enthronement ritual.⁴ The formula is found in almost identical terms in Psalm 72:8, a

¹E.g., from blessings and curses into oracles, or from oracles into law. On this, see M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: OUP, 1985) 500-505.

²C.L. Meyers & E.M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1994) 35-45.

³For Zc. 9-14, the reuse of earlier materials is extensively documented in K. Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah. A Study of the Formation of a Mantological Wisdom Anthology* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994).

⁴W. Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1-8, Sacharja 9-14, Maleachi* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1976) 182.

Psalm which has several key terms in common with Zechariah 9:9-10.⁵ Both look forward to a reign which encompasses the entire known world, and both share the desire for a king who reigns in righteousness (Zc. 9:9; Ps. 72:3), and who is the channel of God's salvation (Zc. 9:9; Ps. 72:4).

Yet the contrast between the expectation of the two passages is as pronounced as the similarity. In Psalm 72, the active party in bringing about the expected blessing is the Davidic king. While the psalm is addressed to God, his part in the process is envisaged as providing the righteous king, who will have the characteristics to bring about blessedness for his people. In contrast, in Zechariah 9 it is the Lord alone who is the active party, bringing about the state of world domination single-handedly.⁶ He is the one who will crush the opposition from surrounding countries (Zc. 9:1-7) and he will himself encamp around his house as a guard (Zc. 9:8).⁷ The Lord will cut off the chariot and the war bow (Zc. 9:10). The coming king is given no role in establishing world dominion in Zechariah. He merely provides the focus for rejoicing, as he heads the triumphal procession into Jerusalem and speaks peace to the nations whose warlike spirit has already been shattered. Whereas in Psalm 72:13 the Davidic king 'saves' (יִשְׁעֵי) the lives of the needy, in Zechariah 9:9 he is himself the object of the Lord's salvation.⁸

A similar transformation has been wrought in the other tradition which Zechariah has utilized, Genesis 49:10, 11. In Genesis 49, a ruler is expected to come from Judah, 'binding his foal (עֵיִרָה) to the vine and his ass's colt (בְּנֵי אֲתוֹנֹת) to the choice vine.' This is clearly a similar figure to Zechariah's coming king whose mount is described as 'an ass, the foal of an ass' (עֵיִר בֶּן־אֲתוֹנֹת). Yet again the differences are as striking as the similarities: the figure in Genesis comes from the warlike tribe of Judah, and is described as having 'his hand on the neck of his enemies' (Gn. 49:8), like a lion crouching over his prey (Gn. 49:8).

⁵Larkin, *Eschatology*, 75.

⁶A. Laato, *Josiah and David redivivus: the Historical Josiah and the Messianic Expectations of Exilic and Postexilic Times*, (CBOT 33; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1992) 270.

⁷Reading קִצְבָה in place of מִצְבָּה, with LXX and Syr. See BHS and Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi*, 169.

⁸Understanding נִשְׁעֵי to have a passive force. The unqualified English translation 'victorious' (NRSV) is too triumphalist: the focus of the Niph'al of שָׁעַ is on victory gained through the intervention of another, whether a great army (Ps. 33:16) or, more frequently, the Lord (e.g., Nu. 10:9; Dt. 33:29; 2 Sa. 22:4; Is. 45:22; Je. 30:7). This is best rendered in English by the passive 'saved' or 'delivered'.

In this context, it seems possible that 'washing his garments in wine and his vesture in the blood of grapes' (Gn. 49:11) has something more in mind than simply abundant fruitfulness.⁹ Clothing stained red with the blood (דָּמָא) of grapes is evocative of an altogether different kind of activity, of outright warfare (cf. Ps. 58:10 [11]; 68:23 [24]). The two images of harvest and judgement, of winepress and blood, are completely merged in Revelation 14:20, while the figure riding to war on a white horse in Revelation 19:13 wears a garment 'dipped in blood'.¹⁰

Zechariah's king, however, is described as 'meek' (עָנָו) and speaking peace (שָׁלוֹם) to the nations. The warlike language is still present in Zechariah 9 but it has been transferred from the royal figure to the Lord himself.¹¹ The donkey, too, is not an animal of war in Zechariah. It is certainly an animal suitable for a king to ride (cf. 1 Ki. 1:33), but there does seem to be a contrast drawn in parts of the Old Testament between a concept of kingship based on power and despotism, represented by horses and chariots, and one based on dependence upon the Lord, symbolized by the king riding on a donkey.¹² The coming king of Zechariah 9 will fall into the latter category.

Thus the coming king in Zechariah, while a figure of greatness and ceremonial importance, does not himself bring about the blessedness of his people through warlike activities. The key actions will come from the Lord, who will deliver the kingdom to the human king as a *fait accompli*. The king's part involves humble dependence upon the Lord. This emphasis is perhaps natural in a 'day of small things' (Zc. 4:10), such as God's people experienced during the exile and subsequent years. When the people are all too aware of their own weakness, then the words 'Not by might, not by power but by my Spirit says the Lord of Hosts' (Zc. 4:6) are both necessary and welcome.¹³

This emphasis is by no means unique to Zechariah. In Ezekiel 34, for instance, the prophet speaks of the Lord's intervention to rescue

his sheep. He will search for them (v. 11), rescue them (v. 12), gather them (v. 13), feed them (v. 14) and judge them (v. 17). In short, the Lord himself will be the shepherd of his sheep (Ezk. 34:15). However, his shepherding of the people also includes the provision of a Davidic king: 'I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David' (Ezk. 34:23). We have here precisely the same combination of circumstances as in Zechariah: God will himself act decisively to bring in the state of blessedness, and will then set up the king of his own choosing over his people—a king who is a new David (in the picture of Ezekiel), or the promised scion of Judah (in the picture of Zechariah).

III. The Good Shepherd

Like the image of the coming king, the picture of the good shepherd is not one invented by Zechariah. In the ancient Near East, the choice of 'shepherd' as a metaphor for kings was a natural one,¹⁴ and it is frequently found in the Old Testament in that sense.¹⁵ The term 'shepherds' in the plural can also refer to kings (e.g., Je. 23; Ezk. 34), though there are some passages in the Old Testament where the term seems to take on a wider connotation, indicating a broader spectrum of leadership than just the monarch (e.g., Je. 25:34-36).¹⁶ Invariably in the Old Testament, however, shepherd denotes either God himself or some kind of earthly ruler, though not necessarily a king.

Shepherd imagery abounds in Zechariah 9-14. As well as being central to the extended prophetic sign-act of shepherding in 11:4-17, and the oracle against the shepherd in 13:7-9, the shepherds are marked out for judgement in 10:3 and 11:3. The question is, however, who does Zechariah have in mind when he speaks of 'shepherds'? Some recent studies have identified the shepherd of Zechariah

⁹The comment of G. von Rad, *Genesis* (3rd ed; London: SCM, 1972) 425, is typical: 'Anyone... who can wash his garment in wine, lives in paradisaical abundance.' Similarly C. Westermann, *Genesis* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982) 263.

¹⁰This figure appears to be another creative reworking of Gn. 49:11: so e.g., J.P.M. Sweet, *Revelation* (London: Pelican, 1979) 283.

¹¹The same oracle of Gn. 49:10 was transformed by Ezekiel into a message of judgement (Ezk. 21:27 [32]). According to Larkin, this could have led to Zechariah wishing to reinstate the ancient promise in an eschatological context (*Eschatology*, 72). Certainly Zechariah's future king, described as righteous (צַדִּיק) and saved (נִשְׁעָר), provides a foil for Ezekiel's 'unhallowed, wicked prince' (Ezk. 21:25 [Heb. v. 30]).

¹²Cf. Ps. 20:7-9 [Heb. vv. 8-10]. So Laato, *Josiah*, 271.

¹³In Zc. 1-8 the stress is on God's presence creating the conditions necessary for the rebuilding of the Temple: see J.A. Hartle, 'The Literary Unity of Zechariah', *JETS* 35 (1992) 150. In Zc. 9-14 the Temple is no longer the focus of interest, perhaps because it has been rebuilt by this time. However, the stress on the priority of divine action remains.

¹⁴So Hammurabi describes himself as 'The shepherd who brings salvation and whose staff is righteous' and Merodach-baladan II is called 'the shepherd who gathers together again those who have strayed.' See L. Dürr, *Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandservartung; ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Schwetschke, 1925) 118-19.

¹⁵For example 1 Ki. 22:17; Is. 44:28.

¹⁶See I.M. Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel* (SVT 56; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 39, 40.

11 as a prophetic figure, rather than a ruler.¹⁷ Reference is often made to Isaiah 63:11, where Moses is apparently called the 'shepherd of his flock'. Yet Moses is in view there undoubtedly as leader rather than prophet. So this reinforces rather than weakens the argument that shepherd in the Old Testament invariably represents either God himself or an earthly leader.¹⁸

Even though they favour identifying the shepherds of Zechariah 11 as prophetic figures (but not those of Zc. 10:3, 11:3 and 13:7-9!), Meyers and Meyers are forced to admit that 'the identification of the prophet here with the role of shepherd is perhaps unique in the Hebrew Bible.'¹⁹ That should, at the very least, require us to be cautious in adopting such an identification, which not only goes against the universal evidence of the rest of the Hebrew Bible but of what we know of the usage of the image in the rest of the ancient Near East. It is, in fact, perfectly possible to retain the traditional leadership connotations of 'shepherd' in Zechariah 11, as we shall see.²⁰

The shepherd motif is first introduced in Zechariah 10:2 where the people are described as wandering like lost sheep, 'afflicted for want of a shepherd'. It is made clear in the following verse, however, that this state of wandering is not due to the total absence of shepherds but the absence of a *good* shepherd. The existing shepherds are the object of God's wrath: 'My anger is hot against the shepherds (הֲרֹעִים), and I will punish the he-goats (הֲעֵתוּדִים)' (Zc. 10:3). A link is already suggested with Ezekiel 34, which condemns first the shepherds (vv. 1-16) and then the rams and he-goats (vv. 17-24). These two groups seem to represent different levels of leadership.²¹ The shepherds have official control over the flock, while the he-goats provide the leadership from within the flock, as may be seen from Jeremiah's call for the faithful to 'be as he-goats before the flock', and lead the exodus out of

¹⁷Thus Larkin states 'Possibly, therefore, the prophet in Zech 11:4-14 is reflecting on the experience of what it means to be a prophet' (*Eschatology*, 116). Similarly Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 250; G. Wallis, 'Pastor bonus: Eine Betrachtung zu den Hirtenstücken des Deutero- und Trito-Sacharja Buches', *Kairos* 12 (1970) 223-36.

¹⁸Though not necessarily a king (cf. 2 Sa. 7:7). B. Otzen recognises that the figure of shepherd in the Old Testament can represent either God or 'den König oder Führer des Volkes' but in his subsequent exposition seems to ignore the possibility of a non-royal 'Führer'; *Studien über Deuterosacharja* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1964) 150.

¹⁹Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 250.

²⁰Laato, *Josiah*, 278-79.

²¹Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 196.

Babylon (Je. 50:8).²² Here, then, the prophet seems to be addressing a message of judgement to all levels of leadership, both 'the shepherds' and 'the he-goats', exactly as in Ezekiel 34.

The answer to the problem of bad shepherds found in Ezekiel 34 is two-fold: first, God himself will act as the shepherd of his people (Ezk. 34:11-16), and second, God will provide for his people a good shepherd (Ezk. 34:23, 24). Exactly the same pattern may be discerned in Zechariah 10:3-4. In addition to punishing the bad shepherds, the Lord himself will 'care for his flock' (Zc. 10:3) and from him will come a cornerstone, a tent peg, a battle bow, indeed every ruler (Zc. 10:4). This latter point is missed by most translations and commentators, who take 'the house of Judah' as the antecedent of מְנַחֵם, and thus translate 'from them' rather than 'from him'.²³ In that case, the point would be a promise that the ruler to come would be from the house of Judah. However, while that translation is grammatically possible and fits other passages such as Genesis 49:8-12 and Jeremiah 30:21, the possibility that the singular is a collective for the house of Judah is here made less likely by the fact that in the last clause of Zechariah 10:3 the house of Judah are referred to in the plural as 'them' (אֲנֵם). In addition, in a passage where the stress is so strongly on God's activity, it makes much better sense to see 'the Lord of Hosts' as the proper antecedent.²⁴ In this case, the promise is that the Lord will provide new leadership for his people, described metaphorically as 'a cornerstone, a tent peg, a battle bow'.

The cornerstone (פִּינֵה) recalls Isaiah 28:16, where God declares 'Behold I am laying in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone, of a sure foundation', and Psalm 118:22: 'The stone the builders rejected has become the head of the corner'. Further, tent peg (יָתֵד) recalls Isaiah 22:20-23, where Eliakim is given an authoritative role over Jerusalem and Judah and described as 'a tent peg (יָתֵד) fastened in a sure place'. The Lord promises to 'place on his shoulder the key of the House of David'. Neither the tent peg nor the cornerstone image is exclusively royal, but both have strong royal

²²J.G.S.S. Thomson, 'The Shepherd-Ruler Concept in the Old Testament and its Application in the New Testament', *SJT* 8 (1955) 410.

²³So e.g., RSV, NIV; Otzen, *Deuterosacharja*, 142-43; H.G. Mitchell, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912) 289; Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 199.

²⁴So B. Stade, 'Deuterosacharja. Eine kritische Studie', *ZAW* 1 (1881) 21; K. Elliger, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten* (8th ed; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985) 156.

associations.²⁵ These associations led the Targum to translate 'corner-stone' and 'tent peg' as 'king' and 'messiah' respectively.

The royal theme is underlined by mention of the 'battle bow' (קֶשֶׁת מִלְחָמָה). This is not an image of an individual, like the corner-stone and tent peg, but represents power, especially military power.²⁶ It connects back to Zechariah 9:10, where the battle bow is mentioned as being cut off by God in the wake of his provision of the eschatological king. In addition to providing a new royal leader, God will also deal with the second tier of leadership, by providing 'every overseer' (כָּל-נוֹגֵשׁ). The class of 'overseers', who have so often become 'oppressors' (cf. Zc. 9:8), will be replaced by men after God's own heart. Though the description of the principal new leader as a royal figure, a new David, is less explicit than in Ezekiel 34, the essential stress of this passage is still the same two-fold intervention of God which is promised in the former passage. The Lord will himself act as Israel's shepherd and transform Israel's leadership from top to bottom.

The critique of Israel's shepherds is taken up again in the shepherd allegory of Zechariah 11:4-17. Here the prophet is instructed to act as shepherd to a particular flock, described as 'the flock doomed to slaughter'. The implements with which he is to shepherd the flock are the staffs 'grace' and 'union'. This he does, removing three other shepherds in the process.²⁷ One might have expected a happy outcome at this point, but it is not to be. The shepherd's patience with his flock is exhausted and they also detest him. The shepherd resigns his post, receives his derisory wages,²⁸ and leaves the flock to the tender mercies of a worthless shepherd.

To understand the meaning of the allegory it is necessary to see that it is a complete reversal of Ezekiel's prophecy:²⁹ whereas in Ezekiel 34, God had promised to be Israel's shepherd, to judge the bad

shepherds, to care for his flock personally and to provide a good shepherd for them, a new David,³⁰ in Zechariah 11 God represents himself as saying to the people that he will no longer be their shepherd, nor will he care for them (Zc. 11:9; cf. Zc. 11:6) and in place of the promised good shepherd will come a worthless shepherd (Zc. 11:15-16).³¹ Further, whereas in Ezekiel 37 the prophet took two sticks and joined them together symbolizing the reunion of Israel and Judah under the shepherd king, 'my servant David' (Ezk. 37:15-24), in Zechariah 11 the staff labelled 'Union' is broken in two by the shepherd himself, annulling the brotherhood between Judah and Israel (Zc. 11:14). In place of 'my servant David' (Ezk. 37:24), God will give the people an uncaring shepherd (Zc. 11:16).

This background indicates clearly whom the shepherd represents: as so often in the Old Testament the shepherd represents both God and *also* the earthly ruler as God's representative or 'under-shepherd'. This collocation of ideas is found clearly in Ezekiel 34: God will be Israel's shepherd (Ezk. 34:11-16) and he will provide for them an earthly shepherd (Ezk. 34:23). So in Zechariah 11, the shepherd's action of abandoning the flock to its fate (v. 9) simply mirrors the Lord's decision not to pity the inhabitants of the land (v. 6). In breaking the staff 'grace', and the covenant which it represents, the shepherd also represents the Lord.³² The Lord will not shepherd his people, instead abandoning them to the fate which they so richly deserve (vv. 8-9). But just as part of God's 'shepherding' of his people involved removal of bad shepherds (Ezk 34:7-10; Je. 23:1-2; Zc. 11:8) and provision of a good shepherd (Ezk. 37:24; Je. 23:4-5), part of that 'not shepherding' involves raising up an earthly 'antishepherd' to rule his people (Zc. 11:15-16), whose actions are the exact opposite of the good shepherd in Ezekiel 34.³³

But after the nadir of v. 16, another change in the fortunes of God's people is announced. The last word is not judgement upon God's people but woe to the worthless shepherd (v. 17), which brings

²⁵Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 200-201. Otzen, *Deuteriosacharja*, 144. See also Ezr. 9:8-9, which may have been influenced by Zc. 10:4.

²⁶Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 202.

²⁷Many historical identifications have been attempted for the three shepherds who were removed. The wide range of the suggestions and complete lack of agreement suggest that perhaps the figure 'three' is intended as a symbol of completeness, rather than literally. See Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 265; A. Caquot, 'Brèves remarques sur l'allégorie des pasteurs en Zacharie 11' in A. Caquot, S. Legasse and M. Tardieu (eds.), *Mélanges Bibliques et Orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*, (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1985).

²⁸E. Lipinski, 'Recherches sur le livre de Zacharie', *VT* 20 (1970) 53-55; Laato, *Josiah*, 284.

²⁹P.D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 344-45.

³⁰Very similar themes are expressed in Je. 23:1-5.

³¹A.S. van der Woude, 'Die Hirtenallegorie von Sacharja XI', *JNSL* 12 (1984) 149.

³²On this Larkin comments: 'Here is a verse in which the "I" of God and the "I" of the prophet are almost inextricable' (*Eschatology*, 128).

³³With regard to v.16 Meyers & Meyers observe that 'these [six] clauses, which list a series of despicable deeds on the part of the foolish shepherd... in tone and style... are strikingly similar to the six clauses in Ezek. 34:16 that describe the ultimate purpose of the good shepherd' (*Zechariah 9-14*, 285). For the term 'antishepherd', see S.L. Cook, 'The Metamorphosis of a Shepherd: The Tradition History of Zechariah 11:17 + 13:7-9', *CBQ* 55 (1993) 459.

with it at least the hope that a return to the promises of Ezekiel 34 and Jeremiah 23 is possible.³⁴ God will give his people over to the bad shepherd because they have wearied the patience of the good shepherd and have detested him. But the abandonment is not total or final, for the sword will come on the bad shepherd as well.

The prophet returns to the theme of shepherds in Zechariah 13:7-9. This oracle speaks again of a sword coming against a shepherd. But this time the shepherd who will be struck is not a bad shepherd but a good shepherd;³⁵ his loss will result in the scattering of the flock and a time of trial and testing for God's people. The symbol of water for purification (Zc. 13:1) is replaced by the sword and fire,³⁶ and the process of judgement begins with the shepherd. It does not end there, however. Many will perish during that time, but those who survive will emerge refined and purified, the true people of God.

To sum up, then, the shepherd imagery of Zechariah 9-14 builds on the ideas of Ezekiel 34 and 37 and develops them in a new direction. Ezekiel 34 had promised that God would judge the shepherds and he-goats (Ezk. 34:1-10, 17-22), the leaders of society at all levels who had sought their own interests rather than the interests of the flock. Ezekiel prophesied that God himself would be the shepherd of his people (Ezk. 34:11-16) and provide a new, good shepherd, a new David (Ezk. 34:23-24), whose coming would usher in the blessing of reunion between Israel and Judah (Ezk. 37:21-24). Zechariah affirms the same themes up to the point of the coming of the good shepherd (Zc. 10:3-4). But at that point a new note is added. The coming of the good shepherd will not immediately usher in peace and prosperity, for the sheep will despise him and rebel against him and wear out his patience with them (Zc. 11:8). In his place, God will give them what they deserve: another worthless shepherd (Zc. 11:15). However, the message is not totally one of despair because the end of the shepherd-allegory is a return to the beginning: a message of woe to the worthless shepherd (Zc. 11:17-19). This leaves open the possibility of a new start to the cycle of judgement and blessing, with the positive outcome expressed by Ezekiel once more a possibility. Blessing is not automatic, however: a repetition of the negative outcome expressed in Zechariah 11 is also possible. Entry into the blessed future is conditional upon the obedience of God's people and their submission to the

³⁴Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi*, 211; Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 304.

³⁵Larkin, *Eschatology*, 177; Laato, *Josiah*, 287.

³⁶Cook, 'Metamorphosis', 461.

good shepherd, while disobedience leads equally to tribulation. In the language of Zechariah 1, the people must return to the Lord, turning away from their evil ways, if they are to avoid repeating the disastrous experiences of their forefathers (Zc. 1:1-6).

Zechariah 13:7-9 expresses related ideas: the way to blessing for God's people leads first through tribulation. The coming shepherd, described as rejected in Zechariah 11, is here described as afflicted, struck down by the Lord's own sword.³⁷ But God's ultimate purpose in all of this is the purification and blessing of his people. The end result will be a renewed covenant relationship between the Lord and his people (Zc. 13:9; cf. Ezk. 37:23).

IV. The Pierced Messiah

In Zechariah 13:7-9, we saw the theme of the afflicted Messiah expressed in terms of the shepherd image. A similar theme emerges in Zechariah 12:10:

I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a Spirit of compassion and supplication, so that, when they look on the one whom they have pierced,³⁸ they shall mourn for him as one mourns for an only child, and weep bitterly for him, as one weeps over a first-born.

This rather enigmatic verse has given rise to many interpretations of who the one is that has been pierced. Larkin has noted the kingly and divine overtones of the language used here,³⁹ which suggests that he is a royal figure. The comparison of the mourning with that at Hadad Rimmon in the plain of Megiddo invites comparison with the death of Josiah, who was similarly mourned by 'all Judah and Jerusalem' after he died, pierced by an arrow at Megiddo (2 Ch. 35:24).⁴⁰ But again the differences are as real as the similarities: the mysterious pierced one in Zechariah 12 was apparently pierced by the Jerusalemites themselves, not by Pharaoh, and the mourning for him is not simply ordinary grief but is triggered by the activity of the Lord in pouring out a spirit of

³⁷Cf. Is. 53:10.

³⁸Literally, the MT reads 'they shall look to me, whom they have pierced'. On this, see Larkin, *Eschatology*, 149.

³⁹*Eschatology*, 162-64. Cf. Otzen, *Deuteriosacharja*, 177-78.

⁴⁰Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi*, 224; Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 344; Laato, *Josiah*, 291.

grace and supplication.

Meyers and Meyers suggest that there is not necessarily a reference intended to a specific historical event here, but rather that the 'pierced one' represents the true prophets of the past, whose suffering often included physical danger and sometimes death (cf. Je. 26:7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20-23).⁴¹ Now, however, the tension between the true and false prophets will be resolved: those who attempted to thwart true prophecy in the past will feel remorseful, while any future false prophet will be cut down ('pierced') by his own parents (Zc. 13:3).⁴²

While this undoubtedly has the virtue of seeking to relate the passage to its wider context and avoiding speculative historical identifications, one wonders if it does justice to the royal overtones of the figure in Zechariah 12:10. If a prophet is intended (or the prophets as a whole) it is hard to see why the imagery should have been influenced by the events surrounding the death of Josiah. It would be more natural for that event to be seen as in some sense 'typological' of the death of a similar, royal figure. Further, accepting that קָרַד usually means a stab wound inflicted by a sword,⁴³ is it not better to identify the pierced one of Zechariah 12:10 with the shepherd of Zechariah 13:7-9, against whom God's sword is coming? The death of that royal figure, which clearly has tragic consequences for the flock (Zc. 13:7), seems an appropriate cause for the intense mourning of the whole community, mourning as intense as that which followed the tragic death of Josiah at Megiddo. But the death of this eschatological shepherd, devastating though it may seem at the time, will ultimately have good consequences, by opening up a fountain of cleansing (Zc. 13:1). At a stroke, the iniquity of the land will be dealt with (cf. Zc. 2:9). The imagery of water is replaced by the refiner's fire in Zechariah 13:9 but the outcome is the same: a purified people who call upon the Lord.

V. The Messianic Themes of Zechariah 9-14 in the New Testament

We have seen above how Zechariah's prophecies frequently picked up earlier material and adapted and reused it. Similarly, his own words have been taken up and adapted by the New Testament writers, who saw them as being fulfilled in Jesus.

⁴¹Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 339.

⁴²Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 340.

⁴³Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 340

Each of the evangelists records the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem upon a colt.⁴⁴ Matthew and John explicitly relate it to Zechariah 9:9, showing that it is a deliberate claim to kingship. Jesus is the humble king⁴⁵ promised by Zechariah: he comes not for judgment,⁴⁶ but to speak peace to the nations.⁴⁷ But Jesus overflows the categories of Zechariah 9:9. For the king was described there as 'saved', while Jesus is the one to whom the crowd come shouting 'Hosanna!' ('Save now!'). Jesus is both the model of complete dependence upon God (e.g. Mt. 26:39), and the Lord who acts to bring salvation. Thus, the first action of Jesus on entering Jerusalem (according to Matthew, Mark and Luke) was to go into the Temple and drive out the merchants and moneychangers. This is hardly the peaceful image of the king on the donkey. Yet this too reflects back to Zechariah's prophecies, for in Zechariah 9:8 the Lord declares:

Then I will encamp at my house as a guard,
so that none shall march to and fro;
no oppressor shall again overrun them,
for now I see with my own eyes.

So Jesus enters Jerusalem fulfilling not only Zechariah 9:9 but Zechariah 9:8 as well: he cleanses God's house—ironically not by driving out the oppressive Romans but by evicting the home-grown merchants.⁴⁸ Jesus takes the part not simply of the earthly king but of the Lord himself.

Another passage which reflects something of the imagery of Zechariah 9:9⁴⁹—but again with significant reversals—is Revelation 19:11-16. There we are shown the King of kings and Lord of lords,

⁴⁴Mt. 21:1-11; Mk. 11:1-11; Lk. 19:29-44; Jn. 12:12-19.

⁴⁵Note Jesus' comments on greatness in God's kingdom just a few verses earlier in Matthew's account (Mt. 20:25-28).

⁴⁶But see below on the cleansing of the Temple.

⁴⁷There may be a hint of this behind Eph. 2:17: 'He came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near.'

⁴⁸John's account of the cleansing of the Temple, while placed at a different point of Jesus' ministry, makes another connection between that event and Zechariah. It records Jesus' words: 'You shall not make my Father's house a house of trade' (Jn. 2:16), which seem to echo Zc. 14:21: 'There shall no longer be a trader in the house of the Lord on that day.' Cf. C. Roth, 'The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah 14:21', *NT 4* (1960) 175; E. Haenchen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1980) 201.

⁴⁹Also in view, even more strongly, is Gn. 49:11-12. On the relationship of that passage to Zc. 9:9-10, see above.

seated not on a donkey but on a white horse. He comes not for salvation and to speak peace but for judgement and to make war. No longer is he humbly garbed, but rather crowned with many crowns. The king is coming, but this time for war!

Not only is Jesus represented as the coming king, he also speaks of himself as the good shepherd (Jn. 10:1-18). There have been other shepherds in the past, bad shepherds, hirelings who cared nothing for the sheep (Jn. 10:12). They deserted them when danger threatened (*cf.* Zc. 11:17) with the result that the sheep have been scattered. The good shepherd, however, lays down his life for the sheep. He will be struck down by God and the sheep will be scattered (Mt. 26:31; Mk. 14:27 *cf.* Zc. 13:7). But again the differences between the good shepherd of the New Testament and the good shepherd of Zechariah are striking. Jesus' flock do not detest their shepherd; far from it, they know his voice and follow him (Jn. 10:4). Judas, however, fulfils the role of the 'traffickers in the sheep': he values the good shepherd's ministry at thirty pieces of silver (Mt. 26:15; *cf.* Zc. 11:11,12), and when he regrets his action he takes the money and casts it into the Temple (Mt. 27:3-10).⁵⁰ Meanwhile, the good shepherd has other sheep to bring in, so that there may be one flock, one shepherd (Jn. 10:16). This points to a reaffirmation of the positive expectation of Ezekiel 34, rather than the negative outlook of Zechariah 11. The result of Jesus' shepherding is abundant life (Jn. 10:10) and unity (Jn. 10:16): the staffs which Zechariah shattered ('grace' and 'union') are restored in Jesus.

The way in which that reversal takes place is, as Zechariah prophesied, through the sword of Judgement falling on the Good Shepherd (*cf.* Zc. 13:7-9). The shepherd becomes himself the sacrificial sheep.⁵¹ The shepherd is struck and the sheep are scattered (Mt. 26:31; Zc. 13:7). But he is not simply the passive object of God's judgement. He himself lays down his life, and he has power to take it up again (Jn. 13:17-18). Because of that resurrection, his followers can rejoice, even as they go through the refiner's fire of trials (1 Pet. 1:3-7; Zc. 13:9).

Finally, John represents Jesus as the pierced Messiah. In John

⁵⁰Interestingly, Matthew's account seems to combine two possible renderings of Zc. 11:13. In Zc. 11, it is disputed whether the prophet throws the money into the 'treasury' (כֶּסֶף) of the Temple or to a 'potter' (כֵּסֶר) working in the Temple. Matthew tells us that the chief priests felt unable to put it into the treasury and so purchased with it the potter's field as a place of burial. *Cf.* F.F. Bruce, 'The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative', *BJRL* 43 (1960-61) 347.

⁵¹K. Nielsen, 'Shepherd, Lamb and Blood. Imagery in the Old Testament - Use and Re-use', *Studia Theologica* 46 (1992) 131.

19:37, he quotes Zechariah 12:10 as being fulfilled in the death of Jesus when the Roman soldier pierced his side with a spear and blood and water flowed out. The flow of water and blood are often referred to as being medical evidence that Jesus was really dead.⁵² However, it seems unlikely that this was what John had in mind. Rather, he regarded the water and the blood as scriptural evidence that Jesus was really the promised Messiah.⁵³ Water and blood are the twin symbols of cleansing in the Old Testament; thus when Jesus was pierced on the cross, John saw the fountain (מְקוֹר) for cleansing promised in Zechariah 13:1 flowing out from his side.⁵⁴ מְקוֹר can describe either a flow of (menstrual) blood (Lv. 12:7; 20:18) or (more frequently) a flow of water (*e.g.* Je. 2:13). But whereas the blood which flows from the 'fountain' described in Leviticus makes unclean, the flow of Jesus' blood makes clean as God through his Spirit brings about mourning and repentance. The annually repeated mourning for Josiah which brought no relief is replaced by redemptive mourning for the death of a victim pierced once for all, never to be struck again.

According to the Book of Revelation, those who do not mourn the suffering and death of Jesus now will do so later: 'Behold, he is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him, every one who pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth will wail on account of him' (Rev. 1:7; *cf.* Mt. 24:30). This too represents a modification of Zechariah's prophecy, since those who mourn are now not simply 'the house of David and Jerusalem' but 'all the tribes of the earth'.

It is striking to see in all of this how the New Testament writers develop and build on the images of Zechariah 9-14, often combining them with other Old Testament passages in order to portray the multifaceted nature of their understanding of Jesus as Messiah. Just as Zechariah 9-14 creatively reshapes earlier materials, so the New Testament writers incorporate and adapt the images of Zechariah 9-14. No one Old Testament image is big enough capture the whole picture. The Old Testament prophets provided a partial portrayal of the One to come, in a way designed to meet the needs of their own generation, as

⁵²So *e.g.*, W. Stroud, *Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ* (2 ed.; London: Hamilton & Adams, 1971); C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 1963) 136.

⁵³In 1 Jn. 5:6-8 the water and the blood are 'witnesses' to Jesus Christ.

⁵⁴M.J.J. Menken, 'The Textual Form and the Meaning of the Quotation from Zech 12:10 in John 19:37' *CBQ* 55 (1993) 508, n. 53. *Cf.* D. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983) 210-19; A.T. Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 224.

well as those of generations to come. Thus to God's people in exile, tempted to despair and give up, Ezekiel's vision of God as the good shepherd gave hope. But to the generation addressed by Zechariah 9-14, tempted to comfortable mediocrity now that the Temple had been rebuilt and Jerusalem restored, alongside a reiteration of the message of God as good shepherd (Zc. 10:3-5), comes the message that blessing is not automatic. If the good shepherd is rejected, bad shepherds will follow (Zc. 11:4-16). Those who fail to learn from the past history of Israel will be doomed to repeat it.

These diverse images are drawn together in the New Testament and applied to Jesus. Just as many pieces of furniture, fabrics and materials, each of which has their own integrity, may be drawn together in a richly furnished room in the service of a greater integrity, so the different Old Testament images are assembled together in the New Testament. The usage of the Old Testament material is never trivial or artificial,⁵⁵ nor is it limited to one or two messianic images. The many different images were freely combined and transformed by the New Testament writers,⁵⁶ to show how all the eschatological promises of the Old Testament had been fulfilled in Jesus, who is both final prophet and great high priest, suffering servant and coming king, good shepherd and sacrificial lamb.

The final word of Zechariah 9-14 and New Testament alike is grace not judgement. Though the shepherd be rejected (Zc. 11:8-9) and pierced by his own people (Zc. 12:10; 13:7-9), though the covenant be broken (Zc. 11:10) and a worthless antishepherd be allowed to rule over God's people for a while, yet that is not God's final word. For God brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep, by the blood of the eternal covenant, so that he might be the God of peace (Heb. 13:20; cf. Zc. 9:11). In Jesus, Jerusalem's king has come to speak peace between God and man. He has come to reestablish union: not simply union between Israel and Judah but a union which tears down the wall of division between Jew and Gentile (Eph. 2:14-17). He has come to enable us to be God's holy people, and him to be our God (Zc. 13:9; Rev. 21:3).

⁵⁵T.W. Manson, 'The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus', *BJRL* 34 (1951-52) 312-32.

⁵⁶H.C. Kee, 'Messiah and the People of God' in J.T. Butler, E.W. Conrad and B.C. Ollenburger (eds.), *Understanding the Word. Essays in Honor of B.W. Anderson* (JSOTS 37; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985) 356.

CHAPTER 14

MESSIANIC MYSTERIES¹

Martin J. Selman

Summary

The Old Testament roots of the concept of an individual eschatological Messiah show a number of significant differences from the established views of Judaism and Christianity. A Messiah in the Old Testament was an anointed leader, and the term was originally appropriate to both Davidic kings and Aaronite priests. The Old Testament's portrayals of the chronology, nature and functions of messianic figures are deliberately enigmatic, describing them in terms which were as much historical and political as eschatological and spiritual. The clarification of these enigmas in the New Testament included additional factors not present in traditional Israelite messianic thinking, and led to considerable surprise about the way Jesus fulfilled Old Testament messianic ideas.

¹An earlier version of this article was delivered in lectures given at Samford University, Birmingham, Al. and William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., in April 1995.