

Introduction

When we read the twelve books in the Minor Prophets, similar words, themes and notions repeating time and again would have caught our attention. Coming to the latter part, it is interesting to find the sudden intensive occurrence of the name of God יהוה צבאות in connection with his messengers who play critical roles since the book of Haggai carrying sharp focus on the temple: Haggai is explicitly named as the divine messenger sent by God (Hag. 1:13), Zechariah resonates the same function (2:13, 15; 4:9; 6:15), while Malachi's name means literally "my messenger". What meaning does יהוה צבאות manifest, especially when associated with messengers? How does the post exilic community perceive their God? Before the discussion on the significance of יהוה צבאות (in connection with his messengers), an overview of its distribution in the twelve books in the Minor Prophets may arouse our interest.

Casting a glance at the distribution of יהוה צבאות in the Book of the Twelve in Table 1 (appearing no matter with messenger formulas or not), one can immediately find its concentration in the latter part of the Book: the post-exilic corpus in the books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, as well as the redactional portion of Amos (the doxologies in particular)¹. Since its occurrence is often connected with messenger formulas, a brief overview including phrases from A to G in Table 1 might appear helpful.

Formulas A to C, without the epithet צבאות, appear more frequently in the pre-exilic and exilic periods. A total of 50 times is found in the pre-exilic and exilic periods (with 9 more variations) and 24 in the post-exilic period (with 2 more variations), less than half of those in the pre-exilic and exilic periods (the variations are not counted).

Formulas D to F possess the epithet צבאות, and appear significantly more frequently in the post-exilic period. אמר יהוה צבאות is insignificant in most books but among its 27 occurrences in this period, 20 are found in Malachi alone. כה אמר יהוה צבאות appears 23 times in the post-exilic period and concentrates in Zech. 1-8 (17 times). Both אמר יהוה צבאות and כה אמר יהוה צבאות are not found in Zech. 9-14. In the post-exilic period, the 15 times of appearance of נאם יהוה צבאות is comparatively fewer than אמר יהוה צבאות (27 times) and כה אמר יהוה צבאות (23 times), and it is not found only in Malachi.

Basically, each book of the post-exilic corpus (except Zech. 9-14) possesses nearly all the formulas. Haggai only lacks כה אמר יהוה צבאות, Zech. 1-8 only אמר יהוה צבאות, while Mal. כה אמר יהוה צבאות and נאם יהוה צבאות. Moreover, formulas with the epithet צבאות happen more frequently in the post-exilic corpus than those without. Contrarily, formulas with the epithet צבאות almost do not appear in the pre-exilic and exilic periods (only twice נאם יהוה צבאות in Nah., 1 variation of נאם יהוה צבאות in Zeph. and 5 other variations from D to E in Amo.).

In short, in the pre-exilic and exilic periods, formulas A to C are

¹ The occurrences of יהוה צבאות in Amo. are found mainly in the post-exilic redactional corpus of the book which is therefore contemporary of Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi. Cf. J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Amos*. ATD 24,2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); Wolff, H. W., *Joel Amos*. BK 14 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975).

overwhelmingly more frequent than D to F, while in the post-exilic period the situation is different: formulas D to F are significantly more than A to C.

As long as earlier studies of messenger formulas (in Ancient Near Eastern environment¹ or Old Testament²) have generally depicted the weight of the sender who appoints and sends his messengers as his representatives to deliver his message or even accomplish various tasks, the use of יהוה צבאות occurring with these formulas is noticeable. However, it is surprising that previous research has not paid much attention to the significance of יהוה צבאות which alone happens 34 times (in addition to 73 times in messenger formulas), whereas researches on messenger formulas in the form of monographs or dissertations have been variously carried out, such as by Westermann,³ Greene,⁴ and Wagner⁵. Therefore, against such background, this current study focusing on the significance of יהוה צבאות will pay particular attention to the role of Yahweh Zebaoth as the one sending out his messengers in the corpus of Haggai-Zechariah 1-8-Malachi.

¹ Meier's study on the messenger in the Ancient Semitic World also holds similar views. Although employing different forms, messengers (in Ancient Semitic World and Bible) in some fashion tend to identify the individual who sent the message ("Thus says PN¹", "PN sent me saying", "PN says"); and the messenger while delivering the message speaks (although not always) as if he were the sender in first person. (Meier, S. A., *The Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988]); see also Meier, S. A., *Speaking of Speaking* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992).

² According to Koch, the messenger formula (ko-amar-formula=KA) legitimates the speaker and compels the hearer to accept the words he utters as coming from the sender of the message. It could be said to have its parallel in the official stamp on a letter today. The sender of the message is brought as near to the recipient of it, and speaks to him in just the same tone, as if the two were face to face.² The constant use in the Old Testament of the *Ko-amar formula* emphasizes the distance between prophet and God. The prophet is the conveyor of the divine word. God is not (or no longer) mysteriously in him. (Koch, K., *The Growth of Biblical Tradition* [trans. Cupitt, S. M.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969]).

³ Westermann, C., *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. White, H. C.; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991).

⁴ Greene, J. T., *The Role of The Messenger and Message in the Ancient Near East*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 169 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

⁵ Wagner, A., *Prophetie als Theologie. Die so spricht Jahwe-Formeln und das Grundverständnis alttestamentlicher Prophetie*. FRLANT 207 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002).

Table 1 Prophetic formulas⁷

Phrases	Hos.	Joe.	Amo.	Oba.	Jon.	Mic.	Nah.	Hab.	Zeph.	Hag.	Zech. 1-8	Zech. 9-14	Mal.
A. נָאֵם יְהוָה	4 ⁸	2:12	14 ⁹ (+4 ¹⁰)	2 ¹¹		2 ¹²			4 ¹³	6 ¹⁴	6 ¹⁵	5 ¹⁶	1:2
B. אָמַר יְהוָה	(3 ¹⁷)	(1 ¹⁸)	6 ¹⁹ (+5 ²⁰)		(3 ²¹)	(1 ²²)			3:20	1:8	(1 ²³)	(2 ²⁴)	3 ²⁵ +(1 ²⁶)
C. כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה			11 ²⁷ (+2 ²⁸)	(1 ²⁹)		2 ³⁰	1:12				2 ³¹	(1 ³²)	

⁷ The numbers of times shown in brackets indicate the variations, which mean those formulas have additional information, mostly are additional epithets as Yahweh's titles.

⁸ 2:15, 18, 23; 11:11.

⁹ 2:11, 16; 3:10, 15; 4:3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11; 9:7, 8, 12, 13.

¹⁰ נָאֵם יְהוָה in 4:5; 8:3, 9, 11.

¹¹ v. 4, 8.

¹² 4:6, 5:9.

¹³ 1:2, 3, 10; 3:8.

¹⁴ 1:13; 2:4 [2x], 14, 17, 23

¹⁵ 1:4; 2:9, 10 [2x], 14; 8:17.

¹⁶ 10:12; 11:6; 12:1, 4; 13:8.

¹⁷ 1:2, 4; 3:1 with the pattern "personal name or suffix pronoun+אֵל־pronoun"

¹⁸ 3:5 with כָּאֲשֶׁר in the front.

¹⁹ 1:5, 15; 2:3; 5:17; 7:3, 9; 15.

²⁰ אָמַר יְהוָה in 1:8 & 7:6; אֵל־ in 7:8 & 8:2; יְהוָה in 8:15.

²¹ אָמַר יְהוָה in 2:11; 4:4, 10.

²² אָמַר in 6:1

²³ אֵל־ in 3:2.

²⁴ first person pronominal suffix+אֵל־ in 11:13, 15.

²⁵ 1:2, 13; 3:13.

²⁶ אָמַר יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ in 2:16.

²⁷ 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6; 3:11; 5:4; 7:17.

²⁸ כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה in 3:11; 5:3.

²⁹ אָמַר יְהוָה in v. 1.

³⁰ 2:3; 3:5.

³¹ 1:16; 8:3.

³² כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה in 11:4.

D. אמר יהוה צבאות	(1 ³⁵)							2 ³⁴	5 ³⁵		20 ³⁶
E. כה אמר יהוה צבאות	(1 ³⁷)							5 ³⁸	17 ³⁹		1:4
F. נאמיהוה צבאות	(3 ⁴⁰)				2 ⁴¹		(1 ⁴²)	6 ⁴³	7 ⁴⁴		2 ⁴⁵
G. יהוה צבאות	(5 ⁴⁶)				4:4		2:13	2:10	12 ⁴⁸ (+4 ⁴⁹)		6 ⁵⁰
								(1 ⁴⁷)			3 ⁵¹

*The numbers denote how many times a particular phrase happens in a book.

* While some scholars call all the formulas "messenger formulas", A and F can be termed as "Yahweh utterance formulas/neum formulas", and C and E, messenger formulas.

33 אמר יהוה צבאות in 5:27.

34 2:7, 9.

35 1:3; 4:6; 7:13; 8:14(2x).

36 1:6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14; 2:2, 4, 8, 16; 3:1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 21.

37 כה אמר יהוה צבאות in 5:16.

38 1:2, 5, 7; 2:6, 11.

39 1:3, 4, 14, 17; 2:12; 3:7; 6:12; 7:9; 8:2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 19, 20; 8:14, 23.

40 נאמיהוה צבאות in 3:13; 6:14; צבאות אלתי הַצבאות in 6:8.

41 2:14; 3:5.

42 אמר יהוה צבאות אלתי תְּדַבֵּר in 2:9.

43 1:9; 2:4, 8, 9, 23 [2x].

44 1:3, 16; 3:9, 10; 5:4; 8:6, 11; 13:2, 7.

45 13:2, 7.

46 אמר יהוה צבאות in 4:13; 5:14, 15.

47 כה אמר יהוה צבאות אלתי in 1:14.

48 1:6, 12; 7:3, 4, 12(2x); 8:1, 3, 9, 18, 21, 22; 9:15; 10:3; 14:16, 17, 21.

49 נאמיהוה צבאות שְׁלֵחֵי in 2:13, 15; 4:9; 6:15.

50 9:15; 10:3; 14:16, 17, 21(2x).

51 2:7, 12; 3:14.

I. Research review

A. The study of the Book of the Twelve

As long as the books of Haggai, Zechariah 1-8 and Malachi belong to the Minor Prophets/Book of the Twelve, it is worth to start with giving a brief introduction of the study of the Book of the Twelve as the background against which the discussion of this present work will be commenced.

Since the 80s of the last century, the study of the Book of the Twelve has attracted much scholarly discussions with regard to reading the twelve books in the Minor Prophets as a whole. Contributions in terms of different essays, books, dissertations, and "Habilitationsschrift" have been made to enhance the study from different perspectives. According to Schart and Redditt, "it became acceptable in scholarly biblical exegesis to view the 12 Prophets as a literary unit... and any interpretation that takes the canonical text seriously has to understand the intention of the final composition of the twelve writings."¹ In 1994, Watts has taken the lead with some other scholars to form the Formation of the Book of the Twelve Consultation in the Society of Biblical Literature, followed by a series of seminars lasting for eight years.²

The focus of scholarly discussions lies on how to read the Book of the Twelve as a coherent unit after being collected, edited and redacted in its process of growth so that it could be called a book akin to Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. For instance, Redditt suggests that 'the coherence derives from superscriptions, framing devices and other redactional techniques, common themes and theology, plot (which includes its own chronology)'.³ House promotes to study the genre, structure, plot, use of characters, and point of view of the Twelve in order to discover that the collection should be read as a single literary construction.⁴ Steck compares the redaction history of the Twelve and Isaiah and advocates that with the final compilation of the Twelve, the twelve books should not be read apart from each other but as a redacted composition.⁵

¹ Schart, A. & Redditt, P. (eds.), *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), i; more review of the research of the Book of the Twelve are available also in Schmid, K. (ed.), *Prophetische Heils- und Herrschererwartungen in den Prophetenbüchern*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 194 (Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk, 2005); Redditt, P., "Recent Research on the Book of the Twelve As One Book" in *Currents in research, biblical studies* 9 (2001), 47-80; Yu, K. S., *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des 'Dodekapropheton' und sein Kanonisierungsprozess*. Dissertation Universität München (München, 2000); Nogalski, J. D. & Sweeney M. A. (eds.), *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*. SBL Symposium Series 15 (Atlanta: SBL, 2000); Schart, A., *Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs: Neubearbeitungen von Amos im Rahmen schriftenübergreifender Redaktionsprozesse*. BZAW 260 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998); etc..

² Studies earlier than this include Wolfe, R. E., "Editing of the book of the Twelve" in *ZAW* 53, 90-129; Coggins regards that "it would be absurd to look for a 'story-line' in the Book of the Twelve; it is an anthology, yet not a random gathering of diverse pieces." (Coggins, R. J., *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], 85).

³ Redditt, P., "The Formation of the Book of the Twelve" in *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, 25.

⁴ House, P., *The Unity of the Twelve*. JSOT Sup. 97 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990), *passim*.

⁵ Steck, O. H., *Der Abschluß der Prophetie im alten Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn:

1. Methodology

a. Diachronic approach

In the course of research, methodology has been one prominent area of concern. The widely devised approaches are generally classified under two streams, namely diachronic and synchronic.¹ (In fact, there is not any single method which can be entirely separated from others. An option claimed by a scholar reflects his/her preference.)

Those employing the diachronic method deem the Book of the Twelve to have undergone stages of redaction under the hands of redactors whose backgrounds are not always explicit, though often implicated by the texts so that the twelve books could be read as a coherent whole. Early scholars suggesting stages of redaction of the Twelve include Ewald who discovers three stages,² Steuernagel, seven,³ and Wolfe, four.⁴ Schneider in the late 70s of the last century identifies four stages of growth of the Book of the Twelve and many redactional comments are arranged systematically,⁵ while Lee argues for a post-exilic redaction during the period of Nehemiah.⁶ Research of redaction critics in the Book of the Twelve in the last three decades includes Schart who offers a redactional-critical study of Amo. 9 which demonstrates its growth through the seven stages of the Book.⁷ J. Jeremias advocates that there is an organic relationship between the earliest books of the Twelve and discovers that Hosea and Amos were created with an eye to each other in that the book of Hosea exerts influence on the composition of Amos, while the book of Amos affected the redactional additions to Hosea.⁸ An influential work of two books on the redaction of the Book of the Twelve has been accomplished by Nogalski who suggests the books in the Book of the Twelve have been edited to connect to one another in such a way that catchwords are inserted in the beginnings and endings of each book.⁹ According to Nogalski, intertextuality “means the interrelationship between two or more texts which *evidence suggests* (1) was deliberately established by ancient author/editors or (2) was presupposed by

Neukirchener, 1991).

¹ Those adhering mainly (but not exclusively) to the former include Nogalski, Jeremias, Schart, Redditt, Steck, and Bosshard-Nepustil, while the latter, Conrad, House, Barton, and Eco.

² Ewald, H., *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1868), 74-82.

³ Steuernagel, C., *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (München: Minerva-Publikation, 1978), 669-72.

⁴ Wolfe, “Editing of the book of the Twelve”, 90-129.

⁵ Schneider, D. A., *The Unity of the Book of the Twelve* (Yale University Ph.D. Dissertation, 1979), 115-52.

⁶ Lee, A. Y., *The Canonical Unity of the Scroll of the Minor Prophets*. Ph.D. Dissertation: Baylor University, 1985 (Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1985).

⁷ Schart, *Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs, passim*.

⁸ Jeremias, J. “Die Anfänge des Dodekapropheten: Hosea und Amos” in Jeremias, J., *Hosea und Amos* (Tübingen : Mohr, 1995), 34-54.

⁹ Nogalski, J. D., *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve*. BZAW 217 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993); Nogalski, J. D., *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*. BZAW 217 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993).

those authors/editors.... [There are] five different types of intertextuality: quotations, allusions, catchwords, motifs, and framing devices.”¹

In short, redaction critics emphasize the different levels and stages of redaction which culminates “in a collection of prophetic voices, some well-known, some not, that spanned centuries.”²

b. Synchronic approach

Belonging to the camp adhering to synchronic approach, Conrad follows Eco’s semiotic approach because of disagreeing with the redactional-critical approach for understanding the formation of prophetic books, including the formation of the Twelve, as long as it “downplays the active role of the reader in interpretation.... [Besides, t]he text has been beaten into a variety of shapes for a variety of uses. Historical critics use the biblical text ‘to get something else’: underlying sources, *Sitz im Leben*, the intention of redaction of redactors, or a history of tradition. The text is used and left behind in search of something other than the *intentio operis*. Seen from this perspective, historical critics ironically can be seen as radical reader response critics.”³ In line with this, House advocates that the Book of the Twelve “was shaped into a unit and accepted as a canonical whole.... Yet it is also desirable to examine the text as it exists in its final form.”⁴

All in all, those adopting the synchronic approach focus on the existing shape and content of the text in which they try to seek whatever (surface) interrelationships or coherence while ignoring the development and growth of the text which reflect the intention of the authors/editors.

c. Middle stand and intertextuality

Some take a middle stand and suggest that both diachronic and synchronic approaches are necessary for a complete understanding of the Book of the Twelve. Rendtorff rightly points out that “in studying the Book of the Twelve as a whole, there is no simple alternative between ‘diachronic’ and ‘synchronic’ reading.”⁵ Sweeney focuses on not only a synchronic literary analysis of the

¹ Nogalski, J. D., “Intertextuality in the Twelve” in House, P. R. & Watts, J. W. (eds.), *Forming Prophetic Literature. Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honour of John D. W. Watts*. JSOT Sup 235 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 102-24.

² Redditt, P., “The Production and Reading of the Book of the Twelve” in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, 12.

A more recent research of Wöhrle relates the Book of the Twelve to the Tora: “Am Ende des Zwölfprophetenbuches und somit am Ende des gesamten Prophetenkanons wird hier also auf die Tora als die bleibend gültige Offenbarung des Gotteswillens verweisen. Die Lektüre des Prophetenkanons und der dort belegten Mahnungen und Verheißungen führt nach diesem Wort zur Lektüre der Tora.” (Wöhrle, J., *Der Abschluß des Zwölfprophetenbuches: buchübergreifende Redaktionsprozesse in den späten Sammlungen* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008], 424).

³ Conrad, E. W., “Forming the Twelve and Forming Canon” in *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, 91-103.

⁴ House, P. D., “Dramatic Coherence in Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah” in *Forming Prophetic Literature*, 207-8.

⁵ Rendtorff, R., “How to Read the Book of the Twelve as a Theological Unity” in *Reading*

Book of the Twelve but also includes diachronic considerations in order for the synchronic analyses to make sense.¹ Schultz in his attempt to adopt a mixed approach seeks verbal parallels which might be labeled quotations by “looking for verbal and syntactical correspondence that goes beyond one key or uncommon term or even a series of commonly occurring terms.... Neither an exclusively diachronic nor an exclusively synchronic analysis can do justice to the multi-functional nature of quotation....”²

Against this background, “intertextuality” has been picked up by both schools of critics who have offered controversial definitions and criticism to study themes/expressions occurring in different books to investigate their intertextual correlations or “inter-connectedness”.³ Scharf comments that “the intertextual allusions cannot be controlled... and the main difficulty for all the different models is establishing controls about what is considered deliberate redactional shaping and what is only accidentally connected.” Schultz, following the opinion of Wolfe, criticizes it to have become simply “a trendy label for the traditional study of inner-biblical exegesis or inner-biblical allusion” and it serves “as a modern literary theoretical coat of veneer over the old comparative approach.”⁴ He refines intertextuality by following Sommer to offer “an alternative to the traditional approach to inner-biblical allusion that is synchronic rather than diachronic in emphasis, reader-focused rather than author-focused, and thus explores the effect rather than the purpose of such interconnections.”⁵ Having acknowledged the arguments against using synchronic intertextuality and diachronic inner biblical exegesis, Stead in his work employing an approach named “a ‘Contextual’ Intertextuality” practically intends “to show that the term ‘intertextuality’ might legitimately be used to describe an approach... which encompasses both synchronic and diachronic elements.”⁶

2. The corpus of Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi

The books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi have been the focus of study among scholars not limited to the ones actively involving in the research of the Book of the Twelve mentioned above. When the three books are investigated together, the first issue concerns how to delineate them: the portion Hag.-Zech. 1-8 is unanimously agreed to belong together, while whether and how Zech. 9-14 and Mal. could be put together depends on different views.

and Hearing the Book of the Twelve, 75-87.

¹ Sweeney, M. A., *The Twelve Prophets 1* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000), xxxix.

² Schultz, R. L., “The Ties that bind” in *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, 32.

³ Cf. fn. 9 in 6 and related discussions for Nogalski’s definition.

⁴ Schultz, “The Ties that bind”, 29.

⁵ Schultz, “The Ties that bind”, 29; cf. Sommer, B. D., “Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A response to Lyle Eslinger” in *VT* 46, 479-89.

⁶ Stead, R. M., *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8* (New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 19. According to Stead, his approach “is an intertextual approach which lies somewhere between the post-structuralist semiotic intertextualite of Kristeva and Barthes, and the historically oriented ‘inner biblical exegesis’ (IBE) associated with Michael Fishbane.” (18).

Since the analysis of Beuken,¹ scholars generally hold consent on the formal features in Hag.-Zech. 1-8: a narrative framework employing the same dating formulas connecting the prophecies together. Insofar as this is not found in Zech. 9-14² and Malachi, opinions on what comes after Zech. 8 vary. Schart believes that Malachi is added after Zech. 9-14 has been incorporated to Zech. 1-8.³ Nogalski proposes that Zech. 9-14 has been inserted between Zech. 1-8 and Mal.⁴

To investigate them as a whole, Coggins has earlier stated that w“ithout making any exaggerated claims that Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi are the most important collections in our Bible, it may be affirmed that they afford a valuable insight both into the historical development of the Jewish community in the Second Temple period and into the literary process of drawing together in final form the sacred traditions of that community.”⁵ Among those studying the Book of the Twelve, Curtis has looked into the redaction history of the Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi corpus with a view to the social location by referring to a multistage redaction history of the Twelve,⁶ while Bauer has looked for socio-economic connections in them.⁷

No matter scholars devising the diachronic or synchronic⁸ method read Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi “intertextually”: repeated/parallel themes and expressions are denoted and investigated. Wolfe has as early as in 1935 seen the three books to belong to the last phase of the Book of the Twelve.⁹ Pierce argues for literary style and specific themes linking the three books together.¹⁰ In response to this, Nogalski accepts his work to illuminate a consistent hermeneutic running in these books but raises doubts on several areas.¹¹ More recently, a list put forward by Redditt to argue for the three books as collections redacted with regard to one another and to the rest of the Book of the Twelve has included the outstanding themes in the three, namely, restoration as the primary one, as well as lack of wages, the temple, God as refiner, divorce and

¹ Beuken, W. A. M., *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp., 1967).

² As the separation of Deutero-Zechariah from Proto-Zechariah is widely acknowledged by scholars, it is not necessary to be explicated here. This current study includes only Proto-Zechariah.

³ Schart, A., “Putting the Eschatological Visions of Zechariah in their Place: Malachi as a Hermeneutical Guide for the last section of the Book of the Twelve” in Boda, M. J. (ed.), *Bringing out the Treasure* (London : Clark, 2004), 333-43.

⁴ Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*, 213ff..

⁵ *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 85-6.

⁶ Curtis, B. G., *Varieties of Strategy in prophetic Ministry: The Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi Corpus in Socio-Literary Analysis*. Evangelical Theological Society 1992 Annual Meeting. San Francisco, CA in http://www.tren.com/e-docs/search_w_preview.cfm?pETS-4442.

⁷ Bauer, L., *Zeit des Zweiten Tempels: - Zeit der Gerechtigkeit : zur sozio-ökonomischen Konzeption im Haggai-Sacharja-Malachi-Korpus* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1992).

⁸ E.g. Opposing the diachronic reading, Conrad holds the Book of the Twelve as a literary whole and studies Hag.-Mal. intertextually with Isaiah (Conrad, E. W., “Messengers in Isaiah and the Twelve” in *JSOT* 91, 83-97).

⁹ Fn. 2 in 5.

¹⁰ Pierce, R. W., “A Thematic Development of the Haggai/Zechariah/Malachi Corpus” in *JETS* 27, 401-11.

¹¹ *Redactional Processes*, 201ff..

God's love, God as king and one, law and prophets, and sin and punishment.¹

In the course of considering all the themes, scholars also pay attention to a specific term recurring particularly often in the three books. מלאך is proposed by Conrad to represent a transition point from the Lord being with his people by means of his prophets (Hosea through Zephaniah), while Boda treats it as a *leitmotif* unifying the corpus Haggai to Malachi.

The study of themes in association with one particular term is the central concern of this present work: the highly frequently used expression יהוה צבאות, in association with other recurring themes, especially the messenger(s) (מלאכים/מלאך) to offer a revived conception of יהוה צבאות which, according to Table 1 (and also Table 2 below), is employed intensively in the post-exilic corpus of the Book of the Twelve.

B. יהוה צבאות in Old Testament

The study of יהוה צבאות has a long history of research which covers mainly five areas, namely its distribution, origin, syntax, etymology and context.

Table 2 Distribution of יהוה צבאות

	in messenger formulas	not in messenger formulas	Total		in messenger formulas	not in messenger formulas	Total
Gen.	-	-	0	Isa. 1-39	11	45	56
Exo.	-	-	0	Isa. 40-55	2	4	6
Lev.	-	-	0	Isa. 56-66	-	-	0
Num.	-	-	0	Jer.	63	19	82
Deut.	-	-	0	Eze.	-	-	0
Jos.	-	-	0	Dan.	-	-	0
Judg.	-	-	0	Hos.	0	1	1
Ruth	-	-	0	Joe.	-	-	0
1-2 Sam.	2	9	11	Amo.	5	4	9
1-2 Kgs.	-	5	5	Oba.	-	-	0
1-2 Chr.	1	2	3	Jon.	-	-	0
Ezr.	-	-	0	Mic. ²	-	1	1
Neh.	-	-	0	Nah.	2	-	2
Est.	-	-	0	Hab.	-	1	1
Job	-	-	0	Zeph.	1	1	2

¹ Redditt, P., "Themes in Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi" in *Interpretation* 61.2, 184-97.

² כִּי־פִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת דִּבֶּר is not a messenger formula.

Psa.	-	15	15	Hag.	11	3	14
Pro.	-	-	0	Zech. 1-8	30	14	44
Ecc.	-	-	0	Zech. 9-14	2	7	9
Songs	-	-	0	Mal.	21	3	24
				Total	151	134	285

There are altogether 285 times¹ of יהוה with צבאות occurring in the Hebrew Bible in different combinations (including יהוה אלהים צבאות, יהוה אלהי צבאות, יהוה אלהי הצבאות, אדני יהוה אלהי הצבאות, אדני יהוה צבאות), among which יהוה צבאות is the shortest and the most common (amounting to 260 times²).³ Table 2 shows that the name יהוה צבאות does not appear in Pentateuch, Jos. and Judg., seldom in the Deuteronomistic history (1 Sam. 1:3, 11; 4:6; 15:2; 17:45; 2 Sam. 5:10; 6:2, 18; 7:8, 26, 27) and most of the Psa.⁴, while its absence in Eze. stands in great contrast to the high frequency in other prophetic books. In comparison to the frequent use (56 times) in Proto-Isaiah (contributing to 3.29% of the Hebrew Bible)⁵, the 83 occurrences in the post exilic prophetic corpus of Haggai-Zechariah 1-8-Malachi (less than 1.5% of the Hebrew Bible)⁶ should be deemed the most intensive, whereas doubt on integrity of the yet high frequent use in Jer. remains because of the complication of almost not finding direct equivalent in its LXX.⁷ The concentration in certain texts has been noticed by scholars to interpret the meaning of יהוה צבאות which appears on specific theological grounds to both prevail in and avoid certain areas.⁸

Origin

The issue of origin concerns on the one hand when it was first used in the

¹ Mettinger has excluded 2 Kgs. 19:31 (Mettinger, T. N. D., *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod theologies*. ConB OT Series 18 [Lund: Gleerup, 1982], 12 and 50ff.).

² Jüngling, H. W., "Zebaot" in *LTK*. Bd. 10, 1389-91.

³ See further statistics analyzed on different grounds in Baumgärtel, F., "Zu den Gottesnamen in den Büchern Jeremia und Ezechiel" in Kuschke, A., *Verbannung und Heimkehr*. Wilhelm Rudolph zum 70. Geburtstag (Tübingen: Mohr, 1961), 1-3; Zobel, H. J., *TDOT* XII, 216ff.; Woude, A. S. V. D., *THAT* II, 498ff.; Rad, G. V., *Old Testament Theology*. Vo. I [trans. Stalker, D. M. G.; Louisville: The Westminster John Knox Press, 2001], 18; Eissfeldt, O., "Jahwe Zebaot" in Sellheim, R. & Maass, F., *Kleine Schriften. Otto Eissfeldt*. Dritter Band (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966), 105-6; Albani, M., *Der eine Gott und die himmlischen Heerscharen: zur Begründung des Monotheismus bei Deuterjesaja im Horizont der Astralisierung des Gottesverständnisses im Alten Orient* (Leipzig: Evang. Verl.-Anst., 2000), 212; etc.

⁴ Despite only 15 times, they are important because of close connection with temple theology.

⁵ See Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 12.

⁶ Cf. Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 12..

⁷ Contra Olofsson claiming צבאות transcribed by Σαβαωθ in LXX to be found never outside Isa. and 1 Sam., since it appears indeed in Jer. 46:10. (Olofsson, S., *God is my Rock* [Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990], 122); (cf. Jos. 6:17; 2 Kgs. 10:16 where Σαβαωθ appears in LXX but צבאות not in MT).

⁸ See following.

Hebrew Bible and on the other hand whether and when it came from outside Israel. The focus of research in this area has long been lying controversially on Shiloh which should have to a certain extent incorporated impact from other religious practices.¹ Whereas יהוה צבאות is first attested in passages (1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2) in association with Shiloh and its temple (the ark narrative), Zobel points out that “the only question is whether the term became associated in Jerusalem with the God of Israel who entered the city with the ark and thus might even derive from venerable Jebusite tradition, or whether it came to Jerusalem from Shiloh as a title already associated with Yahweh as the God of the ark.”² The possibility suggested by Smend for the predicate יהוה צבאות to have been a later projection back to Shiloh on the ground of its connection with ישב הכרבים (1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2)³ has been regarded by Zobel as unfounded since the association of the two expressions does not happen in the language of the Jerusalem cult⁴; yet, there is not compelling reason to contest the origin of יהוה צבאות in Shiloh.⁵ The possibly undisputed oldest instance in Psa. 24:7-10 is employed by Porzig to demonstrate the martial aspect of יהוה צבאות without the need to associate with Shiloh.⁶ Nevertheless, whether this aspect could be validated in Psa. 24:8, 10 is skeptical, insofar as the poet would have, according to Zobel, concerned not with the God who conducts Israel’s wars but the “King of glory” entering and from now on residing in Jerusalem and its temple.⁷ Furthermore, Mettinger has especially stressed the importance of the original, complete title

¹ “Ob dieses Gotteseipitheton, mit dem der im Heiligtum von Silo als Kerubenthroner verehrte Gott-König Jahwe benannt wurde, ein durch die Übertragung des Titels eines ursprünglich in Silo verehrten ‘el sebaot auf Jahwe von Israel den Kanaanäern entlehntes oder vielmehr ein in der eigenen Kultgemeinde entstandenes Gottesprädikat darstellt, läßt sich nicht mehr mit Sicherheit entscheiden.” (Woude, *THAT* II, 506).

² *TDOT* XII, 221.

³ Smend has suggested without certainty that both predicates could be connected: “Stärker ist das Argument des Gottesnames Jahwe Zebaoth, wenn dieser mit der Lade einerseits und mit kriegerischem Wesen andererseits in Beziehung steht. Beides ist wahrscheinlich. Das Fehlen des Ausdrucks in Gen.-Ri. und sein Aufkommen dort, wo es sich um die Lade bzw. ihren Standort und dessen Wechsel handelt (1. Sam. 1,3.11; 4,4; 2. Sam. 6,2,18; 7,8.26f.), kann nicht Zufall sein. Eine gewöhnlich unterschätzte Schwierigkeit liegt freilich darin, dass 1. Sam. 4,4 und 2. Sam. 6,2 das Prädikat ישב הכרבים hinzufügt ist, das man schwer anders wie als Rückprojektion der Verhältnisse des salomonischen Tempels verstehen kann. Was für den Kerubenthroner gilt, könnte auch für den Jahwe Zebaoth gelten.” (Smend, R., *Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963], 59-60); see also Janowski, B., “Keruben und Zion” in Daniels, D. R. [ed.], *Ernten, was man sät*. Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag [Neukirchen-Vluyn : Neukirchener Verl., 1991], 235ff..

⁴ With the quotation from Smend, Janowski mentions “dass das Epitheton ישב הכרבים aufgrund seiner überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Unabhängigkeit vom Gottesnamen יהוה צבאות und der Silolade in 1 Sam 4,4; 2 Sam 6,2 (=1 Chr 13,6) als >Rückprojektion der Verhältnisse des salomonischen Tempels< verstanden werden kann.” (237).

⁵ *TDOT* XII, 221ff..

⁶ Porzig, P., *Die Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament und in den Texten vom Toten Meer* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 213ff..

⁷ *TDOT* XII, 226; cf. Hossfeld, F. L., “Psalm 24” in Hossfeld F. L., & Zenger, E., *Die Psalmen I. Psalm 1-50*, (Würzburg: Echter, 1993), 156ff.; Ch. III on Mal. 1-2).

יהוה צבאות ישב הכרבים,¹ in spite of some others suspecting יהוה צבאות and ישב הכרבים as two titles carrying individual and not interrelated religio-historical backgrounds.²

Along with the disputable provenance in Shiloh, influence or parallels from outside the Hebrew Bible have also been studied. Since there could have been already cultic activities in Shiloh from Middle to Late Bronze periods and contact with some of the fairly widely renounced Canaanite shrines would seem inevitable³, the Canaanite background for צבאות could be detected. While suspecting the nomenclature צבאות to originate with the ark which has its own original meaning, Maag supposes the title אלהי צבאות to emerge in Shiloh to denote a dispute between the indigenous faith and the Yahweh religion.⁴ Ross proposes that the deviation of the royal context of צבאות in the Psa. from the stubborn connection of its root *šb* ' with armies and warfare argues for it to have been taken over from Canaan where a shrine of Baal Sebaot may be guessed.⁵ While believing the צבאות name to be a unique Israelite divine designation,⁶ Mettinger asserts the Canaanite milieu at Shiloh to be traced from certain El features in 1 Sam. 1 and 3 and the iconography associated with Yahweh Zebaoth (despite features of Baal)⁷ being congruent with each other, while 'el *šeba* 'ot and 'el 'elyon would have been twin designations of יהוה צבאות.⁸

In this vein, the general assertion for Shiloh origin has to be assessed with extant Canaanite religious influence. Scholars viewing the "origin" of יהוה צבאות in Shiloh do not ignore the possible extra-biblical traits which have been taken up by the opposers who in fact laid emphasis (more) on צבאות (than on

¹ "The few cases when the cherubim formula occurs alone hardly amount to proof that it was originally an independent designation." (DDD, 1735).

² See Janowski, 235ff.; Schmitt, R., *Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft: eine kritische forschungsgeschichtliche Darstellung* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972), 128ff.. Zobel reminds that "the meaning of z can still be seen from the second title." (223).

³ Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 19.

⁴ Maag, V., *Kultur, Kulturkontakt und Religion. Gesammelte Studien zur allgemeinen und alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1980), 6ff..

⁵ Ross, J. P., "Jahweh *šəbā'ōt* in Samuel and Psalms" in *VT* 17, 89-90 and fn. 1 in 90.

⁶ Mettinger holds that "this divine name seems to have had its organ at Shiloh (1 Sam 1:3; 11; 4:4)... We can trace it back to the temple at Shiloh, but no farther back than that." (Mettinger, T. N. D., *In Search of God* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988], 148-9); see also Eissfeldt, 113ff.; Zimmerli, W., *Old Testament Theology in Outline* (trans. Green, D. E.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978), 75-6.

⁷ Cf. "Das Nebeneinander von kriegerischen Baals- und herrschaftlichen Elszügen dürfte die erste greifbare Stufe der offiziellen Religion Israels und Judas ohnehin schon bestimmen." (Porzig, 216).

⁸ DDD, 1733; similarly, Ross suggests that "Elyon and Sebaot, if my thesis is correct, are both titles of divine majesty taken over from Canaan; the one Jebusite, the other from a major shrine elsewhere." (90); in assuming יהוה צבאות as probably a very archaic designation for Israel's God, Miller makes reference to "the epithets of El and Atirat which designate their creative or procreative activities refer[ing] to their creation of divine beings, for example, *bny bnwt* (El) and *qnyl ilm* (Atirat)." (Miller, P. D. Jr., *The divine warrior in Israel* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973), 155); see also the earlier views of Cross (Cross, F. M., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* [Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1997⁹], 70).

(יהוה צבאות).

Insofar as the trace of Canaanite origin is difficult to be ascertained, it seems much more worthwhile to probe into its use in Jerusalem tradition (such as depicted by Isa. 6; 24). Frankly speaking, most previous researches on יהוה צבאות (especially those seeking Shiloh and concerned extra-biblical origins) have only few, if not nothing, to do with the use in the Old Testament. A genuine focus on the significance of יהוה צבאות in the Old Testament, at least in its most frequently occurring part (Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi) has never been seriously accommodated.

Syntax

Whilst the so-called long form יהוה אלהים צבאות/יהוה אלהי (ה) צבאות is considered as a genitive connection or an attributive structure, the short form יהוה צבאות could analogously be understood as genitive relation or substantive attribution¹ and is widely accepted as a construct relation² with a view to the epigraphic references to portray double determination in Ugaritic like *rsp hgb*³, as well as Yahweh of Teman and “Yahweh of Samaria” in Kuntillet Ajrud belonging to 9th BC^{4,5}. Which of the two forms is to be taken as more original has also been the point of discussion. Opposing the view of Gesenius on ellipsis,⁶ Choi commends the latter owing to its higher frequency of occurrence

¹ “Die versch. grammat. Formen der Langform stellen sich z. einen als eine Genitivkonstruktion (JHWH, Gott der Z.), z. andern als ein attributives Gefüge (JHWH, Gott Z.) dar. Die Kurzform kann analog als Genitivverhältnis (JHWH bzw. Gott der Z.) od. als substantiv. Attribution (JHWH bzw. Gott, der Z. ist) verstanden werden.” (Jüngling, 1390); see also Miller, 152-3; Eissfeldt, 106ff.; followed by Von Rad, 19; Gesenius, W., *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. 5. Lfg., 1098.

² See more reviews from Mettinger on a construct relationship to a subsequent genitive, the composite as a composite of the proper name YHWH and an apposition, an adjectival genitive compound. (135). Contrarily, Cross earlier proposes that “Yahwe sebaot cannot be a construct chain, nor can sebaot, the ordinary word for heavenly armies (the gods) and earthly armies, be turned into an adjective or participle in agreement with Yahweh.” (70).

³ “... that ywhw sebaot, is an actual construct phrase, with the doubly determined proper name ywhw, is strengthened by the nearly identical Ugaritic phrase *ršp šb'i*.” Choi, J. H., “Resheph and *YHWH SEBAOT*” in *VT* LIV,1, 17-28; followed by Porzig suggesting further that “KTU I.17 I 36 spricht vom sbu sps, dem ‘Himmelsheer’, und der Gott raesep kann dort auch als *rsp sby* ‘Resheph of the army’ bezeichnet werden (KTU 1.91,15)”. (216). Yet, according to Mettinger, “this means ‘Resheph of the sunset’ rather ‘Resheph of the host,’ as some have preferred. Thus there is not the slightest indication that the Sabaoth name was adopted by the Israelites from the Canaanites.” (*In Search of God*, 149); see also Mettinger, “Yahweh Zebaoth” in *DDD*, 1730ff.; Albani, 195ff..

⁴ The former in line 2 of “KAgr(9):8” (a form of blessing), while the latter in line 2 of “KAgr(9):10” (a form of thanksgiving) of “Inschriften auf Ton”. (Renz, *Die Althebräischen Inschriften*, 61). See also Mettinger, 1731-2; Porzig, 216-7; Albani, 186ff..

⁵ See also discussions and reviews in Zobel’s “Etymology and Grammatical Considerations.” (218-9).

⁶ “When nouns which the usage of the language always treats as proper names occasionally appear to be connected with a following genitive, this is really owing to an ellipse whereby the noun which really governs the genitive, i. e. the appellative idea contained in the proper name, is suppressed. So evidently in the case of יהוה צבאות *Yahweh* (the God) *of hosts*; the fuller form יהוה אלהי הצבאות 2 Sam. 5:10, or יהוה אלהי הצבאות Am 3:13 is a secondary expansion

throughout the Hebrew Bible.¹ Furthermore, insofar as יהוה צבאות is understood as a construct relation depicting an adjectival, descriptive genitive, it is necessary to reckon צבאות being a concrete, rather than an abstract plural noun² in the course of the interpretation of the יהוה צבאות element.³

Etymology

Scholars basically agree on *šb'* being the root of צבאות. Yet, different emphases have been taken up for interpretation which refer mainly to earthly (1 Sam. 17:45; Isa. 13:4; 31:4; Jer. 32:18; 50:25; Nah. 2:14) and heavenly armies (1 Kgs. 22:19-23; Psa. 148:1-5)⁴, the royal character (Psa. 24; 89; Isa. 6:5; 9:5) and the celestial and mythical nature⁵. Nevertheless, it is controversial to apply all the meanings of *šb'* directly on יהוה צבאות because the latter seldom directly occurs in texts referring to stars or army,⁶ while the heavenly hosts are portrayed as either *seba hassmajim* or *seba*.⁷

Apart from the generally purported opinion on צבאות being derived from the Semitic root *šb'*, Görg has suggested the Egyptian word *db3* which corresponds to “host”.⁸ This is substantiated by Kreuzer who, agreeing *šba* to

of the original יהוה צבאות; יהוה אלהים צבאות in Psa. 59:6, 80:15, 20, 84:9 is due to the mechanical substitution of אלהים for יהוה affected in the 2nd and part of the 3rd book of the Psalms.” (*Gesenius Hebrew Grammar*, 403).

¹ “Resheph”, 18-9; similarly hinted earlier by Von Rad who suggests that “there is much more to be said for assuming that the longer form is to be taken as an interpretation of the older.” (*Old Testament Theology*, 19); to Cross: “There can be no doubt, in my opinion, that *yahwe sebaot* is the earliest form of the epithet and that *yahwe elohe sebaot* is secondary. The latter fits into the category of *lectio facilior*.” (*Canaanite Myth*, 69-70). A different is held earlier by Maier: “Freilich ist so trotz aller Einwände die volle Formel Jhwh alohe (has-)sebaot als ursprünglich anzusehen.” (Maier, J., *Das Altisrätische Ladeheiligtum* [Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1965], 51).

² Eissfeldt has suggested the ending to designate intensive abstract plural (103-23); see also the comments from Miller, 153; Kreuzer, S., “Zebaoth – Der Thronende” in *VT* LVI,3, 352-3.

³ According to Mettinger, the sense of *zebaoth* as a concrete plural “is found in one of the Canaanite glosses to Amarna letters.” (*DDD*, 1732).

⁴ Schwally asserts that “in Zebaoth unbedingt ein kriegerisches Prädikat Jahve’s stecken muss.” (Schwally, F., *Semitische Kriegeralttümer*. Erstes Heft. [Leipzig: Dieterich’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1901], 5).

⁵ See especially “Das himmlische Streitwagenheer im AT und das Zebaoth-Epitheton” in Albani, 208ff.. Though asserting יהוה צבאות to relate more surely to Shiloh, Kraus holds that “vielleicht bezieht sich צבאות ursprünglich auf geheimnisvolle mythische Mächtigkeiten der Naturreligion.” (Kraus, H. J., *Psalmen 60-150*. BK 15 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003], 201).

⁶ Olofsson, 120; Mettinger, *DDD*, 1737ff.;

⁷ Woude, 505, who earlier doubts the connection of יהוה צבאות with heavenly background in terms of cosmological meaning; but see the more recent analysis of Albani on heavenly hosts as the indigenous traditional element in the traditional Yahweh Zebaoth cult in Israel. (*THAT* II, 208ff.).

⁸ “Längst bekannt ist die Tatsache, dass das in ‘Gruppenschreibung’ gehaltene Lexem *db*’ des Ägyptischen ein semitisches Fremdwort darstellt und mit der gleichen Bedeutung (‘Heer’) wie das semitische Grundwort *šb*’ behaftet zu sein scheint.” (Görg, M., “St’wt – ein Gottestitel” in *BN* 30 [1985], 16).

relate closely to *צבאות*, attempts to explore further with the historical and linguistic perspectives as well as religio-historical perspective.¹

Concept: The motif of the Divine Council

Four (interrelated) areas of the significance of *יהוה צבאות* can be detected in Old Testament:

1. the military aspect of *יהוה צבאות* has widely been denoted by scholars² - David in his combat against the Philistine declares his coming in the name of *יהוה צבאות*, while a representative or messenger *איש* in Jos. 5:13 who identifies himself as *שר* (v. 14) has come to Joshua to warrant military success with regard to *צבא יהוה*. His capacity should be compared to the *יהוה צבאות* מלאך, insofar as he brings the divine utterance (*אֲדַבְרֵי מִדְּבַר אֱלֹהֵי עַבְדִּי*);³
2. the angelic entities praising and worshipping *יהוה צבאות* enthroning in the divine heavenly council, e.g. in Psa. 29; 89; Isa. 6;⁴
3. messengers sent out among the entities surrounding the throne of *יהוה צבאות* in the divine council to deliver the divine messages or even accomplish various tasks, e.g. Isa. 6:5; Jer. 23;⁵
4. the council members as officials standing before the throne to receive instructions from Yahweh Zebaoth, such as demonstrated by Zech. 3; Job 1-2; the prophet Isaiah responding to the call in the heavenly council in Isa. 6:8ff. being the most noticeable one; while the two anointed ones in the central vision of Zech. 4 are especially significant in the current study.⁶

None of these functions stand alone. There are multiple ways of the heavenly throne of Yahweh Zebaoth which are interrelated and supplementing each other depending on respective contexts.

To be certain, the latter two areas contribute to the main thrust of the present study: on the basis that Haggai is the prophetic messenger sent by Yahweh Zebaoth (Hag. 1:13), Zechariah is sent analogously (Zech. 2:12, 13, 15; 4:9; 6:15) and Malachi is literally “my messenger”, the themes in the three books Haggai, Zechariah 1-8 and Malachi develop coherently under *יהוה צבאות*.⁷

¹ “Zebaoth”, 347-62.

² Mettinger has demonstrated how one usage of the noun *zb'* corresponds closely with the basic connotations of the divine designation *צבאות* *יהוה*, and also studied the occurrence of this divine designation in passages in which the divine council plays a role. (Mettinger, T. N. D., “YHWH SABAOTH –The Heavenly King on the Cherubim Throne” in Ishida, T. [ed.], *Studies in the period of David and Solomon* [Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1982], 109-38).

³ See discussion on visions in Zech. 1-8 in Ch. II. B. 2. a. iii. α. 1). b).

⁴ Manifested particularly in vv. 3, 6-7, and 8ff. (more analysis in Hartenstein, F., *Die Unzugänglichkeit Gottes im Heiligtum*. WMANT 75 [Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997], 30ff.). See discussion on Haggai in Ch. I. B. 3. C. ii. α., β., and γ.

⁵ See discussion on Haggai in Ch. I. B. 3. C. ii. δ.

⁶ See Haggai in Ch. I. B. 3. C. i. α., and β.; and visions in Zech. 1-8 in Ch. II. B. 2. a. iii. α. 2).

⁷ Cf. The sheer attention paid to this corpus without casting focus on Jerusalem tradition in the study on messengers of God in previous researches in Röttger, H., *Malak Jahwe-Bote von Gott*. RSTh 13 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1978); Guggisberg, F., *Die Gestalt des Mal'ak Jahwe im Alten Testament* (Lyss: Dach, 1979).

Context

The distribution in Table 2 above has shown that יהוה צבאות is absent in some books while its occurrence is significantly frequent in others. Its use in different contexts has been denoted by scholars. In this regard, the meaning of יהוה צבאות during the early period and at Shiloh, in the Jerusalem cult, in narrative literature and Judean prophecy has been explored by Zobel. In addition, the widely recognized studies of Mettinger who comprehensively examines יהוה צבאות throughout the Hebrew Bible render that the texts pertaining to the use of יהוה צבאות to depict the Zion-Zebaoth theology which is to be distinguished from the later Name and Kabod theologies. In doing so, respective backgrounds have been investigated, namely Jerusalem cult tradition (God present in his temple and as king), Deuteronomistic theology in the Deuteronomistic Historical Work¹ and priestly tradition in priestly materials of the Pentateuch and Ezekiel². The latter two theologies “which arouse to replace the Zion-Sabaoth theology as the fundamental statement of Israel’s beliefs were derived from the theology of the Temple. The dethronement of the YHWH *seba’ot* designation from its place in Temple tradition, and its replacement by *sem* and *kabod*, surely represent a victory for terms stemming from the same Temple tradition.... The ‘dethronement of Sabaoth’ was, however, only temporary. After the Exile the circle closes in full with the advent of the prophet Zechariah and his vigorous proclamation that the Lord is on the verge of returning to Zion. And so – as a matter of course – the classical Sabaoth designation again becomes the paramount term for the *Deus Praesens*.”³

In light of this, a serious investigation of the use of יהוה צבאות in not only Zechariah but also Haggai and Malachi sounds not only worthwhile but also compelling in order to probe into the associated restitution of the temple tradition: if יהוה צבאות would have been temporarily dethroned, he has been re-throned in the post exilic time.

II. יהוה צבאות in the books of Haggai, Zech. 1-8 and Malachi

A. Setting the aim

Against the background of scholarly discussion on the books of Haggai, Zechariah 1-8, and Malachi, the present work aims to analyze the significance of the highly recurring expression יהוה צבאות by means of traditio-historical and religio-historical critical methods (with some compositional aspects). In fact, the expression יהוה צבאות amounting to 82 times should have caught even much more attention than מלאך which happens 23 times. To be sure, the latter cannot be evaluated apart from the former.

The Zebaoth theology put forward earlier by Mettinger has already indicated its tight connection with the traditional temple tradition.⁴

¹ See Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 38ff..

² See Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 80ff..

³ *Dethronement*, 134.

⁴ Analogous to the work accomplished by Mettinger to depict Zion Zebaoth theology in

Surprisingly, a serious investigation of the expression in the most frequently occurring corpus (Haggai, Zechariah 1-8, and Malachi) which is also undoubtedly rooted in the temple tradition has not been carried out.

In order to look into the meaning of יהוה צבאות in Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, its particular context in the text must be carefully examined. Results from earlier research have already demonstrated certain significant themes recurring in these books to link them as a corpus. Apart from working with socio-economic aspects,¹ those discussed repeated themes are worth to be briefly reviewed. For example, the “allusions to other texts” listed by Redditt under “redactional devices within Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi” do not appear to be convincing in arguing for redactors to have worked on the three books as the last part of the Book of the Twelve because on the one hand, allusions or associations with other texts happen not only in these three books, while on the other hand, whether the three books present a systematic way of allusions or alluding to certain texts has not been explicated.² It would also be surprising to find that the restoration is a theme given an emphasis prior to the temple (among the other seven themes) which Redditt has given comparatively limited attention.

Therefore, the current work attempts to probe into four areas:

1. what prominent themes in Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi are associated with יהוה צבאות;
2. how they may be more systematically presented and related to each other under יהוה צבאות;
3. what the concept of God is among the early post-exilic audience in these three books;
4. the messenger theme illuminating the concept of God Yahweh Zebaoth against the background of the divine heavenly council: the messengers of Yahweh Zebaoth partaking in the divine council fulfill the divine commands, mostly by means of spreading out the messages of Yahweh Zebaoth from his inner throne room to the outer realm so as to manifest the divine will.

B. Overview of the work

The portions of each book with the occurrence of יהוה צבאות will be mostly translated. Analyses on structure with the particular focus on יהוה צבאות will follow. The significance of יהוה צבאות will finally be investigated. The results of different sections of each book will be summed up at the end of each main chapter.

The entire book of Haggai will be divided into three parts for analysis in Chap. I. The people have been solemnly exhorted to return to יהוה צבאות to rebuild the temple with regard to their deficient living condition by the prophet and messenger Haggai (1:1-15). Encouragement is directed to the community

contrast to Shem and Kabod theologies, the occurrences of יהוה צבאות is not to be rigidly compared with the occurrences of יהוה: the same concept of God is persistent throughout the corpus. Cf. Mettinger, *Dethronement*.

¹ Cf. fn. 6 and 7 in 9.

² Fn. 1 in 10.

in the course of their rebuilding work (2:1-5) with a view to the glorious future upon Yahweh Zebaoth's shaking heaven and earth (2:6-9, 20-23). A reversal to sufficiency in life with agricultural fertility is immediately anticipated in the day of temple foundation (2:10-19) which marks the (preliminary) obedience of the community paid to Yahweh Zebaoth in response to the call from Haggai as the prophet and messenger. The real life situation of the people is totally dependent on Yahweh Zebaoth who is in control of the weather condition.

The division of Zech. 1-8 is so complicated that scholars hold contrasting opinions.¹ In the vision cycle, the assurance of the return of Yahweh Zebaoth to his temple in Jerusalem/Zion provides strong hope for restoration and restitution of the community, while the activities of different messengers manifest Yahweh Zebaoth as the sender and the Lord of the (heaven and) whole earth which is ruled by him in his throne room in the temple (vision 4 as the central vision). Owing to the benevolent act of Yahweh Zebaoth who returns to dwell in his temple, the people are set free from exile and should return to Jerusalem (2:10-17). The frame at the beginning and the end of the vision recalls the disobedience of the former generations resulting in the punishment (exile) presented in a way resonating that depicted in Haggai, while Zech. 8 recaptures the previous main points to give strong hope for future and calls for instant acts in association with asserting again the current perspective in terms of fruitful life situation resulting from agricultural fertility since temple foundation (portrayed in Haggai). Therefore, Zech. 1-8 has comprised the key motifs in Haggai but obedience (with reference to former generations) has to be practiced (from now on) in the long run (not a one-off incidence of temple rebuilding). The sending of the prophet Zechariah (like Haggai) has been emphasized four times in the individual passages. Besides, the heavenly sending scene already traceable in Haggai can be more apparently expounded in Zech. 3.

Though the temple should presumably have been rebuilt, many similar themes in the previous two books are clearly detected again in Malachi. In the two major sections (1:6-2:9 and 2:17-3:23 which are translated), priests and people are exhorted to correct from the practices in cultic matter: they must make proper offerings and tithe to Yahweh Zebaoth in the temple. A reversal from poor to abundant life situation is again mentioned. Immediate corrective measures must be taken by the priests and the people so that a prominent future will start from then. That Yahweh Zebaoth is the great king is explicitly mentioned for the first time which resonates his identity as the Lord of the (heaven and) whole earth in visions in Zech. 1-8, while his providence of fertility by means of favourable weather condition recalls Haggai. Furthermore, the prophet Malachi, the priests and the forerunner messenger (3:1) are all messengers (מַלְאָךְ sing.) under the command of Yahweh Zebaoth in a way comparable to Haggai and Zechariah.

In summary, all the results will be assessed together so that answers to the three above stated aspects would be addressed.

¹ See Chap. II for detailed divisions. Besides, only visions 2, 3 and 6 without explicit rendering of יהוה צבאות are not translated.