INTRODUCTION

From the textual evidence in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, it is apparent that the eschatological hopes of the Persian period Jewish community are intrinsically connected to and perhaps dependent upon the restoration of the Jerusalem temple. For this reason, the reconstruction of the temple, Yahweh’s return and glorification of it, and the associated eschatological expectations are key themes within Hag and Zech 1–8. Owing to the sixth-century Babylonian devastation of Jerusalem and subsequent return to the Persian-governed province of Yehud, several temporal and theological tensions are evident within both texts. Likewise, Hag and Zech 1–8 contain a myriad of references to diverse theological motifs and traditions. The reception and appropriation of such traditions directly inform the prophets’ perception of Israel’s past,

---

1 The present study is largely influenced by the way we restrict the meaning of ‘eschatology.’ Most simply, the term ‘eschatology’ is derived from the Greek word eschatos, meaning “last” or “final,” and implies the study of “the last things.” However, the theological and temporal tensions portrayed throughout the Old Testament reveal a more diverse understanding of eschatology. Our discussion is founded primarily on Gerhard von Rad’s definition of eschatology as “the characteristic feature of the prophet’s message in its actuality, its expectation of something soon to happen.” In this vein, the prophetic message of Haggai and Zechariah “is only eschatological when the prophets expelled Israel from the safety of the old saving actions and suddenly shifted the basis of salvation to a future action of God.” As expected, the prophets’ ‘expelling’ of the old saving actions does not serve to abolish past traditions, but instead, serves to project them into future terms. Therefore, Haggai and Zechariah “expected the new saving action to take exactly the forms of the old one, and that therefore, even in expounding the new, they had recourse to [Y]ahweh’s saving appointments of the past.” Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Volume II: The Theology of Israel’s Prophetic Traditions, (trans. D.M.G. Stalker; New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1965), 115 and 118, respectively.

2 According to the date formulae in Hag and Zech 1–8, the prophetic oracles of Haggai and Zechariah were delivered in and between August, 520 BCE (Hag 1:1) and December, 518 BCE (Zech 7:1), from the second to the fourth regnal year of King Darius I. These dates place Haggai and Zechariah’s ministry during the height of the Persian empire (ca. 538–333 BCE), during the early years of Darius I, prior to the rededication of the temple in 515 BCE. For a general overview of the most relevant issues, cf. Mark J. Boda, “Majoring on the Minors: Recent research on Haggai and Zechariah,” Currents in Biblical Research 2 (2003): 33–68.
present, and future role as Yahweh’s people. In view of such tensions, the present study explores the ways in which the reception and appropriation of the Deuteronomistic, Priestly, and Zion theological traditions informed the conceptualization of the temple and the future in Hag and Zech 1–8. For Haggai and Zechariah, the temple functions as the link between the past, the present, and the future. Both prophets employ Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions to motivate the present reconstruction of the temple. The Zion tradition, on the other hand, provides future hope as it pre–constructs and prefigures the future eschatological hopes centered on Jerusalem. Functionally, the present is characterized by the fusion of the past and the anticipation of the future—it is through such a view that the temple provides continuity with the past and invokes a movement into the future.

The theological traditions imperative to our study are: 1) the Deuteronomistic repository, including the Sinai, Exodus, and conquest motifs; 2) Priestly theology, as expressed in Lev (esp. the Holiness Code of Lev 17–27) and Ezek (esp. 40–48); and 3) Zion theology, inclusive of its reciprocal Davidic and Royal streams. Evidently, both the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions are markedly rooted in the past and present and show very little concern for the anticipation of the future. Antithetical to these is the distinct eschatological pulse of the Zion tradition, which relies heavily on the future, universal fulfillment of God’s redemptive plan for creation. In light of these temporal and theological tensions, our present task is to discover how Haggai and Zechariah’s appropriation of these divergent traditions inform their representation of the temple, the future, and the temple’s role in the future.

THE DEUTERONOMISTIC & PRIESTLY TRADITIONS
IN HAGGAI & ZECHARIAH 1–8

3 There are, of course, special instances where future expectations are expressed in passages such as Deut 4 and 30. When comparing the eschatology of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions to Zion theology, we are speaking of the overall temporal pulse of each tradition.
Deuteronomistic Theology in Hag–Zech 1–8: Centralization, Cult, and Covenant

The theological features characteristic of the Deuteronomistic stream are evidenced most explicitly in the Book of Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History (Josh–2Kgs), and other prophetic texts such as Jeremiah, Amos, and Hosea. Moshe Weinfeld, in his review of Deuteronomistic theology, lists the following tenets as central to the Deuteronomistic stream: the struggle against idolatry; the centralization of the cult; Exodus, covenant, and election; observance of the law and loyalty to the covenant; inheritance of the land; and retribution and material motivation; and fulfillment of prophecy. These features also inform the Deuteronomistic understanding of how God’s transcendent presence could ‘dwell’ with Israel. Deut 12:1–31 makes explicit Israel’s relationship with Yahweh through proper worship at the central sanctuary as a form of covenantal obedience. Repeatedly throughout Deuteronomy, Israel is instructed to worship Yahweh solely at the “place” (מָקוֹם) where He “chooses to cause his name to dwell.” Distinguished from the ‘glory theology’ of the Priestly tradition, which emphasizes God’s physical and immanent presence with Israel through theophanies of Yahweh’s כָבוֹד, Deuteronomistic ‘name theology’ affirms the immaterial and transcendent essence of Yahweh’s presence. Where Priestly theology attests that God’s ‘glory’ fills the sanctuary as

---


5 Weinfeld, Deuteronomy, 1.


evidence of God’s presence, Deuteronomistic theology claims that it is God’s name that dwells there. Thus, Deuteronomistic theology resists the notion that Yahweh actually dwells in the temple in favor of the idea that the temple functions as a dwelling for Yahweh’s name (cf. Deut 12:11; 16:2), with the temple itself being built for his name (cf. 2Sam 7:13; 1Kgs 9:7; 2Kgs 23:27).

Both Haggai and Zechariah contain a deposit of Deuteronomistic terms. Most significant are Hag 2:4–5 and Zech 8:9, 13, which contain vivid allusions to the Deuteronomistic Encouragement Formula, customarily identified with Joshua 1:5–9. The threefold repetition of חָזַק, “be strong,” in Josh 1:6, 7, and 9 is mirrored, literally, in Haggai 2:4. The direct repetition possesses an emphatic quality and enhances the effect of the encouragement. Written in the Qal imperative in both Joshua and Haggai, the divine exhortation calls for confidence, not in human accomplishment, but in the real and active presence of Yahweh. Similarly, Zech 8:9 and 13 provide us with a similar, albeit less explicit illustration of the same Deuteronomistic motif.

---

8 Examples include Deut 12:1–31; 1Kgs 8:16, 29, 43; Jer 7:12. Clements notes that for the Deuteronomist, “[t]here is no mention that Yahweh had a dwelling–place on earth, as the sanctuary on Mount Zion claimed to be, or that the ark was the mysterious symbol of the divine presence, associated with the heavenly king seated upon his cherubim–throne” (Ronald Clements, “Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition,” VT 15 [1965], 302).


10 Cf. Michael N. Van Der Meer, Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses (Leiden: Brill, 2004), and the extensive bibliography of Ralph Smith, Micah–Malachi (WBC, 32; Waco: Word Books, 1984), 155–58; Carol Meyers and Eric Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8 (AB, 25B; Garden City: Doubleday, 1987), 50; Trent C. Butler, Joshua (WBC, 7; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984), xxi provides an extensive list of the passages where Deuteronomistic editing is most evident.


12 Noteworthy is the thematic correspondence between all three passages. Butler identifies the four major Deuteronomistic themes of Joshua—the land, the leadership, the law, and the Lord (Butler, Joshua, xxv). The land that was promised by Yahweh to the forefathers is conquered, inherited, and distributed by the new generation of Israelites under Joshua’s headship. Butler writes: “The land is the reward. Leadership is the means. The law is the
Employing the same term as Haggai, Zechariah also records the divine command to “let your hands be strong” (8:9), and again to “fear not, but let your hands be strong” (8:13). In Zechariah, the verb חָזַק appears in the imperfect jussive, again, serving to intensify the emotive impact of the encouragement. While Haggai addresses three distinct groups—Zerubbabel, the governor of Yehud; Joshua the high priest; and all the people of the land—Zechariah here addresses only the third group, “the people of the land” (Zech 7:5), broadcasting the call to action to the community at large. A similar Deuteronomistic motif is found in 1 Chr 28:20, where David, much like Haggai and Zechariah, employs a similar formula to encourage Solomon in his temple building assignment. In all four cases (Josh 1:6, 7, 9; 1 Chr 28:20; Hag 2:4–5; Zech 8:9, 13), the principal speaker, whether Yahweh, David, Haggai, and Zechariah, respectively, uses the Encouragement Formula to petition for resolute action from the recipient(s) of the message. Exclusively, in the case of David, Haggai, and Zechariah, the required action is from the Israelite community regarding the building or rebuilding of the house of the Lord. With Haggai and Zechariah’s appropriation of the Encouragement Formula comes an optimistic and sanguine view of the present and future conditions in Yehud. Despite the community’s dilatory treatment of the temple, both prophets assure the people that even prior to the completion of the physical temple building, that God’s presence is with them.
In light of these verses, Wessels argues that Haggai’s employment of the Deuteronomistic tradition serves two temporal functions: first, as a way to assure postexilic Israel that they form part of Yahweh’s historical covenant community; and second, to assure them that the spirit of Yahweh remains with them, just as he was with those whom he delivered from Egypt. It is here that Haggai and Zechariah’s application of the Hebrew term דָּבָר (“word,” or “speech”) acquires primacy. In Hag 2:5, Haggai pairs דָּבָר with the verb כָּרַת (“cut or make covenant”) and follows it with a direct reference to the Exodus from Egypt (מִמִּצְרַיִם בְּצֵאתְכֶם). This formula mirrors closely that of 1 Kgs 8:9, where Yahweh makes a covenant (כָּרַת) with Israel following their exodus from Egypt (מִמִּצְרָיִם מֵאֶרֶץ בְּצֵאתָם). The proximity of covenant language with דָּבָר recalls the Mosaic covenant at Sinai, and in effect, appropriates the Exodus traditions associated with the covenant between God and Israel. The association of דָּבָר with the covenantal motif of the Exodus tradition is also reflected in Zechariah’s use of “words and statutes” (וְחֻקַּי דְּבָרַי) in 1:6 and the plural rendering, “words” (הַדְּבָרִים) in 7:7 and 12. In doing so, the prophet appropriates the biblical language of Deuteronomistic theology and articulates the ongoing reality of God’s ‘word’ for the postexilic generation.

---

18 Hag 2:5a is not without serious textual problems. The phrase, מִמִּצְרַיִם בְּצֵאתְכֶם אִתְּכֶם אֲשֶׁר־כָּרַתִּי אֶת־הַדָּבָר is absent from the LXX, Syriac, Vetus Latina, and Syro-Hexaplar versions, but is confirmed by the MT, the Targum, and the Latin Vulgate (and quite possibly col. 22:25 of the Murabba’ât manuscript, which contains a space roughly the size of this clause [Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8; Kessler, The Book of Haggai, 160]). Historically, the MT rendering has been accepted as the lectio difficilior due to the awkward placement and form of את־הַדָּבָר. The majority of scholars have done one of two things: 1) assigned את־הַדָּבָר as the direct object of וַעֲשׂוּ o:f from v.4 (so, Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 47, 51); or 2) viewed it as an explanation for the אִתְּכֶם אֲנִי and the “presence of the Lord” which follows in v.5b (Kessler, The Book of Haggai, 160, 169–73). Recently, Max Rogland (“Text and Temple,” ZAW 119.3 [2007]: 410–15) has proposed a concession between varying opinions, arguing, rather innovatively, that the phrase in 2:5a is to be understood as a direct object governed by the אַל־תִּירָאוּ at the end of the verse: “Do not fear the matter which I covenanted with you when you came out of Egypt, while my Spirit was abiding in your midst.” Rogland compares his translation with several OT passages that contain a considerable gap between the verbal form and direct object (ex. Gen 24:47; 1Sam 8:16; 2Chr 29:19; Amos 6:14). Following both Kessler and Rogland, I see no syntactical or grammatical reason for emending the MT, and instead, see את־הַדָּבָר as thematically and textually connected to what follows in 2:5b (cf. Rogland, “Text and Temple,” 413–14).
19 Cf. also Deut 9:7; 16:3; Jer 7:5.
20 See for example, Deut 9:7; 16:3; Jer 7:5. Meyers and Meyers offer a review of the prophetic influence on Zechariah’s use of the same terms (Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 95–96, 402–403).
By applying the Exodus imagery associated with the Deuteronomistic tradition, both Haggai and Zechariah use the past to secure the present. The encouragement comes in the form of Yahweh’s presence being presently involved with the restoration of the Yehudite community. Here, the principal focus is not a future hope, but Yahweh’s covenant faithfulness, which demands a present ideological and behavioral reorientation centered on covenant obedience. However, a present reorientation towards Yahweh and his covenantal faithfulness is depicted as a correlate of Yehud’s future. The present covenant faithfulness of Yahweh is the means by which future fulfillment is made tangible—a fulfillment, as we shall see, centered on the prophets’ view of the temple.


Haggai and Zechariah use the Priestly tradition in much the same way. The theological framework of the Priestly tradition includes a preoccupation with cultic institutions and the rituals associated with the performance of purity. The texts most often associated with the Priestly tradition include sections of Genesis, Numbers 1:1–10:10, and Exodus 25–31 and 35–40, and the characteristic priestly texts of Leviticus (esp. the Holiness Code of Lev 17–27) and

---

21 Following the presentation of the Encouragement Formula (Hag 2:4) and the guarantee of Yahweh’s presence with Israel (2:5), Haggai immediately invokes the future, with one of the most vivid eschatological expressions of the book (2:6–7). Rather accurately, Meyers and Meyers classify Haggai’s use of the Encouragement Formula as intentionally eschatological: “The prophet offers support through his ability to see in present accomplishments the unfolding of Yahweh’s eschatological purposes, to view immediate tasks in the context of ultimate goals that have worldwide scope” (Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 71). Further, the repetition of the clause, “may your hands be strong” in Zech 8:9 and 13 also serves to express the conviction that the temple rebuilding will be a major turning point for the postexilic community, signifying a new and prosperous way of life. Prosperity in the land, both now and in the eschaton, hinges, therefore, on obedience and hard work on the temple (Eugene Merrill, _An Exegetical Commentary: Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi_ [Chicago: Moody Press, 1994], 225.)


In Priestly theology, the ark, tabernacle, and the temple sanctuary were viewed as the actual earthly dwelling (מִשְׁכָּן) of God’s כָבוֹד ("glory"). Through the coming and going of His כָבוֹד, Yahweh makes his presence known in the temple sanctuary—a presence that extends Yahweh’s inherent holiness outwards in concentric waves to the priesthood, the people, and the land.

On a broad, thematic level, even Haggai’s preoccupation with the rebuilding of the temple shows an inherent familiarity with the Priestly conception of sacred space, Yahweh’s earthly presence, and the significance of the cult. One of the clearest manifestations of the Priestly stream within Haggai is in 1:13, 2:4, and 5 with the Formula of Assistance. Typically linked to the priestly oracles of salvation, Hag 1:13 assures the community that Yahweh is with them. Coupled with the Deuteronomistic Encouragement Formula in 2:4 (“Work, for I am with you”) and 5 (“My Spirit remains in your midst. Fear not.”), Yahweh’s presence serves to

---


25 Ex. Exod 15:13, 17; Lev 15:31; 26:11; Ps 132:5, 7

26 The concept of “rings of decreasing holiness” was originally presented by Jacob Milgrom in his Leviticus 1–16, (AB, 3; Garden City: Doubleday, 2000).


encourage action. The associated notion of fear is similar to other expressions of assurance found throughout the OT. Compare, for example, the parallel diction of Jer 30:10–11, “Fear not, O Jacob…for I am with you” and Isa 41:10, “Fear not, for I am with you; be not dismayed, I am your God…”

In each case, the temporal emphasis is twofold: first, it stresses the efficacious presence of Yahweh in present circumstances; and second, it ensures the continual and abiding presence of Yahweh in future terms. In postexilic Yehud, Haggai’s words serve to encourage the community in their temple building project and to reassure the people of God’s future plans for Israel.

Similar to the prophetic use of the priestly salvation oracles in Isaiah, Haggai inclines Israel to the anticipation of their future redemption through Yahweh. On this account, the assurance given in vv. 4–5 has been rightly regarded as an “entrée into the eschatological message of vv. 6–9.”

Petersen elaborates on the eschatological dimension of Haggai’s speech when he writes: “The ‘I am with you’ statement is not a static assurance. Yahweh’s current presence has significance for the future.”

While Haggai’s practical interest rests in the people’s immediate response to the command to rebuild the temple, the pairing of these literary devices also point to a future reality.

This affinity with Priestly theology is apparent in Zechariah’s interest in the role and authority of the priesthood and ritual standards of purity. Priestly concepts and vocabulary dominate the fourth (3:1–10), fifth (5:1–4), and sixth (5:5–11) visions of Zechariah. The fourth

---

30 Also, Gen 26:24; Jer 1:8; 42:11; 46:28; Isa 43:5.
31 According to Merrill, the negative injunction ‘not to fear’ is related most closely to the language of Second Isaiah (Isa 40:9; 41:13, 14; 43:1; 44:2; 54:4), where Isaiah expresses hopeful anticipation of the second exodus from Babylon and the ultimate deliverance of the nation in the eschaton (Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 37).
32 Merrill, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 37.
33 Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 57.
34 The affinities between the priestly tradition and Zechariah’s fifth and sixth visions have been dealt with exclusively by Dominic Rudman, “Zech 5 and the Priestly Law.” SJOT 14.2 (2000): 194–206). In a reevaluation of the textual relationship between Zech 5 and the priestly laws of Num 5, Lev 14 and 19, Rudman demonstrates the vivid terminological and thematic harmony of the texts.
vision \(^{35}\) details a ritualistic cleansing process, whereby the “angel of Yahweh” removes Joshua’s “iniquity” (עון) and exchanges his “filthy garments” (בְּגָדִים צֹאִים) for “pure vestments/stately robes” (מַחֲלָצוֹת) and a “clean turban” (טָהוֹר צָנִיף). \(^{36}\) The pairing of the terms, צֹאִי and עון with מַחֲלָצוֹת and טָהוֹר (vv. 3–5) conveys a grave distinction between the radical contamination represented by Joshua’s iniquity and the purity ceded to him by the angel of Yahweh. While at first glance, it appears that Joshua’s personal iniquity is in view here, two key features support a communal application of the vision. First, the filth described in vv. 3 and 4 is connected not to Joshua personally, but to Joshua’s “clothes” (בְּגָדִים). Unlike similar rituals within the OT (i.e., Isa 4:3–4), where Jerusalem is viewed as the recipient of God’s purifying judgment, Zech 3 portrays Joshua’s clothes as the object of purification. Second, when read in the context of passages leading up to Zech 3:1–10, the vision acquires a broader scope of application. In 1:3–6, God cautions the Yehudite community to avoid repeating the wayward conduct of their “fathers.” Again, in 2:1–13, Zechariah announces God’s intent to return to Jerusalem as a community. Certainly, the divine instruction given in 3:7 possesses a clear personal tone—as Joshua is debriefed on his role as high priest in a second person singular address (ך תֵל, תִשְׁמֹר, תָּדִין, תִּשְׁמֹר, וְנָתַתִּי)—but even with the divine sanction presented personally to Joshua, his responsibilities as high priest are shown to affect the entire Yehudite community. Thus, the divine purification of

---


\(^{36}\) Scholars are divided concerning the most appropriate interpretation of Zechariah’s use of this term. Petersen, following Beuken, understands it as a direct reference to the regalia of the high priest, alluding to the list of finery found in Isa 3:22 (Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8*, 198–99; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8*, 190). Tollington, on the other hand, asserts that if Zechariah was intentionally referring to the investiture of the high priest, he would have used the more typical priestly term, “holy garments” (בִגְדֵי־קֹדֶשׁ) found in key passages like Ex 28:2; 29:21; and 40:13 (*Tradition and Innovation*, 157).
Joshua is viewed as emblematic of the iniquity of the Yehudite community at large. All said, Zech 3:1–10 presents us with a visionary scene where Joshua is cleansed of all iniquity and granted divine favour. In the same way, the communal vocabulary and context of the oracle points to the broader message, namely that in the postexilic setting, Yehud in its entirety is reinstated as a community chosen by Yahweh. Zechariah’s appropriation of Priestly imagery in this passage informs the community of the divine favor to be expected in the imminent future.

**The Deuteronomistic & Priestly Traditions: The Present Use of the Past**

Haggai and Zechariah’s appropriation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions serve to link the past and present. It is in this sense that these so-called ‘non-eschatological’ traditions serve a certain ‘eschatological’ purpose in the prophetic ministries of Haggai and Zechariah. By applying and reapplying features of these traditions, the prophets provide the postexilic community with the ideological and theological tools necessary for forging their identity as Yahweh’s covenant people within the postexilic context. As we shall see, without a solid understanding of the ways in which the past informs the present (a connection provided primarily by the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions), the appropriation of the Zion tradition’s eschatological view of the temple is unattainable. It is Yahweh’s past and present intervention into Israel’s history which provides the grounds and impetus for understanding his future, eschatological plans for Israel.

**THE ZION TRADITION IN HAGGAI & ZECHARIAH 1–8**

The Zion tradition is highly eschatological in its theological temperament. Throughout the OT, God’s rule in Zion as universal king is intimately linked to his control over Israel and by extension, all creation.37 Similar to the royal theologies of other Ancient Near Eastern cultures, Israel’s Zion tradition offered a blended understanding of divine residence (fixed religious

37 For example, 2Sam 33:1–7; Pss 29, 72, 132; Ezek 47; Isa 2:2–3; 24–27.
center, i.e. the temple city) and political control (centralized dynastic kingship). Subsequent to the Davidic and Solomonic inauguration of the royal court came a prophetic ideology of Zion as:

1) the gathering place for foreign nations to abandon their idols and worship the one and only God, Yahweh; 2) the one source of universal peace, where things are attained not by force, but by God’s spirit (i.e. Isa 2:2–4; 65:17–18; Zech 4:6); and 3) the place of residence for Yahweh’s glory (i.e. Isa 4:5–6; Zech 2:9; 14:6–11).

The Zion Tradition in Hag–Zech 1–8: Evidence of Things Not Yet Seen?

The words “Jerusalem” and “Zion” are missing entirely from Haggai, but figure prominently throughout Zechariah. Evidently, Haggai’s central message was the actual rebuilding of the temple, with Jerusalem elected as the site of construction. The first and most direct representation of the Zion motif in Haggai is demonstrated by the prophet’s preoccupation with the temple, Israel’s neglect of it, and the resultant material hardships. Accordingly, an incomplete and unadorned temple is regarded as the direct cause for the economic deficiencies and agricultural shortages (1:3–11), whereas, its presence in Jerusalem is seen as the very reason for the imminent blessings of Yahweh (2:18–19).

What is most noteworthy is that Haggai shows little, if any modification to the traditional conception of the Zion tradition. Instead, he

---


39 On this, Peter Ackroyd writes: “‘Haggai’s stress lies upon the need for rebuilding, because only thus can the willingness of Yahweh to bless be appropriated by the community. Zechariah’s stress lies upon the reality of God’s intentions, which find their correlative in the rebuilding which is made possible by his will. Neither prophet loses sight of the underlying truth that the rebuilding of the Temple, even if it seems to be undertaken as a result of human effort, is in fact brought about by the working of the spirit of God’ (Exile and Restoration [Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1968], 177).

40 The term “Jerusalem” is found 17 times throughout Zech 1–8, while Zion is found less frequently in 1:14, 17; 2:7, 10; 8:2, 3. For a listing of the frequency of these terms in other exilic and postexilic literature, cf. David Gowan, Eschatology in the Old Testament (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1986), 9–10. Additionally, some scholars (cf. J.J.M. Roberts, “The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition,” JBL 92: 329–44) take the terms ‘Jerusalem’ and ‘Zion’ as synonymous entities reflecting the significance of Jerusalem in Yahweh’s cosmic realm, while others view the terms as distinct, but complementary entities, with Jerusalem representing the monarchic holdings of Israelite kings and Zion as the mountain of God’s temple (Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 120).

41 Mason, Preaching the Tradition, 187.
adopts one salient feature of the tradition—the idea that the temple will be glorified through the wealth of the nations in the eschaton.\footnote{This restrictive use of Zion theology in Haggai is recognized by Kessler, “Tradition, Continuity, and Covenant,” 27.} Hag 2:6–9 contains the strictest eschatological use of the Zion tradition, where the prophet calls—rather laconically—upon the traditional motifs of Zion theology to describe the final and universal glorification of Yahweh, including: the elevation of Mount Zion, the hostile attack of the nations against Zion, the gathering of spoil, the paradisal river flowing from Zion, the pilgrimage of the nations, and the ultimate age of universal peace.\footnote{Cf. Pss. 46, 48, 50, Mic 4:1–5, 11–13; Isa 2:1–4; 60:4–14; Joel 4. These components are adapted from Roberts, “The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition,” 329, and Kessler, “Tradition, Continuity, and Covenant,” 27.} The Zion tradition’s rationale for the rebuilding of the temple pervades this sort of eschatological interpretation—the temple, as Yahweh’s dwelling, must be rebuilt so that he can be honored through the wealth of the nations (2:7).\footnote{A motif that stands firmly in line with the traditions of Ezekiel (ex. Ezek 43:4), Second Isaiah (ex. Isa 40:5), and Third Isaiah (cf. 59:19; 60:1–2, 7; 66:11) but, taken together, all four texts are infused with Zion theology.} As such, the temple is envisioned as the nucleus for the inpouring of the wealth of the nations and the outpouring of peace and prosperity throughout the whole earth.\footnote{There is however a great deal of ambiguity surrounding the means by which this wealth will be delivered to Zion. By obscuring such details, Haggai isolates one feature of the Zion tradition—that the temple will be glorified through the wealth of the nations by some manner or another. Kessler classifies Haggai’s “frustratingly silent” speech as a deliberate rhetorical/hermeneutical technique (Kessler, “Tradition, Continuity, and Covenant,” 27). By doing so, Haggai envelops the future in ambiguity, and instructs the community to wait for the intervention of God through the glorification of his temple. Kessler writes: “The future is thus waiting to be shaped by the intervention of Yahweh and the present is therefore somewhat transitional in nature—life in Yehud is not what it once was, but not yet what it will be” (Kessler, “Tradition, Continuity, and Covenant,” 28). The remaining tension sways medially between the ‘already’ and the ‘not yet’—the completed past and the expected future, however imminent it may be.}

A second feature of Zion theology within Hag and Zech 1–8 is the understanding of time, manifested through a present–future dichotomy. In Haggai’s case, the present economic hardships plaguing Israel are viewed as a direct result of the community’s idle treatment of the temple (1:5–11), while the future is characterized as a pivotal eschatological event where the “treasures of all nations shall come in” and the temple of God will be glorified (2:7). It is for this reason that Haggai calls Israel to “consider their ways” in the present tense in 1:7 and then

again, calls them to “consider their ways” as part of Yahweh’s future purposes in 2:15, 18. Haggai assures Israel that the present restoration of their national identity and the future glory of Zion would not come by way of human efforts, but by God alone. Therefore, Yahweh’s presence serves to both, initiate and consummate the future glory of Israel (Hag 2:3–9). Ronald Clements recognizes the temporal significance the temple retained throughout the postexilic period as a witness to the reality that Yahweh’s ultimate promise had not yet been fulfilled. It is for this reason that there is a clear emphasis on the more “transcendent aspects of the divine nature” throughout Hag and Zech 1–8. For postexilic Israel, nothing short of a supernatural transformation of the world was adequate as the expression of Yahweh’s coming. All that men knew and experienced of God with them in the present was as nothing in the face of the ultimate reality, when God would fully come to them. The present gave a partial view, the future would see the whole.

This tension between the present and future is manifested clearly in Haggai’s discussion of the temple. Without the temple, Israel is void of Yahweh’s glorious presence (1:8), yet, in a very real way, Haggai assures the community that the Lord is presently with them (1:13). As for the future, the temple is to act as an entrée for the glorification of Yahweh through the wealth of the nations (cf. 2:7, 9). Thus, in Haggai’s view of the temple, we see a complex union of theological and temporal factors. On the one hand, the Priestly tradition greatly informs Haggai’s

---

46 Hag 1:5–9 and Zech 1:2–6 contain the most explicit appropriation of the Deuteronomistic notions of covenantal obedience and repentance. The Hebrew expression, עַל־דַּרְכֵיכֶם לְבַבְכֶם שִׂימוּ, “reflect/consider your ways,” in Hag 1:5 employs the same plural construct form of מִדַּרְכֵיכֶם as Zech 1:4, underscoring the fervent demand for reflection. Haggai and Zechariah apply this imagery to the postexilic generation by directing the people’s attention not to Yahweh’s words in Deuteronomy, but to their own situation and their own inaction, thereby focusing their attention not on what they have done, but on what they have not done—namely, rebuilding Yahweh’s earthly dwelling.


48 Clements, God and Temple, 126.

49 Clements, God and Temple, 127.

50 A notion Mason attributes to the Jerusalemite Zion tradition: “[Haggai] sees the significance of the return to Jerusalem after the exile in the revitalization of the hopes expressed in the pre-exilic cult of the Jerusalem Temple” (Mason, “Prophets of the Restoration,” 143).
discussion of the ‘tabernacling’ of God’s כָבוֹד within the temple in Jerusalem. On the other, the rebuilding of the temple in the present postexilic context is viewed as a direct correlate of the final, eschatological will of Yahweh—a quintessential feature of Zion theology. On that account, the significance of the temple in present and future terms is tied to these theological streams, with the Priestly understanding of the temple shaping Haggai’s view of the ‘already,’ and the Zion view of the eschatological role of the temple informing the prophet’s view of the ‘not yet.’

Similar tensions are visible in Zechariah’s appropriation of the Zion tradition. Surpassing the views of Haggai, Zechariah possesses an even more radical appropriation of the ‘already’ and the ‘not yet’ dichotomy (esp. Zech 8:1–8), as well as an emphasis on the future glorification of Zion as the place that the nations will come to seek Yahweh (ex. 8:22–23). However, Zechariah’s appropriation of the Zion tradition deviates from Haggai on three main points. First, Zechariah is particularly occupied with the future transformation and impregnability of Zion as the joint residence of Yahweh and his people. In his systematic review of OT eschatology, Donald Gowan demonstrates the correspondence between the Zion tradition and three major eschatological themes relating to transformation: 1) the transformation of human society; 2) the transformation of the human person; and 3) the transformation of nature—the first of which pervades Zech 1–8. It is here that themes such as the restoration to the Promised Land (Zech 2:7; 8:7–8), the hopes of a righteous king (4:5–10; 6:12–13), and the victory over (1:14–15) and conversion of ‘the nations’ (2:11) are visible throughout Zechariah. Zion is envisioned as a save haven for the people of all nations (2:6–7), impregnable because of the presence of God’s

glory (2:5). Similarly, Zech 8:1–17 reiterates the safety and peace that is to preside over Jerusalem as a result of Yahweh’s divine election of and presence in the land. Even with the defeat of Israel’s enemies, it is the residence of God’s glory in Jerusalem that ensures the final, eschatological reign of peace described in Zech 8:10–12 and 20–23.

Secondly, unlike Haggai, the notion of God dwelling in heaven figures prominently in Zechariah’s appropriation of the Zion tradition. In this way, the Deuteronomistic notion of God dwelling in heaven and the Priestly conception of Yahweh’s presence in the temple are fused with the Zion tradition in an effort to comprehend some of the unfulfilled expectations of the exilic prophets (i.e. ). Both Haggai and Zechariah share the conviction that Yahweh is presently active and dwelling among his people. However, in order to address the despondency stemming from the unfulfillment of certain exilic hopes—for example, the coming of Yahweh to gather all nations to Jerusalem (i.e. Jer 31–33; Ezek 36)—Zechariah needed to balance the present significance of the temple with its future glory. A similar tendency is visible in Ezekiel’s vision of the heavenly temple (Ezek 40–48). Classified by von Rad as belonging to the latest stage of the Zion tradition, Ezekiel’s temple vision describes a heavenly temple that would be manifested on Zion in the eschatological age. In both Ezekiel and Zechariah’s visions, it is the spirit of

---


Haggai also attempts to balance the present and future significance of the temple, reflecting Ezekiel’s view. Petersen comments on the thematic similarities shared by Haggai, Zech 1–8, and Ezekiel, writing: “Zechariah’s visions stand somewhere between purely mundane concerns and an utopian vision of renewal. Zechariah's visions are not concrete in the way in which Haggai concentrates on Agricultural yield (Hag. ii 14–19) and on the preservation of capital (Hag. i 6); and they are not concrete in the way in which Ezek. xl–xlviii provides detailed measurements for the restored temple com-pound. Nor are Zechariah's visions utopian as are the expectations for wealth in Hag. ii 6–7 or as the Ezekiel's vision of a society without religious error (Ezek. xliii 7). Zechariah's visions stand somewhere between utopian social vision and concrete physical and social detail.” Petersen, “Zechariah’s Visions: A Theological Perspective,” *VT* 34.2 (1984): 198.
Yahweh that is to commission and initiate the building of the temple (cf. Ezek 43:1–9; 4; Zech 2:5b, 10–11; 4:6). Thus, For Zechariah, the “eschatological saving orders and offices are already present in the world above” (cf. Zech 6:1–8). And it is here that a unique theological tension emerges. Evidently, Zechariah’s intentional focus on the universal and cosmic aspects of God’s divine nature is in line with the theological makeup of the Zion tradition. However, when considered alongside the anti–temple sentiments of passages like Isa 66:1–2 and Jer 23:24 and 27:5, Zechariah’s view of the heavenly realm acquires further significance. Shared among these passages is the Deuteronomistic idea that God will be present with his people, with or without a visible symbol of his presence. What is Zechariah to do with such prophetic pronouncements that downplay the centrality of the temple? Rather than dismiss the temple as an inefficacious symbol of the cultic orders of old, Zechariah creatively merges a number of theological traditions to capture one salient point—that is, the uncontainable, transcendent nature of Yahweh’s presence. In accordance with the Priestly tradition, Zechariah recognizes the heavenly pattern on which the temple is modeled (esp. 6:1–8); in accordance with the Zion tradition, Zechariah universalizes Yahweh’s presence well beyond the centralized temple sanctuary to include the heavens and the earth (ex. 4:10, 14; 6:5); and in accordance with his prophetic forbearers, Zechariah sought a theological concession between anti–temple and pro–temple sentiments. He accomplishes this by stressing the fact that the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah regarding the uncontainable presence of Yahweh were in fact fulfilled in the postexilic context, with or without a completed temple. God is enthroned in heaven, but simultaneously present with his people in Jerusalem. This is perhaps best demonstrated by the past temporal

---

58 Von Rad, Volume 2, 288.
59 For a brief review of these features as they appear in Zechariah, cf. Clements, God and Temple, 130–34.
orientation of passages like Zech 1:16 and 8:3. Rather than be seen as a rejection of the so-called anti-temple sentiments of Jeremiah and Isaiah, Zechariah’s appropriation of the Zion tradition actually serves to accentuate their fulfillment (cf. Jer 31:31; Isa 57:15, etc.). Thus, rather than search for the solution in this world, Zechariah points to a transcendent, heavenly reality where ancient promises would ultimately be fulfilled.

THE TEMPLE IN HAG–ZECH 1–8: TERMINOLOGY & TEMPORALITY

We now turn our attention to the ways in which the theological and temporal qualities of the Deuteronomistic, Priestly, and Zion traditions inform Haggai and Zechariah’s conception of the temple.

Temple Terminology

Both Haggai and Zechariah use a variety of terms to refer to the temple. Most common throughout the OT as a whole are the expressions, “house of Yahweh” (יְהוָה בֵּית), and “house of God” (אֱלֹהִים בֵּית). The former designation is most recurrent within Hag and Zech 1–8. Less frequent within Hag and Zech 1–8 is the term הֵיכַל, typically associated with texts dating to the exilic and postexilic periods (e.g. Pss, Ezra, 2 Chron). While translated most simply as “temple” or “palace,” when paired with the Tetragrammaton, הֵיכַל denotes particularly, the “house of

---

60 In both cases, the future translation of the perfect, ‘shall return’ as “I will return…” is also justifiable based on the problems concerning the tense of the verb (i.e. Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 137; 156). However, as Meyers and Meyers point out, the oracle according to 1:7 suggests that, “Yahweh has already returned to Jerusalem since the temple project is already well under way” (Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 123). Thus, the use of the perfect tense here indicates that Yahweh’s actual return had already commenced, a theme consistently emphasized by both Haggai and Zechariah.

61 Clements, God and Temple, 134.


63 I.e., Hag 1:2, 4, 8, 9a, 9b, 14; 2:3, 7, 9; Zech 1:16; 3:7; 4:9; 7:3; 8:9
For the most part, Haggai and Zechariah use both "יְהוָה הֵיכַל" and "יְהוָה בֵּית" simply to describe the temple as the dwelling place of God. Interestingly, Haggai and Zechariah’s discussion of the actual ‘temple’ (הֵיכַל) does appear in key passages emphasizing its eschatological significance. Haggai’s employment of הֵיכַל in 2:15 and 18 forms part of an oracle of divine blessing which contrasts past disappointments with the future promises of Yahweh. The question is posed, somewhat rhetorically, in vv. 15–16: “Before the stone was placed upon the stone in the temple of Yahweh (יְהוָה בֵּית), how did you fare?” The answer, announced in the following verses, is that Israel endured a major economic recession and massive agricultural failures. As such, the laying of the temple foundation is seen as a decisive turning point in the current situation in Yehud. Despite the failed harvests and the economic drought characterizing the present situation, Yahweh’s unrestricted promise stands: “But from this day on I will bless you” (v. 19). The agricultural theme underscored throughout this section resembles the covenant blessings related to agrarian fertility in other biblical passages such as Lev 26 and Deut 28. Additionally, the notion that God’s presence in the temple is the source of agricultural and economic abundance is reflected in select Canaanite and Mesopotamian texts of the Ancient Near East. It is for this reason that many scholars have commented on the temporal inflection of this oracle. Rex Mason, for instance, recognizes the centrality of Haggai’s eschatological message throughout 2:15–19: “[I]t is the eschatological ‘Coming’ of God, His ‘Presence’ alone (1:8; 2:9) that fills this human structure with His

---

64 BDB, 228. Some commentators differentiate between Haggai’s use of הֵיכַל and בֵּית, with the former referring specifically to the great assembly hall or inner sanctum of the temple (Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 59–60; Wolff, Haggai, 64–66).
66 Eskenazi recognizes a certain literary uniqueness between “the house of God” and הֵיכַל throughout Ezra-Nehemiah. Cf. Tamara Eskenazi, In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra-Nehemiah (SBLMS, 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).
‘Glory.’…It is God alone who can renew them and who, by His presence in the Temple, will do so.”

The temple is void of theological, ideological, and temporal significance without the active presence of Yahweh. Israel’s obedience to the prophetic message and the expedient completion of the temple act conjointly to, in Mason’s words, “prepare the way of the Lord.”

In view here is Yahweh’s direct and immediate blessing, resulting in an abundant supply of crops (v. 19), as well as the continual sustainment of his people. However, the fact that Haggai’s eschatological intent is not as evident here as in other oracles (cf. especially 2:6–9; 20–23), does not insinuate conclusively that some form of eschatological fulfillment is not envisioned.

Therefore, a balanced understanding of the temporal view of the temple in this passage considers two integrated factors. First, the immediate transformation of Israel’s current situation is stated explicitly through the reversal of the present agricultural conditions. Haggai’s primary purpose is to announce the present reversal of Yehud’s fortunes, indicated by specific material blessings, enabled only by God’s presence in his temple. Second, God’s presence entails the continual protection and blessing of his people—hence, Yahweh’s declaration, “From this day onward, I will bless you” (2:19). As such, there is no need to restrict the assurance of God’s blessing to the postexilic context alone. God’s blessings for postexilic Yehud are seen as “spread[ing] its ripples” far beyond the context of the original audience.

The key here is Haggai’s understanding of God’s presence as it is reflected in the rebuilding of the temple. The temple’s completion signifies both, an end to the divine judgment of agricultural scarcity, and a new phase of divine blessing.

---

69 Mason, “The Prophets of the Restoration,” 144.
70 Mason, “The Prophets of the Restoration,” 144. Others like Petersen (Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 94–6), Meyers and Meyers, (Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 65–6), Wolff, (Haggai, 67–8), and Kessler (The Book of Haggai, 212–14) accent an even more immediate application of God’s promised blessing.
71 Wolff, Haggai, 68.
Additionally, the context of Zechariah’s use of הֵיכַל in 6:12, 13, 14, and 15 also appears significant. The introduction of Zerubbabel in 4:6–10 prioritizes him as the one responsible for the laying of the temple foundation, as well as its completion (4:9).\textsuperscript{72} Similar to Haggai 1:14 and 2:4, Zerubbabel is here assigned the role as chief temple builder. Zech 6:9–15 also deals with the rebuilding of the temple, but instead, the main focus is the crowning of Joshua as high priest. In a personal oracle delivered to Joshua, Zechariah announces the role of צֶמַח, the “branch”\textsuperscript{73}—a figure who will serve as chief temple builder, the bearer of royal honor, and the co-proprietor of the royal throne along with a priest (כֹהֵן) (6:12–13). The reference to צֶמַח as primary temple builder in 4:9 has led the majority of scholars to identify him with Zerubba\textsuperscript{72}bel, the governor of Yehud (also Hag 2:23). However, the passage is far too imprecise to warrant such a conclusion. First and foremost, Zerubbabel’s name is absent from the pericope. Various explanations have been offered in an effort to explain the textual inconsistencies between the presence of ‘Zerubbabel’ in 4:6–10 and its absence in 3:9 and 6:9–15.\textsuperscript{74} Some scholars, such as André Lemaire, move away from a symbolic reading of Zerubbabel and view צֶמַח as the Hebrew form of


\textsuperscript{73} Suffice it to say that Zechariah’s use does not necessarily identify Zerubbabel as the Davidic scion (“branch”) prefigured in Isa 4:2; Jer 23:5, and 33:15.

\textsuperscript{74} For an exhaustive treatment of the major scholarly positions, cf. Rose, \textit{Zemah and Zerubbabel}, 131–41.
Zerubbabel’s Babylonian name.\textsuperscript{75} Alternatively, Paul Redditt argues for a redactional modification of 6:12 so that צֶמַח refers to Joshua, thus underscoring the rising influence of the high priesthood in Yehud.\textsuperscript{76} In light of Zechariah’s inconsistent use of צֶמַח and the context in which it appears, I prefer to view the prophet’s employment of צֶמַח as possessing an intentional dual temporal purpose—in present terms, identifying Zerubbabel as the political leader required for the rebuilding of the temple, and in future terms, expressing the hopes for a restored Davidic monarchy in the future. Meyers and Meyers express a similar view:

By retaining the ideal of kingship to be reestablished at a future time, and by simultaneously accepting the reality of its absence in the present, Zechariah resolves the anomaly of a temple’s being restored without a monarch’s direction…A monarchical participant is needed for temple building, and the Davidic Zerubbabel can fill that position. It is only a symbolic participation, but one that leaves open the possibility that a descendant of Zerubbabel will occupy the royal throne.\textsuperscript{77}

In this way, Zechariah unifies the present and future through his understanding of the temple and the leadership of the Yehudite community. The dual leadership of Zerubbabel and Joshua in the present context provides structure and stability for a revamped political and cultic system in Yehud. Curiously, the text is even imprecise regarding the role of Joshua as the high priestly leader. In 6:11, Zechariah employs an indefinite noun—כֹהֵן as opposed to הַכֹּהֵן—to identify the priestly proprietor of the throne.\textsuperscript{78} Even Joshua, the current priestly leader and direct recipient of the prophetic message is not specifically portrayed as the priestly figure envisioned in the oracle. As Meyers and Meyers make clear, Zechariah’s failure to identify Zerubbabel as צֶמַח gives the

\textsuperscript{77} Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 203.
\textsuperscript{78} The LXX and MT supply significantly different readings of this verse (Meyers and Meyers, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 360–61).
oracle an open and almost timeless scope of application. This way, Zerubbabel’s socio–political and cultic significance in Yehud is communicated clearly, but further restoration of the Davidic monarchy is also expected in future terms.

In sum, Zechariah’s use of הֵיכַל throughout 6:9–15 in the context of eschatological pronouncements demonstrates an astute concern for the royal traditions underlying the reconstruction of the temple, as well as the political role served by Zerubbabel in the Persian period. Regardless of the potential messianic expectations tied to the political leadership of Zerubbabel and the associated priestly role of Joshua, the temple is here viewed as a requisite correlate of the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. Notwithstanding the ambiguity concerning the present and future leadership of Yehud, Zechariah’s point is clear—the temple will be completed and only then will there be a final ingress of many peoples to Jerusalem (cf. 6:15; 8:20–23). Zechariah demonstrates a balanced treatment of time–sensitive issues such as the temple, the present and future political leadership of Israel, and the sustenance of the Jerusalem cult. Thus, Zechariah 6:9–15 contains a unique fusion between three distinct theological streams: 1) the centralized role of the temple professed by Deuteronomistic traditions; 2) the prominence of Joshua as the priestly leader of a restored Israelite cult typical of Priestly theology; and 3) the hope of an autonomous Davidic monarch over Israel, characteristic of Royal and Zion theology.

**Temple Temporality: Has Yahweh Returned?**

Many scholars have also noted the role of time as it relates to Hag and Zech 1–8.79 First and foremost, the direct speech of Yahweh is futuristic in its orientation when dealing with the

---

rebuilding of the temple. However, a distinct temporal tension between the past, present, and future arises in pericopes assuring that Yahweh, in a very real and present way, has returned to Israel, but that the full culmination is yet to come. Notice the temporal orientation of the following passages from Zechariah: “I have returned (שַׁבְתִּי) to Jerusalem with mercy” (Zech 1:16); “Be silent, all flesh, before the Lord, for he has roused himself (נֵעוֹר) from his holy dwelling” (2:17); and “Thus says the Lord: ‘I have returned to Zion (אֶל־צִיּוֹן)’” (8:3). In these verses, the return of Yahweh is described as a completed, past action, realized in the present life of Yehud. According to the date formulae framing each verse, both 1:16 and 2:17 are dated to the second year of Darius (1:7), whereas 8:3 is listed in the fourth year of his reign (7:1). Regardless of the time discrepancy, the message appears the same—Yahweh is presently active in Yehud as a result of a past action. God’s actual presence in Yehud is enhanced by the expression in 2:17. Apart from Zech 2:17, this particular pairing of מְעוֹן and קָדְשֶׁה appears rarely in Deut 26:15, Jer 25:30, Ps 68:6, and 2 Chr 30:27, where it is used to describe God’s residence in heaven. In fact, both Deut 26:15 and 2 Chr 30:27 use the noun שָּׁמַיִם, “heavens” to qualify the location of Yahweh’s “holy habitation.” And while the Deuteronomistic undertones of these passages are clear, their past temporal orientation bears a close semblance to the Zion tradition. In Zechariah, it is Yahweh’s presence in Zion/Jerusalem rather than the temple alone that symbolizes God’s return to Israel. Influenced to a great extent by Davidic and Zion theological traditions, Zechariah envisions a broad, inclusive quality to God’s presence within Zion/Jerusalem. Unlike Haggai, Zechariah’s interest extends well beyond the temple edifice to

---

Footnotes:
80 For Haggai, it was the reconstruction and rededication of the temple that would mark Yahweh’s return to Jerusalem. For more, cf. Hoppe, The Holy City, 113.
include the wider enclave of Zion and Jerusalem as the actual residence of the glory of Yahweh. As 1:16 and 8:3 make especially clear, Yahweh has already returned to Jerusalem with mercy and faithfulness. Thus, it is the whole city that is to be measured (2:2) and inhabited (2:4), and it is the whole city—not just the temple—that is to be God’s dwelling place.

This has led Peter Marinkovic to suggest that the temple is devoid of any major theological significance within Zech 1–8. Marinkovic argues: “It is always the whole city of Jerusalem that is regarded as the place where God is about to or has already taken up his abode…Never is the temple itself mentioned as a unique place in which God is present.” For Marinkovic, Zech 1–8 is not concerned with the temple, but with “the return of Yhwh and his people to Jerusalem,” which, in effect, acts as “the turning point, and thus the beginning, of the process.” While highly innovative and useful on many fronts, Marinkovic’s position disregards the explicit theological content of the divine speech throughout Zechariah. It is only when read in absolute seclusion from Israel’s past theological traditions that Marinkovic’s position is sustainable. Notwithstanding some of the other terminological and theological features of the text, Zechariah’s view of the past, present, and future role of the temple is directly in line with Priestly, prophetic, and Zion traditions. For instance, Zechariah’s repetition of פָּן (2:14, 15 [10, 11]; 8:3, 8) is pregnant with temple language adopted from the Priestly tradition. Through the combination of פָּן and נְחַלֶּת in 2:14, 15 and 8:3, Yahweh affirms his intent to dwell in the midst of Israel. The identical coupling both terms in the divine speech of the Priestly instructions

---

83 See, for example, Ex 24:16; 40:35; Lev 16:16; Num 5:3; 9:17–18. It is worth noting that the use פָּן need not be limited to the priestly corpus, as such. Instead, the use of פָּן “reflects the tendency, under the influence of Canaanite religion, for Israel to localize God’s presence; it nonetheless preserves the notion of God’s transcendence” (Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 168). Thus, Zechariah’s employment of פָּן with reference to God’s presence could infer a number of theological traditions.
concerning the tent of meeting in Exod 25:8 and 29:45–46 is striking. Compare Exod 25:8: “And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell in their midst” (כַּעֲנָן אֵלֶּה) and Exod 29:45–46:

‘I will dwell among the people of Israel (כַּעֲנָן אֵלֶּה) and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them (כַּעֲנָן אֵלֶּה). I am the Lord their God.’

Zechariah’s appropriation of the Exodus motif and Priestly language can hardly be dismissed as coincidental. Thus, Zechariah’s use of שָׁכַן (esp. 8:3) is rightly regarded by Petersen as a less–specific and more inclusive description of the temple reconstruction. How is Yahweh to dwell in the midst of Jerusalem but through his presence in the temple? All throughout Zech 1–8, there is the implicit reality that Jerusalem/Zion is significant by virtue of its possession of the temple. Even when the temple is not explicitly referenced, it is clear that the wider locale of Zion and Jerusalem are meaningful because they contain the temple. Ackroyd comments: “The whole city is in fact sanctified by the very possession of the Temple within it. Holy Temple, holy city, holy land…are all in fact extensions of the central blessing which comes from the shrine which God chooses as his dwelling.” What we have then in the divine speech of Zechariah is a fusion between the Deuteronomistic, Priestly, and Zion conceptions of the temple. Building on Haggai’s ardent call for the rebuilding of the temple, Zechariah appropriates the Deuteronomistic theme of God’s dwelling in heaven, the temple–centric notion of God’s presence associated with Priestly theology, and the universal flavor of the Zion tradition, in an effort to comprehend God’s past, present, and future presence with Israel.

In this way, the past and present model of Jerusalem reaches far beyond “any historical, concrete reality,” but instead, is envisioned and prefigured as an imminent, tangible, and

---

84 Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 298. Likewise, Meyers and Meyers argue: “If Yahweh has returned to Zion, he then dwells in his holy habitation which is within, or ‘in the midst of,’ Jerusalem. Jerusalem as a whole becomes the symbol of all that accompanies sacred space…” (Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 413).

85 Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, 178.
“transcendent reality.” For Zechariah, Jerusalem is elected as the place of residence for Yahweh, where, in the present and near future, he is to ultimately dwell. Imminently, the Lord’s house shall be built in Jerusalem (1:16), God will comfort Zion and choose Jerusalem (1:17), his glory will be present in Israel as a protective “wall of fire” (2:4–5), and Zion will represent Yahweh’s ultimate sovereignty over all nations (cf. 8:3). As the above temporal and theological exchanges demonstrate, Zechariah’s message is not the absolute centrality of the temple, but the absolute centrality of the real and timeless presence of Yahweh. Rather than view the temple as the actual residence of Yahweh, it instead functions as a tangible seal of God’s real and active presence in Yehud. The prophet’s understanding of Yahweh’s presence reaches beyond the centralized locale of the temple to include Jerusalem/Zion and more consummately, the entire earth (Zech 1:10, 11; 4:10, 14; 6:5). Thus, in postexilic Yehud, the temple serves to complement the central fact that Yahweh, whether directly through his temple, or within Jerusalem/Zion, is present and active, in faithfulness and righteousness (8:8).

Moreover, throughout both Hag and Zech 1–8, the first person common singular is coupled with the future perfect/imperfect to communicate divine speech. Most particularly, several verbal forms of the first person common singular perfect indicating a future or imminent action are attested throughout both texts. Rendered in English as “I will” plus the verbal form, the Hebrew construction is typically represented by an imperfect verb with waw conjunctive (Hag 1:8) or a perfect verb preceded by a waw consecutive (2:7). Consider the following:

‘Go up to the hills and bring wood and build the house, that I may take pleasure in it and I will show myself in my glory (יִהְיֶהוֹ הַכְּבוֹד),’ says the LORD (Hag 1:8).

Commentators have discussed the unusual first person Niphal imperfect of כָּבֵד. Because the Niphal can be either reflexive or passive, Smith notes that “I will allow myself to be glorified,” and “I will be glorified” are appropriate translations (Micah–Malachi, 153). The latter form, emphasizing the immediate fulfillment of the action is applied by Petersen (Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 41), whereas Meyers and Meyers (Haggai–Zechariah 1–8, 28) take the qere reading as a cohortative and translate it as “that I may be glorified.” Ackroyd, too, takes it as a reflexive to mean, “I will accept the worship which tends to my honour,” but in doing so, effectively highlights the
Yet once more, in a little while, I will shake the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land. And I will shake all nations, so that the treasures of all nations shall come in, and I will fill this house with glory,’ says the LORD of hosts (Hag 2:6–7).

‘Is the seed yet in the barn? Indeed, the vine, the fig tree, the pomegranate, and the olive tree have yielded nothing. But from this day on, I will bless you,’ (Hag 2:19).

Save v. 6, each pericope employs the future verb conjugation to express direct divine speech. Two noteworthy issues are presented here. First, while each verse possesses some inherent reference to the future, only 1:8 and 2:19 convey a causal relationship between the present state of things and the imminent future. In 1:8, the actions of God “accepting” (רָצָה) and “being honored/glorified” (Niphal, כָּבֵד) are conditioned by the present obedience of the people to rebuild the temple. In effect, Yahweh’s glorious presence and the blessings resulting from it are contingent upon the physical presence of the temple in Jerusalem. The reconstruction of the temple is envisioned as a correlative seal of God’s activity in Yehud. Therefore, the motivation for rebuilding the temple is the twofold promise that God will first, “accept” (רָצָה) the temple in the same way he accepts genuine sacrificial offerings (ex. Lev 22:27; Ezek 20:40, 41) and second, that God will “let himself be honored” (כָּבֵד) by the temple’s physical presence. Similarly, 2:19 offers divine assurance, only this time through the announcement of the end of failed harvests and agricultural drought in exchange for God’s blessings. In a reversal of the temporal context of 1:8, the completion of the temple foundation (cf. 2:18) results in a present fact that without a properly restored temple, worship of Yahweh is impossible. It is here that the blending of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions is evident, not because God’s presence is limited to the temple, but because the temple is what he has chosen. Ackroyd explains: “The God who is lord of heaven and earth, who cannot be contained in a building, nevertheless condescends to reveal himself and to localize his presence in order that blessing may flow out. The Temple is the correlative of the presence of God; its condition only in the sense that this is what God chooses” (Exile and Restoration, 160).

In addition to the discussion in n. 84 above, it should be noted that the verbal forms וְאֶרְצֶה and וְאֶכָּבֵד could be imperfect or cohortative. Whether cohortative, expressing Yahweh’s purpose or intention, or imperfect, carrying a final sense of simple futurity, both actions are contingent upon the preceding divine command to build the temple. Kessler summarizes the relevant issues well in The Book of Haggai, 105–6; 134–36.
end to the divine curses recorded in 1:6, and 9–11, and a continued blessing moving into the future. Thus, in both cases, the present and future are viewed as mutually correlated stages intersecting at the temple. The second issue is the future orientation of the “glory” of Yahweh. Appropriating notions from the Priestly and Zion traditions, Haggai views the ‘glorification’ of the temple building itself as an imminent reality. On these grounds, it is fitting to reject the view that Haggai saw the eschatological shaking as a present reality related to the political events transpiring from Persian imperial rule over Yehud. Rather, the context of the “glory” envisioned in Hag 1:8 and 2:6–9 is the “eschatological glory that the temple will receive” (italics mine). 89

The coming age, signaled primarily by the presence of Yahweh in his temple is definitively certain and recognizably imminent.

Parallel future–oriented configurations are also common throughout Zech 1–8. Frequently, the future perfect (ex. Zech 1:16; 2:5, 10, 15; 6:12; 8:8 [4 times]) and future imperfect (ex. 1:3; 4:9) are employed in divine speech to address the present and future role of the temple. Contrary to Haggai, whose primary focus is the temple and its reconstruction, Zechariah’s interest is focused expressly on the temple’s role as the means by which Yahweh’s wider command over Zion and Jerusalem is accomplished. 90

In essence, the temple’s significance is its intermediary function between Israel and Yahweh, representing God’s presence in Zion, Jerusalem, and Yehud as a whole. Most significant are the transitions found in 1:14–17; 2:1–13; and 8:7–13. When examined for their respective past, present, and future attributes, these passages demonstrate the complex variety of temporal interchanges within Zechariah. Generally, the divine speech centered on the present state of things serves to affirm

---

90 For Hoppe, it is the economic prosperity derived from the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem that binds Haggai and Zechariah’s messages together. He Writes: “Zechariah, like Haggai, links the reconstruction of the Temple to economic prosperity…It is Jerusalem to which God is devoted. It is to Jerusalem that God returns. It is God’s return to Jerusalem that ensures the land’s prosperity” (*The Holy City*, 115–16).
Yahweh’s covenantal faithfulness to Israel. In 1:14, God announces his divine zeal for Jerusalem and Zion, declaring, “I am exceedingly jealous for Jerusalem and for Zion.” The present focus of Yahweh’s determination to save Israel is echoed further in 8:2, where Yahweh repeats: “I am zealous for Zion with great jealousy, and I am jealous for her with great wrath.”\footnote{From a redactional standpoint, it is conceivable that Zech 8:3 is recorded as the fulfillment of the hopes expressed in 1:16b, where the present reality of God’s presence reported in 8:3 (“I have returned to Zion and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem…”) is prefigured by the future expectation, “my house will be built in it,” in 1:16b.} Zechariah’s emphasis on Yahweh’s zeal for Zion and Jerusalem and his presence therein is closely related to the Priestly and Zion understanding of the temple as the intermediary place of God’s presence with his people.

CONCLUSION: THE TEMPLE IN TRANSITION

The Second Temple was drastically different from the Solomonic temple, both in physical structure, historical circumstances, and ideological significance. Distinct from the First Temple, the temple in Persian Yehud no longer served as a socio-political symbol of the Judean nation state. It is perhaps for this reason that it acquired a greater ideological and theological significance throughout the postexilic period. Hag and Zech 1–8 provide a record of the theological, symbolic, and ideological importance of the Second Temple during the Persian period. It is only by accepting the historical, theological, and socio–political realities of the past that the prophets are able to transcend them and communicate a future consistent with the past and present purposes of Yahweh. The present then, is forged by the fusion of the past and the anticipation of the future.

It is here that we see how Haggai and Zechariah reconcile the non–eschatological features of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions with the eschatological orientation of Zion theology. Predominantly, the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions are used to reconstruct the present through understanding the past. By doing so, the prophets call attention to the present
and immediate covenantal obedience required of Israel. This is accentuated most by the Exodus motif employed in both texts, which serves to secure the present through a reflection of the past. Here, hope is based on the present, active presence of Yahweh in Yehud, rather than on an abstract and transcendent future reality. Without a firm understanding of their identity in Yahweh, the physical foundation of the temple is inconceivable—hence the need for Haggai’s fervent call to restore the temple edifice. However, at times, the presently–oriented Deuteronomistic and Priestly view of the temple serve a certain transitional purpose by pointing to the abiding presence of Yahweh. Both the present and future presence of God is affirmed by his activity in the past. Similarly, the future is given substance primarily by the appropriation of the Zion tradition. Uniquely, the Zion tradition is used—more so in Zechariah than Haggai—to pre–construct and prefigure the future; thus allowing the temple to promote not only solidarity with the past, but also innovation for the future. The temple is regarded neither as an expendable religious tradition, nor as a structure possessing its own inherent cultic or theological significance, but rather, as a seal of the effectual and active presence of Yahweh. The theological reality that pervades the ministries of Haggai and Zechariah transcends the physical temple and its cultic significance—instead, the temple stands as a symbol of hope in an age defined by hopelessness. It is through Haggai and Zechariah’s appropriation of these theological traditions that the Second Temple,

already shows signs of entirely new principles while the earlier features of the institution of the house of God are fading away. It marks a stage of transition to a new period which was preparing to give up the institution altogether in practice—even while clinging to it as an eschatological symbol.92
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