

MESSIANIC HOPE AND DAVIDIC COVENANT IN THE CLASSICAL PROPHETS

Guilherme Brasil de Souza

Bachelor's in theology from Southern Adventist University, and Master of Arts in Religion at Yale University. PhD student in Religion and Society at Princeton Theological Seminary.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4340-9968>

E-mail: guibrasil1993@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Messianic hope in the Old Testament has been a debated topic. R. E. Clements states that “virtually all of the major books on Old Testament theology say very little about such messianic hope and, even when they do, do so in a very guarded and circumscribed way.” Despite Clement’s negative assessment, this paper argues for the presence of messianic hope in biblical prophets based on their allusions to the Davidic covenant (1 Sam. 7:1-17). Due to space limitations, this paper will restrict itself to a theological study of the prophetic literature, arguing that a canonical reading of the text indicates the expectation of a future king who would restore David's kingdom

Keywords: Teologia Bíblica. Profetas Clássicos. Esperança messiânica.

RESUMO

A esperança messiânica no Antigo Testamento tem sido um tema debatido. R. E. Clements afirma que “praticamente todos os principais livros sobre a teologia do Antigo Testamento dizem muito pouco sobre essa esperança messiânica e, mesmo quando o fazem, fazem-no de uma forma muito cautelosa e circunscrita”. Apesar da avaliação negativa de Clements, este artigo defende a presença de esperança messiânica nos profetas bíblicos com base nas suas alusões à aliança davídica (1 Sam. 7:1-17). Devido às limitações de espaço, este artigo se restringirá a um estudo teológico da literatura profética, argumentando que uma leitura canônica do texto indica a expectativa de um futuro rei que restauraria o reino de Davi.

Palavras-chave: Biblical Theology. Classical Prophets. Messianic hope.

INTRODUCTION

Messianic hope in the Old Testament has been a debated topic. R. E. Clements (1989) states that “virtually all of the major books on Old Testament theology say very little about such messianic hope and, even when they do, do so in a very guarded and circumscribed way”¹. Despite Clement’s negative assessment, this paper argues for the presence of messianic hope in biblical prophets based on their allusions to the Davidic covenant (1 Sam. 7:1-17)². Due to space limitations, this paper will restrict itself to a theological study of the prophetic literature, arguing that a canonical reading of the text indicates the expectation of a future king who would restore David's kingdom³.

1 THE DAVIDIC COVENANT

To understand this concept of future hope in the prophetic literature, one must first understand the Davidic covenant in 2 Samuel 7:1-17, which formed the precondition for it⁴. This text begins with David’s desire to build a house for the Lord⁵. The Lord replied by reversing David’s request and promising to make a “house” (בַּיִת) for him. The term בַּיִת in this context

¹ See J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), p. 77, where he says that “we have very little evidence of messianism in Judaism in the period 500-200 BCE, but our evidence for Judaism in this period is scanty in any case. Attempts to find messianic expectation in Chronicles are unconvincing”.

² The author of this paper recognizes that word “messianic” is very loaded. For this reason, will attempt to restrict himself to use “eschatological/future hope” expression, since he believes this better captures the idea of the relationship between prophets and the Davidic covenant. The issues of messianic interpretation, the relationship between the Old and New Testament, and the nature of prophecy itself will have to be covered in another paper.

³ This canonical approach was pioneered by Brevard Childs and influenced the Yale post-liberal school of theology. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 72, made the excellent point that in studying the Old Testament on should conduct a “theological reflection which studies the canonical text in detailed exegesis, and seeks to do justice to the witness of both testaments in the light of its subject matter who is Jesus Christ”. He then goes on to say that “There is no one overarching hermeneutical theory by which to resolve the tension between the testimony of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament with its transformed Old Testament. Yet the challenge of Biblical theology is to engage in the continual activity of theological reflection which studies the canonical text in detailed exegesis and seeks to do justice to the witness of both testaments in the light of its subject matter who is Jesus Christ” (CHILD, 1993, p. 72).

⁴ Markus Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), p. 44-45, makes a good point when he says: “what planted the seeds of hope for a Messiah firmly in the royal ideology of Israel was the early belief in the permanent rule of the house of David”.

⁵ P. K. McCarter Jr., *2 Samuel* (Anchor Bible 9; Garden City: Doubleday, 1984), p. 205-208, sees this unit as a literary whole.

designates the dynasty promised to the king. This becomes evident in vv. 13-16, where Yahweh promised to establish David's throne forever (v. 13). In the same breath, Yahweh also promised to punish the king if he committed iniquity; however, he would not take his "steadfast love" from David (v. 15)⁶. The text finalizes with the promise that David's throne would be established "forever" (v. 16).

The lack of stipulations in this covenant shows its unconditional nature. Contrary to the suzerainty treaty of Sinai, the Davidic covenant parallels royal grant treaties found in the Ancient Near East (MCCARTER JR., 2008, p. 205). In this case, God granted David a perpetual dynasty. Although texts such as 1 Kings 9:6-9 and 2 Chronicles 7:19-22 might appear to contradict the unconditionality of this covenant, the core element of the covenant remains paradoxically unconditional. As Willis J. Beecher explained, "any member of the line of David may, by sin, forfeit his own share in the promise, but he may not forfeit that which belongs to his successors to eternity" (BEECHER, 1905, p. 232)⁷.

This tension between the (un)conditional nature of the Davidic covenant would be further explored in the prophetic literature. Despite the threat of corrupt kings, exile, and foreign domination, the prophets would direct their audiences to the future hope of a Davidic monarch who would restore order⁸.

2 AMOS

In the final chapter of his book, Amos predicts the restoration of the "David's booth" (Amos 9:11). Francis I. Anderson and David N. Freedman have alerted readers to the eschatological dimensions of this text⁹. For them, this verse symbolized the eschatological

⁶ Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1990), p. 255, says that "Saul could lose Yahweh's *hesed*, but David, David's son, and David's line can never lose Yahweh's loyalty. Yahweh has made an unconditional promise".

⁷ Felix H. Cortez, *"The Anchor of the Soul that Enters within the Veil": The Ascension of the "Son" in the Letter to the Hebrews* (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2008), p. 60, also makes the insightful point that "The Davidic covenant was unconditional when referring to David's progeny in general; but conditional, when referring to individual Davidic rulers".

⁸ Sigmund Mowinkel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), p. 96, suggested that the idea that the covenant itself "had a certain relation to the future; or, more precisely, it was never fully realized; but there always remained something to be desired".

⁹ Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible 24A (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 903-904, have cautioned readers "not

restoration of the Davidic kingdom, “when the nations will come to Jerusalem to pay homage and tribute to the one true God” (ANDERSEN; FREEDMAN, 2008, p. 903-904). Most likely “the whole restored Davidic kingdom” (ANDERSEN; FREEDMAN, 2008, p. 903-904) is envisaged here.

Although scholars have tended to read this text as a later expansion on earlier material, an earlier dating would be plausible considering the text’s wider literary context¹⁰. The prophet’s dissatisfaction with the Davidic monarchy could be interpreted as a polemic against Ahaz’s political alliance with Assyria during the Syro-Ephraimite War¹¹.

Despite Ahaz’s apostasy in relying on Assyria for help, the prophet believed Yahweh would restore “David’s booth” in accordance with the covenant in 2 Samuel 7:1-14. Ahaz’s failure to live to the standard of David could not abrogate the ultimate unconditionality of the Davidic covenant.

3 MICAH

Micah reiterates Davidic line restoration theme. This time focused not on David’s booth restoration, but on the birth of a new Davidic king. Micah 5:2-5 describes this birth as taking place in the city of Bethlehem, where David was born¹².

The mention of David in Micah 5:2 proves to be another instance where the prophets’ theology of future hope was rooted — in the Davidic covenant. Andersen and Freedman (2008) argued that the Hebrew word מוֹצֵאָה in this verse, should rather have been read as its masculine cognate (מוֹצֵא) with the meaning of origin. For them, this text is derived “out of the original covenant that promised David an enduring dynasty (2 Sam. 7)” (ANDERSEN; FREEDMAN,

[to] expect to apply historical literalism to a passage like this context”.

¹⁰ J. J. M. Roberts, “The Old Testament’s Contribution to Messianic Expectations” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, edited by James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992), p. 44-45, suggests that both Amos 6:2 and Isaiah 10:9 mention the fall of Kullani as an event “with profound consequences for Israelite and Judean security”. He also alludes to the opportunity that Amos could have been written by a writer who was rooted in the Zion theology making an 8th century B.C.E date possible. See also G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, translation D. M. G. Stalker (New York, NY, 1960), v. 2, p. 130-138.

¹¹ See Hans Walter Wolff, *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1977), p. 277.

¹² Delbert R. Hillers points to the significance of this connection between the new ruler and David being born in the same city. See in Delbert R. Hillers, *Micah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 65.

2008, p. 467). In that case, this oracle would be referring “to the covenant guarantees that David’s line would endure forever, interpreted now as ancient predictions of a Davidic messiah for the End-time” (ANDERSEN; FREEDMAN, 2008, p. 467)¹³.

The second half of the oracle points to the “reestablishment ‘of primal rule’ of a Davidic king who would fulfill the promises outlined in chapter 4” (ANDERSEN; FREEDMAN, 2008, p. 468)¹⁴. This David would care for his flock in the strength of the Lord. The future king would “be great to the ends of the earth” (5:2). This image of the exaltation of the Davidic shepherd would be echoed later in Jeremiah 23:1-4 and Ezekiel 34:23-25 after the extinction of the Davidic monarchy.

Despite the inadequate reign of Uzziah, Jotham, and Ahaz, the prophet envisioned a future when God would raise a new king¹⁵. This king would shepherd his people like David (ROBERTS, 1992, p. 45; HILLERS, 1984, p. 65-69).

4 ISAIAH

The promise of the Davidic kingdom restoration and the birth of the child reappear in two key passages: Isaiah 9:1-7 and 11:1-5. The former announces the birth of this child. This child receives the appellations “wonderful counselor, mighty God, everlasting Father, Prince of Peace (9:6)”. Attempts have been made to identify this child with Hezekiah, and his unique names within the context of Egyptian enthronement ceremonies. Such attempts have faced chronological and linguistic challenges¹⁶. Aside from the fact that the date of Hezekiah’s birth does not match this prophecy, only four names are mentioned instead of the usual five in Egyptian enthronement scenes¹⁷.

¹³ Hillers (1984, p. 66) is also open to the possibility that this passage could have been read as speaking of a “new Messianic king who will be born of the old line, or he (Micah) is talking about the reappearance of David himself”.

¹⁴ Andersen and Freedman (2008, p. 468), commenting on this theme point to the Christological implications that such a text had for later Christian readers: “So Christians did not abuse the text when they found Jesus in it. Or to put it more cautiously in a negative way, this mysterious language relates the *mōšēl* whose outings have been from the olden days to God (lî) in a special way. He will rule ‘for’ Yahweh”.

¹⁵ Hillers (1984, p. 66) holds the view that Micah is writing a polemic against the current Judean king.

¹⁶ John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1986), asserts that “this view flies in the face of the chronology of Hezekiah’s birth, and even more seriously, it is evident from the language that no merely human king is being spoken of. This is clearly an eschatological figure, the Messiah” (OSWALT, 1986, p. 245).

¹⁷ For a view favoring the Egyptian royal enthronement tradition see Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary*

Moreover, the child is given divine epithets unprecedented for any Davidic king (OSWALT, 1986, p. 248). The mention of “endless peace for the throne of David” in 9:7 indicates that the prophet “envisions the ideal Davidic monarch” (OSWALT, 1986, p. 248). Brevard Childs (2001, p. 81) recognized the unique attributes of this Davidic king saying: “Each name brings out some extraordinary quality for the divinely selected ruler: a counsellor of unique wisdom and abundant power, endowed with enduring life, and the bringer of eternal peace. [...] the description of his reign makes it absolutely clear that his role is messianic”. Grounded on the Davidic covenant, Isaiah hoped for a Davidic monarch who would “replace once and for all the unfaithful reign of kings like Ahaz” (CHILDS, 2001, p. 81).

This hope in the arrival of a Davidic king would be complemented by the hope of a new kingdom in 11:6-9. The reference to the stump of Jesse in 11:1 makes the connection between the two texts possible. For Akins (1995, p. 213), Isaiah 11:6-9 provided “the culmination” of the Immanuel oracles in Isaiah and the location where “the ideal king like David is powerfully portrayed”. The imagery of the text makes this evident. The narrative in 11:9-6 is scripted as a “return to paradise” (CHILDS, 2001, p. 103). The imagery of a wolf lying with the lamb and cow and bear grazing together fits well with the eschatological hope envisioned by the prophets. For Brevard Childs (2001, p. 104), what Isaiah envisioned in this text “was not a return to a mythical age of primordial innocence, but the sovereign execution of a new act of creation in which the righteous will of God is embraced and the whole earth now reflects a reverent devotion ‘as water covers the sea’”. In this new era of creation, the Davidic king of announced in 9:1-7 would rule.

Therefore, Isaiah’s eschatological vision, similarly to Amos and Micah, reiterates the prophetic hope of a new future in based Davidic covenant. Despite the failure of Davidic kings such as Ahaz to live to the standard of their forefather, God was going to set up a new Davidic king. In his reign the created order would be restored (11:1-9) and ruled under one divine king.

(Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), p. 80. Oswalt (1986, p. 246), on the other hand asserts that “this view flies in the face of the chronology of Hezekiah’s birth, and even more seriously, it is evident from the language that no merely human king is being spoken of. This is clearly an eschatological figure, the Messiah”. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible 19 (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 248, also points to some of the challenges in this view when he says that “there is, however, a problem of form, in that in such rituals the deity addresses the ruler-designate directly (as in 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 2:7) and does so in terms of divine, adoptive sonship, neither of which is the case in the poem (pace von Rad 1958, 230–31). Moreover, only four names are conferred on the son in the poem, and none of the numerous attempts to conjure a fifth name out of v. 6 [7] has been especially persuasive”.

(9:6-7) This eschatological hope restoration of David's kingdom would be projected to the future by Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

5 JEREMIAH AND EZEKIEL

The hope of the restoration of the Davidic line appears in Ezekiel and Jeremiah. Amidst the nation's impending doom, they reaffirmed the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant and the promise of a new David who would bring back the people from exile. Jeremiah 23:1-6 is the first text that illustrates this. The oracle is set during Zedekiah's reign amidst the threat of the destruction of Jerusalem monarchy¹⁸. It begins with a message of judgement and then transitions to a message of restoration. This restoration message follows a three-part formula: (1) Promise to set up "new shepherds"¹⁹ (v. 4); (2) promise of David's coming branch, "the Lord our righteousness" (vv. 5-6); and (3) promise to bring his people up from exile (vv. 7-8).

Despite the apostasy of Israel's leaders, Yahweh would set up a new David in the place of the old. He would be called "the Lord our righteousness"²⁰ (v. 6). The pun on Zedekiah's name which "my Lord is righteous" is evident. Although the previous Zedekiah had forfeited his right to the Davidic throne, Yahweh was sending a new Zedekiah to replace him in accordance with his promise to David.

In Jeremiah 30 this same formula is repeated in reversed fashion. It begins first with restoration from exile (v. 3), promise of a new David (v. 9) and then promise of the rebuilding of the city (v. 18b). Nevertheless, the promise of a new David continues at the center of the message of restoration, but this time within the context of the new covenant.

Finally, Jeremiah 33:7, 14-17 repeats the promises made in Jeremiah 30:3, 9 and 23:5-6,

¹⁸ William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 26-52* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989), p. 624, dates this passage to time of the Deuteronomistic authors towards the end of the Zedekiah's reign.

¹⁹ Roberts (1992, p. 46) also points to the allusions to Isaiah saying that the "oracle seems influenced by several Isaianic passages. The צמח ('sprout') for David recalls Isa 11:1,10".

²⁰ Gordon H. Johnston, "Messianic Trajectories in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel", in *Jesus the Messiah: Tracing the Promises, Expectations, and Coming of Israel's King* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2012), p. 172, sees here a direct reference to the sons of Josiah mentioned in chapter 22. However, as will be shown from the parallelism found in chapters 30 and 33 the shepherd seems to indicate a more general term for religious leaders which could include both kings and priests.

7-8²¹. In each of the three cases the promise of a Davidic king is always at the heart of the message. In each case, the prophet envisions “a new Davidic ruler who will embody the ancient Ideals of just rule” (ROBERTS, 1992, p. 46). The prophet’s hope of a new covenant lines up with his hope for a new future in Israel’s history under a new king.

The same promise of a new era in Israel’s history under a new David reappears in Ezekiel 34:23-25 and 37:24-28²². In both texts, the promise of the arrival of “my servant David” recurs. (34:23-24; 37:24a) However, in 37:25a there is an excursion. It predicts the people would obey Yahweh's ordinances (37:24b) and the repossess the land (37:25a)²³. Moreover, both passages use the titles “my servant David” (34:23-25; 37:25b) and contain a covenant promise (34:25; 37:26). Although 34:25 reads “covenant of peace,” while 37:26 has “everlasting covenant,” the parallelism between the two passages should not be overlooked. Both have the exile as their underlying theme. It is clear from the aforementioned passages that Ezekiel envisioned a new period in Israel’s history, in which Yahweh’s people would return to their land and would be governed by a new David²⁴.

Thus, for both prophets, the Davidic covenant was the presupposition for the future restoration from exile. Although the exile appeared to trigger the end for David’s line, Jeremiah pointed to the hope of a renewal through a branch (Jer. 23:4; 33:14-26). This branch would be called “my servant David” (Ezek. 34:23-24; 37:25). He would bring God’s people back from exile. He would fulfill the promises made to David and usher in a new period in Israel’s history (Ezek. 34:25; 37:24-28; Jer. 33:14-26). The hope for this future David would continue to be reflected after the exile in the works of Haggai and Zechariah.

²¹ Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible 21B (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 542, sees this prophecy as set after the destruction of Jerusalem.

²² For the intertextuality between the two prophetic books, see Holladay (1989, p. 615).

²³ For Roberts (1992, p. 46-47), this oracle represented Ezekiel's response to the crisis of faith caused by the dissolution of the Davidic monarchy in 586 B.C.E. and the hope of a new king and united monarchy.

²⁴ Commenting on the relationship between these two passages from Ezekiel and Jeremiah 31:31-34, Thomas M. Riatt, *A Theology of Exile: Judgement and Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 205, says: “we understand the context, that the whole emphasis is on what can come in the future, rather than on links to what has happened in the past”. He then adds in the same breath: “The source and pattern of Ezekiel's hope for deliverance are the same as Jeremiah's. But onto the dramatic, painstakingly thorough revolution announced in the other authentic oracles in Jeremiah and parts of Ezekiel, Ezek. 34:25-31 and 37:24-28 add the extra and enriching components of Davidic Covenant hopes”. See also Akins (1995, p. 218), who claims that the prophet predicted in this passage “a future Davidic ruler for Yahweh’s people.” It could also be added that both passages seem to echo Isaiah 11:6-9 (especially 34:25) and point to a new era in Israel's history.

6 HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH

In the post-exilic period, Haggai and Zechariah maintained the expectation of the Davidic line return. Haggai envisioned this happening in eschatological proportions (2:23). Despite the tendency to locate Zerubbabel in Haggai's oracle and see it as "being fulfilled in the prophet's lifetime" (BODA, 2007, p. 54), some scholars have objected to this claim²⁵. Carol Meyers, Eric Meyers, and Walter Rose have argued that expressions such as "on that day [...] when God shakes the heavens and the earth" (vv. 21-23) and the status of Zerubbabel as a governor of Judea indicate a future referent²⁶.

In addition to this, the זמח oracles of Zechariah 3:8 and 6:9-15 also seem to point to the same conclusion. Although scholars have read these oracles as an allusion to Zerubbabel, the work of Wolter H. Rose has shed new light on this topic. Rose has raised several challenges to this assumption. Among them are (1) the crowning of Joshua despite Zerubbabel's Davidic origin (6:11-12); (2) the future reference of the זמח oracle, making correlation with the prophecy date and Zerubbabel unlikely; and (3) the unconvincing attempts to read זמח as a "pun" or different name for Zerubbabel. His conclusions have shown that the זמח could refer to the future David mentioned in (pre)-exilic prophets (ROSE, 2000, p. 135-139).

For the post exilic prophets, Zerubbabel's arrival in Judah represented the partial fulfillment of Jeremiah's hopes (22:24-30; 23:5 and 33:14-16). It marked the beginning of the first stage in the restoring process of the Davidic line (Hag. 2:23)²⁷. Nevertheless, Judah's subjection under Persia, the eschatological scene of Haggai 2:21-23 and the זמח oracles of Zechariah 3 and 6

²⁵ Janet E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), p. 130-135, claims the prophetic oracle identifies Zerubbabel as the inheritor and representative of the enduring Davidic lineage. Mowinckel (2005, p. 119) also follows this line of thought pointing out that "what these prophets do is to proclaim, 'In this man (Zerubbabel) the house of David will be restored in its ancient glory. Once again, we shall have a king who will fulfill the ancient ideal of kingship'".

²⁶ Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible 25B (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 82, point out that although "Zerubbabel is a Davidic figure, as the final verse of the oracle makes clear, he is addressed as governor. Moreover, Zerubbabel's lineage is downplayed by virtue of the omission of his patronymic". Wolter H. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 304 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), p. 243, notes the absence of any reference to the Davidic line from which Zerubbabel came, and the fact that Haggai does not use technical words to link Zerubbabel with David indicates that Haggai most likely did not expect Zerubbabel to become king.

²⁷ We would also like to add here that God's promise to make Zerubbabel into "signet ring" in Haggai 2:23 is also an example of this.

indicate the prophet's belief in a final stage of the restoration project. In this second stage, "the fulfillment of the נְזִי oracle of Jeremiah 23:5 is pushed even further into the future" (ROSE, 2000, p. 135). The two prophets, thus, predicted "an eschatological event that would transcend that of their present condition" (ROSE, 2000, p. 170).

Haggai and Zechariah reiterate the oracles of the (pre)-exilic prophets that "we are *not yet* there" (ROSE, 2000, p. 135). The complete restoration of David and his kingdom would only occur after Yahweh's shaking of the heavens and the earth and his overthrow of kingdoms (Hag. 2:21-22).

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has attempted to show hope in a future restoration of Israel under the *aegis* of a new David (Messianic expectation) was a characteristic of Old Testament prophecy. For the prophets, this hope was rooted in the Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7:1-17). For them, Yahweh would send a new David, who would usher in a new period in Israel's history. For Amos, it meant restoration of "David's booth", for Micah the coming of a "shepherd king", for Isaiah the birth of a "prince of peace", for Jeremiah the ruling of the "Lord our righteousness," for Ezekiel the arrival of "David the prince," for Haggai "the shaking of the heavens", and for Zechariah "the branch who would bear royal honor." Belief in the coming David would be read by the NT writers in light of the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

REFERENCES

AKINS, M. T. **The Theological Influence of the Davidic Covenant on the Biblical Understanding of the Messiah**. Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, TX, 1995.

ANDERSEN, F. I.; FREEDMAN, D. N. **Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary**. Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008. v. 24A.

BEECHER, W. J. **The Prophets and The Promise Being for Substance**. The Lectures for 1902-1903 on the L. P. Stone Foundation in the Princeton Theological Seminary. New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company Publishers, 1905.

SOUZA, G. B. Messianic hope and Davidic Covenant in the classical prophets. **Práxis Teológica (Ahead Of Print)**, volume 19, número 1, e-1923, 2023.

BLINKINSOPP, J. **Isaiah 1-39**: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008. v. 19.

BODA, M. J. Figuring the Future: The Prophets and Messiah. *In*: PORTER, S. E. (Ed.). **The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments**. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.

BOCKMUEHL, M. **This Jesus**: Martyr, Lord, Messiah. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

BRUEGGEMANN, W. **First and Second Samuel**, Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1990.

CHILDS, B. S. **Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments**: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

CHILDS, B. S. **Isaiah**: A Commentary, ed. William P. Brown, Carol A. Newsom, and Brent A. Strawn. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

CLEMENTS, R. E. The Messianic Hope in the Old Testament. **Journal for the Study of the Old Testament**, n. 43, p. 3-19, 1989.

COLLINS, J. J. **The Scepter and the Star**: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 2010.

CORTEZ, F. H. “**The Anchor of the Soul that Enters within the Veil**”: The Ascension of the “Son” in the Letter to the Hebrews. Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2008.

HILLERS, D. R. **Micah**: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.

HOLLADAY, W. L. **Jeremiah 2**: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 26-52. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989.

JOHNSTON, G. H. Messianic Trajectories in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. *In*: BATEMAN, H.; BOCK, D. L.; JOHNSTON, G. H. **Jesus the Messiah**: Tracing the Promises, Expectations, and Coming of Israel’s King. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2012.

LUNDBOM, J. R. **Jeremiah 21-36**: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008. v. 21B,

MCCARTER JR, P. K. **II Samuel**: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary. Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008. v. 9.

MEYERS, C. L.; MEYERS, E. M. **Haggai, Zechariah 1-8**: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008. v. 25B.

SOUZA, G. B. Messianic hope and Davidic Covenant in the classical prophets. **Práxis Teológica (Ahead Of Print)**, volume 19, número 1, e-1923, 2023.

MOWINCKEL, S. **He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism**. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2005.

OSWALT, J. N. **The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39**. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.

RIATT, T. M. **A Theology of Exile: Judgement and Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel**. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977.

ROBERTS, J. J. M. The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations. *In*: CHARLESWORTH, J. H. (Ed.). **The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity**. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992.

ROSE, W. H. **Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period**. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

TOLLINGTON, J. E. **Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8**. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

VON RAD, G. **Old Testament Theology**. Translation D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1960. v. 2.

WOLFF, H. W. **Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos**. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977.