

Eschatology and audience: The eschatology of Haggai

H F van Rooy
(*PU for CHE Potchefstroom*)

ABSTRACT

Against the background of Hanson's theories regarding the development of apocalyptic eschatology and the position accorded to the message of Haggai in the post-exilic factional struggle, the eschatology of Haggai is reappraised. It is accepted that the book contains five prophetic oracles, 1:2 and 4-11, 2:15-19, 2:2-9, 2:11-14 and 2:21-23. Haggai 2:15-19 is regarded as the second oracle and is transposed to follow on 1:15a. A redactional framework was added to these oracles. The oracles were addressed to the people of Haggai's time; cognitive dissonance played a role in the formulation of his message, and in the introduction of an eschatological element. The redaction was addressed to the temple community after the restoration of the temple. It shifted the emphasis to the leaders and displays a realised eschatology.

A. INTRODUCTION

The book and message of Haggai gained importance following the work of Hanson (1975) on the development of apocalyptic in Israel. This drew fresh attention to the position of Haggai in the history of prophecy in Israel and to the eschatological elements in his prophecy. Hanson claims that the dawn of apocalyptic dates to the time of Haggai's ministry and regards Haggai as a representative of one of the two parties that were engaged in a struggle for power in Israel in the post-exilic period. Considering all this, as well as the possible audience of Haggai's message, we may reappraise the eschatological elements in this book.

B. HAGGAI AND THE STUDY OF ESCHATOLOGY

It is impossible to deal adequately with research into Old Testament eschatology in a paper of this scope. Here we shall confine ourselves with the position of Haggai and matters pertaining to the eschatological elements of this book.

Hanson's view of Haggai deserves special attention, although his views cannot be dealt with extensively. For a more detailed discussion see Deist (1982/3), De Villiers (1982/3) and Oswalt (1981). The distinction that Hanson makes between the eschatology of the earlier and later prophets is quite important. He distinguishes between prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology and regards the latter as the 'mode assumed by the prophetic tradition once it had been transferred to a new and radically altered setting in the post-exilic community' (Hanson 1975:10).

To understand Hanson's view of the eschatological elements of the book of Haggai one must keep in mind his thesis that the origin of apocalyptic eschatology dates to the sixth and fifth centuries BC and is traceable to the prophetic traditions of Israel. The historical and sociological background to apocalyptic eschatology was a struggle in the community of the second temple between two groups that can respectively be designated the visionaries and the hierocrats (Hanson 1975:29). As there were prophets in both groups, this may be regarded as another example of the prophetic conflict described by Crenshaw. This conflict contributed enormously to the demise of prophecy as a living force in Israel, precisely because it often became clear in the course of history that there was a disparity between hierocratic (status quo) theology and the visionary's experience of his faith (Crenshaw 1971:110–111).

Hanson's views on Trito-Isaiah and especially Isaiah 66 are highly relevant to his evaluation of Haggai's role in this factional struggle. He dates Isaiah 66 to 520 BC, the same year of Isaiah's public activity as recorded in his book. He relates Isaiah 66 to the struggle between the prophetic group that continued the tradition of Deutero-Isaiah and the hierocratic group that controlled the cult (Hanson 1975:172, 1973). Isaiah 66 belongs to the tradition of Deutero-Isaiah, and Hanson (1975:173) sees Haggai as the most energetic champion of the temple party's cause. He regards Isaiah 66:1, 2 as a direct repudiation of the temple-building campaign of Haggai (Hanson 1975:174). In the struggle between the visionaries and the hierocrats, Haggai follows the tradition of Ezekiel 40–48, which is contrary to that of Isaiah 60–62. There were important differences between the two groups regarding the restoration of the temple (cf Hanson 1975:176–177). The hierocratic tradition went through a visionary phase but it was shortlived and fizzled out after the restoration of the temple (Hanson 1975:230–231). The eschatological elements in Haggai must be regarded as part of this phase.

According to Hanson the public ministry of Haggai helped to bring about a turning-point in the history of the hierocratic group. Round 520 BC this

group was discouraged by setbacks, with the result that the restoration of the temple and indeed their whole programme came to a standstill. At this time the people were captivated by the vision of the rival group. During the political disturbances in the Persian empire, starting at the end of 522 BC, the pragmatic, pro-Persian hierocratic party changed into zealous nationalistic reformers who wanted to establish the eschatological reign in their own time (Hanson 1975:244). In this period Isaiah and Zechariah appeared on the scene. They were not willing to wait on Yahweh but wanted immediate action. The pragmatic plans of the hierocrats were cast in the visionary mould of the prophets, with the heart-warming message that the restoration of the temple would usher in the coming of the kingdom of blessedness (Hanson 1975:245). Haggai's message amounted to adopting Ezekiel's programme and announcing that it was being affected by specific persons. He made the restoration of the temple the precondition for the coming of the messianic kingdom (Hanson 1975:248). Haggai's view of the temple differs therefore from that of the pre-exilic prophets in the prominence it assigns the cult and the temple, as he stressed the continuity with the pre-exilic cult. In this sense his message was compatible with the aims of the hierocratic group (Hanson 1975:249).

Hanson's hypothesis attracted considerable attention, because the position of Haggai and the value of his eschatology form part of a comprehensible theory regarding the origin of apocalyptic. The views of other scholars will be dealt with less extensively. It should be noted that not all of them share Hanson's negative evaluation of Haggai. Even Carrol, who does not have a very high regard for Haggai's message, places the latter's eschatological hopes on par with those of Deutero-Isaiah. He calls both of them cult prophets (Carrol 1982:49), although he maintains that Haggai's message boils down to the realisation of eschatological hopes by cultic means (Carrol 1982:56).

Hanson regards the eschatological phase of Haggai's ministry as transient. Fohrer (1958:401), on the other hand, states that Haggai 1:15a; 2:15–19 display the essential characteristics of all eschatological hopes. In this passage the present, which actually already belongs to the past, is compared with the future. In the ongoing course of history, 'today' is regarded as the watershed, the dividing line between the two ages. The eschatology of Haggai comprises the following elements: the promise of blessing on the day that the foundation of the new temple is laid; and the exclusion of the impure; the 'shaking' of nature and the nations that is at hand; and the destruction of the power of the nations and the appointment of Zerubbabel as the human ruler over Israel (Fohrer 1958:406).

Vriezen also assigns the eschatology of Haggai a special place in the history of Israelite eschatology. He distinguishes four periods in this history, namely a pre-eschatological period (before the classical prophets), a proto-eschatological period (Isaiah and his contemporaries), an actual eschatological period (Deutero-Isaiah and his contemporaries, and a transcendentalising period (Vriezen 1953:225). Haggai and Zechariah, together with Deutero-Isaiah, belong to the third period. In their time the eschatological phenomena were considered to be close at hand. The coming of the kingdom of God was not only seen in visions; it was *experienced* as accomplished (Vriezen 1953:223, 225).

Hanson accepts that there are certain eschatological-apocalyptic features in the prophecies of Ezekiel. However, he regards Ezekiel as a precursor not of apocalyptic, but of the hierocratic party to which Haggai also belonged. This view is opposed by Hamerton-Kelly (1970), who does link Ezekiel to apocalyptic movement. He sees the actions of Haggai and Zechariah as an attempt to reconcile the message of Ezekiel with P (Hamerton-Kelly 1970:13). As regards the restoration of the temple, P emphasises human activity, while Ezekiel emphasises that God will take the initiative (Hamerton-Kelly 1970:6–8). The group associated with Ezekiel was not in favour of the attempts to rebuild the temple. This resulted in a stalemate between the eschatologists and the theocrats in the time of Haggai and Zechariah. The actions of Haggai and Zechariah are theocratically inspired, but they tried to reconcile the theocratic message with the eschatological elements of Ezekiel's message. This compromise failed with the result that the eschatological hope for the new temple and the new Zion disappeared from the official theology of Jerusalem (Hamerton-Kelly 1970:14).

There are different explanations of the background to Haggai's activities and his relation to various groups in the early post-exilic period, but the majority of scholars would probably agree with Crenshaw's (1986:279) summary of Haggai's message. 'Restore the house, and the new era will finally dawn'. Nevertheless there are widely divergent assessments of this plain message. Reference has already been made to Hanson's negative judgment. Crenshaw (1971:92) states explicitly that none of the post-exilic prophets ever attained the same heights as the classical prophets. Van der Woude (1982:10), on the other hand, regards Haggai as one of the great prophets of Israel. McKane (1979:178) states that the intense eschatological hopes of Deutero-Isaiah lived on in Haggai, and the cultic concern of Haggai and Zechariah must not be regarded merely as a matter of ritual propriety. It is rather related to their conviction that the eschatological glory portrayed by Deutero-Isaiah will radiate from Zion

and that it will not eventuate until the temple has been purged of all impurity. Von Rad (1975:281) calls the rebuilding of the temple a *status confessionis* in the post-exilic period. He does not attribute the failure to complete the restoration of the temple to a struggle in the community, but rather to a state of complacency that developed among the people. Eybers (1970:1–18) regards the rebuilding of the temple as a sign of dedication to God and willingness to serve him.

Following this discussion of scholarly views on Haggai, his eschatology and his position in the history of Israelite prophecy, we now turn to the composition of his book, the audience of his message and an evaluation of the contemporary and eschatological elements in the book.

C. THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK

Two points regarding the design of the book of Haggai call for special attention. The first concerns the relation between redactional framework of the book and the prophetic oracles, and the second the much debated question whether a passage such as 2:15–19 (or 15–23) was not dislocated from its original position following on 1:15a. When considering these matters one should be wary of extreme positions regarding redaction history of Haggai. On the one hand there is the view of North (1956), who regards all references to Zerubbabel as secondary and accepts only a small kernel of original material. On the other hand, an approach like Child's (1979:467–471), with its emphasis on the canonical shape of the book, does not help to solve problems presented by the redaction of the book, and the eschatological elements of the preaching of Haggai in 520 BC.

As regards the editorial framework, a survey of current opinions is given in two articles by Mason (1977, 1982). The editorial framework consists of 1:1, 3, 12, 13a, 14, 15; 2:1, 2 (probably); 10, 20 (Mason 1977:414). Important elements in the framework include the formula **היה דבר** **אל** instead of **כיד** (2:10, 20). The formula appears twice with **אל** instead of **כיד** (2:10, 20). The framework also emphasises the leaders, Joshua and Zerubbabel, while the oracles were directed to the people (Mason 1977:414–416). In 1:12, 14; 2:2 the people are referred to as the remnant in a context of judgment and promise (Mason 1977:417). Mason is of the opinion that the framework reinterprets the oracles in terms of a realised eschatology and that it dates from a time not long after the oracles. He regards the framework as a theocratic reinterpretation of the eschatological hopes (Mason 1977:417, 420). The message of the oracles was plain, namely that the hardships of the people must be attributed to their failure to rebuild their temple (Mason 1982:142). Eschatology plays

an important part in this message and the temple also has eschatological meaning (Mason 1982:143). The framework resembles the theology of the Chronicler, although it must be dated much earlier than his work (Mason 1977:421; 1982:145). The redaction should be connected with the completion of the restoration of the temple and the fact that some hopes expressed by Haggai did not materialise (Mason 1982:145). Van der Woude (1982:12, 13) is of the opinion that the framework exhibits deuteronomic features and he dates the redaction shortly after the time of Haggai. The question of the relation between the framework and the prophetic oracles is important for the subject under discussion and we shall return to it later.

As regards the displacement of Haggai 2:15–19 (or 23) from a supposed original position following on 1:15a, scholarly views diverse. A review of different viewpoints and the most important arguments for and against can be found in the articles of Eybers (1970/1:19–20) and Koch (1967:53–56). The original motivation for moving Haggai 2:15–19 related to the interpretation that the preceding passage (2:10–14) was directed against the proto-Samaritans, while 2:15–19 was addressed to the Jews. This view does not have much support nowadays (cf May 1968:192, Koch 1967 and Eybers 1970/1:21–23, as against Rudolph 1976:49). Everyone who rejects the link with the proto-Samaritans does not, however, reject the proposed transposition of 2:15–19 (23) (cf May and Koch against Eybers). It is accepted in this paper that 2:15–19 should be transposed to follow 1:15a, with the result that **לְהַשִּׁיעִי** in 2:18 has to be changed to **לְשִׁיעִי**. The main reasons for accepting this proposal are that the peculiar date in 1:15a suggests an oracle; that the oracles in which the expression **שִׁמּוֹ לְבַנְכֶם** occupies an important position (1:5, 7; 2:15, 18 (bis)) would follow on one another; and that the oracles in 1:2–11 and 2:15–19 — which are closely related, address the people and refer to their changed circumstances — would follow on each other if one disregards the apocalyptic framework. The passage dealing with Zerubbabel is left at the end of the book, because the reference to Zerubbabel sets it apart from the other oracles.

D. HAGGAI, HIS AUDIENCE AND CIRCUMSTANCES

Overholt has pointed out the important function of the audience in the prophetic process (1977, 1979a, 1979b, 1981 and 1982). He called attention to two features of audience reaction to a prophetic message, namely the interaction between the prophet and his audience (cf Overholt 1977, 1979a, 1981 and 1982) and the fact that prophetic oracles include quotations of words spoken by the audience, reflecting something of their attitude. This occurs fairly regularly in the book of Jeremiah (Overholt 1979b:273).

As regards the first feature (the interaction between the prophet and his audience), Overholt (1979a:518) states that the authority of the prophet depended on two factors: firstly, a revelation from Yahweh, and secondly 'acknowledgement within a particular social context by some segment of his audience'. There are three elements in the prophetic process, namely the supernatural that had a message to deliver, the prophet who had to deliver the message, and the audience to which the message was directed. The interaction between these three elements is of special importance (cf Overholt 1977:132–133). There are also two norms according to which the community tested the prophet's message, namely consonance with the community's socio-religious traditions and relevance to the current socio-political situation (Overholt 1977:132; for a discussion of Overholt's model, cf Venter 1986:13–17). In this interaction between prophet and audience which is of special importance to the study of Haggai, the hopes and attitudes of the audience played an important part.

When one tries to fathom the reaction of Haggai's audience, one has to consider at least two audiences: the audience of Haggai's oracles, and the audience for which the redaction was intended. To understand the audience of Haggai's oracles, Carrol's theory of cognitive dissonance can be useful (cf 1979:86–87). Although he does not deal with the redaction of Haggai and the possible influence of cognitive dissonance on the redaction, he demonstrates convincingly the role of cognitive dissonance in Haggai's actions. Cognitive dissonance — the result of a conflict between expectations and reality — played an important role in the lives of the returned exiles, whose expectations, fuelled by the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah, were not realised in the years after their return. This was the context of the work of Haggai and Zechariah. The few people who returned from the exile were met by a hostile community and, as a result of their circumstances and their frustrated expectations, were apathetic about the restoration of the temple. Haggai and Zechariah regarded the temple as prerequisite for the expected salvation. Deutero-Isaiah's proclamation of salvation was unconditional. His followers associated the non-fulfilment of the expectations with the sinfulness and cultic heterogeneity of the community. Haggai attributed it to the people's failure to rebuild the temple. According to Carrol (1979:158–163), Zerubbabel also played an important part in the message of Haggai, who supported Zerubbabel's claim to be the legitimate successor of the house of David. Although he mentions possible cognitive dissonance arising from the frustrated expectations about Zerubbabel (Carrol 1979:163–168), he does not consider the possibility that this could have affected the redaction of the book. He concentrates on the frustrated expectations of the community and regards Haggai's actions and message as an attempt to address the cognitive dissonance in the community.

As regards the audience of the redaction, the theocratic community of the restored temple (c 515 BC) appears to be the most likely candidate (cf Mason 1982:145). To claim, as Steck (1971:356) does, that specific parts of the prophetic oracles were addressed to specific arguments of the community is probably more than can reasonably be deduced from the available evidence.

On the basis of this discussion we can evaluate the information in Haggai's oracles regarding the audience of his message and their circumstances. This will be followed by a similar attempt to assess the framework of the book. The oracles comprise 1:2, 4–11, 2:15–19; 2:2–9; 2:11–14 and 2:21–23. It is possible that 2:2 should be regarded as part of the redactional material because it focuses on the leaders and not on the people. In this respect 2:2 agrees with the heading in 1:1. If one accepts this grouping, five prophetic oracles can be distinguished. The first gives information about the circumstances of the people, who are clearly the audience of this oracle, and about their attitude (1:2, 4–11). Their attitude is reflected by a quotation of their words, a typical audience statement. This quotation in 1:2 (accepting the proposal of BHS) indicates the frustrated expectations of the people, and can be regarded as an expression of cognitive dissonance. The audience of the people — or rather their inactivity — are seen as the cause of their present misfortune. Their expectations were frustrated because of their failure to restore the temple. This interpretation of Haggai can be compared to the words of the deuteronomic redactors of Deuteronomy 30:1–10 (cf also Van der Woude 1982:15). Obedience relates to blessings, as disobedience relates to judgment. The main thrust of this first oracle is therefore the command to rebuild the temple. The ultimate aim of the restoration is expressed in the words of Yahweh in 1:8, especially the expression **וְאֶכְבְּדָהּ** (Q). This serves to illustrate the point that the glory and might of God would become visible in the rebuilding of the temple (cf Weinfeld 1982:21, as against Westermann (1971:801). It may be compared with Isaiah 66:5, where the same idea appears. Hanson (1975:180–182) considers it quite probable that Isaiah 66:5 refers to a time, probably 520 BC, when the visionaries were expelled from the temple. To make this interpretation possible, the statement **יִכְבֹּד יְהוָה וְנִרְאָה בְּשִׂמְחָתְכֶם** in Isaiah 66:5, must be regarded as eschatological. It is quite clear, however, that Haggai — who, according to Hanson, represents the other party — does not use it in an eschatological sense. The proof of God's power does not lie in eschatological signs, but in the reality of a restored temple.

The second oracle (Haggai 2:15–19, according to the rearrangement accepted in this paper) follows the first one closely. It is dated on the day

when the rebuilding of the temple commenced. The audience is again the people. The circumstances are again a lack of blessings in nature. The people, however, have commenced work on the temple. This results in an explicit addition to Haggai's message, namely the promise of blessings in nature as a result of the new activities of the people.

In the third oracle (2:3–9), uttered four weeks after the start of the restoration of the temple, a question is again put to the audience (as in 1:4), highlighting their attitude. In this instance it touches on the people's attitude towards the new temple in comparison with their feelings about the previous temple. This question again demonstrates the cognitive dissonance of the community. They had expectations of blessings in nature, but also of the restoration of the glory of Israel. Their attitude speaks of despondency and declining fervour. In the encouraging words addressed to them, reference is made to two matters, namely God's assistance and an eschatological perspective. The reference to Joshua and Zerubbabel in 2:4 is generally attributed to the redaction (cf Hanson 1982:145). The first part of verse 5 too is often regarded as a later addition. Text-critical it is very questionable and reconstructing the original is virtually impossible. Had it consisted of a reference to the exodus from Egypt, it could have been another example of a link with the deuteronomic editors (cf the question posed by Deist 1982/3:31 in this regard). The reference to God's assistance was, however, very relevant in the circumstances. At all events, it is clear that this passage refers to intense eschatological expectations in the time of Haggai (cf Japhet 1982:78).

The fourth oracle (2:11–14) has already been mentioned. It deals with ritual purity. These words were directed to the people who were rebuilding the temple, drawing their attention to the fact that observance of cultic regulations was not equivalent to compliance with all God's commands.

The final oracle was directed to Zerubbabel, according to the framework and the instruction to the prophet. It is again of an eschatological nature and will be dealt with in the next section.

Although the eschatological elements have still to be discussed, one can already demonstrate that the first three oracles afford a good example of the interaction between prophet and audience, in accordance with Overholt's model. The first oracle encompasses the basic command given to the people and addresses their expectations, with due regard to their cognitive dissonance. In this instance the prophet got a positive reaction from the people. He reacts by affirming his message in the second oracle,

adding the promise of blessing. In the course of the people's labours to restore the temple they became despondent. In his reaction to this, the prophet reaffirms his original message, but adds a new element in which he addresses the element of their expectations that did not receive attention previously. This was not included in the original message, but forms part of the prophetic process, namely confirmation of that message. It is even possible to include the fourth oracle in this process, if one were to attribute its origin to a new development among the people, namely an expectation that the restored temple as such would usher in the new era. If this interpretation is sound, the fourth oracle can be regarded as a corrective to a wrong response to the third oracle (cf May 1968:194–196).

As regards the framework, Mason's view is on the whole acceptable. Mason (1977:420) is of the opinion that Haggai demonstrates a realised eschatology. This would accord with the time shortly after the completion of the restoration of the temple. Carrol (1979:162–168, especially 1966) deals extensively with the possibility of cognitive dissonance in the expectations connected with Zerubbabel, but finds only one possible reference to it in Zechariah. It is possible, however, that the redaction of Haggai was influenced by the dissonance in the society at that time. In the redaction the emphasis was shifted to the leaders, indicating that the restored cult, led by the high priest, proved that the prophecies of Haggai were already partially fulfilled in their time. This can be seen as guaranteeing the future fulfilment of the other components of his message. In this way the legitimacy of the priestly leadership in the post-exilic community was connected with the restoration of the temple. In the temple the service of Yahweh was to be continued under new circumstances.

E. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ELEMENTS IN HAGGAI

The first and third oracles of Haggai call for special attention when it comes to analysing the eschatological elements in the book. Haggai 2:2–9 is closely associated with the rebuilding of the temple. It is regarded as the third preserved oracle of Haggai, addressed to the people after they had commenced the work and while they were experiencing cognitive dissonance as a result of the contrast between the product of their labours (i.e. the reconstructed temple) and the previous temple, as well as their frustrated religious expectations. In these circumstances the oracle encourages the people to persevere with the rebuilding. The eschatological perspective in 2:6–9 is added because of the people's eschatological expectations. As regards the contents of this eschatological message, it contains elements often found in texts with an eschatological slant. For purposes of comparison eight elements can also be distinguished in this

passage. These are: the statement about the timing of the future events, the cosmic signs accompanying these events, the events in the world of nations, the reference to the wealth of the nations that would accrue to Israel, the glory that would fill the temple, the fact that the gold and silver belonged to Yahweh, the comparison of the glory of the new temple with that of the old, and the peace that Yahweh would give.

As regards the timing of the eschatological events, Haggai's prediction can be compared with that of Isaiah 61:2–3, where the coming salvation is also depicted as being close at hand. The idea that the eschatological events would be accompanied by cosmic signs is often found in the literature (cf Is 2:19–21; 13:13; 24:18–20; Ezek 38:19–20). The nation's trembling at the time of the eschatological events can be regarded as part of the well-known tradition that Yahweh would scatter the nations on the day of the Lord (cf Von Rad 1975:123–124).

As regards the wealth of the nations, both Ezekiel (e.g. 26:12) and the deuteronomistic writers (e.g. 2 Kings 24:13) stated that the removal of the treasures of the temple and from Judah was attributable to Yahweh's judgment of the people's infidelity. The return of those treasures was a common theme in early post-exilic times. It is part of the message of Deutero-Isaiah (cf Is 45:14) and features prominently in the message of Trito-Isaiah (cf Is 60:5–11; 61:6; 66:12).

The reference to the gold and silver as belonging to Yahweh is related to this (cf Is 60:13). Two remarks are made regarding the splendour of the temple, both dealing with the כבוד of the house. It is stated that Yahweh will fill the house with כבוד and that the כבוד of this house would be greater than that of the previous temple. This is again an echo from the deuteronomistic history, as found in the description of the inauguration of the first temple. In 1 Kings 6:11 mention is made of the כבוד יהוה that filled the house. The glory of that house was described in 1 Kings 6 and 7. The despoiling of that splendour is described in 2 Kings 24 and 25. This part of Haggai's messages shows many similarities to parts of Ezekiel 40–48. Ezekiel 43:5 also contains a reference to the כבוד יהוה filling the temple, as does Ezekiel 44:4. The splendour of the new temple is also subject of Isaiah 60:6 and 13. The comparison of the new temple with the old is, however, peculiar to Haggai. This is closely related to the current situation.

The reference to the future peace of Jerusalem and Israel as a result of the eschatological events also occurs regularly in eschatological proclamations (cf Is 9:5–6). It is part of the promise of the return from Babylonia

in the book of Jeremiah (29:10–14). Ezekiel refers to it in 34:25–31. Haggai's description of the circumstances of his times may even relate to this passage from Ezekiel. Peace is also a regular theme in Trito-Isaiah (cf Is 60:15, 17; 66:12–13).

Haggai's eschatological message is therefore clearly related to the eschatological tradition of earlier prophets. There are many similarities between his message and that of Ezekiel, as may be expected in view of Hanson's theories. Zimmerli (1971:132) even sees a link with Ezekiel in the restoration of the temple as a prerequisite for renewed prosperity. The many similarities between Haggai and Isaiah 60–62 are, however, noteworthy. Hanson contrasts Haggai's message with that of Isaiah 66, but does not attempt to compare Haggai with Isaiah 60–62. In his comparison of Haggai with Isaiah 66 he does not mention the importance of Haggai 2:10–14, the passage dealing with cultic purity. According to the interpretation accepted in this paper, that passage can be used as an argument countering Hanson's thesis that Haggai and Isaiah are opposed, because it emphasises that Haggai's message was not just propaganda for the temple party's cause. Haggai's temple-building programme included the demand of devotion to God and a holy life (cf Mason 1982:144). According to Hanson (1975:59–77), Isaiah 60–62 represents the expectations of the followers of Deutero-Isaiah shortly after the return from exile and thus before the time of Haggai and Isaiah 66. He regards it as 'programmatically' and contrasts it with Ezekiel 40–48. If this is accepted and Haggai is regarded as a propagandist of the hierocratic cause, one would expect to find a close correspondence between Haggai and Ezekiel. Although there are a number of similarities, there is a much closer affinity between Haggai and Isaiah 60–62. Of the eight points that were distinguished in Haggai 2:6–9, six can be found in Isaiah 60–62. These include the expectation that the eschatological events will come to pass in the near future, the restoration and glory of the temple, the return of the treasures, and the advent of peace. This leads to the conclusion that Haggai consciously followed the authors/redactors of Isaiah 60–62. There is also a link between his message and that of the deuteronomistic editors. To regard Haggai simply as a supporter of the hierocratic cause does him an injustice. Isaiah 60–62 represents the expectations of a section of the people after the exile and it was Haggai's interpretation of the causes of their frustration that led him to emphasise the restoration of the temple. He did not exclude the authors/redactors of Isaiah 60–62 from his message.

In the other eschatological section, at the end of the book, four points of comparison can be identified, namely the cosmic signs (as in the previous

section), the actions against the nations, the reference to the time of the eschatological events ('that day') and the reference to Zerubbabel.

As regards the cosmic signs, the discussion of that part of the previous section need not be repeated. The reference to the nations and the actions against them is more extensive than that in the previous section. It includes the idea of Yahweh fighting the battle against the nations. This can be related to the destruction of the nations advancing against Jerusalem, a common theme in eschatological prophecies about the restoration of Jerusalem. It is encountered in the prophecies of Isaiah (cf Von Rad 1975:155–169) and regularly features in the prophecies of Ezekiel and Zechariah (cf Von Rad 1975:293–294). The reference to 'that day' does not relate to the near future, as does the one in the other eschatological passage, but corresponds with the more general prediction often encountered in the prophets, which does not necessarily refer to the near future. The message about Zerubbabel is probably dependent on Ezekiel 34:23 (cf Hanson 1975:344–345). The restoration of the house of David was an intense expectation amongst some of the people who returned from the exile and, in its present form, its relation to his reference to Zerubbabel is quite clear. The simile likening of Zerubbabel to a signet ring should be seen as contrasting with the judgment pronounced on Jehoiachin in Jeremiah 22:24–30, as demonstrated convincingly by Carroll (1979:164). A possibility to be kept in mind is that the reference to Zerubbabel in verses 21 and 23 may be ascribed to the redaction. If so, the original oracle must have been addressed to the people, and not to the Davidide. The original intention of the oracle would then have been to encourage the people with a promise of God's assistance and the fact that they occupy a special place in his heart. Though it is difficult to present convincing evidence for such a view, it is made probable by the fact that the redaction shifted the emphasis to the leaders and that it tends towards a realised eschatology. This passage corresponds more closely with Ezekiel than the other one and it is not possible to demonstrate an affinity with Isaiah 60–62, as was the case in that instance. The emphasis on an individual character is foreign to Isaiah 60–62. If Zerubbabel was introduced into this oracle by the redaction, the redaction must be dated to a time when Zerubbabel was still a factor — a time about which we know fairly little, but which must have occurred not long after the completion of the temple (cf Galling 1961:94–96). From the angle of a realised eschatology, the completion of the work on the temple must have been proof that the promises were being fulfilled and this fuelled expectations regarding the restoration of the house of David. In this sense one can refer to Zerubbabel as a 'continuity figure, a reminder of God's fidelity to the Davidic promises in a general sense' (Dumbrell 1984:263, 264). The argu-

ment that Haggai was part of a messianic movement in Judah, triggered by the turmoil in the empire after the death of Cambyses (Blenkinsop 1984:233), cannot be based on the evidence of this passage alone.

The eschatology of Haggai does not therefore introduce many new elements to the history of eschatology in Israel, but largely follows known traditions. Eschatology was not the main thrust of his message, but was used to encourage the people to persevere with the restoration of the temple. This restoration did not primarily have eschatological ramifications, but was linked to the promise of blessings in nature and on the work of their hands. This message was directed to the people. The redaction shifted the emphasis to the leaders and the message was cast in a framework that emphasised a realised eschatology. As a result the position of the temple and the leaders became more prominent. Cognitive dissonance played a role in the course of this redaction. Haggai should therefore not simply be identified with the hierocrats; however, his message was such that it could be used to further their aims and the redaction was done with this in view.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BLENKINSOP, J 1984. *A history of prophecy in Israel*. London: SPCK.
- CARROL, R P 1979. *When prophecy failed*. Redactions and responses to failure in Old Testament prophetic traditions. London: SCM.
- 1982. Eschatological delay in the prophetic tradition? *ZAW* 94, 47–58.
- CHILDS, B S 1979. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- CRENSHAW, J L 1971. *Prophetic conflict*. Its effect upon Israelite religion. Berlin: De Gruyter. (BZAW 124.)
- 1986. *Story and faith*. A guide to the Old Testament. New York: MacMillan.
- DEIST, F E 1982/3. Prior to the dawn of apocalyptic. *OTWSA* 25 26, 13–38.
- DE VILLIERS, P G R 1982/3. Solving the riddle? Recent trends in apocalyptic research. *OTWSA* 25, 26, 39–58.
- DUMBRELL, W J 1984. The purpose of the books of Chronicles. *JETS* 27, 257–266.
- EYBERS, I H 1970/1. The rebuilding of the temple according to Haggai and Zechariah. *OTWSA* 13 14, 15–26.
- FOHRER, G 1958. Die Struktur alttestamentliche Eschatologie. *ThLZ* 85, 401–420.
- GALLING, K 1961. Serubbabel und der Wiederaufbau des Tempels in Jerusalem, in Kuschke, A, *Verbannung und Heimkehr*, 67–96. Tübingen: J C B Mohr.
- HAMERTON-KELLY, R G 1970. The temple and the origins of Jewish apocalyptic. *VT* 20, 1–15.
- HANSON, P D 1975. *The dawn of apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- JAPHET, S 1982. Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel against the background of the historical and religious tendencies of Ezra — Nehemia. *ZAW* 94, 66–98.
- KOCH, K 1967. Haggai's unreines Volk. *ZAW* 79, 52–66.
- McKANE, W 1979. Prophecy and the prophetic literature, in Anderson, G W (ed), *Tradition and interpretation*. Essays by members of the society for Old Testament study, 163–188. Oxford: Clarendon.
- MASON, R A 1977. The purpose of the 'editorial framework' of the book of Haggai. *VT* 27, 413–421.
- 1982. The prophecies of the restoration, in Coggins, R, Phillips, A Knibb, M (eds), *Israel's prophetic traditions*. Essays in honour of Peter R Ackroyd, 137–154. Cambridge: University Press.
- MAY, H G 1968. 'This people' and 'this nation' in Haggai. *VT* 18, 190–197.
- NORTH, F S 1956. Critical analysis of the book of Haggai. *ZAW* 68, 25–56.
- OSWALT, J R 1981. Recent studies in Old Testament eschatology and apocalyptic. *JETS* 24, 289–310.
- OVERHOLT, T W 1977. Jeremiah and the nature of the prophetic process, in Merrill, A L & Overholt, T W (eds), *Scripture in history and theology*. Essays in honour of J C Rylaarsdam, 129–150. Pittsburgh: Pickwick.
- 1979a. Commanding the prophets: Amos and the problem of bibliocal authority. *CBQ* 41, 517–532.
- 1979b. Jeremiah 2 and the problem of 'audience reaction'. *CBQ* 41, 262–273.
- 1981. Prophecy: the problem of cross cultural comparison. *Semeia* 19–22, 55–78.
- 1982. Seeing is believing: the social setting of prophetic acts of power. *JSOT* 23, 3–31.
- RUDOLPH, W 1976. *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi*. Gutersloh: Mohn. (KAT.)
- STECK, O H 1971. Zu Haggai 1:2–11. *ZAW* 83, 355–379.
- VAN DER WOUDE, A S 1982. *Haggai — Maleachi*. Callenbach: Nijkerk. (POT.)
- VENTER, J L 1986. *Die rondreisende prediker as profet in die vroeg-Christelike kerk: 'n eksegeties-openbaringshistoriese studie*. ThD thesis, Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.
- VON RAD, G 1975. *Old Testament Theology II*. The theology of Israel's prophetic traditions. London: SCH.
- VRIEZEN, Th C 1953. Prophecy and eschatology. *VTS* 1, 199–229.
- WEINFELD, M 1982. s v **הַבַּיִת** ThWAT.
- WESTERMANN, C 1971. s v **הַבַּיִת** kbd schwer sein. ThHAT.
- ZIMMERLI, W 1971. *Man and his hope in the Old Testament*. London: SCM (SBT 2nd ser 20).