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1. Introduction: Rom-Shiloni's Understanding of Haggai as an "Exclusivist" Text

I count it an honour to be invited to participate in this collection of papers, and to respond to Dalit Rom-Shiloni's recent monograph, specifically as it relates to her treatment of the Book of Haggai. Her volume is an excellent work of scholarship: carefully argued, meticulously researched, and clearly presented. It reflects the author's deep and sustained investigation into the prophetic and historiographical material of the 6th and 5th c. BCE and the concepts of inclusion and exclusion found within it. She demonstrates an exemplary command of the various biblical texts relating to her topic and of the relevant secondary literature. I am also grateful to Professor Rom-Shiloni for her careful interaction with and appreciation for my own work. In many places we fully agree.

However, at one critical point we hold divergent perspectives and it is this matter that I will address in my comments here. Rom-Shiloni argues that the Book of Haggai adopts a "subtly exclusionary strategy" vis-à-vis the non-exiled population. I, on the other hand, see Haggai (both the prophet and the book) as manifesting a "non-exclusionary" perspective, in that no group of Yahwists is singled out for inclusion or exclusion. I wish to stress my terminology here—I choose to employ the term "non-exclusionary" for a very specific reason. The terms "exclusionary" and "inclusionary" (or "exclusivist" or "inclusivist"), as used in Rom-Shiloni's Exclusive Inclusivity, designate the refusal or willingness of an elite—or core—group to exclude or to include outsiders into its ranks. As I will argue below, I do not see Haggai (either the prophet or the book) as reasoning within an "in-group" versus "out-group" conceptual

---

2 See especially ibid., 19–30.
Rather, the book chronicles the prophet’s address to all those present in late-sixth-century Yehud, without any reference to one’s fate or geographical location during the Babylonian period. I will argue that when the book of Haggai is allowed to speak with its own voice, and is not read in the light of other more polemical texts, its “non-exclusionary” orientation emerges quite clearly.

The core of Rom-Shiloni’s argument, as I understand it, is this: (1) there is no mention of the non-exiled population in the book of Haggai, either among the named characters (Rom-Shiloni regards Haggai as a Returnee, although I do not believe this can be determined with any certainty; the fact that his lineage is left undefined is likely intentional and highly telling, see infra), or in the terminology applied to the general populace; (2) this absence of any reference to the non-exiled population is analogous to the portrait of the land as empty or devoid any Israelite population in other historiographic (Ezra–Nehemiah) and prophetic (Zech 1–8) texts, and thus reflects the same attitude—although a non-exiled population was indeed present in the land, its existence is passed over in silence, since, for these authors, this population was placed on the same level as non-Jews; (3) The non-specific designations for the population at large (e.g., לשון גוירעין; יבש אמאן) in Hag 1:12–14 and 2:4 are widely agreed upon self-designations of the Returnees cannot refer to or include the Remainees; this leads to the conclusion that (4) in spite of the absence of any clear words of exclusion, Haggai’s message must be understood as exclusively addressed to the community of Returnees. Such an exclusive focus is implicit rather than explicit, but clear nonetheless.

The evidence Rom-Shiloni adduces to support her position moves along two related lines. First, she argues that the outlook of Haggai is similar to that of Zech 1–8, where the non-deported population is disenfranchised by simply ignoring its very existence. This manoeuvre rejects them, not explicitly (as is the case in Ezek 11:14–21; 33:23–29 and Jer 24), but by ignoring their presence in the land. Moreover, just as Zech 1–8 focuses uniquely upon the golah, and upon hopes for its return from Babylon, so too in Haggai the addressees consist exclusively of Returnees, who are called upon to rebuild the Jerusalemite temple. This is seen through Haggai’s emphasis upon the leading members of the community.

---

3 Indeed, this is what I meant by my earlier statement that the various designations of the people in the Book of Haggai were “inclusive of the entire Yehudite community”, J. Kessler, The Book of Haggai: Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud (VTSup, 91; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 141.

4 Indeed, Rom-Shiloni has confirmed, in personal communication, that my summary faithfully reflects her position.

(Joshua, Zerubbabel) who are identified as Repatriates. Furthermore, she asserts that in Haggai, as in Zechariah, “the Repatriates [are seen] as settlers of an empty land.” 9 Rom-Shiloni’s second line of argumentation focuses upon the terminology used for the general population. As just noted, she asserts that the terms כל השכינה הנם (1:12,14; 2:4) are technical terms designating the Repatriates, and could not have been used in a neutral or inclusive fashion in Haggai.

In this brief discussion I will engage these two lines of argument, and assert that neither is able to support the claim that Haggai manifests an exclusivist outlook. I will subsequently raise further questions regarding the plausibility of Rom-Shiloni’s thesis in the context of the sociological and demographic realities of late-sixth-century Yehud. However, before I do so, I must make a few brief remarks about the literary development and purpose of the book of Haggai. An adequate understanding of its literary origins, form, structure, and purpose are foundational to any discussion of its stance regarding questions of inclusion and exclusion.

2. THE BOOK OF HAGGAI: LITERARY HISTORY, MILIEU OF ORIGIN, AND PURPOSE

Numerous recent approaches see the composition of Haggai as forming, from the outset, a part of a larger composition including Zech 1–8,1 or Zech 1–8 and Malachi.2 However, along with Mark J.

Boda and with certain qualifications Jakob Wöhrle, I view the book of Haggai (apart from a few later additions) as having attained its present form prior to any major redactional activity linking it to either Zech 1–8, 9–14, or Malachi. Boda argues that four, largely discrete literary units (viz., Hag 1–2; Zech 1–8; Zech 9–14; and Malachi) were subsequently redactionally joined together.3 Wöhrle, for his part, sees the formation of Hag 1–2 (both its oracles and chronological framework) as having occurred prior to the redactional activity which linked it to Zech 1–8, forming a Hag–Zech 1–8 corpus. He maintains that Zech 1–8 “corrects” the less nuanced

9 Rom-Shiloni, Exclusive Inclusivity, 98.


concept of repentance found in Haggai, adding to it notions of social justice and the need for ongoing obedience.\textsuperscript{10} I have similarly argued that Haggai is a literary unit in its own right (certain minor redactional additions or linking features notwithstanding), standing chronologically prior to Zech 1–8.\textsuperscript{11} Although the arguments for this position cannot be rehearsed here, suffice it to say that a strong case exists for regarding Haggai as a literary unit with its own distinctive form, outlook and purpose. Accordingly, its perspectives on the social and ideological dynamics in Yehud must be derived from its own voice, rather than from other texts.

Despite well-known disagreements regarding the extent to which the outlook of the “redactional framework” in Haggai can be distinguished from that of the book’s oracular material, virtually all are agreed that the oracles of Haggai have been collected and set into a broader literary whole.\textsuperscript{12} The resultant composition is structured in an A/B/A’/B’ fashion with a brief narrative at 1:12–15, connecting the condemnations of 1:2–11 to the expressions of hope and favour in 2:1–9. The “A” sections (1:2–11; 2:15–19) tend to be largely negative in tone (although not without elements of hope and promise, 1:8; 2:18–19) and the “B” sections (2:1–9; 20–23) resplendent with optimism and encouragement.\textsuperscript{13} The work is shaped into the form of a “dramatized prophetic booklet,” whose purpose is to underline the ongoing relevance of the prophetic office and the prophetic word in early Persian Yehud.\textsuperscript{14} It begins with a complete stalemate between Yahweh and the community (1:2–11) and culminates in the expectation that very soon the Yehud’s temple (2:6–9) and Davidic governor would be exalted to heights hitherto unknown (2:23). The impasse with which the book opens is created by “this people’s” (נאם הנמצה ב:2) assertion that it is not the time to come (וב) and build Yahweh’s house.\textsuperscript{15} This stale-


\textsuperscript{13} Thus my proposal in Kessler, The Book of Haggai, 247–51, followed most recently in M. Leuenberger, Haggai (HThKat; Freiburg Herder, 2015), 35–38.

\textsuperscript{14} Kessler, The Book of Haggai, 243–57.

\textsuperscript{15} On this translation see J. Kessler, “It (le temps) en Aggée I 2–4: Conflit théologique ou ‘sagesse mondaine’? ” J/’T 48 (1998), 555–59. This stands in contrast to the more common (and in my view erroneous) rendering, “The time has not come . . . .”
mate, however is broken through the prophetic word, delivered by Haggai, and accompanied by Yahweh’s stirring-up of the spirits of leaders and people who come (8f2) and perform the work of rebuilding (1:12–14). The prophetic word once again intervenes to reassure the community when it becomes paralyzed with fear (2:1–5, and possibly 1:12b) and sets before it the assurance of a future filled with divine blessing (2:6–9; 20–23). The book likely stemmed from a prophetic circle closely associated with Haggai, which understood the prophetic office, the Sinai covenant, the temple and its priesthood, and the monarchy to be integral elements of the nation’s identity, all of which deserved the people’s attention, and all of which Yahweh would restore to their former glory, and beyond. In my view, numerous factors indicate that the book attained its present form (with the possibility of certain later redactional additions, for example 2:5a) sometime before 500. In my opinion, neither the date formulae within the book, nor its contents suggest a later period, and many features within it confirm a late-sixth-century date. Thus, the phrase “the remnant of the people” in Haggai (1:12, 14; 2:2), a core element in Rom-Shiloni’s argument, should be interpreted within the broader development of the concept of the “remnant” from the 7th to the late-6th c. BCE. The demographic realities of mid- to late-sixth-century Yehud are also highly relevant, and these will be considered below. One final comment is critical here: there is no clear evidence of conflict between the Remanese and the Returnees at this early period. This point is of great significance and will be taken up infra.

16 On this point, see the discussion of the people’s fear in Hag 1:12 in E. Assis, “To Build or Not to Build: A Dispute between Haggai and his People (Hag 1),” ZAW 119 (2007), 514–27.


18 On this see further Kessler, “Haggai 2:5a.”

19 By contrast, although Wöhrle and Martin Leuenberger attribute much of Haggai to the early Persian Period, they date its more “eschatological” passages (2:6–8; 21b–23a) to the mid- to late-5th c., and see the formulation of the Hag–1 Zech corpus as likely occurring at this time, Leuenberger, Haggai, 61–63; J. Wöhrle, Die frühen Sammlungen des Zwißchenprophetenbuches: Entstehung und Komposition (BZAW, 360; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 285–322 (301–2, 309–12, 321).

3. CHALLENGES TO ROM-SHILONI’S RECONSTRUCTION

Having stated my own working assumptions regarding the Book of Haggai I return now to the two main lines of Rom-Shiloni’s argument, noted above. It seems to me that there are significant questions and problems with respect to each of them.

3.1. THE ASSUMPTION THAT HAGGAI, AND ZECH 1–8 SHARE AN IDENTICAL OUTLOOK AND PERSPECTIVE

As we have seen, Rom-Shiloni maintains that, like Zechariah, Haggai is a golah-focused text, which, through the trope of the “empty land” excludes any members of the non-exiled population simply by ignoring their existence. Rom-Shiloni and I are in complete agreement that neither Haggai nor Zechariah explicitly names or identifies any group standing in opposition to the intended audience of either the prophet or the book. Thus, we concur that Hag 2:15–19 is not a rejection of Samaritan aid (pace Johann W. Rothstein, Hans W. Wolff and others), and that Hag 1:12–14 does not distinguish two types of Yahwists (some whose spirits are stirred up by Yahweh and rebuild, and others who do not). We similarly agree that the term כל העם באמר in Hag 2:4 does not refer to any excluded population as it (or its plural form) does elsewhere.

Our point of disagreement emerges as Rom-Shiloni expresses her conviction that Haggai and Zech 1–8 are of a piece, both manifesting an avowedly “inclusivist-exclusivist” perspective toward the non-deported population. She states, “Haggai does not use (and probably does not know of) Ezra–Nehemiah’s opposition of ‘otherness’. According to that latter opposition the denigrating analogy between Israel and the Canaanite peoples was re-adapted to their current conflict between Repatriates and Those (Judeans) Who Remained in the land. Haggai seems to be closer to Zechariah’s positioning of the Repatriates as settlers of an empty land, a con-

---

21 This of course stands in striking contrast to the situation in Jer 24 and 42–44, Ezek 11:14–21; 33:23–29, Ezra 3:3; 4:1–5; 6:21; 9:1–2; 10:2, 10, and Neh 4; 6; 9:2, 10:30; 13:1–14; 23–31. In these texts the “out group” from which the returnees are distinguished is either named or described. Thus the Book of Ezekiel differentiates the 597 deportees from those who remained in Jerusalem (Ezek 13:23–29; 33:23–29). A similar perspective is adopted in Jer 24 regarding the Eastern Diaspora who receives divine approbation in contrast to all other Judeans, and in Jer 44 which invokes doom on the Egyptian diaspora. On these various and often divergent portraits, see further J. Kessler, “Images of Exile: Representations of the ‘Exile’ and ‘Empty Land’ in Sixth to Fourth Century BCE Yehudite Literature,” in E. Ben Zvi and C. Levin (eds.), The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts (BZAW, 404; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 309–51. Both Ezra and Nehemiah make similar distinctions, and name the opposing populations: the בְּנֵי זְבָלִים in Ezra 10:2, 11 and the בְּנֵי יָהוֵה in Ezr 9:1, 2, 11; Neh 9:30 and 10:29.

22 Pace M.H. Floyd, Minor Prophets, part 2 (FOTL, 22; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 276 and numerous others, see infra, n. 48.
ception that does not see any others: they are as if transparent, as if invisible.”

In the present context I must leave aside the question of whether Rom-Shiloni’s assumption regarding an exclusivist position in Zechariah is indeed accurate. Although I have significant reservations about her approach to that text, I will for the sake of argument, admit such a possibility, but suggest that even if such a perspective were in evidence in Zechariah, there are no grounds for assuming such to be the case in Haggai. Several considerations call into question Rom-Shiloni’s general identification of the perspective of Haggai with that of Zech 1-8. First, as indicated above, I position myself with those who maintain that the book of Haggai attained its distinctive perspective and ideological thrust prior to and apart from its incorporation into a Haggai–Zech 1–8 corpus, a Haggai–Zechariah–Malachi corpus, or the Book of the Twelve as a whole. Thus, from the outset, purely on the basis of the literary history of Haggai and Zech 1–8, I see no inherent reason why their outlook should be identical. Second, moving to more general comparisons between these two texts, numerous significant elements differentiate them. These include: (1) differences of form (Zech 1–8 consists of a visionary-oracular complex [1:7–6:15] set within a sermonic frame, [1:1–6; 7:1–8:23] whereas Haggai is configured as a dramatized prophetic booklet); (2) differences of structure (Zech 1–8 features visions and oracles, set in a loosely chiastic arrangement framed by narration and exhortation, whereas in Haggai the structure is A/B [narrative interlude] A'/B'); and (3) differences of general outlook (in Haggai once the obstacles of resistance [1:2–11] and impurity [2:15–17] are removed, the outlook for the future is highly positive [2:20–23]; in Zechariah optimism is clouded by ongoing moral failure [7:1–14; 8:16]). Numerous other differences could be cited.

Third, and most significant for our purposes here, the two texts display distinct perspectives regarding the twin elements of movement into the land and return from Babylon. These are doubtlessly crucial elements in the Zecharian world, but strikingly muted or absent in Haggai. The critical movement in Haggai is thus not from outside the land into it (as in Zech 1–8, esp. 2:10–16 [6–12]; 8:1–8), but from outside of an abandoned Jerusalem “up” to it, to rebuild the Temple. At the outset of the book, the people

---

24 See notes 7 and 8, above.
refuse to “come” (Niq, 1:2)27 and rebuild the temple, but, heedng the prophet’s words, they ultimately do so (again Niq, v. 14). Furthermore, on what textual basis, can it be asserted that Haggai “position[s] . . . the Repatriates as settlers of an empty land”? This statement contains two significant problems. The first concerns the assumption that all of Haggai’s hearers are Returnees. To be sure, Zerubbabel and Joshua can be so identified, but no other characters in book can be unequivocally identified as such. Most telling is the fact that no mention is made of the origins of the book’s principal character, Haggai, or of his fate during the Babylonian period. The framers of the book make it impossible to determine whether our prophet was a Remainee or Returnee—surely an astounding omission if debates over inclusion and exclusion were rife in late-sixth-century Yehud.28 The second problem concerns viewing the land as “empty.” Haggai’s preaching is set against the backdrop of a populated Yehud and an abandoned Jerusalemite temple. Thus, in Haggai the land is depicted, not as empty (pace Rom-Shiloni), but as supporting a population living in paneled houses and engaged in agricultural pursuits, which have proven to be highly frustrating. Furthermore, to assume, as is commonly done, that the mention of “paneled houses” in Hag 1:4 implies that their owners were Returnees who returned and rebuilt their abandoned dwellings, is just that—an assumption. These houses could have either been (1) left standing after the Babylonian invasions, or (2) rebuilt shortly after the 587 destructions by non-deportees, or (3) reconstructed some time later by those moving back to the Judean heartland from the Benjaminite region. No indication is given of who built these houses, or when.29 One must studiously avoid reading the motifs of returning and rebuilding abandoned sites, a theme found extensively elsewhere (for example, Isa 44:26; 58:12; Jer 30:18; 33:7; Ezek 36:36; Amos 9:14; Ezra 2:1; Neh 7:6) back into Haggai. The point at issue for Haggai is that the community members have homes to live in, but Yahweh, seemingly, does not.30 To argue, as

27 On this translation, see above, n. 15.

28 Indeed, even if, as Rom-Shiloni assumes, the exclusion of the non-exiled population is a significant issue in late-sixth-century Yehud, and implicit in Haggai, it is nevertheless a stretch to believe that the framers of the book would leave Haggai’s lineage and status as a yishab member undefined.


30 On the concept of the temple as a divine residence see the excellent essays in M.J. Boda and J.R. Novotny (eds.), From the Foundations to the Creations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible (AOAT, 366; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010). See also the insightful observations in R.L. Kohn and R. Moore, “Where is God? Divine Presence in the Absence of the Temple,” in S. Malena and D. Miano (eds.), Milk and Honey: Essays on Ancient Israel and the Bible in Appreciation of the Judaic Studies Program at the University of California, San Diego (Winona Lake,
Rom-Shiloni does, that the term כל שארית היהם in Hag 1:12 is a technical term for the Repatriates (I will return to the use of this term in the next section), and thus the land is understood as having been empty, risks assuming that which one is seeking to demonstrate.

3.2 The Meaning of the Terms “People of the Land” and “Remnant” in Haggai

My second reason for hesitation regarding Rom-Shiloni’s thesis concerns her understanding of the terminology used in Haggai for the “people” addressed by the prophet—that is, those first mentioned alongside Zerubbabel and Joshua in 1:2, then subsequently referred to in 1:12–14 and 2:1–4. Rom-Shiloni presents a detailed argument asserting that the terms used in Haggai for the “people” are customary designations for the Returnees, and could never have been understood in any other sense. To make her point she first examines the root שאר as it appears in 1:12, 14 and 2:2–4, and then the expression כל שארית היהם in 2:5. She argues that these terms stand as part of a longer process of community self-definition and concludes:

It is unlikely that Haggai (and Zechariah) would utilize this overloaded terminology in a neutral or inclusive way. Although, indeed the prophet does not refer to the exile or the return, I find his references to the (Repatriate) leaders Zerubbabel and Joshua, together with his insistence on addressing the people as a Remnant, a telling indication of his orientation on questions of group identity. Haggai seems to follow Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, and he is in line with Zechariah—all great advocates of the Babylonian Diasporan community, and upon return, of the Repatriate community back in Yehud.31

Before analyzing her discussion of this lexical stock in detail, a broader observation is in order. Essentially Rom-Shiloni makes her point by proceeding from an assessment of the terms כל שארית היהם and כל שארית יהודים outside Haggai. She views them as terms inherently carrying specific significations with reference to issues of group identity, referring either to the Remainees or to the Repatriates, depending on the context, but always carrying clear connotations of self-definition, identity, and exclusion. She then approaches the book of Haggai and infers these meanings there. Her statement, “it is unlikely that Haggai (and Zechariah) would utilize this overloaded terminology in a neutral or inclusive way” encapsulates her approach.32

I would suggest that methodologically, the reverse direction is more appropriate—one ought to begin with Haggai itself as a liter-

IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 133–53.
31 Rom-Shiloni, Exclusive Inclusivity, 91; italics mine.
32 Ibid.
ary unit (see my discussion supra) and assess the relevant terms in the context of the phrases in which they are embedded, within the literary flow and structure of the book, as well as in terms of the book's literary history, date and purpose. What is more, consideration must be given to the possibility that the “remnant terminology” in Haggai might indicate an entirely idiosyncratic or independent use of such terminology, or a development of earlier or contemporaneous ideologies of concepts of the remnant, or even an ideological counterpart to them. Rom-Shiloni’s use of the term “overloaded” belies the degree to which her analysis of the terminology rests on prior assumptions. How do we know that the framers of Haggai viewed such language as charged with implications of exclusion and self-definition? Moreover, before inferring influence, the dating of the texts in question must be established and clear lines of influence upon Haggai must be demonstrated. In my view, if one begins with Haggai itself (rather than Ezekiel, Jeremiah, or Isa 40–55), a very different picture emerges from the one Rom-Shiloni presents. Finally, in her study, it is noteworthy that she presupposes that the communities of the 6th–5th c. are divided into two and only two mutually antagonistic groups, and that all of the biblical texts of the period belong to one or the other camp. But is this not to put the cart before the horse? Clearly some texts manifest such polarization, but is it methodologically legitimate to assume bipartite intra-communal polemics in all texts?

In the discussion that follows I will argue that, methodologically, even if the terms פַּעַם וְלֹא לִפְעָם and שַׁמָּאarah שָׁמָאrah can be used as terms of community self-definition and exclusion elsewhere, in order to demonstrate that they must carry this sense in Haggai, two conditions must be met. First, there must be evidence that in-group versus out-group dynamics are clearly at play elsewhere in the book, and second, that a more likely explanation for their presence in Haggai is not to be found.

Let us then turn to the two expressions Rom-Shiloni asserts smack of exclusivism, the term שַׁמָּאarah as it appears in 1:12, 14 and 2:2–3, and then the expression פַּעַם וְלֹא לִפְעָם in 2:4. Given that the latter expression is more easily dealt with, I will consider it first, and then devote greater attention to the former.

33 See esp. ibid., 19–29. In a similar vein, one thinks of Paul D. Hanson’s suggestion that sociology of Yehud reflected a polarization between two groups. He states, “in the realm of religious institutions, as in the realm of politics, the polarization tends to develop primarily between two forces,” cf. P.D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 212. However, it is hardly self-evident that such is always the case. Rom-Shiloni interacts with Hanson, and at times critiques his characterization of the two groups (Exclusive Inclusivity, 129–31) but largely follows his lead in presupposing the existence of two main groups in conflict.

34 On the term פַּעַם וְלֹא לִפְעָם in 2:3, see infra.
3.2.1 ים đáייר

Rom-Shiloni distinguishes between two distinct uses of the phrase ים đáייר in the literature of the 6th and 5th centuries BCE, both of which derive from the prophet Ezekiel. The first use, she suggests, was positive in nature, and was employed by the “in-group” as a term of self-definition. The latter, by contrast, was exclusionary and used to designate opposing communities as “out-groups.”35 She argues that the term ים đáייר in Hag 2:4 reflects this former usage, and asks which group, Returnees or Remaneees, is being designated by this phrase. She then goes on to argue, largely on the basis of the genealogies of Zerubbabel and Joshua, that in Haggai the phrase ים đáייר is a terminus technicus for the Repatriates (following Ezek 12:19 but in contrast to Ezek 16:3; 22:23–31; Ezra 9:1–2; 10: 2, 11; Neh 9:30; 10:29). She concludes, “Haggai does not use (and probably does not know of) Ezra–Nehemiah’s opposition of ‘otherness’.”36

In contrast to Rom-Shiloni’s position, I maintain that Haggai’s use of the phrase ים đáייר is easily explicable apart from any inclusivist/exclusivist ideologies, and is used for a specific reason. Clearly the term’s reference to those who opposed the Returnees’ building efforts in Ezra 4:4 has no relevance in Haggai. The critical issue in Hag 2:4 is whether or not this term designates all of Haggai’s hearers, and what it implies. Numerous scholars opine that the term makes reference to only a part of the Yehudite population. Wolff notes that in the monarchical period this term frequently referred to the Judean landowners and political elite and suggests that this idea is implied in Haggai’s words.37 Francis I. Andersen carries this sense of the term into the late-sixth-century context, arguing that in Haggai it refers to the landowning population.38 Numerous other suggestions, which maintain that the term ים đáייר in Hag 2:4 makes reference to a portion, but not all of the Judean population of late-sixth-century Yehud, have been proposed.39 Yet all these suggestions overlook the fact that in the configuration of the book (2:4 is frequently considered to be a redactional assemblage of several of Haggai’s oracles)40 nothing appears to differentiate this group as a dramatis persona from the ים đáייר in 1:12,14 and 2:2. Thus Ernest W. Nicholson’s suggestion that at times the term ים đáייר refers to all of the population

35 Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 94, 96. She maintains that Ezekiel transformed the term into a derogatory moniker for outsiders.
36 Ibid., 98.
39 For these see Kessler, *The Book of Haggai*, 168.
of a given region appears to be borne out in Hag 2:4. In the text’s dramatic development the same group whose spirits were divinely stirred now suffer discouragement and require further exhortation. All are called to show courage, not merely certain members within the larger group.

Why, then is this expression employed? Rather than assume that issues of exclusivity are at play, the most likely explanation lies in a broader tendency within Haggai—the book’s use of a “hermeneutic of equivalents,” employed to identify the world of its hearers and readers with that of the monarchical Israel of memory and tradition. Numerous examples of such “functional equivalents” appear in the book. These include the calque of the “traditional introduction” of a prophetic book in 1:1, and the assumption that a prophet’s role would involve upbraiding the political and religious leaders and the general populace for their failures (1:3–11; 2:10–14). Especially telling is the subtle substitution of a Persian monarch for a Judean king in the otherwise typical dating formula in 1:1 and elsewhere in the book. Other instances include the use of traditional curse material in 1:5–11, the common deuteronomistic idiom שמות בקול to describe the people’s obedience in 1:12, the use of the Formula of Divine Assistance in 1:13 and 2:4, and that of the Formula of Encouragement in 2:4. The most striking appears in 2:5a, where the Haggai addresses his hearers as those with whom Yahweh made a promise (or covenant) “when you came out of Egypt.” Numerous others could be listed.

Moreover, none of these equivalences is perfectly identical. All are “loose,” yet, taken together, they create implicit links between the province of Yehud, and the Yahwistic Kingdoms of old. The choice of the expression יראת עון is thus easily explained as one further illustration of the book’s use of “functional equivalents” to effectively re-create the impression that despite the numerous changes that had occurred since the demise of monarchical Judah, the situation addressed by our prophet was essentially the same as that which confronted his prophetic forbears. These “former prophets” (cf. Zech 1:4) in their own day confronted an obstinate

---

41 E.W. Nicholson, “The Meaning of the Expression יראת עון in the Old Testament,” JJS 10 (1965), 59–66 (60). Rom-Shiloni (Exclusive Inclusivity, 94) also accepts this sense. This stands in contrast to the position held by Lisbeth S. Fried, “The ‘am hālāres in Ezra 4:4 and Persian Imperial Administration,” in O. Lipschits and M. Oeming (eds.), Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 123–45. Fried argues that the term always refers to the landed aristocracy of a given region. Surprisingly, she considers Hag 2:4 to be inconsequential for her argument (128 n. 7).


43 On the numerous textual, translational and literary critical issues in this verse see Kessler, “Haggai 2:5a.”

44 See the examples summarized in Kessler, The Book of Haggai, 273–74 and elaborated upon throughout the book.
people needing reproof. Now, Haggai played the role of a “traditional” or “typical” Israelite prophet as he assumed the same stance. Such a portrait of Haggai’s role, and especially of his great success, is thus part of the book’s overall goal of demonstrating the ongoing relevance of prophecy in the Persian period. The inhabitants of Yehud, living in sufficiently close proximity to Jerusalem so as to be reasonably expected to participate in the Temple’s reconstruction, and engaged in agricultural and other land-related pursuits, are thus the “functional equivalents” of the landowners of earlier times, the רמך האֶרֶץ. What is more, as will be further discussed infra, on an historical level, in the late 6th c. these would have been both Remanees and Returnees. Nothing in Haggai’s terminology here can be seen to imply any distinction between the two.

3.2.2 כל שארית הָעָם

Rom-Shiloni maintains that the phrase כל שארית הָעָם in 1:12, 14 and 2:2\(^{45}\) refers exclusively to the Returnees.\(^{46}\) In her understanding, Haggai’s words were exclusively addressed to them, and in 1:12, 14, the narrator wishes to underline the fact that they responded in toto. She sees no difference in signification between the expression וכל שארית הָעָם (1:2) and כל שארית הָעָם in (1:12b, 13) and כל שארית הָעָם (2:4). All are clearly understood designations of the Repatriate community. On this point, Rom-Shiloni’s position is the polar opposite of that of Sara Japhet, who sees the term שארית in Haggai as designating the non-deported population.\(^{47}\) Other mediating positions exist, and I will discuss these below.

As noted above, both Rom-Shiloni and I agree that the term כל שארית הָעָם in 1:12, 14 does not introduce a new dramatis persona and thus the “people” (הָעָם) of vv. 2 and 13 are the same as the שארית of vv. 12 and 14. Thus for Rom-Shiloni, the change in terminology has no great significance. In both instances it is only the Returnees who are being addressed. This stands in contrast to two primary lines of interpretation of שארית in 1:12, 14. Numerous exegetes, including William J. Dumbrell, Francis S. North, Hinckley

---

\(^{45}\) At 2:2 MT lacks כל which is however reflected in the LXX and Syr. It is possible that כל was omitted due to haplography passing directly from the ל on שאירה to שאירה. However, it seems more likely that כל is included in 1:12, 14 to emphasize the totality of the community’s response, as opposed to 2:2 where it would be superfluous.

\(^{46}\) 1:12, 14 are narrative descriptions of the effects of the prophetic word, while 2:2 is part of a prophetic oracle itself. Thus, unless one views 2:2 as redactional, the phrase occurs in both the oracles and redactional frame.

G. Mitchell and Wolff (among many others) suggest that the term מַשְׁאָרְיָה here designates the golah members, as opposed to the non-deported population who refused to participate.\(^\text{48}\) Oded Lipschits, who in the main follows Japhet’s definition of the term, sees it as referring to the non-deported population, whose help is needed due to the limited abilities and resources of the Returnees.\(^\text{49}\) Thus, on both of these lines of approach two distinct groups are in view in the book’s conceptual framework.

In my understanding, however, the term is not a specific designation for either the Returnees or the Remainees, and is introduced in 1:12, 14 and 2.2 for a specific purpose, pace both Rom-Shiloni and Japhet. I suggest that the term מַשְׁאָרְיָה in these verses retains and builds upon its basic sense, of “to remain, to be left over, or to escape.”\(^\text{50}\) It designates the community in Yehud which, as I will argue below, includes both Remainees and Returnees as the survivors of the larger group of an earlier time, who have escaped the devastation of the larger whole.\(^\text{51}\) The presence of כל מַשְׁאָרְיָה before מַשְׁאָרְיָה is highly significant. The fact that the entire population responds to the prophet’s preaching serves to underline


\(^{50}\) See the numerous instances cited in DCH 8:220–21, 222–224. Note, for example, Gen 45:7; Isa 57:4; Jer 41:16.

\(^{51}\) Another but in my opinion less likely explanation, could account for the use of the phrase כל מַשְׁאָרְיָה in Haggai. The same expression appears in Jer 41:10, 16. There it used for a group of unnamed persons who appear in connection with other, named persons, who are important office bearers in the community. If such were the case would simply be a way of referring to the population at large. However, as argued above, more seems to be at stake here.
the book’s emphasis on Haggai’s success, and on the ongoing importance of prophecy.52

What is more, I would argue that the term חורין here carries an additional connotation beyond simply that of “survivors,” “rest” or “remnant.” However, this additional ideology is not acquired due to its “overloaded” associations with group self-definition, but due to its associations within the Twelve and beyond, linking the remnant concept to Yahweh’s activity in renewing the people of Israel as a whole53 and the qualities and characteristics of that new people. Put another way, the framers of Haggai are likely giving a signal here, via intertextual allusions generated by the term חורין, that Yahweh has renewed his work among his people, and that the people, in turn, have now demonstrated new and desirable qualities through their renewed obedience.

The concept of the חורין is an important one in the Book of the Twelve,54 and its usage there differs from the overtly exclusionary ideology conveyed in texts such as Jer 24, Ezek 11:14–21; 33:23–29.55 These “exclusivist” texts employ a “skimming and preserving” motif in their conceptualization of the remnant. An elect remnant is “skinned off” and exiled from Judah, “preserved” in the eastern Diaspora, then subsequently returned to Yehud.56 However, in addition to this “skimming and preserving” perspective, other conceptual patterns for understanding the Assyrian and Babylonian conquests and deportations appear in the biblical literature, and present alternative conceptualizations of exile, diaspora,

52 Rom-Shiloni does not comment on the role of חורין in 1:12 and 14. According to her interpretive approach this would have meant that all the Returnees responded to Haggai’s words. However, this would seem to imply that Haggai’s call to rebuild was open to all (cf. the scholars cited in n. 47). However, it should be noted that the latter implication, while to my mind quite likely, does not follow from the statement that “all the Returnees responded.”

53 That is, apart from contexts such as Jer 24 which clearly enfranchise one segment of the community and disqualify all others.

54 The term appears in Amos 1:8; 5:15; 9:12; Mic 2:12; 4:7; 5:6–7; 7:18; Zeph 2:7, 9; 3:13; Hag 1:12, 14; 2:2; Zech 8:6, 11–12.

55 Japhet rightly notes that the root חור מ occurs only rarely in exclusionary contexts. It appears neither in Jer 24, nor in Ezek 11 or 33 in this sense, see Japhet, “The Concept of the ‘Remnant’,” 443. On other distinctly exclusivist texts see further Rom-Shiloni, Exclusive Inclusivity, 33–47.

and return, and of their meaning.\textsuperscript{57} Two such additional motifs are those of “scattering and re-gathering”\textsuperscript{58} and “purging and cleansing,”\textsuperscript{59} both of which appear in the Twelve and beyond.\textsuperscript{60} In the latter, the communities of the monarchic period are subjected to purging by the fires of exile (the location of which is less significant than the experience itself). In the former, judgment consists of “scattering” and renewal is effected through “re-gathering.”\textsuperscript{61} It is highly important to distinguish the concept of the remnant in the “skimming and preserving” motif from that of the “scattering and gathering” pattern. In the former, the exiles from one specific region are elected by Yahweh, to the exclusion of all others, and restored to the land. There is no sense of a “pan-Israelite” perspective where older fissures are now healed (see further infra). In the latter, exiles are re-gathered from all the territories to which they have been banished.\textsuperscript{62} The “scattering and re-gathering” and “purging and cleansing” motifs can be found in Mic 2 and 4, and Zeph 3, two important “remnant passages” within the Twelve. Furthermore, these texts were likely formulated before (or possibly contemporaneous with) the composition of Haggai, and were likely known to its framers.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{57} On this see also Kessler, “Images of Exile.”

\textsuperscript{58} On the motif of gathering and scattering, see the numerous examples in the superb study by G. Widengren, “Yahweh’s Gathering of the Dispersed,” in W.B. Barrick and J.R. Spencer (eds.), \textit{In the Shelter of Elion: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in honour of G.W. Ahlström} (JSOTSup, 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 227–45. Widengren demonstrates that the scattering and re-gathering of a people was a truly ancient motif, and is found in both Mesopotamian and Israelite literature. This imagery occurs in a large number of texts including among others, Deut 28:64; 30:3; Isa 11:12; 49:5–6. See further infra on Mic 2–4 and Zeph 3.

\textsuperscript{59} This motif is common in the HB. Rooted in metallurgy (cf. Ps 12:7[6]; Mal 3:3[2]) it is frequently found in wisdom texts describing the positive effects of suffering upon human character (Prov 3:11–12). It is used in the prophetic literature to describe the restorative effects of the sufferings of exile upon Israel (Isa 48:10; Ezek 22:15).

\textsuperscript{60} Of course these patterns occur outside the Twelve, but space precludes a discussion of these texts here.


\textsuperscript{62} This distinction is not always noted. For example, Japhet appears to assimilate the identification of the Babylonian exiles in Jer 24 with texts such as Isa 11:11–16, which speak of the remnant in terms of exiles scattered in a variety of regions, including Egypt. See Japhet, “The Concept of the ‘Remnant’,” 443. However, this Egyptian community is excluded in Jer 24 and 44:12, 14, 28, both frequently seen as part of a Dtr re-working of the book. By contrast, Rom-Shiloni (\textit{Exclusive Industrious}, 108–11) acknowledges that certain texts, such as Isa 43:5–6; 49:12, Zech 8:7 contain the motif of the exiles’ deliverance from regions at the four points of the compass, and thus reflect a broader vision of diaspora and return than is found elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{63} For these passages as antecedent to Haggai see the majority of com-
In Micah, the theme of gathering the scattered ones (2:12–13) opens the first of the book’s oracles of salvation.64 This passage is generally seen as closely linked to 4:6–7. Both passages contain the term תִּשָׁאָר and both describe a glorious post-catastrophe situation.65 In 4:6–7 the re-gathered ones become a remnant. Prior to such a transformation, they were merely those who “limped” and “strayed” (Heb. עֶזֶל and נֶדֶשׁ), that is those whom Yahweh himself had “afflicted” (עַלְמֶנֶם). Subsequently, however, Yahweh himself transforms them into a remnant.66 As Delbert R. Hillers notes, the description of the remnant here appears to include all who had been engulfed by the catastrophes of the past.67 Such a pattern is echoed in Hag 1:12–14 where Yahweh stirs up of the hearts of “this people,” moving them to obedience. Only then are they described by the term תִּשָׁאָר.

A second important remnant context is Zeph 3:11–13, immediately preceding Haggai in the Twelve. Here, the remnant are those who are left after the proud and arrogant have been extinguished. This is a classic example of the “purging and cleansing” motif alluded to above. Yahweh states that he will remove (פָּרָה) “your proud and arrogant ones” (עֲלֵי הַנַּחֲוָה) likely the rich and upper classes) purging them away, leaving (שָׁאְרָה) only a humble and lowly people (עִם נְעִים וַיְהִי). These ones, who now constitute the remnant (תִּשָׁאָר), will be characterized by righteous deeds and pure speech (3:13) and take refuge in Yahweh’s name (וְזֶה בֵּית יְהוָה 3:12). Moreover, the remnant concept in Zeph 3 evokes a “pan-Israelite” view of the nation and its restoration.68
It is highly significant that in both these texts, that which is most important is not the geographical location of this remnant community. In Mic 2:12 and 4:7 they are gathered from undisclosed locations (and the implication seems to be from not one but many places) and led to Jerusalem. Furthermore, in Mic 5:6–7 [7–8], the “remnant of Israel” is “in the midst of” many peoples/nations (בְּנֵי שֵׁם רָצוֹן) and “among the nations” (בְּנֵי). In Zeph 3:10 the faithful are seen as present in the most remote parts of the ancient world, while in 3:12–13 they are clearly in Jerusalem. It is most significant that these passages foreground the nature and character of the remnant, and Yahweh’s activity on their behalf, rather than any geographical and exclusionary issues. In a sense, all who have experienced the sufferings of foreign invasion and conquest are “exiles” whose tribulations are an essential part of Yahweh’s work or forgiveness and renewal.

Put another way, since Yahweh’s renewal will extend to all Israel, and passage through the fires of exile is the sine qua non of participation in Yahweh’s purposes for his people, all must of necessity be seen as exiles, whether they in fact left the land or not. Moreover, it is highly probable that the framers of Haggai would have been aware of these sections of Micah and Zephaniah (perhaps as a part of the Book of the Four [Rainer Albertz], or as creations of contemporary Yehudite literati [Ehud Ben Zvi]). Those responsible for the book likely employed the term שאריות as a means of indicating that, in light of Yahweh’s activity and the people’s responsiveness, the community in Yehud was to be identi-

includes both the children of the North and those of the South.” E. Ben Zvi, A Historical-Critical Study of the Book of Zephaniah (BZAW, 198; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 234. Floyd (Minor Prophets, 235) similarly concludes, “The creation of a ‘humble and lowly’ remnant through the purgation of the ‘proud and haughty’ from Yahweh’s ‘holy mountain’ recalls the punishment directed against the temple and court establishment in 1:4b and 1:8–9. The whole notion of the remnant is extended by referring it to ‘Israel’ (v. 13) indicating that the new existence of Yahweh’s people will not be any mere reconstitution of the state of Judah but rather a recreation in some new form of the ancient entity that predated the separation of the northern from the southern kingdom.”

69 See A. Lo, “Remnant Motif in Amos, Micah and Zephaniah,” in J.A. Grant, A. Lo, and G.J. Wenham (eds.), A God of Faithfulness: Essays in Honour of J. Gordon McConville on his 60th Birthday (LH BTS, 538, New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 130–48. In this excellent study, Alison Lo insightfully notes the themes of “the totality and inescapability of judgment” and of “God’s transformation of the remnant.” Geography and exclusivity are simply not at issue.

aced with the remnant which Mic 2 and 4 foresaw, and for which Zeph 3 hoped.\(^71\) Furthermore, more broadly in the Twelve, the remnant texts do not focus on exclusion or inclusion based on one’s location during the Babylonian period. Rather in the Twelve, future hope is shaped around a fragmentation/reunion theme. Restoration begins with the healing of the fragmentation of the Northern Kingdom and Southern Kingdom as all Israel unites around Jerusalem and its Davidic ruler (Amos 9:11–12; Hos 3:5; Mic 5:2–5). It culminates with the re-gathering of all Israel into one (Mic 2:12; Zeph 3:20; Zech 8:7). The issue is not so much where one has been (although it must be acknowledged that exile from the land is presupposed in many texts, sometimes to Babylon, but sometimes to places left undefined as in Zech 8:7) but the removal of Yahweh’s judgment, and the hope for re-gathering, healing and restoration, at Yahweh’s hand.

### 3.3 The Demographic Realities of Late-Sixth-Century Yahud

A third area of hesitation regarding the treatment of Haggai in *Exclusive Inclusivity* concerns how an exclusivist reading of the book relates to the historical realia of late-sixth-century Yahud. Our knowledge of the demographic situation in Yahud at that time has expanded rapidly in recent years.\(^72\) Many now affirm that although the urban centre of Jerusalem and several other military sites were devastated and remained largely uninhabited in the wake of the Babylonian invasions, a significant rural population was left in place in close proximity to Jerusalem, both to the north and south.\(^73\) The

\(^71\) James D. Nogalski (*Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* [BZAW, 217, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1993], 235) insightfully observes, “The literary adaptation of Zeph 3:18–20 deliberately prepares the reader for the message of Haggai.” In my opinion, the term נֵגֶף must be read in precisely this light.


\(^73\) See especially Lipschits, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem*, 79–84; idem, “Shedding New Light,” 66–78. The non-exiled population was concentrated in the Benjaminite territory to the north/northeast and at Ramat Rahel and the Rephaim Valley to the south. Lipschits (“Shedding New Light,” 73) states, “After the destruction of Jerusalem and the other major main urban and military Judahite centers by the Babylonians at the beginning of the sixth century BCE... [the non-deported population] contin-
emergence of Persian rule over the region initially had little effect on this general picture. During the late-6th and early-5th c., the number of Returnees was limited, and the population of Jerusalem remained small. Lipschits has suggested that in the very early Persian period, the initial re-settlement of Jerusalem involved only a small group comprising “the new leadership of the province, the priests and office-holders who were connected with the functioning of the temple.” What is more, as the 6th c. drew to a close, there is some evidence of movement from the Benjaminites territory back toward the regions around Jerusalem. Thus, in the late-6th c. the population of Yehud itself consisted of Remainees in the regions surrounding Jerusalem and the Benjaminites territory (regions whose existence had continued much as it had before 587), with the further addition of some Remainees in Jerusalem (and perhaps some other regions). As stated above, there is no evidence for any conflict between these groups, despite living virtually côté-à-côte (especially in the area of Ramat Rahel). Furthermore, despite the absence of a reconstructed temple, the practice of some form of cultic activity at Jerusalem seems likely. If so, dur-

74 Lipschits, The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem, 125.
75 O. Lipschits, “The History of the Benjamin Region under Babylonian Rule,” T.A. 26 (1999), 155–90 (182–85). Lipschits states, “[By] a gradual process, starting from the end of the sixth century, and reaching its peak in the fifth and fourth centuries, a marked demographic decline occurred in the Benjamin region, which may be estimated at over fifty percent. Part of the inhabitants of the territory apparently moved to Jerusalem” (185).
76 See, however, the opposing position in A. Faust, Judah in the neo-Babylonian Period: The Archaeology of Desolation (ABS, 18; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012).
ing this period members of both communities would likely have participated in it, unless, of course the Returnees actively barred the Remainees from accessing the site. However, there is no solid evidence of any such prohibition.\textsuperscript{79} What is more, the use of the term \textit{יְהוֹשָעַנִי} in Hag 2:3 invokes the remembrances of anyone still alive who had seen the temple in its earlier glory.\textsuperscript{80} No sense of exile, return or exclusivity can legitimately be implied through the use of the term here. In sum, given such demographic conditions, it seems to me to be beyond question that, had Haggai (the prophet or the book) wished to exclude the non-exiled population this would have to have been done in the strongest terms possible, leaving no room for any ambiguity. But this is certainly not the case. By contrast, the book has a “pan-Yehud” dimension to it. This is most evident in having the prophet address the province’s governor by his official title “governor of Yehud” (Hag 1:1, 14; 2:2, 21). It is almost universally admitted that the capital of Yehud remained at Mizpah until the mid-5th c.,\textsuperscript{81} and that the Benjaminites region (among other regions in Yehud) was home to a large Remainee population.\textsuperscript{82} Clearly Haggai calls Zerubbabel, the political leader of Yehud, whose primary responsibilities would have involved Mizpah and its environs, to take responsibility for the Temple’s reconstruction (Hag 1:1 etc.). It seems to strain against all historical probability to assume that the prophet’s call to Yehud’s governor to actively promote the rebuilding of the Temple at the same time required him to exclude most of the population of his primary centre of activity (Mizpah) as well as the bulk of the rest of the province. The same may be said of Haggai’s appeal to Yehud’s major priestly authority (Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4, 11–13). Only the rarely-followed hypothesis of Joel P. Weinberg and Daniel L. Smith(-Christopher), according to which the community over which Zerubbabel and Joshua presided consisted of a series of non-contiguous enclaves of Returnees,\textsuperscript{83} could make it possible for Haggai’s words (or the

\textsuperscript{79} Arguments for intra-communal conflict over access to the site of the former temple at this early period based on Isa 63:18 seem unconvincing.

\textsuperscript{80} This is, of course, a representation which occurs within the dramatic flow of the book. I cannot enter into a discussion of its historical probability here. Williamson sees Ezra 3 as having been based on Hag 2, cf. H.G.M. Williamson, \textit{Ezra–Nehemiah} (WBC, 16; Waco, TX: Word, 1985), 48–49.


\textsuperscript{82} Lipschits, “Shedding New Light,” esp. 73–78.

\textsuperscript{83} D.L. Smith, \textit{The Religion of the Landless} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989); J.P. Weinberg, “Zentral-und Partikulargewalt im
book’s intent) to be seen as addressing only a portion of the Yehu-
dite population.

One further element, pointed out years ago by Martin Noth, and again more recently by Hugh Williamson should be mentioned here. It concerns the selective nature of the Babylonian deportations (i.e., some members of certain families were taken, while others were left), and the relatively short interval between the exile and return. Both authors suggest that to suppose that at a remove of only a few years, and given the likelihood that separated family members would be re-united, it is highly improbable that violent and malevolent relations would exist between the members of these divided families and communities. Williamson observes, “Perhaps we should be thinking rather of welcome-home parties between families long divided but not necessarily, therefore, forgotten.”

4. CONCLUSIONS

It cannot be doubted that numerous texts in the HB reflect a positive view of the diaspora and a negative one of those who remained. Rom-Shiloni documents these instances in detail. Yet the polemical nature of some texts should not be inferred in all. As we have seen, numerous texts lack this polemical tone, and portray all Israel as exiles, and all as returnees. It would thus be erroneous to assume that all the literature of the 7th to 4th centuries must reflect the perspective of either one or another of two mutually antagonistic groups. Rather, we should presuppose a diversity of perspectives on inclusion and exclusion in this literature of this period. Such ideological diversity is one of the hallmarks of the HB. The


85 Of course, Rom-Shiloni is correct to observe that profound animus does exist in Jer 24, Ezek 11 and 33, and elsewhere. However, the spirit of these texts should not be imported into Haggai without firm evidence. There is furthermore some indication that some of the ideology in Ezekiel is the product of a highly isolated community. On this see L.E. Pearce, “Continuity and Normality in Sources Relating to the Judean Exile,” HB-Af 3 (2014), 163–84.


87 This is most easily seen in texts employing the “scattering and gathering” motif, described above, cf. Is 11:12; 49:5; Jer 40:12; Mic 2:12; 4:6.

Book of Haggai is a case in point; its focus is on Yehud, and the community dwelling there, whether Remaines or Returnees, Governor, Priests, and general population. All have neglected the Temple, and all are taken to task by our prophet. And, in contrast to the resistance with which so much prophetic preaching was met in earlier days (cf. Zech 1:1–6), now, through Yahweh's initiative, in a time of restoration and renewal under Persian rule, Haggai's words were received and acted upon by the whole community, without any trace of division or exclusion.  

---
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