

Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Master's Theses

Graduate Research

2020

Zechariah 9-14 in Light of Allusions to the Sanctuary Motif in the Old Testament

Artur Boldt

Andrews University, boldt@andrews.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Boldt, Artur, "Zechariah 9-14 in Light of Allusions to the Sanctuary Motif in the Old Testament" (2020). *Master's Theses*. 187.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/theses/187/>

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses/187>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

ABSTRACT

ZECHARIAH 9-14 IN LIGHT OF ALLUSIONS TO THE SANCTUARY MOTIF IN
THE OLD TESTAMENT

by

Artur Boldt

Adviser: Richard M. Davidson

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Thesis

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: ZECHARIAH 9-14 IN LIGHT OF ALLUSIONS TO THE SANCTUARY MOTIF
IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Name of researcher: Artur Boldt

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Richard M. Davidson, Ph.D.

Date Completed: November 2020

Topic

Zechariah 9-14 sheds additional light to the eschatological relevance of the sanctuary by emphasizing God's presence among humankind. The sanctuary motif receives a vertical dimension by focusing on God's original Sanctuary.

Purpose

Firstly, questions of introduction will be answered to give an overview of the material. In this context, the question of genre will be handled with special care. Then it will be defined how the concept of allusions is understood. This concept then will be applied to three different OT sanctuary references. Followed by an evaluation of these

references. Afterwards different passages in Zech 9-14 will be examined in more detail. Finally, a conclusion will be drawn.

Sources

Definitions by Jon Paulien and John Collins are used in this thesis. While they are not specifically related to Zechariah it is important to define ones use of terms like allusion and apocalyptic(-like). Consulting benchmark works by Mark J. Boda, Meyers, Richard M. Davidson or Al Wolters and others will be necessary.

Conclusion

The OT references and allusions to the Sanctuary describe a flexible understanding of it, explaining why the tabernacle, the Solomonic temple and the Herodian temple are not identical. The combining element of all these references is the presence of God among humankind. Zechariah describes a post-figurated sense of that presence of God. A turn away from humankind-made sanctuaries and a return to the original sanctuary in heaven.

Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

ZECHARIAH 9-14 IN LIGHT OF ALLUSIONS TO THE SANCTUARY MOTIF IN
THE OLD TESTAMENT

A Thesis
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Religion

by
Artur Boldt
November 2020

©Copyright by Artur Boldt 2020
All Rights Reserved

ZECHARIAH 9-14 IN LIGHT OF ALLUSIONS TO THE SANCTUARY MOTIF IN
THE OLD TESTAMENT

A thesis
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts in Religion

by

Artur Boldt

APPROVAL BY THE FACULTY ADVISOR:

Richard M. Davidson, Ph.D.
J.N. Andrews Professor of Old Testament
Interpretation

Date Approved

Dedicated to Bogenhofen Seminary,
the place and people helping me to become who I am today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Background to the Topic	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Importance of the Study	3
Delimitations	4
Methodology	4
Questions of Introduction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Date of the Book	6
Unified Authorship?.....	9
Genre: Proto-Apocalyptic Writing.....	11
The Definition of Apocalyptic	11
Elements of Apocalyptic Writing.....	12
Zechariah 9-14 and Collins’ Apocalyptic Characteristics.....	16
Commonalities with Characteristics of Apocalyptic	16
Missing Characteristics of Apocalyptic.....	17
Importance of the Apocalyptic Label.....	18
Allusions	21
Definition and Use	22
The Sanctuary	24
Garden of Eden.....	26
Evaluation	31
Sinai.....	32
Evaluation of the Allusion.....	34
Ezekiel.....	35
Evaluation	38
Proposed Meaning.....	39
Zechariah 9-14 in Light of Sanctuary Allusions.....	40
Context of Zechariah 13.....	42

Linguistic Insights	43
An Allusion to Cleansing?.....	46
The Mount of Olives	48
Context within Zechariah 14	49
Linguistic Insights	50
Mount of Olives: A Post-Figuration of the Tabernacle?	53
Conclusion	57
Bibliography	60

Introduction

Background to the Topic

It can be a challenge to understand the book of Zechariah, but in recent days it has become more prominent within the scientific community. It is one of the most difficult books in the Old Testament and has been the reason for many heated debates in the history of interpretation. To read and interpret Zechariah correctly cannot be achieved in full objectivity because his writing was not fully objective itself. However, I believe that if we are allowing the Holy Spirit and biblical based thought to guide our interpretation, we will be able to uncover much richness in the book of Zechariah. This paper is thus an attempt to contribute to our view on Zechariah. The book of Zechariah is filled with inner-biblical allusions to pre-exile materials.¹ Zechariah, in his responsibility as a prophet, spoke of what God showed to him. The reader may get a glimpse of what he might have had in mind, but there will always remain a slight possibility that our interpretation might be off. Thus, the book of Zechariah needs to be studied with a humble spirit, carefully connecting the dots. As different scholars contribute their parts, our perspective will move closer to objectivity.

The main topic of this inquiry is the sanctuary motif in Zechariah's writing. This idea is closely associated with the sanctuary in the Pentateuch, a place where God and humankind could meet. Just like the idea that mountains should be understood as pre-

¹ Al Wolters, "Zechariah 14: A Dialogue with the History of Interpretation," *Mid-American Journal of Theology* 13 (2002): 39–56.

figurations of the tabernacle², Zechariah uses these images and others to indicate the presence of God in an eschatological scenario. We could call his usage of mountain imagery in this particular case of Zechariah a “post”-figuration of the tabernacle and a restoration of pre-fall conditions in the God- /humankind relationship. The expression “post”-figuration is meant to illustrate that the sanctuary might have a purpose that extends beyond the physical building.

The thesis of this paper is as follows: Could Zechariah be hinting to a time, where the earthly sanctuary has fulfilled its intended historical purpose and is now “post”-figured? This is the topic intended to be examined.

Statement of the Problem

Living in the 21st century can be challenging for readers of the bible. There are many concepts, rituals, phrases and ideas that are not familiar to us anymore. This is why the interpreter has to become familiar with the themes and topics which are important to Zechariah’s thought. In the past decades, scholars assumed that Zech 1-8 had different origins than chapters 9-14. One of the arguments against Zechariah’s authorship of chapters 9-14 states that the importance of the sanctuary to the historical setting of chapters 1-8 is completely missing in the later chapters.³ Scholars argue that this shift in

² Michael L. Morales, *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured: Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus* (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 9–11. See also Psalm 68:17 (ESV): “Sinai is now in the sanctuary.”

³ Wilhelm Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1-8, Sacharja 9-14, Maleachi*, 1st ed., *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, vol. 13/4 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1976), 61.

importance must be the result of later redactional composition.⁴ Yet recently, scholars have discovered connecting points in language, style and concepts between those two parts, but not much commonality was found in regards to the sanctuary.⁵ The Sanctuary may not be the focal point of chapters 9-14, but it is the aim of this paper to show that it is being alluded to in its most fundamental function: a place of the presence of God.

Importance of the Study

The premise of this paper is to show that the concept of the presence of God is not only prominent in Scripture and universally found in the Old Testament, but it also appears in both parts of the book of Zechariah. God's ultimate objective seems to be the restoration of his people to the pre-fall state, while delivering hope and guidance to the present needs of the believers in the meantime. This study is important because it tries to understand the broader perspective of classical and (proto-) apocalyptic literature in light of the Old Testament. If my thesis proves to be valid, the implications could be far-reaching. First, the sole focus on the historical setting might lose its weight in regard to the studies in the book of Zechariah. Biblical scholars often argue from a preterist or futurist perspective, both of which imply that the written content has no reference to us

⁴ John Smith, Merlin Powis, and Julius August Bewer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*, International Critical Commentary (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1912), 232-259; Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); Paul L. Redditt, *Sacharja 9-14*, Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014), 20-28; James D. Nogalski, "Redaction Criticism and the Prophets" in Carolyn J. Sharp, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of The Prophets* (New York, NY: Oxford University, 2016), 288.

⁵ Al Wolters, *Zechariah*, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament (Leuven: Peeters, 2014); Mark J. Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, The New International Commentary of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2016); Anthony R. Petterson, *Haggai, Zechariah & Malachi*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015).

who live in the 21st century. But if Zechariah's intentional sanctuary allusions are in fact in accordance with the grand objective of God—to be present in our lives—then Zech 9-14 contain a message for us about today as well as about tomorrow.

Delimitations

As indicated by the title of this thesis, the focus will not lie on the whole book of Zechariah, but on specific verses in chapters 9-14.⁶ Questions of historical composition are therefore not important to this study. Rather, we will focus on the idea of allusions and their dynamic in the Old Testament, before applying them to our insights to the book of Zechariah in its canonical form. In doing so, we will also touch upon the idea of what identifies as “proto”-apocalyptic writing. This definition alone could be worth a whole paper, which is why only some considerations in this regard will be shared and discussed. The primary aim of this paper is to show that sanctuary allusions are indeed an important part of Zech 9-14. However, this focus point should not be understood to undermine or lessen the importance of other themes and motifs presented in the book.

Methodology

The method of choice is the biblical-historical method of Bible interpretation. This paper will begin with the questions of introduction in order to establish the elementary criteria of our inquiry. Looking at these foundational questions will help us to quickly find the historical setting as we begin to immerse ourselves more deeply into the

⁶ This reoccurring reference of mine to chapters 9-14 is not to be understood as meaning every chapter, but rather the 2nd part of Zech, which others previously have coined “*Deutero-Zechariah*”. It will not be possible to go through all the chapters individually.

topic. Especially the aspect of genre is important because the sanctuary motif is embedded in the apocalyptic-like part of Zechariah. Therefore, it will be necessary to consider some identifying aspects to discover when the described events might take place. Furthermore, we will have a closer look at the definition and use of allusions and the sanctuary motif in the Old Testament. Examples like the Garden of Eden, Mount Sinai and Ezek 11:16⁷ will be more closely examined because they show aspects that are peculiar to the Sanctuary and its nature. The next step of this paper will lead us to the analysis of two main passages, Zech 13:1 and 14:3-5 respectively. These will be the primary objects of my detailed attention in terms of Sanctuary allusions. While Zech 14:3-5 has puzzled many many scholars, 13:1 has not yet received the attention it deserves. In regard of the exegetical part of this study, two expressions will be studied more carefully. First of which is “fountain” (13:1) and the second which is “Mount of Olives” (14:4). Those two words are used rather differently and both of them are alluding to the cultic cosmos familiar to the writer and reader of that time.

Lastly, we will bring together the pieces of the thesis, answering the question why chapters 9-14 are alluding to the Sanctuary imagery. Finally, a conclusion will be drawn.

Questions of Introduction

It may be helpful to have strategy of how to approach every form of writing, but it may not be possible to use one and the same pattern in every case. Hence, every book

⁷ The choice of Ezekiel 11:16 may not come to mind immediately when considering the Sanctuary. But in my estimation, it helps to understand how the Sanctuary can function in extraordinary times.

needs to be investigated with individual sensitivity. Especially in regard to the book of Zechariah, we need to consider three underlying questions, before taking on any task: When was the book of Zechariah written? Is there one writer or many? To what genre does the book of Zechariah belong? These questions are fundamentally important since they give necessary guidelines and tips to the reader on how this book can and should be understood.

Date of the Book

There are three important verses (1:1; 1:7 and 7:1) that give us an indication of the historical context. A king named Darius is mentioned, which gives us the opportunity to undertake a historical discourse. Al Wolters summarizes three options about the identity of this particular Darius. First, Darius I Hystaspis (521-486); second, Darius III Codomannus (336-331) and third, Artaxerxes I (465-425).⁸ Wolters refers back to the conquering of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 587/586, explaining that the exile had been a devastating historical event from which Israel never fully recovered. When Cyrus captured Babylon in 539, the Jews had a renewal of hope. The decree to rebuild the temple in 538 (2 Chr 36:22-23; Ezek 1:2-4) was not brought to completion due to the resistance of the surrounding inhabitants. Israel was divided and it was not until Cyrus died in 529 that the “critical decade” fully showed its impact on the continual interruption of rebuilding the Sanctuary. Israel was searching for an identity and Zechariah was called to give purpose and hope to the nation. According to Wolters, Darius III Codomannus and Artaxerxes provide us with no adequate indications for the dating of the book of

⁸ Al Wolters, *Zechariah*, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 3.

Zechariah. He also accepts “the reliability of the dating formulas in Zechariah, so that certain parts of the book can be dated with considerable precision.”⁹ It is exactly at this point that dating the book of Zechariah becomes interesting. Scholars have argued that the historical references (1:1; 1:7 and 7:1) are only applicable to chapters 1-8. At the same time, the lack of time references in chapters 9-14 makes it almost impossible to specify an exact date of origin. If the second part was authored by someone other than Zechariah, it could have been written hundreds of years later. The mention of Egypt and Greece has led scholars to assume a late date of origin. That is to say, if we assume that Zechariah 1-8 were written during the time of Darius I Hystaspes around 520 BCE,¹⁰ that does not automatically follow that Zech 9-14 were as well. After examining chapters 9-14, Andrew E. Hill comments on the differences in linguistics:

“Based upon evidence from a typological analysis of the post-Exilic prophets, Zechariah 9-14 (and Malachi) most likely date to the period of “pre-Ezra decline” (ca. 520-450 or better 515-485 b.c.).”¹¹

Mark J. Boda mentions the dating in favor of “Greek and/or Maccabean periods” for Zech 9-14, but rejects those ideas. He writes: “While the placement of this text after Zech 1-8 suggests that it is part of later developments in the Zecharian tradition, there is no definitive reason to date the material to a period as late as the fourth century B.C.”¹²

⁹ Ibid., 4.

¹⁰ Mark J. Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, The New International Commentary of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 33. In his commentary, Boda specifies the date in 7:1 to December 7, 518, while referring to Meyers and Meyers in his footnotes.

¹¹ Andrew E. Hill, “Dating Second Zechariah: A Linguistic Reexamination,” *Hebrew Annual Review* 6 (1982): 131–132.

¹² Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 34.

For Boda, chapters 9-10 “most likely arose in the period ca. 515-510 B.C.” and 11:4-16 in the post- ca. 510 period, while chapters 12-14 most likely arose around 445-433 during Nehemiah’s governorship.

In my opinion, it may sound plausible to conclude different times of origin in Zech 9-14, but to place them historically remains mere speculation because there are no clues in the text.¹³ The conclusion written by Meyer and Meyer sounds most plausible:

Nonetheless, as the preceding historical résumé indicates, we can reconstruct some of the significant world events for the second seventy-year period after the Exile, from the dedication of the Second Temple (515 B.C.E) to the Mission of Nehemiah (445 B.C.E). It is within this period, particularly toward its end, that we assign the collection of oracles and utterances that constitute Zechariah 9-14.¹⁴

One observation that has come to my attention, when interpreting the book of Zechariah, is that we can search for clues of origin but may not find sufficient ones. Finding a specific historical context to this book will serve more detailed information as to the needs and hopes of the addressed audience. This will become more evident once we consider the genre of Zechariah’s writing in the following parts of this thesis. The difficulty to prescribe a specific timeframe for the historical fulfillment of the details for these chapters is an indication to us that the fulfillment of these chapters may be of eschatological character. Therefore, we should lay aside preterist or spiritualizing presuppositions.

¹³ Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, Word Biblical Commentary, 32 (Dallas, TX: Nelson/Word, 1998), 246.

¹⁴ Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14* (Yale University Press, 1998), 26.

Unified Authorship?

Scholarship is unanimous on the notion that chapters 1-8 were authored by Zechariah, but chapters 9-14 may have at least one other author. Especially the second part of Zechariah was frequently debated. Everything began with Joseph Mede (1586-1638) when he compared Zech 11:12 with Matt 27:3-10. Mede assumed that Zech 9-11 was fully written by Jeremiah. Since then, people have been wondering whether Zechariah actually wrote the whole book. Critical scholars have based their conclusions on various hypotheses. There is no doubt that there are differences between the first and second part of Zechariah. Michael H. Floyd fittingly writes:

Because so many of its problems have proved to be intractable, proposals regarding their solution can only be rather tentative. Any attempt at interpretation must nevertheless stake some claim regarding the approach that seems most promising, and so I have sought to avoid the by now apparent limitations of either a purely diachronic or a purely synchronic approach.”¹⁵

Building hypotheses and proving them is the only way to gain knowledge, but we must remain reasonable and recognize when there is little evidence to support our claim. It has been argued that different schools of thoughts arose after the exile, which relied on the Zecharian tradition and further complemented the book, based on the current need of each generation.¹⁶ This gives us a good explanation for the numerous differences in style

¹⁵ Michael Floyd, *Minor Prophets: Part 2*, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, 22 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 305. We need to keep in mind though that Floyd rejects a unified authorship of Zechariah. Yet, he recognizes and identifies the big challenges in finding a clear answer.

¹⁶ Paul L. Redditt, *Sacharja 9-14*, Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014), 149.

and theme, except for the lack of sanctuary focus in chapters 9-14. This redactional view of the book of Zechariah is possible, but there is no evidence that necessitates such a view. As argued by other scholars, there is another reasonable and more likely view in regards to these differences. The “social-trajectory”-argument, as proposed and argued by Byron G. Curtis,¹⁷ describes how the differences between the two parts of Zechariah may have been caused by drastical changes in either local or social conditions. As we have already seen, the dating of linguistic elements in the second part of Zechariah suggests that it may have been written during the same generation, while Zechariah might still have been alive. He very likely even wrote it himself.

It is neither crucial nor necessary to settle Zechariah’s single authorship for the further investigation of this study. Even though there are good arguments that can be brought to the table in favor of a unified authorship in the book of Zechariah, they will not be considered here. For further answers on this topic, more detailed and extended arguments are given by Mark J. Boda, Ralph L. Smith and others.¹⁸

What is important, however, is the question of trustworthiness of Scripture. Can Scripture be trusted when it writes that Zechariah authored the book? This paper is based on the premise that Zechariah authored the whole book and intentionally describes a perspective of the Sanctuary that is in harmony with OT thought.

¹⁷ Byron G. Curtis, *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*, Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 25 (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

¹⁸ Mark J. Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, The New International Commentary of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2016), 26–29; Ralph L. Smith, *Micah to Malachi* (Nelson/Word Publishing Group, 1984), 170–173; Richard D. Patterson and Andrew E. Hill, *Minor Prophets, Hosea-Malachi*, Cornerstone Biblical Commentary, 10 (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale, 2008), 522–524.

Genre: Proto-Apocalyptic Writing

The Definition of Apocalyptic

The question of genre is crucial to this thesis and will now be examined in more detail. From my perspective, the complexity of Zechariah 9-14 is grounded on the confusion of different depictions. While it is directed towards a specific audience, many of Zechariah's predictions cannot be traced in the historical accounts. Especially when considering chapter 14. Did Zechariah speak of future events? Future events from his perspective, most certainly. But are there different aspects, which still need fulfilment? Do his oracles have eschatological character? Or should we consider his writings with purely preteristic glasses? Examining the genre will help us to deal with these questions. Various works have been dedicated to answering the question of what makes apocalyptic writings apocalyptic. John Collins has brought more light to this endeavor by the following distinction¹⁹: The term "apocalypse" describes the nature of a book, like the book of Revelation enlightening the reader about the end of the world.²⁰ Yet there are also two other terms, which seem to be used synonymously, "apocalyptic" and "apocalypticism". In clearly defining the differences between those terms, Collins writes:

The confusion latent in the term 'apocalyptic' has been highlighted in the discussion after von Rad, especially by M. Stone (439) and P.D. Hanson (29-30). These scholars distinguish between 'apocalypse' as a literary genre, 'apocalyptic eschatology' as a particular religious perspective and structure of thought, and 'apocalypticism' as a sociological ideology.²¹

¹⁹ John J. Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–20.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 2.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

After introducing these definitions, he immediately adds:

While these three concepts are closely related to each other, their referents do not necessarily coincide exactly. Not every writing which expresses apocalyptic eschatology can be classified as an apocalypse. Much of the confusion which currently reigns results from a failure to observe these distinctions.²²

We can observe the level of difficulty, when attempting to classify the nature of apocalyptic writing. Not every book that has apocalyptic content is an ‘apocalypse’. The book of Zechariah most certainly is not an apocalypse, like the book of Daniel or the New Testament book of Revelation. Thus, it is the nature of the apocalyptic content that is of particular interest to this study.

Elements of Apocalyptic Writing

Collins introduces a “framework of the revelation and its content”²³, explaining:

“The framework in turn involves both the manner in which the revelation is conveyed and the concluding elements. The content embraces historical and eschatological events on a temporal axis and otherworldly beings and places on a spatial axis.”²⁴

What follows now is a list of criteria that are commonly found in the genre of apocalyptic writing, according to Collins:

“Manner of Revelation

1. Medium by which the revelation is communicated.
 - 1.1. Visual revelation may be either in the form of
 - 1.1.1. Vision, where the content of the revelation is seen, or
 - 1.1.2. Epiphanies, where the apparition of the mediator is described.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., 5.

²⁴ Ibid.

- 1.2. Auditory revelation usually clarifies the visual. Epiphanies are always followed by auditory revelation. They may be either in the form of
 - 1.2.1. Discourse, uninterrupted speech by the mediator, or
 - 1.2.2. Dialogue, where there is conversation between the mediator and recipient, often in the form of question and answer.
- 1.3. Otherworldly journey, when the visionary travels through heaven, hell or remote regions beyond the normally accessible world. Revelation in the course of a journey is usually predominantly visual.
- 1.4. Writing, when the revelation is contained in a written document, usually a heavenly book.
2. An Otherworldly Mediator communicates the revelation. Often the mediation consists of interpreting a vision but it can also take the form of direct speech or simply of guiding the recipient and directing his attention to the revelation. The mediator is most often an angel, or in some Christian text, Christ.
3. The Human Recipient.
 - 3.1. Pseudonymity: The recipient is usually identified as a venerable figure from the past. A few Christian apocalypses are not pseudonymous.
 - 3.2. The Disposition of Recipient notes the circumstances and emotional state in which the revelation is received.
 - 3.3. The Reaction of the Recipient usually describes the awe and/or perplexity of the recipient confronted with the revelation.
Content: Temporal Axis
4. Protology: Matters which deal with the beginning of history or pre-history.
 - 4.1. Theogony (in Gnostic texts, describing the origin of the Pleroma) and/or Cosmogony (the origin of the world).
 - 4.2. Primordial events, which have paradigmatic significance for the remainder of history (e.g. the sin of Adam).
5. History may be reviewed either as:
 - 5.1. Explicit recollection of the past, or
 - 5.2. Ex eventu prophecy where past history is disguised as future and so associated with the eschatological prophecies.
6. Present salvation through knowledge is a major way of salvation in Gnostic texts and distinguishes them significantly from other apocalypses.
7. Eschatological crisis. This may take the form of
 - 7.1. Persecution and/or
 - 7.2. Other eschatological upheavals which disturb the order of nature or history.
8. Eschatological judgment and/or destruction. This is brought about by supernatural intervention. It comes upon
 - 8.1. Sinners, usually oppressors, but in Gnostic texts, the ignorant.
 - 8.2. The world, i.e., the natural elements.
 - 8.3. Otherworldly beings, e.g. the forces of Satan or Belial. Or other evil powers.
9. Eschatological salvation is the positive counterpart of eschatological judgment. Like the judgment, it is always brought about by supernatural means. It may involve:
 - 9.1. Cosmic transformation, where the whole world is renewed;

- 9.2. Personal salvation, which may be part of the cosmic transformation or may be independent of it. This in turn may take the form of
 - 9.2.1. Resurrection, in bodily form or
 - 9.2.2. Other forms of afterlife, e.g. exaltation to heaven with angels.

Content: Spatial Axis

10. Otherworldly elements may be either personal or impersonal and either good or bad.
 - 10.1. Otherworldly regions are described especially in the otherworldly journey but also in lists of revealed things in other contexts. Again they may be evaluated in either a positive or a negative way. The Gnostic texts evaluate the lower heavens negatively.
 - 10.2. Otherworldly beings, angelic or demonic.

Paraenesis

11. Paraenesis by the mediator to the recipient in the course of the revelation is relatively rare and is prominent only in a few apocalypses.

Concluding Elements:

12. Instructions to the recipient. These are distinct from Paraenesis (11) and come after the revelation as part of the concluding framework: e.g. they tell the recipient to conceal or publish the revelation.
13. Narrative conclusion. This may describe the awakening or return to earth of the recipient, the departure of the revealer or the consequent actions of the recipients. In some Gnostic texts we find reference to the persecution of the recipients because of the revelation.”²⁵

According to Collins, these elements must be present in order for a piece of writing to be classified as apocalyptic. As we observe the extensive list of what elements are characteristic for apocalyptic literature, we may wonder if each and every element needs to be present in order to make a writing apocalyptic. Tigchelaar notes:

²⁵ Ibid., 6–8.

In modern literary criticism the conviction more and more prevails that genres must be approached as historical entities. They have their own history and should be seen as part of a greater system of literature. “Historical” here implies that genres, and literature as a consequence, evolve. One might say genres are born, live and die.²⁶

He continues saying:

That is why a number of scholars no longer conceive of ‘genre’ as meaning ‘class’, but as meaning ‘family’, or ‘group of historically connected relatives’. This concept of genre implies that not all the characteristic marks of the genre need to be found in every member of the family. Some features present as a rule may be thought of as typical of the family, but there is no single feature which is always present.²⁷

This describes an obvious concern that even Collins recognized when he wrote:

Now it is apparent that no one apocalypse contains all the elements noted in the paradigm above. (...) Again, not all these elements are equally important. The disposition and reaction of the recipient (...) and the concluding elements are by no means constant and obviously are less important than the presence of an otherworldly mediator and human recipient. These less significant elements are noted here because they recur with notable frequency and may be of significance for more detailed study of particular works. However, they are not defining characteristics of either the genre apocalypse or any of its subtypes.²⁸

²⁶ Eibert J C Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18, no. 2 (December 1987): 138–139. This remark is exceedingly insightful since the logical conclusion is that something can be considered apocalyptic while it does not include all elements. The main question might also be as to when we start speaking of ‘apocalyptic’ literature, which is a question not included in the scope of this paper. Historically, given the premise that my chosen date for the second part of Zechariah is correct, Daniel and Zechariah are not too far apart, given that Daniel is located in the 6th century and not the 2nd century, as most preterist interpreters date it. Daniel’s apocalypse is far more advanced than Zechariah’s when Collins characteristics are taken into account.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 139. We will consider the elements present in Zechariah and those missing, drawing a conclusion of how to treat it in terms of ‘apocalyptic’.

²⁸ Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” 8–9. The book of Zechariah clearly is not an apocalypse, but it contains some apocalyptic elements.

Zechariah 9-14 and Collins' Apocalyptic Characteristics

Zechariah's writing is found among the minor prophets and it has been discussed by many to which genre this book belongs. For the most part, the book is considered to contain prophetic material, especially due to its historical context of the exile. Chapters 9-14 are unique in terms of their style in the Bible. They definitely contain elements of apocalyptic/eschatological nature, but they lack other elements which are usually described as apocalyptic literature. This is what we will now consider in more detail by comparing Collins' characteristics to parts of Zech 9-14.

Commonalities with Characteristics of Apocalyptic

We will go through the three different categories proposed by Collins to determine commonalities. The first category is the manner of revelation. Zechariah 9:1 and 12:1 begin with *מִשָּׁא דְּבַר־יְהוָה* ("The oracle of the word of the LORD" ESV), practically structuring the whole of 9-14 into two parts.²⁹ In my estimation, this equals the medium of the revelation.³⁰ Zechariah is the human recipient of this revelation. The

²⁹ Karl William Weyde, "Once Again the Term *MASSĀ'* in Zechariah 9:1; 12:1 and in Malachi 1:1: What is its Significance?," *Acta Theologica* 26 (2018): 251–267. Weyde writes: "Secondly, the frequency of formulas marking divine speech in the Book of Malachi and, to some extent, in Zechariah 9-14 indicates that these collections were by no means regarded as inferior to divine speech based on revelation to a prophet, which we find elsewhere, 264." In contrast to Collins, this seems to suggest that even these utterances of *מִשָּׁא* (9:1, 12:1) in connection to the *דְּבַר־יְהוָה* are an indication of divine revelation. The same phrase appears in Mal 1:1 and it connects these two books in terms of structural similarity.

³⁰ Admittedly, even though one could make a case for these utterances to be divinely inspired, there is no evidence in the text to explain the nature of this inspiration (there is no indication of a vision or auditory explanation in Zechariah).

second category is the content: temporal axis. Protology is not an obvious part of Zechariah's description, while 14:6-7 can in fact be related to the creation story referring to some sort of recreation.³¹ The eschatological crisis mentioned by Collins becomes immediately apparent in 14:1-3 and 14:12-15. It is Jerusalem that is in crisis at first, and then later the nations that rose to fight against Jerusalem. The crisis strongly correlates with the eschatological judgment. The aspect of cosmic transformation is present in 14:3-5, when the Mount of Olives is divided due to the feet of the Lord standing on it, creating a valley. The cosmic transformation continues in 14:10. Collins' third category is not found in Zechariah as will we see in the next part.

Missing Characteristics of Apocalyptic

We may have a medium and a revelation in regards to the first category, but it is not clear how this revelation was presented to Zechariah. There is no dialogue involved in the presentation and no otherworldly journey can be distinguished since what happens in his revelation is strictly imminent to this world. Zechariah narrates the content, but he does not react to it. The revision of history, the second category of content in the temporal axis, is missing in Zechariah since its focus is solely to the future. No mention of an afterlife is found in Zechariah because there are no time related prophecies that could be interpreted "*ex eventu*". Other worldly beings³² are also not mentioned

³¹ Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 763. He writes: "(...) This suggests that 14:7 refers to a day of recreation, with 14:6 returning the earth to a state prior to the creative activity in Genesis 1, and 14:7 initiating the process of creation in Genesis 1. This recreation day, just as the original creation day, is known only to Yahweh, in whose hands are the times and seasons (...)."

³² Zechariah 12:8 might be the only mention of the "Angel of the Lord," but the context of the verse makes it evident that Zechariah just draws a comparison to make his point clear. Elements missing in

explicitly. The content in terms of spatial axis is practically missing in Zechariah. There is no mention of heaven or hell, angels, demons or other indications of the supernatural. Zechariah's eschatology is mainly focused on a state where everyone is at peace with God. He is the one to come home to Jerusalem, not the other way around. The book of Zechariah ends abruptly and there are no instructions given or conclusions drawn.

Importance of the Apocalyptic Label

We have invested some thought into discovering whether or not the book of Zechariah could be considered apocalyptic. As we have come to see, there are evident characteristics of apocalyptic writing, but others are missing. On the basis of Tigheelaar's earlier statement, the following quote states:

Apocalyptic is a compound consisting of eschatological as well as cosmological and mystical elements. Opinions differ however about the importance of such feature. Each definition raises opposition. In fact, in my view, apocalyptic, too, is resistant to definition.³³

Zechariah indeed demonstrates eschatological language and apocalyptic elements, and therefore it is interesting to evaluate what the eschatological message is.³⁴ What depiction of the future does Zechariah provide through the utterances of the Lord?

Zechariah 9-14 sometimes do appear in earlier chapters like chapter 3, where Satan and the Angel of the Lord are mentioned and where there is communication between these parties. Since our focus is limited to chapters 9-14, we will not be investigating the earlier chapters.

³³ Tigheelaar, "More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses," 144.

³⁴ Davidson Richard M. and du Preez Ron, "Biblical Principles for Interpreting Apocalyptic Prophecy," in *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical and Practical Insights*, Scripture Symposium Number 1 (Lansing, MI: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventist, 2007), 43-74. Davidson in his article states on p. 46: "In classical prophecy, eschatology and the windup of the Great

The genre, which cannot be fully described as apocalyptic writing, still contains many elements of it as we have seen³⁵. That is why many scholars have come to ascribe Zechariah to the genre of “proto”-apocalyptic³⁶ writing using prose and poetry to convey his messages. This label tries to acknowledge that Zechariah 9-14 is not fully comparable to apocalyptic books like the book of Daniel. But it raises different questions. Are there implications or limitations of “proto”-apocalyptic³⁷ writings? What makes “proto”-apocalyptic writings “proto”-apocalyptic?

Apocalyptic books like Daniel and Revelation commonly reveal the eschatological intentions of God. Specifically, by the means of symbols and prophetic devices like visions or time prophecies. But this eschatological trait is found in classical prophecy as well, as Davidson noted.³⁸ The book of Zechariah is not an apocalypse. Yet

Controversy is depicted as occurring largely from within history, utilizing God’s people, national, geo-political, ethnic Israel. But apocalyptic eschatology describes a final universal in-breaking of God from outside of history, bringing an end to human history as we know it and the final universal solution to the Great Controversy.” Regarding this distinction Zechariah qualifies more to be of classical prophetic character. Davidson adds on p.47: “(...) apocalyptic contains striking contrasts which are sometimes called ‘dualism’. This is not Greek, Platonic dualism (...). Rather, apocalyptic has the ‘dualism’ of biblical realism, contrasting good and evil (...).” Both of these references show that Zechariah is difficult to define clearly. Neither in apocalyptic, nor in classical prophecy ideas of Greek Platonic Dualism are meant to be seen. Considering these aspects will help us in evaluating the eschatological message of Zechariah.

³⁵ Maybe there are even more elements when taking into consideration that Chapters 1-8 also contain missing elements.

³⁶ Richard D. Patterson and Andrew E. Hill, *Minor Prophets, Hosea-Malachi*, Cornerstone Biblical Commentary, 10 (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale, 2008), 525. The term “proto-apocalypse” was phrased on the premise that some elements of later apocalyptic writings have been missing. I would propose a treatment of proto-apocalyptic writings just like normal apocalyptic writings since it is hard to distinguish why certain elements are missing. Are they missing due to the lack of development, as many seem to argue, or is it a deliberate choice to leave certain elements out?

³⁷ Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*.

³⁸ Davidson Richard M. and du Preez Ron, “Biblical Principles for Interpreting Old Testament Classical Prophecy,” in *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical and Practical Insights*, Scripture Symposium Number 1 (Lansing, MI: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists,

it is referred to as “proto”-apocalyptic in nature by scholars. As mentioned in a quote by Tigcheelar before, it is more reasonable to drop the adjective “proto”, since it could be seen as the family of apocalyptic writing. A helpful suggestion Davidson makes, is the following:

“However, inasmuch as these apocalyptic-like prophecies deal primarily with the deliverance of Israel as a national, geo-political entity, it seems better to consider these as the climax of the kingdom promises/ prophecies made to Israel, and not as fully apocalyptic in nature.”³⁹

If Zechariah were proto-apocalyptic, how would we define the book of Daniel, which was written earlier⁴⁰ There is an elegant transition from historical to eschatological passages in Zechariah.⁴¹ When will the utterances⁴² of Zechariah come to pass? What

2007), 8. On p.23 he observes: “While the following outline sets forth the basic contours of God’s eschatological plan for Israel, one cannot be completely certain of the precise sequence of divinely intended events, because, as noted above in our chart contrasting with apocalyptic prophecy, classical prophecy does not give a detailed and unbroken sweep of history. Rather its ‘prophetic telescoping’ often jumps from the local immediate crisis (...) to the eschatological Day of the Lord (...), without filling in all the historical details in between.” What Davidson describes as “prophetic telescoping” is observable in Zechariah as well. Zech 12 and 13 can be seen as the local focus of crisis, while the eschatological description in Zech 14 is not interested in specific details.

³⁹ Ibid., 27. The proposal of “apocalyptic-like” passages comes closer to what we can observe in Zechariah and affirms the apocalyptic elements that we have pointed out. At the same time elements of classical prophecy are not neglected, which he demonstrates by various OT examples in his article.

⁴⁰ One has to be fully aware that scholarly opinion differs on the dating of the Book of Daniel. I consider it reasonable to suggest that Daniel was authored around 6th century BC and not in the 2nd century BC.

⁴¹ This transition must take place somewhere in chapter 12 or 13. Chapter 12 clearly speaks of the future deliverance of Judah, but the description does not appear to be eschatological in nature. Chapter 13 makes room for the idea of cleansing the Israelites from idolatry and the false prophets, which are judged in verses 7-9. This directly leads to the eschatological judgment of Israel and the nations who rose against Israel. A case could be made that *הַיְהוָה בְּיָוֵם* serves as the marker for the eschatological part of the message, which would mark chapter 12 as the point of transition.

⁴² John J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–20. “In the light of this definition it is immediately possible to distinguish apocalypses from other closely related categories. While oracles, testaments and revelatory dialogues all frequently contain eschatological material analogous to that found in apocalypses, they all lack some aspect of the apocalyptic manner of

message are they designed to portray? The reason why it is so important to establish the apocalyptic-like nature of Zechariah is that the allusions used will have implications for the outcome Zechariah envisioned in the grand perspective of OT thought. All of these questions cannot be easily answered, but they have a strong correlation to the thesis at hand. The first priority of this thesis is not to fully clarify these questions, but to try and begin answering the question of what the sanctuary motif represents in Zechariah's eschatology.

Allusions

In this section, we will examine the tool of this thesis. With Zechariah's use of allusions, it will be argued that he had the sanctuary in mind when he composed Zech 9-14. It first needs to be established how Scripture uses allusions in general and if there are any specific examples of sanctuary allusions. Therefore, we will first establish how allusions and echoes are defined. The next step will be directed at references and examples of sanctuary allusions in the Old Testament.

revelation. Oracles are not mediated at all, but are uttered directly (...) In this way the term 'apocalypse' can be applied to a specific and limited number of texts from the period under consideration." It must be noted that the utterances of Zechariah in chapters 9-14 are not considered as an apocalypse by this definition. This does not exclude them from being apocalyptic, as pointed out in an earlier footnote. There is evidence though to conclude the utterances found in Zech 9:1 and 12:1 are divine revelations.; Karl William Weyde, "Once Again the Term MAŠŠĀ' in Zechariah 9:1; 12:1 and in Malachi 1:1: What Is Its Significance?," *Acta Theologica* 26 (2018): 264. Weyde writes: "Secondly, the frequency of formulas marking divine speech in the Book of Malachi and, to some extent, in Zechariah 9-14 indicates that these collections were by no means regarded as inferior to divine speech based on revelation to a prophet, which we find elsewhere."

Definition and Use

As interpreters of Scripture, we need to be cautious in our approach to Scripture. When it comes to Zech 9-14, which is apocalyptic in nature, we assume that Zechariah is using allusions and echoes of previous materials, transmitted either by writing or oral tradition. Since we are relational human beings there is one thing that never changes: We are under the influence of other people, places and cultural traditions.⁴³ The same counts for writers of Scripture. They are likely influenced by the things they heard and read from earlier prophets and writings. In regards to the definition of allusions, Morner and Rausch write:

Allusions may refer to mythology, religion, literature, history, or art. Their power lies in suggestion and connotation. They serve to evoke emotions, convey information concisely, and establish character, mood, and setting. Often in Poetry an allusion may be central to the reader's understanding and response.⁴⁴

This explains as to why allusions are used. In the Bible, allusions occur frequently. They carry connotations that are helpful in interpreting the material. There is an important distinction that needs to be made though, and it involves the question of intentionality. Intention is very difficult to ascribe with certainty. Paulien describes it as following:

⁴³ Jon Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and the Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 11 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988), 169. He writes: "An author may also be affected by major events, both present and past, and can be influenced by literature read and by the ideas, theories, hopes, and dreams of contemporaries communicated to him in various forms."

⁴⁴ Kathleen Morner and Ralph Rausch, *NTC's Dictionary of Literary Terms: The Comprehensive, Easy-to-Understand Reference to Critical and Literary Terms* (Lincolnwood [Chicago]: IL: National Textbook Company, 1991), 5-6.

To summarize, allusive preferences to previous literature can enter a work in two ways. The author may use a source directly and consciously with its original context in mind. Such an allusion is “willed into being.” The author is fully conscious of the source as well as of its relevance to his composition. He/she is assuming the reader’s knowledge of the source and of his/her intention to refer to that source. On the other hand, an author may ‘echo’ ideas, the origin of which he/she is unaware. In an echo, the author does not point the reader to a particular background source, but merely utilizes a “live symbol” that would be generally understood in his original situation.⁴⁵

Are the allusions in the book of Zechariah intentional or just echoing common knowledge? Paulien describes three different kinds of parallels to determine an allusion: Verbal parallels, thematic parallels and structural parallels.⁴⁶ In classifying direct allusions he proposes five categories⁴⁷:

1. Certain allusions
2. Probable allusions
3. Possible allusions

⁴⁵ Paulien, *Decoding Revelation’s Trumpets*, 172. He continues saying: “The distinction between allusions and echoes is very significant for the study of Revelation. In failing to make this distinction, commentators have interpreted echoes as though the author intended his reader to incorporate a source context into his understanding of the Apocalypse.” The same should be valid for Zechariah, otherwise wrong conclusions will be drawn.

⁴⁶ Paulien, *Decoding Revelation’s Trumpets*, 186. He suggests that verbal parallels are the weakest ones, especially if they only consist of one word. “Their value as evidence increases, however, as the number of parallel words increases and to the extent that the parallel words are ordered in the same or in a similar way as the potential source passage.”

⁴⁷ Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis; MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), 396. “The first two categories indicate a high level of certainty that we are dealing with a direct allusion. (...) The third category (possible allusions) is more problematic. In this case there is enough evidence to indicate that John may have been making a direct allusion to the Old Testament, but not enough to be reasonably certain. Such allusions can be used with caution in interpretation.”

4. Uncertain allusions
5. Nonallusions

Even though Paulien applied these categories in regard to the Revelation, it is still valid to apply the same parallels and categories to the book of Zechariah.⁴⁸ This definition, along with the propositions and categories will serve as guidelines for the evaluation of the allusions and the final conclusion.

The Sanctuary

Before we look at the different allusions, we want to take a closer look at the sanctuary itself. Comparing the structure and form of the tabernacle in the wilderness, the Solomonic temple and the Herodian temple for instance, we come to realize that each of these architectures are similar but not identical. Their similarity may lead to the assumption that they are the same. This does not have to be the case. When we have a closer look at Exod 25:9,40, where Moses receives the command to build a sanctuary, it seems that תְּבִנִית has at least six different ways⁴⁹ how it can be interpreted:

1. Original or prototype
2. Copy, duplicate

⁴⁸ One difference to the book of Revelation might be the oral tradition of Zechariah's time. One may wonder how accessible literature was to individuals, especially in exile. Literature has always been expensive to produce and it displayed a rare commodity. Oral tradition most likely compensated this lack.

⁴⁹ Richard M. Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews" in Frank Holbrook, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews* (Silver Spring MD: Biblical Research Institute General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, 1989), 156–169. In this article Richard Davidson discusses the meaning of תְּבִנִית.

3. Copy of the heavenly Sanctuary as a model for the earthly Sanctuary.
4. Copy of the heavenly Sanctuary as a construction model for the earthly Sanctuary.
5. The heavenly Sanctuary itself is a model for the earthly Sanctuary.
6. Subjective Inspiration of Moses.

Depending on how we understand the template that was given to Moses, we will come to different conclusions. Special consideration should be given to construction model (4) which emphasizes the key features of the sanctuary. This interpretation is particularly interesting as it explains potential differences between the various sanctuaries built in the history of Israel. Furthermore, it would allow the Garden of Eden as an archetype for later sanctuaries.⁵⁰ Therefore, it is plausible to propose that key functions of the sanctuary can appear without the mentioning of the building or the explicit word for sanctuary. Every sanctuary building in the OT can be seen as a depiction of this pattern found in Exod 25:9, they are the horizontal expression of a vertical, heavenly reality, as noted in Hebrews 9:11.

⁵⁰ Angel M. Rodríguez, "Sanctuary Theology in the Book of Exodus," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 24, no. 2 (1986): 142-143. Rodríguez concludes his article, writing: "It seems most probable that what Moses saw was either the heavenly sanctuary archetype itself (i.e., the original) or a miniature three-dimensional model of it. Several considerations point in this direction. First, the mentality in the ancient Near East envisioned the earthly dwelling of the gods as corresponding structurally with their heavenly abode. Second, and of more significance, the OT itself indicates that in heaven there is a temple where Yahweh dwells." And additionally: "Finally, it may be noted that, as in the case of Yahweh's earthly abode, the transcendent God is, in his heavenly sanctuary, also the immanent God, who reaches out to touch his entire creation. The heavenly reality, moreover, should be at the same time the place in which God deals with the sin problem. It is there that the repentant sinner actually is forgiven; it is the place where the mystery of atonement reaches its consummation."

Since the fall of humanity into sin (Gen 3), it was God's intention to reconcile humanity with himself. God and sin cannot coexist together because God is the origin of life and sin is the way to death. In the Hebrew cultic life, there is a clear distinction between ritual purity and impurity.⁵¹ God demonstrated by the daily services and the Day of Atonement how this sin problem will be solved and how the relationship between creator and creation would be restored. For the purpose of this study, the key element of God's presence in the sanctuary will hold special emphasis. Thus, prominent examples in the OT that demonstrate an allusive use in regard to the sanctuary will be discussed.

Garden of Eden

The Bible begins its first chapters by defining a framework of cosmology. God finished the creation of the world (Gen 1:31-2:3) using four verbs to describe his work עשה (to see), כלה (to finish), ברך (to bless) and קדש (to sanctify). These four verbs are used directly in the context of the tabernacle, after it was completed (Exod 39:43; 39:32; 40:33; 39:43; 40:9). These four verbs are linked to the creation of the world, the Sabbath and the sanctuary alike, thereby signifying that the sanctification of the Sabbath has similar weight as the sanctuary. It is not yet applicable to the Garden of Eden, but it highlights that the context of creation has divine character.

⁵¹ Angel M. Rodríguez, "The Sanctuary", in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. Raoul Dederen, Commentary Reference Series vol. 12 (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald Pub. Association, 2000), 383. Rodríguez notes: "Theologically speaking, 'impurity' was a metaphor expressing alienation from God and fellow humans. The unclean person was not to come into contact with other people and was excluded from the sanctuary."

Likewise, God creates with a scheme that is best described as “void and empty”: first he builds the space, then he fills it. This process takes six days and is followed by the Sabbath.⁵² The Sinai narrative has the same order. Six days are followed by a seventh day (Exod 24:15-18a)⁵³. After Creation, the earth seemed to be divided into three areas with different degrees of sanctity: Outside Eden, the Garden of Eden and the Centre with the tree of Life. This is paralleled in the Sinai narrative with the camp, the place where the 70 Elders went on the mountain and the immediate presence of God, which only Moses could witness. Similarly, the sanctuary has three degrees of sanctity⁵⁴ later on: the court, the Holy and the Most Holy. Another similarity is found when רוח אֱלֹהִים (wind of God) comes into the picture before the creation of the world (Gen 1:2) and becomes the source of inspiration for the people building the Sanctuary in subsequent centuries (Exod 31:3-5). Thus, the Spirit of God is involved in both the Creation and the sanctuary. The special relation between the Garden of Eden and the sanctuary becomes even more evident when taking into account the natural instruments found in the sanctuary. For instance, the menorah is often presented to illustrate the tree of life⁵⁵ (Exod 25:31-40; 1 Kgs 7:49). The

⁵² The Sabbath does not have a counterpart like the other days do. The idea proposed is that God fills this space with time with himself, which gives the Sabbath a particular holiness. Further information in: Jacques B. Doukhan, *Genesis*, Seventh-day Adventist International Bible Commentary (Pacific Press, 2016), 70–71.

⁵³ Richard M Davidson, “Earth’s First Sanctuary: Genesis 1-3 and Parallel Creation Accounts,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015): 81.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 73; Robert M. Jr. Hinckley, “Adam, Aaron, and the Garden Sanctuary,” *Logia* 22, no. 4 Reformation (2013): 5–12.

⁵⁵ Davidson, “Earth’s First Sanctuary: Genesis 1-3 and Parallel Creation Accounts,” 70; Martin Pröbstle, *Himmel auf Erden - Gott begegnet uns im Heiligtum*, 1st ed. (Wien: Top Life - Wegweiser-Verlag, 2013), 36; Lifsa Block Schachter, “The Garden of Eden as God’s First Sanctuary,” *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 41, no. 2 Apr-Jun (2013): 75.

inner decoration of the temple had cedars, open flowers and cherubs as references to nature and the Garden of Eden⁵⁶ (1 Kgs 6:18.29.32.25; 7:18-20). Sun and moon as sources of light are depicted with the same word as the light of the lampstand in the sanctuary (Gen 1:14-16; Exod 25:6; 27:20). Eden gives life blessing water (Gen 2:10-14), just like the sanctuary that Ezekiel saw (Ezek 47:1-12), and the heavenly sanctuary on the New Earth (Rev 22:1.2). The precious metals in Gen 2:12 are also used for the tabernacle, the temple and the priestly garments⁵⁷ (Exod 25:7; 28:9.20; 35:9.27; 1 Chr 29:2; 1 Kgs 6:20-22). In addition, the Garden of Eden was placed with an orientation towards the east⁵⁸ (Gen 2:8; Ex 36:20-30; Ezek 47:1). Another similarity is God's walking in the Garden⁵⁹ (Gen 3:8), later mirrored in Deut 23:15 and 2 Sam 7:6.7. Moreover, the two cherubs that guard the entrance of the garden (Gen 3:24) are also associated with the ark of the covenant (Exod 25:18-22; 1 Kgs 6:23-29). The sanctuary was completed on the "first day of the first month" (Exod 40:17) reminding the reader of the creation of the world. Adam is placed in the garden as a representative of God in heaven, just like Aaron represents the mediator between God and humankind in the sanctuary.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Davidson, "Earth's First Sanctuary: Genesis 1-3 and Parallel Creation Accounts," 70.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 71.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 69.

⁵⁹ Davidson, "Earth's first sanctuary: Genesis 1-3 and Parallel Creation Accounts", 74. Davidson makes a further distinction between pre-fall and post-fall Eden, which makes sense. But in my paper, I want to present a different mode of inquiry arguing from obvious, superficial similarities to similarities in function.; Pröbstle, *Himmel auf Erden - Gott begegnet uns im Heiligtum*, 37.

⁶⁰ Hinckley, "Adam, Aaron, and the Garden Sanctuary."

These similarities between the Garden of Eden and the sanctuary may not be comprehensive, but they demonstrate that there is a strong connection between the description of both places. There is not one single passage in the Bible where the Garden Eden is referred to as a sanctuary. But the function that it has served and parallels are so strong that they cannot be ignored.

The Garden of Eden in the Bible is described in two stages. The first stage describes the appearance of the Garden of Eden before the fall of humanity into sin, the second describes the appearance of the Garden of Eden after the fall. Describing the function of the sanctuary after the fall, Bartholomew notes: “The image of God walking in the garden reinforces this in the strongest way – Eden was a place of intimate relationship with God.”⁶¹ Davidson adds important insight to this idea by saying: “The expression used to describe God “walking around” [...] in the Garden (Gen 3:8) is a technical term for God’s presence in the sanctuary (Lev 26:12; 2 Sam 7:6.7).”⁶² But the link does not end here. In Gen 2:2, we see that God sanctifies the Sabbath⁶³ while in Exod 29:42 our attention is put to the fact that God will sanctify his tabernacle. God sanctifies his sanctuary with his presence. Therefore, the Garden of Eden alludes to the grand motif of the presence of God as a central and reoccurring theme.

The description of the Most Holy place in the Sanctuary includes that of an intimate relationship between God and his people. After the fall of humanity, a change had

⁶¹ Craig G. Bartholomew, *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham J. G. McConville, Karl Möller*, ed. J.G. McConville and Karl Möller (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 189.

⁶² Davidson, “Earth’s First Sanctuary: Genesis 1-3 and Parallel Creation Accounts,” 74.

⁶³ For a variety of reasons, the Sabbath can be considered to be a Sanctuary in time. For instance, God’s scheme of form and content in creation only makes sense if the Sabbath (form) is filled with God (content) in order to keep the principles working.

occurred and God entered into the picture “walking around”. What happened at that time is practically a legal trial that reminds the reader of Deut 19:15-21 in the earthly sanctuary and Daniel 7:9-10; Rev 14:6-7 in the heavenly sanctuary. Sin had changed the relationship between God and humankind. Humankind had become corrupted by sin. Therefore, living in the immediate presence of God was unbearable for human beings. The uttering of the *proto-evangelium* in Gen 3:15 builds a direct link to the substitutionary atonement of the sanctuary and promises the restoration of the original purpose of the Garden of Eden. After giving Adam and Eve the promise of a Messiah, he “clothes” them (Gen 3:21) and the same word is used only for Aaron and his sons as priests (Lev 8:7.13; Num 20:28). This link marks another important parallel to the sanctuary, the institution of mediation, which was only needed after the fall.

Another similarity is that the Garden of Eden needs to be “cultivated and kept” (Gen 2:15). This phrase can also be translated as “serving and guarding” and is associated with the work of the priests in the sanctuary (Num 3:7-8; 8:25-26; 18:5-6; 1 Chr 23:32; Ezek 44-44)⁶⁴. There are two important things one can take from this: Firstly, Adam and Eve function as the first priest in the first earthly “temple”. Secondly, the Garden of Eden is a place that needs to be ministered.

Interestingly, Ezek 28:13-14,16-18 describes the Garden of Eden as “Eden, the Garden of God [...] the holy mountain of God”. This description alludes to the imagery of the sanctuary. Not only in regards to the earthly sanctuary introduced in Exodus, but to

⁶⁴ Gregory K. Beale, “Eden, the Temple, and the Church’s Mission the New Creation,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 1 (2005): 7–8.

the heavenly original. Elias Brasil de Souza in his dissertation has demonstrated strongly that the references in Ezek 28 have a heavenly setting in mind.⁶⁵

The main function of the Garden of Eden was to experience the presence of God, which is dramatically illustrated when Adam fears God and flees. Sin has devastated Eden's original purpose.

Evaluation

Methodologically, there is a strong case between the verbal, thematic and structural parallels of the Garden of Eden and the sanctuary. It makes it fairly easy to categorize the function of the Garden of Eden as a "certain allusion" and even more than that. It is not only an allusion, but more likely a pre-figuration, as many have argued. A pre-figuration not only of the sanctuary to come later, but an adaptation of the pattern in Exod 40:8.40 of the sanctuary in Heaven. This example of the Garden of Eden demonstrates that there is a case where no actual building is needed to transfer the sanctuary motif, as long as the needed criteria for the pattern are present. Zechariah may not speak of the Garden of Eden. But he is familiar with his Jewish origins and most likely with Moses' writing and he clearly understands the parallels between the Garden of Eden and the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary. One could argue that Eden is not an allusion on textual basis. This is only true when the earthly sanctuary is in mind. Yet the Garden of Eden definitely has a strong relation to the heavenly sanctuary and

⁶⁵ Elias Brasil de Souza, *The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple Motif in the Hebrew Bible: Function and Relationship to the Earthy Counterparts* (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 2005), 287–290. De Souza connects Ezek 28 to Isa 14:12-15, where "no differentiation between Heaven, Eden, the side of the North and the temple" is made. (p.290) Concluding that the cherub "brought down to Sheol" (Isa 14:15 ESV) has to be brought down from Heaven.

describes OT associative thinking as we will see in the next paragraph. With this in mind, we will turn back to another example in the OT in regards to sanctuary allusions.

Sinai

The historical context of the Mount Sinai narrative is the exodus from Egypt. Moses left Egypt with the Israelites by his side and God leading the way. The question remained: Where were they going? Since they had spent centuries in captivity, it might not even have been clear who this God was that was calling them out of Egypt during uncertain times. They had been praying and weeping during their exile, but there was no personal connection to God. The Israelites had only experienced God and his power through his mighty works, like the ten plagues brought upon Egypt. In the wilderness, with no sanctuary yet existing, God's presence was visible in the form of a pillar of fire and a pillar of cloud (Exod 13:22). This presence of God is equated with the same presence found in the Sanctuary.

As discussed in the previous part, God's intention was to be in the presence of his people and thereby He was leading their way to mount Sinai. After arriving at Mount Sinai, Moses and God interacted on the mountaintop, and Moses served as a mediator between the Israelites and God. After that scene, the presence of God was manifested in a powerful theophany in the middle of thunder and earthquakes (Exod 19:16-19). This was the time when God gives Moses the Ten Commandments and even more stipulations,

civil laws and the ceremonial laws regarding the tabernacle.⁶⁶ What can be concluded from these observations is that Mount Sinai served as a meeting point between God and Moses, establishing his presence⁶⁷ among the Israelites. In Exod 33:18 Moses says: “Then Moses said, ‘I pray You, show me Your glory!’” (NASB). The term used here for glory is כְּבוֹד (glory) and Elizabeth Keck notes on this passage:

The Priestly texts use כְּבוֹד almost exclusively to refer to the presence of God, rather than employing the word in some other sense – such as with reference to the honor, wealth or status of a human or object. There appear to be only two exceptions to this rule, and though they comprise two verses, they both refer to the same thing: the apparel of ‘splendor’ and ‘glory’ of priests’ garments (Exod. 28.2, 30).⁶⁸

Earlier we mentioned that there is a similarity between the Court, the Holy and the Most Holy place in the Garden of Eden and noted a structural parallel to the Sinai narrative with the camp, the place of the 70 elders and the immediate presence of God with Moses.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Elizabeth Keck, “The Glory of Yahweh in Ezekiel and the Pre-Tabernacle Wilderness,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 37, no. 2 (December 2012): 204. She writes: “The second event, the theophany at Sinai, speaks for itself; for P, this was primarily the event at which the Israelites received God’s cultic law and the instruction to build God’s earthly sanctuary. (...) Once the Tabernacle had been build, the Glory never again appeared outside its sanctified precincts.”

⁶⁷ After the Israelites turned to the Golden Calf for worship, God commands Moses to depart from Sinai (Ex 33:1-3). Outside of the Israelite Camp, Moses pitched a tent and called it “the tabernacle of meeting” (Ex 33:7) where everyone saw Moses talking to the pillar of cloud, which descended (v.9). Moses uttered his desire to see the Glory of God (v. 18).

⁶⁸ Keck, “The Glory of Yahweh in Ezekiel and the Pre-Tabernacle Wilderness,” 203. Her footnote on this remark, states: “This leaves, by my count, thirteen instances constituting God’s presence: Exod. 16.7, 10; 24.16, 17; 29.43; 40.34, 35; Lev 9.6, 23; Num. 14.10; 16.19, 42; 20.6.” This is a strong indication that what happens at Mount Sinai is a reflection of God’s immediate presence which he then establishes in the Sanctuary.

⁶⁹ This passage is found in Ex 24 and structurally there is a parallel to Num 11:16.24.25, where God ask Moses to gather 70 Elders in front of the Sanctuary. This parallel indicates that Mount Sinai and the Sanctuary are equated.

Evaluation of the Allusion

There is strong evidence to suggest that the Sinai narrative and the sanctuary motif share common ideas and intentions. When Moses wrote about the exodus story, one may wonder if he intentionally used Mount Sinai as an allusion to the sanctuary. The connection is very strong, but there is some doubt that the reason for this is an allusion to the earthly sanctuary. The Sinai narrative is much more than an allusion to the sanctuary because it is the foundation for the Hebrew cult and cosmos. It must be evident therefore that the presence of God will be central to the description of the narrative. If it were to be only an allusion, what textual reference is it alluding to? Is it connected to Genesis and the Garden of Eden? The allusion would more likely not be a reference to earlier material, therefore it could only be an echo. Thus, it can be argued that the Sinai narrative is much more than an allusion, it is in fact establishing the earthly sanctuary motif itself. The Sinai narrative reveals a strong correlation to the Sanctuary without the earthly sanctuary having been introduced yet. Ps 68:17 states: "Sinai is now in the sanctuary." (ESV) This is only possible if the Sinai narrative takes another vertical reality of the sanctuary into consideration. It is fundamentally imbedded into the cultic cosmos. Zechariah is most certainly acquainted with the Sinai narrative and familiar with its introduction to the sanctuary motif. Just like the Garden of Eden takes inspiration from the heavenly sanctuary, the Sinai narrative introduces us to the reality of God's presence, as shown in his sanctuary. Eden and Sinai may have differences in their appearance, but they share the same function. For Zechariah the presence of God is the key aspect of the sanctuary. This presence of God is real. It is not a spiritual presence, but in fact God meeting humanity in time and space. Rodríguez notes concerning the presence of God:

“And thus, the sanctuary has become the place, or space, where the transcendental God comes to meet with his people.”⁷⁰ This is a major difference to the other religions of surrounding nations, who believed that the gods could not enter the physical world. Strongly influenced by the Greek Platonic Dualism⁷¹ the gods were imagined to be spaceless and timeless. The Sinai narrative demonstrates that God is interested to meet with his people in space and time, being present with his glory by introducing the earthly Sanctuary.

Ezekiel

The context of Ezek 11 enforces the idea of judgment over the elite of Israel that has been tempted by the Babylonian influence. The believers of Israel are scattered in exile and have no immediate access to the sanctuary. That is when God blessed Ezekiel with a vision of his intention. In Ezek 11:16, there is an interesting passage that needs to be especially considered here. It is a statement that attributes the sanctuary to a rather peculiar context and one may wonder about the treatment of the sanctuary:

Therefore say, “Thus says the Lord GOD, “Though I had removed them far away among the nations and though I had scattered them among the

⁷⁰ Rodriguez, “Sanctuary Theology in the Book of Exodus,” 137.

⁷¹ Norman R Gulley, *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 2003), 6. Gulley writes about Plato: “Plato looks at time in a universal sense as an imitation of the eternal. Space is not created, but time is created. God dwells in space, and created beings dwell in time. He is eternal, they are temporal; He is immovable, they are in motion. Plato continued the Parmenides’ focus on both the timelessness and impassability of God.” p.7 Plato’s ideas may have been formulated later in history, but they have been present for a long time. Reading the Bible we need to be aware of such fundamental presuppositions. The Biblical writers had a very much different approach and idea of God. Who interacts with humanity in time and in space, while not being bound to both.

countries, yet I was a sanctuary for them a little while in the countries where they had gone.”⁷²

It is evident that the removed ones are the Israelites in exile, “scattered among the countries”. One particular aspect draws our attention here, the Hebrew reads:

לְהֵם לְמִקְדָּשׁ מְעֻט בְּאַרְצוֹת
(to be a sanctuary in some measure)

The Hebrew raises up questions. Ezekiel seemed to be in Babylonia while the temple in Jerusalem still was intact. How could God become a sanctuary for the scattered Israelites?

Taylor notes:

Such words have a Mosaic ring about them, as if the promised land of Canaan is being held out to the wilderness wanderers once again. The desert experience would not last for ever: one day they would possess the land—not by arrogant claim (as in verse 15), but by a gracious gift of God—and their worship would be purified of all the foreign, corrupting influences that had beset the Israelites since Joshua’s day.⁷³

After the Israelites’ time in wilderness, the establishment of the tabernacle and later on the earthly sanctuary, there is no mentioning that God’s glory appeared outside of the sanctuary — except for this passage. But why? Keck describes the following scenario when speaking about the sanctuary:

Furthermore, in the prophet’s estimation, it has become defunct as a result of its extensive cultic profanation, which prompts the Glory to

⁷² New American Standard Bible: 1995 Update (La Habra, CA: The Lockman Foundation, 1995), Eze 11:16.

⁷³ John B. Taylor, *Ezekiel: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 22 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1969), 112.

depart. Thus, for Ezekiel, the Temple is bereft of ritual purity and ritually clean priest, and had ceased to function or be available well before its physical destruction. Under these conditions, Ezekiel sees the Glory in a foreign land; furthermore, and these conditions we read that Yahweh has become a “sanctuary in some measure” ... among the exiles, contrary to the assumptions of those in Jerusalem.”⁷⁴

God becoming a sanctuary in “some measure” is a very interesting concept in the context of this thesis. The NASB translates *עַלְמָה* with “a little while”. The Hebrew *עַלְמָה* can be translated as “little”. In regards to the translation, one may wonder: A little of what? Of time? Or of quality? The text does not explicitly state what is meant. *עַלְמָה* appears 101 times in the OT, of which Ezekiel uses this root 5 times (Ezek 5:3, 11:16, 16:20, 16:47 and 34:18). Not once does Ezekiel use it to refer to time.

The absence of the Temple for the exiles is the reason that the metaphorical sanctuary Yahweh provides is qualified ‘in some measure’, because by nature it does not possess the cultic accoutrements that complete the worship of Yahweh, and no cultic rites minister to it.⁷⁵

With this in mind, the text is more probable to refer to “in some measure” than to “a little while”. Given the aspect that even exile would come to an end at some point, one could make a case for the translation of “a little while”. But given the argument that the presence of God was only one aspect of many in the cultic life of Israel, and many offerings could only be brought to the temple, it can be argued that God has intended to become a sanctuary “in some measure” to the Israelites in exile. He is committed to the

⁷⁴ Keck, “The Glory of Yahweh in Ezekiel and the Pre-Tabernacle Wilderness,” 208–209.

⁷⁵ Ibid. 213.

covenant that he has made with them (11:19-20). In Ezek 11:22-23 he observes that the Glory of God leaves the city, and by inclusion the sanctuary, to move on a mountain in the east of Jerusalem.

Evaluation

Before the exodus and establishment of the cultic life, God's presence appeared more frequently. In the book of Ezekiel, it is God himself who becomes a sanctuary "in some measure", alluding to the sanctuary in Jerusalem, which is defiled and cannot be accessed by the believers. This incident demonstrates that, similarly to the Garden of Eden representing a pre-figuration of the sanctuary, Ezekiel introduces it as a transfiguration⁷⁶ of the sanctuary due to the special historical need of the faithful ones. The sanctuary is not limited to the temple in Jerusalem. God's presence, which leaves Jerusalem, becomes a sanctuary in some measure. Ezekiel's description is a clear indication of the sanctuary motif, an allusion of previous sanctuary concepts.

It may well be assumed to consider this reference as an echo because of its strong connection to the sanctuary without a clear reference to any specific passage. What we see is that the sanctuary motif is clearly common knowledge and finds adaptations to the specific historical settings.

⁷⁶ Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), 396. Lutz adds: "The cloud calls attention not only to the Sinai scene but beyond that is a widespread biblical symbol for God's presence. Not only did it cover Sinai; it accompanied Israel on its wilderness journey, lay over the tent of meeting (Exod 40:34-38*), and filled the temple (1 Kgs 8:10-11*). In short, our story doubtless contains reminiscences of the Sinai traditions, but it cannot be understood exclusively on that basis." This reminds me of the transfiguration of Jesus in Mt 17, taking place on a "high mountain". For a brief second, Jesus displayed his glory, which led the disciples to desire building three tabernacles. In essence, this pericope focuses on the presence of God among human beings.

Proposed Meaning

While looking at the Old Testament occurrences of sanctuary allusions, especially in the Garden of Eden, Mount Sinai and Ezek 11, a preliminary conclusion can be drawn. Historically speaking, the Garden of Eden was the beginning of the biblical narrative and even here there is evidence suggesting a “pre”-figuration of elements that would later be found in the sanctuary, which are based on the heavenly original. The story around the exodus and movement toward Mount Sinai made it clear that it was a place where God interacted with Moses in a very intimate manner in time and space and where he gave him the instructions for the tabernacle and Sanctuary based on the pattern. The establishment of cultic life and the idea of cultic purity was necessary to allow interaction with a sinless God. Just like the Garden of Eden, the Mount Sinai narrative displays references to the presence of God found in the sanctuary. The specific instance of Ezek 11, being in exile and having no access to the temple in Jerusalem, which was defiled by the Babylonians, necessitated an action on Gods part and caused him to become a sanctuary “in some measure” to the remnant in Exile. This could be termed a “trans”-figuration of the sanctuary since it is not a pre-figuration, but simply taking on a different, more personal dimension. Looking at these instances and knowing about the complexity of the sanctuary services, it seems to be clear that the basic function of the sanctuary can be narrowed down to the presence of God. This element is present among all of these mentions. All these passages are forming the OT sanctuary motif, which later is applied by Zechariah in his writing. The sanctuary motif is a mixture of allusions, echoes and mentioning of historical occurrences. While all earthly sanctuaries may

describe a horizontal adaptation, they are rooted in the heavenly original, which can be described as the vertical reality of God's home.⁷⁷

Zechariah 9-14 in Light of Sanctuary Allusions

The chapters 9-14 are clearly divided into two parts⁷⁸ by the phrase:

מִשָּׂא דְבַר־יְהוָה

(“The oracle of the Word of the Lord” 9:1; 12:1 ESV)

Chapters 9-11 demonstrate more closeness to classical prophecy. There appears no clear scriptural reference to the sanctuary in chapters 9-11. Chapter 9 describes the defending of Israel by God from their enemies (9:1-17). The only reference in this chapter could be: לְבֵיתִי (“my house” verse 8) This reference would ultimately only qualify for an echo. חנה the verb connected to “my house” is a reference that is used in Exod 19:2 and Num 9:17.18.23 in direct reference to the tabernacle. Interestingly, God will encamp around his house, which is different from how he has been present in the sanctuary so far, namely in the Most Holy place. The purpose is protection and it introduces the coming King in verses 9-10. Chapter 10 describes the restoration of Judah and Israel, while also criticizing their reliance on idols (verse 2) and the shepherds (verse 3). The shepherds are then judged by God in detail in chapter 11. These three chapters detail God's displeasure with the way Israel has related towards him. Especially the leaders are judged because

⁷⁷ See Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Τύπος Structures*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 336-388.

⁷⁸ Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 516.

they are leading the sheep astray. Zechariah 9-11 lays the foundation of the apocalyptic judgement found in Zechariah 12-14. Zechariah 12:1 starts with the same expression like 9:1, indicating that a new unit will unfold. It is this unit that shows elements of apocalyptic-like writing and climaxes in its eschatological description. Chapter 12 begins describing troublesome times for Jerusalem and Judah. Despite all crisis God “will give salvation to the tents of Judah” (verse 7 ESV) and “protect the inhabitants of Jerusalem” (verse 8 ESV). Everyone who has come against Jerusalem will be destroyed by God (verse 9). Verses 10-14 may describe a sacrifice that God has made for his people. Interestingly, the reaction to this sacrifice is mourning by everyone. The exact phrase is: “(...) when they look on me, on him whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him (...) (verse 10b). This mourning leads then to chapter 13:1 and the opening of a fountain that will lead to purity. 13:1 is a perfect transition into 13:2-6, which describes that the idolatry and falsehood of the earlier chapter 11, will be nationally wiped out. 13:7-9 have long been discussed in the scholarly community, as to the identity of the stricken shepherd. This might be the only reference in Zechariah, where the shepherd has a positive connotation, because he is called by God as “my shepherd” and “my associate” (verse 7 ESV). Chapter 13 ends with a renewal of the covenantal relationship by stating: “They will call upon my name, and I will answer them. I will say, ‘They are my people’; and they will say, ‘The Lord is my God.’” (verse 9 ESV).

Chapter 14 then introduces us to the eschatological climax. The nations will gather against Jerusalem for battle and the city will be captured (verse 2). God will fight against those nations (verse 3). Verses 4-5 describe the splitting of the Mount of Olives and the creation of an escape path for his people. Supernatural disappearance of light occurs

(verses 6-7) and living water will flow out of Jerusalem, while the seasons will be equal. God is king over all the earth (verse 9). Verse 11 describes that Jerusalem will live in security, because God is their protector. Those who have previously battled against Jerusalem will experience justice by punishment (verse 12.13.15). The remaining people will “go up” to worship the God (verse 16). Those who refuse to go up, will not be receiving rain (verses 18-19). The chapter and book of Zechariah closes with the idea that Holiness is realized.

The first reference that now will be analyzed in terms of allusion is found in Zech 13:1:

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיֶה מְקוֹר מַיִם לְבַיִת דָּוִד וּלְיֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם לְחַטָּאת וּלְנִדָּה
On that day there shall be a fountain opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, to cleanse them from sin and uncleanness. (ESV)

Context of Zechariah 13

Researchers have been indecisive over the years in regards to where this verse should be placed historically. Ralph is convinced that 13:1 is to be strongly connected to 13:2-6.⁷⁹ In contrast, Wolters writes:

“It is a pity that the traditional chapter division makes this verse seem like the beginning of a new pericope. It is instead the end of the preceding one.”⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, Word Biblical Commentary, 32 (Dallas, TX: Nelson, 1998), 281.

⁸⁰ Smith, *Micah to Malachi*, 281; Wolters, *Zechariah*, 424; Mark J. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004), 484; Anthony R. Petterson, *Behold Your King: The Hope Fore the House of David in the Book of Zechariah*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 513 (New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2009), 224.

He bases his observation on the parallels to the preceding verses 12:10-14. It is the answer to the deep morning and describes “that provision will be made for the cleaning of the sins, possibly past and future, of those mentioned at the outset of 12:10 the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem.”⁸¹ Contrasting Wolters, Boda assumes that:

what precedes 13:1 in 12:10-14 reflects the former approach, in which Yahweh grants the community a spirit of favour and of pleading for favour, so that the people experience the grace of God and are motivated to seek this grace through faithful mourning over their past actions against Yahweh. What follows 13:1 in 13:2-5 reflects the latter approach, as Yahweh deals with the deliberate infractions of idolatry and false prophecy through capital punishment.⁸²

This interpretation is logical and explains why it is so difficult to find a correct placement for either preceding or following verses — both fit perfectly. Therefore, the placement appears to be intentional, serving the purpose of connecting both aspects.

Linguistic Insights

Interestingly enough, there is no actual verb in the expression: וּלְנִדָּה לְחַטָּאת (“for sin and for uncleanness”). After the mentioning of the opening of a fountain, the question remains as to the result of this opening? Zechariah assumes that the reader can connect the idea of נִפְתָּח מְקוֹר to cleansing and not, for instance, with an encouraging of sin and impurity. Nevertheless, the idea “cleaning from” seems to be implied by the context of

⁸¹ Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 722.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 724–725.

12:10-14. טָמַא is rarely used to describe the habit of sinning (Prov 14:34 or Isa 3:9). Sometimes, it also applies to the means of sin (like in Hos 10:8; Deut 9:21)⁸³. It is in Num 8:7 that water and sin purification are connected, just like in Zech 13:1. The Hebrew term for sin has the exact same appearance (a feminine singular noun) even though the terms for cleansing are different. The thematic link is still strong in terms of cleansing. In this regard, Boda notes:

This sin-purification offering is legislated for cases of ritual uncleanness rather than moral infractions in Lev. 12:8 and 14:19 (cf. 14:11, 31; 15:15, 30). Furthermore, moral violations have an impact on ritual purity, seen not only in the Day of Atonement legislation in Leviticus 16, but also in cases where there is defiant disregard for ritual purity laws (Lev. 7:20, 21; 20:18; 22:3; Num. 19:13, 20). Defiant moral violations clearly are linked to impurity in priestly texts, in particular sexual sins (e.g., Lev. 18:24-30), idolatry (e.g. Lev 19:31; 20:1-3), sacrifice to Molech (e.g. Lev. 20:2-5), and bloodshed (e.g., Num. 35:33-34). Here in 13:1 water is used for dealing with sin and impurity. The water from this spring could be related to anointing, laundering, or bathing. Reference to sin and impurity probably indicates the full breadth of priestly infractions, including moral violations and ritual impurity, although it is possible that it is ritual impurity that is in view.⁸⁴

The aspect of ritual uncleanness is hinted at by the use of the verb טָהַר (“to be cleaned”) in the Bible. It is associated with menstruation (Lev 12:2), impurity or corruption (Lev 20:21; Ezra 9:11b) and defilement (2 Chr 29:5). What is of importance is not only the idea that menstruation is causing woman to be ritually unclean, but the larger scope of impurity in general to which the term points. Ritual purity is at the fore of Zech

⁸³ Even here in Deut 9:21 sin and water are connected with the mountain imagery. The calf is crushed with fire and thrown into a little stream, flowing down from the mountain.

⁸⁴ Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 724.

13:1. It seems to be missing, but God wishes to restore it. Especially when we consider the following verses, the cleansing from false prophets and false worship is needed.

The participle *niphal* of פתח is used only here in Zech 13:1,⁸⁵ which makes it a little more difficult to see the contextual meaning. The *niphal stem* describes something that is done passively. The house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem cannot open a fountain for the cleansing of sin and impurity by themselves. It must be done for them. Furthermore, as Driver notes, “A *niphal* ptc which along with the verb היה (“to be”) implies that the fountain is to be open continuously.”⁸⁶

This dynamic of a continuous as well as a passively offered cleansing, brings to mind the concept of righteousness by faith⁸⁷, which is a perfect rendering of this OT sanctuary image. It may be difficult to prove that the sanctuary imagery was intended by the author as an allusion due to the lack of a clear scriptural reference, but the function of cleansing through the cultic worldview is present in Zech 13:1. The conclusion becomes more likely by the context of the preceding “pierced one” in Zech 12:10-14.⁸⁸ The mere consideration of the question: “Why does Zechariah use this image?” hints at the obvious

⁸⁵ There are other uses of the *niphal* stem in Eze 44:2; 46:1 and Neh 7:3 referring to the opening of a gate. Interestingly, in Nah 2:7 the gates of rivers are opened to destroy the palace of Nineveh.

⁸⁶ Hinckley G. Mitchell, John Merlin Powis Smith, and Julius A. Bewer, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 268. This implies that once it is opened, it will not be shut down.

⁸⁷ By righteousness by faith I mean that the sinner has nothing to bring before God to make his wrongs right. Grace is a gift from God to the sinner, which is received without any active involvement.

⁸⁸ The interpretation of 12:10-14 as referring to Jesus is not part of this thesis, therefore, some brief remarks here. It depends on the fundamental approach to the interpretation of apocalyptic materials. Retrospectively, it may seem valid to see the death of Jesus as a fulfillment of Zechariah, though there is a major historical difference. While the death of the pierced one in Zechariah is received with mourning and weeping, Jesus’ death was not. Speculating that Zechariah could have envisioned a desired outcome to the death of the pierced one (Jesus), makes it a conditional prophecy. If Jesus’ death were to be received with mourning and weeping, Zechariah’s later chapters might have found their fulfillment.

conclusion that Zechariah used an image very much familiar with his audience. The echo clearly references common sanctuary motif knowledge.

An Allusion to Cleansing?

Michael Floyd writes a precise summary in regard to fountains:

In the original paradise there was a river. Yahweh has the fountain of life (מִקְוֵה חַיִּים Ps 36:10 [Eng. 36:9]). Yahweh is the fountain of living waters (Jer 2:13). The river of life flows from under the altar of the temple in the city of God (Ezek 47:1–12; Joel 3:18; Ps 46:4; Zech 14:8). Here (13:1), as in 3:9 where another word עֵינַי which can mean fountain is used, the purpose is to cleanse the land and its people of sin.⁸⁹

The implication of what Floyd writes is that Yahweh is at the center when it comes to the fountain. He is the one who opens the fountain and, in some sort, he is the fountain himself which will bring cleansing. Boda connects the terms מִקְוֵה (“fountain, well”) and מַעְיָן (“fountain, well”) through passages in Hos 13:15 and Prov 25:26 and connects the description of the river Euphrates to it.⁹⁰ Fountains and waters are inextricably linked⁹¹ with each other in Jer 2:13 and remind the reader of Jesus in the New Testament when he says:

Everyone who drinks of this water will thirst again; but whoever drinks of the water that I will give him shall never thirst; but the water that I

⁸⁹ Floyd, *Minor Prophets: Part 2*, 279–280.

⁹⁰ Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 722.

⁹¹ Zechariah 9:11 and 10:11 use the image of “waterless pit” or “dried up rivers”. In this context this could indicate being void of God.

will give him will become in him a well of water springing up to eternal life. (John 4:13-14)

Springs and water describe a promise of God of ritual purity. Wolters notes:

Here, as often in the OT, water is a means of removing uncleanness (see Exod 29:4, Lev 11:40, 15:5-8, 17:15, 22:6, Num 8:7, 19:7, Deut 23:11).⁹²

Petersen adds the idea that

Yahweh will cause flowing water to remove sin and impurity. Since the motif of flowing water may be associated with the temple (e.g., Ezek. 47:1 and esp. Joel 3:18, though a different Hebrew word for fountain occurs there), one may assume that the fountain mentioned in Zech. 13:1 was thought to be located at the temple. In this case, the flowing water would purify those in Jerusalem who are explicitly mentioned in this saying. The sin and impurity in and of Jerusalem will be removed by the presence of this new, divinely authored fountain.⁹³

This brings us closer to our main goal, interpreting allusions to the sanctuary in Zechariah. The idea of fountains, water and cleansing is connected to the sanctuary and the cultic environment of Israel. Still, it is very difficult to prove that Zechariah had a physical temple in mind when he used this image. What has been uncovered so far through the allusions in the Garden of Eden, Sinai and Ezekiel, is that there are different nuances in each instance. Using the imagery of fountain and water does not need to be a reference to the temple building in particular, but to what is achieved through the temple: namely the presence of God by means of salvation. His presence necessitates ritual purity

⁹² Wolters, *Zechariah*, 425.

⁹³ David L. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 123–124.

which is provided by God and explains why he will open a fountain against impurity and sin. A key element of the Garden of Eden, the wilderness experience at Sinai and Ezekiel's experience is exactly his presence. Zechariah's issue is with the false prophets and the distracted Israelites. The shepherds of Zech 11 and 13:2-6; 7-9 give an indication of the rotten and defiled state of mind Israel was in. They were either unable or not interested to seek God in perilous times. It is something that God will correct by cleansing Israel. Therefore, there are strong indications by a means of echo to this cleansing of Israel in relation to the cultic life and the context of the sanctuary.⁹⁴

The Mount of Olives

וַיֵּצֵא יְהוָה וְנִלְחָם בַּגּוֹיִם הַהֵם כְּיוֹם הַלְחָמוֹ בְּיוֹם קָרָב:

וְעָמְדוּ רַגְלָיו בְּיוֹם־הַהוּא עַל־הַר הַזֹּתִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם מִקְדָּם וְנִבְקַע הַר הַזֹּתִים מִחֲצָיו מִזְרָחָה וְלִמְּוָה גַּיָּא גְדוֹלָה מְאֹד וּמֵשׁ חֲצֵי הַהָר צְפוֹנָה וְחֲצָיו־לְנֶגְבָה:

וְנִסְתָּם גַּיָּא־הָרִי כִי־יִנְגִיעַ גַּי־הָרִים אֶל־אֶצְלֹ וְנִסְתָּם כַּאֲשֶׁר נִסְתָּם מִפְּנֵי הָרְעַשׁ בֵּימֵי עֲזַרְיָה מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה וְכָא יְהִנֶּה אֱלֹהֵי כָל־קְדוֹשִׁים עִמָּו:

(“Then the Lord will go out and fight against those nations as when he fights on a day of battle. On that day his feet shall stand on the Mount of Olives that lies before Jerusalem on the east, and the Mount of Olives shall be split in two from east to west by a very wide valley, so that one half of the Mount shall move northward, and the other half southward. And you shall flee as you fled from the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah. Then the LORD my God will come, and all the holy ones with him.” Zech 13:3-5 ESV)

⁹⁴ Michael Floyd, *Minor Prophets: Part 2*, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, 22 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 550–556.

Context within Zechariah 14

The final chapter in Zechariah is ultimately apocalyptic-like, describing the future of Israel and God's plan with Israel and the nations. The previous chapters 12 and 13 have, step by step, prepared the reader for the eschatological scenario. Chapter 14 introduces God gathering the nations to battle against Jerusalem and, in conclusion, to fight against those nations (14:1-2). A means seemingly necessary in the context of chapter 13 where God opens a fountain against sin and uncleanness while the eradication of idolatry and the false prophets is further pursued. Zech 13:7-9⁹⁵ then describes the "striking of the Shepherd" (verse 7), another measure in eradicating idolatry. It builds a perfect bridge for the eschatological scenario described in Zech 14. Verses 3-5 describe a supernatural transformation of the Mount of Olives into a valley, which serves to protect the remnant mentioned in verse 2. Even the movements of the stars and planets seem to be effected (verses 6-7). Jerusalem will be the center from which "living waters" shall flow (verse 8). The final result will be that God "shall be King over all the earth" (verse 9.) and the establishment of theocracy is realized. Turning to Israel's enemies, it is stated that "their flesh will dissolve in their sockets" (verse 12). The surprising turn in chapter 14 is found at the end (verses 16-19), when the remaining and former hostile nations "go up from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles" (verse 16). The remaining two verses 20-21 conclude the chapter and the book of Zechariah. In addition, they imply that the engraving of the term "Holiness to

⁹⁵ This passage is applied by New Testament authors is applied to Jesus, who was stricken by His enemies (e.g. Matt 26:31, 56, 67; Mark 14:27;). The identity of the Shepherd in Zechariah 9-14 is largely negative. Most likely, they represent the defiled priesthood in Zechariah's times, which play into the idea that God wants to purify Israel. The one exception is 13:7, which is understood as a messianic prophecy by many scholars.

the Lord” on the bells of horses and “the pots in the Lord’s house shall be like the bowls before the altar” — they are ultimately describing the purified state of Israel when there will be no defilement left. This is underscored by the mentioning of “there shall no longer be a trader in the house of the LORD of hosts on that day” (verse 21b ESV). What is translated as “trader” here can be translated as “Canaanite” (NKJV). Finally, the Book of Zechariah ends with a reference to the sanctuary: “the house of the Lord of hosts.”

The transformation of the Mount of Olive is a crucial part of the eschatological scenario of Zechariah. It may not be a “cosmic transformation” on a global scope, but it will be argued here that there is a fundamental implication involved in this particular transformation. There is no room for a detailed interpretation of Zechariah’s view of the future, so the sole focus will be on verses 3-5.

Linguistic Insights

The exegetical insights of Zechariah 14:3-5 will be limited to two distinct markers of the passage. The first one is the Lord’s anthropomorphic description and the appearance of the Mount of Olives in the Bible. The main focus is to determine and evaluate the use of these concepts in relation to the sanctuary allusions.

In verse 3, Zechariah describes how “His feet will stand on the Mount of Olives”, thereby giving God physical, human attributes. This is not new to the biblical worldview. God is not timeless and spaceless in Hebrew cult and cosmos. Contrary to this he is the one seeking to interact with his creation on personal terms. The idea that God is presented in an anthropomorphic way⁹⁶ led scholars to put forth the following hypothesis:

⁹⁶ In verses 3-4 “the Lord will go forth” and “His feet will stand.”

Perhaps the fact that Canaanite deities ceased to be a threat to Yahwism in the postexilic period meant that the mythic motifs drawn from the old Northwest Semitic cults no longer had to be avoided. Rather, the vivid mythic portrayals of divine activity could serve the purpose of late biblical literature, whether priestly or deuteroprophetic, in underscoring the availability of God's presence and power.⁹⁷

It is interesting to me, that this description of God is troubling to some people.

Assuming that Israelites have changed their mind about the qualities of God, the question arises as to how far it has been considered that Zechariah is describing a prophecy in the apocalyptic-like part of this book. Describing God in anthropomorphic terms is a common phenomenon in the Scripture and it does not need to display an engagement with Northwest Semitic motifs or with what we are more familiar with: Greek Platonic Dualism, which suggests that God cannot have a body, due to the concept of timelessness. Describing God in anthropomorphic terms fits the experiences of the Israelites with God best. When we consider the Garden of Eden, where God was walking with Adam and Eve. Or Sinai, where God came down on the top of the Mountain. In Hebrew thought God is presented as interacting in time and space. Daniel sees the Ancient of Days in Dan 7:9-10 and describes him anthropomorphically. That is the way he sees and experiences God. Not distant. But personal and physical. Daniel describes God in anthropomorphic terms, which does not stand in contradiction to the Ten Commandments. That is why there is little basis for us to read too much into the use of an anthropomorphic device. The attempt to be different from other Northwest Semitic

⁹⁷ Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 419.

religions is rather speculative. It is the same anthropomorphic language which is described in Zech 9 when God is portrayed as the divine warrior who will fight for his people to protect them. This theme is commonly found in Scripture.⁹⁸ Rather than expecting a “priestly or deuteroprophetic” redaction, we can ascribe this anthropomorphic description of Yahweh to the stylistic means of literature itself. This stylistic mean demonstrates to us that Zechariah thought of God as interacting with humanity, building his home where his people live. This “standing” may remind the reader of Mic 1:2-4 or Amos 4:13. Contrary to our passage here, “both of these prophet’s portrayals, Yahweh’s earth-moving anthropomorphic activity is directed against Israel.”⁹⁹

God’s appearance in relation to mountains is common in Scripture. Boda notes in his commentary:

The appearance of Yahweh on a mountain is not surprising in light of the regular association between theophanies (divine appearances) and mountains throughout the OT and the ancient Near East (see commentary on 6:18). Yahweh’s presence is linked to Mount Sinai/Horeb in Exod. 19:18; Deut. 33:1-5, to Mount Zion in Ps. 50:2-3, and to Mount Paran in Hab. 3:3. Yahweh’s appearance on the Mount of Olives, however, is unique in the OT.¹⁰⁰

Boda gives important insight into the appearances of God on mountains. They are specific places where God demonstrates his presence, as already discussed with the example of Mount Sinai. The allusion of mountains in the Bible is a direct reference to

⁹⁸ War poems in such OT passages as Exod 15, Deut 33, Judges 5 and Habbakuk 3 need to be considered. They imply that the divine warrior motif has never been avoided.

⁹⁹ Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 419.

¹⁰⁰ Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 755, as we have noted previously.

God's presence. This presence can only be personally experienced when one climbs to the mountain top, like Moses did. The Mount of Olives is a particularly interesting choice. It is mentioned for the first time in 2 Sam 15:30 when David flees from Absalom's rebellion to the "slope of Olives".¹⁰¹ Just like it is meant in Ezek 11:23 where it says that God departed from Jerusalem and turned to the eastern side of the city (Ezek 10:18; 11:22), it also provided a connection of God's departure due to "idolatrous activity, which was rampant in Jerusalem, even defiling the temple itself"¹⁰². The Mount of Olives is the only mountain known in Scripture where not only God was being worshipped but also pagan gods (2 Kgs 23:13). It is located to the east of Jerusalem, which could be an indication that Jerusalem has been conquered, as Boda comments¹⁰³.

Mount of Olives: A Post-Figuration of the Tabernacle?

The Mount of Olives is a peculiar choice for a mountain. If the allusion means that mountains are associated with divine encounters, one has to wonder how the explicit mention of this image should be evaluated in the eschatological scenario in Zechariah.

Boda indicates in regards to the meaning:

The appearance of Yahweh on the Mount of Olives may be another foreshadowing of the ultimate outcome of ch. 14, which envisions the participation of the defeated nations in the Feast of Tabernacles, a festival that celebrated the olive harvest, but also used olive branches to

¹⁰¹ Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 286.

¹⁰² Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, 756.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 755.

build the booths commemorating the wilderness experience (Neh. 8:15; cf. Lev. 23:40).¹⁰⁴

The ultimate outcome in Zech 14 is immediate access to God without any hindrances. After Adam and Eve had fallen into sin by doubting God's intention, they lost access to the presence of God. Sin had left its marks on the God-humankind relationship. But God already had a plan to reunite with his beloved creation. As indicated by the architecture and symbolism of the Sanctuary, he provided humankind with a place where he could be among them while pointing forward to a time in history when he would restore the relationship with humankind. During Israel's journey, God introduced to them the categories of clean and unclean things in order to sensitize Israel for the purity he had in mind. As a result, the cult of Israel was born and deeply engrained in the nation's psyche, in addition to a solemn appeal to educate every child (Deut 6:4-9). In fact, Michael L. Morales wrote his dissertation entitled: *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured*, he proposed: "In the ancient Near East, cosmos and cult were of a piece."¹⁰⁵

This combination of cosmos and cult is especially seen in the Pentateuch where God appears to people on special occasions and on uplifted places. It was on Eden, Ararat, Sinai, Horeb and other instances when God met with mankind. Throughout his book, Morales discovers one thing, of which he writes:

Because temples are the architectural embodiment of the cosmic mountain, then it stands to reason that mountain narratives canonically

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 756.

¹⁰⁵ Morales, *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured: Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus*, 4.; R. Whitekettle, "Levitical Thought and the Female Reproductive Cycle: Wombs, Wellsprings, and the Primeval World," *Vetus Testamentum* 46 (1996): 376–391.

preceding the tabernacle/temple may serve to foreshadow the cultus of Israel – if, indeed, it may be demonstrated the mountain in question is to be understood as “cosmic,” entailing an approach to the divine Presence.¹⁰⁶

This is how we connect the allusion of the Mount of Olives to the Sanctuary in Zechariah 14:3-5. Morales argues that in order for a mountain to foreshadow the cultus of Israel one needs an approach to the divine presence. Do we find an approach to the divine presence in this passage? No, we do not. Still, this mountain serves a purpose. The image of a mountain is not chosen accidentally, but on purpose — particularly because it comprises an allusion to the Sanctuary. The aspect of approaching the divine presence is taken away through the “making a large valley”. Contextually, the valley serves as an exit strategy for the remnant in verse 2. But it has a stronger influence on the eschatological outcome. The transformation from a mountain to a valley has given humanity access to God. Comparing it to the Sinai narrative, God has descended to the mountain top (Exod 19:18) while Moses had to ascend the mountain. All it takes is for God to descend. Historically, the temple reconstruction in the post-exile era has already begun, or even finished. As seen in the previous chapters, the Garden of Eden and Mount Sinai are some sort of pre-figurations, since no sanctuary existed at that time. In the case of Ezekiel, there was a Sanctuary, but it was far away and inaccessible due to the defilement by the Babylonians. Therefore, the Glory of God manifested itself in a transfigured way to Ezekiel, which it had not done since the establishment of the tabernacle.

Once again this indicates that the eschatological nature of Zech 9-14 is prominent and may tell us about a time when there will be no need for a temple that is built by

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 6.

humanity in the future. Zechariah and Haggai were so busy with their beginning ministry to heed the rebuilding of the temple that God could have shared his vision of the future of Israel. A vision that would not be focused on sanctuaries made by humanity and that would follow after His plan of Salvation, which would have been ratified by what he described in Zech 12:10-14. God's intention is to return back to the Eden state of sinlessness. One should mention Rev 21:3-4, which states: "the tabernacle of God is among men, and He will dwell among them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself will be among them, (...) the first things have passed away." This reference in Revelation indicates that God has a sanctuary of his own. One that he will bring along when he comes to us. A sanctuary that is not a copy, but the real thing.

Zech 14 comes back to this image that God is fighting for his people and is present in their midst. Verse 8 describes that "living waters will flow out of Jerusalem", which reminds the reader of Zech 13:1 and the open fountain to cleanse sin and impurity. What if Zechariah does not explicitly mention a building called the sanctuary because God will be the sanctuary —this is true to some degree and yet even Revelation testifies of God's sanctuary in Rev 7:15. This leads us to the only reasonable conclusion. God has a physical home, which he calls sanctuary. This original sanctuary must be placed in heaven, where God is. It is this original that was shown to Moses in Exod 25:8-40. His presence and power and His fountain of living water are ultimately what humanity needs. All allude to the cosmology of the sanctuary that the Israelites are familiar with and hoping for. It is this scenario depicted in the final verses of Zechariah when there is no more need for a manmade building. This depiction of the sanctuary is not a prefiguration because the eschatological nature indicates another realm in time. This depiction comes

very close to what we find in the Book of Revelation. Therefore, Zechariah depicts a return to the original sanctuary, which all manmade/earthly sanctuary have been centered around. The Garden of Eden, Sinai and Ezekiel all depict variants of that pattern described in Exod 25:8.40. Zechariah seems to close with the sanctuary that humanity has made, offering us the outlook to spend time and worship him in his original house.

Conclusion

This paper's thesis is: Could Zechariah be hinting to a time, where the earthly sanctuary has fulfilled its intended historical purpose and is now "post"-figured?

In order to assess this thesis, the topic of genre was analyzed. Apocalyptic writing is meant to give insight into eschatological events and outcomes, especially in time of crisis. After looking at different criteria proposed by Collins, some elements were present while other important elements were missing. It was then proposed to treat proto-apocalyptic writing like apocalyptic-like writing. In a second step, the term 'allusion' was defined and how they can be determined by means of verbal, structural or thematically parallels. In addition, five categories for allusions were introduced. After discovering that the Garden of Eden is certainly an allusion, it also became clear that its character is best described as a pre-figuration of the earthly tabernacle, but a representation of the heavenly original pattern. The Sinai narrative has strong relations to the concept of God's presence and the mountain image is used and associated with the presence of the divine. However, reasons were put forward as to why it is difficult to categorize this passage as just an allusion. It appears to be much more fundamental than an allusion, establishing the Israelite cult and cosmos. At the core of this cult and cosmos is God's presence. This

presence around the Sinai narrative again reminded us of elements, which most likely are connected to the heavenly sanctuary. The critical passage discussed was in Ezek 11:16 where God uses the sanctuary motif in a very peculiar way due to the special circumstances — He wanted to become a sanctuary in some measure for the Israelites in exile because they had no access to the sanctuary still existing in Jerusalem. It is a form of a transfigured sanctuary. With this in mind, it became clear that no particular passage in chapters 9-11 can be identified as an allusion to the sanctuary. Moreover, the context for the eschatological chapters 12-14 was further explored.

Zech 13:1, where “a fountain shall be opened”, clearly indicates the cultic identification as an allusion to the grand perspective of purification needed in the sanctuary. The purification is brought about by God himself. It is him who purifies Israel by eradicating idolatry and false prophets in Zech 13:2-6. This continued in chapter 14 with the purification through war between the apostate “shepherds” and the surrounding nations. The ultimate outcome in 14:19-21, where the remaining nations coming before God to worship him, is initiated in 14:3-5. Zechariah uses the image of the Mount of Olives coming down by an earthquake and turning into a valley to indicate that humankind does not need to try and reach up to God anymore.

It has been argued that the Bible uses the image of the sanctuary in a prefigurative sense (Garden of Eden) and a transfigured sense (Ezek 11:16). In the apocalyptic context of Zechariah 9-14, this would indicate a post-figurative use of the sanctuary motif or in other words: A return to the original sanctuary, made by God. God’s presence among his people has finally been realized. His people are restored to a pre-fall condition. Given all the evidence examined, this interpretation is a logical conclusion. Therefore, Zechariah’s

message of the presence of God reaches from uncertain ancient times to our current uncertain times, providing God's people with glimpses of hope and assurance.

Bibliography

- Adam, A. K. M. “‘What These Cryptic Symbols Mean’: Quotation, Allusion, and John Darnielle’s Biblical Interpretation.” *Biblical Interpretation* 19, no. No. 2 (2011): 109–128.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. “Apocalyptic Themes in Biblical Literature.” *Interpretation* 53, no. No. 2 (1999): 117–130.
- Allen, Garrick V. “Textual Pluriformity and Allusion in the Book of Revelation: The Text of Zechariah 4 in the Apocalypse.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 106, no. 1 (2015): 136–145.
- _____. “Zechariah’s Horse Visions and Angelic Intermediaries: Translation, Allusion, and Transmission in Early Judaism.” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2017): 222–239.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester, UK: Intervarsity, 1972.
- _____. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary*. InterVarsity, 1972.
- Barker, Kenneth L. “Zechariah.” Pages 595–697 in *Daniel—The Minor Prophets*. The Expositor’s Bible Commentary, vol 7. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1985.
- Baron, David. *The Visions & Prophecies of Zechariah: The Prophet of Hope and of Glory*. 2nd Edition. London: Morgen & Scott, 1918.
- Bartholomew, Craig G. *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham J. G. McConville, Karl Möller*. Edited by J.G. McConville and Karl Möller. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Barton, John, and John Muddiman, eds. *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2001.
- Beale, Gregory K. “Eden, the Temple, and the Church’s Mission the New Creation.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 1 (2005): 5–31.
- Bibby, Reginald Wayne. “The Future as an Allusion: Using Social and Personal Forecasts to Uncover Explicit and Implicit Religion.” *Implicit Religion* 19, no. No. 3 (2016): 439–454.
- Boda, Mark J. *A Severe Mercy: Sin and Its Remedy in the Old Testament*. Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

- _____. “Freeing the Burden of Prophecy: Maśśā’ and the Legitimacy of Prophecy in Zech 9-14.” *Biblica* 87, no. 3 (2006): 338–357.
- _____. “From Fasts to Feasts: The Literary Function of Zechariah 7-8.” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (July 2003): 390–407.
- _____. *Haggai, Zechariah*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004.
- _____. “Majoring on the Minors: Recent Research on Haggai and Zechariah.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 2, no. 1 (October 2003): 33–68.
- _____. “Priestly Expansions within Haggai-Malachi and the Twelve.” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 43, no. No. 2 (Sum 2016): 177–185.
- _____. *The Book of Zechariah*. The New International Commentary of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Boda, Mark J., and Michael H. Floyd, eds. *Bringing out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9 - 14*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 370. New York, NY: Sheffield Academic, 2003.
- Boda, Mark J., Michael H. Floyd, and Colin M. Toffelmire, eds. *The Book of the Twelve & the New Form Criticism*. Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Near East Monographs. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.
- Brandenburg, Hans. *Die Kleinen Propheten II*. Gießen: Brunnen, 1963.
- Brown, William P. *Obadiah through Malachi*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- Buchanan, John M. “Zechariah’s Problem.” *The Christian Century* 132, no. No. 25 (December 2015): 3.
- Calvin, Johannes. *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets: Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai*. Calvin’s Commentaries. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2009.
- Carter, John W. “An Introduction to the Interpretation of Apocalyptic Literature.” *Journal of Biblical Theology* 2, no. No. 1 (2019): 132–152.
- Collins, John J. “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre.” *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–20.
- Cook, Stephen L. “The Metamorphosis of a Shepherd: The Tradition History of Zechariah 11:17 + 13:7-9.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, no. 55 (1993): 453–66.
- Crotty, R.B. “The Suffering Moses of Deutero-Zechariah.” *Colloquium* 14 (1982): 43–50.

- Curtis, Byron G. *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*. Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblia 25. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Davidson, Richard M. "Biblical Principles for Interpreting Apocalyptic Prophecy." In *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical and Practical Insights*, 43–73. Scripture Symposium Number 1. Edited by Ron du Preez. Lansing, MI: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventist, 2007.
- _____. "Biblical Principles for Interpreting Old Testament Classical Prophecy." In *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical and Practical Insights*. Scripture Symposium Number 1. Edited by Ron du Preez. Lansing, MI: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2007.
- _____. "Earth's First Sanctuary: Genesis 1-3 and Parallel Creation Accounts." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015): 65–89.
- _____. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
- _____. *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Τύπος Structures*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.
- Davis, Ellen F. "The Tabernacle Is Not a Storehouse: Building Sacred Space." *Sewanee Theological Review* 49, no. 3 (2006): 305–319.
- Dederen, Raoul, ed. *Handbook of Seventh-Day Adventist Theology*. Commentary Reference Series Vol. 12. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald Pub. Association, 2000.
- DiFransico, Lesley. "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusion through Metaphor: Washing Away Sin in Psalm 51." *Vetus Testamentum* 65, no. 4 (2015): 542–557.
- Dominic, Paul A. "The Apocalyptic with a Difference." *The Way* 52, no. No 1. (2013): 65–80.
- Doukhan, Jacques B. *Genesis*. Seventh-day Adventist International Bible Commentary. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016.
- Ego, Beate, Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Kristin De Troyer, eds. *Minor Prophets*. Biblia Qumranica, vol. 3B. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Eidsvag, Gunnar Magnus. *The Old Greek Translation of Zechariah*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 170. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Evans, Craig A. "The Implications of Eyewitness Tradition." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31, no. 2 (December 2008): 211–219.

- Fee, Gordon D., and Robert L. Hubbard Jr., eds. *The Eerdmans Companion to the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Floyd, Michael H. *Minor Prophets: Part 2. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature*, 22. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- _____. “The מַסָּא (Massa’) as a Type of Prophetic Book.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121, no. 3 (Autumn 2002): 401–422.
- _____. “Welcome Back, Daughter of Zion!” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 70 (2008): 485–504.
- _____. “Zechariah and Changing Views of Second Temple Judaism in Recent Commentaries.” *Religious Studies Review* 25, no. 3 (July 1999): 257–263.
- Foster, Robert. “Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization: A Fresh Look at Zechariah 11:4–17.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126, no. 4 (2007): 735–753.
- _____. “Undoing the Future: The Theology of the Book of Zechariah.” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 34 (2012): 59–72.
- Frolov, Serge. “Is the Narrator Also among the Prophets? Reading Zechariah without Presuppositions.” *Biblical Interpretation* 13, no. 1 (2005): 13–40.
- Gibson, Jonathan. “Covenant Continuity and Fidelity: Inner-Biblical Allusion and Exegesis in Malachi.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 66, no. No. 2 (2015): 313–316.
- Goldingay, J., and P. Scalise. *Minor Prophets II Old Testament Series*. New International Biblical Commentary, 18. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Goswell, Greg. “The Eschatology of Malachi after Zechariah 14.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132, no. 3 (2013): 625–638.
- Graets, H. “The Last Chapter of Zechariah: The Central Sanctuary of Deuteronomy.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 3, no. 2 (January 1891): 208–230.
- Gulley, Norman R. *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2003.
- Guthrie, Donald, and Motyer, eds. *Brockhaus Kommentar Zur Bibel 3: Jesaja - Maleachi*. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1982.
- Hanson, Paul D. “Apocalypticism.” Pages 157–161 in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia*, vol. 1. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1976.

- _____. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- _____. "Zechariah 9 and the Recapitulation of an Ancient Ritual Pattern." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 37–59.
- Harriman, K. R. "The King Arrives, but for What Purpose?: The Christological Use of Zechariah 13-14 in Mark 13." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 10, no. 2 (2016): 283–298.
- Hellholm, David. "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 13–64.
- Hill, Andrew E. "Dating Second Zechariah: A Linguistic Reexamination." *Hebrew Annual Review* 6 (1982): 105–134.
- Hinckley, Robert. "Adam, Aaron, and the Garden Sanctuary." *Logia* 22, no. 4 Reformation (2013): 5–12.
- Høgenhaven, Jesper. "The Book of Zechariah at Qumran." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 27, no. 1 (2013): 107–117.
- Isaac, Gordon L. "Eschatology vs. Apocalyptic." *Liturgical Ministry* 19, no. No. 1 (Winter 2010): 21–28.
- Jingling-Tsai-Chen, Jenny. "The Use of Zechariah 14 in the Book of Revelation." Dallas Theological Seminary, 2004.
- Keck, Elizabeth. "The Glory of Yahweh in Ezekiel and the Pre-Tabernacle Wilderness." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 37, no. 2 (December 2012): 201–218.
- Keuss, Jeffrey F. "Marilynne Robinson and the Literary Self: The Gift of Pre-Apocalyptic Literature in the Age of Rational Religion." *Crux* 52, no. No. 3-4 (2016): 49–57.
- Klein, George L. *Zechariah*. New American Commentary, 21B. Nashville, TN: B&H, 2008.
- Kline, Jonathan G. "Transforming the Tradition: Soundplay as an Interpretive Device in Innerbiblical Allusions." *Harvard Theological Review* 107, no. No. 4 (2014): 500.
- Larkin, Katrina. *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah: A Study of the Formation of Mantological Wisdom Anthology*. Leiden: Kok Pharos, 1994.
- Laubach, Fritz. *Wuppertaler Studienbibel: Der Prophet Sacharja*. 2nd ed. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1984.
- Leske, Adrian M. "Context and Meaning of Zechariah 9:9." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62,

- no. 4 (October 2000): 663–678.
- Longman, Tremper, III, Mark J. Boda, Al Wolters, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, Howard I. Marshall, Tom Thatcher, Cynthia Long Westfall, and Craig A. Evans. *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Memaster New Testament Studies. Eerdmans, 2007.
- Lunn, Nicholas P. “The Temple in the Wilderness: Allusions to the Hebrew Sanctuary in the Baptism and Temptations of Christ.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 59, no. No. 4 (2016): 701–716.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis; MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2001.
- Mason, Rex A. “The Relation of Zech 9-14 to Proto-Zechariah.” *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 227–239.
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward. “Alteration of OT Imagery in the Book of Revelation: Its Hermeneutical and Theological Significance.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36, no. 3 (September 1993): 307–316.
- Meek, Russell. “Intertextuality, Inner-Biblical Exegesis, and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Ethics of a Methodology.” *Biblica* 95, no. 2 (2014): 280–291.
- Menken, Martinus J J. “Striking the Shepherd: Early Christian Versions and Interpretations of Zechariah 13,7.” *Biblica* 92, no. 1 (2011): 39–59.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *An Exegetical Commentary - Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Minor Prophets Exegetical Commentary Series. Biblical Studies Press, 2003.
- _____. “Remembering: A Central Theme in Biblical Worship.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 43, no. 1 (March 2000): 27–36.
- _____. “Royal Priesthood: An Old Testament Messianic Motif.” *Bibliotheca sacra* 150, no. 597 (January 1993): 50–61.
- Meyer, F. B. *The Prophet of Hope: Expositions of the Book of Zechariah*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1952.
- Meyers, Carol L, and Eric M Meyers. *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Miller, Geoffrey David. “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 9, no. No. 3 (2011): 283–309.
- Mitchell, Hinckley G., John Merlin Powis Smith, and Julius A. Bewer. *Haggai, Zechariah,*

- Malachi and Jonah*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Moberly, R. W. L. "Scriptural Echoes and Gospel Interpretation: Some Questions." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 11, no. No. 1 (September 2017): 5–20.
- Morales, Michael L. *Cult and Cosmos: Tilting Toward a Temple-Centered Theology*. Biblical Tools and Studies, vol. 18. Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014.
- _____. *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured: Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus*. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- Morner, Kathleen, and Ralüh Rausch. *NTC's Dictionary of Literary Terms: The Comprehensive, Easy-to-Understand Reference to Critical and Literary Terms*. Lincolnwood (Chicago): IL: National Textbook Company, 1991.
- Moseman, David R. "Reading the Two Zechariahs As One." *Review and Expositor* 97 (Fall 2000): 487–498.
- _____. "The Date Formulae in the Book of Zechariah: An Important Key for Interpreting Zechariah." *Review and Expositor* 106, no. 4 (2009): 575–589.
- Ndekha, Louis W. "Zechariah the Model Priest: Luke and the Characterisation of Ordinary Priests in Luke-Acts." *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 74, no. No. 1 (2018): 1–7.
- Niditch, Susan. "Good Blood, Bad Blood: Multivocality, Metonymy, and Meditation in Zechariah 9." *Vetus testamentum* 61, no. 4 (2011): 629–645.
- Nogalski, James D., and Marvin A. Sweeney, eds. *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 15. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- O'Kennedy, Daniël Francois. "Key Themes in Zechariah 1-8." *Old Testament Essays* 32, no. No. 1 (2019): 215–228.
- Patterson, Richard D., and Hill, Andrews E. *Minor Prophets, Hosea-Malachi*. Cornerstone Biblical Commentary, Vol 10. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale, 2008.
- Paulien, Jon. *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and the Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 11. Berrien Spring, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988.
- Perowne, T.T. *Haggai and Zechariah, with Notes and Introduction*. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1890.
- Person, Raymond F. *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School*. Journal for the Study of the

- Old Testament Supplement Series 167. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993
- Petersen, David L. *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- _____. "Zechariah's Visions: A Theological Perspective." *Vetus Testamentum* XXXIV, no. 2 (1984): 195–206.
- Peterson, Anthony, R. *Haggai, Zechariah & Malachi*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015.
- _____. *Behold Your King: The Hope Fore the House of David in the Book of Zechariah*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 513. New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2009.
- _____. "The Shape of the Davidic Hope across the Book of the Twelve." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 35, no. 2 (2010): 225–246.
- Philipps, Elizabeth. "Narrating Catastroph, Cultivating Hope: Apocalyptic Practices and Theological Virtue." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 31, no. No. 1 (2018): 17–22.
- Prinsloo, G. T. M. "Inner-Biblical Allusion in Habakkuk's נשׁמ(Hab 1:1-2:20) and Utterances Concerning Babylon in Isaiah 13-23 (Isa 13:1-14:23; 21:1-10)." *Old Testament Essays* 31, no. No. 3 (2018): 663–691.
- Proebstle, Martin. *Himmel auf Erden - Gott begegnet uns im Heiligtum*. 1st ed. Wien: Top Life - Wegweiser-Verlag, 2013.
- Pyper, Hugh S. "Reading in the Dark: Zechariah, Daniel and the Difficulty of Scripture." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29, no. 4 (2005): 485–504.
- Redditt, Paul L. *Introduction to the Prophets*. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.
- _____. "Israel's Shepherds: Hope and Pessimism in Zechariah 9-14." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (October 1989): 631–642.
- _____. "Nehemiah's First Mission and the Date of Zechariah 9-14." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (October 1994): 664–678.
- _____. "Prophecy and the Monarchy in Haggai and Zechariah." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 76, no. 3 (July 2014): 436–449.
- _____. "Recent Research on the Book of the Twelve as One Book." *Currents in Research* 9 (2001): 47–80.
- _____. *Sacharja 9-14*. Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament.

- Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014.
- _____. “The Rhetoric of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology.” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 28, no. 4 (2001): 361–371.
- _____. “The Two Shepherds in Zechariah 11:4-17.” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (October 1993): 676–686.
- Rhyder, Julia. “‘The Temple Which You Will Build for Me in the Land’: The Future Sanctuary in a Textual Tradition of Leviticus.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24, no. No. 2 (2017): 271–300.
- Rodríguez, Angel M. “Sanctuary Theology in the Book of Exodus.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 24, no. 2 (1986): 131–137.
- Rom-Shiloni, Dalit. “‘How Can You Say, ‘I Am Not Defiled...’” (Jeremiah 2:20-25): Allusions to Priestly Legal Traditions in the Poetry of Jeremiah.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133, no. 4 (2014): 757–775.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Haggai, Sacharja 1-8, Sacharja 9-14, Maleachi*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament 13/4. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976.
- Schaefer, Konrad R. “Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion.” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 66–91.
- Schellenberg, Angeline. “One in the Bond of War: The Unity of Deutero-Zechariah.” *Didaskalia (Otterburne, Man.)* 12, no. 2 (2001): 101–115.
- Seufert, Matthew. “Zechariah 1.11’s Allusion to Isaiah and Jeremiah.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 42, no. No. 2 (December 2017): 247–263.
- Seufert, Matthew, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of The Prophets*. New York, NY: Oxford University, 2016.
- Shea, William H. “The Seleucids as Cedars, and the Maccabees, Messiah and Herodians as the Shepherds in Zechariah 11.” Pages 141–163 in “*For You Have Strengthened Me*”: *Biblical and Theological Studies in Honor of Gerhard Pfandl in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Martin Pröbstle. St. Peter am Hart, Austria: Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2007.
- Shin, Seoung-Yun. “A Diachronic Study of the Language of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 135, no. 2 (2016): 265–281.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah-Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary, 32. Dallas, TX: Nelson/Word, 1998.

- Smith, John, Merlin Powis, and Julius August Bewer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*. International Critical Commentary. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- Souza, Elias Brasil de. *The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple Motif in the Hebrew Bible*. Adventist Theological Dissertation Series 7. Berrien Springs, MI: ATS Publications, 2005.
- Speedling, Barbara Baker. "Celebrating Sabbath as a Holistic Health Practice: The Transformative Power of a Sanctuary in Time." *Journal of Religion and Health* 58, no. No. 4 (2019): 1382–1400.
- Steiner, Richard C. "Four Inner-Biblical Interpretations of Genesis 49:10: On the Lexical and Syntactic Ambiguities of 'ad [Hebrew Characters] as Reflected in the Prophecies of Nathan, Ahjiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132, no. 1 (2013): 33–60.
- Sweeney, Marvin Alan. *The Twelve Prophets: Micah, Nahum, Habbakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Taylor, John B. *Ezekiel: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 22. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1969.
- Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia. "Compelled by Honour - A New Interpretation of Zechariah ii 12a (8a)." *Vetus testamentum* 54, no. 3 (2004): 352–372.
- _____. "Through a Glass Darkly: Zechariah's Unprocessed Visionary Experience." *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 573–594.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J C. "More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18, no. 2 (December 1987): 137–144.
- Timmer, Daniel C. *The Non-Israelite Nations in the Book of the Twelve: Thematic Coherence and the Diachronic-Synchronic Relationship in the Minor Prophets*. Biblical Interpretation Series, vol. 135. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Treves, Marco. "Conjectures Concerning the Date and Authorship of Zechariah 9-14." *Vetus Testamentum* 13, no. 1 (1963): 196–207.
- Ulrich, Eugene, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants Volume 2: Isaiah-Twelve Minor Prophets*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Unger, Merrill Frederick. *Zechariah: Prophet of Messiah's Glory*. Zondervan, 1963.
- Walvoord, John F., and Roy B. Zuck, eds. *Jesaja - Maleachi*. 3rd Edition. Das Alte Testament: Erklärt und Ausgelegt, vol. 3. Holzgerlingen: Hänssler, 2000.

Way, Kenneth C. "Donkey Domain: Zechariah 9:9 and Lexical Semantics." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129, no. 1 (2010): 105–114.

Werser, Nicholas R. "Second Temple Jewish Literary Traditions in 2 Peter." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 78, no. No. 1 (January 2016): 111–130.

Weyde, Karl William. "Once Again the Term MAŚŠĀ' in Zechariah 9:1; 12:1 and in Malachi 1:1: What Is Its Significance?" *Acta Theologica* 26 (2018): 251–267.

Whitekettle, R. "Levitical Thought and the Female Reproductive Cycle: Wombs, Wellsprings, and the Primeval World." *Vetus Testamentum* 46 (1996): 376–391.

Wolters, Al. *Zechariah*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

_____. "Zechariah 14: A Dialogue with the History of Interpretation." *Mid-American Journal of Theology* 13 (2002): 39–56.

_____. "Semantic Borrowing and Inner-Greek Corruption in LXX Zechariah 11:8." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 4 (1999): 685–690.

_____. "Targumic KRWB (Zechariah 14:20)=Greek Koryphaia." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115, no. 4 (1996): 710–713.

Yee, Gale A., Hugh R. Page, and Coomber, eds. *The Old Testament and Apocrypha*. Fortress Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2014.

Yogev, Jonathan. "The Seven Eyes of God." *Vetus Testamentum* 69, no. No. 2 (2019): 307–319.

The Holy Bible, English Standard Version (ESV). Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2007.

The New American Standard Bible (NASB). La Habra, CA: The Lockman Foundation, 1995.