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ABSTRACT

This study identifies and examines the earliest layers of archaeological and textual evidence concerning the reconstruction of Jerusalem in the Achaemenid Persian Period (550 – 330 BCE) to illuminate the historical and ideological processes by which the city regained its prominence after its destruction in 587 BCE. The centrality and importance of Jerusalem within Yahwism was not a given at the time. In fact, a multi-centric and international religion appeared to be developing in the aftermath of the conquest of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. In light of the destruction of the city in 587 BCE, the study first presents the development and history of the physical site with particular attention to indications of its socio-political status. Data from over a hundred years of archaeological excavations is presented and interpreted, revealing a slow process of recovery with evidence for administrative consolidation in the late fifth century and a more stable, urban population emerging in the fourth century. In four subsequent exegetical chapters, an ideological and cultural-historical approach to early restoration era prophetic texts is used to situate historically and explicate the way in which their authors and tradents addressed encumbrances to reconstruction. The chapters focus on Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi and show how the authors and tradents, employing native and imperial traditions, reaffirm, promote, and even mandate Jerusalem as the sacred center of Yahwistic life and cult, especially vis-à-vis the developing Torah that did not explicitly identify Jerusalem as this sacred center. The study concludes by providing new insights on the utility of the Jerusalem traditions as a powerful symbol for survival and revitalization in the Persian and Early Hellenistic periods, and by connecting the prophetic work to the continuing importance of the site in the territorial and theological discourse of the Graeco-Roman period.
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CHAPTER 1.
INTRODUCTION

Successive Greek, Jewish, and Roman writers, Hecataeus of Abdera, Aristeas, Philo, Josephus, and Pliny, are each known to have extolled Jerusalem as one of the great cities of the eastern Mediterranean world. Indeed, by the Herodian period, Jerusalem developed a significant pilgrimage economy that consistently drew travelers in numbers many times its own population (Goodman 2007). The city, however, rose to these heights from a state of near total destruction and collapse. In 587 BCE, the Babylonians laid the last of at least two devastating sieges, capturing and destroying the city. The conquest of Jerusalem resulted in the exile and dispersion of the inhabitants of the city and the surrounding countryside.¹ Recent estimates, supported by an ancient literary repertoire attesting to the devastation, suggest a dramatic decline in the population of Jerusalem and its environs, perhaps as high as 90%.² The destruction and devastation undermined political and cultic

¹ As with other subjugated groups, the Babylonians settled Judeans in ethnic enclaves. Biblical texts locate Judeans at several sites in Mesopotamia: Tel-ribbon, Tel-melah, Tel-harsha, Cherub, Addan, Immer, and Casiphia (Ezek 3:15; Ezra 2:59; 8:17). Cuneiform texts place Judeans at ʿĀl-Ŷāḥūdu, Naṣar, and Bīt-Abī-rām, in the regions east and southeast of Nippur; and, attest to individuals with Yahwistic names working as artisans, laborers, tenant farmers, and low level public officials (Coogan 1974; 1976; Zadok 1979: Ephʿal 1983: 109-110; Joannès and Lemaire 1999; Pearce 2006: 407-408; Magdalene and Wunsch 2011: 115-117). Archaeological surveys also point to a significant increase in settlement activity in the central flood plain of the Euphrates during this period (Adams 1981: 177-178), probably related to these and other large population transfers. This data inveighs against the notion that the Babylonians only deported the Judean elite. Although the number of deportees is impossible to determine, estimates around twenty thousand or more do not seem unreasonable (Smith 1989: 31-32; Albertz 2004: 81-90). Judeans also fled the collapse of Judah, migrating to neighboring states (e.g., Ammon, Samaria, Moab, the Coastal Plain, Anatolia, or Egypt). For a thorough, if at times unnecessarily acerbic, response to minimalist views of the exile, see Faust 2012.

² Lipschits (2005: 210-218, 267-271) estimates the total settled area of pre-destruction Jerusalem and its environs at approximately 1,000 dunams (or decares, 1 dunam/decare = 1000 m²) with a population of approximately 25,000; and, the total settled area in the Persian period at 110 dunams with a population of 2750. Though these population estimates are highly speculative, the dramatic reductions in settled area are undeniably significant. For additional references and contrasting views, refer to n. 1 in chapter two infra. On the wider regional disruption of the Neo-Babylonian period, see n. 1 supra and n. 12 infra. Lipschits (2005: 259-271) estimates that the population of the entire kingdom decreased by about 70%.
claims for Jerusalem and the impetus for its reconstruction and restoration (see infra). This dissertation attributes to the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi a critical ideological role in the nascent stages of the movement from destruction and depopulation to reconstruction and restoration.

**RECONSTRUCTING JERUSALEM: OUTLINE, METHOD, SCOPE**

The authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi advocate for the reconstruction of Jerusalem as a critical response to the crises of post-collapse Judean society. The importance of this territorial dimension in these prophetic texts is not consistently appreciated in current scholarship as there is a strong tendency to perceive the centrality of Jerusalem as a given and consequently not to see its promotion as a critical element in the literature. This tendency is aggravated by another tendency, namely, to focus on the textual dimension of Persian period Yahwism, according to which, the most important development of the Persian period is seen to be “putting not the temple but a book at the centre of official Yahweh religion” (Albertz 1994: 466). For some, the exile and the restoration are a watershed when Yahwism transformed, however gradually, from a temple cult into a “religion of the book” (Grabbe 2004: 359-360). Certainly, it is important to acknowledge the movement towards increased textuality and templeless worship and practice, especially for Yahwistic communities in the Diaspora (Pearce and Jones 1998; Tuval 2012); yet, it also remains important to understand how the Jerusalem-centered stream of Yahwism asserted primacy and to what end. In this dissertation, I argue that, by using and shaping social memory (Yahwistic and imperial), authors and tradents of early Persian period prophetic literature promote Jerusalem’s reconstruction not only as a cultic and political center but, under the strain of imperial and regional villenage, as a powerful symbol for survival and revitalization.

The present chapter provides an outline of the dissertation and a précis of some relevant historical and ideological processes related to the destruction of Jerusalem and
the collapse of the Judean kingdom. The outline identifies the key concerns and arguments of the remaining chapters as well as my methods and the scope of the analysis. The précis establishes the problems, territorial and ideological, which complicated efforts to rebuild Jerusalem and created the need and context for a prophetic response. I contend that political and cultic centralization in the eighth and seventh centuries concentrated power in the city of Jerusalem and so amplified the social, cultic, and economic impact of its destruction. In the aftermath of destruction, Yahwism developed in directions not necessarily conducive to restoration and reconstruction, necessitating a prophetic response to reassert or redefine the relevance and theopolitical legitimacy of the city and its royal patrons, the Davidides.

Before turning to the prophetic response, the next chapter provides a thorough analysis of the archaeological and epigraphic evidence relating to Persian period Jerusalem. Though I cannot claim to have been able to divorce myself fully from my familiarity with biblical literature, the chapter was written under the conviction that the historical and archaeological contextualization of biblical literature is valuable yet cannot proceed fairly when the literature itself is the foundation of that endeavor. My analysis makes a contribution by moving beyond the studies of Finkelstein (2008) and Lipschits (2009), which focus primarily on demography, to construct a site profile from four lines of converging evidence: material remains, fortifications, epigraphic evidence, and material culture. The convergence of this evidence suggests that the reconstruction and repopulation of Jerusalem proceeded slowly. The site evolved into a cultic and administrative center by the end of the fifth century and supported a more stable, urban population only by the fourth century. Settlement activity likely concentrated around the southern and central areas of the southeastern hill.

For the dissertation, this archaeological analysis provides a material and architectonic profile against which to test the prophetic profiles of Jerusalem and by which to understand their origin and goals. Extant prophetic literature reflects different
physical realities in Jerusalem and, therefore, this literature cannot all share a common historical context. Some texts presume a temple, some do not. Some texts criticize urban development, others criticize its lack. Some identify landmarks, others ruins. Some respond to Assyrian hegemony, some to Babylonian, and some to Persian. Even the limited prophetic corpus analyzed in this dissertation reflects changes in the material and architectonic profile within the Persian period. Interpreted against this profile, this corpus reflects on and illuminates the challenges and progress of the town’s reconstruction.

The core of this study, chapters three through six, is an analysis of the early restoration prophetic literature produced by authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi that reflects and informs the archaeological profile. Prophetic literature preserves vibrant social commentary, criticizing deficient realities and envisioning ideal futures; it reflects and shapes social memory and social reality. Especially when anchored by an archaeological analysis, prophetic visions can be significant and valuable historical witnesses. While my archaeological analysis confirms that Jerusalem reemerged as a cultic and administrative center and developed a small yet stable urban population by the end of this period, Persian period prophetic literature contextualizes this development, attesting to the travails and aspirations of an impoverished agrarian society struggling for relevance and purpose. Though the texts are a coherent corpus that share common elements, each has a distinct emphasis, envisioning and heralding the reconstruction of Jerusalem in different ways: in Isaiah, as re-creation, in Haggai, as revitalization, and in Zechariah and Malachi, as re-consecration and reformation. Through cultural-historical and ideological analysis, in synchronic and diachronic perspective, I explicate these visions and highlight the ways in which they laid the foundation for Jerusalem’s centrality in the late Persian and Greco-Roman periods.

As it is not my intent to engage the dialectic of exile and restoration but rather to limit this study to the archaeological and textual evidence related to the restoration, the focus is on prophetic literature clearly set within the Persian period. Excluded texts have
a much more ambiguous setting (e.g., Joel), were primarily written in the shadows of destruction and exile (e.g., Jeremiah and Ezekiel) rather than under the hopeful anticipation and aegis of a new era, or belong to a different genre (e.g., Songs of Ascent). Although earlier texts anticipate restoration and in many cases construct visions of it, and later literature does not completely come out from the shadow of exile, the form and content of the earlier texts gives little to no clear indication that their authors are active participants in the restoration. By contrast, in every respect, in whole rather than only in part, authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi situate themselves amid the restoration. As I will argue, these authors and tradents are not merely engaged in an imagined restoration; they are participating in the process and in focused dialogue with the people and circumstances of that age. My study, therefore, affirms a strong,

3 Although a certain determination is impossible, my assumption is that the authors and tradents are members of Jerusalem’s temple guild, likely Levites and temple singers (though this narrower affiliation is less clear than often claimed; see my discussions ad loc). My sense is the authors and tradents of Isaiah and Zechariah 1–8 likely returned from Babylon in the early Persian period while Haggai is possibly written by a cleric who remained in the land. The authors of Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi could have been later returnees or part of the community living in or around Jerusalem. On the complex compositional issues, refer to the relevant chapters.

4 Naturally, the persuasive appeal and communicative intent of any given text is dependent on the audience’s access to that text. In a study of the “celebrative texts issued by the ancient kings,” Liverani (2006: 2353) identifies three “spheres of audience and levels of mobilization” of these texts according to degrees of accessibility. These spheres, also relevant to prophetic texts, are the “inner audience,” the “wider audience,” and the “outer audience” (see and cf., Levin 2003).

In the case of the prophetic texts, the inner audience consists of the literate community and scribes in Jerusalem and in other Yahwistic communities that received a given text. This audience had direct access to the text, could read and study it, and was presumably the most aware of the issues it was primarily meant to address. This inner audience was the only group with authority over the text; it could reject, re-write, accept, and/or disseminate it. Given this authority, any education of this audience through the text had to be consistent with established norms, or else be either surreptitious or compelling, if the text was going to be accepted, studied, and disseminated.

The wider audience consisted of the lay participants in the cult (mostly free, adult males in Yehud and possibly in some centers outside Yehud, who recognized the religious authority of the inner audience). This audience received the text filtered by the inner audience, who read it to them and taught them from it (either through homilies or by other means).

The outer audience consisted of those who did not participate, either by choice or status, in the cult (women, slaves, foreigners, etc.). This outer audience received the text, if at all, filtered by the wider
though not uncontested, consensus that this literature stems from the late sixth to fifth century and predates the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles.\(^5\)

My method of analysis in these core chapters is primarily cultural-historical and ideological. Although recourse is made to a wide range of textual and literary critical methods of analysis, the history and formation of passages and books, particularly on a micro-level, are not primary concerns. Many of the texts are composite in nature or at least present fertile ground for redaction and textual criticism; that work is valuable and the subject of many great monographs and articles. The multitude of theories pertaining to the composition and editorial history of the texts under consideration as well as many complex text-critical questions could not be thoroughly assessed in the context of this dissertation. Simply put, textual and literary-critical discussions are now of such complexity and number as to make a thorough engagement, especially in a work focused on questions of culture, ideology, and history, inevitably inadequate. My goal, as such, is cultural-historical and ideological analysis that is sensitive to such discussions and at points even makes contributions, but is not overwhelmed by them.

My explication of the visions starts in chapter three with Isaiah. Proceeding from the address to Jerusalem in Isaiah 40:2, the authors and tradents responsible for the latter part of the book promulgate a theological justification for her restoration through sophisticated mythopoeia. I show how they use imperial and Yahwistic tropes and idioms to address practical and ideological obstacles to restoration, especially to call for a return to Jerusalem, to assign the task of temple building to Cyrus, the Persian monarch, to recount the reinstallation of the cult vessels and reapply the Davidic covenant to the “servants of Yahweh,” to reify the sacred and ethical character of Jerusalem, and to promote Jerusalem’s reconstruction as essential to renewal in the Yahwistic community.

---

5 On the questions of date and composition, see my discussions ad loc.
At the same time, I draw attention to key chronological markers that situate the core text in the early Persian period and to key spatial markers and landmarks in Isaiah that locate addressees in Babylon and in the northern hill country and so point to the international character of the discourse. I conclude by observing that the tradent responsible for including Isaiah 36–39 as a critical pivot in the book presents the Persian period restoration as a potential fulfillment of eighth and seventh century prophecy that advanced centralization in and the repopulation of Judah from Jerusalem in response to the Assyrian invasion of 701 BCE and its aftermath.

In light of the fact that eighth and seventh century prophecy provided an important intellectual milieu for the early textualization of Deuteronomic theology, it is not surprising that this theology is a critical touch point in the restoration. In chapter four, I explore the way in which the author of Haggai creatively employs the centralization laws of Deuteronomy, as well as sapiential, priestly, prophetic, and royal tropes, to present the reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem as a moral, cultic, and economic imperative that will improve the fortunes of the impoverished post-collapse agrarian society. I contend, however, that the argument is characterized by significant reversals that point to an evolution of the prophetic Sprachkritik from that of the seventh and sixth centuries, which criticized the kings of Judah for failing to maintain their zeal for cultic reform in the aftermath of the Assyrian invasion. This evolution hints at a change in the social and cultic location of the prophets (to the Jerusalem temple) and reflects the need and desire to promote Jerusalem and her temple in the early restoration context.

Indeed, Zechariah 1–8 clearly places the prophet under the aegis of the high priest in Jerusalem and presents prophetic visions and oracles concerning the priority and reconstruction of Jerusalem and her temple in the style of a “temple song.” In chapter five, I analyze the temple song of Zechariah 1:8–6:15 as well as the prose frame in 1:1-7 and 7:1–8:21, highlighting, on the one hand, the ritual and symbolism by which the author promotes the reconstruction and reconsecration of Jerusalem, the temple, and
Judean institutions, and, on the other, the careful efforts of a later tradent to temper the expectations in Haggai and the temple song with an emphasis on moral reformation, and also to argue for the centrality of Jerusalem for all Israel (not just Judah). I conclude by observing that Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 provide, by the nature of their arguments, their presentation of the conditions in Jerusalem (in concert with the archaeological profile), and their date formulae, strong, likely firsthand, evidence for the existence of an active revitalization movement advocating for the reconstruction and centrality of Jerusalem in the late sixth century.

In order to strengthen the temporal origins of these two texts in the sixth century and to illuminate the historical development of the arguments for Jerusalem’s reconstruction as a heuristic tool to assess the date(s) of the Isaianic perspectives, in chapter six, I test and explore the literary relationship of Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi to Haggai and Zechariah 1–8. At the outset, I highlight the significance of the former as *mašʾōt* in relation to the latter and call attention to a messenger motif as evidence for the diachronic relationship of the texts and as literary devices that encourage an integrated reading of them. On this form-critical and redaction-critical foundation, I trace the development of three lines of thought through these texts: the explicit and implied imperial and regional context(s), the nature and status of Judean leadership and the Judean community, and the status of the city and the temple. I relate this analysis to Isaiah and to the archaeological profile in chapter two. My conclusions in chapter six reinforce the diachronic relationship suggested by the form-critical and redaction-critical evidence and also take the position that the Isaianic perspectives predate these texts. Importantly, the chapter highlights the way in which the texts of Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi reflect changes in the reconstruction and restoration of Jerusalem, especially in regards to its urban settlement, the presence of the temple, and the geopolitical context.

In the conclusion to this dissertation, I rearticulate the strategies used by the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and the historical process
implied by them. In relation to the archaeological profile, I affirm that the texts reflect the Persian period era and attest to an international conversation on the evolution and trajectories of Yahwism. I contend that the promotion of Jerusalem for these authors and tradents carried territorial and theological importance, and provided for them an opportunity to craft a charter for Yahwists that they believed exemplified and best reflected the trajectory of the Torah. These authors and tradents not only laid a critical ideological foundation for the reconstruction and recovery of Jerusalem in the Persian period; they (re-)embedded Jerusalem as the eternal spiritual capital for Judeans and their spiritual heirs, the Jews. I highlight both positive and negative aspects of this legacy, and suggest some directions for future research.

THE RISE AND FALL OF STATE IDEOLOGY IN JUDAH

Of course, people rebuild cities after disasters all the time and generally do not need prophetic motivation to do so. The need for shelter, a livelihood, and community are often sufficient to engender a desire to rebuild. The destruction of Jerusalem in 587 BCE, however, presented challenges for reconstruction that were acute and far-reaching—and required a prophetic response—largely because of complex socio-political processes of centralization and individuation that affected the kingdom of Judah and its cult in the late eighth and seventh centuries.

Under Hezekiah, king of Judah, an assault on ancestral cults and tomb rites aimed to desacralize (rural) land as a deliberate tactic in a strategy to resist Assyrian imperialism and protect Judean independence (Halpern 1991: 68-77; 1996: 317-318). The tactic supported a military strategy to abandon the countryside, avoid open field combat with invading Assyrian forces, and strengthen fortifications and urban centers to discourage or withstand siege operations (Halpern 1991: 18-49; 1996: 313-321). Through centralization, chiefly in Jerusalem, the Judean king hoped to survive the invasion and avoid the fate of the conquered northern kingdom of Israel. As Sennacherib pillaged and
razed Judah’s countryside and towns in 701 BCE, and deported many Judeans, primarily from the Shephelah, the prophets collaborated with royal policy by implying “that the destruction of rural Judah was an extension of the destruction of Israel … Jerusalem alone remained sacrosanct to Yhwh and was to be the progenetrix of a restored Israel” (Halpern 1996: 320). The concurrence of Assyrian aggression, Hezekiah’s defensive strategy, and the prophetic critique effected the disenfranchisement of Judean clans by undermining rural clan life and associated cultic practices, and by advancing political and cultic centralization in Jerusalem (Halpern 1991; 1996: 303-321; Bloch-Smith 2009).

Jerusalem and the Davidic monarchy survived but Judah’s recovery from the devastation caused by the invasion of Sennacherib proceeded slowly. Manasseh, Hezekiah’s successor, was able to initiate and finance at least a partial recovery through the trade in cereals with Ashkelon and the Mediterranean world and the expansion of an Arabian trade network, in which the king participated and profited along with Edom, Samaria, and Damascus. The recovery “required and reinforced central direction” and involved the redistricting of Judah, fracturing “large lineages” and cutting “across the old clan lines” (Halpern 1996: 323-324). Though Manasseh likely permitted the revitalization of traditional cultic practices in order to resacralize the land and repopulate the hinterland, accounting for the negative assessment of him in Kings and Chronicles, his policies nevertheless intensified the transition from kin-based, subsistence living to a

---


7 Faust and Weiss (2005) argue that Judah expanded into the Negev to support the production and trade of cereals (and an expansion of grazing) as a part of a Mediterranean economic system. Finkelstein (1992) and Singer-Avitz (1999) discuss the importance of the Arabian trade network. Tebes (2006) argues that the Arabian trade and the Mediterranean cereals trade were complementary networks. In light of an analysis of the rosette stamped jar handles, Koch and Lipschits (2013) prefer to date this expansion primarily to the reign of Josiah, which is probably its zenith.
state regulated, cash crop economy, exploiting the Dead Sea for perfumes and the northern and western hills for wine and olive oil (Halpern 1996: 320-328).

As the opportunities for expansion and confrontation with imperial powers recurred in the reign of Josiah, the assault on traditional cultic practices and intractable elements of the kinship system was revived. As illustrative of this development, the Priestly (or Holiness) texts, while incorporating the language and ideology of kinship, express “constant concern with appointed lineage chiefs, not elders” and so presume “that the state will run the kinship network” (Halpern 1996: 329). Going even further, Deuteronomy “levels old social distinctions, revaluing the status of women, slaves, debtors, resident aliens, and war captives, enlisting the underclasses and elite sympathy for them to hammer out a common code of moral indignation and political correctness, to impose a cultural identity that presses claims prior to the obligations of kinship and personal loyalty” (Halpern 1996: 329). Consequently, the Judean scribal elite advances “the individual in the cause of collectivization … [t]he individual was no longer first a citizen of a clan section, but of a national collective” (Halpern 1996: 329-330). Law and prophet conspire with the state to create a collective consciousness to press supra-tribal economic and political interests over the parochial interests of the clans.

During the reigns of Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Josiah then, the people were increasingly alienated from their “land, gods, kin, ancestors, [and] tradition” and Judean identity and practice became inextricably interwoven with the ideologies of state, centered in Jerusalem (Halpern 1996: 336). As such, when the Babylonians conquered and destroyed Jerusalem, an ideological and socio-religious system rooted in and dependent on the city fell into disarray and, along with the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of its elites and skilled workers, the kingdom of Judah collapsed. This destruction and collapse not only implied that Yahweh had abandoned Jerusalem but even more drastically could be construed to imply the defeat of Judean cult and culture.
PROBLEMS IN POST-Collapse JUDEAN SOCIETY

Post-collapse societies naturally face significant challenges maintaining or redefining social, political, economic, and religious identity and cohesion. In the case of Judah, the politics of centralization and the Assyrian and Babylonian military campaigns eviscerated the clans and the agrarian infrastructure of ancestral lands, houses, tombs, and gods. The lower classes, including refugees from the royal estates and disbanded civil, cultic, and military services, were alienated from their traditional lineages and land by that social revolution. Although elites could reinvent their lineages through scribal technology, deportation and dislocation threatened even their links to the land. Reflexively, whether as a result of the eviscerated clan system or dislocation and deportation, there is no evidence for virgin development of multi- or single-chambered, rock-hewn tombs, multi-family compounds, four-room houses, or any other archaeological reflexes of an agnatic clan system, common to Iron I and Iron II, in post-collapse Judah (Faust 2012: 93-106).

Despite the hallmarks of a post-collapse society, existing four-room houses at Mizpah (Zorn 2003) and Gibeon (Lipschits 1999: 176), re-use of rock-cut bench tombs at Abu Ghosh, Kh. ‘Almit, Mizpah, Gibeon, Gibeah, and Jerusalem (Stern 2001: 339-341), Mesopotamian-style bath-tub coffins found in Mizpah and in Jerusalem and its environs (Bloch-Smith 1992: 223; Zorn 1993) as well as the gbn, m(w)ṣh, and lion stamp impressions (see chapter two ad loc) point to homogeneity in the social and cultural

---

8 On post-collapse societies, see Tainter 1999; Schwartz and Nichols 2006; and, applied to Persian period Yehud and Idumea, see Faust 2007; 2012; Stern 2007.

9 Faust (2012: 94-106) acknowledges that there is evidence for limited reuse of such tombs and houses and, of course, some caution is warranted in that so few domestic structures of any kind have been found. Interestingly though, the collapse (and regeneration) of the Judean agnatic clan system has literary correlates in the semantic evolution of mišpāhā (“clan, clan section”) and the nuanced use of bêt ʾābôt (“house of the fathers”) in the Persian period. Vanderhooft (2009: 490-491) observes that, in Persian period texts, mišpāhā not only refers to agnatic clans but also to non-agnatic, economic, and military sodalities (Neh 4:7; 1 Chr 2:55; 4:21). Indeed, the term mišpāhā is eventually supplanted by bêt ʾābôt, which though a linguistic extension of the agnatic term bêt ʾâh (“father’s house”), refers to real and/or fictive clans or clan sections, grouped by socio-political, economic, or cultic affiliations.
practices of a limited area in the Benjamin region, inclusive of an eviscerated Jerusalem and its environs, and in continuity with the practices of the late Judean kingdom. According to 2 Kings 25:22-25 and Jeremiah 40–41, in the wake of Jerusalem’s destruction, the Babylonians established a new political administration and placed troops or a garrison in Mizpah.¹⁰ In addition to exiled and dispersed communities, a small remnant of the kingdom of Judah persisted in this limited area of post-collapse Benjamin.

Despite the influential arguments of Lipschits (2005: 237), the evidence does not warrant the conclusion that this territory “flourished during the sixth century B.C.E.” and only declined in the fifth and fourth centuries. The sixth century remains are modest and suggest relative impoverishment vis-à-vis Iron II. Indeed, close analysis of Lipschits’s own data points a different direction. Lipschits (2005: 246) identifies a hundred and forty-six Iron II settlements in Benjamin. He locates a hundred and ten sites in the northern and eastern zones and, therefore, thirty-six in the central and western zones (Lipschits 2005: 246-247). Lipschits (2005: 246-247) also identifies fifty-nine Persian period settlements in Benjamin, seventeen in the northern and eastern zones and so the other forty-two in the central and western zones. As Lipschits (2005: 246-247) observes, the drop in sites occurs in the northern and eastern zones. North of Bethel, there is a precipitous decline in activity, from twelve sites to two. In the eastern zone, there is also a sharp drop in activity “east of a line running through Bethel–Michmash–Gibeah–Anathoth,” from seventy-one sites to fourteen with an even more pronounced decline, from twenty-seven sites to one, “in the area between Michmash and the slope running

¹⁰ On the political centrality of Mizpah, see Lipschits 1999; 2005; Zorn 2003. On a continued administrative presence at Ramat Raḥel, see Lipschits, Gadot, and Langgut 2013. To my mind, however, the existence of three, roughly coeval stamp impression systems in the sixth century—the gbn system centered in Gibeon, the m(w)jš system centered in Mizpah, and the lion system centered in Ramat Raḥel and Jerusalem—suggests that the royal estates devolved into the hands of local sheikhs in a territorial rather than provincial administration (see also n. 13 infra and chapter two ad loc). For additional arguments against provincialization, see esp. Vanderhooft 1999; 2003a; 2003b.
down toward Jericho.” Lipschits (2005: 247) concedes that the abandonment of these sites is indicative of “the complete cessation of settlement throughout the Jordan Valley and the western littoral of the Dead Sea … connected with the collapse of the economic, military, and political system of the kingdom of Judah,” that is, in the sixth century BCE. He also acknowledges that the Babylonians likely caused the destruction of the fortress at Tell el-Fûl (Lipschits 1999: 177-178; 2005: 241, esp. 201). Consequently, as the total number of sites in the central and western zones actually increases by six between Iron II and the Persian periods, there is no basis for Lipschits’s conclusion that settlement in Benjamin only diminishes in the fifth and fourth century.

Lipschits also neglects to mention how many of the forty-two Persian period sites in the region are newly founded. Using slightly different data sets, Milevski (1996-1997) identifies nine new sites; Carter (1999) identifies thirty-three; and, Edelman (2005; 2007) identifies twenty-seven. Clearly, not all of the thirty-six Iron II sites continued into the Persian period, as the simple addition of anywhere from nine to thirty-three sites would exceed Lipschits’s total of forty-two. As evidence for activity in both Iron II and the Persian period does not preclude the possibility of a gap, the actual percentage of sites that were continuously settled is almost certainly lower still. Indeed, according to Zorn (1994), Mizpah experiences a demographic decline from Iron II to the Babylonian period. The overwhelming evidence, therefore, suggests that the number of continuously settled sites must have declined in the early sixth century and then steadily risen in the Persian period (cf. Faust 2007: 36-41).11

Though Mizpah emerged as the political center of this small remnant in the hill country, Samaria became the leading Yahwistic city of the hill country. After conquering

11 Gibeon is the only site that may have resisted these demographic trends of the Babylonian period. Its period of prosperity starts in the seventh century and clearly diminishes by the fifth century, but it is impossible to determine whether and at what pace its prosperity starts to ebb in the early or the late sixth century.
the kingdom of Israel, and bi-directional deportations that resulted in a steep settlement decline and some change in material culture, the Assyrians supported the reconstruction of this city and a network of small secondary centers, villages, estates, and forts in the western and northern Samarian hills (Stern 2001: 49-51; Zertal 2003). Though the province may have been stagnant and even in decline in the Babylonian period, excavations and surveys nevertheless indicate a continuity of settlement and material culture from the late Assyrian reconstruction through the Babylonian and Persian periods. In the Persian period, settlement expanded dramatically (Zertal 1990; 2003).

12 For the excavations and surveys and relevant commentary, see Dar 1986; Finkelstein, Lederman, and Bunimovitz 1997; Stern 2001: 49-51; Zertal 2003; Knoppers 2006a.

It is difficult to understate the disruption of Neo-Babylonian rule in the Levant. Nebuchadnezzar’s campaigns in the Levant were unrelenting and severe. According to the Babylonian Chronicle (BM 21946), Nebuchadnezzar spent at least nine of his first twelve regnal years subjugating the Levantine client kingdoms, collecting tribute, laying waste to urban centers, and deporting conquered peoples. In later years, Nebuchadnezzar carried out a protracted siege of Tyre and campaigned against Sidon, Arwad, Gaza, Ashdod, Ammon, Moab, and Egypt (Eph’al 2003: 183-189; Lipschits 2005: 66-67). Notably, there is no evidence Nebuchadnezzar ever repopulated the Levant with settlers or deportees from other regions, as the Assyrians had, and only minimal evidence for garrisons, Babylonian officials, and investments in the regional economy (Vanderhooft 1999; 61-114; 2003a; 2003b; Betlyon 2003). Reflecting the sharp contrast with Assyrian imperialism, the Babylonian kings, excluding Nabonidus, avoided Assyrian imperial ideology and royal titulary (Beaulieu 1989: 143; Vanderhooft 1999: 9-59; 2003a; 2003b). Under Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonians pursued a centripetal model of imperial control with the campaigns to the Levant aimed at securing Babylonian hegemony and counteracting Egyptian influence through extortion and intimidation, de-urbanization and ruralization, and disruption of regional economic and political cooperation.

Corroborating evidence for this model is pervasive in the archaeological record. Lehmann’s study of pottery trends in Syria and Lebanon are particularly revealing. Lehmann (1998: 15-21, 29) highlights considerable evidence for regional exchange in the Near East and Greek imports in pottery dating from 650 to 580 BCE. He associates the end of this discrete pottery assemblage with Nebuchadnezzar’s early campaigns, noting especially the destruction levels at Sultantepe and northern Palestinian sites such as Tel Dan and Tel Kabri (Lehmann 1998: 21). From 580 to 540 BCE, though Greek imports continue, the repertoire is small and limited and evidence for regional exchange is sparse (Lehmann 1998: 21, 29-30; see also, Weinberg 1971; Boardman 1999: 46-54; Vanderhooft 1999: 83-87). Indeed, there is evidence Nebuchadnezzar deported Greeks to Babylon and, likely in response, that the Greeks shifted their trade from the Levant to Naucratis and Daphnae in the Nile Delta (Vanderhooft 1999: 86-87, esp. n. 106). Astoundingly, at this apex of Babylonian hegemony, “Mesopotamian pottery now ceases to reach areas west of the Euphrates” and the development of the Mediterranean economy proceeded apace, largely despite the Babylonians (Lehmann 1998: 29, 32).
As the dominant regional center in the hill country, Samaria undoubtedly exerted significant *de facto* authority, even if it did not exert *de jure* political control over the post-collapse society in Benjamin, as Alt (1934) and others have suggested. Samaria attained and maintained cultural hegemony in the hill country through at least the Babylonian and early Persian periods.

Excavations and surveys in Megiddo, Phoenicia, Philistia, Samaria, Judah, and the Transjordan echo the conclusions reached by Lehmann. Stern (2001: 312-331) makes four key observations:

1. Most urban centers destroyed by the Assyrians in the eighth and seventh centuries, and not rebuilt by them, show little to no signs of activity before the Persian or Hellenistic periods.
2. Some urban centers that survived the Assyrian campaigns, or that were rebuilt, exhibit destruction levels in the late seventh or early sixth centuries, attributable to the Egyptian-Babylonian conflict, and generally show little to no signs of renewed activity before the Persian or Hellenistic periods.
3. Most urban centers without destruction levels are characterized by depressed activity with little to no signs of construction or material remains dating to the Neo-Babylonian period.
4. Only a small number of often still diminished urban centers, such as Samaria, Tell el-Far’ah (N), Gibeon, Mizpah, Gibeah, Tell el-ʿUmeiri, Tell Jawa, Heshbon, and Buseirah, have yielded evidence for continuous settlement activity through the Babylonian period.

In general, the rich evidence for Assyrian presence in the Levant from 715 to 640 BCE is unmatched by the Babylonian presence from 604 to 538, though the periods are comparable in length (Stern 2001: 348-350).

In addition to Alt, see McEvenue 1981; but, cf. Williamson 1988. The Babylonians, even under Nabonidus, likely employed a territorial, rather than provincial, system of direct rule. This distinction is significant and, along with the practice of settling deportees or captives in enclaves named after their place of origin or ethnicity—toponyms reflecting captives from Asia Minor, Phoenicia, Syria, Philistia, Arabia, and Egypt are attested (Eph’al 1978: 80-83; Zadok 1978: 60-61; Vanderhooft 1999: 100-102)—, explains the proliferation of ethnarchies in the Persian period and subsequent eras. Luttwak (1976) artificulated a parallel, though not identical, distinction between hegemonic and territorial control in the Roman Empire, which is a popular model among Mesoamerican historiants (e.g., Hassig 1985: 92-103; D’Altroy 1992).

The differences between territorial and provincial governance are ideological and administrative. The Assyrian provincial system acknowledged the existence of discrete states and recognized the territorial integrity of these states, even as they were subjugated to Assyrian direct (provinces) or indirect (clients) rule. By contrast, the Babylonian territorial system reflected the ideological perspective of its kings, who, as Beaulieu (1989: 143) aptly puts it, “considered themselves rulers of one city, Babylon.” From this ideological perspective, military expansion augmented the Babylonian hinterland. Generally speaking, the Babylonians did not maintain as elaborate a network of clients as the Assyrians had and certainly did not tolerate strong clients, effectively eliminating many state-level bureaucracies and vesting power in the hands of local, tribal sheikhs and even clan chiefs, some of whom still claimed the titles king or governor. The Babylonian system of governance encouraged, deliberately or not, the development of ethnarchies and sodalities, leading ultimately to the Persian period *ḥatru* and the ethnarchies enumerated in Persian period nation and tribute lists.
From the vantage point of the time, the Jerusalem-centered stream of Yahwism was experiencing its dénouement. Its existence was now sustained almost entirely by a lament tradition, which struggled to explain the violability of Zion and the Davidic covenant. In the hill country and in the Diaspora, its proponents debated collective or individual liability for the destruction of the temple (Ezek 18; 20; cf. Jer 31:29-30), without reaching a positive resolution (Knohl 2003: 101-122; cf. Halpern 1991: 11-17). Hope rested with kings in captivity (2 Kgs 25:27-30), a new covenant written on the heart (Jer 31:31-34), and an imaginary temple (Ezek 40–42). By the advent of the Persian period, the leading sheikh of Judah bore the name Sheshbazzar, “Shamash protects the father,” (Ezra 1:8) and the deposed Davidic family named the royal heir, Zerubbabel, “seed of Babylon” (1 Chr 3:19). For some liturgists, the destruction of Jerusalem marked an end to the Davidic covenant (Ps 89:39-53; Lam 5:16).

At the same time, new forms of worship and practice emerged within Yahwism, sometimes reinvigorating or reimagining old ideas and practices. Emphasis on the Sabbaths, fasting, prayer, confession, public reading, folklore, and non-sacrificial ritual, such as circumcision, characterized templeless cult and contributed to social cohesion and boundary maintenance. An emergent and evolving Torah breathed vitality and vibrancy into Yahwism, providing a literary patrimony that could be appropriated by Yahwists regardless of their place(s) of worship (Albertz 1994: 523-533; Knoppers 2011c). Yahwism was becoming a diverse, international religion (Knoppers 2009; 2011b). In these developments, Yahwists demonstrated an extraordinary capacity for adaptability, an
ability to re-envision themselves in a fashion that accommodated various social and political conditions. With these trends, however, came routinization and a profound and existential threat to Jerusalem (and arguably Yahwism itself), particularly as the developing Torah left vague and unanswered a critical question, “Where is the place that Yahweh has chosen?” The authors and tradents of Persian period prophetic literature clearly and unequivocally responded, “Jerusalem!”
CHAPTER 2.

“NO HOUSES HAD BEEN BUILT”:
THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PERSIAN PERIOD JERUSALEM

The Persian period is generally regarded as a somewhat indistinct and sparse period in the archaeology of Judah and Jerusalem. The Neo-Babylonians conquered the petty kingdom and its capital in at least two campaigns; they destroyed urban fortifications, infrastructure, and industry, and exiled or dispersed the elites and skilled artisans. The conquest brought an end to the kingdom of Judah and also left an indelible mark of destruction layers and collapsed masonry in the archaeological record at Jerusalem (Kenyon 1974: 170-171; Avigad 1983: 53-54; Lipschits 2005: 210-218). Following the Babylonian, Persian, and early Hellenistic periods, the Hasmoneans, Herod the Great, the Romans, and the Byzantines successively reinvented the city, leaving undeniable evidence of their significant occupation and architectural accomplishments. In between the ruins of the pre-exilic period and the great foundations of the Hellenistic period should rest Jerusalem of the Persian period. Unfortunately, the archaeological evidence is fragmentary and difficult to interpret with no clear signs of domestic architecture. Attempting to reconstruct the town of this period from the archaeological record is, therefore, a substantial challenge.

---

1 The extent of the devastation to Jerusalem and Judah is frequently underappreciated and understated in recent scholarship. Barstad (1996; 2003), e.g., has championed the case for “a functioning society” with “many of its political institutions still intact” (1996: 18-19) and/or “its various socioeconomic institutions still intact” (2003: 4). Against Barstad 1996, see Faust 2012, who is a vociferous voice for the near total collapse of Judean society. Lipschits (2005) takes a via media, arguing for a sharp decline in the population of Jerusalem and its environs as well as the Jordan valley and western littoral of the Dead Sea, and more moderate declines in Benjamin and the north-central Judean hills. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to systematically evaluate the conquest. In my view, Lipschits (2005) is the best case scenario for the continuity thesis. Certainly, as agreed on by Faust (2012) and Lipschits (2005), Jerusalem yields very little evidence for continuity. Possibly reflected in the lion stamp impressions and a burial site is a small remnant and occasional cultic use (e.g., pilgrimage); archaeological evidence indicates very little else.

2 For a comprehensive bibliography of the excavations in Jerusalem, see Bieberstein and Bloedhorn 1994; Vaughn and Killebrew 2003: 431-81; and, this chapter passim.
Still, a re-evaluation of the record can provide modest, yet important, insight on Persian period Jerusalem. This chapter presents and interprets the archaeological data related to the settlement and its occupational character. The discussion proceeds through a summary of the finds from the northernmost to the southernmost areas of Jerusalem, a systematic assessment of the evidence for Persian period fortifications, a review of the epigraphic evidence, especially Yehud stamp impressions and coins, and an analysis of nearby burial sites and significant material remains. The discussion concludes with interpretations and reflections on the growth and development of Jerusalem. Consistent with regional developments and changes in imperial strategy, there are two stages in the occupation and history of Persian period Jerusalem: an early stage in the sixth and early fifth centuries of very weak activity and a later stage from the late fifth through the late third centuries in which the town starts to resume its status as a provincial center, albeit remaining small in size.

THE SETTLEMENT

Extensive excavation in the past hundred years has produced a reliable archaeological profile of Jerusalem. As a result, negative evidence, as well as positive evidence, can reasonably be used to delineate the extent of the settlement in Persian period Jerusalem.\(^3\)

Excavations of Mount Zion (Broshi 1976: 82-83; Broshi and Gibson 1994), the Armenian Garden (Tushingham 1967: 72; 1985: 33-38; Bahat and Broshi 1976; Gibson 1987; Geva 2003: 524-526), the Citadel of David (Johns 1950; Amiran and Eitan 1970; Geva 1983; 1994; Sivan and Solar 1994), Erlöscherkirche (Lux 1972: 191-195; Vriezen 1995), HaGai Street (Kloner 1984), and Jewish Quarter (Avigad 1983: 61-63; Geva 2000: 24; 2003: 524-526; 2006: 7-11) have shown that the western hill was not inhabited in the Persian and early Hellenistic periods. Apart from isolated small finds and pottery sherds,

\(^3\) Though not indiscriminately, see my discussion \textit{infra}; Finkelstein 2009: 4, 7, 10-11; cf. Finkelstein, Koch, and Lipschits 2011; De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg 2012: 141-143.
these areas have no remains indicative of Persian or early Hellenistic activity. Instead, late Hellenistic or Roman period architectural and material remains consistently and immediately superimpose Iron IIB/C remains. Settlement in the Persian period can not have involved the western hill.

The eastern hill consists of three clearly defined regions: the Temple Mount, the Ophel, and the City of David (fig. 1). Though there is no clear topographical demarcation between the eastern hill and the northern hills, the Tyropoeon Valley to the west separates it from the western hill; the Kidron Valley to the east separates it from Mount Scopus and the Mount of Olives; and, the meeting of the Kidron and Tyropoeon, and the Hinnom valleys creates its southern ridge. The northeastern ridge, often identified in Jewish tradition as Mount Moriah, is the point of highest elevation, the present-day location of al-Haram al-Sharif, and the ancient site of the Herodian Temple Mount and the First Temple. The central ridge, or Ophel, lies immediately south of the Temple Mount and, starting in Iron IIA/B, served primarily as an important administrative area (B. Mazar 1989). Between the Ophel and the southeastern ridge, or City of David, there is “a marked narrowing, if not cutting, of the ridge” and a depression separating the two.

4 Instructively, all the Yehud stamp impressions found outside the limits of the southeastern hill date to the Hasmonean period, providing additional confirmation that the western hill was not occupied until that time (Geva 2007; Lipschits 2009: 11; Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2011: 38-41). The most significant small finds are coins (see my discussion ad loc). The coins and scattered pottery probably reflect scavenging activities (Schiffer 1996: 106-114).

5 On this widely accepted conclusion, see Finkelstein 2008; Lipschits 2009.

6 The term Ophel (עפל) has topographical and functional connotations as it refers to an elevated and fortified point in a town, typically featuring public buildings, i.e., an acropolis. The term עפל is used in biblical texts for the acropolis of Jerusalem (Isa 32:14; Mic 4:8; Neh 3:26, 27; 11:21; 2 Chr 27:3; 33:14) and Samaria (2 Kgs 5:24), and in the Mesha Inscription for the acropolis of Qerihô (KAI 181, line 22). For an archaeological comparison and analysis of royal architecture and acropoleis in the Iron Age Levant, see Sharon and Zarzecki-Peleg 2006. In Jerusalem, the Ophel of David may have been situated at the northernmost limits of the City of David; later Judean monarchs, however, chose to construct a new Ophel higher up the slope, nearer to the Temple Mount (B. Mazar 1989; E. Mazar 2002: 3-15). Throughout this work, as reflected in fig. 1, the Ophel refers to the area up slope rather than the purported Ophel of David, unless explicitly stated otherwise.
areas (Kenyon 1966: 77, 83; 1967a: 26-27; Steiner 2001: 21). The southeastern ridge, which descends gradually until it reaches the intersection of the Tyropoeon, Kidron, and Hinnom valleys, has had residential, public, and industrial uses throughout history.

**Summary of the Evidence**

The positive and negative evidence from the eastern hill presents a fragmented and problematic portrait of settlement. The results of several excavations can be summarized, from north to south, as follows (fig. 2):
Figure 2: Archaeological Excavations of the City of David, 1867–2008, courtesy of the Megalim Institute, R. Reich, and A. Altshul.
1. Kenyon (1968: 104) identified Persian period pottery in fills at Site S/II along the eastern edge of the Ophel, but not, in the southwestern corner of the Temple Mount (Sites G and J), where Kenyon only reached the Umayyad period (Prag 2008: 101-241); in the central Ophel (Sites S/I and S/III-IV), where Herodian and Hasmonean remains superimpose “small pockets of IAII debris on bedrock” (Prag 2008: 243); or, on the southern crest, in Site R, where Kenyon (1966: 83) halted work because of the precipitous terrain. Subsequent excavations expanding Kenyon’s areas near the Temple Mount, Western Wall, and on the Ophel exposed Herodian and Hasmonean remains superimposing Iron II structural and material remains, and only uncovered a few local and Attic sherds and a horse’s head figurine from the Persian period (Ben Dov 1985: 61; B. Mazar 1989: x). The ongoing Temple Mount Sifting Project (Barkay and Zweig 2006; 2007: 41-42) has yielded a small repertoire from the Persian and early Hellenistic periods, mainly consisting of local and Attic sherds, alabaster vessels, and coins. Reich and Shukron (2002: 78*) have not reported Persian period finds in their preliminary reports of Area L on the Ophel’s eastern slope.

2. Along the western slope of the City of David, probes by Reich and Shukron (2005; 2007: 64-65) in the Givati Parking Lot (Area M) and excavations by Crowfoot and FitzGerald (1929: 59-85, esp. 67-68), immediately south of the lot, yielded Persian period pottery, including a Persian period stamp

---

7 Excavators also uncovered two Yehud stamp impressions (B. Mazar 1969: 170, pl. XXXXVI:3; Ben Dov 1985: 70; E. Mazar 2002: 17) but, they are late types dating to the second and first centuries BCE (Geva 2007; Type 17 in Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007a; 2011: 717).

8 Barkay and Zweig have created a website for the Temple Mount Sifting Project, which includes unofficial and official progress updates in English and Hebrew, links to news articles, and other resources. The URL is http://templemount.wordpress.com/.
impression in each case.\(^9\) Kenyon (1964a: 13; 1966: 80, 83-84, pl. XXVI/A) did not report Persian period remains in her Site M in this area nor have Ben Ami and Tchehanovetz (2008; personal communication, 2012) in renewed excavations of the parking lot.

3. Above the western slope, on the northern crest of the City of David, Macalister and Duncan (1926: 31-78, 179-181, 189-191) recovered Persian period sherds, including six lion and fifty-four Yehud stamp impressions (Duncan 1931: 139-146; Lipschits 2009: 12).\(^{10}\) This collection of handles represents the most significant concentration in any area of the City of David (Lipschits 2009: 12). Crowfoot (1929c: 158) likewise reported “masses of pottery of the Persian period” on the crest, in an area immediately south of the Macalister and Duncan excavations, though the absence of pottery plates makes it impossible to verify this claim.

4. Excavations along the eastern slope and in the Kidron Valley have turned up Persian and early Hellenistic remains, including architectonic evidence, stamp impressions, and bullae (Shiloh 1984: 7-9, 14, 20, 29; Reich and Shukron 1998; 2007; Franken 2005: 89-131; E. Mazar 2009: 72-79). Significantly, Shiloh (1984: 4, Table 2) discerned a Persian period stratum (Stratum IX) fully or partially represented in Areas G, E1, D2, and D1.

5. In Area G, the upper levels of which were exposed by Macalister and Duncan in Field 5 and Kenyon in Sites A and P, Shiloh (1984: 20) reported that the excavators uncovered supporting walls stabilizing debris and fills; “more

---

\(^9\) The stamp impressions found by Reich and Shukron is a middle type, dating to the fourth and third centuries BCE, originally identified as Type 13\(d\) by Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007b: 116) and then revised to Type 13\(f\) (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2011: 298). On the stamp impressions found by Crowfoot and FitzGerald, see n. 39 \textit{infra}.

\(^{10}\) The lion types are early; the other fifty-four stamp impressions consist of early, middle, and also Hasmonean types (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007a; 2011).
massive walls (W.311, 314) and layers of stone (L.763, 806)”; and, a “rich” pottery assemblage “typical of the Persian period.” One of the area supervisors, Jane Cahill (2008: xix; forthcoming) has interpreted the walls as terraces. The pottery assemblage included sixteen of the thirty-seven stamp impressions found in Stratum IX (Ariel and Shoham 2000). By contrast, aside from one stamp impression, excavations at the Gihon Spring by Reich and Shukron (1999a; 1999b; 1999c; 2000a; 2000c; 2002; 2003a; 2004: 217; 2007) did not yield evidence for Persian or early Hellenistic period activity. Reich and Shukron (2004: 217; 2007: 64) suggest that the approach to the spring was deliberately blocked or concealed as a defensive measure related to the construction of Hezekiah’s tunnel in the late Iron II and that it remained inaccessible until the second century BCE.

6. In Area E1, Shiloh (1984: 14) claimed that the evidence of Persian period activity was limited to earthen and gravel dumps and a thin supporting wall. De Groot (2001; De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg 2012: 19-22, 173-176), the area supervisor, has argued that three distinct phases are discernable. In the earliest phase (IXc), the Ashlar House, a public building constructed in Iron II and partially destroyed at the end of Stratum X (ca. 586 BCE), was reoccupied (De Groot 2001; De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg 2012: 21-22). In the second phase (IXb), the Ashlar House was abandoned and covered by sloping limestone chip layers and debris (De Groot 2001; De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg 2012: 20-21). In the third phase (IXa), a terrace wall, paving stones or floors, and two tabun ovens were constructed above the chip layers (De Groot 2001; De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg 2012: 19-20). Excavators uncovered thirteen stamp impressions, of the thirty-seven found in Stratum IX, in Area E1 (Ariel and Shoham 2000: see esp. 138 and Table 2).
Reich and Shukron (1999b; 2001) have not reported any Persian period finds in their preliminary reports of Area J to the east of Shiloh’s Area E.

7. In Areas D2 and D1, Shiloh (1984: 7) reported primarily limestone chip layers and gravel dumps, which he attributed to a quarry that “occupied most of the upper rock terrace in Area D1.” The excavators discovered traces of the quarry under the foundations of two walls running immediately parallel to one another (1984: 8; on the walls, see infra). Additionally, excavators uncovered eight stamp impressions, of the thirty seven found in Stratum IX, in these areas: five in D1 and three in D2 (Ariel and Shoham 2000). Reich and Shukron’s (1998; 2007) excavations in the same vicinity, in Area B, which overlaps Area D1 and D2, and in Area A, on the Kidron Road to the southeast, yielded a small assemblage of Persian period sherds, including seven stamp impressions.

8. The late Persian and early Hellenistic periods (Stratum VIII) are much more poorly attested in Shiloh’s excavations. Stratum VIII is only fully or partially represented in Areas E1 and E2 and scarcely represented in Areas D2 and D1 (Shiloh 1984: 4, Table 2). Aside from an important structure found in Area E1 with an early Hellenistic (3rd century BCE) in situ pottery assemblage on its floor, the primary features of Stratum VIII are fill, debris, and refuse, supporting walls, and the beginnings of an agricultural terrace system that

---

11 Based on their earlier excavations in the same vicinity, Weill (1920: 173-180, 193) and Kenyon (1967a: 188-189; 1974: 263-264; Prag 2008: 5-32) dated the quarry exclusively to the late Roman and Byzantine periods. The evidence of limestone chip layers from Shiloh’s excavations shows that the late Roman and Byzantine builders expanded an existing quarry.

12 The stamp impressions found by Reich and Shukron in these areas are middle or unclassified types according to the Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007b; cf. 2007a; 2007c; 2011) typology. The middle types date to the fourth and third centuries BCE.
characterizes much of the eastern slope in Stratum VII.\footnote{On Stratum VIII, see Shiloh 1984: 9-10, 15, 48; De Groot 2001; 2004; 2005; De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg 2012: 17-18, 76-79, 176-179; Cahill 2008: xix; forthcoming. Particularly interesting are three columbaria, uncovered in Areas B, D2, and E3, could date to either Stratum IX or Stratum VIII. De Groot (personal communication, 2005) reported that the columbaria are pre-Stratum VII and he assumes that, because there are no columbaria attested in Palestine before the Hellenistic period, they belong to Stratum VIII (4th to 2nd centuries). For a report on the columbarium in Area E3 and relevant discussion, see De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg 2012: 76-79, 177. Shiloh (1984: 11; 1985: 52) dated the columbarium in Area E3 to the end of the Iron Age and the columbarium in Area D2 to the Persian period. With respect to the latter, Shiloh (1985: 52) writes, “The eastern part of the columbarium was damaged by the Hellenistic terrace wall, and the columbarium in turn damaged the northeastern corner of the large Iron Age building of the 8th century BCE … In view of these data, we assume that the columbarium belongs to Stratum 9 (the Persian period).” Ariel and Lender (2000: 18-21) discuss the columbarium excavated in Area B and tentatively date it to the Hellenistic period, though primarily on account of its function rather than stratigraphic evidence. Ariel (personal communication, 2005) notes that Weill first excavated the structure in 1913 and since then “all dating, [and] contextual information” was removed when it was preserved in concrete. Notably, like the columbarium in Area D2, it is located within the Hellenistic terrace system on the eastern slope, which raises some suspicion that, as in Area D2, where the terrace wall cuts the columbarium, this columbarium belongs to an earlier phase in the agricultural reclamation of this area. On the agricultural functions of columbaria, see Tepper 1986; 2007: 45-47; Hirschfeld and Tepper 2006.} Excavators uncovered ten stamp impressions in Stratum VIII: one each in Areas G and D2 and eight in Area D1 (Ariel and Shoham 2000).\footnote{Another four stamp impressions, uncovered in Area D2, were attributed to Stratum VIII-VIIB (Ariel and Shoham 2000). According to the Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007a; 2011) typology, at least one of these four is a late type, dating to the Hasmonean period. Notably though, all of the stamp impressions found in Stratum IX and VIII are early or middle types (Lipschits 2009:17).}  

9. In the excavation of the Lower Siloam Pool, Reich and Shukron (2007: 163-8) reported no Persian period finds in preliminary reports. Indeed, most excavated areas in the vicinity of the Upper and Lower Siloam Pools, have failed to yield any significant evidence of Persian or even early Hellenistic period activity with the exception of a salvage excavation conducted by Shlomit Wexler-Bdolah (Geva, personal communication, 2012). In Site N, Kenyon (1964a: 13-14, pls. VI/B, VII) found Herodian remains on bedrock; in Site K, small pockets of Iron II pottery superimposed by late Hellenistic remains (1966: 84, pls. XXVI/B, XXVII/B, XXVIII/A); in Site F, Iron II...
subterranean channels and fortifications and late Hellenistic and Roman dam walls (1964a: 11, pl. V; 1965:14-17, pls. VI-VIII/A); and, in Site V, no finds earlier than the Roman and Byzantine periods (1966: 88; Prag 2008: 5-32). In Shiloh’s Area K, about forty meters southwest of Site V, Ariel and Magness (1992) also reported no finds lying under the Roman and Byzantine remains. Likewise, Shiloh’s (1984: 4-6; De Groot, Cohen, and Caspi 1992; De Groot and Glick 1992) excavations in Area A1 and A2, which were limited in scope, did not yield Persian period material or architectonic evidence, though, in the former, excavators uncovered a few material and architectonic remains and an overflow channel from the Siloam Pool that date to Iron II. A modest exception to the results in the southern area is a probe, Shiloh’s Area H, on the eastern slope of the southwestern hill, which revealed a few Persian period sherds (De Groot and Michaeli 1992: 51).

These results point to a concentration of activity on the northern and central crest and eastern slopes of the City of David and apparently weak activity near the Ophel and the southern crest of the eastern hill. Notably, Lipschits (2009) has challenged Finkelstein’s (2008; 2009) similar interpretation of the evidence.

Absence of Evidence: The Case of the Ophel

Lipschits (2009: 5-9) and indeed others before him, have quite reasonably observed that some consideration for the absence of evidence on the Ophel and at the southern crest of the eastern hill must be ascribed to later building activities.\(^\text{15}\) Especially on the steep and

\(^{15}\) One of the most cogent descriptions of the different nature of Jerusalem vis-à-vis traditional tell sites in Israel is still that of Crowfoot and Fitzgerald (1929: 7-8), who wrote, “In old English towns, for example, the Roman stratum lies buried some 10 feet under the ground, but its burial was due to the circumstances of the Anglo-Saxon conquest, and since the recovery after that conquest the changes in the level have been insignificant: we can still walk into Norman churches on the level of our present streets, and the buildings which line our pavements may belong to any of the intervening centuries or only to the last one … Conditions of stratification in Jerusalem are a little complicated by the hilly character of the site, but the conclusions are all the plainer. The best building sites are on top of the ridges, and here the rock is
narrow ridge of Jerusalem’s eastern hill, Hasmonean, Herodian, Roman, and Byzantine builders had to situate their prominent buildings on stable foundations, such as the natural bedrock or sturdy remains that functioned like bedrock, primarily the monumental architecture of the Middle Bronze or Iron II periods (Lipschits 2009: 5-8). Yet, as Finkelstein (2009: 4, 11) observes in a rejoinder, “[w]alls, floors, sherds, stone vessels, metal implements and other finds do not evaporate”!

In light of Finkelstein’s observation, ascribing the absence of evidence to later building activities must have limits. Chiefly, it can not adequately explain areas in which subsequent strata consistently superimpose strata earlier than the period in question and in which there is little or no debris from the period in question relative to the earlier periods. In such cases, it is reasonable to have expected, at minimum, occupational debris so that, if absent, the absence of evidence is significant and likely points to very weak activity, especially from a period of roughly four hundred years, spanning from the Babylonian destruction to the Hasmonean state. Indeed, precisely such observations lead Lipschits (2009: 9-12) to conclude that the western hill was not settled in the Persian period, even if construction in that area is less topographically demanding.16

As such, the claim of weak activity on the Ophel is warranted in light of the sparse remains from the Temple Mount Sifting Project, the absence of architectonic evidence and the sparse material remains near the Western Wall and on the Ophel, and the stratigraphic evidence of late Hellenistic and Herodian remains overlying Iron II

still visible on the surface, clearances have kept pace with rebuildings, and there has been no rise at all in the ground. However abnormal it may seem, this persistence of the building level on the hill tops in spite of long periods of ruin and decadence is natural in the circumstances, but it has been compensated by a really abnormal rise in the levels in the valleys … during periods of prosperity the levels have remained almost constant, during periods of decadence the rises have been considerable.”

16 Finkelstein, Koch, and Lipschits (2011) have now collaborated on an article suggesting that the mound of Jerusalem was boxed-in by the Herodian Temple platform. The attraction of this theory is that the land area and strategic advantage of situating the town exclusively on the Temple Mount is consistent with other sites of the time. The problems posed by the MB settlement, the lack of supporting evidence, and reasons to be discussed infra are, however, at the present state of evidence, too significant to overcome.
remains. Lipschits (2009: 12) counters that the Persian period fills uncovered by Macalister and Duncan come from the Ophel, but this interpretation is unlikely on three counts. First, Field 5 is located at a significant enough distance from the Ophel, and separated from it by a sharp decline and gully (see supra), to warrant skepticism. The material removed from the Ophel would have been, more immediately, deposited on the slopes of the Ophel, rather than carried into the City of David. Kenyon (1968: 104) found some sherds in Site S/II on the eastern slope; Reich and Shukron (2002: 78*) did not. Second, the lack of architectonic evidence and material remains on the Ophel inveighs against it. Finkelstein (2008: 505-506) rightly contends that the (relative) absence of such evidence in that area is important. Had significant activity taken place on the Ophel, it should have been reflected in some architectural remains or a sizeable quantity of Persian period sherds and stamp impressions. On this point, the presence of Iron II sherds in significant quantities is decisive. Third, a more suitable explanation for Macalister and Duncan’s finds presents itself in the evidence for a monumental Iron I/II building in the area.\(^\text{17}\) The reuse of such a public building, as De Groot argues for the Ashlar House in Shiloh’s Area E1, is probable and consequently, the fills unearthed by Macalister and Duncan are likely related to the reuse of that monumental building and/or similar public buildings in the immediate area.\(^\text{18}\)

Franken’s (2005: 89-103) analysis of the deposits found at the foot of the rock scarp in Kenyon’s Square A/XVIII, just below the monumental building, strengthens this third point. Specifically, Franken (2005: 91-93, 98) observes that the formation process


\(^\text{18}\) For more substantive discussion of this issue, see infra. On the absence of Persian period finds in this area from E. Mazar’s (2009) excavations, cf. the similar explanation of Finkelstein et al. (2007: 150) for the absence of Iron IIB finds. On the tendency towards reuse of such monumental structures in the Levant, see Sharon and Zarzecki-Peleg 2006: 148, 150; more generally, see Schiffer 1996: 103-106.
reflected by the deposits is not consistent with intermittent dumping. Rather, the sequence of deposits of tumbled Iron II masonry, pottery from Iron II and the early Persian period, and a thick deposit of “tan soil” and “light grey clay soil” suggests a clearing process (Franken 2005: 91-93, 98). As such, Franken (2005: 92, 98) concludes that the important Iron II buildings on the crest “were either provisorily restored during or after the exile, or people squatted in the ruins” and subsequently the area was cleared to prepare for new building activities. In this process, retaining walls, such as those found in Kenyon’s and Shiloh’s excavations, were constructed on the slope to contain the debris and possibly permit some modest agricultural or horticultural activities (Franken 2005: 92; Shiloh 1984: 20; Cahill 2008: xix; forthcoming).

**Absence of Evidence: The Case of the Southern Crest**

In the southernmost areas, the argument that absence of evidence indicates weak activity is not as strong because, in general, the pre-Byzantine or pre-Roman remains are scant and positive evidence for destructive quarrying activities affecting all earlier strata is unequivocal. Moreover, the absence of evidence at the Gihon Spring virtually demands that the Persian period inhabitants of the town accessed their water supply from the pools at the southern end of the town. The excavations in Kenyon’s Site V and Shiloh’s Area K yielded few pre-Byzantine remains and, along with the Byzantine architecture uncovered in Bliss and Dickie’s (1898) excavations, indicate a massive restructuring of the city in that area (Prag 2008: 5-32; Reich 2004: 129). This restructuring includes the evidence that the quarries expanded across the southern crest in the Roman and Byzantine periods (Reich 2004: 127-129; Weill 2004: passim, pls. III, XIX-XXII, XXIII/B; see also fig. 3; n. 11 supra). Consequently, the absence of evidence on the southern end of the hill is likely not evidence of absence, especially in light of some, limited signs of activity from a recent salvage excavation by Wexler-Bdoulah and Shiloh’s Area H and Reich and Shukron’s Area A on the opposite western and eastern boundaries of this area. Naturally,
this conclusion must be weighed against the evidence from Kenyon’s Site F and Shiloh’s Area A1, which revealed Iron II architectural and material remains and no overlying Persian period remains. Yet, still, the likelihood that the inhabitants accessed the water supply in this area, rather than at the Giḥon Spring, is compelling and as such the southern crest of the hill should be regarded as, at least, a functional, if not developed, part of the settlement.

Evaluation of the Evidence

Ultimately, the absence of in-situ assemblages or residential architectonic evidence related to the Persian period, should elicit significant caution in assessing the built-up areas on the eastern hill. The total absence of both, everywhere on the hill, is an
undeniably significant, arguably insurmountable, obstacle for demographic analysis. Clearly, the inhabitants of the town completely abandoned the western hill and even largely abandoned the neighborhoods on the eastern slope, eventually preparing the latter for agriculture or horticulture. Any domestic or public structures were confined to the crest of the hill but the relative density and nature of those structures is not readily discernable. Three pieces of data can at least help elucidate the nature of the settlement: fortifications, which also confirm its extent, epigraphic evidence, and material remains.

FORTIFICATIONS

Although the subject of Jerusalem’s fortifications always generates significant discussion and controversy, recent excavations have provided sufficient evidence to map their probable courses. In the Middle Bronze II and Iron Ages, Jerusalem’s fortifications included four components relevant to the present discussion: (1) the primary wall circumvallating the eastern hill and notably, on the southeastern hill, built mid-slope, (2) the walls and stone plinth of an Iron I/II monumental building and citadel at the northern end of the City of David, (3) secondary fortifications, east of the primary wall, in the Kidron Valley, consisting of two Middle Bronze II towers protecting the entrance to the Giḥon Spring and an Iron IIB/C wall that may have incorporated the towers and

19 In light of the data, but reflecting slightly different interpretations, Finkelstein (2008: 506-507) has suggested a density coefficient of twenty people per dunam over a settlement of twenty to twenty-five dunams (pop. 400-500) while Lipschits (2009: 20) has proposed a higher coefficient of twenty-five people over fifty to sixty dunams (pop. 1250-1500). Finkelstein (2008: 503; 2010: 44) has repeatedly implied that Lipschits has advanced two different population estimates: ca. 1500 and ca. 3000. The former, however, is a population estimate for the City of David (Lipschits 2006: 32; 2009: 20) while the latter is an estimate for the City of David and its environs (Lipschits 2005: 210-218, 258-271).


21 Macalister and Duncan 1926: 37-65, pl. V; Mazar 2009: 43-65; see also infra.
enclosed a neighborhood that developed outside the primary wall,\(^2\) and (4) an Iron IIB wall enclosing the western hill.\(^3\) In the Persian period, the primary wall and secondary fortifications on the eastern slope were abandoned and new fortifications were built along the crest, salvaging the walls and plinth of the Iron I/II building and citadel. At all other points on the eastern hill, the Persian period fortifications incorporated and repaired the primary wall. Consistent with the lack of activity on the western hill, the Iron IIB walls on the western hill show no signs of repair in the Persian period (contra Ussishkin 2006).

The Eastern Ridge Wall

The eastern ridge wall constructed in the Persian period not only salvaged the walls and monumental stone plinth of the Iron I/II citadel in the City of David but also established a new line that later Hasmonean and Byzantine builders followed. Locating the city wall above the earlier primary and secondary fortifications reduced the area for intramural settlement, likely reflecting the reduction in the population. Positively, the position of the walls on the crest and the smaller size of the intramural settlement provided security and improved defensibility vis-à-vis reconstructing the earlier mid-slope wall. By salvaging and reincorporating the walls of the Iron I/II citadel, the Persian period inhabitants were able to construct strong fortifications with lower transaction costs.

The use of the eastern ridge for a new city wall, through reincorporation and salvage of the Iron I/II citadel, *prima facie*, suits the Persian period better than subsequent periods of greater affluence and settlement activity. In the latter periods, Hasmonean and Byzantine rulers would have been more likely to maintain the Middle Bronze and Iron IIB fortifications on the slope to maximize the settlement area, had those still been exposed. The Persian period builders, however, set a new precedent and so left an


\(^3\) Avigad 1983: 46-60; Avigad and Geva 2000a; 2000b: 133-159; Geva and Reich 2000; Geva 2003: 510-518.
indelible mark on the architectonics of the eastern hill that guided their heirs. Notably, the profile of activity at the Gihon Spring is consistent with these observations. As the spring was not used in the Persian period, its fortifications were quite reasonably abandoned. In the second century BCE, the spring was again in use and so it is unlikely that its fortifications would have been abandoned had the new line not already been established.

Elements of the eastern ridge wall were documented by Clermont-Ganneau and unearthed by Guthe, Parker, Weill, and Macalister and Duncan (fig. 2). The most important elements were those uncovered by Macalister and Duncan and re-excavated by Kenyon in Sites A and P, Shiloh in Area G, and E. Mazar at the City of David Visitor’s Center (figs. 2, 4-5, 7-12, 14-16); and, those excavated by Weill and re-excavated by Shiloh in Area D1 (figs. 2-3, 18-22).²⁴

*Robert A. S. Macalister and John G. Duncan, 1923-1925 (figs. 2, 4-6)*

Macalister and Duncan explored a large area on the southeastern hill, subdivided and numbered as Fields 5, 7, and 9, in accordance with the British Mandate Field System. Along the eastern ridge, Macalister and Duncan (1926: 49-74; Duncan 1931: 189-213) excavated the original wall of the Iron I/II citadel for a length of 122 meters and ascribed it to the Jebusite period. They also excavated the massive stepped stone structure, calling it the North (Stair) Bastion or “Jebusite” Ramp; another segment of the stepped stone structure, which they called the South Bastion; two towers, the larger of which they called the Intermediate or “Solomonic” Tower; and, walls extending from the southeast corner of the tower, which they referred to as the Outer Wall and the “Greek” Wall.

---

²⁴ The elements of the wall identified or excavated by Clermont-Ganneau (1971: 296), Guthe (1883: 139-164, Tafel IV, V), and Parker (Vincent 1911) are not supported by sufficiently detailed stratigraphic reports or photos. It is impossible, therefore, to discern whether these fragments belong to the Persian period or the later Hasmonean and/or Byzantine rebuilds. Simons (1952: 68-131), though, provides particularly insightful analysis of these early excavations. Also, Duncan (1931: 204) claims that the Outer Wall (see *infra*) excavated by him was initially unearthed by Guthe.
Macalister and Duncan (1926: 65-73; Duncan 1931: 200-201, 204-210) regarded the two bastions as roughly contemporary with the original wall on the crest; and, the towers, the upper courses of the original wall, and the Outer and “Greek” walls as additions.

Macalister and Duncan (1926: 55-59, figs. 47-55; Duncan 1931: 192-195, figs. facing pp. 190-191) interpreted the Intermediate Tower as the first addition to the original wall. The tower measures approximately seventeen meters long on its outer face and projects from the rock scarp about nine meters at the south end and six meters at the north end. Its E-W walls are two and a half meters thick while its N-S wall is five meters thick. The tower rests on and cuts the South Bastion or stepped stone structure. Macalister and Duncan observed a sloping line of debris in the north face of the tower (fig. 5) that they interpreted as indicative of a stone glacis contemporary with the stepped stone structure, and noted that the tower may have concealed or closed a postern in the original wall. They attributed the lower, rougher courses of the tower to David; its upper, finer courses to Solomon; and, two “hurried repairs” to Hezekiah and Nehemiah.

By analogy to the masonry of the tower, Macalister and Duncan (1926: 63-65, figs. 56-59; Duncan 1931: 198-200, figs. facing pp. 198-199) identified “Davidic” and “Solomonic” repairs to the original wall south of the tower and ascribed the Outer Wall, abutting the southeast corner of the tower and running parallel to the original wall, with Hezekiah. They noted that the Outer Wall is “composed of polygonal blocks more or less
uniform in size” with occasional “Solomonic dressing” and “few wide interstices,” which have been “filled up and carefully plastered over” so that “the chips used in filling them do not as a rule show” (Macalister and Duncan 1926: 67; Duncan 1931: 203-204). By contrast, they observed that, in the “Davidic” repairs, “the blocks were smaller and more irregular” with “larger interstices” and “the chips used in filling these interstices were not buried in mortar” (Macalister and Duncan 1926: 67, cf. 65; Duncan 1931: 199).

Macalister and Duncan (1926: 69-76, figs. 63-65; Duncan 1931: 207-213, fig. facing p. 199) identified the “Greek” Wall, running above the Outer Wall in Field 7 and along its outer face in Field 9, with the Hasmoneans; and, repairs to it, with the Romans. The “Greek” Wall consists of finished and dressed ashlar stones resting on a rough stone and rubble foundation. The “Greek” Wall was strengthened by cement and stood on its

Figure 5: Northern Face of the Intermediate Tower, Macalister and Duncan Excavations, 1923-1925, from Macalister and Duncan 1926: 54, fig. 48. Note oblique line H-H.
own strength when the excavators undercut its foundations. The construction technique and style is similar to other walls excavated by Warren near the Ophel and Bliss and Dickie on the southern ridge, which have now been more accurately attributed to the Byzantine period (Wightman 1993: 209-216, esp. 214).

In Field 5, at the northern end of this excavation area, Macalister and Duncan (1926: 49-51, fig. 46; Duncan 1931: 189-190) interpreted the upper courses of the original wall and the stepped stone structure, as well as a small tower abutting the wall as the first post-exilic additions. They describe the masonry of the upper courses as a “coarse type” of “somewhat small stones, badly shaped” with “interstices being roughly filled with chips and mortar”; and, the masonry of the tower as consisting of irregular, hammer shaped stones and interstices “carelessly” filled with chips and mortar (Macalister and Duncan 1926: 51; Duncan 1931: 190). In their excavation report, they interpreted the tower and the upper courses as a “Post-Exilic” (6th–1st BCE) repair and addition to buttress the original wall (Macalister and Duncan 1926: 99). In a subsequent monograph, Duncan (1931: 189-190) explicitly claimed the small tower and additional courses dated to the Hasmonean period.

Macalister and Duncan (1926: 137-143, pl. XIV) also observed that, in several places, the walls and towers on the ridge were cut by pools and cisterns, which they dated to an Arab Stratum (fig. 6). Reich (1987: 161-162, fig. 2) reexamined their data and has cogently argued that the plans reflect typical “Second Temple period private houses in Jerusalem” and “stepped and plastered water installations [miqva’ot] of the type common in Jerusalem at that time.” Notably, Macalister and Duncan (1926: 140-141) themselves observed that the plaster of some of the cisterns contained Hasmonean and Roman sherds. These water installations establish the terminus ante quem of the small tower, the stepped stone structure, the Intermediate Tower, and the upper courses of the original wall in the Herodian period.
Figure 6: Field 5, Arab Stratum, Macalister and Duncan Excavations, 1923-1925, from Macalister and Duncan 1926: pl. XIV. Note pools and cisterns on the eastern edge of the excavation area (cf. fig. 17 infra).
Figure 7: Plan of Sites A, H, and P, Kenyon Excavations, 1961-1967, from Steiner 2001: 5, fig. 1.2. Square A/I-III reaches the outer face of the Intermediate Tower while Square A/XVIII and Site P bound the small, northern tower. Note that Kenyon did not excavate the upper courses of the Stepped Stone Structure.
Adopting a more rigorous method of excavation in clearly defined squares and trenches, Kenyon located and excavated Trench I, Squares A/XXIII, A/I-III, A/XVIII, and Site P near the important elements of the fortifications uncovered by Macalister and Duncan to test their conclusions and illuminate the stratigraphic sequences (fig. 7). Kenyon did not ascribe any of the walls on the crest to pre-exilic periods but rather concluded that everything Macalister and Duncan had found, including the stepped stone structure, was post-exilic. Owing to a rougher finish and an accumulation of midden containing Persian period sherds deposited against the scarp, Kenyon (1963: 14-15, pls. VII/B, VIII/B; 1967a: 111, pls. 54-55; 1974: 183-185, pls. 77, 79) identified the small segment of the original wall she excavated in Square A/XVIII and Site P, north of the small tower, with Nehemiah (fig. 8).\footnote{In two reports, Kenyon (1963: 15; 1974: 183) appears to have erred in identifying the Persian period midden as “lapping up against the foot of the wall.” As Kenyon (1967a: 111) herself apparently recognized, and studies by Franken (2005: 89-93) and Steiner (2011) clearly show, the midden collected only at the scarp below it.} She also argued that the small tower and the upper courses of the

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure8.jpg}
\caption{Eastern Ridge Walls, North of the Small Tower, Square A/XVIII, Kenyon Excavations, 1961-1967, from Kenyon 1967: pl. 55. Note the battered construction of the original wall and the stones of the tower and the later wall lying above it.}
\end{figure}
original wall were the first addition, constructed anytime after the original wall in the mid-fifth century BCE (Kenyon 1967a: 114-115; 1974: 191-193).

Kenyon (1962: 76-81, pls. XVIII, XIX/B; XX/A; 1963: pl. VI/B; 1964a: 10, pls. III/B-IV/A; 1964b: 37-38; 1967a: 114-115, pls. 56-57; 1974: 192-193, pls. 18, 76, 78, 81) reexamined the Intermediate Tower in Squares A/XXIII and A/I-III. She discovered the lower, “Davidic” courses undulating over the walls of Iron IIA/B houses built on the eastern slope (fig. 9-11). This discovery invalidates Macalister and Duncan’s ascription of the tower to David and Solomon. At the northern end of its outer, eastern face, Kenyon discovered that the tower also rested on a sloping “tumble of stones,” which

---

**Figure 9: Foundations of the Intermediate Tower, Kenyon Excavations, 1961-1967**, from Kenyon 1965: pl. III. The lower courses of the tower are at the top of this photo, just above the meter stick. Note the uneven rise of the foundations (cf. fig. 11 *infra*).
was covered by Hasmonean pottery and coins (fig. 10). She assumed the surface containing the pottery and coins was contemporary with the construction of the tower, though it does not continue beneath it. The surface was covered by stones that Kenyon attributed to the partial collapse of the tower. Above the collapse, Kenyon found more Hasmonean pottery and coins. At the southern end of the tower, she discovered a similar stratigraphic sequence and so concluded that the tower dated to the second century BCE. She also observed that the foundation trench of the Outer Wall cut the Hasmonean surface and so, that that wall was a slightly later, addition (Kenyon 1964a: 10, pl. III/B).

In her stratigraphic report of these squares, Steiner (2005) agreed with Kenyon’s interpretation of the tower and the Outer Wall. According to Kenyon, the Intermediate Tower was, therefore, a second, clearly Hasmonean, addition.

In light of these discoveries, Kenyon (1962: 79, 81; 1967a: 115; 1974: 192-193) reinterpreted the stepped stone structure. She believed that the sloping line of debris visible on the north face of the Intermediate Tower (fig. 5) was indicative of a surface level and not stone debris from the stepped stone structure. Assuming the stepped stone

---

**Figure 10: Section E-W of Squares A/I-III, Kenyon Excavations, 1961-1967.** from Kenyon 1962: 80, fig. 4. Note the tumble of stones at the base. This may have been part of a repair in the second century BCE to bolster the unstable foundations of the tower.
structure lay beneath this surface level, and also, like the tower, above the Iron II houses on the slope, she concluded that the stepped stone structure was built *after* the tower as: “a subterranean buttress to strengthen a weak place in the foundations of the summit wall,” presumably against erosion (1967a: 115-116; 1974: 192-193). It was, therefore, the third addition to the original wall.

*Yigal Shiloh, Area G, 1978-1985 (figs. 2, 12-13)*

Shiloh’s excavations in Area G continued the investigation of the eastern slope east of the outer face of the fortifications. Having discovered that the stepped stone structure (Shiloh’s W.302) actually continued underneath the Iron II houses on the slope, rather than above them as Kenyon had thought, and that Iron I pottery and architecture lay underneath the structure, Shiloh (1984: 16-17, 27) agreed with Macalister and Duncan

---

26 As Steiner (2001: 51-52) observes, Kenyon did not relate the stepped stone structure, as found by Macalister and Duncan near the summit, to the terraces she excavated in Trench I or the step structure in Square A/XXIII. Indeed, the relationship of these components to the stepped stone structure is not settled, see Cahill 2003; Steiner 2003; A. Mazar 2006; Finkelstein et al. 2007. In her evaluation of Kenyon’s excavations, Steiner (2001: 42-53; 2003) has favored an Iron IIA date for the stepped stone structure.
that it was an early feature. He also identified the original wall on the crest (W.796) as contemporary with the stepped stone structure and dated the two features to Iron IIA, slightly later than Macalister and Duncan (Shiloh 1990: 8). Furthermore, noting ashlars in the Iron II debris of his excavations on the slope, and Kenyon’s discoveries of a casemate wall in Site H as well as ashlars and a volute capital on the eastern slope in

---

27 Cahill and Tarler, Shiloh’s area supervisors, have expressed disagreements with Shiloh’s conclusions regarding the date of the original wall and the stepped stone structure. They note that Kenyon’s (1965: 12; 1974: 92) excavations in Site P revealed Late Bronze potsherds near the wall’s inner face and argue that the stepped stone structure is a mantle contemporary with the substructural terraces and so datable by the Late Bronze II/Iron I transition pottery found in the substructure (Cahill and Tarler 1992; 1994: 34, 41; Cahill 2003; 2008; forthcoming). Their date agrees with Macalister and Duncan’s.
Square A/XVIII, he speculated that the stepped stone structure originally supported a public building located at the summit (Shiloh 1984: 16-17, 27; 1993: 703).  

Like Macalister and Duncan, Shiloh felt that the original wall and the stepped stone structure were incorporated into a fortification system with the addition of the Intermediate Tower (W.310), the upper courses (W.309) of the original wall, and the small tower (W.308), though, only as early as the Persian period and certainly, by the Hasmonean period (Shiloh 1984: 20-21, 29-30; 1990: 11). Naturally rejecting Macalister and Duncan’s dating of the Intermediate Tower because of its position on top of Iron II ruins, Shiloh nevertheless agreed with them, over against Kenyon, that it, and not the small tower, was the first addition. He observed that the tower was built on Stratum IX (6th to 5th centuries BCE) fill and formed an integral part of W.309 (Shiloh 1984: 30). Yet, in contrast to both Macalister and Duncan and Kenyon, Shiloh (1984: 20, 30) believed the debris visible on the north face of the Intermediate Tower (fig. 5) was caused by a Hasmonean and Herodian glacis (fig. 13), laid soon after the construction of both the

---

Intermediate Tower and the upper courses, to seal and enhance the fortifications at the crest. For reasons not clearly defined, Shiloh (1990: 8, 10-11) argued that the small tower was added after the glacis in the first century CE and, therefore, that it was the last addition to the fortifications.

_Eilat Mazar, 2005-Present (figs. 2, 14-17)_

More recently, E. Mazar has excavated a small and important area between and partially overlapping Kenyon’s Sites P and H, above Shiloh’s Area G, in Field 5. By removing the unstable, small tower, she exposed a join between the lower courses of the original wall (W.20 = Shiloh’s W.796) and the stepped stone structure (fig. 14); and, discovered that,
Figure 15: Plan of Iron I/II Monumental Building, Eilat Mazar Excavations, 2005-Present, from E. Mazar 2009: 64. Note that the chalk floor reaches W.107, W.218, and W.214.

like the Intermediate Tower, the small tower may have concealed a postern (E. Mazar 2009: 56-58, 76, 81). The join confirms that the original wall and the stepped stone structure form a single architectural unit. In light of her find, an early date for this wall and the stepped stone structure is suggested by the Late Bronze pottery Kenyon found along its inner face (see n. 27 supra) as well as its likely relationship to both the Iron I/II building excavated by E. Mazar (2009: 43-66) behind it and the lower parts of the stepped stone structure (fig. 15), which, as first recognized by Shiloh (see supra), lie over the remains of Iron I and under Iron II remains.29

29 As the stone plinth is cut by Hasmonaean and Herodian pools, cisterns, and chambers, its terminus ante quem is the first century B/Ce (figs. 6, 17; Macalister and Duncan 1926: 89-143, pls. I, VI, XIV; Reich 1987: 160-162; E. Mazar 2009: 80-86). If a Persian period date is granted to the small tower and the wall’s upper courses (as will be argued), the terminus ante quem of the stone plinth is the fifth century BCE. Mazar’s excavation relates W.20 to a monumental building on the summit for which the stepped stone structure likely served as a stone plinth (fig. 15). In particular, the stone plinth joins an E-W wall (Mazar W.107). This E-W wall is related to two other walls (Mazar W.218 and W.214) by patches of a chalk floor. All the walls were built on fills containing pottery indicative of the Late Bronze II/Iron I
In the sealed context underneath the small tower, Mazar (2009: 74-79) discovered two dog burials and beneath that, two stratified layers of debris above Iron II remains, sloping at alternate angles, and containing Persian period pottery from the sixth to early fifth centuries BCE (figs. 15-16). The Iron II and Persian period remains included bullae transition. Kenyon likewise discovered Late Bronze II sherds near the inner face of W.20 (see n. 27 supra). The latest pottery in the excavated fills beneath the stepped stone structure is indicative of the same period (E. Mazar 2007: 44-66; 2009: 31-65). On the slope, houses of the Iron IIA/B period were built over the lower levels of the stepped stone structure (figs. 12, 33). Iron IIB additions to the building as well as occupational debris from it and the adjacent area indicate that all the structures on the crest and slope remained in use at least until Jerusalem’s destruction by the Babylonians in the sixth century BCE. As already noted (see especially n. 28 supra), remains from the Iron I/IIA building, including ashlars, a volute capital, and bullae, were uncovered by Kenyon in Site H and Square A/XVIII and by Shiloh in Area G. Mazar’s excavations have, therefore, confirmed the relationship of the original wall to the stepped stone structure and provided a likely date in Iron I/IIA as first suggested by Shiloh. On the stepped stone structure, see esp. Cahill 2003; Steiner 2003; A. Mazar 2006.

The alternative theory proposed by Finkelstein et al. (2007: 155-159) would, as they admit, reduce the evidence for Iron IIA/B activity on the crest to a small debris layer, which is inconsistent with the additional evidence for an Iron II public building. On this issue, as it relates to the alternative theory proposed by Finkelstein et al. and the interpretation of absence in the archaeological record, see the list item marked (2) in Finkelstein et al. 2007: 157; and cf. Finkelstein et al. 2007: 147, paragraph 4; Finkelstein 2009: 4, 7, 10-11. Since Finkelstein et al. published their article, E. Mazar (2009: 43-66) has made discoveries that address some of their chief criticisms, namely the join confirming that the wall and stepped stone structure are a single architectural unit (cf. Finkelstein et al. 2007: 149) and a partial floor or surface, which, while not covering the entire area, reaches the major architectural elements of the structure (cf. Finkelstein et al. 2007: 154). The alternative theory proposed by Finkelstein et al. (2007: 155-159) may reflect secondary reuse of the foundations in the late Hasmonean or Herodian period. On this tendency in the Levant, see Sharon and Zarzecki-Peleg 2006: 150; more generally, see Schiffer 1996: 103-106.
and a seal of the late seventh and sixth centuries (Mazar 2009: 67-71, 76-79). The Persian period pottery contains no Attic forms, stamp impressions, or remains indicative of a period later than the fifth century. These finds suggest the area retained an administrative character in the sixth century and also definitively establish the *terminus post quem* of the small tower and the upper courses of the wall (W.27 = Shiloh’s W.309) in the mid to late fifth century BCE.

Mazar’s excavations on the summit have also developed and confirmed evidence from Macalister and Duncan’s excavations that the area was reinvented in the Herodian

---

30 In personal communication, 2010, Yiftah Shalev, who is working on the remains found in these layers, confirmed this information and allowed me to consult pre-publication pottery plates.
period with the construction of mikva’ot (figs. 6, 17). Mazar (2007: 71-76; 2009: 81-86) excavated or re-excavated a vaulted chamber (2.55 x 1.55m), a large pool (5.0 x 3.2m), two mikva’ot (2.5 x 4.3m; 2.95 x 2.35m), and a double pool (northern part = 3.4 x 2.5m; southern part = 2.2 x 1.3m). These installations reuse and/or cut the foundations of the Iron I/II building and eastern ridge wall (fig. 17). Finkelstein et al. (2007: 155-159) have shown that one of the mikva’ot (2.5 x 4.3m) shares a common orientation and level with parts of the monumental building as well as wall fragments uncovered by Macalister and Duncan. The plan, including the mikvah, is indicative of a Hellenistic building. Though they argue that their plan reflects the first use of the remains, it more likely reflects reincorporation and reuse of the Iron I/II monumental building (see n. 29 supra).

Figure 18: Wall M and Transversal Wall B, Weill Excavations, 1913-1914. from Weill 2004: 103, pl. IX/A. Though the relationship is unclear, note that Wall B clearly reaches Wall M (cf. figs. 3, 19).
Raymond Weill, 1913-1914 (figs. 2-3, 18-19)

Weill (1920: 108-109; 2004: 27-28, pls. I, III, IV/B, VII-VIII/A, IX/A) excavated a double wall on bedrock roughly 230m south of Area G, along the upper ridge of the eastern slope. He designated it Wall M (figs. 3, 18-19). Weill provided no stratigraphic data regarding the wall and instead commented chiefly on its masonry and design. The two coplanar walls that make up the double wall have no space between them, though the inner wall has a facing that Weill (2004: 27) felt was “intended to remain visible.” Nevertheless, Weill believed the walls were contemporary. He described the inner face as appearing to blend with “a compact fill of undressed material” and, by contrast, the outer face as “very neat” (2004: 27). He observed that the wall showed signs of “hasty repairs” and an “unequal quality of the material in several places” and featured “independent vertical panels” without “dressed binding” indicating that it “was built at the same time.
along its whole length, by sections defined on the ground” (2004: 27-28). Largely owing to this construction technique, Weill attributed the wall to Nehemiah (cf. Neh 3) or, alternatively, the late Judean monarchy.

Figure 20: Plan of Area D1, Strata 15–6, Shiloh Excavations, 1978-1985, from Shiloh 1984: 47, fig. 9 (cf. figs. 3, 18-19 supra; figs. 21-22 infra).
W.157 = Weill’s Transversal Wall B,
W.151/152/153/161 and L.314 in the NW corner (Quadrants C4-G4) = Weill’s Wall M
W.52 = Columbarium
W.163 and W.168 = Terrace Walls
W.169 = Stratum VIII Terrace or Retaining Wall (?)
Yigal Shiloh, Area D1, 1978-1985 (figs. 2, 20-22)

In Area D1, Shiloh (1984: 7-8, 48, pls. 8:1, 9:2, 11:2, 12:1; 1990: 4-5, 8; Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir 2000: 64, 70, 83-84, plans 18-19 in pocket) reexamined Wall M. His excavations revealed that the wall was constructed on a Persian period quarry of the sixth through fifth centuries and also that the skin wall (W.152) exhibits a unique architectural function relative to the inner wall (W.151/161). At its northwestern end, Shiloh discovered that the skin wall joins an E-W wall (W.153) to either create or seal a gap (c. 1.5m wide) in the inner wall (fig. 20). The removal of the stone fill (L.314) in

![Figure 21: W.151/161/152 and Locus 314, Square G-4, Area D1, Dated 1978, from Shiloh 1984: pl. 12: 1 (cf. fig. 22 infra).](image)

31 The description of this area by Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir (2000: 64) is difficult to reconcile with the photos and plans. They seem to argue W.152/153 created an opening between W.151/161: “There a corner of the outer W.152 joins W.153 running to the west, creating an opening between the corner and a northerly continuation of the city wall, W.161.” The photos, however, appear to show that W.152/153 closes the opening (figs. 21-22). The plans also seem to reflect this (Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir 2000: plans 18-19 in pocket). W.153/L.314, then, fills up the space behind W.152 and between W.151/161 so that it rests against the scarp (Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir 2000: plan 21 in pocket). Although Shiloh’s discussions are not as specific and not as definitive concerning the stratigraphical relationships, Shiloh too seems to presuppose the interpretation presented by Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir, as he dates the walls to Stratum VII, instead of Stratum VI as L.314 might suggest. Alternatively, the excavators may envision that W.152 acted as a sill for the postern or perhaps even an early fausse-braye, see esp. Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir 2000: plan 21 in pocket, which gives the impression the steps led to the surface of W.152. Also, Weill may have discovered another postern to the south (Wightman 1993: 103-104), which would allow a person to step onto the fausse-braye at one end and exit at the other. Still, a comparison of photos of the area seems to indicate that W.152 was completely removed in front of the postern to expose the steps found on bedrock (see figs. 21-22).
the gap exposed a stepped passageway or postern (figs. 21-22). On the basis of the ceramic evidence in Locus 314, Shiloh concluded the postern was blocked in the early Roman period (Stratum VI), possibly to secure the southern end of the city in advance of the Roman siege of Jerusalem in 70 CE. The stone fill (L.314) fixes the \textit{terminus ante quem} of the postern and all of the walls to the first century B/CE. The position of W.151/161 and the postern, resting above the quarry, fixes the \textit{terminus post quem} in the mid to late fifth century BCE.

Wightman (1993: 103-104) has attempted to reach a more precise dating of the wall by noting the relationship of W.152 to W.157, first excavated by Weill as Transversal Wall B (figs. 3, 18-20). Shiloh’s excavations have shown that W.157 is part of a terrace system constructed on the eastern slope. The terrace system had earlier and later phases. Some terrace walls date to late phases of Stratum IX and Stratum VIII. For example, the foundation trench of W.157 cuts one of the earlier terrace walls (W.169). Notably, W.169 was superseded by the construction of W.163 to the west. Most of the terrace walls, such as W.163, are part of a substantial development of the terrace system in Stratum VII (2nd to 1st century BCE). In any case, Wightman’s argument assumes that the Transversal Wall B (W.157) is a later abutment to W.152, an argument that can not be proven on the present evidence. Although Weill’s description, plans, and photos of the
wall clearly indicate that it reached W.152, unfortunately, as Shiloh’s plan seems to indicate, Weill cleared the remains of W.157 that stood on the scarp and immediately in front of W.152, and so removed any chance to re-examine the relationship. It is equally possible, perhaps more likely even, that W.152 cut W.157.32

Synthesis

Weill, Macalister and Duncan, Kenyon, Shiloh, and Mazar have clearly uncovered evidence that at least proves new fortifications were built along the crest of the southeastern hill between the mid-fifth century BCE and the first century B/CE; and, that these fortifications were repeatedly rebuilt and repaired in that period. Despite the complexity of the data, the circumstantial evidence, in addition to the \textit{prima facie} considerations already noted (see supra), points to the \textit{terminus post quem}, the fifth century BCE, as the initial construction date of the eastern ridge wall:

1. Although the Persian period (Stratum IX) is fully represented in the Areas D1, D2, and G, outside this line of fortifications, the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods (Stratum VIII) are only scarcely represented in D1 and D2 and not at all in Area G (Shiloh 1984: 4, Table 2). Fortifications above these areas provide a plausible, even probable explanation for the scarce finds and weak activity in Stratum VIII. Even in the areas in which Stratum VIII is fully or partially represented (Areas E1, E2, and E3), the predominant architectural features, namely terrace walls and columbaria, reflect typical extramural, agrarian pursuits (Shiloh 1984: 8-11, 14-15).33

---

32 The drop shadow in fig. 3, which seems intended to indicate stratigraphical relationships, gives the impression that Wall B continues underneath Wall M. This is also FitzGerald’s (1922: 14-15) interpretation of Weill’s (1920: 110) enigmatic description. If this is the case, the removal of W.152 at this point might reveal W.157 underneath it and also may still show the relationship of W.157 to W.151. Unfortunately, Weill’s photos (figs. 18-19) do not illuminate the relationship between W.157 and W.152.

33 On the columbaria found in Shiloh’s excavations, see n. 13 supra. On the agricultural functions of columbaria, see Tepper 1986; 2007: 45-47; Hirschfeld and Tepper 2006.
2. The construction of fortifications in the fifth century BCE aligns favorably with Franken’s (2005: 89-103; see also supra) analysis of the pottery from Kenyon’s Square A/XVIII; De Groot’s (2001; see also supra) reconstruction of Phases IXc and IXb in Area E1; and, the quarry and quarrying refuse attested in Areas D1 and D2 (Shiloh 1984: 7-9, 29; Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir 2000: 59-62). In each of these cases, the formation processes and stratigraphic sequence points to Persian period (pre-fourth century BCE) construction and likely fortifications on the crest of the eastern hill.

3. Reich and Shukron (2003b) and Bar-Oz et al. (2007) have shown that the sloping debris evident in the northern face of the Intermediate Tower—and interpreted by Shiloh and those following him as a glacis—is actually a garbage dump, covering an area on the eastern slope approximately 400 meters long (N-S axis), fifty to seventy meters wide (W-E axis), and up to eight to ten meters in depth. The total deposit, therefore, is roughly 200,000 cubic meters (400 X 50 X 10), which, as it dates to the first centuries B/CE, represents an average deposit of 2000 cubic meters of rubbish per annum (Reich and Shukron 2003b: 14)! Reich and Shukron (2003b: 17) conclude that such a massive scale points to a coordinated waste management program. In any case, the dump is not an architectural-defensive complement to the fortifications on the crest and so not necessarily contemporary with them.

4. Several elements of these fortifications have been consistently described by all excavators as hurried or rushed repairs. The small, northern tower employed irregular stones, left wide interstices that were “carelessly” filled, and was constructed on fill; the Intermediate Tower undulates over Iron II houses; the “Davidic” repairs to the original wall, like the small tower, employed irregular stones and left wide, “carelessly” filled interstices; and W.151/152 was built in sections of unequal quality. Such poor workmanship,
if it is indicative of the Persian period, would account for the lack of Persian period architectural remains elsewhere. Moreover, such workmanship is inconsistent with the normal practice of the Seleucid and Hasmonean builders, who tended to construct more robust structures by situating them on bedrock or stable Iron II foundations. There is also a stark contrast between the masonry of the towers, the “Davidic” repairs to the original wall, and W.151, and the clearly later extensions at other points on the eastern and western hills (Geva 1993). The later masonry exhibits greater similarities to the masonry Macalister and Duncan ascribed to Solomon and Hezekiah.

The mid-fifth century date, therefore, is probable for the initial construction of the eastern ridge wall, particularly, the small tower and upper courses of the original wall. Admittedly, the relationship of these latter two features to the Intermediate Tower and other parts of the wall remains uncertain and much more hypothetical, because of the absence of compelling stratigraphical data from the excavations conducted to date.

As already observed, the position of the Intermediate Tower, undulating over the ruins of Iron II houses and Stratum IX fill fixes its terminus post quem in the sixth or fifth centuries BCE while the water installations cutting it set its terminus ante quem in the Herodian period. As Kenyon’s (1962: 76-80, figs. 2-4) “contemporary” surface lies above, not beneath, the foundations of the tower, it does not provide reliable grounds on which to date its original construction to the Hasmonean period (fig. 10). On the contrary, the readily discernable evidence of two construction phases, and perhaps two more stages of repair as suggested by Macalister and Duncan, implies a longer, rather than shorter, history within the general chronological timeframe. The limited excavations of the inner face by Macalister and Duncan (1926: 58-59) and Kenyon’s (1962: 79-80, fig. 4) extramural excavations have indeed shown that it collapsed at least once in antiquity.

Clearly, Macalister and Duncan’s attribution of the construction and repair of the tower to David and Solomon must be rejected in light of its stratigraphic position. Yet,
the distinctions in masonry highlighted by them are patent and significant. On the one hand, as the “Davidic” construction and repairs generally reflect irregular and inferior construction techniques, akin to the small, northern tower, these activities may reasonably reflect the Persian period. The superior masonry of the “Solomonic” repairs, on the other hand, likely reflects the Seleucid period in Jerusalem from 168 to 141 BCE. Interestingly, the small tower and the Intermediate Tower may have concealed or closed posterns or gates in the original wall. This evidence comports with aforementioned indications that the eastern slope was adapted to agricultural purposes in the late Persian and early Hellenistic period and that the Gihon Spring was abandoned from the sixth through the second century BCE.

In the Persian period, the inner wall must have functioned as the primary wall on the eastern ridge but, in the Hasmonean period (post-141 BCE), the Outer Wall was likely constructed to allow a modest expansion of the southeastern hill (though the inner wall evidently continued to serve as the enceinte of the town). Significantly, Macalister and Duncan (1926: 75) highlight the instructive sequence of the pottery filling the space between the walls: “On the very surface, 3 to 5 feet down, there were Arab sherds and other remains. At 6-8 feet depth were Seleucid remains. From 8 feet to 20 feet down, there was a complete mixture of earlier pottery, and at 20 feet again Seleucid sherds with Rhodian jar-handles reappeared.” They also reported a “great number of Rhodian jar handles close on the [inner] face of the outer wall” (Macalister and Duncan 1926: 77). In the late Hasmonean or Roman period, houses, cut by later sewers and Arab foundations, were constructed on the fill (Macalister and Duncan 1926: 76-77).

In Area D1, W.151 may represent a Persian period continuation of the inner wall or the Outer Wall while W.152 is possibly a continuation of the Outer Wall or a later, early Roman wall.\(^{34}\) L.314, containing Roman period pottery and resting above W.151

\(^{34}\) See, similarly, Wightman 1993: 103-105. Also see n. 31 supra on the functions of W.152.
and W.152, precludes the identification of W.152 with the Greek Wall, as does the absence of Byzantine pottery and coins (Shiloh 1984: 4, Table 2; Ariel 1990: 112-113). As the Byzantine fortifications were the latest walls on the southeastern hill, their infrequent attestation probably owes to the robbing of the stones. By contrast, a postern between W.151/W.161 suits the later Persian and Hellenistic context, given the ongoing development and use of the quarry and the terrace system in Strata VIII-VI. The postern may have actually served as an important entrance from the fields and the Kidron Valley. Shiloh’s excavations recovered stamp impressions near this area (see supra) and even a Persian period Lycian coin in Stratum VII (Ariel 1990: 99, 111, 113). Moreover, as already noted, while Reich and Shukron did not discover Persian period remains further to the north in the Kidron Valley (Area J) or at the Gihon Spring, they did find Persian period sherds and stamp impressions in the Kidron Valley in Area A, southwest of D1.

Reuse of the Iron II Walls

Unfortunately, there is no additional evidence in the City of David for specifically Persian period fortifications. The remaining, exposed fortifications are Middle Bronze, Iron II, Hellenistic, Herodian, Roman, Byzantine, and much later in date. Some limited evidence, however, suggests that Iron II fortifications were likely repaired in the Persian period. Chiefly, the material remains from the excavations of Crowfoot and FitzGerald on the western slope and crest of the City of David show that Iron IIB walls remained standing and exposed, and so were probably incorporated into the Persian and early Hellenistic period fortifications.

John W. Crowfoot and Gerald M. FitzGerald, 1927-1928 (figs. 2, 23-26)

In their 1927 season, Crowfoot and FitzGerald (1929: 12-26, plts. I-IV/A; XXII) excavated a narrow trench on the western slope of the southeastern hill, uncovering two massive walls, which they called “gate towers” (fig. 23-24) The outer N-S façade of the north wall was followed for five and a half meters before reaching a sewer while its width
was traced its full length to just under eight and a half meters. The full length of the outer N-S façade of the south wall was measured at nineteen meters while its width could only be traced approximately four meters as its eastern half was disturbed by later Byzantine
walls. Thirteen courses of the north wall were preserved and ten of the south to a height of approximately six meters. Although the stone varies in size, some are just over a meter in length. Both walls have a rubble core. The passageway between them is roughly three and a half meters wide.

Based on the massive size of the towers, Crowfoot and FitzGerald suggested that the gate towers were originally constructed in the Bronze or early Iron Age. In the masonry of the walls, however, they discerned evidence for different coursing, structural repairs, and two types of limestone: *mizzi* was used in the lower courses and corners and *meleke* was used in some of the upper courses (fig. 25). They observed that the *meleke* showed signs of tooling with a “broad adze” and also highlighted similarities to

---

35 On the lithics and geology in the vicinity of the City of David, see Gill 1996.
Macalister and Duncan’s “Solomonic” Tower (presumably the upper courses) and Weill’s Wall M (Shiloh’s W.152). Noting that Weill attributed Wall M to Nehemiah, they suggested the latest courses or repairs might date to that time or to the Hasmoneans. As the pottery between and around the walls contained a mix of Iron Age through early Roman types (Crowfoot and FitzGerald 1929: 66-71, pls. XI, XII), they argued that the walls remained standing until the Jewish Revolt of 70 CE.\footnote{The excavators claim that stratification was impossible due to the intrusive foundations of the late Roman and Byzantine constructions that overturned the debris. Though Crowfoot and FitzGerald (1929: 5) claim otherwise, an earthquake that shook Jerusalem during the excavation (July 11, 1927) may have also caused some disturbance in the exposed remains. Still, they note that the “Early Iron Age objects greatly preponderated within 2 or 3 metres of the rock” (Crowfoot and FitzGerald 1929: 65, cf. 10, 20-21).}

After the revolt, Crowfoot and FitzGerald (1929: 34-35, pl. XXII) believe the walls were abandoned and only much later reused as part of a substructure for a late Roman or early Byzantine building. They note that the passageway was closed by a “cross-wall,” roughly two meters in width, abutting the inner faces of the towers. In this

\textbf{Figure 25: Masonry of North Tower, Crowfoot and FitzGerald Excavations, 1927}, from Crowfoot and FitzGerald 1929: pl. II. Note the three protruding stones arranged as headers (cf. fig. 29). The difference in limestone between the lighter, softer \textit{meleke} and the darker, rougher \textit{mizzi} stones is also evident.
wall, on the second or third course, Crowfoot and FitzGerald (1929: 34, no. 17 on pl. XII) found a late Roman potsherd and so dated the cross-wall to that period. Additional walls to the west and at the southwestern corner of the south tower were identified as elements of the substructure. These walls formed “Rooms” 40 and 43 and Area 17, immediately adjacent to and incorporating the towers. No remains of a superstructure, however, were found. Crowfoot and FitzGerald reasoned that the late Roman or early Byzantine restructuring in this area resulted in the robbing and total removal of that superstructure.

Ussishkin (2006) has challenged the date and the very nature of the gate towers, arguing that the towers were constructed in the first centuries B/CE and already then as a substructure. Ussishkin’s argument is largely predicated on the assumption that the western ridge of the City of David was not fortified at any point after the Middle Bronze Age. Ussishkin argues that once the Iron IIB walls enclosed the western hill, it became unnecessary to build walls on the western ridge of the City of David. Moreover, asserting that the design and location of the gate has no typological parallel, claiming that the number of gates mentioned in the book of Nehemiah is inconsistent with a wall enclosing only the southeastern hill, and seizing upon Nehemiah 7:4, which reports that “the city was large and spacious” and “there were few people in it,” Ussishkin argues that, in the Persian period, the full course of the walls circumvallating the western and eastern hills was rebuilt, even though the settlement was limited to the southeastern hill. As there is no archaeological evidence the walls on the southwestern hill were rebuilt in the Persian period, Ussishkin does not attempt to marshal any evidence in this direction. He relies largely on the aforementioned assumptions and texts; ignores typological parallels in Jerusalem; does not address the location of the Akra on the southeastern hill; and, does not take into account fortifications that Crowfoot and FitzGerald found to the south on the western ridge, or the walls that Kenyon found to the south and the north.

In the 1928 season, Crowfoot (1929a; 1929b; 1929c) excavated on the crest of the southeastern hill, on the western side of Fields 9, 11, and 13 (fig. 26). In all three fields,
Crowfoot was able to trace the remains of a wall for a total distance of twenty-eight meters. This wall was constructed of *meleke* and dubbed the “Long Wall.” Crowfoot found the wall resting on limestone chip layers. In the chip layers, Crowfoot recovered twenty-four Seleucid copper coins, primarily from the reign of Antiochus III and no later than Antiochus IV. At other points, the wall was clearly constructed on layers containing...
Iron II and Persian period pottery. Debris found near the wall included Rhodian and other Hellenistic period stamp impressions. Additionally, Crowfoot discovered that the wall was cut by a late Roman and Byzantine cistern, Byzantine walls, and, most significantly, by a late Hellenistic or Herodian cistern abutting the south gate tower. The clear and strong stratigraphical data fixes the date of the long wall to the first half of the second century. Based on the data, Crowfoot identified the long wall with the Akra, built by Antiochus IV in 168 BCE (1 Macc 1:33-36; Josephus, Ant. 12.5.4).

Hasmonean walls excavated by Kenyon to the south in Site K and to the north in Site M also inveigh against Ussishkin’s theory. South of the gate, northwest of the Siloam Pool, west of the long wall, and likely also west of any Iron II and Persian period fortifications on the crest of the hill, Kenyon (1966: 84-85, pls. XXVI/B, XXVII/B, XXVIII/A; 1967a: 116, 133-134, pls. 58-59; 1974: 193-194, pls. 82-83) excavated a wall segment that she identified as a retaining wall for a massive terrace that extended the ground level out thirty-seven meters from the ridge (fig. 27-28). For technical reasons, the wall could only be partially exposed, though, even so, already to a width of three and a half meters, sufficient to suggest that the wall also functioned as part of the Hasmonean

Figure 27: Top of Hasmonean Terrace and Fortification Wall, Site K, Kenyon Excavations, 1961-1967, from Kenyon 1966: pl. XXVIII/A.
enceinte. North of the gate, Kenyon (1966: 83-84, pls. XXVI/A, XXVII/A; 1967a: 135; 1967b: 69, XX/B; 1974: 195) exposed two wall segments in Site M. The later segment is built against and cuts an earlier fill with pottery dating to Iron IIA (fig. 29). It is three and a quarter meters in width and was exposed for a length of four and quarter meters. Kenyon observed that this wall cut houses dating to the second and first centuries BCE and that the walls of these houses ran up to another wall nine meters to the west, which she thought functioned as an earlier Hasmonean city wall.

The Hasmonean walls found by Crowfoot and Kenyon effectively disprove Ussishkin’s contention that the western ridge of the City of David was not fortified, and given the proximity and compatible course of the finds to the towers, heavily inveighs
against his interpretation of their original nature and function. Based on this evidence, though, Kenyon (1967a: 134-35; 1974: 194) not only assumed that the gate towers were part of the Hasmonean fortifications but that they were constructed in the Hellenistic period.\footnote{Stern (1982: 50-53; 2001: 464-68) provides a general overview of the style of fortifications in the Persian period and notes that the gate reflects these styles. In support of his interpretation, he cites Kenyon (1963: 15-16; 1964b: 45-46). Though she makes no specific claims about the towers in the earlier writings Stern cites, other than that they are post-exilic, she very clearly attributed them to the Hasmonean period in her later monographs (Kenyon 1967a: 134-135; 1974: 194).} Although Kenyon’s interpretation can not be ruled out, in which case the towers, like the long wall, probably relate to the Akra built by Antiochus IV in 168 BCE.
(1 Macc 1:33-36; Josephus, Ant. 12.5.4), the evidence of earlier pottery and coins, the massive size of the walls, as well as the variations in the coursing and signs of repairs hint that original construction of the towers predate the Seleucids. To be sure, there is nearly a complete absence of Bronze Age wares that could give credence to Crowfoot and FitzGerald’s interpretation, as the excavators themselves note. Yet, they did unearth substantial quantities of Iron Age pottery, figurines, and stamp impressions as well as Persian and early Hellenistic pottery, stamp impressions, and coins.

In general, the pottery ascribed to the early Iron Age, and at least one of the stamp impressions ascribed to the Persian period, are predominantly from Iron IIB/C. Notably, the assemblage includes several examples of the anthropomorphic and animal figurines and hole-mouth jars typical of the period (Crowfoot and FitzGerald 1929: pl. XI). Consistent with this ceramic evidence, the width of the gate towers is most immediately parallel to the Broad Wall excavated by Avigad in the Jewish Quarter (fig. 30-31) and the Iron IIB wall excavated by Kenyon and Shiloh on the eastern slope of the City of David (figs. 32-34). Recognizing that walls typically thicken at gates, and given topographical demands, the width of the Broad Wall, which varies from six and a quarter meters to just under seven and a quarter meters, and the eastern slope wall, which varies from four and

---

38 Crowfoot (1927) originally interpreted the structure as Seleucid or Hasmonean but, in the final report, provided similar reasons as those I have offered for a change of mind.

39 As noted supra, the pottery remains of the low level included one stamp impression, possibly belonging to the Persian period. Six other impressions (nos. 1, 3-7) are incorrectly interpreted by FitzGerald (Crowfoot and FitzGerald 1929: 68). Fitzgerald imprecisely ascribed a lmlk stamp impression to “the Persian period or earlier” (Crowfoot and Fitzgerald 1929: 67). Of course, as Albright (1930: 167) already noted, the lmlk stamp impressions date to Iron II. Three of the impressions, nos. 3-5, are ṭ-yḥd types, Type 17 according to Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007a; 2011: 697-699), and date to the second century BCE (see also Ariel and Shoham 2000: 137-139, 159-161). Two stamps, nos. 6-7, are marked with “a pentagram” and traces of two letters, yod and šin, and belong to the yršlm type that is late Hasmonean in date (Ariel and Shoham 2000: 137-39, 160-163). Only one of the stamp impressions, namely no. 2, inscribed yḥ, dates to the Persian period (Crowfoot and FitzGerald 1929: 67). It is Type 14, a middle type that Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2011: 445) date to the fourth and third centuries BCE.
a half to seven meters in width, are comparable. By contrast, the Hasmonean walls in Jerusalem typically range from two to four and a half meters in width. The Broad Wall may have also featured a gate comparable in width at four meters and constructed in a manner similar to the passage between the gate towers. Like the gate towers, the Broad Wall consists of a rubble core with irregular courses of mizzi fieldstones—both with stones up to a meter in length—comprising its face and reinforcing the corners and some meleke stones in the upper courses. The eastern slope wall and the gate towers are situated on bedrock, fill, and large boulders. The gate towers, the Broad Wall, and the eastern slope wall are all constructed on slopes. In measurements, materials, technique,


---

40 In his narrative, Shiloh (1984:12; see also Cahill and Tarler 1994: 36) only describes the wall as thickening to five meters, but the plans (Shiloh 1984: fig. 15, on p. 53) clearly show that the wall thickened as much as seven meters (see also Wightman 1993: 39). Kenyon’s segments of the eastern slope wall are uniformly described as five meters in width (Franken and Steiner 1990: 50; Steiner 2001: 89).

41 Wightman (1993: 100) observes that the length of the south gate tower (19m) is similar to the length of the Intermediate Tower (17m), but length is not as compelling as width.

42 Avigad (1983: 59) initially proposed that a visible gap in the Broad Wall owed to a gate. He noted that the topography suited the presence of a gate and that later Iron II and Hasmonean gates were built at the location. In the publication of the final report, however, Avigad and Geva (2000a: 45) demurred from that assessment, suggesting instead that the gap was created by intensive robbing of the stone.
Figure 31: Map of the Jewish Quarter with Excavation Areas, Avigad Excavations, 1969-1982, from Geva 2000: 22, fig. 1.3. The Broad Wall (W.555) is in Area A.
Figure 32: Plan of Areas E1 and E2, Strata 12-10, Shiloh Excavations, 1978-1985, from Shiloh 1984: 53, fig. 15. Note the width of the Iron IIB W.219.
and location, the gate towers, the Broad Wall, and the eastern slope wall exhibit remarkable affinities. Consequently, the original construction of the gate towers likely dates to Iron IIB.\textsuperscript{43}

Further confirmation of this date is indicated by the presence of Persian period and early Hellenistic pottery and coins along the outer face of the towers as well as the variations in coursing and signs of repairs, which suggest that the towers were and remained standing through these periods. In Area 17, along the outer face of the south gate tower, Crowfoot and Fitzgerald (1929: 106) recovered 133 coins, which they cautiously dated to fourth century BCE. Another 319 coins from the Hasmonean period

\textsuperscript{43} The most likely patron for the construction of the towers is Uzziah of whom the Chronicler writes, “Uzziah built towers in Jerusalem at the Corner Gate, at the Valley Gate, and at the Angle, and fortified them” (2 Chr 26:9). Additionally, Jotham may have built up the Ophel immediately south of the temple (2 Chr 27:3); Hezekiah likely repaired the eastern slope walls and constructed the Broad Wall enclosing the western hill (Isa 22:8-10; 2 Chr 32:5); and, as recently argued by Reich, Manasseh likely constructed the Kidron Valley Wall (2 Chr 33:14). On these Iron II walls, see the sources cited in the introduction to this section \textit{supra}; also, cf. Wightman 1993: 59-63 with regard to the textual evidence.
were found one and a half to two meters above bedrock in Room 40, adjacent to the towers (Lambert 1927; Crowfoot and FitzGerald 1929: 15, 19, 103-105).\textsuperscript{44} The towers likely escaped significant destruction by the Babylonians because these fortifications had been superseded by the construction of the wall enclosing the southwestern hill. The variations in coursing and signs of repairs likely relate to reconstruction in the mid-fifth century, the second century, and the first century BCE. Notably, apart from these gate towers, Kenyon’s (1968: 104) excavations in Site S/II on the eastern side of the Ophel also suggest Iron IIB walls remained standing and exposed, as she found Persian pottery along the inner face of an exposed section of the wall.

\textit{The Persian Period Fortifications}

The salvage and reincorporation of the gate towers found by Crowfoot and FitzGerald, the Ophel wall found by Kenyon, and the old City of David citadel walls enclosed a relatively small settlement area on the eastern hill. This development, as already noted, is consistent with the limited settlement activities reflected in the archaeological record and a portrait of a depopulated town. Ascribing this activity to the Hasmonean period paints a portrait of contraction in a period of expansion and also compresses the complex development of the fortifications into too short a time frame. The foregoing analysis,

\footnote{These have been used to date the gate towers. Indeed, Crowfoot and FitzGerald (1929: 15) were even inclined to do so. Curiously, Crowfoot and FitzGerald (1929: 19) note the coins “were found close to the south wall of Room 40 in a position they could not have occupied before this wall was built.” This would suggest the coins more likely relate to the construction of the south wall rather than the gate towers. Yet, Crowfoot and FitzGerald dated this wall along with the cross-wall to the late Roman period. If the sherd found in the cross-wall, however, was not embedded in the wall, but rather was simply found in the interstices, it would not provide as compelling a \textit{terminus post quem}. In this case, the towers might have been destroyed by Alexander Jannaeus and used as a substructure at the time. Such an explanation has a certain logic in view of the fact that under Simon Maccabaeus, John Hyrcanus, and Alexander Jannaeus the vestiges of the Akra were destroyed and the First Wall, circumvallating the western hill, was completed. With the completion of the First Wall, the wall on the western slope would no longer be primary. It also better explains the relative absence of late Roman and Byzantine wares at the lower levels and the awkward suggestion that the late Roman and Byzantine builders re-excavated the towers in order to build their substructure. Unfortunately, it is really impossible to know for sure as Crowfoot and FitzGerald were not definitive on the sherd’s exact position.}
however, is sensitive to the entire history and development of the fortifications and ascribes to the Hasmoneans (post-141 BCE), by way of the Outer Wall and Kenyon’s Site K wall, the expansion of the southeastern hill consistent with archaeological and literary evidence. The “Solomonic” repairs, W.152, and repairs to the gate towers are likely the earlier work of the Seleucids (168-141 BCE).

Although the Persian period fortifications reflect a significant contraction in the town’s size, their presence in the mid-fifth century BCE, in agreement with the epigraphic data sketched in the last chapter, suggests that Jerusalem achieved imperially sanctioned, administrative, and political importance.45 Casting some doubt on the

45 Moreover, the construction of “rushed” fortifications of the type reflected by the archaeological evidence aligns favorably with biblical claims that Nehemiah hurriedly rebuilt the walls in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes (Neh 3–4; 6:1, 15-16). Even the evidence that the wall was constructed in teams who worked in sections is reflected in the archaeological data. Following Böhl (1997: 382-397), Finkelstein’s (2008: 510-513) suggestion that the list in Nehemiah 3 and the claim that Nehemiah rebuilt the city walls are Hasmonean propaganda simply does not hold up under close scrutiny. Although the list is almost certainly an addition to the Nehemiah Memoir and likely underwent significant redaction, the claim that Nehemiah rebuilt the city walls is still at the core of the book and many more passages would have to be excised in order to expunge it from Nehemiah’s legacy (e.g., see Wright 2004). If this were done, on what basis would Nehemiah have earned his status as a cultural hero, on account of which Finkelstein suggests the Hasmoneans attributed to him the construction of the wall? What accomplishments are left? A desire, even Hasmonean desire, to aggrandize Nehemiah’s legacy may very well have prompted late editorial activity in Ezra-Nehemiah, but the identification of Nehemiah as a cultural hero worth such aggrandizement is more likely if the tradition already attributed the reconstruction of Jerusalem’s walls to him. Ben Sira, writing around 175 BCE, credits Nehemiah with the fortification of Jerusalem (49:13) and notably, preserves a tradition that the Temple Mount was fortified in the time of Simon, almost certainly the son of Onias, 219-196 BCE (50:1-4). Skehan and di Lella (1987: 9, 550-551) highlight the exuberant nature of the panegyric and argue that the author was a contemporary of the latter. Ben Sira, in recognizing Nehemiah’s accomplishments, must have seen or known that the town had fortifications before Simon fortified the Temple Mount. If not, why not ignore Nehemiah as Ben Sira does of Ezra? Greater praise would redound to Simon in the absence of the reference. Additionally, the Roman-era historian, Appian (Syr. 50), though not mentioning the destruction of Jerusalem’s walls, compares Pompey’s conquest of the town to that of Ptolemy I. Illuminating the latter event, Josephus (Ant. 12.4-6; Ap. Ap. 1.208-212), who quotes Agatharchides of Cnidus on the matter, claims Ptolemy I captured the town through duplicitous rather than martial action, entering the town on the Sabbath when the Jews would not resist. Such duplicity only seems necessary if the inhabitants of Jerusalem could have otherwise resisted a siege, which would have required fortifications. Indeed, would Ptolemy have even needed to conquer Jerusalem if it was unfortified? On Josephus’s account of the Persian period, see the overview by Feldman 2001. All this said, short of finding the walls inscribed with the name Nehemiah or an extra-biblical imperial edict authorizing
tendency of the Persians to authorize the construction of walls, Hoglund (1992: 211) claims that urban fortifications were rare in the Persian period and, similarly, Finkelstein (2008: 510), referring to Stern (2001: 464-468), asserts that Persian period fortifications, as a matter of imperial policy, are limited to the coastal regions. These claims are not accurate. Finkelstein’s appeal to Stern, in particular, is strange as Stern (2001: 464) observes that fortifications have been uncovered not only at numerous coastal sites, namely “Acco, Tell Abu Hawam, Gil’am, Megiddo, Tel Megadim, Tel Mevorakh, Dor, Mikhmoret, Tell Abu Zeitun, Jaffa, Tell el-Ḥesi, Ruqeish, and elsewhere,” but also at “Samaria, Jerusalem, Tell en-Naṣbeh, and Lachish, and at Heshbon in Transjordan.” Certainly, the number of fortified urban settlements in the hill country is considerably less in the Persian period than in the Iron Age but all the sites that functioned as administrative centers or capital cities have fortifications. Jerusalem would be a significant exception to this pattern. More generally too, the construction of fortifications coincides with a general movement towards administrative consolidation in the region in the late fifth and early fourth centuries BCE (see infra).

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

A substantial corpus of epigraphic evidence, including ostraca, stamp impressions and coins found in Jerusalem and the surrounding area, as well as letters and a memorandum from Elephantine, point to the provincialization of Yehud and changing centers of administration and production in the Persian period. One suggestive piece of evidence for the administrative character of Jerusalem is an Aramaic ostracon (Naveh 2000: 9):

ככרן [1] לֶחֶנֶנֶיה
בצק
Loaves (of bread): [1] thousand; for Ḥananiah dough

Nehemiah to rebuild them, I am not averse to ascribing their reconstruction to Bagavayah or an early fourth century successor to satisfy those for whom the coincidence of archaeological, epigraphic, and biblical evidence is, as a matter of principle, unacceptable.
This is a significant quantity and likely relates to some sort of public order. Additionally, at least two, perhaps up to five, other ostraca found in Shiloh’s excavations are typologically similar to the tax receipts or ration lists so common among the Idumaean ostraca (Naveh 2000: 9-13, see esp. IN 16, 18, 19, 23-24).

From the stratified layers sealed underneath the small tower of the eastern ridge wall, E. Mazar (2009: 76-79) recovered several bullae and a seal. Two of the bullae and the seal evince clearly Babylonian cultic scenes. The seal is inscribed with the legend šlmt. The archaeological context, epigraphy, and the scene suggest a date in the mid-sixth to the mid-fifth century BCE (Byrne 2008; Van der Veen 2008). These bullae and the seal, along with stamp impressions found on the crest by Macalister and Duncan, support the thesis that the Iron I/II monumental building was reused in the early Persian period and functioned as an administrative center of the town (on which, see supra).

The Yehud stamp impressions are particularly instructive for tracing administrative changes in the region. Indeed, the attestation of the toponym Yehud is naturally evidence for an administrative unit of that name and contrasts sharply with the earlier practices reflected by lmlk, zoomorphic, and geomorphic stamp impressions and the gbʿn gdr and m(w)ṣh stamp impressions. The earlier types identify the jars and produce in them as property of tribal or supra-tribal sheikhs and their estates while the Yehud stamp impressions identify the jars and contents as property of a province. Although there is arguably very little practical significance in this distinction—sheikhs,

46 Nehemiah 7:2 mentions that a Hananiah was commander of the citadel and held power in Jerusalem with Nehemiah’s brother, Hanani. Naveh (2000: 9), however, assigns the ostracon slightly later in the fourth century or even the third century BCE for paleographical reasons. Still, the ostracon was found in Stratum IX (sixth to fifth century BCE) rather than Stratum VIII (fourth to second century BCE).


48 The šlmt seal is particularly interesting, given the possible identification of its owner with the daughter of Zerubbabel, a Davidic scion and governor of Yehud (1 Chr 3:19) and/or the wife of another governor, Elthanath (Avigad 1976: 11-12, 31-32; cf. Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2011: 1 n. 1). Unfortunately, the identification is impossible to validate on the present evidence.
in either case, administered the territory—, the ideological contrast is potent, especially as proof of provincialization.

Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007a; 2011) have classified 582 known Yehud stamp impressions into early, middle, and late types, based on stratigraphic and paleographic considerations. The 128 stamp impressions identified as early types represent roughly 22% of the corpus and date to the late sixth and early fifth centuries. Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007c: 80) note that “the early types show considerable uniformity in their Aramaic lapidary script, significant diversity in content, and relatively restricted distribution.” The “diversity in content” largely owes to the use of personal names and/or the title “governor” (phw) as well as variants in the spelling of the toponym Yehud (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007a: 14-24; 2007c: 80-84). The middle group of 312 stamp impressions, roughly 54% of the corpus, is characterized by wider distribution and greater standardization. There are three middle types, down from twelve, all of which are incised without names or titles and with the defective spelling of the toponym, yhd or yh, instead of yhwd (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007a: 24-29; 2007c: 80-86). Notably, the middle group employs “non-Aramaic letter forms such as the Paleo-Hebrew he” (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007c: 85-86). The remaining 142 stamp impressions are classified late types and represent 24% of the corpus. There are two late types, dating to the second century: the t-yhd types exclusively incised in paleo-Hebrew characters and the yh-ligature (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007a: 29-30).

The stamp impressions are impressed on storage jars that contained olive oil or wine. The geographical distribution of the stamp impressions points to production centers in the Rephaim Valley, a primary collection center at Ramat Rahel, and distribution to various administrative centers, especially Jerusalem, Mizpah, Nebi Samwil, Jericho, and En Gedi (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2011: 31-59). In the sixth century, there is evidence for three roughly coeval systems: the gbn stamp impression system centered in Gibeon, the m(w)šh stamp impression system centered in Mizpah, and the lion stamp impression
centered in Ramat Raḥel and Jerusalem. The Yehud stamp impression system superseded these three systems, succeeding the lion stamp impression, taking over and integrating the m(ḥ)sḥ network, and excluding Gibeon, perhaps transferring administration of that horticultural and viticultural region to Nebi Samwil.49 Notably, the Yehud stamp impression system does not share the same links to the Shephelah as reflected by petrographical analysis of the storage jars used in the lion stamp impression system but does reflect the reactivation of administration in the Jordan Valley and the western littoral of the Dead Sea at Jericho and En Gedi (Gross and Goren 2010).

The stamp impression system, in general, is related to the production of olive oil and wine at Judean estates and its distribution to local administrative centers. Lipschits (2012) also argues that the stamp impression system is developed in response to imperial administration, extending as it does from the advent of Assyrian hegemony (c. 732 BCE) through the Babylonian, Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid periods to the Hasmonean revolt. Indeed, Lipschits (2012: 7) asserts that the large complex at Ramat Raḥel is a Judahite administrative center established with Assyrian oversight. This thesis is sound but should be qualified by two key facts: (1) The geographical distribution of the stamp impressions is largely limited to local and regional sites rather than sites associated with military encampments and movements and, with the exception of one Yehud stamp

49 Interestingly, 1 Chronicles 8–9 identifies Gibeon and Gibeah as central to the Saulide patrimony and, as such, the prominence of these towns in the Neo-Babylonian period may coincide with a resurgence in that family’s fortunes or at least the usefulness of those narratives for inter-regional polemics (Edelman 2001, 2003; Amit 2003; 2006; Blenkinsopp 2006). In turn, the cessation of settlement at Gibeon and Gibeah in the Persian period may coincide with the revived fortunes of the tribe of Judah, or more specifically the Davidides, especially reflected in the appointment of Zerubbabel (see subsequent chapters). The tensions between the families are an obvious and recurrent feature in biblical narratives. Yet, even though the Chronicler promotes the supremacy and claims of the Davidides in its vision of Israel, quickly rejecting any Saulide pretensions to kingship in the narrative of 1 Chronicles 10, Benjamin maintains its prominence, as evident in its important position in the organization of the Chronicler’s genealogies and as Judah’s close ally throughout the narrative (Knoppers 2006b: 25-27). The Chronicler, therefore, promotes a vision or reflects a reality in which tensions between Saulides and Davidides did not undermine the special relationship between Benjamin and Judah.
impression from Babylon, is unattested at imperial centers, forts, or depots outside Judah, and (2) the system has no parallels outside Judah. The stamp impression system is, therefore, a local solution for the collection and distribution of goods to local administrators and military garrisons (imperial or Judean) and not a system to provision imperial armies or collect and ship in-kind taxes or tribute outside the province.

Yehud coins from the Persian period similarly reflect the growth and development of the provincial administration and perhaps signal the centrality of Jerusalem sooner than the stamp impression system. The coins are a distinct sub-group of the Palestinian coin types, based on the Philisto-Arabian issues and employing Greek, Persian, and Phoenician motifs. They bear legends with the provincial name, Yehud, or personal names inscribed nearly exclusively in paleo-Hebrew script with two extant exceptions that have the provincial name written in Aramaic script. The coins are conventionally dated to the fourth century BCE and have been discovered primarily in Jerusalem or its environs, though Tell Jemmeh in Philistia and Mount Gerizim in Samaria are notable

---

50 On the Yehud stamp impression found in Babylon, see Naveh 1996: 45-46.
51 The number of lion and Yehud stamp impressions at Ramat Rahel significantly exceeds those found at Jerusalem through the middle types, which date to the fourth and third centuries. It is only with the late types that an absolute majority of Yehud stamp impressions are found in Jerusalem. The *yršlm* stamp impressions, which decisively signal the centrality of Jerusalem, only appear in the Hasmonean period. The dominance of Ramat Rahel in the Babylonian and Persian era system obviously reflects its key role in the collection and distribution of the stamped jars. Its role beyond that is difficult to surmise. As Lipschits et al (2011) have shown, considerable investments were made at the site. It is, therefore, certainly possible that it functioned as the center of civil administration, the home to the governor. Nevertheless, the archaeological excavations also indicate that the site was solely administrative in nature and did not accommodate a large domestic population or a cultic center, which are often corollaries of central sites. The Persian period prophetic literature, as examined in subsequent chapters, may reflect a tension in this regard, i.e., it may reflect and express dissatisfaction with a civil administration centered in Ramat Rahel, rather than Jerusalem. This may also account for the apparent prominence of the high priest in civil matters, perhaps as the leading functionary, *a de facto* mayor of sorts, in Jerusalem. Of course, the Nehemiah Memoir clearly situates its protagonist in Jerusalem, though perhaps as an innovation on his part (see, e.g., Neh 2:8) and so, in turn, an unstated cause of his tension with the priests.

exceptions. Whereas the stamp impression system is unique to Judah, the Yehud coin issues are parallel to Samarian coin issues that were discovered in the cities and environs of Samaria, Shechem, and the caves of Wadi ed-Daliyeh. The Samarian coins share the same weights and similar motifs to the Yehud coins. Given this parallel, it is possible to posit a similar status for Samaria and Yehud in the Persian period, at least insofar as these coins attest to the right to mint coinage and, in that respect, a provincial status within the Fifth Satrapy of the Persian Empire, the Transeuphrates.

Although it is not certain, the Yehud coins were most likely minted in Jerusalem (Ariel 1982: 277; Meshorer 1982: 30-31; Meshorer and Qedar 1991: 9-10; cf. Spaer 1977: 203). Evidence that Jerusalem served as the mint comes from the motif of the lily, which appears on some of the Yehud coins, either as a primary or secondary feature. The lily is likely an emblematic representation of the temple. According to biblical tradition, the shape of the lily adorned the first temple (2 Chr 4:5 // 1 Kgs 7:26; 1 Kgs 7:19, 22) as well as cultic vessels (Exod 25:33) and so may have been incorporated into the second temple too. The most compelling evidence for a Jerusalem-based mint, however, is found among the Yehud coins discovered at Tell Jemmeh. One of these coins bears the legend “Yohanan the Priest” with motifs identical to other coins found at Tell Jemmeh and to coins found at an excavation in Beth-Zur inscribed with the legends “Yeheziqyah the Governor” (Barag 1985).

53 According to Meshorer (1982: 13), there are more than 300 such coins extant. The vast majority, however, are unprovenanced. Those found in controlled excavations include, three in Jerusalem, one in Ramat Rahel, one in Beth-Zur, one north of Jericho, five in Tell Jemmeh, and an undetermined number at Mount Gerizim (Ariel 1982; Machinist 1994; Stern 2001: 565). Many of the unprovenanced coins are believed to originate from the vicinity of Bethlehem and the southern environs of Jerusalem (Spaer 1977: 203).

54 For a survey of the Samaria coins, see Meshorer and Qedar 1991.

55 The lily-motif in Israel is attested in archaeological discoveries of capitals, pillars, and cultic vessels decorated with the lily (Meshorer 1982: 29-30, esp. n. 53 and n. 54).
A letter (of which two drafts are preserved) and a memorandum of the Yedaniah archive from Elephantine confirm an active civil and cultic administration centered in Jerusalem. The letter, dating to 407 BCE, petitions the governor of Yehud, Bagavahya for support to rebuild a temple to Yahweh in Elephantine. The letter refers to previous correspondence with the governor, “Jehohanan, the high priest, and his colleagues the priests who are in Jerusalem,” and “Avastana, brother of Anani, and the nobles of Judah” and parallel correspondence with “Delaiah and Shelemiah, sons of Sanballat governor of Samaria” (TAD A4.8; cf. A4.7; Porten 1996: 139-147). A reply came as a joint recommendation from Delaiah and Bagavahya (TAD A4.9; Porten 1996: 148-149).

By the end of the fifth century, therefore, a civil and cultic administration is unequivocally attested in Yehud, with at least a cadre of priests operating in Jerusalem. The leadership and garrison in Elephantine regards this administration as comparable to that of Samaria and as possessing sufficient influence or authority in the region as to be of assistance in an appeal to the Persian administration in Egypt, or alternatively as having legal standing in the case, perhaps as an ethnarch.

**Burial Site and Significant Material Remains**

Interestingly, material remains from burial sites around Persian period Jerusalem and a few finds from the City of David plausibly reflect a small cadre of cosmopolitan administrators and priests. In Chamber 25 of Cave 24 at Ketef Hinnom, Gabriel Barkay (1986; 1994) discovered several items, including a Mesopotamian bathtub coffin along with a mixed assemblage of late Iron II, Neo-Babylonian, and Persian period pottery and small finds, which suggest affluent burials influenced by Mesopotamian and Iranian

---

56 The line reads, אגרה שלחו מראן ועל יהודה כהן רבא וכניהם כהנים ובירושלים (TAD A4.8:18). The relative clause, ועל יהודה כהן רבא וכניהם כהנים, can only modify either יהודה כהן רבא וכניהם כהנים or בירושלים. Thus, this letter does not prove that the governor was in Jerusalem. In fact, the need to identify the locale of the priests may suggest that the governor was located elsewhere or more likely, seeks to refer to the particular cadre of priests in Jerusalem vis-à-vis (Yahwistic) priests elsewhere.
customs. Notably, another Mesopotamian bathtub coffin was found in the Manaḥat area in the environs of Jerusalem (Clermont-Ganneau 1971: 232-233). Zorn (1993), discussing parallel finds at Tell en-Naṣbeh, contends bathtub coffins are only attested in Judah after the exile and into the Persian period.

Among the rich repertoire of small finds from Chamber 25, Barkay (1994: 100) highlights several jewelry items that resemble Iranian pieces, especially a pair of gold earrings “influenced by the goldsmiths’ art of the Achaemenid Persian kingdom and … probably dat[ing] to the 5th century B.C.E.” Barkay (1994: 97-98) also recovered fragments of eleven core-formed amphoriskoi from the repositories at Ketef Hinnom (three of which could be restored) and, in Chamber 25, found the Ketef Hinnom silver scrolls, inscribed with the Aaronic priestly benediction (Num 6:24-26).

Reich (1994a; 1994b) discovered additional tombs in the Mamilla neighborhood in use in the Iron II, Babylonian, and Persian periods. The layered distribution of the pottery within these tombs allowed Reich to precisely date them and also narrow the chronological horizon of Chamber 25 at Ketef Hinnom. Reich observed that a black juglet and globular juglet, common to the Iron II burials at Mamilla and most Iron II burial assemblages in Judah and Israel, are not present in the chambers excavated by Barkay at Ketef Hinnom and, generally, that the assemblages differ “radically.” As such, Reich (1994a: 115) suggested that the Ketef Hinnom tombs only “came into use toward the very end of the 7th century B.C.E. and perhaps only at the beginning of the 6th century B.C.E.” At Mamilla, Reich highlighted Neo-Babylonian and early Persian period assemblages in Tombs 5 and 19. The latter yielded a particularly “unusual assemblage” that included “a bronze mirror, kohlstick and fibula; a small hematite swan-shaped weight; a cylinder seal; several silver rings set with bits of blue glass; a tiny Egyptian vessel of some blue glass-like material and a black Attic amphoriskos dating from the mid-5th century BCE” (Reich 1994b: 92-93).
The assemblages at Ketef Hinnom Chamber 25 and Mamilla Tomb 19, though unusual, are characteristic of an “Achaemenian style,” with parallels at several sites in Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Iran (Stern 2001: 470-73). Comparable Persian influence is also discernable in two “Persian style” pottery fragments recovered from Kenyon’s excavations in Site A (Franken 2005: 128), Persian and Mesopotamian style weights (Eran 1996: 231, see W 153; W 166) and a small corpus of chalk and alabaster vessels from the Temple Mount and the City of David that are attributable to the Persian period (Cahill 1992: 190-198; Barkay and Zweig 2005: 3; 2008: 2). Regarding the chalk vessels, Cahill observes that the ledge-rim bowls and trumpet bases, in particular, are typologically similar to flat-based stone bowls and other stone tableware discovered at Persepolis and so, taking into consideration the stratigraphic contexts of similar finds throughout Israel, argues that this vessel type was introduced in the Persian period and then imitated in later periods.

A double protome stone figurine found in Locus 381 of Area D1, depicting two opposing, recumbent lions with attached forequarters, may also reflect a Persian style and date to the Persian period. Ariel (2000: 74) notes that the locus in which the object was found belongs to Stratum XII, a clearly pre-exilic period, but the closest parallels to the object are the “monumental double protome capitals [of lions and bulls] dating from the 6th-5th centuries BCE found in Persepolis.” Other parallels, including a double protome capital found in Sidon, scattered figurines throughout Syria, as well as reproductions on coins from Lydia, all date to the Persian period or the later Hellenistic period (2000: 74). As such, the figurine is likely intrusive to Stratum XII and, based on the typological parallels, dates to the Persian period (contra Ariel).

The cosmopolitan nature of the Persian period assemblages found at Ketef Hinnom and Mamilla—including objects not only in Mesopotamian or Iranian style but also from Phoenicia, Greece, and Egypt—is consistent with other finds in Jerusalem and its environs. The presence of amorphiskoi at Ketef Hinnom and Mamilla, taken together
with another example from Stratum IX in Shiloh’s Area G (Ariel 1990: 149-150, 153), attests to a certain consistency with which these vessels, however few in number, appear in Persian or possible Persian period contexts.\(^{57}\) Similarly, an archaic Greek coin, originating from the island of Cos and discovered in Chamber 25 at Ketef Hinnom (Barkay 1984-1985), is complemented by two Attic archaic coins, one discovered at Givat Ram (Meshorer 1961) and another on Mount Zion (R. Barkay 1984-1985: 4, n28), and a Lycian coin from Locus 1819 of Area D2 (Ariel 1990: 99-100, 11-13). The Cos coin dates from the latter half of the sixth century, the Attic coins to the end of the sixth century, and the Lycian coin to the first half of the fifth century. Given that such coins are exceptionally rare throughout Palestine, it is perhaps significant that four have been found in Jerusalem. Additionally, a small number of chalcedony-carnelian gemstones, probably imported from Egypt, and other jewelry items were found in Persian period strata in Shiloh’s excavations (Ariel 1990: 149-166; Swersky 1996; Zuckerman 1996).

Though not abundant, this small assemblage of luxury and foreign items reflect Persian, Mesopotamian, Greek, and Egyptian cultures and influences, probably facilitated by demographic shifts, associated with immigrant potters, imperial administration, and/or repatriation. There is little evidence to indicate strong trade relationships, given the striking absence of imported storage jars (Tushingham 1985: 33-38; De Groot and Ariel 2000: 98, 146-149; Franken 2005: 100), the paucity of molluscs (Mienes 1992), fish (Lernau and Lernau 1992) and faunal remains (Horwitz 1996), worked bone and ivory (Ariel 1990: 119-148), stone tools (Hovers 1996), flint implements (Rosen 1996), and loomweights and whorls (Shamir 1996). The relatively small number of these finds indicates that the town had a very small domestic population and limited trade with the coastal areas or beyond.

\(^{57}\) Note also the unguentarium from Area D1 (De Groot and Ariel 2000: 146-147, fig. 28:23) and the lekythos from the Armenian Garden (Tushingham 1985: 37, 183, 186, 398, fig. 46:1).
The overwhelming impression of the archaeological evidence is that Jerusalem in the Persian period and early Hellenistic periods was small. In the Babylonian period, on the evidence from the material remains found by Kenyon in Square A/XVIII, E. Mazar underneath the small tower, and Shiloh in the Ashlar House, some very limited activity may have taken place at the site. Barkay’s Chamber 25 also suggests that at least one family continued to make use of its tomb at Ketef Hinnom. Among other things though, the archaeological evidence and the geographical and numerical distribution of the *m(=)̄w̄* stamp impressions indicate Mizpah, rather than Jerusalem, was the administrative center (Zorn, Yellin, and Hayes 1994; Zorn 2003; Lipschits 2005: 149-152, 237-241).

In the early Persian period, activity may have slightly intensified in Jerusalem, given the evidence from areas possibly active already in the Babylonian period and the substantial number of lion and other early Yehud stamp impressions found in the Macalister and Duncan excavations. Still, the area of settlement in the Babylonian and early Persian periods likely did not exceed twenty to twenty-five dunams, roughly the area of the ridge above Areas G, E, and D; and, could not have been very densely populated. The small number of inhabitants cleared, repaired, and reused what they could of the remains of Iron II Jerusalem, including most notably the Iron I/II monumental building and the Ashlar House.

From the mid to late fifth century through the end of the Persian period, Jerusalem gradually assumed greater importance as an administrative center in the Judean hills, became a fortified settlement, and, according to the epigraphic evidence, included a temple. The settlement likely did not yet fully exploit the Ophel, though the modest

---

58 I am not implying here that the temple was constructed in the mid-fifth century BCE, only that by this time the extra-biblical evidence confirms it. On this issue, see the subsequent chapters. For the view that the temple was constructed in the mid-fifth century BCE, see Edelman 2005. I am not inclined towards this thesis, though what Edelman has highlighted is a tradition that Nehemiah played a significant role in the construction of the temple (e.g., Neh 2:7-8; 2 Macc 1:18; Josephus, *Ant.* 11.165). Lemaire (2007: 61)
finds of Kenyon in Site S/II and the occasional Attic sherds found in the area may point to developing activity in this period. Near the Siloam pools, the very modest evidence from Shiloh’s Area H and Reich’s Area A, on opposite slopes of the pools probably points to increasing activity. Overall, these changes suggest the enlargement of the active area to approximately forty dunams and a moderate increase in population density, likely in response to the security provided by the fortification of the town.

These increases are consistent with Jerusalem’s growing importance reflected in the regional settlement patterns and epigraphic evidence, and with broader geopolitical developments of the period. Changes in Benjamin’s urban settlement patterns and recovery in the rural sector of the north-central Judean highlands together with the

59 From the Babylonian through the end of the Persian period, the most striking and evident change in Benjamin is the decline and even cessation of settlement at Gibeon and Gibeah and renewed or increased activity at Nebi Samwil and Jerusalem. The rural sector in Benjamin experiences slight growth, most substantially in the southern zone near Jerusalem and in the western zone.

60 In the north-central Judean highlands, there is a significant recovery in the rural sector, such that the total settled area of the region ultimately returns to Iron II levels. Most of the settlement activity in the Persian period, however, occurs in a more concentrated area, near “fortresses” at Kh. Umm el-Qala, Kh. Kabbar, Kh. Abu Twain, Kh. el-Qatt, Kh. Zawiyye, and Beth-zur (Edelman 2005; 2007). This pattern is imitated outside the province of Yehud, in the Shephelah, near Kh. er-Rasm, Kh. Rasm Shu’liya, and Lachish (Edelman 2005; 2007).

Given that most of the virgin sites are located in these clusters and occupy less than five dunams, Edelman (2007) argues that the settlement patterns may be the archaeological reflex of haṭru-administered lands. This suggestion has merit and can be reinforced by the epigraphic and biblical evidence relating to the administration of the province. The most striking correspondence is the coetaneous and analogous use of šaknu (“chief”), the highest administrative official of the haṭru, in its Hebrew and Aramaic cognate form, segan (pl. -im). The segan (pl. -im) is attested in the Wadi Daliyeh and Elephantine papyri, and also exclusively in the exilic and post-exilic texts of Isaiah 40–66, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah (Lemaire 2007: 55-56). This office is not attested in Judah’s monarchic or pre-monarchic past. In addition, the Idumaean Ostraca point to parallel mechanisms of taxation and redistribution while the registers in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7 attest compatible socio-political organization by toponyms and (cultic) sodalities, Nehemiah 11 evinces martial overtones, and, though ubiquitous in tribal cultures, the narratives

89
wider distribution patterns and increased numbers of Yehud stamp impressions of the middle types, the introduction of coinage, and the evidence for social stratification and a temple in the correspondence from Elephantine, clearly point to an active civil and cultic administration in Yehud and likely the emergence of Jerusalem as its provincial capital. As Egypt gained its independence in 404, southern Palestine, including Yehud, assumed new importance as a new border and buffer zone. The entire area underwent significant transformation as the Persians sponsored the construction of administrative centers and fortresses to secure their geopolitical and economic interests against the Egyptian state and its formal and informal allies (Fantalkin and Tal 2006; Lipschits and Tal 2007; Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007c). Persian armies attacked Egypt in 385, 383, and 373, suppressed revolts in Asia Minor in the 360s and in Sidon in the 359, attacked Egypt again in 351, suppressed revolts in Cyprus and Sidon in its aftermath, and re-conquered Egypt in 343 (Briant 2002: 646-675, 681-688, 991-998, 1003-1005).

Likely to serve the growing population of Jerusalem and the region, new potters appear to have moved inland in the fourth and third centuries. These potters supplanted the indigenous potters that had earlier moved inland from the coast to service the Judean highlands after the exile. Many new shapes that start to appear in the ceramic repertoire in the late fifth and fourth centuries are “closely related to Greek pottery,” reveal the use of more plastic clays, and suggest the introduction of a new “type of kiln which was more

——

in Ezra-Nehemiah prominently mention the ethnic assembly; all expected reflexes of ḫātru-administration. Tyrian and Ashdodite enclaves attested in Mesopotamia may have likewise been resettled as parallel ḫātru in the Shephelah and southern hill country of the territory eventually incorporated into the Hellenistic province of Idumaea. Their names appear prominently in the Idumaean Ostracca and these groups are notable antagonists in Ezra-Nehemiah. Pearce (2006; 2011: 272-274) demonstrates that Judeans were attached to ḫātru-administered lands and may have formed their own Judean ḫātru in Mesopotamia.

Edelman (2007) tries to support her thesis by identifying possible Persians or Mesopotamians in the lists of Ezra-Nehemiah. This is unnecessary as ḫātrus evince diverse ethnic, economic, and cultic constituents (Stolper 1985: 70-103; Pearce 2006; 2011), though it is perhaps worth noting the evidence for Persian material culture in Jerusalem, including Persian-style jewelry, stone vessels typologically similar to Persepolis wares, and a double protome (see supra).
economic in fuel consumption” (Franken 2004: 100). The immigrant potters were “used to higher firing temperatures” and demonstrated superior skills to the indigenous potters (Franken 2004: 100-101, 198-199). Their pottery eventually replaced the local pottery, particularly after the emergence of larger workshops and production centers in the late Hellenistic period (Franken 2004: 200).

Throughout all these periods, the population of Jerusalem remained well below the carrying capacity of the site as demonstrated by earlier Iron II and later Herodian occupations. Unfortunately, little more can be said about the population at the site with any certainty as the absence of domestic architecture makes methodologically sound estimates impossible. Marked by ruins that pointed to its former prosperity, we can only reasonably posit that Jerusalem in the Persian and early Hellenistic periods attained a fortified administrative citadel and temple. The town served no more than the immediate economic, security, and religious needs of a provincial governor, and the local clergy, landowners, farmers, herders, and vine-dressers, merchants, and free or bonded laborers—the majority of whom lived on rural estates, farmsteads, and tenements rather than in the city. The most readily observable improvements in Jerusalem, other than its fortifications, are the later columbaria and the eastern slope terrace system, suggesting a stable urban population only developed in the late Persian and early Hellenistic period.
CHAPTER 3.
RECREATING JERUSALEM: THE ISAIANIC PERSPECTIVE(S)

The convergence of extra-biblical and archaeological evidence relating to Jerusalem is productive in reflecting social, economic, political, and even cultic developments of the Persian period. Between the evidence of the historical précis in the opening chapter and the evidence from archaeology in chapter two, there are solid grounds to conclude that Jerusalem indeed suffered severe depopulation and that its recovery in the Persian period proceeded slowly, with the construction of fortifications, confirmation of a temple, and a stable urban settlement only emerging in tandem with broader administrative consolidation in the late fifth and fourth centuries. This profile intensifies the need to investigate the reemergence of Jerusalem as a central place from a cultural-historical and ideological perspective, especially to contextualize the historical process by which it attained an elevated status in spite of such an unremarkable recovery. Judean literature and, even more, purportedly contemporaneous prophetic literature is a critical resource for this task and, therefore, the focus of the next four chapters.

Judean literature indicates that the destruction and the slow recovery of Jerusalem created a crisis of confidence in Yahweh, in centralization doctrine, and in the necessity and ideological justification for reconstruction. These concerns are partially reflected in laments, especially Lamentations and Psalms 44, 69, 74, 79, 89, 102, and 137. The theology of these texts is generally consistent, conveying grief suffused confessions of corporate guilt, anguish over severed relations with Yahweh, and horror at the ruination and disgrace of Jerusalem and her inhabitants. Yet, because this literature tends to frame these concerns within a worldview and liturgical practices in which Jerusalem’s preeminence and Yahweh’s sovereignty are assumed, a diversity of belief and dissent does not readily surface. In late prophetic literature and historiography, however, counter-narratives are preserved. Opposition and reluctance to rebuilding the city and to settling
in it are noted in many texts (Hag 1:1-11; Zech 8:4-8; Ezra 4; Neh 4:1-12; 11:1-2). Many texts may also reflect the challenges of restoring the temple and maintaining enthusiasm for tithes and offerings (Hag 2:3; Mal 1:6-14; 3:8-12; Ezra 3:12-13; Neh 13:10-13). This lack of enthusiasm may have come especially from those who, in addition to worshipping Yahweh, also venerated other deities (Isa 57:3-13; 65:3-4; 66:3, 17; Jer 44) and/or worshipped at other cult sites (Isa 19:18-19; Jer 41:4-5; Zech 7:2-3).

Indeed, although retrospectively Yahwism seems inextricably linked with Jerusalem, the lack of explicit references to it in the Torah raises significant doubts about the pervasiveness of its importance in Yahwistic circles. In fact, the Torah not only neglects Jerusalem, it accords great significance to other Yahwistic sites such as Shechem (Gen 12:6-7; 33:18-20), Bethel (Gen 12:8; 28; 31; 35), Hebron (Gen 13:18; 23:2, 19), Mount Sinai (Exod 3–4; 19; 24:15-18; Deut 4–5; 33:2), and Mounts Gerizim and Ebal (Deut 11:29-30; 27:4, 12-13). Even though Jerusalem is possibly identified by alternate names and allusions (e.g., Salem in Gen 14:18; cf. Ps 76:2), the refusal to make the connection explicit suggests either an uncertainty about the city’s status and future and, therefore, a reluctance to commit to its elevation or a deliberate attempt to decouple the narratives from the explicit locale of Jerusalem, presumably because of the delegitimizing effect of its destruction; or, because of ambivalence or even outright hostility towards the city and the cultic claims made for it.¹ This evidence raises a provocative and important counterfactual: What if Yahwists had altogether abandoned the Davidic covenant and with it, Jerusalem as a sacred site?

¹ Amit (2000: 130-168) has already identified this important issue and discusses each of the possible references to Jerusalem: Salem in Abram’s encounter with Melchizedek (Gen 14:17-20), the land of the Jebusites in the covenant ceremony in Genesis 15:7-21, Mount Moriah in the Akedah (Gen 22), as well as the place that Yahweh will choose throughout Deuteronomy and the “dwelling between his shoulders” (Deut 33:12). Amit (2000: 167-168) argues that the refusal to name the site reflects uncertainty about its status and also a theology that privileges the whole land of Israel and the holiness of the people over centralization in Jerusalem. N.B. Updating or clarifying glosses are very common in the Torah, as, e.g., with Bethel/Luz (Gen 28:19) and other sites (Gen 22:14; 26:33; 35:20; Deut 3:14).
The scribes of Persian period prophetic literature, especially Deutero-Isaiah (DI) and Trito-Isaiah (TI), appear to have been acutely aware of this potentiality and sought to address it.² Of all the biblical texts, Isaiah contains the most eloquent and sustained reflections on Jerusalem.³ Jerusalem, as a city and community, in relationship with Israel and Yahweh, is its persistent and arguably primary focus—a point that has, more recently, factored into studies of the raison d’etre for the development of the Isaiah tradition.⁴ Indeed, the book of Isaiah appears to have evolved, at least in part, as a lieu de

² Internal evidence points to the genesis of Isaiah in the eighth century with ongoing development and supplementation only culminating in the production of a stable prophetic text in the Persian or early Hellenistic period. Williamson (1994) and Stromberg (2011) have developed perhaps the most compelling reconstructions of the work of DI and TI respectively. Williamson (1994) asserts that the author responsible for DI inherited and redacted the “literary deposit of First Isaiah” (=Proto-Isaiah =PI), a collection of texts gathered from the eighth century through the early exilic period. Concerning Isaiah 1–12, Williamson (1994: 116-155) argues that ch. 1 is later and that DI relocated and supplemented material at 2:2-4, 5:25-30, and 8:21-22, and added 11:11-16 and ch. 12. Concerning Isaiah 13-27, Williamson (1994: 156-183) views chs. 24–27 as later texts and concludes that DI shaped Isaiah 13-14 as a preface to the Oracles of the Nations. Concerning Isaiah 28–39, Williamson (1994: 184-239) regards chs. 34–35 and 36–39 as later additions and DI as responsible for shaping ch. 33 as a bridge to chs. 40–55. Stromberg (2011) largely accepts Williamson’s work and develops a complementary theory of TI as reader and redactor of the composite work of PI and DI. Concerning Isaiah 56–66, Stromberg (2011: 11-39) regards chs. 60–62 and 63:1-6 and 63:7–64:11 as earlier (yet post-DI) materials around which TI composed a frame that consisted of 56:1-8 and 65–66, and likely also 56:9–59:21. Stromberg (2011: 147-247) argues that TI makes several additions to PI and DI at “structurally significant points,” including Isaiah 1:27-31, 4:2-6, 6:13β, 7:15, 11:10, 48:1, 19b, 22, and 54:17b, and that TI was responsible for the editing and inclusion of chs. 36–39. Although certainly open to criticism, Williamson and Stromberg, taken together, have constructed a useful and coherent compositional theory. My analysis will focus primarily on the core texts in chs. 40–55 and 55–66 and only in a few cases consider the additions and redactional activities of DI and TI in their inherited materials. The critical point for my purposes is the view that DI and TI were never independent compositions and each shaped a tradition that they inherited. Given this fact, it is also not impossible to accept the argument for the essential unity of the composition, see Haran 1963; Sommer 1998: 187-195. For those interested in other contrasting views, they are generally well represented in Williamson (1994), Stromberg (2011), and Berges (2012a).

³ The Book of Psalms is, perhaps, an exception to this statement, particularly with respect to the Songs of Ascent and Royal Psalms. The promotion of Jerusalem, however, is not a sustained concern throughout the book.

⁴ On the identity of Israel in Isaiah, see Williamson 1989; Knoppers 2011; 2012. Regardless of the merits of their compositional theories, see esp. Seitz 1991; Laato 1998; Berges 2012a on the literary and redactional significance of Jerusalem. A common tendency to downplay the importance of the temple most likely reflects the small number of explicit references to it in either DI or TI and a tendency among scholars
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mémoire (a “site of memory”) for scribal reflections on Jerusalem. DI reflects this concern, right at the outset, with a message of hope for the devastated city, “Speak to the heart of Jerusalem, and announce to her that her service is fulfilled, that her guilt is settled, that she has received from Yahweh’s hand double for all her sins” (40:2).

5 Baltzer (2001: 49-53) offers a very sensitive analysis of the legal, temporal, and religious significance of this verse. In examining the last phrase, Baltzer (2001: 53) draws a link to Babylon’s fate in Isaiah 47:9 and the condition of Zion in 54:1, 4 to suggest the doubling of the punishment refers to Jerusalem’s childlessness (loss of inhabitants) and widowhood (estrangement from Yahweh). Blenkinsopp (2002: 181) suggests a link with Isaiah 51:19, in which DI identifies two punishments that Jerusalem has faced: devastation (famine) and destruction (military defeat).
In DI and TI, the reconstruction of Jerusalem and its temple is a vital fulfillment of that command to console the city—addressing the ideological and practical challenges to that process, is consistently at the forefront of these prophetic texts. This chapter traces the literary arguments, first, in DI and, second, in TI. My exegetical analysis proceeds sequentially through key texts with particular attention, in the first part, to how DI uses the motif of movement, especially *parousia* and processions, and how DI reconfigures the Davidic covenant in order to renew and affirm the political and cultic importance of Jerusalem. My analysis also highlights the creation motif in DI as it relates to Jerusalem. In the second part of the chapter, the analysis concentrates on how TI brings this latter motif forward and develops it to present Jerusalem as progenetrix of a restoration community. For DI and TI, reconstruction is an imminent and immanent act of renewal, or re-creation, and an event that singularly and definitively signals the vindication of Yahweh and hope for Israel. Adapting imperial rhetoric and appealing to traditions of the Torah, DI and TI argue for reconstruction.

**RECONSTRUCTION IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH**

Isaiah 40:1-8 provides a theologically and structurally rich introduction to DI that emphatically identifies Jerusalem and the temple, and movement towards them, as the central concerns of the proceeding literary composition. The divine commission to console Jerusalem in Isaiah 40:1-2 is immediately followed by an imperative to clear a way in the wilderness so that the glory (כבוד) of Yahweh can be revealed for all humanity to see (40:3-5). As glory (כבוד) is a metonym for the divine presence, the imperative

---

6 The infrequent use of the terms היכל (Isa 44:28; 66:6) and בית (Isa 56:5, 7; 60:7; 64:11; 66:1, 20), especially in DI, is not indicative; rather, a diverse vocabulary is employed to refer to the temple and sometimes it is mentioned only by way of pronouns or symbolic and metaphorical language (see infra).

7 The prophetic reply or divine-prophetic dialogue in 40:6-8 has stimulated vigorous debate, see, e.g., Blenkinsopp 2002: 183-184; Clifford 2002: 71-83; Landy 2009: 146-152. I am not sure that the prophet’s reply reflects a reluctance to accept the divine commission as typically interpreted. The reply in vv. 6-7 is a neutral and philosophical oeuvre to setup v. 8. Certainly, v. 8 is affirmative, whether understood
envisions a divine \textit{parousia} and cultic procession. Already in this introduction, the restoration of the temple in Jerusalem, as the earthly dwelling place of God’s glory and the destination of a divine or cultic procession, is necessarily in view. The nature and the implications of the \textit{parousia} envisioned in this passage are developed and worked out in the two major sections of DI, Isaiah 40–48 and Isaiah 49–55. Notably, a thematic inclusio, in Isaiah 40:8b and 55:10-11, affirms the constancy of Yahweh’s words and binds together DI’s contiguous contributions to the book.

\textit{The International Context: Isaiah 40–48}

There are four major actors in DI’s presentation of the divine \textit{parousia}: Yahweh, Cyrus, the servant, and Zion. Yahweh initiates and guarantees a new political order, returns to the city, revitalizes the land, and commissions the other actors. Cyrus, presented as Yahweh’s anointed (yet unwitting) agent and as the earthly architect of the new political order, moves against the enemies of Israel, will rebuild Jerusalem and the temple’s foundations, and releases the exiles. The servant called to righteousness and exclusive worship, is responsible for leading Israel back to Yahweh and Jerusalem, and acting as a witness to the unfolding events. Zion/Jerusalem, presented alternately as a city and a community, and closely associated with the servant, is the herald and beneficiary of the \textit{parousia}.\footnote{The restoration of Zion/Jerusalem is the critical consequence and purpose.}

Isaiah 41:1–42:9 implicitly introduces Cyrus. The form of this discourse is an address to the nations, cast as a cosmic trial, with two parallel parts, opened by calls to

\footnote{As in DI, I will use Zion and Jerusalem more or less interchangeably, though Zion clearly has a stronger association with cultic and royal themes whereas Jerusalem tends to encompass the city as a whole with less of a cultic and royal emphasis. On the relationship between the servant and Zion, see Wilshire 1975; Sawyer 1989; Willey 1995; Korpel 1996.}
order in 41:1 and 41:21 (Clifford 2002: 84-93). The essential proposition defended in the trial is Yahweh’s supremacy; this proposition buttresses the judgments in Israel’s favour in 41:8-20 and 42:1-9. A key argument in the trial is Yahweh’s power to predict and bring about “the things to come” (41:4, 22-23, 26-29), especially realized in the summons of the victor from the east and north, who will trample kings and rulers (41:2-3, 25). The certain referent, as the text eventually clarifies, is Cyrus. Significantly, the argument, as constructed, presupposes that Cyrus’s actions are complete. Cyrus’s actions are the “former things” (הראשנות) by which the people may have confidence in the “new things” (חדשות) that Yahweh declares (42:9).

9 The parallels are the call to order in 41:1 // 41:21, the interrogation in 41:2-7 // 41:22-29, and the verdict in 41:8-20 // 42:1-9 (cf. Clifford 2002: 89, whose outline differs slightly).

10 The delay in naming Cyrus likely stems from an effort to emphasize Yahweh’s supremacy and de-emphasize the role of the agent.

11 Indeed, in Isaiah 44:24-45:13, Cyrus’s actions are entered as evidence proving that Yahweh “confirms the word of his servant and fulfills the prediction of his messengers” (44:26a). Moreover, the prophet’s “new song,” which begins in 42:10, likely has the Egyptian campaign of Cambyses as its historical backdrop. The villages of Kedar and Sela and the coastlands, mentioned in 42:11-12, are areas through which Cambyses passed on the Egyptian campaign. This “new song” culminates with the identification of Egypt, Kush, and Seba as ransom for Israel (43:3) and, in the next discourse, refers to their merchants, traders, and men as soon to be subjugated to Zion (45:14). As such, the statements concerning Cyrus are statements after the fact and the terminus post quem for the text is at least the reign of Cyrus’s successor, Cambyses, who brought these territories under Persian dominion (similarly, see Fried 2002). For primary sources concerning the Egyptian campaign, see Kuhrt 2007: 107-127. For analysis, see Dandamaev 1989: 70-82; Briant 2002: 50-55; Cruz-Uribe 2003. Kush presents something of a problem. The Saites repeatedly campaigned against Kush, extending their control to the second cataract, over which the Persians also assumed control, as suggested by archaeological evidence from the fortress of Doriginarti (Heidorn 1991; Briant 2002: 55). There is some late evidence that Cambyses attempted and perhaps succeeded in conquering Meroë (Diodorus 1.33.1; Josephus, Ant., 2.10.2; Strabo 17.1.5), but Dandamaev (1989: 80-81), among many others, disputes these claims as Kush is not listed in the Behistun Inscription (cf. Herodotus, Hist., 3.17, 20-21, 25-26). Kush only appears as a tributary of the Persian Empire in the later inscriptions of Darius I (see, e.g., DNa 25), which may suggest an even later terminus post quem for the text, in the reign of Darius I. Still, Persian control up to the second cataract and the close association of Egypt and Kush in biblical thought is probably enough to account for its appearance in this triad if the text were written in the reign of Cambyses.

12 So Clifford 2002: 93, who writes that v. 9 “announces that the first things, the stirring up of Cyrus to defeat kings, have already occurred. The new thing, Israel’s role in cooperating with Yahweh’s work, is now announced ahead of time, so that Israel may cooperate with full consciousness.”
This passage and the three that follow it, in Isaiah 42:10–43:8, 43:9–44:5, and 44:6-23, introduce the servant and develop Yahweh’s intimate relationship with the people who will participate in this act of re-creation. In Isaiah 41:1–42:9, Yahweh offers help to “my servant Israel, Jacob whom I have chosen, the offspring of Abraham my friend” (41:8-20) and commissions Israel to “bring forth” (יוצא) and “establish” (שים) “justice” (משפט) in threefold repetition: “justice (משפט) to the nations he will bring forth (יוצא)” (42:1), “faithfully he will bring forth (יוצא) justice (משפט)” (42:3), and “he will not grow faint or be crushed until he has established (שים) justice (משפט) throughout the earth” (42:4).  

Isaiah 42:10–43:8, replete with cultic and mythological imagery, presents Yahweh as the gracious divine warrior who justly chastens and restores Israel; by divine command, Yahweh orders the scattered people to return from the four corners of the world. Isaiah 43:9–44:5 calls Israel to be witnesses to divine action, not by recounting the former things but by looking forward to the present and future things that Yahweh is doing in Israel’s favour despite their previous rebellion and present exhaustion. Isaiah 44:6-23 elaborates on Israel’s call to be witnesses by juxtaposing the mute relationship between foreign idols and their makers, and stressing the non-existence of those gods, and then exhorting Israel to remembrance (v. 21), repentance (v. 22), and praise (v. 23) before their maker. These four discourses, therefore, present the servant as an idealized Israel, helped by Yahweh, commissioned to bring forth justice, justly chastened and redeemed, and called to righteousness, remembrance, and witness.

Having introduced Cyrus and the servant, and Yahweh’s relationship to them, DI amplifies the character and legitimacy of Cyrus in direct relation to his appointed role in

---

13 Duhm (1922) regarded Isaiah 42:1-4 as the first of the so-called “Servant Songs” that, collectively, were interpolations written by a different hand. For the position I have chosen to follow, namely that Isaiah 42:1-4 forms part of Isaiah 41:1–42: 9, see Clifford 2002: 84-93. Duhm’s position has greatly increased speculation about the identity of the servant. For successively updated and useful surveys of the scholarship on the “Servant Songs,” see North 1956; Kruse 1978; Tharekadavil 2007.

14 On the integrity and function of the idol passages within Isaiah 40–48, see esp. Clifford 1980.
Israel’s restoration and Jerusalem’s reconstruction. In 44:26, returning now explicitly to the divine commission and the proclamation to the cities of Judah in the opening chapter, Yahweh confirms “the word of his servant” and announces that Jerusalem will be inhabited and the cities of Judah rebuilt. Notably, passive verbs (תִּבָּנֶינָּה and תָּהִיטָה) briefly delay the identification of the agent until, in v. 28, Yahweh declares, by name, that Cyrus is “my shepherd” (רָעִי) and that he will undertake “my every delight” (כל־חפצי). Signalled by a coordinating infinitive (לאמר), DI clarifies that Yahweh’s delight is Jerusalem’s reconstruction and the re-establishment of the temple.\(^{15}\)

The call of Cyrus is confirmed in the sharpest of language: Cyrus is Yahweh’s “anointed” (משיח), whose right hand Yahweh grasps, to whom Yahweh subjects the nations and their kings and gives the treasures of the world, and for whom Yahweh levels mountains and city gates (45:1-3). From a biblical and Near Eastern ideological standpoint, Cyrus’s royal status and his charge are plain (Fried 2002). As Yahweh’s shepherd and anointed, he is Yahweh’s chosen king.\(^{16}\) As Yahweh’s chosen king, it falls

---

\(^{15}\) Note the repetition of the participle לאמר to introduce the three pronouncements in vv. 26b, 27, and 28 that aim to reinforce or prove that Yahweh is the sole creator (v. 24) and also “the one who confirms the word of his servant and the counsel of his messengers” (v. 26a). Perhaps following the LXX and Vulgate, the NSRV reads לאמר in v. 28 as another instance of the participle or ignores it altogether, and reads and חלשים as parallel objects of the participle, i.e., “who says of Cyrus … and of Jerusalem.” The infinitive form in the MT, however, inveighs against this reading. Instead, complementing v. 26b where Yahweh proclaims that Jerusalem will be inhabited and the cities of Judah rebuilt, the speaker in v. 28b is Cyrus, who repeats the divine pronouncements. Blenkinsopp (2002: 244-245) regards the phrase proceeding from the coordinating infinitive as an addition, due to grammatical and stylistic difficulties, the redundancy of this sentiment vis-à-vis vv. 26b and 28a, and the conspicuous absence of references to the foundation of the temple in Isaiah 40–55, which however appears here in v. 28b. Certainly, v. 28b is redundant insofar as “my every delight” in v. 28a must refer to the reconstruction of Jerusalem on account of v. 26b. Still, despite alternative renderings in the LXX and the Vulgate, the phrase in v. 28b appears in these versions and, more importantly, the MT is supported by 1QIsa\(^{a}\) and 1QIsa\(^{b}\). As such, there is no textual precedent for its absence. I would add that though explicit references to the “temple” are indeed largely absent throughout Isaiah 40–66, it actually forms the subject of much of the text as my analysis will show. It may be that the reference to the temple, in this instance, reflects a deliberate allusion to a royal edict, such as those found in Ezra 1:2-4 // 2 Chr 36:23 and/or Ezra 6:3-5.

\(^{16}\) Despite the absence of the title מלך, mention of a throne, and an invitation to sit at the right hand of Yahweh, as observed by Baltzer 2001: 222; cf. Fried 2002.
to him to rebuild Yahweh’s city and temple. As Fried (2002: 383-386) has shown, the acclamation of Cyrus reflects an ideological trope common in the comparative literature of the early Persian period, in which subject peoples ascribe to the Persian kings the traditional titulary of their native kingship. This tendency, reflected in the inscriptions and literature of collaborators, such as Udjahorresnet, and the Persian kings themselves, encouraged local acceptance of the Achaemenid regime, which, in turn, helped the local aristocracy receive and maintain special privileges (Fried 2002).

Despite the radical nature of these declarations, undoubtedly, though not explicitly, in light of Cyrus’s foreignness, DI expresses no equivocation or ambiguity in the language. In Isaiah 40–48 at least, Yahweh’s plan for the restoration and reconstruction of Jerusalem emphatically places Cyrus at the forefront, as a divinely authorized royal agent. In 45:9-10, DI even anticipates and censures those who would challenge the divine plan. In 45:11-13, Yahweh seconds the riposte by affirming again that Cyrus will rebuild the city and now adding that Cyrus will “release the captives.”

Insofar as this legitimization potentially risked a negative reaction from traditional Judean political or cultic power structures, tied to either the Davidic dynasty or the previous Babylonian administration, this presentation of Cyrus provides compelling evidence that the Yahwists who identified with the text, and disseminated it, relied on imperial authorization or, at least, goodwill (Fried 2002; cf. Bedford 2001). By indigenizing the Achaemenid Persian imperial complex, DI argues that its royal charters, edicts, decrees, and/or judgments could (though, to be cautious, not necessarily always) be considered divinely sanctioned and authoritative for the Judean community.

Fried (2002) has attempted to develop this argument even further by claiming that this presentation of Cyrus actually implies the supersession of the Davidic dynasty. From

---

an historical and literary perspective, it is doubtful DI intends to imply the supersession of the Davidic dynasty by Cyrus; the text is simply written in an historical context in which Judah has no native, governing regent. The political interest and focus is the supersession of Neo-Babylonian imperial rule by Cyrus, an aim that crystallizes in the last three discourses, which vividly present the impotence of the Neo-Babylonian gods and the collapse of the empire. There is no explicit condemnation of the Davidic dynasty and DI implicitly limits the role of Cyrus and the Achaemenid kings. While Yahweh anoints Cyrus to bring about the restoration, the Persian kings have no enduring function within the life of the community, as reflected by the complete absence of Cyrus or any other Achaemenid king after Isaiah 48. In fact, DI ultimately announces Yahweh’s intent to extend the promises of the royal covenant with David to the entire community (55:3), not to Cyrus or to any other Achaemenid king.\(^\text{18}\) Cyrus is a means to an end.

In 45:14-25, DI reaffirms the greater emphasis on Jerusalem and the temple. In this discourse, DI relates the cosmological dimensions of the divine plan, anticipating Jerusalem’s reconstruction as the ultimate vindication of Israel and enduring testimony to the pre-eminence, creative and salvific power, and provision of Yahweh. The discourse glorifies Jerusalem’s restoration and the reconstruction of the temple as a temporal victory but, more than this, as a cosmic victory and act of re-creation. DI reflects this in the melding of images of heaven, earth, city, and temple (Clifford 2002: 124-127).\(^\text{19}\) Jerusalem is the point at which all these intersect; it is an axis mundi.

In support of this insight, Clifford (2002: 123n2, 124-126) highlights the second singular feminine suffixes in vv. 14-17 and the verbal form of דְּשֵׁב in v. 19, which

---


\(^{19}\) Stuhlmueller (1970) examines the motif of (re-)creation in Deutero-Isaiah in considerable depth and notes the likely allusion to the Babylonian akiti festivals. Especially notable is the stark contrast drawn in vv. 18-19 with traditional Mesopotamia creation epics, especially the Enūna Eliš, in which creation takes place as a battle with chaos (though cf. 51:9-10). The importance of this theme will be discussed further in relation to the third stage of the composition, Isaiah 56–66.
typically denotes “seeking” Yahweh in a sanctuary. The use of בקע is particularly illuminating as it suggests that מקום (“place”), also in this verse, obliquely refers to the temple (as the implied positive of the negative, i.e., the place where Yahweh did speak) and therefore that vv. 18-19 identify the original creation of the city and temple as a primeval event co-terminus with the creation of the cosmos.

Notably, this short paean to re-creation in 45:18-19 forms a bridge between the picture of foreign traders, merchants, and tall men of stature as chained and coming over to Jerusalem in 45:14-17 and the summons of the “survivors” in 45:20. Consequently, the “survivors” in v. 20 should be identified with the traders in v. 14, so that the trial of the traders is the trial of the survivors called to order in v. 20, in the recreated Jerusalem. As such, the discourse, through v. 25, asserts that these foreign commercial agents, and by extension their nations, will be subjugated to Jerusalem, as a vivid, practical reflex of the act of re-creation that vindicates Israel and glorifies Yahweh.

The passage as a whole highlights the centrality of the city and the temple, and makes a theological argument for restoration and reconstruction. Restoration and reconstruction are presented as necessary to achieve balance in the heavenly and earthly realms, and so vindicate Israel and even, to some extent, Yahweh. As later stages of the composition emphasize, it is ultimately in this gracious act of re-creation that the events of the sixth century are seen to culminate, not in the supersession of a Babylonian capital by a Persian capital or in the glorification of the Persians (or even just of Cyrus).

The de-legitimization of Neo-Babylonian imperial rule is, nevertheless, presented as a necessary correlate and precursor to Jerusalem’s elevation, and is vividly argued in Isaiah 46:1-13, 47:1-5, and 48:1-22. In 46:1-13, the captivity of Babylon’s gods is

---

20 The emendations proposed by BHS for 45:14, reading traders (יוגעי) and merchants (סוחרי) for wealth (יְגִיע) and profit (.Deserialize), are unnecessary (see also LXX). The abstraction encompasses the person by metonymy. On these emendations, see Blenkinsopp 2002: 256.
assumed (46:2) and restoration is presented as imminent (46:13). Incisively, DI juxtaposes the patrons of Babylon and Zion. On the one hand, Bēl and Nabû, Babylon’s patrons, are carried by pack animals that falter under their weight, and not only are they unable to save the pack animals from this “burden” (משא), they are themselves taken into exile (46:1-2). On the other hand, DI asserts that Yahweh, Zion’s patron, continues “to carry” (נשא) Israel and will bring them to safety (46:3-4; cf. Exod 19:4; Deut 1:31).

The capture and destruction of Babylon and the collapse of her empire are progressively visualized with even greater force in Isaiah 47:1-5, culminating in 48:1-22. There is little merit to the objection that Cyrus’s capture of Babylon, at least according to Mesopotamian sources, was peaceful, while DI seems to envision a dramatic military conflagration; this ignores the salient point of which the rest is an over-exuberant metaphor, that is, Babylon’s imperial dominion has come to an end. In Isaiah 48:1-22, the text refers one last time to Cyrus, re-emphasizing his divine authorization to bring about the end of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (48:14-15). The exuberance culminates with the

---

21 These elements of the discourse reinforce the probable historical setting of the composition after the military and political provisions provided by Cyrus, mentioned in 46:11 as “the bird of prey from the east, the man of my plan from a distant land.” (see n. 11 supra on the historical context).

22 On the parody of civic and cultic processions and the relationship to Babylonian processional omens, see Baltzer 2001: 255; Schaudig 2008.

23 On the wordplay between “burden” (משא) and “to bear” (נשא), see Baltzer 2001: 254-258. Although DI’s argument seems inconsistent with the Cyrus Cylinder, in which Cyrus lauds himself as chosen by Bēl and Nabû and therefore, by implication, not their captors, this incongruity is superficial. Not only does the reinstatement and restoration of Babylon’s gods in the Cyrus Cylinder imply their deposition and capture, the emphasis in the biblical text is not on the capture of Bēl and Nabû but that these gods could no more save the Babylonians from defeat than the pack animals bearing them from place to place. In either text, a real defeat takes place; the biblical text simply offers a more satirical take on the events. On the Cyrus Cylinder, see Harmatta 1974; Kuurt 1983; Schaudig 2001: 550-556; Kuhrt 2007: 70-74.

24 As Briant (2002: 41) observes, these cuneiform texts, and Greek tradition, evoke “suspicion to the extent that it agrees with the image that Persian propaganda itself would have portrayed,” and as such, may not accurately reflect the historical situation. The Chronicle, at least, mentions a pitched battle at Opis (Grayson 1975: 109, iii 12–14). For discussions of Cyrus’ conquest of Babylon and the primary sources, see Beaulieu 1989: 219-232; Schaudig 2001; Briant 2002: 40-44; Vanderhooft 2006; Kuhrt 2007: 70-87. For an alternative view that the text actually reflects events in the reign of Darius, see Albertz 2003.
transparent, unmitigated euphoria of a certain and accomplished reality: “Leave Babylon! Flee from the Chaldeans! With a joyful shout, proclaim! Announce this! Bring this to the end of the earth: Say, ‘Yahweh has redeemed his servant Jacob!’” (48:20).

Interestingly, near the end of this first stage of the composition, the prophet makes a rare self-referential statement: “Yahweh has sent me” (48:16). This self-referential statement situates the prophet as the primary human advocate of the restoration to which the people are called in 48:20 and provides, as its implied historical backdrop, a hint concerning a greater concern: a present, impoverished community of “Israel.” The text at this point actually moves back and forth from past to present perspectives. In v. 17, Yahweh declares, “I am Yahweh your god, who teaches you to succeed, who leads you in the way you should go.” In vv. 18-19 though, Yahweh laments that had the people only listened in the past, they would have enjoyed prosperity and progeny instead of exile and destruction. The lament immediately precedes the command to flee Babylon in v. 20, which is followed by allusions to Yahweh’s provision of water for Israel in the wilderness at the exodus (v. 21). By alluding to this past provision, the prophet clearly encourages the people to flee Babylon with faith that Yahweh will once again provide. Likewise, the lament concerning Israel’s past disobedience in v. 18 is not simply a retrospective indulgence; it is intimately related to the verses it bridges. It expresses an implicit hope that the people who join the restoration will listen to the god who teaches and leads them, unlike their forefathers, in order that prosperity, progeny, and a new exodus might be realized. The journey always looks forward to Zion (Clifford 1993: 3-5).

*The Return to Zion: Isaiah 49–55*

Isaiah 40–48, therefore, is an account of the divine *parousia*, a revelation of Yahweh’s glory in the international events of the age. Yahweh’s glory is revealed through the dramatic reversal that brings about the collapse of the Neo-Babylonian Empire and brings to power a messianic king to effect the reconstruction of Jerusalem and the temple. This
reversal answers the critic who claims that Jerusalem remains under Yahweh’s judgment. Yahweh’s plan affirms the centrality of Jerusalem and provides a way to return.

In the second stage of DI, the hope for prosperity, progeny, and a new exodus forms a backdrop to poignant reflections on the servant’s sacrificial mission to fulfill the call for return and restoration, culminating with the restoration of the temple vessels (52:11-12), a panegyric to the faithful servant (52:13–53:12), and two paeans concerning Yahweh and Jerusalem in chapters 54 and 55. The servant’s success in this stage of the composition actualizes the hope of 48:18-19. Indeed, Yahweh rewards the servant with prosperity and progeny (53:10-12; 54), on the basis of which DI invites Israel to participate in the restoration and fully realize the everlasting covenant Yahweh made with David (55, esp. vv. 3-4). This stage of the composition, therefore, continues the dramatic reversal of the first stage with particular emphasis on the reversal of Jerusalem’s condition through the active repossessession of the site and reinstallation of the cult vessels.

Isaiah 49:1-26 immediately takes up the shift in perspective. While the discourse logically and chronologically follows on the previous discourses, DI intensifies the bifurcation of Israel, juxtaposing the servant Israel, actively participating in the restoration, and the nation Israel, or the “many” (רבים) as they are called in Isaiah 52:14 and 53:11-12, who must yet respond. Yahweh gives the servant Israel, “as a covenant to the people, to restore the land (and) to repossess a desolated heritage” (v. 8). They are already in, or shortly will come to, the land, charged to restore it so that they might be a “light” to the nation Israel, and so essentially function as a living invitation to the nation to return (vv. 9-13).25

25 In light of this bifurcation, I find it difficult to endorse fully Stromberg (2011: 229-234), who alleges that TI’s distinction between the righteous and wicked is novel vis-à-vis DI. Stromberg’s compositional argument is sound but the theological interpretation requires nuance in light of the relatively strong concern that DI expresses for ethical transformation (e.g., 41:1-42:9, 50:10-11, 55:7). It also seems to go unnoticed that Isaiah 40–55 is likely directed towards the community of the text, its Bekenntnisgemeinschaft (“confessional community”), while Isaiah 56–66 is directed towards those outside...
In v. 14, the city, Zion, laments that she is abandoned and forgotten. Yahweh, however, demurs, “your walls are continually before me” (v. 16), and then reminds her, “your builders hurry” (v. 17a), and directs her, “Look all around and see all of them! They have been gathered, they have come to you” (v. 18). So, while DI acknowledges the ruined and devastated condition of the city and its countryside, and Yahweh promises, even swears ( переводить), that the exiles will continue to return, the statements as a whole, especially in light of the perfective aspect of v. 18, point to DI’s perspective, amid a developing restoration. This developing restoration is very important in Isaiah 49–55, because through it, Zion, like the people in vv. 8-13, serves as a beacon to which a greater ingathering responds (vv. 19-26). In vv. 22-26, Yahweh assumes the role of the divine warrior to definitively vindicate Israel, bring in the nation from the four corners of the world, and utterly and completely humiliate their enemies. In this way, Israel’s honor and Yahweh’s honor is restored.

This ingathering and the condition of Zion remain central concerns of the subsequent discourses in Isaiah 49–55. The discourses imply the depressed state of Zion (49:14-21; 51:3, 17-20; 52:1-12; 54), highlight the servant who has responded faithfully and bears a burden, presumably of restoration and reconstruction, on behalf of the nation (49:1-13; 50:4-11; 52:7–53:12), rebuke those unwilling to return (50:1-3; 51:12-13, 18), and continue to stress Yahweh’s promises to complete the ingathering and shower blessings on Israel in proportion to their faithfulness (49:22-23; 51:11; 54:13; 55). In

that community but still within the Blutgemeinschaft (“kinship community”). The rhetorical strategies are, therefore, quite different. It is unproductive to catalog the political, socio-economic, and cultic ills in the former case, especially if the aim is convincing that group of the necessity to return to Jerusalem. On the distinction between Bekenntnisgemeinschaft and Blutgemeinschaft, see Blenkinsopp 2003a: 136.

Against the pointing of the MT, 1QIsa reads, “בוניך.” This reading is supported by Aquila and Theodotion, though not by Symmachus. Other LXX texts, Targums, and the Vulgate support or assume a verbal form of בנה, and so are somewhat more aligned with Qumran. As the consonantal MT is ambiguous, the best option is likely to re-vocalize as בְּנוֹי to agree with the majority of the ancient witnesses. For a fuller discussion of this problem and the related problem of the vocalization of מַרְאֶסְיָא in this verse, see Barthélemy 1986: 364-367.
51:1-8, DI, often in the voice of Yahweh, calls on the people to respond, encouraging those who pursue and know righteousness (v. 1) and those who have “my teaching (תורתי) on their hearts” (v. 7) to recognize their birthright, embrace hope and faith in the victory of their god, and reject fear. In 51:9-23, DI again calls on the people to reject fear and recognize their liberation while, in 52:1-12, DI praises the procession to Zion. Perhaps most striking of all is this latter vision of a purified Israel. Echoing Isaiah 48:20, the prophet emphatically calls for the procession to leave Babylon: “Depart! Depart! Go out from there! An unclean thing, do not touch! Go out from the midst of her! Purify yourselves, who carry the vessels of Yahweh!” The phrases “from there” and “from the midst of her” situate the prophet in Jerusalem with the sentinels who proclaim and celebrate the return of Yahweh to Zion (52:7-12, esp. vv. 8, 11-12).27

The restoration of the temple vessels, although mentioned ever so briefly, is, as Ackroyd (1987) has argued for other biblical texts, an important “continuity theme” in post-exilic literature.28 The temple vessels link the restoration with the pre-exilic temple and cult, and even the received tradition concerning the exodus (Ackroyd 1987). The restoration of the temple vessels, as such, symbolizes the reparation of the breach brought about by exile. Ackroyd (1987: 54) observes that this symbolic importance is vividly

27 Regarding the location of the text’s composition, see Barstad 1997: esp. 23-58; Tiemeyer 2010. Blenkinsopp (2002: 102-104) provides a succinct review of the arguments for the Babylonian and the Palestinian locations. In my opinion, the geographical, ecological, and literary arguments in favor of the Palestinian location are persuasive. The arguments in favor of the Babylonian location do suggest, however, that the author is a repatriate who had lived in Babylonia. Haran’s (1963) thesis that Isaiah 40–48 was written in exile while Isaiah 49–66 was written as a repatriate is plausible and highly attractive.

28 Barstad (1997: 69-70) observes the standard way to refer to the temple vessels is כלי‏בית‏יהוה (“the vessels of the house of Yahweh”). The absence of בית in Isaiah 52:11, Barstad argues, is important and, given the holy war imagery of the passage, he proposes reading, “the weapons of Yahweh.” This argument is not persuasive, as there are no biblical parallels to Barstad’s proposed reading and the meaning “weapons” is typically denoted through the use of a modifier such as מלחמה (“war”; see, e.g., Deut 1:14; Judg 18:11; 1 Sam 8:12; Jer 21:4; Ezek 32:27). Furthermore, the combination of cultic imagery with images of holy war and/or the divine warrior are common.
expressed in Hananiah’s prophecy in Jeremiah 28:2-4. Interestingly, in Hananiah’s prophecy, the return of the temple vessels is coupled with the restoration of the king as a double proof that Yahweh will break Babylonian hegemony.

The second element of Hananiah’s prophecy—the restoration of the king—is also addressed in DI, taken up in the closing discourses of this stage of the composition, as DI applies the Davidic covenant and kingship to the people. Instrumental to the reapplication of the Davidic covenant is the servant, whose faithfulness, as elaborated in the ‘fourth servant song’ in 52:13–53:12, makes the transfer of terms to the people possible. By literary proximity, the servant’s victory, which is divinely assured in 52:13, is contextually related to the procession from Babylon and the restoration of the temple vessels. DI asserts that the servant has made atonement for Israel, bearing the sins of the nation and the marks of their oppression, in captivity and in the restoration (53:3-12), and so merits Yahweh’s blessing (53:10-12). The servant’s vicarious suffering, though tragic to the point of death, is a victory that yields prosperity and progeny (52:13-15; 53:10-12), fulfilling the hope expressed in Isaiah 48:18-19 and echoing the covenant promises to David in 2 Samuel 7 (cf. its parallel in 1 Chr 17).

Isaiah 54 develops the description of Yahweh’s blessings, including peace and security from enemies, which unambiguously reiterates the covenant promise of rest. Undoubtedly related to this, this chapter reaffirms the reconstruction of Jerusalem, the Davidic capital. According to Isaiah 54:17, the secure city is the inheritance of the servants, who, by its reconstruction, are vindicated. This is the first occurrence of the plural of בְּנֵי, which replaces the singular form from this point forward, strongly suggesting a transition to the author’s more immediate past and present or even the

---

29 Although Hananiah’s prophecy is ultimately invalidated, it reflects agreed-upon ideas about what the restoration would entail/require, as even suggested by Jeremiah’s reply in 28:5-6.
These servants are the human protagonists of the third stage of the composition in Isaiah 56–66.

The crescendo culminates in Isaiah 55:3 with the decisive reapplication of the Davidic covenant to the nation, \( I \) will make with you (pl.) an everlasting covenant; the promises to David will stand true.”\(^{32}\) In vv. 4-5, DI clearly argues that the covenant continues. In v. 4, DI describes David as a witness and a leader and commander of the peoples, which compares with the servant Israel as a witness in Isaiah 43:10, 12; 44:8 and, more immediately in v. 5, with the promise that Israel will call out to the nations who run after them, respectively corresponding to the roles of commanding and leading. The twofold restoration of the temple vessels and kingship, therefore, is given full expression in Isaiah 52:1–55:13 and provides the foundation for the confident codicil in 55:6-13, which invites the wicked to repent, declares that Yahweh’s words and purpose are always accomplished, and offers the text as a memorial (שם) and sign (אות).\(^{33}\)

**RECONSTRUCTION IN TRITO-ISAIAH**

In Isaiah 56–66, TI picks up motifs and themes from DI but moves away from emphasis on movement towards Jerusalem and devotes more attention to issues touching on the

---

\(^{30}\) On this transition, see Blenkinsopp 1997; Stromberg 2011: 244-247. Everything in the previous narratives is accomplished by Yahweh, Cyrus, and the servant, an ideal Israel. The servant, as an ideal embodiment, does not occupy the present; the present is occupied by servants, who are the promised seed of the servant (53:10) and who uphold and continue the mission of that servant.


\(^{32}\) With Williamson (1978) and Kaiser (1989), I am inclined to read התמי הָדוֹד as an objective genitive; cf. Caquot 1965; Boudreuil 1981; Gentry 2007. Either because of Yahweh’s promises to David, or because of David’s faithfulness to Yahweh, Yahweh will make an everlasting covenant with the people. In both cases, the result is the same; the people assume David’s position in the covenant, as vv. 4-5 indicate.

\(^{33}\) As such, it is impossible to accept Bedford’s (2001: 80) argument that the text is not programmatic. The servant’s successful mission is a prototype and proof of Yahweh’s faithfulness.
constitution of the community.\textsuperscript{34} The purpose of the servant’s mission to bring forth justice and the exhortations to ethical living in Isaiah 40–55 comes into sharper focus immediately in the opening oracle of TI: “So says Yahweh: Uphold justice (מששה) and act with righteousness (צדק) for soon my salvation (ישועתי) is coming and my righteousness (צדק) is being revealed!” (56:1).\textsuperscript{35} This opening oracle links ethics with the anticipated parousia and restoration; and, links the issue of identity—that is, the identity of the righteous and the unrighteous—with reconstruction (e.g., 57:14; 58:12). TI, therefore, approaches the physical reconstruction and restoration of Jerusalem and the temple from a significantly different perspective than DI. So, while borrowing motifs and themes from DI, TI places considerably more emphasis on the nature of the city and community, emphasizing its sacred status as a bulwark to ethical exhortations. TI argues that a new city of faithful Yahwists can be or will be the progenetrix of Israel. The argument has four critical components: (1) TI presents Jerusalem in the tradition of ANE divine cities, (2) TI argues that this status as a divine city carries ethical obligations for those who would inhabit it, (3) TI argues that Jerusalem restored will be the progenetrix of Israel, and so (4) TI affirms the priority of rebuilding Jerusalem and identifies those who neglect it as enemies of Yahweh.

\textsuperscript{34} Isaiah 56–59 provides, at least, commentary on a constitution, if not prescribing the basic elements of one: it sets rules of inclusion and exclusion, identifies Sabbath observance providing access to the temple and the land, and establishes codes of conduct for the political, legal, and economic elite. In Isaiah 56:8, the passage concerning foreigners and eunuchs is identified as an oracle (נאם) of Yahweh and, in Isaiah 59:21, Yahweh commends the prophetic commentary as a covenant (ברית) with the people for perpetual proclamation. On Isaiah 56:1-8 as prophetic instruction or “prophetic tōrā,” see Muilenburg 1956: 652-653; Smith 1995: 61-62; see also and cf. de Hoop 2008. On the change in addressees from Israel in Babylon (e.g., Isa 55:12) to Israel in the land, see Rendtorff 1993: 185-186.

\textsuperscript{35} Rendtorff (1993: 183) observes that Isaiah 56:1 uniquely reflects both the pairing of מששה and צדק, specific to PI, and ישועתי and צדק, specific to DI, which is strong evidence that TI, or as Rendtorff prefers, Steck’s “Greater Isaiah,” has inherited both texts.
Although many commentators have noted DI’s exceptional ability to critique and even satirize Babylonian mythology, TI’s facility with myth is not typically recognized. TI, however, not only proves capable of understanding the polemic of DI but also capable of mythopoeia that weaves together elements of DI and broader ANE themes to promote the pre-eminence of Jerusalem and the temple. The ethical dimension of TI, though seemingly TI at its most practical and relevant, is part of this mythopoeia. TI validates and affirms the theological foundations and priority of the city of Jerusalem.

TI evidently recognized in DI, and elevates, several critical themes commonly associated with the theological foundation of cities. In particular, DI reflects a common homology associating sacred space with the cosmos or the typical ANE merism “the heavens and the earth.”

The homology has several components and attendant motifs, especially in its ANE manifestations. Cities were perceived to be a locus of divine-human relations; deities chose cities, involved themselves in its construction or in the construction of the central sanctuary, resided in the city and temple, ensured its defense, and

36 Eliade’s (1959) seminal work on sacred space forcefully argues that its association with heaven and earth is a universal phenomenon of *homo religiosus*. This homological relationship between the cosmos and the temple is integral to Isaianic theology at its earliest stages. The programmatic call of the prophet in Isaiah 6, regarded as part of the first stage of the composition and influential for all tradents of the Isaiah, is especially pertinent because the passage assumes and blurs distinctions between the two. Yahweh is seated on a “high and exalted” (ouncements) throne yet the hem of his robe fills the temple (6:1), while the seraphs declare that his glory fills the whole earth (6:3). In the prophet’s subsequent encounter with the seraphs, it is not entirely clear whether the setting is the temple or heaven or, more likely, the temple is acting as a conduit or axis mundi, linking heaven and earth. Williamson (1994: 37-38) argues that Isaiah 40:1-8 is styled on Isaiah 6, especially in that there are relatively unique parallels to “a voice calling” (6:4; 40:3) and to “a voice speaking” (6:8; 40:6) and a shared emphasis on the glory of God (6:3; 40:5). Both narratives presume an audience with Yahweh, though a setting in the heavenly council is not explicit. Williamson (1994: 38-56) demonstrates that the influence of Isaiah 6 is also evident in other parts of DI and even TI. Indeed, Stromberg (2011: 160-174) has made a strong case that TI alludes to this passage, especially in Isaiah 57, and even adds 6:13b to Isaiah 6 to imbue a sense of hope regarding the restoration. In the latter argument, Stromberg is following Williamson (1994: 35). There is explicit recognition of the idea that the tabernacle and temple symbolized the cosmos in early Jewish literature, see Josephus, *Ant.*, 3.123, 180-187; Philo, *Moses*, 2.6 [88], 12 [117].
and granted legitimacy to the ruling dynast.\textsuperscript{37} The literary and actual topography of the city often included a cosmic mountain, either a true mountain or a ziggurat, as a particularly intimate locus for divine-human contact and a conduit between heaven and earth (56:7; 57:13; 65:11; 66:20).\textsuperscript{38} Gardens and flowing water were also typical of the topographical inventory, evoking primeval rivers or heavenly settings (51:3; 58:11).\textsuperscript{39} Cities could be personified and even deified to reflect their symbolic importance within the community (40:9; 49:14; 52:1-2; 60:13; 62:11; 66:8).\textsuperscript{40} Cities with strong theological pedigrees functioned as political and cultic capitals with royal and divine enthronement liturgy integral to the mythopoëia (40:9-11; 60).\textsuperscript{41} To this end, the ubiquitous motif of the divine warrior was often deployed to emphasize the deity’s role as civic defender or avenger (42:10–43:8; 49:25-26; 59:15-20 62:10–63:6).\textsuperscript{42} The divine warrior motif celebrated the defeat of enemies or, more abstractly, chaos, as a precursor to royal or divine enthronement in the city or temple (45:1-3: 51:9-10).\textsuperscript{43} Processions with cultic

\textsuperscript{37} Van de Mieroop (1997: 46-50) highlights the dual role of religious and political centre in Mesopotamian cities while Westenholz (1998) and Nissinen (2001) survey the portrayal of cities in relevant Mesopotamian texts. Sheriffs (1988) compares the portrayal of Babylon and Jerusalem along these lines while Weinfeld (1998) traces such ideas about Jerusalem through biblical events and literature.

\textsuperscript{38} On the cosmic mountain in comparative religion, see the seminal work of Eliade 1958: 367-387; and, with a focus on West Semitic religion, Clifford 1972. Levenson (1987) draws on these comparative studies to explicate the theological rendering of the motif in the Hebrew Bible.

\textsuperscript{39} On rivers and trees in ancient Mesopotamian cosmology, Albright (1919) remains instructive. Using Eden as a starting point, see Stordalen 2000. On the garden of God in Isaiah, see Berges 2002a.

\textsuperscript{40} On the personification and deification of cities, see Fitzgerald 1972; 1975; Biddle 1991; Westenholz 1998.

\textsuperscript{41} On divine and royal enthronement, see the classic works of Frankfort 1948 and Engnell 1967. On the close relationship between enthronement and capital cities in literary formula, see Buccellatti 1964. On these themes in regards to Jerusalem/Zion and biblical literature, see Ollenger 1987; Weinfeld 1998; and many of the essays in Batto and Roberts 2004.

\textsuperscript{42} On the divine warrior motif, see Cross 1966; Miller 1973; Kang 1989; and, more specific to DI and TI, see Hans 1975. Sheriffs (1988) emphasizes the divine warrior motif in his comparison of the civic ideologies of Babylon and Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{43} Niditch (1996: 21-24) provides a useful summary of this “victory-enthronement” pattern.
vessels or tribute (45:14; 49:22-23; 52:11; 55:5; 60; 66:18-20) and descriptions of inlays and appointments (54:11-12) also strengthen the homology.

The confluence of all these motifs is evident in comparative literature, such as the Babylonian creation epic, *Enūma Eliš*, which seems to have exerted some influence on the composition of DI. The motifs, however, permeate in whole or in part many different types of texts—myths, epics, hymns, prophecy, and even historiography—in many different historical periods; place names and personal names also reflect this pervasive homology (Westenholz 1998). Many exemplars of these motifs date as far back as the Sumerian period, indicating the broad temporal range and embeddedness of the language in the ANE literary and mythological mindscape. One particularly insightful exemplar is the Hymn of Enlil, which adds a critical ethical dimension:

The powerful lord, who is exceedingly great in heaven and earth, who knows judgment, who is wise
He of great wisdom takes his seat in the Duranki,
In the princeship he makes the Kiur, the great place, come forth radiantly,
In Nippur, the ‘bond’ of heaven and earth, he establishes his place of residence
The City – its panorama is a terrifying radiance,
Against its outside no powerful god advances,
Its interior is the “mouth of a sharp knife,” the “mouth of catastrophe”
Preparing the snare for the rebellious land, the pit, the net,
To him who speaks mightily it does not grant life,
It permits no inimical word to be spoken in judgment,
… improper speech,
Hostile words, hostility, and unseemingness,
… … …, evil, oppression,
Looking askance, acting without regard, slandering,
Arrogance, the breaking of spells, …
These abominations the city does not permit.
Nippur – its arm is a great net,
Within it (the city) the urin-bird stands,
The evil and wicked man do not escape its hand,

The city, which is bestowed with steadfastness,  
For which righteousness and justice have been made a lasting possession,  
…  
In the city, the holy settlement of Enlil,  
In Nipur, the beloved shrine of father Kurgal  
…  
Enlil when you mapped out the holy settlement on the earth  
You built the city Nippur by yourself  
The Kiur, your pure place  
In the Duranki, in the middle of the four quarters of the earth, you founded it,  
Its soil is the life of the land (Sumer), …  

Notably, Weinfeld (1977: 194-195) has observed that the Hymn’s appeal to righteousness and justice in Nippur reverberates in the Isaianic phrases “righteousness dwelled in her” in Isaiah 1:21 and “city of justice, the faithful city” in Isaiah 1:26, texts likely composed by TI. The conviction of the Hymn and Isaiah (especially, PI and TI) is that only ethical behavior is acceptable in a divine city (e.g., Isa 2:2-4; 4; 11:9; 33:5, 14-15; 65:25).

The Ethical Dimension and the Sabbath

TI intimately relates the ethical dimension to reverence of the Sabbath. In TI’s opening exhortation, the observation and reverence of the Sabbath in 56:2 is a practical application of the imperative to justice and righteousness in 56:1. Reverence of the Sabbath is amplified by another injunction in 58:13-14, at the mid-point between two more detailed exhortations on justice and righteousness in 58:1-12 and 59:1-8. Notably, the exhortation in 58:1-12 is particularly rich in allusions to the Sabbath year, the Jubilee, and the Day of Atonement, leading to Hrobon’s (2010) insightful observation that TI’s concept of Sabbath embraces all of these, along with the Sabbath day.

46 Many scholars have noted connections between Isaiah 1 and 65–66 and, therefore, suggested that TI reorganized, shaped, and supplemented the materials to create an introduction appropriate to the whole book. For relevant discussion, see Liebreich 1956; Sweeney 1988: 21-24; Beuken 1991; Tomasino 1993; Carr 1996; Williamson 2006: 7-162; Stromberg 2011: 147-160.
In 58:1–59:8, TI highlights several socio-economic and legal problems affecting the community. TI portrays a disordered community, beset by “dispute” (רהב), “dissent” (המכות האנונימית: יר), and “aggression” (המכות האנונימית: יר), according to 58:4. In 58:9, Yahweh invites the people to “give up” (תשידי) the “yoke” (ܡܰܡܐ, ἀρέστι), “raising a finger” (שלח אצבע), “speaking unjustly” (דבר־אובָּל), which is echoed again in Isaiah 59:3 and more explicitly connected with legal issues in 59:4. According to Isaiah 59:4, “no one” in the community “issues a legitimate summons” (יאים נשפט באמותה) or “judges honestly” (יבואים לאומתא), instead, they “rely on chaos” (כעוסсу עלコード), “speaking lies” (דבר אשא), “creating hardship” (הרו עמל), and “producing injustice” (הכולל לאון). In the starkest language, the prophet claims that the community commits “deeds of violence” (פעל חמס) in 59:6 and “hastens to shed innocent blood” (וימהרו לשפך דם נקי) in 59:7.

The vocabulary of the discourse emphasizes economic injustice, especially in Isaiah 58:3-12, a discrete section within 58:1–59:8, devoted to the topic of fasting. In this passage, TI argues that the true nature of fasting is not ritual self-affliction (vv. 3a, 5) but rather practical self-sacrifice (vv. 6-10). In 58:3, TI condemns those who “pursue pleasure” ((customer רמזים) and “oppress all your workers” (customer רמזים). The root of the verb translated “oppress” is ככ, and typically carries connotations of enslavement and, in

---

47 BHS suggests מּוֹטֶה (“perversion”) instead of MT מוטה (“yoke”), citing the Syriac, Targum, and Ezekiel 9:9. Blenkinsopp (2002: 175) proposes the same. The MT, however, is undoubtedly correct as מוטה points back to Isaiah 58:6. Indeed, the translation of 58:6 in the Targum indicates that the Targum does not provide support for the reading proposed by BHS and Blenkinsopp. The Targum is interpreting מוטה as juridical oppression, consistently translating with דין (judgment) in 58:6 and 58:9.

48 TI alludes to 58:6 by the reuse of מוטה (“yoke”) and שלח (“to send”). As v. 9 is a recapitulation of v. 6, שלח אצבע (“stretch out [raise] a finger”) should be understood as the action that causes a person to be “oppressed, enslaved” (מַעְבְּרָה וּרְאוֹבָּה) and should be read in a sequence that builds to “your hands defiled with blood and your fingers with guilt” (כפיכם ניגלו בדם ואצבעותיכם בעון) in 59:3 and reaches its climax with the “deeds of violence in their hands” (פעל חמס בכפיהם) in 59:6. The sense, therefore, is that the people should give up even raising a finger against another. For a similar reading, see Koole 2001: 144-146. As the context is juridical and economic, this violence and oppression is likely the act of enforcing indentured servitude as a result of an unpaid debt (see further infra) and possibly the mistreatment of the pledged labor, though simply the act of taking pledged labor, especially with indifference to the hardship it creates, could potentially lead to starvation and death within the family that otherwise depended on that person.
the economic domain, alludes to exploitation, especially of bonded or pledged labor. In 58:6-7, TI presents fasting as a response to this oppression:

Is not this a fast that I choose? To loosen the chains of injustice, unfasten the straps of a yoke (אשלה רוטים חפשים), and release the oppressed (שלח חפשים), removing every yoke (משה) and to bring home the suffering homeless? When you see [someone] naked, you cover him! You do not hide yourself from your own kin!

The primary abuse in v. 6 is likely economic, specifically the practice of taking bonded or pledged labor in lieu of interest or capital payments (Blenkinsopp 2003a: 179). The idiom שלח חפשים (“free” or “let go free”) is revealing, as it is, with but one exception in Job 39:5, only “used elsewhere of the manumission of [commercial and domestic] slaves (Exod 21:26-27; Deut 15:12-13, 18; Jer 34:8-16)” (Blenkinsopp 2003a:179). The rhetoric in v. 7, to aid the hungry, homeless, and naked (58:7) on the grounds of common kinship (58:7), strengthens the economic context of the statements by implying a subsistence crisis, which could lead to foreclosure on property and human pledges, and so exacerbate famine, and increase homelessness, poverty, and debt slavery. True fasting is a voluntary, deliberate abstention from self-interest in order to alleviate this distress.

At the mid-point, in 58:13-14, TI relates these ethical obligations to the Sabbath by exhorting the community to refrain from “pursuing pleasure.” The concern with “pursuing pleasure” links Isaiah 58:13 with 58:3 and structures the entire complaint

49 See HALOT 2: 865. Although the object, “your workers” (עצביכם), clearly fronts the economic sense of the verb, the notion of enslavement to foreigners sharpens the rhetorical force of the argument; the oppressed, under the Babylonians, are now the oppressors.

50 The link to the indictment in v. 3 about oppressing your workers inveighs against it but is there an underlying resentment in the charges to “bring home the suffering homeless” and “not to hide yourself from your own kin,” i.e., that the people addressed did nothing to help those in Babylon? There are strong political overtones in v. 6, given the association of the yoke with exile in Jeremiah 27–28.

51 It also forges a strong thematic parallel with the socio-economic crisis in Nehemiah 5, which reflects similar concerns over food shortages, debt slavery, and a divided community. On these issues, see Blenkinsopp 2003a: 177-179; Ristau 2007b.
This repetition, in addition to providing structure, signals that the enclosed passage is its amplification or the definition; “to pursue pleasure,” therefore, is defined as economic exploitation and social neglect (58:4). From TI’s perspective, this self-interest is an obstacle to restoration, reconstruction, and tenure; only correct behavior will ensure Yahweh’s ongoing blessing, advance restoration and reconstruction (58:12), and secure tenure (58:14). As Rofé (1985) observes, TI is part of a tradition that extends the prohibition against land cultivation on the Sabbath to commercial activities.

This expansion of the Sabbath concept is especially significant because observing “my Sabbaths” (שבתוני) is identified in Isaiah 56:3-4 as a criterion of admission to the temple. Levenson (1984: 292-293) notices that the phrase “who observe my Sabbaths” (אשר ישמרו את שבתתי) in 56:4 exhibits verbal and contextual links with Leviticus 19:30 and 26:2 and Exodus 31:13. Leviticus 19:30 and 26:2 preserve the twofold instructions to “observe my Sabbaths and revere my sanctuary” (את שבתתי תשמרו ומדקדשי תיראו) while Exodus 31:13 is part of a pericope that concludes Yahweh’s instructions concerning the construction and operation of the Tabernacle. Exodus 31:13 identifies the observation of “my Sabbaths” (שבתוני) as a “sign” (אות) between Yahweh and the people, presumably a...
sign of the Sinaitic covenant (Levenson 1984: 293). These passages, by literary proximity and language, connect the Sabbath concept, the Tabernacle, and the Sinaitic covenant.

Notably, there are also integral links between these concepts and the creation account in Genesis 1:1–2:3. The creation account, of course, provides an etiology for the Sabbath (2:2-3; cf. Exod 20:8-11; 23:12; 31:12-17) and it is on the seventh day that Moses is taken up in a cloud to receive Yahweh’s instructions about the Tabernacle (Exod 24:16). The construction of the Tabernacle, particularly as summarized in Exodus 39:1–40:33, is typologically similar to the creation account. In each, God commands the work, inspects and approves it, and blesses and sanctifies it (Weinfeld 1981: 503). These close links may account for the use of tent imagery for the creation of the cosmos and Jerusalem in DI (40:22; 54:2). In TI, observance of the Sabbath and its ethical dimensions are critical prerequisites to participating in the temple-covenant community and introduce and lay a foundation for the re-creation of Jerusalem. TI, therefore, reflects an intimate understanding of the nexus of all these concepts and even provides an insight into its possible or at least desired application in post-exilic Judean society.

Re-Creation and Rebirth

Significantly, the homology of sacred space and the cosmos naturally and readily supports the creator as builder and builder as creator motifs. Cosmic creation is described as construction and the construction of sacred space as an act of cosmic creation, with a mixing of the vast array of related motifs. In DI, the former occurs several times. In Isaiah 40:12-31, Yahweh is portrayed as the surveyor who measures (מדיד) and marks off (יתכן) the heavens and the earth. In Isaiah 42:5 and 44:24, Yahweh is a smith who

54 See also Van Leeuwen 2010, who highlights a co-occurring motif of “filling” (מלא) the cosmos or the temple, especially with the divine “glory” (ה Hubb) or knowledge of it. For the tabernacle, see Exod 40:34-35. For the temple, see 1 Kgs 8:11; Ezek 10:4; 43:5; 44:4; Hag 2:7; 2 Chron 5:14; 7:1-2. For the earth, see Num 14:21; Isa 6:3; Hab 2:14; Ps 72:19.
hammers (רמסי) out the shape of the earth and thrice-repeated, in Isaiah 48:13, 51:13, and 51:16, is the affirmation that Yahweh laid the earth’s foundations.

In DI, the language of creation is often deployed as a metaphor for Yahweh’s redemptive plan or acts, rather than simply as a discourse on cosmic creation.⁵５ DI works from the general affirmation that Yahweh is the creator of the cosmos and everything in it (40:12-31; 42:5; 44:24; 45:7, 12, 18; 48:13; 51:13) to the particular assertions that Yahweh is the creator of salvation (41:20; 45:8; 48:7), Israel (43:1, 7, 15; 44:2, 24), and Jerusalem (54:5). The declaration that Yahweh is the creator of Jerusalem is arguably the culmination of the creation motif in DI as it fulfills the promise of consolation.

TI builds on this declaration and even more clearly establishes the divine foundations of Jerusalem in at least three ways. First, the city is celebrated and honored by Yahweh and earthly dignitaries. Aside from the obvious depiction of this in Isaiah 60, Biddle (1991) insightfully identifies TI’s use of “mural crown” imagery. Likely informed by DI’s close association of jewelry and the walls of Jerusalem in Isaiah 49:14-18 and 54:11-13, TI declares of Zion, “you will be a beautiful crown in Yahweh’s hand and a royal diadem in the palm of your god” (62:3). This metaphor has antecedents in mural crowns depicted or described in Hittite and Mesopotamian glyptic art and literature (Biddle 1991: 178-179). Mural crowns symbolize and connect divine and royal authority with city battlements and walls, and also evoke the cosmic circle encompassing the heavens and the earth (Biddle 1991: 177-179).⁵６ In TI, the metaphor vividly confirms the epithet “the city of Yahweh, Zion of the Holy One of Israel” (עיר יהוה ציון קדוש ישראל), given in Isaiah 60:14.⁵７ The image of Zion as a mural crown and this epithet set

---

⁵⁵ On the interrelationship of creation and redemption in DI, see Harner 1967; Stuhlmueller 1970; Von Rad 1984; Clifford 1993: 5-14; Lee 1995.

⁵⁶ The cosmic circle is attested in Isaiah 40:22 (see, also, Job 22:14; 26:10; Prov 8:27).

⁵⁷ Strawn (2007) has built a circumstantial argument that chapter 60 as a whole reflects the idioms and iconography of the Apadana reliefs. Certainly, the portrait, especially with respect to the willing obeisance of foreigners, is bold, contra Stansell (2009), who argues the claims are economic rather than
Jerusalem apart as a sacred city at the intersection of divine-human affairs. TI sanctifies and glorifies Jerusalem by unequivocally prescribing her identity as the deity’s city.

Second, TI develops the portrait of Yahweh as creator of Jerusalem by presenting the city’s reconstruction as an act of creation or re-creation:

For, look, I am creating (כִּי־הנְנִי בָּרָא) a new heavens and a new earth,
The former things will not be remembered nor trouble the heart,
Rather celebrate and take unending joy (כִּי־אַמַּשֵׁש וּלְיָדָע) in what I am creating (בָּרָא).
For, look, I am creating (כִּי־הנְנִי בָּרָא) Jerusalem for joy (תְּלָה) and her people for celebration (משות).

The context, interjections, and imperatives of this passage point to present continuous action; creation is Yahweh’s intervention to bring about the promises of 65:13-16. The parallel constructions centering on ברא (“create”) provide clear definition to the scope and referent intended by “new heavens and new earth.” As often the case in DI, this is not original or eschatological creation but creation deployed as a metaphor. The new heavens and new earth are Jerusalem and her people.

Third, TI connects this theme of creation to maternal imagery, emphatically reversing the plight of the abandoned, forsaken, and barren Zion of DI, where in DI such reversals are only anticipated:

No longer will it be said of you, “Forsaken,” nor of your land will it be said “Desolation”;
for you will be called “My delight is in her,” and your land, “Married”;
for Yahweh delights in you, and your land will be married.

political in nature. Stansell’s argument is somewhat disingenuous in that, while it might be affirmed that the primary concern is the influx of wealth for the temple, processions of tribute by foreign dignitaries are undeniably political. This is the reason that the Apadana reliefs feature such a procession so prominently. It is simply not possible to separate the one from the other. Indeed, v. 12 definitively states that the nation or kingdom that does not serve Zion, will perish. I do not think the author has in mind an economic depression or market crash!

For as a young man marries a young woman, so your builder will marry you,\textsuperscript{59} and as the bridegroom rejoices over the bride, so will your god rejoice over you.

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\] you will be called, “Sought Out, A City Not Forsaken.”

\[\ldots\]

Before she starts labor, she gives birth;
before her contractions start, she delivers a son.
Who has heard of such a thing? Who has seen such things?
Can a land be born in a day? Can a nation be delivered in a moment?
Yet as soon as Zion was in labor, she delivered her children.

\[\ldots\]

Rejoice with Jerusalem, and be glad for her, all you who love her;
Celebrate with her, enthusiastically, all you who mourn over her
that you may nurse and be satisfied from her comforting breast;
that you may suck and take delight from her overwhelming abundance.
For so says Yahweh:
I will extend prosperity to her like a river, and the wealth of the nations
like an overflowing stream;
and you will nurse and be carried on her hip, and play on her knees.
(62:4-5, 12b; 66:7-8, 10-12; cf., e.g., 49:14-23; 51:3, 17-20; 52:1-12; 54)

In these passages, Zion is wedded to Yahweh and gives birth to a nation; embedded in this is a claim to political, spiritual, and economic centrality and pre-eminence, and a privileged relationship with Yahweh.

\[\textsuperscript{59}\text{ The image of incestuous marriage suggested by the MT reading, “your sons (בְּנֵיכֶם) will marry you,” has led commentators and versions to read בְּנֵךְ (“your builder”), following Lowth 1833: 118, and assuming Yahweh as Zion’s fiancé and builder (see, e.g., Ps.147:2). Blenkinsopp (2003a: 233) notes that this reading is not supported by ancient versions and therefore he prefers the MT, providing a plausible rationale for it, namely the play on the double meaning of בָּלֻא, “to marry” and “to possess,” i.e., the marital image is subtly shifted to make a statement regarding inheritance and tenure. This rationale is not without its merits as tenure is a concern in the broader context of TI; but, the immediate context does not support it. Even though the MT reading is already reflected in the proto-masoretic and Greek traditions, it is difficult to escape the logic of the emendation in light of the parallel image in the second half of the verse where “your god” is parallel to “bridegroom.” Indeed, the immediate context, including the processional imagery in 62:10-12, coupled with the later images of birthing and child-rearing in 66:7-12, points to hierogamy as the appropriate and original symbolism. It seems likely that the MT reading arose, early on, out of a pious desire to suppress this explicit statement of hierogamy.}\]
Notably, all of the Isaianic traditions (PI, DI, and TI) appear to have found particular vibrancy and potency in scenes and images of mothers and children, perhaps because of the fragile balance at pregnancy, birthing, and throughout infancy between anxiety, struggle, pain, and mortality, on the one hand, and euphoria, hope, newness, and immortality, on the other. New births hold out the promise of new relationships (among humans and between them and the divine), new realities (political, economic, social, environmental), and new worlds.

*The Statement of Claim*

For interpreters such as Hanson and Blenkinsopp, homology and metaphor in TI defers the expectations of reconstruction and restoration to the eschaton for a community of the text faced with ostracism and disillusioned by unrealized divine intervention. This thesis rests heavily on Isaiah 65:13-16 and 66:5 as evidence of a schism leading to ostracism. Yet, these passages simply can not carry this weight.

Contrary to Blenkinsopp’s argument, the supposed “excommunication” in Isaiah 66:5 is not about access to the temple in Jerusalem, nor is it an enduring condition. In order to sustain this interpretation, Blenkinsopp necessarily reads Isaiah 66:6 as eschatological in nature (2003: 301), but then is faced with the abrupt transition from “excommunication” in v. 5 to rejoicing in vv. 7-11, which he unsatisfactorily explains as thematic, reflecting “the close association between the new Zion and the new people” (2003: 304). The problems with this interpretation are that vv. 1-5 are not primarily about the “new people” but rather about the unfaithful “brethren” who will receive their comeuppance, and vv. 7-11 are not anticipatory but rather invite the audience of the text

---

60 TI simply does not provide enough information to evaluate the nature of the “excommunication” or persecution. It could relate to the land tenure crisis hinted at throughout the book or exclusion from a political or cultic assembly, event, or synod, or perhaps even refers to exclusion or lack of support in exile.
to behold the miracle transpiring before them.\(^{61}\) As such, v. 6 must allude to an event perceived by TI as dealing the anticipated comeuppance to the enemies of Yahweh and leading to the rebirth of Israel.

A clue as to the nature of the event is provided in Isaiah 66:1. This verse is generally taken as a negative statement about the temple. Yet, the verse evokes a sentiment expressed in the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:5-7) and at the dedication of the first temple (1 Kgs 8:27-53), namely that Yahweh has no need of a temple and can not be contained by one. The sentiment is likely expressed to avoid the hubris or arrogance

---

\(^{61}\) On the opponents of TI, I agree with Middlemas (2005b: 182), who argues that TI lacks evidence for “a clearly defined division in the community along the lines of different ideological perspectives at the time of its composition.” I am especially skeptical of the assertion that TI reflects a marginalized or sectarian group in conflict with a “Jerusalem establishment” (Rofé 1985; Blenkinsopp 2003a). As even Rofé points out, the “opponents” in TI are consistently condemned for their neglect of Jerusalem and its temple. Consequently, if the term “establishment” is useful at all to describe opponents of TI, it is much more likely an establishment with Benjaminite, Samarian, rural, and/or other affiliations. Still, even this assertion is speculative as there is no compelling evidence of a single group or party under attack. TI simply expresses dissatisfaction with an agglomeration of political, socio-economic, and cultic ills. It is not even clear where the illicit activities are taking place. The cultic offenses take place in unspecified locales (57:3-13; 65:1-7): valleys, rock cliffs, trees, gardens, tombs, mountains, and hills. Some of the commercial and legal activities presume an urban centre, but which one or is it even only one? Jerusalem is not identified as the setting and, in fact, if TI is dated to the early Persian period, Jerusalem is not particularly likely given its condition (see ch. 2). Ramat Rahel, Mizpah, Samaria, or Lachish are more likely to have had the level of activity presupposed by the condemnations as well as a population guilty of neglecting Jerusalem and its temple. Hanson (1975) and Tuell (2005) suggest the competing groups are Levites and Zadokites; Rofé (1988) and Blenkinsopp (2003a), pietists and priests; Smith (1987) and Schramm (1995), monotheists and syncretists; Sekine (1989) and Koenen (1990), inclusivists and exclusivists. The fact that scholars have been able to fit the data to support such varied proposals is evidence for the lack of clear definition in TI; tensions certainly existed but the argument for organized groups is weak. Millenarian and apocalyptic groups are unconvincing and anachronistic on genre considerations alone (Collins 1998:23-25). By this, I do not mean to suggest there were no vigorous debates or conflicts, even ostracism of certain individuals or families, in the ebb and flow of Judean politics, only that there is no evidence for the crystallization of cohesive parties. To be sure, the gôlâ clearly make up part of TI’s community and may have generated tensions. The gôlâ, however, may not have been a homogenous group so that the gôlâ, or sons of the gôlâ (בני גולה), found, e.g., in Ezra-Nehemiah is likely only one expression of returnees. Certainly, neither DI nor TI expresses any knowledge of a group or party identified as such. On contemporary Yahwistic practices in the sixth century, see Ackerman 1992.
inherent in building a house for a deity; it has a sort of apotropaic function. This correspondence with texts related to the first temple invites the reader to expect the reconstruction of the temple so consistently anticipated throughout DI and TI, rather than anti-temple rhetoric.

To be sure, the verse also implies a question shared by those parallel texts, that is who may build the house (2 Sam 7:5; 1 Kgs 8:7-19). TI argues in 66:3-4 that the temple can not be built by people who would defile it with profane practices, regardless of their apparent interest in doing so. It can only be built by the “humble and contrite in spirit, who trembles at my word” (v. 5). The logic of v. 6 is, in light of all this, unavoidable. The

---

62 Levenson (1984: 296; 1988: 88) argues that it reflects the bi-directionality of the sacred space and cosmos homology, where the cosmos, in this case, is depicted as sacred space.

63 Solomon’s prayer reverberates even more broadly in TI, reinforcing the likelihood that 66:1 is pro-temple rhetoric. In particular, Isaiah 56:6-7 promises to foreigners (בֵּית הַנְּכֶר), who love the name of Yahweh (שֵׁם יְהֹウェָה), a place to rejoice in the house of prayer (בֵּית תפָּלָה), just as 1 Kings 8:41-43 implores Yahweh to listen to the foreigner (בֵּית) who, hearing of the name (שֵׁם) of Yahweh, comes and prays (הָתיָפְלַל) in the temple (הָתיָפְלָה); cf. 1 Chronicles 17:4-6; 28:2-8, 2 Chronicles 2:6, and 6:18-41. These similarities are not simply verbal links but rather reflect shared theological convictions evolving out of the internationalization of Yahwism. Adapting the Akkadian name-placing formula, šuma šakahû, the tradents of Hebrew name theology, such as TI, developed new ways to speak about and conceptualize the divine, creating, or at least privileging, ideas about hypostasis, transcendence, and universalism (Richter 2002). Name theology does not preclude or assume divine presence but rather binds Yahweh by covenant and reputation to Jerusalem, its temple, and the community. The name theologians do not reject Yahweh’s presence on earth, in Jerusalem, in the temple or within the community; name theology simply frees Yahweh to be at once a patron deity and at the same time the one and only deity with a general and universal concern for the cosmos and everything in it. In fact, name theology permits greater presence because human culpability only threatens Yahweh’s name or reputation—Yahweh can withdraw the name or be an active agent in its rehabilitation and still remain impeccable—whereas without name theology, human culpability is a direct affront to Yahweh so that holiness demands the withdrawal of presence (where the name could remain). Name theology and monotheism expand the ideological possibilities and necessity for Bekenntsgemeinschaft. The foreigner, without any other legitimate deities to worship, must have access to Yahweh and therefore the opportunity for association by confession. Yahweh, as a universal deity, must accept genuine confession of this sort, and yet must also be able to maintain a particular relationship with Israel. The openness to foreigners, ironically, permits, even invites, a more exclusivist approach to ascriptive membership, requiring that outsiders, and even insiders, meet the standards of confessional membership in order to be a legitimate part of the Blutgemeinschaft. TI, therefore, can simultaneously take a more exclusivist approach with respect to ethical responsibilities and cultic practice, and a more inclusivist approach with respect to ethnicity.
“tremblers” are, in fact, the temple builders; quite literally, the noise from the city—Yahweh’s retribution against those that have neglected and profaned the cult—is the reconstruction of the temple (so, also, Middlemas 2005b: 180-181). This victory is the basis for the hope and judgment anticipated in Isaiah 66:7-16. Consequently, in contrast to scholars who read anti-temple rhetoric, v. 1 piously heralds the construction of a house to worship Yahweh, indicated as underway in v. 6.

This solution seems the most probable, especially in light of the progression of the argument in 63:7–64:12, 65:1-7, and 65:8-25. In 63:7–64:12, the community recalls Yahweh’s “gracious deeds” (63:7-9, 10-14) as a preamble to a lament on the crisis of the exile and the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (63:15–64:11), culminating in an appeal to Yahweh to finally act (64:12). In a powerful response, Yahweh claims that he was always ready to act but the nation never truly asked, and even at that, Yahweh still claims to have responded, “Here I am! Here I am!” Yet, the nation refused (65:1-2). Yahweh then catalogues the nation’s idolatry and syncretism as evidence justifying Israel’s punishment (65:3-7). In Isaiah 65:8-25, the “historical” lesson is related to the present circumstances. Despite a just punishment, TI indicates that the “servants” were preserved so as not to destroy “the wine found in the cluster” (65:8). Yahweh promises

64 Along similar lines, see Middlemas 2005b: 181.

65 The phrase, הנני הנני (“Here I am! Here I am!”), echoes the prophetic response in Isaiah 6:8, הנני (Here I am!). Yahweh takes over the prophetic call. This allusion contributes to an intricate layering of language connecting Isaiah 65–66, Isaiah 57, and Isaiah 6. As Stromberg (2011: 165-168) observes, Isaiah 57:15 and 6:1-2 connect on the divine title, “High and Lofty One” (רֶם וְנְשָא) and the affirmation of holiness (קדוש) and Isaiah 65–66, 57, and 6 all interrelate on the motif of the “seed” (זרע) with Isaiah 65:9 and 57:13 reflecting a scenario in which the “holy seed” (זרע קדש in 6:13b), “seed from Jacob” (זרע יעקב in 65:9), seed blessed of Yahweh (זרע ברך יהוה in 65:23) “inherit” (ירש) and “possess” (נחל) the holy mountain. By contrast, the seed of the adulterer (מנאף), the unfaithful one (תזנה), and deceit (שקר) in Isaiah 57:3-4 sacrifice on a high and lofty mountain (הר גבירנה והשמע). Isaiah 65 clearly connects the current and former generations and condemns their cultic practices (see Schramm 1995; Ackerman 1987: 165-212) and presents the “holy seed” or “new wine in the cluster” (התירוש באשכול in 65:8) as the new creation in Jerusalem (65:17-19). In essence, TI is asserting that the people are engaged in the very same activities that led to the destruction of Jerusalem and Judah. Although seemingly weighted towards condemnation, there is a clear offering of hope and a theology of restoration in TI, which may not have been original to PI.
these servants their inheritance and title to the land, the Judean mountains from the Sharon in the northwest and to Achor in the southeast (65:9-10), over against those who are alleged to have forsaken Yahweh, neglected the holy mountain, and, therefore, as this argument goes, have no title to the land (65:11-12).

The literary context suggests that the neglect of the holy mountain in v. 11 refers, at least in part, to a failure or lack of interest in rebuilding the temple; the historical and/or theological context of the passage may relate to disputes over tenure, reflected also in Ezekiel 11:14-21 and 33:23-29, where the rights and title of expatriates to the land are called into question by apparent peers in the land. As in Ezekiel, there is vindication for the community of text. Scholars who view Isaiah 65:17-25 in primarily eschatological or apocalyptic light, because of the idealized vision of cosmological renewal, interpret Isaiah 65:13-25 (like 66:7-11) as an attempt to salvage Yahweh’s promises by deferring reconstruction and vindication to the eschaton. Yet, as indicated supra, the heightened language in this passage reflects the idiom of ANE building texts. Read as such, Isaiah

66 The reference to the Sharon plain is surprising as it is located in the northwest and, in the Persian period, was controlled by the king of Sidon (KAI 2:19-23; COS 2.57). Knoppers (2012: 162-163) suggests that the Sharon is a northern reference point, parallel to Jacob in v. 9, while the Achor Valley is a southern reference point, parallel to Judah in v. 9. Knoppers, therefore, understands the references as a geographic merism, encompassing the central hill country and embracing an expansive view of Israel. On the identification of Achor with Ḥel-Buqêʿah, a valley south of Jericho and conduit to En-Gedi, see Noth 1955: 42-55; Cross and Milik 1956; Kallai 1986: 119-121.

According to Joshua 15:7, the Achor valley comprised part of Judah’s northern border that cut Jerusalem to the south (Josh 15:7). Consequently, the geographical reference points enclose the Ephraimite and Benjaminite hill country, inclusive of Jerusalem but not the Judean hill country south of it. This geographical orientation, therefore, lays claim to a very different patrimony than that traditionally associated with Judah, the traditional Israelite patrimony “from Dan to Beersheba” (Judg 20:1; 1 Kgs 4:25), or the Davidic kingdom of 2 Samuel 8.

67 In agreement with Schramm (1995) and Rofé (1985), contra Hanson (1975), there is no compelling reason to accept that TI is in conflict with the Ezekielian or priestly tradents. Certainly, there is differing emphasis and considerable room for theological disagreement but this much can be made of differences between DI and TI and yet TI is a tradent of the former. As Schramm (1995: 110-111) observes, the practices of TI’s opponents, even assuming that TI is engaged in hyperbole, would be as offensive to the Ezekielian or priestly tradents as to TI.
65:13-25 serves as an ideal introduction to 66:1-6 and as an ideal introduction to the rebirth of Israel in 66:7-11, if these texts confirm the reconstruction of the temple. The reconstruction of the temple, and so Isaiah 66:1-6, is the powerful and tangible statement of claim against those who neglect the holy mountain.

CONCLUSIONS

Homology and metaphors in Isaiah prescribe the identity of Jerusalem as the divine city and promote its reconstruction and its restoration to a central place in Yahwistic faith. From DI through TI, this program involves de-legitimatization of Babylon, royal legitimation, and sophisticated mythopoeia, using ANE tropes and idiom, to promote the city and the theology of the scribe. Commenting on this program and its exuberant rhetoric of creation, Levenson (1988: 89-90) notes its ideological necessity in light of the reality faced by the authors and their community:

The re-creation of the temple-city could only have been conceived as a reenthronement of YHWH after a long period in which his palace lay in ruins, and his faithful subjects seemed abandoned and helpless. The reconstruction of the temple-city was not only the recovery of national honor, but also a renewal of the cosmos, of which the temple was a miniature. It is for this reason that YHWH is here said not to build Jerusalem, but to create it (bōrē, v. 18) just as he creates (bōrē, v. 17) the new heaven and the new earth.

Echoing the archaeological profile, the Isaianic program clearly recognizes and responds to the destitution of the early Persian period, depicting Jerusalem, first, as an abandoned mother and focusing divine concern on the breached walls and absence of houses and then, transformed, as a bride, mural crown, and new mother.

DI provides ideological strategies for accepting the realities of Persian hegemony and the absence of a Davidic king, particularly in light of the critical role of kings in the rebuilding of temples and capital cities. The text defends the legitimacy of reconstruction by divinely authorizing the Persian king to act as a patron for the reconstruction of the temple and city, and by empowering Yahweh’s people to accept for themselves the
promises of the Davidic covenant, which include peace and security in the temple and city. DI validates the latter claim and establishes critical continuity between the first temple and the second by recounting the return of cult vessels.

TI visualizes the reconstruction of Jerusalem as the re-creation of a divine city and a new *Bekenntnisgemeinschaft* (“confessional community”). TI is certainly concerned with the physical reconstruction of Jerusalem but the real innovation in its rhetoric, certainly vis-à-vis Mesopotamian and West Semitic parallels, is the malleability of the city, as both a physical site, even a physical site personified or deified, and a community. The re-creation of Jerusalem, while encompassing a physical rebuilding program, is ultimately about the creation or re-creation of a new people. A community is born through the reconstruction of the temple and the city (so also Berges 2002a; 2002b).

Emphasizing belief and praxis over birth, TI envisions a community with particular convictions: embracing the name of Yahweh, revering and upholding the Sabbath, showing solidarity with the marginalized, and manifesting concern for Jerusalem. Their primogenitors are the mourners (57:18; 61:2-3; 66:10), the watchers on the wall (62:6), the preserved cluster (65:8), those who tremble at the word of Yahweh (66:2, 5), and the servants of Yahweh (54:17; 56:6; 63:17; 65:8-9, 13-15; 66:14). Their inheritance is Jerusalem and the hill country from the Sharon to the Achor (65:10).

The language and theology of TI seems to align the tradents with the Holiness (H) tradition. Following Knohl (1995: 14-19), who credits H with the Sabbath injunctions in Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3, and Milgrom (2003), who assigns these injunctions and the creation account in Genesis 1:1–2:4 to an H redactor, the complex yet certain connections between the Sabbath, the tabernacle, creation, and the Sinai covenant in the Torah are largely the product of H.68 The plural construct תּוֹבֵּעָת is, as a consequence, peculiar to

---

68 Olyan (2005) argues that Exodus 31:12-17 is a composite text made up of an H unit in vv. 12-15 and a P unit in vv. 16-17. Stackert (2011) takes a similar approach to Olyan (2005) but attributes substantially more to P, including 31:12-13α, most of v. 15 as well as 35:1 and most of 35:2. In either case
this tradition, Ezekiel, TI, and Chronicles. Significantly, Knohl (1995: 204-215) identifies the origins of H in the same historical context as PI and so sees strong theological connections between the two. It seems appropriate, therefore, that the H tradition and the Isaianic tradition continued to participate in a common intellectual horizon. At the very least, the arguments for an internecine conflict between priests and visionaries are much more tenuous given this alignment.

Interestingly, name theology and a strong affinity for Jeremiah, identified by scholars such as Sommer (1998), also suggest a concern for fidelity to the Deuteronomic tradition while Van Seters (1999) has argued for DI’s theological similarities with the Yahwist (J-source), especially given its universalist themes and invocation of the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob. This convergence of scholarly claims is perhaps best interpreted as evidence that DI and TI are aware of a Torah already in the late sixth century and that they are influenced by the many traditions of that work.

If this is the case, DI and TI’s contribution to their community is a text that promulgates a theological justification for Jerusalem and its reconstruction, perhaps even

though, phrases containing the plural construct שב gratuites are still assigned to H. The merit of this approach is that it upholds Genesis 1:1–2:3 as P, as argued by Oyan (2005: 203, esp. n. 8), Stackert (2011: 12-13), and even Knohl (1995: 18), and retains for P a command to observe the Sabbath. This approach to the texts would not invalidate my argument supra. On Exodus 20:11, which provides a parallel etiology for the Sabbath to Exodus 32:17, see and cf. Knohl 1995: 67, 170-172 (n.b. n. 14); Milgrom 2003: 38-39; Olyan 2005: 203, n. 8; 205, n. 15; 208-209.

69 Blenkinsopp (2011: 498-499) argues that the language of creation in DI shows affinities to the Yahwist source. He notes several verbal links that are instructive, especially breath and spirit (רוח, נשמה) and “to form, mold” (יוצר). His arguments against an affinity with the first Genesis creation account are less compelling. He claims a contrast in cosmogonic perspectives reflected by DI’s tent or curtain imagery (40:22) vis-à-vis the firmament (רקיע) in Genesis 1:6-8, 14-15, 17, 20 yet does not recognize DI’s use of a verbal form of the root Redistribution of Yahweh’s creative activities (42:5; 44:24), as well as the links between the creation account and the construction of the Tabernacle that likely inform the tent or curtain imagery (see supra). Too much is also made of Isaiah 45:6-7, 18-19 as an apparent polemic against the first Genesis account (Blenkinsopp 2011:499; so, also, Weinfeld 1968; Sommer 1998: 142-145). In 51:9-11, DI describes creation as divine conflict, including a reference to תהום (Tehom, “the deep”). For a more thorough rebuttal of an alleged polemic, see Deroche 1992.
vis-à-vis the Torah, which is silent on this subject. Contrary to many traditional interpretations, the community of this text is clearly not a group at odds with an existing establishment in Jerusalem. Rather, DI and TI envision the creation of a new establishment in Jerusalem. In this regard, it is important not to allow diachronic realities to isolate DI and TI from one another. Though TI is clearly more concerned with the nature of post-exilic Yahwistic faith and, therefore, starker in its judgments, TI did not circulate independently and is inextricably bound to DI and its visions. Indeed, DI and TI present a largely complementary view that those who follow Yahweh’s call are a light and signal to the rest of Israel and the nations.

As argued by Knoppers (2011; 2012), there is insufficient evidence in DI and TI to conclude that the community of this text, while concerned with Jerusalem’s centrality, narrowed its concept of Israel to Judah, the gôlā, or a sectarian identity. Rather their concern for Jerusalem reflects a theological commitment that the rebirth of Israel can only occur through the reconstruction of the city and temple. The condemnation of an agglomeration of political, socio-economic, and cultic ills in TI has led scholars to posit a dramatic and diverse field of potential opposition parties. Given that many of the suggestions have merits, the results of this research, taken together, may suggest that no particular group is intended (see n. 61 supra). The rhetoric of destruction and judgment functions as a more general warning about the fate of the wicked. Ultimately, the dominant vision is the redemption and ingathering of “all flesh” (66:18-23) with the primary means to this end presented as the reconstruction and restoration of Jerusalem to be Israel’s progenetrix.

The argument, therefore, is a rather traditional one and not dissimilar to the argument made by the monarchic era prophets in response to the invasion of Sennacherib (Halpern 1996: 319-320, citing Isa 37: 21-32; Mic 5:9-13 after 5:1-8). In the immediate aftermath of that invasion, the prophetic vision of restoration went, at least to the prophetic mind, unfulfilled—not incidentally, there is a literary gap between the invasion
of Sennacherib and the restoration in Isaiah. It is only in the restoration that DI and TI rediscover and reapply that vision. Interestingly, Halpern (1996) sees in Hezekiah’s reforms and Proto-Isaianic ideology, the seeds of the Deuteronomic reform—a multi-step move from diversity in traditional culture to its radical critique and rejection. In DI and TI, the critique is reactivated to legitimize the restoration. It is not surprising, as such, that another nearly contemporary prophet, Haggai, turns especially to Deuteronomy to enlist, once again, the under-classes and elite sympathy to re-impose a collective identity through the reconstruction of Jerusalem (cf. Halpern 1996: 329).
CHAPTER 4.

REVITALIZING JERUSALEM: THE PERSPECTIVE OF HAGGAI

Whereas DI and TI are anonymous or pseudonymous voices of the early restoration period with a powerful literary legacy but an unattested historical one, Haggai and Zechariah are the period’s iconic prophetic figures. In Ezra 5:1-2 and 6:14, they receive credit for motivating the governor, Zerubbabel, the high priest, Joshua, and the Judean community to complete the reconstruction of the Jerusalem temple. Consistent with this recognition, the book of Haggai is not explicitly concerned with Jerusalem’s reconstruction *per se*; its focus is the temple’s reconstruction, and the state of the Judean community and leadership in relation to that project.¹ Yet, Jerusalem is a powerful, if latent, cultic, economic, and socio-political symbol in the work. The author of Haggai displays unambiguous confidence in Jerusalem’s centrality for the Judean community, even without making direct reference to the city and even where the traditions to which the author alludes make no explicit claims as such.

Thucydides (*Hist.* 1.10.2) famously observed that “if the city of the Lacedaemonians were deserted, and only the temples and the foundations of its buildings were left, after the passage of considerable time, there would eventually be widespread doubt that their power measured up to their reputation.” Whatever other methodological implications this oft-cited statement raises for historical and archeological research, by it, Thucydides articulates the challenge of preserving and/or shaping cultural memory in the absence of meaningful monuments. Thucydides acknowledges a nearly universal human tendency to judge success, power, and position by visible monuments. The archaeological

---

¹ Throughout this chapter, I use the terms “book of Haggai” and “Haggai” interchangeably and refer to the author of the book anonymously as “the author” or “the prophet.” I never refer to the author as Haggai, though occasionally I refer to the prophetic character by his name. The context will clearly reflect the distinction. For an excellent survey of recent research and a thorough bibliography on Haggai beyond the works cited in this chapter, see Boda (2003a).
portrait of Jerusalem sketched in chapter two indicates that while Jerusalem reemerged at the center of Judean political and cultic life in the late fifth century, its ascendancy is not reflected in any particularly impressive monuments. In the early restoration period, its monuments destroyed and robbed, Jerusalem’s enduring legacy as a political and cultic site lay in its symbolic vitality for the Judean community. The preservers and advocates of that vitality are to Jerusalem what Thucydides is to Sparta.

The vitality of Jerusalem in Haggai, given its destitute condition and the agrarian interests of the book’s implied audience, is remarkable. In this text, Jerusalem is the implied setting of most, if not all, of the vignettes and, therefore, a focal point for the Judean community. The author’s presumption that the temple should be rebuilt in Jerusalem and that it should be this temple and no other is self-evident. Still, the fulcrum of the book, particularly of its incipient oracle, is the community’s reluctance to come to Jerusalem and rebuild that temple. Even though there is no explicit polemic against other sites,² there is an ambiguity or uncertainty regarding Jerusalem’s status to which the book appears to respond. Haggai’s support for the immediate reconstruction of the temple and Davidic leadership (see infra) strongly endorses Jerusalem’s reestablishment as the central place for the Judean community. Indeed, the author actually takes the argument even further by tying the imperative to rebuild to centralization legislation in Deuteronomy and linking vindication and revitalization to reconstruction. Any potential challenges to these views are unequivocally resolved in the text, that is, the actors in the text are presented as taking the correct course of action that reestablishes or will reestablish Jerusalem as a central place in light of the prophetic word.

Significantly, the author’s tour de force relies on a wealth of cultural resources that must have held considerable authority for the intended audience. The author advances an argument thoroughly grounded in the major streams of existing traditions.

² On the possibility of such a polemic in Haggai 2:14, see my discussion infra.
The author protests the people’s reluctance to come to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple with sapiential precision; distinctively ensconces the imperative to come and rebuild within Deuteronomic and Davidic covenantal frameworks; and, validates that imperative by appealing to priestly notions of clean and unclean as well as the reversal of prophetic judgment against the Davidic house. This chapter highlights this creative achievement as it is reflected in the date and organization of the work and in the portrayal of the restoration, the temple, and Judean leadership. In doing so, I emphasize the ways in which the text simultaneously assumes and advances the primacy of Jerusalem in order to provide ideological legitimacy for political and cultic re-centralization in the early restoration era.

THE DATE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK

Regarding the structure and organization of Haggai, Kessler (2002a) persuasively argues that the oracular pronouncements, narrative framework, and date formulae of Haggai form four scenes or vignettes (Hag 1:1-15; 2:1-9; 2:10-19; 2:20-23) and a unified whole that capture dramatic moments or issues in the life of the post-exilic Judean community.4

---

3 Throughout this work, I use Deuteronomic (Dtn) to refer to characteristics of Deuteronomy; and, Deuteronomistic (Dtr) to refer to the characteristics of so-called Deuteronomistic historiographical and prophetic texts. On the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH), see McKenzie 1992; Knoppers and McConville 2000; Römer and de Pury 2000; Knoppers 2000; 2010; Richter 2005; Knoppers and Greer 2010. On the “Deuteronomistic school” and prophetic literature, see Weinfeld 1992; Person 1993; 2002; Schearing and McKenzie 1999. In my opinion, Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic thought are distinct discursive threads (Knoppers 1996; 2001). The lexical and ideational inventory of these works became part of Judean cultic and scribal traditions. As such, I am skeptical about the idea of a “Deuteronomistic school” redacting texts in the Persian period.

4 On the unity of Haggai, see also Floyd 1995. Kessler’s (2002a: 31-57) survey of the previous scholarship on Haggai indicates that a four part structure and the unity of Haggai are not, or at least have not been, dominant views. Nevertheless, while recognizing that structure is often fluid, esp. in the HB, and that, as such, texts often exhibit multiple points of delineation and so a tapestry or mosaic of structural possibilities, my own analysis infra uses and expands the significant explanatory power of Kessler’s views. I am, therefore, persuaded that the four part structure and all its constituent parts, the narrative framework, date formulae, prose, and oracular material, reflect an early, if not original, compositional form. On productivity or “fruitful”-ness as an important criterion of a reliable theory, see Zuckerman 1991: 270-271.
Kessler (2002a: 251; 2006: 106-107) instructively observes that the four scenes are united by A/B/A/B parallelism, in which oracles of reproach (A) juxtapose encouragement (B). The “B” sections share particularly notable similarities, such as relative temporal clauses (2:6, 23), the shaking of the heavens and earth (2:6, 21), and the assurance of “present acceptability despite inferior or humble status” (Kessler 2006: 107).

The four scenes address (1) the socio-economic condition of the people and the status of the temple, (2) the quality and ultimate place of the temple within a divine economy, (3) the transition of the community from unclean to clean and cursed to blessed at the climactic moment of the temple’s foundation, and (4) Zerubbabel’s status relative to Yahweh and the people. Generally, these scenes presume conditions of privation and hardship, which the author attributes to a divine curse on the people for their failure to commence the reconstruction of the temple (1:2-11; 2:15-17). The author presents Haggai as a prophet speaking into this experience of privation and hardship with optimism and anticipation to motivate the community’s transition from anomie to action and from alienation to approbation. Though a relatively short book, the four scenes communicate a sophisticated scribal perspective that inextricably links the reconstruction of the temple to the agricultural life and future aspirations of a nascent restoration community.

Given the overall perspective and orientation of the text, and given that the date formulae are integral to the literary composition, Haggai is accepted by many to be contemporary testimony to the events which it describes and on which it comments.6

---

5 Boda 2004a: 38 succinctly proposes a plausible two-stage development, 1:1–2:9 then 2:10-23, which recognizes the important literary pivot between (A/B)1 and (A/B)2. Still, little is gained in our understanding of the text or the community by this compositional theory and, as such, I tend not to be inclined towards it. On the forms of the oracles, see esp. Koch 1967; Floyd 2000.

6 Generally, Haggai lacks evidence for themes, literature, or historical events/contexts later than the setting claimed by the date formulae. Although I appreciate Beuken’s (1967) argument for Chronistic influence, Mason (1977) has shown that none of the features are exclusively Chronistic. If there is a relationship, Haggai may have influenced Chronistic thought (see my conclusion infra).

In support of a late sixth century date, Kessler (2002a: 52) lays out five significant points. First, Haggai 2:23 anticipates the elevation of Zerubbabel and, therefore, it is likely “the governor still held his
Significantly, the precise tripartite formulae found in Haggai are used almost exclusively in biblical literature with reference to the templeless period (Curtis 2006: 94-102). Tripartite formulae first appear in narratives and prophecy chronicling the temple’s destruction and the exilic period (2 Kgs 25:1-3; Jer 39:2; 52:4, 31; Ezek 1:1; 8:1; 24:1; 29:1; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1; 40:1), continue to be used in accounts related to the reconstruction of the temple (Hag 1:1, 15; 2:10; Zech 1:7; Ezra 6:15) and otherwise occur only in two anomalous cases (Gen 7:11; 2 Chr 3:2). The initial use of the formulae clearly follows heightened chronometric and chronographic tendencies in contemporary Mesopotamia (Curtis 2006: 102-109). The first astronomical diaries and earliest extant Babylonian texts that consistently employ tripartite formulae date from 747 to 539 B.C.E. (Van Seters 1997: 79-92; Rochberg 2006: 1936-1937; Curtis 2006: 102-109). Its pattern of use in biblical literature prima facie suggests that the practice was adopted in Judah when the Neo-Babylonian Empire assumed control of the Levant and yet did not persist.

office.” Second, the text does not contain any reference to the final construction of the temple in 515 BCE, which is unlikely if it had taken place before the publication of the text, given that the text is especially concerned with precisely this issue. Third, the author knows only Darius I, and does not distinguish him from later kings of the same name, especially Darius II (r. 423–404 BCE). Fourth, “the theological themes of Haggai show affinities with the two main traditions of the exilic period: Deuteronomism and the priestly tradition.” Fifth, the date formulae are “a foundational structuring device” that likely point to a roughly contemporary author (see, also, Floyd 1995).

In addition to these five points, linguistic considerations support a late sixth century date, see esp. Hill 1981; 1982; 1983. Notably too, the rhetorical questions in Haggai 2:3—“Who among you survivors saw this house in its former splendor? How does it look to you now? Is it not like nothing in your eyes?”—work on the prima facie assumption that the primary readers could recall the house as it existed before its destruction in 586 BCE. If so, any date after 500 BCE strains credulity (keeping in mind that such individuals must have been born at least around 591 BCE to have seen and recalled “its former splendor”).

Middlemas’s (2005a; 2007) terminology, templeless, is especially appropriate in this context because, as I argue infra, it was the absence of the temple and the anticipation or hope for its reconstruction that animated the heightened chronometric tendencies of these prophetic authors.

For additional discussion, including on bipartite forms and the significance of the sequence of the elements, see Yaron 1957; de Vaux 1961: 178-193; Van Seters 1997: 294-295; Kessler 2002: 41-51; Curtis 2006: 94-102, 103n.44. It is interesting to observe that the anomalous occurrence in 2 Chr 3:2 concerns the construction of the first temple. The priestly account of the flood, of which Gen 7:11 is a part, is one of the most chronologically intensive narratives in all of biblical literature.

7 Middlemas’s (2005a; 2007) terminology, templeless, is especially appropriate in this context because, as I argue infra, it was the absence of the temple and the anticipation or hope for its reconstruction that animated the heightened chronometric tendencies of these prophetic authors.

8 For additional discussion, including on bipartite forms and the significance of the sequence of the elements, see Yaron 1957; de Vaux 1961: 178-193; Van Seters 1997: 294-295; Kessler 2002: 41-51; Curtis 2006: 94-102, 103n.44. It is interesting to observe that the anomalous occurrence in 2 Chr 3:2 concerns the construction of the first temple. The priestly account of the flood, of which Gen 7:11 is a part, is one of the most chronologically intensive narratives in all of biblical literature.
among the scribes writing later biblical texts in the Persian and early Hellenistic periods. This pattern of use points to the significance of the temple’s destruction as a very specific watershed for the Judean scribal community that inspired temporary use of these chronometric and chronographic practices in cultic literature, perhaps to permit the faithful observance of mourning rituals (e.g., Zech 7:2-7) and also predict and chronicle the anticipated restoration.\(^9\) The book of Haggai, in this case, would fit a very specific milieu and preserve contemporary Judean scribal perspectives at that early, templeless stage in the restoration era (see also n. 6 supra).

**THE TEMPORAL FRAME AND SITZ-IM-LEBEN**

The date formulae, and supplementary material in literary proximity to the formulae, are not only consistent with sixth century practices but also provide significant information critical to understanding the communicative context and purpose of the book. By dating scenes to the second year of Darius (1:1, 15; 2:10), the author explicitly sets an imperial stage and, by expressly referring to Darius as king (מלך in 1:1, 15) and Zerubbabel as governor (פחא in 1:1, 14; 2:2, 21), tacitly accepts Achaemenid imperial administration (Meyers and Meyers 1987: 5-6; Kessler 2002a: 115; Bowick 2009: 107-116). The styles, as used, reflect the contemporary conventions, the prevailing political reality, and communicate acceptance of them. If the author regarded this prevailing imperial and gubernatorial context as illegitimate, these official styles likely would have been omitted or altered in some way.\(^{10}\)

---

\(^9\) Insofar as literature that for other reasons is generally accepted as dating to the templeless period (e.g., Kings, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8; though cf., Isaiah 40–66) reflects this tendency while literature that is dated later does not (e.g., Zechariah 9–14, and Malachi), this assertion is not the outcome of circular reasoning; it is descriptive rather than prescriptive. Note also, Ezra 6:15 is part of the Aramaic section of the book, which is generally considered the oldest and most authentic layer.

\(^{10}\) Imperial instability after Cambyses’s death is reflected in documents dated to Bardiya’s reign (Briant 2002: 102); and, the Egyptian revolt in 404 BCE is reflected in texts dated to the native Egyptian monarch, Amyrtaeus (Redford 2006: 263). More subtly than this, yet no less pregnant with meaning, a scribe could have neglected the title פחא for Zerubbabel and מלך for Darius and/or used a style reading
Acceptance is provisional, though. The announcements that Yahweh will “shake” (רעש) creation and the nations (2:6-7, 21) and that Yahweh intends to overthrow (המרד) and shatter (שמד) the political and military power of the kingdoms (2:22) affirm the overall supremacy and sovereignty of Yahweh. Contextually, the “shaking” activities are Yahweh’s interventions in the earthly plane of international and ecological affairs. Moreover, the relative temporal clause, “once again, in a little while” (עוד אחד мало היא) in 2:6a, preceding the announcement that Yahweh intends to shake creation and the nations in 2:6b-7, not only anticipates imminent action but implicitly identifies the present reality as an outcome of previous “shaking” activities. Past and current events, potentially even such specific events as the revolts and conflicts that occurred at the death of Cambyses and the ascension of Darius, are, inferentially, evidence of Yahweh’s past presence and activities, and the basis for confidence in Yahweh’s imminent presence and activities. As such, “once again, in a little while” promotes a view that Darius’s earthly sovereignty is legitimate, deriving as it does from Yahweh’s cosmic sovereignty; but also

“Zerubbabel son of David, king of Judah,” to promote independence and challenge the legitimacy of the prevailing imperial order.

11 On the “shaking” motif, see Kessler 1987; Bedford 2001: 238-254; and my discussion infra.
12 On the translation of the relative temporal clause, see Kessler 2002a: 160, 173-175.
13 This is not to suggest a simple one-to-one correlation between certain historical events and the “shaking” activities, only that those events could provide a historical reality that could be interpreted cosmologically and so inspire hope. Some Mesopotamian omens and rituals interpret terrestrial instability as indicative of imminent threats, e.g., TU 45, Obv. 16, a building ritual, reads,

(An omen says:) if the earth quakes, (then) an enemy will rise and the dwellings of the land will not be secure. (Another omen says:) if the earth turns around, there will be injustice in the whole land, the land will turn mad. (Linssen 2004: 286)

Further note that the upheavals of Darius’s ascension were not immediately quelled within the king’s first year, as suggested in the ideological construction and telescoping of the Behistun inscription. Even within the inscription, the account of the rebellions of Elam and Saka in 520–519 BCE evince that problems persisted (V § 71-74) and, once these revolts were quelled, other historical sources indicate that Darius set upon an ambitious program of imperial expansion, administrative reorganization, and fiscal reform. Considering Darius’s ambitious political and economic agenda, his early reign must have imparted a sense of innovation and variability, holding the possibility that the world could change suddenly and dramatically. On the ascension and conflicts of Darius’s reign, see esp. Briant 2002: 107-161. On the significance of Darius’s ascension for Haggai, see Wolff 1988: 74-76.
that the two are only temporarily aligned, until Yahweh shakes the nations again. The text promotes a carefully considered, pragmatic, and clearly provisional approach to imperial authority, which emphasizes Yahweh’s primary, if not exclusive role, as patron of the temple, the community, and the Judean leadership.\textsuperscript{14}

While the year date and “shaking” texts set this imperial and cosmological stage, the months and days of the date formulae situate the four scenes during public gatherings toward the end of the harvest and the beginning of the ploughing and sowing season in the Judean agricultural cycle. There are four such dates in Haggai, with the last repeated three times: “the sixth month, on the first day of the month” (1:1); “the twenty-fourth day of the month” (1:15); “the seventh month, on the twenty-first day of the month” (2:1); and, “the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month” (2:10, 18, 20).

The book opens in the sixth month. By this time, Judean farmers had typically completed the most labor intensive tasks of the harvest, namely, the gathering of cereals, legumes, and grapes; only the gathering of the summer fruit, figs, and olives remained (Hopkins 1987: 186; Borowski 2003: 28, 37; contra Meyers and Meyers 1987: 21).\textsuperscript{15} The

\textsuperscript{14} This emphasis contrasts sharply with Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, and even Isaiah in which the patronage of the Persian kings is much more prominent.

\textsuperscript{15} As the HB only formally recognizes a vernal start to the year (Exod 12:2; Deut 16:1), I am assuming this orientation. The emphasis on the harvest provides additional corroboration (e.g., Hag 1:6, 9). This vernal orientation of the calendar, however, obscures the important autumnal orientation to Judean agrarian life, according to which the agricultural year ends with the sixth month (Exod 23:16; KAI 182; Wagenaar 2005: 13-21; cf. Borowski 1987: 33; Körtin 1999: 69, 75). In this regard, note especially the significance of the first day of the seventh month (Lev 23:23-25; Num 29:1-6), the Day of Atonement on the tenth day (Lev 16:29; 23:27; Num 29:7), and the Festival of Ingathering or Booths in the third week (Lev 23:34, 39; Num 29:12-34; see more \textit{infra}). H is likely responsible for assimilating elements of the popular autumnal orientation to the Priestly Torah (Knohl 2007:40-45). In my opinion, tensions in the HB between vernal and autumnal calendars probably mirror tension between a state and cult authorized civil calendar and a popular agrarian calendar, as well as the partial assimilation of the latter into the former, rather than teleological development by which “the traditional agrarian, solar-oriented calendar from pre-exilic times is gradually replaced by the lunar (or, more correctly, lunisolar) calendar of the Babylonian type” (Ulfgard 1998: 37-47). Nevertheless, Ulfgard (1998: 45-47) instructively observes that a vernal orientation has the tendency to deemphasize the agrarian thrust of Judean festivals and invite the
scene starts on the first day of the month when Judeans would have gathered to celebrate
the new moon (cf. Num 10:10; 28:11-15; 1 Sam 20; Isa 1:13). The scene concludes on
the twenty-fourth day, which, given the instruction to gather wood in Haggai 1:8, may
correspond to the first or second day of the Wood Offering Festival mentioned in the
Temple Scroll and other calendrical documents from Qumran, or perhaps provides an
etiology for it (4Q325 Frg. 2, 7; 4Q365 Frg. 23, 4-12; 4Q394 Frg. 1-2, v, 8-9; 4Q409 Frg.
1, i, 3-4; 11Q19 xi, 12-13; xxiii; 2-11, xliii, 4; 11Q20 vi, 11-17; cf. Neh 10:34; 13:31;
Josephus, J.W. 2.429-430; m. Ta’an. 4:5).17

The second scene is set in the seventh month. During this month, Judeans
celebrated the turn of the agricultural year and the end of the harvest season, especially
with the Festival of Ingathering or Booths (Exod 23:16; 34:22). According to priestly
traditions (P and H), the festival commenced on the fifteenth day and ended on the
twenty-first day (Lev 23:34, 39; Num 29:12-34). The second scene appears to be set,
therefore, on the last day of the festival. Curiously, there is no explicit reference to the
development of stronger political and cultic justifications. The civil calendar helps forge more distinctively
Judean, and, in an imperial context, subversive, festal practices.

16 M. Roš Haš 1:1, identifies four “New Year” days, referring to the first day of the sixth month as
the “New Year” for the “tithing of the cattle,” i.e., it marked the end and beginning of the fiscal year for
determining the tithe on animals. In this vein, see n. 15 supra. The antiquity of the custom is naturally an
open question. On the new moon, see Keel 1998: 102-109 (and the literature cited there).

17 On the Wood Offering Festival and the relevant Qumran texts, see esp. Yadin 1985:101-109;
Milgrom 1993-1995; Crawford 1994; Tov and White 1994; Talmon and Ben-Dov 2001: 165, and the
literature cited therein. If such a festival is in view, Haggai 1:8 may explain the otherwise inexplicable three
week delay in fulfilling the prophet’s instruction; it is a specific direction not just to gather wood for
reconstruction but actually one that also implies the time when construction should begin, namely, after the
people have gathered wood for the Wood Offering Festival and the repair of the temple. 4Q365 Frg. 23,
4b–6a expressly links the gathering of wood for the festival to temple construction: “When you come to the
land that I am giving you as an inheritance and (when) you live on it in security, bring wood for a burnt
offering and for all the work of the house that you will build for me in the land.” Lines 1-4 quote Leviticus
23:42–24:2, suggesting that the subsequent and otherwise extra-biblical material in 4b–6a is part of a
reworked Pentateuch (Crawford 1994). Milgrom (1993-1995), in fact, argues from Nehemiah 10:35 and
13:31 that it is probable, or at least possible, that “Nehemiah’s Pentateuch” contained these instructions.
The text in Haggai may augment this argument by providing additional evidence for the presence of this
tradition at an even earlier date or perhaps, as mentioned supra, providing an etiology for its development.
festival, though its theological profile is reflected in the language and themes of the scene, especially references to the deliverance from Egypt (2:5a; cf. Lev 23:43), the need for rain (1:10-11; cf. 1 Kgs 8: 35-36; Zech 14:12), and the abiding presence of Yahweh and filling of the temple with splendor (2:4-9; cf. 1 Kgs 8).\footnote{On the diachronic development of the festival’s theological profile, see Ulfgard 1998. On rain and the festival, see esp. Milgrom 2001: 2030, 2043-2047; cf. Weyde 2004: 123-130.}

By the ninth month, the date of scenes three and four, Judean farmers had finished the ploughing and early sowing season and were beginning the late sowing season (Hopkins 1987: 186). While the day is not agriculturally significant, the repetition of this date signals its preeminent importance within the narrative world as the day that the foundations of the temple are laid (see \textit{infra}). At this time of year, the absence of a temple would be acutely felt. As a community entered the rainy season, its temple served as a hedge on the orderly functioning of the natural world; its absence could be a source of great anxiety (1 Kgs 8:35-36 // 2 Chr 6:26-27; Ps 65; Joel 2:15-24; Zech 14:7).\footnote{For some ANE parallels to the biblical passages cited, see Hurowitz 1992: 322-323; Stevens 2006: 51. For discussion on the role of ANE temples in supporting agrarian life, see Stevens 2006: 136-172 and relevant literature cited there.}

The three-month period covered by Haggai’s four scenes provides a window into a community without a temple, experiencing a disappointing harvest, as well as that same community as it has laid the temple’s foundations and is looking forward with a promise of divine approbation to a new agricultural year. At the center of the book and this three-month period is the community’s harvest festival, taking place as a communal, pilgrimage festival in a central place, around the site of the emerging temple.

\textbf{The Nature of the Restoration}

Related to the temporal setting, the author invokes the historical memory and literary motifs of exile and restoration, initially by presenting the people as engaged in rebuilding
their houses and livelihood, and rejecting the task of rebuilding Yahweh’s house. The author describes the people’s motives in a curious way, (1:2). It is possible to read בַּעַת as an infinitive construct in an oblique relationship to בַּעַת and so, the implicit subject as the people, “it is not time [for us] to come, a time [for us] to rebuild,” or to read בַּעַת as the subject, “the time has not come, the time to rebuild,” akin to οὐχ ἢκει ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι in the LXX (cf. Kessler 2002a: 103-104, 123-127; 2002b).

The first reading has greater resonance with the rest of the first scene precisely because it identifies the people as the problem rather than time. The passage that follows explicitly condemns the people’s attitude and their priorities in vv. 4 and 9 and demands action in v. 8 (Kessler 2002a: 111-112, 128-130, 133-139; 2002b). Once the people respond, the author explicitly announces the reversal of their inaction by asserting, “and they came” (וִיבָאוּ) in v. 14. As such, the repetition of בַּעַת in v. 2 (לא בַּעַת) and v. 14 (וִיבָאוּ) creates a leitmotiv—the “coming” of the people—which frames and binds together the oracular and narrative sections of the first scene. This leitmotiv intensifies the portrait of a self-interested and astigmatic community for whom the divine-prophetic word provides necessary motivation to proceed with an otherwise arrested restoration.

Still, the grammatical ambiguity in v. 2 along with the threefold repetition of בַּעַת between vv. 2 and 4 clearly and perhaps deliberately expands the semantic valence of the prophetic reproach. The author may also be implying an objection to the task on menological grounds, to which the prophet caustically responds, “Is it time for you yourselves to live in (ישב) your finished (ספן) houses while this house is desolate (הרב)?”

20 Kessler (2009a: 28) argues there is “no exile” in Haggai and that the theme is “strikingly absent.” This overstates the case, as my discussion infra will show. Still, the author’s allusions to the exile are consistent with the “hermeneutics of generalization” that Kessler (2006: 107-110) argues characterize this author’s use of earlier traditions. Among other reasons noted infra, the author may have generalized the exilic experience in order to mitigate the ruptures and discontinuity it generated in the community’s cultic, social, and political identity. For a comparative perspective on this process, see Stott 2009.
(v. 4). By then calling on the people to consider the results of their efforts, the prophet offers the present reality of privation and hardship as evidence that they have not gained, and have actually suffered, by waiting (vv. 5-11). The prophet mocks a menologically grounded objection to the reconstruction of the temple. As such, even in this form, time is not really the issue. The issue is their use of time and their inaction, that is, the failure to come. The caustic reproach of v. 4 stresses this through its characterization of the people’s choices and the temple’s condition. The well-chosen adjective חרב, meaning not only disrepair but also abandonment, contrasts the “abandoned” unoccupied temple to which the people have not yet come, with the “lived-in” (ישב) houses.

21 The repetition of the second masculine plural pronoun reflects the Hebrew and reinforces the forcefulness of the prophetic reproach. On the houses as ספוןים, see Meyers and Meyers 1987: 23-24 and Kessler 2002a: 128, who see this word as creating a contrast between “finished” houses and an unfinished temple; cf. Ackroyd 1968: 155; Petersen 1984: 48; Hurowitz 2003: 589-590; and, Boda 2004a: 89-90, who see a contrast between luxurious, “paneled” houses and a plain temple. The sense “to panel or cover” more accurately reflects the meaning of the word (1 Kgs 6:9; 7:3, 7; Jer 22:14; cf. HALOT 2:764). To be sure, the author of Haggai is familiar with Jeremiah 22 (cf. Hag 2:23 // Jer 22:24) and, as such, may be sharpening the critique by identifying the people’s houses with the luxuriously paneled buildings of royalty and the doomed pre-exilic community (Jer 22:13-15). Still, as paneling is one of the last steps in construction, the former meaning may legitimately convey the sense and contrast implied by the use of the word in this context. The general sense of privation and hardship, the parallel state of the temple as “desolate” (ורש), and the lack of references to luxury seem more appropriately contrasted with “finished” or “covered” than luxurious (Kessler 2002a: 128). Most of the occurrences of the root ספן in biblical literature are found in the account of the construction of the First Temple (1 Kgs 6:9; 7:3, 7) and, as such, read with this in mind, the author of Haggai may be sharpening the critique by not only comparing the condition of the people’s houses to the ruined temple of their time but the completed temple of former times. Also, as a denominalized form of ספנות, ספוןים may highlight that the people’s houses have roofs and, by contrast, the temple does not. Implicit in this observation is a potential critique of sacrifices or worship at an open air altar, which may be the implied grounds for the subsequent concern with unclean sacrifices (cf. my discussion ad loc). Suffice it to say, the terminology is pregnant with meaning.

22 Edelman (2005: 115-116) points out that, according to Babylonian menologies, the day the prophet delivers the message is propitious while the day the people respond and start rebuilding the temple is not, which, if known by the author, makes the reproach all-the-more-caustic.

23 My thoughts, in this regard, are informed by Kessler (2002b), who makes a strong case along these lines, arguing more specifically for the sapiential orientation of the concept of time in Haggai.

24 On the significance of חרב, see Kessler 2002a: 128-130; Vriezen 2010; see and cf. Ackroyd 1968: 155-157, who highlights the connotation of defilement, a sense that is probably intended, presaging the problem raised in Haggai 2:10-14.
Barthélemy (1992: 924) argues that the *leitmotiv* of the people coming anticipates that they must come to Jerusalem from surrounding villages and farmsteads. Although it could simply mean that the people must come to the Temple Mount from the lower town, Barthélemy’s argument is strengthened by the prophet’s description of the temple as הרוב (1:4, 9), an unlikely word choice if the town around the temple were heavily populated; and, by the author’s agricultural motifs (1:6, 10-11; 2:15-19), which presume a largely rural population (Kessler 2001: 150-151). The condition of the Temple Mount, therefore, points to similar conditions for the whole of Jerusalem. This limited information, such as it is, aligns favorably with minimalist demographic theories such as my own and accurately reflects my reading of the archaeological data on the reality of the late sixth century and early restoration period in Jerusalem (see also, Kessler 2001).

Significantly, as the prophetic reproach and summons to come is addressed only implicitly to the people but explicitly to the governor and the priest, and as the governor and the priest, together with the people, fulfill the summons, the text could, perhaps should, be taken as evidence that Zerubbabel and Joshua were not residing in Jerusalem. If the address is taken seriously, they should be counted alongside the general population as at least equally reluctant to rebuild, contrary to the strong tendency in scholarship to assume that Haggai was working in collaboration with Zerubbabel and Joshua to achieve their agenda to rebuild the temple. Indeed, the book of Zechariah contains similarly subtle indications that Zerubbabel was not exercising leadership from Jerusalem and

---

25 The urban landscape is almost entirely absent. There are no references to cities or villages and there are no palaces, gates, or storehouses in Haggai. Note, e.g., that the author uses מגורה in 2:19, rather than אוצר. The former probably refers to a barn or granary in a rural setting while the latter refers to public, often royal storage facilities. Yet, rather ironically, the presumptive setting is urban, that is, in Jerusalem.

26 This tendency is largely informed by Ezra, which presents the latter two as initiating the project on their return. This information is not provided in Haggai. In both cases, however, the authors are typically reserved about the motivations or mindset of their characters.
perhaps was not so eager to rebuild the temple (see my next chapter). If this was the case, the call “to come” takes on an even greater and more profound resonance and challenges traditional historical analysis and reconstruction.

The implication, though, is not that Jerusalem is completely devoid of inhabitants or that there are other urban sites that are legitimate or rival centers. The presumptive setting of the second scene in Jerusalem, during the Festival of Ingathering or Booths, as well as the reference in the third scene to offerings made “there” (2:14) suggest at least some minimal cultic activities occurring in Jerusalem, probably at the “abandoned” temple site. These subtle insights into the status of Jerusalem are consistent with evidence from other texts (Jer 41; Zech 7) and the archaeological record. The salient perspective communicated by this evidence is of a blighted and depopulated Jerusalem and yet one that, to the prophetic perspective, remains the natural center for the community.

Curiously, even while emphasizing the need for restoration and the coming of the people, Haggai lacks any explicit mention of aliyah. Rather, the author ever so subtly develops the topos of exile and restoration, and shapes memory of it through nuanced characterization—of the people as a “remnant” (שָׁאָר in 1:12, 14; 2:2) and a portion thereof as “survivors” (הנשאר in 2:3)—and through allusion to the exodus (2:5).

Moreover, it is entirely possible in this light that Zerubbabel was not only reluctant to rebuild the temple but deliberately eschewed the royal aspirations inspired by his lineage. In fact, such an interpretation is perhaps the best way to account for the silence regarding Zerubbabel outside of accounts concerned with temple reconstruction, i.e., Zerubbabel never yielded to populist efforts to make him king of an independent Judah. The Davidic family by this point could very well have been and likely were loyal clients of the Persian king. The portrait of Jehoiachin at the end of the book of Kings, as supported by the well known rations tablet mentioning the king (Weidner 1939), suggests a move in this direction already under Babylonian hegemony, such that the Davidic family became a retainer in the Babylonian and subsequently the Persian courts. The story of Zerubbabel preserved in 1 Esdras 3:1–5:6, although generally considered historically unreliable, assumes the continuation of such privilege. The practice itself is quite common in royal courts throughout history.

See my previous chapters and excellent discussions by Ackroyd 1968: 25-31; Lipschits 2001; 2005: 112-118; see and cf. the interesting, though less probable view of Sacchi 2000: 46-68.

The LXX prima manus does not include the allusion to the exodus and Sinaiitic covenant, but it is attested in the MT, Tg. J., Vulgate, and probably also Mur 88. On the text-critical and literary issues, see
author does not distinguish between an in-group or an out-group of returnees and remainees, or use the exile as an explanation for the community’s state of anomie and alienation. Instead, the author presents the people as a single community, under the leadership of Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel, the governor (פדח) of Yehud, and Joshua son of Jehozadak, the high priest (כהן גדול). The author’s use of “all the remnant of the people” (を持מי הארץ) in 1:12 and 1:14 to enclose “the people” (עם) in 1:12-13, and “all people of the land” (כל־עם הארץ) in 2:4 immediately after “the remnant of the people” (שארית העם) in 2:2, referring in each case to the same people, strongly resists the delineation of distinctive groups or sub-groups; all the people are a remnant and all the people are “of the land” (Kessler 2002: 141-142, 164, 168-169).30

Barthélemy 1992: 927-928; Petersen 1984: 61, 66; Kessler 2002a: 160, 169-171; Rogland 2007a. From a literary and theological perspective, the strong presence of Deuteronomic traditions throughout the work (see infra) and the setting of this scene during the Festival of Ingathering (cf. Deut 31:10-13) support the appropriateness, even theological necessity, of affirming the covenant. The repetition of the second plural pronominal suffix in v. 5a, “with you when you came out of Egypt” is very reminiscent of the literary technique employed in Deuteronomy 5:3-4: “Not with our ancestors did Yahweh make this covenant, but with us, who are all of us here alive today. Yahweh spoke with you face to face at the mountain, out of the fire.” As Levinson (1997: 152) remarks of the Deuteronomic passage, “The insistent staccato of repetition suggests that the author’s true appeal is to their own contemporaries…” In Haggai 2:5a, this is, in fact, the natural meaning.

30 As such, the epithet “people of the land” evidently does not have the same connotations as it does in Ezra-Nehemiah. It is difficult, though, to draw any definitive conclusions about the significance that should be attached to this generalization. Everyone constructs, consciously or sub-consciously, identity markers and boundaries. As my analysis shows supra and infra, this author held particular political and ideological positions that undoubtedly reflect identity markers and boundaries yet the lack of information about the author’s views relative to those held by the rest of the population makes the motives for the generalization unclear. Is the author generalizing as a strategy to promote integration among different ethnic, cultural, religious, social, or political groups and to which party or parties is the strategy directed? Alternatively, is the author simply representing a milieu in which such distinctions are not primary considerations? Though Kessler (2002a: 262-265) seems to assume the latter, the deliberateness with which the author assiduously promotes homogeneity may inveigh against such an interpretation. Contra Kessler (2002a: 263), there is always an “other” because, as subjective individuals, humans define themselves through relationships and relational networks. The author’s refusal to shed light on the dynamics behind their “inclusive” representation of the people leaves open the possibility that those motives are actually exclusivistic, i.e., the author defines “the people” so narrowly that dissent is not permissible and so alternate groups are not even recognized. In this case, an “inclusive” text may reflect a remarkably intolerant society while an “exclusive” text may reflect a more tolerant one. The “exclusive” text at least
Underscoring this, the author never refers to the Babylonian exile or go'lä and avoids potentially divisive references to tribal ancestors or supra-tribal entities, only otherwise referring to the people as “this people” (העם הזה) in 1:2 and 2:14 and “this nation” (הגוי הזה) in 2:14. The allusion to the exodus in 2:5, as such, is a clever rhetorical ploy. The allusion evokes the topos (exile and restoration) through a common origin story rather than the more immediate experience of the Babylonian exile. By alluding to the exodus and, by extension, associated elements of the descent into Egypt and the return to Canaan, the author generalizes the exilic experience; all the people are exiles and returnees of a sort.

**RECONSTRUCTION AS A COVENANT IMPERATIVE**

Preeminently, as the allusion to the exodus affirms, the people in Haggai are presented as a covenant community, bound together by their common fear of Yahweh (1:12), their openly contests identity in dialogue with different groups, however narrow its own definition and however prejudicially it represents opposite positions. Consider, e.g., the different way in which democracies and totalitarian regimes tend to characterize their people. As such, the author’s hermeneutics of inclusion could be construed as supercessionist and so the scope of “this people” in 1:2 and 2:14 and “this nation” in 2:14 as limited to the author’s immediate audience and clique. “This” people, that is, those right here, are the remnant and the people of the land, the one and only people, a people so circumscribed that even tribal or clan designations are too broad in scope to be applied by the author. Nevertheless, that the author does seem to generalize the exilic experience as an identity marker suggests, at least, an inclusive attitude towards repatriates and non-repatriates.

31 It is difficult to understate the peculiarity of this absence. The only other books to lack even a single occurrence of “Israel” (ישראל) are Jonah, Habakkuk, Job, Lamentations, and Esther. Of these, Lamentations and Esther use “Judah” (יָהוָה) and Jonah uses “Hebrew” (עברי) while the absence of such terms from Job is not surprising given the nature of its content. As such, Habakkuk and Haggai stand together as distinctive and remarkable cases among the biblical books. On the phrases “this people” and “this nation,” see May 1968; Kessler 2002a: 205, 213-214.

32 Such argumentation seems most likely to have originated with a group that did not experience exile, but seeking common ground and asserting equal footing with a group that did. The lack of privilege given to aliya or urban life, and the agrarian focus of Haggai, in light of the archaeological evidence for greater urbanism in Judah’s northern highlands than in the central and southern highlands, is possibly telling of the community that produced the text or out of which its namesake emerged, i.e., reflecting an affiliation with the rural communities south of Jerusalem, rather than those situated in the towns north of it. In this vein, Beuken (1967: 216-229) plausibly argues that Haggai was a Judean farmer, among those who were not exiled to Babylon. On the hermeneutics of generalization in Haggai, see Kessler 2006: 107-110.
work on the temple (1:14), and the presence of Yahweh’s spirit (2:4-5). The author roots the identity of the community in these elements rather than in exile and restoration. The importance of the covenant is especially discernable in the forms and allusions of the first scene. The generic form underlying or embedded in the first scene is the prophetic disputation (Graffy 1984: 98-104). The elements of this form include an introduction often with a quotation of a popular argument (v. 2); a programmatic refutation (v. 4); and, extended first (vv. 5-8) and second refutations (vv. 9-11). The first and second refutations in Haggai indicate that the covenant between Yahweh and the people has been breached, by drawing heavily on Deuteronomic concepts and language and narrating the community’s experience of fully realized futility curses (in 1:10-11).

Notably, as Kessler (2002a: 103-156) insightfully observes, the covenant violation that has provoked the futility curses is not idolatry or any other sins commonly identified as provocations. Rather, the failure to reconstruct the temple animates the disputation and, according to Haggai, has provoked the covenant curses. Specifically, the desolation (חָרָם) of the temple (vv. 4, 9) activates the drought (חרב in v. 11). Kessler (2002a: 155-157), following Petersen (1984: 50), argues that, by identifying the neglect of the temple as a covenant violation, this disputation is a creative interpretation of the law that may have evolved from a reapplication and broadening of the instruction in Deuteronomy 28:58-59a to fear the divine name. While the charge and disputation are innovative, it is likely that the author relied on the thoughtful application of several, more immediate, Deuteronomic traditions than 28:58-59a.

---

33 On futility curses, see Hillers 1964, especially pp. 28-29. Tollington (1993: 190) observes that futility curses typically express potential (future) consequences rather than past events as in Haggai. The intent of narrating them as past events, though, is to reveal that the covenant has been violated and that Yahweh has already passed judgment. The technique is interesting in that it altogether bypasses the “lawsuit” (ריָב) and, therefore, the rhetorical targets of the disputation do not merely stand accused, but convicted. The community’s experience of futility is the unequivocal proof.
Specifically, strong lexical and ideational similarities to the Deuteronomic corpus of cultic law (12:1-16:17) and parts of its preamble (4:44-11:32) aligns the text of Haggai with Deuteronomy’s innovative and transformative call for centralization.\textsuperscript{34} In contrast to DI and TI, who focus on vindicating Yahweh and reaffirming Jerusalem by critically engaging ANE typologies, Haggai responds to the doubts about Jerusalem’s status primarily by revisiting, renewing, and reformulating the argument for centralization through appeal to Deuteronomy. Haggai deploys rhetoric designed to unify one people (as highlighted \textit{supra}) around one god and one place.

As the inverse instruction to the prohibition of idolatry and pagan cultic sites, Deuteronomy 12:5-7 instructs the people to seek (דרש) and come (בוא) to the place Yahweh will put the divine name, bringing sacrifices and tithes, eating (אכל) in the divine presence, and “rejoicing in all your labor (משלא), you and your houses (אמות וحجرות), in which Yahweh your god has blessed you.” Both the Deuteronomic passage and Haggai use \textit{בוא} to describe the action of the people and, as such, the \textit{leitmotiv} of Haggai 1:1-15 precisely echoes the instruction to come in Deuteronomy. It is the failure to heed this instruction that forms the problem in Haggai 1:2 and it is the obedience to it that the author highlights in 1:14. Deuteronomy 12:5-7 also links the divine presence with communal meals and agricultural festivals, an instructive contrast to the condition of the people, in Haggai 1:6, who “eat (אכל) but are not full (שביע),” and, in Haggai 1:11, whose labors (言い) are cursed.\textsuperscript{35} Deuteronomy 12:8-28 expands on the instructions in 12:5-7 and includes the collation of grain (דגן), wine (תירוש), and oil (יצהר) as found in Haggai 1:11, further strengthening the likelihood of an allusion or common ideational inventory.

\textsuperscript{34} The absence of any allusion to the laws concerning public offices (16:18–18:22) is interesting especially in light of the ongoing debate concerning the coherence of that unit with the corpus of cultic law. For representative arguments, see Lohfink 1993; Levinson 1997.

\textsuperscript{35} On the importance of communal meals in cultic and social contexts, see Altmann 2011 and the work of my colleague, Greer 2011.
Similarly, Deuteronomy 14:23 enjoins the people, “In the presence of Yahweh (לפני יהוה) your god, in the place that he will choose as a dwelling for his name, you will eat (אכל) the tithe of your grain (דגן), your wine (תרושת), and your oil (ץצר), as well as the firstlings of your cattle and flock so that you may learn to fear (יראה) Yahweh your god always.” The three products of the land, grain, wine, and oil, occur again in this passage as does the connection between the divine presence and communal meals. The instruction also avers that communal meals lead the people to fear Yahweh. This latter element resonates with Haggai 1:12, which likewise claims that once the people and their leaders obeyed, the people “trembled (יראה) before Yahweh (מצנפ יהוה).”

Two additional Deuteronomic passages may also have influenced the prophetic disputation in Haggai 1:2-11. First, the disputation, especially vv. 4-6, shares thematic elements with Deuteronomy 8:1-20, in which the people coming (בואו) into the land (8:1) are reminded that Yahweh humbled them through hunger, fed them, and kept them clothed in the wilderness (8:3-4) and so, they must continue to fear (יראה) Yahweh (8:6), and not exalt themselves after, among other things, eating (אכל) their fill (שבע) and building fine (טוב) houses (8:10, 12). The author of Haggai appears to draw on and recast the elements of this exhortation, mostly in the negative propositions in 1:4, 6, to illustrate the people’s violation of the covenant. The passages are also related by their common, yet inverse, presentation of the relationship between agriculture and covenant obedience and disobedience (8:7-10 // Hag 1:6, 10-11; 2:19).

Second, Deuteronomy 11:13-20 provides resonance to the disputation, again signaled by the common collation of grain, wine, and oil (11:14 // Hag 1:11). The first four verses of this passage, in particular, link the promise of rain and a successful livelihood with covenant faithfulness and conversely, drought with covenant

---

36 The author of Haggai may have chosen ספן instead of טוב to describe the condition of the houses for the reasons indicated in n. 21 supra and also because טוב has a positive connotation, which would be inconsistent with the general tone of reproach.
disobedience, as in Haggai 1:10-11. Also, the instruction, “You shall set (שָׁמְתוּ) these words of mine upon your heart (לְבָבְכֶם),” in Deuteronomy 11:18 provides an instructive counterpoint to the twice repeated phrase, “Set your heart (שָׁמְמוּ לְבָבְכֶם) on your ways” in Haggai 1:5 and 7.\(^{37}\)

For the author of Haggai, Deuteronomy evidently anticipated and now explains the privations and hardships of the people; it also forecasts their future blessings. The *leitmotiv* of the coming (בَا) of the people is one of the keys to the relationship, a particularly effective one because it allows the author to evoke the idea of restoration and yet, also avoids the alternative, עָלָה, and its strong associations with the return from Babylonian captivity.\(^{38}\) The shared lexical and ideational inventory with Deuteronomy is amplified by the allusion to the exodus in Haggai 2:5, which reinforces the identification of the people or remnant in Haggai with the paradigmatic community of Deuteronomy.\(^{39}\)

The *leitmotiv* and the allusion to the exodus are, therefore, interrelated and reflect the

---

[37] Petersen (1984: 49) calls attention to the parallel phrase in Deuteronomy 32:46, where, like Haggai 1:5, 7, and 2:18, the imperative appears, שם לְבָבְכֶם.

[38] עָלָה is used in the command, “Go up (עָלָה) to the mountain (הֵר) and bring (וָבַיֵּם) wood and build (וָבנו) the house” (Hag 1:8). If Sweeney (2000: 538) were correct that הֵר, being singular and having the definite article, refers to the Temple Mount, this usage of the verb would evoke the restoration motif, intimating that the aliya will only be fully realized once the people “go up to the mountain …and build the house.” The grammatical syntax (imperfect + w\(^{\text{q}}\)qatal\(\text{t}^{-}\)), however, indicates that the intervening instruction “bring the wood” is successive rather than epexegetical and, therefore, that the mountain to which the people should go is the mountain from which they will retrieve the wood, not the place to which they will bring it. As such, עָלָה either reflects the vividness of direct speech, i.e., it refers to a specific mountain known to or even within view of the speaker and addressees, though that mountain is not otherwise identified (Kessler 2002a: 133), or it refers to an area of mountainous terrain (“hill country”) as, e.g., with the verb עָלָה in Deuteronomy 1:24, 41, 43; Joshua 10:6; Jeremiah 17:26; and, Nehemiah 8:15. Consequently, עָלָה in this verse is not used with its occasional post-exilic theological coloring to refer to the return from exile.

[39] The idea is that the author is reading the descent into Egypt and the return to Canaan as an exile and return, and consequently that there is a “restoration” community in Deuteronomy. The basis for such a reading of the text is actually provided in Deuteronomy 30:1-10, which encourages exilic and post-exilic communities to identify themselves with the paradigmatic community of Deuteronomy. That this passage is almost certainly late, possibly as late as the Persian period, only strengthens the argument by offering explicit evidence of the tendency to read and apply Deuteronomy paradigmatically to exilic and post-exilic communities in the period under examination.
author’s apparent intent to generalize the exile and restoration motifs and, more importantly, to link Haggai’s community to the first entry into the land and the centralization legislation in Deuteronomy. The author casts everyone as “coming” to Jerusalem, whether from their houses or out of Egypt (or, by implication, from Babylon), and casts everyone as survivors, part of a remnant, a community, which shares a covenant responsibility to come to the place of the divine name.

**The Temple as Bourse**

One of the clear subtexts of the prophetic disputation, already in the first scene, is the economic motive for covenant obedience. The second scene (2:1-9) amplifies these motives, adding to the development of a thesis that the temple’s reconstruction will not only resolve the agricultural crisis and hardships of the people but also generate wealth (Carroll 1994: 41). Notably, the rhetorical questions in 2:3 that appear to represent the disillusionment of the people, arising from a comparison between the modesty of the emerging temple with its former state, are raised by the prophet, not the people. As the people’s disillusionment is implicit rather than explicit, the scene seems primarily constructed as a second *apologia* for the necessity of the temple, that is, to reinforce the argument of the prophetic disputation in the first scene. The imperatives to take courage (חזק) and work (עשה) as well as the word of comfort (אליראה) in 2:4-5 seem aimed at emphasizing the priority of the project vis-à-vis an audience that remains, at least somewhat, disengaged. This encouragement is rooted in the expectation that the temple will act as a treasury; Yahweh “will shake the heavens and the earth, the sea and the dry land” and “all the nations” to bring treasure to the temple (2:6-9). The author clearly signals the ideological importance of this wealth through the repetition of words within this semantic domain: “treasure” (חמדה), “glory” or “splendor” (כבוד; 2x), “silver” (כסף), “gold” (זהב), and “prosperity” (שלום) all occur within the short space of vv. 7-9. Notably, the two occurrences of כבוד enclose Yahweh’s assertion, “The silver is mine and the gold
is mine,” giving clear definition to its intended connotation as splendor. For the author, the temple’s function to generate and store wealth is one of its essential characteristics.\(^{40}\)

In the narrative world at least, the people accept the divine promise of approbation and continue their efforts. The third scene (2:10-19), therefore, preserves a symbolic dialogic speech act related to and interpreting the significance of the restoration of the temple’s foundation on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month. Notably, the date appears three times, twice in scene three (2:10, 17) and once more to introduce scene four (2:20). Threefold repetition often signifies completion (or fullness) and so emphasizes the importance of the day and the accompanying prophetic word commemorating this critical stage of reconstruction (Meyers and Meyers 1987: 63), exactly three months after work on the temple began. Possibly also presupposing a consecration or purification ritual, the day is pivotal in the community’s transition from alienation to approbation.\(^{41}\)

The dialogic speech act integral to the scene contains two related priestly rulings on the transmutability of holiness and impurity, which are subsequently used to illustrate that only the temple can transform the unproductive or unclean “work” (משנה ידיהם) and offerings of the people.\(^{42}\) The author advances this interpretation of the speech acts by

---

\(^{40}\) The temple stores wealth by enabling Yahweh to act on behalf of the community through cosmic, universal, and ecological interventions. The temple provides a home for the divine presence, which, in turn, should, in the same manner as an imperial palace, reflect Yahweh’s dominion and wealth.

\(^{41}\) Petersen (1984: 87-96) and Kessler (2002a: 208-209) suggest that a comparative ritual background for this passage is a Mesopotamian rite for temple repairs, performed by the kalû priests. On this ritual in Zechariah 1–8, see Petersen 1974; Halpern 1978; and, infra. On this rite generally and other consecration and purification rites, see Ellis 1968; Linssen 2004: 100-109, 147-151; Sparks 2005: 158-164.

\(^{42}\) Verhoef (1987: 118) observes that the food products mentioned in 2:12 are related to the agricultural products in 1:11 while Meyers and Meyers (1987: 57-58) relate the phrase “work of their hands” (משנה ידיהם) in 2:14 to a set of references in Deuteronomy (14:29; 16:15; 24:19; 28:12; 30:9), observing that, in this set, the phrase refers to the harvest, “part of which is to be returned to Yahweh in the form of offerings.” The questions, therefore, seem to frame the agricultural issue as a cultic one. Interestingly, the first question and answer rhetorically admit the possibility that the people are holy but, in this case, their holiness is not transmittable and so can not produce prosperity (2:12). The second question examines the case if the people are unclean and so whether such a state is the source of their agricultural futility (2:13). In this vein, the dead body must symbolize the ruined temple. The people are unclean and so
presenting agricultural futility as a practical reflex of the unclean work. Although the appeal to agricultural futility redeploy a strategy used in the first scene, the perspective has changed in a significant way. Reflecting the different points in the agricultural cycle of each of the scenes, the unproductive state in 1:6 is characterized by the low yield of the harvest, in spite of an aggressive sowing season, while, in this case (2:16), the unproductive state is characterized by a diminishing surplus of the cereals and wine in storage (Petersen 1984: 90-91). The latter part of the scene then draws a contrast between the former state of 1:6, 10-11 and 2:15-17 and an anticipated, even partially realized, reversal in 2:19. This reversal is the evidence that the people can expect renewed productivity from the day of the foundation of the temple going forward. Consequently, the restoration of the temple’s foundation, not only reverses the community’s alienation, but is a critical key in moving the community from agricultural futility and economic impoverishment to productivity and success.

While enrichment and agricultural fertility are traditional ideological tropes related to temple construction (Hurowitz 1992: 322-323), a practical reality probably lies behind these promises. Temples in the ancient world were a focal point for the collection and redistribution of resources.\(^{43}\) The absence of the temple, therefore, ceded resource control to regional or imperial administrators in other centers. Consequently, as center and periphery models governed regional and imperial relations,\(^{44}\) Judeans might not have enjoyed a very significant measure of their work product and would have been enriching the temples and administrative centers in other areas, or would have been farming in relative isolation without adequate markets and the social and commercial advantages also the work of their hands because they come into contact with and offer sacrifices at a ritually unclean altar (2:13-14). For excellent analysis of 2:10-14, see Koch 1967; Petersen 1984: 70-85.

\(^{43}\) For a general introduction to the economic nature of the Jerusalem temple, see Stevens 2006. For the economic role of the Jerusalem temple in the Persian period, see Schaper 1995; 1997.

\(^{44}\) On center and periphery in Persian period regional and imperial relations, see the excellent essays in Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Kuhrt 1990 as well as ch. 1.
provided by temples. In Haggai, this reality appears to be reflected in the scattering harvest in 1:9 and the dwindling agricultural surplus in 2:16, curses that betray the community’s frustrations with the lack of control over their own agricultural products. The reconstruction of the temple undoes these curses not only in spiritual terms, by mitigating divine displeasure, but in practical terms, by strengthening the community’s ability to store and process goods locally. The reconstruction of the temple reestablishes the locus for fiscal and agricultural policy and administration of the province in Jerusalem, which, in the author’s worldview, facilitates divine blessing manifested in agricultural and economic success.

ZERUBBABEL AS HOFFNUNGSTRÄGER FOR THE TEMPLE’S RECONSTRUCTION

A corollary of this issue would be a comparably independent political administration in the province, which is precisely the subject of the fourth scene. This scene, addressed to Zerubbabel, identifies the governor as Yahweh’s chosen servant and future signet ring (Hag 2:23). The precise nature of Zerubbabel’s anticipated political status is, therefore, straightforward enough. Despite the attempts of some scholars to defuse its royal themes, the oracle clearly anticipates Zerubbabel’s elevation from governor to king.45 Yahweh’s

45 Rose (2000: 208-243) is perhaps the strongest critic of the royal interpretation, arguing that none of the key words, לָקַח (“to take”), עֶבֶד (“servant”), בָּרֶךְ (“to choose”), or חותם (“signet ring”), have exclusively royal implications; the author fails to “use words like מֶלֶךְ or מֶשֶל (2000: 243); and, taken seriously, the imagery and terminology of שומ כחותם (“make you like a signet ring”) does not denote delegated authority, which would require giving Zerubbabel the signet ring rather than making him like one. With regard to the signet ring imagery, Rose argues that it means Yahweh,

…will bring Zerubbabel into a position in which he will be like a signet ring: Zerubbabel will be inseparably connected with YHWH, as a signet ring is inseparably connected with its owner. Zerubbabel will not be thrown away and destroyed like the kingdoms of the nations, just as someone does not remove his signet ring or throw it away (2000: 234).

Though Rose’s arguments are well-taken on many points, few of his arguments address the literary logic and context of the oracle (and insofar as Rose does address the logic and context, his answers are weak). The repetition of Zerubbabel’s patronymic, son of Shealtiel, on five separate occasions within the book (1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 22) provides strong evidence of its significance to the author, which is most naturally explained by its identification of Zerubbabel as a grandson of Jehoiachin and scion of David. The repetition of Joshua’s patronymic, son of Jehozadak, functions in a similar way to create a link to the pre-exilic
intent to overthrow “the thrones of the kingdoms” (כסא ממלכות) and destroy “the strength of the kingdoms” (חזך ממלכות), metonyms of political and military power, set priesthood (1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4). Zerubbabel and Joshua’s presence within and at the head of the community is a sign of restoration and blessing, reversing the exile of the last king and high priest of Judah; they are also the essential functionaries for the reconstruction of the temple. Furthermore, contra Rose, the dramatic intervention described in vv.21-22 is not a judgment oracle against the nations that poses a possible threat to Zerubbabel or the Judean community from which they must be spared. Yahweh is not angry; no sins of the nations are enumerated; nothing about vv.21-22 points to judgment as the motivating factor of Yahweh’s activity. Indeed, the book of Haggai as a whole is not the least bit concerned about the nations in and of themselves. As the parallel oracle in 2:6-9 indicates, Yahweh intends to shake creation and the nations in order to bless the community, i.e., in order to fill the temple with wealth. As such, Yahweh’s actions in vv.21-22 should be seen in a similar light; they are an intervention designed to make possible the realization of the oracle in v.23. As the oracle indicates that Zerubbabel is already in a special relationship with Yahweh, a chosen servant, the act of taking Zerubbabel and making him like a signet ring has to denote an even greater status that builds upon the already existing relationship and the events described in the book and in the oracle itself. In the context of temple restoration, and in the wake of the subjugation of the political and military power of the nations in vv.21-22, the only logical conclusion is an elevation in status from governor to king, especially given that the key words in the oracle, חшибка,burger, and הרמ,s have royal implications (even if not exclusively so). The reversal of the Jeremian prophecy against Jehoiachin makes this elevation explicit, not through the principle of delegated authority as Rose accurately points out but because both texts use the simile in precisely the same way, i.e., to compare the divine-leader relationship to the relationship of an individual to their signet ring. So, just as Yahweh once removed the signet ring, in the case of Jehoiachin, Yahweh now promises to put it back on, in the case of Zerubbabel; Yahweh intends to wear once again the house of David as a signet ring. This interpretation creates an exact parallel with 2:6-9: just as Yahweh will shake the nations to reverse the ignominy of the temple so Yahweh will shake the nations to reverse the ignominy of the house of David. The absence of words such as מלך or משל is not for reasons of “political discretion” or “deliberate reticence” (cf. Kessler 2002a: 237); rather, the author avoids these words because the reversal of the Jeremian prophecy is contingent on the reconstruction of the temple and Yahweh’s intervention (see my discussion). It would be premature to declare Zerubbabel a king at this point, especially because the author does not envision Zerubbabel as an active agent in his future elevation, beyond his role as temple builder. Though anticipating a royal future for Zerubbabel, the author, by describing the overthrow of the nations as a cosmological intervention of Yahweh, does avoid a messianic interpretation of Zerubbabel that would countenance rebellion. As such, Kessler (2002a: 238) is quite correct that Zerubbabel’s future status is, in some sense, secondary to “his presence in the community, which serves both as a link with the past and as evidence of the firstfruits of good things to come, for both the nation and its royal house.” On this oracle and Zerubbabel more generally, see Sauer 1967; Beyse 1972; Japhet 1982; 1983; Rose 2000; Kessler 2006; Bowick 2009.

46 On the translation of כסא in the plural, Wolff (1988: 98, 103) observes that the LXX reads θρόνους βασιλέων, “thrones of kings,” reflecting the syntactical possibility that the plural absolute is sufficient to indicate the plural sense of the construct (see GKC §124p-r). It is not, however, required. See, e.g., Meyers and Meyers 1987: 67; Sweeney 2000: 553, who read the singular as a reference to the Persian throne as the locus of power over the kingdoms of the Near East. In either case though, the end result is the
the stage for this elevation, while the allusion to the Jeremiah 22:24 and, therefore, the reversal of Jeremiah’s prophecy against Jehoiachin assure it. To be sure, the author’s predictions are highly generalized and, therefore, are potentially malleable to the present and future realities of the readership (Kessler 2002a: 226-239), but this malleability likely reflects uncertainty about the form of its realization rather than its essential nature. In particular, by presenting the overthrow of “the thrones of the kingdoms” with no apparent reconstitution of a political or military order, the author is perhaps allowing that Zerubbabel will be a king without a traditional kingdom, that is, a titular ethnarch; and, by offering Zerubbabel and the Judeans no active role in the military and political events that Yahweh will bring about, the predictions do not promote rebellion and so imply a passive, even compliant, disposition toward imperial powers. Indeed, the text seems to reflect confidence in an already partial realization of the hopes embodied in these predictions, insofar as the Judeans have their own Davidic governor, a high priest, and their own sovereign, Yahweh, who is above Darius.

Furthermore, the actions to take and make Zerubbabel like a signet ring are cast as future events, implying contingency. Contextually, this contingency can only be related

same: the royal power of the kingdoms, whether embodied in the singular throne of the Persian king or in the many thrones of the kingdoms, is overthrown.

47 As Wolff (1988: 103) observes, this intervention is not directed against “the nations themselves but their militant nature” and, as Kessler (2006: 108) observes, this intervention does not involve a dramatic eschatological battle centered on Jerusalem or Judah. The chariots and the horsemen annihilate themselves (Wolff 1988: 103; Kessler 2006: 108). Wolff (1988: 103-104) and Kessler (2002a: 224) both observe that this account of mutual annihilation, “each by the sword of his brother” (אש ברזר ע אחר) may allude to the themes of fratricide (§10, 11, 41, 45) and rebellion (§16-55, 71-75) in the Behistun story, though biblical parallels are perhaps more immediate (Exod 14; Deut 28:6-7; Judg 7:22; Isa 19:2; Jer 46:16; Ezek 38:19-21; 2 Chr 20). In any case, the outcome of Yahweh’s intervention is peace and security.

48 This characterization might reflect the Deuteronomic “Law of the King” (Deut 17:14-20), which expressly limits the king to reading the Torah so that he “learns to fear Yahweh” (ילמד ליראה את־יהוה). Haggai 1:12 affirms that Zerubbabel obeyed the voice of Yahweh and implies, but does not state explicitly that Zerubbabel, as one of the people, feared Yahweh. The status of signet ring would also seem to elevate Zerubbabel counter to Deut 17:20. On the Deuteronomic law of the king, and contrasts with royal ideology in the Deuteronomistic History, see esp. Knoppers 1996; 2001; Levinson 2001.
to the unfinished temple restoration project. The oracle, therefore, functions preeminently as an instruction to remain faithful to that task. This time Yahweh’s house has to be built before Yahweh will build anyone else a house (cf. 2 Sam 7)! Moreover, the eschatological undercurrents of the oracle, especially indicated by the phrase “on that day” (ביום ההוא), spiritualize the royal overtones by the explicit negation of the present day. The author provides grounds on which the community can rest its hope for Zerubbabel’s elevation but that day is not today and, as a future event, requiring the absence of political and military powers, its occurring almost entirely depends on Yahweh—“almost” because it also depends on the Judean community completing its task to rebuild the temple.

In the literary context, therefore, the present is as, or even more, important than the future. Similar to 2:1-9, the vision of the future operates primarily to provide encouragement in the present. The essential feature of the oracle is simply that Zerubbabel makes possible the reversal of the prophetic judgment against Jehoiachin. His presence within the community, let alone as governor of Yehud, already indicates that part of that judgment has been undone. Furthermore, by announcing that Yahweh has chosen Zerubbabel and by declaring him to be a servant, the oracle presents Zerubbabel, the scion of David, as a legitimate mediator of Yahweh’s favor, overseer of the temple’s restoration, and, in turn, an enabler for the era of prosperity foretold in 2:6-9. In all these ways, the author portrays Zerubbabel as a living symbol and an embodiment of hope—ein persönlicher Hoffnungsträger—for the religious and political aspirations of the community and all the promises laid out in the book (Wolff 1986: 86; Kessler 2006: 117).

49 Notably too, the restoration of the temple’s foundation in the preceding scene gives rise to this oracle, creating an inversion of the thematic link between peace and security and the construction of the temple as expressed in 1 Kings 5:17-19. The construction of the temple and the establishment of peace and security are at least simultaneous, if not the former precipitating the latter, in contrast to Kings where the latter is a prerequisite for the former.
Haggai’s call to rebuild the temple and the envisioned reversal of the ignominy of the Davidic lineage is the vanguard of reconstruction. In Haggai, the land is unproductive, and in the author’s view remains so, until the temple’s foundations are rebuilt. Future productivity and political independence are stalled because of the complacency of the people, including the governor and high priest, who have failed to attend to the temple’s reconstruction. Haggai recounts the successful summons of the prophet and obedient response of the Davidic scion in leading the people to rebuild, and anticipates the collapse of foreign power and the reinstatement of the Davidic house as key elements in prophecies of revitalization. Haggai promotes the reconstruction of the temple as a critical step to divine approbation, especially the blessings of wealth and political independence. Haggai, therefore, encourages confidence in the merits of the temple. The temple’s reconstruction is the essential, unifying vehicle and catalyst that will help the struggling agrarian community in Yehud overcome its present hardships; it is a trigger for the restoration of Jerusalem and the Judean community (similarly, Bedford 2001).

Interestingly, in constructing the argument in this way, the text stands in stark contrast to key parts of Jeremiah. In Jeremiah, the temple is an unreliable institution because of its alliance with the state (ch. 7); the Davidic house is rejected (22:24); and, the destruction of Jerusalem holds promise for economic revitalization through repopulation from the center and renewed attention to the agrarian hinterland (ch. 32). In Haggai, all of these ideas are explicitly reversed. These reversals underscore the evolution of the elite Sprachkritik that initially animated the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah, that first introduced centralization in Judah, and that had resulted in the literalization of prophecy (Halpern 1996: 333-338).

As Halpern observes, the prophetic critique of Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah “helped to apply pressure against the propertied classes on behalf of the indigent, and indirectly of the state apparatus” and ultimately inspired collectivization and
centralization in Deuteronomy. As traditional culture and religion reasserted its popular and political appeal, especially after Josiah’s death, some prophets asserted their independence from the state apparatus, promoting a utopianism that sought to decouple radical monotheism from the power of the king. Halpern (1991; 1996) does not address this theological response but it is clearly evident in Jeremiah (22:24-30; 36:20), Ezekiel (34), the law of the king (Deut 17:14-20), and the anti-monarchic revisions of Samuel (8:1-22; 10:17-27; 12:1-25). It reaches its apex in DI and TI. The virulent critique of the idols, the democratization of the Davidic covenant, and visions of a utopian community centered around Jerusalem, embracing the Holiness tradition or, more radically, Deuteronomic ideals, augured a new political order in which the (purified) temple, not the state occupied the center. The relationship between Yahweh and the true cultic community would be unmediated. This ideology was rooted in the social justice traditions of Israel’s pre-monarchic past; developed by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, each along different lines, in protest of the puppet kings of the sixth century; cultivated in light of the collapse of the Judean kingdom; and, potentially operable within the Persian imperial system.

Haggai returns to the earlier traditional prophetic function, that is, applying pressure to the propertied classes on behalf of the indigent and the state, but now does so under the influence of the once radical innovation of textualization. There is no appeal to

50 Because Halpern largely ignores this theological current, his brilliant thesis requires some modification. Halpern (1996: 338) implies that Judean intellectuals failed to critique the “defects in their own programs.” This is perhaps true but the anti-monarchic stream indicates that some prophets did ultimately recognize and sought to redirect the totalitarian impulse of their rhetoric. Rather than critique it or abandon it, the prophets took the rhetoric its logical next step. Having already severed the lineages and removed the intermediaries between individual and state, they imagined the removal of the state and theocratic rule (cf. Halpern 1996: 332). Notably, though, the prophets were not willing to completely abandon the Davidic covenant entirely; they only severely circumscribed the power of the king.

51 Israel’s social justice traditions included not only rhetoric about leadership (Halpern 1996: 331) but also the seeds of its critique, as especially evident in Judges 1–16. In Ezekiel 48, there is clearly an idealization of an Israeliite amphictyony. This antiquarian interest may reflect Greek influence.
the mythic past. Instead, Haggai reverses the trajectory of the anti-state prophetic critique and realigns the prophet with the state by redeploys mechanisms of social control established in the literary canon. Perhaps because the reality and typologies of temple building required royal patronage or because prophetic utopias were unable to galvanize and motivate the masses, in Haggai, the cult of the leader (cautiously) returns. The scribe tentatively revives old alliances and issues a call to rally around the leader.

Haggai’s reversal suggests an evolution in the originating point of the prophetic voice rather than truly incompatible theological convictions. It seems unlikely that the author of Haggai would disagree with the importance, even primacy of Jeremiah’s moral and ethical imperatives, or that the author believes the reconstruction of the temple can truly cure all ills. Certainly, as the next chapter demonstrates, the contemporaneous author of Zechariah 1–8 does not disagree. Yet, the contrast does highlight the very significant difference in the nature of the discourses, which demand and reflect different socio-political realities. Haggai is a text that suits the conditions obtaining in Jerusalem in the Persian period; a text such as Jeremiah, let alone Amos, Hosea, or Micah, does not.

In this light, Beuken’s (1967) argument that Haggai is a prophetic text related to the Chronistic tradition merits some renewed attention. Although this position seems untenable at first glance given the almost certain priority of Haggai over Chronicles, there is a shared tendency in these texts to present prophecy in service to the temple or as emanating from the temple. The eremitic prophet of Kings is not prominent in Chronicles and likewise, the prophet of Haggai is not portrayed as such. As a literary phenomenon possibly reflecting an actual change in the social and cultic location of the prophets, this transformation places Jerusalem (once again) at the center of Judean cultic life and presents its temple as the trustee of the literary deposit of previous centuries.

Naturally, all of these elements prescribe the re-emergence of Jerusalem as the cultic and political capital of Yahweh’s people. Despite lacking even a single reference to Jerusalem, Haggai presents Jerusalem as the anchor of a collective identity. By crafting
an argument for reconstruction of the temple that is sapiential, legal, cultic, and political, Haggai roots reconstruction in literary traditions actively shaping the identity of that society. It is wise to come and rebuild. It is the place Yahweh has chosen and, therefore, there are legal and cultic imperatives to do so. It is necessary to do so to achieve purity and holiness that leads to economic blessing and it is appropriate and propitious to do so in light of the presence of the Davidic scion. As a result of this project, the people go up to Jerusalem, celebrate in Jerusalem, receive instruction in Jerusalem, and have their political aspirations renewed in Jerusalem. Haggai, therefore, is not simply about the reconstruction of the temple, it is about the reconstruction of Jerusalem.
Despite sharing acclaim with Haggai for an instrumental role in motivating Zerubbabel, Joshua, and the Judean community to complete the reconstruction of the Jerusalem temple (Ezra 5:1-2; 6:14), Zechariah 1–8 reflects not only convergent but also divergent interests concerning the reconstruction of Jerusalem. Clearly, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 converge on many points. Even cursory readings reveal that both texts are set within the early restoration period, in the early reign of Darius I, acknowledge Persian hegemony, and presuppose the conditions of privation and distress that obtained in Jerusalem at that time; and, that both texts are concerned with the reconstruction of the temple under the auspices of Zerubbabel and Joshua and identify this project as essential to the future aspirations of the community.

More discreetly, these texts share a strong emphasis on human responsibility and agency in the reconstruction process. Although Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 claim active divine intervention in the world in support of reconstruction, neither text suggests that only divine intervention will set things right. In Haggai, the reconstruction of the temple by the people is a necessary prerequisite to Yahweh’s intervention. In Zechariah 1–8, divine intervention is predicated on the penitence of the people and the practice of justice. Neither text protests Persian hegemony; neither expresses frustration with ongoing

---

1 Throughout this chapter, I refer to Zechariah 1–8 as Zechariah (or Zechariah 1–8) and the author anonymously as “the author” or “the prophet.” I never refer to the author as Zechariah, though occasionally I do refer to the prophetic character by his name. The context will always clearly reflect this distinction. Following convention and consensus, I treat Zechariah 1–8 as a discrete unit, the first person core of which was probably written earlier and by a different author than Zechariah 9–14. Although I typically specify chapters and verses or provide some other clarification, any undetermined references to Zechariah in this chapter refer to the first eight chapters only. Curtis (2006: 231-76) provides a thorough overview of the state of research on the relationship between Zechariah 1–8 and 9–14 while Boda (2003a) provides an excellent survey of recent research and a thorough bibliography on Zechariah 1–8. See also my discussions of the redactional issues passim.
oppression nor a strong sense of “political estrangement” (cf. Bedford 2001: 264-270). Both texts exhort the people to seize their moment of opportunity and embrace their leadership. Quite remarkably, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 depart from pre-exilic prophetic literature in exactly this regard. There are no oracles of judgment or woe; no troubles or interference from neighbors; no condemnations of prevailing sacrilege; and, no recriminations of kings or priests. In Haggai, a sapiential warning is issued and the people obey! In Zechariah 1–8, the people do what their ancestors failed to do, repent! In both texts, conditions, though difficult, are favorable to the community’s aspirations and reconstruction is underway, and there is every indication that the authors of these texts not only expect that the people can bring about the new era, the authors affirm that they are already doing so and exhort them to continue to do so (cf. Cook 1995: 128). Their message is not that Yahweh will rebuild the temple or Jerusalem but rather that Yahweh will vindicate the people if they do it themselves.

Fundamentally, these texts envision the reconstruction of the temple as essential to revitalizing the Judean community. This revitalization is characterized as a national renewal, central to the corporate identity of the people and the re-legitimization of the high priest and the Davidic house. In this respect, Bedford (2001: passim, esp. 305-310) accurately observes that the authors and tradents of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 promote reconstruction as an act of social integration, rather than a politically or socially divisive action. Nevertheless, temple building conveys political messages, especially rebuilding a temple linked to a deposed and exiled dynasty and its destroyed and derelict capital city. Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 are texts that affirm Jerusalem, its temple, and its Davidic patrons, reviving a particular socio-political stream of Yahwism centered on Jerusalem.

Hurowitz (2003) insightfully observes that the motivation for reconstruction, whatever its socio-political consequences, arises however from a much more basic theological conviction that the temple provides a locus for divine action or presence. On this point, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 have distinct emphases; the former portrays the
temple as the locus for divine action while the latter, as the locus for divine presence (Hurowitz 2003). In Haggai, the reconstruction of the temple is a covenant imperative that moves the community from alienation to approbation, alleviate its economic distress, potentiate Yahweh’s dramatic intervention to shake creation and overturn political and military power, and thereby reverse the humiliation of the community and the Davidic house. In Zechariah 1–8, the imminent reconstruction of the temple and Jerusalem is, in and of itself, evidence of divine approbation arising from national penitence. The reconstruction of the temple and the city is part of a divine process by which Yahweh will dwell again among the people, reversing the humiliation of the community, the priesthood, and the Davidic house, and thereby potentiating future divine blessings.

The communicative power of these texts rests on this constant oscillation between the divine and human planes. The temple and by extension Jerusalem serves as an ideal focal point for this oscillation because, in the theological mindset of the scribes, it exists in both planes and mediates between them. In Haggai, the conditions faced by the people reflect the condition of the temple: abandonment of the latter is experienced as famine by the former or, positively, splendor is experienced as agricultural and ecological renewal. In a slightly different, yet analogous, vein, in Zechariah 1–8, Jerusalem and the temple participate in the exile and the restoration and, as Meyers and Meyers (1992: 134-135) observe, the holiness of Jerusalem and the temple requires the holiness of the people. These homologies strengthen the cultic and cultural resonance of the temple and the city for the reader (Eliade 1959: 166-180), aim to resolve the tension between a less than ideal reality and Yahweh’s sovereignty, and closely relate reconstruction to corporate renewal.

The precise nature of these homologies, and related strategies and concerns, such as the personification of Jerusalem, explicit concern for the city and its reconstruction, anti-Babylonian rhetoric, and a strong ethical dimension, are divergent points of interest from Haggai, though converging, in some respects, with the Isaianic perspectives. Significantly though, the strong ethical dimension with an esoteric and somewhat unique
emphasis on ritual and moral purification sets Zechariah 1–8 apart from both Isaiah and Haggai. Penitence precedes the return of Yahweh; purification and reconsecration precedes the completion of the temple; probity precedes the restoration of the people. This chapter will explicate the convergent and divergent interests of Zechariah 1–8 as it relates to concern for Jerusalem. After preliminary arguments about the composition and structure of the text, I analyze each reference to Jerusalem in the vision-oracle complex and in the prose frame. In Zechariah 1–8, the reconstruction of Jerusalem is promoted as a highly symbolic and ritual act of vindication, purification, and reconsecration.

The Composition of the Text

In contrast to the progressive, highly focused, and lucid text of Haggai, Zechariah 1–8 is a mystifying and multi-layered text, consisting of eight night visions with accompanying oracular interpretations (1:8–6:15), bounded by an introductory call to repentance (1:2-6) and a concluding series of divine prophetic words that are constructed as a response to an inquiry about fasting (7:2–8:23). Each major section opens with date formulae: the

---

2 This section of the chapter incorporates and revises Ristau 2009a.
3 Many scholars have attempted to distinguish between a visionary and an oracular complex within the night visions. Certainly, there are formal markers within the night visions, such as variations on the formulas “Thus says Yahweh” (עם אמר יהוה) and “the word of Yahweh came to me” (ויהי דבר־יהוה אלי), which has led Petitjean (1969: VIII, passim), e.g., to identify 1:(14-16-17; 2:10-17 [Eng 2:6-13]; 3:8-10; 4:6b-10a; 6:9-15 as an oracular Grundlage and, by comparison, Seybold (1974: passim) to identify 1:8-15; 2:1-4 [Eng 1:18-21]; 2:5-9 [Eng 2:1-5]; 4:1-6a + 10b-14; 5:1-4; 5:5-11; 6:1-8 as a visionary Grundlage. The problem with such approaches is the oracular material provides integral commentary on the visionary material. As Halpern (1978: 168) remarks, The case for their excision … rests on the largely dubious presupposition that a change in form reflects a change in author. Here the reverse is true: the prophetic passages ground the night vision in contemporary history; they relate the abstruse to the concrete. This is explicit in the remark, “And you will know that Yhwh sent me” (2:13, 15; 4:9; 6:15). If the nations previously ascendant over Judah are despoiled (2:13), if many peoples join themselves to Yhwh (2:15; cf. 8:20-22, 23), if Zerubbabel (4:9) and the people from afar (6:9-15) complete the Temple, Zechariah has indeed stood in the council of Yhwh. It is in these prophecies, and not in the visions, that the prophet establishes his credentials (see Deut 18:21-22).

Consequently, the night visions are likely an integrated, unified composition. At most, it may be speculated that the visionary and oracular sections may roughly correspond to the “dream” sequences experienced by
introduction (1:1-6) is dated “in the eight month, in the second year of Darius,” the vision-oracle complex (1:7–6:15) is dated “on the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month, which is the month of Shebat, in the second year of Darius,” and the conclusion (7:1–8:23) is dated “in the fourth year of Darius the king … on the fourth day of the ninth month, in Chislev.” Infelicities in the text, especially the abrupt shifts in the prophetic voice from third to first person, suggest that the text evolved from a first person core, perhaps written by the prophet Zechariah, and then eventually completed by a later author. Unfortunately, as the proliferation of redaction-critical studies on the text show, there is no firm consensus regarding this compositional development. 4

Still, some modest observations about that process are warranted. The first date formula at the start of the book opens a section in which the prophetic voice is entirely third person. The transitions from the third person perspective of the date formulae in 1:7 and 7:1 to the first person perspective in 1:8 and 7:4 are infelicitous. As such, the date formulae are likely secondary to the text, along with the third person material in 1:2-6 and material interspersed throughout 7:2–8:23. 5 Indeed, the aims of the date formulae

---

4 For a thorough bibliography of the relevant studies, see Boda 2003a: 166-169.

5 As already noted, I am referring to the shifts in the prophetic voice, not the shifts in voice between authors, speakers, and characters. On this basis, separating out the first and third person material in 7:2–8:23 is difficult. Assuming the integrity of the passages that immediately proceed from the first or third person introductions, 7:2-7 and 8:18-23 proceed from a first person introduction, “and the word of Yahweh of hosts came to me” (ויהי דבריהו חצאות אלי) while the date formula in 7:1 and the oracular material in 7:8-14 use a third person formula, “the word of Yahweh came to Zechariah” (ויהי דבריהו אשרל צראיה). Curiously, 8:1-17 is introduced by a formula without either the first person singular pronoun or the name Zechariah: “the word of Yahweh of hosts came” (ויהי דבריהו חצאות). By the inclusion of חצאות, the formula resembles the first person formula, perhaps suggesting that the prepositional phrase, “to me” (אלי), was lost (so the NRSV?), though neither the LXX nor the Targums provide textual support for such a theory. In any case, a significant complicating factor is that much of the material in 7:8–8:23 is introduced by the formula, “Thus says Yahweh” (כה אמר יהוה), which, like the formula in 8:1, and apart from the first person introductions in 7:4 and 8:18, is otherwise indistinguishable with regard to its first or third person perspective, and yet may mark potentially discrete units. Boda (2003b: 393-402; 2004a: 40-41) approaches the issue differently, concluding that the original core is 7:2-14 and 8:14-23 to which 8:1-8 and 8:9-13 were
seem secondary to the core interests of the text. The dates, in and of themselves, have no
cultic significance and are not intimately related to the content that they introduce. The
only evident aims of the date formulae are to set the book in the Persian period before the
construction of the temple and to relate Zechariah 1–8 to Haggai. Especially in regard to
this latter purpose, the introduction appears artificially set in the eighth month of the
second year of Darius, between the dates of the second and third scenes of Haggai, in
order to inter-relate the two texts (see infra). In this way, the author of the date formulae
highlights prevailing social memory that Haggai and Zechariah prophesied around the
same time and also suggests that the texts centered on them occupy a related ideological
and thematic horizon. The evidence for compositional affinities between Haggai and
Zechariah 1–8, amassed especially by Meyers and Meyers (1987: xliv-lxvii), likely owes
to this final stage author of Zechariah 1–8.6

added. He argues that “Zechariah 8:14 introduces the contrast motif (‘just as I had … so now I have’),
providing an appropriate transition from disaster at the end of chapter 7 to blessing of 8:18-23” (2004a: 40).
He also observes that the “key to this blessing both for the former generation (7:9-10) as well as the present
generation (8:16-17) is justice” (2004a: 40). Unfortunately, while Boda’s position has merit, he does not
address the rather conspicuous third person formula at 7:8, which would seem to inveigh against his
conclusion that all of chapter seven (short of v. 1) is original. In my opinion, no certain delineation is
possible in the absence of clearer markers or textual evidence. For other theories on the compositional
history of this section, see the works cited in Boda 2003a: 166-169; 2003b. On the formulas as evidence for
the structural unity of the passage, see Clark 1985.

Boda (2003c: 51-52) cautions that the date formulae of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 exhibit considerable
diversity and so can not prove the composite unity of the texts. Meyers and Meyers (1987: xlvi-xlvi) take
some of this diversity into account in their theory of 7 + 1, where seven formulae share a feature but one
does not. In any case though, as argued already supra, there is strong evidence for the overall literary
integrity of Haggai, including its date formulae. The appearance of composite unity more than likely stems
solely from the interests and compositional tendencies of the authors of Zechariah 1–8, without
contemporary redactional activity in Haggai. My thesis, therefore, differs from Meyers and Meyers in that
I do not think that the date formulae of Haggai are editorial insertions of an author of Zechariah 1–8, or that
any author of Zechariah 1–8 truly attempted to create a compositional unit. Instead, the similarities between
the texts reflect a deliberate attempt on the part of those authors to promote intertextuality, arising from the
common subjects of the literature and the social memory that the prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, were
active at the same time. These points mitigate Boda’s critique as it might be applied to my work.
Despite these signs of a complex compositional development and links to Haggai, Zechariah 1–8 exhibits creative integrity and its own unique perspective. Suffused with biblical and ancient Near Eastern ritual, symbolism, and intertextual allusions, the author of the text promotes a coherent vision for the reconstruction of Jerusalem as a vital process in the continuing restoration, reorganization, and reformation of Judean society. In particular, Jerusalem and its temple are portrayed as instrumental to the reconstitution of society after the exile and as the present and future locus of divine, cultic, political, social, and economic power. The lack of references to the completion of the temple or historical events later than Darius’s reign, the author’s general orientation and perspective towards the Judean leadership and an ongoing Babylonian captivity (see infra), as well as linguistic considerations (Hill 1981; 1982; 1983), suggest that the core in 1:8–6:15 and perhaps also the prose frame reflect the views of the early restoration period, written down between the terminus post quem of the text in Darius’s fourth year (518 BCE) and the construction of the temple.7

The Structure of the Vision-Oracle Complex (1:8–6:15)

Developing the work of Petitjean (1966; 1969), Lipiński (1970), and Petersen (1974), Halpern (1978) has shown that the underlying literary form of the vision-oracle complex in 1:8–6:15 is a “temple song,” expressed in a distinctly Judean cultic and tradition-historical vernacular, though with considerable affinities to Mesopotamian temple rebuilding rituals, related purification and consecration rites performed by exorcists and lamentation priests, and also the divine combat cycle.8 The fourth and fifth visions, at the

7 So also Meyers and Meyers 1987: xlv. As Halpern (1978: 168) indicates, the completion of the temple is one of the essential claims on which the author-prophet’s credentials depend (4:9; 6:15); its completion, therefore, would certainly merit, even demand, notice (contra Boda 2004a: 30).

8 For a more speculative thesis along these same lines, see May 1938, who argues that the vision-oracle complex reflects a New Year coronation ritual for Zerubbabel with parallels to Mesopotamian rites. For more recent work in this direction, see Laato 1994; Boda 2006. More generally on such parallels in the Bible, see Hurowitz 1992; Bedford 2001.
center of the vision-oracle complex, exhibit the features of Mesopotamian temple rebuilding rituals, while the vision-oracle complex, as an integrated and unified whole, exhibits the essential elements of a divine combat cycle.

The divine combat cycle is a ubiquitous conceptual matrix of ancient Semitic literature in which the irreducible mytheme is a hero who provides deliverance from an intractable foe, thereby restoring order and receiving acclamation. By comparing elements of the visions with ancient exemplars of the form, especially the *Enūma Eliš*, the Song of Erra, the Baal Cycle, and the book of Judges, Halpern (1978) convincingly argues that this cycle is the conceptual matrix that underlies and unifies the night visions of Zechariah 1:8–6:15.

The cycle in the night visions starts with the angel of Yahweh pleading for Jerusalem and the cities of Judah (1:2-12). Yahweh responds, promising deliverance (1:13-17) and sending out an angelic vanguard to announce the unfolding divine plan (2:1-9). Yahweh then gathers the oppressed people (2:10-11), reaffirms that the enemy will be defeated (2:12-13), calls for a celebration (2:14a), and announces that the divine presence will be present among the celebrants (2:14b-16).

The combat phase of the cycle begins with Yahweh roused to action in 2:17. In the divine council, Yahweh champions and commissions two associates (3:1-10), sending Zerubbabel against the enemy (3:8-9). By the spirit of Yahweh, Zerubbabel defeats the mighty enemy, “the great mountain,” and it is foretold that he will complete the struggle and reestablish cosmic order to great acclamation (4:1-10). Strikingly, the reconstruction of the temple is presented as a symbol of the defeat of Babylon, a decisive stroke against the enemy (Petitjean 1969: 253-265; Halpern 1978: 187). Along with this victory, justice is dispensed (5:1-4), wickedness is purged from the land (5:5-11), angelic heralds are sent

---

9 My outline of the divine combat cycle in the night visions is adapted from Halpern 1978: 189.
out to proclaim victory (6:1-8), and the future of the two associates is confirmed (6:9-15). The cycle concludes in anticipation of the completion of Yahweh’s house (6:15).

*Jerusalem in the Divine Combat Cycle*

In the combat cycle, Jerusalem occupies an important, preeminent place: it is the subject of contention. The city is mentioned twenty-three times in the vision-oracle complex, in the first (1:7-17), second (2:1-4), and third (2:5-9, 10-17) visions, and at the outset of the fourth vision (3:1-10). The first and second visions set Jerusalem apart for divine concern and deliverance while the third vision stresses its holiness and status as an axis mundi. At the same time, all three visions reflect a reality of deprivation and desolation in tension with this elevated view. The sacredness of the city, established in these first three visions, affirms the cultic and socio-political centrality of Jerusalem and precipitates the stress on purification and probity in the remaining visions.

*The First Vision (1:8-17)*

The first vision in Zechariah 1–8 presents Jerusalem and the towns of Judah as the object of Yahweh’s wrath and the angel of Yahweh’s implicit rhetorical appeal for compassion: “O Yahweh of hosts, how long will you not be compassionate to Jerusalem and the towns of Judah, which you cursed these seventy years?” (v. 12). This complication of the book focuses attention on the physical sites of Jerusalem and the towns of Judah; it is divine concern for this geographical space that rouses Yahweh to action. Quite surprisingly, the angel and Yahweh only address the condition of the physical city, not the people: Yahweh burns with jealousy for Zion and Jerusalem (v. 14) and, answering the angel’s appeal, announces, “I have returned to Jerusalem with ‘compassions’ (רחמים): my house will be built in her … and the measuring line stretched out over Jerusalem” (v. 16). The pronouncements continue with divine promises that Jerusalem and the towns of Judah will prosper, Zion will receive comfort, and Yahweh will again choose Jerusalem (v. 17).
The city and the towns of Judah are, in this vision at least, the sole objects of angelic and divine concern.\(^\text{10}\)

The author constructs Yahweh’s response to the angel’s rhetorical appeal in v. 12 with a notable flourish. The use of the plural absolute רחמים in v. 16 counters the appeal for “compassion” with “compassions.” The idiomatic language of the vision situates the text within the stream of biblical thought that identifies Jerusalem as the place “chosen” by Yahweh.\(^\text{11}\) In the historical context of a competition among cult places, this language is exclusivistic as is the claim concerning the house in v. 16, which is by inference a singular house.\(^\text{12}\) Arguably too, at v. 12, there is implicit political rhetoric embedded in the phrase “Jerusalem and the towns of Judah” as it suggests continuity with the pre-exilic southern polity of Judah and, by the conspicuous absence of Israel, discontinuity with the northern Israelite state.\(^\text{13}\)

---

\(^\text{10}\) To be sure, the author is using synecdoche: Jerusalem and the towns of Judah are metonyms for the people who (should) inhabit them. The restoration of Jerusalem and the towns of Judah imply, even demand, the restoration of the people. Yet, the emphasis is clearly on the city, which the prophet even goes on to personify as a participant in the experience of exile and return. In the second and third visions, the city experiences the exile (“these are the horns that scattered … Jerusalem” in 2:2) and is summoned to return from Babylon (“Now Zion escape, you who dwells with daughter Babylon” in 2:11), which, while clearly exposing the author’s use of synecdoche, also unmistakably promotes the importance and centrality of the city and the towns of Judah to the cultural and religious identity of the people.

\(^\text{11}\) See, e.g., 1 Kings 8:16, 44, 48; 11:13, 32, 36; 14:21; 2 Kings 21:7; 23:27; Psalms 78:68; 132:13; 2 Chronicles 6:5, 6, 34, 38; 12:13; 33:7. On this issue, see also the previous chapter.

\(^\text{12}\) See esp. Knowles 2006, who examines archaeological and biblical evidence of and problems with centrality or (competing) centralities in the popular worship and religion of the Persian period. Notably too, Knoppers (2003: 314-21) presents and evaluates evidence for Persian period Yahwistic temples and sanctuaries and the influence competition among them may have had on the Chronicler’s portrait of Jerusalem while Frey (1999: 171-203), whose focus is the Hellenistic period but whose insights are still relevant for the Persian period, provides a useful, if in parts problematic, survey of potential rivals to the Jerusalem temple.

\(^\text{13}\) Although references to Israel in 2:2 and especially the “House of Israel” in 8:13 show that the author perceives northern Israel as sharing a common heritage, Judah and Jerusalem are undeniably at the center of the author’s hope for restoration (see esp. 2:16; 7:7; 8:15). The reference to the “House of Israel” in 8:13 perhaps belies that exclusivity but even in this case, the thrust of the passage presumes that its future salvation and blessing are dependent on its political and cultic subordination to Jerusalem and Judah (see further ad loc). On Israel in Zechariah 1–8, see the brief discussion by Danell 1946: 266-67. For a
These opening verses simultaneously admit to Jerusalem’s abject condition and evoke an ideological discourse that invites utopian expectations.\(^{14}\) This mix of ideology and pragmatism is evident in the depiction of the harsh realities of the Neo-Babylonian conquest (v. 15), the alienation of the patron deity from the land (vv. 12, 16), and the divine authorization for reconstruction (vv. 16-17). The allusion to seventy years likely draws on the seventy-year prophecy in Jeremiah 25:11-12 and 29:10 (Orr 1956; Fishbane 1985: 479-85; Winkle 1987a, 1987b; Tollington 1993: 184-85; Applegate 1997) and together with the proclamation of divine authorization to rebuild the city and its temple—announced in the divine first person—brings the text into dialogue with ideologies embedded in prophetic literature and Mesopotamian building and restoration texts. Such texts share emphasis on cities as objects of divine concern that necessitate and call for their reconstruction and restoration in order to restore cosmic order (\textit{infra}; Boda 2006).

Still, the “measuring line” in v. 16 places a pragmatic invitation and plan for reconstruction at the center of the ideological messages concerning Yahweh’s return on the one hand (v. 16a) and Yahweh’s promises on the other (v. 17). Moreover, the angel’s appeal to lift the curse (עָנָן) laid on Jerusalem and the towns of Judah (v. 12), Yahweh’s admission of anger, compounded by the evil of the nations (v. 15), and even the announcement of Yahweh’s desire and intent to return and bless Jerusalem (vv. 16-17) highlight the underlying situation of destruction and distress that apparently still obtained in the author’s present. In particular, the threefold repetition of “again” (עוד) in v. 17, which intensifies Yahweh’s promises of prosperity, divine comfort, and election for

\(^{14}\) Boda (2006) traces this theme throughout Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, concluding of the authors that “[b]y doing this they were imposing a temporary myopia on their community as a strategy for dealing with life under the hegemony of a great power. Such short-sighted focus on the temple project enabled the community to concentrate and combine their efforts in the midst of the present dystopia in hopes of the inauguration of their utopia.”
Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, notably and inescapably highlights the absence of these conditions in the immediate past and the implied present.

*The Second Vision (2:1-4)*

In the second vision, an angel identifies Jerusalem, along with Judah and Israel, as having been “scattered” by “four horns” (v. 2). There is an apparent incongruity in the images of the vision, which evoke either industrial or agricultural motifs (Love 1999: 179-96). The verb “scatter” (זרה) is often an agricultural motif, reflected in its frequent connotation “to winnow” (e.g. Isa 30:24; Ruth 3:2). It is commonly used as a prophetic metaphor or motif for the exile, especially in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, with the people as the explicit or implicit object. It is, however, also used in industrial settings with reference to scattering the remains of images or idols (Exod 32:20; Isa 30:22) and, in another case, the burnt coals from a fire (Num 16:37), though never to reinforce a prophetic metaphor of exile. Still, expected accompaniments of an agricultural motif are images of threshing floors, winnowing forks, wind, or gathering; by contrast, this vision features קרנות (vv. 1-2, 4), either evoking the “horns” of an altar, the metal “horns” of a soldier’s helmet, or the “horns” of oxen; and, חרשים (vv. 3-4), who are either “craftsmen” or “ploughers.”


15 The Freer-Washington papyrus and the Alexandrinus and Marchalianus codices do not attest Jerusalem. One Greek witness does not attest Israel but preserves Jerusalem. Many Greek texts, including a probable reconstruction of the Nahal Hever Minor Prophets scroll (Tov et al. 1990: 71), as well as the Vulgate and the Peshitta, however, support the Hebrew in listing all three. For discussion of the problem, see Meyers and Meyers 1987: 138; Hanhart 1998: 97-98.

16 See Leviticus 26:33; 1 Kings 14:15; Isaiah 41:16; Jeremiah (4:11; 15:7; 31:10; 49:32, 36; Ezekiel 5:2, 10, 12; 6:8; 12:14, 15; 20:23; 22:15; 29:12; 30:23, 26; 36:19; Psalms 44:11; 106:27. Similarly, in Jeremiah 51:2, the Babylonians are the subject while in Ezekiel 29:12 and 30:23, 26 the Egyptians are the subject.

17 The wind motif appears later in Zechariah 2:10 and 6:5.
iconography, myth, and prophecy often employ oxen or bulls—potentially the horned animals symbolized by the metonym—as a destructive force. Four horns, that is, two pairs of horns, suggest two oxen and so most likely symbolize the imperial powers that effected the Israelite and Judean exiles, namely Assyria and Babylon (Boda 2004b: 63). The image of the four horns then clearly falls within the agricultural domain set by הָרָשִׁים ("scatter"), especially as two oxen are the typical number used to plough the fields (Borowski 1987: 51-52), and because of this, oxen are more likely than an altar or a soldier’s helmet to be the things symbolized. Indeed, an altar can not perform the action that the horns perform in this vision, namely “scatter” Judah, Israel, and Jerusalem, and the soldier’s helmet circuitously points back to oxen in any case as the horns on a helmet are invariably animal horns (Boda 2004b: 61-63; cf. Good 1982: 59).

The reference to הָרָשִׁים presents greater difficulties for an agricultural motif because it is not usually taken to refer to an agricultural occupation. More often, it is translated as “artisans” or “blacksmiths.” Another possibility, though, is “ploughers,” which would alleviate the tension in the images (Good 1982: 56-59; Boda 2004b: 62). While the nominal form חָרָשׁ always refers to an artisan or blacksmith19 and the LXX reads τέκτονας (“carpenters” or “artisans”), which assumes that reading, the meaning “plougher” occurs three times in biblical texts (Isa 28:24; Amos 9:13; Ps 129:3) and in each of these cases, a substantive participial form of חָרָשׁ is used as here. As such, the reading, “ploughers,” is not unlikely and even preferable given the context.

---

18 The northern exile is probably also in view, not only because the number of oxen suggests two enemies, but also because both Israel and Judah are mentioned in 2:2 [Eng 1:19].

Somewhat reminiscent of Ištar dispatching the “Bull of Heaven” to punish Gilgamesh, the vision probably presupposes an agricultural scene in which two oxen have trampled unrestrained over the fields and scattered the harvest. In response, Yahweh sends ploughers to “throw down the horns” (לידות את קרנות), that is, the ploughers round up and harness or domesticate the oxen (Good 1982: 58-59). The vision, therefore, portrays the reinstatement of order in the lands of the Near East and the domestication of foreign powers to Yahweh’s rule. It is undoubtedly significant that this reading resonates with Yahweh’s exasperation at the nations for their unbridled destruction (v. 15) and, in this way, advances a logical progression from the first vision through this vision and into the third vision. As Good (1982: 59) observes, this vision portrays a critical step in Jerusalem’s reconstruction; it envisions the removal of Israel’s enemies from its lands, presumably by the Persian kings, so that in the next vision, the angelic vanguard can appropriately announce the imminent reconstruction of Jerusalem.

---

20 Significantly, just as in the Epic of the Gilgamesh, there is, perhaps, an astronomical/astrological undercurrent to the night visions. The Bull of Heaven, probably Gugalanna in other Sumerian texts, was represented by the Taurus constellation. The Pleiades is part of the Taurus constellation. The Pleiades may be the astronomical counterpart to the seven eyes of Yahweh in 3:9; 4:2, 10, though more likely the seven eyes represent the seven planets (see infra). The four ploughers may refer to the four stars that formed the ancient constellation of the plough, i.e., the triangulum plus Gamma Andromedae. According to the Babylonian MUL.APIN star catalogue, Pleiades and Taurus were the first and second constellations of the path of the moon (IV, 31-39) while the plough is the incipit constellation of the path of Enlil, probably marking the vernal equinox (I, 1-39).

21 The imagery is especially appropriate for the eleventh month in which the vision is set, as the ploughing season began around this time of the year (Hopkins 1987: 186).

22 The characterization of the Persian kings as farmers may actually stem from their own ideological self-representations (Briant 2002: 232-240, 914-915). Four ploughers may reflect the kings Cyrus, Cambyses, Bardiya/Gaumata, and Darius. Babylonian tablets provide evidence that Bardiya was recognized as king by some at least (Briant 2002: 102). Alternatively, the choice of four may simply represent a matching or superior counterpart to the four horns (Boda 2004a: 251-216; 2004b: 62).

The image may also interact with and reverse prophetic images of the abandonment of Jerusalem and the Judean hills. For example, Isaiah 7:25 predicts that “all the hills that were plowed with a hoe, you will not come there for fear of briers and thorns; it will be pastureland for cattle and the treading of sheep.” By envisioning the re-domestication of oxen, the prophet is then envisioning the renewal of agricultural activity and perhaps also appealing, ever so subtly, to the notion of an empty and untilled land to justify its reclamation by returnees.
The Third Vision-Oracle (2:5-9, 10-17)

The third vision picks up on the divine authorization to rebuild initially proclaimed in 1:15-17. It opens with a man on his way to measure Jerusalem for its width and length (2:5-6). The “measuring line” (חבול מדזה) in v. 5 and the measuring described in v. 6 evoke a common occupational domain and activity with the word “line” (קוה) in 1:16, though vv. 5-6 focus the action more specifically. The קוה is used in connection with most stages of construction, including land surveying, marking or determining dimensions, and justifying corners and walls while the חבל is used exclusively in biblical texts to refer to land surveys, especially to apportion land (Amos 7:17; Micah 2:4-5; Ps 16:6; 78:55). These references to trade tools again emphasize the pragmatic nature of the call to restoration and elevate the activities associated with these mundane tools to an important part in the divine plan; these tools are the divinely ordained and authorized means to restore Jerusalem and, by reference to these tools, the author of these visions invites human participation to enact the divine plan. Hard work not divine intervention alone, or royal beneficence for that matter (cf. Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah), will effect the reconstruction of Jerusalem.

Strikingly though, the third vision introduces a somewhat unexpected caveat to the reconstruction of Jerusalem. Following the image of a man measuring Jerusalem for its width and length (2:5-6), an angel is sent running after this man to tell him “as a village without walls, Jerusalem will dwell” (vv. 7-8). The angel explains that the men

23 Floyd (2000: 363-64) observes this point and then argues that “[t]hese contrasting connotations serve to emphasize that the rebuilding of new edifices, which involve the use of a קוה, has now become extensive enough to entail the use of a חבל מדה. The third vision thus signals that the prophecy of the first vision (1:14b-17) has begun to be fulfilled.” While the conclusion is correct in my opinion, the argument is flawed. Surveys, involving the חבל מדה, would have to precede the construction of buildings and walls and consequently Floyd’s understanding of the relationship of one term to the other is not accurate. Nevertheless, the first vision is a summary and commission to rebuild Jerusalem while the third vision actually describes the first step in that process of reconstruction: the surveying of the land.

24 This is the most likely reading of פרזות תשב ירושל, though Meyers and Meyers (1987: 154-56) suggest another attractive reading: “Jerusalem will be inhabited, with its villages.” The object, “villages”
and cattle in Jerusalem will be too numerous (v. 8) and that Yahweh will be a wall of fire around the city and the glory in it (v. 9). This vision, therefore, seems to reflect an author that is self-conscious about the lack of walls in Jerusalem; it is ideological spin that turns the absence of walls into an occasion for divine immanence and blessing. The rhetoric compares to the juxtaposition of fire and glory in Deuteronomy 5:24, Isaiah 4:5, and 2 Chronicles 7:1-3 as well as the unfolding of Yahweh’s presence in the pillar of fire, at Sinai, or descending upon the tabernacle (Exod 13:21-22; 14:24; 19:18; 24:17; 40:38).

Petersen (1984: 171) suggests a possible parallel to the Achaemenid Persian capital of Pasargadae, which had no walls and was surrounded by “fire altars that symbolized the cosmic god Ahura Mazda.” In any case, this particular declaration stands in contrast to the concern for Jerusalem’s walls in Psalms 51:18 and, more notably, the Nehemiah memoir, as well as the ideological tendency in Chronicles and even in Zechariah up to this point to associate building projects with divine blessing.25

The angel announces that the reason Jerusalem will have no walls is the multitude of people and animals living in it. Combined with the ingathering of people envisioned in v. 15—the first occurrence of עם (“people”) in the book—the caveat then also promotes a vision of the city as ever-expanding. The city is, therefore, the critical foundation of the

---

restoration and its reconstruction is essential to completing the ingathering of the people. It is tempting to see this portrait of the city, in addition to its obvious parallels to universal themes in Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah, as alluding to Babylon’s multi-ethnic milieu and centrality in the Near Eastern world. At the very least, there is an implicit connection and contrast created between Jerusalem and Babylon. From the physical dislocation/collocation of Zion in Babylon to the parallel phrases בֵּית־בָּבֶל and בֵּית־צִיון in v. 11 and v. 14 to the typological and ideological similarities between historical representations of Babylon and the representation of Jerusalem as a universal capital, this vision seems to anticipate Jerusalem supplanting Babylon as the center of the world.

In any case, the critical element of the oracular material in vv. 10-17 is the reversal of Yahweh’s alienation from the city, marked by his return and the divine authorization to rebuild. Yahweh’s indignation, implied abandonment of the city, and subsequent compassion and return is typologically and ideologically similar to Marduk’s indignation and rejection of Babylon and subsequent compassion and return as recounted in Esarhaddon’s Babylon inscription (Borger 1967: 10-31; COS 2.120) and in the Cyrus Cylinder (Harmatta 1974; Kuhrt 1983; Schaudig 2001: 550-556; Kuhrt 2007: 70-74). More immediately, the author’s language in this context seems chosen to maintain continuity with the rhetoric in v. 9. The verb translated “dwell” is not the standard ישב but rather שכן, which often has a cultic nuance because of its etymological relationship to the maqtal noun המשכן (“tabernacle”), its use (as here) with בתוך (“in the midst of”) in the Torah and elsewhere, and always with reference to Yahweh’s presence with the people (Exod 25:8; 29:45-46; Num 5:3; 35:43; 1 Kgs 6:13; Ezek 43:7, 9), as well as its liturgical use in Psalms to evoke images of archaic Israel or to verbalize the presence of Yahweh (15:1; 68:16, 18; 74:2; 78:55, 60; 85:9; 120:5-6; 135:21).

Such links to Israel’s formative epic may have also motivated the assertion that Yahweh will inherit Judah as his portion (v. 16), which draws on two key words prominent in the land discourse in the Torah and the book of Joshua, נחל (‘to inherit’).
and חלק ("portion"). Of course, in this instance, it is Yahweh who inherits and takes possession, not the Israelites; ironic language in a religious system that would confess all the earth belongs to Yahweh already (see esp. Ps 82:8). Yet, it is not unique in the biblical texts. The language actually echoes the claim that Israel is Yahweh’s inheritance (Exod 19:5-6; 34:9; Deut 32:9; Jer 10:16; 51:19). A certain incongruity still obtains in that the object is land and not a people, but this may serve to impart some of the meaning into the text: Yahweh claims his portion in the “holy land” (אדמות הקדש) to be set apart from the other lands of the world just as he claimed Israel as a “holy people” (גוים קדשים) to be set apart from the other peoples of the world. This, of course, emphasizes the true nature of Jerusalem as a metonym for the people—Jerusalem is its people—but it also places great stress on the significance of the city and the land for Judean identity.

Noticeably, referring to the land as אדמה הקדש—the only occurrence of this phrase in biblical texts (cf. Exod 3:5; Ezek 48:12-13)—invites reading “holy habitation” (מעון קדש) in v. 17—a phrase used only elsewhere to refer to heaven (Deut 26:15; Jer 25:30; Ps 68:6; 2 Chr 30:27)—as synonymous, in which case the “holy land” is essentially “heaven on earth.” Moreover, the phrase “and [Yahweh] will choose again Jerusalem” in 2:16b reintroduces the centrality of Jerusalem within Judah, and so puts the city at the center of the land, at the apex of the holy habitation. As the abode of the people and the divine, this portrait draws Jerusalem at the intersection of the human and divine planes; it is an axis mundi. The phrase is also a verbatim repetition of 1:17 and so recapitulates and highlights the central focus of the whole unit. The repeated sentiments

26 More immediately, “portion” (חלל) refers back to the land survey of Jerusalem in 2:5-6. As discussed above, the “measuring line” (חבל מידה) is usually used to apportion land. In fact, חבל can also mean “region,” which is a synonym of “portion” (see esp. Deut 32:9; Josh 19:9). Is the man measuring Jerusalem so that Yahweh can (re-)assert his (rightful) land claim?

27 It is perhaps notable, however, that an epithet like “holy city” (עיר הקדש) does not appear here but see Zechariah 8:3 and my discussion ad loc.
form an inclusio that circumscribes the second and third visions and defines them as a treatise on Yahweh’s re-election of Jerusalem.

Indeed, in Zechariah 3:2, Yahweh identifies himself and rebukes the adversary by the name “Yahweh who has chosen Jerusalem” (יהוה בחורה ירושלים). This epithet consummates 1:17–2:16 and confirms its literary purpose; the re-election of Jerusalem is now past tense, so much so that Yahweh is named by that action. The passage employs Deuteronomistic vernacular to this end. Zechariah 3:2 definitively declares that Jerusalem is the place that Yahweh has chosen (cf. Deut 12). The epithet also compares to another post-exilic text, 2 Chronicles 32:19, in which the Chronicler identifies Yahweh as the god of Jerusalem. Though both epithets seem like conventional biblical language, they are actually quite unusual.28 Their particularity stands in stark contrast to the cosmic epithet Yahweh of hosts, the most prominent divine name in Zechariah 1–8. These epithets reduce Yahweh from being a god of the whole cosmos, as especially envisioned in Zechariah 1:8-11, to a god particular to Jerusalem, that is, a patron deity. The Zecharian text, like the Chronicistic text, reflects the tension within Yahwism between universalistic themes and a desire for particularity.29 It also evinces a move to subsume the universal and the particular in a theology of Jerusalem that places the city at the center of the world, as a home to the nations, while also placing those nations under the dominion of the city’s patron Yahweh and, by extension, Yahweh’s chosen people. The reconstruction of Jerusalem, therefore, signifies self-determination and vindicates the people and their god before the nations.

28 For an analysis, especially with reference to 2 Chronicles 32:19, see Mitchell 2004. I am not so sure that Zechariah reflects the same level of psychological tension that Mitchell ascribes to the Chronicler.

29 For an insightful synchronic analysis of this delicate tension in biblical texts, see Levenson 1996, who concludes, “On the one hand, the universality of God and of his realm are generally assumed. On the other, a single undifferentiated humanity is not assumed, except occasionally in primordial times and in some of the Wisdom Literature. The fractured unity of primeval humanity is to be restored in the reorientation of the nations toward YHWH enthroned in Jerusalem” (168).
The Temple and the Community in the Divine Combat Cycle

As the fourth vision concerns the High Priest Joshua, it marks a turning point in the night visions towards an emphasis on the temple and the community around it. This vision and the fifth vision that follows it occupy the center of the night visions, and as already noted, share considerable affinities with late exemplars of Mesopotamian temple rebuilding rituals. Naturally, a sacred city must have a temple. The reconstruction of the temple requires the purification of the High Priest and portrays the completion of the temple as a ritual act of purification and vindication that reconstitutes civil order and economic productivity. The ritual, therefore, enacts or prescribes pragmatic realities.

Comparison of the Mesopotamian temple rebuilding rituals to the fourth and fifth visions is not without its challenges and ambiguities. For instance, Halpern (1978), and his predecessors (see supra), identify the libittu maḫrītu of the rituals, the single stone inscribed with seven eyes (אבן אהת שבינה עינים) set before Joshua (3:9), and the “capstone” or “former stone” (האבן הראשה) brought out by Zerubbabel (4:7) with stones laid at the foundation of the temple. This interpretation is possible but amplifies the obtuse nature of the visions, which is reflected in and resolved by Halpern and others through modifications or restructuring of the text. It is more likely that these stones consummate the reconstruction of the temple.

In Mesopotamian temple rebuilding rituals, the libittu maḫrītu is a stone removed from the temple at the outset of the reconstruction process. It clearly has ritual importance, but the ritual logic demands that the libittu maḫrītu remains secluded until the temple is completely restored. The kalûtu (“lamentation priest”) is charged with making offerings and reciting liturgies before the stone, presumably in order to assuage the wrath of the gods for the destructive processes involved in the reconstruction of the temple.

---

temple (Linssen 2004: 109). The late Seleucid exemplar of the Mesopotamian temple rebuilding ritual, which preserves ritual procedures for laying the foundation, does not prescribe the reintegration of the stone at that time (Linssen 2004: 293-298, Rev. 2-13). Interestingly though, one of Esarhaddon’s inscriptions refers to the king carrying a *libittu mahṛītu* on his neck and laying it in the foundation of the temple but, in that case, the *libittu mahṛītu* is clearly a new brick, not one removed from the dilapidated temple (Borger 1967: 5, § 2, V, 23-24). Esarhaddon’s inscription, therefore, actually helps clarify that the *libittu mahṛītu* and its Hebrew counterpart הַאֶבֶן הָרַאשָׁה (4:7) probably refer more generally to any brick of ritual importance in the rebuilding process, including a stone from the old temple, a first brick for the new temple, a foundation stone, or a capstone.

Indeed, there are Hebrew idioms the author could have used to denote a corner or foundation stone: אֶבֶן לְפָנָה and אֶבֶן לְמֻסָדָה (Jer 51:26; cf. Isa 28:16; Ps 118:22).

As such, the specific connotation of these terms must derive from the literary context. In the present case, the literary and temporal logic and context of 4:6-10 strongly militates against identifying הַאֶבֶן הָרַאשָׁה as a stone laid at the foundation of the temple. Reflecting a common literary technique within the vision-oracle complex, the divine words in vv. 6b-7 and vv. 8-9a are essentially parallel restatements, the one abstruse and the other concrete. As clearly evident in the concrete revelation of 4:8-9a, the divine message presents Zerubbabel’s past accomplishment, the laying of the temple’s foundation, as the basis for confidence in his future accomplishment, the reconstruction of the temple. The same contrast applies to the preceding divine message in 4:6b-7:

---

31 For a different approach to this evidence, see Ellis 1968: 26-29; Boda 2006: 227 n.62.
32 The completion of the temple is graphically described: וְיָדָיו תְבַצַּעְנָה (“and his hands will complete [it]”). The verb in the piel, from the root בִּצָּע, typically denotes an act of violence (Isa 10:12; 38:12; Ezek 22:12; Job 6:9; Lam 2:17), which contrasts with the declaration of 4:6 disavowing might or power as the method for Zerubbabel’s accomplishment. Perhaps, the author intends to evoke either the idea of a ritual combat with the mountain (as in 4:7) or with chaos, or is drawing an allusion to Isaiah 10:12 to depict the reconstruction of the temple as a decisive act and consummation of Yahweh’s work on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, which augurs the destruction of the community’s enemies. See also *infra*. 
Consequently, the אבן הרואשה must refer to a capstone, lintel, or some other final stone in the construction process. Precisely because the *libittu mahrītu* in the temple rebuilding rituals is likewise not laid in the foundation, the stone of seven eyes (3:9) and the capstone (4:7) parallel the *libittu mahrītu* that is removed from a dilapidated temple, and set before the priests, and, in the Mesopotamian texts, before “the god of the foundation,” as an object of ritual oblation and lamentations during the restoration process. Although the Mesopotamian tradition is not explicit, the ritual acts associated with removing the stone from the dilapidated temple and its seclusion and veneration, must ultimately prepare for its ritual emplacement in the restored temple to establish continuity between the old and the new structures (cf. Ellis 1968: 26-29). In Zechariah 1–8, such a transformation is almost certainly envisioned in the progressive revelations of the fourth and fifth visions.

The fourth vision most clearly shares some of the elements in the extant Mesopotamian tradition. Specifically, Joshua receives new garments and a clean turban, signifying his ritual purification (3:1-5), analogous to the putting on of garments in the Mesopotamian tradition (Linssen 2004: 293-298, Obv., 14; 301-305, Obv., 15). After

---


34 It is unclear whether human or angelic agents clothe Joshua and set the turban on his head. The plural verbal forms in 3:5 refer back to the angel’s instructions in 3:4, which are given to “the ones standing before him” (העמדים לפניו). Presumably, these are the same as “these who stand” (העמדים לפניים) in 3:7 and possibly also “your colleagues who sit before you” (ראויכי הישבים לפניכם) in 3:8, in which case the latter defines them as human agents. Alternatively though, the identification of the colleagues as הישבים may have been deliberate in order to distinguish them from העמדים, in which case הם they or “attendants” are members of the heavenly council and the ones who clothe Joshua. The latter alternative seems more likely.
Joshua is clothed, the angel of Yahweh assures him that he will have authority over the temple and its courts and access to the heavenly council (3:6-7) and that he along with the colleagues sitting before him are “men of a sign” (3:8). The angel then explicates the sign by announcing Yahweh’s plans in the first person: “I am bringing out my servant, Ṣemaḥ (צמח)” (3:8b) and “I will remove the guilt of this land in a single day” (3:9b). Interrupting this proclamation is a divine oracle that identifies Yahweh as having set “the stone” (האבן) before Joshua, an act that mirrors the incipit removal of the libittu mahrītu, particularly in regard to its analogous placement before the high priest in the Judean tradition and before the kalūtu in the Mesopotamia tradition, and in that both ritual acts convey divine appeasement and authorization for the reconstruction of the temple (Linssen 2004: 293-298, Obv. 13-19; 301-305, Obv. 14-23).

The biblical oracle goes a step further than the ritual texts though in that it also portrays Yahweh’s ritual transformation of the stone by an engraving and anticipates its reintegration in the temple. By interrupting the statements in 3:8b and 3:9b with the information concerning the stone, the author not only emphasizes the importance of the stone and its transformation but intimates that Ṣemaḥ (צמח) is being brought out especially to reintegrate the stone in the completed temple (3:8b) and that by this act, because the fourth vision is set in the heavenly council and the angel of Yahweh is repeatedly characterized as standing (1:11; 3:5; and, possibly 4:14, see infra). On a related issue, see the note infra.

On the difficult form מַהְלְכִים, it is common to read it as a masculine plural noun, meaning “passageways, places to walk” (cf. Ezek 42:4), or “journeys,” (cf. Jon 3:3, 4; Neh 2:6), which would yield the translation, “I will give you places to walk among these attendants” (so, similarly, Tg. רֶמֶלָּאֵנְבָּן and Vulgate ambulantes), which would yield the translation, “I will give to you ones who walk among these attendants.” In the latter case, the מַהְלְכִים are likely prophets, who could converse and walk about with the angels (as in Zechariah 1–8). The author may have used מַהְלְכִים as a play on מַלְאֲכִים (‘angels, messengers’). Both ideas are innovations in priestly responsibilities: the former by providing direct access to the heavenly council and the latter by either presenting the prophets as priestly counselors (as opposed to their usual role as royal counselors) or, less likely but more impressive and fitting the context of the charges given immediately before this, by giving the high priest authority over the prophets, if נתן (“to give”), in this case, has its occasional meaning of giving someone oversight or responsibility.
Yahweh will achieve the purification of the land (3:9b). This interpretation of Zechariah 3:8-9 is supported by the fact that these verses are preceded by the assurance that the newly purified Joshua will have authority over the temple and its courts (3:6-7)—it is only logical, as such, that this assurance would also include provisions for the reconstruction of that temple—and the concluding promise of prosperity and security (3:10), which is a common ideological feature associated with the construction of ancient Near Eastern temples (Hurowitz 1992: 322-323).

The fifth vision then builds on the fourth vision, though as anticipated by 3:8-9, the focus shifts from Joshua to Zerubbabel, who clearly assumes the role prescribed for Šemāḥ. In the fifth vision, the prophet sees a lampstand (מנורה) with a bowl (גלה) atop it.

36 In order to capture the nuance of this interpretation, I would translate the message as “I am bringing out my servant Šemāḥ because of the particular stone that I have set before Joshua, on a single stone, seven eyes, I am engraving its inscription—an oracle of Yahweh of hosts—and so I will remove the guilt of this land in a single day.” N.B. how the repetition of אחד (“single”) further emphasizes the relationship between the single stone and the removal of guilt in a single day. Some scholars have suggested that the stone represents some aspect of the priestly vestments, see, e.g., Petersen 1984: 211-212; VanderKam 1991: 562-570; 2004: 31-34. VanderKam’s theory that the seven (pairs of) eyes of the stone reflect the fourteen stones on the high priestly ephod and breastpiece is vitiated by the emphasis on a “single” stone. Petersen’s theory is more plausible, though ultimately the overall thrust of the passage seems to me to inveigh against the idea that the vestments are still in view. The matter of the vestments has already been addressed in 3:1-5 while 3:6-10 expands the discussion to related, yet different, matters concerning the role of the newly purified high priest. The object in v. 9 is, after all, a stone, not a garment!

37 Several scholars have challenged the identification of Zerubbabel with Šemāḥ. As on royalist interpretation of the signet ring (see my previous chapter), Rose (2000: 15-43, 91-141) is perhaps the most rigorous critic of this position. He rejects the identification on four grounds: “(a) the crowning of Joshua rather than Zerubbabel, (b) the use of the name Zemah rather than Zerubbabel, (c) the discontinuity conveyed by the name Zemah when properly understood, and (d) the future reference of most of the elements in the description of Zemah” (2000: 141). Ironically, Rose does not consider that his own evidence, in particular that 6:9-15 is not a coronation ceremony (2000: 56-59), partly addresses (a) and (d). In any case, I address most of these objections infra, but also cf. Bedford 2001: passim, especially in regards to the reformulation of royal state ideology and the ideology of temple rebuilding in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8; and, the speculative but suggestive proposal of Lemaire (1996a) that Šemāḥ is Zerubbabel’s second, Hebrew name. Notably, Rose (2000: 133-134) critiques Lemaire by arguing that double names are made explicit in biblical and extra-biblical texts:

…it is not unusual that someone is given a different name … what is unusual is a situation where in one document one finds the two different names used alternatingly [sic], without an explicit
that has seven spouts (שבעה מוצקות) for seven lamps (שבעה נרות) and two olive trees on opposite sides of it (4:2-3). The angelic interpretation of these elements is interrupted by two divine messages (4:6-7; 8-10). The two divine messages present Zerubbabel bringing out the *libittu mahrītu*, האבן הרארשת, and completing the reconstruction of the temple as predicted in the fourth vision. After this interruption, the prophet’s angelic interlocutor interprets the elements of the vision, that is, the lamps and the olive trees. This transition in 4:10 from the divine messages back to the angelic interpretation has received considerable scholarly attention.

Typically, scholars carve this verse into two parts: v. 10a, “For who despises the day of small things? They will rejoice and see the stone of tin in the hand of Zerubbabel” (כי מי בז ליום קטנות ושמחו וראו את האבן הבדיל ביד זרבבל) and v. 10b, “These seven are the eyes of Yahweh scanning the whole earth” (שבעה עלי תיודヘה מדấים לכל האוריו). In turn, scholars assume that v. 10b is the logical continuation of the anticipated angelic interpretation that starts “and he answered me” (ויען ויאמר אלי) in v. 6; and, that v. 10a concludes the interpolated divine messages that start at “This is the word of Yahweh to

connection between the two being made in any possible way… [Lemaire] would have made his case stronger if he had provided parallels for that. (2000: 134)

Aside from the very strong implicit connection between the two as the builders of the temple as well as other textual and thematic links between the Ṣemaḥ oracles and the character of Zerubbabel, there are actually several biblical parallels. Most immediately, there are even two probable cases in the second Ṣemaḥ oracle in 6:9-15, namely, Heldai/Helem and Josiah/Hen! Other examples include Jethro/Reuel (Exod 2:18; 3:1), Pul/Tiglath-Pileser (2 Kgs 15:19-20, 29), Azariah/Uzziah (possibly variants rather than distinct names; 2 Kgs 14:21–15:34), and Shallum/Jehoahaz (1 Chr 3:15; 2 Chr 36:1-4). There are possibly still others in the genealogical tables of Chronicles but these are more difficult to prove and more uncertain. Two other noteworthy but unlikely identifications are David/Elhanan (1 Sam 17; 2 Sam 21:19) and Sheshbazzar/Zerubbabel (Ezra 1–5).

38 On the nature of the lampstand, and possible examples discovered in archaeological excavations, see esp. Petersen 1984: 216-223; Meyers and Meyers 1987: 229-239. There is a seemingly extraneous occurrence of the word שבעה (“seven”) in the MT between “seven lamps” and “seven spouts”; cf. LXX, in which this intervening seven is not attested. Meyers and Meyers (1987: 235-238) suggest that this intervening seven is distributive, i.e., each of the seven lamps has seven spouts/wick holes, resulting in forty-nine flames. Such a lamp has no archaeological reflex, but Meyers and Meyers suggest that as an unreal/visionary object, it may symbolize the Jubilee (Lev 25:8-12).
Zerubbabel” (ה דריווה אלירובבל) in v. 6 (e.g., Halpern 1978: 169-170). The placement of the *atnah* on “seven” (these seven”) in the MT, however, suggests that “these seven” should be read as the subject of the verbal constituents “rejoice” (שמחה) and “see” (رأית). The Masoretes evidently interpreted the phrase, “they are the eyes of Yahweh roaming the entire earth” (עין יהוה המשותם בכל־הארץ), as an integral, appositional remark that not only identifies the seven lamps atop the lampstand but also defines the subject, “these seven,” of the clause in v. 10a. As this reading avoids unsupported textual emendations and inter-relates the divine messages concerning Zerubbabel with the angelic interpretation of the visionary objects, it is probably preferable.

Significantly, the ellipsis of the *nomen rectum* of “these seven” suggests that its antecedent is not only the seven spouts and lamps of 4:2 but also the “seven eyes” of the single stone set before Joshua in 3:9. The appositional remark of v. 10b reinforces this possibility as it picks up the key word עין (“eye”) in its determination of “these seven” as the eyes of Yahweh. In this way, the author links 3:9, 4:2, and 4:10, such that the seven eyes of the stone are the seven lamps, which are the eyes of Yahweh. The fifth vision describes the engraving of the stone set before Joshua and brought out by Zerubbabel to complete the temple.

The inter-relationship of 3:9, 4:2, and 4:10 presupposes aspects of ancient Mesopotamian and Israelite cosmography, which were reproduced in the iconography that adorned their temples. Halpern (1978: 170, 174-177) goes some way in elucidating this cosmological background by highlighting a conceptual resemblance between the seven eyes of the stone in 3:9 and the Mesopotamian *lumāșū*, which were counterparts, or representations, of the gods visible in the stars. In KAR 307:33, *lumāșū ša DINGIR.MES* (“astral-likenesses of the gods”) are inscribed on the *ašpu*-stone of the lower heavens while, in another text, CT 26.45:10, the *lumāșū* number seven (Halpern 1978: 174).

39 On lamps as indicative of divine presence, see Petersen 1984: 227-229 and my discussion *infra.*
Significantly, the *Enūma Eliš* presents Marduk’s emplacement of the *lumāšū* in the heavens as integral to the creation of order and time (Ee 5:1-7; Halpern 1978: 175-176). Esarhaddon, in a cylinder text concerned with the restoration of Babylon, remarks that he inscribed *lumāšū* corresponding to the writing of his name on clay foundation deposits (Borger 1967: 28, § 11, Ep. 40, 4-18), probably to mirror Assur’s creative acts and so symbolize the “rectification of cosmic time” (Halpern 1978: 175). These inscriptions are extant on the “Black Stone” and two prisms (Ellis 1968: Figs. 34-35).

Sargon seems to have done something similar. Gadd (1948: 93) notes that excavators at Khorsabad excavated bricks at some of the temple entrances that were “moulded in relief and bright with coloured enamels, the figures standing out in yellow (with other colours in detail) against a deep-blue background.” The figures “represent a lion and bull, a bird, a fig-tree, and a plough; of these the bull and plough are shared with the Black Stone [of Esarhaddon], which also has trees, though of other kinds” (1948: 93). Gadd also adds that “[t]here need be little hesitation in believing that these Khorsabad figures display to us the šīṭir burume as the Assyrians represented it, the writing of the motley-coloured constellations upon the blue background of the heavens” (1948: 93-94).

While evidence of Israelite and Judean cosmology and astronomical practices is limited, Isaiah 47:13 attests to the general practice of astronomical observation and some texts refer to important constellations and stars (Amos 5:8; Job 9:9; 38:31-33). Moreover, some biblical texts evince a cosmography comparable to Mesopotamian cosmography. Like the *ašpu*-stone of the lower heavens, in Exodus 24:10, the sky is likened to sapphire pavement (לָבְנַת הַסָּפִיר) and, similarly, in Ezekiel 1:26 and 10:1, to sapphire stone (אֱבֶן הַסָּפִיר). Also, like the *lumāšū*, some biblical texts identify celestial bodies, installed by Yahweh, with divine or angelic beings, both in polemic and in

---

40 For additional discussion, see Luckenbill 1925; Gadd 1948: 93-95; Ellis 1968: 121-124.
41 On these passages and my brief discussion of Israelite cosmology, see Wright 2000.
panegyrics (Deut 4:19; 2 Kgs 23:5; Amos 5:26-27; Ps 89:6-9; 148:1-6; Job 38:7). Keel and Uehlinger (1998: 283-372) have shown that this “astralization of the heavenly powers” has clear reflexes in the seal impressions of the Iron Age IIC.\(^{42}\) It is also evident from my analysis of Isaiah (see ch. 3) that many biblical texts promote a close identification between the temple and the heavens.

Although the biblical texts do not explicitly link the lamps of the temple with the planets or angelic/divine beings, Zechariah 4 heavily influenced Philo and Josephus as well as later rabbinic sources, especially Byzantine era liturgical poetry, which clearly articulate the astral significance of the temple lamps (Fine 2005: 146-163).\(^{43}\) Yannai’s liturgical poem on Numbers 8 is especially instructive because it explicitly identifies the lamps of the menorah with the planets and with angelic beings (Schwartz 2001: 269). Significantly, in Mesopotamian astronomy, and reflected also in Yannai’s poem, the ancients recognized the existence of seven planets: Mercury, Venus, Jupiter, Saturn, and Mars along with the Sun and the Moon (Hurowitz 1998: 152-153). Additionally, the prominence of the menorah as an artistic motif from the second century BCE onwards, the prominence of the zodiac in Byzantine era synagogues, and the ‘En-Gedi Synagogue Inscription, noted by Halpern (1978: 176 n.43), which not only refers to the signs of the zodiac, but includes a phrase drawn from Zechariah 4:10, “he whose eyes roam the entire earth” (דוהי משוטט בכל ארה), illustrates that this textual evidence had clear

---


\(^{43}\) Fine (2005: 201) observes that the liturgical poetry of late antiquity seems to be phenomenologically related to the use of the zodiac in the Byzantine era Jewish synagogues. Although, the zodiac in Jewish synagogues is clearly a later phenomenon, unattested before the fourth century CE, the adoption of it reflects a persistent interest in the Jewish community with calendrical calculations and concepts related to the divine/heavenly order and cosmic time. This interest has more immediate precursors in the Qumran calendrical texts, though it probably owes its ultimate origins to the exilic experience and the diffusion of Babylonian astronomy/astrology in the Persian and Hellenistic periods. As such, the fifth vision of Zechariah may reflect a nascent stage in this development.
iconographic and inscriptive reflexes. A particularly stunning example of this reflex was uncovered at the center of a Second Temple synagogue near Migdal (Fig. 35). Furthermore, Halpern (1978: 176-177, n.43) notes that the parallel use of the root שות to describe the movement of Yahweh’s eyes across the earth in Zechariah 4:10 and Satan’s activities in Job 1:7 and 2:2; the comparable use of the hitpa‘el of הלך to describe the movement of the angelic beings in Zechariah 1:10, 11 and 6:7; and, the parallel use of בוש in Zechariah 6:5 and Job 1:6 and 2:1 to describe the divine/angelic beings presenting themselves before Yahweh. These parallels suggest functional similarities between the eyes of Yahweh and divine agents. As such, there is strong circumstantial evidence that Judean intellectuals in the Persian period likely associated the planets with divine/angelic counterparts who functioned as the eyes of Yahweh, in like manner to the Mesopotamian


45 The imagery carries even additional resonance given its possible allusion to the inspectors or agents of Near Eastern kings, who were known as the king’s eye (Oppenheim 1968; Briant 2002: 343-344).
concept of lumāšū, and represented this belief with physical and incised/painted lamps in the temple, as explicitly reflected in later Jewish texts and iconography.46

Consequently, the seven eyes of the stone and the seven lamps of the lampstand carry an underlying cosmic significance that Zechariah 4:10 highlights by the identification of “these seven” with “the eyes of Yahweh roaming the entire earth.” As all the imagery is inter-related and necessary to construct this interpretation of the fourth and fifth visions, the present arrangement of the text, including the placement of the Zerubbabel oracles within the fifth vision, however difficult, is likely original. Through this arrangement, the author presents a vision for the reconstruction of the temple as critical to the reestablishment of cosmic, and cultic, order and time that presupposes a highly complex, yet authentically Near Eastern and Judean, cosmography. As the seven lamps representing the eyes of Yahweh are inscribed on the capstone that Zerubbabel brings out to complete the temple project, the ritual emplacement of the capstone activates Yahweh’s presence within the community. Moreover, the identification of the eyes of Yahweh with astral bodies/divine beings, as suggested by the comparative evidence, indicates that the emplacement of the stone reenacts the divine act of creation and the ordering of the heavens (cf. Job 9:1–10:22; 38:1–40:2).

Interestingly, “these seven” eyes or lamps rejoice at the sight of “the stone of tin” (האבן בדיל) in the hand of Zerubbabel. Given the context, likely refers to collected slag from the metalwork in the reconstruction process, the industrial residue that, once purged, leaves pure and precious metals.47 This industrial process helps clarify

46 See, similarly, the influential work of Gunkel 1895: 127-130.
47 On the “stone of tin,” cf. Petersen 1974, who identifies it as a precious stone typical of ancient Near Eastern foundation deposits. N.B., Petersen observes that the Persian period practice was not to inscribe these precious stones, which mitigates Halpern’s (1978: 173) position that the tin stone is inscribed. In this case, the ritual presupposition of v. 10 would appear to be that, along with the ritual reintegration of the capstone in v. 7, Zerubbabel will have in his hands a “stone of tin” or foundation deposit, probably to be placed behind or underneath the capstone. As the capstone is inserted with its inscribed face inward or downward (as suggested by in situ discoveries of such stones), covering the
the violent connotations of במשה (“complete, finish”) in 4:9 and aligns the text favorably with the imagery of Isaiah 1:24-28, in which the purification of Israel, as a process in the restoration of Zion, is characterized as the turning aside of “all your tins” (כמלחمه). In this view, the stone of tin would be analogous, though not necessarily identical, to the “stone of lead” (אבן העפרת) that Yahweh presses into the mouth of Wickedness in the seventh vision (Halpern 1978: 180). In both cases, the image is one of purification, first, of the temple in the fifth vision and, second, of the land in the seventh vision. It also fulfills and concretizes the removal of guilt envisioned in 3:9, by its vivid depiction of the eyes of Yahweh rejoicing at the sight of the polluted residue in the hand of Zerubbabel, and so reinforces the likelihood that 3:9, 4:2, and 4:10 are purposefully inter-related by the author.\(^{48}\) The day of small things is the day of the completion of the temple, which however innocuous and insignificant it may seem to some, effects the purification of the people and land (Halpern 1978: 181-182).

The fifth vision concludes, like the fourth vision, on the theme of prosperity that, as noted ad loc, often marks the successful reconstruction of temples. Specifically, the prophet asks the angel to interpret the meaning of the two olive trees on either side of the bowl atop the lampstand (4:11) and the “two branches of the olive trees that empty the gold (of the olive trees) through two golden channels” (4:12). The second question functions appositionally to the first to provide additional information about the olive trees rather than as a completely new question. As such, the angelic interpretation applies to the olive trees, not just the branches, and so identifies both images as “the sons of oil who

---

\(^{48}\) On this relationship and other connections in Zechariah 3–4, see Becking 2006.
stand by the lord of the whole earth” (4:14). As argued by Petersen (1984: 230-231) and Redditt (1995: 68), “sons of oil” (בני יוצר) is an image of agricultural prosperity and satiety, similar to the image of “the fertile hill” (קרן ברעום) in Isaiah 5:1 or the common collation of grain (דגן), wine (תירוש), and oil (יוצר), especially in Deuteronomy, that often represents the abundance of the land.

The golden channels described in v. 12 transform these olive trees into proverbial money trees, as it is gold that flows from them. Traditionally, scholars have assumed that the channels fuel the seven lamps, but the text does not specifically link the channels to the lamps and, in any case, the text is explicit that gold, not oil, flows through the channels. As the vision likely represents an interpretation of the inscription on the capstone, another suitable, if not preferable option, is that the channels extend to the edges of the stone so that, once it is fitted in its place, the gold would symbolically empty into the very structure of the temple. The inscription, therefore, visualizes and, by its emplacement, expresses hope for, or even attempts to potentiate, the blessings of wealth and prosperity that were anticipated with the temple’s reconstruction.

Clearly though, the olive trees are not merely inanimate money trees but rather individuals “who stand by the lord of whole earth” (העמדים על אדון כל הארץ). The olive trees symbolize those making the era of prosperity possible as mediators of divine wealth. Most commentators identify Joshua and Zerubbabel as the intended referents because their roles in the reconstruction of the temple occupy a central place in the fourth and fifth visions and their positions as high priest and governor already set them apart as representatives of Yahweh. Moreover, Petersen (1984: 233) insightfully observes that the epithet “sons of oil” introduces not only the concept of abundance but also the filial language of sonship integral to concepts of kingship and kinship in the biblical texts.

49 Also, the oil used for lamps, like that used for anointing, is שמן. So, just as the abundance of oil is not meant for an anointing ceremony, it is unlikely that the abundance of oil is meant to fuel the lamp.
These “two generative and beneficent” manifestations of fertility, agricultural abundance and filiation, are incisively encapsulated in the “two sons of oil,” and perhaps ideally represented by human figures (Petersen 1984: 233).

Yet, the characterization of the sons of oil as העמדים על אדונם כל הארץ evokes a scene in the heavenly council, a common setting in the night visions, and generally the domain of prophets and angels rather than priests and kings. Boda (2001), therefore, argues that the two sons of oil are the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, whose prophecies fuel the reconstruction of the temple. Boda’s interpretation resonates with the general prominence of the divine council in the night visions and the possible reference to prophets as מהלכים بين העמדים האלה in the fourth vision (3:7). Still, the threefold symbolism of “the two sons of oil who stand by the lord” evokes even stronger parallels with the many standing angels in the night visions, as well as Abraham’s encounter with the three men by the oaks of Mamre in Genesis 18, the threefold repetition of the divine name in the Aaronic blessing in Numbers 6:24-27, and representations of the heavenly throne room in which seraphim or cherubim stand on either side of the enthroned deity, as envisioned in 1 Kings 22:19 and Isaiah 6:1-2 and reproduced in the design of the ark (Exod 25:10-22; 37:1-15) and the holy of holies (1 Kgs 6:23-28; 8:6-7). The filial language of sonship also has an angelic counterpart in the variations of the epithet “sons of God” (Gen 6:2, 4; Ps 29:1; 89:7 [Eng 89:6]; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7).

On the primary symbolic level, the identification of the two sons of oil with angelic attendants of the heavenly council is preferable, especially as the branches are presented as a source of wealth and prosperity that fulfills themes of divine blessing for the faithful community. Yet, the dyadic prominence of Joshua and Zerubbabel in the fourth and fifth visions, focusing on their relationship to the temple, strongly suggests at least a secondary identification with the “two” sons of oil. As such, the vision is probably

---

50 On this identification, see esp. Rose 2000: 177-207 and the supporting scholarship he cites.
and deliberately multivalent, perhaps conveying the archetypal nature of the constitution of Judean society. On the one hand, the lampstand symbolizes the earth or cosmos and its lamps the presence and benevolent gaze of Yahweh while the olive trees symbolize the hosts of heaven, who mediate divine blessings. On the other, the lampstand symbolizes the temple or the cult community while the olive trees, or two sons of oil, symbolize the community’s leadership, who represent and mediate the benevolent presence of Yahweh, whether they are Joshua and Zerubbabel or Haggai and Zechariah for the first community of readers, or other royal, priestly, and prophetic dyads, such as Aaron and David or Aaron and the Messiah in later Judaism (Neusner 2007: 83, 97-98, 151-153, 161) or even anonymous prophetic figures, as in Revelations 11:4. The salient point of the fourth and fifth visions is that the reconstruction of the temple validates the community’s leadership and reestablishes the cosmic center of Judean society.

So, while the Mesopotamian temple rebuilding rituals help elucidate the ritual background of the fourth and fifth visions, their form should not be rigidly imposed on the text nor artificially constrict its scope. The fourth and fifth visions encapsulate the entire reconstruction process with notable emphasis on the completion of the project and hopes for wealth and prosperity. The visions also engage broad themes of purification and governance. As Halpern (1978: 178-180) observes, the theme of purification prefigures the sixth and seventh visions that depict the purifying role of the written word and the ultimate purgation of iniquity and wickedness, which are at least implicitly related to the successful reconstruction of the temple.

As it pertains to governance, the dyadic motif of the fourth and fifth visions promotes cooperative administration of the community but not necessarily a dyarchy. As indicated in the fourth vision, the high priest, Joshua, and his colleagues are a sign of the emergence of Zerubbabel (3:8). Though Joshua receives juridical and administrative oversight of the temple, its courts, and perhaps even the prophets (3:7), this authority remains within the cultic sphere and ultimately in service to Zerubbabel’s emergent
leadership. As with the theme of purification, the issue of governance is revisited. In the final oracle of the vision-oracle complex, the text designates Joshua as a counselor to Ṣemaḥ, that is, Zerubbabel, who will emerge to rule as king (6:9-15). Despite the proliferation of theories that have arisen in regards to the passage, the substance of it is relatively straightforward. The terms “crown” (עטרת) and “throne” (כסא) as applied to Joshua in this oracle do not raise him to co-regency, but rather signify the dignity of his

51 The investment of juridical authority is indicated by the root דינים (“to judge, plead, rule”) in this verse. Potentially in view is a constitution consistent with the laws of public officials (Deut 16:18–18:22), and in particular the judicial authority of the temple and the priest (Deut 17:8-13). There is no clear allusion to those laws, however, in this passage and so it is unclear if a legal process akin to Deuteronomy 17:8-13 is presumed. If it was, then the text might also share the Deuteronomic conception of kingship and so a severely circumscribed role for Zerubbabel. On the Deuteronomic conception of kingship, see Knoppers 1996; 2001; Levinson 2001.

52 On the identification of Zerubbabel as Ṣemaḥ, see my n. 37 supra.

53 On the different approaches, see the excellent summary of Rose 2000: 151-162. The chief difficulty of the oracle, in my opinion, is whether there are one or two crowns. The prima facie evidence is that עטרת in v. 11 and עטרת in v. 14 are plene and defective spellings of a feminine plural noun, meaning “crowns.” Rose (2000: 84-86), however, notes that this form can actually be explained as a feminine singular -ōt form (cf. Job 31:35-36). He argues that the -ōt feminine singular may be of Phoenician origin and is reflected in the words חכמות in Proverbs 9:1, עגלות in Hosea 10:5, and possibly עתי in Psalms 132:12. On this argument, see also Meyers and Meyers 1987: 363. The singular reading for vv. 11 and 14 has considerable merit, if an explanation could be offered for the author’s use of an old Phoenician form. The LXX provides mixed evidence, supporting the plural in v. 11 but translating a singular in v. 14. Meyers and Meyers’s (1987: 346-353) theory of two crowns, one of silver and one of gold, the silver crown placed on the head of Joshua and the other, golden crown, placed in the temple, rests on exactly such a reading and, given the laconic, elliptical tendencies of the night visions in other places, provides a reasonable and attractive solution to the problem. Notably, the plural form in v. 14 can be vocalized with the present consonants as a feminine singular construct, but the construct is grammatically incorrect. The absolute form is required, which would necessitate emending the text to עטרת. It seems doubtful that the second form would be the Phoenician feminine singular and not also the first, as Meyers and Meyers seem to suggest (1987: 363). Another possible reading, suggested to me by Jeff Hudon, personal communication, 2009, might explain the plural form, i.e., the crown has two or more parts, akin to the double, red and white, crown of the Egyptian pharaohs, perhaps one part of gold, to symbolize the ultimate authority of the priest in the cultic sphere and one part of silver to symbolize his penultimate authority in the civic sphere. On the plural form used in this way, see GKC §124b, l; WOC §7.4.1c, e. Fortunately, a solution to this problem is not integral to the meaning of the text because only one head is crowned, so ultimately the only consideration is whether one or two crowns are made and placed in the temple, a trivial consideration that does not detract from the fact that Joshua receives a crown or that the oracle anticipates Zerubbabel’s elevation to kingship.
office and the intimacy of the peaceful counsel shared between him and the future king.\textsuperscript{54}

Also, as the oracle envisions Zerubbabel’s ascension as a future event, it is not a coronation ceremony. Rather, the primary purpose of the oracle is symbolic: it reverses the judgment against Jehoiachin in Jeremiah 22:18-30, anticipates the temple’s reconstruction, and announces the imminent fulfillment of the prophecies of MT Jeremiah 33:14-18 (also, 23:5-6) that predict the renewal of the royal and priestly offices (Boda 2004a: 240-241).

\textit{The Prose Frame (1:2-6; 7:2–8:23)}

The broad themes of purification and governance that are so prominent in the fourth through eighth visions are also prominent in Jeremiah 23:5-6 and 33:14-18, as well as another text of some significance, Isaiah 1:24-27 (see \textit{supra} and \textit{infra}). These Jeremian and Isaianic prophecies associate restoration and the renewal of governance with the dispensation of justice and righteousness in the land and so suggest a similar relationship between the elevation of Zerubbabel in Zechariah 3:8-9, 4:6-10, and 6:9-15 and the concerns for purification, justice, and the purgation of iniquity and wickedness in the fourth, fifth, and sixth visions (Halpern 1978: 184-185). This emphasis and point of view is shared by the prose frame bounding the night visions. In Zechariah 1:2-6 and 7:2–8:23,

\footnote{\textsuperscript{54} For similar conclusions, see Rose 2000: 44-68; Boda 2004a: 341. The terms are applied to intimate or trusted subordinates in other places too: the king and the Queen Mother in 1 Kings 2:19 and Jeremiah 13:18 and the king and his counselors in Esther 3:1 and 8:15. As Boda (2001; 2004a: 335) observes, the only detectable polemic in the oracle seems directed towards Joshua, rather than Zerubbabel, especially so if Meyers and Meyers (1987: 346-353) are correct that there are two crowns, one of silver and one of gold, and the former is the one given to Joshua. The impetus of the passage then seems to be to remind Joshua that Zerubbabel is, in fact, in charge, and, as a Davidic scion, is not merely a Persian governor, but the rightful king of Judah, even if he does not presently occupy that office. This too may be the thrust of the characterization of the priests as signs or omens for the emergence of Šemah in 3:8-10 (see, e.g., Petersen 1984: 208-211). In any case, the salient point is that Zechariah 1–8 does not promote or presume a dyarchy. Though Joshua has clear authority over the temple and should be an intimate counselor to the governor/king, Zerubbabel is preeminent over Joshua.}
the author presents purification, or penitence, and justice as essential to the reconstruction of Jerusalem and Judean society as a whole.

In an insightful study of the prose frame, Boda (2003c: 55) observes that these sections share common features. In both, the author issues a challenge to the present generation (1:3; 7:5-6) that immediately leads to a didactic review of the message of the former prophets, the faithless response of the former generation (1:4; 7:7-12ab), and the resulting divine discipline (1:5-6a; 7:12c-14; 8:14). Penitence (1:6b) closes the opening section while exhortation (8:16-19) and promises of future salvation (8:1-13, 15, 20-23) conclude the latter section.

The language in these sections also shares common features, drawing heavily on Jeremiah and showing considerable affinities to penitential or proto-penitential prayers such as 1 Kings 8, Isaiah 59:9-15 and 63:7–64:11, Jeremiah 32:17-25, Lamentations, Psalms 74, 79, 89, and 106, Daniel 9:4-19, Ezra 9:6-15, Nehemiah 1:5-11, and Nehemiah 9:6-37 (Boda 2003c).\(^{55}\) As in the prose frame, the exemplars of penitential prayer in Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah are recited in the context of fasts, share a national focus, and seek relief from the devastation of oppression, captivity, hardship, and privation.

The efficacy of penitential prayer is one of the core messages of the prose frame and, therefore, a critically important cipher through which to understand Zechariah 1–8. As Boda (2003c: 67-68) observes, the penitence reported in 1:6a opens the way forward to the fulfillment of the promise in 1:3, that is, “Return to me, says Yahweh of hosts, and I will return to you, says Yahweh of hosts.” In 1:16, Yahweh announces, “I have returned to Jerusalem.” The act of penitence, therefore, produces positive results; it initiates Yahweh’s acts of consolation and compassion.

In the concluding prose section (7:2–8:23), a delegation from outside Jerusalem that inquires about fasting are not given a simple answer but challenged precisely on the

issue of penitence. This challenge sets up a contrast between the normative practice of the community in Jerusalem, exemplified in the opening section (1:2-6), and the uninformed practices outside Jerusalem reflected by the Bethel delegation.\(^{56}\) Consequently, the proposed resolution for the community outside Jerusalem—all the people of the land and the priests, who are the addressees in 7:5 and the houses of Judah and Israel, who are specifically addressed in 8:13—is to recognize the normative teachings and participate in the normative practices that emanate from Jerusalem.

The structure of the reply in the concluding section reinforces the envisioned socio-political and cultic centrality of the city as well as the importance of its reconstruction.\(^{57}\) Specifically, the reply consists of a series of concentric parallels:

---

\(^{56}\) The grammatical and lexical ambiguity of the text obscures the origin, destination, and composition of the delegation. For surveys of the possible grammatical, lexical, and text critical options, see esp. Van Hoonacker 1908: 635-647; Beuken 1967: 143-145; Hoffman 2003: 200-203; Ristau 2009a: 204-207. While recognizing that certainty is elusive, the most probable solution, contra Ristau 2009a, is that Bethel is a metonymous or elliptical subject referring to the inhabitants of that settlement, Šarezer is the object, and אוֹ�־מלָקָה אֲנַשֶי is an explanatory gloss identifying Šarezer’s qualifications as a messenger in the Persian administration rather than the identification of a second messenger, Regem-melek, and an accompanying entourage. Note, however, the ancient versions, LXX, Targums, and Syriac (cf. Vulgate), take Bethel as an *accusatives directionis*, a reading most recently defended by Blenkinsopp (2003b: 100). Despite the virtually unanimous testimony of the versions, I am inclined against it because בחצרו lacks a prepositional prefix or a locative suffix, and the addressees are “the priests who are in the house of Yahweh of hosts,” which presumptively refers to the temple in Jerusalem. Although בית אל never appears with an impersonal subject (Ristau 2009a: 206), a metonymous or elliptical use of a city name for its inhabitants is well attested (Hoffman 2003: 201 n.66; see also Zech 2:11 [Eng. 2:7]); and, though the temple is unfinished, Haggai 2:10-14 likewise evinces ongoing cultic activity and priestly inquiries. Finkelstein and Singer-Avitz (2009) note that excavations at Beitin (biblical Bethel) are consistent with a period of decline in northern and eastern Benjamin starting already in the seventh century and that signs of activity at Beitin in the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods are negligible. Finkelstein and Singer-Avitz (2009: 43, 45) suggest the site may have been abandoned (cf. Lipschits 2005: 242-243). In that case, Bethel may refer more broadly to northern Israel (e.g., Amos 3:14; 5:4-5). Onترجم as a title, see Lipiński 1973: 42-43. My translation would read, “Now [the people/priests of] Bethel sent Šarezer, an envoy (תרגם) of the king and his men (i.e., royal officers), to petition the favor of Yahweh and ask the priests of the house of Yahweh of hosts, ‘Should I mourn and fast in the fifth month, as I have done for so many years?’”

\(^{57}\) The redactional history, or alternatively the unity, of this passage is a matter of considerable debate (see esp. n. 5 supra as well as Boda 2003b and the literature cited therein). Although grammatical and lexical incongruities may point to redactional expansions, the promises and exhortations ultimately
a. questions (7:2-7)

b. exhortation from antecedence (7:8-14)

c. oracles of salvation for Jerusalem (8:1-8)

c’ oracles of salvation for Judah and Israel (8:9-13)

b’ exhortation from consequence (8:14-17)

a’ answers (8:18-23)

As the initial inquiry involves a delegation from the periphery coming to Jerusalem (a), the centrality of the city is, already at the outset, fundamental to the presentation. Indeed, the corresponding answers that envision the transformation of fasts into festivals also anticipate the regularization of the pattern set by the initial inquiry in continuous pilgrimages by the peoples and nations to seek and entreat Yahweh at Jerusalem (a’). The repetition of the pi’el infinitive construct of רצון (“to entreat”; 7:2, 8:21, 22) makes this relationship between (a) and (a’) explicit.

At the second level, the exhortations emphasize the importance of justice by references, in the first case, to Yahweh’s former judgment (b) and by references, in the second case, to Yahweh’s future plans (b’). Yahweh’s future plans are to do good to Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. This particularization stands in contrast to the interests of the initial petitioners, who come from Bethel. Yet, drawing on the salvation oracles of the first and third level, the divine prophetic words explicitly affirm that this preferential treatment should not give rise to fear because Jerusalem’s salvation is ultimately the salvation of Judah, Israel, and the nations (8:13, 20-22).

At the third level, parallel oracles illuminate Yahweh’s promises of salvation for Jerusalem, symbolized by the renewal of its urban life (c); and, for the houses of Judah and Israel, symbolized by agricultural and ecological effusion (c’). Significantly, the

---

relate to the question asked in v. 3, by expanding the “liturgical and communal extent” of the discussion and moving it “beyond the ritual level to the question of motives and ethics” (Boda 2003b: 399).
promises to the latter rest on the former; the prophet explicitly relates the future fortunes of the houses of Judah and Israel to the foundation of the temple in c’. Notably, c’ is circumscribed by an inclusio, “let your hands be strong” (תחזקנה ידיכם), which exhorts the people of the land to remain faithful to the task of reconstruction on which their ultimate salvation and future prosperity are presented as resting.

Notably too, the promises concerning Jerusalem repeat and amplify the promises made in the first three night visions. In particular, Yahweh’s jealousy towards Zion and Jerusalem and intent to dwell there are reaffirmed (8:2-3; cf. 1:14, 16-17; 2:9, 14-15) and Yahweh again promises to repopulate the city (8:4-5; cf. 2:8-9), to bring back the exiles (8:7-8; cf. 2:10-11), and recommits to a patron-client relationship with the people (8:7-8; cf. 2:6-7, 15). As a sort of seal of these promises, Yahweh proposes to rename Jerusalem “the city of truth” (עיר האמת) and the Temple Mount “the holy mountain” (הר הקדש). The epithet “the city of truth” is otherwise unattested in biblical texts, though it echoes Isaiah’s “faithful city” (קריה נאמנה in Isa 1:21, 26), while “the holy mountain,” though rarely formulated with the definite article (only here and in Isa 27:13 and Jer 31:23), is quite a common epithet in comparable formulations throughout the biblical corpus, especially in later texts.58

The renaming of Jerusalem and the Temple Mount has important parallels, likely antecedents, in Isaiah 1:26, 60:14, 18, 62:4, 12, and Ezekiel 48:35. Each of these cases relates renaming to the anticipated restoration of Jerusalem. As Halpern (1998: 627) observes, naming introduces “distinctions into chaos,” it establishes the right relationship of the named to its surroundings, signifies a change in status, and directs the named towards its proper function. Naming is an act of creation and authorization, renaming an act of recreation and reauthorization. Naming evokes or prescribes the essence of the

---

58 הר קדשי (Isa 11:9; 56:7; 57:13; 65:11, 25; 66:20; Ezek 20:40; Joel 2:1; 4:17; Zeph 3:11; Ps 2:6), הר קדש (Ps 3:5; 48:2; 99:9), הר קדש אלוהים (Ps 87:1), הר קדש אלהי (Dan 9:16), הר קדש צבי (Ezek 28:41), הר צבי קדש (Dan 11:20), and הר צבי קדש (Dan 11:45).
named. The significance in Zechariah 1–8 is that the first epithet identifies Jerusalem as the locus for the justice prescribed in the exhortations bounding this oracle while the second epithet looks back to the epithets מִשְׁמַעְתָּהּ קֹדֶשׁ and אֲדֹמֵת הָקְדָשׁ in the third vision-oracle, revisiting the holiness motif and reasserting that the Temple Mount is the apex, “the holy mountain,” of the “holy land” and Yahweh’s “holy habitation.” These epithets, especially the former, allude to the interrelationship of justice, purification, and restoration articulated in Isaiah 1:21-26 and, therefore, link the reconstruction of the city and the temple with the reconstitution of a cultic society dependent on Yahweh.

Interestingly, the conclusion in 8:20-23 revisits the dichotomy of universal and particular visions of Jerusalem reflected in and discussed supra in connection with the third vision-oracle of 2:5-9, 10-17. In 8:20-22, the motifs are universal but, in 8:23, universality is again subsumed to particularity, as in the third vision-oracle. The vision reflects occasional biblical imagery of the ingathering of the nations to Jerusalem to entreat Yahweh (cf. Isa 2:2-3; 60; Jer 3:17; Micah 4:2; Zech 2:15) but, in 8:23, the prophet anticipates that representatives of the nations “will grasp the cloak” (הָצִיאוּ עֲבָרָתָם) of “a Judean” (#אֱלֹק יְهوֹדִי) and ask to go with him because God is with him.59 The expression “grasp the cloak” is common Semitic idiom for supplication and submission (Brauner 1974: 35-38; Greenstein 1982: 217-18). This idiom, taken together with the substance of the entire verse—that God is mediated to the nations through a Judean—attributes to Jerusalem a type of dominion not always present in the comparable passages. The universalism in vv. 20-22, therefore, is not truly egalitarian. It is realized in this case

59 The phrase איש יהודי (“a Judean”), because it suggests a single individual, may, therefore, intimate someone in particular, who is not identified in this verse. Is it coincidental that “ten men” grasp this man’s cloak; that there are, in Zechariah 9, ten nations, Hadrach, Aram, the tribes of Israel, Hamath, Tyre, Sidon, Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, and Ashdod; and, that the capital, Damascus, is said to belong to Yahweh? Does Zechariah 8:23–9:8 suggest that a Judean was elevated to the gubernatorial administration in Damascus? What of Josephus’s apparent identification of Sheshbazzar with Shethar-bozenai, who in Ezra 5:3, 6; 6:6, 13 is identified as an associate/co-administrator of the Transeuphrates with Tattenai (Antiq., 11.12, 101)? Was Zerubbabel promoted (cf. Zech 9:9-10)? Obviously, this is entirely speculation.
in a startlingly bold claim for universal dominion, which echoes the domestication of the horns in 2:1-4, Jerusalem’s envisioned supercession of Babylon throughout the night visions, and presumes Yahweh’s particularity towards his people as reflected in the epithet, Yahweh who has chosen Jerusalem in 3:2. Still, this dominion is not accomplished through military force, nor is it presented as a political or military dominion. Instead, the emphasis is on the mediation of divine favor, and presumably, within the broader context of the conclusion, the mediation of truth and holiness, which is to be the essence of the renamed city.

Despite the proposed and anticipated elevation of Jerusalem to such an exalted status, the rhetorical question in 8:6—“For if it would be too difficult in the eyes of this remnant of the people in these days, would it be too difficult also in my eyes?”—interrupts the divine blessings and sharply points to the exceptional nature of the pledges in light of the prevailing conditions in Jerusalem. Some of these prevailing conditions are specifically identified in 8:10 as the absence of wages and security. It is probably also sound to infer that the blessings envisioned for Jerusalem and the people of the land would ameliorate present realities so that the promises of a multi-generational community of old and young (8:4-5) address the realities of a first generation community, promises of prosperity and abundance (1:17; 3:10; 4:12-14; 8:12) address economic and agricultural distress, promises of deliverance (2:1-4, 12-13; 8:7, 13) address oppression, promises of patronage and adoption (2:14-16; 8:3, 8) address exile and fragmentation, exhortations to practice justice (7:9-10; 8:16-17, 19) and promises of renewed governance (3:7; 6:9-15) address disorder and alienation, and promises of universal recognition (2:15; 8:20-23) address isolation. Strikingly, the future looking aspect of all the promises and exhortations concerning Jerusalem and the people of the land, along with the references to an exilic community in the third and eighth vision-oracles, presents
exile as a continuing and prevailing condition. Likewise, the promises of reconstruction (1:16; 2:5-9; 4:6-10; 6:15) point to a city and likely temple still under construction.

CONCLUSIONS

If only because of its greater length, Zechariah 1–8 engages a wider set of topics than the nearly contemporary text of Haggai. The supplementary nature of much of that additional material is clearly evident. The author of Zechariah 1–8 supplements concern for the reconstruction of the temple with concern for the reconstruction and restoration of Jerusalem, Judah, and even Israel; the coming of the people to rebuild, with the restoration of the exiles; the obedience of the people, with the penitence of the people; the role of Zerubbabel, with the role of Joshua; the reversal of Jeremian prophecy, with its fulfillment; the purpose of the nations in relation to the temple, with Jerusalem’s place among the nations; and, the renewal of agricultural life, with the renewal of governance and justice. This supplementation, however, does not merely broaden the scope of the information; it creates significant tensions between the texts.

For instance, in Haggai, the primary complication is the community’s failure to come to the temple and rebuild it. This inaction is the reason for their privation and suffering and so they are chastised by the prophet. Their positive response to this chastisement leads to the laying of the temple’s foundation three months later and, along with that, the imminent, partially realized reversal of their condition. To some extent, the author of Zechariah 1–8 accepts the validity of this portrait (see esp. 8:9-15) but also clearly promotes a more rigorous moral program. The author of Zechariah 1–8 introduces a call to repentance and the penitent response of the people at a critical moment, in the eighth month of Darius’s second year, immediately preceding the laying of the

---

60 This perspective lays the groundwork for later theological developments, e.g., Daniel 9 in which the “seventy years” prophecy of Jeremiah 25:11 and 29:10 (cf. Zech 1:12; 7:5; 2 Chr 36:21) is presented as failed and its promises delayed sevenfold, i.e., seventy weeks of years, see esp. Bergsma 2009.
foundations and the announcement in Haggai that alienation has turned to approbation. The new narrative created by the author of Zechariah 1–8 is that obedience and penitence turns alienation into approbation. This new narrative predicates successful reconstruction and approbation on an additional set of obligations. Indeed, penitence leads into the purification themes of the night visions and the moral didacticism and imperatives of the conclusion in 7:1–8:22. The latter especially links reconstruction and approbation to truth and justice. This change has significant repercussions, as it effectively attenuates Haggai’s dramatic vision of divine vindication and revitalization (without impugning it). In Zechariah 1–8, the promises of a renewed Davidic house are contingent not only on the reconstruction of the temple, but also on the moral and ethical reformation of the community.

Another element of tension relates to the different roles for the temple/Jerusalem in these texts. For the author of Haggai, the significance of the temple is communal, as intimated by the festal framework, and economic, as reflected in the anticipated approbation. Reconstruction serves as a catalyst for divine vindication and an end to the prevailing political and military order. By contrast, the author of Zechariah 1–8 accepts not only the communal and economic importance of the temple but additionally promotes its judicial and moral significance. Moreover, the author of Zechariah 1–8 envisions an effulgent Jerusalem drawing in the nations rather than divine intervention that overturns present realities. To be sure, this international ingathering in Zechariah 1–8 should not be misconstrued as universalism. The author of Zechariah 1–8 promotes the preeminence of Jerusalem and the Judean people relative to the nations, but the striking contrast with Haggai remains, that is, the ongoing existence of the nations is assumed and so the challenge to the existing political or military order is more muted.

The undeniable commitment expressed in both texts is that the temple/Jerusalem is an essential feature of corporate identity, and that reconstruction is a religious imperative and a vital transfer operation in the community’s transition from the imperfect
yet provisionally acceptable and opportune present to an ideal, fully realized restoration. As such, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 testify to an active Judean revitalization movement in the late sixth century.61 Furthermore, points of convergence and divergence between the texts and the emphasis on exhortation within them suggest an ongoing conversation likely occurring at the center of the nascent Judean community.62 Significantly though, the texts lack evidence for sustained or virulent conflict and rivalry between established factions or parties (Bedford 2001: passim). At the heart of the ideological programs in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 are visions of vindication that anticipate an imminent and successful restoration of a unified community, the reversal of the ignominy of that community and of its political and cultic institutions, and the benevolent blessing and presence of their god mediated through the reconsecration and reconstruction of Jerusalem.

61 On revitalization movements and transfer operations between existing and goal cultures, see esp. Wallace 1956; 1970: 188-199. Despite the utility of the concept of “revitalization movements,” I am not as confident about Bedford’s (2001: 264-270) and Cook’s (1995) appeal to millenarianism. To be sure, there is some overlap between the general contours of millenarian movements and the prophetic proclamations of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 but the phenomenon is not so much defined by these generalities as it is by its peculiarities, e.g., its frequent relationship to Christian millennialism, a belief in an end to history, and its pronounced dualism and futurism, none of which are clearly and consistently featured in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8. Perhaps because Bedford and Cook appeal to this phenomenon, they fail to appreciate the importance of homology in religious expression and so overemphasize, or simply misinterpret, the role of divine intervention and eschatology in both texts at the expense of the emphasis on human responsibility and agency (see supra). The authors of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 do not present a hopeless situation that is “so dire that only divine intervention will redress the situation” (Bedford 2001: 266) nor does Zechariah 1–8, in particular, evince a “lack of hope in history” (Cook 1995: 128). Both authors identify the present situation as opportune and conducive to their ideological programs and seek to empower the community, rather than simply appeal to the divine, to ensure it is undertaken. Future, divine approbation and vindication is highlighted as an inducement to continue ongoing, efficacious activities. As such, ascribing millenarianism to Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 involves abandoning important formal criteria and diluting it to a point that it becomes almost indistinct from revitalization movements in general. Therefore, while the general category of revitalization movements is useful, millenarianism, in particular, is problematic. Indeed, recognizing that revitalization movements are formally distinguished from reform movements insofar as the former advocates sudden change as opposed to gradual change, it is justifiable to question whether there is sufficient information in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 to claim that these texts even promote revitalization as defined by anthropologists.

62 On the social location of the authors, see my previous chapter and also Cook 1995: 123-165; Bedford 2001: 264-310; Kessler 2002a: 266-269; Curtis 2006: 81-280.
As demonstrated in the previous chapters, DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8 reflect attempts to revive and promote the political and cultic centrality of Jerusalem to bolster a nascent restoration. The authors and tradents of that literature respond to the ideological and practical concerns created by the destruction of the site and the collapse of earlier political and cultic institutions. The authors and tradents employ and reshape imperial ideologies and myth as well as ideas from the Torah and prophetic predecessors to construct a theology of Jerusalem and to address these concerns. The texts acknowledge the Spartan conditions in Jerusalem in the early Persian period and convey hope that a multi-generational community will reside there again (Isa 65:20-23; Zech 8:4-5). Consequently, the themes of return or coming to Jerusalem are primary concerns, as might be expected. At the outset of the period, the governor and even the high priest may not have been living or presiding in Jerusalem; Haggai and Zechariah invite both, along with the people, to come to Jerusalem (Hag 1; Zech 6:9-15, cf. chs. 3–4). Interestingly, the geographical orientation of TI and Zechariah 1–8 includes the Sharon (Isa 65:10), Israel (Zech 2:2 [Eng 1:19]; 8:13), and Bethel (Zech 7:2) and the tenor of all these prophetic books, DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8, tends to emphasize inclusiveness and integration in its efforts to promote the reconstruction of Jerusalem.

Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi hint at a different historical context, still within the Persian period, which is less concerned with the reconstruction of the city and more concerned with its ongoing viability and security.\(^1\) Of course, situating these texts in

\(^1\) As will be highlighted, political and cultic administration is more developed and presumed to be operating from Jerusalem and there are also indications of evolution in imperial and regional politics. As a later portrait of Jerusalem, Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi provide insight on the evolution of reconstruction and outstanding issues of centrality and governance.
specific or even relative historical contexts predictably elicits controversy and rigorous debate. Still, these texts offer scholars a significant heuristic advantage because of their discernable chronological and literary relationship to Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, and even to DI and TI. Highlighting and examining this temporal relationship can, in turn, provide insight into the evolution of the intellectual and theological discourse about Jerusalem and even its physical condition in the Persian period.

Despite disagreement regarding the precise or absolute context for all three books (in whole or in part), there is a strong consensus that these texts are post-exilic and a compelling (though not uncontested) view that these texts share the specific temporal relationship reflected in their canonical ordering. In regard to an absolute context, most scholars assign the oracles of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 to a narrow temporal range from 520–516 BCE (or shortly thereafter), in keeping with their date formulae and lack of references to a completed temple.² Although comparable temporal cues are not provided in Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, recent studies of inter-textual allusions and the maššāʾ literary framework (Zech 9:1; 12:1; Mal 1:1) at least exclude proposed earlier dates for these texts (by establishing dependence).³ Generally now, these texts are dated securely after their predecessors in the fifth century or later.⁴

---


³ On the maššāʾ literary framework, see Floyd 2002; cf. Boda 2006b. On inter-textual allusions, see especially the essays in Boda and Floyd 2003. There are probably three stages in Zechariah: the vision-oracle complex (1:8–6:15), the prose frame, and first maššāʾ (1:2-6; 7:2–8:23; chs. 9–10), and the second maššāʾ (chs. 11 + 12–14). As with DI and TI, each author or tradent not only inherited the preceding stage but also shaped/rewrote it. As argued in the previous chapter, the author of the prose frame is responsible for linking Haggai-Zechariah 1–8 while the author of Malachi, as argued infra, is responsible for linking Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. On the order of composition, see infra and, more comprehensively, Schart 1998; 2000; Curtis 2000; Boda 2007a. For an alternative, perhaps still more popular, view that Malachi was linked to Haggai-Zechariah 1–8 ahead of Zechariah 9–14, see Bosshard and Kratz 1990; Steck 1991; Nogalski 1993a; 1993b; Redditt 2003.

⁴ Otzen (1964) is representative of a scholarly tradition arguing for a complex picture of redaction for Zechariah 9–14 with its constituent parts variously dated to the pre-exilic through the Hellenistic period. Stade’s (1881; 1882) late Hellenistic date has also retained a following. Recent commentators, however,
Indeed, most recent commentators accept that Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi are intentionally related or even inter-related on one or more literary levels. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the author of the prose frame of Zechariah 1:2-6 and 7:2–8:23 likely added the date formulae in Zechariah 1:1, 1:7, and 7:1 with reference to the date formulae in Haggai in order to situate the repentance of the people in Zechariah 1:1-6 ahead of the laying of the temple foundations, and the broader vision for reformation highlighted in Zechariah 7–8 ahead of the completion of the temple. Many other scholars, using a variety of methods, have demonstrated strong connections between Zechariah 1–8 and the two maš’ôt that follow it, including Mason (1976; 1982) from an inner-biblical perspective, Sweeney (2000) from a literary, reader-centered perspective, Floyd (2002) from a form critical perspective, Boda (2003b) from a redaction critical perspective, and Curtis (2006) from a sociological perspective. In turn, that Malachi is identified as a maşšāʿ is likely a deliberate literary strategy to relate it to the mašʿôt of Zechariah 9–14.

The maşšāʿ formula in Malachi identifies מלאך (literally, “my messenger”) as an agent or intermediary of the divine word, creating dissonance and consonance with the other texts. The use of this appellative distinguishes this formula and book from the mašʾôt formulae in Zechariah 9:1 and 12:1 (dissonance); yet, the scribe appears to have drawn the apellative from Zechariah 1–8 and embedded it as a motif in Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi to strengthen the connection between them (consonance). In tend to prefer a less complex theory of composition and a fifth century date (Boda 2003a). For additional discussion and literature on the date (and composition) of Zechariah 9–14, see Meyers and Meyers 1993: 52-59; Curtis 2006: 118-126. Malachi is usually placed in the fifth century, though some scholars, such as O’Brien 1990: 113-133, prefer an earlier sixth century date and some even a later Hellenistic date. For a “representative sampling of the positions taken by biblical scholars past and present on the date of the book of Malachi,” Hill’s Appendix A (1998: 393-395) is very helpful. This chapter reinforces and strengthens the consensus view dating Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi to the Persian period.

5 Personally, I agree with Ben Zvi (1996) concerning the integrity of the individual books and the importance of reading them as such, while still recognizing that as these books came to be transcribed on the same scroll, scribes did make changes to promote thematic unity or particular reading strategies, i.e., the books came to be read and transcribed also as units.
Zechariah 1–8, the מלאך יהוה is a heavenly figure who interacts with the implied author and the high priest Joshua (1:13, 14; 2:3; 3:1, 5-6; 4:1, 4-5; 5:5, 10; 6:4-5). In Zechariah 3–4, prophetic, royal, and priestly figures are all presented as having access to the heavenly realm and so also as potential messengers. Outside of Zechariah 1–8, there are three more occurrences of מלאך יהוה (“messenger of Yahweh”) in the three prophetic texts. Each occurrence identifies the מלאך יהוה with one of the socio-religious or political offices having access to the heavenly realm: the prophet in Haggai 1:13, the king in Zechariah 12:8, and the priest in Malachi 2:7. As Boda (2007a: 124-127) observes and also argues, the integrity and originality of each of these occurrences is doubtful on literary and text-critical grounds. The author or “messenger” of Malachi, given the appellative in the maššāʾ formula, is the likely author of these secondary insertions and in being so, not only invested the prophetic, royal, and priestly offices with authority as divine messengers (or affirms such), but integrated and encouraged a comprehensive reading of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

Flowing through these texts are at least three lines of thought that relate to the ongoing viability of Jerusalem and that have potentially productive relationships: the explicit and implied imperial and regional context(s), the nature and status of Judean leadership and the Judean community, and the status of the city and the temple. By analyzing these thought lines, this chapter shows that Jerusalem is presented, from Haggai to Malachi, as ever more entrenched at the center of Judean cult and polity, with a noticeable evolution in its status and governance. Through this analysis, this chapter explicates two additional prophetic perspectives on Jerusalem’s reconstruction, that is, those of Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, and provides a foundation for the diachronic interpretation of the Jerusalem-centric textual strategies deployed in all Persian period prophetic texts. The nature of this thematic development reinforces the diachronic relationship of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi sketched above and suggests that DI and TI are earlier texts than this triad.
THE EXPLICIT AND IMPLIED IMPERIAL AND REGIONAL CONTEXT(S)

The positive portrayal of the Persian Empire, as opposed to earlier, profoundly negative portrayals of the Assyrian and Babylonian Empires, is an interesting, diagnostic feature of post-exilic literature. The portrait of Cyrus in Isaiah 40–48 is the epitome of this tendency but the date formulae of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, especially those that refer to Darius as king (Hag 1:1, 15; Zech 7:1), are similarly representative. The circumspection shown in the latter texts with respect to a royal or messianic interpretation of Zerubbabel and Joshua further underscores an apparently prevailing conviction that Persian rule was legitimate and divinely authorized and, therefore, a state of affairs to which Judeans must be resigned, at least in the interim. In Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, the attitude of the authors towards Persian authority is less explicit, though especially in the former, no less impressive. The references to the imperial context are at times oblique but on the whole appear to situate the texts later than DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8. In all cases, as in the preceding texts, Yahweh exerts sovereign control over the imperial and regional contexts in favor of Jerusalem.

6 On this circumspection, see chapters 4–5 ad loc. In spite of my assertion in previous chapters that Zerubbabel is given preeminence over Joshua, it is important not to carry this too far. The consistent, unequivocal coupling of Zerubbabel and Joshua is, in itself, strong evidence for their cooperation in governance, regardless of whether Zechariah 4:14 and 6:13 authorize it or not. Rose (2000: 250-251) falsely dismisses the political power of the priesthood by relegating its jurisdiction to the temple, as though that jurisdiction had little political significance. On the contrary, temple oversight meant oversight of a treasury, which was often connected with imperial administration (Schaper 1995; 1997); and, the possible assignment of certain royal prerogatives to the priesthood, which Rose himself appreciates, only enhances their political clout and confirms their cooperative role with the governorate. Boda (2001) helpfully argues that Zechariah 1–8 circumscribes the authority of the priests by promoting the continuing role of the prophetic and royal offices in Yehud. Yet, if such a polemic is at play, it may strengthen rather than lessen the probability of shared governance of a sort; a polemic, by its nature, presumes a situation contrary to that which is desired, namely a situation in which the priests are blurring the distinctions between priest and king or, in this case, governor. Also, Nehemiah seems to evince a struggle by the governorate, on the strength of a new imperial mandate, to take back and consolidate power vis-à-vis the powerful priesthood (to which we might add Boda’s reading of Zechariah as additional proof of the early recognition of the problem and an attempt to already then mollify the ambitions of the priests) and therefore, this too presupposes that something akin to a dyarchy had at some point existed in the earlier periods (cf. n. 26).
The significance of Persian rule in Zechariah 9–14 has often been under-appreciated or misunderstood because of a fundamental misinterpretation of the geographical orientation of the book. Perhaps stemming from the tendency to read Zechariah 9–14 as apocalyptic or proto-apocalyptic literature or simply the ubiquity of the particle כל ("all") in these chapters, scholars have tended to universalize its descriptions of conflict among “the peoples” (עם) and “the nations” (גוים). Contextually though, “the peoples” and “the nations” refer to the inhabitants and nations of the Persian satrapy of the Transeuphrates, that is, territories that constituted the patrimony of Abram’s descendants (Gen 15:18-21). Universal conflagration is only suggested by a linguistically and contextually unnecessary, yet very common, translation of הארץ as “the earth.”

Zechariah 9:1-8 identifies the geographical interests of the masšā’ by defining the scope of הארץ as the Persian satrapy of the Transeuphrates, starting with Hadrach and the satrapal capital, Damascus, in the north and continuing with an inventory of its major centers, from north to south, in vv. 1b-7. This more limited geographical scope is also indicated by the repetition of the words רע (“neighbor”) and סביב (“surrounding”) throughout chapters 11–14. In 11:6, Yahweh decrees that the inhabitants of the land will “fall each into the hand of their neighbor (رعاו) and into the hand of their king (מלכו).” In 12:2, Yahweh makes Jerusalem “a cup of reeling for all the surrounding (סביב) peoples.” In 12:6, Judah will devour “to the right and to the left all the surrounding (סביב) peoples.” In 14:13, panic will cause the peoples to “seize the hand of their neighbor (رعاו)” and “raise their hand against their neighbor (رعاו)’. In 14:14, “the wealth of all the

---

7 For a view, e.g., that Zechariah fundamentally opposes Persian rule, see Sweeney 2000: 561-567.
8 Furthermore, the identification of Damascus as a capital, and the geographical outline of the Transeuphrates in 9:1-8, provides strong implicit evidence that Zechariah 9–14, on the one hand, post-dates the creation of this satrapy, which likely occurred in the reign of Xerxes (Stolper 1989), and on the other, pre-dates the Hellenistic era when Antioch replaces Damascus as the administrative capital in Syria.
9 The ultimate referent, the inhabitants of the land, is, in this case, plural and, therefore, I employ the plural pronoun to translate the singular possessive pronouns.
surrounding (םכלב) nations” will be gathered together. Given these repetitive indications of proximity, a preferable translation for הנдей, in most cases, is “the land” with the onus on interpreters to demonstrate that “the earth” is contextually preferable and/or necessary.

Through the catalogue of conquests and victories described in Zechariah 9, the author anticipates a pax Persica to be synonymous with a pax Dei, the former earthly reality reflecting the latter cosmological reality. The actions of the Persian king are closely identified with the will of Yahweh and prepare for Yahweh’s return to Jerusalem. In 9:13, the author claims solidarity with the Persian Empire by setting the sons of Zion (בני ציון, “your sons, Zion”) against the sons of Greece (בני יוון, “your sons, Greece”), most likely in light of the Greco-Persian wars (Curtis 2006: 173-181); and so, it would be counter-intuitive that the author is rejecting solidarity within this same chapter. In 9:1-8, the subjugation of the Transeuphrates is of Persia and of Yahweh. Persian rule is provisionally accepted and supported under the universal sovereignty of Yahweh.

To be sure, the assertion that the Persian king is merely Yahweh’s agent and the true universal king is Yahweh has a potentially subversive subtext. Yet, Zechariah 9–14 does not envision an end to the kingdoms of the earth (as in Haggai) and, therefore, there is no explicitly predicted end to Persian rule. Indeed, in the ancient Near Eastern mindset, divine kingship does not preclude, rather it demands and justifies human kingship; human kingdoms replicate heavenly patterns on earth. Yahweh’s victory and enthronement, as visualized in 14:9 and 14:16-19, anticipate Jerusalem’s elevation to primacy as the sacred center of the Transeuphrates (reading “land” for הארץ not “earth”). This victory has clear political implications, as signaled by the tribute procession and religious pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 14:14 and 14:16-19, but it does not foresee or demand the end of Persian rule. In fact, the reference to Egypt in 14:18-19 may reflect expectations for its pacification and re-subjugation within the Persian Empire in relation to the rebellions in Egypt in the fifth century (see n. 11-12 infra).
Notably, the divine pronouncement in 11:6, enacted through the subsequent shepherd sign-act, anticipates and, from a literary point of view, sets off the conflicts that culminate with the conflagration envisioned in chapters 12–14. The sign-act seems rooted in a particular historical context and related to an actual historical controversy. Likely, the breaking of the staves in 11:10 and 11:14, representing affinity between Israel and Judah, and Jerusalem and its neighbors, reflects the crisis in Ezra 4:6-23 or a similar type of event. In Ezra 4:6-23, representatives of king Artaxerxes, supported by the Samaritans, express concern about the reconstruction of Jerusalem’s walls and request and receive imperial authorization to stop it, which they do “by force” (בָּאָדָם). The opponents may have taken advantage of the Inaros revolt in Egypt as a climate that would elicit a supportive response by exploiting fears of an expanding crisis. If not a reference to this

10 Morgenstern (1956; 1957a; 1957b; 1960; 1962; 1967; 1969) proposed an overzealous and flawed historical reconstruction of such an event, which Sowers (1996) attempted to refine. Sowers article improves upon Morgenstern but the interpretation of Ezra 4:6-23 is incorrect. The reference to the previous rebellion of the city probably refers to the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BCE, not a hypothetical destruction of the city in the reign of Xerxes, as both Sowers and Morgenstern assert. The letters are chiefly concerned with an attempt to rebuild the walls (4:12-13) and do not imply that the city was in ruins, rather only that reconstruction, especially of the walls, was not complete (though would be soon). Ezra 4:6 indicates that concerns about the rebuilding project may have been initially raised in the reign of Xerxes but reached a head in the reign of Artaxerxes with the martial action described in Ezra 4:23. On the authenticity of the correspondence and its detractors, see Fried 2012.

11 In the mid-fifth century, ca. 462, the Libyan Inaros, aided by an Egyptian chieftain Amyrtaeus and the Athenian navy, attacked and laid siege to the citadel at Memphis in a bid to overthrow Persian hegemony in Egypt. For an excellent historical overview, see Hoglund 1992: 97-164. The Athenians supported the revolt in order to open a second front in the war with Persia over Cyprus. The Persians, occupied principally with Cyprus at the time, responded slowly. The siege lasted for nearly six years before being lifted in 456 by a Persian force under the command of the satrap of the Transeuphrates, Megabyzus. Fortunately for the Persians, the revolt did not gain widespread support, either among the commoners or the Egyptian elite. Insofar as the coalition could not even take the citadel at Memphis, Persian imperial control was never really threatened. Yet, the inability of the Persians to quickly suppress the revolt exposed a weakness in their military deployment and strategy—a weakness the Egyptians would exploit to achieve their independence in 404 and to lead or support revolts in the Levant and Asia Minor throughout the fourth century (until they were re-subjugated by Artaxerxes III in 343). Soon after the suppression of the Inaros revolt in Egypt, Artaxerxes concluded a peace with Athens, who had suffered significant naval losses in the Persian response. On the Peace of Callias, see Meiggs 1972: 129-151, 487-495; Briant 2002: 557, 579-580, 582, 591, 967-968, 971, 974-976, 1008.
context, the sign-act may relate to Judean politics set against any number of regional and inter-regional instabilities in the fifth through fourth centuries; or, it may simply anticipate such instabilities in response to unsettled state affairs. Regardless of the precise context, the breaking of the staves, to signal a rift in the relationships between Judah and Israel, and between Jerusalem and its neighbors, is the apparent consequence of the unethical conduct of the leaders in Jerusalem; it is not a condemnation of Persian rule (contra Sweeney 2000: 668-669). The sign-act condemns conduct seen to threaten the hard-won pax Persica of chapter nine and to lead to the conflict of chapters 12–14.

Persians and Edomites in Malachi

In general, Malachi does not share the same imperial, transnational interests as Haggai or Zechariah and so the Persian period context is not explicit. Still, this setting is perhaps discernable in the titles governor (פֶּתַח) and “great king” (מלך גדול), and in other images related to the latter. The appellation “great king,” regularly used by ancient Near Eastern kings, is appropriated by Yahweh in Malachi 1:15b. In Malachi, this appropriation is supported by ideological language that points to the Achaemenid period.

---

12 As noted in chapter 2, after Egypt won its independence in 404, Persian armies attempted to retake Egypt in 385, 383, and 373, suppressed revolts in Asia Minor in the 360s and in Sidon in 359, attacked Egypt again in 351, suppressed revolts in Cyprus and Sidon in the aftermath of that attempt, and re-conquered Egypt in 343 (Briant 2002: 646-675, 681-688, 991-998, 1003-1005).

13 This disruption of the pax Persica is amplified by a possible allusion to Achaemenid Persian formulae. C. Mitchell, personal communication, observes that Zechariah 12:1b follows creation formulae common to royal Achaemenid inscriptions. The formula in Zechariah 12:1b includes a tripartite declaration of the creative action of Yahweh, parallel to what might be said of Ahura Mazda, but rather than continuing with the peace or happiness of the people and a proclamation of kingship (e.g., “who gives shalom to humanity, who made Darius king”), v. 2 announces the discord Yahweh is creating because of Jerusalem, Mitchell, personal communication, suggests that this disruption puts Yahweh at odds with the imperial regime but I would demur. The use of imperial language implies close identification with the imperial regime, dissatisfaction that the actions of the shepherds, who in Zechariah 11 have broken the peace, and anticipates the restoration of order by martial action, reflective of the introductory formulae that precedes lists of lands and peoples under Achaemenid rule. On the two types of formulae, see Lincoln 2008.

14 For discussion of this title, see O’Brien 1990: 118-120; Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2011: 77-80.

15 Note, however, Ahura Mazda possesses and dispenses kingship but is never identified as a king, in contrast to Yahweh and Mesopotamian deities. On Achaemenid kingship, see Root 1979; 2013.
Appropriately, Yahweh, or Yahweh’s name, is recognized, worshipped, and feared among the nations (Mal 1:5, 11, 15b). Describing the domain of that recognition, the idiom, “from the rising of the sun (םֶמֶרֶד הַשָּׁמֶשֶׁת)" in Malachi 1:11, not only supports the trope of divine kingship in vernacular common to Achaemenid kings but echoes Yahweh’s declaration of sovereignty over Cyrus in Isaiah 41:25a and 45:5-6:

I have stirred up one from the north, he comes from the rising of the sun (םֶמֶרֶד הַשָּׁמֶשֶׁת), summoned by my name.

I am Yahweh, and there is no other; besides me there is no god. I arm you, though you do not know me, so that they may know, from the rising of the sun (םֶמֶרֶד הַשָּׁמֶשֶׁת) to its setting, that there is no one besides me; I am Yahweh, and there is no other.

Malachi 3:16 and 3:20 [4:2] further reinforce an Achaemenid context by presenting Yahweh as a sovereign referring to a “book of remembrance” (ספר זכרון) and as “the sun of righteousness with healing in her wings” (שמש צדקה ומרפא בכנפיה), possibly evoking the faravahar common to Achaemenid royal inscriptions.

Perhaps the most productive information establishing the Persian period context of Malachi, however, is references to Edom. In Malachi 1:2-5, the author juxtaposes Edom and Israel and their tribal ancestors, Esau and Jacob, in order to assert Yahweh’s

---

16 This passage is often regarded as a Persian-ism in light of Esther 6:1 (ספר הזכרונות). Deuel (1996) insightfully suggests that the key phrase is an idiom better translated memorandum, so referring to the writing and archiving of messages as an aide-mémoire (see, e.g., TAD A4.9; Porten 1996: 148-149).

17 The winged sun-disk or faravahar in Achaemenid tradition has many antecedents in ancient Near Eastern iconography and even has a parallel on the lmlk stamped jar handles of the Judean monarchy. For relevant discussion on solar imagery and this passage, see Taylor 1993: esp. 211-216. On parallel imagery in TI, see Strawn 2007. Note also the view that the faravahar represents the glory/wealth, khvarnah, of the deity; see Shahbazi 1974; 1980; Calmeyer 1979; cf. Lecoq 1984; Soudavar 2003. Numismatic reflexes of this iconography are reflected in the Yehud drachm and Yehud coins inscribed with the falcon. On the falcon and khvarnah, see Soudavar 2003: 86-87. On Yehud coins, see chapter 2. As Malachi so closely identifies Yahweh with imperial ideology, the evidence may support Bolin’s (1995) novel suggestion that Yahwists of the Achaemenid period actively presented Yahweh as a local manifestation of Ahura Mazda, though it is notable that the languages identifies Yahweh more closely with the king than with the deity (refer to n. 15 supra).
favor and love for the latter. Especially significant is the allusion to Edom’s destruction, as well as an apparent concern about Edom’s restoration. While Haggai and Zechariah do not refer to the kingdom, the destruction of Edom is mentioned in Isaiah 63:1-6. Malachi’s allusion to the ongoing desolation of the kingdom and the negative prediction concerning Edom’s potential restoration shows a marked development from TI, which revels only in its destruction. TI appears to be much nearer to the destruction.

Current archaeological and historical opinion on Edom attributes and dates the destruction of the kingdom to the Babylonian king Nabonidus in the mid-sixth century (Beaulieu 1989: 166, 169; Bartlett 1989: 157-161; 1999: 287-295; cf., though, the more cautious appraisal of MacDonald 1999: 295-301; Bienkowski 2008: 335). O’Brien (1990) argues on this basis that Malachi’s allusion to Edom favors an earlier setting for the book, between 550 and 500 BCE. She argues that the potential for restoration, implied in Malachi 1:4, could only have existed in the immediate aftermath of the destruction because the infiltration of the Nabateans, which she dates to the fifth century onwards, ended such expectations (1990: 117-118). This argument is flawed on three counts:

1. The infiltration of the Nabateans occurred in the late fourth or third centuries, not the fifth century as O’Brien claims, and results in different settlements (Bartlett 1990; 1999; Bienkowski 2008). Their infiltration, even if it started earlier, likely had little effect on the supra-tribal administrative centers of the traditional Edom in the Persian period.

2. Excavations at Buseirah (i.e., Bozrah) and Tell el-Kheilefeh suggest continuous or renewed occupation at these tribal centers through the sixth to the fifth century (Bartlett 1999: 285-297; Bienkowski 2002; 2008).
3. However historically or culturally imprecise it may be, Edom’s reconstruction by the Nabateans, or even by the Qedarites, as Lemaire (1994) has suggested, would still be consistent with 1:4.\footnote{Bartlett (1999: 285-297; cf. Josephus, \textit{Antiq.} 1.12.4) argues that the Nabateans may relate to biblical Nebaoith, in which case biblical writers genetically relate the Nabateans to Esau/Edom and Qedar (Gen 25:13; 28:9; 36:3; Isa 60:7; 1 Chr 1:29). This argument is now generally rejected for linguistic and geographical reasons (Eph’al 1984: 222-223; Knoppers 2004: 278-279).} Contrary to O’Brien, the potential for restoration could have existed at any time after the rise of the Persians and even grown in intensity in the fifth century. Furthermore, whether such hope or fears existed because of work undertaken by the Persians, Edomites, Nabateans, Qedarites, or some combination of these groups, the more salient point is that a fifth or even fourth century setting is sustainable and even preferable because Malachi actually relies not on evidence of restoration but on evidence for continued desolation.

Indeed, the appeal to Yahweh’s preference for Jacob over Esau is offered as an answer to doubts about Yahweh’s love. The answer is predicated on a reality in which Yahweh’s preference was manifest; the petitioner can be certain about Yahweh’s love because Israel is restored and Edom still lies desolate (and will remain so). The appeal, therefore, assumes only Israel’s (not Edom’s) recovery and restoration, most likely epitomized by the reconstruction of the temple and Jerusalem around which the subsequent concerns of the book dwell. The communicative power of the appeal likely relies on cultural memories that Edom in the seventh and sixth centuries encroached on Judah’s southern territories and collaborated with the Babylonians in destroying Jerusalem and burning the temple (Isa 34; Ezek 25:12-14; 35; Joel 4:19-21 [3:19-21]; Obad; Mal 1:2-5; Ps 137:7; Lam 4:21-22; 1 Esdras 4:45).\footnote{For relevant discussion, see Bartlett 1982; Dicou 1994; Glazier-McDonald 1995; Mathews 1995: 69-117; Assis 2006; Tebes 2011.} Yahweh’s preference and love for Jacob is proven by the (implied) restoration of Jerusalem and Edom’s destruction and ongoing desolation.
JUDEAN LEADERSHIP AND THE COMMUNITY

Although imperial and regional politics receive some attention, and set an important historical context, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi are all more deeply concerned with local politics and cult. The texts, however, present starkly different portraits. The authors of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, on the one hand, endorse Zerubbabel and only to a slightly lesser extent Joshua in a nascent restoration. The authors of Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, on the other hand, do not name any community leaders, only offices and leading families, and are generally critical of Judean leadership. Zechariah 9–14 presents a complex picture of nobles and priests, referring to the house of David (משהת ביתדוד) in 12:7-10 and 13:1, the clan of the house of David (משהת ביתדוד) and the clan of the house of Nathan (משהת בית נתן) in 12:12, the clan of the house of Levi (משהת בית לי) in 12:13, and the clan of the Shimeite (משהת השמעי) in 12:14. Zechariah 9–14 also includes enigmatic references to kings (9:9; 11:6), shepherds and sheep merchants (10:3; 11:4-17, 12:7), and “one whom they have pierced” (אשר־דקרו, 12:10). The situation in Malachi, although critical in tone, may reflect a political landscape akin to Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 as Malachi only refers to priestly and gubernatorial offices, namely, the “governor” (פחה) in 1:8, Levi in 2:4-9, and the sons of Levi (בני לי) in 3:2b-4. Yet too, the text may reflect an evolution in that landscape, indicated by the implied deference of the priests towards the governor in 1:8 and the absence of references to the house of David. Notably, Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, as opposed to Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, explicitly refer to Yahweh as king (Zech 14:9, 16-17; Mal 1:14). As in DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8, concerns about Judean leadership are ultimately connected to the fate of Jerusalem.

Judah and David in Zechariah 9–14

The cruces interpretum for the complex picture in Zechariah 9–14 are the enigmatic references to the king in Zechariah 9:9 and to “one whom they have pierced” in 12:10. These appellations are generally interpreted eschatologically or as references to
Zerubbabel or another Davidide. These interpretations, however, are problematic, as especially the reference to the king seems to have a present orientation, not an eschatological one, and yet the title of king seems out-of-place given the political realities of the time. Despite very elevated language to describe Zerubbabel in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, this particular title, even by implication, is judiciously avoided and not otherwise conferred on him (see n. 6 supra).

Recognizing these problems with the traditional interpretations, Leske (2000) has argued for a compelling solution to the *cruces interpretum*, proposing that the king and “one whom they have pierced” is Judah. He supports this argument by identifying and considering the implications of inter-textual allusions to Judah’s blessing (Gen 49:10-12) and the servant motif in DI and TI. The latter provides precedent for the personification of a collective as a royal yet afflicted figure while the former, by reference to a purebred ass as a preferred mount (עֵירֹה in Gen 49:11 // עַיִר and בני אתנו in Zech 9:9), invokes the patriarch Judah (Leske 2000: 671-673). The identification of Judah as the king and “one whom they have pierced” is further strengthened by the otherwise inexplicable and awkward absence of Judah from Zechariah 9:10, alongside Ephraim and Jerusalem, as opposed to 9:13 where all three appear together; and, likewise, the inexplicable absence of Judah from Zechariah 12:10, alongside David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, as opposed to 12:7, where all three appear together. This identification also resolves the persistent difficulty with the simile in Zechariah 12:10, likening mourning for the “one whom they have pierced” to weeping over “a firstborn.” The preposition כ

---

20 Although generally so, the sheer number and variety of proposals is actually quite staggering. For an overview of many of the proposals, see Pettersen (2009: 129-148, 213-245).

21 Putting forward this proposal is not to deny the clear and obvious trajectory of later readings. Alternative readings of the text took root very quickly, as attested e.g. by its New Testament afterlife in Matthew 27:9-10. On such readings, and the role of translation in their development, see esp. van der Kooij 2003. A parallel phenomenon occurs in Haggai, as attested by the expansions of the text in the LXX. N.B. the later messianic interpretation of Haggai 2:7, on which see Verhoef 1987: 103-104.
(“like, as”) militates against popular identifications with Zerubbabel or his son, Meshullam, as these two are firstborn, not merely “like” them. For Judah, who, of course, is fourth born and yet granted the kingship as though he were firstborn, the simile is perfectly appropriate.

Personified as king, Judah is the source and foundation of leadership, as clearly affirmed in Zechariah 10:4. Much of the rest of the text is concerned with their shepherds and Yahweh’s anger against them (10:2-3a). The critique of the leadership is severe. In the prophetic sign-act of Zechariah 11:4-16, they are characterized as murderous, greedy, and pitiless slave traders (11:5), exasperating the efforts of the prophet to shepherd the flock and so inciting him to break the staves that represent covenant with the peoples and between Israel and Judah (11:7-14).22 This internal dissension leads Yahweh to invest the prophet as a “foolish shepherd” (רעה אויל), to portend a coming shepherd who will neglect and devour the flock. Zechariah 11:17 is an imprecation against the worthless shepherd, that a sword might strike his arm and right eye (חרב על־זרעו ועל־עין ימיני). The semantic domain of this imprecation and Zechariah 9–11 in general leans heavily towards military activities, the significance of which extends beyond a depiction of Yahweh as divine warrior and in this case augurs the wounding of the shepherd in battle.

Indeed, in the second maśśā’, Yahweh ultimately strikes down the shepherd (13:7) by bringing “the peoples” against Jerusalem (12:1-2; 13:8-9; 14:2).23 Yahweh,

---

22 On “slave traders,” see supra, esp. n. 32. On the identity of “the peoples,” see also supra.

23 The shepherd is identified in Zechariah 13:7 as an associate or friend. Some have suggested, therefore, that this is not the worthless shepherd. Yahweh, however, as before calls for the sword to strike this shepherd and no other shepherd is introduced in the intervening narrative. The appellation “associate” identifies this shepherd as a Davidide. For a view that Zechariah 9–14 reflects a transfer of authority or prerogatives to corollary Davidic and priestly lineages, i.e., to the house of Nathan and the house of Shimei, see Boda 2007b. For an overview of the history of interpretation, see Petterson 2009: 149-212.

Contextually, Zechariah 13:7 should be understood as a pivot. In this verse, Yahweh invokes, or commences, what is revealed in 12:1–13:6, the consequences of which are summarized in 13:8-9. Zechariah 14 re-envisions the same conflagration in an international context, adopting a decidedly stronger eschatological/apocalyptic tone. As such, 13:7-9 bridges essentially parallel descriptions of the same event.
however, comes to Jerusalem’s defense (12:3-4, 9; 14:3-4, 9, 10-15), which galvanizes Judah to action (12:5-6). Yahweh, in turn, grants Judah pride of place in the ensuing victory against “the peoples” (12:7a), in order to humble the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (12:7b, 10-14; 13:9), yet the house of David should retain its place at the head of Judah and Jerusalem (12:8; 13:1). Notably, neither Judah nor Jerusalem escapes unscathed. From the land, two-thirds of the people are exiled or killed (13:8) while from the city half are exiled (14:2, 5). The attack, however, purifies, cleanses, and refines those who survive (12:10-14; 13:1-2, 9) and also brings about an end to idolatry and false prophecy (13:2-6), a peaceful agricultural existence (13:5-6), ecological upheaval (14:4-8, 10), the universal kingship of Yahweh (14:9), permanent security (14:10-11), renewed settlement in Jerusalem (12:6; 14:11), the destruction of Jerusalem’s enemies (12:9; 14:12-14a, 15), an ingathering of wealth (14:14b), renewed festivities and pilgrimage (14:16-19), the total sacralization of Judah and Jerusalem (14:20-21a), and the removal of the slave traders from the temple (14:21b).

The second maššā’ contrasts, amid this conflagration, the leaders of Jerusalem and the clans of Judah. As Zechariah 10:3b plainly identifies Judah as Yahweh’s flock and it is concern for this flock that incites Yahweh’s anger against their shepherds (10:3a), the shepherds and sheep merchants are the inhabitants and leaders of Jerusalem, especially the clans of the houses of David, Nathan, and Levi, and the clan of the Shimeite (11:4-17; 12:12-14).24 The telos of the conflagration is captured in Yahweh’s declaration, “I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of gratitude (חן) and commiseration (תחנון), so that they will look to me—the one

---
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12:1–13:6 and 14:1-21, each introduced by the last occurrences of הנה (See!) in the book, one account with a primarily local/national focus and the other with a regional/international focus.

24 “Sheep merchants” is perhaps a broader title that may have a regional, imperial, and economic scope, given that the sheep merchants are perhaps juxtaposed with the community’s shepherds in 11:4-17. Nevertheless, in 14:21, the hope is expressed that they will be removed from the temple. The appellation, therefore, seems to include cultic personnel (and perhaps other leaders, cf. Neh 13:4-9).
whom they have stabbed, they will mourn for him as one mourns for an only child and
grieve for him as one grieves for the firstborn” (12:10). Sweeney (2000: 689) quite
instructively recognizes that the spirit of gratitude and commiseration indicates Yahweh’s
“interest in promoting a sense of concern in the house of David.” This portrayal contrasts
sharply with the depiction of the shepherds as pitiless and greedy slave traders (11:4-5).
As such, the conflict has the effect of transforming Judah’s leaders, who are now, by the
spirit poured out on them and their re-orientation towards Yahweh, presented as humbled
and as mourning for the wounded of Judah. In effect, the shepherds are convicted of their
shortsightedness and neglect of the flock.

Because of the practical concern for the house of David, the historical context is
likely a post-exilic period in which the house of David remained a significant, though, in
the mind of the prophet, corrupt, political force. The lack of an ongoing, prominent role
for the house of David in later post-exilic literature, such as Malachi and Ezra-Nehemiah
through the books of Maccabees, indicates that Zechariah 9–14 should be placed in the
half-century or century around/just after the time of Zerubbabel.25 Especially significant
in this regard is that the position and relevance of the Davidic house in Zechariah 9–14 is
not eschatological or messianic in nature; the house is plainly presented as an active,
leading family whose moral authority and claim to leadership is being challenged by the
prophet. The resignation of the shepherd in the prophetic sign-act and the striking of the
shepherd in Zechariah 13:7, as such, should be understood as indicative of a decline and
diminution of the role of the house in Judean politics. Despite the sharp critique, the
prophet envisions and promotes the restoration of the house of David to leadership in the

25 Of course, retrospective interest in the house of David persists, as especially reflected by
Chronicles and the New Testament genealogies of Jesus. The preservation of the Davidic genealogy
through the Hellenistic and Roman period does suggest that the family/clan retained some importance in
the community. On the dating of Zechariah 9–14, refer again to n. Error! Bookmark not defined.. Related
to this, Boda (2003b) builds a persuasive case that the good shepherd in Zechariah 11:4-17 represents
Zerubbabel.
community in 12:8 and 13:1. In the longer view of the history of the period, however, the absence of evidence for continuing Davidic involvement in governance seems to indicate that the house of David did not recover from this crisis in the way envisioned by the text.

Priests and Policy in Malachi

In Malachi, the political picture is not as sharply drawn. The text lacks exclusivist language, embracing a wide audience. This is especially evident in the messenger’s terms of address, such as Israel (1:1, 5; 2:16), Jacob (1:2; 2:12; 3:6), and at one point, “the whole nation” (3:9), each of which emphasizes an inclusive community. Judah and Jerusalem are singled out in 2:11 and 3:4 but they are not set over or against other potential insiders; they are simply part of the messenger’s audience. In Malachi 2:10, the messenger rhetorically asserts, “Do not all of us have one father? Did not one god create us?” Similarly, the messenger refers to the priests as priests (1:6; 2:1) or by their common tribal ancestor Levi (2:4; 3:3), rather than potentially divisive alternatives, such as Levites, sons of Aaron, or sons of Zadok. The attack on the priests, which is central to the text, is severe yet lacks differentiation and evidence of priestly divisions, classes, and hierarchies, and matches its critique of priestly office-holders with esteem for the priestly office (O’Brien 1990; Schaper 2004). The socio-political and cultic situation in Jerusalem appears settled with the emphasis on critiquing entrenched priestly power and policy.

In Malachi 1:8, the messenger severely criticizes priestly offerings as impure and suggests that the priests would, or do, show greater deference in the sacrifices they present to the governor (חachable) than those they bring to Yahweh. This priestly deference to the governor, and possibly veiled disdain by the author for that honor shown to him, may suggest a change or growth in gubernatorial authority, perhaps now no longer a Davidic governor.26 By not identifying either a governor or high priest by name, Malachi may

26 As previously noted, the challenge to Davidic authority in Zechariah 9–14 may reflect events, perhaps echoed in Ezra 4:6-23 (as discussed supra), that ultimately led to the appointment of non-Davidic, less nationalistic, Persian loyalists as governors. Owing to their loyalty to the Persian crown, these new
reflect a move away from “a cult of leadership” and may provide evidence of declining autonomy with native political figures casting a shorter shadow over the community. Such a development seems consistent with the aftermath of the challenge to Davidic and priestly authority, envisioned in Zechariah 9–14.

Moreover, the absence of references to the house of David in Malachi may not only reflect such a development but also a concomitant intellectual trend among Judean scribes away from the Davidic covenant, as employed in Isaiah 40–55, Haggai, and Zechariah, towards more exclusive reliance on the authority of Moses. As widely recognized, Malachi is chiefly concerned with the authority and application of the Torah, especially injunctions concerning proper sacrifice (1:8-14; cf. Lev 22:17-25; Deut 15:21), accurate priestly instruction (2:7; cf. Lev 10:10-11; 22:9; Deut 33:8-11), divorce and exogamy (2:10-16; cf. Lev 21:14b-15; Deut 7:3-4; 24:1-4), and the payment of tithes (3:8-10a; cf. Lev 27:30; Num 18:21-24). Reflecting the convention of covenant curses in Leviticus 26:14-46 and Deuteronomy 27:2-26 and 28:15-68, corruption of the community (2:8), disunity (2:10-12, 16), divine indifference (2:13, 17), and a lack of agricultural prosperity (3:9-11) are presented as prevailing symptoms of the failure to observe these cultic convenances, necessitating Malachi’s rebuke with principles drawn from creation (2:10, 15; cf. Gen 1:1–2:25; Deut 32:6). Malachi anticipates the purification of the priesthood (3:1-4); divine adjudication (3:5) of the legal convenances concerning sorcerers (cf. Deut 18:10), adulterers and false witnesses (cf. Exod 20:14, 16; Deut 5:18, 20), and those who mistreat the hired worker (cf. Lev 19:13), the widow, the orphan, and the

appointees may have had the political clout to consolidate power in the governorate. To be sure, there is no direct evidence of this instability or change in Malachi and the hypothesis relies heavily on relating admittedly oblique testimony in Zechariah 9–14, Malachi, and Ezra-Nehemiah, and the genealogies of the House of David to known governors from the epigraphic evidence, but what is clear, particularly from the latter evidence, is that at some point in the Persian period the Davidic house lost practical influence and active interest in the restoration of Davidic kingship declined significantly.
resident alien (cf. Deut 24:17); and, a decisive judgment (3:19 [4:1]). There is no attention in this progression of concerns for the Davidic covenant or the role of the king.

Amid these concerns, the injunctions concerning divorce and exogamy (2:10-16) and the payment of tithes (3:8-10a) are particularly significant because they raise ethical and cultic issues with socio-political repercussions that help to situate the text. Although Torrey (1898), Hvidberg (1962), Isaksson (1965), and Petersen (1995) have argued that the language of Malachi 2:10-16 is figurative and primarily refers to idolatry and apostasy, rather than exogamy, Glazier-McDonald (1987: 84-120) has shown that the attraction of this interpretation owes to the consistent correlation of exogamy and idolatry in biblical texts. Exogamy is, therefore, at issue but it is the figurative interpretation that “brings the religious consequences to the forefront … [and] their interrelationship that adds pathos to the text by heightening the severity of the offense” (1987: 120). Exogamy, according to Malachi, spiritually and practically undermines the coherence and integrity of Israelite and Judean lineages (Sweeney 2000: 731-739).

Glazier-MacDonald’s criticism is important in that it effectively shows how the text is taking advantage of very productive metaphors that work at multiple levels. In fact, there is yet another added dimension to this text, as it seems to call attention to an even more basic issue than exogamy or idolatry, that is, faithlessness or infidelity. Divorce, exogamy, and idolatry are all symptomatic of this more essential and pervasive issue. Of particular interest is the emphasis on the spiritual unity of the people and the temporary, somewhat abrupt transition in the target of criticism from Levi to Judah, who is curiously described as having committed an abomination “in Israel and in Jerusalem.” If Judah personifies the leadership, as he does in Zechariah 9–14 and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, it seems that Malachi is not merely critical of marriage to foreign women as an act leading to idolatry but as an act perceived to be a threat to Jerusalem and perhaps also a source of division between Israel and Judah. If, just as Judah is a personification, the “daughter of a foreign god” (בת־אל נכר) in 2:11 is a personification,
that is, of a foreign city (and so by synecdoche, its people),\textsuperscript{27} Malachi is possibly also concerned with foreign alliances, whether of a political, cultic, or commercial nature.\textsuperscript{28}

Naturally, many scholars have noted that Malachi’s concern with this issue resonates with the problem of exogamy in Ezra-Nehemiah. Notably though, in contrast to Ezra-Nehemiah, Malachi does not present divorce as the solution to the problem but as symptomatic of it and consequently reports Yahweh’s hatred of divorce (Mal 2:16). So, although Malachi and Ezra-Nehemiah share this common concern, there is a certain dissonance in their presentations that probably reflects distinct stages in the development of the issue and the criticism of it. Malachi’s account of the events likely reflects an earlier, incipient stage in the horizon of this issue in the post-exilic community. The state of the problem in Malachi is such that the messenger wants to halt the practice whereas in Ezra-Nehemiah the practice is so widespread that Ezra and Nehemiah are not content to halt it but want to reverse it.\textsuperscript{29}

Significantly, exogamy is not the only such issue on which Malachi bears some resemblance to Ezra-Nehemiah. Malachi’s concern with inadequate tithes (3:8-12) resonates with a similar problem in Nehemiah’s second term as governor (13:10-14). In contrast to Nehemiah, however, the prophet does not possess the political clout to compel compliance and, therefore, relies on spiritual persuasion. The text appeals to covenant blessings and curses, encouraging the people to test the efficacy of the blessings by complying with stipulations to tithe (3:8-10a). Malachi assures the readership that if they do so, Yahweh will respond by granting them abundance and plenty (3:10b-12). Echoing

\textsuperscript{27} On this convention, see my ch. 3; Fitzgerald 1975.
\textsuperscript{28} The reference to “weeping and mourning” on the altar may have in mind rituals of deities such as Molek or Hadad-Rimmon, perhaps an echo of Zechariah 12:11 and the crisis presented there. On the inter-relationship of exogamy and foreign alliances in post-exilic literature, see Knoppers 1996: 622-626.
\textsuperscript{29} The impracticability of the solution in Ezra-Nehemiah suggests the ideological nature of that text, likely written in the late Persian or Hellenistic period, well after the events it narrates but perhaps at a time that social solidarity remained or even increased in importance.
Haggai, Malachi relates approbation to the covenant and the condition of the temple, but now within the framework of a much broader set of social and cultic concerns.30

THE STATUS OF THE CITY AND THE TEMPLE

The changes in the imperial, regional, and local contexts already hint at the significant evolution in the temporal setting from Haggai to Malachi and at the increased concern to address not the issues of aliyah and coming to Jerusalem but the consequences and political and cultic instability associated with establishing or re-establishing a capital. As previous chapters have illustrated, the reconstruction of Jerusalem and its temple is a clear and pressing concern in post-exilic prophetic literature. The undertaking, however, was not a straightforward proposition. DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8, as well as the material remains, indicate that though a small Yahwistic community may have existed in the environs of Jerusalem, the temple and the town remained in disrepair and largely desolate from its destruction in 587 BCE through the fourth year of Darius I, the terminus post quem provided by Zechariah 1–8. This literature refers to the foundation of the temple (Hag 2:8; Zech 4:9; cf. Isa 44:28) and anticipates its imminent reconstruction (Hag 2:1-9; Zech 4:9; 6:13, 15; cf. Isa 66:6) with attendant expectations of approbation, but also acknowledges the under-populated and under-developed reality of the city evident in the material remains.

In Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, the city is occupied, the temple has been rebuilt, and both are central to community life. The former observation is perhaps most readily revealed by the contrast between the complete absence of the phrase יושבי ירושלים (“inhabitants of Jerusalem”) in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 and its repeated occurrence in Zechariah 12–14 (12:5, 7-8, 10; 13:1). Other references to Jerusalem in Zechariah 9–14 (9:9-10; 12:2-3, 6, 9, 11; 14:2, 4, 8, 10-12, 14, 16-17, 21) and the references to Jerusalem

30 In addition to ch. 4, refer to Rogland 2007b for a possible reading of Haggai 2:17 as a criticism of a lack of donations or tithing to the temple.
in Malachi 2:11 and 3:4 also imply or assume that it is a functional, populated city, central to the political and cultic life of the Judean community. Of course, that it is functional and populated is not to suggest that it is necessarily thriving. Indeed, Malachi especially attests to a climate of distress, famine, and spiritual ennui not unlike that presented in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8. The decisive contrast is the role of the temple, which in Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi includes active fiscal administration.  

**The Temple in Zechariah 9–14**

The first reference to the temple in Zechariah 9:8 forms part of a conclusion to an oracle against the nations of the Transeuphrates. The verse indicates Yahweh’s intention to “encamp (חנה) at my house” and so ensure that it is not overrun again, “for now I have seen with my eyes.” Over against more typical cultic language (e.g., שכן), the phrase, “encamp at my house,” using חנה, evokes nomadic or military encampment, likely to emphasize Yahweh’s readiness as a warrior. The concluding justification, however, is ambiguous. It may contrast Yahweh with either the satrap of the Transeuphrates, who sees only from Damascus, that is, “the eye of Aram” (9:1), or the Persian king, who may have relied on royal inspectors known as the king’s eye (Briant 2002: 343-344). Alternatively, if an object for Yahweh’s gaze is inferred, it may mean that Yahweh has now seen the house—that is, the completed temple—and consequently, will encamp before it and, by implication, rule the Transeuphrates from Jerusalem. In this case, the “eye of Aram” in v. 1, which is Damascus, is superseded by the eyes of Yahweh at Jerusalem. Unless the third reading is adopted, the verse implies but does not demand the completion of the temple, especially given the preference for שכן חנה over שכן.

---

31 In my proceeding discussion of the temple in Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, I exclude references that only refer to an altar, as an altar could have, and according to Ezra 3:2-6 did, predate the reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 3:2-6). An earlier altar may have even been erected shortly after the destruction of the first temple (Jer 41:4-7), though Blenkinsopp (1998) makes a strong case that Jeremiah 41:4-7 refers to a temple in Mizpah.
Admittedly, the second mention of the temple in Zechariah 11:13 is also oblique, at least with regard to a place or person in the temple, designated as הָיוֵרָא, to which or to whom the autobiographical protagonist throws thirty pieces of silver. Typically, הָיוֵרָא is translated “the potter,” though contextually it seems strange that the protagonist should throw silver to a temple potter. Such an action hardly resonates with the forceful recriminations of the protagonist against those who employ him: to what end does the protagonist throw silver to the temple potter? Another option is reading with the Syriac and emending the Hebrew to הַאוֹרֶה, “the treasury.” Although the yodh – aleph interchange is plausible (Isbell 1978; Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 93, §5.8), and the emendation resolves the awkwardness of a potter, Torrey (1936: 254) astutely observes that the development of the lectio difficilior in the MT is then difficult to explain.

Torrey (1936), therefore, suggests a third, very compelling option that resolves the problems of the other two proposals. He retains the MT, but argues that הָיוֵרָא denotes a founder or moulder, not a potter. He cites the occasional use of the root יָצַר for casting (Exod 32:2-4, 24; Isa 44:9-11; Hab 2:18); the reading of the LXX, especially Aquila’s choice of πλάστης; and, the Persian practice of melting down metals, as recounted by Herodotus in Hist., 3.96.2. Torrey also shows that the Targum, traditionally used to support the reading “treasury,” actually does not refer to the treasury per se but rather to an official called אָמֵרָכְלָא רַבָא, “the chief Amarkal,” corresponding etymologically to the Persian amārkār, “accountant.” The Targumist, therefore, recognizes that הָיוֵרָא refers to an official rather than a place. Subsequent studies by Eissfeldt (1937), Delcor (1962) and Schaper (1995; 1997) accept and strengthen the likelihood of Torrey’s interpretation.

In the literary context of Zechariah 11:13, Torrey’s interpretation is especially appropriate, as the story then depicts the protagonist not simply tossing the silver into the treasury but rather tossing it to the founder, as though to imply that it is worthless and should be melted down or recast. Such an act by the protagonist more clearly parallels the breaking of the staves immediately before and after this passage and so resonates with the
overall context and tone of the story. In any case, whether the passage refers to the treasury or a person associated with it, the presence of the temple is assumed and it is operational and sufficiently secure to provide fiscal administration.

The third and fourth references to the temple in Zechariah 14:20-21, by and large, reinforce the perspective apparent in the second reference. Although eschatological in orientation, the passage still implies the presence of the temple in the author’s present. The juxtaposition of the “pots” (סירות) in the “house of Yahweh” (בית יהוה) with the “bowls” (מזרקים) in front of the “altar” (מזבח) implies gradations of holiness in the sacred precinct and so a precinct that consists of more than just the altar (Greer 2010: 29-31). Additionally, the author anticipates the future removal of merchants from the temple, implying their presence there in the author’s present. The peculiar word choice for merchants, כנעני, that is, literally “Canaanite,” derives its force and meaning in part by its allusion to the כנעניי in Zechariah 11:7, 11, who buy and sell the people (11:5). These merchants are, therefore, slave traders. The author’s moral indignation aside, the presence of merchants or slave traders reinforces the economic role of the Jerusalem temple in the period, as evident in the reference to the temple in Zechariah 11:13, and so also testifies to economic life in the city.

The Sacred Precinct in Malachi

In Malachi, at least three of the four references to the temple are opaque. The first reference to the temple occurs in Malachi 1:10. Yahweh suggests that the doors to the altar be shut to prevent further sacrifices. Arguably, the rhetoric does not require literal

---

32 Reading כנעניי הצאן (“sheep merchants”) in 11:7 and 11:11 as proposed by BHS and supported by the LXX, τὴν Χαναανῖτιν (“the Canaanite” in 11:7) and οἱ Χαναναῖοι (“the Canaanites” in 11:11), rather than MT כנעני הצאן (“especially the oppressed sheep”). On these readings, see, e.g., Meyers and Meyers 1993: 261-262, who note the use of “Canaanite” to refer to merchants in Ezekiel 17:4, Hosea 12:8 [12:7], Zephaniah 1:11, Proverbs 31:24, and Job 40:30 [41:6]. The pejorative force of the term, applied here to the priests (and nobles) of Jerusalem, is under-appreciated; it is almost certainly equivalent to the English slurs “to jew” or “to gyp” and carries strong cultic and ethnic implications that would likely have been deeply offensive to those so slighted.
doors, as the emphasis is not on a literal action but rather a symbolic one to end vain sacrifices. Nevertheless, the messenger’s inspiration for this symbolic action is probably rooted in the actual existence of doors or gates to the altar. The second (possible) reference to the temple, in Malachi 2:11, is perhaps the most obscure and contentious.³³ The messenger asserts אשר אהב ויהוה קדש יחיה אש קרוב (“which he loves”) may modify the potentially ambiguous קדש, making a potential translation, “Judah has profaned the beloved sanctuary of Yahweh.” This reading is far from certain though as קדש can legitimately refer to a place, person, thing, or attribute. As such, the phrase may be construed more broadly to refer to the violation of a holy thing, that is, marriage, or a boundary that maintains the holiness of the temple and the people and/or honors the holiness of Yahweh. The third reference to the temple occurs in Malachi 3:1. In this verse, it is announced that Yahweh will suddenly come to ‘his temple’ (היכלו). The context suggests that the temple to which Yahweh will come already exists. Alternatively, the implied absence of the divine presence, which requires Yahweh to come, could also be construed to mean that it has not been (fully) rebuilt and for this reason, Yahweh has not actually taken up residence there yet.

The fourth reference to the temple, in Malachi 3:10, is, however, decisive with regard to the presence of the temple. In this passage, Yahweh challenges the people to “bring in the full tithe to the storehouse (בית האוצר) so that there is food in my house (בביתי).” Clearly, with Yahweh as the speaker, the first possessive pronoun definitively determines that the house is the temple. Moreover, the concern of the entire dialogue, Malachi 3:8-12, is one that only makes sense in the context of a completed temple that can receive tithes for public and cultic administration. Malachi 3:10, therefore, echoes Zechariah 11:13 and, even more decisively, parallels Nehemiah 10:38, which addresses the same issue of tithing and clearly reveals that the storehouse (בית האוצר) is part of the

---

³³ For a discussion of the problem and a review of the relevant literature, see Hill 1998: 230-231.
temple complex: “The Levites will bring up the tithe of the tithe to the house (בית) of our god, to the rooms (הלשכות) of the storehouse (בית האוצר).” Overall, the existence of the temple resonates with the general tone of the prophetic book, addressed to an entrenched priesthood and reflecting varied socioeconomic and cultic concerns that are more likely to have arisen from its existence, rather than from a period before its completion.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In part, this chapter set out to test an emerging consensus to date Haggai, the various stages of Zechariah, and Malachi in relative succession from the sixth and fifth centuries by considering the coherence of their intellectual perspectives through time against the backdrop of the proposed setting. Three lines of thought generally reinforce the literary and the temporal relationship between the books and form coherent intellectual threads that resonate with the implied historical setting as well as other textual precursors and successors. Both the commonalities and divergences in these thought lines strongly imply the temporal relationship and order of the books: Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, Zechariah 9–14, and Malachi. Moreover, as this chapter and also the previous chapter has shown, Zechariah, in particular, appears to be strongly influenced by DI and TI and, therefore, DI and TI were likely written earlier than Zechariah and Malachi, at least.\(^{34}\)

The relative status of the temple and the city in these texts supports the proposed diachronic relationship. DI, TI, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 reveal a situation in which the temple is not rebuilt and the city is not repopulated, while Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi show clear development in this regard. The nature and status of Judean leadership and the community is also instructive. DI and TI know no Davidic leadership and attempt to transfer its prerogatives to “the servants.” Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 strongly endorse the

\(^{34}\) For contrary views that date TI, or at least significant portions of it, to the period of Malachi or Ezra-Nehemiah or later, see Blenkinsopp 2003: 27-90; Berges 2012a; 2012b: 1-22. On inter-textuality in Zechariah and the influence of Isaiah, see Delkurt 2000; Sweeney 2000: 561-706; Stead 2009: esp. 92-103; cf. Nurmela 2003.
Davidic scion Zerubbabel and the high priest Joshua. Zechariah 9–14 heavily criticizes yet still supports the house of David. Malachi recognizes a governor of Yehud without any indication that a Davidide occupies that office. Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi express concerns about issues in the community, particularly slavery, exogamy, and tithing. The issues, as addressed, are consistent with changes in the economic and socio-political context of the fifth century (Ristau 2007b; 2009c; 2013). The explicit and implied imperial and regional context for all the texts is the Persian period, yet differences in presentation suggest distinct settings: DI and TI in the reign of Cambyses, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 in the reign of Darius, and Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi in the reign of Xerxes or Artaxerxes.

The centrality of Jerusalem for Israel and the nations is affirmed throughout this literature. In Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi, as in DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8, Yahweh is active at the imperial and regional level in favor of Jerusalem. Consistently, Yahweh is active in the world to create optimal conditions for reconstruction and to bring about approbation for faithfulness. Jerusalem is depicted as a site for ingathering, not only of permanent migrants but of temporary pilgrims. In DI, the emphasis is on the ingathering of the Diaspora. In TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8 and Zechariah 9–14, while *aliyah* or coming to Jerusalem remain strong motifs, significant emphasis is placed on the procession of tribute bearers and festal pilgrimage. Connected to these motifs, but also reflecting urban development, Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi attest to a growing economic importance of Jerusalem, as a center for commerce and the collection of tithes and taxes.

One of the under-appreciated elements of the texts is the hope expressed for greater Israel and a geographical orientation that consistently looks northward from Jerusalem. The argument for reconstruction, especially in TI, rests in large part on rampant corruption and on the need for ethical and cultic rebirth in Jerusalem, with its inheritance from the Achor to the Sharon. Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 emphasize social integration and concern for Jerusalem with no indication of social divisions or political
rivalries with a northern polity. Zechariah 1–8 emphasizes the importance of judicial and moral reformation, perhaps aware of the ethical concerns articulated by TI, and as in TI, presents the reconstruction of Jerusalem as a source of salvation for northern Israel. Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi express concerns over a deteriorating relationship with Israel, possibly a response to the new power structures and institutions established in Jerusalem. Strikingly, Zechariah 9:13 identifies Judah and Ephraim as sons of Zion:35

For I have bent Judah as a bow, I have nocked (מלא) Ephraim; and, I will arouse your sons, Zion, against your sons, Greece; and, I will wield you (Zion) as a warrior’s sword.

DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8, therefore, attempt to unify Yahwists and draw them to the task of rebuilding Jerusalem; Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi address the consequences or tensions created by reconstruction while still advocating for the centrality of the city and the unity of Israel.

Significantly, the argument for integration seems to have encouraged an evolution away from the Davidic covenant as a touch point for the centrality of Jerusalem towards more exclusive reliance on the authority of the Torah, perhaps owing to tensions between some Yahwists and Davidic leadership in Yehud. In DI, TI, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, there is a common horizon of language and deliberate inter-textuality with the Torah. Attempts are made to demonstrate fidelity to the laws and ideas of the Torah or to expand them (only occasionally to dispute them). TI, Haggai, and Zechariah 1–8 even attempt to identify reconstruction of Jerusalem as a moral and cultic imperative with justification from the Torah.

Malachi, however, stands apart from DI, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah not only for its sustained focus on this theme but because of its explicit instruction to “remember the torah of Moses” (זכרו תורת משה in 3:22 [4:4]). Instructively, Childs (1962: 45-65, 74-80)

35 This view of the restoration of Jerusalem, as a shared patrimony, is mirrored in Chronicles, especially 1 Chr 9:2-3; 11:4; 2 Chr 30:1, 5, and Jeremiah 31.
observes that a theology of memory emerges in texts associated with crisis and the reinterpretation of past traditions, especially the texts of Deuteronomy, DT, Ezekiel, and the complaint Psalms. In these texts, memory serves the critical functions of promoting continuity with the past and encouraging actualization and internalization of traditions, especially in contexts where cultic performance is threatened. The imperative “to remember” in Malachi certainly operates in this semantic domain, so much so that it epitomizes the book itself. Malachi is an eloquent and forceful plea to actualize and internalize the torah of Moses.

Furthermore, the promise to send Elijah to “turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of children to their parents, so that I will not come and strike the land with a curse” (3:24 [4:6]) identifies the ends of this plea: to avoid the “curse,” which refers to the covenant curses, and, therefore, inversely to realize the promise of the restoration. Indeed, however implicitly it is undertaken, this plea is clearly localized in Jerusalem. The priests of the temple in Jerusalem are the community to whom the plea is clearly directed (as demonstrated supra). The text, therefore, is promoting the appropriation of the “torah of Moses” and its actualization—remembrance—as a means to enact its reality and so confirm the sacredness of Jerusalem. Malachi, therefore, moves in an interesting direction vis-à-vis, e.g., Haggai’s attempt to identify reconstruction as a covenant imperative, and amplifies Zechariah 1–8’s emphasis on reconsecration and reformation to plead for the promulgation and practice of torah in Jerusalem. Interestingly, the author of Malachi, as those of DT, TI, Haggai, and Zechariah, still constructs this movement within a discourse that envisions and desires the complete restoration of Israel through the reconstruction and restoration of Jerusalem.
CHAPTER 7.
CONCLUSION: FROM CULT TO CULTURE

The prophetic literature of the Persian period reflects the incipient ideas of the restoration era that informed the eventual socio-political and cultic renewal of Judean society. The authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi reinterpreted the literary repertoire and legacy of the Israelite and Judean kingdoms and crafted new ways forward for their cultic and cultural communities. Their records, visions, and ideas responded to historical realities that threatened distinctive elements of Judean identity: the Davidic covenant, the priority of Jerusalem, and the temple cult. In the aftermath of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the collapse of the kingdom of Judah, these authors and tradents confronted an existential threat to Judean identity.

The symbolic vitality of any socio-political or cultic space depends considerably on social memory. Capitals tend to adopt and reflect, in architecture and propaganda, a conservative or classical image of their community and its values rather than overtly challenging custom and convention. The conservative or classical image evokes an aura of antiquarian authority and, in turn, lends ideological legitimacy and credibility, especially to regimes making radical departures from tradition. Reconstruction of a capital can require an equally important reengagement with social memory. Especially in the absence of monuments, speech, writing, and ritual, which elucidate and expound on social memories, are the primary, albeit acutely self-reflexive, resources for this task.

As Halpern (1996) so incisively demonstrates, the ideology that claimed Jerusalem as an exclusive cultic center in the late Iron Age was a radical innovation and

---

1 This tendency is especially true of disembedded capitals, which Jerusalem was at its initial incorporation within the Israelite state(s) of the hill country (Joffe 1998).

2 On this tendency of cultural memory towards self-reflexivity, see Assman 1995: 132. In biblical studies, this tendency is usually identified as inner-biblical allusion or exegesis.
rejection of tradition. Given even the testimony of its primary adherents, this ideology did not take root or decisively influence the Judean psyche at the time, let alone transform the broader Yahwistic community. Indeed, the innovation only seems to have held currency with Judean elites in the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah. Without royal patronage, the Judean elite, as reflected in Deuteronomistic texts, reverted to traditional practices and cults to which the vast majority of Yahwists also adhered. Unable, therefore, to penetrate and decisively influence the Judean psyche, Jerusalem-centered ideology remained a marginalized stream of Yahwism.

Nevertheless, the corollary effects of political and cult centralization were pervasive, leading inexorably to the collapse of Judah under the pressures of Babylonian imperialism (see my introduction) and supporting the development of prophetic and monotheistic traditions with significant afterlives. This dissertation has explored Persian period prophetic perspectives on Jerusalem’s reconstruction in light of these two effects. In this conclusion, I synthesize and contextualize insights gleaned from this exploration and propose some directions for future research.

**PRESENT INSIGHTS**

In the post-collapse period, the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi emphatically refused to be silent about the neglect of Jerusalem within Yahwism. The prevailing lack of concern for Jerusalem, to which they responded, took two forms. On the one hand, the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi attest to a reluctance to rebuild and restore Jerusalem and the temple; on the other, they craft a theological argument for the centrality of Jerusalem as a response to Yahwistic literature and practices that privileged other sacred sites or practices.

---

3 On this innovation, see also and esp. Weinfeld 1998; Roberts 2003. For an alternative view, dating this innovation to the Maccabean period, see Hjelm 2004; but, cf. Ristau 2007a.
The Territorial Dimension

Consistent with the archaeological evidence, the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi acknowledge the depressed demographic condition of the town.\footnote{Unfortunately, on a purely architectonic level, the skeptical assessments of scholars, such as Carroll (1994) on Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, are essentially correct. These texts provide very few details about reconstruction beyond asserting that it is taking place, and attesting to the underlying harsh conditions. The sole positive architectonic claim made in any of these texts is that the temple’s foundations were laid on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month in the second year of Darius—a claim made in Haggai 2:18. Though the date is not confirmed again, this claim is consistent with Zechariah 8:9, which refers to the prophets who were present when the foundations were laid (probably an oblique reference to Haggai is intended by the plural), and the existent of the temple in subsequent texts. There is likely also a negative architectonic claim in the visionary disclosure in Zechariah 2:8 that “like an unfortified village Jerusalem will be inhabited,” suggesting the city did not have fortifications at the time. Although this information is limited, the convergence on these points is certainly germane to a portrait of Persian period Jerusalem, elucidating some general contours of the pragmatic realities in the late sixth century. It does not, however, contribute much toward our understanding of the architectonics of the settlement.} DI announces divine consolation and a return to a desolate Jerusalem. TI speaks about the impending reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem as a miraculous act of creation and rebirth. Haggai compares the desolation of Jerusalem to famine. Zechariah envisions surveys and measurements as preparation for reconstruction. While Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi evince development on these earlier texts by reflecting the successful reconstruction of the temple and the return of a civic culture, still these texts note and respond to muted enthusiasm for a newly rebuilt temple.

Prevailing neglect is an admission of all these texts. Their witness and the archaeological profile of Jerusalem are consistent; concern for Jerusalem clearly receded in the aftermath of destruction. Given the importance of the territorial dimension to Judean self-identity in the Greco-Roman period, specifically the centrality of Jerusalem and the Land of Israel, perhaps in the longue durée, this neglect might have posed an existential threat to Yahwism, as its diverse expressions, without a unifying territorial dimension, might have ultimately been unable to prevent its worship and practice from dissipating and disintegrating in the ancient world. The authors and tradents of Isaiah,
Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi give credence to such an existential threat and argue for centralization as a means to address social and cultic fragmentation.

All the authors and tradents envision Jerusalem at the center of the land, central to the entire Yahwistic community. Proscriptively or simply as a reflex of restoration, the literature places considerable stress on movement to Jerusalem. The textual expressions of movement are multifarious, including parousia, aliyah, festal pilgrimage, and many other types of cultic and socio-political presentations and processions. The authors and tradents permit (not all in equal measure) some malleability in the precise manifestation of the territorial dimension of centrality, likely as a means to appeal to a broad spectrum of Yahwists. As not all the textual expressions of centrality demanded resettlement in Jerusalem, the authors and tradents of this literature laid a foundation for Jerusalem as a territorial anchor for national and trans-national manifestations of Yahwism. Ultimately, this malleability may have also contributed to interpretations of centralization that simultaneously acknowledged claims of centrality and “complex hierarchies” of local sites of worship and the central site at Jerusalem (Knowles 2006: 127-128). Yet, all the textual expressions promote and stress the localization of the divine presence or name in Jerusalem and associate movement towards Jerusalem with justice, fertility, and renewal (cf. Knowles 2006: 93-102). There is no equivocation on this point: Jerusalem, according to these authors and tradents, is or should be the geographical heartland of Yahwism.

Moreover, the promises of justice, fertility, and renewal are not simply theological abstractions in DI, TI, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. DI envisions Jerusalem as a place of peace and security for Yahweh’s people and their progeny; TI as a righteous community in which justice liberates and protects rather than oppresses. TI expresses

5 On the national and international dimensions of Yahwism, see Knoppers 2009: 2011b.
6 Notably, there are no polemics against possible competitors; Gerizim, e.g., is not denigrated or even challenged. Such malleability may explain ongoing coordination in the development and preservation of the Torah despite emerging differences in interpretation and application (see and cf. Knoppers 2011c) as well as the political cooperation implied by the Elephantine correspondence (TAD A4.7-9).
strong hopes for the recreation of civil and cultic society and a stable multi-generational community, reliable housing, and sustainable viticulture. Haggai likewise envisions agricultural blessings; Zechariah, a stable multi-generational community and the reconsecration of civil and cultic governance; and, Malachi, cultic renewal and a place of remembrance. The common element of all these aspirations is the idea of a home, for Yahweh and for Yahweh’s people, which nurtures, protects, and advances the practical political, social, and economic interests of the community.

Notably, the historical development of local and imperial administration of the site is reflected in the prophetic discourse. DI expresses concern for Jacob and Israel as people groups rather than states, with Cyrus’s conquest of Babylon as the primary historical referent. TI identifies Jerusalem as the spiritual centre of an inheritance in the central and northern hill country, yet does not refer to provincial polities. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi address a polity in Yehud but retain concern for the filial relationship between Israel and Judah. Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 are explicitly dated to the reign of Darius; Zechariah 9–14 presents and privileges Jerusalem within unstable regional politics of the Transeuphrates. Clearly embedded in these texts then is the historical evolution from Neo-Babylonian territorial administration to provincialization under Darius and the creation of the Transeuphrates under Xerxes.

Interestingly, though the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi advocate for the centrality of Jerusalem, they generally reflect at least provisional acceptance of Persian governance. Even in the promotion of Zerubbabel in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 and in the concern for the house of David in Zechariah 9–14,

---

7 There is no clear reason given as to why that home could not be Samaria or Mizpah or another city or town in the hill country but perhaps one reason for the implicit rejection of Samaria and Mizpah is that these towns were also centers of imperial administration, whereas in the case of Jerusalem, the official residence for the civil and imperial administration may have remained in Mizpah for a time and even subsequently located at Ramat Rahel, giving Jerusalem the aura of independence. On the residence at Ramat Rahel, see Lipschits et al 2011.
aspirations for Judean statehood are relatively muted. The house of David is primarily instrumentalized to advance reconstruction and, in Zechariah 9–14, responsible for protecting the city. The texts acknowledge and respect Achaemenid Persian hegemony in the early restoration period in many different ways, e.g., through the regnal date formulae in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, Yahweh’s commissioning of Cyrus to rebuild the city and temple in DI, and the appropriation and implicit validation of imperial rhetoric for Yahweh in TI, Zechariah 9–14, and Malachi. Although presented as a universal spiritual capital, Jerusalem’s primary role is limited to the hill country and the Transeuphrates, respecting the boundaries of the Empire. Its role is generative, a progenetrix for the political, cultic, and economic life of the impoverished community, rather than seditious at the imperial level or divisive at the local level. The authors and tradents of Persian period prophetic literature, therefore, often present and promote pragmatic perspectives on the reconstruction of Jerusalem.

The Theological Dimension

The interrelated issue of the theological neglect of Jerusalem may have arisen largely because Yahwists attempted to refashion their worship and practice to the realities of a templeless and, to some extent, stateless cult; it also seems to have arisen in light of the cultural ascent of the Samarians and the development of the Torah. Knoppers (2011c) has incisively shown that the Torah must have emerged as a common patrimony of Judeans and Samarians. The literary development of this patrimony would necessarily have involved certain compromises, likely among them a deliberate ambiguity about central shrines and sacred space. Though perhaps reflecting the destruction of Jerusalem and so less a negotiated compromise and more a reflection of the status quo, the Torah gives attention to a variety of sites such as Bethel, Shechem, Hebron, Sinai, and Gerizim, but

---

8 Knoppers (2011a) has demonstrated this assertion primarily on text-critical grounds. For a similar argument based on an examination of Samaritan halachah, see Bóid 1989, esp. starting at p. 324.
no explicit attention to Jerusalem. Unsatisfied with this development, templeless worship and practice, and a prevailing Judean cult of mourning, the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi clearly believed and argued that Yahweh’s honor demanded Jerusalem’s restoration and that with this restoration would come approbation.

To make the argument, these authors and tradents appealed to their prophetic predecessors and the emerging Torah to reassert and defend Jerusalem’s centrality. DI reverses the negative judgments of Jeremiah, rejecting accommodation with Babylon for the victory of the Persians and appealing to the perdurance of the Davidic covenant in the actions of a foreign king and the community as a whole. TI challenges social injustice and advocates for a righteous temple town by linking the recreation of the town to an ethical interpretation of the Sabbath, in a way that evokes the Holiness traditions of the Torah and mimics imperial ideology and propaganda. Haggai links reconstruction to Deuteronomic centralization and sapiential and priestly principles; and, envisions the reversal of Jeremiah’s signet ring prophecy. Zechariah 1–8 embraces divine combat myth and temple ritual, identifies Yahweh by an epithet that unequivocally endorses Jerusalem as the chosen place of Deuteronomy, and constructs a vision of the city that reconciles and echoes prophetic promises and language from Isaiah and Jeremiah. Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi respond to the threat posed to Jerusalem by the reorganization of the Persian

---

9 Refer to chapter three, esp. n. 1. The argument that the Torah presents itself as pre-Jerusalem is a common but not persuasive mitigating counterpoint: (1) The Torah includes many updating/clarifying glosses but, inexplicably, does not for Jerusalem, even where it would be possible to do so, and (2) By privileging and naming other sites, the Torah conspicuously highlights their antiquity and connections to the patriarchs as well as Jerusalem’s lack thereof. The Torah is not a Jerusalem-centered document, let alone a Jerusalem-exclusive document, even though it was subsequently construed as such.

10 For an argument that inner-biblical dialogue and diachrony is an artificial construct designed to reinforce a Hasmonean political and cultic theology of supersessionism, see Hjelm 2004. In my opinion, Hjelm severely flattens the nature of the dialogue, inexplicably privileging 1 Maccabees as a lens through which to read that dialogue. The competing nature of many of the claims in biblical literature is very poor propaganda if conceived in a single place and time, and provides far too much grist for the opponents of the Hasmoneans. For an in-depth review of Hjelm, see Ristau 2007a. Japhet (2006) refutes similar arguments that situate this dialogue in the Persian period.
Empire and regional tensions, exhorting Judean elites in Jerusalem to faithfulness and sound political and priestly leadership. Malachi, especially, configures this exhortation with reference to the Torah. The work of the authors and tradents of Isaiah, Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi to promote Jerusalem developed and sharpened a reading strategy that permitted innovation and adaptation, the principles of which would persist into the Jewish rabbinical tradition. Consistently, it is their interaction with the existing repertoire of Yahwistic literature that elucidates the communicative intent and power of the texts.

All the texts also adopt and use imperial discourse either to chastise the Babylonian Empire, identify with the Persian Empire, or elevate the status of Jerusalem. As Bolin (1995) argues for analogous language in the request of the Elephantine Yahwists to rebuild their temple, this strategy may reflect an attempt to identify Yahweh as a regional manifestation of Ahura Mazda and as a royal proxy, in order to cultivate and maintain imperial support for reconstruction. The strategy may also be a reflex of elite emulation. In either case, the authors and tradents co-opt the power, prestige, and perdurance of imperial propaganda to stress “Yahweh’s proprietorship over Zion” and to promulgate Jerusalem’s “redesignation as Yahweh’s, not David’s, town” within a Persian ideological and administrative framework (Halpern 1998: 641; cf. Strawn 2007: 115).11

At another, much more problematic level, this strategy is a form of theological imperialism; Jerusalem is constructed as a city at the center of the world, permitting no rival.12 Although a model of inclusive monotheism arguably predominates, the authors

---

11 This redesignation is not to deny David ongoing recognition as a cult founder or even a critically important role in the history of the city. It is only that DI and TI construct a theological narrative in which the reconstruction of the capital city is not a seditious act and that holds in tension Judean and imperial ideological demands. Even in Haggai and Zechariah, the expectation of Davidic governance is constructed in such a way that subordinate rule is at least provisionally acceptable.

12 Ben Zvi (2011: 138-141) argues that this construction is part of a literary and ideological strategy to resist, control, and even defeat the imperial centre. Prophetic literature, according to Ben Zvi, imagined a rival Israelite Empire with Jerusalem as its imperial capital as a response to the Persian or Hellenistic Empires.
and traders nevertheless link the supremacy of Jerusalem to violent and xenophobic motifs, including vengeance against Edom (Isa 63:1-6), the destruction of unbelievers (Isa 66:15-17, 24; Zech 14:12-15, 17-18; Mal 4:1, 3), the expulsion of traders or Canaanites from the temple (Zech 14:21; cf. 11:7), and the condemnation of exogamy (Mal 2:10-16). Once ideas such as these are developed, they inevitably have collateral consequences and afterlives. Indeed, many scholars have recognized, and it should not go unstated in this dissertation, that these motifs continued to percolate in Judean, later Judeo-Christian, and Muslim culture(s) and have provided ideological legitimacy for policies of violence and displacement.¹³

The immutable centrality of Jerusalem constructed out of this interaction with native and imperial texts was, inevitably, a critical ideological watershed in the evolution of Yahwism towards Judaism and Samaritanism. By way of the prophetic texts, Jerusalem’s centrality reemerged as an important pillar of Judean Yahwism, a pillar which Samaritans naturally rejected.¹⁴ While this theological difference did not prevent cooperation between the political administrations in Yehud and Samaria and likely did not preclude cooperation in maintaining the Torah (Knoppers 2011c; Dušek 2012), it was an essential element in the schism. The lack of evidence for a “hard break” until the destruction of Gerizim, Shechem, and Samaria by the Judeans under John Hyrcanus in 110 BCE (and even after this point) is not surprising;¹⁵ cultic and religious schisms do not preclude cooperation in maintaining the Torah (Knoppers 2011c; Dušek 2012), it was an essential element in the schism. The lack of evidence for a “hard break” until the destruction of Gerizim, Shechem, and Samaria by the Judeans under John Hyrcanus in 110 BCE (and even after this point) is not surprising;¹⁵ cultic and religious schisms do not preclude cooperation in maintaining the Torah (Knoppers 2011c; Dušek 2012), it was an essential element in the schism. The lack of evidence for a “hard break” until the destruction of Gerizim, Shechem, and Samaria by the Judeans under John Hyrcanus in 110 BCE (and even after this point) is not surprising;¹⁵ cultic and religious schisms do

¹³ Though controversial and arguably tendentious in nature, see the essays in Thompson 2003, especially those of Prior, Gunn, and Whitelam.

¹⁴ Some measures of the success of the argument are its praxeological reflexes (Knowles 2006); the asymmetrical address in TAD A4.7-8 (Ben Zvi 2011: 96 n. 4); the identification of Moses as the founder of the city in Hecataeus of Abdera (Mendels 1983; Schwartz 1996: 121); and, the use of Jerusalem to refer to the territory of Yehud/Judaea in the Letter of Aristeas (Schwartz 1996: 123-124) and in the corpus of yršlm stamp impressions (Bocher and Lipschits 2013).

¹⁵ The Hasmonene propagandists of 1 and 2 Maccabees betray surprisingly little hostility towards their northern neighbors or the temple at Gerizim. Arguing that the destruction of Gerizim, Shechem, and Samaria may not have caused a decisive schism between the groups, see Schwartz 1993; cf. Dušek 2012. Arguing for a schism in the third century CE, see Crown 1991. Arguing against an “absolute breach”
not generally occur in one moment in time and do not necessarily preclude ongoing cooperation and mutual recognition.\textsuperscript{16} It is self-evident, however, that competing claims of centrality, for Gerizim and Jerusalem, were ultimately irreconcilable.

The centrality of Jerusalem was also an important pillar of the Hellenistic Diaspora (Schwartz 1996; Pearce and Jones 2008). TI, in particular, perfectly anticipated the importance and ideology of the \textit{polis} in the Hellenistic period by wedding the ancient Near Eastern trope of the city as a divine consort to the Greek notion of the mother-city. As Schwartz (1996: 120-123) observes, the idea of Jerusalem as the central Judean \textit{polis} resonated with the Diaspora and “legitimized Judaism … as the patria politeia” of the \textit{metropolis}.\textsuperscript{17} Schwartz (1996: 126-127) observes too that in the Roman period, when affiliation with Jerusalem became problematic, Jews increasingly appealed to a heavenly or future Jerusalem, an image also born of these early Persian period prophetic texts.

It is difficult to know if another central site, such as Mount Gerizim, or even the “Land of Israel” as a whole could have captured the Yahwistic imagination in the same way as Jerusalem. As Samaritanism has persisted to the modern era, it is not unreasonable to think so. Yet, I am inclined to think not because Jerusalem—its sacredness established by a royal covenant and confirmed by its “triumphant” resistance to the Assyrian Empire—possessed a unique symbolic vitality, productively revived in Persian period prophetic literature. The idea of Jerusalem evolved not simply as a sacred site, an altar, or a temple but as a city and community. As Westenholz (1998: 44)

\textsuperscript{16} By way of analogy, the Great Schism of 1054 neither marked the start of tensions between the Catholic and Orthodox churches nor the end of positive relations between them. Despite analogous issues of civic and priestly primacy, the relationship between the Catholic and Orthodox churches continued, including efforts at reconciliation, and religious, military, and economic cooperation.

\textsuperscript{17} For most in the Diaspora, affiliation with the city superseded affiliation with the temple (Schwartz 1996). Interestingly, the Jewish Diaspora tended to resist the argument for localization of the divine presence in the Jerusalem temple, privileging instead the thought of 1 Kings 8:27 and Isaiah 66:1, which universalizes the presence of Yahweh.
instructively observes, sacred cities, especially through personification, can assume a totemic function, augmenting or supplanting the totems associated with revered clan heads, ancestors, and guardians. In light of the evisceration of the Judean clans in the seventh and sixth centuries, the powerful idea of a community, a Bekenntnismgemeinschaft, centered on Jerusalem, served a critical social function to arrest anomie and cultural assimilation and ultimately, as envisioned in TI and Zechariah, may very well have been the salvation of the Blutbegemeinschaft. City-centered, Jerusalem-centered theology could transcend, and yet could be construed to fulfill, the arguably parochial and tribal interests of the Torah; it put in the hands of the authors and tradents of Persian period prophetic literature, and their heirs, an ideational inventory that had universal, rather than just tribal, scale. Through personification, Jerusalem also came to embody and represent essential feminine principles, rebirth and renewal, which augmented the symbolic power of the city and which would otherwise have been lost to Yahwism in its transition to monotheism. Jerusalem immanentizes the promise and prospect of radical and positive transformation. As long as Jerusalem exists, there is the hope and expectation that the people of Yahweh can inaugurate a community of peace and justice. Jerusalem is the foundation for perpetual hope: לשה הנאה בירושלם!

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This study is an important complement to recent work on the Babylonian and Persian periods. It provides a sequel to Lipschits (2005); an ideological complement to the praxeological study of Knowles (2006); a view on the reconstruction of Jerusalem to complement that of the temple in Bedford (2001); and, an alternative historical reconstruction with a more traditional view of the diachronic development of Judean literature than Hjelm (2004). It counter-balances the tendency to rely primarily on late

---

18 On the evolution of goddesses and the feminine principle in the transition from polytheism and monotheism in the ANE, see Lerner 1986: 141-160; Frymer-Kensky 1992. For a study of the particularly evocative feminine imagery in DI, see Baumann 2001.
historiographical literature by uniquely explicating the prophetic perspective. Grounded by a comprehensive archaeological survey, it helps address the critical question of how advocates of Jerusalem argued for the theological legitimacy necessary to claim territorial importance within post-collapse Judean society.

Nevertheless, this study has a number of limitations. Although suggesting concerns for national honor, collective identity, and economic security, this study does not fully exhaust the range of political and socio-economic factors that precipitated the reconstruction of Jerusalem. Beyond national honor, identity, and economic security, why did some Yahwists choose to rebuild Jerusalem? The authors and tradents of Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi call attention to a variety of political, social, and economic issues that invite more analysis. My research, emerging from this dissertation, is focused especially on the issues of kinship and land tenure (Ristau 2007; 2009c; 2013).

Future studies could also take into consideration the important liturgical literature of Psalms and the late historiographical literature of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. For example, Chronicles demonstrates similar tendencies as the prophetic literature examined in this dissertation. Chronicles responds to the Deuteronomistic History, reversing the Deuteronomistic rejection of the city and temple (2 Kgs 23:27; cf. 2 Chr 36:21-23) just as the prophetic literature responds to Jeremiah’s rejection of the same; instrumentalizing the house of David for future generations (Ristau 2005; 2009b); redesignating Jerusalem as Yahweh’s, not David’s, town (1 Chr 28:5; 29:23); identifying Torah observance with Jerusalem (Ristau 2005; 2009b); and, locating Jerusalem in the Torah (2 Chr 3:1). By extending the scope of this dissertation to include Psalms, late historiographical literature, and Hellenistic Jewish literature, it would be possible to evaluate more thoroughly the theological trajectories of early restoration literature and their afterlives.
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