Kessler, John. *The Book of Haggai: Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

CHAPTER ONE.
ON READING THE BOOK OF HAGGAI:
QUESTIONS OF METHOD AND PERSPECTIVE

1.1. INTRODUCTION

The present study is premised upon the assumption that the book of Haggai has evidentiary value for the study of early Persian Yehud.[1] The principal objective of my inquiry is to examine the specific vision of prophecy and society portrayed in the book of Haggai set against the social context in which the book was produced.[2] However the book's evidentiary value can only be accessed when an adequate methodological approach to it is employed. Such an approach must include an understanding of the redactional history of the text, an analysis of the historical, political, sociological, economic, and demographic circumstances surrounding the oracular and redactional material in the book, due consideration of the ideological, literary, rhetorical, and theological orientation of the book, as well as a detailed exegesis of the text itself. The necessity of such a multi-disciplinary and integrative approach becomes evident

---

[1] Yehud is the commonly used English equivalent for the Hebrew *yᵉhûdâ* and the Aramaic *yhd* or *yhwd*. These terms were used in the Persian period to designate the administrative unit which comprised the former territories of Judah and Benjamin (though reduced in size). I will employ the term Judaea and Judah when I make reference to this region in other historical periods. I employ the term "early Persian Yehud" as a general designation of the early period of Persian rule in the West, approximately from Cyrus' conquest of Babylon in 539, to the beginning of the fifth century. All ancient dates are BCE. The designations BCE and CE will be employed only when potential ambiguity exists.

[2] I have adopted the following formal conventions in this study: Commentaries and major monographs on Haggai will be cited by the name of the author alone. A full list of such works is included with the abbreviations. In order to make this work as accessible as possible to all readers, in general, non-English works will be cited from their English translations, where such exist. Other non-English sources, where cited, will be translated. Where individual Hebrew and Aramaic words are cited for purposes of general historical and archaeological discussion, they will simply be transliterated. In the more detailed exegetical sections, the Hebrew characters will be used.

when one considers various attempts to use the text of Haggai as an historical source, often with less than satisfactory results.

This introductory chapter will first examine a variety of approaches, methodologies, and perspectives relevant to the reading of Haggai, and assess their contributions and limitations. This survey will both introduce the reader to the critical discussion of the book, and set that discussion in an historical perspective. Subsequently I will outline my own methodological approach to the text, and explain how the present study will proceed.

1.2.   EARLY CRITICAL EVALUATIONS OF HAGGAI: OF WHAT VALUE IS THIS BOOK?

The scholarly literature of the nineteenth to the first half of twentieth centuries quite frequently found the book of Haggai to be something of an embarrassment within the prophetic corpus of the Hebrew Bible. As early as 1912, H. G. Mitchell observed that it had "long been the fashion to disparage the book of Haggai."[3] Quite frequently, these negative evaluations of the book of Haggai were based upon the following supposed deficiencies: (1) the prophet's impoverished literary style and theological content; (2) the prophet's nationalism and exclusivism; (3) the prophet's narrow focus upon the reconstruction of the temple, and (4) the prophet's preoccupation with law, ritual, and ceremony, to the exclusion of any spiritual or ethical concerns.

---

[3] Mitchell, p. 36. Mitchell specifically refers to Gesenius and de Wette, and cites a passage from the latter which includes comments by Marti and Reuss.

Haggai's literary abilities were frequently disparaged. His vocabulary and style were described as "crabbed", "threadbare", and "poverty-stricken."[4] His book was described as "small and simple, without any passage of power and beauty."[5] Our prophet was said to lack the capacity for original thought and to have been content to borrow the ideas and words of his earlier counterparts. In 1893, A. Weiser concluded that Haggai was "an imitator of the prophets, one who stands closer to Judaism than to the old prophecies."[6] The label "epigon" (imitator) was one that would remain in the scholarly lexicon with reference to Haggai for quite some time. The expression was used of our prophet by G. Sauer[7] and G. Fohrer[8] but rejected by J. Lindbloom[9] and K. Beyse.[10] A more recent variation on this theme sees Haggai as relying heavily on the words of the classical prophets, and having an "access to Yahweh which appears limited when compared to that of the classical prophets."[11]

---

[4] Descriptions cited by G. L. Robinson, (*The Twelve Minor Prophets*, [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1953], p. 145) without indication of their source.

[5] J. A. Bewer, *The Literature of the Old Testament*, (rev. ed.; New York: Columbia University, 1933), p. 236.

[6] A. Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, (1893, Eng. tr. New York: Association Press, 1961), p. 268. J. Wellhausen, (*Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, [trans. Black & Menzies, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1883, repr., 1973], p. 410) appears to apply the term "Judaism" to everything written after the "pristine" period of prophetic religion.

[7] G. Sauer, "Serubbabel in der Sicht Haggais und Sacharjas", in *Das ferne und nahe Wort. Festschrift Leonhard Rost*, (ed. F. Maass; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967), p. 203.

[8] G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, (trans. D. Green; London: SPCK, 1970), p. 460.

[9] J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*, (1934, Eng. tr. D. M. Barton; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), p. 421.

[10] K. Beyse, *Serubbabel und die Königserwartungen der Propheten Haggai und Sacharja: Eine historische und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, (Arbeiten zur Theologie 1/48; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1972), p. 65.

[11] B. D. Sommer, "Did Prophecy Cease? Evaluating a Reevaluation", *JBL* 115 (1996): 42-43. Interestingly, Sommer offers no evidence to support the claim regarding limited access as it relates to Haggai. In fact he admits that, unlike Zechariah, Haggai is addressed directly by Yahweh!

Not only was his style bereft of originality and interest, Haggai was said to be a zealous nationalist. In this regard, attempts were made to integrate Haggai's vision into the broader perspective of the Jewish attitude to the Gentiles at the beginning of the postexilic period. Some scholars posited a dialectic between a growing spirit of narrow exclusivism and a movement towards proselytism at that time.[12] It was maintained that the theme of the "pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem" was closely allied to the impulse towards proselytism.[13] Others spoke of "contradictory attitudes" within Israel with respect to the Gentile nations. Bright affirmed the existence of one theological understanding whereby Israel, as the servant of Yahweh, was called to suffer on behalf of the nations.[14] Yet he also maintained that at the same time there was an eager desire for divine judgment against the nations.[15] The attempt to distinguish "universalistic" from "particularistic" strands both in the Hebrew Bible as a whole, and within prophetic literature, figured in many analyses of Israelite religion produced in the earlier part of the last century.[16] Deutero-Isaiah was seen

---

[12] In 1898, A. Selbie (s. v. "Gentiles" in *A Dictionary of the Bible dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents including the Biblical Theology*, [ed. J. Hastings; New York: Scribners, 1898], 2:149) stated, "Israel's attitude towards other nations . . . underwent most important modifications in the post-exilic period. The reformation of Ezra deliberately aimed at fostering that spirit of exclusiveness which gave so much offense to the Gentile world. . . . Side by side with this exclusiveness a proselytizing tendency was developed." E. J. Hamlin (s. v. "Nations", *IDB* 3:517) states, "The object of the (later postexilic) mission was to make Jews out of the people of the nations, to bring them to worship God at Jerusalem. It was closely linked with Jewish nationalism and legalism."

[13] So Hamlin, "Nations", 3:517.

[14] J. Bright, *The Kingdom of God*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1953), p. 162. H. M. Orlinsky summarily dismissed such a notion. He riposted that "nothing could have been further from the prophet's mind [i.e. Deutero-Isaiah] than that Israel was in existence for the welfare of the nations, or that other nations could achieve equality with Israel in God's scheme of things." (H. M. Orlinsky, "The So-Called 'Suffering Servant' of Isa 53", in H. M. Orlinsky and P. A. H. de Boer, *Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah*, [SVT 14; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967], p. 36.)

[15] Bright, *Kingdom of God*, p. 165.

[16] See, for example, W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development*, (London: SPCK, 1930), pp. 276-77, who begin their discussion of the postexilic

as the parade paradigm of an inclusive, universalistic, and non-legalistic religious approach, in contrast to such figures as Ezekiel, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

For several commentators, this tension between nationalism and universalism was to be seen in the differing attitudes of Haggai and Zechariah. Haggai, it was affirmed, was materialistic and bigoted. He displayed no interest in the salvation of the nations but was merely interested in their "subjugation and spoliation."[17] One very dim view of our prophet's attitude regarding the Gentiles maintained that "Haggai's picture of the future was narrowly nationalistic. [He] had no further interest in the nations than to get hold of their money; for the rest let them kill each other off and be done with it (Hag 2:22)!"[18] Zechariah, by contrast, had a more nuanced perspective and favoured the conversion of the nations. This conversion was to be achieved through divine intervention, rather than military devices.[19] Two elements in Haggai have been traditionally cited as proof of that prophet's nationalistic attitude. The first is the alleged exclusion of the Samaritans from the rebuilding of the temple (2:10-14). The hypothesis that the priestly *torah* of 2:10-14 became the basis for the exclusion of the Gentiles was formulated by J. W. Rothstein.[20] E. Sellin

period with a section on "particularism and universalism." They see the former as characteristic of the priests and the latter as present in the writings of Deutero-Isaiah. See also J. Morgenstern, "Two Prophecies from 520-516 B.C.", *HUCA* 22 (1949): 365-431, who analyzes Isa 60 in terms of this motif. He distinguishes vv. 1-3 and 5-7 which are untinged by nationalism and reflect the voluntary submission of the nations to Yahweh, from the rest of the chapter which manifests "a plain and assertive nationalism . . . . Yahweh's favor is for Israel alone; the nations of the world, He will subject to Israel, that they may be exploited to the utmost by His people" (pp. 396-98).
[17] R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, (New York: Harper and Bros., 1941), pp. 606-7.
[18] F. James, "Thoughts on Haggai and Zechariah", *JBL* 3 (1934): 231.
[19] Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, pp. 606-7.
[20] J. W. Rothstein, *Juden und Samaritaner. Die grundlegende Scheidung von Judentum und Heidentum. Eine kritische Studie zum Buche Haggai und zur jüdische Geschichte im ersten nachexilischen Jahrhundert*, (BWAT 3; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1908).

proclaimed Haggai's decision to have been "the birthday of postexilic Judaism."[21] The second element is Haggai's alleged conception of Israel's position as a dominant world power following the destruction of the power of the nations (2:6-9, 20-23).

Closely linked to this nationalistic view of Haggai is the understanding of our prophet as one who actively promoted rebellion against the Persian empire. In an article published in 1957,[22] L. Waterman proposed the hypothesis of a rebellion attempt on the part of Zerubbabel, encouraged and supported by Haggai and Zechariah. Waterman's thesis was not new. For quite some time speculations had been made concerning the relationship of the rebellions in the Persian Empire to the oracles of Haggai.[23] James, Pfeiffer and Oesterley and Robinson[24] had already posited an independence movement under Zerubbabel which was supported by Haggai. The possibility of such a movement continues to be proposed as a viable hypothesis[25] although it is not widely accepted.[26] In a

[21] Sellin, p. 413.

[22] L. Waterman, "The Camouflaged Purge of Three Messianic Conspirators", *JNES* 13 (1954): 73-78.

[23] Mitchell, p. 20; W. H. Bennett, *The Religion of the Post Exilic Prophets: The Literature and Religion of Israel*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), p. 74; J. M. Powis Smith, *The Prophets and their Times*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), p. 196.

[24] James, "Haggai", pp. 229-35; W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, (London: SPCK, 1934), pp. 404-8; Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, pp. 602-4.

[25] Cf. J. Bright, *A History of Israel*, (2nd. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), p. 372; R. Carroll, "Prophecy, Dissonance and Jeremiah XXVI", *TUGOS* 25 (1973-74): 12-23; idem, *When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophets*, (London: SCM, 1979), pp. 162-64. (Carroll sees the movement as essentially an attempt to restore the monarchy rather than an explicit attempt at rebellion against the Persians). H. J. Katzenstein, "Gaza in the Persian Period", *Trans* 1 (1989): 68-82, esp. p. 74 and even more recently J. Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel*, (2nd. edtn.; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996), p. 203.

[26] Cf. the early criticism in A. Bentzen, "Quelques remarques sur le mouvement messianique parmi les Juifs aux environs de l'an 520 avant Jésus-Christ", *RHPR* 10 (1930): 493-503, followed by P. R. Ackroyd, "Two Historical Problems of the Early Persian Period", *JNES* 17 (1958): 13-27 and idem, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.*, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), pp. 164-65. More recently see L. L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 1:128.

more nuanced manner, R. Mason discerns a strong political orientation in Haggai's oracles that the redactional framework attempts to attenuate.[27] Likewise, T. Chary does not hesitate (in contrast to Siebeneck[28] and van Hoonacker[29]) to affirm that Haggai could have "made Zerubbabel himself the bearer of the messianic hopes."[30]

Not only given to a nationalistic and particularistic attitude, Haggai was also viewed as a pragmatic materialist. This approach is purportedly seen in Haggai's understanding of the significance of the temple and his attitude toward the riches of the nations. According to the most extreme expression of this view, for Haggai the temple amounts to a kind of talisman.[31] Pfeiffer maintained that for Haggai, "the present prosperity and future glory of his people depended entirely on the rebuilding of the temple."[32] It was asserted that "Haggai's work . . . was done when the work on the temple was revived. It was otherwise with Zechariah. . . . He devoted himself to the spiritual edification of the community."[33] It was affirmed that, in Haggai's thought, the temple's reconstruction would act as a guarantee of blessing and fruitfulness. This interpretation of Haggai's view of the temple has remained influential in subsequent scholarship although it frequently appears in a more nuanced form. For example, Hanson[34] and Hamerton-Kelly[35] affirm that Haggai saw the rebuilding as a necessary prerequisite for the coming of the eschatological era,

---

[27] R. Mason, "The Purpose of the 'Editorial Framework' of the Book of Haggai", *VT* 27 (1977): 413-21, esp. pp. 420-21.

[28] R. T. Siebeneck, "The Messianism of Aggeus and Proto-Zacharias", *CBQ* 19 (1951): 314-15.

[29] Van Hoonacker, p. 526.

[30] T. Chary, *Les prophètes et le culte à partir de l'exil*, (Paris: Desclée, 1955), p. 134.

[31] James, "Haggai", p. 321.

[32] Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 602.

[33] Barnes, p. xlv.

[34] P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), pp. 248-49.

[35] R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic", *VT* 20 (1970): 1-15.

yet without being its guarantor. Haggai's view of the temple is said to be similar to his interest in the treasures of the nations (Hag 2:7). For James, Pfeiffer, and certain others, Haggai was interested in the Gentiles' riches on a purely material level. He simply wanted to "get hold of their money."[36] Furthermore, Haggai's emphasis on the temple was seen to belie an attitude which focused on ritual and ceremony, and was utterly devoid of ethical concern. Pfeiffer states that Haggai's "great concern was not the moral and religious wickedness of the people, but adherence to rules of Levitical purity and the fulfillment of ritual acts."[37]

In sum, for certain scholars, Haggai was a key figure in the general movement away from the vital living "Hebraic" religion toward a "Jewish" system which was characterized by exclusivism and narrow particularism, and focused on ritual law and ceremony.[38] Powis Smith called Ezekiel the "father of Judaism" due to his "exaltation of ritualism and legalism" which "imperiled the ethical supremacy of the ethical element in religious life."[39] As noted, Sellin called Haggai's declaration (2:14) the birthday of postexilic Judaism.[40] In an essay published in 1961, F. Hesse stated, "Haggai was no precursor of Jesus Christ. He is one of the fathers of Judaism."[41]

---

[36] James, "Haggai", p. 321.

[37] Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 603.

[38] Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 268.

[39] Powis Smith, *Prophets*, p. 175. Cf. the similar view of Ezekiel in H. P. Smith, *The Religion of Israel: An Historical Study*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914), pp. 196-226, especially the chapter entitled "Legalism Triumphant."

[40] Sellin, p. 413.

[41] F. Hesse, "Haggai." In *Verbannunug und Heimkehr: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Festschrift Wilhelm Rudolph*, (ed. A. Kuschke. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961), pp. 109-134, esp. p. 129. It should be noted, however, that Hesse's purpose is to situate Haggai in his historical moment and, from that perspective (rather than some typological or Christological one), ascertain what kerygmatic value the text has within the church; cf. my earlier and more critical comments in J. Kessler, "Le rôle du prophète dans le livre d'Aggée", (Thèse de doctorat; Sorbonne-Paris IV, 1995), p. 10.

Many contemporary readers will be taken aback by such statements. However such an approach to postexilic religious practice in general, and to postexilic prophecy in particular was quite common in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Given the very different way in which the Persian period is treated in modern scholarship, I believe it to be worthwhile at this point to briefly describe the then-dominant perception of the period we are discussing. An illustration of how widely this reconstruction was accepted can be seen in the *Old Testament Theology* of Hermann Schultz (1836-1903).[42] Schultz dialogues with the luminaries of nineteenth-century scholarship, such as Wellhausen, Keunen, de Wette and others, and his work provides a popular distillation of the OT scholarship of his time.[43] Schultz presents the following general scenario.[44] From the late seventh century, priestly legal pronouncements assumed greater importance than prophetic proclamation and the true prophetic spirit began to be lost (p. 321). During the exile Ezekiel and the priests constructed an idealized and logical system of ritual worship, that they attributed to Moses (p. 321). This approach made the older ideals of the prophets virtually inaccessible to the people. The majority of the exiles had become wealthy and at ease in exile, and

---

[42] Schultz was professor of theology at Göttingen. His *Old Testament Theology,* which ran four German editions, was translated into English and ran two editions (*Old Testament Theology: The Religion of Revelation in its Pre-Christian Stage of Development*, [2nd. edtn.; trans. J. A. Paterson; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark], 1898). For an evaluation of Schultz's work, and a discussion of his importance see J. H. Hayes and F. C. Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History and Development*, (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), pp. 110-14. I have chosen Schultz's *Theology* for two reasons. First, as an OT theology, rather than a more specialized historical or exegetical study, Schultz's work presupposes certain historical assumptions to be past debate and therefore critically assured. Second, Schultz's *Theology* was highly influential, especially in that it sought to apply historical and critical judgments to broader issues of the theological meaning and value of the Old Testament. Hayes and Prussner (*Theology*, p. 110) describe Schultz as a "moderate conservative" who sought to "integrate critical scholarship with confessional orthodoxy." They note that his work had wide appeal and ought to be considered one of the most valuable OT theologies of the nineteenth century.

[43] See Schultz's own acknowledged debt to Wellhausen (*Theology*, 1:72).

[44] The following page references in the text are from his *Theology*, volume 1.

"willingly and readily" adopted the religion of their conquerors (p. 322).
However, a small and faithful believing community gathered around certain
"prophets of the exile."[45] Schultz (following Josephus, *Ant.* 9.1.1f) then affirms
that, had it not been for this prophetic remnant, Cyrus would have never issued
his edict.[46] This exilic prophetic community without priest, king, temple, or
worship found "its true life in the spiritual beauty of religion." Open hearted, it
was ready to "receive the whole world into the new Israel." With the exception
of the Sabbath, little attention was paid to outward forms. This small community
returned to Jerusalem, but its spiritual uniqueness was soon lost. Under
Zerubbabel, and with the prophetic support of Haggai and Zechariah, a new
beginning was made. Things rapidly degenerated, however, for a number of
reasons.[47] The temple, ruling Davidide, and prophets (presumably Haggai and
Zechariah) were profoundly disappointing, mere shadows of that which had
gone before (p. 327-28, 331). Schultz saw the postexilic prophets as "Epigonoi
standing on the boundary line of mere learned imitation."[48] Faith was soon

---

[45] Schultz affirmed that this faithful remnant had to endure suffering, not only because of the
scorn of their negligent co-religionists, but also at the hands of their conquerors. "And as danger
drew nearer Babylon, this faithful prophetic remnant naturally became the object of suspicion
and hatred. They were regarded as natural allies of every enemy. . . . [M]any doubtless died as
martyrs" (p. 323). The more "worldly minded" Israelites, however, allied themselves with the
Babylonians, and were thus able to enjoy the "peace and comforts" which they were beginning to
obtain. The leaders of this remnant were not the priests, (who were wholly concerned with law),
but prophets who demonstrated "unfettered faith and enthusiastic piety" (p. 324). Had it not
been for this faithful remnant gathered around these prophets, Judah, like Ephraim, would have
"perished in a world of heathenism without leaving a trace behind" (pp. 324-25).

[46] He states (*Theology* 1: 325) "It never occurred to him to dismiss to their homes the other nations
that had been transplanted by their Assyrian or Babylonian conquerors. . . . He acted as he did
because . . . restoration had been foretold and eagerly desired."

[47] Schultz, (ibid., p. 326f.) opines that it had become impossible to live in peace with the Persian
authorities, that provincial neighbours aroused the ill will of the Persians against the community,
and that war with Egypt sapped the resources which were produced.

[48] Ibid., 1:327. In a similar vein, in 1892, C. H. Toy (*Judaism and Christianity: A Sketch of the Progress
of Thought from Old Testament to New Testament*, [London: British and Foreign Unitarian
Association, 1892], p. 53), summarized postexilic prophecy as follows, "The old prophecy had
spent its strength; after the exile it was no longer what it had been, and in our period it is only the

eclipsed by legalism.[49] A great turning point occurred with the emergence of Ezra, whose legalism and particularism brought an end to the vital, inclusive, non-legalistic movement begun during the exile.

> Israel, the people of God, became the people of 'the Jews'. . . . The lofty enthusiasm, the joyous assurance that relied on the Divine Spirit without looking anxiously to a sacred book, was replaced by an inward weakness which leant all the more heavily on the former strength. Instead of inward religious assurance, the letter of the law governed the life of the people. . . . Everything of true religious import that could be attained from an Old Testament standpoint, the prophetic age attained.[50]

Schultz maintains that in the years that followed, both the prophetic spirit and the legalistic approach remained among the people. The latter did serve to preserve the traditions of the earlier prophetic period. Thus, "this age led on, not merely to the Pharisaism that was hostile alike to Christ and to the prophets, but also to those Israelites who found in Jesus the fulfillment of their eager longings" (p. 332).[51] Thus the negative evaluations of our prophet, cited earlier, stand within a long line of scholarly opinion[52] which saw the Persian period as

---

shadow of its former self. . . . The great legal movement . . . had superseded the old spontaneous utterance of prophetic men. . . . Yet there still came occasionally the breath of the prophetic impulse, though in comparatively feeble form."

[49] Schultz comments, "There was among the returning exiles an overwhelming proportion of priests, men actually devoted to a religious career" (p. 328). These priests began to shape the life of the community. Due to the lack of a "healthy secular life" this led to an "unhealthy element akin to Pietism" which also attributed an "exaggerated importance to ritual." Methodologically this last comment is quite interesting in that Schultz perceives a common tendency in specific manifestations of Christian and Jewish religious expression, and evaluates them quite apart from any theological content (cf. modern religious anthropology), but with reference to their relative "health" as forms of spirituality.

[50] Ibid., 1:331.

[51] Cf. Hesse, "Haggai", p. 127-29.

[52] Such negative evaluations of Haggai in particular, and Judaism in general, raise serious, broader issues regarding anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism. The citations presented above are

characterized by the birth of Judaism and the decline of prophecy, movements both reflected in Haggai.

It should be noted that these rather disparaging readings of Haggai are not fully representative of the scholarly treatment of our prophet. S. R. Driver, admitting that Haggai's style was "simple and unornate," saw him as a prophet "not devoid of force" whose words were shaped in a way similar to that of Hebrew poetry.[53] Mitchell similarly defended Haggai's literary abilities.[54] W. H. Bennett complained that it was "not fair to contrast [Haggai's teaching on the temple] with the more ethical and spiritual messages of the earlier prophets. . . . The reasoning [in Haggai] is an application of the doctrine of Ezekiel and the Deuteronomic writers, that material conditions are an index to the moral and spiritual value of character and conduct."[55] S. Davidson saw Haggai's eschatology as "defective; but right as far as it went."[56] The majority of the commentaries written on Haggai gave serious attention to the book and its meaning, and avoided some of the hasty conclusions reached on the basis of superficial readings.[57] Certain scholars challenged the assumption that Haggai, with Zerubbabel, was active in a rebellion against the Persian crown.[58] The

neither intended to "label" their respective authors, nor to be viewed as an indication of their personal attitudes to the Jewish communities of their day. The quotations are simply meant to evoke the general scholarly ethos of the period. See G. Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism*, (London: SCM, 1983), p. 58f for a fuller treatment of the issue of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism in biblical scholarship. On the diversity and complexity of the various attitudes to Judaism in nineteenth-century Germany, with special attention to de Wette, cf. J. Pasto, "When the End is the Beginning? or when the Biblical Past is the Political Present: Some Thoughts on Ancient Israel, 'Post-Exilic Judaism' and the Politics of Biblical Scholarship", *SJOT* 12 (1998): 157-202.

[53] S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, (International Theological Library; new ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 344.

[54] Mitchell, p. 37.

[55] Bennett, *Post-Exilic Prophets*, p. 77.

[56] S. Davidson, *The Text of the Old Testament Considered*, (London: Longman et al., 1856), p. 973.

[57] See the bibliography in Wolff, p. 23-24.

[58] Bentzen, "Mouvement messianique", *passim*.

interpretation whereby 2:10-19 referred to the exclusion of the Samaritans was deemed inadequate.[59]

One significant point, however, remains to be underlined regarding this "earlier" phase of criticism of the book of Haggai. Scholars of all stripes, even those most critical of Haggai from a stylistic, theological or religious point of view, agreed that the book was an excellent historical resource. J. Bewer commented, "He was no great prophet. . . . His book . . . is small and simple, without any passage of power and beauty. But for the history of our time *it is of the highest value*."[60] Pfeiffer agrees saying, "Negligible though the book appears from the point of view of literature and religion *it is of the greatest importance, together with Zechariah, as a historical source*."[61] Oesterley and Robinson conclude that the book is "of importance for the insight it gives of the early postexilic conditions in Palestine."[62] Torrey, in contrast to his characterization of the material in Ezra 1-6 as "untrustworthy" calls Haggai (and Zechariah) "*our first and only sure source of information* between Nebuchadnezzar and Nehemiah."[63] This notion of Haggai as a valuable historical source is intriguing, since it has, as we shall see, remained rather constant in historical reconstructions of the early Persian period. What is interesting in the literature just cited is that no precise definition was given regarding the *way* in which Haggai can be used as an historical source. Clearly, the use of any prophetic text for purposes of historical

---

[59] So for example, A. Cody, "When is the Chosen People called a *gôy*?", *VT* 14 (1964): 1-7, and Chary, p. 31.

[60] Bewer, *Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 235-36, emphasis mine, and in the following citations.

[61] Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 603.

[62] Oesterley and Robinson, *Introduction*, p. 406.

[63] C. C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910), p. 303.

reconstruction is a complicated matter, and, what is more, such use will vary from text to text.[64]

The frequently one-sided and reductionistic approaches of this earlier period have been largely abandoned in recent literature. Nevertheless these studies did raise some important issues. Indeed, in a very real sense, the present study will re-examine many of the questions raised in this earlier body of literature. These include the approach of the book of Haggai to such issues as the significance of the temple, the nature of participation in the nascent community in Yehud, the relationship of that community to the Persian Empire, and, most especially, the nature of prophecy and the role of the prophet. However due to various crucial methodological inadequacies, most notably the lack of exegetical depth, a failure to recognize the ideological shaping of the text itself, as well as an inadequate grasp of the realities of the Persian period, these approaches produced images of Haggai which later scholarship tended to reject.

1.3.   HAGGAI AND SECOND TEMPLE SECTARIANISM: WHOSE SIDE IS HAGGAI ON?

In time a "second wave" of readings of Haggai emerged. These readings integrated two new factors into their analyses: (1) an awareness that aspects of the book may have been ideologically driven, and (2) a desire to relate the book's perspectives to the political, sociological, and religious landscape of the early

---

[64] On some broader issues of historiography cf. S. Japhet, "'History' and 'Literature' in the Persian Period: The Restoration of the Temple", in *Ah, Assyria...Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor*, (Scripta Hierosolymitana 33; ed. M. Cogan and I. Eph'al; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1991), p. 174-88; cf. F. E. Deist, "The Nature of Historical Understanding", *OTE* 6 (1993): 384-98 and J. Elayi, "Réflexion sur la place de l'histoire dans la recherche sur la Transeuphratène achéménide", *Trans* 8 (1994): 73-80.

Persian period. A foundational study of this type is O. Plöger's *Theokratie und Eschatologie* which appeared in 1959.[65] Plöger sought the origins of later Jewish sectarianism in the Persian period. However it was in the years of 1968-1973 that three detailed proposals were put forth which attempted to identify Haggai with one or another of the putative competing groups and factions within Second Temple Judaism. In his 1968 article and 1971 monograph, M. Smith theorized concerning the development of two competing theological groups from the ninth century through to the destruction of the Second Temple.[66] Smith claimed that three principal parties were to be found in Jerusalem in the postexilic period: (1) the descendants of those who remained in the land after the Babylonian conquest. This group, called the *'am ha'aresI* in the literature of the period, worshipped Yahweh as well as other deities; (2) a first group of returnees, or *benê haggôlâ* who were members of the former aristocracy and insisted on the worship of Yahweh alone. Zerubbabel was the leader of this group; and (3) a group of exiled priests who returned to Jerusalem. This group was under the leadership of Joshua. Some of these priests adhered to a "Yahweh-alone" position, whereas others were syncretistic.[67] Conflict arose over the reconstruction of the temple. The Yahweh-alone group wanted to exclude the syncretists from participation in the rebuilding project. The priestly group stood in the middle, and was able to turn the situation to its own advantage. An agreement was reached between the Yahweh-alone party and the priestly group. According to this agreement, the

---

[65] O. Plöger, *Theokratie und Eschatologie*, (WMANT 2; Neukirch: Neukirchener Verlag, 1959); Eng. tr., *Theocracy and Eschatology*, (trans. S. Rudman, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968).

[66] M. Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the Persian Period", in *The Greeks and the Persians*, 1968, pp. 386-401; idem, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971). For a summary of the major issues, see Grabbe, *Judaism*, 1:105-7. Cf. also S. Talmon, "The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism in the Early Second Temple Period", in S. Talmon, *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies*, (Jerusalem: Magnes /Hebrew University, 1986), pp. 165-201.

[67] Smith, *Palestinian Parties,* pp. 107-8.

Yahweh-alone party under Zerubbabel would be recognized as the legitimate political authority, and would take control of the rebuilding of the temple. Furthermore, this group would provide financial support and encourage other exiles to return. It would also recognize Joshua's leadership of the Jerusalem cult. The priestly group, in return, agreed to adhere to the purity rules set down by the Yahweh-alone group. What is significant for our purposes is Smith's view of Haggai. On one hand the prophet is clearly to be allied with the Yahweh-alone group of returnees because of his declaration that Zerubbabel was the coming messiah, and his rejection of the syncretistic practices condemned by that group.[68] Yet, on the other hand, Smith views Haggai as something of a moderate in that he may have promoted a further compromise that would have allowed for the participation of the syncretistic group. This proposal, however, was quashed by Zerubbabel.[69]

In 1970, R. G. Hamerton-Kelly proposed an alternative social context for Haggai.[70] He maintained that Ezekiel and P were the fundamental sources for understanding the Second Temple. In his view, according to the Ezekielian tradition, the "genuine" temple existed in the heavens and would one day be revealed and descend to the earth. The precise moment of this great event had been determined by God. According to the contrasting priestly vision, however, even though the "true temple" existed in the heavens, it was incumbent upon the people of God to build a replica below. Once it had become evident that the glorious promises of Deutero-Isaiah were unlikely to be fulfilled in the near future (promises that Hamerton-Kelly associated with the tradition of Ezekiel),

---

[68] Ibid., pp. 108-9.

[69] Ibid., pp. 112-13.

[70] Hamerton-Kelly, "Temple and Origins", *passim*. Hamerton-Kelly based his analysis upon von Rad's reconstruction of the principal theological traditions of the postexilic period, cf. *infra*.

the priestly group took over the leadership of the nascent community. Its blueprint was Deuteronomy, and it had little or no eschatological interest. Postexilic apocalyptic expectation was born out of a dissatisfaction with this lack of eschatological hope in the priestly theology. The people's neglect of the temple (to which Haggai alludes, Hag 2:1-11), was not primarily due to their laziness. It was rather the result of an ideological conflict. Haggai proposed a compromise by connecting the building of the temple to the coming of the eschatological era. According to Hamerton-Kelly, this compromise was rejected. The hierocracy won the debate, and the eschatological hope concerning the new temple and the new Zion soon disappeared from the official theology.[71] Again, in this reconstruction Haggai is a moderate who proposes a mediating position which is ultimately rejected by the hard-liners.

In his work *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, published in 1975, P. D. Hanson also attempted to provide a socio-theological explanation for the origins of apocalyptic eschatology. A large portion of his analysis concerns the theological and sociological setting in Judah in 520. Hanson presupposes a polarization of the community in two parties which he calls "visionary" and "hierocratic." The first group was made up of an alliance of various dissident alienated elements, especially those holding to the eschatological message of the prophets.[72] This group had little political or religious power. The second group was composed of Zadokite priests who had taken control of the temple, the priesthood, and the local government. Hanson then seeks to apply to the sociological categories of K. Mannheim, M. Weber, and E. Troeltsch to this polarized situation.[73] Contrary to Hamerton-Kelly's portrait, for Hanson Haggai is associated with the Zadokite

---

[71] Ibid., p. 14.
[72] Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, p. 217.
[73] Ibid., pp. 212-20.

hierocracy. Ezekiel had transformed the Zadokite ideal into a restoration programme. Haggai, following Ezekiel, was interested primarily in the temple reconstruction. Those opposed to the Zadokites were not the disciples of Ezekiel (as Hamerton-Kelly affirmed) but followers of Deutero-Isaiah, joined by a large number of disenfranchised Levites.[74] According to Hanson, Haggai's compromise consisted of linking the rebuilding of the temple to eschatological hopes. This compromise was accepted by the people. After the completion of the temple, however, the eschatological aspect of Haggai's message was abandoned by the Zadokites. Haggai had in effect surrendered the impartiality of the prophetic office to the political prerogatives of the ruling elite.[75]

Hanson's judgment regarding Haggai and Zechariah is highly negative. In his view, Haggai and Zechariah placed prophecy at the service of the Zadokite hierocracy without reservation and without criticism. "In giving Yahweh's unquestioned sanction to a particular human institution, and to particular priestly and royal officials, they were wedding their fate to the fate of that institution and those officials, and were giving up the independent stance always maintained by the classical prophets vis-à-vis the institutions of the temple and royal court."[76]

A full analysis of Hanson's monograph is clearly beyond my purposes here.[77] Nevertheless, even apart from broader issues related to his methodology,[78]

---

[74] Ibid., pp. 220-40.

[75] Ibid., p. 247.

[76] Ibid.

[77] The literature in response to Hanson's thesis is large and diverse. For an early critique see R. Carroll, "Twilight of Prophecy or Dawn of Apocalyptic?", *JSOT* 14 (1979): 3-35 and R. Mason, "The Prophets of the Restoration", in *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd*, (ed. R. J. Coggins, A. Phillips and M. Knibb; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 137-54, esp. pp. 138-46. For a recent challenge to Hanson's thesis relative to Isa 56-66 see B. Schram, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration*,

significant questions must be raised with reference to Hanson's treatment of Haggai. The first area of concern is his lack of a detailed analysis of the demography and economy of Yehud, or its status within the Persian Empire and its relationship to Persian imperial interests and goals.[79] This lack of historical rootedness is exacerbated by Hanson's use of the sociological methodologies of Mannheim, Weber, and Troeltsch[80] in that these approaches, formulated and elaborated in a European and "ecclesiastical" context[81] are applied to Yehud in 520 without adequate justification of the validity of such an approach.[82] Similarly, Hanson presupposes the division of the community between two and only two parties.[83] This would appear to be quite arbitrary, given the proliferation of sects

(JSOTSup 193; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

[78] Such questions would include: (1) can the undated oracles in Isa 56-66 be used in such a precisely detailed historical reconstruction? (cf. Carroll, "Twilight", pp. 24-25 and idem, "So What do We *Know* about the Temple? The Temple in the Prophets", in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period*, (JSOTSup 175, ed. T. C. Eskenazi and K. H. Richards; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), p. 39. C. T Begg, (*CBQ* 54 [1992]: 514-15), discusses this question in his review of W. A. M. Beuken, *Jesaia*, (Deel III, POut; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1989); (2) is it legitimate to set in total opposition the theological perspectives of Zech 1-8, on one hand, and Zech 9-14 and Isa 56-66, on the other? Can the theologies of Ezekiel and Isa 56-66 be so easily identified? (Cf. R. J. Bauckham, "The Rise of Apocalyptic", *Them* 3 [1977-78]: 11.) On the significant differences between Ezekiel and Zech 1-8, see Petersen, pp. 116-18.

[79] I have attempted to demonstrate the methodological importance of these kinds of considerations in J. Kessler, "Reconstructing Haggai's Jerusalem: Demographic and Sociological Considerations and the Quest for an Adequate Methodological Point of Departure", in *Every City Shall Be Forsaken: Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East* (JSOTSup 330; ed. L. L. Grabbe and R. Haak; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 137-58.

[80] Hanson neither evaluates the validity of their analyses nor provides a critical appreciation of their methodology, their classifications, and the success of their studies.

[81] Carroll, "Twilight", pp. 27-28.

[82] Carroll observes, "Anybody may use particular analyses but without a critical evaluation of the tools of analysis very little light is thrown on anything. The analogy between the settled empire life of Christianity and the struggles for community of the early postexilic period is too loose to be useful" (ibid., p. 28). On the broader issue of the use of sociological analogies in Biblical studies, cf. R. R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), p. 16. For a fuller discussion of the role of the social sciences in biblical studies, see C. E. Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period*, (JSOTSup 294; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 60-74 (with bibliography). See esp. p. 69, n. 143 and 144 with reference to the dangers of the applications of modern methodologies and analogies to ancient contexts.

[83] Hanson affirms, "In the realm of religious institutions, as in the realm of politics, the

and groupings that existed in other periods.[84] Furthermore, groupings and parties may be divided on certain points but in agreement on others.

Even more serious is the fact that Hanson's reading of Haggai is based on several unsubstantiated assumptions. First, he affirms that Haggai used "the visionary forms of the prophets"[85] (i.e. Deutero-Isaiah and his disciples) but without the perspective of a cosmic redemption that characterized their prophecies.[86] However Hag 2:6-9 and 2:20-23 use language found extensively in prophetic, eschatological traditions: the assault of the nations, the intervention of the divine warrior, the preservation of Jerusalem, and the cosmic renewal.[87] Hanson affirms the importance of these traditions for Trito-Isaiah and the "visionary" group, but ignores the presence and role of these themes in Haggai. He devotes 180 pages of exegesis to Isa 56-66[88] and five pages to the analysis of Haggai, without a single exegetical comment!

Hanson attributes a very pronounced political intention to Haggai. He speaks of Haggai's "masterful strategy" according to which "the detailed, pragmatic plans representing the interests of the hierocrats were cast into the visionary forms of the prophets, orchestrating the impulses of the visionaries and the realists into one passionate message."[89] But is it possible to affirm that this tactic (which, in the final analysis, is nothing but a ruse) was the prophet's

---

polarization tends to develop primarily between two forces." *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, p. 212. I do not perceive this to be true even from a contemporary political perspective.

[84] For a survey of the issue of sectarianism see Grabbe, *Judaism*, 1:103-11.

[85] Ibid., p. 245.

[86] Ibid., p. 17.

[87] This will be explored and developed in my exegesis of 2:6-9 and 2:20-23; cf. provisionally Chary, p. 33 and G. von Rad, "The City on the Hill", in G. von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, (trans. E. W. T. Dicken; London: SCM Press, 1984), pp. 232-42.

[88] Carroll has suggested that Hanson's sympathies are with the visionary group, a suggestion which the latter denies ("Twilight", pp. 26-27).

[89] Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, p. 245.

intention? Nothing in the text appears to confirm such a motive. By contrast, Haggai appears to stand in the tradition of classical prophecy. He does not hesitate to confront the political and religious leaders, as well as people (Hag 1:1-2; 2:1-3, 12-14). Third, Hanson affirms that Haggai promised the people that the arrival of the eschatological era would accompany the rebuilding of the temple. However it is far from clear that such an affirmation is to be found in Haggai.[90]

In sum, like their earlier counterparts, the three reconstructions described above use Haggai as an historical source without much consideration of the basis upon which such use can be made. The book is assumed to provide great insight into the intra-communal conflict of the period.[91] Furthermore, the text of Haggai is not exegeted in great detail, but cited in passing, in the attempt to sketch the theological landscape of the period. Again, the questions and issues raised in these studies are valid ones. Yet the answers are frequently given without adequate methodological and exegetical support.

1.4. THEOLOGICAL TRADITIONS AND LITERARY DEVELOPMENT: WHAT WERE THE THEOLOGICAL CONCERNS OF HAGGAI AND HIS EDITORS?

Another highly significant avenue of approach to the book of Haggai was developed by various scholars who sought to read the book in terms of its theological roots and its utilization of traditions found elsewhere in biblical literature.[92] Until quite recently, the application of this promising approach to

---

[90] This issue will be explored in my exegesis *infra*.

[91] For a survey of various reconstructions of this conflict, cf. Kessler, "Haggai's Jerusalem", p. 138-42.

[92] This form of traditions analysis is not to be confused with either source criticism or *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, as practiced, for example, in Pentateuchal studies. This approach,

Haggai has been rather limited. At times, exegetes noted the affinity between a certain tradition and a particular aspect of Haggai. Von Rad, for example, maintained that the motif of the pilgrimage to Zion, evident in other passages (Isa 2; Mic 4) was discernible in Hag 2:6-9.[93] He then attempted to elucidate the particular use Haggai makes of the tradition. While von Rad's analysis is highly insightful, and involves sound methodology and careful exegesis, its application to Haggai is limited. Only one section of the book is dealt with, and there is no attempt to establish the broader framework of religious traditions which form the wider backdrop against which the book of Haggai is to be understood. Furthermore, the presence of the idea of a pilgrimage to Zion in 2:6-9, which is central to von Rad's thesis, is rejected by certain exegetes. Such scholars see the passage in a more bellicose light, and view the treasures brought to Jerusalem as war booty or tribute.[94]

Various studies have sought to relate the religious traditions in Haggai to the various stages of the book's development. Frequently such approaches attempted to establish a distinction between the prophet's own theology and the theological perspective underlying the redactional framework through the

---

sometimes called *Traditionsgeschichte*, consists of identifying the intellectual world (or *geistige Welt*), and the theological matrix of a text, with special attention to any innovative or distinctive usages of existing traditions. For an excellent discussion of the relationship between *Traditionsgeschichte* and *Überlieferungsgeschichte* see O. H. Steck, "Theological Streams of Tradition", in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*, (ed. D. A. Knight; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), pp. 183-214. See also D. A. Knight, s. v. "Tradition History", *ABD* 6:633-38, and von Rad, "City", pp. 232-42. Von Rad speaks of certain concepts as being considered "axiomatic" by the prophets who draw upon these themes in their own proclamation.

[93] Von Rad, "City", p. 240f.

[94] P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Ancient Israel*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 135; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), p. 90; P. D. Hanson, "Zechariah 9 and the Recapitulation of an Ancient Ritual Pattern", *JBL* 92 (1973): 58-59; Petersen, p. 68 and idem, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*, (SBLMS 23, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 17.

analysis of the religious traditions present in the two sections. The studies of W. A. M. Beuken[95] and R. Mason[96] are cases in point. In Beuken's opinion, an editor working within a chronistic milieu reinterpreted, resituated, and actualized the prophet's oracles for the needs of a later period, primarily to justify the rejection of Samaritan cult practices.[97] An earlier collection of Haggai's oracles reflected an entirely different milieu of origin, theological vision, and future hope.[98] In a similar fashion, R. Mason maintained that the redactional framework attenuated the prophet's eschatological expectations, since these expectations had gone unfulfilled.[99] Both scholars attempted to differentiate these two distinct perspectives within the book on the basis of each section's idiosyncratic vocabulary, socio-political perspectives, or rootedness in a given theological tradition. [100] These pioneering studies have provoked lively debate[101] and set the tone for much of the subsequent discussion. More significant, however, than the accuracy of any particular conclusion is the use of religious traditions for an understanding of the redactional history of the book. This represents a clear departure from the more naïve use of the book as an historical source. Diachronic matters are introduced, and the book itself is subjected to analysis as a source. What remains to be seen, however, is whether the book does indeed belong to one or another of these proposed traditional matrices, whether the social location

---

[95] W. A. M. Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühnachexilischen Prophetie*, (SSN 10; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1967).

[96] Mason, "Editorial Framework", pp. 413-21.

[97] Beuken (p. 72) discusses the redactional "actualization" in 2:14.

[98] Ibid., pp. 216-29, 334-37.

[99] Mason, "Editorial Framework", pp. 420-21.

[100] This has recently been undertaken by A. Sérandour, ("Les récits bibliques de la construction du second temple: leurs enjeux", *Trans* 11 [1996]: 9-32) who sees the oracles and framework as being distinguishable on the basis of their distinctive vocabulary and their view of dyarchic leadership.

[101] See, for example, Mason's critique of Beuken's "chronistic milieu" in "Editorial Framework", *passim*.

of these various theological tradents or communities can be determined, and, most crucially, whether a distinction in perspective can be successfully established between the various constituent elements of the book.[102]

Scholars have long been aware of the great diversity of theological traditions present in Haggai. Bright, for example, affirmed Haggai's thought to be steeped in Zion theology.[103] T. Chary declared that "many already classical messianic expectations" were present in 2:6-9.[104] The discussion of the theological motifs and traditions in the book of Haggai has become a key element of most modern commentaries. One may cite Petersen's analysis of Hag 2:20-23,[105] or Peckham's designation of Hag 2:5 as a "crasis of allusions."[106] It has furthermore been observed that this presence of a variety of diverse and possibly disparate traditions must be situated in the context of the movement toward the collection and consolidation of religious traditions after the exile.[107]

As noted above, some earlier scholars saw this copious use of diverse traditions as evidence of the degenerate and unoriginal nature of prophecy in Haggai.[108] More recent scholarship, however, has paid significant attention to the theological motivation behind the particular use of earlier traditions in the

---

[102] For a broader discussion of this latter question, see R. Clements, "The Prophet and His Editors", in *The Bible in Three Dimensions*, (JSOTSup 87; ed. D. J. A. Clines; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), pp. 202-20. This issue will be taken up in greater detail in the following chapter.

[103] Bright, *Kingdom of God*, p. 165; idem, *History of Israel*, p. 371. See also, G. Fohrer, s. v. "Sivn", *TDNT* 7:292-319.

[104] Chary, *Prophètes et culte*, p. 132.

[105] Petersen, pp. 98-105.

[106] B. Peckham, *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions*, (ABRL, New York: Doubleday, 1993), p. 745.

[107] See for example, Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, pp. 305-6; Mason, "Prophets of the Restoration", p. 141; W. Zimmerli, "Prophetic Proclamation and Reinterpretation", in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*, (ed. D. A. Knight; London: SPCK, 1977), pp. 69-100; P. D. Hanson, "Israelite Religion in the Early Postexilic Period", in *Ancient Israelite Religion*: *Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. P. D. Miller, P. D. Hanson, and S. D. McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), pp. 485-508.

[108] See *supra*, pp. 6-7XX.

book.[109] One major work of this genre is that of J. A. Tollington, published in 1993.[110] The book is devoted to an analysis of various aspects of Haggai and Zech 1-8. With reference to Haggai, Tollington discusses the date at which the book achieved its final form, the basis of the prophetic authority of Haggai, the way in which Haggai received his revelation, Haggai's view of leadership in the restoration community as well as the concepts of messianism, eschatology (specifically judgment), and the relationship between Israel, Yahweh and the nations of the world. It is primarily in connection with these latter, more theological themes, that Tollington discusses the use of earlier traditions in Haggai. She examines the use of various traditions in the book and the particular reasons why the traditions are so used. While in certain regards Tollington's work parallels my own, significant differences of focus, objective, and methodology exist.[111]

The nature and use of religious traditions has received attention from both religious anthropology and biblical scholarship. Most significant here is the growing awareness of the impact of the process of transmission (*traditio*)[112] on

---

[109] See, for example, the discussion of Haggai's use of the Davidic traditions in S. V. Wyrick, "Haggai's Appeal to Tradition: Imagination Used as Authority", in *Religious Writings and Religious Systems*, (vol. 1; ed. Jacob Neusner; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), pp. 117-25.

[110] J. A. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, (JSOTSup 150, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

[111] These will become apparent as this discussion proceeds. The most significant is my discussion of the use of religious traditions. Furthermore, as I do not include Zechariah, much more attention can be allotted to issues more germane to Haggai. I will not only examine the nature and purpose of Haggai's use of earlier tradition, I will also inquire as to what the book as a whole, and the use of religious tradition in particular, can tell us about the role of the prophet in the early Persian Yehud. Furthermore, in order to do so, I shall take a more detailed look at several historical issues which greatly influence one's reading of the book.

[112] See, for example, J. Audinet, "Du transmettre ou la tradition comme pratique sociale", in J. Audeinet et. al. *Essais de théologie pratique: l'institution et le transmettre.* (Le Point Théologique; Paris: Beauchesne, 1988), pp. 109-15; and idem, "Dispositifs du 'transmettre' et 'confession de la foi'", in *Essais de théologie pratique: l'institution et le transmettre* pp. 166-205.

that which is transmitted (*traditum*).[113] M. Meslin rejects the notion of religious tradition as "the simple quasi-mechanical transmission of a lifeless and ossified deposit."[114] In his opinion such transmission is a "doubly living process" because of "unceasing interaction" between the past and the present, between *traditio* and *traditum*. Transmission of tradition is thus essentially "dialogical and diachronic."[115] In a similar vein, Knight takes into consideration the notion of "*Vergegenwärtigung*" or the transforming process of interpretation and actualization which earlier traditions undergo when they are reformulated or reapplied in a later period.[116] Zimmerli[117] and Steck[118] employ a similar methodological approach. What is significant in light of these recent studies, is that recontextualization of traditions is now accurately seen to be no neutral process, but rather a profoundly hermeneutical one.[119] It is essential therefore that an analysis of Haggai take into account this interpretive and hermeneutical activity--this *Vergegenwärtigung*--on the part of the prophet and his editors.

1.5.   SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC ANALYSES OF EARLY PERSIAN YEHUD

Most of the recent analyses of early Persian Yehud and its literature employ social scientific methodologies, and seek to identify and describe the milieu of origin of the various relevant texts. The works of W. Robertson Smith, M. Weber, and E. Durkheim were foundational in this regard.[120] In more recent

---

[113] D. A. Knight, s. v. "Tradition History", *ABD* 6:633.

[114] M. Meslin, *L'expérience humaine du divin. Fondements d'une anthropologie religieuse*, (Cogitatio Fidei 150; Paris: Cerf, 1988), p. 381.

[115] Ibid.

[116] Knight, "Tradition History", p. 634.

[117] Zimmerli, "Prophetic Proclamation", p. 76.

[118] Steck, "Streams of Tradition", pp. 183-98.

[119] In a similar vein, B. Childs, (*Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, [OTL; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979], pp. 75-79) notes this hermeneutical activity in the redaction of prophetic texts.

[120] For a resumé of the influence of the social sciences in biblical studies, see C. E. Carter,

literature these methodological approaches have been utilised in several areas. Anthropological and sociological approaches have been applied to questions regarding the history of ancient Israel, aiming at the comprehension of its political origins and social structures.[121] Likewise, data drawn from the anthropological study of non-Western societies has been used to elucidate certain aspects of Israelite ritual.[122] More recently ethnoarchaeology,[123] a discipline that concerns the application of ethnographic studies to archaeological problems, has entered Syro-Palestinian archaeology and the terms "new archaeology," "sociological archaeology"[124] or "contextual archaeology" are frequently employed.[125] These approaches seek to broaden the horizons of archaeology in order to integrate on the one hand, archaeological and textual data, and, on the other, questions relative to ecological, political, economic, and social conditions.[126] Particularly significant in this regard are the recent demographic

---

Emergence, p. 60-70 and idem, "A Discipline in Transition: The Contributions of the Social Sciences to the Study of the Hebrew Bible", in *Community, Identity, and Ideology: Social Science Approaches to the Hebrew Bible*, (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study; ed. C. E. Carter and C. Meyers, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), pp. 3-36. Cf. also A. D. H. Mays, "Sociology and the Old Testament", in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives*, (ed. R. E. Clements; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 39-63. I am indebted to Carter for much of the following overview.

[121] As for example in the work of Alt, Noth, Mendenhall and Gottwald.

[122] M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), pp. 41-57; Meslin, *Expérience humaine*, pp. 66-80, 144-46; J. W. Rogerson, "Anthropology and the Old Testament", in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives*, (ed. R. E. Clements; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 17-37.

[123] For a summary see C. Kramer, ed. *Ethnoarchaeology. The Implications of Ethnography for Archaeology*, (New York: Academic Press, 1977); cf. two recent volumes of *Near Eastern Archaeology* (63/1[2000] and 63/2 [2000]), both devoted to ethnoarchaeology.

[124] C. Meyers and E. Meyers, "Expanding the Frontiers of Biblical Archaeology", *Y. Yadin Volume*, (ErIsr 20; ed. A. Ben Tor, J. C. Greenfield and A. Malamat; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989), pp. 142*-43*.

[125] W. Dever, "Biblical Archaeology: Death and Rebirth", in *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology,* (ed. A. Biran and J. Aviram, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993), pp. 706-22.

[126] Meyers and Meyers, "Expanding the Frontiers", p. 143. On this, cf. P. R. Davies, ed., *Second*

studies of Palestine,[127] especially during the postexilic period.[128] Of a similar

interest is the work of H. Kreissig and H. Kippenberg[129] on the economic

situation in Judah after the exile as well as the analysis of its social structure,

economic, and political situation elaborated by J. P. Weinberg[130] and D. L.

Smith.[131] However, such approaches are not without limitations. A significant

bibliography now exists on the limits[132] and on the validity[133] of such approaches,

especially the use of analogies[134] to comprehend Israelite institutions. Valuable

criticisms and reservations have been expressed.[135]

Temple Studies 1: Persian Period, (JSOTSup 117; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

[127] M. Broshi, "Estimating the Population of Ancient Jerusalem", *BAR* 4 (1978): 10-15; idem, "La population de Jérusalem", *RB* 82 (1975): 5-14; R. Gophna and M. Broshi, "The Settlements and Population of Palestine during the Early Bronze Age II-III", *BASOR* 253 (1984): 41-53; idem, "Middle Bronze Age II Palestine: Its Settlements and Population", *BASOR* 261 (1986): 73-90.

[128] J. P. Weinberg. "Demographische Notizen zur Geschichte der Nachexilischen Gemeinde in Juda", *Klio* 54 (1972): 46-50.

[129] H. G. Kippenberg, *Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa. Eine religions-soziologische Studie zum Verhältnis von Tradition und gesellschaftlicher Entwicklung*, (SUNT 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978); H. Kreissig, Die *sozialökonomische Situation in Juda zur Achämenidzeit*, (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 7; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1973).

[130] J. P. Weinberg, "Das *BEIT 'ABOT im* 6-4 Jh. v.u.Z.", *VT* 23 (1973): 400-414; "Die Agrarverhältnisse in der Bürger-Tempel-Gemeinde der Achämenidenzeit", *Acta Antiqua* 22 (1974): 473-85; "Zentral-und Partikulargewalt im achämenidischen Reich", *Klio* 59 (1977): 25-43; "*Netînîm* und 'Söhne der Sklaven Salomos' im 6.-4. Jh. v.u.Z.", *ZAW* 87 (1975): 355-71; "Transmitter and Recipient in the Process of Acculturation: the Experience of the Judean Citizen-Temple-Community", *Trans* 13 (1997): 91-105. Weinberg's major articles have been translated and are available in English as J. Weinberg, *The Citizen-Temple Community*, (JSOTSup 151; trans. D. Smith-Christopher; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

[131] D. Smith, *The Religion of the Landless*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989).

[132] See, for example, N. P. Lemche, "On the Use of 'System Theory', 'Macro Theories' and Evolutionistic Thinking in Modern OT Research and Biblical Archaeology", *SJOT* 2 (1990): 73-88.

[133] See, for example, the review of Wilson, *Prophecy and Society* by G. E. Mendenhall in *BA* 44 (1981): 189-90. In this vigourous critique of Wilson's work, Mendenhall rejects the analogical use of African tribal groups for the understanding of Hebrew prophetism. See also Lemche and J. M. Sasson, "On Choosing Models for Recreating Israelite Pre-Monarchic History", *JSOT* 21 (1981): 3-24.

[134] Cf. Carter, *Postexilic Judah*, pp. 32-34.

[135] Ibid., also idem *Emergence*, pp. 68-70.

Sociologists, biblical scholars and historians of Israelite religion have found the phenomenon of prophecy and the nature of the prophetic institution in Israel to be an area of common interest. A large number of introductions and specialized studies have described the evolution and history of Israelite prophetism, the various forms of prophetic speech, the prophets' theological tendencies, and other issues related to the phenomenon.[136] More recent studies of prophecy, which reflect the influence of the social sciences, have followed several paths. Some have attempted to analyze the mechanism of prophecy more closely. Others have investigated the prophets' authority and the strata within society that granted them their support.[137] Yet others have attempted to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the prophet within society.[138] In this connection, discussions of the prophetic role and the social location of the prophet have become highly significant.[139] Interestingly, Haggai has received little attention in this regard. He is at times considered to be a "cult prophet,"[140] or associated with one or another of the various supposed theological and sociological groupings of the early Persian period. One article has been devoted

---

[136] The bibliography here is voluminous. For a general survey see J. Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel*, (2nd. edtn.; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996). See also J. A. Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, (3rd. ed.; OTL; trans. John Bowden; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1989), pp. 239-81; L. Ramlot, s. v. "Prophétisme", *DBS* 7 cols. 811-1222; R. E. Clements, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation,* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), pp. 51-75; cf. also the earlier survey articles by G. Fohrer in *Theologische Rundschau* 19 (1951): 277-346; 20 (1952): 192-271, 295-361; 28 (1962): 1-75, 235-97, 301-74; 40 (1975): 193-209, 337-77; 41 (1976): 1-12.

[137] B. O. Long, "Prophetic Authority as Social Reality", in *Canon and Authority: Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology*, (ed. G. W. Coats and B. O. Long; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), pp. 3-20; idem, "Social Dimensions of Prophetic Conflict", *Semeia* 21 (1981): 31-53.

[138] Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*; D. L. Petersen, *The Roles of Israel's Prophets*, (JSOTSup 17; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

[139] Wilson, *Prophecy and Society,* p. 8f; D. L. Petersen, *Roles*; P. Berger, "Charisma and Religious Innovation: The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy", *American Sociological Review* 28 (1963): 945-50; J. Williams, "The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy", *JAAR* 37 (1969): 153-65, (the last two are cited in Long, "Prophetic Authority", p. 7). Blenkinsopp, *History,* pp. 26-39, with bibliography.

[140] Blenkinsopp, *History*, p. 201.

to Haggai's role, but it only deals with Hag 2:10-14.[141] Closely related to discussions of the prophetic role and social location[142] is the issue of the fate of prophecy in the Persian period, especially its supposed cessation, a view which has been challenged in recent scholarly literature.[143] It seems judicious to affirm, with Petersen, that significant change did occur with reference to the prophetic office during the Persian period.[144] In this regard the book of Haggai does indeed contain valuable data about the nature and functioning of prophecy and presents the historian with a significant resource for understanding of the place of prophecy in early Persian Yehud.

1.6. THE PRESENT STUDY: PURPOSE, APPROACH, AND STRUCTURE

The preceding survey of issues and approaches to the study of Haggai in its Persian context was intended to demonstrate that a fresh examination of the book and its social context is indeed warranted. This task is made all the more

---

[141] E. M. Meyers, "The Use of *Tôrâ* in Haggai 2, and the Role of the Prophet in the Restoration", in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*: *Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday*, (ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor; Winona Lake: Eisenbraun's/American School of Oriental Research, 1973), pp. 69-76.

[142] Here see recently, J. Blenkinsopp, "The Social Roles of Prophets in Early Achaemenid Judah", *JSOT* 93 (2001): 39-58, with bibliography.

[143] See B. D. Sommer, "Did Prophecy Cease?" Sommer cites the relevant bibliographic data on both sides of the question (p. 31, n. 1 and 2). He personally concludes that prophecy did indeed cease in the Persian Period. Cf. also O. H. Steck, *Der Abschluss der Prophetie im Alten Testament*, (BthSt 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991).

[144] D. L. Petersen, "Rethinking the End of Prophecy", in *"Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden": Collected Communications to the XIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament*, Jerusalem 1986, (BEATAJ 13; ed. M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988), pp. 65-71. Cf. also his more recent articles, "Israelite Prophecy: Change versus Continuity", in *Congress Volume: Leuven, 1989*, (ed. J. A. Emerton; SVT 43; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), pp. 190-203, and "Rethinking the Nature of Prophetic Literature", in *Prophecy and Prophets: The Diversity of Contemporary Issues in Scholarship*, (ed. Y. Gitay, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), p. 23-40.

fruitful by the virtual explosion of publications dealing with our prophet, as well as the Babylonian and Persian periods in Palestine, which has occurred since 1980. Several major commentaries on Haggai have appeared, such as those of Amsler, Wolff, Petersen, Meyers and Meyers, Verhoef, and Redditt, as well as several studies of Haggai in commentaries on the Minor Prophets, including those of Craigie, Achtemeier, Motyer, and Floyd. As Carter has noted, during the first three quarters of the last century, Yehud was generally treated peripherally in the context of larger works, or was the subject of shorter, more specific studies.[145] This situation no longer obtains. A major body of literature now exists on the Persian Empire.[146] We have a large and growing corpus of monographs and specialized studies on Syria-Palestine in the Persian period.[147] The journal *Transeuphratène* has contributed enormously to this literature, especially through its comprehensive bibliographic and review articles on disciplines such as archaeology, epigraphy, numismatics, and Old Testament.[148] The two recent

---

[145] Carter, *Emergence,* p. 33.

[146] Cf. the work of the Achaemenid History Workshop, which has published 10 volumes to date. Of special importance due to its length and comprehensive nature is P. Briant, *Histoire de l'empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*, (2 vols., Achaemenid History 10; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1996). Also significant here are M. A. Dandamaev and V. G. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran*, (trans. P. L. Kohl; Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988) and M. A. Dandamaev, *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire*, (trans. W. J. Vogelsang; Leiden and New York: E. J. Brill, 1989).

[147] Cf., for example (with bibliography): W. D. Davies and J. Finkelstein, eds., *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol. 1, Persian Period (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), henceforth *CHJ*; P. R. Davies, ed., *Second Temple Studies 1: Persian Period,* (JSOTSup 117; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); E.-M. Laperrousaz and A. Lemaire, *La Palestine à l'époque perse*, (Paris: Cerf, 1994); T. Eskenazi and K. Richards, eds., *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple and Community in the Persian Period*, (JSOTSup 175; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); J. Elayi and J. Sapin, *Beyond the River: New Perspectives on Transeuphratène*, (JSOTSup 250; trans. J. E. Crowley, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998=Eng. tr. of *Nouveaux regards sur la Transeuphratène*, [Paris: Brépols, 1991]); Carter, *Emergence*; J. Elayi and J. Sapin, *Quinze ans de recherche (1985-2000) sur la Transeuphratène à l'époque perse*, (Suppléments à *Trans* 8; Paris: Gabalda, 2000).

[148] *Trans* 1 (1989): 131-64; *Trans* 4 (1991): 83-195; *Trans* 10 (1995): 87-211; *Trans* 17 (1999): 47-169. A full listing of the specific review articles and their authors may be found at www.perso.infonie.fr.

bibliographic surveys and analyses published by P. Briant[149] that supplement the extensive bibliography in his *Histoire de l'empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*, as well as the related web-site,[150] have provided scholars with a regularly updated source of data on a variety of issues related to the Persian period. In comparison with the relative paucity of literature which existed as little as twenty years ago, we are now the beneficiaries of a large body of critical literature related to our period.

We have observed the quasi-unanimous verdict that the book of Haggai represents a rich resource for the historical reconstruction of early Persian Yehud. However, as the deficiencies of certain approaches to Haggai demonstrate, unless a comprehensive, interdisciplinary and integrative approach is used, results may be less than satisfactory. In the chapters which follow, therefore, I will present an analysis of Haggai which includes: (1) a careful philological, syntactical, and literary-rhetorical analysis of the text, including its use of theological and religious traditions found elsewhere in biblical literature; (2) an analysis of the text's redactional history; and (3) an understanding of the broader political, religious, and sociological context (involving here the resources available through archaeology as well as the judicious use of the social sciences) contemporaneous with the production of the oracles and framework of the book.

However as one examines these aforementioned elements, one must determine *how* a document such as the book of Haggai can most profitably be used, or, more particularly, what *kind of data* it is liable to yield. Especially significant here is the understanding that Haggai is a text with specific

---

[149] P. Briant, "Bulletin d'histoire achéménide", in *Recherches récentes sur l'empire achéménide*, (Supplément à *Topoi* 1; Lyon and Paris: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen, 1997), pp. 5-127; idem, *Bulletin d'histoire achéménide II*, 1998-2000, (Persica 1; Paris: Thotm, 2001).
[150] www.achemenet.com; cf. also www.transeuphratene.com and www.perso.infonie.fr.

ideological goals and theological preoccupations. Stated in the simplest of terms, the book of Haggai contains dates, prophetic oracles, and brief narrative sequences relating to prophetic activity in the context of early Persian Yehud, all of which are woven into a literary whole. As such, the book has much to tell us about prophecy and society *as it was understood by the framer(s) of that literary whole, as revealed through the book's portrait of Haggai the prophet.*[151] Thus my interest is not in the naïve use of the book as a springboard from which to access the hard facts of "what really happened" but rather to examine the data in the book, in order to understand the specific perspective or perspectives contained in it vis-à-vis the issues to which the book speaks.[152]

At this point it may help to illustrate how such a reading functions, and its ultimate usefulness. It is frequently asserted that the people's refusal to come and build the temple (Hag 1:2) was rooted in theological and eschatological convictions regarding the appropriate time for its reconstruction. It is affirmed that, in the eyes of the people, the divinely appointed time for such a project had not yet arrived, whereas Haggai advocated immediate rebuilding.[153] However, as

---

[151] The question of the relationship between this redactional portrait and the "historical Haggai" will be explored in ch. 2.

[152] Cf. my arguments in "The Second Year of Darius and the Prophet Haggai", *Trans* 5 (1992): 63-84. This approach is elaborated and defended in M. H. Floyd, "The Nature of the Narrative and the Evidence of Redaction in Haggai", *VT* 45 (1995): 470-90, esp. pp. 473, 489-90.

[153] For a survey of the development of this position, cf. ch. 5, pp. XX-XX, infra. For a statement of it, cf. P. R. Bedford, "Discerning the Time: Haggai, Zechariah and the 'Delay' in the Rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple", in *The Pitcher is Broken: Memorial Essays for G. W. Ahlström*, (JSOTSup 190; ed. S. W. Holloway and L. K. Handy; Sheffield: JSOT, 1995), pp. 71-94 and H. Tadmor, "'The Appointed Time Has Not Yet Arrived': The Historical Background of Haggai 1:2", in *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*, (ed. W. W. Hallo, L. H. Schiffman, and R. Chazon; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999), pp. 401-8. Cf., more recently, P. R. Bedford, *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*, (JSJSup 63, Leiden: Brill, 2001), esp. pp. 168-80 and 273-90. As noted in the introduction, I am not able to incorporate my response to Bedford's recent work in the present study.

I have endeavoured to demonstrate elsewhere,[154] and as will be discussed in the exegesis below, whatever the historical realities may have been, both the syntactical formulation of Hag 1:2 and the context of Hag 1 as a whole make it clear that the editor of Haggai does not want the reader of the text to perceive the debate as theological, nor its resolution to be the result of Haggai's theological expertise and sophisticated scholarly handling of the relevant texts and traditions. Quite to the contrary, the reader is meant to view the people as self-centred and obstinate, and Haggai as a profoundly effective prophet whose words cut through hardened hearts and achieve the desired result. The question to be asked, then, is not so much, "what *really* happened?" (although that question is not an invalid one) but rather "why was it important for the redactor to set Haggai in this *particular* light and for the reader/hearer to perceive the situation in such a way?" The same can be said regarding the various social, political, and theological issues touched upon in the book. It is my conviction that, if the book of Haggai is read this way, a significant piece of the mosaic of perceptions current in early Persian Yehud may be brought to light.

Viewed from this perspective, the book of Haggai may be analyzed as an expression of the culture or sub-culture that produced it.[155] Put another way, the book of Haggai can serve not so much as a lens through which history may be

---

[154] J. Kessler, "*'t* (le temps) en Aggée i, 2-4: conflit théologique ou 'sagesse mondaine'?" *VT* 48 (1998): 555-59.

[155] Cf. from a different perspective, E. T. Mullen, *Narrative History and Ethnic Boundaries: The Deuteronomistic Historian and the Creation of Israelite National Identity*, (SemeiaSt; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), and idem, *Ethnic Myths and Pentateuchal Foundations*, (SemeiaSt; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997). Mullen (*Ethnic Myths*, p. 2) asserts that quite frequently national identity is developed via traditions created from whole cloth. This position has been vigourously challenged by F. Deist, as it relates to Yehud, on the analogy of the South African experience (F. E. Deist, "The Yehud Bible: A Belated Divine Miracle?", *JNSL* 23 [1997]: 117-42). On the broader issues involved in the discussion of ethnicity cf. S. Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).

reconstructed (although, with due critical caution certain elements of it can be used in such a fashion), but as an unselfconscious testimony to the vision of prophecy and society which was nurtured and promulgated by those who configured and disseminated the book of Haggai.[156] Smith, similarly, invites modern readers to view Haggai, Ezra, and Nehemiah from the perspective of an "exilic consciousness" which has significantly shaped the perception of the social and religious experience reflected in them."[157] This approach to the reading of Haggai is also consistent with the general orientation of "contextual archaeology"[158] which treats texts, material remains, social structure, and ideological and theological convictions as valid means of reconstructing the larger whole.

I return to my point of departure. My goal in this study is to pursue an understanding of the distinctive portrait of Yehudite society in general, and the prophetic role in particular, which is encountered in the book of Haggai. In order to do this, my study will proceed as follows. Chapter 2 will discuss the book's redactional history and set that process within a chronological framework. In this connection the question of the relationship between Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 will also be discussed. Chapter 3 will examine a number of specific historical issues, critical to an understanding of the text, which are contemporaneous with the text's creation. Yet in order not to prejudice the reading of the text, these historical questions will be resolved either apart from the data in Haggai, or with minimal appeal to it. This redactional and historical analysis will provide a "platform" from which a reading of the text will then be undertaken in chapters

---

[156] Cf. ch. 10, *infra*.

[157] Smith, *Landless*, p. 197. Despite my serious disagreements with Smith regarding the exegesis of Hag 2:10-19, this methodological approach to reading Haggai is highly appropriate.

[158] Cf. n. 122 and 123, *supra*.

4-8. In these chapters, each pericope of the book will be examined in four sections: (1) translation and textual criticism; (2) structural and literary considerations; (3) exegesis; and (4) rhetorical and hermeneutical use of religious traditions. Chapter 9 will present a literary analysis of Haggai, with special attention to its structure, form, and purpose. Chapter 10 will summarize the distinctive perspectives of the book which were identified in the course of this study, and subsequently set forth a proposal regarding the social location and purposes of the framers of the book.