

HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH 1-8: DIARCHIC MODEL OF LEADERSHIP IN A REBUILDING PHASE

Danie O'Kennedy
Old and New Testament
University of Stellenbosch

Abstract

Yahwists in the post-exilic community in Jerusalem envisioned their future in diverse ways. The books of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 emphasize that in a rebuilding phase God does not merely use a holy place but also special leaders. These books advocate a diarchic model of leadership in which the responsibilities are shared by a religious leader (Joshua) and a political leader (Zerubbabel). This article focuses on this diarchic model of leadership and offers possible responses to the following questions: What do we know of these two leaders? Why did Joshua need purification (Zech 3)? Who was the most influential leader or was there a balance of leadership? Was there conflict between these leaders? The article concludes with a comparison between the diarchic model of leadership in the post-exilic community in Jerusalem and leadership in the first years of a new democratic South Africa.

Keywords: Haggai, Zechariah 1-8, Joshua, Zerubbabel, Leadership

Introduction

Birch et al. (1999:423-424) discuss the diverse ways in which Yahwists in the post-exilic community¹ envisioned their future. According to them Haggai, Ezekiel 40-48 and Zechariah 1-8 (either Proto-Zechariah or First Zechariah)² present the most concrete options. Ezekiel's restoration vision represents a belief that Israel should be a hierarchy, a nation ruled by priests. Haggai seems to believe in the restoration of the Davidic monarchy through Zerubbabel, a member of the Davidic house. Zechariah 1-8 presents a third option, somewhere between the viewpoints of Ezekiel and Haggai. Proto-Zechariah is advocating a diarchic model of leadership in which the responsibilities are shared by a religious leader (Joshua) and a political leader (Zerubbabel). The question may be posed: Does only Proto-Zechariah refer to such a diarchic model of leadership? Several books³ in the Old Testament refer to the two leaders Zerubbabel and Joshua,⁴ but this article will concentrate on Haggai and Zechariah 1-8. Information and insights from the other biblical books will also be used to help us form a better picture of this diarchic model of leadership.

¹ Scholars use different names referring to this community and its people: Jews; the province Yehud; Israelites; Jerusalem based community; post-exilic community in Jerusalem; people of God/Yahweh; etc. Different names will be used in this article but it all refers to the Jerusalem based post-exilic community that lived in the Persian province Yehud.

² The terms Proto-Zechariah, First Zechariah and Zechariah 1-8 will be used as similes.

³ Kgs, 1 Chron, Ezra, Neh, Hag and Zech 1-8.

⁴ The books Ezra and Nehemiah use the spelling Jeshua.

We focus on this diarchic model of leadership in the re-building phase of the post-exilic community and will offer possible responses to the following questions: Who were these two leaders? Why did Joshua need cleansing? Who was the most influential leader or was there a balance of leadership? Was there conflict between these leaders? The article concludes with a comparison between the diarchic model of leadership in the post-exilic community in Jerusalem and post-apartheid South Africa.

A Few Literary and Socio-Historical Remarks on Haggai and Zechariah 1-8

The books of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 are often discussed together but scholars have divergent opinions concerning the composition of these books.⁵ We acknowledge the similarities and close relationship between Haggai and Zechariah 1-8.

Literary structure of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8

Haggai

The socio-historical background to the book Haggai is relatively clear, but its literary features are less so. In most English translations the book is set out entirely in prose; however, the Hebrew text (BHS) interprets Haggai's speeches as poetry (1:3-11; 1:15b; 2:3-9; 2:14-19; 2:20-23). It is difficult to make a sharp distinction between prose and poetry, but clearly Haggai is not a story as in the prose narrative of Jonah (Petersen 2002:206).

Most scholars divide the book of Haggai in four or five sections (Petersen 1985:41ff; Le Roux 1987:20; Verhoef 1987:20-25; Meyers & Meyers 1992:21-23; March 1996:711; Willi-Plein 2002:1ff; Brueggemann 2003:248-249). The creation of these sections is dictated by the chronological headings in Haggai: (1) 1:1-15a:⁶ Speech delivered in the second year of Darius, on the first day of the sixth month (Aug 29, 520 BCE); (2) 1:15b-2:9: Speech delivered in the second year of Darius, on the twenty-first day of the seventh month (Oct 17, 520 BCE); (3) 2:10-19: Speech delivered in the second year of Darius, on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month (Dec 18, 520 BCE); (4) 2:20-23: Speech delivered on the same day as the previous one (Dec 18, 520 BCE). The introductory datings (1:1; 2:1, 10 and 20) are all associated with the word-event formula "The word of Yahweh came through/to Haggai". The content of these different sections can be described as follows:

- 1:1-11: Prophetic call to work on the temple
- 1:12-15a: Response of leaders and people
- 1:15b-2:9: Assurance of God's presence
- 2:10-19: Priestly ruling with prophetic interpretation
- 2:20-23: Future hope – Zerubbabel, chosen signet ring

⁵ There is a definitive relationship between these two books and the respective prophets. The prophet Zechariah was a contemporary of Haggai and the two are named in Ezra 5:1 as the prophets who urged the rebuilding of the temple in 520 BCE. There are different opinions on the relationship between the books Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: (a) Some scholars think that these two books were originally a single book edited by the same final redactor or composer (Meyers & Meyers 1987:xliv-xlviii; Sykes 1997:124), (b) Others believe that Zech 1-8 was a response to Haggai and therefore written by different editors in different times (Petersen 1985:124-125).

⁶ This section can also be divided into the following two sections due to the date mentioned in 1:15a (Sept 21, 520 BCE): Hag 1:1-11 and 1:12-15a. The other four sections have a specific chronological reference in the beginning of each speech while 1:15a can probably be a closing date.

References to leadership, especially the leaders Joshua and Zerubbabel,⁷ occur in the entire book. The first three sections (1:1-11; 12-15a; 1:15b-2:9) refer directly to Joshua and Zerubbabel, the fourth section (2:10-19) ignores their names and the last section (2:20-23) refers only to Zerubbabel (vv 20 and 23).

Zechariah 1-8

Proto-Zechariah is a blend of visionary and oracular material. Both types of material are set in prose. Most modern scholars agree that Zechariah 1-8 falls into three distinct literary units (Achtmeier 1986:109; Meyers & Meyers 1992b:1062-1063; Willi-Plein 1998:540-541; Redditt 2000:1412-1413; *et al*).⁸

- 1:1-6: Summons to repentance
- 1:7-6:15: Seven (or eight visions) interspersed with oracles
- 7:1-8:23: Features of the time of salvation

These three literary units may be divided into further sections.⁹ The above structure indicates that the visions form the centre part of Zechariah 1-8. The author supports the hypothesis that Zechariah 1:7-6:15 forms a 'perfect number' of seven visions with Zechariah 3 as an extra prophetic vision.¹⁰ The overall structure can be seen as a series of circles with Yahweh and the whole world as the largest circle (vision 1 and 7), and the temple and the leadership of Yehud at the centre (vision 4). Vision 2 and 6 deal with Judah/Yehud, and vision 3 and 5 with Jerusalem (Meyers & Meyers 1992:1063). According to this structure Zechariah 3 and 4 forms the core of Proto-Zechariah.¹¹ The spiritual office of the high priest Joshua stands in the centre of chapter 3 and the governor Zerubbabel is at the centre of chapter four (Hanhart 1998:254).

The structure of Zechariah 1-8 and the visions emphasize the importance of leadership as the centre or core of the visions. The redactor/s responsible for the present shape of Proto-Zechariah made a successful attempt to call attention to the visions of chapter 3 and 4 in two ways: (1) by the place where it has been situated; and (2) by the special features given to it (VanderKam 1991:554; O'Kennedy 2003b:370-388).

Socio-historical background to Haggai and Zechariah 1-8

Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 originated in the post-exilic community of Jerusalem. It is difficult to construct the exact historical setting but the biblical text and non-biblical material provide us with a few clues. The people of Judah went into exile in 586 BCE when the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem. In 539 BCE the international scene changed when King Cyrus led Persia in displacing Babylon as the imperial power controlling the Mediterranean region. Cyrus made it Persian policy in 538 BCE to repatriate people that had been exiled to Babylon, a policy celebrated in Ezra 1:1-4. He allowed the

⁷ Wessels (2003:502-518) also discusses the role of the prophet Haggai, the priests and king Darius as leaders.

⁸ Smith (1984:181) believes that the symbolic crowning of Joshua (6:9-15) forms a separate unit or section.

⁹ Cf commentaries on Zechariah for detailed structure.

¹⁰ Cf discussion in O'Kennedy (2003b:370-388).

¹¹ Some scholars see Zech 3 as a secondary addition or verses 8-10 as a supplementary oracle (cf Meyers & Meyers 1987:222; Reventlow 1993:54; Petersen 1985:202; *et al*). Most scholars argue that the original vision in Zech 4 consisted of verses 1-5 or 6a and 10b-14 (Rudolph 1976; Petersen 1985; Redditt 1995; Delkurt 2000; *et al*). Two separate oracles addressed to Zerubbabel (6b-7 and 8-10a) were inserted to the original vision (Willi-Plein 2002:61).

Judean exiles to return to Jerusalem and made the Judahite Sheshbazzar¹² the first governor and in charge of the building project (Ezra 5:14, 16). Evidently it was a token return, for we know that a large number of Jews were flourishing in the Babylonian community under the tolerant Persian regime (Cross 1975:15-18; Redditt 1995:4-10; Ollenburger 1996:738). What we know is that Haggai instructed the people in 520 BCE to start with the temple building and that it was completed in the sixth year of Darius (515 BCE).

The texts of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 place their historical setting in the second year of Darius, the Persian king (cf Hag 1:1; Zech 1:1). He was remembered for his administrative and trading skills. Darius organized his Persian empire in different protectorates or satrapies which included smaller units or provinces. Judah, now called Yehud in Aramaic, was part of the fifth satrapy called Abar Nahara (Beyond the river) (Miller & Hayes 1986:450-456; Meyers & Meyers 1987:xxxix-xxxvii).

The Persian policy toward exiles, especially under Darius, was motivated by more than kind-heartedness. It was probably designed to foster loyalty in the provinces and to provide efficient means of imperial control, including the collection of taxes. Darius supported the reconstruction of provincial institutions under authorized local leadership. This might explain Darius' lenient policy towards Judah and its people, and especially the role of Zerubbabel. In the province of Yehud the Jerusalem temple was more than a religious center. It was the administrative, cultic and financial center of an essentially agrarian economy. A rebuilt temple would bring more people to Jerusalem and the employment of more priestly personnel. More people with more skill would eventually also benefit the production of theological thought and literature in Jerusalem and its surroundings (Ollenburger 1996:738; Kessler 2001:157-158; Wessels 2003:510-511). Darius' specific interest in detail administration throughout the empire, may have reflected in his concern for the Jerusalem cult. It is also possible that the Persian encouragement to codify laws in the different provinces may have been an impetus for the forming of the books Haggai and Zechariah.

What did the ordinary Jerusalemite experience during the time of king Darius? We must keep in mind that the post-exilic community in Jerusalem did not merely consist of returned exiles. Unfortunately there are no biblical texts that give explicit voice to those who remained in the land. This fact is not a surprise because it was the politically powerful and religiously influential people who went to Babylon. Those who remained in the land were not part of the elite and were possibly known as 'the people of the land' (Hag 2:4)¹³ (Birch, Brueggemann, Fretheim & Petersen 1999:421). A primary tension in the post-exilic community seems to have centered around conflicts between the 'people of the land' and 'the sons of exile'. Yahweh worshippers that stayed in Judah (and probably a few from Samaria as well) sought to participate in the rebuilding of the Temple but were rejected by the returnees (Ezra 4:3).

In conclusion we can say that the books Haggai and Zechariah portray a community in a restoration or rebuilding phase. We can probably accept that Zechariah experienced a more positive situation than Haggai. Society had already started to transform. Progress on the rebuilding of the temple served as a marker for the beginning of a new era (cf Zech 3:9 and

¹² Although Ezra 5:16 says that Sheshbazzar laid the foundations of the temple it is difficult to tell what his role was and what he did. The book of Ezra does not mention his name again and the books of Haggai and Zechariah refer to the role of Zerubbabel in the temple building process. We can say that the leadership of Sheshbazzar left no real imprint in the life of the post-exilic community (Japhet 1982:93).

¹³ Besides these groups the community also consisted of foreigners or the so-called resident aliens. We shall later in this article refer more to the possible tension between these different groups (cf 4:2).

4:19) (Meyers & Meyers 1987:510-513). According to Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 two leaders, Joshua and Zerubbabel, were prominent in this rebuilding phase.

Two Prominent Leaders: Joshua and Zerubbabel

Joshua the high priest¹⁴

One finds several passages in the Old Testament, referring to Joshua the priest (or high priest), the son of Jehozadak.¹⁵ According to the books Ezra and Nehemiah, Joshua was the leader of the first group that returned to Jerusalem and began to work on rebuilding the temple (Ezr 2:2 = Neh 7:7). Joshua himself is never given the title ‘high priest’ in Ezra, a fact which is in harmony with the tendency of the book to avoid titles. According to Nehemiah 12:10-12, he was the father of Joiakim who probably succeeded him as high priest. Ezra mentions that Joshua worked closely with Zerubbabel in re-establishing the worship of God in Jerusalem (Ezra 3:1-5), joined in starting construction of the second temple, and motivated the people to complete the temple (Ezr 3:1-13; 5:1-2; Hag 1-2) (Gitay 1985:474; VanderKam 1991:553).¹⁶

All references to Joshua in the book of Haggai¹⁷ and in Zechariah 6:11 identify him as Joshua, son of Jehozadak, the high priest (הכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל). The reference ‘son of Jehozadak’ is omitted in Zechariah 3 in which his name alone occurs three times (vv 3, 6, 9) and together with the title הכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל twice more (vv 1 and 8). According to passages in Chronicles and Kings Joshua was in exile. 1 Chronicles 5:29b-41 (MT) contains a genealogical list of the descendants of Aaron and it concludes with a reference to Joshua’s father, Jehozadak, being sent into exile. This list also identifies Seraiah, Joshua’s grandfather, who was in turn the son of the last reigning high priest of the first temple (cf 2 Kgs 25:18; Jer 52:24). These references provide evidence that Joshua was a Zadokite priest and a true descendent of Aaron, and that he was the legitimate heir to the senior priestly office within the Israelite cultic system. It is possible that the Persian king knew of Joshua’s hereditary background and religious significance (Ezra 2:2). In their eyes he must have been a respectable religious leader for the community in Jerusalem and someone who would not cause too many political problems for the Persian empire (Tollington 1993:125-126).

The visions and oracles of Zechariah provide us with a fuller impression about the duties of Joshua (3:1, 3, 6, 8, 9; 6:11) (VanderKam 1991:553-554). The book of Zechariah portrays that the restoration of the priesthood after the exile begins with a specific high priest, Joshua. Zechariah 3:1-10 depicts Yahweh ordaining or installing Joshua as high priest of Jerusalem, the representative of the post-exilic community in the face of God. His guilt is taken away and he is clothed with festal apparel and a clean turban. Joshua is cleansed and forgiven in a rite performed in the divine council, not in some standard purification ritual. As high priest Joshua is the one who connects the earthly human realm with the divine heavenly realm. To him was given the messianic announcement of the coming of ‘My Servant’ and the ‘Branch’ who would finally remove the people’s sin (Zech 3:8-9). In another vision (Zech 6:10-15), Joshua is given a crown and equated with the Branch (Petersen 1984:204; Hanhart 1998:218; Floyd 2000:384).

¹⁴ One also finds the Aramaic form Jeshua in some of the references. The Hebrew form of the name, Joshua, is used by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah.

¹⁵ Some translations and scholars use the spelling Jozadak.

¹⁶ It is strange that Joshua does not feature in the celebratory passage about the dedication of the temple (Ezr 6:15-22).

¹⁷ Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4.

There is still one question in connection with the role of Joshua: Does Zechariah refer to a group of priests together with Joshua? The reference in Zechariah 3:8 (אֶתְּהָרַעֲיָד) ¹⁸ may refer to colleagues of the high priest but Zechariah clearly states that there is a high priest with significant prerogatives, one whose purity enables the priestly system as a whole to function properly (Petersen 1984:204).

Zerubbabel the governor

The name Zerubbabel literally means 'shoot of Babylon' which suggests that he was born in exile. References in Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezr 2:2; Neh 7:7; 12:1, 47) portray that Zerubbabel was among those who had returned from Babylon after the exile. These texts give the impression that he returned almost immediately after the decree of Cyrus. Although we have several Biblical verses referring to Zerubbabel mystery surrounds his origins as well as his end. In 1 Chronicles 3:16-19 Zerubbabel is described as a grandson of the Davidic king Jehoiachin and most Old Testament verses designate him as the son of Shealtiel.¹⁹ 1 Chronicles 3:19 differs from these references and lists Pedaiah as Zerubbabel's father. Solutions for this contradiction are suggested by both harmonizers and critical scholars. The harmonistic way is to keep both testimonies and justify the fact that Zerubbabel is presented as son of both Shealtiel and Pedaiah. The critical approach offers two possible solutions. One is to assume that there is an error in the Masoretic text and that the Septuagint reading (the son of Shealtiel) in 1 Chronicles 3:19 is correct. The other solution is to accept both texts and argue that we deal with two different men (Japhet 1982:71-72; Mason 1997:1312-1313).

We have mentioned that Zerubbabel was seen as a Davidic descent because he was the grandson of the Davidic king Jehoiachin (1 Chron 3:16-19). Haggai also described him as God's 'servant' and 'signet ring' (Hag 2:23). These two terms are used describing pre-exilic Davidic kings (cf Ps 89:20; Jer 22:24). The prophet Haggai seems to have envisioned both the rebuilding of the temple and a restoration of the Davidic dynasty after the exile (Hag 2:6-9; 15-19; 20-23). Zechariah was a little more muted in his prophecy and the name Zerubbabel occurs four times in one short oracular section (Zech 4:6, 7, 9, 10). In the visionary parts of Zechariah 4 there are no direct references to Zerubbabel but the symbolic language of the vision may refer indirectly to Zerubbabel. Verses 3 and 11 refer to the two olive trees and verse 12 to the two branches of the olive trees. Although his name does not appear in the rest of Zechariah many scholars believe that the title 'Branch' (צֶמַח)²⁰ refers to Zerubbabel (Zech 3:8; 6:12) (Ackroyd 1985:1162-1163; Beyer 1992:1084-1086; Mason 1997:1312-1314).

Zerubbabel is not merely depicted as a Davidic descendant 'son of Shealtiel' but also as מִשְׁפָּט (governor). In Haggai this is mentioned four times (Hag 1:1, 14; 2:2, 21) and in Nehemiah 12:47 his status is equated with that of Nehemiah, the governor appointed by the Persians in the following century. It is difficult to determine the precise function and authority of the governor in the Persian empire because the title was apparently applied to

¹⁸ This phrase may also refer to members of God's court (cf Redditt 1995:66) or merely members of the community. The text clearly states that they are an omen (מוֹפֵת) of things to come.

¹⁹ Cf Ezra 3:2, 8; 5:2; Neh 12:1; Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 3.

²⁰ This 'plant' term is used by some Israelite prophets describing Jerusalem or a Davidic ruler (Ezek, Isa, Jer) (Petersen 1985:210). Rose (2000:248-249) believes that צֶמַח refers to a future figure and some commentators may think that it refers to the high priest Joshua (cf Redditt 1995:66). The most likely hypothesis is that צֶמַח refers to Zerubbabel. In Zech 6:12 the term appears where the text specifies that the Branch is to build the temple, a task reserved to Zerubbabel in 4:9.

individuals who had different degrees of responsibilities over satrapies or smaller provinces. Despite this uncertainty one can accept that a holder of the title ‘governor’ was officially appointed by the Persians to be responsible for administrative matters in a specific geographic area. We can assume that Zerubbabel as governor had the respect of the Persian leaders who presumably believed that he would be loyal to them. According to Tollington (1993:133) this is somewhat surprising because he was a descendant of David and thus a natural focus for the monarchic and messianic hopes of the Israelite people. The Persians took a calculated risk when appointing Zerubbabel to participate in the re-establishment of the Jerusalem community.

The precise date of Zerubbabel’s arrival in Yehud is difficult to establish.²¹ He probably began his activities immediately after the decree of Cyrus (538 BCE) and is explicitly mentioned for the last time in the second year of Darius (520 BCE). Zerubbabel was probably leader for a period of 17 to 18 years and was active during the reign of the Persian kings Cyrus, Cambyses and Darius (Japhet 1982:71). Unfortunately Zerubbabel disappeared from the scene and there is no Old Testament reference after the description of his important role in the temple building.²² In Ezra 5:3-6:15 the authority to rebuild the temple was questioned by Tattenai the governor of the province. King Darius gave his approval for the work to continue. However, no reference is made in the correspondence with the Persian court to Zerubbabel’s presence or of his presence at the temple dedication in 515 BCE (Ezra 6:15). There are many hypotheses about the ‘disappearance’ of Zerubbabel, but at this stage they are all speculative. We have to say that we simply do not know for what reason we stop hearing about Zerubbabel: (1) Perhaps he was exterminated by the Persians or removed from the office; (2) He could have simply died; (3) The enigmatic passage in Zechariah 12:10 may suggest that he was killed by his own people after a dispute (Miller & Hayes 1986:459-460; Rose 2000:33-36).

Who was the Most Influential Leader? Were they Equal?

The names Zerubbabel and Joshua/Jeshua occur together twelve times in the Old Testament.²³ Ezra 3:2 is the only reference where Joshua’s name is placed before that of Zerubbabel. Does this statistic mean that Zerubbabel was considered by the biblical authors/redactors as a more important leader than Joshua? It is difficult to come to such a conclusion merely on account of a specific word order and we must investigate the issue further.

Was Zerubbabel more prominent in the book of Haggai and Joshua more prominent in Zechariah 1-8?

Both Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 refer to Zerubbabel and Joshua. We have discussed that Joshua’s name is mentioned five times in Haggai (1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4). His name always follows that of Zerubbabel, but is not included with the Davidic heir in the oracle that concludes the book (Hag 2:20-23). Haggai seems to believe in the importance of the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. He speaks to Zerubbabel, a member of the Davidic house, with language associated with royal people (Hag 2:23 “... and make you like a

²¹ Rose (2000:33-36) discusses the different opinions that differ between an arrival soon after 538 BCE on the one hand and any moment between 538 and 520 BCE on the other.

²² Three New Testament verses include him in the genealogy of Jesus (Mat 1:12, 13; Luk 3:27) but these verses make no further comment about him.

²³ Cf Ezra 2:2; 3:2, 8; 4:3; 5:2; Neh 7:7; 12:1; Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4.

signent ring; for I have chosen you..."). Haggai saw Zerubbabel as the leader of the whole world (VanderKam 1991:554; Birch, Brueggemann, Fretheim & Petersen 1999:423). It is true that Haggai merely refers to Joshua. He had nothing distinctive to say about the specific role envisaged for Joshua. It seems as if the first three sections of the book Haggai treat Zerubbabel and Joshua as equal partners but that Haggai 2:20-23 focuses only on Zerubbabel. One must also take into consideration that the book Haggai focuses on the rebuilding of the temple rather than the operation of the cult; therefore we would not expect any references to a priest in this context.

In the above discussion we mentioned that the book Haggai closes with a special emphasis on Zerubbabel. On the other side Zechariah 1-8 discusses the role of Joshua first (Zech 3) before anything is mentioned of Zerubbabel (Zech 4). Does this mean that Zechariah considers Joshua as more influential? The much-disputed oracle in Zechariah 6:9-15 refers to crowns for Joshua and someone termed 'Branch'. Miller and Hayes (1986:460) argue that it was Joshua the high priest who ended up wearing a crown as the only 'anointed' in the community.²⁴ Cook (1995:134) believes that the text cannot be taken as identifying Joshua or any future priestly officeholder with the Branch (vv 12-13). Cook argues that the text does not speak of a contemporary figure (Joshua or Zerubbabel) but looks forward to the coming of a future Davidide, the Branch. If the Zechariah 6 appendix represents a later layer of the Zechariah tradition, it emphasizes that this tradition was not satisfied with a realized eschatology. There are still a few unanswered questions concerning the exact meaning of Zechariah 6:9-15, but one can probably not accept the hypothesis that these verses try to degrade the role of Zerubbabel.

There are also other references in Zechariah 1-8 that suppose a balance of leadership, especially Zechariah 4. In verse 14, the climax of chapter 4, the angel told Zechariah that the two branches of the olive trees were בני הַיַּצְהָר (literally 'sons of oil').²⁵ Most scholars²⁶ agree that this phrase refers to Joshua and Zerubbabel despite the fact that they have different opinions concerning the special meaning of the 'sons of oil'. Within the context of chapters 3 and 4 two persons are explicitly identified as having the responsibility for the temple that is ascribed to the two 'sons of oil', Joshua and Zerubbabel. The use of a particular Hebrew word הַיַּצְהָר may also have another meaning besides that of bounty. Fresh oil represents a fresh beginning; consequently, leadership for the post-exilic community in Jerusalem is structured in a new way. Rather than the old form of royal dominance over the priesthood, a new model of leadership has emerged: Royal and priestly figures are on equal ground. Zechariah's vision in chapter 4 provides a blueprint for the new community that is characterized by a balance of leadership and authority (Brown 1996:152).

²⁴ Some Bible translations (RSV, NIV, TEV) translate Zech 6:11 into the singular (crown) and this is also supported by the LXX (LC) and the Syriac. We prefer the plural as in the MT, supported by most LXX witnesses and the Targum.

²⁵ The LXX and Peshitta read 'sons of fathers'. The Targum translates it into 'sons of princes'. The NRSV translates this phrase into 'anointed' but Meyers and Meyers (1987:258) and Redditt (1995:68) argues that one cannot translate it into 'anointed' because of the particular nuances of the word הַיַּצְהָר. The Hebrew word conveys the meaning of fresh new oil and is used in Hag 1:11. The fresh, unprocessed oil (הַיַּצְהָר) is different from the traditional oil of anointment (שֶׁמֶן) (Van der Woude 1984:95; Petersen 1985:230-321; Redditt 1995:68; Brown 1996:152).

²⁶ Cf Hanson (1979:255-256); Smith (1984:205); Petersen (1985:232-233); Meyers & Meyers (1987:258-259); VanderKam (1991:554); Brown (1996:152); Floyd (2000:383). Van der Woude (1984:95) believes that it refers to the future priestly prince and priest (Zech 3:8; 6:12-13). According to Rose (2000:206-206) the two sons of oil are most likely not human leader figures, but heavenly beings, attendants of the heavenly court. In this article we support the traditional viewpoint that the two sons of oil refer to Joshua and Zerubbabel.

One can conclude saying that there is no reason to believe that Zerubbabel was more prominent in Haggai and Joshua more prominent in Zechariah 1-8. There may be certain verses focusing more on one leader but these books as a whole portray a balance of leadership between Joshua and Zerubbabel.

Was there a possible Conflict between these two Leaders?

There is evidence in the Old Testament that suggests there were conflicts and tensions between groups in Yehud during the time of Zerubbabel and the temple reconstruction. The nature of these tensions is more hinted at than discussed. Some scholars like Hanson (1979)²⁷ work with a so-called conflict model. There were possible conflicts over theological, ideological, political and economic issues. Communities usually consist of a great variety of groupings with different views. It is therefore not improbable to assume that many different views and perspectives on religious matters existed in the post-exilic community in Jerusalem. The post-exilic community in Jerusalem was not a homogeneous group of people with a united vision. It is wise, because of the hypothetical nature of our knowledge of early societies, to allow for a variety of groups and convictions. The conflict should not be narrowed down to two parties alone (Wessels 2003:508-509).

Miller and Hayes (1986:458) argues that the hostility between the community in Jerusalem and the surrounding peoples dates primarily from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah and nearer to the editor's time than to the period of the temple reconstruction. There may be a difference in the degree of conflict but the books Haggai and Zechariah did not evolve in a conflict free society.

We have referred to the possible conflict between different groups within the post-exilic community. The question remains: Was there also conflict between the two individuals Zerubbabel and Joshua? Most of the returnees were strongly Yahwistic and seemed to follow the nationalistic and exclusivistic theology of Deuteronomy. This meant that anyone considered impure by the strict Yahwists could only take part in the Jerusalem cult after he had "separated themselves from the pollutions of the nations of the land to worship the Lord the God of Israel" (Ezra 6:21). The vision of Zechariah in chapter 3 portrays that even the high priest Joshua is falling short of this strict Yahwism. Miller and Hayes (1986:459) believe that the strict Yahwists were led by Zerubbabel and the less strict Yahwists were represented by Joshua. Therefore the work on the temple could not proceed until a compromise between these two groups and their leaders had produced a 'peaceful understanding' and cooperation (Zech 6:13). These tensions may explain Zerubbabel's disappearance from the scene.

We accept that there was some conflict in the community during the time of Haggai and Zechariah. However, the Biblical text does not provide us with direct evidence of conflict between Joshua and Zerubbabel. There are hints in the text that suppose a balance of

²⁷ Hanson (1979:241-248; 260-262) regards Hag and Zech as polemical literature and explains these books against the background of inner-community struggles in post-exilic times. The struggle is perceived to be between those who went into exile (Zadokite priesthood or hierocratic group) and those who remained in Judah (disenfranchised Levites or visionaries).

Kessler (2001:138-142) discusses the different variations of the conflict model. According to Kessler adherents of the conflict model may be divided into three major groups on account of their understanding of the fundamental nature of the conflict: (1) *Theological and ideological conflict* (e.g. Bedford; Hamerton-Kelly; Hanson; Smith; Gottwald); (2) *Economic and land tenure conflict* (e.g. Kreissig and Weinberg); (3) *Ethnic, political and theological conflict* (e.g. Bolin and Thompson). These different conflict models suppose the presence of a sizable population in Jerusalem and Yehud.

leadership (equal status) and a harmonious relationship, especially the vision in Zechariah 4 and Zechariah 6:13 (Brown 1996:152; Tollington 1993:175-176; O'Kennedy 2003b:384-385).²⁸ Lastly, one can say that the prophets Haggai and Zerubbabel wouldn't advocate a diarchic model of leadership if there was major conflict between these leaders. Two leaders with conflicting viewpoints would not be the best for the rebuilding of the temple and nation.

Why did Joshua need Purification?

The vision in Zechariah 3:1-10 describes the cleansing of Joshua the high priest.²⁹ The text portrays that his filthy clothes are taken away and that he is clothed with festal apparel and a clean turban. Verses 6-10 commission him to head the restored temple cult. Joshua receives a juridical function that formerly pertained to the prophets and a divinatory function formerly executed by the prophets. He would fulfill this role until the time when a descendant of David could resume the role of king (Zech 3:8).

The question may be posed: Why did only the high priest Joshua need cleansing and forgiveness? Was it because of the strict nationalistic and exclusivist Yahwism practiced by the post-exilic community? Or was it because he was not a son of exile? (Miller & Hayes 1986:459). We have referred to the different conflict models in the previous discussion. Hanson (1979:254) believes that the accusations by Satan and the reference to the filthy clothes stem from the growing conflict between the so-called temple (hierocratic) and prophetic (visionary) parties. According to Hanson the prophetic or visionary party has accused the Zadokite candidate for high priest of being defiled. We can resolve the problem of Joshua's purification by focusing on the conflict model and on Joshua as a representative of a specific group. But perhaps the best option is to focus on the high priest Joshua as the representative of the post-exilic community in the face of God. The guilt of Joshua refers to the guilt of the people of God (Hanhart 1998:218).

One may further pose the question: Why didn't Zerubbabel need cleansing and forgiveness? Wasn't he also a representative of the post-exilic community? The Old Testament refers several times to the important role of the kings as representatives of God on earth. The Deuteronomists judged the kings of Israel and Judah according to their obedience or the lack of obedience to God. Yahweh granted forgiveness to king David after his confession of sin (2 Sam 12:13; Ps 51). On the other hand the Old Testament places more emphasis on the role of the high priest as mediator between God and his people. The high priest played an important role in the atonement rituals (cf Lev 4-5, 16).

We can conclude by saying that the vision in Zechariah 3 does not suggest that Joshua was more unclean than Zerubbabel or any other person. The Old Testament refers to the significant role of the high priest in the atonement rituals; therefore in Zechariah 3 Joshua the high priest is portrayed as the representative of the community in need of divine purification and forgiveness.

²⁸ Cf discussion of 'Branch' (3.2) and 'sons of oil' (4.1).

²⁹ Cf O'Kennedy (2003a:410-422) for a detailed analysis of Zech 3:1-10 and other forgiveness passages in Zech 1-8.

How long did this Diarchic Model last?

The texts of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 do not inform us about the precise duration of the diarchic model of leadership.³⁰ We know that in the face of harassment of the Persian officials and the hostility of peoples who surrounded Judah, the temple was completed on 12 March 515 BCE. Neither Zerubbabel or Joshua is explicitly mentioned in the narrative of the completion and dedication of the temple (Ezra 6:14-18) but one can assume that they were present because of their active role in the rebuilding of the temple (Ezra 3-5). There is also no direct reference that indicates that Zerubbabel and Joshua were 'removed' from the scene before the dedication. After 515 BCE the diarchic leadership 'disappeared' from the scene (Cross 1975:16; Rose 2000:34).

We can say that the diarchic model of leadership lasted at least from the second year of king Darius (520 BCE) until the completion of the temple in 515 BCE.³¹ Although this may only be a few years in the rebuilding phase of the post-exilic community one can argue that it was perhaps the most significant years of the post-exilic community in Jerusalem.

Finally, one must emphasize that Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 had a short-term and long-term vision on leadership. They focused on Joshua and Zerubbabel in the short-term and in their prophecies they found promises of a new idealized David, chosen by Yahweh to be their leader and in which they could put their hope. This may also be called realized- and futuristic eschatology.

Summary and Conclusion

The above discussion has led the author to make the following conclusions. In these conclusions we want to reply to the questions posed in the introduction.

- (1) The concept of diarchic leadership emphasized in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 is unique in the prophetic literature nor was it a system which pertained among Israel's neighbours (Tollington 1993:175).
- (2) The diarchic leadership in post-exilic Jerusalem consisted of the religious leader Joshua and the political leader Zerubbabel. Joshua's father Jehozadak was a high priest; therefore Joshua was a Zadokite high priest and true descendent of Aaron. Zerubbabel the governor was officially appointed by the Persian Empire to be responsible for administrative matters in a specific geographic area. Zerubbabel's real significance is that he was seen as a Davidic descent because he was the grandson of the Davidic king Jehoiachin. The Persians took a calculated risk when appointing a Davidide to participate in the re-establishment of the Jerusalem community. A descendant of David would have been a natural focus for the monarchic and messianic hopes of the Israelite people.
- (3) The biblical text does not portray that one of these leaders was more influential than the other. There is no reason to believe that Zerubbabel was more prominent in Haggai and Zerubbabel more prominent in Zechariah 1-8. There are some passages referring more to one leader than the other (e.g. Hag 2:20-23) but both books as a whole sketch a

³⁰ There is even a possibility that it was only a visionary model and did not realize at all. Tollington (1993:180) mentions that evidence is found in later Jewish writings (e.g. the *Testaments of the Twelve and Dead Sea Scrolls*) to suggest that hopes for two leaders or messianic figures had persisted or been reborn. The question still remains: Did they visualize two leaders because it 'worked' in the past or because it did not realize?

³¹ There is also a possibility that the diarchic leadership started earlier, perhaps soon after 538 BCE when Joshua and Zechariah returned with the Judean exiles to Jerusalem (Ezra 2:2; Neh 7:7).

picture of a balanced leadership, two equal leaders working together in the temple building process.

- (4) One can assume that there was some degree of conflict between various groups in the post-exilic community. However, the text of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah does not portray major conflict between Joshua and Zerubbabel.
- (5) It is difficult to determine the duration of the diarchic leadership model. This model lasted at least from the second year of king Darius (520 BCE) until the completion of the temple in 515 BCE. Although this may only be a few years in the rebuilding phase of the post-exilic community one can say that it was perhaps the most significant years of the post-exilic community in Jerusalem.
- (6) Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 focus on two important leaders. This does not mean that these books ignore the role played by Yahweh in the rebuilding phase. The vision in Zechariah 4 symbolizes the close relationship between Yahweh and the earthly leaders. The lamp-stand symbolizes the divine presence³² and the two trees symbolize Joshua and Zerubbabel (4:2-3). There is a relationship of interdependence between the trees or branches and the lamp-stand. By itself, oil can do nothing. The lamp needs oil to function and God needs civil and religious leaders in order to have a community that honours Him. One can also say that the trees need light to grow and the leaders need the support of God to carry out their work. The post-exilic community cannot exist without symbiosis between God and human leaders. According to this vision these leaders are close to Yahweh, not isolated from him (cf 4:14 'These are the two sons of oil who stand by the Lord of the whole earth').

Postscript: Diarchic model of Leadership in Post-apartheid South Africa

We have a very good modern-day example of a diarchic model of leadership in post-apartheid South Africa. There are many similarities between the South African context and that of the post-exilic community in Jerusalem:

- Many of the influential leaders of Judah were taken into exile in Babylon and returned after the decree of Cyrus in 538 BCE. The post-exilic community in Jerusalem started their rebuilding phase after 538 BCE. Many influential South African leaders went into exile during the apartheid years and came back to South Africa just before the 1994 elections. The rebuilding process of South Africa started on 27 April 1994³³ after the first democratic election in South Africa.
- In the post-exilic Jerusalem community they had a diarchic model of two prominent leaders: Zerubbabel the political leader and Joshua, the religious leader. In South Africa we had president Nelson Mandela as political leader and bishop Desmond Tutu as religious leader and chairperson of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).³⁴

³² Zech 4 depicts God's presence among his people, especially in his temple. Several symbols, objects and metaphors mentioned in chapter 4 emphasize this divine presence. At the heart of the night visions stands the vision of a lamp-stand flanked by two olive trees. Although Zechariah nowhere identifies the lamp-stand it probably symbolizes Yahweh Himself.

³³ Technically one can say that the rebuilding process in SA already started on February 18, 1990 after the releasement of Nelson Mandela out of prison, but the real process started after the election and the appointment of Nelson Mandela as the first president of the new democratic South Africa in 1994.

³⁴ In the Apartheid years (1970-1974) we had a similar situation when two brothers were the most influential leaders in the Afrikaner community. BJ (John) Vorster was prime minister (1966-1978) and state president

- The diarchic model of leadership didn't last long in the post-exilic community in Jerusalem, perhaps the five to six years between 520-515 BCE. In South Africa the 'diarchic model' of President Mandela and bishop Tutu lasted one term of five years (1994-1999) but it was crucial years in the establishment of a new South African democracy.³⁵
- According to Zechariah 3 the concept of forgiveness played a significant role in post-exilic Jerusalem. Archbishop Tutu was the chairperson of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Forgiveness is indispensable to the reconciliation process and played a significant role in South Africa.
- In South Africa there wasn't a temple building process but there was a process of building a new nation with new values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, PR 1985. s v Zerubbabel. *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, 1162-1163.
- Achtemeier, E 1986. *Nahum-Malachi*. Atlanta: John Knox Press. (Interpretation.)
- Beyer, BE 1992. s v Zerubbabel. *ABD* 6, 1084-1086.
- Birch, B, Brueggemann, W, Fretheim, TE & Petersen, DL 1999. *A theological introduction to the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Brown, WP 1996. *Obadiah through Malachi*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press. (Westminster Bible Companion.)
- Brueggemann, W 2003. *An introduction to the Old Testament: The canon and Christian imagination*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Cook, SL 1995. *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The post-exilic social setting*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Cross, FM 1975. A construction of the Judean restoration. *JBL* 94, 4-18.
- De Cruchy, J, Cochrane, J & Martin, S 1999. Faith, struggle and reconciliation, in De Cruchy, J, Cochrane, J & Martin, S (eds.), *Facing the truth: South African faith communities and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, 1-11. Cape Town: David Philip Publishers.
- Delkurt, H 2000. *Sacharjas Nachgeschichte: Zur Aufnahme und Abwendung prophetischer Tradition*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (BZAW 302.)
- Floyd, MH 2000. *Minor prophets: Part 2*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. (FOTL 22.)

(1978-1979) and his brother JD (Koot) Vorster the moderator or chairperson of the Dutch Reformed Church Synod (1970-1974). In those years the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC or NGK) was the most influential church amongst the white Afrikaner community because 95% of the cabinet members and 70% of the members of parliament belonged to the DRC (Potgieter 1979:274; Kuperos 1999:114). A big difference between the Vorster brothers and the diarchy of Mandela and Tutu is that the Vorster brothers were not really involved in the re-building of the entire South African community.

³⁵ Both these leaders still have a major influence in the South African community but officially the 'diarchic' model lasted till the end of Nelson Mandela's term as official president. The establishment of the TRC was approved during the first session of the new South African parliament on 21 Oct 1994 and on 15 Dec 1995 it passed the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act. The TRC began its work in Feb 1996 and also completed most of its work in 1999 (De Gruchy, Cochrane & Martin 1999:1-3).

- Gitay, Y 1985. s v Jeshua. *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, 474.
- Hanhart, R 1998. *Dodekapropheton 7.1: Sacharja 1-8*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. (BK14/7.1.)
- Hanson, PD 1979. *The dawn of apocalyptic: The historical and sociological roots of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology*. Rev ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Japhet, S 1982. Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel – Against the background of the historical and religious tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah. *ZAW* 94, 66-98.
- Kessler, J 2001. Reconstructing Haggai's Jerusalem: Demographic and sociological considerations and the search for an adequate methodological point of departure, in Grabbe, LL & Haak, RD (eds), *'Every city shall be forsaken': Urbanism and prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East*, 137-158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kuperus, T 1999. *State, civil society and apartheid in South Africa: An examination of Dutch Reformed-State relations*. Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Le Roux, JH 1987. Die boek Haggai, in *Tweegesprek met God*, Burden, JJ & Prinsloo, WS (reds.), 287-296. Kaapstad: Tafelberg Uitgewers. (Die literatuur van die Ou Testament 3.)
- March, WE 1996. s v The book of Haggai. *The New Interpreter's Bible* 7, 705-732.
- Mason, R 1997. s v Zerubbabel. *NIDOTTE* 4, 1312-1314.
- Meyers, C & Meyers, EM 1987. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*. New York: Doubleday. (AB 25B.)
- 1992a. s v Haggai, Book of. *ABD* 3, 20-23.
- 1992b. s v Zechariah, Book of. *ABD* 6, 1061-1065.
- Miller, JM & Hayes, JH 1986. *A history of ancient Israel and Judah*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- O'Kennedy, DF 2003a. The theological portrayal of forgiveness in Zechariah 1-8. *Scriptura* 84, 410-422.
- 2003b. Zechariah 3-4: Core of Proto-Zechariah. *OTE* 16/2, 370-388.
- Ollenburger, BC 1996. s v The book of Zechariah. *The New Interpreter's Bible* 7, 735-840.
- Petersen, DL 1984. Zechariah's visions: A theological perspective. *VT* 34/2, 195-206
- 1985. *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*. London: SCM Press. (OTL.)
- 2002. *The prophetic literature: An introduction*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Potgieter, FJM 1979. Jacobus Daniël Vorster 1909- 'n Voorlopige oorsig van sy lewe – en huldeblyk. *NGTT* 20/4, 272-276.
- Redditt, PL 1995. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. (NCB.)
- 2000. s v Zechariah, Book of. *Eerdmans dictionary of the Bible*, 1412-1413.
- Reventlow, HG 1993. *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (ATD 25/2.)
- Rose, WH 2000. *Zemah and Zerubbabel. Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Rudolph, W 1976. *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*. Gütersloh: Mohn. (KAT 13.)
- Smith, RL 1984. *Micah-Malachi*. Waco, Texas: Word Books. (WBC 32.)

- Sykes, S 1997. Time and space in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8. *JSOT* 76, 97-124.
- Tollington, JE 1993. *Tradition and innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTSup 150.)
- VanderKam, JC 1991. Joshua the high priest and the interpretation of Zechariah 3. *CBQ* 53, 553-570.
- Van der Woude, AS 1984. *Zacharia*. Nijkerk: G F Callenbach. (POT.)
- Verhoef, PA 1987. *The books of Haggai and Malachi*. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan. (NICOT.)
- Wessels, WJ 2003. The tip of the iceberg: Leadership and leader interaction in the book of Haggai in a time of resettling and reconstruction. *OTE* 16/2, 502-518.
- Willi-Plein, I 1998. s v Sacharja/Sacharjabuch. *TRE* 29, 539-547.
- 2002. Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi. Draft of commentary to be published in *Züricher Bibelkommentare (ZBK)*.