

## *Zerubbabel, Persia, and Inner-biblical Exegesis*

DAVID B. SCHREINER

Indiana Wesleyan University,  
College of Adult Professional Studies  
[dbschreiner@gmail.com](mailto:dbschreiner@gmail.com)

*This essay discusses the socio-political expectations surrounding Zerubbabel as disclosed in Hag 2:20–23. Concurring with the consensus that Jer 22:24–30 is critical to understanding Hag 2:20–23, this essay engages the ideas of Wolter Rose and John Kessler, ultimately concluding that Hag 2:20–23 embodies a manto-typological exegesis of the Jeremianic tradition. Thus, Haggai is communicating to Zerubbabel that his role moving forward corresponds to his Davidic predecessors but is not tantamount to it. By implication, the prophet is proclaiming that the Davidic line will continue to play a role for the Second Temple community.*

KEYWORDS: *Zerubbabel, Persia, Haggai, Inner-biblical Exegesis, Davidic Dynasty*

### INTRODUCTION

Zerubbabel in his historical context is one of the most mysterious and thought-provoking situations in all of the Old Testament. In “The Mysterious Disappearance of Zerubbabel,” Ted Lewis surveys the political landscape of early Persian Period Judah in order to determine what can be deduced from Zerubbabel’s appearance and then abrupt disappearance.<sup>1</sup> He ultimately concludes, based on the investigative principle of who-stands-to-benefit-the-most-by-Zerubbabel’s-disappearance, that the priesthood was most likely involved in his disappearance.<sup>2</sup> By

1. Theodore J. Lewis, “The Mysterious Disappearance of Zerubbabel,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel, and Dennis R. Magary; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 301–14.

2. Lewis, “The Mysterious Disappearance of Zerubbabel,” 313–14.

implication, one gains the impression that early Persian period Judah was the center of ambition and political subterfuge, all of which was brought to a head with the events of Dairus I's initial years on the Persian throne. However, and to his credit, Lewis tempers his intriguing conclusions when he states, "Ultimately, this is a mystery that we cannot solve."<sup>3</sup>

Zerubbabel's abrupt disappearance from the biblical and historical record is an intriguing case. However, this essay will engage Zerubbabel's mysteriousness from a different angle as it will attempt to understand some of the expectations surrounding his service to the Second Temple community. Focus will fall upon Hag 2:20–23, the critical passage for any attempt to understand Zerubbabel's socio-political role. Indeed, Hag 2:20–23 has not suffered from a dearth of commentary, and so after sketching the briefest of pictures, contributions by Walter Rose and John Kessler will be discussed in detail as their ideas offer an intriguing way forward. Yet this essay will reframe Kessler's work by discussing the strategic use of the  $\text{פ}$  prefix in terms of inner-biblical exegesis. This essay proposes that Hag 2:20–23 is a manto-typological exegesis of the tradition of Jer 22:24–30,<sup>4</sup> disclosing that Zerubbabel's socio-political role will be akin but not tantamount to his Davidic predecessors. Thus, the Davidic dynasty represents a viable socio-political option moving forward.

3. *Ibid.*, 305.

4. The scholarly consensus recognizes that the sense of Jer 22:24–30 is the necessary cognitive backdrop for understanding the full implications of the Haggai oracle. For views representative of the debate's poles, see William Holladay, *Jeremiah* (Hermeneia; 2 vols.; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1986–90), 1:608–09; William McKane, *Jeremiah* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 1:546–52.). Most germane is the status of Jer 22:24 within the debate. Even those who argue for a complicated textual history of the Jeremianic text often concede that v. 24 with its signet imagery is likely the earliest element. For example, McKane (*Jeremiah*, 1:544) understands v. 24 to be the "nucleus" that was subject to expansion. Consequently, understanding v. 24 as a foundational element to the Jeremianic pericope virtually ensures that Haggai, Zerubbabel, and the early Second Temple community would have been aware of the tradition that decried judgment upon Jehoiachin and, by implication, his progeny. Indeed, the status of v. 30 with its explicit rejection of Jehoiachin's progeny does not enjoy the benefit of a scholarly consensus. However, whether or not v. 30 was later inserted into the original oracle is a moot point, at least for the present task. Haggai invokes הוֹתֵם. Such an invocation directly correlates the person of Zerubbabel with Jehoiachin, which is critical to understanding the type of inner-biblical exegesis (see below). Furthermore, the rejection of one's descendants from the right to rule is the logical implication of the rejection of the Davidic monarch.

## FRAMING THE DEBATE

The range of opinions regarding what Hag 2:20–23 says about the role of Zerubbabel and the Davidic dynasty can be broadly demarcated. Does Haggai foresee an imminent role for Zerubbabel and the Davidic line or one that is more distant and/or abstract? In the case of the former, scholars who understand Hag 2:20–23 either as a call for insurrection against Darius I and Persia or as an expectation of Persia's fall often find their greatest support in 1) the socio-political milieu of the first years of Darius I's reign and 2) a particular pericope in First Zechariah.<sup>5</sup> For example, Leroy Waterman advocated that Haggai's final oracle in conjunction with his temple-centric vision "culminate in the confident expectation of freedom from Persian rule and the immediate establishment of an independent Jewish state."<sup>6</sup> According to Waterman, the proof exists in the masoretic tradition's reading of Zech 6:9–14, which softens the prophetic words in an attempt "to hide from view the pitiable spectacle of two loyal and devoted prophets and a worthy governor of the royal line of David who unwittingly and solely because of inefficient means of communication were thus pilloried before the larger world and liquidated as craven conspirators."<sup>7</sup>

While Waterman's argument has been systematically critiqued,<sup>8</sup> Rainer Albertz and Joseph Blenkinsopp represent more recent conclusions that emphasize the value of Darius I's turbulent socio-political context in understanding Haggai's vision for Zerubbabel and the Davidic line. Hypothesizing the need for Darius to secure his southwestern border, Albertz suggests that the establishment of Zerubbabel as governor was an attempt to appeal to the nationalistic senses of the Judeans and secure fidelity. However, Darius's gamble must have failed for Albertz understands Zech 6:9–14 as substantiation that Zerubbabel was removed from the scene.<sup>9</sup> More pointedly than Albertz, Blenkinsopp sees

5. On the undeniable theological continuity between Haggai and First Zechariah, which may also be indicative of compositional continuity, see Eric M. Meyers and Carol L. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8* (AB 25B; Garden City, NJ: DoubleDay, 1987).

6. Leroy Waterman, "The Camouflaged Purge of Three Messianic Conspirators," *JNES* 13 (1954): 76.

7. Waterman, "The Camouflaged Purge," 78.

8. Peter Ackroyd, "Two Old Testament Historical Problems of the Early Persian Period," *JNES* 17 (1958): 13–27.

9. Rainer Albertz, *Israel In Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* (trans. David Green; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2003), 125–26.

Haggai's final oracle as "the prediction of the overthrow of the Persian Empire and the restoration of the native dynasty," which is supported vividly via the *הרותם* imagery.<sup>10</sup> The language according to Blenkinsopp is indicative of a "messianic movement in Judah, comparable with the movement in contemporary Babylon, triggered by the political turmoil throughout the Persian Empire between the death of Cambyses in July 522 and the final restoration of order by Darius two years later."<sup>11</sup>

While the views of Waterman, Albertz, and Blenkinsopp correctly emphasize not only the Persian method of governance that utilized indigenous dynasties<sup>12</sup> but also the effects of the turbulent socio-political milieu upon the interpretation of Haggai's final words to Zerubbabel, points of criticism can be leveled against such types of interpretive positions. First, there is an assumption that the people of Judah exhibited the same attitude and/or actions of rebellion as those in other parts of the empire. Yet as Sarah Japhet states, "The data available to us at this stage do not enable us to reconstruct such a rebellion in Israel's history."<sup>13</sup> Indeed, one may point to Zech 6:9–14 as evidence, which has been the case. However, not only is this evidence circumstantial at best, but if one sees Zech 6:9–14 as an intentional emendation, then one must consider other textual issues that, according to Eric and Carol Meyers, do more harm than good.<sup>14</sup> Finally, interpretive positions that perceive Haggai's final words to Zerubbabel as a call for insurrection and/or the anticipation of an immediate restoration of the Davidic line do not properly consider the following phenomena: 1) the full implications of the phrase *בְּיִוֵם הַהוּא*; 2) the association of Hag 2:20–23 with Hag 2:6–9 and the implications that follow, and 3) the cosmic battle motif in Hag 2:20–23. All of these phenomena converge to suggest an eschatologicalization occurring within the oracle, which in turn implies that the prophet may have been recalibrating the audience's perspective toward the future and less on immediate insurrection and restoration of the Davidic dynasty

10. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (rev. and en. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 202–03.

11. *Ibid.*, 203.

12. André Lemaire, "Zorobabel Et La Judée À La Lumière De L'Épigraphie (Fin Du VIe S. AV. J.–C.)," *RB* 103 (1996): 48–57.

13. Sara Japhet, "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah," *ZAW* 94 (1982): 24.

14. Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8*, 350–53.

under Zerubbabel.<sup>15</sup> Many scholars emphasize the eschatological nuances of this oracle and thus understand the function of Zerubbabel and the Davidic dynasty spoken of in this oracle as indicative of something that will enjoy its maturation in another dispensation.

For example, Pieter Verhoef acknowledges how “the recent upheaval among the warring nations would have contributed to this imagery,”<sup>16</sup> but the eschatological nuances of the oracle are too great to be ignored. Thus, according to Verhof, Haggai’s final words suggest “a wider perspective than the person of the Judean governor as the contemporary of the prophet.”<sup>17</sup> Meyers and Meyers also understand the eschatological nuances of the oracle to be quite pervasive. For example, they believe Hag 2:20–23 to be the “inevitable conclusion to 2:15–19,” which deals with future realities. Second, the Hiphil forms of רעש and הפך with the phrase ביום ההוא import a distinctly eschatological flavor. Meyers and Meyers also understand the imagery surrounding the function of Zerubbabel to display “instrumentability” and “vice-regency.”<sup>18</sup> Thus, “The overwhelming imagery of the oracle is not only eschatology, it is also theocratic.”<sup>19</sup>

The conclusions of Verhoef and Meyers and Meyers are representative of those that correctly emphasize an important characteristic of Haggai’s final oracle—its eye for the future. In other words, Haggai appears to envision a dispensation that exists beyond the present socio-political context. Therefore, when this reality is considered alongside the socio-political characteristics of the second year of Darius I, a dialectic appears in this oracle as it relates to the expectations of Zerubbabel and the Davidic dynasty. The function of neither Zerubbabel nor the Davidic line can be understood solely by concrete and immediate realities or solely by those that are more distant and more abstract.

15. Thus, I am invoking the terms “eschatologicalization” and “eschatology” generically, broadly referring “to Israel’s orientation toward the future as the arena where God will act decisively in accord with God’s deity, promises, and commands.” See R. Kendall Soulen and Richard N. Soulen, “Eschatology,” in *Handbook of Biblical Criticism* (3d ed.; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 55.

16. Pieter A. Verhoef, *Haggai and Malachi* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 140.

17. *Ibid.*, 150.

18. Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8*, 68.

19. *Ibid.*, 47.

## ROSE, KESSLER, AND A WAY FORWARD

Walter Rose has provided an important discussion on the expectations associated with Zerubbabel and by implication the Davidic line.<sup>20</sup> Appearing at the end of his lengthy and intricate discussion of Zerubbabel, Rose emphasizes key phrases detailed in Hag 2:20–23. Zerubbabel is called a “servant” (עַבֵּד), he is “chosen” (בַּחֵר) and “taken” (לִקַּח), and is to be made like a הוֹתֵם. In the case of the first three phrases, Rose rightly argues that while each is associated with the Davidic traditions, the nuances of the Haggai context militate against any simplistic assumption that Zerubbabel is being perceived as another royal figure in the vein of his forefather David. עַבֵּד is associated with David on numerous occasions, but only rarely with others.<sup>21</sup> בַּחֵר is associated only with the kings David and Saul,<sup>22</sup> and the invocation of לִקַּח to communicate a divinely sanctioned mission restricts the semantic possibilities.<sup>23</sup> Ultimately, Rose emphasizes that the marshalling of these terms to argue for royal expectations for Zerubbabel and the Davidic line overstates things.<sup>24</sup>

Rose’s criticisms are valid to a certain point. On the one hand, his conclusions appear to disregard the logical principle of synergism—the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Indeed, taken in isolation, neither of these terms demands that Zerubbabel enjoys royal expectations, but when considered together in the context of the early Persian period along with Zerubbabel’s Davidic lineage, it seems only logical that the expectations pertaining to Zerubbabel will inform the “royal” prerogatives of the dynastic line moving forward.<sup>25</sup> In other words, Rose’s desire to expose the semantic possibilities on his way to separating the passage from Davidic undertones ultimately creates a dubious dynamic. On the other hand, Rose is correct to suggest that there are subtle nuances in the terms and images used, and they converge to reveal

20. Wolter H. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period* (JSOTSup 304; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000).

21. *Ibid.*, 211.

22. *Ibid.*, 213–16.

23. *Ibid.*, 218.

24. *Ibid.*, 210–18.

25. I use the parenthesis around the term “royal” intentionally. As will be detailed, I think that the prophet is addressing the royal expectations of Zerubbabel and the Davidic line. However, the subtleties of the prophet’s message suggest that any royal expectation should be nuanced.

the prophet's intention. These revelations are furthered upon considering the phrase ושמתיך כחותם (v. 23).

It is critical to understand that Rose perceives Jer 22:24 to be the context necessary to properly Haggai's intentions in this phrase. "[Jer 22:24] is generally seen as in some way providing the background to the verse in Haggai, and I think this observation is valid."<sup>26</sup> Also, "I do not want to disagree with finding a connection between two oracles . . ."<sup>27</sup> But what separates Rose from many interpreters is his assertion that Jeremiah is declaring that Jehoiachin has no personal worth in the eyes of the Lord (versus the rejection of him as a royal authority). While lengthy, Rose's argument clues on the syntax of the Jeremianic context and the usage of the generic term חותם (versus the more specific term טבעת). Moreover, Rose states that just because the immediate context of the Jeremianic oracle is royal in its agenda, it does not necessarily follow that all the oracles speak to kingship. Ultimately, the imagery invoked by Jeremiah in 22:24 is not what is expected when a signet ring that represents authority is cast off. Thus, "[King Jehoiachin] is compared to a seal on the hand of Yhwh, symbol of high personal value, but he has lost his privileged position, and Yhwh feels like throwing him away, as if he had become an objection of no personal value at all."<sup>28</sup>

With respect to the effect these conclusions have on Hag 2:23, Rose stresses the similarity between passages, namely that the imagery invoked by Haggai is not consistent with the declaration of royal authority by means of a signet ring. The Lord gives nothing to Zerubbabel. Rather, the Lord's desire is to make him like a חותם.<sup>29</sup> Important for Rose is the use of a simile.<sup>30</sup> As for the socio-political upheaval anticipated in vv. 20–23, no explicit statements exist that demand a nuance of royal authority.<sup>31</sup> "One does not find a statement about Zerubbabel being Yhwh's anointed or about his autonomous rule (governed by God) present or future, and there is no explicit promise that God will make the

26. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*, 221–22.

27. *Ibid.*, 235.

28. *Ibid.*, 228–29.

29. *Ibid.*, 237–38.

30. *Ibid.*, 238. Rose emphasizes the ך preposition. See below for other implications associated with this prefix.

31. *Ibid.*, 241–42.

nations subject to his chosen one.”<sup>32</sup> In the end, Rose perceives there to be an expectation that Zerubbabel will experience the opposite of his ancestor. He will enjoy personal worth or value in the eyes of the Lord.

Rose’s argument does well to stress that Jer 22:24 is the cognitive backdrop necessary for understanding the prophetic declaration to Zerubbabel. Furthermore, he correctly highlights the nuances of the imagery and language and draws laudable interpretive conclusions. However, the vagaries of the oracle may not necessarily be indicative of what he characterizes simply as a non-royal expectation. It could be that something more nuanced is involved. To flesh out this point, John Kessler’s article “Haggai, Zerubbabel, and the Political Status of Yehud: The Signet Ring in Haggai 2:23” becomes important.<sup>33</sup>

According to Kessler, understanding the expectations surrounding Zerubbabel and the Davidic dynasty initially requires the consideration of four issues. The first is the political status of Judah. The debate regarding this topic is fierce, but Kessler categorizes four options.<sup>34</sup> First, Judah was a part of the province of Samaria. Second, Judah briefly enjoyed status as an independent province, but was quickly consumed by the province of Samaria. Third, Judah enjoyed a lengthy period of independence and was governed by a relatively stable line of Jewish governors. Fourth, Judah was a vassal-kingdom during the Babylonian and Early Persian periods and was ruled by a member of the Davidic dynasty. Kessler sides with option three, based on biblical, lexical, and archaeological data. The second issue to consider is the association of Hag 2:21–23 with 2:6–9. According to Kessler, both passages “use language of present acceptability despite inferior status.”<sup>35</sup> Third, one must consider Haggai’s hermeneutics of generalization. Kessler believes that Haggai intentionally generalizes, attenuates, and obfuscates popular prophetic motifs in order to focus the audience’s attention upon the most salient elements.<sup>36</sup> Fourth, the nature and purpose of the signet ring imagery in Jer 22:24 and Hag 2:23 is critical, and

32. *Ibid.*, 240–41.

33. John Kessler, “Haggai, Zerubbabel, and the Political Status of Yehud: The Signet Ring in Haggai 2:23,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (ed. Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak; LBHOTS 427; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 102–19.

34. *Ibid.*, 103–06.

35. *Ibid.*, 107.

36. In the case of Hag 2:23, the most salient point is the realization that “Zerubbabel will experience exaltation at the hand of Yahweh.” *Ibid.*, 110.

Kessler believes that two realizations illuminate this nexus most clearly. On the one hand, the use of *חֹתֶם* is intentional as it functions to update Jer 22:24 in light of the circumstances of the early Persian period, and on the other hand, the issue at stake is the personification of Yahweh. The *חֹתֶם* imagery is a means to an end. According to Kessler therefore,

The real trope consists of the personification of Yahweh, who is likened to the owner of a signet who, in one case, in utter anger and disgust, despite its preciousness to him, removes his signet and throws it away, and who, in the other, due to changed circumstances, picks up that which was formerly discarded and puts it on again.<sup>37</sup>

Armed with these principles, Kessler argues that Haggai's final oracle is intentionally vague in its address to the function of Zerubbabel and the Davidic dynasty. On the one hand, it is clear that Haggai responds to the oracle of Jeremiah by stating that that which was pronounced in Jeremiah is undone. On the other hand, Haggai is intentionally unclear about the details. "What is lacking, however, in the text of Haggai . . . is an indication of *the precise nature* of the correspondingly positive future experience of Zerubbabel."<sup>38</sup> Thus, Kessler believes that this final oracle tempers any misplaced nationalism as it encourages the community to "accept the then-present realities" as evidence that "Yahweh's promises to the nation and its royal house were not defunct."<sup>39</sup>

There is much with which to agree in Kessler's article. He properly considers the socio-historical context behind Hag 2:20–23, including an awareness of Persian political policy and the era of insurrection, without compromising the demands of the text. Of those demands, Kessler properly weighs the eschatological nuances, which allows him to conclude that the prophet has one eye fixed on the future. However, in the remainder of this essay I will reframe particular elements of Kessler's presentation, namely his statements that Hag 2:23 "corrects" Jer 22:24 and the nuances of the *כִּי* preposition prefixed to *חֹתֶם*. A consideration of inner-biblical exegesis offers an illuminating perspective that explains the now-future dialectic, the nuanced imagery

37. *Ibid.*, 113.

38. *Ibid.*, 115.

39. *Ibid.*, 117.

associated with חזתם, and the convergence of literary traditions in a Second Temple context.

#### INNER-BIBLICAL EXEGESIS: REFRAMING KESSLER

It is incontrovertible that the phrase כחזתם is a *crux* for Hag 2:20–23 and its expectations of Zerubbabel and the Davidic line’s role moving forward. As for the significance of this phrase, the implications of inner-biblical exegesis offer an intriguing explanation. According to Fishbane, certain socio-religious and historical developments engendered the reinterpretation and contextualization of authoritative traditions, and the vestiges of this process can be detected within the biblical tradition. Fishbane has proposed four basic types of inner-biblical exegesis: scribal, legal, aggadic, and mantological. What concerns this essay initially is mantological exegesis, which considers that which is “ominous or oracular in scope.”<sup>40</sup> Moreover, mantological exegesis may be visual or auditory, transformative or non-transformative. Thus, Hag 2:20–23 can be understood as a type of transformative mantological exegesis of the Jeremianic tradition that “readapts, reapplies, or revises” the older oracle.<sup>41</sup> More specifically, it mitigates the cognitive dissonance<sup>42</sup> that was undoubtedly present amongst the people of early Persian period Judah. Having experienced the Babylonian exile, and the fulfillment of Jeremiah’s denouncement of Jehoiachin, the presence of a Davidic heir in one of the highest profile political positions in conjunction with the political upheaval of Darius’s second year would have imported confusion, wonder, and uncertainty.

Interestingly, Kessler describes these dynamics but falls short of using terms familiar to inner-biblical exegesis. Consider a somewhat lengthy statement.

40. Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 443.

41. *Ibid.*, 460. On how the idea of readapting, reapplying, or revising the prophetic word interacts with a view of scriptural inspiration, see below.

42. *Ibid.*, 445. On cognitive dissonance and biblical prophecy, see Robert P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed: Cognitive Dissonance in the Prophetic Traditions of the Old Testament* (New York: Seabury, 1979); *idem*, “Ancient Israelite Prophecy and Dissonance Theory,” in *The Place is Too Small for Us: The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship* (ed. R. P. Gordon; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 377–91; reprint *Numen* 24 (1977): 135–51.

[T]he use of the signet imagery was not one option out of a vast range of possibilities. Rather it was taken up specifically because of its presence in the Jeremianic tradition. In all probability, the tradition cried out for further reflection once the Davidic Zerubbabel was reinstated by the Persians. How did the presence of Zerubbabel square with Jeremiah's words of rejection directed against Jehoiachin and his descendents? How could those who treasured those words—possibly the non-exiled community, as opposed to the returnees—follow the leadership of Zerubbabel (a member of the returnee group) in the temple reconstruction project? The critical interpretive questions vis-à-vis Hag 2:23 is thus not “How is Zerubbabel like a signet ring?” but rather “How does Hag 2:23 develop the ideas of Jer 22:24–30?”<sup>43</sup>

From this quote, one sees that Kessler recognizes that the hermeneutical connection between the two passages is such that Haggai's oracle addresses the authoritative tradition in order to alleviate the confusion that would have arisen in light of present circumstances.

Yet, there appears to be another level to this prophetic exegesis, and to unpack this, the prefixed  $\text{פ}$  becomes the point of focus as it can signal inner-biblical exegesis. More specifically, it may signal typological inner-biblical exegesis, a specific type of aggadic exegesis.<sup>44</sup> According to Fishbane, typology “sees in previous events or places the prototype pattern, or figure of historical persons, events or places that follow it in time.”<sup>45</sup> Inner-biblical typologies therefore “constitute a literary-historical phenomenon which isolates perceived correlations between specific events, persons, or places in time with their later correspondents”<sup>46</sup> As to the nature of the relationship between correspondents, Fishbane states,

[The later correspondents] will never be precisely identical with

43. Kessler, “Haggai, Zerubbabel, and Yehud,” 112–13.

44. According to Fishbane, “fixed rhetorical terms” signal typological exegesis, and in such cases  $\text{כַּן . . . כְּאֲשֶׁר}$  is frequent. However, Fishbane admits, “Now and then  $\text{כְּאֲשֶׁר}$  is replaced by  $\text{כִּי}$  and variants.” Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 352. Other scholars recognize the role of the  $\text{פ}$  prefix in signaling inner-biblical exegesis (e.g., Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990], 202–05).

45. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 351.

46. *Ibid.*, 351.

their prototype, but inevitably stand in hermeneutical relationship with them. Not only do typologies emphasize the likeness between two correspondents, but the nexus between them is always exegetically established.<sup>47</sup>

Applied to Hag 2:20–23, this oracle also appears to be a typology of a biographical nature. By invoking terms and ideology traditionally associated with the Davidic dynasty alongside the *הוֹתֵם* imagery, which was particularly significant for Zerubbabel's grandfather Jehoiachin, the prophet is defining Zerubbabel's role, and the Davidic dynasty which he represents, through a correlation with the Davidic descendent who was ushered off to Babylon and signified the rejection of that line. Thus, Zerubbabel can be perceived in one sense as the anti-Jehoiachin, signifying that the Davidic line will once again play a strategic role for the Second Temple community. Yet one would be incorrect to insist that Zerubbabel's role will correspond exactly to the roles of his preexilic predecessors. As this essay has discussed, there are methodological, historical, and interpretive factors that work against such a conclusion. Instead, the prophet is espousing that Zerubbabel's role will correspond to that of his forefathers' as king but not be tantamount to it. With Zerubbabel, the Davidic dynasty will again enjoy the position of the community's figurehead and highest-ranking political official. In other words, Zerubbabel symbolizes that the Davidic dynasty represents a viable political option moving forward, albeit in a nuanced fashion. By implication, Haggai is communicating that the Davidic covenant is not null and void.

## CONCLUSION

In sum, this essay has discussed in detail the conclusions of Walter Rose and John Kessler on the expectations surrounding Zerubbabel, and by implication the Davidic line, according to Hag 2:20–23. While Rose offers some important considerations—that Jer 22:24 is the necessary cognitive backdrop and that the imagery of both Jer 22:24 and Hag 2:23 is nuanced—this essay suggests that John Kessler best understands the host of dynamics involved with trying to ascertain the expectations of Zerubbabel and the Davidic dynasty. Kessler best considers the socio-political dynamics of the second year of Darius I, the Persian use of indigenous dynasties to ensure political stability, and the imagery and content of Haggai's final oracle in its immediate and book-level contexts.

47. *Ibid.*, 351.

Most importantly, Kessler properly explains that the hermeneutical relationship between Jer 22:24 and Hag 2:23 is paramount when trying to understand the expectations surrounding the Davidic line. Yet this essay also reframed Kessler's work in terms of inner-biblical exegesis. This essay suggests that Hag 2:20–23 constitutes a complex manto-typological exegesis of the Jer 22:24–30 tradition.<sup>48</sup> On the one hand, it clarified the dissonance that would have existed within the Second Temple community as it tried to rectify the Jeremianic tradition with the realities of the second year of Darius I (mantological exegesis). On the other hand, it communicated that Zerubbabel's socio-political role could be correlated with those of his monarchic predecessors, but just not in the exact same capacity (typological exegesis). By implication, Haggai's final oracle also communicated that the Davidic line would enjoy political viability and continued divine sanction as the future unfolded, even if in a nuanced way.

But does Hag 2:20–23 constitute a “reversal” of the Jeremianic tradition? Rose is hesitant. “I do not want to disagree with finding a connection between the two oracles, though I would be somewhat cautious about whether one can say that Haggai was consciously reversing the Jeremiah oracle.”<sup>49</sup> Yet in light of the proposal offered here, one must concede that the Haggai oracle *reverses* the Jeremianic one, at least in a general sense. The debate of whether הוֹתֵם conveys a sense of authority or personal value notwithstanding, that which was done in Jehoiachin is undone—or reversed—in the person of Zerubbabel.

Assuming this concession, another more fundamental question particularly relevant for evangelicals creeps to the forefront. Does such a concession erode one's view of scriptural inspiration? Does conceding a reversal of the prophetic word undermine a high view of Scripture? According to Lawson Stone, the final form of Scripture is the “apex” of a lengthy process of textual development that saw Israel's authoritative traditions pass through various stages of growth and transmission.<sup>50</sup> By implication, “all stages of development are regarded as participating to

48. Admittedly, such a complex exegesis may be unique. However, as argued, both typological and mantological types are present. Yet more fundamentally, the proposal offered here embodies the essence of inner-biblical exegesis. As emphasized by Fishbane, there is a vibrant and protean relationship between the *traditio* and *triditum*. To restrict it by any preconceived notion undermines the exegetical activity. See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 13.

49. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*, 235.

50. Lawson G. Stone, “On Historical Authenticity, Historical Criticism, and Biblical Authority: Reflections on the Case of the Book of Joshua,” *AsTJ* 56/57 (2002): 85.

some degree in divine revelation and inspiration. Development is not inimical to the truth-value of Scripture. The progressive development of Scripture has a role in the overall picture of God's historical revelation."<sup>51</sup> Therefore, inspiration is not static and merely a feature of the text's final form. It is dynamic and a divinely sanctioned influence that oversaw the entire process of the canon's formation.

Haggai's reversal of the Jeremianic tradition therefore should not be understood negatively. Rather, the textual relationship described in this essay provides a window into the progressive nature of God's revelation. It demonstrates how God's word continually nourished the community by explaining their experiences and, when necessary, revisiting past experiences in light of newly disclosed prophetic insight that could clarify points of confusion. In this instance, the status of Zerubbabel in the early Second Temple period forced a reconsideration of an extant Jeremianic tradition. In the process, the Lord revealed through his prophet Haggai that redemption from exile was a reality that extended to persons and familial lines, not just nations.

51. *Ibid.*, 85.